

The Ancient & Modern Library
of
Theological Literature

Justin Martyr's Apology

11,1,23

LIBRARY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

PRINCETON. N. J.

PRESENTED BY

The Widow of George Dugan, '96

Division.....

Section.....

BR
65
.J83
A66
1889

THE FIRST APOLOGY

OF

JUSTIN MARTYR

1872

THE FIRST APOLOGY

OF

JUSTIN MARTYR,

ADDRESSED TO THE EMPEROR
ANTONINUS PIUS.

*PREFACED BY SOME ACCOUNT OF THE WRITINGS
AND OPINIONS OF JUSTIN MARTYR.*


BY JOHN KAYE,
FORMERLY LORD BISHOP OF LINCOLN.



LONDON
GRIFFITH FARRAN OKEDEN & WELSH
NEWBERY HOUSE, CHARING CROSS ROAD
AND SYDNEY

[The Rights of Translation and Reproduction are Reserved.]


EDITOR'S NOTE.



THE references in Bishop Kaye's Introduction are to the Paris Edition of Justin's Works, published in 1636. They have been collated afresh with a copy of that Edition in Sion College.

Where these references are followed by another in brackets, it should be understood that such bracketed reference is to the page in our own translation, which is that of William Reeves, published in 1717.

CONTENTS.



CHAP.	PAGE
I. ON THE WRITINGS OF JUSTIN MARTYR,	1
II. THE OPINIONS OF JUSTIN RESPECTING THE ΛΟΓΟΣ AND THE TRINITY,	33
III. JUSTIN'S OPINIONS RESPECTING ORIGINAL SIN, THE FREE- DOM OF THE WILL, GRACE, JUSTIFICATION, PREDESTI- NATION,	57
IV. JUSTIN'S OPINIONS RESPECTING BAPTISM AND THE EUCHA- RIST, WITH A PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO A PASSAGE IN THE FIRST APOLOGY,	63
V. THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL—THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY—THE MILLENNIUM—FUTURE JUDGMENT— ANGELS—DEMONS,	74
VI. THE CONDITION OF THE CHRISTIANS IN THE TIME OF JUSTIN, AND THE CAUSES OF THE RAPID DIFFUSION OF CHRISTIANITY,	83
VII. THE HERESIES MENTIONED BY JUSTIN—MISCELLANEOUS OBSERVATIONS,	92

CHAP.	PAGE
VIII. AN EXAMINATION OF THE QUESTION, WHETHER JUSTIN QUOTED THE GOSPELS WHICH WE NOW HAVE? . . .	97
IX. CONTAINING ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE PRECEDING CHAPTERS FROM THE WRITINGS OF TATIAN, ATHENAGORAS, AND THEOPHILUS OF ANTIOCH, WITH ADDITIONAL RE- MARKS,	112


*These pages contain the substance of part of a Course of Lectures,
delivered at Cambridge in the Lent Term of 1821.*

THE FIRST APOLOGY OF JUSTIN MARTYR, . . .	(1)
---	-----

SOME ACCOUNT OF THE WRITINGS

OF

JUSTIN MARTYR.



CHAPTER I.

ON THE WRITINGS OF JUSTIN MARTYR.

AMONG the Fathers, Justin Martyr is the earliest of whose works we possess any considerable remains. He marks the commencement of what may be termed the ecclesiastical, in contradistinction from the apostolic period. Hence the care with which his opinions have been examined, and the importance which has been attached to them. One party appeals to him as expressing the sentiments of the primitive Christians on some of the fundamental articles of our faith; while another regards him as having exerted a most fatal influence over the interests of religion, by introducing into the Church a confused medley of Christianity and Platonism, to the exclusion of the pure and simple truths of the gospel. The object of the present work is to enable the theological student to pronounce between these contradictory representations, by laying before him an accurate account of Justin's opinions.

It is not my intention to engage in the discussion of the

different hypotheses which have been framed respecting the chronology of Justin's life. The data are too few and too uncertain to justify us in coming to any decided conclusion. We know from himself¹ that he was born at Flavia Neapolis, in Samaria, of Gentile parents;² and we are told by Eusebius,³ who refers to Tatian, Justin's scholar, that he suffered martyrdom at Rome, in the reign of Marcus Antoninus.⁴ One important circumstance, from its connexion with the history of his opinions, is that he had carefully studied the tenets of the different philosophical sects;⁵ having successively attached himself to the Stoics, the Peripatetics, the Pythagoreans, and the Platonists. To the last he manifestly gave the preference; but, not deriving from any of them the entire satisfaction which he had expected, he was induced to examine and, having examined, to embrace Christianity; finding it, as he himself states, the only sound and useful philosophy.⁶ He appears, however, after his conversion, to have retained a

¹ *Apol.* i. *sub initio*. See also *Apol.* ii. p. 52 A; *Dial.* p. 349 C. Ed. Paris, 1636.

² "Did we not see Christians in greater number and of greater sincerity from among the Gentiles than from the Jews and Samaritans." *ἑαυτοὺς ἡμᾶς ὁρῶντες πλείονάς τε καὶ ἀληθεστέρους τοὺς ἐξ ἑθνῶν πᾶν ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίων καὶ Σαμαρείων Χριστιανούς (εἰδότες)*. *Apol.* i. p. 88 B (p. 65). See also *Dial.* pp. 226 A, 245 C, 348 C, 531 D.

³ *Eccl. Hist.* l. iv. c. 16. Tatian, *Oratio ad Gracos*, p. 157 D. Ed. Paris, 1636.

⁴ See also Jerome in *Catalogo*. Dodwell, *Diss.* iii. in *Irenæum*, § 19, *Diss.* iv. § 34, supposes him to have suffered martyrdom in the year 149, at the age of thirty; this inference he draws from an account, manifestly erroneous, given by Epiphanius, *Hæc.* 26 or 46.

⁵ See the commencement of the *Dialogue with Trypho*; and with respect to the Platonists, *Apol.* ii. p. 50 A.

⁶ *ταύτην μόνην εὕρισκον φιλοσοφίαν ἀσφαλῆ τε καὶ σύμφορον*, p. 225 C. Justin gives an interesting account of the manner in which he was induced to study the Prophetic Writings, by the arguments of an aged man, whom he accidentally met on the sea-shore, p. 219 E, and to whom he appears to allude, p. 241 B. "I will preach the Divine Word which I heard from that man." *κηρύξω ἐγὼ θεῖον λόγον, ὃν παρ' ἐκείνου ἤκουσα τοῦ ἀνδρός*.

fondness for his former pursuits, which he evinced by continuing to wear the philosophic habit.¹

Of the works printed in the Paris edition, it is now generally admitted that the *Confutation of Certain Tenets of Aristotle*, the *Christian Questions to the Greeks*, the *Greek Questions to the Christians*, the *Answers to the Orthodox*, the *Exposition of the True Faith respecting the Trinity*, the *Epistle to Diognetus*, and the *Epistle to Zenas and Serenus*, were not composed by Justin. The following circumstances induce me also to entertain doubts respecting the genuineness of the *Hortatory Address to the Greeks*. In p. 20 B,² where the author is endeavouring to show that Plato, having met with the writings of Moses in Egypt, had embraced the doctrine of the divine unity, but was deterred from openly declaring his sentiments by dread of encountering the same fate which befell Socrates, he mentions the appearance of God to Moses out of the burning bush, and speaks as if God had Himself appeared; whereas Justin, not only in his *Dialogue with Trypho*, where he might be supposed to hold a different language from that in which he addressed the Gentiles, but in his first *Apology*,³ maintains that it was Christ Who, on that

¹ *Dialog. cum Trypho*. p. 217 B, C.

² "Therefore God, knowing that the false belief of polytheism, like a disease, disturbs men's minds, and wishing to abolish and overthrow it, when He first appeared to Moses, said to him, 'I am that I am.' For it behoved, I think, the future prince and leader of the Hebrew people first of all to know the living God. Wherefore appearing to him first, since indeed it was possible for God to appear to man, He said to him, 'I am that I am.'" εἰδὼς τοίνυν ὁ Θεὸς τὴν τῆς πολυθεΐτης μὴ ἀληθῆ δόξαν ὡσπερ τινὰ νόσον τῇ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἰνοχλοῦσαν ψυχῇ, ἀνελθὼν καὶ ἀνατρέψαι βουλόμενος, πρῶτον μὲν τῷ Μωσῇ φανεῖς, ἔφη πρὸς αὐτὸν, ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὢν. ἔδει γὰρ, οἶμαι, τὸν ἀρχοντα καὶ στρατηγὸν τοῦ τῶν Ἑβραίων γένους ἴσισται μέλλοντα πρῶτον ἀπάντων τὸν ὄντα γινώσκειν Θεόν. διὸ καὶ τοῦτω πρώτῳ φανεῖς, ὡς ἦν δυνατὸν ἀνθρώπῳ φυνῆναι Θεόν, ἔφη πρὸς αὐτὸν, ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὢν.

³ P. 96 B. (p. 80.)

occasion, appeared to Moses. The account also of the origin of polytheism, which is given in p. 19 D, does not correspond with the statement in the second *Apology*. In the former passage,¹ we are told that the serpent, when he assured our first parents that if they ate of the fruit of the tree of knowledge they should be as gods, impressed them with the persuasion that there were other gods besides the Creator of heaven and earth; and that they, retaining this persuasion after their expulsion from Paradise, transmitted it to their posterity. But in the latter passage² the statement is, that the angels, to whom God had committed the superintendence of this lower world, transgressing His commands, became connected with women; and that from this intercourse sprang demons, who were the authors of idolatry and polytheism. The accounts of the Septuagint translation in p. 13 D, and in the first *Apology*, p. 72 C (p. 39), do not appear to me to have proceeded from the same pen; and in p. 21 C,³ the author of

¹ See also pp. 34 C, 36 C. In p. 32 B, the author says that the heathen were induced to represent their gods under human forms, by the statement in the Book of Genesis, that God made man in His own likeness after His image, from which they inferred that man is in form like unto God. "The book of Moses saying of the appearance of God, 'Let us make man in our image,'" etc. τῆς γὰρ Μωσέως ἱστορίας ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ Θεοῦ λεγούσης, ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα κ. τ. ἔ. See also p. 36 C. Compare this with the mode in which the same text is applied in the *Dialogue with Trypho*, p. 285 A. In the fragment of the *Tract on the Resurrection*, ascribed to Justin, the author applies this text to the fleshly man. "For does not the Word say, 'Let us make man in our own image, and after our likeness?' What? He clearly refers to the carnal man." ἧ γὰρ οὐ φησὶν ὁ λόγος ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν, καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν; ποῖον; δηλονότι σαρκικὸν λέγει ἄνθρωπον. Grabe, *Spicil.* t. ii. p. 187.

² P. 44 A. Compare *Apol.* i. pp. 55 E (7), 67 D (30), 69 C (33).

³ "There is a great difference between these according to the opinion of Plato himself. For the maker produces that which he makes, without the need of anything else; but the creator constructs his work, having received the power of workmanship from his material." καίτοι πολλῆς διαφορᾶς ἐν τούτοις οὔσης, κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ Πλάτωνος ὁξάν. ὁ μὲν γὰρ ποιητῆς, οὐδενὸς ἰτέρου προσδιόμενος, ἐκ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ δυνάμεως καὶ ἔξουσίας ποιεῖ τὸ ποιοῦμενον

the *Hortatory Address* makes after Plato a distinction between ποιητης, "Maker," and δημιουργος, "Creator"—words which Justin uses indiscriminately.¹ To evade the inference drawn from these discrepancies, it may be said that Bishop Bull (*Def. Fid. Nic.* sec. iii. chap. 2) has pointed out a coincidence of sentiment in this work and in the second *Apology*. The author of the former says of Plato, that "having heard in Egypt that God, when He sent Moses to the Hebrews, said, 'I am that I am,' he (Plato) knew that God had not declared His proper name; since no proper name can be assigned to God. For names are given for the purpose of describing and distinguishing things, inasmuch as they are many and various. But no one existed before God who could give Him a name; nor did He deem it right to give Himself a name, inasmuch as He is one and alone; as He Himself testifies through His prophets, saying, 'I God am the first, and I am the last, and beside me is no other God' (Isa. xlv. 6). On this account, therefore, as I said before, God, when He sent Moses to the Hebrews, did not mention any name; but mystically declared Himself to be the one and only God, by means of a participle, ἐγὼ γάρ φησιν εἰμι ὁ ὢν, 'I, He said, am He that liveth.'"² With this passage Bull

ὁ δὲ δημιουργός, τὴν τῆς δημιουργίας δύναμιν ἐκ τῆς ὕλης εἰληφώς, κατασκευάζει τὸ γιγνόμενον.

¹ Thus *Apol.* i. p. 57 A (p. 10), "With God the Father and Creator of all things." μετὰ Θεοῦ τοῦ πάντων πατὴρ καὶ δημιουργῶ. And p. 66 C (p. 28), "God the Creator of the universe." τὸν πάντων ποιητὴν Θεόν. See also pp. 60 C (16), 66 E (29), 70 A, B (35), 92 A (71).

² ἀκηκοὼς γὰρ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ τὸν Θεὸν τῷ Μωσῇ εἰρηκέναι, ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ὢν, ὁπηνίκα πρὸς τοὺς Ἑβραίους αὐτὸν ἀποστέλλειν ἔμελλεν, ἔγνω ὅτι οὐ κύριον ὄνομα ἑαυτοῦ ὁ Θεὸς πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔφη. οὐδὲν γὰρ ὄνομα ἐπὶ Θεοῦ κυριολογεῖσθαι δυνατὸν. τὰ γὰρ ὀνόματα εἰς δήλωσιν καὶ διάγνωσιν τῶν ὑποκειμένων κείται πραγμάτων, πολλῶν καὶ διάφορων ὄντων. Θεῶν δὲ οὔτε ὁ τιθεὶς ὄνομα προὔπηρχεν, οὔτε αὐτὸς ἑαυτὸν ὀνομάζειν ᾗθήν δεῖν, εἰς καὶ μόνος ὑπάρχων, ὡς αὐτὸς διὰ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ προφητῶν μαρτυρεῖ λέγων, ἐγὼ καὶ μόνος ὁ Θεὸς πρῶτος καὶ ἐγὼ μετὰ ταῦτα, καὶ πλὴν ἑμοῦ Θεὸς ἕτερος οὐκ ἔστι. διὰ τοῦτο τοῖνον, ὡς καὶ πρότερον ἔφη οὐδὲ ὀνοματὸς τινος ὁ Θεὸς ἀποστέλλων πρὸς τοὺς Ἑβραίους τὸν Μωσῆα μέμνηται, ἀλλὰ διὰ τινος μεταχρῆς εἶνα καὶ μόνον Θεὸν ἑαυτὸν εἶναι μυστικῶς διδάσκει, ἐγὼ γάρ, φησίν, εἰμι ὁ ὢν. P. 19 B.

compares one in the second *Apology*,¹ to which reference will hereafter be made, and which is as follows: "But no name has been given to the Father of all things, inasmuch as He is unbegotten; for by whatever name any one is called, he must be posterior to him who gave the name; and Father, God, Creator, Lord, Master are not names, but appellations given from His benefits and works. But His Son, who alone is properly called Son, the Word, Who was with Him before the creation, and begotten when in the beginning He created and adorned all things by Him, is called Christ, because He was anointed, and because God adorned all things by Him; a name which also contains in itself an unknown signification; like as the appellation 'God' is not a name, but the notion of an ineffable thing implanted in the nature of men." Between these passages there is undoubtedly one point of coincidence; in both it is said that no name could be given to God, because no one existed before God to give the name. But here the coincidence ends. We have already observed the discrepancy respecting the Divine Person who appeared to Moses. We may add that the word *κυριολογεῖσθαι*, "to give God a name," are used in the former passage in a sense totally different from that in which Justin uses it in the *Dialogue with Trypho*,² where it

¹ ὄνομα δὲ τῷ πάντων πατρὶ θετὸν, ἀγεννήτων ὄντι, οὐκ ἔστιν. ᾧ γὰρ ἂν καὶ ὀνόματι (ἰ. ὀνόματί τις) προσαγορεύηται, πρεσβύτερον ἔχει τὸν θέμενον τὸ ὄνομα. τὸ δὲ Πατὴρ, καὶ Θεὸς, καὶ Κτίστης, καὶ Κύριος, καὶ Δεσπότης, οὐκ ὀνόματά ἐστιν, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν εὐποιῶν καὶ τῶν ἔργων προσήσεις. ὁ δὲ υἱὸς ἐκείνου, ὁ μόνος λεγόμενος κυρίως υἱὸς, ὁ λόγος πρὸ τῶν ποιημάτων καὶ συνῶν καὶ γεννάμενος, ὅτε τὴν ἀρχὴν δι' αὐτοῦ πάντα ἔκτισε καὶ ἐκόσμησε, Χριστὸς μὲν, κατὰ τὸ κεχρίσθαι καὶ κοσμηῆσαι τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ τὸν Θεόν, λέγεται, ὄνομα καὶ αὐτὸ περιέχον ἄγνωστον σημασιαν. ὃν τρόπον καὶ τὸ Θεὸς προσαγόρευμα οὐκ ὀνομά ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ πράγματος δυσεξηγήτου ἔμφυτος τῇ φύσει τῶν ἀνθρώπων δόξα. P. 44 D. Compare *Apol.* i. pp. 58 B (12), 94 D (16).

² P. 277 B. "That besides the All-wise Father of the universe, another is called Lord by the Holy Spirit." ὅτι καὶ παρὰ τὸν νοούμενον ποιητὴν τῶν ὅλων ἄλλος τις κυριολογεῖται ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος. Compare also the use of the word *θειολογεῖν* in the *Hortatory Address*, p. 20 E, where it signifies

signifies to apply the title "Lord" to Christ. These circumstances, though minute, appear to me to confirm the suspicions respecting the spuriousness of the work which Dupin¹ seems to have formed from the difference between the style and that of Justin's acknowledged writings. I shall, therefore, in the following pages, confine my references to the two *Apologies* and to the *Dialogue with Trypho*; the fragment of the *Treatise on Monarchy*, and the *Address to the Greeks*, whether genuine or not, affording nothing which can assist me in the prosecution of my present design.

The first *Apology*, which stands second in the Paris edition, was addressed to Antoninus Pius, Marcus Antoninus, Lucius Verus, the Senate and the people of Rome. Authors differ respecting the date. Justin, in the course of the work, speaks of Christ as having been born one hundred and fifty years before,² evidently using round numbers. There are allusions to the death and deification of Antinous,³ as to events which had recently occurred; as well as to the revolt of Barchochebas⁴ and the decree of Adrian,⁵ by which the Jews were forbidden to set foot in Jerusalem under pain of death. These notices, however, will not assist us in determining the precise year in

to discourse on divine things, to play the theologian, and in the *Dialogue with Trypho*, p. 277 C, where it signifies to apply the title θεός to Christ, εἰ οὐκ καὶ ἄλλον τινὰ θεολογεῖν καὶ κυριολογεῖν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον φατὶ ὑμῶν. It is used, however, in the former sense, p. 340 B. "You learn by discoursing on divine things why at first an A was added to the name Abram." ἀλλὰ διὰ τί μὲν ἐν ἄλφα πρώτῳ προσετίθη τῷ Ἀβραάμ ὄνομα θεολογεῖς.

¹ *Bibliothèque*, tom. i. p. 58. Casimir Oudin also expressed doubts respecting the genuineness of the work, *De Script. Eccl.* tom. i. p. 187. His arguments are stated by the Benedictine editors in their preface, where the reader will also find their reasons for believing the work to be the same as that mentioned by Eusebius under the title of ἰλιγγισοί, "refutation."

² P. 83 B (56). ³ P. 72 A (38). ⁴ P. 72 E (39). ⁵ P. 84 B (59).

which the treatise was composed. Dodwell¹ supposed it to have been written in the very commencement of the reign of Antoninus Pius, before Marcus Antoninus received the appellation of Cæsar, because he is not designated by that title in the introduction; but many critics, among them the Benedictine editors, place it as late as 150. The treatise itself highly deserves our attention, as the earliest specimen which has reached our times of the mode in which the Christians defended the cause of their religion. It is not remarkable for the lucid arrangement of the materials of which it is composed; its contents, however, may be reduced to the following heads:—I. Appeals to the justice of the ruling powers, and expostulations with them on the unfairness of the proceedings against the Christians, who were condemned without any previous investigation into their lives or opinions, merely because they were Christians; and were denied the liberty, allowed to all the other subjects of the Roman Empire, of worshipping the God whom they themselves preferred.² II. Refutations of the charges of atheism, immorality, disaffection towards the Emperor, which were brought against the Christians.³ These charges Justin refutes by appealing to the purity of the gospel precepts, and to the amelioration produced in the conduct of those who embraced Christianity; and by

¹ *Diss.* iii. in *Irenæum*, § 14. See the Prolegomena to the *Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum*, Venice 1775, tom. i. c. 17, § 1.

Sub in. 54 D (4), 56 E (9), 68 D (32). Justin plays upon the words *Χριστός* (Christ) and *χρηστός* (good), p. 55 A (5). He contends that the evil lives of some professing themselves Christians ought not to be urged as an argument against Christianity itself, inasmuch as the same argument might be urged with still greater force against philosophy, 55 B (6), 56 C (9).

³ Pp. 56 B (8), 70 B (36), 58 E (13), 59 A (14), 60 C (16), 61 B (18), 64 C (25), 78 B (47); *Apol.* ii. p. 51 B. In the second passage Justin seems to insinuate that the charges of gross sensuality and cruelty, which were falsely alleged against the orthodox, might possibly be truly alleged against the heretics. See Dodwell, *Diss. in Iren.* iv. § 26.

stating that the kingdom to which Christians looked forward was not of this world, but a heavenly kingdom. III. Direct arguments in proof of the truth of Christianity, drawn from miracles and prophecy. With respect to the former, Justin principally occupies himself in refuting the objection that the miracles of Christ were performed by magical arts.¹ With respect to the latter, he states in forcible terms the general nature of the argument from prophecy,² and shows the accomplishment of many particular prophecies³ in the person of Jesus: inferring, from their accomplishment, the reasonableness of entertaining a firm persuasion that the prophecies yet unfulfilled—that, for instance, respecting Christ's second advent—will in due time be accomplished.⁴ IV. Justin does not confine himself to defending Christianity, but occasionally becomes the assailant, and exposes with success the absurdities of the Gentile polytheism and idolatry.⁵ In further confirmation of the innocuous, or rather beneficial character of Christianity, Justin⁶ concludes the treatise with a description

¹ P. 72 A (38).

² P. 88 A (65): "For what motive could ever possibly have persuaded us to believe a crucified man to be the first begotten of the unbegotten God, and that He should come to be the Judge of all the world, had we not met with those prophetic testimonies of Him proclaimed so long before His incarnation, and were we not eye-witnesses to the fulfilment of them?"

τίνοι γὰρ ἂν λόγῳ ἀνθρώπῳ σταυραθέντι ἐπιθόμεθα, ὅτι πρωτότοκος τῷ ἁγιότητι Θεῷ ἴσται, καὶ αὐτὸς τὴν κρίσιν τοῦ παντὸς ἀνθρωπίου γένους ποιήσεται, εἰ μὴ μαρτύρια, πρὶν ἢ ἰλθεῖν αὐτὸν ἄνθρωπον γινόμενον, κεκηρυγμένα περὶ αὐτοῦ εὔρομεν; κ. τ. εἰ. See pp. 60 A (16), 72 B (38), and some remarks on the interpretation of prophecy, 76 D (45), *Dial. cum Tryph.* p. 341 C.

³ Among the prophecies specified are Gen. xlix., Ps. i. iii. xix. xxii. xxvi. cx., Isa. i. ii. vii. ix. xi. xxxv. l. liii. lxiv. lxx., Micah v., Zech. ix. See from p. 73 to p. 87 (40-65).

⁴ P. 87 A (62).

⁵ P. 57 C (11), where Justin speaks of the immoral lives of the artisans who were employed in making idols. 58 A (12), 67 A (29). In p. 93 D (73), Justin observes that the most unlearned Christians were well instructed in the knowledge of divine things.

⁶ P. 93 D (73).

of the mode in which proselytes were admitted into the Church, of its other rites and customs, and of the habits and manner of life of the primitive Christians. At the end of this treatise, in the Paris edition, is found a rescript of Adrian in favour of the Christians, as translated by Eusebius¹ from the Latin. Justin alludes to such a document towards the conclusion of the *Apology*, and its genuineness is generally admitted. There is, moreover, an edict,² addressed by Antoninus Pius to the Common Council of Asia, respecting which doubts are entertained; and a letter of Marcus Antoninus to the Senate of Rome, ascribing his victory during the German War to the prayers of the Christian soldiers in his army. This letter is manifestly spurious.

According to Eusebius,³ the second *Apology* was presented to Marcus Antoninus; but Pearson, and after him Thirlby, thought that it was addressed, as well as the former, to Antoninus Pius, relying on the passage in p. 43 B: "You do not think it fitting for a pious Emperor, nor for the son of a philosophic Cæsar, nor for a sacred Senate." In the title it is said to be addressed to the Roman Senate; in the beginning of the treatise, as it at present stands, we find the words "O Romans," and, subsequently, the expressions, "It is manifest to you," "I wish to know you."⁴ But we also find, "To thee, O Emperor,"⁵ from which we might be induced to suppose that it was addressed to the Emperor. It has been inferred, from the expectation expressed by Justin, p. 46 E, that he

¹ *Eccles. Hist.* l. iv. c. 9.

² See Lardner's *Heathen Testimonies*, c. 14. He defends its genuineness.

³ L. iv. c. 16. See the Note of Valesius on c. 17, and the Prolegomena to the *Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum*, tom. i. c. 17, § 3. We find in p. 46 C the expression, Μουσωνίου δὲ ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἡμᾶς, "Musonius, who was among those who belonged to us," but it affords no clue to the date.

⁴ P. 47 C, B.

⁵ P. 42 C. See also p. 47 B, βασιλικὸν δ' ἂν καὶ τοῦτο ἔργον εἴη, "and this also may be a kingly work."

should become the victim of the artifices and calumnies of the philosopher Crescens, that he composed this treatise not long before his martyrdom. This is the statement of Eusebius, l. iv. c. 16. Lardner supposes that the beginning is lost; and it appears to be in other respects imperfect.¹ It was occasioned by the punishment inflicted on three persons at Rome, whom Urbicus, the prefect of the city, had put to death merely because they were Christians. After exposing the gross injustice of this proceeding, Justin replies to two objections which the enemies of the gospel were accustomed to urge. The first was, "Why, if the Christians were certain of being received into heaven, they did not destroy themselves, and save the Roman governors the trouble of putting them to death?"² Justin's answer is, that if they were so to act they would contravene the designs of God, by diminishing the number of believers, preventing the diffusion of true religion, and, as far as depended upon them, extinguishing the human race. The second objection was, "Why, if they were regarded by God with an eye of favour, He suffered them to be exposed to injury and oppression?"³ Justin replies, that the persecutions with which they then were, and with which many virtuous men among the heathens had before been visited, originated in the malignant artifices of demons, the offspring of the apostate angels, who were permitted to exercise their power until the designs of the Almighty were finally accomplished. Another objection,⁴ of a different kind, appears to have been urged against the Christians: that in exhorting men to live virtuously,

¹ The words *προέφημεν, ὡς προέφημεν*, "we have said before," "as we have said before," occur pp. 43 D, 45 A, 46 C, 47 E. Pearson supposes the references to be to the first *Apology*, pp. 58 B (12), 96 A (80) (perhaps rather to 68 C (31) or 75 A (43)), 83 C (56), 71 C (37).

² P. 43 C.

³ P. 43 E.

⁴ P. 47 D. Some appear also to have urged the different notions of right and wrong entertained by different nations, in confirmation of the belief that all actions are indifferent, and that there will be neither rewards nor punishments after death, p. 48 A.

they insisted, not upon the beauty of virtue, but upon the eternal rewards and punishments which await the virtuous and wicked. Justin replies that these are topics on which every believer in the existence of God must insist, since in that belief is involved the further belief that He will reward the good and punish the bad. With respect to direct arguments to prove the divine origin of Christianity,¹ that which Justin principally urges is drawn from the fact that no man ever consented to die in attestation of the truth of any philosophical tenets; whereas men, even from the lowest ranks of life, braved danger and death in the cause of the gospel. Towards the conclusion of the tract,² Justin states that he was himself induced to embrace Christianity by observing the courage and constancy with which its professors encountered all the terrors of persecution.

The *Dialogue with Trypho* was posterior to the first *Apology*, to which it contains a reference;³ but with respect to the precise date, there is the same difference of opinion among the critics as in the case of the other treatises. Trypho says of himself⁴ that he resided principally at Corinth, having been obliged to quit Judæa by the war which had just taken place; in which passage he is usually supposed to allude to the revolt of Barchochebas; though Dodwell⁵

¹ P. 48 E. Compare *Dict.* p. 350 A.

² P. 50 A. Compare Tertullian's *Apology*, *sub fin.*

³ P. 349 C: "For I had no regard for any of my people (I speak of the Samaritans), when I compelled Cæsar by writing; I spoke to lead those into error who trust in Simon Magus of their race, whom they say is God above all rule and power and strength." οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους τοῦ ἐμοῦ, λέγω δὲ τῶν Σαμαρείων, τινὸς φροντίδα ποιούμενος, ἐγγράφως Καίσαρι προσομιλῶν, εἶπον πλανᾶσθαι αὐτοὺς πειθομένους τῷ ἐν τῷ γένει αὐτῶν μάγῳ Σίμωνι, ὃν Θεὸν ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἰξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως εἶναι λέγουσι. See *Apol.* i. p. 69 D (33). Compare also *Apol.* ii. p. 52 A.

⁴ P. 217 D. Compare p. 227 A.

⁵ *Diss. Iren.* iii. § 14, iv. § 42. See the *Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum*, tom. i. c. 17, § 2.

thinks that the allusion is to a revolt mentioned by Julius Capitolinus in his *Life of Antoninus Pius*.¹ Scaliger inferred, from the words, "The war that has just taken place," that the *Dialogue* was composed during the reign of Adrian. But even if we interpret the word $\nu\hat{\nu}\nu$ strictly, the fair inference is that the dialogue then took place, not that it was then committed to writing,² which was done some time afterwards for the information of Justin's friend, Marcus Pompeius.³ The revolt of Barchochebas, however, must have been finally suppressed before the dialogue took place, since there is a reference⁴ to the decree of Adrian, by which the Jews were prevented from going up to Jerusalem, and they are said no longer to have possessed the power of persecuting the Christians. The word $\nu\hat{\nu}\nu$ must consequently be interpreted with some degree of latitude. Some critics have suspected that Justin's Jew is a fictitious personage, or at least that no such dialogue actually took place; nor are there wanting circumstances which give countenance to the suspicion. The introduction looks like an imitation of the introductions to Plato's dialogues, and to the philosophical dialogues of Cicero. It is difficult also to conceive that Justin would have ventured in a real dialogue⁵ upon

¹ C. 5.

² Justin mentions in p. 306 D his intention of committing the conversation to writing, in order to convince the Jews that he really entertained the sentiments which he had expressed; and that he did not put them forth merely for the purpose of making converts of Trypho and his friends. From more than one passage it appears that Justin did not put down all that was actually said. See pp. 229 A, 278 B, 356 B, 357 E.

³ P. 371 B. Who this Marcus Pompeius was is unknown. Thirlby, not without reason, ridicules Grabe's conjecture that he was a bishop of Jerusalem.

⁴ P. 234 A, C.

⁵ I allude particularly to his derivation of the words Israel, p. 354 D, and Satan, p. 331 B. Jones, however, infers from the latter derivation that Justin was acquainted with the Syriac. On the Canon, Part I. c. 16, Thirlby contends that Justin was acquainted with the Hebrew, or rather that these derivations do not prove the contrary. Note on p. 331 B.

the interpretation of Hebrew words which sometimes occur; or if he had so ventured, that his opponents would have allowed them to pass uncontradicted. The suspicion, however, had never occurred to Eusebius,¹ who assigns Ephesus as the scene of the dialogue; and Le Nourry thinks that he discovers in the interruptions, digressions, etc., proofs of its reality. Whether it was real or not is immaterial to our purpose, which is only to ascertain what were Justin's opinions. If it was real, it occupied two days; on the latter of which some Jews were present, who did not hear the former day's disputation, and on whose account Justin repeats several arguments which he had before urged.² The part containing the end of the first and the beginning of the second day's disputation is lost, as is proved by the references,³ found in the

¹ *Hist. Eccl.* l. iv. c. 18. See p. 237 C.

² See pp. 304 A, 311 D, 320 B, 322 B, 346 D, 351 A, 352 E. The name of one of those who were present only on the second day was Mnaseas, p. 312 B.

³ See pp. 306 A, D, 333 A, 364 A. See, however, pp. 288 E, 291 D, and Grabe's remark, *Spicil.* tom. ii. p. 162. The Benedictine editors deny that there is anything wanting, and account for these appearances by saying that, as Justin wrote down his conversation with Trypho from memory, he sometimes forgot to insert passages to which he afterwards referred, supposing that he had inserted them.

It has been remarked to me that I was, in the former edition of this work, guilty of an omission in taking no notice of the doubt cast upon the genuineness of the *Dialogue with Trypho* by Wetstein, in the Prolegomena to his edition of the Greek Testament. I will now, therefore, supply that omission. Wetstein's words are—"Ego vero cuperem mihi eximi scrupulum de hujus Dialogi auctore ex diligenti ejus lectione injectum, nimirum, quod non utatur in Veteris Testamenti locis citandis Versione τῶν ὁ', sed magis accedat ad Origenis Editionem Hexaplaem; quum quæ Origenes obelis jugulavit omittat, quibusque asteriscos apposuit addat etiam: quum idem in Daniele aliâ Versione, nescio an Symmachi, utatur. Si Justinus mortuus est, antequam Symmachi atque Theodotionis Versio ederetur, et si integro sæculo præcessit Origenem, quomodo potuit istius opere uti? aut si non usus est, quomodo potuit accidere ut prorsus eadem verba iisdem in locis adderet vel demeret, ubi ille vel asteriscis quid vel obelis significaverit? Quare de hoc auctore quid statuendum sit, doctiores

latter part of the dialogue, to arguments and quotations which no longer appear.

viderint ; mihi rem compertam proposuisse sat est." In the eighth chapter of this work I have shown that Justin frequently quoted from memory. No inference, therefore, unfavourable to the genuineness of the *Dialogue*, could be drawn from the want of agreement between his quotations and the present text of the Septuagint version, even if that text accurately represented the text as it stood in his day. But that is not the case. It is admitted on all hands that we possess no *pure* copy of that version as it existed before the time of Origen. Although, therefore, Justin's quotations differ from the present text, they may have agreed with the text of the edition of the Septuagint version (ἡ κοινή) generally used in his time. The same remark applies to the Hexaplar edition, as corrected by Origen : we possess no *pure* copy of that edition, and cannot infer from the agreement of Justin's quotations with the present Hexaplar text that they agreed with that text as framed by Origen. On the supposition, then, that Wetstein's statements were correct, they would afford very slight ground for questioning the genuineness of the *Dialogue*, ascribed, as it is, expressly to Justin by Eusebius, and containing, as it does, many internal marks of genuineness.

But M. Krom, minister of the Church, and Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the College of Middleburgh, in a tract published in 1778 (for the use of which I am indebted to the kindness of Professor Jeremie of the East India College) denies the correctness of Wetstein's statements. He examines several of Justin's quotations, particularly a very long one from Isaiah lii., liii., liv., and shows that they agree in general with the present text of the Septuagint version, even in places in which it differs widely from the versions of Symmachus and Theodotion ; and that neither are the words marked with asterisks in the Hexaplar edition generally inserted, nor those marked with obeli omitted. Thus that which Wetstein denominates *res comperta* proves, on a more accurate examination, to be contrary to fact.

M. Krom, however, admits that Justin's quotations do occasionally differ from the present text of the Septuagint, and assigns several causes from which the difference may have arisen. Justin may have either quoted from memory, or, satisfied with representing the sense of the passage, may have been careless about the words ; or, as I have already suggested, the text of the Septuagint version which he used may have differed from the present text. One remarkable instance of such a difference occurs, p. 348 E, where Justin affirms that in the Greek version used by the Jews, the reading of Gen. xlix. 10 was ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῶν, "until

The remark which was made upon the first *Apology* applies equally to this work: it is not perspicuously written, and we have difficulty in discovering the train of the author's reasoning. After an introduction,¹ in which Justin gives an account of the manner of his conversion to Christianity, and earnestly exhorts

that which is in store (Shiloh) come," whereas the reading of the Septuagint was ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ ᾧ ἀπόκειται, "until that which is in store for him shall come." In our present text, however, the reading is not ᾧ ἀπόκειται, but τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ. The passage is twice quoted in the first *Apology*, and in both instances the reading is ὁ (manifestly an error of the transcriber) ἀπόκειται. Another consideration which ought to render us diffident in drawing conclusions from Justin's quotations is, that in his writings, as well as in those of the other Fathers, the transcribers appear frequently to have corrected his quotations by the text of the Septuagint version which they used. This circumstance will account for the instances in which words marked with asterisks in the Hexaplar edition are inserted, or words marked with obeli omitted.

With respect to Justin's quotations from Daniel, if (as we suppose) he quoted the edition of the Septuagint then generally used, his quotations could not but differ from our present text, which is not the text of the Septuagint, but of Theodotus. M. Krom, however, denies the existence of that close resemblance between Justin's quotations and the version of Symmachus, which Wetstein professes to have found; and states that they approach more nearly to the readings of the version which was published, under the title *Daniel secundum Septuaginta ex Tetraplis Origenis*, from the Codex Chisianus. Justin more than once refers to a Greek version used by the Jews, pp. 353 C, 360 C, 367 A, and supposed by some to be the Version of Aquila. In some instances he probably adopted its readings: Symmachus, in framing his version, may have done the same; and we may thus account for any occasional agreement which may be found between Justin's quotations and the version of Symmachus. The conclusion, therefore, at which we arrive is, that Wetstein's statements are incorrect; and that, even if they were correct, they would furnish very slight grounds for questioning the genuineness of the *Dialogue with Trypho*.

Wetstein appears, on nearly similar grounds, to have cast doubts on the genuineness of nearly the whole of Philo's works. He was answered by Wesseling in an *Epistle to Herman Venema de Aquile in scriptis Philonis Judæi fragmentis*, published in 1748, which has not fallen in my way.

The editor of the *Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum* has also examined Wetstein's objections in his Prolegomena.

¹ From the beginning to p. 225 D.

Trypho to follow his example, Trypho replies to the exhortation by saying that Justin would have acted more wisely in adhering to any one of the philosophical sects to which he had formerly been attached, than in leaving God, and placing all his reliance upon a man.¹ In the former case, if he lived virtuously, he might hope to obtain salvation; in the latter, he could have no hope. His only safe course, therefore, was to be circumcised, and comply with the other requisitions of the Mosaic law. Justin answers that the Christians had not deserted God, though they no longer observed the ceremonial law.² They worshipped the God who brought the forefathers of the Jews out of the land of Egypt, and gave the law, but who had plainly declared by the prophets that He should give a new law—a law appointing a new mode of purification from sin by the baptism of repentance and of the knowledge of God³—and requiring a spiritual, not a carnal circumcision.⁴ The ceremonial law⁵ was in truth given to the Jews on account of the hardness of their hearts as a mark of God's displeasure at their apostasy when they made the golden calf

¹ P. 225 D. Trypho admits that he did not believe the horrible charges brought against the Christians; and says that the morality of the gospel was of a character so sublime that no man could live up to it, p. 227 B.

² P. 227 E. One objection urged against the Christians was, that they drank hot drinks on the Sabbath. See Thirlby's Note, p. 246 E.

³ P. 229 D. See pp. 251 C, 287 C, 292 B, 351 B.

⁴ Pp. 229 C, 233 D, 235 E, 236 C, 245 D, 261 D, 341 A, 342 A, 366 D. Justin states that one design of the rite of circumcision was to distinguish the Jews from other people, particularly in the latter times, when they were to suffer the punishment decreed against them for crucifying the Messiah, pp. 234 A, 236 B, 238 A, where he quotes Ezek. xx. 19, p. 366 E. Christians had the true circumcision, that of the heart, p. 320 A. The Jews affixed a carnal meaning to all the ordinances of the law, p. 231 D.

⁵ Pp. 235 E, 237 A, 244 C, E, 263 E, 265 B, 291 D. In p. 247 A, Justin seems to contend that the reasonableness of the ceremonial law can only be maintained on this supposition. In p. 263 A, he says that

in Horeb. All its ordinances, its sacrifices, its Sabbath, the prohibition of certain kinds of foods, were designed to counteract the inveterate tendency of the Jews to fall into idolatry.¹ If, says Justin, we contend that the ceremonial law is of universal and perpetual obligation, we run the hazard of charging God with inconsistency, as if He had appointed different modes of justification at different times; since they who lived before Abraham were not circumcised, and they who lived before Moses neither observed the Sabbath,² nor offered sacrifices, although God bore testimony to them that they were righteous. Having, as he thinks, satisfactorily proved that the ceremonial law is no longer binding, Justin replies to an argument urged by Trypho, that the prophecy of Dan. vii. 9 taught the Jews to expect that the Messiah would be great and glorious; whereas the Messiah of the Christians was unhonoured and inglorious, and fell under the extreme curse of the law—for He was crucified. Justin's answer is,³

some parts of the law were designed to enforce piety and justice; others referred mystically to Christ; others were directed against the hardness of heart of the Jews. In p. 263 E, he distinguishes between the authority of the natural and ritual law; in p. 292 C, between that which is of perpetual and universal obligation (*τὰς αἰώνιας καὶ φύσει δικαιοπραξίας καὶ εὐσεβείας*, p. 266 B; *τὰ αἰώνια δικαιώματα*, p. 264 D) and that which was merely directed against the perverting of the Jewish people. In p. 320 E, he refers to the *φυσικαὶ ἔννοιαι*, the sense of right and wrong implanted in our nature. See *Apol.* ii. p. 52 A.

¹ P. 240 E. See also pp. 236 C, 245 B, 261 C, 265 A, 292 A, 319 C, 320 B.

² It has been inferred, as it appears to me erroneously, from Justin's reasoning in this passage, that he believed the first institution of the Sabbath and of the rite of sacrifice to have taken place during the sojourning of the Israelites in the wilderness. I conceive him to have alluded to the peculiar sacrifices of the Mosaic law, and to the peculiar mode in which the Jews kept the Sabbath. In p. 236, he speaks of the sacrifices offered by Abel.

³ P. 249 C. See also pp. 232 D, 245 D, 247 E, 268 B. *Apol.* i. p. 87 A (p. 63). Justin refers, in proof of the twofold Advent, to Ps. cx., which the Jews interpreted of Hezekiah, pp. 250 D, 309 B; to Ps. lxxii., which

that the Scriptures of the Old Testament speak of two advents of the Messiah,—one in humiliation, the other in glory; though the Jews, blinded by their prejudices, looked only to those passages which foretold the latter. He then proceeds to quote passages of the Old Testament¹ in which the Messiah is called God and Lord of hosts. In this part of the *Dialogue* Justin extracts from the Old Testament several texts in which he finds allusions to the gospel history. Thus the Paschal Lamb was a type of Christ's crucifixion;² the offering of fine flour for those who were cleansed from the leprosy was a type of the bread in the Eucharist;³ the twelve bells attached to the robe of the high priest, of the twelve apostles.⁴

Justin next undertakes to prove that the various prophecies respecting the Messiah were fulfilled in Jesus.⁵ But having quoted Isa. vii. to prove that the Messiah was to be born of a Virgin,⁶ he first runs into a digression caused by an inquiry

they interpreted of Solomon, pp. 251 D, 288 D; to Gen. xlix., pp. 271 C, 272 C; Micah iv., p. 336 A, which the Jews themselves applied to the Messiah. Justin speaks of the personal appearance of Christ as mean—an opinion derived from the literal interpretation of Isa. liii. 2, 3, pp. 255 C, 326 E, 316 C, 311 A. The two goats mentioned in Lev. xvi. 7 were also types of the two Advents, pp. 259 D, 338 A.

¹ He refers to Ps. xxiv., p. 310 E, which the Jews applied to Solomon, p. 254 E, or to Hezekiah; Ps. xlvii. and Ps. xcix., p. 255 D, E; Ps. xlv., p. 256 E. Justin also finds an argument on the fulfilment of the predictions of Christ Himself respecting the false prophets who would come in His name, p. 253 B.

² P. 259 B.

³ P. 259 E.

⁴ P. 260 D. Ex. xxxix. 25. The number of bells is not mentioned.

⁵ Trypho had called upon Justin to give this proof, pp. 254 C, 258 E. It was impossible, he contended, that a crucified man should have conversed with Moses and Aaron, p. 256 C.

⁶ P. 262 A. The Jews contended that the word translated *παρθένης*, "virgin," ought to be translated *νεᾶνις*, "young woman," and applied the prediction to Hezekiah, pp. 291 A, 294 A, 297 D. See also p. 310 C, where Justin contends that the mere fact of a young woman giving birth to a son could not be deemed a sign.

from Trypho,¹ whether Jews, who led holy lives, like Job, Enoch, and Noah, but observed the Mosaic law, could be saved; and afterwards into a second digression, occasioned by a remark of Trypho that the Christian doctrine² respecting the

¹ P. 263 C.

² P. 267 B. Trypho here expressly asserts that the Jews expected in their Messiah a mere man whom Elias was to anoint. "For we all look for Christ the man born of men, and Elias who will anoint Him." καὶ γὰρ πάντες ἡμεῖς τὸν Χριστὸν ἄνθρωπον ἕξ ἀνθρώπων προσδοκῶμεν γενήσθαι, καὶ τὸν Ἡλίαν χρίσαι αὐτὸν ἰλθόντα. P. 268 A. Allix, in his *Judgment of the Jewish Church*, c. 25, *sub in.*, had remarked that this was Justin's representation of the expectation of the Jews in his day. "A greater objection," he says, "than all these may be very naturally made by a judicious reader, concerning what I said of the testimonies of the Jews before Christ about the distinction of the divine Persons and the divinity of the Λόγος. On the one side may he say, you own that the Jews after Christ have opposed the doctrine, as being contrary to the unity of God; there are plain proofs of it, even in the second century. And it is certain that Trypho did not believe that the Messiah was to be any other than a mere man, and so did the Jews believe, as it is witnessed by Origen, lib. ii. *contr. Cels.* p. 79." Burgh also had spoken of Trypho as arguing in the very spirit of modern Unitarianism, vol. i. p. 86. Yet I find in Dr. Burton's *Testimonies of the Ante-Nicene Fathers*, p. 41 (2nd ed. p. 47), the following statement: "Justin, *Dial. cum Trypho*, c. lxxviii. p. 166, Ed. Bened. The next passage is important, as showing the opinion which the Jews entertained concerning their Messiah. Justin's words are these: 'As to the Scriptures which we quote to them (the Jews) which expressly prove that Christ was to suffer and to be worshipped, and that He is God, they are compelled to allow that these were spoken concerning Christ, but they have the presumption to say that this (Jesus) is not the Christ; but they acknowledge that He was to come, and to suffer, and to be a King, and to be worshipped as God.'

"According to the opinion of the Jews, therefore, who ought to be the best interpreters of their own prophecies, the human nature and the humble condition of Jesus were not the obstacles to their believing Him to be the Messiah; and it was their belief, as it is that of Christians, that the Messiah, who was to come, was God. Dr. Priestley was, therefore, entirely at variance with Justin Martyr when he said 'that the Jews expected that their Messiah would be a mere man, and even be born as other men are.' If Justin reported the opinion of the Jews fairly, their expectations concerning the Messiah were directly opposite to these." (In his second

pre-existence and divinity of Christ, and His subsequent assumption of humanity, was monstrous and absurd.

edition the learned author adds, "And a remarkable expression of Philo-Judæus may be quoted in this place, who, when he is speaking of the repugnance felt by the Jews to pay divine honours to Caligula, observes, that they would more easily believe that God would change into man than a man into God.") "Origen, however, certainly says that all the Jews did not expect their Messiah to come as God or Son of God. We may observe also that in this and other places already quoted (see No. 25, p. 37, 2nd ed. p. 42) Justin expressly says that Christ is *to be worshipped* as God; and yet he as plainly says in many places that there is *only one God*.

"Justin's arguments in this chapter arise from the following remark of Trypho, who said to him, 'You are attempting to demonstrate a thing which is incredible and almost impossible, that God submitted to be born, and to become man.' Justin, however, acknowledges the proposition, and proceeds to demonstrate it."

In the above statement there are several particulars in which I must be permitted to dissent from the learned author. I cannot allow that the Jews *ought to be the best interpreters of their own prophecies*: if so, we Christians are sadly in error. But perhaps the learned author meant to say that the Jews *ought to be the best interpreters of the meaning which they themselves affixed to their own prophecies*. Again, I cannot allow that, according to Justin's representation of the opinions of the Jews in his day, *the humble condition of Jesus was not an obstacle to their believing Him to be the Messiah*. In p. 249 B is the following passage: Καὶ ὁ Τρύφων, παυσαμένου μου, εἶπεν, ὦ ἄνθρωπε, αὐταὶ ἡμᾶς αἱ γραφαὶ καὶ τοιαῦται ἔνδοξον καὶ μέγαν ἀναμένειν, τὸν παρὰ τοῦ παλαιοῦ τῶν ἡμερῶν ὡς υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου παραλαμβάνοντα τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν, ἀναγκάζουσιν. οὗτος δὲ ὁ ὑμέτερος λεγόμενος Χριστὸς ἄτιμος καὶ ἄδοξος γέγονεν, ὡς καὶ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ κατάρρα τῇ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ περιπεσεῖν ἐσταυρώθη γάρ. "And Trypho, when I concluded, said, these and similar passages of Scripture compel us to look for a glorious and great personage, who, as the Son of man, is to receive an eternal kingdom from the Ancient of Days: whereas He whom you call Christ was unhonoured and inglorious, so as even to fall under the extreme curse of the law; for He was crucified." Justin, in answer to this objection, proceeds to show at considerable length that the prophets speak of two Advents of the Messiah; the one in humiliation, the other in glory. Surely he might have spared himself this trouble, if he had not supposed that the humble condition of Jesus was an obstacle to His being received by the Jews as their Messiah.

Lastly, notwithstanding the learned author's statement, I must still

One argument urged by Trypho,¹ in order to prove that Jesus was not the Messiah, is that Elias, who, according to the pro-

adhere to the opinion expressed by Allix, "that Trypho," whom Justin brings forward as representing the Jews of his day, "did not believe that the Messiah was to be any other than a mere man." I observe that Justin takes considerable pains to prove that the ancient prophets have applied the titles of God and Lord of hosts to the future Messiah (see p. 254 E, *et sequ.*). This was surely an unnecessary waste of time and labour, if the prevalent belief of the Jews of his day was *that the Messiah, who was to come, was God*. To what purpose does Trypho quote Isa. xlii. 8 (p. 289 B), but in order to prove the absolute unity of God, in opposition to Justin's assertions respecting the divinity of the Messiah? But to remove all doubt on the subject, let us consider the whole passage from which the sentence at the commencement of this note is an extract. Trypho thus addresses Justin, ἀναλαβὼν οὖν κ. τ. ι., p. 267 A. "Finish your argument, taking it up from the point where you left off; for to me it appears strange and wholly incapable of proof." (May I suggest to the learned author, on whose remark I am commenting, the propriety of reconsidering the translation of this sentence in p. 39 N, 27? I observe that it is allowed in his second edition, p. 45.) "For that you should say that this Christ existed, being God, before all ages, and then submitted to be born and to become a man, and that He was not a man born of man, appears to me not only strange, but foolish." Justin replies, "I know that this doctrine appears strange, and especially to those of your race, who, as God Himself exclaims, were never willing either to understand or do what God prescribes, but listen only to your own teachers. But, even if I cannot show that this Jesus pre-existed, being God, the Son of the Maker of the universe, and became man born of the Virgin, even then it does not follow that He is not the Christ of God. But as I have shown that He, whoever He may be, is the Christ of God, though I may not have shown that He pre-existed and submitted, in compliance with the will of His Father, to be born a man, subject to like passions with us, and having flesh, you ought to say that I am mistaken only in this (latter) respect, but ought not to deny that He is the Christ, (even) if He appears as a man born of men, and is proved to be elected to the office of the Messiah." If Justin thought that he was addressing men who believed that *the Messiah, who was to come, was God*, he must be allowed to be most unfortunate in the selection of his arguments. Then

¹ P. 268 A. Justin's answer to Trypho's inquiry, "How the spirit of Elias could be in John?" deserves notice, p. 269 A.

phets, was to be the precursor of the Messiah, had not appeared. Justin answers that the prophecies concerning Elias had, with

follows a passage which has furnished ample matter for discussion ; containing an admission on the part of Justin that there were persons in his day who confessed that Jesus was the Messiah, but said that He was a mere man. To this reasoning of Justin, Trypho replies in the following manner : *ἰμοὶ μὲν δοκοῦσιν οἱ λέγοντες ἄνθρωπον γεγενῆσθαι αὐτὸν, καὶ κατ' ἐκλογὴν κειχρῖσθαι, καὶ Χριστὸν γεγενῆσθαι, πιθανώτερον ὑμῶν λέγειν, τῶν ταῦτα ἄπειρ φῆς λεγόντων· καὶ γὰρ πάντες ἡμεῖς τὸν Χριστὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐξ ἀνθρώπων προσδοκῶμεν γενήσεσθαι, καὶ τὸν Ἡλίαν χρίσθαι αὐτὸν ἐλθόντα· ἰὰν δὲ οὗτος φαίνεται ἂν ὁ Χριστὸς, ἄνθρωπον μὲν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων γενόμενον ἐκ παντὸς ἐπίστασθαι δεῖ· ἐκ δὲ τοῦ μηδὲ Ἡλίαν ἐληλυθέναι οὐδὲ τοῦτον ἀποφαινομαι εἶναι.* “What they say, who affirm that He was born a man, and was selected to be anointed, and thus became Christ, appears to me more credible than what is said by them who talk as you do. For we all expect that the Christ will be born a man from human parents, and that Elias will come and anoint Him. If, therefore, this (Jesus) appears to be the Christ, be assured that He was a man born of men ; but as Elias has not yet come, I affirm that He was not the Christ.” We must either say that Trypho does not express the opinion of the Jews of his day, or that their belief was not *that the Messiah, who was to come, was God.*

But what are we to say to the passage produced by Dr. Burton? Let us examine it in connexion with the context. As Dr. Burton observes, Trypho had said to Justin, “You are attempting to demonstrate a thing, which is incredible and almost impossible, that God submitted to be born and became man,” p. 292 D. Justin answers that, if he had endeavoured to establish this point by appealing to human authority, Trypho might have justly been indignant ; but he had rested the proof entirely on the authority of Scripture. Justin subsequently asks Trypho, “Do you understand that in the Sacred Scriptures any other person is proposed as an object of worship, and is called Lord and God, besides Him who made this universe, and Christ, who has been proved by so many quotations from Scripture to have been born a man?” Trypho rejoins, “How can we admit it, when this lengthened discussion has turned upon the inquiry whether there is another (God) besides the Father only?” Justin then quotes Isa. liii. 8 : “Who shall declare His generation?” to prove that the Messiah was not to be the seed of the race of man. “How then,” replies Trypho, “was it said to David that God should take to Himself a Son out of his (David’s) loins, etc.?” Justin endeavours to explain this seeming contradiction ; and then proceeds to charge the Jewish teachers, firstly, with saying that those passages in the Septuagint translation which were directly opposed

respect to Christ's first coming, been accomplished in John the Baptist ; and that before Christ's second Advent, Elias would

to their own opinions, were not extant in the original ; secondly, with affirming that those predictions which could in any way be accommodated to events in the time of Solomon, Hezekiah, etc., were intended to refer to those monarchs, and not to the Messiah ; and thirdly, when they were compelled to confess that there were passages in Scripture which clearly spoke of the Messiah as suffering, and as an object of worship, and as God, with taking refuge in the cavil that this (Jesus) was not the Messiah ; though they admitted that the Messiah was to come, and to suffer, and to reign, and to be worshipped as God. "And we bring those scriptures before them which prove clearly that Christ was both liable to suffering, and was to be worshipped, and was God, which also we set before you, which things they necessarily agree to be said of Christ, but they dare to say that this is not Christ. But they confess that He is to come, and to suffer, and to reign, and to be worshipped as God, which is ridiculous and foolish, as I will show." *ἀς δ' ἂν λέγωμεν αὐτοῖς γραφὰς αἱ διαβρῆδην τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ παθητὸν καὶ προσκυνητὸν καὶ Θεὸν ἀποδεικνύουσι, ἃς καὶ προανιστόρησα ὑμῖν, ταύτας εἰς Χριστὸν μὲν εἰρῆσθαι ἀναγκαζόμενοι συντίθενται, τοῦτον δὲ μὴ εἶναι τὸν Χριστὸν τολμῶσι λέγειν.* "ἐλεύσεσθαι δὲ καὶ παθεῖν, καὶ βασιλεῦσαι, καὶ προσκυνητὸν γενέσθαι Θεὸν ὁμολογοῦσιν, ὅπερ γελοῖον καὶ ἀνόητον, ὁμοίως ἀποδείξω (p. 294 C, the passage translated by Dr. Burton). This passage, therefore, taken in connexion with the context, far from proving the belief of the Jews in Justin's time to have been *that the Messiah, who was to come, was God*, proves, on the contrary, that Trypho and his companions entered upon the inquiry, not only not entertaining such a belief, but most unwilling to entertain it ; and that it was only by compulsion, as as it were, *ἀναγκαζόμενοι*—because they could not elude the force of the express declarations of Scripture—that they admitted the prophetic descriptions of the Messiah to imply that He was God. In confirmation of this interpretation, I would refer the reader to the admission made by Trypho, p. 302 C, which Allix has noticed.

If any reliance can be placed on Justin's authority, the Jews of his day, as Allix expresses himself, did not believe that the Messiah was to be any other than a mere man, who was to be selected from the rest of His countrymen on account of His strict observance of the Mosaic law, pp. 291 B, E, 267 D. They suspected that the time fixed for His coming by the prophets had passed, but affirmed that He was living in a state of obscurity, and would remain ignorant of His high character and destination, until He should be anointed and made manifest by Elias, pp. 226 B, 336 D.

himself appear. Justin further contends that the Messiah must have already come,¹ because, after John the Baptist, no prophet had arisen among the Jews; and they had lost their national independence agreeably to the prediction of Jacob.² Trypho now calls upon Justin to show that in the Old Testament mention is ever made of another God, strictly so called, besides the Creator of the universe.³ Justin answers that, whenever in Scripture God is said to appear to man, we must understand the appearance to be of the Son, not of the Father; as when God appeared to Abraham at the oak of Mamre,⁴ to Lot,⁵ to Jacob,⁶ to Moses out of the burning bush,⁷ and to

¹ P. 270 E. In p. 314 A, Justin says that the spiritual gifts, formerly conferred singly upon the Jewish kings and prophets, were all united in Christ, agreeably to Isa. xi., on which Trypho had founded an argument against Christ's divinity.

² P. 271 E. Gen. xlix. 10. According to Justin, Gen. xlix. 11 and Zech. ix. 9 were prophetic of the calling of the Gentiles, pp. 272 C, D, 273 A. But Gen. xlix. 11 contained other predictions. The words, "he washed his garments in wine, and his clothes in the blood of the grape," were prophetic of the washing of the sins of mankind by Christ's blood, inasmuch as true believers are His garments. Since, also, the blood of the grape is the gift of God, not the produce of human labour, this verse predicted that Christ was to have blood, but not blood derived from a human source, pp. 273 E, 286 D, 301 C: See *Apol.* i. p. 74 B (p. 41).

³ P. 274 B. Trypho admits that the word God is often used in a lower signification, as when God is called the "God of gods." See also pp. 269 B, 293 C.

⁴ P. 275 A. Gen. xviii. 340 D, 356 A. According to Trypho, the Jews understood that God the Father appeared in the first instance, and then three angels in human form, two of whom were sent to destroy Sodom, the third to announce to Sarah that she would have a son. See p. 342 A.

⁵ Pp. 236 D, 277 A. Gen. xix.

⁶ P. 280 D. Gen. xxviii., xxxii., xxxv. Pp. 313 A, 354 D, 355 E.

⁷ Pp. 282 C, 340 D, 357 E. Ex. iii. 2. Trypho says that an angel appeared to Moses, though God the Father conversed with him. See *Apol.* i. pp. 95 B (72), 96 C (79).

Joshua.¹ Justin also appeals to Ps. cx. and xlv. to show that David speaks of another Lord and God besides the Creator of the universe ; and quotes Prov. viii. and Gen. i. 26, iii. 22, to prove the pre-existence of Christ.²

After these digressions Justin resumes his proof that the Messiah was to be born of a virgin, and quotes Isa. liii. 8, Ps. xlv. 7.³ Trypho, however, interrupts him, and says that although Jesus might be recognised as the Lord, and Messiah, and God by the Gentiles, the Jews, who were the worshippers of God, Who made Him as well as them, were not bound to recognise or worship Him.⁴ Justin, in answer, quotes Ps. xcix. and lxxii. to show that, even among the Jews, they who obtained salvation obtained it only through Christ. But what, rejoins Trypho, are we to say to the words which the prophet Isaiah speaks in the name of God Himself, "I am the Lord God ; that is My name: I will not give My glory to another" ?⁵ Justin replies, that Scripture cannot contradict itself. If we are unable to reconcile, entirely to our satisfaction, those passages in which God declares His absolute unity with those in which He speaks of Christ as God, we ought to rest assured that they are reconcilable, though our imperfect faculties may be unequal to the task. In this case, however, the context plainly shows that God meant to say that He would give His glory only to Him Who was to be the Light of the Gentiles,—that is, to Christ.

Justin now returns once more to Isa. vii.,⁶ and to the proof that the Messiah was to be born of a virgin, but is interrupted by Trypho, who tells him that he ought to be ashamed of

¹ P. 286 A.

² P. 285 A. In Gen. i. 26 the Jews contended that God addressed the words "Let us make man," etc., either to Himself or to the elements.

³ Pp. 286 C, 301 B.

⁴ P. 287 C.

⁵ Isa. xlii. 8, p. 289 B.

⁶ P. 290 D.

narrating stories respecting the birth of Christ which could only be compared to the fables¹ current among the heathen respecting the birth of Perseus from Danæ, and the descent of Jupiter under the appearance of a shower of gold. It would be better at once to say that the Messiah was a mere man, elected to the office on account of His exact compliance with the Mosaic law, than to hazard the incredible assertion that God Himself submitted to be born and to become a man.² Justin, in answer, again quotes Isa. liii. 8,³ in order to prove that the Messiah was not to be born after the ordinary manner of men; and asserts that when Isaiah, vii. 14, said, "A virgin shall conceive," etc., he intended to interpret the promise made mystically to David in Ps. cxxxii. 11, which had been alleged by Trypho to show that the Messiah was to descend, in the natural course of generation, from David. In this part of the *Dialogue*, Justin observes that in some instances the Jews denied the genuineness of the passages which directly confuted their opinions; in others, applied passages, manifestly prophetic of the events of the Messiah's life, to the actions of mere men; and when they were obliged to confess that a passage did apply to the Messiah, they took refuge in the assertion that Jesus was not that Messiah; but that the Messiah was still to come, and to suffer, and to reign, and to be adored as God. Justin quotes also Isa. xxxv. to show that the Messiah was to effect miraculous cures.⁴ After charging

¹ Pp. 291 B, 297 B. Justin contends that this fable, and others of a similar nature,—as the stories of Bacchus, Hercules, Æsculapius,—were mere corruptions of the predictions of the Old Testament respecting the Messiah, put forth by the devil for the purpose of deluding mankind. He makes the same observation respecting certain ceremonies introduced into the mysteries of Mithras, pp. 294 E, 296 B, 304 B.

² P. 291 C.

³ Pp. 293 D, 301 B.

⁴ P. 295 E. In p. 308 C, Justin contends that Jesus was the Messiah, because the predictions which He delivered respecting the rise of heresies after His ascension, and the sufferings which His followers would undergo, had been exactly fulfilled. See pp. 254 A, 271 B.

the Jewish teachers with having expunged from the Septuagint version several passages clearly prophetic of the Messiah,¹ and quoting portions of Scripture, some of which he had before alleged, to prove that the Messiah was not to be born after the ordinary manner of men, he proceeds to show that Isa. vii. could not apply to Hezekiah, but was fulfilled in Jesus.²

Trypho now inquires of Justin whether he really believed that Jerusalem would be rebuilt, and all the Gentiles, as well as the Jews and proselytes, collected there under the government of the Messiah; or whether he merely professed such a belief, in order to conciliate the Jews.³ Justin, in answer, admits that this belief was not universal among the orthodox Christians; but that he himself maintained that the dead would rise again in the body and live for a thousand years in Jerusalem, which would be rebuilt, and beautified, and enlarged: he appeals in support of his opinion to Isaiah, and to the Apocalypse, which he ascribes to John, one of Christ's apostles.

Justin having produced several passages from the Old Testament⁴ in which he finds allusions, sufficiently fanciful, to the particular mode of the Messiah's death, and to the Cross, Trypho rejoins, "The whole Jewish nation expects the Messiah. I also admit that the passages of Scripture which you have quoted apply to Him; and the name of Jesus or Joshua, given to the son of Nun, inclines me somewhat to the opinion that your Jesus is the Messiah. The Scriptures, moreover, mani-

¹ P. 297 E.

² P. 302 C.

³ P. 306 B. See also pp. 312 C, 368 A, 369 A. In p. 346 B, Justin says that the sacrifices which will then be offered to God will be the spiritual sacrifices of prayer and praise.

⁴ Pp. 312 E, 316 E, 259 C, 338 B. The Jews seem to have been at a loss to understand why Moses, who forbade them to make any likeness of any creature, set up the brazen serpent, pp. 322 B, 339 A. Compare *Apol.* i. p. 90 B (68).

festly predict a suffering Messiah; but that He should suffer death upon the Cross, the death of those who are pronounced accursed by the law, fills me with perplexity." Justin answers, that the curse applied only to those who were crucified on account of their transgressions; whereas Christ was sinless, and submitted to this ignominious death, in obedience to the will of His Father, in order that He might rescue the human race from the penalty due to their sins.¹ After quoting Ps. iii. 5, Isa. lxxv. 2 and liii. 9, as prophetic of the Messiah's crucifixion and resurrection, Justin shows at considerable length that Ps. xxii. is descriptive of the perfect humanity,—of the sufferings, death, and resurrection of the Messiah.²

Justin comes at last to speak of the conversion of the Gentiles;³ and contends that the Christians are the true people of God, inasmuch as they fulfil the spiritual meaning of the law, and do not merely conform, like the Jews, to the letter. They have the true circumcision of the heart;⁴ they are the true race of priests dedicated to God,⁵ and typified by Jesus the High Priest in the prophecy of Zechariah;⁶ they offer the true spiritual sacrifices which are pleasing to God, agreeably to the prophecy of Malachi;⁷ they are the seed pro-

¹ Compare p. 338 B.

² P. 324 C. The Jews denied that this Psalm was prophetic of the Messiah. The mode in which Justin explains an expression in the Psalm, from which it might be inferred that Christ was ignorant of His own fate, is worthy of attention, p. 326 B.

³ P. 335 E. The Jews appear to have applied some of the passages which predict the conversion of the Gentiles to the proselytes, as Isa. xlix. 6, p. 350 C.

⁴ P. 342 A.

⁵ "We are the true priestly race of God" (*ἀρχιερατικὸν τὸ ἀληθινὸν γένος ἵσμεν τοῦ Θεοῦ*), p. 344 C. "We are the true spiritual Israelites" (*Ἰσραηλιτικὸν γὰρ τὸ ἀληθινὸν πνευματικόν. κ. τ. ἐ.*), p. 228 E. "We are a holy people" (*λαὸς ἅγιός ἵσμεν*), pp. 347 B, 365 D, 353 B, and 366 A.

⁶ iii. 1, pp. 342 C and 344 C.

⁷ i. 10. The meaning affixed to this prediction by the Jews was that

mised to Abraham,¹ because they are actuated by the same principle of faith which actuated Abraham,—they are, in a word, the true Israel.²

Justin concludes with enumerating the benefits conferred upon the Jews by God, and reproaching them with their ingratitude.³ They had at last filled up the measure of their iniquities by crucifying His only-begotten Son; and they still persecuted His disciples, although it was evident that the capture of Jerusalem,⁴ and the destruction of their temple by the Romans, was a punishment inflicted on them for their rejection of Jesus, and for that only, since they were no longer addicted to the idolatrous practices which had drawn down the vengeance of the Almighty on their forefathers. Their only hope, therefore, of safety lay in repenting of their transgressions, renouncing the errors of their teachers, and cordially embracing Christianity.

Although I am far from wishing to deny that there are in this Treatise many weak and inconclusive arguments, many trifling applications and erroneous interpretations of Scripture, many attempts to extract meanings which never entered into the mind of the Sacred writer, yet I cannot think it deserving of the contempt with which some later critics have spoken of it. It proves at least that the state of the controversy was not essentially different in the days of Justin from its present state; that after the lapse of seventeen hundred years the difficulties to be encountered in disputing with the Jews, the objections

God rejected the sacrifices offered by those who *then* inhabited Jerusalem, but accepted, as sacrifices, the prayers of the Jews who were dispersed by the Captivity, p. 344 E.

¹ P. 347 C.

² Pp. 349 E, 352 E, 355 B, 359 D.

³ P. 360 D *ad fin.*

⁴ The application of the prophecy of Noah to the Jews and Romans deserves attention, p. 368 B.

to be answered, the prejudices to be overcome, are nearly the same. It supplies us also incidentally with some curious facts, illustrative of the spirit by which the Jews and Christians were mutually actuated towards each other. With respect to the sentiments entertained by the Christians towards the Jews, we find Trypho, p. 263 C, inquiring whether they who lived according to the Mosaic law would be saved. Justin answers, that as the Mosaic law comprehended the unchangeable and fundamental principles of morality, they who had lived up to it before the coming of Christ would be saved through Him; and after His coming they also would be saved who observed the whole law, both moral and ceremonial, provided that they believed the crucified Jesus to be the Christ of God, and did not attempt to force the observance of the ritual law upon others. He admits, however, that many thought otherwise, and contended that the observance of the Mosaic rites was incompatible with the profession of Christianity. Thus the Gentile converts in Justin's age, and the Jewish in the apostolic times, appear to have been equally ready to act on the principle of exclusion. On the other hand,¹ we learn that the Rabbis forbade their hearers to hold any intercourse with the Christians;² that they pronounced curses against them in the synagogues;³ and that they sent persons into every part of the civilised world with directions to denounce Christianity as a pestilent heresy, and to misrepresent the conduct and morals of its professors.⁴ Justin speaks of the proselytes as animated by a more bitter spirit of hostility than the Jews themselves.⁵

¹ See Wilson's Illustration, etc., c. xi.

² Pp. 256 C, 339 D.

³ Pp. 234 B, 266 E, 321 D, 323 D, 345 A, 363 D, 366 E. From the last passage it appears that the curse was pronounced after the conclusion of the prayers. See Jerome in Esaiam v. 18, xlix. 7, lii. 4, and in Amos i. 11, where he says that the Jews cursed the Christians under the name of Nazarenes. See *Apol.* i. p. 77 A (45).

⁴ Pp. 234 E, 335 C, where the charges against the Christians are mentioned more in detail.

⁵ P. 350 E.

He ridicules the trivial questions on which the Jews wasted their time and labour,¹ and censures their cavilling temper.² He charges them with denying Christ through fear of persecution,³ with entertaining low and unworthy notions of God,⁴ and with corrupting the Septuagint version.⁵ With respect, however, to the last charge, the Christians appear to have been more justly liable to it than the Jews.⁶ Justin further affirms that the Jews were allowed by their Rabbis to have a plurality

¹ Pp. 339 D, 340 B.

² P. 343 C.

³ Pp. 258 C, 262 E.

⁴ P. 341 E, Justin accuses them of anthropomorphism. See p. 364 A.

⁵ Pp. 297 C, 349 A. See also p. 343 D. Justin's specific charges against the Jews were—

I. That they had suppressed a passage in Ezra, in which the Passover was represented as a type of the Redeemer; but this passage is not now extant in any either of the Greek or Hebrew copies. Lactantius quotes it. *Institut.* iv. 18.

II. That they had suppressed a passage in Jeremiah, which, however, is now extant in every copy, both Greek and Hebrew, xi. 19. Justin admits that in his day it was found in some of the copies used in the synagogues.

III. That they had suppressed another passage in Jeremiah, which is not now found in any copy, either Greek or Hebrew. This passage is cited more than once by Irenæus, who in one instance ascribes it to Isaiah. L. iii. c. 23; l. iv. c. 39, 56, 66; l. v. c. 31.

IV. That they have suppressed the words ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου (“from the cross”) in the 96th Psalm, ver. 10. In the Epistle of Barnabas, chap. viii., we find the following passage: “that the kingdom of Jesus from the cross” (ὅτι ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ ξύλου), from which we may infer that the author had ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου in his copy; but there is nothing corresponding to the passage in the old Latin version. The reading was known to Tertullian and many of the Fathers; and Le Nourry says that it is found in some manuscript psalters of great antiquity. See *Apol.* i. p. 80 B (50), and Dr. Bernard's *Note on Cotelerii Patr. Apostol.*


Justin further charges the Jews with having erased a passage containing an account of the mode of Isaiah's death, p. 349 B.

⁶ Some writers have thought that Justin himself was the guilty party. See Thirlby's note on p. 297 B, and Pearson *On the Creed*, Article v. p. 242, 5th ed. The Jews asserted that the version of the Septuagint was in some places incorrect. P. 294 B.

of wives, and that the polygamy of the patriarchs was alleged in defence of the practice.¹

There is in p. 307 A an enumeration of Jewish sects, in which the names of the Genistæ, Meristæ, and Helleniani occur; of the former two, Isidorus, *Origin.* viii. 4, p. 63, has given some, though not a satisfactory account; of the Helleniani, no trace, I believe, is to be found in any other writer.

Without meaning to lay any particular stress upon the authority of Justin in such matters, I will observe that he appears not to have recognised any other than *circumcised* proselytes.²



CHAPTER II.

THE OPINIONS OF JUSTIN RESPECTING THE ΛΟΓΟΣ AND THE TRINITY.

HAVING given the above short account of the genuine works of Justin which have descended to our times, we will proceed

¹ P. 363 E. According to Justin, a great mystery was concealed under the polygamy of the patriarchs: "And David's one act of transgression with the wife of Uriah shows, O men, I say, that the patriarchs had many wives without committing fornications, but they had a certain arrangement and practised many mysteries." και ἡ μία δὲ αὐτῆ τῆς παραπτώσεως τοῦ Δαβὶδ πρὸς τὴν τοῦ Οὐρίου γυναῖκα πρᾶξις, ὧ ἀνδρες, ἔφην, δείκνυσιν ὅτι οὐχ ὡς πορνεύοντες πολλὰς ἔσχον γυναῖκας οἱ πατριάρχαι, ἀλλ' οἰκονομία τις, καὶ μυστήρια πάντα δι' αὐτῶν ἀπετελείτο. P. 371 A. See p. 364 B.

² P. 351 D.

to the examination of his opinions; and will in the first place consider what he has delivered respecting the Λόγος, and the doctrine of the Trinity. That he asserted the divinity of the Λόγος, and a real Trinity, is admitted even by those who are most anxious to prove that the early Christians were Unitarians; but they endeavour to invalidate his testimony by contending that he was the first who openly maintained these doctrines, which were suggested to him by the writings of Plato—in other words, that he was the first who corrupted the Gospel, by endeavouring to engraft the notions of Gentile philosophy upon its sublime but simple truths. That Justin had studied and admired the Platonic philosophy we know from himself, but that he was indebted to it for the doctrines of the divinity of the Λόγος, and of the Trinity, is a position to which we cannot yield our assent; because, in the first place, no sufficient proof has yet been produced—that even the germ of those doctrines exists in the writings of Plato; and because, in the next place, his own references to those writings are wholly at variance with the position.

The design of his two *Apologies* is to give an accurate description of the faith of the Christians, and to remove the prejudices which existed against them in the minds of the heathen. One of these prejudices was that they worshipped a crucified man.¹ Not so, he replies; the object of our worship is the Divine Λόγος, who was content to become incarnate, and to die on the Cross for the sake of mankind. Now as

¹ “For here they look upon it as downright madness to assign to a crucified man the next place to the immutable, eternal God, parent of all things, being entirely in the dark as to the mystery of this order; and therefore I advise you to give diligent attention while I expound it to you.” ἐνταῦθα γὰρ μανίαν ἡμῶν καταφαίνονται, δευτέραν χάραν, μετὰ τὸν ἄτρεπτον καὶ ἀεὶ ὄντα Θεὸν καὶ γεννήτορα τῶν ἀπάντων, ἀνθρώπῳ σταυρωθέντι δίδοναι ἡμᾶς λέγοντες, ἀγνοοῦντες τὸ ἐν τούτῳ μυστήριον ᾧ προσέχειν ὑμᾶς, ἐξηγουμένων ἡμῶν, προτρεπέμεθα. P. 61 A (18). Compare p. 68 A (31), 90 B (68).

Justin's wish was to render the doctrines of Christianity as acceptable as possible to the Gentiles, by pointing out features of resemblance between them and the tenets of the philosophers,¹ it is reasonable to suppose that he would not fail to allege those passages of Plato's writings which he conceived to afford the strongest confirmation of his opinions respecting the Λόγος and the Trinity. What, then, are the passages which he produces? One from the *Timæus*,² to prove that when Plato, speaking of the Person who is second to the Supreme God, said, "He expressed Him in the universe in the figure of the letter X," he alluded to the brazen serpent set up by Moses in the wilderness, but did not understand that the serpent was typical of the Cross of Christ. Another passage³ quoted by

¹ "Not that the doctrines of Plato are alien to those of Christ, but that they are not wholly the same, as is also the case with those of others, as the Stoics, poets, and historians." οὐχ ὅτι ἀλλότριά ἐστι τὰ Πλάτωνος διδάγματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀλλ' ὅτι οὐκ ἐστι πάντα ἴμοια, ὡσπερ οὐδὲ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων, Στωικῶν τε, καὶ ποιητῶν, καὶ συγγραφέων. P. 51 B. Compare 66 C (28).

² The passage in Justin runs thus: καὶ τὸ ἐν τῷ παρὰ Πλάτωνι Τιμίῳ φυσιολογοῦμενον περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅτε λέγει, ἐχίασεν αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ παντὶ, παρὰ Μωσέως λαβὼν ὁμοίως εἶπεν. P. 92 E (72). But Plato in the place alluded to is speaking of the creation of the soul of the universe. ταύτην οὖν τὴν ζύστασιν πῦσαν διπλὴν κατὰ μῆκος σχίσαι, μίσην πρὸς μέσην ἑκατέραν ἀλλήλαις, οἷον χ, προσβαλὼν, κατέκαμψεν εἰς κύκλον. P. 36, tom. iii. ed. Serr.

³ "And finding by Moses that the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters, he likewise mentions a third, for he gives the second place to the Logos of God decussated upon the world, and the third place he assigns to the Spirit which is said to move upon the face of the waters, thus expressing himself; 'The Third about the Third.'" καὶ τὸ εἰπεῖν αὐτὸν τρίτον, ἐπειδὴ, ὡς προεἶπομεν, ἐπάνω τῶν ὑδάτων ἀνέγνω ὑπὸ Μωσέως εἰρημένον ἐπιφέρεισθαι τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ πνεῦμα. δευτέραν μὲν γὰρ χώραν τῷ παρὰ Θεοῦ λόγῳ, ὃν κεχιάσθαι ἐν τῷ παντὶ ἔφη, δίδωσι. τὴν δὲ τρίτην τῷ λεχθέντι ἐπιφέρεισθαι τῷ ὕδατι πνεύματι, εἰπὼν, τὰ δὲ τρίτα περὶ τὸν τρίτον. P. 93 B (72). The passage in Plato runs thus: "All things about the King of all and on account of Him, this is the cause of all good; the Second about the Second, and the Third about the Third." περὶ τὸν πάντων βυσιλία πάντ' ἐστὶ, καὶ ἐκείνου ἕνεκα πάντα. καὶ

Justin is from the Second Epistle, where he endeavours to discover an allusion to the Trinity in the words, "The Third about the Third," in which he supposes Plato to have referred to the description of the Spirit moving on the face of the waters, in the first chapter of Genesis. It is utterly impossible that passages like these should have been the sources from which Justin originally drew his notions respecting the Λόγος and the Trinity.

If we turn to the *Dialogue with Trypho*, we learn that the Jews as well as the Gentiles objected against the Christians the divine honours paid by them to a crucified man. How does Justin answer the objection? By alleging passages from the Old Testament, from which he proves that Christ, Who preached and was crucified under the Emperor Tiberius, was the Λόγος, made flesh, Who had before conversed with the patriarchs; and Whom, together with the Holy Spirit, the Father addressed when He created man. Are we, therefore, to conclude that he was indebted solely to those passages for his knowledge of the doctrines of the Divinity of the Λόγος and the Trinity? Yet this surely is as reasonable a conclusion as to infer, from the passages before cited, that he borrowed them from Plato. In both instances he used arguments which he

ἐκεῖνο αἰτίον ἀπάντων τῶν καλῶν. δεύτερον δὲ περὶ τὰ δεύτερα καὶ τρίτον περὶ τὰ τρίτα. P. 312, tom. iii. Compare *Dial.* p. 220 C. "And to consider this greatest and most noteworthy work, the remaining Second and Third." καὶ τοῦτο μέγιστον καὶ τιμιώτατον ἔργον ἠγεῖσθαι, τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ δεύτερα καὶ τρίτα. If the *Hortatory Address to the Greeks* was the composition of Justin, the argument acquires still greater force; for though the author of that work mentions many of Plato's opinions respecting the nature of God, the creation of the world, etc., which he supposes to have been borrowed from the writers of the Old Testament, yet he is wholly silent concerning the Λόγος. Indeed, Justin's repeated assertion that Plato was indebted to the writings of Moses and the prophets for whatever right notions he possessed on the subject of religion, is incompatible with the supposition that he would himself borrow doctrines from Plato.

deemed most likely to have weight with the persons whom he was addressing. He was anxious to persuade both the Gentiles and the Jews that the writings which they respectively esteemed of the highest authority contained intimations, however obscure, of those sublime doctrines; but the sources from which he himself derived the knowledge of them were the rule of faith handed down in the Church, and the writings of the New Testament. I mean not to affirm that the notions which he imbibed in the schools of heathen philosophy have not affected his language in speaking of the doctrines: I say only that he did not derive the doctrines themselves from that source.

Another circumstance well deserving consideration is the manner in which Justin mentions these doctrines. He uniformly speaks of them as held not by himself alone, or the more enlightened few, but by all the members of the Christian community. Had he been conscious that he was broaching opinions either utterly unknown or not generally received in the Church, he would surely have deemed it necessary to allude to the fact; and to anticipate the charge, to which he obviously exposed himself, of misrepresenting the tenets of the Christians. He has indeed been accused of betraying this consciousness in a passage in the *Dialogue with Trypho*,¹ where he admits, if we may believe the Unitarian

¹ Justin had been contending that, even if it could not be proved that Christ was God, the Son of the Ruler of the universe, and born of a virgin, yet it did not therefore follow that the Jews were justified in rejecting Him; since, though a man born of men, He might have been elected to be the Messiah. He then goes on: καὶ γὰρ εἰσὶ τινες, ᾧ φίλοι, ἔλεγον, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡμετέρου γένους ὁμολογοῦντες αὐτὸν Χριστὸν εἶναι, ἄνθρωπον δὲ ἐκ ἀνθρώπων γενόμενον ἀποφαινόμενοι οἷς οὐ συντίθεμαι. οὐδ' ἂν πλείστοι ταῦτά μοι δοξάσαντες εἴποιεν, ἐπειδὴ οὐκ ἀνθρωπέσις διδάγμασι κεκελεύσμεθα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ πείθεσθαι, ἀλλὰ τοῖς διὰ τῶν μακαρίων προφητῶν κηρυχθεῖσι, καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ διδαχθεῖσι. P. 267 E. This passage has exercised the ingenuity of the commentators. The Latin translation in Thirlby's edition is as follows:

writers, that the majority of Christians in his day regarded Christ as a mere man, born after the manner of men. The passage is not without difficulty ; but the sense put upon it by the Unitarians is at variance with every sound principle of interpretation. The fact, moreover, that, among the other charges urged against the early Christians, they were accused of *worshipping* a crucified man, is scarcely compatible with the supposition that the doctrine of the mere humanity of Christ was the prevalent opinion among them. In a word, the whole tenor of Justin's language is irreconcilable with the theory that he invented, or at least first published, the doctrines of the Divinity of the Λόγος and of the Trinity.

“Sunt enim nonnulli, o amici, dixi, ex genere nostro profitentes ipsum Christum esse, sed hominem ex hominibus genitum esse affirmant. Quibus non assentior; neque id sane multi qui in eadem mecum sententiâ sunt” (though ταῦτα is in the text, the translator appears to have read ταῦτα) “dixerint. Siquidem jussi-sumus,” etc. Bull, instead of ἡμετέρου, would read ὑμετέρου, and understand the expression ὑμετέρου γένους of the Jewish Christians. This correction derives support from the expressions ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους τοῦ ὑμετέρου, ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους ὑμῶν, which are frequently applied by Justin to the Jews. I am inclined, however, to retain ἡμετέρου, and to translate thus: “For there are some, my friends, of our race (Christians, as opposed to Jews, ὑμέτερον γένος) who confess that He was the Christ, but affirm that He was a man born of human parents, with whom I do not agree; nor should I, even if very many of those who think as I do were to say so, since we are commanded by Christ to attend, not to the doctrines of men, but to that which was proclaimed by the blessed prophets and taught by Himself;” where I understand the words πλεῖστοι ταῦτα μοι δοξάσαντες to mean those who agreed with Justin in professing Christianity. But, whether this translation is correct or not, the word τινές, opposed as it is to πλεῖστοι, is alone sufficient to prove that the doctrine of the mere humanity of Christ was the opinion of the minority, and that a small minority, in the time of Justin. Wilson, *Illustration*, etc., p. 152, translates the passage nearly as I do: “There are some of our race who acknowledge Him to be Christ, yet maintain that He was a man born of human parents; with whom I do not agree, nor should I, if very many, who entertain the same opinions with myself, were to declare” for this doctrine.

Some writers, in order to remove from the early Fathers the charge of borrowing their doctrine respecting the Λόγος from Plato, point out the Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament, the works of Philo, and the traditional interpretations of Scripture current among the Jews of our Saviour's time, and preserved in the Chaldee Paraphrases, as the sources from which the language of the early Fathers respecting it was derived; but they are not, as it appears to me, borne out in their opinion by the works of Justin Martyr. A large portion of his *Dialogue with Trypho* is occupied in proving that, whenever God is said in the Old Testament to have appeared to the patriarchs, it was, in fact, the Λόγος Who appeared. How greatly would he have added to the force of his arguments, if he had shown that this interpretation of the passages in Scripture to which he appealed was in strict conformity with the tradition of the Jewish Church! But neither he nor his opponent seems to have entertained the slightest suspicion that any such traditional interpretations existed. I mean not to allege Justin's silence as a proof that they did not exist, but that, even if they did exist, it is most improbable that he derived his own opinions from them.

Having, as we think, satisfactorily replied to the charge which has been brought against Justin of corrupting the gospel by an admixture of philosophical notions derived from the writings of Plato, we will proceed to consider what he has actually delivered respecting the Λόγος and the Trinity.

In the first *Apology*,¹ Justin, when defending the Christians

¹ P. 60 (17). "Worshipping the Creator of all—we honour the Master Who instructed us in this kind of worship, and Who was born for this very purpose, and crucified under Pontius Pilate, Procurator of Judæa, in the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, even Jesus Christ, Whom we know to be the Son of the true God, and therefore hold Him the second in order, and the prophetic Spirit the third." τὸν δημιουργὸν τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς σεβόμενοι—τὸν

against the charge of atheism, says that they worshipped the Creator of the universe, and placed next to Him His Son, and honoured in the third place the prophetic Spirit. In another place the same statement is made with reference to the same charge.¹ Again, speaking of the opinions of Plato, Justin says: "For he gives the second place to the Logos of

διδάσκαλόν τε τούτων γενόμενον ἡμῖν καὶ εἰς τοῦτο γεννηθέντα Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν σταυρωθέντα ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου τοῦ γενομένου ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ ἐπὶ χρόνοις Τιβερίου Καίσαρος ἐπιτρόπου, ἰδὼν αὐτὸν τοῦ ὄντως Θεοῦ μαβόντες καὶ ἐν δευτέρᾳ χάρα ἔχοντες, πνεῦμα τε προφητικὸν ἐν τρίτῃ τάξει—τιμῶμεν. See, with reference to the *Λόγος*, p. 59 E (15). *Apol.* ii. p. 51 D.

¹ "Him and His only-begotten Son Who has instructed us in what I just now mentioned concerning these evil spirits, and likewise acquainted us with another host of good and godlike ministering spirits,—both These, I say, together with the Spirit, Who spake by the prophets, we worship and adore." ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνόν τε, καὶ τὸν παρ' αὐτοῦ ἰδὼν ἰλθόντα καὶ διδάξαντα ἡμᾶς ταῦτα καὶ τὸν τῶν ἄλλων ἐπομένων καὶ ἰξομοιουμένων ἀγαθῶν ἀγγέλων στρατὸν, πνεῦμά τε τὸ προφητικὸν σεβόμεθα καὶ προσκυνοῦμεν. P. 56 C. This passage has been alleged by the Roman Catholics to prove that, in the earliest times of the Christian Church, worship was paid to angels. To get rid of the inference, Protestant writers have had recourse to various expedients. Grabe connects καὶ τὸν—στρατὸν with ἡμᾶς, and supposes Justin to have meant that "the Son of God communicated the truths (of which Justin was speaking) to us (men) and to the host of good angels." This interpretation he supports by referring to Eph. iii. 10: "To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the Church the manifold wisdom of God." ἵνα γνωρισθῇ νῦν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἰξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ. And to Irenæus, lib. ii. c. 55: "The ever co-existing Son of the Father of old time, and from the beginning, ever reveals the Father to the angels, and to the archangels, and to the principalities and powers, and to all to whom God will reveal Him." "Semper co-existens Filius Patri olim et ab initio, semper revelat Patrem et Angelis, et Archangelis, et Potestatibus, et Virtutibus, et omnibus quibus vult revelare Deus." Others, and among them Le Nourry, though a Benedictine, connect καὶ τὸν—στρατὸν with ταῦτα, and suppose Justin to mean that the Son of God communicated to us these truths (viz. that the demons were not gods), and also the knowledge of the existence of a host of good angels. (We find διδάξαντος ταῦτα. *Apol.* ii. p. 49 A. *ἰδιδάξες ταῦτα. Apol.* i. p. 99 B.) Others, instead of στρατὸν, would read

God decussated upon the world, and the third place he assigns to the Spirit, which is said to move upon the face of the waters, thus expressing himself, 'The Third about the Third.'¹ And with reference to the rite of baptism: "For they are washed in the name of God the Father and Lord of all, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit."² And again: "In every eucharistical sacrifice we bless the Maker of all things through His Son Jesus Christ and through the Holy Spirit."³

When we proceed further to inquire into the manner in which Justin distinguishes between the Persons of the Trinity,

στρατηγόν, and construct for Justin a sentence which, careless as he is, we believe him to have been incapable of writing. One thing is certain—that Justin, who expressly states that there were three objects of Christian worship, the Creator of the universe, His Son, and the prophetic Spirit, could not intend to represent the angelic host as a distinct object of worship. I have sometimes thought that in this passage καὶ τὸν—στρατὸν is equivalent to μετὰ τοῦ—στρατοῦ, and that Justin had in his mind the glorified state of Christ, when He should come to judge the world, surrounded by the host of heaven. Compare the *Dialogue with Trypho*, p. 247 E. "For the Son of man will come upon the clouds, even as Daniel foretold, the angels with Him." ὡς υἱὸς γὰρ ἀνθρώπου ἐπάνω νεφελῶν ἐλεύσεται, ὡς Δανιὴλ ἐμήνυσεν, ἀγγέλων σὺν αὐτῷ ἀφικνουμένων. *Apol.* i. p. 87 B (63). "When encircled with heavenly glory and His host of angels." ὅταν μετὰ δόξης ἐξ οὐρανῶν μετὰ τῆς ἀγγελικῆς αὐτοῦ στρατιᾶς κ. τ. ἔ. So p. 71 B (37). Justin, speaking of Satan, says: "Who together with all his hosts of angels, and men like himself, shall be thrust into fire, there to be tormented, world without end, as our Christ has foretold." ὃν εἰς τὸ πῦρ πεμφθήσεται μετὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ στρατιᾶς καὶ τῶν ἐπομένων ἀνθρώπων, κολασθησομένους τὸν ἀπέραντον αἰῶνα, προεμήνυσεν ὁ Χριστός. In the *Dialogue*, p. 264 A, we find, "that by this arrangement the serpent who has done evil from the beginning, and his angels who are like him, may be destroyed." ἵνα διὰ τῆς οἰκονομίας ταύτης ὁ πονηρευσάμενος τὴν ἀρχὴν ὄφης καὶ οἱ ἕξομοιωθέντες αὐτῷ ἄγγελοι καταλυθῶσι. See also pp. 327 D, 360 D, and 284 B, where Christ is said to have called Himself the Leader of the Heavenly Host. Compare p. 286 A.

¹ *Apol.* i. p. 93 B (72).

² *Apol.* p. 94 A (74).

³ *Ib.* p. 98 C (91).

we find that there are certain epithets and expressions which he applies to the first Person alone, such as Unbegotten,¹ Ineffable, the Maker and Creator of all things.² He says³

¹ So I translate ἀγέννητος. Waterland, in all these passages, would substitute ἀγέννητος for ἀγέννητος, vol. iii. p. 248, ed. Oxon. 1823. ὅτι πρωτότοκος τῷ ἀγεννήτῳ Θεῷ ἐστι. “That He is the first-begotten of the unbegotten God.” *Apol.* i. p. 88 A (64). τὸν γὰρ ἀπὸ ἀγεννήτου καὶ ἀρρήτου Θεοῦ λόγον μετὰ τὸν Θεὸν προσκυνοῦμεν καὶ ἀγαπῶμεν. “We worship and love the Word of the unbegotten God, together with God.” *Apol.* ii. p. 51 D. See also p. 50 C. ὁ γὰρ ἀρρήτος πατὴρ καὶ κύριος τῶν πάντων οὔτε ποὶ ἀφίκεται οὔτε περιπατεῖ, οὔτε καθεύδει, οὔτε ἀνίσταται, ἀλλ’ ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ χώρῳ ὅπου ποτε μένει, κ. τ. εἰ. “The ineffable Father and Lord of the whole world neither comes to any place, nor walks about, nor sleeps, nor rises up, but remains in His own country wherever that may be.” *Dial.* p. 356 E. τοῦ μόνου καὶ ἀγεννήτου καὶ ἀρρήτου Θεοῦ υἱόν. “The Son of the only and unbegotten ineffable God.” P. 355 D. τῷ ἀγεννήτῳ Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. “To the unbegotten God through Christ.” *Apol.* i. p. 85 B (60). μετὰ τὸν ἄτρεπτον καὶ ἀεὶ ὄντα Θεόν. “The next place to the immutable eternal God.” P. 61 A (18). Θεῷ δὲ μόνῳ τῷ ἀγεννήτῳ διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐπέμεθα. “We come over to the obedience of the only unbegotten God through His Son.” P. 61 B (18). Justin, as we have already seen, says that God has no proper name — no name expressive of His essence: the names which we apply to Him are expressive only of His attributes. Thus *Apol.* i. p. 94 D (76). ὄνομα γὰρ τῷ ἀρρήτῳ Θεῷ οὐδεὶς ἔχει εἰπεῖν. “Because we have not any appellation for the ineffable majesty of God.” P. 95 C (79). τὸν ἀνονομαστον Θεὸν λελαληκέναι τῷ Μωσῆϊ. “It was the unnameable God Who thus conversed with Moses.” *Apol.* ii. p. 45 D. See p. 9, n. 1. ὄνομα δὲ τῷ πάντων πατρὶ θετὸν, ἀγεννήτῳ ὄντι, οὐκ ἔστιν. *Dial.* p. 277 B. παρὰ τὸν νοούμενον ποιητὴν τῶν ὅλων. A doubt, however, may arise whether in some cases Justin does not use the word *God* absolutely, not with reference to the Father, as distinct from the Son and Holy Spirit.

² Thus He is called ὁ πάντων πατὴρ καὶ δημιουργός. *Apol.* i. p. 57 A (10). ὁ ποιητὴς τοῦδε τοῦ παντός, p. 70 B (35). ὁ δημιουργός τοῦδε τοῦ παντός, pp. 60 C (16), 92 A (70). ὁ δεσπότης πάντων καὶ πατὴρ Θεός, pp. 76 E (45), 81 C (52), 83 D (57). ὁ ποιητὴς τῶν ὅλων Θεός καὶ πατὴρ. *Dial.* p. 225 A. ὁ παντοκράτωρ καὶ ποιητὴς τῶν ὅλων Θεός, pp. 234 B, 310 A. ὁ πατὴρ τῶν ὅλων καὶ ἀγέννητος Θεός, p. 342 A.

³ ὑπὸ ἄλλου τοῦ ἐν τοῖς ὑπερουρανίοις ἀεὶ μένοντος, καὶ οὐδενὶ ὀφθέντος, ἢ ὁμιλήσαντος δι’ ἑαυτοῦ ποτε, ὃν ποιητὴν τοῦ ὅλου καὶ πατέρα νοοῦμεν. “By Him Who remains always in the highest heaven, and is seen of none, neither

also that the Father never descended on earth or appeared to man, but remained always in the highest heaven.

With respect to the second Person in the Trinity, Justin says that in the beginning, before all created things, God begat from Himself a certain Rational Power, Who is called by the Holy Spirit the Glory of the Lord, sometimes the Son, sometimes the Wisdom; and he illustrates the mode of generation by a comparison borrowed from a fire, which does not diminish the fire from which it is lighted.¹ So this Rational Power was generated without any abscission or division of the essence or substance of the Father. Sometimes instead of the word generation, Justin uses emission or prolation.² The

holds converse with any except by another's agency, Whom we recognise as the Father and Creator of the universe." *Dial.* p. 275 A. οὐ τὸν ποιητὴν τῶν ὅλων καὶ πατέρα, καταλιπόντα τὰ ὑπὲρ οὐρανὸν ἅπαντα, ἐν ὀλίγῳ γῆς μορίῳ πεφάνθαι τῶς ὅστιποιον, καὶ μικρὸν νοῦν ἔχων, τολμήσει εἰπεῖν. "No one even with little sense will dare to say that the Father and Creator of the universe left the highest heaven, and showed Himself to any one in a small part of the earth." P. 283 B. See also p. 356 E, quoted in note 1, p. 56, 357 B.

¹ ἀρχὴν πρὸ πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων ὁ Θεὸς γεγέννηκε δυνάμιν τινα ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ λογικὴν, ἣτις καὶ δόξα Κυρίου ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου καλεῖται, ποτὲ δὲ υἴος, ποτὲ δὲ σοφία—καὶ ὅποιον ἐπὶ πυρὸς ὀρῶμεν ἄλλο γιγνόμενον, οὐκ ἐλαττουμένου ἐκείνου ἐξ οὗ ἢ ἄνοψις γέγονεν, ἀλλὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ μένοντος. *Dial.* p. 284 A. εἰπὼν τὴν δυνάμιν ταύτην γεγενῆσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς δυνάμει καὶ βουλῇ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' οὐ κατὰ ἀποτομὴν, ὡς ἀπομεριζομένης τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς οὐσίας, ὅποια τὰ ἄλλα πάντα μεριζόμενα καὶ τεμνόμενα οὐ τὰ αὐτὰ ἐστὶν ἢ καὶ πρὶν τεμῆσθαι· καὶ παραδείγματος χάριν περιλήψωμεν τὰ ὡς (ἢ ὡς τὰ) ἀπὸ πυρὸς ἀναπτόμενα πυρὰ ἕτερα ὀρῶμεν, οὐδὲν ἐλαττουμένου ἐκείνου, ἐξ οὗ ἀναφθῆναι πολλὰ δύναται, ἀλλὰ ταῦτο μένοντος, p. 358 D.

² ἀλλὰ τοῦτο τὸ τῶ ὄντι ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς προβληθὲν γέννημα, πρὸ πάντων τῶν ποιημάτων συνῆν τῶ πατρί. καὶ τούτῳ ὁ πατὴρ προσομιλεῖ, ἢ προσωμίλει. "And this Product being truly prolated by the Father was one with the Father before all created things. And the Father held intercourse with Him." P. 285 E. γενόηκαμεν ὄντα καὶ πρὸ πάντων ποιημάτων, ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς δυνάμει αὐτοῦ καὶ βουλῇ προελθόντα. "We knew that He was begotten before all created things by the power and will of the Father." P. 327 B. ὅτι οὐκ ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπινον ἔργον, ἀλλὰ τῆς βουλῆς τοῦ προβάλλοντος αὐτὸν πατρὸς

general opinion of the Ante-Nicene Fathers appears to have been that, previously to this generation or emission, the Logos subsisted from eternity in a state of most intimate union with the Father, though personally distinct from Him, being His Intelligence and His Counsellor in devising the plan of creation. But though we find in Justin's writings nothing decidedly at variance with this opinion, he nowhere expresses it in clear and explicit terms. For most of the passages, quoted by Bull and Grabe,¹ in order to prove that Justin held the doctrine of the coeternity of the Logos with the Father, are capable of a different interpretation, and may be understood merely of an

τῶν ὄλων Θεοῦ. "That He is not made by man but by the will of Him Who made Him, God the Father of the universe." P. 301 B.

¹ ὄνομα δὲ τῆ πάντων πατρὶ θετὸν, ἀγεννήτῳ ὄντι, οὐκ ἔστιν. ᾧ γὰρ ἂν καὶ ὀνόματι (f. ὀνόματί τις) προσαγορεύηται, πρεσβύτερον ἔχει τὸν θέμενον τὸ ὄνομα. τὸ δὲ πατήρ, καὶ Θεὸς, καὶ κτιστῆς, καὶ Κύριος, καὶ δεσπότης οὐκ ὀνόματά ἐστιν, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν εὐποιῶν καὶ τῶν ἔργων προσήρσις. ὁ δὲ υἱὸς ἐκείνου, ὁ μόνος λεγόμενος κυρίως υἱὸς, ὁ Λόγος πρὸ τῶν ποιημάτων καὶ συνῶν καὶ γεννώμενος, ὅτι τὴν ἔρχην δι' αὐτοῦ πάντα ἔκτισε καὶ ἐκόσμησε, Χριστὸς μὲν κατὰ τὸ κεχρίσθαι καὶ κοσμηῆσαι τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ τὸν Θεόν, λέγεται ὄνομα καὶ αὐτὸ περιέχον ἄγνωστον τημασίαν· ὃν τρόπον καὶ τὸ Θεὸς προσαγόρευμα, οὐκ ὄνομά ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ πράγματος δυσεξηγήτου ἔμφυτος τῇ φύσει τῶν ἀνθρώπων δόξα. *Apol.* ii. p. 44 D, translated in p. 6^o of this work. On this passage Bull remarks: "In his verbis docet Justinus Deo Patri et Filio nullum propriè nomen competere, sed tantùm appellationes quasdam, ab ipsorum beneficiis et operibus petitas, ipsis a nobis tribui. Hujus autem assertionis rationem hanc affert: quod Deus Pater ingenitus atque æternus sit; Filius vero ut Verbum ejus ipsi coexistat; ac proinde uterque neminem habeat se antiquiorem, qui ipsi nomen imponeret. Quin et Christi nomen ejus Divinitati tribuit Justinus, quasi scilicet ὁ Λόγος et Filius Dei Deo Patri coexistens et ex ipso ab æterno nascens (tanquam scilicet æternæ lucis æternus splendor) tum Christi nomen sortitus fuerit, quum Pater per ipsum cuncta conformaverit ornaveritque." *Def. Fid. Nic.* sect. iii. c. 2, *sub in.* With respect to this comment, we may observe, in the first place, that Justin does not assert that no name can properly and essentially be given to the Son, but to the Father of all things, an appellation uniformly applied by Him to the Father, as distinct from the Son; in the next place, that Justin does not say that the Son existed together with the Father *from eternity*, but before all created things, πρὸ τῶν ποιημάτων; and thirdly, that Justin does not

existence prior to the creation of all things. The expression which is in appearance most opposed to the doctrine of the coeternity of the Son with the Father is in a passage of the *Dialogue with Trypho*, p. 358 E, where Justin quotes Gen. xix. 24 to prove that the Old Testament recognises two distinct Lords,—One Who descended on earth to hear the cry of Sodom; the Other Who remained in heaven, “Who,” Justin goes on to say, “is the Lord of the Lord on earth, as being Father and God, and is the cause of His (the Lord on earth) being both powerful, and Lord, and God:” *ὅς καὶ τοῦ ἐπὶ γῆς Κυρίου Κύριός ἐστιν, ὡς πατήρ καὶ Θεός, αἰτιός τε αὐτῷ τοῦ εἶναι καὶ δυνατῷ, καὶ Κυρίῳ, καὶ Θεῷ.* See Bull’s remarks on this passage,

say that the Son received the name of Christ, when the Father made all things by Him. Grabe accordingly seems not to have been satisfied with Bull’s interpretation, though he contends that the word *συνών*, “being in company with,” implies the eternal existence of the Son with the Father; referring in support of his opinion to the *Dialogue with Trypho*, p. 267 B; *προὔπαρχειν Θεὸν ὄντα πρὸ αἰώνων τοῦτον Χριστόν*, “Christ to have been God before all ages,” p. 276 D; *τὸν καὶ πρὸ ποιήσεως κόσμου ὄντα Θεόν*, “He was God before the foundation of the world,” and to p. 285 E, quoted in note 2, p. 43, of which passages, as well as of p. 264 A—*ὅς καὶ πρὸ ἑωσφόρου καὶ σελήνης ἦν*, “Who existed before the morning star and the moon,” it may still be said that they are not decisive; for Arius appears to have been willing to call Christ, *τὸν ἐκ πατρὸς πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων γεγεννημένον, Θεὸν λόγον*, “God the Word, begotten of the Father before all worlds.” Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* l. i. c. 26. Waterland also classes Justin among the writers who make the generation of the Son *temporary*, vol. i. p. 104. Observe, too, what he says respecting Bishop Bull in p. 105. There is in p. 302 B a very remarkable passage: *καὶ Δαβὶδ διὰ πρὸ ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης ἐκ γαστρὸς γεννηθήσεσθαι αὐτὸν κατὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς βουλὴν ἐκήρυξε*, “And David proclaimed that He was begotten from the womb of the sun and the moon, according to the will of the Father.” The reference is to Ps. cx. 3: *ἐν ταῖς λαμπρότησι τῶν ἁγίων σου, ἐκ γαστρὸς πρὸ ἑωσφόρου ἐγέννησά σε*, “In the beauties of holiness from the womb before the morning star have I begotten Thee.” Commentators generally understand this verse of the generation of the Son to create the universe; but in p. 286 E, Justin refers it to His birth from the Virgin. See pp. 82 E (56), 250 C, 310 A. In p. 309 C, the words *ἐκ γαστρὸς* are omitted.

sect. iv. c. 1, *Def. Fid. Nic.* Again, p. 311 B, Justin says: ὅς ἐστι Κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων διὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ δόντος αὐτῷ πατρός, “Who is the Lord of hosts by the will of the Father Who gave Him the dominion.” When, however, we find it expressly stated that it was Christ who appeared to Moses, and described Himself as the Necessarily Existing “I am that I am,” we must conceive Justin to have maintained the perfect divinity of Christ, and consequently His coeternity with the Father.¹

This Rational Power, according to Justin, was begotten or emitted, that He might be the minister² of the Father in creating the universe,³ and conducting what the Fathers term the Economy.⁴ Hence we find Him present at the creation

¹ *Apol.* i. p. 95 E (80).

² μετὰ τοῦ φαινομένου μὲν, ἐκ τοῦ τῆ τοῦ πατρός βουλῆ ὑπηρετεῖν· Θεοῦ δὲ, ἐκ τοῦ εἶναι τέκνον πρωτότοκον τῶν ὄλων κτισμάτων. *Dial.* p. 354 D. Compare pp. 279 A, 280 D, 283 B, 284 A, 356 C, 357 C.

³ ἀλλ’ ἐπειδὴ ἐννοηθέντα τὸν Θεὸν διὰ λόγου τ’ ἔν κόσμον ποιῆσαι ἔγνωσαν. “Because they found that God reflecting upon Himself made the world by His Logos or Wisdom.” *Apol.* i. p. 97 B (81). ὥστε λόγῳ Θεοῦ ἐκ τῶν ὑποκειμένων καὶ προδηλωθέντων διὰ Μωσέως γενεῆσθαι τὸν πάντα κόσμον καὶ Πλάτων, καὶ οἱ ταῦτα λέγοντες, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐμάθομεν. “And that this chaos first mentioned by Moses was the subject-matter out of which the Logos of God made the world, both Plato and his followers and we are agreed.” P. 92 D (71). ὥσπερ τᾶλλα πάντα ζῶα λόγῳ Θεοῦ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐγεννήθη. “And all the other animals were made in the beginning by the Word of God.” *Dial.* p. 310 C. It has been already observed that Justin applies the expressions, Maker and Creator of all things, to the Father exclusively: the Λόγος was ministerial. Justin speaks of the world as created out of matter without form: ἕλκην ἄμορφον οὖσαν στρέψαντα (l. τρίψαντα) τὸν Θεὸν κόσμον ποιῆσαι. “God created the world out of a chaos of rude matter.” *Apol.* i. p. 92 C (71). Compare pp. 58 B (12), 99 A (94). We must not, however, thence infer that he maintained the eternity of matter.

⁴ By the word οἰκονομία, I understand that dispensation which commenced with the generation of the Son for the purpose of creating the universe, and will end when “He shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the

of man;¹ He it was Who appeared to Abraham,² Who wrestled with Jacob,³ Who conversed with Moses from the burning bush,⁴ Who announced the approaching fall of Jericho to Joshua,⁵ Who inspired the prophets,⁶ Who in the fulness of time condescended to be born of the Virgin,⁷ to assume the human form, and to suffer death on the Cross; Who rose again from

Father" (1 Cor. xv. 24). This is the meaning of the word in its fullest acceptation: but it is also applied to any particular event or epoch in that dispensation. Thus to the Passion of Christ, *καὶ τῇ τοῦ γενόμενου πάθους αὐτοῦ οἰκονομία*, "And to the task of His completed Passion," *Dial.* pp. 247 D, 331 A; to His assumption of our nature, p. 264 A; to His compliance with the Mosaic ordinances, p. 291 E; to His ministry on earth, p. 315 A; to His birth from the Virgin, p. 348 B. Sometimes the word appears to be equivalent to mystery, and to signify that some hidden meaning is couched under any action or event; for instance, under the polygamy of the patriarchs, pp. 364 A, 371 A. So we find, p. 334 E, with reference to Jonah's gourd, *διὰ τῆς οἰκονομίας τοῦ ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἀνατεῖλαι αὐτῷ σικυῶνα*. "By this mysterious arrangement a gourd arose for him out of the earth." Mosheim, *Cent.* ii. p. 2, c. 3, sect. viii., speaks of a mode of disputing *κατ' οἰκονομίαν*; but there is no vestige of this use of the word in Justin or the earlier Fathers. In my work on Clement of Alexandria, p. 398, I have gone fully into this question.

¹ *Dial.* p. 285 B.

² *ὅτι ὁ ὀφθείς τῷ Ἀβραάμ πρὸς τῇ ὀρυτῇ τῇ Μαμβρῆ Θεός*. "That God appeared to Abraham at the oak of Mamre." *Dial.* pp. 275 A, 276 E, 281 E. See p. 34, n. 3.

³ *Dial.* p. 281 E. See p. 25, n. 6.

⁴ *ἐν ἰδέᾳ πυρὸς ἐκ βάτου προσωμίλησεν αὐτῷ (τῷ Μωσεί) ὁ ἡμέτερος Χριστός*. "Our Christ talked with him (Moses) out of the bush in the appearance of fire." *Apol.* i. p. 95 B (79). *Dial.* pp. 282 D, 340 D. See p. 25, n. 7.

⁵ *Dial.* p. 286 A.

⁶ *λόγος γὰρ ἦν καὶ ἔστιν ὁ ἐν παντὶ ὄν, καὶ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν προσιπῶν τὰ μέλλοντα γίνεσθαι*. "For the Word was and is and exists in all things, Who also prophesied by the prophets who were to come." *Apol.* ii. p. 49 A.

⁷ *λοιπὸν οὖν καὶ ὅτι οὗτος διὰ τῆς παρβένου ἀνθρώπος γεννηθῆναι κατὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ βούλησιν ὑπέμεινεν, ἀπόδειξον, καὶ σταυραθῆναι, καὶ ἀποθανεῖν' δῆλον (f. δηλοῦ) δὲ καὶ ὅτι μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστὰς ἀνελήλυθεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν*. *Dial.* p. 286 C. *ἀλλ' εἰς ἀπόδειξιν γεγονόασιν οἶδε οἱ λόγοι, ὅτι υἱὸς Θεοῦ καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ ὁ Χριστός ἔστι, πρότερον λόγος ὢν καὶ ἐν ἰδέᾳ πυρὸς ποτε φανείς' ποτὲ δὲ καὶ*

the dead, ascended into heaven, and shall come again to judge mankind.¹

Of the titles applied by Justin to the second Person in the Trinity, some have reference to His nature; some to the relation in which He stands to the Father; some to the part which He bears in the gospel economy. In the first respect He is repeatedly called God,² and said to be the object of worship.³

In the second respect He is called the Son of God in a peculiar sense,⁴ or His only-begotten Son, His Reason or

ἐν εἰκόνι ἀσωμάτων· νῦν δὲ διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀνθρωπίου γένους ἀνθρώπος γενόμενος, ὑπέμεινε καὶ παθεῖν κ. τ. εἰ. *Apol.* i. p. 96 A (80).

¹ καὶ αὐτὸς τὴν κρίσιν τοῦ πάντος ἀνθρωπίνου γένους ποιήσεται. “And that He should come to be the Judge of all the world.” *Apol.* i. p. 88 A (64). See p. 57 B (10).

² ὃς καὶ λόγος (f. supplend. καὶ) πρωτότοκος ὢν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ Θεὸς ὑπάρχει. *Apol.* i. p. 96 D (81). *Dial.* pp. 267 B, 276 D, quoted in note 1, p. 44, p. 314 B. οὗτος αὐτὸς Θεὸς ὢν σημαίνει τῷ Μωσῆϊ, p. 282 E. καὶ ἄγγελος καλούμενος καὶ Θεὸς ὑπάρχων, p. 283 D. μαρτυρήσει δέ μοι ὁ Λόγος τῆς σοφίας, αὐτὸς ἂν οὗτος ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων γεννηθείς, p. 284 C. ἵνα καὶ Θεὸν ἀνωθεν προσελθόντα, καὶ ἀνθρώπον ἐν ἀνθρώποις γενόμενον, γνωρίσητε, p. 288 E. ὁ μὲν γὰρ (Μωσῆς) πρόσκαιρον ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς τὴν κληρονομίαν, ἅτι οὐ Χριστὸς ὁ Θεὸς ἰσως, οὐδὲ υἱὸς Θεοῦ, pp. 340 D, 354 A. τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡμετέρου ἱερέως, καὶ Θεοῦ, καὶ Χριστοῦ, υἱοῦ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων, γίγνεσθαι μελλόντων, p. 343 B. καὶ τοῦ πάθους ὃ πέπονθε δι’ αὐτοῦ ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, μέμνηται, p. 345 A. Θεὸς Θεοῦ υἱός, p. 357 D. οὐκ ἂν ἐξηγεῖσθε αὐτὸν εἶναι Θεὸν, τοῦ μόνου καὶ ἀγεννήτου καὶ ἀρρήτου Θεοῦ υἱόν, p. 355 D. ἀλλ’ ἐκείνον τὸν κατὰ βουλὴν τὴν ἐκείνου καὶ Θεὸν ὄντα, p. 357 B.

³ τὸν γὰρ ἀπὸ ἀγεννήτου καὶ ἀρρήτου Θεοῦ λόγον μετὰ τὸν Θεὸν προσκυνούμεν καὶ ἀγαπάμεν. *Apol.* ii. p. 51 C. ὅτι γοῦν καὶ προσκυνητός ἐστι καὶ Θεὸς καὶ Χριστὸς ὑπὸ τοῦ ταῦτα ποιήσαντος μαρτυρούμενος. *Dial.* p. 287 B. See also pp. 294 C, 302 B.

⁴ καὶ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς μόνος ἰδίως υἱὸς τῷ Θεῷ γεγέννηται, Λόγος αὐτοῦ ὑπάρχων, καὶ πρωτότοκος, καὶ δύναμις. *Apol.* i. p. 68 C (31). υἱὸν αὐτοῦ (f. αὐτὸν) τοῦ ὄντως Θεοῦ μαβόντες, p. 60 D (16). *Apol.* ii. p. 44 D, quoted in note 1, p. 44. μονογενὴς γὰρ ὅτι ἦν τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων οὗτος, ἰδίως ἐξ αὐτοῦ Λόγος καὶ δύναμις γεγεννημένος κ. τ. εἰ. *Dial.* p. 332 C.

Word,¹ His First-born or Begotten,² His Power,³ His Thought or Intelligence, if the received reading is correct,⁴ His Christ or Anointed,⁵ His Glory, His Wisdom.⁶

¹ According to the passage quoted from the *First Apology* in note 7, p. 47. Christ was the Λόγος before He was the Son and Messenger of God. ταῦτα ὁ Λόγος, Θεῖος (f. Θεός) ἄν, εἰργάσατο, "The Reason that is Divine would these things bring about effectually." *Apol.* i. p. 58 D (13). ὁ δὲ Λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ, "The Logos of God is His Son," p. 95 D (79).

² γνόντις αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον μὲν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ πρὸ πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων καὶ τῶν πατριάρχων, υἱόν. *Dial.* p. 326 E. See pp. 310 B, 311 B, 367 D, 344 C. τῷ δὲ καὶ τὸν Λόγον, ὃ ἐστὶ πρῶτον γέννημα τοῦ Θεοῦ. *Apol.* i. p. 66 E (29). νοεῖτε, ᾧ ἀκροαταί, εἴ γε καὶ τὸν νοῦν προσέχετε, καὶ ὅτι γεγενῆσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦτο τὸ γέννημα πρὸ πάντων ἀπλῶς τῶν κτισμάτων ὁ Λόγος ἐδήλου· καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον τοῦ γεννῶντος ἀριθμῶ ἑτερόν ἐστιν, πᾶς ὁστισοῦν ἐμολογήσεις. *Dial.* p. 359 B. Justin uses the word generation in speaking of Christ both as begotten before all created things, and as born from the Virgin. See the passages quoted in note 1, p. 44, as instances of the former use of this word, and the following examples of the latter: εἰ δὲ καὶ ἰδίως παρὰ τὴν κοινὴν γένεσιν γεγενῆσθαι αὐτὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ λέγομεν λόγον Θεοῦ, κ. τ. εἰ. *Apol.* i. p. 67 E (30). εἰ δὲ διὰ παρθένου γεγενῆσθαι φέρομεν, p. 68 B (31). δι' ἣν δ' αἰτίαν διὰ δυνάμεως τοῦ λόγου κατὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς πάντων καὶ δεσπότου Θεοῦ βουλὴν, διὰ παρθένου ἀνθρώπος ἀπεκυθῆθαι, κ. τ. εἰ., p. 83 D (57). διὰ γὰρ παρθένου τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματος Ἰακώβ, τοῦ γενομένου πατρὸς Ἰουδα, τοῦ δεδηλωμένου Ἰουδαίων πατρὸς, διὰ δυνάμεως Θεοῦ ἀπεκυθῆθαι, p. 74 D (41), where διὰ δυνάμεως Θεοῦ, "by the power of God," is equivalent to διὰ δυνάμεως τοῦ λόγου, "by the power of the Word," in the passage before cited. See also *Apol.* ii. p. 45 A. *Dial.* p. 241 B. In p. 316 E, the word γένεσις is used with reference to the time when the Holy Spirit descended upon Christ at His baptism, and the voice from heaven declared Him to be the Son of God, τότε γένεσιν αὐτοῦ λέγων γίγνεσθαι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἐξόστου ἢ γνώσεως αὐτοῦ ἐμελλε γίγνεσθαι, υἱὸς μου εἰ σὺ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε.

³ οὐ γὰρ σοφιστὴς ὑπῆρχεν, ἀλλὰ δύναμις Θεοῦ ὁ Λόγος αὐτοῦ ἦν. *Apol.* i. p. 61 D (19). ἡ δὲ πρώτη δύναμις μετὰ τὸν πατέρα πάντων καὶ δεσπότην Θεόν, καὶ υἱός, ὁ Λόγος ἐστὶν, ὃς τίνα τρόπον σαρκοποιηθεὶς ἀνθρώπος γέγονεν, ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς ἐροῦμεν, p. 74 B (41). καὶ ὁ ἄγγελος τοῦ Θεοῦ, τουτέστιν ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ πεμφθεῖσα ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. *Dial.* p. 344 A.

⁴ καὶ τοῦτο αὐτὸ, ᾧ φίλοι, εἶπε καὶ διὰ Μωσέως ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγος, μηνύων ἡμῖν, ὃν ἐδήλωσε, τὸν Θεὸν λέγειν τούτῳ αὐτῷ τῷ νοήματι ἐπὶ τῆς ποιήσεως τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. κ. τ. εἰ. *Dial.* p. 285 A. But Thirlby suggests that we should read γενήματι.

With reference to the part borne by Him in conducting the gospel economy, He is styled, as we have already seen, the Minister,¹ and the Angel or Messenger of God.²

We have stated that Justin supposed the generation of the Son to have taken place without any abscission or division of the essence or substance of the Father ; and that he illustrated his notion by referring to a fire, which suffers no diminution though another fire is lighted from it. This comparison implies that the Father and Son are distinct, though of one substance. There were, however, in his day those who contended that the power sent forth from the Father was inseparable from Him,³ as the light of the sun on the earth is inseparable from the sun in the heavens ; so that when the sun sets, the light is withdrawn. In like manner the Father, when He wills, causes a power to proceed from Himself, which He also recalls at pleasure. Such was the power which appeared to Moses, Abraham, and Jacob, and was called a messenger or angel when it bore the commands of God to man ; the glory of God, when it was seen under an incomprehensible appearance ;⁴ a man, when it assumed the human form ; and the *Λόγος*, when it repeated the words of the Father to man. The angels

⁵ κατὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, “against the Christ of God.” *Dial.* p. 322 C. τὸν ἑαυτοῦ Χριστόν, “this Christ.” D.

⁶ ἥ τις καὶ δόξα Κυρίου ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου καλεῖται, ποτὲ δὲ υἱός, ποτὲ δὲ σοφία, κ. τ. ἴ. *Dial.* p. 284 A, C. δόξα τοῦ γεννήσαντος. D.

¹ See note 2, p. 46.

² καὶ ἄγγελος καλεῖται καὶ ἀπόστολος· αὐτὸς γὰρ ἀπαγγέλλει ὅσα δεῖ γνωσθῆναι, καὶ ἀποστέλλεται μνηύσαν ὅσα ἀγγέλλεται. *Apol.* i. p. 95 D (79). See p. 60 A (15). *Dial.* pp. 275 C, 276 D, 283 C, D. μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελον, pp. 301 C, 321 A, 355 B, 356 C. In p. 251 B, we find an enumeration of the names given to Christ in Scripture. βασιλεὺς, ἱερεὺς, Θεὸς, κύριος, ἄγγελος, ἄνθρωπος, ἀρχιστράτηγος, λίθος, παιδίον. See also pp. 313 C, 327 C, 355 B. αἰώνιος ἡμῖν νόμος καὶ τελευταῖος ὁ Χριστὸς ἐδόθη, pp. 228 B, 242 A, 261 C, 271 C, 346 C.

³ *Dial.* p. 358 A.

⁴ ἐν ἀχαρήτω ποτὲ φαντασία.

also were emanations from the Father of the same kind. In opposition to this opinion, Justin maintains that the angels have a distinct, and positive, and permanent existence, and are not resolved into the substance from which they issued; and that the power to which the word of prophecy gives the titles of God and angel is not merely the Father under a different name, but is numerically distinct from Him.¹

With respect to the human nature of Christ, Justin uniformly speaks of Him as perfect man,² but without sin.³ He seems, however, to have thought that the divine nature in Christ was so blended with the human as to be in a certain sense communicated to it. For, speaking of the moral precepts of Christ, he says that the cause of their perfection is to be sought in the nature of *Him* by whom they were delivered. *μεγαλειότερα μὲν οὖν πάσης ἀνθρωπείου διδασκαλίας φαίνεται τὰ ἡμέτερα*

¹ οὐχ, ὡς τὸ τοῦ ἡλίου φῶς, ὀνόματι μόνον ἀριθμεῖται, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀριθμῶ ἕτερόν τι ἐστίν, p. 358 C. Compare p. 276 E. ὅτι οὗτος ὁ τε τῶ Ἀβραάμ καὶ τῶ Ἰακώβ καὶ τῶ Μωσῆ ἄφθαι λεγόμενος, καὶ γεγραμμένος Θεός, ἕτερός ἐστι τοῦ τὰ πάντα ποιήσαντος Θεοῦ, ἀριθμῶ λέγω, ἀλλ' οὐ γνώμη· οὐδὲν γάρ φημι αὐτὸν πεπραχέναι ποτὲ ἢ ἄπερ αὐτὸς ὁ τὸν κόσμον ποιήσας, ὑπὲρ ὃν ἄλλος οὐκ ἐστι Θεός, βεβούληται καὶ πράξαι καὶ ὁμιλῆσαι, p. 285 D. πρὸς τινα καὶ ἀριθμῶ ὄντα ἕτερον, λογικὸν ὑπάρχοντα, and p. 359 B, quoted in note 2, p. 49.

² καὶ ἀποδεικνύων ὅτι ἀληθῶς γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος ἀντιληπτικῶς παθών. (f. ἀντιληπτικὸς παθών.) *Dial.* p. 325 A. καὶ δι' ἑαυτοῦ ὁμοιοπαθοῦς γενομένου καὶ διδάξαντος ταῦτα. *Apol.* ii. p. 49 A. καὶ γὰρ γεννηθεὶς δύναμιν τὴν αὐτοῦ ἔσχε, καὶ αὐξάνων κατὰ τὸ κοινὸν τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων ἀνθρώπων, χρώμενος τοῖς ἀρμόζουσιν, ἐκάστη αὐξήσει τὸ οἰκίον ἀπένεμι, τρεφόμενος τὰς πάσας τροφὰς, κ. τ. ἐ., pp. 315 C, 328 E, 332 D. Justin finds a singular argument in proof of the supernatural birth of Christ on the words of Dan. vii. 13, 14. ὅταν γὰρ ὡς υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου λέγῃ Δαυιδὸν τὸν παραλαμβάνοντα τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν, οὐκ αὐτὸ τοῦτο αἰνίσσεται; τὸ γὰρ ὡς υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου εἰπεῖν, φαινόμενον μὲν καὶ γενόμενον ἄνθρωπον μνησί, οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρώπινου δὲ σπέρματος ὑπάρχοντα δηλοῖ, p. 301 A. See p. 25, note 2. See also p. 331 E, where there appears to be an allusion to the Docetæ. In p. 327 A, Justin assigns reasons why Christ called Himself the Son of man.

³ ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ ἀναμάρτητος εἶναι. *Dial.* p. 330 A, D. See also pp. 337 E, 234 D, 235 B, 241 B, 254 B.

διὰ τοῦτο, λογικὸν τὸ ὄλον τὸν φανέντα (Thirlby would read διὰ τὸ λογικὸν ὄλον τὸν φανέντα, Pearson διὰ τοῦ τὸ δι' ἡμῶς Χριστὸν γεγονέναι καὶ σῶμα καὶ λόγον καὶ ψυχὴν.¹ Where, whether we interpret καὶ λόγον of the Divine Nature, or suppose it equivalent to νοῦν as distinguished from ψυχὴν, Justin must be understood to say that Christ was λογικὸς as to the whole of His human nature. It should, however, be observed that, according to Justin, the whole human race participated of the Λόγος. In the *First Apology*² he supposes an objection of this nature to be made—that they who lived before Christ entered upon His ministry and taught mankind how to believe and act, could not be held accountable for their actions; to which he answers—that Christ, the first-born of God, was the reason (Λόγος) of which the whole human race participated; so that all who lived according to reason (μετὰ λόγου) were Christians, even though they were reputed to be atheists; for instance, Socrates, Heraclitus, and others, amongst the Greeks; Abraham, Ananias, Azarias, Misael, Elias, amongst the barbarians.³ While on the contrary, they who lived contrary to reason (ἄνευ λόγου) were bad men and enemies of Christ; and, as Justin means his reader to infer, equally accountable with those who

¹ *Apol.* ii. p. 48 B.

² P. 83 B (56). Compare *Apol.* ii. p. 41 E. μετὰ λόγου ὀρθοῦ βιοῦσιν, “they live by the aid of a true reason.” Christ was in part known to Socrates. *Apol.* ii. p. 48 E.

³ ἐν βαρβάροις. As Justin here calls Abraham, etc., barbarians, in compliance with the prejudices of the heathens whom he is addressing, may not what he says respecting the seed of the word, implanted in the breasts of all men, be said in accommodation to the same prejudices, with the view of procuring a more favourable reception for the doctrine of the Λόγος? Le Nourry and the Benedictine editors have taken some pains to rescue Justin from the suspicion, founded on this passage, that he believed that the Gentiles could, by the mere light of reason, attain to eternal salvation. See Casaubon, *Exercit. ad Baronii Annales*, i. 1. In *Apol.* i. p. 96 E (81), Justin says that Abraham, Isaac, etc., were the first who applied themselves to the study of divine things.

lived wickedly after Christ's coming. Whatever right opinions the Gentile philosophers entertained respecting the nature of the Deity,¹ the relation in which man stands to Him, and the duties arising out of that relation, were to be ascribed to this seed of the word implanted in their bosoms. But to them was given only a small portion: the true believer in Christ alone possesses its fulness.²

As it was the Λόγος who suggested to the Gentile philosophers and lawgivers whatever right notions they possessed, so was it also the Λόγος who inspired the ancient prophets. We have already cited one passage to this effect;³ but the same statement occurs repeatedly in Justin's writings.

¹ οὐ γὰρ μόνον Ἑλλησι διὰ Σακράτους ὑπὸ λόγου ἠλέγχθη ταῦτα (the absurdities of the Gentile polytheism) ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν βαρβάροις ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ λόγου μορφωθέντες, καὶ ἀνθρώπου γενομένου, καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κληθέντος. *Apol.* i. p. 56 A (7). Here an opposition seems to be intended between Λόγος and ὁ Λόγος, "Reason" and the "Logos;" but it is not observed in other passages. διὰ τὸ ἔμφυτον παντὶ γίνεαι ἀνθρώπων σπέρμα τοῦ λόγου. *Apol.* ii. p. 46 C. οἱ γὰρ συγγραφεῖς πάντες διὰ τῆς ἐνοούσης ἐμφύτου τοῦ λόγου σπορᾶς ἀμυδρῶς ἐδύναντο ὄρᾶν τὰ ὄντα. ἕτερον γὰρ ἐστὶ σπέρμα τινὸς καὶ μίμημα κατὰ δύναμιν δοθέν· καὶ ἕτερον αὐτὸ οὐ, κατὰ χάριν τὴν ἀπ' ἐκείνου, ἢ μετουσία καὶ μίμησις γίνεσθαι, p. 51 D. ἀπὸ μέρους τοῦ σπερματικοῦ θείου λόγου, p. 51 C. ὅθεν παρὰ πᾶσι σπέρματα ἀληθείας δοκεῖ εἶναι. *Apol.* i. p. 82 A (52). As the word Λόγος in Justin's writings is used in three different senses, for the Reason or Word of God—the second Person in the Trinity; for reason occasionally; and for speech or the word spoken; we may expect to find occasional difficulty in determining the precise sense in which it is used. See Casaubon, *ubi supra*.

² τοὺς (μὴ) κατὰ σπερματικοῦ λόγου μέρος, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ παντὸς λόγου, ὃ ἐστὶ Χριστοῦ (I. Χριστός), γινώσιν καὶ θεωρίαν. *Apol.* ii. p. 46 C. ὅσα γὰρ καλῶς αἰεὶ ἐφθέγγεσθαι καὶ εὔρον οἱ φιλοσοφῆσαντες ἢ νομοθετήσαντες, κατὰ λόγου μέρος εὐρέσιως καὶ θεωρίας ἐστὶ ποιηθέντα αὐτοῖς. ἐπειδὴ δὲ οὐ πάντα τὰ τοῦ λόγου ἐγνώρισαν, ὅς ἐστι Χριστός, καὶ ἐναντία ἑαυτοῖς πολλάκις εἶπον, p. 48 C. οἱ πιστεύοντες αὐτῶ ἐσὼν ἄνθρωποι, ἐν οἷς οἰκεῖ τὸ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ σπέρμα, ὁ Λόγος. *Apol.* i. p. 74 B (41). ἐν οἷς αἰεὶ δυνάμει μὲν πάριστοι, καὶ ἐναργῶς δὲ παρίσταναι ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ (ὁ Χριστός). *Dial.* p. 273 E.

³ *Apol.* ii. p. 49 A, quoted in note 6, p. 47. See also *Apol.* i. 75 C (43). ἕτι δὲ οὐδὲν ἄλλω θεοφοροῦνται οἱ προφητεύοντες, εἰ μὴ λόγῳ θείῳ, καὶ ὑμεῖς, ὡς

With respect to the third Person in the Trinity, we have seen that Justin represents the Holy Ghost, in conjunction with the Father and the Son, as an object of worship. The distinct personality of the Holy Spirit is also incidentally asserted.¹ It is, however, not unworthy of observation that the passages most explicitly declaring the doctrine of the Trinity are found in the *First Apology*, not in the *Dialogue with Trypho*; in which Justin's principal object was to establish the pre-existence and divinity of Christ. When, therefore, he alleges the passage in Gen. i. 26, "Let us make man in our image after our likeness," the only inference which he draws is, that the Almighty then addressed Himself to some distinct rational being.² In like manner, in alleging Gen. iii. 22, "Lo, Adam is become as one of us to know good and evil," he proceeds no further than to conclude from the words "as one of us," that there were two persons *at least* in conference with each other; and he afterwards applies them solely to the Son.³ When the Holy Spirit is mentioned in the *Dialogue*, it is chiefly with reference to the inspiration of the prophets, or to His operation on the hearts of men.

But though, in the passages above quoted, a distinct personality is ascribed to the Holy Ghost, we find others in which the Spirit and the Λόγος seem to be confounded. Thus, in allu-

ὑπολαμβάνω, φήσετε. P. 76 D (45). μὴ ἀπ' αὐτῶν τῶν ἐμπνευσμένων λέγεσθαι νομίσητε, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τοῦ κινουῦντος αὐτοὺς θείου λόγου.

¹ καὶ ἀποκρίνεται αὐτοῖς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ἢ ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ πατρὸς, ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἰδίου, κ. τ. ἔ. *Dial.* p. 255 C. ἔσθ' ὅτε γὰρ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα καὶ ἐναργῶς πράττεισθαι τι, ὃ τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος γίνεσθαι ἦν, ἐποίησ' ἔσθ' ὅτε δὲ καὶ λόγους ἐφθέγγετο περὶ τῶν ἀποβαίνειν μελλόντων, φεγγόμενον αὐτοὺς ὡς τότε γιγνομένων ἢ καὶ γεγνημένων, p. 341 C. καὶ τὸ εἰπεῖν αὐτὸν τρίτον, ἐπειδὴ, ὡς προείπομεν, ἐπάνω τῶν ὑδάτων ἀνέγνω ὑπὸ Μωσέως εἰρημένον ἐπιφέρεσθαι τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ πνεῦμα. *Apol.* i. p. 93 B (72).

² *Dial.* p. 285 D, quoted in note 1, p. 51.

³ οὐκοῦν εἰπῶν, ὡς εἷς ἐξ ἡμῶν, καὶ ἀριθμὸν τῶν ἀλλήλοις συνόντων, καὶ τὸ ἐλάχιστον δύο, μεμήνυκεν. *Dial.* p. 285 D.

sion to Luke i. 35, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee," Justin says, "It is not allowed me to conceive that the Spirit and the power from God is any other than the Word, the first-begotten of God."¹ Grotius, in his note on Mark ii. 8, says that the early Fathers frequently used the word *πνεῦμα* to signify the divine nature in Christ, and quotes this very passage from Justin in proof of the statement; and doubtless the word may without any over-refinement be there so understood. Perhaps, however, the idea present to their minds was, that as, in the mystery of the Incarnation, the Holy Ghost came upon the Virgin, and the power of the Highest overshadowed her, and the *Λόγος* thereby became flesh, the Holy Spirit, the power of the Highest, and the *Λόγος* were the same. But Justin attributes the inspiration of the ancient prophets sometimes to the *Λόγος*, sometimes to the Holy Spirit.² Here it is difficult to interpret the latter of the divine nature in Christ, and yet the two

¹ τὸ πνεῦμα οὖν καὶ τὴν δύναμιν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐδὲν ἄλλο νοῆσαι θεμίζε, ἢ τὸν λόγον, ὃς καὶ πρωτότοκος τῷ Θεῷ ἐστι. *Apol.* i. p. 75 B (43). Compare this passage with *Dial.* p. 327 C. The ancients were very fond of contrasting Eve with the Virgin Mary. As, through Eve, a virgin, sin was brought into the world, so, through Mary, a virgin, has its power been destroyed. ἵνα καὶ δι' ἧς ὁδοῦ ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄφεις παρακοὴ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔλαβε, διὰ ταύτης τῆς ὁδοῦ καὶ καταλύσιν λάβῃ, παρβένος γὰρ ὄσα Εὐὰ καὶ ἄφθορος τὸν λόγον τὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄφεις συλλαβοῦσα, παρακοὴν καὶ θάνατον ἔτεκε, κ. τ. ἐ. "For in the same way that disobedience was first brought into the world by the serpent, so also it was destroyed; for Eve, the incorrupt virgin, conceiving the word from the serpent, brought forth disobedience and death." Eve conceived the word from the serpent, Mary the Word from God.

² See note 6, p. 47, and note 3, p. 43. καὶ πάλιν ὁ αὐτὸς προφήτης Ἡσαΐας, θεοφορούμενος τῷ πνεύματι τῷ προφητικῷ, ἔφη. "And again the same prophet Isaiah, as he was moved by the prophetic Spirit, says." P. 76 A (44). For the *Λόγος*, see *Dial.* pp. 268 B, C, 314 B, C, 370 C. For the Holy or Prophetic Spirit, *Dial.* pp. 242 C, 249 E, 271 D, 274 B, 275 C, 277 B, D, 284 A. *Apol.* i. pp. 72 B (38), 94 E (77). In p. 243 C, we find λέγει γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς διὰ Ἡσαΐου, "For God says by Isaiah." The same Spirit Who inspired the prophets also anointed the Jewish kings. *Dial.* pp. 272 B, 313 C.

appear to be identified. I know no other mode of explaining this fact than by supposing that, as the *Λόγος* was the conductor of the whole gospel economy, Justin deemed it a matter of indifference whether he said that the prophets were inspired by the *Λόγος*, or by the Holy Spirit Who was the immediate agent. The Holy Spirit is called in Scripture the Spirit of Christ.¹


Had the work which Justin composed in confutation of the heretics of his day (*Apol.* i. p. 70 C (36)) come down to our hands, we should probably have obtained a clearer insight into his notions on these abstruse subjects. As it is, we cannot doubt that he maintained a real Trinity; whether he would have explained it precisely according to the Athanasian scheme is not equally clear; but I have observed nothing in the *Apologies* or in the *Dialogue with Trypho* which appears to me to justify a positive assertion to the contrary. Those passages which seem to imply an inferiority in Christ to the Father may without any forced construction be understood of the part borne by Christ in conducting the economy.

In the first chapter¹ we mentioned that Justin accused the Jews of having erased from the prophecy of Jeremiah a passage which is not found in any copy, either Greek or Hebrew. The purport of the passage is that the Lord

¹ Rom. viii. 9; Gal. iv. 6; Phil. i. 19; 1 Pet. i. 11. In the last passage, the immediate reference is to the inspiration of the prophets. In the following passage Justin says that the prophets saw visions: ἐν ἐκστάσει. τοῦτον δὲ αὐτὸν οὐκ ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει αὐτοῦ ἐωράκει ὁ προφήτης, ὡς περ οὐδὲ τὸν διάβολον καὶ τὸν τοῦ Κυρίου ἄγγελον οὐκ αὐτοψία ἐν καταστάσει ἂν ἐωράκει, ἀλλ' ἐν ἐκστάσει ἀποκαλύψεως αὐτῷ γεγεννημένης. "In a trance. For the prophet saw Him not in revelation, even as he did not see the devil nor the angel of God with his own eyes in person, but being taken out of himself, as it were, he saw Him in a vision." *Dial.* p. 343 A.

² P. 33, note 5. Observe the expression ἐν ᾧ μένειν, "to remain in Hades," p. 326 C.

God remembered the dead among the Israelites who were His, and descended to preach His salvation to them. Here we have an approach to the doctrine of Christ's descent into hell.



CHAPTER III.

JUSTIN'S OPINIONS RESPECTING ORIGINAL SIN, THE FREEDOM OF THE WILL, GRACE, JUSTIFICATION, PREDESTINATION.

MAN, according to Justin, was created an intelligent and rational being, capable of choosing the truth, and securing his own happiness, and consequently capable of transgression :¹ for this is the property of everything created that it is capable of virtue and vice ;² and on this capacity of choosing good and evil Justin rests the accountableness of men and angels.³ What were Justin's opinions respecting the change made by

¹ καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν νοερὸν καὶ δυνάμενον αἰρεῖσθαι τὰ ληθῆ, καὶ εἶ πράττειν, τὸ γένος τὸ ἀνθρώπινον πεποιήκειν, ὥστ' ἀναπολόγητον εἶναι τοῖς πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ· λογικοὶ γὰρ καὶ θεωρητικοὶ γενένηται. *Apol.* i. p. 71 B (37). In *Dial.* p. 259 A, the body of Adam is said to have been made the habitation of the inspiration from God : τοῦ ἐμφυσήματος τοῦ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ. See also p. 316 A. ἀλλ' ὡς ἐγίνωσκε καλὸν εἶναι γενέσθαι, ἐποίησεν αὐτεξουσίως πρὸς δικαιοπραξίαν καὶ ἀγγέλους καὶ ἀνθρώπους, καὶ χρόνους ἄρισε μέχρις οὗ ἐγίνωσκε καλὸν εἶναι τὸ αὐτεξουσίον ἔχειν αὐτούς· καὶ ὅτι (f. ὅτε) καλὸν εἶναι ὁμοίως ἐγνώριζε, καὶ καθολικῶς καὶ μερικῶς κρίσεις ἐποίηι, πεφυλαγμένου μέντοι τοῦ αὐτεξουσίου, p. 329 A.

² γεννητοῦ δὲ παντὸς ἢδε ἡ φύσις, κακίας καὶ ἀρετῆς δεκτικὸν εἶναι, κ. τ. ἔ. *Apol.* ii. p. 45 E.

³ τὸ δ' ἐξακολουθεῖσαι οἷς φίλον αὐτῷ, αἰρουμένους δι' ὧν αὐτὸς ἐδωρήσατο λογικῶν δυνάμεων, πείθει τε καὶ εἰς πίστιν ἄγει ἡμᾶς. *Apol.* i. p. 58 C (13). Here we have something like preventing grace. καὶ δι' αὐτοὺς ἡμεῖς οἱ ἄνθρωποι, καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι, ἐλεγχθησόμεθα πονηρουσάμενοι, ἐὰν μὴ φθάσαντες μεταβώμεθα *Dial.* p. 370 C.

the fall in man's condition, with reference to this capacity of choosing good and evil, does not clearly appear. He speaks of a concupiscence existing in every man, evil in all its tendencies, and various in its nature;¹ and on one occasion seems to distinguish between original and actual sin.² He says also that man, being born the child of necessity and ignorance, becomes by baptism the child of choice and knowledge; but the necessity and ignorance in which man is said to be born are not referred to the transgression of Adam.³

From the indistinctness of Justin's language respecting the effects of the fall on the posterity of Adam, we may expect to find an equal indistinctness on the subject of grace. He insists, however, repeatedly that man stands in need of illumination from above, in order to be enabled rightly to understand the sacred Scriptures;⁴ and we find something resembling converting grace in *Dial.* p. 344 A.

¹ σύμμαχον λαβόντες τὴν ἐν ἐκάστῳ κακὴν πρὸς πάντα καὶ ποικίλην φύσει ἐπιθυμίαν. *Apol.* i. p. 58 E (13).

² ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τοῦ γένους τοῦ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὃ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀδάμ ὑπὸ θάνατον καὶ πλάνην τὴν τοῦ ὄφους ἐπεπτάκει, παρὰ τὴν ἰδίαν αἰτίαν ἐκάστου αὐτῶν πονηρευσαμένου. *Dial.* p. 316 A.

³ Ἐπειδὴ τὴν πρώτην γένεσιν ἡμῶν ἀγνοοῦντες κατ' ἀνάγκην γεγενήμεθα ἔξ ὑγρᾶς σπορᾶς κατὰ μίξιν τὴν τῶν γονέων πρὸς ἀλλήλους, καὶ ἐν ἔθει φαύλοις καὶ πονηραῖς ἀνατροφαῖς γεγόναμεν, ὅπως μὴ ἀνάγκης τίνα μηδὲ ἀγνοίας μένωμεν, ἀλλὰ προαιρέσεως καὶ ἐπιστήμης, κ. τ. ἔ. *Apol.* i. p. 94 C (76). The opposition between the first and second birth in this passage implies that the baptized person is an adult. In *Dial.* p. 353 E, Justin says that Adam, by his transgression, brought death upon himself; but Christians, if they keep God's commandments, can attain to a state of exemption from suffering and of immortality, and are thought worthy to be called the sons of God.

⁴ *Dial.* pp. 247 A, 250 C. οὐδὲ γὰρ δύναμις ἐμοὶ τοιαύτη τις ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ χάρις παρὰ Θεοῦ μόνη εἰς τὸ συνίεναι τὰς γραφὰς αὐτοῦ ἰδόθῃ μοι· ἥς χάριτος καὶ πάντας κοινανούς ἀμισθῶτι καὶ ἀφθόνως παρακαλῶ γίγνεσθαι, pp. 280 B, 305 A. εἰ οὖν τις μὴ μετὰ μεγαλῆς χάριτος τῆς παρὰ Θεοῦ λάβοι νοῆσαι τὰ εἰρημένα καὶ γεγενημένα ὑπὸ τῶν προφητῶν, οὐδὲν αὐτὸν ὀνήσει τὸ τὰς ῥήσεις δοκεῖν λέγειν, pp. 319 B, 326 E, 346 E. The inability of the Jews to

On the subject of justification, Justin is sufficiently clear and explicit. He uniformly assigns the merits or death of Christ as the cause, and faith as the medium by which we are justified. By Christ's stripes we are healed; ¹ by His stripes all are healed who approach the Father through Him; ² by His blood all who believe on Him are purified; ³ the Father willed that He should bear for the whole human race the curses due to all; ⁴ He endured the servitude even of the cross in behalf of the various races of men, having purchased them by His blood and the mystery of the cross. ⁵ The names of Helper and Redeemer are applied to Christ, though with an immediate reference to the power of casting out demons in His name. ⁶ With respect to the medium of justification, it is asserted that men are purified by faith through the blood and death of Christ; ⁷ and that Abraham was not justified by circumcision, but by faith. ⁸ In order, however, to secure the benefits arising

understand the Scriptures was the effect of a judicial blindness inflicted on them by God, p. 274 E. Compare p. 287 E.

¹ μηδὲ χλευάζητε αὐτοῦ τοὺς μώλωπας, οἷς ἰαθῆναι πᾶσι δυνατὸν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἰάθημεν. *Dial.* p. 366 D. See also p. 323 B.

² δι' οὗ τῶν μολώτων ἴασις γίγνεται τοῖς δι' αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν πατέρα προσχωροῦσιν. *Dial.* p. 234 A.

³ προαγγελτικὸν ἦν τοῦ πάθους οὗ πάσχειν ἔμιλλε, δι' αἵματος καθαίρων τοὺς πιστεύοντας αὐτῷ. *Apol.* i. 74 A (41). *Dial.* pp. 259 A, 273 E, 338 D. δι' αὐτῶν παθόντα λόγον, p. 336 A.

⁴ εἰ οὖν καὶ τὸν ἑαυτοῦ Χριστὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐκ παντὸς γένους ἀνθρώπων ὁ πατὴρ τῶν ὄλων τὰς πάντων κατάρas ἀναδέξασθαι ἐβουλήθη. *Dial.* p. 322 E. Observe the whole passage.

⁵ ἐδούλευσε καὶ τὴν μέχρι σταυροῦ δουλείαν ὁ Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐκ παντὸς γένους ποικίλων καὶ πολυειδῶν ἀνθρώπων, δι' αἵματος καὶ μυστηρίου τοῦ σταυροῦ κτησάμενος αὐτούς. *Dial.* p. 364 D.

⁶ βοηθὸν γὰρ ἐκείνον καὶ λυτρωτὴν καλοῦμεν, οὗ καὶ τὴν τοῦ ὀνόματος ἰσχὺν καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια τρέμει κ. τ. ἐ. *Dial.* p. 247 C.

⁷ καὶ μηκέτι αἵμασι τράγων καὶ προβάτων, ἢ σποδῷ δαμάλειος, ἢ σειμιδάλειος προσφοραῖς καθαριζομένους, ἀλλὰ πίστιν διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, ὅς διὰ τοῦτο ἀπέθανεν. *Dial.* p. 229 E. αἵματι σωτηρίῳ πισπιστεύκαμεν, pp. 241 E, 259 A, 273 E, 338 D.

⁸ καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ὁ Ἀβραάμ, ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ ὢν, διὰ τὴν πίστιν ἦν ἐπίστευσε τῷ

from Christ's death, repentance and a renunciation of our past evil habits are necessary.¹ It has been already observed that Justin, in interpreting Gen. xlix. 11, says that the Holy Spirit calls those who have received remission of sins through Christ His garments.² We may not find in Justin those nice and subtle distinctions which controversy subsequently introduced into the question of justification; but the substance of the true doctrine is there—that man is justified on account of the merits of Christ through faith, of which faith a holy life is the fruit.

We have seen that Justin maintained such a degree of freedom in men as rendered them accountable for their actions. When, however, he is urging the argument from prophecy in the *First Apology*,³ an objection of this kind seems to have occurred to him—that events, in order to be predicted, must be foreknown—that what is foreknown must be irreversibly fixed—and consequently, that whatever happens, happens by a fatal necessity; men have nothing in their own power, and are not accountable for their conduct. In reply to this objection, and in order to show that men act well and ill by their own free choice, Justin argues thus:—"We see that the conduct of the same man is various at different times; is sometimes

Θεῷ ἰδικαιώθη. *Dial.* pp. 241 C, 319 E. *Apol.* i. p. 60 D (17). In p. 327 E, Justin says that the Fathers who hoped in God confessed Christ, δηλωτικὰ ἔστι τοῦ καὶ πατέρας αὐτὸν ὁμολογεῖν τοὺς ἐλπίσαντας ἐπὶ τὸν Θεόν.

¹ ἀπαλλαγὴν δὲ τοῦ θανάτου τοῖς μεταγινώσκουσιν ἀπὸ τῶν φαύλων καὶ πιστεύουσιν εἰς αὐτὸν ἐργάζεται. *Dial.* p. 327 E. τοῦτο δὲ ἔστιν ὡς, μετανοήσας ἐπὶ τοῖς ἁμαρτήμασι, τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ λάβη ἄφῃσιν· ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς ὑμεῖς ἀπατᾶτε ἑαυτοὺς, καὶ ἄλλοι τινὲς ὑμῖν ὅμοιοι κατὰ τοῦτο, οἱ λέγουσιν ὅτι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ὄσι, Θεὸν δὲ γινώσκουσιν, οὐ μὴ λογίσσεται αὐτοῖς Κύριος ἁμαρτίαν, p. 370 D. See also pp. 267 A and 259 D, where Christ is said to have been an offering for all sinners who would repent and live righteously.

² *Dial.* p. 273 E, quoted in p. 25, note 2. A nearly similar thought occurs in p. 344 B.

³ P. 80 D (51). Compare Tucker, *Light of Nature*, vol. iv. p. 282.

good, sometimes bad; but this could not be the case if his character was fixed by a fatal necessity—if it was fated that he should be either good or bad. Nor would some men be good, and some bad, since in that case we should represent fate as at variance with itself, or place no distinction between virtue and vice, making them dependent only on opinion. This only is irreversibly fated, that they who choose what is good shall be rewarded; they who choose what is evil, punished. For man cannot be a fit object either of reward or punishment, if he is virtuous or wicked, not by choice, but by birth.” In another place, he says that events are foretold, not because they happen from a fatal necessity, but because God foreknows what man will do.¹ He brings forward a cavil of the Jews, either real or supposed, to this effect, that if it was foretold that Christ should die on the cross, and that they who caused His death should be Jews, the event could not fall out otherwise.² To this he replies that God is not the cause that men, of whom it is predicted that they shall be wicked, prove wicked; but they are themselves the cause; and if the Scripture foretells the punishment of certain angels and men, it is because God foreknows that they will be unchangeably wicked, not because He has made them so. He illustrates his meaning by a reference to the prediction that the Messiah should enter Jerusalem seated on an ass.³ That prediction, he says, did not cause Him to be the Messiah, but pointed out to mankind a mark by which they might know that He was the Messiah. In all these passages there is no mention of predestination: God foreknows events, but does not preordain them.⁴ He acts, however, or rather forbears to act, in consequence of this foreknowledge: for instance, He defers the

¹ P. 82 A (52). See *Dial.* p. 234 B.

² *Dial.* p. 370 A.

³ *Dial.* p. 316 A.

⁴ On one occasion Justin says that through Christ we are called to a salvation prepared beforehand by the Father, δι' οὗ ἐκλήθημεν εἰς σωτηρίαν τὴν προητοιμασμένην παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν. *Dial.* p. 360 D.

punishment of the devil and his angels out of consideration to the human race, because He foreknows that many, now living or yet unborn, will repent and be saved; and He will not therefore bring on the consummation of all things, until the number of those foreknown to be good and virtuous shall be accomplished.¹ It should be observed that these remarks are for the most part introduced incidentally, and ought not therefore to be construed too strictly. If Justin held the doctrine of predestination at all, it must have been in the Arminian sense—*ex prævisis meritis*.²


On the subject of the Divine Providence, Justin held that it was not merely general, but extended to particular men and events. For, speaking of the philosophers, he says that the greater part of them never bestowed a thought on the inquiry, whether there was one God or many; and whether the Divine Providence extended to each individual or not, conceiving that such knowledge contributed nothing towards happiness.³ Nay,

¹ *Apol.* i. p. 71 B (37). καὶ γὰρ ἡ ἐπιμονὴ τοῦ μηδέπω τοῦτο πρᾶξαι τὸν Θεὸν διὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον γένος γεγένηται. προγιγνώσκει γὰρ τινὰς ἐκ μετανοίας σωθήσεσθαι μέλλοντας, καὶ τινὰς μηδέπω ἴσως γεννηθέντας. See also p. 82 D (55). καὶ συντελεσθῆ ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν προεγνωσμένων αὐτῷ ἀγαθῶν γιγνομένων καὶ ἐναρέτων, δι' οὓς καὶ μηδέπω τὴν ἐπικύρωσιν πεποιήται. See also *Apol.* ii. p. 45 B; *Dial.* p. 258 A. In pp. 261 B and 297 A, Justin speaks of those who are foreknown to believe in Christ, and to exercise themselves in the fear of the Lord; and in p. 346 C, he says that the wonderful providence of God was the cause that the Christians were found wiser and more pious than the Jews, through the calling of the new and eternal covenant. See also p. 364 C, κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἀξίαν καὶ κατὰ τὴν πρόγνωσιν, ὅποῖος ἕκαστος ἔσται, προλέλεκται, where the allusion is to Jacob's prediction respecting the character and fortune of his sons and their posterity.

² See *Dial.* pp. 319 E, 370 C, 234 B.

³ P. 217 E. The concluding words of this sentence are perhaps corrupt, certainly obscure,—ἐπεὶ οὐδ' ἂν ἠύχόμεθα αὐτῷ δι' ὅλης νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας. I follow the translation in Thirlby's edition; the Benedictines translate, "neque fore ut eum tota nocte ac die precaremur," which is ambiguous. Justin uses the expression διοίκησιν τοῦ κόσμου with reference to the divine

he adds, "they endeavour to persuade us that God watches over the universe, and genera and species, but not over me and you and each individual; since, if He did, we should not pray to Him day and night." Justin's view of the subject is agreeable to the language of Scripture and to the dictates of common sense; for a providence like that above described is evidently no providence at all, or at least can furnish no ground of love towards God—no motive to devotion. I do not think that this account of Justin's opinion is at variance with the fact that in another passage, to which I shall hereafter have occasion to refer, he says that God entrusted the care of the world to the angels.



CHAPTER IV.

JUSTIN'S OPINIONS RESPECTING BAPTISM AND THE EUCHARIST,
WITH A PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO A PASSAGE IN THE
FIRST APOLOGY.

IN the *First Apology*, p. 93 E (73), Justin tells the Emperors that he will detail to them the mode in which the Christian converts, being renewed through Christ, dedicate themselves to God. "As many," he says, "as are persuaded, and believe that what we teach is true, and undertake to conform their lives to our doctrine, are instructed to fast and pray, and entreat from God the remission of their past sins, we fasting and praying together with them. They are then conducted by us to a place where there is water, and are regenerated in the same manner in which we were ourselves regenerated.

governance, p. 246 E. In p. 91 D (70), ἐν τῇδε τῇ διοικήσει seems to be equivalent to *in this world*.

For they are then washed in the name of God the Father and Lord of the universe, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit." Justin then alleges in proof of the necessity of this regeneration, John iii. 3, and Isa. i. 16,¹ which he supposes to have been prophetic of Christian baptism; and states that the apostles had transmitted both the mode of performing the rite and the reason on which the necessity for its observance rested. "Since," he says, "at our first birth we were born without our knowledge or consent—in order that we may not remain the children of necessity and ignorance, but may become the children of choice and knowledge, and may obtain in the water remission of the sins which we have committed, the name of God the Father and Lord of the universe is pronounced over him who wishes to be regenerated, and has repented of his sins," etc.² Justin then runs off, as is his custom, into a long digression respecting the washings and other ceremonies introduced at the suggestion of the demons into the religious worship of the Gentiles, in imitation either of what was actually enjoined in the Mosaic law, or was foretold by the prophets as afterwards to take place under the Christian dispensation.³ He proceeds to animadvert on the blindness of the Jews, who maintained that it was the Father, not the Son, Who conversed with Moses and the patriarchs; thereby showing that they knew neither

¹ This passage is again referred to in p. 81 D (52) and *Dial.* p. 229 E, where, in the words ἀλλὰ, ὡς εἰκός, πάλαι τοῦτο ἐκεῖνο τὸ σωτήριον λουτρὸν ἦν, ὃ εἶπετο τοῖς μεταγινώσκουσι, "But as was fitting that was that ancient saving washing which follows those who repent," there appears to be an allusion to 1 Cor. x. 4. The Benedictine editors, for εἶπετο, read εἶπε, τό. Compare pp. 235 E, 342 B, 369 C. See also pp. 263 C, 231 C.

² The passage is quoted in p. 58, note 3.

³ Justin observes that the name φωτισμός, "illumination," was given to baptism: καλεῖται δὲ τοῦτο τὸ λουτρὸν φωτισμός, ὡς φωτιζομένων τὴν διάνοιαν τῶν ταῦτα μανθανόντων, "This baptism is called illumination because the minds of the catechumens who are thus washed are illuminated," p. 94 D (76). φωτιζόμενοι διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦτου, "Being illuminated by the name of this Christ." *Dial.* pp. 258 A, 351 A.

the Father nor the Son. Returning at length to the mode of initiating the new convert, he says,¹ “ After we have thus washed *him* who has expressed his conviction, and assented to our doctrines, we take him to the place where those who are called brethren are assembled, in order that we may offer up earnest prayers in common for ourselves and for the baptized person, and for all others in every place, that, having learned the truth, we may be deemed worthy to be found walking in good works, and keeping the commandments, so that we may attain to eternal salvation. Having ended our prayers, we salute each other with a kiss. Bread is then brought to that brother who presides, and a cup of wine mixed with water ; and he, taking them, gives praise and glory to the Father of the universe through the name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit ; and employs some time in offering up thanks to Him for having deemed us worthy of these gifts. The prayers and thanksgivings being ended, all the people present² express their assent by saying Amen, which, in the Hebrew tongue, answers to *γένοιτο* in the Greek. The president having given thanks, and the people having expressed their assent, they who are called among us deacons give to each of those present a portion of the bread and of the wine mixed with water, over which the thanksgiving was pronounced, and carry away a portion to those who are absent. And this food is called among us *εὐχαριστία* ; of which no one is allowed to partake who does not believe that what we teach is true, and has not been washed with the laver (of baptism) for the remission of sins and unto regeneration, and does not live as Christ has enjoined. For we do not receive it as common bread and common drink ; but in the same manner as Jesus Christ our Saviour, being made flesh through the Word of God, had both flesh and blood for our salvation ;³ so we are also taught that the food

¹ P. 97 B (82).

² πᾶς ὁ παρὼν λαός.

³ It is not easy to ascertain precisely what Justin meant in this passage, which runs thus in the original : ἀλλ' ὃν τρέπον διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ σαρκωποιηθεὶς

over which thanksgiving has been pronounced by the prayer of the Word which came from Him, by which food, undergoing the necessary change, our flesh and blood are nourished, we are taught, I say, that this food is the flesh and blood of the incarnate Jesus. For the apostles, in the memoirs composed by them, which are called Gospels, have declared that Jesus gave them this injunction, that having taken bread and given thanks, He said, 'Do this in remembrance of Me, this is My body;' and that, in like manner, having taken the cup and given thanks, He said, 'This is My blood;' and that He distributed the bread and wine to them alone." Justin adds, that through the suggestion of wicked demons, bread and wine were placed before the persons to be initiated into the mysteries of Mithras, in imitation of the Eucharist.

He then proceeds to give an account of the meetings of the Christians on the Lord's day. "Afterwards," he says, "we remind each other of these things, and they who are wealthy assist those who are in need, and we are always together; and over all our offerings we bless the Creator of all things, through

Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν καὶ σὰρκα καὶ αἷμα ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν ἔσχεν, οὕτως καὶ τὴν δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφήν, ἐξ ἧς αἷμα καὶ σάρκες κατὰ μεταβολὴν τρέφονται ἡμῶν, ἐκείνου τοῦ σαρκοποιηθέντος Ἰησοῦ καὶ σὰρκα καὶ αἷμα ἰδιδάχθημεν εἶναι, p. 98 A (89). The commentators in general understand the words *διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ*, "through the Word of God," of the *Λόγος*, or Word of God, and *δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ*, "by the prayer of the Word which came from Him," of the prayer or blessing pronounced by Christ at the time of instituting the Eucharist. (We find *λόγῳ εὐχῆς καὶ εὐχαριστίας*, "by the rational service of prayers and praises," p. 60 C (16). In p. 88 C (65), *τὸν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγον*, "the Word of God," and in *Dial.* p. 328 E, *τὸν παρ' αὐτοῦ λόγον*, "the word from Him," mean the word which the prophets and Christ were commissioned to deliver from God.) Yet the expression, "Jesus Christ made flesh through the Word of God," has a strange sound. We should rather expect to find it said that Jesus Christ was the Word made flesh, *ὁ Λόγος σαρκοποιηθεὶς*, as in p. 74 B (41). See *Dial.* pp. 264 A, 310 B, 326 E. In p. 83 D (57), however, it is said that Christ was born of the Virgin *διὰ δυνάμεως*

His Son Jesus Christ, and through the Holy Spirit. And on the day called Sunday there is an assembling together of all who dwell in the cities or country; and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read as long as circumstances permit. Then, when the reader has ceased, the president delivers a discourse, in which he admonishes and exhorts (all present) to the imitation of these good things. Then we all rise together and pray; and, as we before said, prayer being ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president offers prayers in like manner, and thanksgivings, with his utmost power;¹ and the people express their assent by saying Amen; and the distribution of that over which the thanksgiving has been pronounced takes place to each, and each partakes, and a portion is sent to the absent by the deacons. And they who are wealthy, and choose, give as much as they respectively deem fit; and whatever is collected is deposited with the president, who succours the orphans and widows, and those who through sickness or any other cause are in want, and those who are in bonds, and the

τοῦ λόγου, "by the power of the Word;" (διὰ δυνάμεως Θεοῦ, "by the power of God," p. 74 D (42)). See p. 49, note 2. Compare p. 61 D (19), δυνάμις Θεοῦ ὁ Λόγος αὐτοῦ ἦν, "the power of God was His Logos," p. 75 B (43), τὸ πνεῦμα οὐκ καὶ τὴν δύνάμιν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐδὲν ἄλλο νοῆσαι θέμις, ἢ τὸν λόγον, "By the Spirit and power of God we ought to understand the very Logos." Justin may therefore in like manner have said that Christ was made flesh through the Word of God. As it appears to me, Justin in this passage does not intend to compare the manner in which Jesus Christ, being made flesh by the Word of God, had flesh and blood for our sake, with that in which the bread and wine, over which the thanksgiving appointed by Christ has been pronounced, become the flesh and blood of Christ; but only to say that, as Christians were taught that Christ had flesh and blood, so were they also taught that the bread and wine in the Eucharist are the body and blood of Christ; ἐν πρόπῳ is merely equivalent to *as*.

¹ ὅση δυνάμις αὐτῷ ἀναπέμψει. So ὅση δυνάμις αἰνοῦντες, p. 60 C (16). The word ἀναπέμψει seems to imply that these prayers and thanksgivings were offered in a loud tone of voice.

strangers sojourning among us, and, in a word, takes care of all who are in need. But we meet together on Sunday because it is the first day in which God, having wrought the necessary change in darkness and matter, made the world; and on this day Jesus Christ our Saviour rose from the dead. For He was crucified on the day before that of Saturn; and on the day after that of Saturn, which is the day of the Sun, having appeared to the apostles and disciples, He taught them the things which we now submit to your consideration."

To take the particulars stated in this passage in their order. We find regeneration connected with the rite of baptism.¹ In the *Dialogue*, baptism is called the laver of repentance and of the knowledge of God, which was appointed for the sin of the people of God.² It is also opposed to the washings of the Mosaic ritual,³ and to circumcision.⁴ Conformably to the injunction of our blessed Lord, it was performed in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; and the candidate was fitted for receiving it by prayer and fasting. After baptism, he was received into the congregation, and joined in prayer,⁵ and was admitted to a participation in the Eucharist, all present having first saluted each other with the kiss of peace.

¹ So in *Dial.* p. 367 D, ὁ γὰρ Χριστὸς, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως ὄν, καὶ ἀρχὴ πάλιν ἄλλου γένους γέγονεν, τοῦ ἀναγεννηθέντος ὑπ' αὐτοῦ δι' ὕδατος, καὶ πίστεως, καὶ ζύλου τοῦ τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ σταυροῦ ἔχοντος. In p. 321 C, τὸ μυστήριον πάλιν τῆς (τῆς πάλιν) γενέσεως ἡμῶν refers to the final restoration of the Jews. The following passage has been urged as affording presumptive proof that infant baptism was practised in Justin's time: καὶ πολλοὶ τινες καὶ πολλὰ, ἐξηκοντοῦται καὶ ἑβδομηκοντοῦται, οἳ ἐκ παίδων ἐμαθητεύθησαν τῷ Χριστῷ, ἄφθοροι διαμένουσι. *Apol.* i. p. 62 A (20).

² P. 231 C. δι' ὕδατος ἀγνίσαι, p. 314 A.

³ Pp. 229 D, 231 C, 235 E, 236 B, 263 C, 369 C. τίς ἐκείνου τοῦ βαπτίσματος χρεῖα ἀγίῳ πνεύματι βεβαπτισμένῳ, p. 246 C.

⁴ P. 261 D.

⁵ From a passage in the *Dialogue*, p. 318 A, it appears that, in Justin's opinion, prayer was most acceptable to God when offered by the

With respect to the Eucharist, we find that in Justin's time water was mixed with the wine ;¹ that the president, having taken the bread and the wine mixed with water into his hands, offered up praises and thanksgivings to God ; that the deacons then delivered the bread and wine to all present, and carried away a portion to those who were absent.

When we compare this account with the notices on the subject of the Eucharist in the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles, we find that considerable alterations had taken place in the mode of celebration ; occasioned probably by the necessity of correcting abuses and obviating inconveniences. The first converts appear daily, after their principal meal, to have taken bread and drunk wine in commemoration of the death of their Saviour ; and it is probable that tables were prepared in the houses of the rich, at which the poorer brethren were received, and partook of the Eucharist.² At a later period, the practice at Corinth was that the brethren assembled together in some one appointed place for the purpose of eating the Lord's Supper, still connecting it with their meal.³ Probably the abuses which prevailed there, and were condemned by St. Paul, or others of a similar nature, rendered it eventually expedient to make the celebration of the Eucharist entirely distinct from the meal ; which appears, from the passage just cited, to have been the case in Justin's time.

As in those days nothing but unavoidable necessity could have prevented a Christian from attending the stated meetings,

supplicant in a kneeling posture, and with his face bowed forwards to the earth.

¹ So Irenæus, l. iv. c. 57, "temperamentum calicis."

² Acts ii. 46, *κλῶντίς τε κατ' οἶκον ἄρτον*, "breaking bread from house to house," where *κατ' οἶκον*, "from house to house," is evidently opposed to *ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ*, "in the temple."

³ I Cor. xi. 20.

the custom of sending a portion of the consecrated elements to the absent probably originated in the charitable desire to testify to them that, though absent, they were present to the thoughts and affections of their brethren; and to prevent them from losing their share in the benefits arising from the commemoration of the death of Christ. One inference we may draw from the custom—that the thanksgiving pronounced by the president was deemed necessary to give the bread and wine, so to speak, their sacramental character—to make them, as Justin expresses himself, no longer *common* bread and wine. In Justin's description we find the deacons employed, as from the account of the institution of the office in Acts vi. we might expect them to be employed, in distributing the bread and wine to the communicants.¹

On the ground that the bread and wine in the Eucharist are not common bread and wine, Justin says that none were allowed to receive them but baptized believers, who lived conformably to the precepts of Christ. His reason for saying that they are not common bread and wine is assigned in the passage quoted in p. 65, note 3; from which Le Nourry² infers that Justin maintained the doctrine of Transubstantiation. It might, in my opinion, be more plausibly urged in favour of Consubstantiation,—since Justin calls the consecrated elements bread and wine, though not common bread and wine.

¹ In the *Dialogue*, p. 259 E, Justin says that the offering of fine flour made for those who were cleansed from the leprosy (Lev. xiv. 10) was the type of the bread in the Eucharist, which Jesus Christ our Lord ordered to be offered in remembrance of the suffering which He underwent for those who are cleansed as to their souls from all wickedness; in order that we may give thanks to God for having created the world and all things in it for the sake of man, and for having delivered us from the wickedness in which we lived, and for having finally dissolved powers and principalities through Christ, Who suffered according to His will.

² *Apparatus ad Bibliothecam maximam Veterum Patrum*, p. 408.

But in the *Dialogue with Trypho*¹ we find Justin stating that the bread in the Eucharist was commemorative of the body, and the cup of the blood of Christ; and in a subsequent passage² he applies to them the expression dry and liquid food. We may therefore conclude that, when he calls them the body and blood of Christ, he speaks figuratively. He applies the word *θυσία* to the Eucharist, or rather to the thanksgivings and prayers which were offered up during the celebration of the rite;³ for he allows of none but spiritual sacrifices under the Christian dispensation. The account given by Justin of the intimate union which subsisted among the brethren, and of the readiness with which the rich contributed to the relief of the wants of the poor, proves that the spirit of love which distinguished the first converts still animated the members of the Christian community. They still

¹ ὅτι μὲν οὖν καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ προφητείᾳ (Isa. xxxiii. 13 *et seq.*) περὶ τοῦ ἄρτου ὃν παρέδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ ἡμέτερος Χριστὸς ποιεῖν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ τε σωματοποιήσασθαι (f. σσωματοποιῆσθαι) αὐτὸν διὰ τοὺς πιστεύοντας εἰς αὐτὸν, δι' οὓς καὶ παθητὸς γέγονε, καὶ περὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου ὃ εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ παρέδωκεν εὐχαριστοῦντας ποιεῖν, φαίνεται, p. 296 E. See also p. 260 A. "Justinus in *Dialogo cum Tryphone* dixit ἄρτον ποιεῖν, *panem facere vel conficere*, hoc est, Christi exemplo εὐλογεῖν καὶ εὐχαριστεῖν, benedictione et gratiarum actione consecrare in Sacramentum Corporis Christi. Alludit Justinus voce ποιεῖν ad vocem Christi apud Paulum, 1 Cor. xi. 24. πάντα ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν." Casaubon, *ad Baronii Annales*, xvi. 33.

² ταῦτα γὰρ μόνα καὶ Χριστιανοὶ παρέλαβον ποιεῖν, καὶ ἐπ' ἀναμνήσει δὲ τῆς προφῆς αὐτῶν ξηρὰς τε καὶ ὑγρὰς, ἐν ᾗ καὶ τοῦ πάθους ὃ πίπτονθε δι' αὐτοῦ ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ μέμνηται, p. 345 A. The passage is evidently corrupt. Thirlby proposes to read, ὃ πίπτονθε δι' αὐτοῦς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ μέμνηται. The language, however, is such as would scarcely have been used by a believer in the corporal presence.

³ P. 260 C. Compare p. 344 D, πάντας οὖν οἱ (πάσας οὖν, Jebb.) διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τούτου θυσίας ἅς παρέδωκεν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς γίνεσθαι, τουτέστιν ἐπὶ τῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου, τὰς ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ τῆς γῆς γιγνομένας ὑπὸ τῶν Χριστιανῶν προλαβῶν ὁ Θεὸς μαρτυρεῖ ἐναρέστους ὑπάρχειν αὐτῶ, with p. 345 A, ὅτι μὲν οὖν καὶ εὐχαὶ καὶ εὐχαριστίαι, ὑπὸ τῶν ἄξιων γιγνόμεναι, τέλειαι μόναι καὶ ἐναρέστοί εἰσι τῷ Θεῷ θυσίαι, καὶ αὐτὸς φημι. See also p. 346 B, and *Apol.* i. p. 58 A (12), 60 C (16).

distinguished each other by the endearing appellation of *brother*.

We learn, moreover, from the passage above cited, that on the first day of the week, or, as Justin styles it, the day of the sun,¹ the brethren met together for the purposes of religious worship; and he assigns as the reason for the selection of that particular day, that on it God began the work of creation, and Christ rose from the dead. So long as the converts to the gospel were principally of Jewish origin, it is reasonable to suppose that, as they attended the service of the temple, and frequented the Jewish synagogues, so they kept the Jewish Sabbath,—holding, however, meetings for religious worship on the first day of the week, in commemoration of Christ's resurrection from the dead. The admission of the Gentiles into

¹ The reader will observe that Justin calls the first day of the week ἡ τοῦ ἡλίου ἡμέρα, "the day of the sun," and the last ἡ κρονική, "the day of Saturn." Dion Cassius, in *Pompeio*, c. 6, says that the Romans derived the practice of assigning the names of the planets to different days from the Egyptians, and that it had become in a certain degree national among them, καὶ ἤδη καὶ τοῦτο σφίσι πάτριον πρόπον τινά ἐστιν. Whether the Egyptians, having received the computation of time by weeks from the Jews, applied the names of the seven heavenly bodies then known to be immediately connected with our system to the days of the week, or whether their observation of the heavenly bodies first led them to compute time by periods of seven days, may be doubtful; but it appears certain that the computation was made subservient to the purposes of astrology. Dion has recorded two explanations of the manner in which the names of the heavenly bodies came to be assigned to the different days. The early Christians, if of Jewish extraction, retained, if of Gentile, adopted the scriptural computation by weeks; and finding the astronomical or astrological names of the days of the week generally received throughout the Roman Empire, in their Apologies addressed to the heathen, naturally used those names. Selden, in the 13th and following chapters of the third book of his work, *De Jure naturali*, etc., which we recommend to the careful perusal of those who, whatever be the side they espouse, shall hereafter engage in the controversy respecting the institution of the Sabbath, has collected all that can be found on this not uninteresting subject.


the Church was quickly followed by the controversy respecting the necessity of observing the Mosaic ritual,—a controversy carried on, as we collect from the writings of the New Testament, with great bitterness; one consequence of which was that the converts, whether Jew or Gentile, who believed that the injunctions of the ceremonial law were no longer obligatory, soon ceased to observe the Sabbath; some even went the length, as Justin informs us,¹ of attaching criminality to the observance, as bespeaking a species of return from Christianity to Judaism. Bearing, however, in mind that one reason assigned by Moses for the sanctification of the Sabbath was that on the seventh day God rested from the work of creation, they added to the original reason for observing the first day of the week—the commemoration of Christ's resurrection—another, that on that day God commenced the work of creation.² Thus far, and thus far only, can it in my opinion be truly said that the Lord's day was substituted in place of the Jewish Sabbath: at first it was observed in conjunction with the Sabbath, and with a reference only to the resurrection.

In Justin's account of the Christian assemblies we find mention of a president, deacons, and a reader. That the deacons were regarded as fulfilling the same duties as the ministers whose appointment is recorded in Acts vi. cannot, I

¹ The word *σαββατισμῶν*, "to keep the Sabbath," is always used by Justin with a particular reference to the Jewish law, pp. 229 C, 236 E, 237 A, 238 A.

² In the *Dialogue*, p. 241 E, Justin says that a greater mystery was annexed by God to the eighth day than to the seventh. This mystery he afterwards states to be the command to circumcise on the eighth day, which was a type of the true circumcision from error and wickedness, received by Christians through Jesus Christ, Who rose from the dead on the first day of the week, which, when the weekly circle is complete, corresponds to the eighth day, p. 260 C. The number of persons saved in the ark was also a symbol of the day on which Christ arose from the dead, being the eighth in number, but the first in power, p. 367 D.

think, be doubted. But should any person infer that because bishops and presbyters are not expressly named by Justin, no minister with those titles then existed in the Church, his inference would not be warranted by the premises. Justin, it should be remembered, was addressing heathens, who could not be supposed to take any interest in the titles borne by the ministers of the new religion; nor did it form any part of Justin's plan to enter into minute details respecting the government or discipline of the Church. Tertullian, who in his other works frequently mentions bishops, priests, and deacons, in his *Apology*, addressed to the governors of Proconsular Africa, uses language even more general than that of Justin. In one respect the president appears to have been regarded as occupying the place of an apostle; for as the early converts, who sold their lands and possessions, laid the price at the feet of the apostles,¹ so, according to Justin, whatever was collected for the use of the poor at the meetings on the Lord's day was deposited in the hands of the president.



CHAPTER V.

THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL—THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY—THE MILLENNIUM—FUTURE JUDGMENT—ANGELS—DEMONS.

IN the introduction to the *Dialogue with Trypho*,² the old man by whose discourse Justin was converted to Christianity enters into a discussion respecting the soul. Having stated that the heathen philosophers could not tell what the soul is, he proceeds to affirm that the soul is not immortal; "for if immortal,

¹ Acts iv. 35.

² P. 222 E.

it must also be necessarily-existent, as some of the followers of Plato asserted, and as others erroneously asserted the world to be. Yet, though not immortal, all souls do not die, for that would be a benefit to the bad ; but the souls of the good exist in a happier, and those of the bad in a worse state, awaiting the day of judgment, when those which appear worthy of God will be exempt from death, and the rest be punished so long as God wills them to exist and to be punished. God alone is necessarily-existent and incorruptible, and on that very account is God ; all other things, including the soul, are created and corruptible." He afterwards arrives at the same conclusion by a different train of reasoning.¹ "The soul," he says, "is either life, or has life. If it is life, it must cause something else, not itself, to live ; as motion moves something else, not itself. No one can deny that the soul lives. If, then, it lives, it lives not as being life, but as partaking of life ; and that which partakes is different from that of which it partakes. The soul partakes of life because God wills it to live ; and in like manner it will cease to partake of life when God wills it not to live. For its existence does not flow from itself, as the existence of God from Himself. As man does not always exist, nor is the body always united to the soul, but, when this union is to be dissolved, the soul quits the body, and the man no longer exists ; so when the soul is no longer to exist, the vital spirit departs from it, and it exists no longer, but returns thither whence it was taken."

Whether Justin wished to be considered as implicitly adopting these opinions of his instructor appears to me doubtful ;² but even if he did, it is evident that he meant not to deny

¹ P. 224 B.

² In the *Dialogue*, p. 241 B, he refers to an argument which he had received from his instructor, ὃν παρ' ἐκείνου ἤκουσα τοῦ ἀνδρός, "which I heard from that man," against the perpetual obligation of the ceremonial law. See p. 2, note 5.

the immortality of the soul, but only to say that it was not immortal in its own nature,—that its immortality was the gift of God. In a subsequent part of the *Dialogue*¹ he quotes the fact, that the Witch of Endor called up Samuel's soul, to prove the existence of the soul after its separation from the body. In the *First Apology*² he says that the souls of the wicked are in a state of sensation after death, and, imitating Christ's example, refers to the passages in which God calls Himself the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, to prove that those patriarchs, though dead, were still in being.³ His notion seems to have been, that God conferred upon our first parents the gifts of incorruptibility and immortality, which they lost by their transgression; but which may now be regained by us if we believe, and lead virtuous and holy lives.⁴

We have seen that Justin's venerable instructor speaks of the punishment of the wicked as enduring so long as God wills. Justin always speaks of it as eternal.⁵ There is no absolute contradiction between the two statements, which may

¹ P. 333 A.

² P. 66 D (29). τῷ δὲ κολάζεσθαι, ἐν αἰσθήσει καὶ μετὰ θάνατον οὔσας, τὰς τῶν ἀδίκων ψυχάς. See also p. 65 A (26). ὅτι καὶ μετὰ θάνατον ἐν αἰσθήσει εἰσὶν αἱ ψυχαί.

³ P. 96 E (81). Compare Matt. xxii. 32.

⁴ ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ ἀποδείξαι ὑμῖν ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐνειδίξει τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, τοὺς καὶ Θεῷ ὁμοίως ἀπαθείς καὶ ἀθανάτους, ἐὰν φυλάξωσι τὰ προστάγματα αὐτοῦ, γεγεννημένους καὶ κατηξιωμένους ὑπ' αὐτοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ καλεῖσθαι, καὶ οὗτοι ὁμοίως τῷ Ἀδὰμ καὶ τῇ Εὐᾷ ἐξομοιούμενοι θάνατον ἑαυτοῖς ἐργάζονται. *Dial.* p. 353 E, referred to in p. 58, note 3. See p. 265 D. οἱ ἐὰν ἀξίους τῷ ἐκείνου βουλεύματι ἑαυτοὺς δι' ἔργων δείξωσι, τῆς μετ' αὐτοῦ ἀναστροφῆς καταξιωθῆναι προσελήφμεν συμβασιλεύοντας, ἀφθάρτους καὶ ἀπαθείς γενομένους. *Apol.* i. p. 58 B (13). καὶ τῷ πάλιν ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ γενέσθαι διὰ πίστιν τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ αἰτήσεις πέμπτους, p. 60 D (17).

⁵ αἰώνιον κόλασιν κολασθησομένων, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ χιλιονταετῆ περίοδον. *Apol.* i. p. 57 B (10). See also pp. 59 B (12), 65 A (26), 67 D (30), 83 B (56). *Apol.* ii. pp. 41 C, E, 45 E, 46 D, 47 D. *Dial.* p. 344 B. So also αἰώνιον κατάσχουσιν, pp. 340 D, 349 B. ἀπίστως κολάζεσθαι, p. 264 B.

be reconciled by saying that God wills the punishment to be eternal. But the former mode of expression implies the possibility that the torments of the wicked may have an end, which the positive language of Justin seems to exclude. Previously to the final judgment, the soul will be reunited to the body, which, in the case of the good, will not only be rendered immortal and incapable of suffering, but even if, during this life, it laboured under any deformity or defect, it will then be raised in a state of complete integrity.¹ The bodies of the bad will also be rendered immortal, in order to endure the eternity of suffering to which they are destined. The place of future punishment he calls by the name of Gehenna.²

In the *Dialogue with Trypho*,³ Justin speaks of the appearance of *the man of sin* as immediately connected with the second coming of Christ in glory. His appearance was to be the prelude to severe persecutions against the Christians. Bishop Pearson⁴ supposes Justin to have believed that this

¹ *Apol.* i. p. 57 B (10). The passage is corrupt, but the meaning clear. P. 65 C (26). τὴν δὲ δευτέραν (παρουσίαν) ὅταν μετὰ δόξης ἐξ οὐρανῶν μετὰ τῆς ἀγγελικῆς αὐτοῦ στρατιᾶς παραγενήσεται κεικήρυκται, ὅτι καὶ τὰ σώματα ἀνεγερῆσι πάντων τῶν γενομένων ἀνθρώπων, καὶ τῶν μὲν ἀξίων ἐνδύσει ἀφθαρσίαν, τῶν δ' ἀδίκων ἐν αἰσθήσει αἰωνία μετὰ τῶν φαύλων δαιμόνων εἰς τὸ αἰώνιον πῦρ πέμψει, p. 87 B (63). ὅτι κἄν τις ἐν λάβῃ τινὶ σώματος ὑπάρχων φύλαξ τῶν παραδεδομένων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ διδαγμάτων ὑπάρξῃ, ὁλόκληρον αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ, μετὰ τοῦ καὶ ἀθάνατον καὶ ἀφθαρτον καὶ ἀλύπητον ποιῆσαι, ἀναστήσει. *Dial.* pp. 296 A, 359 D.

² ἡ δὲ γενεά ἐστι τόπος ἔνθα πολάζεσθαι μέλλουσιν οἱ ἀδίκως βίωσαντες. *Apol.* i. p. 66 B (28).

³ ἡ δὲ δευτέρα (παρουσία) ἐν ἡ μετὰ δόξης ἀπὸ τῶν οὐρανῶν παρέσται, ὅταν καὶ ὁ τῆς ἀποστασίας ἄνθρωπος, ὁ καὶ εἰς τὸν ὑψιστον ἔξαλλα λαλῶν, ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἄνομα τολμήσῃ εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς Χριστιανούς, p. 336 E.

⁴ The passage to which Pearson refers is as follows :—Ἔπερ γίγνεται ἐξόστου εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνελήθη μετὰ τὸ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆναι ὁ ἡμέτερος Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, τῶν χρόνων συμπληρουμένων καὶ τοῦ βλάσφημα καὶ τολμηρὰ εἰς τὸν ὑψιστον μέλλοντος λαλεῖν ἥδη ἐπὶ θύραις ὄντος (ὄν), καιρὸν καὶ καιροὺς καὶ ἡμῖσιν καιροῦ διακατέξῃεν Δανιὴλ μηνύει. καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀγνοοῦντες πόσον χρόνον διακατέχῃεν μέλλει, ἄλλο ἡγισθῆ· τὸν γὰρ καιρὸν ἕκαστον ἔτη ἐξηγισθε λέγεσθαι, εἰ δὲ τοῦτό

event was near at hand ; this, however, does not strike me as a necessary conclusion from the words.

We have seen that, among other questions put by Trypho to Justin, he asks whether the Christians really believed that Jerusalem would be rebuilt,¹ and that they, as well as the patriarchs, prophets, and Jews, and proselytes who lived before the coming of Christ, would be collected there. Justin replies that, although many pure (in doctrine) and pious Christians were of a different opinion, yet he himself, and as many Christians as were in every respect orthodox, ὀρθογνώμονες κατὰ πάντα, were assured that they who believe in Christ should rise in the flesh,² and for the space of a thousand years

ἔσπιν, εἰς τὸ ἐλάχιστον τὸν τῆς ἀνομίας ἀνθρώπων τριακόσια πενήκοντα ἔτη βασιλεύσαι δεῖ, ἵνα τὸ εἰρημένον ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου Δανιὴλ, καὶ καιρῶν (f. καὶ καιροῦς), δύο μόνους καιροῦς λέγεσθαι ἀριθμήσωμεν, p. 250 A. Here we have a plain allusion to Dan. vii. 25 (xi. 36, etc.); 2 Thess. ii. 4 *et seq.* The last passage seems to have suggested the word διακατέχειν to Justin ; but he employs it as relating to the time during which the man of sin was to have dominion, not to that during which he was to be restrained from appearing. See the use of the word κατέχειν. *Apol.* i. 82 D (55).

¹ C. I, p. 28. *Dial.* p. 306 B, *et seq.* Compare pp. 368 A, 369 A.

² To this resurrection Justin applies the words παλιγγενεσία, ἐν οἷς καὶ τὸ μυστήριον πάλιν τῆς γενέσεως (τῆς πάλιν γενέσεως) ἡμῶν, καὶ ἀπλῶς πάντων τῶν τὸν Χριστὸν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ φανήσεσθαι προσδοκῶντων. "Regeneration, in which also is the mystery of our regeneration and the appearance in flesh of all those who believe in Christ in Jerusalem." P. 312 C. Middleton has most unfairly charged Justin with maintaining that the saints will pass the millennium in the enjoyment of sensual pleasures. Nothing of this kind is to be found in Justin's description ; and in p. 346 B, he cautions Trypho against supposing that the Mosaic sacrifices will then be revived, or any but spiritual sacrifices offered : οὐ (τοῦ Χριστοῦ) ἐν τῇ πάλιν παρουσίᾳ μὴ δόξετε λέγειν Ἡσαΐαν ἢ τοὺς ἄλλους προφήτας θυσίας ἀφ' αἱμάτων ἢ σπονδῶν ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον ἀναφέρεισθαι, ἀλλὰ ἀληθινούς καὶ πνευματικούς αἶνους καὶ εὐχαριστίας. "Do not think that Isaiah and the other prophets say that at His (Christ's) second coming offerings of blood and libations will be offered upon the altar, but true and spiritual praises and giving of thanks." It has been observed, c. I, p. 24, that Elias is to appear before Christ's second Advent.

inhabit Jerusalem, rebuilt and beautified and enlarged. In confirmation of this opinion, he quotes Isa. lxxv. 17, and the book of Revelation, which he expressly ascribes to the Apostle St. John. At the expiration of the period of one thousand years, the general resurrection was to take place;¹ and after the general resurrection and judgment, this whole frame of things was to be consumed by fire.²

I will take the present opportunity of laying before the reader the different notices scattered over Justin's works respecting angels and demons. In opposition to those who thought that angels were only emanations, sent forth for a particular purpose, and then resolved again into that from which they issued, Justin ascribes to them a positive and permanent existence.³ To certain of them God committed the charge of watching over men and over this nether world;⁴ but, as they possessed freedom of will,⁵ and were capable of evil as well as good, they allowed themselves to be seduced into transgression by the beauty of women; from their intercourse with whom sprang demons. These apostate angels enslaved the human race by magical arts,⁶ by terrifying or by injuring them, by instructing them in sacrificial rites, and inducing

¹ P. 308 B.

² *Apol.* i. p. 66 B (28), where Justin appeals to the authority of the Sibyl and Hystaspes. *Apol.* ii. p. 45 C.

³ *Dial.* p. 358 C. Compare pp. 311 D and 312 B, where Justin proves from Ps. cxlviii. 1, 2, that angels are heavenly powers. They required food, but not such food as men require. Their food was manna, according to Ps. lxxviii. 24. *Dial.* p. 279 D.

⁴ *Apol.* ii. p. 44 A, referred to in c. i. p. 4, note 2. Trypho appears to have been scandalized at the notion that an angel could fall. *Dial.* pp. 305 C, 306 A.

⁵ *Dial.* pp. 316 A, 370 A. In the former passage he seems to limit the freedom of men and angels by saying that they were free to do that which God had empowered each to do, *πράττειν ὅσα ἕκαστον ἐνεδυνάμωσε δύνασθαι ποιεῖν.*

⁶ See *Apol.* i. p. 61 A (18).

them to offer incense and libations, which became necessary to themselves after they were subjected to passions and lusts.¹ Having enslaved mankind, they sowed among them murders, wars, adulteries, wantonness, and all kinds of wickedness. The poets and mythologists, ignorant that these evils were the work of the angels and of the demons, their offspring, ascribed them to the deities, whose names the angels appropriated to themselves at pleasure.² In order more securely to establish their dominion, the demons employed every art to seduce men from the worship of the true God, adapting their temptations to the character of the individual :³ if he was of a low and grovelling temper, addressing themselves to his senses, and, as it were, nailing him to idols and earthly objects ; if he was of a more contemplative cast, perplexing him with subtle inquiries, and urging him into impiety. With this view, also, after Christ's ascent into heaven, they instigated different men,⁴

¹ οἱ καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἀλόγως βιούντων αἰταῦσι θύματα καὶ θεραπείας. "Who get their sacrifices and worship by exacting upon the follies of wicked men." *Apol.* i. p. 59 D (15).

It should be observed that Justin makes a clear distinction between the worship of idols and that of the heavenly bodies. We have seen his notions respecting the origin of the former (c. i. p. 4) ; but he believed, and according to him Trypho also believed, that God actually permitted the heathen to worship the sun and moon as God. This notion was founded on a misinterpretation of the Septuagint version of Deut. iv. 19. *Dial.* pp. 274 B, 349 E.

² In the *First Apology*, p. 55 E (7), Justin gives a similar account, and says that men, being ignorant of the existence of wicked demons, called them gods, assigning to each the name which he had appropriated to himself. Compare p. 57 D (11), where he says that the images, the objects of worship in the heathen temples, bare the names and the forms of wicked demons. See also p. 67 D (30). In proof of this opinion he frequently appeals to Ps. xcvi. 5. οἱ θεοὶ τῶν ἔθνῶν δαιμόνια ἴσιν, "the gods of the heathen are demons," as in *Dial.* p. 306 B.

³ *Apol.* i. p. 92 B (70). The devil enabled Pharaoh's magicians to work wonders. *Dial.* pp. 294 E, 306 B. He also inspired the false prophets, p. 325 A.

⁴ *Apol.* i. p. 69 C (34).

among them Simon the Samaritan, to give themselves out for gods; as previously to Christ's appearance on earth they had suggested various fables to the poets, founded on what the holy prophets had foretold respecting the coming of Christ and the future punishment of the wicked, to the end that men, having their minds preoccupied with those fables, might regard the narrative of Christ's life and actions with less reverence.¹ In like manner, they caused various rites to be introduced into the heathen mysteries, bearing a resemblance to those which were to be instituted under the Christian dispensation. Thus from Isa. i. 16, which Justin refers to baptism, the worshippers in the heathen temples were instructed to sprinkle themselves before they made their offerings;² and from what the demons had learned respecting the future institution of the Eucharist, bread and a cup of water were placed before the candidates for initiation into the mysteries of Mithras, as a part of the ceremony.³ This imitation of the prophetic writings extended even to the precepts of righteousness inculcated in the Sacred Volume.⁴

¹ *Apol.* i. p. 89 A (66), where Justin alleges several instances of imitation, some of them sufficiently extravagant. Compare pp. 68 C (31), 90 A (67), 97 A (82). *Dial.* pp. 297 B, 295 A, 294 E. The demons did not know that the Messiah was to be crucified, and did not in consequence invent any fables with reference to the crucifixion, p. 90 B (68).

² *Apol.* i. p. 94 E (77).

³ *Apol.* i. p. 98 C (90), referred to in c. iv. p. 66. In the *Dialogue*, p. 304 B, Justin says that the practice of initiating the votaries of Mithras in a place called a cave was derived from Isa. xxxiii. 16. οὗτος οἰκήσει ἐν ὑψηλῷ σπηλαίῳ πέτρας ἰσχυρᾶς, "his place of defence shall be the munitions of rocks;" from which passage he infers that Jesus was born in a cave near Bethlehem. See Casaubon, *Exercit. ad Baronii Annales*, ii. 1. See also p. 296 B.

⁴ οὐ καὶ τοὺς λόγους πάντας μιμήσασθαι ἐπεχείρησαν· δικαιοπραξίας γὰρ λόγους καὶ παρ' ἐκείνους λέγεσθαι ἐτεχνάσαντο. "Of which they attempted to imitate all the prophetic writings, and they also managed by art that precepts of righteousness should be spoken among them." P. 296 C.

Actuated by a spirit of unremitting hostility against God and against goodness, the demons instigated all the persecutions to which not only the Christians, but the virtuous among the heathen were exposed.¹ They also excited the Jews to put Christ to death.² They were the authors of the calumnious accusations brought against the Christians.³ To their suggestions were to be traced the different heresies which had arisen in the Church; ⁴ the unjust and wicked laws which had been enacted in different states; ⁵ in short, they were the authors of all evil existing in the world. Among these evil angels the serpent who deceived Eve, called also in Scripture Satan, and the devil, was pre-eminent; ⁶ who, together with the other apostate angels and with wicked men, will be consigned to eternal flames at the consummation of all things.⁷

With respect to demoniacal possessions, Justin says that the Christians,⁸ by adjuring demons in the name of Christ,

¹ This opinion is repeatedly stated by Justin. See *Apol.* i. pp. 55 D (6), 59 D (15), 82 B (53). *Apol.* ii. pp. 41 D, 45 D, 46 C, 50 B. *Dial.* p. 258 D, where it is said that the persecutions of the Christians will continue till Christ's second coming, p. 360 D.

² *Apol.* i. p. 96 A (80).

³ *Apol.* i. pp. 58 D (13), 68 D (31). *Apol.* ii. p. 51 B.

⁴ *Apol.* i. pp. 69 D (33), 91 A (69), 92 A (70).


⁵ *Apol.* ii. p. 48 A.

⁶ *παρ' ἡμῶν μὲν γὰρ ὁ ἀρχηγέτης τῶν κακῶν δαιμόνων ὄφεις καλεῖται, καὶ σατανᾶς, καὶ διάβολος.* "But the ringleader and prince of evil spirits is by us called the serpent, and Satan, and false accuser." *Apol.* i. p. 71 A (37). Compare *Dial.* pp. 264 A, 304 D, 327 D, 331 B, 353 E, 354 E.

⁷ *Apol.* i. pp. 71 B (37), 82 D (56), 87 B (63). *Apol.* ii. p. 46 D. *Dial.* p. 361 C. This notion of Justin, that the punishment of the apostate angels will not take place until the end of the world, has by some been stigmatized as heretical. See Le Nourry, p. 416. Perhaps Justin meant that all their power of doing mischief, and consequently their only source of gratification, would then be taken away, and they would exist for ever in a state of unmitigated misery.

⁸ *Apol.* ii. pp. 45 A, 46 D. *Dial.* pp. 247 C, 302 A, 311 B. In the last passage, Justin says that a demon would possibly obey, if adjured by a

were enabled to work cures which the Jewish and heathen exorcists had in vain attempted. He here speaks as if the suffering party was really possessed by a demon; but on another occasion he classes possessed and insane persons together, and says that the souls of dead men had entered into them.¹ There, however, is no real contradiction; for he supposed that wicked angels hovered about the beds of dying men,² on the watch to seize the parting soul; which being now brought within their power, was compelled to obey their bidding. The souls of the prophets and holy men of old had thus fallen under the dominion of demons; as was evident from the power, exerted by the Witch of Endor, of calling up the soul of Samuel; and the demons could, by a similar exercise of power, cause them to possess the bodies of men.



CHAPTER VI.

THE CONDITION OF THE CHRISTIANS IN THE TIME OF JUSTIN, AND THE CAUSES OF THE RAPID DIFFUSION OF CHRISTIANITY.

IN the *Dialogue with Trypho*, we find Justin using the following language:³ “There is no race of men, whether of Jew in the name of the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob. He speaks of the demons as trembling at the name of Christ. ὃν καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια φρίσσει. Pp. 269 D, 350 B, 361 C.

¹ καὶ οἱ ψυχαῖς ἀποθανόντων λαμβανόμενοι καὶ ριπτούμενοι ἄνθρωποι, οὓς δαιμονιολήπτους καὶ μαινομένους καλοῦσι πάντες. “And those persons who are violently caught up and dashed down again by departed spirits, and who pass among you all for demoniacs and mad.” *Apol.* i. p. 65 A (26).

² *Dial.* p. 332 E. Justin speaks as if a petition to be delivered in the hour of death from the power of evil spirits formed a special topic in the prayers of Christians.

³ P. 345 C.

barbarians or of Greeks, or bearing any other name, either because they live in waggons without fixed habitations, or in tents, leading a pastoral life, among whom prayers and thanksgivings are not offered to the Father and Maker of the universe through the name of the crucified Jesus." As Justin is then endeavouring to show that the prediction of Malachi,¹ which speaks of the universal diffusion of true religion among the Gentiles in the days of the Messiah, was fulfilled in the actual state of Christianity, we must make allowance for some exaggeration in the description. We may interpret his language more strictly, when he says that new converts were continually added to the Church through the admiration excited by the virtuous practice and enduring constancy of the Christians. He states,² with regard to himself, that in embracing Christianity, he was in no small degree influenced by observing that the Christians, against whom so many calumnies were propagated, encountered death, and whatever else is deemed most dreadful, without fear. Such persons, he reasoned with himself, could not be leading wicked and dissipated lives. "For what lover of pleasure," he asks, "or intemperate man, or delighting to feed on human flesh, would embrace death, thereby to lose all that he deemed desirable? and would not rather strive, by every means, to evade the pursuit of the governors, in order that he might live for ever in this world? Much less would such a man denounce himself to the magistrate." On another occasion he says,³ "It is evident that no one can terrify or enslave those who have believed in Jesus. For when condemned to be beheaded, to be crucified, to be cast to wild beasts, into chains, or into the flames, or to be otherwise tortured, they never swerve from the profession of their faith. Nay, the more frequently such punishments are inflicted, the greater the addition to the

¹ I. 11.

² *Apol.* ii. p. 50 A. Compare *Apol.* i. p. 63 C (23).

³ *Dial.* pp. 337 B, 350 A, 360 D.

faithful and pious believers in the name of Jesus; as when you cut off the fruit-bearing parts of the vine, it puts forth other flourishing and fruitful branches."

As the main object of the *First Apology* is to remove the unfavourable impression which had been made on the minds of the Emperors by the calumnious accusations circulated against the Christians, Justin naturally appeals to the moral precepts delivered by Christ, and to the fact that the Christians lived in conformity to them. "We," he says, "follow the one unbegotten God, through the Son—we who formerly delighted in vicious excesses, but now are temperate and chaste—we who formerly had recourse to magical arts, but have now dedicated ourselves to the good and unbegotten God—we who formerly placed our greatest pleasure in acquiring wealth and possessions, but now bring all that we have into a common stock, and impart to every one in need—we who hated and destroyed each other, and, on account of the difference of manners, refused to live with men of a different tribe, now, since the appearance of Christ, live on terms of familiar intercourse with them, and pray for our enemies, and endeavour to persuade those who hate us without a cause to live conformably to the perfect precepts of Christ, to the end that they may become partakers with us of the same joyful hope of a reward from God the Ruler over all."¹

But though many might become favourably disposed to Christianity by contemplating the pure and blameless lives of its professors, and thus be induced at length to imitate the virtues which they admired, yet to the majority the Christians were the objects at once of hatred and contempt.² They were

¹ *Apol.* i. p. 61 B (18). In the *Dial.* p. 309 A, Justin challenges his opponents to prove that the Christians were actuated by the love of gain, or glory, or pleasure.

² *Apol.* i. p. 63 C (23).

regarded as the vilest of men,¹ and treated with the greatest contumely and injustice.² The most unnatural and revolting crimes were laid to their charge ; they were accused of feeding on human flesh,³ and, after their horrible repast, of extinguishing the lights, and indulging in a promiscuous intercourse. They were also charged with atheism and impiety,⁴ because, as Justin states,⁵ they would not worship the gods of the Gentiles, or offer libations and sacrifices to dead men. No measure, which promised to accomplish their destruction, was rejected on account of its iniquity or atrocity ; their domestics were solicited to inform and to give evidence against them ;⁶ and Justin in one place states that murders were purposely committed by others, in order that the Christians might be charged with the guilt ;⁷ and that their servants, their children, or their wives were then put to the torture, in the hope that some expression might drop in the moment of agony which might furnish matter of accusation against them. So strong was the current of public feeling against them, that Justin ventures to ask of the Emperors no more than this⁸—that when the Christians were brought before the tribunals, they should not be condemned merely because they were Christians, but should be dismissed, unless they were convicted of

¹ ἀνθρώποις οὐδενὸς ἀξίοις, “Men of no worth,” is Trypho’s expression, p. 225 E. In p. 349 B, Justin repels the charge, οὐκοῦν οὐκ εὐκαταφρόνητος δῆμος ἴσμεν, οὐδὲ βάρβαρον φύλον, οὐδὲ ὅποια Καρῶν ἢ Φρυγῶν ἔβη. “For we are no a despicable people, nor a barbarian race, nor a nation like the Carians or Phrygians.”

² ἀδίκως μισουμένων καὶ ἐπηρεαζομένων. “Unjustly loaded with public odium and oppression.” *Apol.* i. p. 53 B (1).

³ *Dial.* p. 227 B.

⁴ *Apol.* ii. p. 47 A.

⁵ *Apol.* i. p. 68 E (32).

⁶ *Dial.* p. 254 A. Justin here alludes to Matt. x. 36.

⁷ *Apol.* ii. p. 50 B.

⁸ *Apol.* i. p. 56 E (9). Yet, in the Epistle of Adrian subjoined to the *Apoloogy*, that Emperor directs that they who accused the Christians falsely shall be punished.

some crime. "I do not," he adds, "go the length of calling upon you to punish our accusers."

In one of the passages above cited,¹ allusion is made to Christians who denounced themselves to the magistrates. As Justin expresses no disapprobation of the practice, M. Barbeyrac has inferred that he approved this extravagant display of zeal.² M. Barbeyrac confirms his inference by appealing to another passage in the same *Apology*,³ in which Justin supposes an objector to say, "If you (Christians) are so eager to go to God, why do you not kill yourselves, and give us no further trouble?" Justin answers, "The reason why we do not destroy ourselves, and yet, when we are questioned, boldly confess that we are Christians, is this: We are taught that God did not make the world without an object, but for the sake of the human race; and that He delights in them who imitate His attributes, and is displeased with them who embrace what is evil either in word or deed. If, therefore, we all should destroy ourselves, we should, as far as depends on us, be the cause that no one would be born or instructed in the divine doctrine, or even the cause that the whole human race would fail; and thus we should act in opposition to the will of God. But when we are questioned, we do not deny that we are Christians, because we are not conscious to ourselves of any evil; and because we think it impious not to speak the truth under every circumstance." M. Barbeyrac infers from this passage that Justin did not consider a Christian to be really the cause of his own death, when, through an ill-regulated desire of martyrdom, he denounced himself. But when we inquire into the circumstances which gave rise to Justin's remark, we shall find that they have no connexion with the case supposed by M. Barbeyrac. A Christian, named

¹ P. 84.

² *Traité de la Morale des Pères*, c. 2, sect. viii.

³ *Apol.* ii. p. 43 C.

Ptolemy, was brought before Urbicus, the Prefect of Rome, and asked whether he was a Christian? On his replying in the affirmative, Urbicus ordered him to be led away to execution. Another Christian, named Lucius, who witnessed the transaction, immediately exclaimed to Urbicus, "What is the reason that you have ordered a man to be punished who has been convicted of no crime whatever, but has merely confessed that he is a Christian? The judgment which you have pronounced befits neither a pious Emperor, nor the son of a philosophic Cæsar, nor the sacred Senate." Urbicus made no other reply to this address than by saying to Lucius, "You also seem to be a Christian." Lucius admitted that he was, and Urbicus ordered him also to be led away to execution. Justin adds that he thanked the governor for the sentence, knowing that he should now be delivered from the tyranny of such wicked rulers, and should go to the Father and King of heaven. It is evident that, in coming forward as he did, Lucius was not actuated by any desire of martyrdom, but was impelled by a feeling of indignation at the gross injustice of the Prefect's conduct towards Ptolemy. It is true that, when condemned to death, he expressed his joy at the prospect of quitting this world, and being admitted to the presence of his heavenly Father; but the desire of encountering death was not the motive which influenced him in addressing Urbicus. The case of a Christian who denounced himself to the magistrate through the desire of martyrdom does not seem to have been in Justin's contemplation. He states the case of a voluntary suicide on the one hand; of a Christian who, when questioned, denied that he was so on the other; and he condemns both. He argues that Christians would be culpable if they destroyed themselves. Why? because they would act in opposition to the will of God, Who did not create the world without an object. The fair inference, therefore, would seem to be that Justin would have condemned a Christian who exposed himself to death without an object. The youth

who made the extraordinary proposal to the governor of Alexandria on which M. Barbeyrac has remarked, had an object in view—that of convincing the governor that the Christians did not practise in their assemblies those gross immoralities which were attributed to them.¹ I mean not, however, to say that Justin does not sometimes use language which implies, on the part of the early converts, an eagerness to court martyrdom :² I am far from defending such language ; but, as I have elsewhere stated,³ there were circumstances in the situation of the first Christians which ought to prevent us from being too severe in condemning it.

M. Barbeyrac also says that Justin entertained very exaggerated notions of the merit of celibacy. On one occasion Justin, in order to point out the superiority of the precepts of Christ to those of the heathen moralists, says that with respect to chastity, they forbade practices which human laws allowed (for instance, the practice of divorcing a wife and contracting another marriage), and that they controlled the inward desire as well as the outward act.⁴ He then adds that many persons of both sexes, who had been instructed in Christianity from their infancy, and had, when he wrote, attained the age of sixty or seventy, had led an uniform life of continence. On another occasion Justin says that the Christians either abstained from marriage altogether, or married with the sole view of having children.⁵ These passages, however, are not mentioned by M. Barbeyrac, who

¹ *Apol.* i. p. 71 E (38).

² *Apol.* i. p. 57 A (10). *σπεύδομεν ἐπὶ τὸ ὁμολογεῖν*, "We are in haste to be confessing."

³ In my account of Tertullian's writings, p. 154.

⁴ *Apol.* i. p. 62 A (20).

⁵ *Apol.* i. p. 71 D (38). In the *Dialogue*, p. 337 B, Justin seems to urge, as a proof of the superiority of the Christian morals, the fact that each man contented himself with a single wife.

refers to the third chapter of the fragment of the tract on the *Resurrection of the Flesh*, in which the author distinctly applies the epithet *unlawful*, ἀνομον, to marriage. Grabe endeavours to get over the difficulty by saying that the word ἀνομον should be translated *indifferent*; because, as we have seen, Justin allowed that marriage might be contracted for the purpose of having children. But few, I think, will be satisfied with this interpretation. If the fragment was really the work of Justin, we must conclude that, like other disputants, in his eagerness to answer the objections immediately before him, he did not stay to examine very accurately the soundness of his answer.

It is unnecessary to notice what M. Barbeyrac has said respecting Justin's opinions on the lawfulness of an oath, since, according to his own admission, Justin has merely recited our Saviour's words.¹

Living so nearly as Justin did to the apostolic age, it will naturally be asked whether, among other causes of the diffusion of Christianity, he specifies the exercise of miraculous powers by the Christians. He says, in general terms, that such powers subsisted in the Church²—that Christians were endowed with the gift of prophecy;³ and in an enumeration of spiritual gifts conferred on Christians, he mentions that of healing.⁴ We have seen, also, in a former chapter,⁵ that he ascribes to Christians the power of exorcising demons. But

¹ *Apol.* i. p. 63 D (23).

² *Dial.* p. 254 B. διὰ τε τῶν ἔργων, καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ καὶ νῦν γιγνομένων δυνάμεων. "On account of the work and the acts of power worked now in His name."

³ παρὰ γὰρ ἡμῖν καὶ μέχρι νῦν προφητικὰ χαρίσματα ἔστιν. "For there is also now the gift of prophecy among us." *Dial.* p. 308 B. See also p. 315 B.

⁴ *Dial.* p. 258 A.

⁵ Chap. v.

he produces no particular instance of an exercise of miraculous power, and therefore affords us no opportunity of applying those tests by which the credibility of miracles must be tried. Had it only been generally stated by the evangelists that Christ performed miracles, and had no particular miracles been recorded, how much less satisfactory would the gospel narratives have appeared! how greatly the evidence in support of our Saviour's divine mission been diminished!

I know not that I can take a better opportunity than the present of offering a few remarks on the arguments urged by Justin in proving the truth of the Christian revelation. I have elsewhere observed¹ that nothing can be more unreasonable than to censure the *Apologies* of the early Fathers, because they do not contain—what they never were designed to contain—a regular exposition of the evidences of Christianity. They were composed with the view of removing the prejudices of the opponents of the new religion, and instructing mankind in its real character and design. Whatever mention occurs of the evidences of Christianity is merely incidental. In his dispute with Trypho, Justin was naturally led to insist rather on the argument from prophecy than on that from miracles. A large portion of the *Dialogue* is occupied in showing that the prophecies relating to the Messiah in the Old Testament were accomplished in Jesus.² Another argument urged by Justin is derived from the fulfilment of the predictions delivered by Jesus Himself;³ to foretell future events being, as he observes, the work of God alone.⁴ But though he appeals more frequently to the fulfilment of prophecy, he occasionally


¹ In my volume *On Tertullian*, p. 134.

² See also *Apol.* i. pp. 88 A (64), 73 B (40), *et seq.*

³ *Dial.* pp. 253 B, 254 A, 271 A, 308 C,

⁴ ἐπειδὴ ἔργω φαίνεται γινόμενα ὅσα φάσας γενέσθαι προσῆπεν, ὅπερ Θεοῦ ἔργον ἐστίν. "Because we see these things fulfilled according to His prediction, for this or nothing is the work of God." *Apol.* i. p. 60 A (16).

introduces the mention of Christ's miracles ;¹ yet as it might be said that they were performed by magical arts, he seems to have thought that, without the argument from prophecy, they would not of themselves be sufficient to establish the divine mission of Jesus.² They who express surprise that the miracles wrought by Jesus and His disciples did not produce instant conviction in the minds of all who witnessed them, have not sufficiently attended to the state of opinion either among the Jews or Gentiles. The distinction between their incredulity and that of modern sceptics is this. They readily admitted the fact that an event out of the ordinary course of nature had occurred, but denied that it afforded conclusive proof of the divine mission of Him through whose agency it was brought to pass. The modern sceptic takes a different course : he stops us at the very threshold, by asserting that no testimony whatever can outweigh the antecedent incredibility of the event.



CHAPTER VII.

THE HERESIES MENTIONED BY JUSTIN—MISCELLANEOUS OBSERVATIONS.

JUSTIN mentions Simon,³ and says that he was a native of Samaria ; that through the assistance of the demons he performed magical miracles at Rome in the reign of Claudius

¹ *Dial.* p. 254 B. In the *First Apology*, p. 73 A (40), both miracles and the fulfilment of prophecy are mentioned, but the argument turns rather on the latter. It was foretold that Christ would work miracles ; Jesus worked miracles : He was therefore the Christ.

² *Apol.* i. p. 72 A (38).

³ *Apol.* i. p. 69 C (33). See also p. 91 B (69) ; *Apol.* ii. p. 52 A.

Cæsar, and was in consequence regarded as a god; that a statue was erected in his honour, having the following inscription in Latin, "Simoni Deo Sancto";¹ that nearly all the Samaritans, and a few of other nations, adored him as the supreme god,² and called a female, by name Helena, who then travelled about with him, but had before been a prostitute, his first intelligence, τὴν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἔννοιαν πρώτην γενομένην.

Justin mentions also Menander,³ another Samaritan, who was set on by the demons; and when he resided at Antioch, deceived many by magical arts. He persuaded his followers that they should never die; and some in Justin's time still maintained the same doctrine.

A third heretic, mentioned by Justin as his contemporary, is Marcion of Pontus,⁴ who taught that there was a god superior to the Creator of the universe, and another Christ besides the Christ announced by the prophets. He had, according to Justin, numerous followers.

Justin⁵ mentions cursorily that there were heretical sects

¹ This story respecting the statue erected in honour of Simon Magus has been repeated by several of the Fathers, and was generally received as true, until in 1574 a statue was dug up in the Island of the Tiber, having an inscription commencing thus: "Semoni Sanco Deo Fidio Sacrum." The majority of learned men have since been of opinion that Justin, deceived by the similarity of names, mistook a statue in honour of a Sabine deity for one erected to Simon Magus. Thirlby affects to defend Justin. Dr. Burton, in the notes to his *Bampton Lectures*, p. 374, decides in favour of Justin's accuracy.

² τὸν πρῶτον Θεόν. In the *Dialogue*, p. 349 D: Θεὸν ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς, καὶ ἐξουσίας, καὶ δυνάμεως. "God above all principality, and power, and might."

³ *Apol.* i. pp. 69 E (34), 91 A (69).

⁴ *Apol.* i. pp. 70 A (35), 92 A (70).

⁵ *Dial.* p. 253 E. The Marciani were probably the same as the Marcosii, so called from Marcus.

under the names of Marciani, Valentiniani, Basilidiani, Saturniliani, so called from the individuals who first broached the different heresies. He speaks, or rather assents to Trypho,¹ who speaks of Christians who, without scruple, ate food offered to idols.

We have seen his own inference from the words in Gen. i. 26 :² "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness;" and iii. 22 : "Lo, Adam is become as one of us." Some heretics affirmed that the Almighty addressed these words to the angels, by whom the human body was made.³

Justin speaks of two descriptions of Christians who denied that the Jews would finally be restored to the land of their ancestors, and that Jerusalem would be rebuilt: one class, as we have seen, consisted of Christians who were in other respects orthodox; the other,⁴ of heretics who denied the resurrection of the dead, and affirmed that the soul, immediately on its separation from the body, was received into heaven.

It has been already observed⁵ that Justin alludes to heretics who affirmed that the power who appeared to Moses, Abraham, and Jacob, was only an emanation from the Father, bearing different names, according to the functions assigned him; being inseparable from the Father as the light of the

¹ *Dial.* p. 253 A. These were probably some of the Gnostic sects. Justin couples the eating of things offered to idols with idolatry itself, and says that a Christian would rather suffer death than be guilty of either offence.

² P. 54.

³ *Dial.* p. 285 E. It appears from Irenæus, i. c. 22, and Tertullian, *de Res. Carnis*, c. 5, that Menander, Marcus, and Saturnilus affirmed the human body to be the workmanship of angels.

⁴ P. 78; *Dial.* p. 307 A.

⁵ P. 50.

sun on the earth cannot be separated from the sun in the heaven.

Justin applies the name of sophists to certain persons who contended that, when God said, in Gen. iii. 22, "Lo, Adam is become as one of us," the expression was to be understood figuratively; not as spoken of two or more persons numerically distinct from each other.¹

We know, from the assertion of Justin himself,² that he composed a work against all the heresies which had arisen in the Church; but it has not reached our time.

Allusion has been made to a passage in the *First Apology*,³ in which Justin appears to insinuate that the horrible crimes which were falsely charged upon the Christians in general by their adversaries might, perhaps, be committed in the assemblies of the heretics.

Justin twice appeals to the Acts of Pilate,⁴ in order to show that the predictions of the prophets concerning the Messiah were accomplished in Jesus: first, with respect to the circumstances which attended His crucifixion; and secondly, with respect to the wonderful cures which He performed. Justin appeals⁵ also to the records of the census made by Cyrenius, the first Procurator at Judæa, in proof of the birth of Christ at Bethlehem, and of the time when the event

¹ *Dial.* p. 359 A.

² *Apol.* i. p. 70 C (36).

³ P. 8, note 3, p. 70 B (36).

⁴ *Apol.* i. p. 76 C (44), 84 C (56). Thirlby suspects that Justin was deceived by the fraud of some Christian who had falsified the genuine Acts, or misrepresented their contents. Both the circumstances to which Justin alludes are found in the spurious Acts of Pilate now extant. Respecting the Acts of Pilate, see Lardner, *Heathen Testimonies*, c. 2; Casaubon, *ad Baronii Annales*, xvi. 154.

⁵ *Apol.* i. p. 75 E (43), 83 B (56); *Dial.* p. 303 E.

occurred. He says that Christ was thirty years of age, more or less, before He was baptized by John,¹ and that He worked at His father's trade, in order to inculcate the duties of justice and industry.²

It has been frequently observed that Justin is not very accurate in his chronology. He supposes that Ptolemy, the king of Egypt who caused the Septuagint version to be made, was contemporary with Herod, king of Judæa.³ He says also, if the reading is correct, that Christ suffered under Herod the Ascalonite.⁴ I say, if the reading is correct; for in a subsequent passage he distinguishes very accurately between Herod the Great and Herod to whom Christ was sent by Pilate.⁵

We may state, as another instance of Justin's view of chronology, that he supposed Deucalion to be the same as Noah.⁶

In speaking of the prophecies by which the coming of Christ was announced, he says that some were uttered 5000, some 3000, some 2000, some 1000, some 800 years before the event; and he immediately adds that Moses was the first prophet, and quotes the prediction of the dying Jacob.⁷ Pearson's remark on this passage is, "Mira Chronologia." But when

¹ *Dial.* p. 315 D.

² *Dial.* p. 316 C. See Mark vi. 3.

³ *Apol.* i. p. 72 C (39).

⁴ *Dial.* p. 272 A. καὶ γὰρ Ἡρώδην, ἀφ' οὗ ἔπαθεν, Ἀσκαλωνίτην γενομένην λέγοντες, "Naming Herod the Ascalonite under whom He suffered." Perhaps, instead of ἀφ' οὗ ἔπαθεν, we should read ἀφ' οὗ ἐπαύσατο. Both ἔπαθεν and ἐπαύσατο occur in the preceding sentence, ὅτι οὖν οὐδέποτε ἐν τῷ γένει ὑμῶν ἐπαύσατο οὔτε προφήτης οὔτε ἄρχων, ἐξ ὅτου ἀρχὴν ἔλαβε, μέχρις οὗ οὗτος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς καὶ γέγονε καὶ ἔπαθεν. Casaubon, i. 2, would omit the words ἀφ' οὗ ἔπαθεν, or read ἐφ' οὗ ἐγεννήθη, too arbitrary a change.


⁵ P. 330 D. See *Apol.* i. p. 78 E (48).

⁶ *Apol.* ii. p. 45 C.

⁷ *Apol.* i. p. 73 B (39). See p. 92 C (71). *Dial.* p. 247 B.

Justin called Moses the first prophet, he seems to have meant that Moses was the first who recorded the prophecies of former ages ; not to have asserted, as Pearson infers, that Moses lived 5000 years before Christ. On another occasion he says that David lived 1500 years before Christ.¹ According to the received chronology, Malachi prophesied about 400 years before Christ, and David lived between 1000 and 1100 years before Christ. In both cases it differs about 400 years from Justin's chronology, who places the last prophet 800, David 1500 years before Christ. Grabe supposes Justin to have placed an interval of 5500 years between the creation and the birth of Christ, and to have alluded to Adam when he spoke of a prophecy delivered 5000 years before Christ.

Justin quotes the Sibyl and Hystaspes as saying that all corruptible things will finally be consumed by fire.² On another occasion he states that the perusal of their books, as well as those of the prophets, had been prohibited through the instigation of the wicked demons, lest the readers should be led to the knowledge of the truth ; but that, notwithstanding the prohibition, the Christians continued to read them.³



CHAPTER VIII.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE QUESTION, WHETHER JUSTIN
QUOTED THE GOSPELS WHICH WE NOW HAVE ?

LARDNER, in his account of Justin, conceives it to be plain, "that our Gospels are the books Justin made use of as

¹ *Apol.* i. p. 80 C (50).

² *Apol.* i. p. 66 C (28).

³ *Apol.* i. p. 82 C (53). See Casaubon's remarks on this statement of Justin, *Exercit. ad Baronii Annales*, i. 11.

authentic histories of Jesus Christ.”¹ Since, however, the controversy respecting the origin of the first three Gospels was raised in Germany, the correctness of the inference, which seemed so plain to Lardner, has been questioned; and in our own country, a prelate, who occupies a place in the foremost rank of Biblical critics, has expressed a decided opinion, “that Justin did not quote our Gospels.” If I venture to state the reasons which induce me to withhold my assent from the opinion so expressed, I trust that I shall be acquitted of the rashness and presumption of *unnecessarily* opposing myself to one, for whose learning and acuteness I cannot but entertain the greatest respect. But, professing as I do, to give an account of the writings and opinions of Justin Martyr, the reader will reasonably expect from me some notice of this important question. The principal value of the writings of the Fathers consists, perhaps, in the testimony which they bear to the authenticity of the books of the New Testament.

It is certain that the only book of the New Testament expressly referred to by Justin is the Revelation, which he ascribes to the Apostle St. John. Yet it is scarcely possible to conceive that he had not, in the course of his travels, and during his residence at Rome, met with most of the other books which now compose our canon. On the supposition that he had met with the present Gospels, the same reasons would have induced him to make his quotations from them, which induced the Church to admit them into the canon, in preference to all the other narratives of our Saviour’s life and ministry. If he did not quote them, we must either suppose that he was unacquainted with them; or we must admit that a document then existed, which Justin deemed to be of greater authenticity than our present Gospels, but which has since been lost.

¹ *Credibility of the Gospel History*, c. x. sect. ix.

Dodwell, in his *Dissertations on Irenæus*,¹ has stated the following reasons for thinking that the books from which Justin made his quotations were our present Gospels. He calls them Gospels²—the passages which he quotes are extant in our Gospels, with very little variation, and the insertions of passages from apocryphal books are very rare³—the account which he gives of the origin of what he terms ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν Ἀποστόλων corresponds with the origin of our Gospels, viz. that two were written by apostles, and two by companions of the apostles.⁴ Moreover, Irenæus,⁵ who was nearly contemporary with Justin, speaks as if it was a fact universally acknowledged, that there were only four Gospels; and assigns reasons why there could be neither more nor less than four.

The learned prelate, however, to whom I have alluded, thinks that the expression ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν Ἀποστόλων is wholly inapplicable to our present Gospels.⁶ For—

I. “The term Ἀπομνημονεύματα denotes not several works, each written by a different person, but simply one work.” The

¹ *Diss.* i. c. xl.

² οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ’ αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια. “The apostles in their commentaries called the Gospels.” *Apol.* i. p. 98 B (90). Bishop Marsh supposes the words ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια to be an interpolation.

³ Dodwell’s words are, “Tum et ex ipso Justino qui e nostris Evangelii loca plurima adduxit, et quidem id castissime, raro admodum immistis Apocryphis.”

⁴ ἐν γὰρ τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν ἃ φημι ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκείνοις παρακολουθησάντων συντεταχθῆναι. *Dial.* p. 331 D. Dodwell’s remark is, “S. Lucæ verba ipsa respexisse videtur, ἕδος κάμοι παρακολουθηκότι.”

⁵ Tatian, Justin’s scholar, composed a *Diatessaron*. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* l. iv. c. 29. Theodoret, *Hæret. Fab.* l. i. c. 20. The assertion, therefore, of Victor Capuanus that Tatian’s harmony was called διὰ πάντες is either erroneous, or, with Ittigius, we must read πάντων for πάντες. According to Epiphanius, *Hæret.* 26 or 46, some called Tatian’s *Diatessaron* “the Gospel according to the Hebrews.”

⁶ See Bishop Marsh’s *Illustration of his Hypothesis*, Appendix, sect. iii.

title *Ξενοφώντος ἀπομνημονεύματα* is used to denote a *single* work composed by a single author; consequently, *ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν Ἀποστόλων* must mean a *single* work composed by more than one author. But is this a necessary inference? The title *Ξενοφώντος ἀπομνημονεύματα* means a collection of such sayings and acts of Socrates as were remembered by Xenophon; in like manner, *ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν Ἀποστόλων* means a collection of such sayings or acts of Christ as were remembered by the apostles. But the recollections of each apostle might be recorded in a separate book. One book might be entitled *ἀπομνημονεύματα Ματθαίου*, another, *ἀπομνημονεύματα Ἰωάννου*, while the general title might be *ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν Ἀποστόλων*.

II. "If Justin had departed from the common use of this title, and had meant to describe four different Gospels, written by four different authors, two of whom were not apostles, he would surely not have adopted the title *τῶν Ἀποστόλων*, as applicable to all four; he would not have used the title *Memoirs by the Apostles*, if only two out of the twelve were concerned in drawing them up." The material part of this objection had been anticipated by Bishop Pearson, who, in speaking of the passage of Eusebius, in which the account given by Papias of the origin of St. Mark's Gospel is recorded, observes that the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke were understood by the ancients to be *ἀπομνημονεύματα Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου*.¹ The term *ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν Ἀποστόλων*, therefore, applies to *them* as well as to the other two Gospels. But the learned prelate seems to lay great stress on the article *τῶν*, and to infer from it that *all* the apostles must have been concerned in drawing up the work. Let us, however, suppose that Justin had our present Gospels before him; by what more appropriate title could he refer to them, when addressing a heathen Emperor

¹ "Sic Marci Evangelium credebant Veteres nihil aliud fuisse quam Petri ἀπομνημονεύματα." *Vindiciæ Ignatiane*, Pars I. c. 6, p. 297. The passage of Eusebius is in *Hist. Eccl.* l. iii c. 39.

or a Jew, than by that of ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν Ἀποστόλων? The fallacy, if I may venture to use the term, lies in assuming that Justin refers to a work actually existing under the title of ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν Ἀποστόλων, whereas the expression is Justin's own, intended to convey to a heathen or a Jew a correct idea of the nature of the works which he quotes. The works were known to Christians by the title εὐαγγέλια, "Gospel,"¹ as is evident from the clause which the learned prelate wishes to expunge as spurious; and had Justin been addressing Christians, he would have used that title. But it is further urged that "Justin's constant practice is to name the author from whom he quotes; and if we consult his numerous quotations from the Old Testament, we shall find that he does not content himself merely with saying, as it is written by the prophets or by the prophet, but that he adds by what prophet." If this statement were more *strictly* correct than it is, satisfactory reasons might be assigned why Justin, in disputing with a Jew, should specify the book of the Old Testament to which he appeals, and yet not mention the particular Gospel which he is about to quote. In quoting the former, the object of Justin would be to influence Trypho's judgment, by appealing to an authority which the Jews held in the highest veneration; and he would naturally be minute and precise in his reference. But in quoting the New Testament, the authority of which was denied by the Jews, his object would be not

¹ See the quotation in p. 99, note 2. There are two other passages in which the word εὐαγγέλιον is used to signify a written gospel: one in p. 227 C, where Trypho says that he had read the precepts delivered ἐν τῷ λεγομένῳ εὐαγγελίῳ, "in the so-called gospel;" the other in p. 326 D, where Justin says, καὶ ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ δὲ γέγραπται εἰπών, Πάντα μοι παραδέδοται ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τὸν Πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς, οὐδὲ τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ Πατήρ, καὶ οἷς ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ, "And it is written in the gospel that He said: All things are delivered unto Me of the Father. And no man has known the Father but the Son, and no man the Son but the Father, and they to whom the Son has revealed Him,"—an evident quotation by memory from Matt. xi. 27.

so much to convince Trypho, as to state certain facts ;¹ the same exactness of citation would consequently be useless. On one occasion he appears almost to apologise for quoting the sacred books of the Christians.² Should it be said that in his *First Apology* addressed to an heathen Emperor, Justin is no less exact in specifying the prophet, whose book he quotes, we reply, that the principal object for which Justin there refers to the books of the Old Testament, is to show that the prophecies respecting the Messiah were fulfilled in Jesus. It was important, therefore, to quote the precise words of the prophecy ; and Justin, with the view of proving that he does quote accurately, introduces his quotations by a short history of the Septuagint version, in order that the Emperor may, by referring to a work so generally known, satisfy himself of their correctness. The difference between the two cases is that, in quoting the Old Testament, Justin appeals to an authority ; in quoting the New, he does not : and this difference sufficiently accounts for the different manner in which the quotations are made.

III. Another objection is that Justin is very exact in his quotations from the Old Testament : from which circumstance it is inferred that, if he had quoted our present Gospels, the same verbal coincidence would have been found in the quotations from them. But is Justin really so exact in his quota-

¹ Thus, in the *First Apology*, where he says that the Christians gave to the prince of evil demons the titles Serpent, Satan, and Devil, he adds, *ὡς καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἡμετέρων συγγραμμάτων ἐρευνήσαντες μαθεῖν δύνασθε*, “As you may easily learn from our Scriptures,” p. 71 A (37).

² *Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἀνέγνως, ὦ Τρύφων, ὡς αὐτὸς ὁμολογήσας ἔφης, τὰ ὑπ’ ἐκείνου τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν διδαχθέντα, οὐκ ἄτοπον νομίζω πεποιηκέναι καὶ βραχέα τῶν ἐκείνου λόγια πρὸς τοῖς προφητικοῖς ἐπιμνηθεῖς.* “For since you have read, O Trypho, as you have confessed, the teachings of our Saviour, I do not think it unseasonable for me to quote some of His precepts together with the prophetic writings.” P. 235 D. If Trypho had not admitted that he had read the precepts delivered by Christ, Justin would have thought it unseasonable to quote them.

tions from the Old Testament as this objection represents? In *Apol.* i. he ascribes to Zephaniah a passage which is found in Zech. ix. 9,¹ and which he himself gives to Zechariah in the *Dialogue with Trypho.*² In another passage he has mixed together Num. xxiv. 17, Isa. xi. 1 and li. 5.³ In another he appears to have mixed together Isa. vii. 14 and Matt. i. 23.⁴ In another he professes to quote the prophet Micah, v. 2, but gives the words precisely as they stand in Matt. ii. 6.⁵ In another he has mixed together Isa. lxxv. 2 and lviii. 2.⁶ In another he ascribes to Isaiah a passage, part of which is found in Jer. xxvii. 3.⁷ In another⁸ he ascribes to Jeremiah a passage which is found in Daniel. These instances, to which many others might be added,⁹ are surely sufficient to prove that Justin is not *uniformly* accurate in his quotations from

¹ P. 76 D (44). The latter part of the quotation agrees more nearly with the quotation of the same passage in Matt. xxi. 5 than with the Septuagint. There is not a verbal coincidence in the two quotations by Justin.

² P. 273 A. In p. 268 B, he gives Mal. iv. 5 to Zechariah.

³ P. 74 C (42). In p. 269 B, he mixes together Num. xxvii. 18, 20, xi. 17, and Deut. xxxiv. 9.

⁴ P. 74 E (42).

⁵ P. 75 D (43).

⁶ P. 76 A (44).

⁷ P. 84 B (59). See also p. 89 A (65).

⁸ P. 86 E (62).

⁹ In p. 344 B, Justin states a circumstance respecting Jesus, the High Priest mentioned in Zech. iii., which is not found in Scripture. In p. 232 D, he assigns to Hosea a passage which, in other places, he rightly gives to Zechariah. In p. 367 C, we find ὅτι ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐα λέλειπται ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ πρὸς τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ, ὅτι ἐπὶ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ τοῦ Νῶε ἔσωσά σε, "that it is said in Isaiah by God to Jerusalem, Because I saved thee in the deluge of Noah," which Thirlby, with reason, conjectures to be an erroneous quotation from memory of Isa. liv. 8, 9. One of Middleton's charges against Justin is founded upon his negligent mode of quoting Scripture; and it is remarkable that all the instances are taken from the Old Testament. *Enquiry*, p. 161. In *Apol.* i. p. 95 A (101), Justin speaks of Moses as feeding his uncle's flock, τοῦ πρὸς μητρὸς θεοῦ, in Arabia. See Thirlby's note. He says also that, as the bodies of the younger Israelites grew during their journey through the wilderness, their clothes grew also, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ τῶν νεωτέρων (ἐνδύματα) συνήζανε. *Dial.* p. 361 D. See Deut. viii. 4.

the Old Testament. The strictest verbal coincidence is observable in the quotations from the Psalms; for which Thirlby¹ seems satisfactorily to account, by remarking that the Psalms always formed a considerable part of the service of the Church, and thus were impressed more accurately on the memories of Christians.

Let us now consider in detail the passages in which Justin expressly refers to the ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν Ἀποστόλων. *Apol.* i. p. 75 A (43). “And the angel of God that was sent to her delivered his embassy in these words: ‘Behold thou shalt conceive in thy womb by the Holy Ghost and bring forth a Son, and He shall be called the Son of the Highest, and thou shalt call His name Jesus, for He shall save His people from their sins,’ even as they who have recounted to us all things concerning our Saviour Jesus Christ have taught.” The former part of this quotation is found, though the words are not precisely in the same order, in Luke i. 31, 32; the latter in Matt. i. 21. Justin joined the two quotations together, perhaps from error of memory, perhaps by design.

P. 98 B (90). “For the apostles in their commentaries called the Gospels have left this command upon record: That Jesus took bread, and when He had given thanks, He said, ‘Do this in commemoration of Me, for this is My body;’ and in like manner He took the cup, and when He had given thanks He said, ‘This is My blood,’ and delivered it to them only.” Here Justin evidently means to give the sense, not the exact words, of Scripture.

P. 98 D (92). In this place there is no quotation, but Justin states that the ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν Ἀποστόλων, or the συγγράμματα τῶν Προφητῶν, “writings of the prophets,” were

¹ P. 239 E.

read in the assemblies of the Christians every Sunday. Unless, therefore, the ἀπομνημονεύματα here alluded to were our present Gospels, we must suppose that a work, esteemed to be of so high authority as to be publicly read in the Church, had wholly disappeared in the interval between Justin and Irenæus, who recognised only our present Gospels. Is this probable?

Dial. p. 328 B. "For they who saw Him suspended on the cross, wagging their heads and shooting out their lips, and talking very mockingly among themselves, uttered those words which have been recorded in the commentaries of the apostles: 'He called Himself the Son of God, let Him come down and walk; let God save Him.'" Justin in this instance has evidently, in quoting from memory, mixed up with Matt. xxvii. 42, words from Ps. xxi. 7, to which he had just referred.

P. 329 C. "Holding His peace and resolving not to answer any of Pilate's questions, as it is written in the commentaries of the apostles." This is a reference, not a quotation.

P. 331 B. "For after Christ had come up out of the river Jordan, where a voice had said of Him, 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten Thee,' it is written in the commentaries of the apostles that the devil drew near to Him and tempted Him, saying, 'Worship me;' but Christ answered him, 'Get thee hence, Satan, thou shalt adore the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve.'" In this passage Justin appears to have referred to Luke iii. 22, iv. 8, but, quoting from memory, to have cited the words of Ps. ii. 7, instead of Luke iii. 22. Is there not also reason for suspecting that Justin, in arguing with a Jew, might think that he added weight to his argument by substituting for the

actual words of the Gospel, words from the Old Testament, which the Jews themselves interpreted of the Messiah?¹ It ought, however, to be observed that the Codex Bezae in Luke iii. 22 gives the words as Justin quotes them; and that Clemens Alexandrinus,² who certainly quoted our Gospels, gives them in the same manner. They appear also to have been extant in the gospel used by the Ebionites.³

P. 331 D. "In the commentaries written by His apostles and their followers, it is carefully stated that His sweat ran down like drops of blood upon the earth while He prayed, saying, 'If it be possible, let this cup pass from Me.'" Here Justin evidently quotes Matt. xxvi. 39, though he adds from Luke xxii. 44, a circumstance which gives great weight to his argument; his purpose being then to show that the prediction in Ps. xxii. 14 was actually accomplished in Christ's sufferings.

P. 332 B. "What was done is written in the apostolic commentaries." And shortly after, "As we have learnt from the commentaries." Here are only references.

P. 333 B. "And yielding up the Ghost upon the cross, He

¹ Compare p. 316 D.

² "For at the Lord's baptism a voice sounded from heaven testifying to the love, 'Thou art my beloved Son, this day have I begotten Thee.'" *αὐτίκα γοῦν βαπτιζομένη τῷ Κυρίῳ ἀπ' οὐρανῶν ἐπήχησε φωνὴ μάρτυς ἡγαπημένου Τίος μου εἶ σὺ ἀγαπητὸς, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε. Paddag. l. i. c. 6, p. 113, ed. Pot.*

³ Epiphanius, *Hær.* x. or xxi. sect. xiii., "And there came a voice from heaven saying, Thou art My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And again, This day have I begotten Thee." *καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, λέγουσα, σὺ μου εἶ υἱὸς ὁ ἀγαπητὸς, ἐν σοὶ ἠδόκησα. καὶ πάλιν, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε.* In sect. iii. Epiphanius says that the Ebionites used the Gospel of St. Matthew (but corrupted and mutilated, sect. xiii.), and called it the Gospel according to the Hebrews, affirming that Matthew alone wrote in Hebrew.

said, 'Father, into Thy hands I commit My spirit;' even as I have learnt from the apostolical commentaries." This quotation agrees with Luke xxiii. 46. In the received text we find "I will commend," instead of "I commend"; but the latter is marked as a various reading. Again, "It is also written in these commentaries that He spoke thus: 'Unless your righteousness shall exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven,'" which agrees with Matt. v. 20.

P. 333 D. "These things are shown to have taken place in the writings of the apostles." Here is only a reference.

P. 333 E. "And the saying that He gave to one of the apostles the surname of Peter is also related in the commentaries of the apostles; and also two other apostles, the sons of Zebedee, He surnamed Boanerges, that is, sons of thunder, as a sign that He was the same," etc. Here, although there is no quotation, there is an evident allusion to Mark iii. 17.

P. 334 B. "The wise men from Arabia being taught by the star which appeared at the time of His birth, as it is written in the commentaries of His apostles, came to Him and worshipped Him. And it is written in the commentaries that He rose again on the third day after His crucifixion. For some of your nation, trying Him, said, 'Show us a sign;' and He answered them, 'An evil and adulterous generation seeketh a sign, but no sign shall be given to them but the sign of Jonah.'" In the former part of the passage, though there is no quotation, there is a manifest reference to the second chapter of St. Matthew; and in the latter part there is an almost exact verbal coincidence with Matt. xii. 39.

P. 327 B. "Having written that He was the Son of God in the commentaries of the apostles." Here is no quotation.

The inference which I am disposed to draw from the consideration of the above passages is, not that Justin quoted a narrative of our Saviour's life and ministry agreeing in substance with our present Gospels, though differing from them in expression, but that he quoted our present Gospels from memory. This inference is, as it appears to me, equally deducible from those passages which he quotes without any express reference to the ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν Ἀποστόλων. It is, moreover, necessary always to bear in mind, as has been already observed, that Justin does not appeal to the New Testament as an authority; he wishes merely to give a true representation of the doctrines and precepts of the gospel, and for this purpose it was sufficient to express the meaning without any scrupulous regard to verbal accuracy.

IV. It is objected that "Justin has quoted from his Memoirs by the Apostles, what does not exist, either in sense or substance, in any of our four Gospels." In p. 315 D, we read, "And when Jesus came to the river Jordan where John was baptizing, and descended into the water, fire was kindled in Jordan, and the apostles have written that when He came up out of the water, the Holy Spirit descended upon Him like a dove." The construction of this sentence is not very clear, and it has, in consequence, been conjectured that we ought, instead of ἀνήφθη, to read ἀνήφθαι. Grabe,¹ who has discussed the passage at considerable length, retains the old reading, and wishes to restrict the words, "the apostles wrote," to the latter part of the sentence, so that the authority of the apostles is appealed to *only* in confirmation of the descent of the Holy Spirit in the shape of a dove. This fact Grabe supposes Justin to have obtained from the present Gospels, and to have added the statement respecting the fire from tradition. Lardner appears disposed to acquiesce in this solution of the difficulty, which derives support from the fact

¹ *Spicil.* t. i. p. 19.

that, in quoting from the Old Testament, Justin sometimes mixes up statements not found in the sacred volume.¹ I have already referred to a statement respecting Joshua, the high priest, who, according to Justin, is said to have been clothed in filthy garments because he had married a fornicatress: a statement of which there is no vestige in the prophet Zechariah.² I referred also to the following statement, in p. 361 D, respecting the children of Israel in their journey through the wilderness: "Whose shoe-latchets were not broken, nor were the shoes themselves worn out, nor did the garments grow old, but those of the youths grew larger as they did," where, manifestly referring to Deut. viii. 4 and xxix. 5, he has mixed up facts derived from some other source than Scripture. It is not, therefore, improbable that Justin obtained the statement respecting the fire from tradition, and added it to the gospel narrative. The learned prelate, however, whose opinions on this subject I am venturing to controvert, thinks that Justin quoted the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which was also called the Gospel according to the twelve. For, according to Epiphanius,³ it was recorded in that Gospel that after Christ had ascended out of the water, and the Holy Spirit had descended, and the voice had come from heaven, a great light shone around the place. It has been observed that in Justin

¹ *Credibility*, c. 10, sect. viii.

² See p. 103, note 9. Thirlby supposes Justin either to have confounded Joshua with Hosea, who was commanded to take such a wife, i. 2, or to have had in his mind Ezra x. 18, where the sons of Jeshua, the son of Jozadak, are said to have had *strange* wives.

³ Part of the passage is quoted in p. 144, note 1. *καὶ ὡς ἀνῆλθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος, κ. τ. ἔ. . . καὶ εὐθὺς περιέλαμψε τὸν τόπον φῶς μέγα*, "And as He came out of the water, etc. . . and straightway a great light shone round about the place." The author of the tract *de Baptismo Hæreticorum*, printed with Cyprian's works, says that a similar account was given in an heretical forgery extant under the title *Prædicatio Petri*. "Item, quum baptizaretur, ignem super aquam visum. *Quod in Evangelio nullo est scriptum*," "When He was baptized, there was a fire upon the face of the water, which is written in no Gospel," p. 30, ed. Oxon.

the fire is said to have been lighted when Jesus descended into the water; whereas, in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the light shone after Jesus had come up out of the water; a difference not merely of words, but of fact. The learned prelate, however, considers this difference of no importance. To Dodwell¹ it appeared of so much weight that he was induced to conclude from it that Justin did not quote the Ebionite Gospel, but obtained the account from tradition. Lardner suggests that the words *πῦρ ἀνήφθη*, "fire was kindled," may be nothing more than a particular explication of the words *ἀνεώχθησαν οἱ οὐρανοὶ*, "the heavens were opened," in our present Gospels. Is it not more likely that they arose out of the declaration of the Baptist, that He who was to come after him would baptize with the Holy Ghost and *with fire*?

The learned prelate urges another passage,² in which Justin quotes a saying of our Lord not to be found in our present Gospels, "Wherefore also our Lord Jesus Christ said, 'Them whom I shall catch unawares among you, even them will I judge.'" This saying of our Lord is also quoted by Clemens Alexandrinus;³ and because Clemens has on another occasion expressly quoted the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the learned prelate argues that both he and Justin obtained the saying from that Gospel. But this is surely to draw conclusions from very insufficient premises. We find in the Acts of the Apostles⁴ a saying of our Lord not recorded in the Gospels; why might not the saying in question have been handed down in the same manner by tradition?⁵

¹ *Diss. in Irenæum*, ii. sect. ix.

² *Dial.* p. 267 A.

³ *Quis dives salvetur?* sect. xl. 40, t. ii. p. 957, ed. Pot. Clemens does not ascribe the saying expressly to Christ.

⁴ X. 35.

⁵ See Jones *On the Canon*, t. i. appendix, part 2, sect. xii. Grabe, *Spicil.* t. i. p. 327.

I will conclude my remarks on this interesting question with the words of an able writer,¹ who, at the same time that he protests against a gross misrepresentation which had been made of the learned prelate's opinion, thus expresses his dissent from the opinion itself: "In fact, the modern German divines appear to have been the first who thought the verbal diversity of Justin's quotations from the present text of the evangelists to be of any consequence. As a question of criticism, I own it is a difficult one; and, did I think that Justin had not quoted our present books, I should not hesitate a moment to avow it. But when we reflect that there is no difference in the *facts* mentioned; that the verbal coincidence is sometimes exact, and sometimes so great as to appear exact in a translation; that Justin calls his books by the name of Gospels, and says that they were written by apostles and apostolic men, which precisely corresponds with ours, two of which are by apostles and two by apostolic men; and that Irenæus makes no mention of any other books so similar to ours as Justin's were, if they be not the same;—when we reflect on these things, we shall find it hard to believe that Justin quoted any other Gospels than ours. If, however, it be thought necessary, notwithstanding all this, to grant that he did not quote our books, then it will be an inference scarcely less favourable to Christianity, that a set of sacred writings, different from ours, did yet testify to the truth of the same facts."

¹ Everett, *Defence of Christianity*, etc., p. 474.

CHAPTER IX.

CONTAINING ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE PRECEDING CHAPTERS FROM THE WRITINGS OF TATIAN, ATHENAGORAS, AND THEOPHILUS OF ANTIOCH, WITH ADDITIONAL REMARKS.

PAGE 6, note 2. Tatian uses the words *θεολογεῖν*, *θεοποιεῖν* to signify what we express by the word *deify*, pp. 149 D, 157 B. Athenagoras uses *θεολογεῖν* in a sense approaching more nearly to that in which it is used in the Hortatory Address. *Legatio*, pp. 18 D, 24 C. *θεοποιεῖν* means to deify, in 24 B, D.

P. 8. In the *Dialogue with Trypho*,¹ Justin alludes to the charge which was brought against the Christians of eating human flesh, and of indulging in the most horrible sensuality. Tatian alludes to the same charge, and complains of the injustice of condemning the Christians merely because they were Christians.² Athenagoras³ complains that the Christians were not allowed the liberty, which all other subjects of the Roman Empire enjoyed, of worshipping the gods whom they preferred; and that they were persecuted only on account of their name: he affirms also that no proof was ever brought forward that they were guilty of the crimes laid to their charge. The same calumnies are noticed by Theophilus.⁴

P. 8, note 2. Theophilus also plays upon the words "Christ" and "good."⁵

¹ P. 227 B, referred to in chap. vi. note 3, p. 86.

² Pp. 149 B, 158 D, 162 D, 164 A.

³ *Legatio*, *sub in.* pp. 2 C, 3 A, 4 C, 7 D, 34 D, 38 B.

⁴ L. iii. pp. 119 B, 126 D.

⁵ ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν ὁμολογῶ εἶναι Χριστιανός, καὶ φορῶ τὸ Θεοφιλῆς ὄνομα τοῦτο, ἐλπίζων εὐχρηστος εἶναι τῷ Θεῷ, "For I declare myself to be a Christian, and I bear the name of Theophilus, hoping to be serviceable to God." L. i. p. 69 B. Compare p. 77 B.

P. 8. In *Apol.* i. p. 64 D (25), Justin says that the Christians prayed for the Emperors. So also Athenagoras, *Leg. sub fin.* Theophilus, l. i. p. 76 D.

P. 17, note 5. Athenagoras speaks of "the common, inborn notion."¹ We find also "the eternal judgments." *Dial.* p. 246 A.

P. 48, note 3. Athenagoras² quotes the same passage from the second Epistle of Plato, and thus argues upon it: ἄρ' οὖν ὁ τὸν αἰδίου νοῦν καὶ λόγῳ καταλαμβανόμενον περινοήσας Θεὸν, καὶ τὰ ἐπισυμβεβηκότα αὐτῷ ἐξειπὼν, τὸ ὄντως ὄν, τὸ μονοφυῆς, τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἀποχεόμενον, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἀλήθεια· καὶ περὶ πρώτης δυνάμεως· καὶ ὡς περὶ τὸν πάντων βασιλέα πάντα ἐστὶ, καὶ ἐκείνου ἔνεκεν πάντα, καὶ ἐκείνο αἴτιον πάντων· καὶ περὶ δύο καὶ τρία· δεύτερον δὲ περὶ, τὰ δεύτερα· καὶ τρίτον περὶ, τὰ τρίτα· περὶ τῶν ἐκ τῶν αἰσθητῶν γῆς τε καὶ οὐρανοῦ λεγομένων γεγονέναι μείζον ἢ καθ' ἑαυτὸν τάληθές μαθεῖν ἐνόμισεν; ἢ οὐκ ἐστὶν εἰπεῖν. He had just before said, Πλάτων δὲ τὰ ἄλλα ἐπέχων, καὶ αὐτὸς εἰς τε τὸν ἀγέννητον Θεὸν καὶ τοὺς ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀγεννήτου εἰς κόσμον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ γεγονότας, τοὺς τε πλανήτας καὶ τοὺς ἀπλανεῖς ἀστέρας, καὶ εἰς Δαίμονας τέμνει· περὶ ὧν Δαιμόνων αὐτὸς ἀπαξιῶν λέγειν τοῖς περὶ αὐτῶν εἰρηκόσιν προσέχειν ἀξιοῖ. Then follows a quotation from the *Timæus* of Plato.³ If Athenagoras had supposed that the writings of the Greek philosopher contained any intimations of the doctrine of the Trinity, here, surely, was a favourable opportunity for introducing the subject: but he is silent.

P. 39. Athenagoras,⁴ in like manner, appeals to the belief of the Christians in the doctrine of the Trinity, for the pur-

¹ *De Mort. Res.* p. 54 D.

² *Legatio*, p. 26 A.

³ Tom. iii. p. 40, ed. Serr.

⁴ *Legatio*, p. 11 A.

pose of defending them against the charge of atheism : τίς οὖν οὐκ ἂν ἀπορήσαι, λέγοντας Θεὸν πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν Θεὸν καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον, δεικνύντας αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν ἐν τῇ ἐνώσει δύναμιν, καὶ τὴν ἐν τῇ τάξει διαίρεσιν, ἀκούσας ἀθέους καλουμένους ; he had before said : οὐδὲ ἡμεῖς ἄθεοι, ὑφ' οὗ λόγῳ δεδημιούργηται καὶ τῷ παρ' αὐτοῦ πνεύματι συνέχεται τὰ πάντα, τοῦτον εἰδότες καὶ κρατοῦντες Θεόν.¹ In a subsequent passage we find, ὑπὸ μόνου δὲ παραπεμπόμενοι τούτου, ὃν ἴσως (f. ἴσασι) Θεὸν, καὶ τὸν παρ' αὐτοῦ λόγον εἰδέναι, τίς ἢ τοῦ παιδὸς πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ἐνότης, τίς ἢ τοῦ πατρὸς πρὸς τὸν υἱὸν κοινωνία, τί τὸ πνεῦμα, τίς ἢ τῶν τοσοῦτων ἔνωσις καὶ διαίρεσις, ἐνουμένων τοῦ πνεύματος, τοῦ παιδὸς, τοῦ πατρός.² And again, ὡς γὰρ Θεὸν φαμέν, καὶ υἱὸν τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ, καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον, ἐνούμενα μὲν κατὰ δύναμιν, τὸν πατέρα, τὸν υἱὸν, τὸ πνεῦμα· ὅτι νοῦς, λόγος, σοφία υἱὸς τοῦ πατρός· καὶ ἀπόρροια, ὡς φῶς ἀπὸ πυρὸς, τὸ πνεῦμα.³ With respect to Theophilus, it is well known that he is the earliest Christian writer who has used the word *τριάς*, "Trinity." In his second book he is commenting on the work of creation, as described in the first chapter of Genesis. Having assigned a reason why the sun and moon were not created till the fourth day, he goes on to say that the sun is a type of God, the moon, of man ; and then adds, ὡσαύτως καὶ αἱ τρεῖς ἡμέραι (f. ins. πρὸ) τῶν φωστήρων γεγωνῖαι τύποι εἰσὶ τῆς τριάδος, τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῆς σοφίας αὐτοῦ. τετάρτῳ δὲ τύπῳ (f. τόπῳ) ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος ὁ προσδεῆς τοῦ φωτὸς, ἵνα ᾗ Θεὸς, λόγος, σοφία, ἄνθρωπος.⁴ It is not very easy to discover wherein the correspondence between the types and antitypes consists ; one thing, however, is certain, that, according to the notions of Theophilus, God, His Word, and His Wisdom constitute a Trinity, and, it should seem, a Trinity of persons ; for man, whom he afterwards adds, is a person. One remarkable circumstance is, that Theophilus assigns to the third Person the title *σοφία*,

¹ *Legatio*, p. 7 A.³ P. 27 A.² P. 12 C.⁴ P. 94 D.

“Wisdom,”¹ which is usually assigned by the early Fathers to the second, as in the passage just quoted from Athenagoras.²

P. 40, note 1. Immediately after one of the passages just quoted from Athenagoras, follow these words, *καὶ οὐκ ἐπὶ τούτοις τὸ θεολογικὸν ἡμῶν ἴσταται μέρος, ἀλλὰ καὶ πλήθος Ἀγγέλων καὶ λειτουργῶν φαμέν, οὓς ὁ ποιητὴς καὶ δημιουργὸς κόσμου Θεὸς διὰ τοῦ παρ’ αὐτοῦ λόγου διένειμε καὶ διέταξε περὶ τε τὰ στοιχεῖα εἶναι καὶ τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, καὶ τὸν κόσμον καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ τὴν τούτων εὐταξίαν.*³ Here Athenagoras says nothing of any worship to be paid to angels, though his words seem to imply that, in order fully to state the notions of the Christians respecting the Deity, it was necessary to add that they believed in the existence of a multitude of angels who were to have their attention continually directed to the elements, heavens, etc. We should bear in mind that Justin and Athenagoras were replying to a charge of atheism; and they appear to have thought that they strengthened their case by saying, “We not only believe in God, but also that He has subject to Him a multitude of ministering angels.” It is to be observed that, according to the statement of Athenagoras, God distributed to those angels their various offices through the instrumentality of the *Λόγος*; so that they were, in fact, the ministers of the *Λόγος*.

P. 42, note 1. Thus Tatian, *Θεὸς ὁ καθ’ ἡμᾶς οὐκ ἔχει*

¹ Compare l. i. p. 74 B: *ὁ Θεὸς διὰ τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς σοφίας ἐποίησε τὰ πάντα. τῷ γὰρ λόγῳ αὐτοῦ ἐστερωθήσαν οἱ οὐρανοὶ, καὶ τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ πασᾶ ἡ δύναμις αὐτῶν.* I give the passage as it stands in the Benedictine edition; the latter part is a quotation from Ps. xxxiii. Again, l. ii. p. 96 D: *ἔτι μὴν καὶ ὡς βοηθείας χρῆζων ὁ Θεὸς εὕρισκεται λέγων, ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ’ εἰκόνα καὶ καθ’ ὁμοίωσιν· οὐκ ἄλλω δὲ τινι εἴρηκε, ποιήσωμεν, ἀλλ’ ἢ τῷ ἑαυτοῦ λόγῳ καὶ τῇ ἑαυτοῦ σοφίᾳ.*

² Theophilus himself gives the title *σοφία* to the second Person in l. ii. pp. 88 C, 100 A, and to God *absolutely*, l. i. p. 71 B.

³ *Legatio*, p. 11 A.

σύστασιν ἐν χρόνῳ, μόνος ἀναρχος ὢν, καὶ αὐτὸς ὑπάρχων τῶν ὅλων ἀρχή.¹ Again, τὸν ἀνωνόμαστον Θεόν.² Again, ὑπὸ τοῦ πάντων δημιουργοῦ.³ Again, ὁ δὲ τῶν ὅλων δεσπότης.⁴ Unless, as was before remarked, it should be thought that some of these passages are to be understood of God *absolutely*. In Athenagoras we find, ἓνα Θεόν—τὸν τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς ποιητὴν, αὐτὸν μὲν οὐ γενόμενον (ὅτι τὸ ὄν οὐ γίγνεται, ἀλλὰ τὸ μὴ ὄν) πάντα δὲ διὰ τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ λόγου πεποιηκότα, etc.⁵ Again, ἓνα τὸν δημιουργὸν τῶν ὅλων νοῶν ἀγέννητον Θεόν.⁶ Again, ὁ τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς δημιουργὸς καὶ πατήρ.⁷ Again, ἀποπίπτουσι τῷ (1. τοῦ) λόγῳ θεωρητοῦ Θεοῦ.⁸ Theophilus, in like manner, uses the expressions ὁ Θεὸς ἀγέννητος ὢν καὶ ἀναλλοίωτος⁹—τὸν ποιητὴν καὶ δημιουργὸν τῶν ὅλων—ὁ μὲν τοί γε Θεὸς καὶ πατήρ καὶ κτιστὴς τῶν ὅλων.¹⁰

P. 42, note 3. Theophilus¹¹ supposes the following objection to be made :—“ You say that God cannot be limited to a place, yet you say that He walked in Paradise.” Theophilus answers, “ It is true that God cannot be limited to a place, or be found in a place ; for He has no place of His rest (Isa. lvi. 1). But His Word, by whom He made all things, being His Power and Wisdom, assuming the person of the Father and Lord of the universe, came into Paradise in the person of God, and conversed with Adam. For the Divine Scripture itself instructs us that Adam said that he heard a voice ; but what is this voice else than the Word of God, who is His Son.”

P. 57. Tatian thus states his view of the Christian doc-

¹ P. 144 C.

² P. 144 D.

³ P. 145 D.

⁴ P. 151 D.

⁵ *Legatio*, p. 5 C.

⁶ P. 7 A. See also p. 10 A.

⁷ P. 13 B.

⁸ P. 24 B. See pp. 5 B, 26 A.

⁹ P. 82 C. See p. 71 C.

¹⁰ P. 110 B. See pp. 122 D, 89 A.

¹¹ L. ii. p. 100 A. Theophilus calls God τόπος τῶν ὅλων, “ the place of the universe,” l. 2, p. 81 D, and ἑαυτοῦ τόπος, “ His place,” p. 88 B.

trine respecting the second Person in the Trinity:¹ "God was in the beginning; but we understand the beginning to be the power of the Word. For the Lord of all things, being Himself the substance of all things, with reference to the creation which did not yet exist, was alone; but inasmuch as He comprehended all power, and all things, visible and invisible, subsisted in Him, all things were with Him. For with Him also by a rational power subsisted the Word, who was in Him. By the unity of His will the Word went forth; and the Word going forth not ineffectually (but so as to produce an effect, viz. the creation of the universe), became the first-born work

¹ Θεὸς ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ· τὴν δὲ ἀρχὴν Λόγου δύναμιν παρειλήφαμεν· ὁ γὰρ δεσπότης τῶν ὅλων, αὐτὸς ὑπάρχων τοῦ παντός ἢ ὑπόστασις, κατὰ μὲν τὴν μὲνδέτω γεγεννημένην ποίησιν μόνος ἦν· καθὼ δὲ πᾶσα δύναμις ὄρατῶν τε καὶ ἀράτων αὐτὸς ὑπόστασις ἦν, σὺν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα· σὺν αὐτῷ γὰρ διὰ λογικῆς δυνάμεως αὐτὸς καὶ ὁ λόγος, ὃς ἦν ἐν αὐτῷ, ὑπέστηκε· θελήματι δὲ τῆς ἀπλότητος αὐτοῦ προηδὴ λόγος· ὁ δὲ λόγος, οὐ κατὰ κενῷ χωρήσας, ἔργον πρωτότοκον τοῦ πνύματος (f. πατρὸς) γίγνεται· τοῦτον ἴσμεν τοῦ κόσμου τὴν ἀρχήν. γέγονε δὲ κατὰ μερισμὸν, οὐ κατὰ ἀποκοπήν. τὸ γὰρ ἀποσμηθὲν τοῦ πρώτου κεχώρισται· τὸ δὲ μερισθὲν οἰκονομίας τὴν αἴρεσιν προσλαβὼν οὐκ ἐνδεῶ τὸν ὄν ἐἴληπται πεποιήκεν. ὡσπερ γὰρ ἀπὸ μιᾶς δαδὸς ἀνάπτεται μὲν πυρὰ πολλὰ, τῆς δὲ πρώτης δαδὸς διὰ τὴν ἕξαιψιν τῶν πολλῶν δαδῶν οὐκ ἐλαττοῦται τὸ φῶς· οὕτω καὶ ὁ λόγος, προελθὼν ἐκ τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς δυνάμεως, οὐκ ἄλλογον πεποιήκει τὸν γεγεννηκότα. καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ λαλῶ, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀκούετε, καὶ οὐ δήπου διὰ τῆς μεταβάσεως τοῦ λόγου κενὸς ὁ προσομιλῶν λόγου γίγνομαι· προβαλλόμενος δὲ τὴν ἑμαυτοῦ φωνήν, διακοσμεῖν τὴν ἐν ὑμῖν ἀκόσμητον ὕλην προήρημαι. καὶ καθάπερ ὁ λόγος, ἐν ἀρχῇ γεννηθεὶς, ἀντεγέννησε τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς ποίησιν, αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ τὴν ὕλην δημιουργήσας· οὕτω καὶ γὰρ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ λόγου μίμησιν ἀναγεννηθεὶς, καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἀληθοῦς κατάληψιν πεποιημένος, μεταρρυθμίζω τῆς συγγενοῦς ὕλης τὴν σύγχυσιν, p. 145 A. This difficult passage has furnished ample room for discussion. Petavius, and the author of the *Dissertation on Tatian*, in the Oxford edition, thought that by λόγου δύναμιν, "the power of the Word," was meant the same as by λογικῆς δυνάμεως which follows, that is, the power of reason by which God produces all things; in other words, that, before the emission of the Λόγος, He existed only in *posse*, not in *esse*. Bull, on the contrary, and Le Nourry contend, that by λόγου δύναμις we must understand the power of the Word, that is, the Word Himself, referring in support of this interpretation to ἡ δὲ τοῦ λόγου δύναμις in p. 146 D. The expression λογικῆς δυνάμεως occurs again in p. 146 B. Λόγος γὰρ

of the Father. Him (the Word) we know to be the beginning of the universe."

"He was begotten by division, not by abscission. For that which is cut off is separated from the original; but that which is divided, voluntarily taking its part in the economy, does not impoverish Him from Whom it is taken. As many fires are lighted from one torch, yet the light of the first torch is not diminished by the lighting of many from it; so the Word (or Reason) proceeding from the power of the Father, did not render Him who begat destitute of Word (or Reason). For I speak, and you hear; yet I who converse am not, by the transfer of the words, rendered destitute of the word; but

ἰπουράνιος, πνεῦμα γεγονῶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ Λόγος ἐκ τῆς λογικῆς δυνάμεως, where the Oxford editor translates ἐκ τῆς λογικῆς δυνάμεως, "Ex potentiâ divina τοῦ λόγου productrice." Petavius also differs from Bull respecting the translation of the words διὰ λογικῆς δυνάμεως αὐτὸς καὶ ὁ Λόγος, ὅς ἦν ἐν αὐτῷ, ὑπέστησε, which the former renders "*per rationalem vim* Λόγος ἴipse, qui in eo erat, extitit:" the latter, "*per rationalem potentiam tum ipse, tum Λόγος qui in ipso erat, substitit.*" I have followed Petavius, thinking his translation more agreeable both to the construction of the sentence, and to the whole scope of the passage; being further confirmed in this opinion by a corresponding passage of Tertullian, quoted by the Oxford editor, "*Ante omnia Deus erat solus, quia nihil aliud extrinsecus præter illum. Ceterum ne tum quidem solus: habebat enim secum, quam habebat in semetipso Rationem suam scilicet,*"—*contra Praxeam*, c. 5. The Oxford editor suggests very plausibly that we should read αὐτοῦ instead of αὐτὸς. In p. 155 D, Tatian speaks of demons who were smitten, λόγῳ Θεοῦ δυνάμεως. We find λόγῳ δυνάμει, p. 157 C, with reference to the healing of diseases. Bull translates the words θελήματι δὲ τῆς ἀπλότητος αὐτοῦ literally by the words "*Voluntate autem simplicitatis suæ;*" and Waterland is angry with Whitby for not allowing the words to appear as they lie in the author, without the mean artifice of giving them a false turn. *By the will of His simplicity the Word proceeded forth*, tom. iii. p. 271. I wish that Bull and Waterland had told us the exact meaning which ought to be attached to the words. *By the will of His simplicity* I conceive that Tatian meant to express the simplicity of the divine nature, and the consequent unity of the divine will.

sending forth my voice, I design to reduce into order the confused matter in you. And as the Word, being begotten in the beginning, begat in turn the creation in which we are, having formed matter for His own use; so I also, being begotten again after the imitation of the Word, and having arrived at the comprehension of the truth, reduce into order the confusion of kindred matter." In this passage we find the notion respecting the subsistence of the Λόγος from eternity in a state of most intimate union with the Father, which I have stated to be common among the Ante-Nicene Fathers, but not to be clearly expressed by Justin.¹ When, too, Tatian says that the Λόγος was not only *in*, but *with* the Father, he appears to intend to express a distinct personality. Waterland has observed, that he speaks only of a *temporal* generation.² In order to explain the mode of it, he uses the same illustration of a fire which Justin had used; he distinguishes, however, between the words "to divide" and "to cut off," which Justin has used indifferently. The inference apparently intended to be drawn from the comparison with a fire is, that the substance of the Father was not divided in consequence of the generation of the Λόγος. The intent of the subsequent illustration, taken from the human voice, is less clear, and the illustration itself open, perhaps, to some objection. It is also used by Justin.³

It will be observed that Tatian calls the Λόγος the beginning of the universe, τοῦτον ἴσμεν τοῦ κόσμου τὴν ἀρχήν. This title I conceive to have been derived from Prov. viii. 22: "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old," which is twice⁴ quoted by Justin in proof of the generation of the Word to create the world; though he does not apply the title ἀρχή to the Λόγος. Bull supposes Tatian to have meant by the word ἀρχή the idea and exemplar

¹ P. 44.

³ *Dial.* p. 284 B.

² Vol. iii. p. 270.

⁴ *Dial.* pp. 284 D, 359 A.

of the universe, which was always present to the Deity; and thus in one sense it might be said that the universe was present to the Deity before the creation; in its ἀρχή, or principle, or idea, that is, in the Λόγος.¹ If this was Tatian's meaning, we must allow that he has expressed it very imperfectly; yet I seem to discover more traces of the influence of Gentile philosophy on his language and opinions than on those of his master Justin.

Let us proceed to Athenagoras. Defending the Christians against the charge of atheism, he says:² "I have sufficiently shown that we are not atheists; we who hold one God, Unbegotten, Eternal, Invisible, not subject to suffering, incomprehensible, not circumscribed by place, conceived only by the

¹ "Sed et hoc voluit significare Tatianus, Deo ante conditum mundum etiam ipsum quodammodo mundum præsentem fuisse; quum ipsi revera præsens fuerit ὁ Λόγος mundi principium, qui et idea est et exemplar, sive ars divina, quâ Pater universa, quum voluit, molitus est." *Def. Fid. Nic.* sect. iii. c. 6.

² τὸ μὲν οὖν ἄθεοι μὴ εἶναι, ἕνα τὸν ἀγέννητον καὶ αἰδιον καὶ ἀόρατον καὶ ἀπαθῆ καὶ ἀκατάληπτον καὶ ἀχώρητον, ἧ μόνῳ καὶ λόγῳ καταλαμβανόμενον, φωτὶ καὶ κάλλει καὶ πνεύματι καὶ δυνάμει ἀνεκδιηγήτῳ περιεχόμενον, ὅφ' οὐ γιγνέσθαι τὸ πᾶν διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ λόγου καὶ διακεκόσμηται καὶ συγκατατίθεται, Θεὸν ἄγοντες, ἰκανῶς μοι δέδεικται. νοοῦμεν γὰρ καὶ υἰὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ· καὶ μή μοι γελοῖόν τις νομίση τὸ υἰὸν εἶναι τῷ Θεῷ. οὐ γὰρ, ὡς ποιηταὶ μυθοποιοῦσιν, οὐδὲν βελτίους τῶν ἀνθρώπων δεικνύντες τοὺς θεοὺς, ἢ περὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς, ἢ περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ πεφρονήκαμεν· ἀλλ' ἔστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγος τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐν ἰδέᾳ καὶ ἐνεργείᾳ. πρὸς αὐτοῦ γὰρ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ πάντα ἐγένετο, ἐνὸς ὄντος τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ· ὄντος δὲ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐν πατρὶ, καὶ πατρὸς ἐν υἱῷ, ἐνόητι καὶ δυνάμει πνεύματος· νοῦς καὶ Λόγος τοῦ πατρὸς, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ. εἰ δὲ δι' ὑπερβολὴν συνέσεως σκοπεῖν ὑμῖν ἔπεισιν ὁ παῖς τί βούλεται, ἐρῶ διὰ βραχέων· πρῶτον γέννημα εἶναι τῷ πατρὶ, οὐχ ὡς γενόμενον (ἐξ ἀρχῆς γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς, νοῦς αἰδιός ἄν, εἶχεν αὐτὸς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὸν λόγον, αἰδιῶς λογικὸς ἄν) ἀλλ' ὡς τῶν ὑλικῶν ξυμπάντων, ἀποίου φύσεως καὶ γῆς (f. ὁποίας φύσεως καὶ γένους) ὀχρείας ὑποκειμένων δίκην, μεμιγμένων τῶν παχυμεστέρων πρὸς τὰ κουφότερα ἐπ' αὐτοῖς, ἰδέα καὶ ἐνεργεία εἶναι προελθόν. συναῖδει δὲ τῷ λόγῳ καὶ τὸ προφητικὸν πνεῦμα. Κύριος γὰρ, φησὶν, ἔκτισέ με, ἀρχὴν ὀδῶν αὐτοῦ εἰς ἔργα αὐτοῦ. καὶ τοὶ καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ ἐνεργοῦν τοῖς ἐκφανοῦσι προφητικῶς ἅγιον πνεῦμα, ἀπόρρητον εἶναι φάμεν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀπορρῶν καὶ ἐπιαναφερόμενον, ὡς ἀκτῖνα ἡλίου. *Leg.* p. 10 A.

mind and reason, surrounded by ineffable light and beauty, the Spirit and Power, by Whom, through His Word, everything was made and adorned and is preserved. We acknowledge also a Son of God; and let no one think it ridiculous that there should be a Son of God. For we deem not of God and the Father, or of the Son, as the poet's fable, who represent the gods as no better than men. The Word of the Father is the Son of God, in idea and operation. For by Him and through Him were all things made, the Father and the Son being one: the Son being in the Father, and the Father in the Son, by the unity and power of the Spirit. The Mind and Word of God is the Son of God."

"But if you (O Emperors), through the excellence of your understanding, are desirous to inquire what the Son means, I will briefly explain myself. He is the First-begotten to the Father, not as if made (for from the beginning God, being the eternal Mind, had within Himself the Word or Reason, being from eternity rational), but as if proceeding forth to be the idea and operating cause of all material things, of whatever nature and kind, which are subjected as a vehicle to Him, the denser parts being mixed with the lighter. The prophetic Spirit agrees with what I say: 'The Lord,' He says, 'formed me the beginning of His ways to His works.' Though we also say that the Holy Spirit, Who works in those who speak prophetically, is an emanation from the Deity, flowing forth and reflected as a ray of the sun."

In another passage,¹ Athenagoras says to the Emperors

¹ ἔχειτε ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν καὶ τὴν ἑπουράνιον βασιλείαν ἐξετάξιν, ὡς γὰρ ὑμῖν, πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ, πάντα κεχείρωται, ἀνωθεν τὴν βασιλείαν εἰληφόσι (βασιλείω γὰρ ψυχὴ ἐν χειρὶ Θεοῦ, φησὶ τὸ προφητικὸν πνεῦμα) οὕτως ἐν τῷ Θεῷ καὶ τῷ παρ' αὐτοῦ λόγῳ, υἱῷ νοουμένῳ ἀμερίστῳ, πάντα ὑποτέτακται. *Legatio*, p. 17 D. We find in p. 15 C, πάντα γὰρ ὁ Θεός ἐστιν αὐτὸς αὐτῷ, φῶς ἀπρόσιτον, κόσμος τέλειος, πνεῦμα, δύναμις, λόγος. "For God Himself is all things in Himself, inaccessible light, a perfect world, a spirit, power, the Word."

whom he is addressing, "You may estimate the heavenly empire by your own; for as all things are subject to you, father and son, who have received the empire from above (for the prophetic Spirit says that the soul of the king is in the hand of God, Prov. xxi. 1), so all things are subject to one God and to His Word, Who is conceived to be the Son, inseparable from Him."

In the former of these passages we find the subsistence of the *Λόγος* from eternity in a state of intimate union with the Father expressly declared; and though Athenagoras does not use the term, yet, as Bull has observed,¹ he evidently had in his mind the notion, which was afterwards conveyed by the term *περιχώρησις* or Circumincession; a word designed to express the mutual penetration, if I may so express myself, of the three Persons of the Trinity—the entireness of their union. We find also the notion that the *Λόγος* was the idea or exemplar of all created things; and that He was begotten in order to be the agent in the work of creation. Still we find mention only of a temporal generation. The illustration contained in the second passage has been noticed by Gibbon:² he calls it profane and absurd, and says, with a sneer, that it has been alleged without censure by Bull. But the object of Athenagoras in employing it was, not to explain the mode of subsistence of the Father and Son, but to show that the monarchy, as it was termed,—the unity of the divine government,—was not infringed by the distinction of Persons in the Godhead. Bull produces the passage in order to clear Athenagoras from the charge of Sabellianism; and undoubtedly a Sabellian would not have used the illustration. Such, however, are the difficulties inherent in the very nature of the subject, that it is scarcely possible for a writer so to guard his expressions as not to be open to cavil. How apt soever

¹ *Def. Fid. Nic.* sect. iv. c. 4.

² Chap. xxi. note 50.

an illustration may be in one point of view, it may be most inapplicable in another, and lead to most inconvenient consequences.

Let us now consider the language of Theophilus. Speaking of the prophets, he says¹: "First they taught us with one consent that God made all things out of nothing. For nothing was contemporaneous with God. But He being His own place, and wanting nothing, and existing before the ages, willed to make man by whom He might be known. For him, therefore, He prepared the world. For he that is created stands in need (of another); but He that is increate wants nothing. God, therefore, having His own Word internal within His own bowels, begat Him, emitting Him in conjunction with His wisdom before all things. He had this Word as His minister in the work of creation, and by Him He made all things. He is called the beginning, because He is the commencement and ruler over all things created by Him. He therefore being the Spirit of God, and the beginning, and the wisdom, and the power of the Most High, descended into the prophets, and through them spake of the creation of the world and of all other things. For the prophets were not

¹ καὶ πρῶτον μὲν συμφώνως ἐδίδαξαν ἡμᾶς, ὅτι ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων τὰ πάντα ἐποίησεν. οὐ γὰρ τι τῷ Θεῷ συνήκμασεν· ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ τόπος ὢν, καὶ ἀνενδής ὢν, καὶ ὑπερέχων πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων, ἠθέλησεν ἄνθρωπον ποιῆσαι ᾧ γνωσθῆ. τούτῳ οὖν προητοίμασε τὸν κόσμον. ὁ γὰρ γεννητὸς καὶ προσδής ἐστιν· ὁ δὲ ἀγεννητὸς οὐδενὸς προσδῖται. ἔχων οὖν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ λόγον ἐνδιάθετον ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις σπλάγχχνις ἐγέννησεν αὐτὸν, μετὰ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ σοφίας ἐξερευζάμενος πρὸ τῶν ὄλων. τούτῳ τὸν λόγον ἔσχεν ὑπουργὸν τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γεγεννημένων, καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ τὰ πάντα πεποίηκεν· οὗτος λέγεται ἀρχὴ, ὅτι ἄρχει καὶ κυριεύει πάντων τῶν δι' αὐτοῦ δεδημιουργημένων. οὗτος οὖν ὢν πνεῦμα Θεοῦ, καὶ ἀρχὴ, καὶ σοφία, καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου κατήρχαστο εἰς τοὺς προφήτας, καὶ δι' αὐτῶν ἐλάλει τὰ περὶ τῆς ποιήσεως τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀπάντων. οὐ γὰρ ἦσαν οἱ προφῆται ὅτι ὁ κόσμος ἐγένετο, ἀλλὰ ἡ σοφία ἢ ἐν αὐτῷ οὐσα ἢ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ὁ Λόγος ὁ ἅγιος αὐτοῦ ὁ αἰεὶ συμπαρὼν αὐτῷ. L. ii. p. 88 B. In p. 92 D, we find ἡ διάταξις οὖν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦτο ἐστίν, ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ φαίνων ὡσπερ λύχνος κ. τ. εἰ. "The creation is of God, His Word appearing as an illumination," etc. See p. 93 B.

when the world was made; but the Wisdom of God Who was in Him, and His Holy Word Who was always present with Him."

In another passage¹ he says: "For the sacred Scripture represents to us Adam saying that he heard the voice (of God); but what else is the voice than the Word of God, Who is His Son? Not as the poets and writers of fables talk of the sons of gods born from intercourse with women, but as the truth represents the Word, always internal in the heart of God. For before anything was created, God had Him as His counsellor, being His mind and intelligence; but when God willed to create what He had designed, He begat this Word to go forth, to be the first-born of all creation; not being Himself emptied of the Word, but having begotten and always conversing with the Word."

Here again we find the notion of the subsistence of the Word from eternity in a state of most intimate union with God, and of His subsequent generation to create the world. We have observed that Theophilus is the earliest Christian author in whose writings the word "Trinity" occurs; he is the first also who distinguishes expressly between the Λόγος ἐνδιάθετος and προφορικὸς, the internal and emitted Word. Theophilus also, like Tatian, applies the title ἀρχὴ to the Λόγος with a particular reference to Proverbs viii. and Genesis i.²

¹ καὶ γὰρ αὐτὴ ἡ θεία γραφὴ διδάσκει ἡμᾶς τὸν Ἀδὰμ λέγοντα τῆς φωνῆς ἀκηκοῦναι· φωνὴ δὲ τί ἄλλο ἐστὶν ἀλλ' ἢ ὁ Λόγος ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅς ἐστι καὶ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ. οὐχ ὡς οἱ ποιηταὶ καὶ μυθολογοὶ λέγουσιν υἱοὺς θεῶν ἐκ συνουσίας γεννωμένους· ἀλλὰ ὡς ἀλήθεια διηγεῖται, τὸν λόγον, τὸν ὄντα διαπαντὸς ἐνδιάθετον ἐν καρδίᾳ Θεοῦ. πρὸ γὰρ τι γίνεσθαι, τοῦτον εἶχε σύμβουλον, ἑαυτοῦ νοῦν καὶ φρόνησιν ὄντα. ὁπότε δὲ ἠθέλησεν ὁ Θεὸς παιῆσαι ὅσα ἐβουλεύσατο, τοῦτον τὸν λόγον ἐγέννησε προφορικόν, πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως, οὐ κενωθεὶς αὐτὸς τοῦ λόγου, ἀλλὰ λόγον γεννήσας, καὶ τῷ λόγῳ αὐτοῦ διαπαντὸς ὁμιλῶν, L. ii. p. 100 A.

² P. 88 D. So in p. 92 B. ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν, ταυτίστι,

P. 46, note 3. I have observed in this note that, because Justin speaks of the world as created out of matter without form, we must not, therefore, suppose him to have maintained the eternity of matter. The Benedictine editors are extremely anxious to clear him from the suspicion of having entertained such an opinion, and with this view refer to passages in the *Hortatory Address to the Gentiles*. But having already declared my doubts of the genuineness of that tract, I cannot rely upon the passages quoted from it. As, however, Justin's instructor applauds him for saying, in opposition to the Platonists, that the world was not eternal,¹ we may reasonably infer that he did not maintain the eternity of matter.

If we turn to Tatian, we shall find him expressly affirming that matter had a beginning: "For matter is not without beginning as God is, and thus it is not equal in power to God. For it is created and was begotten by no other, but was emitted by the sole Creator of all things."²

Athenagoras, in like manner distinguishing between the

διὰ τῆς ἀρχῆς γεγενῆσθαι τὸν οὐρανὸν, καθὼς ἔφθην δεικνύμενοι. In a description of the Deity, p. 71 A, we find the following remarkable passage: εἰ γὰρ φῶς αὐτὸν εἶπω, ποίημα αὐτοῦ λέγω· εἰ λόγον εἶπω, ἀρχὴν αὐτοῦ λέγω· νοῦν ἢ εἰπω, φρόνησιν αὐτοῦ λέγω· πνεῦμα ἢ εἶπω, ἀναπνοὴν αὐτοῦ λέγω· σοφίαν ἢ εἶπω, γέννημα αὐτοῦ λέγω· ἰσχὺν ἢ εἶπω, κράτος αὐτοῦ λέγω· δύναμιν ἢ εἶπω, ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ λέγω· πρόνοιαν ἢ εἶπω, ἀγαθοσύνην αὐτοῦ λέγω· βασιλείαν ἢ εἶπω, δόξαν αὐτοῦ λέγω· κύριον ἢ εἶπω, ἑαυτὸν λέγω· πατέρα ἢ εἶπω, τὰ πάντα αὐτοῦ λέγω· πῦρ ἢ εἶπω, τὴν ὄργην αὐτοῦ λέγω. See also p. 73 D; l. iii. p. 122 D.

¹ *Dial.* p. 223 A. See Beausobre, *Histoire du Manichéisme*, l. 5, cc. 2, 4, 5.

² P. 145 C. He had just before said of the Λόγος, αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ τὴν ὕλην δημιουργήσας, "He created matter by Himself." In another place he says that all matter was sent forth or emitted by God; some of it to be considered as being without form before a separation had taken place, some as being adorned and reduced to order after the separation, p. 151 A. See Beausobre, l. 5, c. 5.

divine nature and matter, says that the former is increate and eternal, the latter created and corruptible: τὸ μὲν γὰρ θεῖον ἀγένητον εἶναι καὶ αἰδίον, νῶ μόνῳ καὶ λόγῳ θεωρούμενον· τὴν δὲ ὕλην γενητὴν καὶ φθαρτὴν.¹ In another place he says that God and matter differ as widely from each other as the artisan and the materials upon which he employs his art.²

Theophilus says expressly that God produced all things from a state of non-existence into a state of existence: τὰ πάντα ὁ Θεὸς ἐποίησεν ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων εἰς τὸ εἶναι.³ In another place he asks, “What mighty power do we ascribe to God, if we say that He made the world out of subject-matter? An artisan, if materials are given him, makes what he chooses. But the power of God is displayed in this—that He makes what He chooses out of nothing.”⁴ He afterwards says that, according to the scriptural representation, God made the world out of matter which had been produced by Him.⁵

¹ *Legatio*, p. 5 B. So p. 23 A. λέσομεν ἑαυτοὺς ἰσότημον τὴν ὕλην τὴν φθαρτὴν καὶ ῥευστὴν καὶ μεταβλητὴν τῷ ἀγεννήτῳ, καὶ αἰδίῳ, καὶ διαπαντὸς συμφῶν ποιῶντες Θεῷ. We will pass over that. “Matter which is corruptible, fluctuating, and changeable, is held in equal honour with the Unbegotten, eternal God, who always works consistently.”

² εἰ δὲ διστάσιν (ὕλη καὶ Θεὸς) πάμπλου ἀπ’ ἀλλήλων, καὶ τοσοῦτον ὅσον τεχνίτης καὶ ἡ πρὸς τὴν τέχνην αὐτοῦ παρασκευή—καὶ ἡ πανδεχὴς ὕλη ἀνὲν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ δημιουργοῦ διάκρισιν καὶ σχῆμα καὶ κόσμον οὐκ ἐλάμβανεν. “But if they (matter and God) differ wholly from each other, not only in their Creator, but in the manner of their creation, and the all-embracing matter did not receive individuality, and form, and shape, without God the Creator.” P. 14 D. Beausobre justly remarks that this passage is not irreconcilable to a belief in the eternity of matter. L. 5, c. 5.

³ L. i. p. 72 A. Compare p. 75 A. L. ii. pp. 88 B, 92 B.

⁴ τί δὲ μέγα εἰ ὁ Θεὸς ἐξ ὑποκειμένης ὕλης ἐποίησεν τὸν κόσμον; καὶ γὰρ τεχνίτης ἄνθρωπος, ἐπὰν ὕλην λάβῃ ἀπὸ τινος, ἐξ αὐτῆς ὅσα βούλεται ποιεῖ. Θεοῦ δὲ ἡ δύναμις ἐν τούτῳ φανεροῦται, ἵνα ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ποιῇ ὅσα βούλεται, L. ii. p. 82 C.

⁵ ταῦτα ἐν πρώτοις διδάσκει ἡ θεία γραφὴ τῷ τρόπῳ τινὶ ὕλην γενητὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ γεγονῆναι, ἀφ’ ἧς πεποίηκε καὶ δεδημιούργηκεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν κόσμον, p. 89 A.

P. 46, note 4. The word *οικονομία* is used by Tatian, but not with any reference to the gospel dispensation. In a passage quoted in note 6, p. 116, he says that whatever is only divided takes its part in the economy, *οικονομίας τὴν αἵρεσιν προσλαβόν*. In another place he speaks of those who trust to the economy of matter, *ἕλης οἰκονομίας*, meaning those who ascribe the cure of diseases to combinations of matter;¹ and when he is ridiculing the astrologers, he calls the constellations the dispensers of fate, *τῆς εἰμαρμένης οἰκονόμους*.²

Athenagoras uses the word in a sense which bears a nearer resemblance to that in which I have supposed Justin to use it. Speaking of the assumption of the human form by the heathen deities, he says, "Although God assumed the flesh according to the heavenly economy, yet it is a slave to lusts."³

Theophilus, speaking of earthly monarchs, says that "they are not made to be worshipped, but to receive appropriate honour; for they are not gods, but men appointed by God, not to be worshipped, but to give righteous judgments,—for they are in a manner entrusted with an administration by God."⁴ He says, on another occasion, that no person is able

¹ P. 157 B. In p. 151 B, Tatian speaks of the human body as being *μιας οἰκονομίας*, "of one economy;" and shortly after we find *ἐντοσθίων οἰκονομία*, "the economy of the inwards," and *κατ' οἰκονομίαν συμφωνίας*, "unison according to economy." Speaking of those writers who turned the heathen mythology and the Iliad into allegory, he says that they introduced the Greeks and barbarians as contending *χάριν οἰκονομίας*, "for the sake of economy," p. 160 B.

² Pp. 149 B, 150 A.

³ *Legatio*, p. 21 D.

⁴ ὅτι οὐκ εἰς τὸ προσκυνεῖσθαι γέγονεν, ἀλλὰ εἰς τὸ τιμᾶσθαι τῇ νομίμῳ τιμῇ. Θεὸς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν, ἀλλὰ ἄνθρωπος ὑπὸ Θεοῦ τεταγμένος, οὐκ εἰς τὸ προσκυνεῖσθαι, ἀλλὰ εἰς τὸ δικαίως κρίνειν· τρόπον γάρ τινι παρὰ Θεοῦ οἰκονομίαν πεπίστευται, L. i. p. 76 D.

worthily to explain the whole economy of the six days of creation.¹ He says also that the disposition of the stars in the work of creation contains the economy and order of just and pious men, who observe the commandments of God ;² and in alluding to the narrative in Scripture respecting Cain and Abel, he talks of the economy of the narrative, τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῆς ἐξηγήσεως.³

P. 48. Tatian gives the title of God to Christ, and calls Him, in one instance, the God Who suffered ;⁴ in another, God Who appeared in the form of man.⁵

Athenagoras also gives the title of God to the Son ;⁶ and Theophilus, referring to John i. 1, says expressly that the Word is God.⁷

P. 52. Bull, speaking of the περιχώρησις, or circumin-
 cession of the three Persons in the Trinity,⁸ says “that some
 of the ancients also ascribe a περιχώρησις to the two natures in
 Christ ; but that in so doing they do not speak accurately.
 For since περιχώρησις, in its strict sense, is the union of things
 entering in all respects into each other (which is signified by
 the preposition περι), in order to justify the use of the term, no

¹ L. ii. p. 91 B.

² P. 94 D.

³ P. 105 B.

⁴ He is speaking of the Holy Spirit, Whom he calls τὸν διάκονον τοῦ πεινον-
 θότος Θεοῦ, “the Minister of the suffering God,” p. 153 A.

⁵ Θεὸν ἐν ἀνθρώπου μορφῇ γεγονέναι καταγγέλλοντες, “proclaiming that God
 appeared in the form of man,” p. 159 C. In another passage he calls
 upon the heathen to renounce the demons, and to follow the only God, to
 Whom he applies what St. John (i. 3) says of the Λόγος ; “All things were
 made by Him, and without Him was not any thing made,” ἀλλὰ παραιτη-
 σάμενοι τοὺς δαίμονας Θεῷ τῷ μόνῳ κατακοιουθήσατε· πάντα ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ, καὶ χωρὶς
 αὐτοῦ γέγονεν οὐδὲ ἓν, p. 158 D.

⁶ See the first passage quoted in p. 113.

⁷ Θεὸς οὗν ἦν ὁ Λόγος καὶ ἐκ Θεοῦ πεφυκός, L. ii. p. 100 C.

⁸ *Def. Fid. Nic.* sect. iv. c. 4.

one of the things so united should be without or beyond the other ; but wheresoever one of them is, there the other should also be. But in Christ, though the divine nature enters in every respect into the human, the human does not in turn enter into the divine ; for the human is finite and limited,—the divine infinite and unlimited ; so that the human cannot be wheresoever the divine is.” There is, in other words, a perfect *περιχώρησις* of persons in the divine nature, but not a perfect *περιχώρησις* of natures in the person of Christ. Still, according to Bull’s view, Justin is correct in saying that the divine nature pervaded, or perfectly entered into the human.

Justin puts into the mouth of the old man who converted him to Christianity, the following question : “ What, then, is our relationship to God ? Is the soul divine, and immortal, and a part of that royal intelligence ? *αὐτοῦ ἐκεῖνου τοῦ βασιλικοῦ νοῦ μέρος.*” *Dial.* p. 221 E. So Tatian, p. 146 C, says that man obtains immortality by partaking of a portion of God. *Θεοῦ μοίραν.* See Beausobre, lib. 6, c. 5.

That partial insight into the truth, which the Gentile poets and philosophers possessed, and which, according to Justin, they obtained through their participation in the *Λόγος*, is traced by Athenagoras to what he terms their “ sympathy with the breath of God.” *ποιηταὶ μὲν γὰρ καὶ φιλόσοφοι, ὡς καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐπέβαλον στοχαστικῶς, κινήτεες μὲν, κατὰ συμπάθειαν τῆς παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ πνοῆς, ὑπὸ τῆς (αὐτὸς) αὐτοῦ ψυχῆς ἕκαστος ζητῆσαι, εἰ δυνατὸς εὐρεῖν καὶ νοῆσαι τὴν ἀλήθειαν· τοσοῦτον δὲ δυνηθέντες ὅσον περινοῆσαι, οὐχ εὐρηγται ὄν (f. Θεόν) οὐ παρὰ Θεοῦ ἀξιώσαντες μαθεῖν, ἀλλὰ παρ’ αὐτοῦ ἕκαστος.* *Legatio*, p. 7 D.

P. 53. We have seen¹ that Athenagoras calls the Holy Spirit an emanation from God, flowing forth and reflected like

¹ *Leg.* p. 10 D, quoted in note 2, p. 120.

a ray of the sun. In another place he says that the Holy Spirit is an emanation, as light from a fire.¹ Justin, on the contrary, in speaking of the generation of the Son, expressly censures those who compared it to the emission of a ray from the sun, and uses the illustration of a fire lighted from another fire.² We have here another instance of the difficulty of bringing forward, on this mysterious subject, any illustration to which an objection may not be made. Justin's illustration better conveys the notion of a distinction of persons; that of Athenagoras, the notion of an unity of substance. But they who are disposed to raise cavils will say that the former tends to Tritheism; the latter to Sabellianism.

I have observed that Theophilus speaks explicitly of a Trinity;³ and, as it should seem, of a real Trinity—a Trinity of Persons. Yet we find him speaking of the Spirit of God as surrounded or confined by the hand of God;⁴ and saying that the Spirit of God, Which moved on the face of the waters in the work of creation, was given by God in order to vivify it, as the soul is given to man.⁵ Justin, as we have seen,⁶ supposed the Spirit of God, in the first chapter of Genesis, to be the Holy Spirit,—an application of the passage to which Theophilus appears to have been a stranger.

P. 55. The opinion of Athenagoras respecting the in-

¹ και ἀπόρροια, ὡς φῶς ἀπὸ πυρός, τὸ πνεῦμα. *Leg.* p. 27 A.

² See p. 50.

³ See p. 114.

⁴ οὕτως ἢ πᾶσα κτίσις περιέχεται ὑπὸ πνεύματος Θεοῦ, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ περιέχον σὺν τῇ κτίσει περιέχεται ὑπὸ χειρὸς Θεοῦ, L. i. p. 72 C.

⁵ πνεῦμα δὲ τὸ ἐπιφερόμενον ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος, ὃ ἔδωκεν ὁ Θεὸς εἰς ζωογόνησιν τῇ κτίσει, καθάπερ ἀνθρώπῳ ψυχὴν, L. ii. p. 92 C. Compare p. 74 A. ὁ θεμελιώσας τὴν γῆν ἐπὶ τῶν ὑδάτων, καὶ δὸς πνεῦμα τὸ τρέφον αὐτήν· οὗ ἡ πνοὴ ζωογονεῖ τὸ πᾶν. In p. 110 B, Theophilus calls God τροφία πάσης πνοῆς. πνεῦμα Θεοῦ in p. 78 D, corresponds to τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, "the Holy Spirit," in p. 106 C.

⁶ See p. 41.

piration of the prophets, was that the Spirit from God moved their mouths like instruments ;¹ or, as he expresses himself in another place, that the Spirit made use of the prophet as a player on the pipe does of the pipe.²

The language of Theophilus on this subject differs not widely from that of Athenagoras. He speaks of the prophets as inspired by the Holy Spirit, or by God Himself ;³ so that, being holy and just, they were deemed worthy to be made the instruments of God, and to partake of His wisdom.⁴

¹ ἔχομεν Προφήτας μάρτυρας, οἱ πνεύματι ἐνθέῳ ἐκπεφωνήκασιν καὶ περὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ περὶ τῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ. εἰποῖτε δ' ἂν καὶ ὑμεῖς, συνέσει καὶ τῇ περὶ τὸ ὄντως θεῖον εὐσεβείᾳ τοὺς ἄλλους προὔχοντες, ὡς ἔστιν ἄλογον, παραλιπόντας πιστεύειν τῷ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ πνεύματι, ὡς ὄργανα κεινηκῶτι τὰ τῶν Προφητῶν στόματα, προσέχειν δόξαις ἀνθρωπίναις. *Legatio*, p. 8 A. Tatian's description of the prophetic writings, p. 165 B, deserves attention.

² καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν προφητῶν, οἱ κατ' ἔκστασιν τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς λογισμῶν, κινήσαντος αὐτοῦ τοῦ θείου πνεύματος, ἀνεργούντο ἐξεφώνησαν συγχεραμένου τοῦ πνεύματος, ὡσεὶ καὶ αὐλητῆς αὐλόν, ἐμπνεῦσαι, p. 9 D. Here Athenagoras says that the prophets spoke κατ' ἔκστασιν, in a state of rapture or ecstasy. On this point he agreed with Montanus, though I see no reason for suspecting, with Tillemont, that he ever attached himself to the Montanists. See the Preface of the Benedictine editors, part iii. c. 14. Justin, speaking of the prophet Zechariah, says, τοῦτον δὲ αὐτὸν οὐκ ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει αὐτοῦ ἐωράκει ὁ προφήτης, ὡς περὶ οὐδὲ τὸν διάβολον καὶ τὸν τοῦ Κυρίου ἄγγελον οὐκ αὐτοψία, ἐν καταστάσει ἂν, ἐωράκει, ἀλλ' ἐν ἐκστάσει ἀποκαλύψεως αὐτῆς γεγεννημένης. *Dial.* p. 343 A, quoted in p. 56, note 1. The difference between the two representations seems to be that, according to Justin, the prophet was in a state of rapture when he saw the vision which he recorded : according to Athenagoras, when he delivered or wrote the prophecy.

³ L. i. p. 78 D ; l. ii. pp. 106 C, 110 A, 111 C, 128 B. See also p. 88 C, quoted in p. 123, note 1, and 88 D. Μωσῆς δὲ—μᾶλλον δὲ ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὡς δι' ὄργανου, δι' αὐτοῦ φησίν, “For Moses spoke—or rather the word of God through him as by an instrument.” In these passages the inspiration of the prophets is attributed to the λόγος. πάντες οἱ πνευματοφόροι, “All they who were inspired,” p. 100 C. L. iii. p. 125 A.

⁴ οἱ δὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι, πνευματοφόροι πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ προφήται γενόμενοι, ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐμπνευσθέντες καὶ σοφισθέντες, ἐγένοντο θεοδίδακτοι καὶ ὅσιοι καὶ δίκαιοι. διὸ καὶ κατηξιώθησαν τὴν ἀντιμισθίαν ταύτην λαβεῖν, ὄργανα Θεοῦ γενέ-

The account of the prophets given by Justin, or rather by the old man who converted him to Christianity, is that "long before all those who are deemed philosophers, lived blessed and just men, lovers of God, who spake by the Holy Spirit, and foretold future things, which are now happening. They are called prophets. They alone saw the truth, and told it to men; neither respecting nor fearing any one, nor influenced by the love of glory, but speaking those things only which they heard and saw, being filled with the Holy Spirit."¹

The author of the *Hortatory Address to the Greeks* says that "it was only necessary for the prophets to surrender themselves entirely to the operation of the Divine Spirit; that the divine quill descending from heaven, and using the instrumentality of just men, as of a harp or lyre, should reveal to us the knowledge of divine and heavenly things."²

P. 56. Tatian gives the following account of the creation and fall of angels and men.³ "The heavenly Λογός, being a Spirit from the Father, and the Λόγος from the rational power, in imitation of the Father Who begat Him, made man the image of immortality; that, as incorruption is with God, so man, partaking of a portion of God, might also have immortality. The Λόγος, before the creation of man, was the

μεινοι, καὶ χωρήσαντες σοφίαν τὴν παρ' αὐτοῦ, δι' ἧς σοφίας εἶπον καὶ τὰ περὶ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀπάντων, L. ii. p. 87 D.

¹ ἐγένοντό τινες πρὸ πολλοῦ χρόνου πάντων τούτων τῶν νομιζομένων φιλοσόφων παλαιότεροι, μακάριοι, καὶ δίκαιοι, καὶ βεοφιλεῖς, βεῖω πνεύματι λαλήσαντες, καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα βεσπίσαντες, ἃ δὴ νῦν γίνεσθαι προφήτας δὲ αὐτοὺς καλοῦσιν· οὗτοι μόνου τὸ ἀλλῆες καὶ εἶδον καὶ ἐξεῖπον ἀνθρώποις, μήτ' εὐλαβηθέντες μήτε δυσωπηθέντες τινα, μὴ ἡττημένοι δόξης, ἀλλὰ μόνου ταῦτα εἰπόντες ἃ ἤκουσαν καὶ ἃ εἶδον, ἀγίῳ πληρωθέντες πνεύματι. *Dial.* p. 224 D.

² ἀλλὰ καθαροὺς ἑαυτοὺς τῇ τοῦ βεῖου πνεύματος παρασχεῖν ἐνεργείᾳ, ἢ αὐτὸ τὸ βεῖον ἐξ οὐρανοῦ κατιὸν πλῆκτρον, ὥσπερ ὄργανον κιθάρας τινὸς ἢ λύρας, τοῖς δίκαιοις ἀνδράσι χρώμενον, τὴν τῶν βεῖων ἡμῖν καὶ οὐρανίων ἀποκαλύψῃ γνώσιν, p. 9 B.

³ P. 146 B.

Creator of angels. Each species was created free, not being good in its own nature, which is the property of God alone; but capable, in the case of man, of perfection through freedom of choice,—so that the wicked might be justly punished, being wicked through their own fault; and the good might be justly praised on account of their good deeds,—not having, in the exercise of their freedom, transgressed the will of God. Such was the case with respect to angels and men.”

“But the power of the Word, possessing within Himself a prescience of futurity, not by any fatal necessity, but by (fore-seeing) the determination of those who were free to choose, predicted future events; restraining men from wickedness by prohibitions, and praising those who persevered in goodness. And when men followed one who, on account of the priority of his birth, was more subtle than the rest, and set him up as God, though he opposed himself to the law of God, the power of the Word excluded both the author of this madness and all his followers from intercourse with Himself. And he who was made in the image of God, the more powerful Spirit being withdrawn from him, became mortal; and the first-born angel, through his transgression and ignorance, was manifested as a demon; and they who imitated his phantasms became almost of demons, and through (the abuse of) their freedom were delivered over to their own folly.” He then proceeds to say that the demons introduced the doctrine of fate, and connected it with astrology.

In order that we may understand what Tatian means by the withdrawing of the more powerful Spirit, we must turn to another passage,¹ in which he says, “We recognise two different

¹ P. 150 D. Tatian, on one occasion, says that “God is a Spirit; not the spirit pervading matter, but the preparer of the spirits in matter and of its forms,” p. 144 C; in another, that “the spirit pervading matter is inferior to the diviner Spirit,” p. 144 D. Compare what is said in my

spirits—one, which is called the soul; the other, greater than the soul, the image and likeness of God. Both those spirits were united in the first men (*ἀνθρώποις τοῖς πρώτοις*), so that in one respect they were material; in another, superior to matter.” He then goes on to say, that the universe is material; and though its parts differ, according to their different degrees of beauty, yet the whole is pervaded by a material spirit. There is a spirit in the stars, in angels, in plants and water, in men, in animals, which, though one and the same, is thus variously modified.¹ As, then, the soul partakes of this material spirit, it is not immortal in its own nature, but mortal. It may, however, not die. It dies, and is dissolved with the body, when it knows not the truth; again, it does not die, although it is dissolved for a time, when it has acquired the knowledge of God. “The soul, therefore,” Tatian proceeds,² “did not save the spirit, but was saved by it; and the light comprehended the darkness. The Word is the light of God; and

work on Clement of Alexandria, respecting the principal and subject spirit, p. 225. To those who are devoid of the Spirit, Tatian gives the title of *ψυχικοί*, p. 154 C. See p. 155 B.

¹ P. 152 A. The soul is called *πολυμερής*, “consisting of many parts,” p. 153 B.

² P. 152 C. καθ' ἑαυτὴν γὰρ σκότος ἐστὶν (ἡ ψυχὴ) καὶ οὐδὲν ἐν αὐτῇ φωτεινόν. καὶ τοῦτό ἐστιν ἄρα τὸ εἰρημένον, ἢ σκοτία τὸ φῶς οὐ καταλαμβάνει. ψυχὴ γὰρ οὐκ αὐτὴ τὸ πνεῦμα ἔσωσεν, ἐσώθη δὲ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ φῶς τὴν σκοτίαν κατέλαβεν. ὁ λόγος μὲν ἐστὶ τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ φῶς, σκότος δὲ ἡ ἀνεπιστήμων ψυχὴ. διὰ τοῦτο μόνη μὲν διαιωμένη πρὸς τὴν ὕλην νεύει κάτω, συναποθνήσκουσα τῇ σαρκί. συζυγίαν δὲ κεκτημένη τὴν τοῦ θείου πνεύματος οὐκ ἔστιν ἀβοήθητος· ἀνέρχεται δὲ πρὸς ἄσπερ αὐτὴν ὀδηγεῖ χωρία τὸ πνεῦμα. τοῦ μὲν γὰρ ἐστὶν ἄνω τὸ οἰκητήριον. τῆς δὲ κάτωθεν ἐστὶν ἡ γένεσις· (See p. 151 A, ὡς εἶναι κοινὴν πάντων γένεσιν.) γέγονε μὲν οὖν συνδιδαιτον ἀρχῆθεν τὸ πνεῦμα τῇ ψυχῇ· τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ταύτην ἔπεσθαι μὴ βουλομένην αὐτῷ καταλείπειν, ἢ δὲ ἄσπερ ἕναυσμα τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ κεκτημένη καὶ διὰ τὸν χωρισμὸν τὰ τέλεια καθαρᾶν μὴ δυναμένη, ζητοῦσα τὸν Θεὸν, κατὰ πλάνην πολλοὺς θεοὺς ἀνετύπασε, τοῖς ἀντισοφιστεύουσι δαίμοσι κατακολυθήσασα. πνεῦμα δὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ παρὰ πᾶσιν μὲν οὐκ ἔστι· παρὰ δὲ τισὶ τοῖς δικαίως πολιτευομένοις καταγόμενον, καὶ συμπλεκόμενον τῇ ψυχῇ, διὰ προαγορεύσεων ταῖς λοιπαῖς ψυχαῖς τὸ κεκρυμμένον ἀνήγγειλε. καὶ αἱ μὲν πειθόμεναι σοφίᾳ σφίσιν αὐταῖς ἐφέιλκοντο πνεῦμα συγγενές.

the ignorant soul, darkness. On which account, when it is alone, it bends downwards towards matter, dying together with the flesh. But having obtained an union with the Divine Spirit, it is no longer destitute of aid, but ascends to the places to which the Spirit conducts it. For the dwelling-place of the Spirit is above ; the origin of the soul from below. In the beginning, then, the Spirit dwelt with the soul, but quitted it, because it refused to follow the Spirit. But the

αἱ δὲ μὴ πιθόμεναι καὶ τὸν διάκονον τοῦ πιπυνοῦτος Θεοῦ παραιτούμεναι θεόμαχοι μᾶλλον, ἢ περ θεοσεβεῖς, ἀνεφαίνοντο.

Beausobre has given the following translation of this passage, *Histoire du Manichéisme*, l. 4, c. 3:—"L'ame de sa nature," dit Tatien, "n'est que ténèbres, et n'a rien de la lumière. De là ce mot de l'Écriture, *Les ténèbres n'embrassent point la lumière*, car l'Esprit n'est pas sauvé par l'ame, mais c'est lui qui sauve l'ame, et c'est *la lumière qui embrasse les ténèbres*. La Raison est la lumière de Dieu : les ténèbres sont une ame qui est dans l'ignorance. C'est pourquoi quand elle est seule, elle s'abaisse aux choses matérielles, et meurt avec la chair. Mais quand elle est unie avec l'Esprit elle monte au lieu où elle est conduite par l'Esprit. En effet, le siège de l'Esprit est le Ciel, mais le siège de l'ame est la nature matérielle" (in the original, τῆς δὲ κάτωθεν ἔστιν ἡ γένεσις. Beausobre defends his translation by a reference to Jas. iii. 6, καὶ φλογίζουσα τὸν πρόχον τῆς γενέσεως, "and setteth on fire the course of nature." But γένεσις seems rather to mean in this place nature, as rendered in our version. See Grotius *in loco*, and τὴν παλαιὰν γένεσιν, p. 150 D). "Au commencement, l'Esprit étoit familièrement uni avec l'ame, et vivoit, pour ainsi dire, avec elle : mais n'ayant pas voulu suivre les lumières de l'Esprit, il la laissa. Cependant, elle conserva encore comme une étincelle de feu caché sous la cendre ; mais à cause de la séparation de l'Esprit, elle n'a pas la force d'apercevoir les choses parfaites. En cherchant Dieu, elle s'est égarée, et en a imaginé plusieurs, séduite par la fraude des Démons." Beausobre's comment on the passage is, "L'ame est donc l'ouvrage du Créateur : l'Esprit est un don de Dieu. Voilà les différens genres, ou les différentes natures de Basilide. Le Créateur ne connoissoit que la première, et ne commença à savoir, qu'il y en a une plus excellente et plus parfaite, que lorsque l'Esprit descendit sur Jésus." In my work on Clement of Alexandria, p. 272, note 1, I have said, with reference to this comment, that Beausobre appears to put interpretations on some of the expressions which the words will not bear. On further consideration, I do not change my opinion.

soul, retaining some spark, as it were, of the power of the Spirit, being unable, through its separation from the Spirit, to see that which is perfect, erring in its search after God, figured to itself many gods, following the fraudulent devices of the demons. But the Spirit of God is not with all; sojourning only with some who lived righteous lives, and united with their souls, It declared, by means of predictions, secret things to other souls; some of them obeying wisdom, drew down to themselves a kindred spirit;¹ while those which did not obey, but rejected the Minister of God Who suffered, proved rather adversaries than worshippers of God.”

“It is, then,” he afterwards says,² “our business to recover that which we have lost, and to unite the soul to the Holy Spirit, and earnestly to aim at an union with God.” After some other further remarks on the soul of man, Tatian proceeds: “Man alone is the image and likeness of God;³ that man, I mean, who does not live like animals, but, raised far above humanity, draws near to God Himself. The point to which I must now address myself is, to explain of what kind the image and likeness of God is. That which admits not of comparison is nothing but the Self-existent itself; that which is compared to the Self-existent is different from it, but like to it. The perfect God is without flesh, but man is flesh. The soul is the bond of the flesh, and the flesh holds together the soul. Such is the form of the constitution (of man) if God chooses to dwell in it by His ambassador, the Spirit, that it may be His temple.⁴ But if it is not so, man excels the beasts only in uttering articulate sounds; in all other respects he is

¹ As Tatian here speaks of a kindred spirit, so p. 145 D, he talks of a kindred matter.

² P. 153 D.

³ We have seen that in the passage quoted in p. 133, Tatian calls the more powerful Spirit the image and likeness of God.

⁴ διὰ τοῦ πρεσβεύοντος πνεύματος, p. 154 B.

of the same conversation as they, being no longer the likeness of God."

In another place¹ Tatian says, that "the perfect Spirit is, so to speak, the wings of the soul, which the soul casting off through sin, fluttered like a newly-fledged bird, and fell to the ground. Passing from its heavenly society, it longed for an intercourse with inferior things. The demons quitted their original abode: the first created human beings were driven out. The former were expelled from heaven; the latter from earth, not this earth, but one better than this. It is our duty, then, henceforward to aspire to our ancient state, and to cast down every obstacle which impedes our progress." And again:² "We have learned that, of which we were ignorant, through the prophets, who, being persuaded that the spirit together with the soul will receive immortality—the heavenly covering of mortality—foretold things which other souls knew not; and it is possible for every one that is naked to obtain this covering, and to return to his ancient kindred."

Tatian is particularly careful to guard against the notion that man fell by any fatal necessity. "We were not created," he says, "to die; but we die through our own fault."³ Our

¹ P. 158 D.

² P. 159 B. The meaning of this passage is not very clear, *ὅτινις ἄμα ἢ ψυχῇ πεπεισμένοι ὅτι πνεῦμα τὸ οὐράνιον ἐπένδυμα τῆς θνητότητος, τὴν ἀθανασίαν, κερτήσεται.* The Benedictine editors wish to substitute *σῶμα* for *πνεῦμα*. Tatian says in another place, "Men, after the loss of immortality, have vanquished death by dying (to the world) through faith; and a calling has been given to them through repentance, according to the words of Scripture, '*They were made a little lower than the angels*' (Ps. viii. 5). It is possible for the vanquished to vanquish in turn, by renouncing the condition of death; and what that is, they who wish for immortality may easily see," p. 154 D. See also p. 155 C, *θώρακι πνεύματος ἐπουρανίου καθωπλισμένος*, "The heavenly Spirit arming itself with a breastplate."

³ P. 150 D.

freedom has destroyed us. When we were free, we became slaves : we were sold through sin. Nothing evil was made by God : we brought forth wickedness ; and they who brought it forth are able in turn to renounce it." In another passage he says that "the sin of man was the cause of evil in the natural world."¹

The inference from these different passages seems to be that, according to Tatian, in man were originally united a spirit and a soul ; the former of purely celestial origin, the latter material ; or, to speak perhaps more accurately, a portion of that inferior spirit which pervades matter.² Man being, with reference to this material soul, peccable, abused the freedom with which he was endowed, and listening to the suggestions of wicked demons, refused to follow the guidance of the heavenly Spirit, Which in consequence quitted him. Thus deserted by the Divine Spirit, he became mortal ; and by his sin all evil, moral and natural, was introduced into the world. As, however, he fell by the abuse of his freedom, so by the right use of it he may rise again, and reunite himself to the heavenly Spirit, and thus replace himself in his original state of innocence and happiness. It must be confessed that this account of the original state, and of the fall of man, savours more of the spirit of Gentile philosophy than of Scripture ; yet in one respect it differs not greatly from that scheme, which assigns as the cause of the fall, that God withdrew the special influences of His presence from our first parents.

I find in Athenagoras little that has any direct bearing on these subjects. On one occasion he is censuring those who

¹ P. 158 D.

² See the passage p. 144 D, quoted in p. 133, note I. Tatian speaks of the evaporation of this material spirit, when the flesh is annihilated by fire, p. 146 A. *κάν πῦρ εξαφανίση τὸ σάρκιον, εξατμισθεῖσαν τὴν ὕλην ὃ κόσμος κεχώρηκεν.*

thought that they sufficiently established the truth of a future resurrection, by saying that it was necessary to the final judgment of mankind.¹ "This argument," he says, "is clearly shown to be inconclusive by the fact that, although all rise again, all do not rise to judgment. For if to answer the ends of justice is the sole cause of the resurrection, then they, who have neither done good nor evil, that is, very young children, need not rise." Here the future condemnation of man is made to depend entirely on the commission of actual sin. In another place² he says that "man, according to the design of his Maker, pursues a regular course with reference to his nature by birth, which is common to all; and the disposition of his members, which does not transgress its peculiar law; and the end of life, which is the same to all; but, according to the determinations of his own reason, and the operation of the ruler who has obtained dominion over him, and of the attendant demons, he is carried in different directions; although the power of reasoning is common to all." The ruler to whom Athenagoras here alludes is a power or spirit,³ who is conversant with and pervades matter, and being opposed to God, induced man to abuse the freedom with which he was endowed, and led him into transgression. On the subject of the Divine Providence, Athenagoras says,⁴ that "they who

De Mort. Res. p. 55 D. Athenagoras says that the soul is immortal.
eg. p. 30 D.

² *Legatio*, p. 29 A.

³ P. 27 A, D. Athenagoras speaks of a material spirit. *Legatio*, pp. 30 C, 27 B.

⁴ ὅτι δεῖ τοὺς ποιητὴν τὸν θεὸν τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς παραδειξαμένους τῇ τούτου σοφίᾳ καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ τὴν τῶν γενομένων ἀπάντων ἀνατιθέναι φυλακὴν τε καὶ πρόνοιαν, εἴγε ταῖς ἰδίαις ἀρχαῖς παραμένειν ἐβέλοιν· ταῦτα δὲ περὶ τούτων φρονοῦντας μηδὲν ἠγεῖσθαι μήτε τῶν κατὰ γῆν μήτε τῶν κατ' οὐρανὸν ἀνσιτρόπιστον μὴδ' ἀπρονόητον, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πᾶν ἀφανὲς ὁμοίως καὶ φαινόμενον, μικρὸν τε καὶ μείζον, διήκουσαν γινώσκειν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ ποιήσαντος ἐπιμέλειαν. δεῖται γὰρ πάντα τὰ γενόμενα τῆς παρὰ τοῦ ποιήσαντος ἐπιμελείας· ἰδίως δὲ ἕκαστον καθ' ὃ πέφυκε καὶ πρὸς πέφυκεν. *De Mort. Res.* p. 60 B.

admit God to be the Creator of the universe must, if they mean to abide by their own principles, refer the custody and providence over all things to His wisdom and justice. Under this persuasion they must think that everything, both in earth and heaven, is directed and governed by Providence ; and that the care of the Creator extends to all things alike, whether unseen or seen, whether small or great. For all created things *in general* stand in need of the care of the Creator ; and each *in particular* according to its nature and the end for which it was created." He asserts the same doctrine in another place ;¹ although, like Justin, he ascribes to God a general superintendence over the universe, and says that the angels were appointed to watch over the different parts.

Theophilus,² speaking of wild beasts and noxious animals, affirms that "nothing evil proceeded from God : all things were originally good, very good. But man by his transgression affected other living things with evil ; for when he transgressed, they transgressed with him. — When, however, man shall return to his original state, and cease to do evil, they also shall return to their original gentleness." A considerable portion of the second book consists of a comment on the account of the creation given in the book of Genesis. Speaking of the creation of man, Theophilus alleges,³ as a proof of his superior dignity, that, whereas God created all other things by a word, He considered the creation of man a work worthy of His own hands ; and as if He even stood in need of assistance, said to His Word and Wisdom, "Let *us* make man," etc. Man after his creation was placed in Paradise,⁴ the means of im-

¹ *Legatio*, pp. 29 A, 27 C.

² L. ii. p. 96 B.

³ P. 96 C. There is a description of Paradise, p. 97 D. See also p. 101 B.

⁴ P. 101 D. Theophilus says that Adam was not forbidden to eat of the fruit of the tree of life. He repeats his notion respecting this inter-

provement being afforded him, so that he might go on to perfection; and being at length declared a god, might ascend into heaven.¹ For he was created in a sort of intermediate state; neither wholly mortal, nor wholly immortal, but capable of both conditions. Adam was forbidden to eat of the fruit of the tree of knowledge, because, being yet in a state of infancy, he could not worthily receive knowledge.² Some appear to have thought that the fruit of the tree of knowledge was evil in itself, and therefore productive of death. This Theophilus denies, and says that knowledge is in itself good. "It was not, therefore, the fruit of the tree which brought pain, and sorrow, and death into the world, but Adam's disobedience. God, however, when He cast our first parents out of Paradise, determined in His mercy that they should not continue for ever in sin; but having been punished by banishment, and disciplined for an appointed time, should be restored to Paradise. This restoration will take place after the resurrection. For as an earthen vessel which has a flaw is broken up and formed anew, by the potter, that it may be sound and perfect, so man is broken to pieces by the power of death, that he may be rendered *sound* in the resurrection; that is to say, without spot, just and immortal." In conformity to this

mediate state of man in p. 103 C. "If God had created man immortal, He would have made him a god; if mortal, God would have appeared to be the author of his death. Man was therefore made capable of both conditions: that, keeping the commandment of God, he might receive immortality as a reward, and become a god; or, disobeying God, might be the author to himself of death." Theophilus says that the majority deemed the soul immortal, because God breathed the breath of life into Adam's nostrils, p. 97 C.

¹ ἕτι δὲ καὶ θεὸς ἀναδειχθείς. Justin uses the expression, *τελείω γενομένων*, "having become perfect." *Dial.* p. 225 D. Man is called *πλάσμα καὶ εἰκὼν Θεοῦ*, "a figure and image of God." *L. i.* p. 72 A.

² P. 102 A. The Benedictine editors employ a chapter of their Preface in proving that Theophilus, when he calls Adam an infant, speaks metaphorically.

view of Adam's original state and fall, Theophilus states that God created him free.¹

Though I find nothing in the three books of Theophilus which has a direct bearing on the question of justification, there is in the first book a passage, p. 74 D, deserving notice, in which he describes faith as the moving principle of human conduct. With respect to the Divine Providence, Theophilus says,² that it may be traced in the provision made, that every kind of flesh should have its appropriate food. "The care of God," he says in another place,³ "extends to the dead as well as to the living."

P. 65, note 3. The expression *διὰ τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ (τοῦ Θεοῦ) λόγου* occurs repeatedly in Athenagoras, pp. 5 C, 11 A, 12 D, 17 D, 34 D. In all these instances it is to be understood of the *λόγος*.

P. 67. Justin speaks of the renunciation of all worldly things, but not with any direct reference to the profession made in baptism, p. 348 A. I find in Tatian no express reference either to baptism or the Eucharist. A passage has already been cited, in which he speaks of himself as "born anew according to the imitation of the Word."⁴

Athenagoras is also silent respecting the Christian sacraments. In defending the Christians against the charge of not offering sacrifices to the gods, he says that the best

¹ ἐλεύθερον γὰρ καὶ αὐτεξούσιον ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, "God created man free and independent," p. 103 D. So also τὸν ἄνθρωπον κύριον ὄντα ἀμυρτῆσαι, "man had failed to be a lord," L. ii. p. 96 B.

² τὴν τε πρόνοιαν ἣν ποιῶται ὁ Θεός, ἐτοιμάζων τροφὴν πάσῃ σαρκί, L. i. p. 73 A. See also L. iii. p. 122 D. καὶ προνοία τὰ πάντα διοικεῖσθαι ἐπιστάμεθα, "And we know that all things were ordered by Providence."

³ L. ii. p. 116 B.

⁴ καὶ γὰρ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ λόγου μίμησιν ἀναγεννηθεῖς, p. 145 C. See note 28.

sacrifice is to know the true God, and to approach Him with pure uplifted hands.¹ He requires only a bloodless sacrifice, and a reasonable worship.

Theophilus, on one occasion,² says that Christians are so called, because they are anointed with the oil of God; but whether he meant to allude to the practice of anointing as a part of the ceremony of baptism, or, figuratively, to the unction of the Holy Spirit, is uncertain. On another occasion he says³ that God, in the work of creation, blessed the creatures inhabiting the waters, to show that hereafter all who come to the truth, and are regenerated and receive a blessing from God, shall obtain repentance and remission of sins through water and the laver of regeneration. Theophilus twice uses the word *ἐξομολόγησις* to express that confession of sin which originates in genuine repentance, but not with any reference to ecclesiastical discipline.⁴

P. 73, note 1. In l. 2, p. 91 D, Theophilus says, *ἔτι μὴν καὶ περὶ τῆς ἐβδόμης ἡμέρας, ἦν πάντες μὲν ἄνθρωποι ὀνομάζουσιν, οἱ δὲ πλείους ἀγροοῦσιν ὅτι παρ' Ἑβραίοις ὃ καλεῖται σάββατον*

¹ ἀλλὰ θυσία αὐτῷ μεγίστη, ἣν γινώσκωμεν τίς ἐξέτινε καὶ συνεσφαίρωσε τοὺς οὐρανοὺς—ὅταν—ἐπαίρωμεν ὀσίους χεῖρας αὐτῷ, ποίας ἔτι χρεῖαν ἐκατόμβης ἔχει; . . . καίτοι προσφέρειν δεῖν ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν, καὶ τὴν λογικὴν προσάγειν λατρείαν. *Legatio*, p. 13 B, C, D.

² τοιγαροῦν ἡμεῖς τούτου εἵνεκεν καλούμεθα Χριστιανοί· ὅτι χρίμεθα ἔλαιον Θεοῦ. L. i. p. 77 C.

³ ἔτι μὲν καὶ εὐλογήθη ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ τὰ ἐκ τῶν ὑδάτων γινόμενα, ὅπως ἦ καὶ τοῦτο εἰς δεῖγμα τοῦ μέλλειν λαμβάνειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους μετάνοιαν καὶ ἄφρασιν ἁμαρτιῶν διὰ ὑδατος καὶ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας πάντας τοὺς προσιόντας τῇ ἀληθείᾳ καὶ ἀναγεννωμένους καὶ λαμβάνοντας εὐλογίαν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, L. ii. p. 95 B. Tertullian calls Christians *Pisciculi*, *de Baptismo*, c. 1. See my work on that author, c. 1, note 73. Theophilus has been supposed to allude to baptism in the concluding words of the third book, ὅπως σχῆμα σύμβολον καὶ ἀρραβῶνα τῆς ἀληθείας, "That you may have a symbol and earnest of the truth."

⁴ L. ii. pp. 103 B, 105 C.

Ἑλληνιστὶ ἐρμηνεύεται ἑβδομάς· ἥτις εἰς πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων ὀνομάζεται μὲν, δι' ἣν δὲ αἰτίαν καλοῦσιν αὐτὴν οὐκ ἐπίστανται.

P. 75. Tatian, as we have seen, agrees with his master, Justin, in affirming that the soul is not immortal. "The soul, O Grecians, is not immortal in itself, but mortal. It may, however, escape death. For, being ignorant of the truth, it dies and is dissolved together with the body; and rises again together with the body at the consummation of all things, suffering death by a punishment of eternal duration. On the other hand, having obtained the knowledge of God, it dies not, though it is dissolved for a time. For in itself it is darkness, and there is no light in it."¹ In a subsequent passage he says that "the soul is not simple, but complex—being compound, so as to be visible through the body. For neither can it appear without the body, nor does the flesh rise again without the soul. Man is not, as some babblers affirm, a rational animal, capable of intelligence and knowledge. For irrational creatures will be shown to be, according to them, capable of intelligence and knowledge."² On another occasion he says that the soul is the bond of (that which keeps together) the flesh, and that the flesh holds in the soul.³

Viewing these passages in connexion with others already quoted in this chapter,⁴ we find that Tatian conceived man to consist of a body and soul. The soul is a portion of the spirit pervading matter, and consequently not in itself immortal; and the union between the soul and body is dissolved by death. But after the consummation of all things the body will rise again,⁵ and the soul be reunited to it, and the general

¹ P. 152 B, quoted in p. 134.

² P. 153 D.

³ δεσμὸς δὲ τῆς σαρκὸς ψυχῆ, σχετικῆ δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς ἢ σάρξ, p. 154 B, quoted in p. 187.

⁴ Pp. 134-138.

⁵ P. 145 D. We find ἐν ἡμέρᾳ συντελείας πρὸς αἰώνιου βωρᾶ παραδοθήσεται, "On the day of consummation it will be delivered to the gluttony of

judgment will take place. They who have during this life endeavoured to unite their souls to the Divine Spirit will attain to an eternity of happiness; they who have allowed their souls to sink downwards, and to be occupied entirely with material things, will be doomed to an eternity of misery.

According to Athenagoras, God made man of an immortal soul and a body, and gave him intelligence, and a law implanted in his nature.¹ If, however, the soul unites itself to the spirit pervading matter, and looks not upwards to the heavens and to their Creator, but downwards to the earth, as if it was mere flesh and blood, it ceases to be a pure spirit.² The opinions of Athenagoras,³ respecting the resurrection of the body, are detailed in the tract which he wrote expressly on that subject. In it may be found nearly all the arguments which human reason has been able to advance in support of the doctrine.

eternal fire," p. 155 D. Tatian affirms that above the visible heavens exist the better ages, *αιῶνες οἱ κρείττονες*, having no change of seasons, from which various diseases take their origin; but blessed with an uniform goodness of temperature, they enjoy perpetual day, and light inaccessible to men who dwell here below, p. 159 A. In contradistinction from those better ages, he calls the present state of things *τοὺς καθ' ἡμᾶς αἰῶνας*, p. 145 D.

¹ καθ' ἣν ἐποίησεν ἄνθρωπον ἐκ ψυχῆς ἀθανάτου καὶ σώματος, νοῦν τε συγκατασκευάσεν αὐτῷ καὶ νόμον ἔμφυτον, κ. τ. ἔ. *De Mort. Res.* p. 54 A. Compare *Legatio*, p. 31 A.

² πάσχει δὲ τοῦτο ψυχὴ μάλιστα τοῦ ὕλικου προσλαβοῦσα καὶ ἐπισυγκραθεῖσα πνεύματος, οὐ πρὸς τὰ οὐράνια καὶ τὸν τούτων ποιητὴν, ἀλλὰ κάτω πρὸς τὰ ἐπίγεια βλέπουσα καθολικῶς (εἰς γῆν f. om.) ὡς μόνον αἷμα καὶ σὰρξ, οὐκ ἐστὶ πνεῦμα καθαρὸν γιγνομένη. *Legatio*, p. 30 C.

³ In the *Legatio*, Athenagoras says that after death the good will remain with God, exempt from change and suffering as to their soul; not as flesh, though they will have flesh, but as an heavenly spirit, p. 35 D. See also p. 39 B, C, where he intimates an intention of writing expressly on the resurrection of the body.

We have seen that Theophilus describes Adam as neither mortal nor immortal when created, but capable of either condition.¹ In order to obtain immortality, man must believe in God and fear Him.² For God will raise up his flesh in a state of immortality together with his soul; and, being made immortal, he will see God perfectly. Theophilus speaks of the punishment to be undergone by the wicked hereafter as eternal.³ We have remarked that, according to Theophilus, man will, after the resurrection, be restored to Paradise,⁴ which he describes as situated on this earth, in the eastern parts, refulgent with light, and abounding in beautiful plants.⁵

P. 79. In stating Tatian's notions respecting the fall of man, we quoted a passage in which it is said that, before the creation of man, the Λόγος created angels, who were endowed with freedom;⁶ that one of these angels, to whom Tatian applies the epithet "first-born," being more subtle than the rest,⁷ rebelled against the divine law, and persuaded others to join him in his revolt, and to proclaim him as a god. That, in consequence of this revolt, he and his followers were excluded from the divine intercourse, and became a host of demons, he being their chief. They taught men to believe that all events happened by a fatal necessity,⁸ being dependent

¹ P. 193. He says, also, that the majority concluded the soul to be immortal, because God is said in Scripture to have breathed into Adam's nostrils the breath of life, and thus to have made him a living soul. L. ii. p. 97 C.

² L. i. p. 74 C. In p. 77 D, Theophilus urges some of the common arguments, in order to show that the resurrection of the body is probable. See also l. ii. pp. 93 B, 94 D.

³ L. i. p. 79 A, C; l. ii. p. 110 D.

⁴ P. 140.

⁵ Compare p. 97 D, with p. 101 B.

⁶ P. 133.

⁷ The Greek word is φρονιμώτερος (φρονιμώτατος in the Septuagint). The serpent is described in Gen. iii. as more subtle than any beast of the field.

⁸ διάγραμμα γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἀστροβουλίας ἀναδείξαντες, ὡς περ οἱ τοῖς κύβοις παίζοντες,

upon the position of the stars, of which they drew schemes. For, when expelled from heaven, they sojourned among the different animals which either creep on the earth, or swim in the waters, or range the mountains; and in order that they might be thought still to dwell in heaven, and might give a specious appearance to their irrational life, they raised the creatures among which they lived to heaven, and named the constellations after them. Hence the names of the signs of the Zodiac.

In a subsequent passage¹ Tatian says: "The demons (so you call them), taking their composition from matter, and having the spirit which is in it, became intemperate and luxurious; some of them turning to the purer, some to the inferior portions of matter, and framing their conduct accordingly. These, O Greeks, you worship, though formed out of matter, and having deviated far from their appointed and regular course. For the above-mentioned (demons), turning aside through their folly to vainglory, and casting off all control, desired to steal the honours of divinity,—and the Lord of the universe has permitted them to revel (in their

*τὴν εἰμαρμένην εἰσηγήσαντο λίαν ἄδικον, p. 147 A. So p. 148 B. τοιοῦτοί τινες εἰσὶν οἱ δαίμονες, οὗτοι οἱ τὴν εἰμαρμένην ἄρισαν· στοιχειώσις δὲ αὐτοῖς ἡ ζώσις ἦν, κ. τ. ἔ. "Such were the demons who traced out their destiny. But enchantment was their means of making alive." The word *στοιχειώσις* is used with reference to the artifices of the demons, first in producing diseases, and afterwards in removing them, p. 156 B. Saturn and the other planets and stars are called *τῆς εἰμαρμένης οἰκονόμοι*, "the managers of destiny," pp. 149 B, 150 A.*

¹ P. 151 C. Tatian, as we have seen, held that the *ἄγγελος πρωτόγονος*, "first-born angel," and his followers, after their revolt, became demons. He now appears to be speaking of their subsequent condition, when they had departed still further from their allegiance to God. The Paris editors are careful to guard the readers of Tatian against what they term his error, in supposing that demons are material. Tatian applies the term *δαίμονες*, "demons," to the heathen gods, p. 165 A.

rebellion) until the world shall come to an end, and be dissolved, and the Judge shall appear, and all men who, notwithstanding the opposition of the demons, aspire to the knowledge of the perfect God, shall receive through their trials a more perfect testimony in the day of judgment."

But though the demons are material, they have not flesh.¹ Their composition is spiritual, like that of fire or air. Their bodies, consequently, cannot be seen, excepting by those who are guarded by the Spirit of God: those who are only animal (*οἱ ψυχικοί*) cannot see them. On this account, also, the substance of demons has no place of repentance; for they are the brightness (*ἀπανγάσματα*) of matter and evil—and the design of matter is always to bring the soul within its power. Hence the sole object of the demons is 'to lead men away from the truth. With this view they invented the arts of divination and set up the Oracles.² They employ every artifice to prevent the soul from rising upwards, and pursuing its way to heaven.³ If they possessed the power, they would drag down the heavens, together with the rest of the creation; ⁴ but,

¹ P. 154 C. Tatian afterwards says that the demons occasionally exhibited themselves to the *ψυχικοί*, p. 155 B.

² P. 152 B. Compare p. 153 B, where Tatian, after he has observed that the demons deceive solitary (deserted by the diviner Spirit) souls by visions, adds that, "as they have not flesh, they do not easily die; but even while living they work the works of death, themselves dying as often as they discipline their followers in sin; so that what is peculiar to them at present, viz. that they do not die like men, will, when they come to be punished, be the cause of their dying through all eternity. The shortness of man's existence curtails his power of transgression; whereas the demons, whose existence is infinite, contract an infinite guilt." I am not sure that I understand the author's meaning in this passage, in which he seems strangely to confound natural with spiritual death; but I conceive it to be that no change can take place in the condition of demons, because they are not subject to death as men are; they go on sinning to eternity—a state which he calls eternal death.

³ P. 155 A.

⁴ P. 155 C.

as they cannot effect this, they are continually—by means of the inferior matter—warring against the matter which is similar to themselves. Successfully to resist them, we must put on the breastplate of the Heavenly Spirit. One great object of the demons is, to persuade man that whatever happens to him, either of good or evil, whether he falls sick or recovers from sickness, is owing to their agency.¹ To this end they invented amulets, philters, and charms, in order that man might be induced to trust to them, or, at least, to the properties of matter, rather than to his Creator.

On one occasion Tatian combats the notion that the demons are the souls of dead men.² “For how,” he asks, “can souls become efficient agents after death? unless we suppose that man, after death, can acquire greater powers of action than he possessed while living.”

We have seen that Athenagoras speaks of angels to whom God assigned the office of watching over the well-being of the universe.³ In a subsequent passage,⁴ having recited the opinions of the Gentile philosophers respecting demons, he goes on to explain his own views of the subject. He says that “Christians, in addition to the Father, the Son His Word, and the Holy Spirit, acknowledge other powers, conversant about matter and pervading it, one of whom is opposed to God; not as strife is to friendship in the system of Empedocles, or night to day in the phenomena of nature (since anything actually opposed to God must cease to exist, its very composition being dissolved by the power and force of God); but because to the goodness of God, which is His inseparable

¹ P. 155 C.

² P. 154 D. The passage is corrupt, but the meaning clear.

³ P. 139. See p. 11 A.

⁴ *Legatio*, p. 27 A. I have given the sense rather than a literal translation of the passage.

attribute, is opposed the spirit conversant with matter, created indeed by God, as the other angels were created by Him, and entrusted with the administration of matter and its forms. For the angels were created by God with reference to His various works ; that, as God exercised a *general* providence over the universe, they might exercise a *particular* providence over the different parts assigned them. But, as in the case of men who are free to choose virtue and vice (since you would neither honour the good nor punish the bad, unless virtue and vice were in their own power) some are found faithful, some unfaithful, in that with which they are entrusted ; so of the angels, some continued such as they were created by God, fulfilling the ends for which He created and designed them, but others abused both their nature and the power committed to them ; among them the ruler of matter and its forms, and others who were placed immediately around its first firmament ; *they* smitten with the desire of women, and yielding to carnal lusts ; *he* becoming negligent and faithless about the administration of that with which he was entrusted. From the intercourse of the angels with women sprang those who are called giants. The angels, therefore, who were expelled from heaven, hovering about the air and earth, and no longer able to elevate themselves to heavenly things, and the souls of the giants, who are the demons, wandering about the world, excite motions corresponding, some to the substances which the demons assumed, others to the desires which the angels felt. But the ruler of matter, as may be seen from the events which happen, opposes himself in his whole conduct to the goodness of God. So much were even the Gentiles struck with the confusion apparent throughout the world, that they doubted whether it was under the direction of Providence ; and Aristotle determined that the parts below the heavens were not. Whereas the general providence of God extends alike to all things, and each particular thing follows its own particular law ; but the motions and influences of the demons introduce these disorders, im-

elling individuals and nations, in part and generally, from within and from without, according to the proportion subsisting between matter and the affection to divine things. On which account, some men of no small repute thought that the universe was not constituted with any order, but was driven about by irrational chance ; being ignorant that, with reference to the composition of the universe, nothing is without its fixed object, or is neglected, and that there is a reason for the creation of each part, so that it never transgresses its appointed order." Then follows a passage already quoted,¹ relating to the original constitution of man ; after which Athenagoras adds, "The powers which draw men towards idols are the above-mentioned demons, who settle upon the victims, and suck the blood ; but the gods, in whom the multitude delights, and whose names are given to the statues, were men, as we may know from their respective histories."² He then states that the demons in reality exert the powers which are ascribed by the vulgar to the idols ; and goes on to explain the mode in which men are perverted to the worship of idols.³ His notion is, that "the irrational and visionary movements of the soul with respect to opinions, call up different idols ; sometimes extracting them out of matter ; sometimes framing and begetting them to themselves. And the soul is principally subject to this affection, when it lays hold of, and is mixed up with, the material spirit ; not looking upwards to heavenly things and to their Maker, but downwards entirely to the earth, as if it were only flesh and blood, and no longer a pure spirit. These irrational and visionary movements of the soul beget imagina-

¹ P. 139.

² Athenagoras proves this at great length, p. 31 A.

³ P. 30 C. Athenagoras seems in this passage to use the word *εἰδωλον* ambiguously ; either to signify an image presented to the mind, or a material object of worship. Concerning the powers exerted by the idols, *τὰς εἰδώλων ἐνεργείας*, see pp. 17 C, 25 A, where Athenagoras admits that some wonders are wrought by the idols, but says that they ought not to be ascribed to the gods whose names the idols bear.

tions leading to a mad desire of idols. But when the tender and flexible soul, untaught, and unacquainted with sound reasonings, having never contemplated the truth, or comprehended in its thought the Father and Maker of the universe, receives the impression of these false opinions, the demons, who hover about matter, sucking up the steam and blood of the victims, laying hold, in order to deceive man, of these movements of the souls of the multitude which lead to falsehood, cause images to flow into them, as if proceeding from the idols and images, the names of which they have appropriated to themselves. Thus, too, the demons obtain the credit of those rational movements of the soul which belong to it as immortal, when it either foretells the future or remedies the present.”

Theophilus appears to have written a work,¹ in which he had said much respecting Satan, whom he describes as still working in men, and calls a demon and dragon, assigning as the reason for this latter name that he was a fugitive from God; for he was originally an angel.² Speaking of the heathen poets, Theophilus says that they were inspired by demons; and in proof of this assertion states that, when men under the influence of a demoniacal possession were exorcised in the name of the true God, the spirits which seduced them confessed themselves to be demons.³

With respect to the gods of the heathen, Theophilus affirms repeatedly that they were dead men.⁴ He calls them also demons, impure demons; whence we may infer that he agreed with Athenagoras in thinking, though he does not expressly say so, that the demons were the instigators of

¹ L. ii. p. 104 D.

² διὰ τὸ ἀποδεδρακέναι αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, p. 104 D.

³ L. ii. p. 87 C.

⁴ L. i. pp. 75 A, 76 A; l. ii. pp. 80 D, 86 B, 110 A.

idolatry, and reaped the advantage of the worship which they caused to be paid to the statues of dead men.¹

P. 85. Tatian, speaking in his own person, thus describes the moral character of the Christians of his day:² "I wish not to reign; I wish not to be rich; I avoid military office; I abhor fornication; I will not make long voyages through the insatiate desire of gain; I contend not at games in order to obtain a crown; I am far removed from the mad love of glory; I despise death; I am superior to every kind of disease; my soul is not consumed by grief. If I am a slave, I submit to my servitude; if I am free, I pride not myself in my noble birth. I see one sun common to all; I see one death common to all, whether they live in pleasure or in want."

In a subsequent passage Tatian says:³ "With us there is no desire of vainglory, and we consequently affect not a variety of doctrines; but separated from the vulgar and earthly sentiment, and obeying the precepts of God, and following the law of the father of incorruption, we renounce all that rests on human opinion. Not only do the rich learn philosophy, but the poor also enjoy instruction gratis;⁴ for that which comes from God cannot be paid for by any worldly compensation. Thus we receive all who wish to hear, even though they are old women or children. In a word, all ages receive honour with us; but all lasciviousness is far removed from us." Speaking of his own conversion to Christianity, Tatian says⁵ that, "observing the trifling questions on which the Gentiles, who affected the character of wisdom, employed themselves; their ignorance of all that really deserved to be known; their presumption; their pride; the variety of opinions which pre-

¹ L. i. p. 76 C; l. iii. p. 118 A.

² P. 150 B. Compare p. 162 D.

³ P. 167 A.

⁴ See p. 168 C. Compare p. 9, note 5.

⁵ Pp. 163 C to 165 C.

veiled among them even on the nature of virtue and vice, some holding that to be honourable which others deemed infamous—whereas the nature of virtue must be always the same ;—observing all these things, and having been initiated into their mysteries, and ascertained the flagitious character of their rites, he considered with himself in what manner he could arrive at the truth. While he was thus considering, he met with certain barbarous writings, ancient in comparison with the dogmas of the Greeks ; divine in comparison with their error. To these he gave his assent, moved by the unpretending character of the diction ; the simplicity of the speakers ; the mode in which the work of creation was rendered easy of comprehension ; the prediction of future events ; the excellence of the precepts ; and the doctrine of the subjection of the universe to one God.”

As Tatian exposes at some length what he deems the abominations of the theatrical exhibitions, and of the public games, we may conclude that he did not deem it consistent with the profession of Christianity to attend them.¹

Athenagoras, having recited some of the moral precepts delivered by our Saviour, in order to explain to the emperors the real character of Christianity, asks,² “ Who among those, who analyze syllogisms, and resolve ambiguities, and explain etymologies, and define homonymes and synonymes, and categories, and axioms, and the subject and the predicate, and profess that by such instructions they can make their hearers happy—who among them are so purified in their souls as, instead of hating, to love their enemies ; as, instead of doing that which is even deemed a mark of the greatest moderation—of retorting evil language—to bless their calumniators, and even to pray for those who are laying snares against their life ? The heathen teachers of knowledge, on the contrary, are ever

¹ Pp. 160 D to 162 B.

² *Legatio*, p. 11 C.

forming some forbidden scheme against their adversaries, and desiring to do them injury; making their profession a mere flourish of words, and not a rule of practice.¹ But among us you may find illiterate persons, and artisans, and old women, who, if they cannot show the benefits resulting from their profession by their words, show it by practice. For they do not commit words to memory, but show forth good deeds;—when struck, they strike not again—when robbed, they have not recourse to the law—they give to those who ask—and love their neighbours as themselves. Is it likely that we should thus purify ourselves, unless we believed that God presided over the human race? No one can say so. But because we are persuaded that we shall render an account of our present life to the God Who made both us and the world, we choose the moderate and benevolent, and (in human estimation) despised course of life; thinking that even if we lose our lives, we cannot suffer any evil *here*, to be compared with the reward which we shall receive *hereafter* from the great Judge, on account of our gentle and benevolent and temperate behaviour.”² In a subsequent passage,³ Athenagoras states that, agreeably to the injunctions of their blessed Master, Christians are pure, not only in their actions and their words, but even in their thoughts; knowing that the eye of God is ever over them, and that being Himself wholly light, He looks into the very heart.

He alleges as a proof that the Christians were not guilty of the crimes imputed to them, that no one of their slaves, who

¹ τέχνην λόγων, καὶ οὐκ ἐπιδείξιν ἔργων, τὸ πρᾶγμα πεποιημένοι. So p. 37 A, οὐ γὰρ μελέτη λόγων, ἀλλ' ἐπιδείξει καὶ διδασκαλία ἔργων, τὰ ἡμέτερα, “Not by the use of words, but by the display and practice of deeds.” “Quotus enim quisque Philosophorum invenitur, qui sit ita moratus, ita animo ac vita constitutus, ut ratio postulat? qui disciplinam suam, non ostentationem scientiæ, sed legem vitæ putet? qui obtemperet ipse sibi, ac decretis suis pareat?” Cicero, *Tusc.* ii. c. 4 or 12.

² The same argument is again urged, p. 35 C.

³ Pp. 35 C. 36 A.

must have been privy to the fact, had ever been brought forward to give evidence against them, or had even laid such crimes falsely to their charge.¹ “For how,” he says, “can any one accuse of homicide, or of eating human flesh, those who cannot bear to be present even at the execution of a person justly condemned? While others rush with eagerness to behold the combats of the gladiators, and the conflicts with wild beasts, we renounce such sights, thinking that there is little difference between witnessing and committing homicide. Can we then commit murder, who will not even look upon it, lest we should bring upon ourselves guilt and pollution?” Athenagoras then goes on to say that the Christians would neither use medicines in order to procure abortions, nor expose their offspring.

Having stated that the purity of the Christians extended not only to their actions, but also to their desires and thoughts,² he adds that they regarded the younger members of the community as their children; those of their own age as brothers and sisters; those advanced in years as their parents. “Having then,” he proceeds, “the hope of eternal life, we despise the things of this life, and all in which the soul takes pleasure. Each of us confines himself to his own wife; and marries not to satisfy desire, but to beget children. Many among us, both men and women, have grown old in a state of celibacy, through the hope that they shall thereby be more closely united to God. But if the condition of virgins and eunuchs is more acceptable to God, and even thoughts and desires exclude us from His presence, surely we shall renounce the act when we shun the very wish. For our profession consists not in well-composed sentences, but in practice. Either we remain as we are born, or we contract one marriage; for a second marriage is a decorous adultery. ‘For whoever,’ He (Christ) says, ‘puts away his wife, and marries another,

commits adultery;’ neither allowing us to put away our wives, nor to marry again. For he who cuts himself off from his first wife, even though she be dead, is a concealed adulterer; transgressing the hand (work) of God in the creation (for God in the beginning created one man and one woman), and dissolving the union of the flesh.” M. Barbeyrac¹ has animadverted, and not without reason, upon the preference ascribed to a life of celibacy in the above passage; upon the restriction of the use of marriage to the sole object of having children; and upon the condemnation pronounced against second marriages. Nothing indeed can be more forced than the application of the texts of Scripture, or more inconclusive than the reasoning.

Theophilus pursues the same course of argument as Athenagoras in defending the Christians against the calumnious accusations of their adversaries. Having recited the precepts of the gospel respecting purity of thought and wish, universal benevolence, humility, obedience to magistrates, he asks,² “Can they who learn such precepts live like brute beasts, or indulge in unnatural lusts, or eat human flesh? they who are not permitted even to behold the combats of the gladiators, lest they should become, as it were, accessaries to murder; they who are not permitted to frequent the theatres, lest their eyes and ears should be polluted by the horrible and vicious stories which form the subjects of the dramatic exhibitions? Far be the thought of doing such acts from Christians, who are chaste, temperate, who confine themselves to one wife—among whom purity is cultivated, injustice and sin are extirpated, justice and law are observed, piety is practised, God is confessed, truth sits in judgment, grace and peace act as guardians and protectors, the Holy Word is the guide, Wisdom the teacher, the true life the director, God the king.”³

¹ *Traité de la Morale des Pères*, c. 4, sect. vi.

² L. iii. p. 126 D.

³ I entertain doubts about the words ζων βαββύσι in the text; if they are

Theophilus does not appear to have entertained the exaggerated notion of the merit of celibacy which we have remarked in Athenagoras. Speaking of what he terms the prophecy of Adam,¹ in Gen. ii., "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh," he says that it was accomplished in the conduct of the Christians. "For who," he asks, "being lawfully married, does not (comparatively) despise his father, and mother, and kindred, and relations—cleaving and united to his wife, and concentrating his affections in her? so that many have not refused to encounter death for the sake of their wives." Theophilus describes himself as originally a Gentile, and converted to Christianity by reading the sacred writings of the prophets, and observing how events corresponded to their predictions.²

P. 90. On the subject of the subsistence of miraculous powers in the Church, most of my readers will remember the remarks of Gibbon³ on the reply made by Theophilus when challenged by Autolycus to point out a single person who had been raised from the dead. Theophilus answers that there is no great merit in believing what we see; that Autolycus, who believed that Hercules who was burned, and Æsculapius who was killed by a thunderbolt, still lived, was not very consistent in doubting the assertions of God Himself in Scripture respecting the resurrection of the dead; that perhaps, if his demand was satisfied, he would still remain incredulous; that the natural world supplies many analogies from which we

not an interpolation, ζωνῆ must refer to the title which our Saviour gives Himself, John xi. 25, xiv. 6.

¹ L. ii. p. 104 C.

² L. i. p. 78 D; l. ii. p. 88 A.

³ Chap. xv. p. 476, quarto ed. Autolycus does not promise, on the production of a person so raised, to embrace Christianity, but to believe in the resurrection of the dead. L. ii. p. 77 C.

may infer that the dead will rise. But Theophilus certainly does not accept the challenge of Autolycus; he does not even say that he himself knew an instance in which a dead man had been raised. Having elsewhere¹ stated my opinion respecting the date of the cessation of miraculous powers in the Church, I shall now say nothing further on the subject.

P. 92. Theophilus opposes "holy churches" to "heresies."
L. ii. p. 94 A.

P. 96. Justin speaks of Damascus and Rama as situated in Arabia. *Dial.* pp. 305 A, 304 D.

P. 97. Tatian speaks² as if Moses was considered by some to be contemporary with Inachus; and says, that in that case he lived 400 years before the Trojan war. The Sibyl is also mentioned as more ancient than Homer.³

The verses of the Sibyl are once quoted by Athenagoras,⁴ who says that Plato had mentioned her. Theophilus gives long extracts from the verses of the Sibyl,⁵ and names her together with the prophets.⁶

According to Theophilus, Moses lived 900 or 1000 years before the Trojan war.⁷ He says⁸ also that, according to

¹ In my work *On Tertullian*, p. 100.

² P. 172 C.

³ P. 173 C.

⁴ *Legatio*, p. 33 D. See the *Hortatory Address to the Greeks*, p. 16 D.

⁵ L. ii. pp. 81 B, 88 A, 107 C, 112 A.

⁶ τίνυν Σίβυλλα καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ προφῆται, "This Sibyl and the remaining prophets," p. 116 A.

⁷ L. iii. p. 131 C.

⁸ L. ii. p. 106 D. In l. iii. p. 129 B, he assigns the reason why Noah was so called, ὡς Νῶε, καταγγέλλων τοῖς τότε ἀνθρώποις μέλλειν κατακλυσμὸν ἔσεσθαι, προσφῆτευσεν αὐτοῖς λέγων, δεῦτε, καλεῖ ὑμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς εἰς μετάνοιαν, διὸ

some, Deucalion was the same as Noah. We have seen that he speaks of the prophecy of Adam.¹

The author of the *Hortatory Address to the Greeks* speaks of Moses as the first prophet and legislator:² Ἄρξομαι τοίνυν ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου παρ' ἡμῖν προφήτου τε καὶ νομοθέτου Μωσέως.

P. 108. We find in Athenagoras a passage³ which appears to be meant for a quotation from the New Testament, but is not found in our present books. Lardner⁴ says that "there is no necessity of supposing that Athenagoras ascribes them (the words) to Christ, or that he took them

οἰκείως Δευκαλίων ἐκλήθη. "Even as Noah proclaimed to men that the flood would shortly come, and prophesying to them saying, 'Come hither, God calls you to repentance'; wherefore he was also called Deucalion." He had previously said, ὑπὸ τοῦ Νῶε Ἑβραϊστὶ, ὅς διερμηνεύεται τῇ Ἑλλάδι γλώσση ἀνάπαυσις, "By the Hebrew name Noah, which is interpreted in the Greek tongue ἀνάπαυσις, 'rest.'" In l. ii. p. 108 C, we find the following derivation of the word Ἱερουσαλήμ: κατὰ δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν ἐγένετο βασιλεὺς δίκαιος, ὀνόματι Μελχισεδέχ, ἐν πόλει Σαλήμ, τῇ νῦν Ἱεροσόλυμα. (f. Ἱερουσαλήμ.) οὗτος ἱερεὺς ἐγένετο πρῶτος πάντων ἱερέων τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου ἀπὸ τούτου ἢ πόλις ἀνομάσθη Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἢ προσηρμένη Ἱεροσόλυμα. "But at that time there was a righteous king named Melchisedech, in the city of Salem, which is now Jerusalem. He was made the first of all priests (ἱερεὺς) by God the Most High. Wherefore the city was called Jerusalem."

¹ P. 217.

² P. 9.

³ πάλιν ἡμῖν λέγοντος τοῦ λόγου, ἴαν τις διὰ τοῦτο ἐκ δευ-ἔρου καταφιλήσῃ ὅτι ἤρσεν αὐτῷ· καὶ ἐπιφέροντος, οὕτως οὖν ἀκριβῶσασθαι τὸ φίλημα, μᾶλλον δὲ τὸ προσκύνημα, δεῖ ὡς, εἴ που μικρὸν τῇ διανοίᾳ παραβολαθείη, ἕξω ἡμᾶς τῆς αἰωνίου τιθέντος ζωῆς. *Legatio*, p. 36 C. The Benedictine editors refer to Clemens Alexandrinus. *Pæd.* l. iii. p. 301, ed. Potter.

⁴ *Credibility*, c. 18, sect. xx. Lardner refers to Jones *On the Canon*, vol. i. p. 551. Le Nourry doubts whether Athenagoras quoted the Nazarene Gospel, or gave the sense instead of the precise words of Scripture, p. 487. Tatian speaks of αἱ θεϊόταται ἐρμῆνειαί, p. 151 C; and of himself as θειοτέρως τινὸς ἐκφωνήσεως λόγῳ καταχρωμένου, p. 152 A.

out of any copies of our Gospels, or from any Apocryphal Gospel. They may be as well cited from some Christian writer, whom Athenagoras thought to have expressed himself upon this subject agreeably to the strict doctrine of Christ delivered in the Gospels." I must confess that I am not satisfied with this solution,—though I cannot suggest a better.

THE
FIRST APOLOGY OF ST. JUSTIN
FOR THE CHRISTIANS
TO
ANTONINUS PIUS.

THE
FIRST APOLOGY OF ST. JUSTIN
FOR THE CHRISTIANS
TO
ANTONINUS PIUS.

To the Emperor Titus Ælius Adrianus Antoninus Pius Augustus Cæsar,¹ and to his son Verissimus the philosopher, and to Lucius the philosopher, the natural son of Cæsar, but the adopted of Pius, the lover of learning; and to the sacred senate, and to all the people of Rome, in the behalf of men of all ranks and nations unjustly loaded with public odium and oppression, I,² Justin, the son of Priscus, and grandson of

¹ From this liberal inscription of titles, you may see that St. Justin was not of the same spirit with our Quakers in point of salutation; for the understanding of which inscription you are to take notice that the first named in it is the Emperor Antoninus Pius, the adoptive son of Adrian; the second, called Verissimus, is Marcus Antoninus the philosopher, the adoptive son of Antoninus Pius; the third is Lucius Verus, the son of Ælius Verus, who had been Cæsar, and was the adoptive son of Antoninus Pius. The titles here bestowed by the martyr were the most beloved ones; for the family of the Antonines from Adrian to Commodus affected the title of philosophers as much as that of fathers of their country, etc.

² Ἰουστίνος Πρίσκου τοῦ Βακχίου, etc. Jerome in his catalogue makes Priscus Bacchius the father of Justin; and herein is followed by Caristo-

(2) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

Bacchius, natives of Flavia Neapolis¹ of Palestine, Syria, I, who am one of this suffering multitude, humbly offer this Apology.²

II. It is the voice of reason, and ever attended to by men truly pious and worthy the name of philosopher, that truth alone is the thing to be had in the highest honour, and to hold the first place in our affections, and the ancients to be followed not one step further than they are followers of truth. The same right reason dictates also that we are not only to strike in with any sect of men, unjust either in practice or principle, but, moreover, that a lover of the truth must by all means, and before life itself, and in defiance of all the menaces of death, choose to square his words and actions by the rules of justice whatever it cost him. And whereas you wear the glorious titles of pious and philosophers, and guardians of justice and lovers of learning, though these, I say, are the darling characters you affect to be distinguished by everywhere,

phorson, and by all the versions of Justin, till that corrected by the learned Dr. Grabe; but it is evident from the construction of the words that Priscus was the father, and Bacchius the grandfather; for τῶν ἀπὸ Φλαουίας being of the plural number cannot agree with Πρίσκου τοῦ Βακχείου of the singular, if it was but one person. The great Du Pin has taken up with this common mistake, and the ingenious author of the notes upon him has overlooked it also, which I the rather wonder at, because the excellent Dr. Cave, whom he is pleased sometimes to animadvert upon, would have set him to rights in this matter in his most accurate life of this martyr.—*Vid.* tom. i. *Spicileg. Patr. Sac.* xi. p. 134; and Vales., *Notes upon Euseb.* p. 66.

¹ This Flavia Neapolis anciently went by the name of Sichem, a noted city of Palestine in the province of Samaria, and from a colony sent thither by Flavius Vespasian called Flavia.—*Vid. Not. Vales. ad Euseb.* lib. iv. chap. xii.

² Ἐντευξίν. Valesius in his notes upon this word in Eusebius, p. 66, says that ἔντυγχάνειν is to go and supplicate the Emperor either by a petition in writing or by word of mouth, and so τὴν προσφωνήσιν καὶ ἔντευξίν ποιῶμαι are both included in this version, whether it was delivered in writing or by word of mouth according to Perionius.

yet whether you make them good or no shall be seen by the following discourse; for we come not here with a design to flatter or ingratiate by the power of fine words, but we come in plain terms to demand judgment according to the strictest and exactest rules of justice, that neither prejudice nor the vanity of getting into the good graces of superstitious men, nor blind passion, or a scandalous report which has so long prepossessed you, might any longer prevail with you to pass sentence against yourselves by condemning the innocent; for it is a maxim among us Christians that we cannot possibly suffer any real hurt, if we cannot be convicted of doing any real evil: "You may kill indeed, but you cannot hurt us."¹

III. But that you may not look upon this as a senseless bravado, or bold flourish only, we pray the charge against Christians may be examined into, and if upon examination the allegations prove true, let them be punished accordingly, or rather do you who are the judges award the punishment, and not leave it to the discretion of the mob.² But if nothing criminal can be made out against us, you cannot surely judge it reasonable to injure a harmless people barely upon an evil report; though, let me tell you, while thus you consult not your judgment but your passion in the distributions of justice, you will pull down the mischief upon yourselves which you are heaping upon us. Every man of sense must own it

¹ Ὑμῖς δ' ἀποκτεῖναι μὲν δυνασθε, βλάψαι δ' οὐ. In this sentence I doubt not but our Martyr had reference to that of Plato, where we have the same sense in almost the same words, and in an *Apology*. For thus Socrates tells the Athenians: εὖ γὰρ ἴστε ἂν ἐμὲ ἀποκτείνετε τοιοῦτον οἶον ἐγὼ λέγω, οὐκ ἐμὲ μείζω βλάψετε ἢ ὑμᾶς αὐτοῦ. ἐμὲ γὰρ οὐδὲν βλάψει οὔτε Μέλιτος οὔτε Ἄνυτος, etc.—Plato's *Apology of Socrates*, Camb. edit. p. 26.

² Μᾶλλον δὲ κολάζειν. I have followed Dr. Grabe's conjecture in the version of these words. But Dr. Cave translates them thus: "Nay, let them be more severely punished than other men."—*Prim. Christianity*, p. 83.

(4) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

the fairest and most equitable way of proceeding in courts of judicature for the people to deliver in a just unexceptionable declaration of their words and actions, and then for the magistrates to proceed to sentence, not as the lust of tyranny and oppression pushes on, but as piety and true wisdom steer their judgment. By this expedient happy will the prince and happy will the people be who are in such a case ; for it is a saying of one of the ancients, "That till magistrates and people both thus philosophise, the body politic will never be well."¹ Accordingly, therefore, it shall be my business, in the first place, to lay before the public a faithful memorial of our life and doctrine, that we may not thank ourselves for our sufferings, which for want of due information you may inflict upon us ; but then remember, it is your parts and duties, according to the aforesaid rule of reason, to see that when you have heard the cause you are found to judge righteous judgment ; for, believe me, you will be without excuse before God for the time to come, if after you understand the Christian cause, you refuse a Christian justice ; the bare application of a name without any fact falling under that name is looked upon as neither good nor evil ; and as for our name, which is tantamount to a crime against a Christian, if we are tried upon that article, we must certainly be acquitted as very good men ; but as we should deem it unreasonable when convicted of real crimes to plead a bare name only in arrest of judgment, so, on the other side, if both with respect to our name and the nature of our polity we are found altogether innocent, it lies at your door to take care, lest by unjustly punishing a people convicted of no evil you yourselves deservedly smart for such injustice. Praise and punishment, then, cannot with reason be charged upon a mere name, unless there be actions either good or bad to justify the charge ; but it is very notorious that when

¹ *Platonis*, lib. v., *de Repub.* And it being a saying also familiarly in the mouths of these emperors, it is the more pertinently made use of by the apologist.

any of your own religion are brought to trial, you never punish before you convict them; but when a Christian is indicted, you snatch at the shadow of his name for a substantial crime; ¹ whereas would you but give yourselves leave to consider that name, you would find it more becoming to animadvert upon the accusers than the accused; for we are indicted by the name of Christians, but now *χρηστός* is a word for kind or good; and such a word surely cannot be a just foundation of hatred.² Again, if any of the accused retract the name of Christian, you take him presently at his word, and acquit him as having nothing more criminal to charge against him; but he who has the courage to stick to the profession of his name is certain to suffer for so doing, when the life of the professor and the non-professor both ought to be the subject of your inquiry, that the merits of both might be manifested by their actions.

IV. But as some disciples³ have so learned their Master

¹ This is the general complaint which runs through all the ancient Apologies, that they were accused, condemned, and executed merely for the name of Christian; and this name in truth was their boast, their ornament of grace, the chain about their neck in which they gloried above all the titles here below; and therefore when the champion Attalus was led about the amphitheatre in scorn, he had a table before him with this inscription: "This is Attalus the Christian," Euseb. *Hist.* lib. v. p. 162. And when Christianity had well-nigh subdued the world, Julian the apostate set himself to banish this name from the face of the earth, and always in derision called the Christians Galileans; and not only so, but made a law that they should only be called by that name, *Naz. Invect. in Julian.* i. p. 81.

² The ignorance and malice of persecuting upon the account of this name you will find in *Tertullian*, chap. iii.; *Lactan.* lib. iv. chap. vii. Our Saviour is called Chrestos by Suetonius, *in vitâ Claudii*; but Tacitus, who lived in the same age with him, is right in the name both of Christ and Christians. "Quos vulgo Christianos appellabat," and then adds, "Auctor nominis ejus Christus."—Tacit. *Annal.* lib. xv.

³ The lives of the primitive professors were one of the greatest and most sensible arguments that by degrees subdued the heathen world to Christianity. This was the motive that worked upon our Justin. He saw prodigious

(6) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

Christ as to witness a good confession, and when put to the question have, by their Christian bravery, so wrought upon their enemies as to win them over, if not to embrace the faith, yet at least to admire it, so, on the contrary, others by not living up to their holy profession have given occasion to the dissolute part of mankind to blaspheme Christianity in general for their sakes. But neither is this right, for many among you put on the name and habit of a philosopher whose lives are not of a piece with their dress or suitable to their profession, and you know very well that there have been those who have held and propagated opinions contrary to the ancients, and yet have all been clothed alike with the name of philosopher; nay, there have been professors of atheism, and your poets have very liberally indulged their muse upon the uncleanness of Jove and his family; and the succeeding wits who tread in their steps, and espouse the same opinions, are so far from being taken up and prosecuted, that you assign them public pensions and honours for thus sweetly exposing your gods.

V. Why then may not we Christians meet with a little of this good usage, we who will give security not to do any harm, or to harbour any opinions that have a real tendency to atheism? But you hold not the scales of justice even; for, instigated by headstrong passions, and driven on also by the invisible whips of evil demons, you take great care we shall suffer, though you care not for what; for¹ verily I must tell

sufferings and prodigious patience; he saw that their principles were above the standard of the best philosophy, and what they taught they lived, and consequently that such good people must have good reason for what they did and suffered so extraordinarily. "I thought with myself," saith he, "that it was not possible for such persons to wallow in vice and sensuality, it being the interest of the wicked and voluptuous to avoid death, to dissemble with princes and magistrates, and to do anything to save their skins." And this, from a Platonic, brought him over to be a Christian. —*Apol.* i., according to the Cologne ed. p. 50.

¹ This he also repeats in his other *Apology*; and how current this opinion

you that heretofore these impure spirits, under various apparitions, went into the daughters of men and defiled boys, and dressed up such scenes of horror that such as entered not into the reasons of things, but judged by appearance only, stood aghast at the spectres; and, being shrunk up with fear and amazement, and never imagining them to be devils, called them gods, and invoked them by such titles as every devil was pleased to nickname himself by. When Socrates, therefore, by dint of true reason, diligently applied himself to bring these hidden works of darkness to light, and to rescue mankind from the impositions of devils, then these very devils struck in with men of the same black spirit and delight in mischief, to get Socrates taken off for an ungodly wicked fellow and an introducer of new demons.¹ The same train have they laid against us, and are working our ruin with all their might. For not only Socrates employed his share of reason among the Greeks to argue them out of these impostures, but even the very Logos, or Reason itself, took upon Him the form and nature of a man to destroy the same kingdom of darkness among the barbarians; upon Whose word it is that we aver these demons to be not only not good, but evil and abominable spirits, whose actions men of any affection for virtue would be

was before and after the time of Justin you may see in the *Notes ad Spicileg. Patr. Sæc. i.* p. 369. They concluded these evil spirits to have a finer sort of body, which was refreshed from the nidours and streams of the sacrifices; and from the amazing power they exercised upon mankind, together with a mistaken passage in Scripture, as I have shown in my *Notes upon Tertullian*, chap. xxii., arose this opinion.

¹ That when Socrates was setting up the worship of one God at Athens, one article of Melitus against him was, that he was ἄθεός, an atheist, and an introducer of strange gods, see the forementioned *Apol. of Plato*, p. 18; and in what sense Socrates and other virtuous philosophers are said to have been partakers of the Divine Logos, I will show hereafter. I keep to the term Logos in the English, because I think it less ambiguous, and more expressive of the personality of the Son of God than barely the Word, as we render it in St. John, and because Justin Martyr is thought to be something in particular, as you will see anon, in the explanation of it.

(8) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

ashamed to imitate; and for this worshipful reason is it that we are branded with the name of Atheist.¹

VI. And thus far we frankly confess the charge, that with respect to the gods in worship among you we are atheists; but far otherwise in respect of the most true God, the Father of righteousness, purity, and every virtue, a God infinitely removed from the least mixture or spot of evil: Him and His only-begotten Son (Who has instructed us in what I just now mentioned concerning these evil spirits, and likewise acquainted us with another host of good and godlike ministering spirits), both these, I say, together with the Spirit Who spake by the prophets, we worship and adore,² and our way of worshipping is in spirit and truth;³ and as we have been taught, so are we

¹ Christianity was called "the atheism," and by the Emperor Julian is seldom called by any other name. And thus Lucian ranks the Christians with Atheists and Epicureans.—*Pseudomant.* p. 828, tom. xxi.

² Καὶ διδάξαντα ἡμᾶς ταῦτα καὶ τῶν ἄλλων, etc. Bellarmin Petavius, and other doctors of the Romish Church, have notoriously played the Jesuit upon this passage, and forced Justin to speak for the worship of angels in this manner by the help of a comma after ταῦτα: "God and His Son who has thus taught us, and the host of good angels, and the Spirit who spake by the prophets, we worship," etc. So that here we have the Third Person in the ever-blessed Trinity to be worshipped in the fourth place after the angels. But to see how knavishly they have dealt with our author in this place, and for a fuller explication of the words, I refer to the excellent Bishop Bull in his *Defens. Fid. Nic.* p. 70, whose sense I have followed; but Dr. Cave translates it thus: "Him and His only-begotten Son (Who instructed us and the whole society of good angels in these divine mysteries)," *Primitive Christianity*, p. 13. And for this sense is Dr. Grabe in his Annotations. It appears, indeed, from the apostle's caveat in his Epistle to the Colossians, that angel-worship crept into the Church very early, but it was always cried out against, and at last publicly condemned by the whole Laodicean Council, Can. 35; and, besides, you will quickly find Justin, in this very *Apology*, saying that "God only is to be worshipped," and repeating the Trinity of Persons as the object of worship, without any mention of angels.

³ Λόγῳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ, I translate "spirit and truth," according to that of St. John in πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ, to which Sylburgh says they allude.

ready to communicate the same freely to every one that is willing to learn.

VII. But perhaps it will be objected that some Christians have been taken up and convicted as evil-doers. Well, I will grant the objection and more; not only that some, but many, and at many times, have been thus duly convicted upon a fair trial; but then I must tell you again that you condemned not the persons aforesaid as criminals, but as Christians. Moreover, we confess that as all the sects in general among the Greeks went under the common name of philosopher, though extremely different in opinions, so truly among the barbarians¹ the professors of this new wisdom, whether in reality or appearance only, go all by the same title, and are denominated Christians; wherefore we pray that all those who are indicted by the name of Christian may be examined as to their actions, and that every person convicted may suffer as an evil-doer, and not as a Christian;² and if he be found not guilty, that he may be discharged as a Christian who has done nothing worthy of punishment. And as to our false accusers, far be it from us to desire you to punish them³—their own painful wickedness, and utter ignorance of all that is good and amiable, is punishment in abundance.

VIII. I could wish you would take this also into consideration, that what we say is really for your own good; for it is in our power at any time to escape your torments, by denying the faith when you question us about it. But we scorn to purchase

¹ "Clemens Alexandrinus often calls the Jews 'barbarians;' and Epiphanius calls Christianity 'the barbarism.'"—*Lang.*

² "And not as a Christian," in allusion to that of St. Peter, 1 Pet. iv. 15.

³ Οὐ γὰρ τοῖς κατηγοροῦντας κολάζειν ἡμᾶς ἀξιάσομεν. This relates to the rescript of Adrian, wherein severe penalties are threatened to the false accusers of Christians.

(10) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

life at the expense of a lie;¹ for our souls are winged with a desire of a life of eternal duration and purity, of an immediate conversation with God the Father and Maker of all things;² we are in haste to be confessing and finishing our faith, being fully persuaded that we shall arrive at this beatific state if we approve ourselves to God by our works, and express our passion by our obedience for that divine life which is never interrupted by any clashing evil. But to lay before you, in short, what we expect, and what we have learned from Christ, and what we teach the world, take it as follows: Plato and we are both alike agreed³ as to a future judgment, but differ about the judges—Rhadamanthus and Minos are his judges, Christ ours. And moreover we say that the souls of the wicked, being reunited to the same bodies, shall be consigned over to eternal torments, and not, as Plato will have it, to the period of a thousand years only.⁴ But if you will affirm this to

¹ Mental reservation was a thing unknown to the primitive Christians; they looked upon a lie as bad in all, but monstrous in a Christian—as being a renunciation of that truth to which they had engaged themselves in baptism, and therefore would not lie to save their lives. Accordingly Tertullian rejects the notion of saving life by equivocating with the utmost scorn and contempt.—*Apol.* c. 27.

² “A Christian,” says Tertullian, “thanks his judges for condemning him,” *Apol.* c. 46. “And when Lucius was charged by Urbicus for being a Christian, because he offered to speak for one he thought had hard measure, he immediately confessed the charge, and was forthwith condemned, and thanked his judge for so doing.”—*Just. Mar. Apol.* ii. p. 43. “And when Arrius Antoninus, Proconsul of Asia, saw the Christians voluntarily come thronging to execution, he ordered some few only to be executed, crying out to the rest: ‘O unhappy people, if you have such a mind to die, have you not halters and precipices enough to end your lives with, but you must come here for execution?’”—*Tertul. ad Scap.* c. iv. p. 71. So certain their hopes and so strong their passions for the enjoyments of the other world.

³ Πλάτων δὲ ὁμοίως.—*Vid.* Plat. in *Gorgia*, tom. 1, edit. Serrani, p. 524, and in *Apol. Socrat.*

⁴ Οὐχὶ χιλιονταετῆ περίοδον.—*Vid.* Plat. *Timæum*, p. 42, tom. 3, edit. Serran. This passage of Justin is express from the eternity of hell torments,

be incredible or impossible, there is no help but you must fall from error to error, till the day of judgment convinces you we are in the right.

IX. But we cannot vouchsafe to worship with numerous victims, and garlands of flowers, the work of men's hands,¹—what you must help into the temple, and being so placed think fit to dub them gods; for we know them to be senseless, inanimate idols, and in nothing resembling the form of God (for we cannot conceive God to be anywise like what is drawn to represent and honour Him by), but in imitation only of those evil spirits who have imposed upon the world under such titles and apparitions. But what need I mention to such knowing persons as you are how the artists manage the subject-matter of their gods, how they hack and hew it, and cast it and hammer it, and not seldom from vessels of dishonour; by changing their figure only, and giving them another turn by the help of art, out comes a worshipful set of things you call gods. This we look upon not only as the highest flight of human folly, but as the most injurious affront to the true God,

and is a clear comment upon that place of Justin in his *Trypho*, where this eternity of torments may seem doubtful.—*Αἱ δὲ (ψυχαὶ) κολάζονται ἕστ' ἂν αὐτὰς καὶ εἶναι, καὶ κολάζεσθαι, ὁ Θεὸς θέλη, Dial. cum Tryph.* 223.

¹ 'Αλλ' οὐδὲ θυσαίαις πολλαῖς καὶ πλοκαῖς ἀνθρώπων. "The primitive Christians startled at everything that had but the least symbolizing with the heathen idolatry; they looked upon the very making of idols, without any design to worship them, as an unlawful trade, and inconsistent with Christianity."—*Tertul. de Idolat.* Can. 6, p. 88. "The Council of Ancyra condemned those to a two years' suspension from the sacrament, who sat down with their heathen friends upon their festivals in their idol-temples, though they touched not one bit that was offered to the idol."—Can. 7. "Nay, if a Christian did but wear a garland (a thing usually done by the heathen priests) he was excommunicated for two years; nay, if he did but go up to the Capitol to see the Gentile sacrifices, and did not see them, he was punished as if he did."—*Concil. Illiber. Vid. not. Albaspin.* Can. 55, p. 69. Can. 59, p. 71: Happy had it been for Christendom had this aversion to idols continued to this day.

Who is a God of glory and form ineffable, thus to transfer His incommunicable Name¹ upon such corruptible and helpless things as wood and stone. Besides, the artificers of what you worship are the lowliest of men, and, not to mention particulars, practised in all sorts of wickedness, as you yourselves are very sensible of; men who debauch the girls while they are helping them to make your gods. Oh! stupidity of men as thunderstruck! that ever you should let such beasts have a hand in making your gods, and put them and the temples which hold them under the protection of such villains, never reflecting what an execrable crime it is, either to think or say, that men have the care and keeping of the gods!

X. And while we look upon God as the Giver of all good things, we can never think He stands in need of the material and gross oblations of men; but we are taught, and most firmly believe and know, that they only are the acceptable worshippers of God who form their minds by the mind eternal, and express it in temperance, justice, humanity, and such other virtues as are the essential excellences of the Divine Nature, or the more proper inmost perfections of Him Who is a God unnameable;² and this Almighty Being, so good in Himself, made all things in the beginning for the good of man out of a

¹ "Ὁς . . . ἐπιονομάζεται. To this purpose we find in the Book of Wisd. xiii. and xiv. 21, "They did ascribe unto stones and stocks the incommunicable Name."

² "A God unnameable." This is a title we have more than once in this *Apology*, and is very frequent in the other writings of this martyr, particularly in his first *Apology* according to the vulgar editions: ὄνομα καὶ τῶ πάντων πατρὶ θετὸν ἀγεννήτω ὄντι, οὐκ ἔστιν, etc., p. 44. In these and the words following Justin teaches that God the Father and the Son have no proper names, but appellations only, which we give them upon the account of their good works and actions, etc.; and the reason he gives for this assertion is this:—that the unbegotten God being eternal, and His Son eternally coexisting with the Father, there could be none before Them to impose a name upon Them.

chaos of rude ill-favoured matter ; and they who walk according to His will, and demonstrate their worthiness by their works, we are sure will be admitted into the Divine presence, there to reign with Him, where corruption and suffering never come. For as He created us at first, when we were not, so by the same power will He restore us to being again, and crown with the immortal enjoyment of Himself such as have made it their choice to please their Maker ; for though we had no choice in our creation, yet in our regeneration we have ; for God persuades only, and draws us gently in our regeneration, by co-operating freely with those rational powers He has bestowed upon us. And we are verily of opinion that it would be for the interest of all men living not only to tolerate the learning of the Christian faith, but to give it all the public encouragement possible ; for that inward conscientious discharge of our several duties, which human laws can never reach, the wisdom which is from above would bring about effectually, were it not for those false and atheistical accusations which are sowed about the world by diabolical spirits, who take advantage to strike in with that original sin and proneness to all evil that reigns in our nature, and which is sure to enter into confederacy with them ; but of all their accusations we are entirely innocent.

XI. But upon the first word you hear of our expectations of a kingdom,¹ you rashly conclude it must needs be a kingdom

¹ The primitive Christians were so warmed with the expectation of a Kingdom in the Heavens, that they did little else but prepare to die, and took the first opportunity they could of getting out of the world ; and being continually discoursing of, and comforting one another with the hopes of this Kingdom, were overheard by their enemies, and falsely accused as treasonable affecters of the empire, when alas ! (as Justin Martyr here assures the emperors) they meant nothing less ; and what contributed very much to this passion for death was an opinion they generally had of the day of judgment being near at hand, a terrible day, which they earnestly prayed they might not be spectators of. This opinion was started early, as

(14) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

upon earth, notwithstanding all we can say that it is one in Heaven, and though you have such an experimental proof to the contrary from our professing ourselves Christians upon examination, when we know death to be the certain consequence of such a profession. But were our thoughts fixed upon a kingdom of this world, we would surely deny our religion for the safety of our lives, and have recourse to all the methods of concealment to secure us in a whole skin against that good day we expect. But since our hopes do not fasten upon things present, the preservation of our lives is the least of our concern, because we know our murderers can cut us short but a few days ; for all must die.

XII. I must tell you likewise that of all men living we are the greatest promoters of peace, and bring you in the most powerful auxiliaries to establish it in your dominions, by teaching that it is impossible for any worker of iniquity, any covetous or insidious person, any one, either vicious or virtuous, to hide himself from God ; and that every one is stepping forward into everlasting misery or happiness according to his works. And if all men were once fully possessed with a notion of these things, who would make the bold adventure to embrace the pleasures of sin for a season, with his eyes upon eternal fire at the end of the enjoyment ? Who would not strive all he could to check himself upon the brink of ruin, and to adorn his mind with such virtue as might give him admission to the good things of God, and secure him from everlasting vengeance ? But as to the penalties of your laws, offenders are not so careful about lying hid from them, because they know you to be but men, and therefore possible to be put upon, and upon the score

appears by that caution given by St. Paul to the Thessalonians about it (2 Thess. ii. 3, 4) ; and it lasted for some ages after, as is evident from several places in Tertullian, *de cult. famin.* lib. 2, c. 9, *ad uxor.* lib. 1, c. 5, which I mention here once for all, because the reader will meet with this opinion in the *Apology* before him.

of that possibility are encouraged to sin on. But were they fully persuaded of the impossibility of concealing anything from God, not only the works of their hands, but even the motions of their minds, the direful storm of wrath they see just dropping upon their heads, would needs make them prepare with all speed for a better course of life, as you yourselves will grant.

XIII. But you seem to be afraid that such a notion of God's Omniscience should force every one to be good, and so quite and clean spoil the trade of punishing. Executioners perhaps may be afraid of this, but pious princes surely never can. But such fears, I am verily persuaded, are the suggestions of evil spirits, who get their sacrifices and worship by exacting upon the follies of wicked men ; but you who set up for pious and philosophers will not, we suppose, be drawn into the same unreasonable practices. But if you, like other weak people, will be borne down with the iniquity of the times, and make truth give place to custom, do your worst ; but such wicked princes as have no regard for truth can do no more than robbers in a desert, for the Logos has declared you shall not thrive long in your idolatrous course ; that Logos, Who next to God His Father we know to be the supreme and justest of Kings, and above all the principalities and powers in nature. For as all men are shy of taking up with poverty, suffering, or disgrace, merely for the sake of custom, so is every person of sense equally unwilling to do what reason declares is not to be done, notwithstanding it has the plea of custom for its practice.

XIV. Our Master Jesus Christ, from Whom we take the name of Christians, the Son and Apostle¹ of that God who is the Supreme Lord and Maker of the universe, has foretold

¹ Ἀπόστολος. Christ is called the Apostle of God from His being sent by Him into the world, and is so styled in Heb. iii. 1 : "Consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus."

(16) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

our sufferings ; which to us is a manifest confirmation of the truth of all His other doctrines, because we see these things fulfilled according to His prediction ; for this or nothing is the work of God, to declare a thing shall come to be, long before it is in being, and then to bring about that thing to pass according to the same declaration.

XV. And now I might spare myself the trouble of saying a word more, considering the truth and justice of our proposals ; but because I am sensible how difficult a task it is for men bowed down with aged ignorance to be set straight in a moment, and for a further satisfaction to the lovers of truth, I shall enlarge in its defence, knowing it not impossible to get the better of ignorance by setting matters in a fuller light.

XVI. In the first place, then, it is certain we cannot justly be branded for atheists, we who worship the Creator of the universe, not with blood, libations, and incense (which we are sufficiently taught He stands in no need of); but we exalt Him to the best of our power with the rational service of prayers and praises,¹ in all the oblations we make unto Him ; believing

¹ Λόγῳ εὐχῆς καὶ εὐχαριστίας. What the Latin translator means by his *Oratione Precum ac gratiarum actionis*, I cannot well tell ; but I think he can by no means be right in the translation of these words. The sacrifices of old, both of Jew and Gentile, were offered in a corporeal way, by slaughter, fire, and incense, but the sacrifice of Christians is offered only *λόγῳ εὐχῆς καὶ εὐχαριστίας*, “by way of prayer and thanksgiving,” as Mr. Mede translates these words, p. 358. So that according to this learned person these words are to be understood of the manner of offering ; the bread and wine, the matter of the Christian sacrifice, are offered *λογικῶς* spiritually ; which the Fathers in the first Council of Nice call *ἀθύτως θύσθαι*, “to be sacrificed without sacrificing rites.” And this sense is further confirmed by what follows, where Justin argues against the gross way of the Gentiles sacrificing, by consuming in fire what God made for our nourishment. “*Ὅση δύναμις*, which I translate, “to the best of our power,” I take notice of only by the by in this place because I shall have occasion to explain it more

this to be the only honour worthy of Him ; not to consume the creatures which He has given us for our use, and the comfort of those that want, in the fire by sacrifice, but to approve ourselves thankful to Him, and to express this gratitude in the rational pomp of the most solemn hymns¹ at the altar in acknowledgment of our creation, preservation, and all the blessings of variety in things and seasons ; and also for the hopes of a resurrection to a life incorruptible, which we are sure to have for asking, provided we ask in faith. Who that knows anything of us will not confess this to be our way of worshipping ? And who can stigmatize such worshippers for atheists ? The Master Who instructed us in this kind of worship, and Who was born for this very purpose, and crucified under Pontius Pilate, procurator of Judea, in the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, is Jesus Christ, Whom we know to be the Son of the true God, and therefore hold Him the second in order, and the Prophetic Spirit the third ;² and that we have

fully hereafter ; only I believe the impartial reader will hardly conceive this passage to be a good proof for extemporary prayer.

¹ Πομπὰς καὶ ὕμνους. Dr. Grabe observes that the word Πομπή often signifies that public pomp and pageantry which was exhibited at the heathen sports ; and from hence concludes that it is translated hither to signify those prayers which are recited with more than ordinary solemnity at the celebration of the Eucharist. The mention of hymns in this place, and not one word of them in that where Justin is giving an account of their way of public worship, is a plain argument that he did not design to acquaint them with every particular they did at their religious assemblies ; for there is no doubt but singing of psalms was a part of divine service, and as a main part too mentioned by Pliny in his Letter to Trajan—*Secum invicem canere*—“ they sang psalms together, or alternately, or by turns ; ” for so perhaps the words may signify. These psalms were partly David’s, partly extemporary raptures while inspiration lasted, or set compositions taken out of the Holy Scriptures, or of their own composing, as you find in Tertul. *Apol.* c. 39 ; and this continued till the Council of Laodicea ordered that no psalms composed by private persons should be recited in the church, Can. 59.

² Here again you see the sacred Trinity of Divine Persons mentioned in their order, and the Prophetic Spirit in the third place, which evidently

good reason for worshipping in this subordination, I shall show hereafter. For here they look upon it as downright madness to assign to a crucified man the next place to the immutable, eternal God, Parent of all things,¹ being entirely in the dark as to the mystery of this order; and therefore I advise you to give diligent attention while I expound it to you.

XVII. But first I am to caution you against those spirits, which I have already accused for practising upon you, that they do not delude and pervert you from reading and understanding what I am now proposing to your consideration; for to hold you in slavery and bondage is the prize they contend for, and sometimes by visions in sleep, sometimes by magical impostures, they make sure of all such as are little concerned about their salvation. I could wish you would follow our example, who by the persuasions of the Logos have revolted from these spiritual wickednesses, and come over to the obedience of the only unbegotten God, through His Son Jesus Christ. We, who heretofore gave ourselves a loose to women,² now

shows that the interposition of angels, sect. 6, must be looked upon only as in a parenthesis, and that St. Justin no more intended those ministering spirits for the objects of Christian worship than he intended they should take the place of the Holy Ghost in the order of worship.

¹ The reader will find in this *Apology* God continually called *γεννητορα τῶν πάντων* and *πατέρα τῶν ὄλων*, "Maker of all things and Father of the universe;" and therefore he is desired once for all to take notice that our author repeats this attribute so often, because some heretics in his time denied God to be the Maker of heaven and earth, and he expressly mentions Marcion for one, sect. 35, who taught another god greater than the Creator of the world.

² *Οἱ πάλαι μὲν πορνείαις χαίροντες*, etc. This wonderful change in manners is often appealed to by the primitive converts; and that men so long bent to lust and passion should be set upright in a moment, I look upon as a miracle in morality; for nothing but the mighty grace of God, and the brightest hopes of future happiness, could prevail with all sorts of men thus to embrace the Christian faith at the certain expense almost of their

strictly contain within the bounds of chastity ; we, who devoted ourselves to magic arts, now consecrate ourselves entirely to the good unbegotten God ; we, who loved nothing like our possessions, now produce all we have in common, and spread our whole stock before our indigent brethren ; we, who were pointed with mutual hatred and destruction, and would not so much as warm ourselves at the same fire with those of a different tribe upon the account of different institutions, now since the coming of Christ cohabit and diet together, and pray for our enemies ; and all our returns for evil are but the gentlest persuasives to convert those who unjustly hate us, that by living up to the same virtuous precepts of Christ they might be filled with the same comfortable hopes of obtaining the like happiness with ourselves, from that God Who is the Lord of all things.

XVIII. But before I enter further into the explication of the Christian mysteries, it will not be amiss to give you a taste of the very doctrines delivered by Christ Himself, to show that we are no cheats, nor have any design to trick upon you in this matter, and I shall leave it to you to examine, as princes who are well able, whether this is not the very doctrine of Christ, and the same we preach to the world. His discourses are short and sententious, for He was no trifling sophister, but Christ the Power of God, and the Wisdom of God. Thus then He delivered Himself concerning chastity: "Whoso looketh upon a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart before God"¹ (Matt. v. 28). "And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out ; it is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of heaven with

lives ; and from the bitterest enemies, and the lewdest of men, to become the most loving, forgiving, and chastest people in the world.

¹ "Ο; ἄν ἰμβλέψῃ. In Scripture quotations you are to observe that Justin does not tie himself to the very words of the text, but their sense only.

(20) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire. And whosoever shall marry her that is divorced from her husband committeth adultery" (Matt. v. 29, 32, xix. 9). "And there are some which are made eunuchs of men, and some who have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake; but all cannot receive this saying" (Matt. xix. 11, 12). So that such kind of second marriages of persons divorced, and the very looking upon a woman to lust after her, which are not criminal by human laws, by our Master's laws are adultery;¹ for not only the adulterer in fact but in will is condemned by Christ. And for good reason, because the inward desires, as well as the outward actions, are equally manifest to God. And I can produce abundance of both sexes who have from their childhood been disciplined unto Christ,²

¹ In times of persecution very many Christians abstained from marriage, to be freer from the cares of the world, and more expeditious in the service of God and their brethren; and those who married, did it (as our Martyr elsewhere says) only for the sake of children, and the bringing them up in the Christian religion; but the first Fathers were extremely severe against second marriages, looking upon them but as a better kind of adultery; and by the apostolical canons such as engaged in second marriages after baptism were made incapable of any degree in the ministry. However, this severity is much abated, if it is to be understood (as some say it is) of such only as had two wives at once; for we are told by a learned person that there were three sorts of bigamy—the first, a man's having two wives at once, this was condemned by the Roman laws; the second, when the former wife being dead, the man married a second time; a third, when for any slight cause a man put away his wife by a bill of divorce, which was but too frequently done, and allowed by the laws of those times, but condemned by the Church; and of this last sort of bigamy many of the ancient canons are to be understood.—*Vid.* Justell. Not. in Can. i. *Conc. Laed.*

² Οἱ ἐκ παιδῶν ἰμαθητευσεν. This passage, I think, is hardly capable of being wrested to signify less than the baptism of children; for the Martyr speaks of such as had been disciplined unto Christ from their childhood, and this discipling, we know, was by baptism (Matt. xxviii. 19, where we have the same word μαθητεύω); and these disciples, he says, also continued virgins all their time, which is another argument of their being baptized from their

and lived in a constant course of spotless virginity to sixty or seventy years of age ; and I cannot but glory in being able to produce so many instances of Christian purity out of every nation. But why should I go about to muster up a numberless multitude of such who have taken leave of their intemperance, and come over to the Christian institution ? For Christ called not the just, and temperate, but the impious, incontinent, and unjust to repentance, according to His own saying, " I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance " (Matt. ix. 13) ; for our heavenly Father delights not in the correction, but the amendment of sinners.

XIX. Concerning the duty of universal love, He thus teaches : " If ye love them which love you, what do ye more than other men ? For sinners do the same. But I say unto you, Pray for your enemies, love those that hate you, and do good to them which curse you and despitefully use you " (Matt. v. 44, 46). Concerning giving alms to the poor, and against vainglory in doing them, He commands thus : " Give to every one that asketh, and from him that would borrow turn not away " (Matt. v. 42). " And if ye lend to them of whom ye hope to receive again, what thanks have ye ? Do not publicans the same ? " (Luke vi. 34). " Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal ; but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where

childhood ; but, above all, the opposing the children to such as had changed from intemperance, and consequently were men, and converted and baptized upon a due consideration of the Christian principles. This opposition, I say, makes it plain to me that he meant such persons as were disciplined into Christ, before they were capable of learning the Christian doctrine by instruction. Now this *Apology* is not fifty years younger than St. John's Revelation, and if a person of Justin's learning and curiosity was able to know such a plain matter of fact as baptism, and if the Martyr had sincerity enough to declare it ingenuously, then I take this to be a very strong proof for infant baptism.

(22) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

moth and rust doth not corrupt" (Matt. vi. 19, 20). "For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul, or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" (Matt. xvi. 26; Luke ix. 25). "Be ye kind and merciful, as your Father is kind and merciful, who maketh His sun to rise upon sinners, on the evil and on the good" (Matt. v. 45, 48). "Take no thought what you shall eat, or what you shall put on; are you not much better than birds and beasts? And yet God taketh care of them. Be not therefore solicitous what you shall eat, or wherewithal ye shall be clothed, for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of these things. But seek ye the kingdom of God, and all things shall be added unto you. For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also" (Matt. vi. 21, 25, 26, 33). "Take heed that ye do not your alms to be a spectacle to men, otherwise ye have no reward of your Father which is in heaven" (Matt. vi. 1).

XX. Concerning patience, submission, and meekness, these are our Master's rules: "Whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also;¹ and him that taketh away thy cloak, forbid not to take thy coat also" (Matt. v. 39, 40). "Whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of hell-fire" (Matt. v. 21). "Whosoever shall

¹ "Whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." Isidore the Pelusiote upon this passage (*Ep.* 127, l. 3, p. 269) has so truly expressed the primitive spirit, and the turn is so engaging, that I will not ask pardon for setting it down. "The King of Heaven," says he, "came down to instruct the world in the laws of an heavenly conversation, which He has proposed in a way of conflict, quite contrary to that in the Olympic games, for there he that fights and conquers wins the garland; here he that is beaten and bears it with patience receives the crown; there he that is smitten and returns blow for blow; here he that turns the other cheek is celebrated the victor in the theatre of angels; for the Christian victory is measured not by revenge but patience. This is the new law of crowns; this the new way of conflict and contention."

compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain" (Matt. v. 41). "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven" (Matt. v. 16). A Christian hand must by no means be lifted up in resistance; for Christ will not have His disciples like the rest of the world, but orders them to shine with a distinguishing patience and meekness, and to win men over from their sins by such gentle arts of conversion. And I could give you a proof of the influence of such bright examples from many converts among us, who from men of violence and oppression were transformed into quite another nature, perfectly overcome by the passive courage of their Christian neighbours, or by observing the new astonishing patience of such injured Christians as they chanced to travel with, or the experience they had of their fidelity in their dealings.

XXI. Concerning swearing not at all, and a perpetual regard to truth in all our communication, He thus ordains: "Swear not at all,¹ but let your yea be yea, and your nay, nay; for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil" (Matt.

¹ Some of the ancient Fathers from this text, "Swear not at all," held the taking of an oath unlawful; but far the greatest part of them were of another opinion, and interpreted this prohibition, of swearing by the creatures (which was the case of the Jews, and which our Saviour and St. James principally aim at, and which is countenanced by the text when rightly pointed), and of vain, rash, and false swearing. It would be well, indeed, if the honesty of Christians now-a-days did supersede the necessity of oaths, and that their majesty was not prostituted by their multitude and the meanness of the occasion; but that it is lawful to take an oath, we have our Master's practice, who answered upon oath; and St. Paul's often calling God to witness, to justify the thing, and the military oath taken by the Christian soldiers, put it out of doubt; the form of which is thus set down by Vegetius, an heathen, viz.—"They swore by God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit, and the majesty of the emperor, which next to God is to be loved and honoured by mankind." And this you will find exactly agrees with the account given long before of the Christians by Tertullian, *Apol.* c. 32.

(24) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

v. 37). Concerning the worship of God only, He thus appoints: "This is the first Commandment, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve with all thy heart and with all thy strength" (Matt. iv. 10), the Lord thy God Which made thee. And a certain person coming to Him, and addressing Him in these words, "Good Master," He returned him this answer, "There is none good but God only" (Matt. xix. 16, 17), Who made all things.

XXII. But those now who are found not to make His precepts the rule of their lives are to be looked upon as no Christians, let them say never such fine things of His law; for it is not the sayers, but the doers, that shall be justified. "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them, heareth Him that sent me. Many will say unto me, Lord, Lord, have we not eaten and drunk in Thy name, and done wonders? And then will I say unto them, Depart from me, ye that work iniquity" (Matt. vii. 21-24). "Then shall there be wailing and gnashing of teeth, when the righteous shall shine forth as the sun, but the wicked shall be turned into everlasting fire" (Matt. xiii. 42, 43). "Many shall come to you in my name in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits. But every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire" (Matt. vii. 15, 16, 19). But Christians in word only, who talk these precepts, but live them not, such we beg may smart for their hypocrisy.

XXIII. As to tribute and custom,¹ no men living take such

¹ To this purpose Tertullian argues, *Apol.* c. 42, that though they would not pay taxes for the maintenance of the heathen temples, yet they made sufficient amends for this in their faithful payments of all the rest. The

pains to pay their collectors so faithfully as we do, who pay them in obedience to our Lord's command ; for when some came to Him with this question, " Is it lawful to give tribute unto Cæsar or not? Tell me (says He) whose image this money bears? They say unto Him, Cæsar's. Then saith He unto them, Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's" (Matt. xxii. 17, 20, 21). Accordingly, therefore, we render unto God only the tribute of worship,¹ and to you a cheerful obedience in all things else, acknowledging you to be emperors and rulers upon earth, and withal praying that imperial majesty may be always found in the company of true wisdom.² But if neither our prayers, nor all our contributions for the good of the public, will touch you with any concern for Christians, we shall be no losers ; for we believe, or rather are fully assured, that every one according to his demerits shall suffer in eternal fire, and shall give a strict account to God in proportion to the power he is intrusted with, as Christ has declared, " For unto whomsoever God has given much, of him shall be much required " (Luke xii. 48).

XXIV. Turn back your thoughts upon the past emperors, and you will find they all died like other men ; and could you but discover one to be in a state of insensibility, you would

truth is, the primitive Christians were strictly conscientious in everything, but in nothing more (as you will find in these *Apologies*) than in what related to the public, and concerned their duty and obedience to rulers and governors, and those too very often the worst of men.

¹ Θεὸν μὲν μόνον προσκυνοῦμεν. We worship God alone. Angels, therefore, are not to be worshipped, and Christ and the Holy Ghost Which are worshipped are consequently God.

² Tertullian, likewise, *Apol.* c. 39, tells us, " It was a solemn part of the Church in his time to pray for the happiness and prosperity of the princes under whom they lived. And the Church of England is so truly primitive in this point, that her liturgy has been thought too much clogged with prayers for kings."

(26) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

make a welcome discovery to the wicked world ; but since all departed souls continue in sensation,¹ and everlasting fire is treasured up for the unrighteous, let me advise you to look well about you, and lay these things seriously to heart. For even necromancy,² and the inspection of the entrails of sound children, and the calling out the souls of dead men, and what the magicians term dream-senders and familiars, and many other practices of the dealers in this black art, may induce you to believe that souls after death are in a state of sensation ; and, moreover, those persons who are violently caught up, and dashed down again by departed spirits,³ and who pass among you all for demoniacs and mad, and likewise the Amphilochean, Dodonæan, Pythian, and other like oracles, and also the doctrines of many of your writers, such as Empedocles, Pythagoras, Plato, and Socrates, and Homer's *Ditch*, and Ulysses's *Visit to the Infernal Shades, and their Confabulations with him*,—these, I say, all argue the immortality of human

¹ Here we have two things expressly asserted by Justin Martyr ; one, that all departed souls are in a state of sensation, against Dr. Coward's notion of their being in the same senseless state with the body till the resurrection ; the other, that all the wicked whatsoever shall suffer eternal torments, against the learned Mr. Dodwell, in his *Epistolary Discourse*, "proving from the Scriptures and the First Fathers that the soul is a principle naturally mortal," etc.

² The several species of magic you will find mentioned by Tertullian, *Apol.* c. 23. The sum of what he drives at in this section is to prove the immortality of human souls from the practice of magicians, in raising up, and conversing with departed spirits ; the inspection of the entrails of young children supposes that the souls of these children stood by and assisted the inspectors in the revelation of things to come. For a more particular account of this horrid practice, and for the meaning of the words *δνειροπομοποι* and *πάρεδροι*, I refer the learned reader to Dr. Grabe's Notes upon this *Apology*.

³ Such were the two demoniacs in the country of the Gergesenes, who came out of the tombs, "exceeding fierce, so that no man might pass by that way" (Matt. viii. 28) ; and from their dwelling only among tombs, these spirits were concluded to be the souls of dead men.

souls, and several others of the same opinion about spirits with ourselves, with whom we desire the like treatment, as having not a less, but a much greater faith in God than they ever had, being under a full expectation of being restored to these bodies, after they are dead and rotten, because we know that with God nothing is impossible. -

XXV. And truly what to any considering person would seem more incredible, were it not that we ourselves are in a body, than to be told that it is possible for bones and nerves and flesh to be spun out from a seminal drop, into such a thing as we see man to be ; I speak this by way of hypothesis ; supposing, I say, before you were in the state you now are, and generated of such parents, any one should come and show you this seminal drop and the picture of man, and withal aver it to be possible for such a creature to rise out of such a principle, which of you would think it credible before he saw the production ? Not one, I daresay, would deny it to be impossible. In the same manner you are now possessed with a disbelief of a resurrection, because you never saw a person rise again from the dead : but as at first you would not believe it possible for this little speck to work itself into a man, though now you see it true in fact, so ought you to conclude it as practicable for human bodies covered in the earth, and dead like seed, to spring again in their season at the Almighty Word, and put on incorruption. But how suitable such a power is to God which those cut out for Him who affirm everything to depart into that original matter from whence it came, and after that departure to be gone for ever, and irrevocable even beyond the call of God Himself ; whether this, I say, is a becoming notion of Almighty Power, I will not now inquire ; but this I will venture to say, that these gentlemen would never have believed it possible that themselves and the whole world could have been what they now find they are, and from such principles.

(28) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

XXVI. But we have justly presumed it the most rational to believe what may seem inconsistent with the nature of things, and to men impossible, rather than stand out and imitate others in a foolish infidelity, especially since our Master Christ hath taught us,¹ "That the things which are impossible with men are possible with God" (Luke xviii. 27); and likewise given orders, "Not to fear them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do; but fear Him who after He hath killed is able to destroy both soul and body in hell" (Matt. x. 28).

XXVII. Now hell is that place where the wicked live, and such as disbelieve the revelations of God by Christ, shall suffer; and the Sibyl and Hystaspes hath both given out that this whole system of corruptibles shall be destroyed by fire;² nay, the Stoics have a conceit that God Himself shall be resolved into fire, and that there shall rise a new world refined from the ruins of the old; but we conceive far more honourably of God than to range the Creator of the universe among things subject to alteration.

XXVIII. If, then, we hold some opinions near of kin to the poets and philosophers in greatest repute among you, and others of a diviner strain, and far above out of their sight, and have demonstration on our side into the bargain, why are we to be thus unjustly hated, and to stand distinguished in misery above the rest of mankind? For in saying that all things

¹ This great philosopher and Christian martyr was so far from thinking with our modern reasoners, that his faith ought to go no further than clearness and connection of ideas, that he thought it reasonable, and becoming finite minds, to believe beyond the ken of mortal eye, and to conclude that possible to God which to us might seem impossible.

² "Esse quoque in fatis reminiscitur affore tempus,
Quô Mare, quô Tellus, correptaque Regia Cæli
Ardeat, et mundi moles operosa laboret."

—Ovid, *Metam.* lib. i.

were made in this beautiful order by God, what do we seem to say more than Plato? When we teach a general conflagration, what do we teach more than the Stoics? When we assert departed souls to be in a state of sensibility, and the wicked to be in torments, but the good free from pain and in a blissful condition, we assert no more than your poets and philosophers. By opposing the worship of the works of men's hands, we concur with Menander the comedian, and such as affirm the workman to be greater than his work; and by declaring the Logos, the First-begotten of God, our Master Jesus Christ, to be born of a Virgin without any human mixture, and to be crucified and dead, and to have rose again and ascended into heaven, we say no more in this than what you say of those whom you style the sons of Jove.

XXIX. For you need not be told what a parcel of sons the writers most in vogue among you assign to Jove;¹ there is Mercury, Jove's interpreter, in imitation of the Logos, in worship among you, and your grand teacher; there is Æsculapius, the physician smitten by a bolt of thunder, and

¹ The kingdom of darkness had well-nigh overcast the whole world when the Sun of Righteousness rose upon it. The worship of false gods obtained everywhere but among the Jews, and this universal idolatry being one of the greatest obstructions to the light of the gospel, and the prevailing sin of these times, the reader must be content to find the first Christian apologists very large upon this head, in order to root out this pack of vanities, and to ridicule and argue them out of the world; and because the worship of a crucified man was that which they mostly stuck at, Justin makes a parallel, and shows that this Christ, the God of Christians, neither as the Son of God, nor of a Virgin, nor as a crucified man, could justly be objected against and denied divine worship by those who had so many sons and daughters of Jove, and such too as suffered death, in constant worship amongst themselves. But this kind of idolatry being now quite out of doors, I shall not trouble the reader with any notes upon the gods of the heathen, as thinking it altogether unedifying, and therefore, once for all, refer the more curious to the remarks of Dr. Grabe in his edition of this *Apology*.

(30) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

after that ascending into heaven ; there is Bacchus, torn to pieces ; and Hercules, burnt to get rid of his pains ; there are Pollux and Castor, the sons of Jove by Leda, and Perseus by Danæ, and the mortal Bellerophon, who fell from his Pegasus ; not to mention Ariadne, and others like her, translated into constellations, according to your writers. Moreover, I would fain know why you always deify the departed emperors, and have a fellow at hand to make affidavit that he saw Cæsar mount to heaven from the funeral pile? Nor can I think there is any need of repeating to such knowing persons the extravagances recorded of every son of Jove, only to put you in mind that they are recorded for the better corrupting and improving young students in the arts of debauchery ; for every one thinks it noble to equal the gods in wickedness. But far be it from men of sense to harbour such opinions of the gods, namely, that their Jove, the supreme and father of all the gods, should be a parricide, and the son of a parricide, and be captivated by the vilest lusts, and descended upon Ganimedè and a crew of notorious adulteresses, and beget children after his own likeness. But as I have said, these are the stratagems of wicked spirits ; whereas we teach that such only should be crowned with a blessed immortality who have imitated God in virtue ; and those who have lived wickedly, and not repented to the amendment of their lives, we believe shall be punished in fire everlasting.

XXX. As to the Son of God called Jesus, should we allow Him to be nothing more than man, yet the title of the Son of God is very justifiable upon the account of His wisdom ; for is not God styled by your own writers, Father of Gods and Men ? But now if we say that the Logos of God is properly the begotten of God, by a generation quite different from that of men, as I have already mentioned, yet even this I say is no more than what you might very well tolerate, considering you have your Mercury in worship under the title of the Word and

Messenger of God. As to the objection of our Jesus being crucified, I say that suffering was common to all the fore-mentioned sons of Jove, but only they suffered another kind of death ; so that Christ does not seem at all inferior to them upon the score of the difference of His suffering, but much superior even in this very respect of His passion, as I shall prove in the following discourse, or rather indeed have proved already ; for the excellency of every one is to be judged of by the nature and end of his actions. As to His being born of a Virgin, you have your Perseus to balance that ; as to His curing the lame and the paralytic, and such as were cripples from their birth, this is little more than what you say of your Æsculapius.

XXXI. But in order to make it more plain that whatever we have declared from Christ and His preceding prophets is true and older than any of your writers, and that we desire to be believed, not because we deliver many the same things with them, but because we deliver the truth, and nothing but the truth, and that Jesus alone is properly the Son of God, as being the Logos, and First-begotten, and Power of God, and by His counsel was made man, and taught these doctrines for the conversion and restoration of mankind, before Whose coming in our flesh these same evil spirits, by their instruments, the poets, dressed up fables to represent these things as already past and over, on purpose to defeat the good designs of His coming ; just such another pack of scandalous wicked lies they have at present invented to render Christians odious, for which they cannot produce one witness, nor anything like proof, as I shall presently make appear.

XXXII. But first, I cannot but take notice that though we hold some opinions like those of the Greeks, yet the name of Christ is the only thing we are hated for, and though never so innocent, yet we are dragged to execution like criminals ;

(32) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

while others in other places have the liberty of worshipping trees, and rivers, and mice, and cats, and crocodiles, and many other such like silly animals; nor do the same things neither pass universally for deities, but different countries have different gods; insomuch that they charge each other with irreligion for not worshipping the same deities; and yet, forsooth, the only thing you accuse us for is for not worshipping the same gods, for not offering libations, and the nidors of fat, and plaited garlands, and victims to departed spirits and you need not be told that the same deities obtain not everywhere, for what serves some for a god serves others for a sacrifice.

XXXIII. I must tell you in the next place that we Christians out of all parts of the world, who formerly were worshippers of the sons of Semele and Latona, Bacchus and Apollo, whose abominable amours and practices with men it is a shame to mention, and who adored Proserpina and Venus, a brace of goddesses whose mysteries you now celebrate, one stark, staring mad for Adonis, the other ravished by Aidoneus or Pluto; we who adored Æsculapius; or any of those who pass among you for gods, now through Jesus Christ have them all in the greatest contempt, though at the utmost peril of our lives; but dedicate ourselves to the service of the Unbegotten Impassible God, who never had, we are sure, any affair with Antiope and such like, nor anything to do with Ganimede, nor ever stood in need of the help of the hundred-handed giant which your Jove is said to have obtained at the suit of Thetis, nor ever solicitous to show his gratitude for his deliverance that her son Achilles should have ample satisfaction for being deprived of his harlot Briseis, and revenge the affront at the expense of many of the Grecians' lives. We heartily pity those who can believe such stuff about the gods they worship, but we know that the wicked spirits are at the bottom of all these impostures.

XXXIV. Thirdly, it is notorious that after Christ's ascension into heaven, these same accursed spirits furnished out a set of men who gave out themselves to be gods; and yet were you so far from punishing such villains that you did them the greatest honour. For there is Simon, a certain Samaritan of the village Gitthon, who in Claudius Cæsar's time, by his magic arts with the powers of darkness, did such wonderful feats in the imperial city of Rome, that he gained the reputation of a god, and accordingly is honoured by you, like your other gods, with a statue erected upon the Tiber between the two bridges, with this Latin inscription, "Simoni Deo Sancto," "To Simon the Holy God."¹ And the Samaritans, almost in

¹ John Daille, in his *Abuse of the Fathers* (for that ought to be the title of the book),—instead of recommending the authority of such men, who lived so near the apostles both in point of time and virtue, instead of insisting upon their general agreement in articles fundamental, and other truly admirable and edifying excellences in their writings,—this author, I say, chiefly pleases himself in picking holes, and exposing what he calls faults, in the best light for a malicious eye; like an ill-natured painter, who draws a shade over all the beauties of a face, and mainly employs his pencil to magnify scars and pockholes; and this passage, among others, he has pitched upon for the discredit of Justin Martyr. "The good Father," says he in his fleeing way, "was mistaken, and instead of Semoni read Simoni, and for Sanco, Sancto; whereas our learned critics now inform us it was only an inscription to one of the pagan demi-gods, 'Semoni Deo Sanco.'" The learned Dr. Grabe, who is just the reverse of John Daille, and employs his learning to keep us upon the ancient bottom, and justify the Fathers from the errors of transcribers, yet even he is of opinion that our Justin was imposed upon in this inscription; and Valesius himself concludes so likewise; and the main grounds they go upon is, that in the last age there was a statue dug up with this inscription, "Semoni Sango Deo Fidio Sacrum." If this should be a mistake of our Justin, it is no great matter; but it is a mistake wherein Irenæus, Tertullian, Eusebius, Augustin all concur. But when I consider that our Martyr himself was a Samaritan, and lived in the next age; that he was a person of great learning and gravity, of a genius wonderfully inquisitive about matters of this nature; that he was at this time at Rome, where every one, no doubt, could inform him (if he had not Latin enough for the inscription) what strange god this was the statue of, as easily as any one about London

(34) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

general, though very few of other nations, confess and worship him as the first and principal god; and a certain Helena who strolled about with him at that time, and had been a common prostitute in the stews, they entitle the next intelligence to him; and one Menander likewise, a Samaritan, of the village Capparetæa, and a disciple of Simon, set on work by the same demons, and residing at Antioch, imposed upon many by the same magic arts, as we very well know, and wrought up his followers into a persuasion that they should never die;¹ and there are some of his sect who are possessed with the same frenzy to this day.

could tell now whose the statue is at Charing Cross; that he presented this *Apology* to the Emperors and Senate of Rome, to whom he would be careful what he said, and not in two different places insist upon the same thing, and press for the demolishing of this statue, which, if not the statue of Simon Magus, must needs be resented as a bold and notorious fable, and have a very ill effect upon his *Apology* and the Christian cause; when I consider these things, I say, they weigh much more with me on the side of Justin, and the other Fathers, than a conjecture merely grounded upon the statue lately dug up does against them. Moreover, we learn from Baronius and Gruter that there were other statues to this Semoni Sango in several places of Italy, besides that in the Tiberine Island, and so the Fathers could not be easily mistaken about this pagan demi-god; and Lactantius and St. Augustin expressly mention this Sangus as the god of the Sabines; and the Christian writers do likewise affirm that the statue of Simon Magus was erected by public authority, whereas this to Sangus was of private donation by Sextus Pompeius; the statue of Sangus was of stone, that of Simon Magus of brass. So that here we have two statues of different materials, and with different inscriptions, and yet they must be one and the same, because the Fathers are to be discredited. Unless, therefore, Daille and le Clerk can prove that the Tiberine Island could not hold two statues, they prove nothing to the purpose; but some men never think they make a good figure but when they stand upon the ruins of Christian antiquity. See this matter fully cleared in a book called *Defensio S. Augustini adversus Joan. Pheresoni Animadversiones*, p. 176.

¹ A doctrine much perhaps of the same complexion with what Mr. A——ill broached lately, though not, I believe, with the same success of followers.

XXXV. There is one Marcion, also of Pontus, who at this time instructs his disciples in the doctrine of another god, greater than the Creator of the world, and who, by the assistance of the evil spirits, has spread this poison so effectually about every nation as to prevail upon many to subscribe to the blasphemy, and deny the Maker of the universe to be God, professing another greater deity, and a creator of greater worlds; and yet all this sort of men go by the name of Christians, as I have already said; just like the philosophers who, though they differ never so much in principles, yet all take upon them the common title of philosopher. But whether these heretics are really guilty of those cursed and scandalous actions, which are industriously spread abroad about Christians, such as putting out the candles, and promiscuous copulations, and the devouring of human flesh, I cannot say; but this I am sure of, that you do not harass and destroy them as you do us for these detestable doctrines.¹ But I have

¹ Because the reader will meet with this horrid charge against Christians in all these *Apologies*, of promiscuous mixtures, and devouring an infant at their meetings, I think it will not be impertinent in this place to acquaint him with the grounds of such false and malicious accusations. Origen fathers them upon the Jews, as if they had invented them on purpose to bring Christianity into disgrace; "and these lies," said he, "succeeded so well, that even some in his time would not hold the least conversation with a Christian; but though the Jews had malice enough to invent anything to the prejudice of Christians, yet I can hardly be persuaded that all this was pure lie and invention without any ground. We know that in the most early times of the gospel there were several sorts of heretics, such as Simon Magus, Menander, Marcion, Marcus, Basilides, etc., who all covered themselves over with the gilded name of Christians, and yet were all guilty of these horrid abominations charged upon Christians in general." Irenæus, *adv. Heres.* lib. i. c. i. p. 28, and c. ix. p. 70, reports that they debauched in private the woman which they had perverted and brought over to their sect (as many with shame and sorrow acknowledged upon their return to the Church); and not only so, but they openly married the women they had seduced from their husbands, and laughed at the chaste and orthodox Christians as a parcel of blockheads, styling themselves the pure, the perfect, and the seeds of election. Clemens Alex-

(36) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

composed a treatise of all these heresies, which I am ready to produce for your satisfaction, if you are ready to peruse it.

XXXVI. But we who are truly Christians are so far from maintaining any unjust or ungodly opinions, that exposing of infants, which is so much in practice among you, we teach to be a very wicked practice; first, because we see that such children, both girls and boys, are generally all trained up for the service of lust; for as the ancients bred up these foundlings to feed cows, or goats, or sheep, or grass-horses, so now-a-days such boys are brought up only to be abused against nature; and accordingly you have a herd of these women and effeminate men, standing prostitute for sale in every nation; and you traffic with such kind of cattle, and take toll and custom for

andrinus, likewise, *Strom.* lib. iii. p. 430, tells the same story of the Carpocratians that Minutius Felix does of the Christians, namely, that both men and women used to meet at supper in imitation of the love-feast, and after they had been well warmed with meat and drink, put out the candles and promiscuously mixed with one another. And Epiphanius tells us of the Gnostics, *Heret.* xxvi. p. 42, that they had their wives in common, and when a stranger of their own sect came to them, both men and women had a sign to know one another by; for by stretching out their hands by way of salutation, and by tickling each other in the ball of their hand, they knew the stranger to be of their party. Amongst their brethren, the Carpocratians, they were wont to mark their disciples and proselytes under the right ear with a slit or hole; and this agrees with the charge of the heathens, that they knew one another at first sight by privy marks and signs, which perhaps is referred to Minutius Felix. Besides, Epiphanius, *Heret.* xxvi. p. 43, tells us that the Gnostics at their meetings were wont to take an infant begotten in their promiscuous mixtures, and beating it in a mortar, to season it with honey and pepper, and some other spices and perfumes to make it palatable, and then like swine or dogs to devour it, and this they accounted their "perfect passover." Now this being the practice of these abominable heretics, who had the forehead to style themselves Christians, it is no wonder if both Jews and Gentiles, who were greedy of any occasion to blacken the Christians, should load them all in general with these detestable crimes, either not knowing them to be false, or else not willing to distinguish between Christians true or false.

their wickedness, when all such monstrous practices ought to be quite and clean rooted out of the world. And besides, whoever has to do with such wicked creatures, not only defiles himself with a mixture repugnant to all the laws of religion and temperance, but it is a great chance that the sinner does not pollute himself with some of his own children or nearest relations. Some there are who prostitute their own wives and children, and others are cut publicly for pathic obscenity, and their instruments made a sacrifice to the mother of the gods. And of all the established deities among you, a painted serpent is the greatest symbol and mystery. And such actions as you commit in the face of the sun, and are creditable vices among you, as if you had not one spark of divine light left, those you charge upon us; though this charge will do no harm to us, who are entire strangers to such sins, but to the doers of them only, and to such as falsely lay them to the charge of Christians. But the ringleader and prince of evil spirits is by us called the serpent, and Satan, and false accuser, as you may easily find from our Scriptures, who together with all his host of angels, and men like himself, shall be thrust into fire, there to be tormented, world without end, as our Christ has foretold; and the reason why God has not done this already is out of mercy to such of mankind as He foresees will repent and be saved; some of which are now in being, and others as yet unborn. And from the beginning He made mankind intelligent and free creatures, fit for the choice and practice of truth and goodness, so that every sinner should be without excuse before God; for we are endued with reason, and formed for contemplation. If any one, therefore, shall disbelieve the providence of God, or shall deny His existence, notwithstanding the evidence of His world, or assert Him to be a Being delighted with wickedness, or as unactive as a stone, and that vice and virtue are nothing in themselves, and depend only upon the opinions of men; this, I say, is a consummate piece of impiety and injustice. And another reason against ex-

(38) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

posing infants is, that we are afraid they should perish for want of being taken up, and so bring us under the guilt of murder.

XXXVII. Moreover, the end of Christians in marrying is the Christian education of their children, and such as refuse to marry contain themselves perpetually within the bounds of chastity. And to give you a very persuasive and sensible argument that promiscuous copulation is not one of the mysteries in practice amongst us, a Christian youth sent a petition to Felix, the President of Alexandria, to give a surgeon leave to cut him; for without leave from the president such kind of operations are interdicted; but when Felix would not sign the petition, the youth persisting in his resolution, at length satisfied his conscience and those about him who were of his mind, by performing the operation upon himself. I do not think it improper in this place to put you in mind of the late Antinous, whom all were prevailed upon by fear to worship as a god, notwithstanding they well knew what he was, and whence his original. But lest any one should object that we can show no reason why our Christ should not be looked upon as a mere man, and His miracles the effects only of magic, and therefore cried up for the Son of God, I shall enter upon the proof of His divinity, not so much trusting to the reports of men as the predictions of prophets, and necessitated to believe, because we see things with our own eyes already fulfilled according to these predictions, and a fulfilling on every day; and this, I believe, you yourselves will grant to be the strongest demonstration of the truth imaginable.

XXXVIII. There were of old, among the Jews, certain prophets of God, by whom the prophetic spirit made proclamation of things to come long before they were in being; these prophecies, just as they were delivered, were committed to writing by the prophets themselves in their own Hebrew

mother tongue, and the books put into the custody of the kings of Judea then in being. When Ptolemy, therefore, king of Egypt, was setting up his library, and very inquisitive about the most curious collection of all sorts of books, being informed of these prophetic writings, he despatched an ambassador to the Jewish high priest,¹ who was at that time invested with the regal power, to request of him a present of these prophecies, and accordingly the royal high priest sent them in their original language; but the contents of these books being not intelligible to the Egyptians in the Hebrew tongue, he sent a second embassy to desire him to send over men to translate them into Greek; and by these means these books are in being with Egyptians to this day, and this translation is in the hands almost of every Jew all the world over; which, though they read, they understand not, but blindly take Christians for their enemies, and whenever it is in their power treat us as cruelly as you do, which I doubt not but you will readily grant me. For in the last Jewish war, Barchochebas, the ringleader of the revolting Jews, ordered the Christians only to be dragged to the most grievous torments unless they would renounce and blaspheme Jesus Christ.

¹ Γῶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων τότε βασιλεύοντι Ἡρώδη. This is another passage which that "Orbillius Patrum," John Daille, has chosen to expose what he thinks to be the nakedness of this Father; for (says he) Justin Martyr, speaking of the translation of the seventy interpreters, affirms that Ptolemy, king of Egypt, sent his ambassadors to Herod, king of Judæa, whereas the truth of the story is, that he sent to Eleazar the high priest, two hundred forty and odd years before Herod came to be king of Judæa. Dr. Grabe, who makes it his business to do justice to the primitive Fathers, who deserve so well of the Christian world, well knew that his Justin was a person too well qualified to be guilty of so notorious an oversight in point of chronology, and in a matter so near his own time, has by a happy conjecture restored him to himself by substituting *ἱερεῖ* instead of Ἡρώδη, which, no doubt, was a blunder in the transcriber. *Vid.* notes upon this place.

(40) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

XXXIX. Now in these books of the prophets we find it foretold that there was One a-coming into the world Who, being born of a virgin, and grown up to man's estate, should cure every disease and malady in nature, and raise the dead, and be treated with spite and ignominy, and at length this Jesus our Christ should be fastened to a cross, and die, and rise again, and ascend up into heaven, and that He was truly the Son of God, and should be worshipped under that title, and that He should send out some to preach these tidings to every nation, and that the Gentiles should come over to the faith in greater numbers than the Jews; and these very prophecies went of Him before His coming, some five thousand, some three, some two, some one thousand, and some eight hundred years only;¹ for in these succeeding generations there was a succession of some prophets or other.

XL. And the great prince of prophets, Moses, thus expressly signified: "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto Him shall the gathering of the people be; binding His foal unto the vine, and washing His garments in the blood of grapes" (Gen. xlix. 10, 11). It is incumbent therefore upon you to make diligent inquiry how long the Jews had a prince or ruler properly their own, and you will find, until the appearance of Jesus Christ our Master, the great Expositor of these prophecies, little understood before; and you will see it exactly verified according to what the divine, holy, and prophetic Spirit foretold by Moses, "That a lawgiver should not depart from Judah, until Shiloh come;" for Judah was the father of the Jewish nation, and from whom they took the name of Jews. But after the coming of Shiloh, you yourselves reigned over the Jews, and reduced their whole kingdom

¹ "Some five thousand, some three," etc. The more curious will find the chronology of these several periods adjusted by Dr. Grabe in his notes upon this place.

into a Roman province ; that part of the prophecy which says “ that unto Him shall the gathering of the people be,” or “ that He shall be the expectation of the Gentiles,” denotes the general expectation of His second coming,—a truth your own eyes bear witness to, and the thing proves itself ; for you see all sorts of men big with the hopes of His second coming in glory, Who was crucified in Judæa, after which crucifixion you immediately became masters of their whole country.

XLI. Moreover, “ the binding His foal unto the vine, and washing His garments in the blood of grapes,” was a significative symbol of what Christ was to do and suffer ; for there stood the foal of an ass tied to a vine at the entrance of a certain village, which He ordered His disciples to go and bring Him, upon which He got and rode into Jerusalem, where the stately temple of the Jews then was, which you since have razed to the ground ; and to fulfil the sequel of the prophecy He was afterwards crucified. For “ washing His garments in the blood of grapes ” prefigured the passion He was to undergo, purifying by His blood such as should believe in Him ; for what, by the prophet, the Divine Spirit calls His garments are the faithful, in whom the Logos, the seed of God, dwells.¹ “ The blood of grapes ” typifies that He Who was to come should have blood, but not of human, but of divine generation ; and the first power next to God the Father, and Lord of all, is His Son the Logos ; but how this Logos was incarnated and made

¹ Τοῦ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ σπέρμα, ὁ λόγος. I take the liberty to dissent from Dr. Grabe in this place, who thinks that πνεῦμα ought to be restored in the room of σπέρμα, because of the word οἰκεῖ ; but Christ is said to dwell in the faithful as well as the Holy Spirit. Κατοικῆσαι τὸν Χριστὸν διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, “ that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith ” (Eph. iii. 17), and in many other places to the same purpose. But, moreover, the main design of Justin in this prophecy is to establish the divine generation of Christ, and therefore he emphatically calls Him τὸ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ σπέρμα, “ the seed of God,” in opposition to ἀνθρώπειον σπέρμα, “ the seed of man,” which immediately he twice repeats in expounding the blood of the grape.

(42) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

man shall be declared in order. But as man had no hand in making the blood of the grape, but God only, so this is an emblem that the blood of the Logos was of no human extraction, but descended from the power of the Most High, as I have already declared.

XLII. Isaiah, another prophet, foretells the same things, but in other words: "There shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Rod shall come forth out of the root of Jesse, and to it shall the Gentiles seek" (Isa. xi. 1, 10).¹ Now this shining Star out of Jacob, and this Rod out of the root of Jesse, is Christ; for He was conceived by the power of God, and born of a virgin of the seed of Jacob, the father of Judah, from whence arose the Jewish nation; and Jesse, according to his oracle, was reckoned among His ancestors, but He was the son of Jacob and Judah in a lineal succession.

XLIII. Again, concerning His being to be born of a virgin, hear the express words of the same prophet Isaiah, and they are these: "Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a Son, and shall call His name Immanuel," that is, "God with us" (Isa. vii. 14). For such things as were incredible and impossible to be, in the opinions of men, God by the prophetic Spirit foretold should be; that when they found such things in being, the very predictions should make it hardly possible to disbelieve them. But that such as understand not the prophecy before us, may not turn to the objections upon us which we charge upon the poets, and father this conception upon a lustful Jove, I shall endeavour to set the words in a clearer light. This expression, therefore, "Behold, a virgin shall conceive," manifestly declares that a virgin shall conceive without any carnal concurrence, for upon that she must cease to be a virgin; but the power of God coming down upon the virgin

¹ Ἀνατελεῖ ἄστρον ἐξ Ἰακώβ. See Dr. Grabe's conjecture upon this prophecy.

overshadowed her, and made her conceive in the pure state of virginity; and the angel of God which was sent to her, delivered his embassy in these words: "Behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb by the Holy Ghost, and bring forth a Son, and He shall be called the Son of the Highest, and thou shalt call His name Jesus, for He shall save His people from their sins" (Luke i. 31, 35; Matt. i. 21), as the evangelists have taught us, whom we believe, and the rather because the prophetic Spirit by the same Isaiah has foretold He should be born, just as we have now declared. By the "Spirit and power of God," we ought to understand the very Logos, who, according to the aforesaid prophet Isaiah, is the "first-begotten of God."¹ This Spirit coming down and overshadowing the virgin, did impregnate her, not in a carnal way, but by a power divine. Jesus is an Hebrew word, and in Greek σωτήρ, that is, Saviour, in allusion to which the angel delivered himself thus to the virgin, "And thou shalt call His name Jesus, for He shall save His people from their sins."

XLIV. That the prophets were inspired by nothing but the divine Wisdom or Logos, Who could foresee things at such a distance, is what I believe you yourselves will grant me; but where this Logos was to be born, hear what Micah, another prophet, says, and thus it stands: "And thou, Bethlehem, in the land of Judah, art not the least among the princes of Judah; for out of thee shall come a Governor That shall rule My people Israel."² Now this Bethlehem, where Christ Jesus was born, is a certain village in Judæa, about thirty-five furlongs from Jerusalem, as you may see in the censual tables of Cyrenius, the first Prefect of Judæa;³ and how Christ after

¹ See Dr. Grabe's conjecture about the corruption of this place.

² Mic. v. 2, as it is cited by St. Matt. ii. 6.

³ Ἐπιτρόπου. For the understanding of this word Dr. Grabe refers to Grotius in c. ii. *Luc.* And whoever desires to see more may consult Vales. upon Euseb. *Hist.* lib. i. c. v., and Montac. *Apparat.* iv. p. 156, etc.

(44) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

He was born lived in obscurity, and how this obscurity of life was foretold likewise, we have our prophets to show, for thus they speak ; —¹

XLV. “Unto us a Child is born, and a young Man given, and the government shall be upon His shoulders” (Isa. ix. 6). Now this was a prophetic description of the power of the Cross, to which He applied His shoulders at His crucifixion, as I shall manifest in the progress of this discourse. And again, the same Isaiah, as he was moved by the prophetic Spirit, says, “I have spread out My hands to a rebellious gain-saying people, which walketh in a way that is not good” (Isa. lxv. 2). “They ask of me the ordinance of justice ; they take delight in approaching to God” (Isa. lviii. 2). And by another prophet, in other words, He spake thus : “They pierced My hands and My feet, and upon My vesture did they cast lots” (Ps. xxii. 16, 18). But David, both a king and a prophet, who spake this, suffered nothing like it ; but the hands of Jesus Christ were pierced and extended upon a Cross, while the Jews reviled and denied Him to be the Christ. For, according to the prophet, they led Him to the judgment-seat, and flouted Him, saying : “Thy judgment be upon us.”² “They pierced His hands and feet” refers to the nails that fastened them to the cross ; and when they had crucified Him, the crucifiers “parted His garments, and upon His vesture did they cast lots ;” and for the truth of this you may satisfy yourselves from the acts of Pontius Pilate ; and how literally it was prophesied that He should make His entrance into Jerusalem upon the foal of an ass, I shall lay before you in the words of the prophet Zechariah :³ “Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion ; shout, O

¹ Here is a deficiency, and of what, consult Dr. Grabe.

² Matt. xxvii. Here you have not the very words, but the sense only, as Justin often does cite in this manner.

³ Τοῦ Σοφοῦ. Here is another terrible oversight charged upon our Martyr by John Daille, namely, that he quotes this prophecy out of

daughter of Jerusalem : behold, thy King cometh unto thee, meek, and sitting upon an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass.”¹

XLVI. But when you hear the prophets speaking, as it were, under the names of different persons, you must not look upon the men who speak so much as upon the divine Logos who inspires them ; for sometimes He personates a prophet, sometimes He speaks in the person of God, the Lord and Parent of the universe, sometimes in the person of Christ, sometimes under the representation of the people in conference with the Lord or His Father ; and there is nothing more familiar than this way of introducing several persons speaking, though the whole was composed by one, even among your own writers. Now the Jews, not animadverting to this manner of personating in the prophetic writings which they had in keeping, overlooked Christ, even before their eyes, and mortally hate us who affirm Him already come, and to have been crucified, and prove it demonstrably to have come to pass according to the prophets' predictions.

XLVII. A plain example of which, you have in the words of Isaiah the prophet just now mentioned, delivered in the person of God the Father : “ The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib : but Israel doth not know, My people doth not consider. Ah, sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evil-doers, wicked children, ye have forsaken the Lord ” (Isa. i. 3, 4). And again, elsewhere, the prophet speaks in the person of the Father : “ What is the house ye build unto Me ? saith the Lord ; the heaven is My throne, and the

Zephaniah, which is only to be found in the prophet Zechariah ; but had this censor been as good at mending as he is at making holes, he might have found this very prophecy cited by Justin from out of Zechariah ; for thus he speaks : *προφήτευθη δὲ ὑπὸ Ζαχαρίου ἐνὸς τῶν δώδεκα, — οὕτως — χαῖρε σφόδρα θύγατερ Ζιών, etc. Dial. cum Tryph. p. 273.*

¹ Zech. ix. 9, according as they are cited by Matt. xxi. 5.

(46) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

earth is My footstool" (Isa. lxvi. 1). And again, elsewhere : "Your new moons and Sabbaths My soul hateth ; your great day of fasting and resting I cannot away with ; when you come to appear before Me, I will not hear you ; your hands are full of blood, bring no more vain oblations ; incense is an abomination unto Me ; I am full of the fat of lambs, and the blood of goats ; who has required these at your hands?" (Isa. i. 11-15). "But loose the bands of wickedness, and undo the heavy burdens ; bring the poor that are cast out of thy house, and cover the naked, and deal thy bread to the hungry" (Isa. lviii. 6, 7). And what these commands of God by His prophets were you may understand by these examples.

XLVIII. When the prophetic Spirit speaks in the person of Christ, He speaks in this wise : "I have spread out My hands to an incredulous and gainsaying people, which walketh in a way that is not good" (Isa. lxx. 2). And again : "I gave My back to the smiters, and My cheeks to them that struck them ; I hid not My face from shame and spitting. For the Lord God will help Me, therefore shall I not be confounded ; therefore have I set My face like a flint, and I know that I shall not be ashamed. He is near that justifieth Me" (Isa. l. 6, 7, 8). And again : "They parted My garments among them, and cast lots upon My vesture ; they pierced My hands and My feet" (Ps. xxii. 16, 18). "I laid Me down and slept, and rose again, for the Lord raised Me" (Ps. iii. 5). And again : "They shoot out the lip, and shake the head, saying, Let the Lord deliver him" (Ps. xxii. 8, 9). All which you may plainly see was fulfilled in Christ by the Jews ; for while He was crucifying they distorted their lips, and wagging their heads, said, "He that raised the dead, let Him save Himself" (Matt. xxvii. 39).

XLIX. When the prophetic Spirit personates a prophet in foretelling things to come, He speaks thus : "Out of Sion shall go forth a law, and the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem,

and He shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people, and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more" (Isa. ii. 3, 4). And that this scripture was thus fulfilled you have good grounds to believe; for there went out of Jerusalem into the world men in number but twelve, and those, too, men of no learning and of as little eloquence; but they went forth in the power of God, and published to every nation that they were sent to instruct them in the word of God, and sent by Christ. And this has had so good an effect that we, who heretofore were continually devouring each other, will not now so much as lift up our hand against our enemies, nor tell an untruth to escape those that are hunting after our blood, but cheerfully confess Christ, and as cheerfully go to execution for so doing, though we might easily come off by the help of that mental reservation in your poet, "My tongue has sworn, but my mind has not."¹ But now if the soldiers you list, and who article with you to be true, can prefer their plighted troth before all the endearments of life, parents, country, and every relation,—if they can stake their all upon their allegiance to you, who can reward them with nothing incorruptible,—how ridiculous would it be in Christians, we whose souls are set upon nothing but the joys of immortality, not to charge through every affliction for the prize we so passionately desire, and which we are sure to be crowned with by Him who is able to give!

L. Hear also in what manner the prophetic Spirit delivers Himself, by the mouth of him who was both prophet and king, concerning the preachers of the gospel and the publishers of Christ's coming into the world: "Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge. There is no speech nor language where their voice is not

¹ *Eurip. Hip.*

(48) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

heard ; their sound is gone out through all the earth ; and their words to the end of the world. In them hath He set a tabernacle for the sun, which is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, and rejoiceth as a giant to run his course" (Ps. xix. 2-5).

LI. Should I add more of David's prophecies to these I have already produced, I am of opinion it might be both pertinent and useful ; for from hence you might take a survey of that kind of life which the prophetic Spirit exhorts men to, and you might see Herod the king of the Jews, and the Jews themselves, and Pilate your procurator of Judæa, and his soldiers, all conspiring against Christ ; and how it was foretold that, in spite of all this opposition, every nation should come at length to believe in Him. And here likewise you may see how God calls Him His Son, and promises to subdue all His enemies unto Him, and how the devils should labour with all their might to hide themselves from the power of God, the Parent and Lord of all things, and from the power of His Christ ; and lastly, how God should invite all men to repent before the coming of the day of judgment. The words of prophecy are these : "Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful. But his delight is in the law of the Lord ; and in His law doth He meditate day and night. And he shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth fruit in his season ; his leaf shall not wither ; and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper. The ungodly are not so : but are like the chaff which the wind driveth away. Therefore the ungodly shall not stand in the judgment, nor sinners in the congregation of the righteous. For the Lord knoweth the way of the righteous : but the way of the ungodly shall perish. Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing ? The kings of the earth stood up, and the rulers took counsel together, against the Lord, and against His Christ : Let us break their bonds

asunder, and cast away their cords from us. He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision. Then shall He speak unto them in His wrath, and vex them in His sore displeasure. Yet have I set my King upon my holy hill of Sion. I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten Thee. Ask of me, and I shall give Thee the heathen for Thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for Thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; Thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel. Be wise now therefore, O ye kings: be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Obey His doctrine, lest the Lord be angry, and ye perish from the right way, when His wrath shall be kindled on a sudden. Blessed are all they that put their trust in Him."¹

LII. And again, in another prophecy, which the prophetic Spirit delivered by the same David concerning Christ's kingdom, which was to commence just after His crucifixion, He speaks in this wise: "Sing unto the Lord all the whole earth, and be telling of His salvation from day to day. For the Lord is great, and cannot worthily be praised: He is more to be feared than all gods, for all the gods of the heathen are but the idols of devils; but it is the Lord that made the heavens. Glory and worship are before Him, power and honour are in His sanctuary. Ascribe unto the Lord, the Father everlasting, worship and power; bring presents, and come into His courts. Let the whole earth stand in awe of Him, and be made so fast in His worship that it cannot be moved. Let them rejoice among the nations, for the Lord reigneth from the tree"² (Ps. xcvi. 1-11).

¹ Ps. i. and ii.

² *Vid. Dial. cum Tryph.* p. 298. And in allusion to the Cross are those words in the Book of Wisdom, "Blessed is the Word whereby righteousness cometh" (Wisd. xiv. 7).

(50) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

LIII. But because the prophetic Spirit speaks of futurities and things past, and lest this should prove any offence in the reader's way, I shall clear it a little more particularly. I say, then, that what the Spirit knows must certainly come to pass He declares as already fulfilled; and that we are thus to understand His words will be very evident, if you reflect a little upon the passages I have quoted; for David, about 1100 years¹ before the crucifixion of Christ in our flesh, gave out the prophecies aforesaid, and not one, either of his predecessors or successors, were ever crucified, or brought such glad tidings to the Gentile world. But our Jesus Christ, after His crucifixion and death, rose again and ascended into heaven and entered upon His kingdom; and what He proclaimed to all nations by His apostles spreads a universal joy upon the hearts of such as are in expectation of that immortality which is brought to light by His gospel.

LIV. But lest any should collect from what has been said that we are assertors of fatal necessity, and conclude that prophecy must needs infer predestination,² we shall clear ourselves as to this point also. For we learn from these very prophets

¹ Δαβιδ ἔτισι χιλίοις καὶ πεντακοσίοις. Here again Dr. Grabe has wiped off a sad blemish, which the aforesaid John Daille would fix upon Justin in point of chronology, and has plainly proved it to be an error in the scribe. See the notes upon this passage.

² That the pagans were very much inclined to infer, with the Stoics, a fatal necessity from the prediction of things to come, is evident from what Origen replies to Celsus upon this subject. Orig. *contra Cels.* lib. ii. p. 72. I know that our Martyr is thought hardly of for magnifying the power of man's will, but this is notoriously evident to have been the current doctrine of the Fathers, through all the first ages till the rise of the Pelagian controversy, though they all acknowledged *χάριν ἐξαίρετον* a mighty assistance of divine grace to raise up the soul for divine and spiritual things. And Justin tells his adversary, that it is vain for man to think of rightly understanding the prophets unless he be assisted *μετὰ μεγάλης χάριτος τοῦ πατρὸς Θεοῦ*, "by a mighty grace derived from God." *Dial. cum Tryph.* p. 319.

that rewards and punishments are to be distributed in proportion to the merits of mankind, and it is a truth we ourselves profess. For if it be not so, but all things are determined by fate, then farewell freedom of will; and if this man is destined to be good, and that evil, then neither the one nor the other can be justly approved or condemned; so that unless we suppose that mankind has it in his power to choose the good and refuse the evil, no one can be accountable for any action whatever. But to prove that men are good or evil by choice, I argue in this manner. We see in the same person a transition to quite contrary actions; but, now, was he necessitated either to be good or bad he would not be capable of this contrariety, nor so often vary from one to the other; besides, there would not be this diversity of virtuous and vicious in the world; for either we must say with you that destiny is the cause of evil,—and then destiny would act contradictorily to herself in being the cause of good,—or else I must say, what I have said already, that you conclude virtue and vice to be in themselves nothing, but to receive their estimate of good or bad from the opinions of men only, which, according to right reason, is a consummate piece of impiety and injustice.

LV. But this, I will tell you, is destiny, inevitable destiny, that those who choose to walk in the paths of virtue shall meet with proportionate returns of honour, and those who prefer the contrary course shall be punished accordingly; for God has not made man like trees or beasts, without the power of election; for he that has no hand in making himself good or bad, but is born so ready made, is no proper subject for the distributions of justice; for neither the good nor the evil are such by themselves, but only as they are framed by the hand of destiny.

LVI. Moreover, the Holy prophetic Spirit has instructed us in the doctrine of free-will by Moses, who introduces God,

speaking to the new-made man in this manner: "Behold, good and evil is before you; choose the good."¹ And again, by another prophet, Isaiah, He speaks to the same effect in the person of God, the Father and Lord of the universe: "Wash ye, make you clean, put away the evil of your doings, learn to do well, judge the fatherless, and plead for the widow. Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord: Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool. If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land: But if ye refuse and rebel, the sword shall feed upon you: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it" (Isa. i. 16-20). And whereas it is said that the "sword shall feed upon you," and not that the disobedient shall be cut off by swords, I must tell you, by the by, that the "sword of God" is fire, which shall prey upon those who have made wickedness their choice, and therefore He says, "The sword shall feed upon you; the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." Whereas had He spoken of a common sword which cuts off, and despatches in a moment, He would not have used the word "feeding upon," which intimates a gradual destruction.

LVII. When Plato therefore said "that the blame lies at his door who wills the sin, but God wills no evil,"² he borrowed the saying from Moses; for Moses is older than any of your Greek writers;³ and as to all their notions about the immortality of the soul, and punishments after death, and their divine theories, and such-like doctrines, the philosophers and poets plainly took their hints from the prophets, which they consulted and built upon, and by this means the seeds of truth

¹ Deut. xxx. 15, 19. See Dr. Grabe's notes upon this.

² Plat. *de Repub.* lib. x. p. 617, edit. Henr. Stephani.

³ At the easiest computation, between Moses and Homer there are above 600 years; nay, Cadmus, the first inventor of letters among the Grecians, was some ages junior to Moses.

seem to be scattered about the world ; but it is evident they understood them not as they should do, from the manifold contradictions amongst them.

LVIII. By maintaining, therefore, that future events have been foretold by the prophets, we do not maintain that the things foretold came to pass by any fatal necessity, but from that divine prescience which foresees all the actions of men, without necessitating them to act. And since a just retribution of rewards and punishments is a current opinion in the world, God has been pleased to second this notion by the prophetic Spirit, the more to awaken mankind and to print a future judgment perpetually upon their minds, and withal to show that His providence is concerned about us, and observes all our actions.

LIX. But it was brought about by devil-craft to be made a capital crime to read the books of Hystaspes Sibylla,¹ and the

¹ The great objection against the Sibylline oracles, etc., is, that they so plainly and expressly foretell Christ to the heathen world ; as plainly, if not more than the prophets did to the Jews ; but was not Christ as manifestly foretold by Balaam, the Aramitic sorcerer, as by the prophet Isaiah ? Did not Job, who was not of Israel, speak of the great article of the resurrection ? (xix. 25). Did not Daniel in his captivity communicate his prophecies to the Gentiles as well as the Jews ? And was not a prophet sent to Jeroboam, an Israelite indeed by birth, but a pagan in religion ? All which plainly prove that God never delivered Himself more plainly by His prophets than when He transacted with Gentiles, and not with Jews. And this likewise proves what Clemens Alexandrinus tells us in *Stro. c. vi. p. 270*, that as God raised up prophets among the Jews to bring them to salvation, “ Sic et selectissimum quemque è Paganis servare voluisse, prophetas ipsis proprios, propriâ ipsorum dialecto excitando ; ” and to these Sibyls, Justin, Clemens, Origen, Eusebius, Lactantius, send the heathen for the truth of Christianity, and laid so great a stress upon them, that they were called Sibyllists. But now, had all these books of the Sibyls been Christian forgeries (not to mention the baseness of such pious frauds abominated by the first Christians), they would never have been so sillily impudent as to have appealed to them before the emperors, and to the

(54) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

prophets, upon a presumption that men would not venture upon such books for better information at the peril of their lives, but rather sit down contented slaves to the powers of darkness. But the devils missed their aim, for we are not only afraid to read these scriptures, but, as you see, frankly offer them to your perusal, presuming they may be well accepted by all; but if we gain a few only, we shall be great gainers, for God will look upon us as good husbandmen, who have done our best, and will reward us accordingly.

LX. But to return from this digression to the prophecies

whole world. And Origen would never have challenged Celsus, or any of the heathens, to give a considerable instance where these books were interpolated by Christians, which, no doubt, they would have triumphantly produced, had they any such interpolations to produce, *Orig. contr. Cels. lib. i.* Moreover, it is certain that in Cicero's time the Sibylline prophecies were interpreted by some in favour of Cæsar, as predicting a monarchy, *Cic. Div. l. ii.*, "Eum, quem revera regem," etc. "That if we would be safe, we should acknowledge him for a king who really was so." Which interpretation Cicero after Cæsar's death was so much offended with, that he quarrelled with the oracles and the interpreters, "Quamobrem Sibyllam quidem sepositam," etc. "Wherefore let us shut up the Sibyl, and keep her close; that according to the decree of our ancestors, her verses may not be read without the express command of the Senate." And then adds, "Cum Antistitibus," etc. "Let us also deal with the Quindecimviri and the interpreters of these Sibylline books, that they would rather produce anything out of them than a king." And that in the *Eclogue* of Virgil, "Ultima Cumæi venit," etc., written about the beginning of Herod the Great. and flatteringly applied to Pollio's son Saloninus, speaks of such a golden age and renovation of all things, as cannot be fulfilled in the reign of any earthly king, and in a strain prophetic. The same year that Pompey took Jerusalem, one of the Sibyl oracles made a mighty noise, viz., "That Nature was about to bring forth a king to the Romans." And Suetonius, in his *Life of Augustus*, says, "That this so terrified the Senate that they made a decree that none born that year should be educated, and that those whose wives were with child applied the prophecy to themselves." And Appian, Plutarch, Sallust, and Cicero all say that it was this prophecy of the Sibyls which stirred up Cornelius Léntulus at that time, he hoping that he was the man designed for this king of the Romans.

concerning Christ, it was prophesied, that after His resurrection God the Father of all things should take Him up into heaven, there to reign till He had put down His spiritual enemies, the whole host of darkness, under His feet, and till the number should be fulfilled which He foreknew would be men of piety and virtue, for whose sake He suspends the general conflagration. Hear the words of the prophet David to this purpose, "The Lord saith unto my Lord, Sit Thou at my right hand until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool. The Lord shall send the rod of Thy strength out of Sion : rule Thou in the midst of

The words of Suetonius in the *Life of Vespasian* are very remarkable, "Percrebuerat oriente toto vetus et constans opinio, esse in fatis, ut eo tempore Judæâ profecti rerum potirentur;" and to the same purpose are those of Tacitus (*Hist.* l. v.), "Pluribus persuasio inerat, antiquis Sacerdotum literis contineri, eo ipso tempore fore, ut valesceret oriens, profectique Judæâ rerum potirentur." Now that which I look upon as the most probable account of these express prophecies concerning Christ, I mean how they came to be so rife among the heathens, is this, that the Jews in their dispersion took all occasions to speak the most magnificent things of their expected Messiah; and that these prophecies, by the more than ordinary grace of God, shone brighter and clearer upon their minds during their captivity, as the great support to them under their exile; and that the Jewish oracles came to be admitted into the Sibylline books laid up in the Capitol, I believe, was upon this occasion. Now the books of Sibyls were of two kinds, those bought by Tarquin, and burnt with the Capitol in the time of Sylla; and these we find from Livy were full of nothing but idolatry and superstition. But after the rebuilding of the Capitol, there were others brought from Erythræa by the three ambassadors deputed for that purpose; and afterwards upon the same design were others sent by Augustus, as Tacitus tells us, *Annal.* lib. vi., "Quæsitis Samo, Ilio, Erythris, per Africam etiam et Siciliam et Italicas Colonias Carminibus Sibyllæ, datum Sacerdotibus negotium, quantum humanâ ope potuissent, vera discernere." And to the same purpose Suetonius, *Aug.* c. 31. Now who can doubt but in this search after the Sibylline oracles, many of the Jewish prophecies were picked up (especially those famous ones concerning the new king), and carried with the rest to Rome; for after the first were burnt with the Capitol, who could possibly distinguish the one from the other? And therefore Tacitus cautiously adds in the afore-cited passage, "quantum humanâ ope potuissent."

Thine enemies. Thy people shall be willing in the day of Thy power, in the beauties of holiness ; from the womb have I begotten Thee before the morning star" (Ps. cx. 1-3). Now these words, "The Lord shall send the rod of Thy strength out of Jerusalem," are predictive of that most powerful doctrine, which the apostles after their departure from Jerusalem proclaimed to the whole world ; which very doctrine we embrace and teach everywhere, though we know it is death by your law to teach it, or so much as profess the name of Christ. But if the Christian profession must still meet with such bitter treatment, remember what I told you before, that the farthest you can go is to take away our lives ; but the loss of this life will certainly be no ill bargain to us. You, indeed, and all such wicked enemies, without repentance, shall one day dearly pay for this persecution in fire everlasting.

LXI. But lest men of perverse minds for the staggering of Christian converts should object, that we ourselves allow Christ not to have been born above an hundred and fifty years, in the time of Cyrenius, and that He broached His doctrine under Pontius Pilate ; and from hence cry out that all mankind before the birth of Christ must consequently have been innocent, I shall by way of prevention solve this doubt. One article of our faith then is, that Christ is the First-begotten of God, and we have already proved Him to be the very Logos, or universal Reason, of Which mankind are all partakers ; and therefore those who live by reason are in some sort Christians,¹

¹ For the better understanding of this passage, which is so severely excepted against by Daille, Casaubon, and others, you are to observe in what sense our Justin uses the word *λόγος* ; and his notion is plainly this, that Christ was the Eternal *λόγος* or Wisdom of His Father, the *λόγος ἐνδιάθετος καὶ οὐσιώδης*, the inward substantial Word of His Father, the Fountain of Reason, as the sun is the fountain of light, and that from Him there was a *λόγος* or Reason naturally derived into every man, as a beam and emanation of light from that sun ; to which purpose Origen, who is exactly of the same opinion, expounds that of St. John, "In the beginning

notwithstanding they may pass with you for atheists. Such among the Greeks were Socrates and Heraclitus, and the like ; and such among the barbarians were Abraham, and Ananias, and Azarias, and Misael, and Elias, and many others, whose actions, nay, whose very names, I know, would be tedious to relate, and therefore shall pass them over ; so, on the other side, those who have lived in defiance of reason, were unchristian, and enemies to the Logos, and such as lived according to Him ; but they who make reason the rule of their actions are Christians, men of undaunted courage and untroubled consciences, for whose sake the Logos, by the will of God, the Father and Lord of all, was by the very power of Himself made man in the womb of a virgin,¹ and was named

was the Logos, and the Logos was with God, and the Logos was God. That was the true Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world," Orig. *Com. in Joan.* p. 25, *vide etiam*, p. 40. Upon this same occasion Justin, in his *Second Apology*, p. 46, calls Christ the *τοῦ παντός λόγον*, "the universal Word or Reason." And Heraclitus, and those who lived according to reason in part, are here said to live *κατὰ σπέρματι τοῦ λόγου μέρος*, according to the seminal word sown in their nature. Now, inasmuch as by this "Logos all things were created, that are in heaven and that are in the earth" (Col. i. 16), the effect must in some measure partake of the efficient. The case then, in short, is no more than this, every man is naturally endued with reason, as a light kindled from Him who is the Logos or Wisdom of His Father, and may be so far said to partake of Christ, the original Wisdom ; and so far as they live "after the image of Him that created them," may be said *κατὰ λόγον βιοῦν*, and in this sense be called Christians. But Justin nowhere affirms that the Gentiles might be saved without the entertainment of Christianity ; for in many places in this *Apology* you find him denouncing eternal fire against such as refuse to embrace the faith ; but only so far as those who never heard of the gospel lived up to reason, so far were they akin to the original Logos, and in some sort Christians. And that whatever was rightly taught by Socrates among the Greeks, or by others among the barbarians, was in effect done by the Logos Himself, "the Word made flesh."

¹ *Λιὰ δυνάμει τοῦ λόγου.* Section 43, "The Spirit and Power of God" which overshadowed the virgin, our Justin interprets to be the Spirit and Power of the very Logos. And here again he says, the Logos

(58) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

Jesus, and was crucified, and died, and rose again from the dead, and went again into heaven ; all which I have proved at large, and is very intelligible to any person of honest understanding. And because enough has been said upon this head, I shall proceed to others, which at present seem more necessary.

begot Himself ; and that of St. Luke i. 35, πνεῦμα ἅγιον and δύναμιν ὑψίστου, “the Holy Spirit and the Power of the Most High.” Tertullian likewise expounds of the very Logos, *adv. Prax.* c. 26. This, I confess, seemed to me at first sight a very harsh interpretation, but finding, upon second thoughts, that it related not to His eternal generation, but only to that in time and in the womb of a virgin, I concluded that these Fathers could mean no more than what the Scriptures plainly say, viz. that He took upon Himself our flesh, and made Himself man in the womb of a virgin. But then this interpretation manifestly overthrows what the author of the *Reasonableness of Christianity* would insinuate, pp. 199, 200, 201, and elsewhere, that Christ was only the Son of God, because He was conceived in the womb of a virgin by the immediate power of God : “Adam,” says he, “is called the son of God (Luke iii. 38), and had this part of his Father’s image, viz. that he was immortal ; but Adám transgressing, forfeited his immortality, and begot children after his own image, mortal like their father ; but God willing to bestow eternal life on mortal men, sends Jesus Christ into the world, who being conceived in the womb of a virgin by the immediate power of God, was properly the Son of God, according to what the angel declared to His mother (Luke i. 30-35). And being the Son of God, and not having forfeited that Sonship by any transgression, He was the Heir of Eternal Life, as Adam should have been, had he continued in his filial duty.” But now, not to ask how Christ can be said to be the only, and the only begotten Son of God upon the account aforesaid, when Adam was the first man, and without either father or mother, immediately formed by God Himself, and therefore called expressly the son of God (Luke iii. 38) ; not to ask this, I say, our Martyr, who most certainly was fully acquainted with this grand article of the Christian faith, has put it beyond dispute, that Christ was not properly the Son, the only begotten Son of God, because conceived by the power of the Most High ; for He interprets this “Most High” of the very Logos Himself, and more than once. And if Christ is God, as Justin in this *Apology* expressly calls Him, and above twenty times in his other writings, then His human generation may very justly be ascribed to Himself as God.

LXII. Because then it was foretold by the prophetic Spirit that the land of the Jews should be laid desolate, hear the words of the prophecy, which personate a people in a maze at what had befallen them: "Zion is a wilderness, Jerusalem a desolation, our holy and our beautiful house, where our fathers praised Thee, is burnt up with fire, and all our pleasant things are laid waste. And Thou refrainest Thyself for these things, and dost hold Thy peace, and afflict us very sore" (Isa. lxiv. 10, 11, 12). And what a desolation Jerusalem has been, according to this prediction, you yourselves know with a witness. It was, moreover, prophesied concerning this desolation, that not a Jew should be tolerated to live there; for thus Isaiah has it, "Your country is desolate, strangers devour it in your presence, and there is none to inhabit" (Isa. i. 7). And what care you have taken of fulfilling this prophecy, you need not be told, for you have made it capital in a Jew to set a foot in his own country.¹

LXIII. And how it was foretold that our Christ should cure all diseases and raise the dead, you may learn from hence: "At His coming the lame shall leap like a stag, and the tongue of the dumb shall be eloquent, the lepers shall be cleansed, and the dead shall rise and walk about" (Isa. xxxv. 6). And how He performed these miracles, you may easily be satisfied from the acts of Pontius Pilate, and how the prophetic Spirit declared beforehand that both He and those who trusted in Him should lose their lives, I refer you to this passage in Isaiah: "Behold, how the righteous perisheth, and no man layeth it to heart; and merciful men are taken away, none considering that the righteous is taken away from the evil to come; he shall go in peace, he is taken from among us" (Isa. lvii. 1, 2). Again, you may see how it was published by

¹ Concerning this interdict against the Jews entering into the Holy Land under pain of death, see Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* lib. iv. c. 4, and Tertull. *Apol.* c. 21.

(60) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

the same Isaiah, that the Gentiles who expected Him not, should worship Him; but the Jews, who were always in expectation of Him, should not know Him, even when He was come unto them. The words are delivered in the person of Christ, and run thus: "I am sought of them that asked not for me: I am found of them that sought me not: I said, Behold me, behold me, unto a nation that was not called by my name. I have spread out my hands unto a rebellious people, which walketh in no good way, but after their own thoughts; a people that provoketh me to anger continually to my face" (Isa. lxx. 1-3). For the Jews, who had these oracles in keeping, and were always up in expectation of the Messiah, saw Him not when before their eyes; and not only overlooked Him, but abused Him to the last degree of ignominy. But the Gentiles, who sat in darkness and had heard nothing of Christ till after His apostles went from Jerusalem, and expounded the things concerning Him, and published the prophecies,—these people, I say, were filled with joy and faith at the glad tidings, and both renounced their idols, and also consecrated themselves to the Unbegotten God through Christ.¹ And that the infamous stories spread about against the professors of Christ, and the miseries that should befall the spreaders of them, and such as value themselves so mightily for adhering to the customs of their forefathers, that all these things were foreknown, you may easily perceive from this short passage in Isaiah, "Woe be to them who call bitter sweet, and sweet bitter" (Isa. v. 20).

LXIV. Moreover, that He was to be made man for the sake of mankind, and that He should be contented to suffer, and to be treated in the most dishonourable manner, and at length come again in glory, I shall propose to your observation the

¹ That this was the ancient form of words proclaimed by the deacon, upon the dismissal of such catechumens from the Church as were shortly to be baptized; see Dr. Grabe's notes upon the place.

prophecies upon this head. "Because He hath poured out His soul unto death, and was numbered with the transgressors, and bare the sin of many, and made atonement for the transgressors" (Isa. liii. 12). "Behold, my Servant shall deal prudently, He shall be exalted and extolled, and be very high. As many were astonished at Thee; His visage was so much marred, more than any man, and His form more than the sons of men: so shall many nations admire, and the kings shall shut their mouths at Him: for that which had not been told them shall they see, and that which they had not heard shall they understand" (Isa. lii. 13-15). "Lord, who hath believed our report? and to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed? For He shall grow up before Him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground: He hath no form or comeliness; and when we shall see Him, there is no beauty that we should desire Him. He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief: and we hid as it were our faces from Him; He was despised, and we esteemed Him not. Surely He hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem Him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But He was wounded for our transgressions, He was wounded for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon Him; and with His stripes are we healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all. He was oppressed, and He was afflicted, yet He opened not His mouth: He is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so He opened not His mouth. He was taken away by distress and judgment" (Isa. liii. 1-8). Accordingly, upon His crucifixion His disciples all deserted and denied Him, but upon the sight of their Master just risen from the dead, and when He had let their understandings into the prophecies where this whole scene of suffering and triumph was described, and had made His ascension into heaven before their eyes, and thus fully con-

(62) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

vinced them, and showered down upon them the powers of the Spirit, they went out in the strength thereof into every nation, preaching these things, and from their mission were called apostles.

LXV. And to acquaint us that the sufferer of all this was of a generation inexplicable, and that He should rule over His enemies, the prophetic Spirit speaks thus: "Who shall declare His generation? for He was cut off out of the land of the living, for the transgression of My people was He stricken; and He made His grave with the wicked, and the rich in His death, because He had done no violence, neither was any deceit in His mouth. Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise Him; He hath put Him to grief. When Thou shalt make His soul an offering for sin, He shall see His seed, He shall prolong His days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in His hand. He shall see of the travail of His soul, and shall be satisfied. By His knowledge shall My righteous Servant justify many, for He shall bear their iniquities. Therefore will I divide Him a portion with the great, and He shall divide the spoil with the strong, because He has poured out His soul unto death, and He was numbered with the transgressors, and made intercession for many" (Isa. liii. 8-12). Hear another prophecy concerning His ascension: "Lift up the gates of heaven, and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors, that the King of glory may enter in. Who is the King of glory? The Lord strong, the Lord mighty in battle" (Ps. xxiv. 7, 8). And that you may see how He is to come again from heaven in glory, I will give you the prophecy of Daniel: "Behold, the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and His angels with Him" (Dan. vii. 13).

LXVI. Since therefore we thus demonstrably prove that the things now come to pass were proclaimed by the prophets long before the events, how can we withhold from believing

that the prophecies as yet unfulfilled will as verily be accomplished in their season as those we now see verified with our own eyes? For as these were once foretold and disbelieved, and yet came to pass, so the remainder will be brought to as certain an issue, in spite of ignorance and infidelity; for the very same prophets have foretold a twofold Advent of Christ, one wherein He was to come in the guise of an inglorious suffering mortal, and this is over; the other, wherein He shall come in His own form, encircled with celestial glory, and His host of angels, when He shall raise from the dead all the men that ever had a being,¹ and shall invest the righteous with bodies incorruptible, and make the ungodly, together with these wicked spirits, feel His vengeance in fire everlasting.

LXVII. And the prophetic predictions concerning this second Advent you have thus delivered by Ezekiel: "The bones came together, bone to his bone, and the flesh came upon them" (Ezek. xxxvii. 7, 8). "And every knee shall bow to the Lord, and every tongue shall confess Him" (Isa. xlv. 23). And for the pains and torments the wicked shall undergo hereafter, pray consider these words: "Their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched" (Isa. lxvi. 24). And then shall they repent, when repentance shall be too late. And what the unbelieving Jews will say and do in that day, when they shall see Him coming in His glory, the prophet Zechariah describes in this manner: "Ho, ho, come forth, and flee from the land of the north, for I have spread you abroad as the four winds of the heavens" (Zech. ii. 6). "And then will I make Jerusalem a cup of trembling, not of trembling

¹ Here again you see Justin Martyr, as clear and express as words can make him, for a general resurrection to eternal happiness or misery, "a resurrection of all the men that ever had a being," against Mr. Dodwell, in his *Epistolary Discourse* above cited. *Vide* Sozom. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. i. c. iii. *versus finem.*

with the countenance only, but in their heart, and shall rend not their garments, but their minds. And tribe shall mourn to tribe. And they shall look upon Him whom they pierced." (Zech. xii. 2, 10, 12¹), and shall say: "O Lord, why hast Thou made us to err from Thy ways? The glory which our forefathers were blessed with is turned to our reproach" (Isa. lxiii. 17, lxiv. 11).

LXVIII. I have a great many other prophecies in store, but I forbear, concluding what has been produced to be enough in reason for the conviction of such as have ears that will admit them to a fair hearing, and understandings prepared for truth. I can hardly persuade myself that you can take us for such romancers as those who dress up stories about the fictitious progeny of Jove, mighty talkers, but able to prove nothing. For what motive could ever possibly have persuaded us to believe a crucified man to be the First-begotten of the Unbegotten God, and that He should come to be the judge of all the world, had we not met with those prophetic testimonies of Him proclaimed so long before His incarnation? Were we not eye-witnesses to the fulfilling of them? Did we not see the desolation of Judæa, and men out of all nations proselyted to the faith by His apostles, and renouncing the ancient errors they were brought up in? Did we not find the prophecies made good in ourselves, and see Christians in greater number and in greater sincerity from among the Gentiles than from the Jews and Samaritans? For all sorts of people are by the prophetic Spirit styled Gentiles; but the Jews and Samaritans stand distinguished by the name of the house of Israel and Jacob.

LXIX. And how this also was foretold that there should

¹ These are various passages out of the prophet Zechariah, as they occurred to the memory of Justin, and the sense, and not the express words set down by him.

be more believers from the Gentiles than from the Jews and Samaritans, I propose this prophecy to your consideration : “ Sing, O barren, thou that didst not bear ; break forth into singing, and cry aloud, thou that didst not travail with child : for more are the children of the desolate than the children of the married wife ” (Isa. liv. 1). The Gentiles were the desolate, a people not cultivated by the true God, but bewildered in the worship of the works of their own hands ; but the Jews and Samaritans had the Word of God delivered to them by the prophets, and were always in expectation of the Christ ; and yet, when present, they had eyes and saw Him not, except a small remnant, whom the prophetic Spirit foretold should be saved. He speaks thus in the person of the people : “ Except the Lord of hosts had left unto us a very small remnant, we should have been as Sodom, and we should have been like unto Gomorrah ” (Isa. i. 9). Now Sodom and Gomorrah are related by Moses to be cities whose inhabitants were abominably wicked people, and which God destroyed with fire and brimstone, and saved not one alive, except a Chaldean foreigner called Lot and his daughters ; and that all this country is a desert, and burnt up, and barren to this day, they who will give themselves the trouble may see the truth of it with their own eyes. And how the Gentiles should become the truest and most faithful converts, the prophet Jeremiah thus intimates : “ All the house of Israel are uncircumcised in the heart, but the Gentiles in the foreskin ” (Jer. ix. 26).

LXX. So many, therefore, and such mighty proofs as your own eyes are witnesses to cannot fail, methinks, of generating a firm and rational faith in the minds of those who are lovers of truth, and not carried away with opiniatrey and passion ; but the instructors of your youth, who read them lectures out of the fables of the poets, never let them into the ground of these fictions. And that they are the work of devilcraft only, the better to delude mankind and hold them in darkness, I

shall now prove.¹ For these devilish spirits no sooner understood by the prophets that Christ was to come, and the ungodly to be punished with fire, but they trumped up that crew of Jove's sons abovesaid, imagining by this forgery to debauch the world into an opinion, that these prophecies concerning Christ were just such another pack of lies as the fables of the poets; and these stories they divulged among the Greeks and all the Gentiles, when they learned from the prophets that these were the people that should mostly come over to the Christian faith; but not diving far enough into the sense of the prophets, they attempted to copy after them, and, like men in the dark, blundered in their imitation, as I shall now show you.

LXXI. The prophet Moses, then, as I have said, was the

¹ The Son of God no sooner enters upon His prophetic office but the devil attacks Him in person and from Scripture; for as far as he was able to form any conjecture from Scripture concerning the state of the new King and Kingdom, so far he endeavoured to impose upon the Word, by rivalling it in his kingdom of darkness. He had his Perseus, the son of Jove by a virgin, he had his priests and sacrifices, his baptisms and mock communions, etc. He had reigned a long time as the god of this world, and taken possession everywhere but in Judæa, and was in the most flourishing condition when Christ came down to destroy his kingdom; and though these evil spirits did confess and tremble, and flee before Him, yet did their power continue for some ages after, and seems to be permitted by Providence so to do, on purpose as one great argument to proselytise the world by; for to their power over evil spirits do the first Christians constantly appeal upon all occasions. Now, after so much evidence from Scripture and antiquity, to say, as some have done, that possessions were nothing but diseases; and oracles and the like were all pure priestcraft, which the Fathers by the true name call devilcraft, is in short to say anything to render the name of priest in general odious. But if the Christians of the first ages did cast out devils so frequently, as they say they did, and which you will find in the *Apologies* they insist upon oftener than in any one thing in their writings, then I leave it to any considering person, what deference is due to the judgments of those who were gifted with such a miraculous power for the propagation of the Christian doctrine.

ancientest of writers, and he delivered this prophecy, which I have already quoted: "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto Him shall the gathering of the people be; binding His foal unto the vine, and washing His garments in the blood of the grape" (Gen. xlix. 10, 11). Upon hearing these prophetic words, the devils set up Bacchus for the son of Jove, and make him the inventor of the vine, and introduce an ass into his mysteries, and give out that after he was torn in pieces he ascended into heaven.¹ And because it is not expressly determined in this prophecy of Moses, whether He Who was to come was the Son of God, and whether He who should ride upon the foal was to continue upon earth, or to ascend into heaven; and the word foal denoting either the foal of an ass or a mare, not knowing, I say, which of the two was to be a symbol of His Advent, or whether He should be the Son of God or man, they proclaimed Bellerophon, a mere man of man, to have ascended up to heaven upon his horse Pegasus. Moreover, finding by another prophet, Isaiah, that He was to be born of a virgin, and ascend to heaven by Himself, they forged a Perseus to mimic Him in this also. And when they saw Him described by the prophecies, "Rejoicing as a giant to run his course," they preached up the giant Hercules running over the whole earth. And again, perceiving by the prophets that He was to cure all sorts of diseases, and to raise the dead, they palmed their Æsculapius upon the world to ape Him in this also.

LXXII. But here the devils were out in their politics not to have one of Jove's sons crucified in imitation of Christ.

¹ These several instances of diabolical imitation you may find more particularly illustrated by our Justin in his excellent *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*; and to the less knowing I would recommend that done into English by no ill hand. I have consulted Dr. Grabe's *Spicilegium* for changing *οἶνον* into *ὄνον*, and think his reasons conclusive.

(68) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

But this, as I have showed you, being symbolically represented, they could not spell out the meaning of the symbol; though the cross, according to the prophet, was the greater characteristic of His power and government, and is visible almost in everything you see. For cast your eyes upon the world, and tell me whether anything is transacted, any commerce maintained, without the resemblance of a cross? Without this trophy of ours you cannot go to sea, for navigation depends upon sails, and they are made in fashion of a cross;¹ there is neither ploughing nor digging, nor any handicraft work performed without instruments of this figure; nay, a man is distinguished from a beast by the uprightness of his body and the extension of his arms, and the prominency of the nose he breathes through, which are all representations of the cross, in allusion to which the prophet thus speaks: "The breath of our nostrils Christ the Lord."² Moreover, your banners declare the power of this figure, and the trophies you

¹ Concerning the sign of the cross, you will find among all the earliest writers of the Church that they constantly made use of it, not only in the Sacrament of Baptism, but in all the common actions of life; for Tertullian, *de Cor. Mil.* c. iii. p. 102, tells us "that upon every motion, at their going out and coming in, at their going to the bath, or to bed, or to meals, or whatever their employment or occasions called them to, they were wont, 'frontem signaculo terere,' to make the sign of the cross upon their forehead; and this they did," he moreover adds, "not that it was imposed by any law of Christ, but introduced by a pious custom as a sensible means to revive their faith, and remind them of their Lord, and to let the heathen world see that they gloried in their crucified Master, who was foolishness to the Gentile and a stumbling-block to the Jew upon this very account." But how far they were from adoring a cross, as was objected against them, you will see sufficiently answered and ridiculed in the following *Apology*.

² These words are literally understood of King Josiah or Zedekiah, but mystically applied by the Fathers in general to our Saviour Christ, and this occasioned by the version of the Septuagint, which has not *χριστός κυρίου*, "the anointed of the Lord," as Josiah was, but *χριστός κύριος*, "Christ the Lord," which can hardly be understood of any but our Saviour Christ. See Dr. Grabe's notes upon this place.

use everywhere in your public processions¹ are symbols of power and dominion, although in your practice you have no respect to the reason of the figure; and the images of your departed emperors you consecrate upon cross-like engines, and inscribe them gods. Since, therefore, we invite you by reason and the ceremony of the cross, so much in vogue among you, we know we shall be blameless for the future, whether you embrace the faith or not, for we have done our best to make you Christians.²

LXXIII. But these restless demons, not contented to foist upon the Gentile world the fictitious sons of Jove before the coming of Christ, but even after His appearance and public converse with men, when they found by the prophets that all nations should come to fix their faith and expectation on Him, they raised up another set of impostors, namely, Simon and Menander, both Samaritans, who by their magic arts have imposed upon many, and do as yet hold them in the same delusion; for in the reign of Claudius Cæsar, in your imperial city of Rome, there was one Simon, as I told you, who bewitched the sacred Senate and the Roman people into that astonishment of his person as to conceit him a god, and to honour him with a statue like the other gods. Wherefore our petition is, that you would communicate this *Apology*, both to the sacred Senate and to the people of Rome, that if any of them should chance to be hampered in his doctrines, they might, upon this information, disengage themselves from the

¹ Here is a desideratum, which I have filled up and connected as well as I can.

² I desire the reader once again to take notice of this expression, ὅση δύναμις, which cannot possibly, I think, signify in this place anything else than what I have translated it, viz. "We have done our best;" because this expression has been urged against set forms of prayer, with how little reason I shall show anon, when I come to the passage from whence they urge it.

(70) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

error; and we likewise pray that you would be pleased to pull down his statue.

LXXIV. These seducing spirits likewise do all they can to smother the notion of hell-fire, but to as little purpose as they attempted to stifle the coming of Christ from the knowledge of the world; for all they can do is only to prevail with unreasonable people, such as have been slaves to their lusts, and blindly take up with the opinions in fashion; these, I say, are the only people they work upon to hunt us out of our lives; and yet to these mortal enemies are we so far from returning hatred for hatred, that from our hearts we pity them, and desire nothing more than to bring them over to a better mind. For we are under no concern for death, being very sensible that all must die, and that there is nothing new under the sun, but what has been is. And if nothing here below will satisfy the owners thereof, no, not the year about, so as to secure their minds from wants and passions, the only way left is to apply to our religion for that satisfaction which is nowhere else to be found. But if they believe nothing after death, and are positive that the dead depart into a state of insensibility, they do indeed befriend us in effect by discharging us from the present sufferings and hardships of this life; but then they show themselves wicked, spiteful, and positive to the last degree in this their opinion; for though they do free us from all evil by destroying us, yet they do it not with this intent, but to deprive us only of life, and all the pleasures that belong to it.

LXXV. Another prime agent for the kingdom of darkness, whom these spirits of wickedness brought upon this stage, was one Marcion of Pontus, whom I have already mentioned. This fellow now teaches his followers to deny God, the Maker of heaven and earth, and His Son Christ proclaimed by the prophets, and preaches up another god besides the Creator,

and another son besides His Christ, upon whom abundance of people pin their faith as the only teacher of the truth, and make a mock at us, without so much as offering us a proof of their own assertions ; but are blindly carried off like lambs by a wolf, and made a prey to his wicked doctrines, and to the devils, the contrivers of them. For the only prize these same spirits contend for is to seduce mankind from God the Creator, and from the First-begotten Christ. And such grovelling minds as cannot lift themselves from earth, they did and do fasten to earthen gods, gods made with hands, and fitted to the minds of the worshippers ; but upon men of a more exalted genius, and enured to divine contemplations, they practise more slyly ; and if they are not persons of sound judgment, and pious lives, and disengaged from passion, they throw them down from their speculations into very gross impieties.

LXXVI. But to let you see that not only your poets, but Plato himself, borrowed from our Master (I mean from the Logos Who spake by the prophets), I must tell you that what he teaches concerning God's creating the world out of a chaos of rude matter is none of his own ; for, hear the express words of Moses aforesaid, the greatest of prophets, and older than any of the Grecian writers, by whom the prophetic Spirit, showing how, and out of what sort of matter God made the world in the beginning, thus speaks : " In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form, and void ; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. And God said, Let there be light : and there was light." And that this chaos, first mentioned by Moses, was the subject-matter out of which the Logos of God made the world, both Plato and his followers and we are agreed ; and you yourselves may soon be satisfied as to this point. And what your poets call Erebus, or hell, is spoken of by Moses also. (Deut. xxxii. 22.)

LXXVII. And whereas Plato, in his *Timæus*, philosophising about the Son of God, says, "He expressed Him upon the universe in the figure of the letter X;"¹ he evidently took the hint from Moses; for in the Mosaic writings it is related that after the Israelites went out of Egypt, and were in the desert, they were set upon and destroyed by venomous beasts, vipers, asps, and all sorts of serpents, and that Moses thereupon, by particular inspiration from God, took brass and made the sign of the cross, and placed it by the holy tabernacle, and declared that "if people would look upon that cross, and believe, they should be saved;"² upon which he writes that the serpents died, and by this means the people were saved. Plato upon reading this passage, and not knowing it to be a type of the cross, and having only the idea of the letter X in his mind, said, that the next power to the Supreme God was decussated or figured in the shape of a cross upon the universe; and finding by Moses "that the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters," he likewise mentions a third, for he gives the second place to the Logos of God decussated upon the world; and the third place he assigns to the Spirit, which is said to "move upon the face of the waters," thus expressing himself, "The third about the third."³ And how the prophetic Spirit has foretold the general conflagration by the mouth of Moses, you may perceive from these words: "An everlasting fire shall descend and burn unto the lowest hell" (Deut. xxxii. 22).

LXXVIII.⁴ It is not therefore we who take our opinions

¹ See Sylburg upon this place at the end of Dr. Grabe's edition.

² Ἐάν προσβλέπητε. These words of Moses are not extant in Holy Scripture, though the sense is, Num. xxi. 9; nor are those of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (xii. 21); and so perhaps both quoted out of the same Apocryphal Book of Moses which might be then extant.

³ See Dr. Grabe's notes upon this passage of Plato.

⁴ This section alone I think sufficient to vindicate our Justin from the aspersions of Daniel Zuicker and others, who charge him with Platonizing

from others, but others take theirs from us ; for you may hear and learn these things from such among us as are not able to distinguish a letter : rude indeed, and barbarous in speech, but in mind wise and faithful, and some of them lame and blind ; and from hence you might plainly see that Christianity is not owing to human wisdom, but to the power of God.

LXXIX. I shall now lay before you the manner of dedicating ourselves to God through Christ upon our conversion ; for should I omit this, I might seem not to deal sincerely in this account of the Christian religion. As many therefore as are persuaded and believe¹ that the things taught and said by

in the great doctrine of the Trinity ; they well knew the authority of this martyr in the Christian Church, and how frequently and expressly he asserts the divinity of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost ; and therefore resolved to invalidate his testimony by charging him with introducing the Trinity from Plato's school. But hear the martyr in this place obviating this calumny, as if he prophetically foresaw what would be charged upon him. He had a little before said "that Plato had learned that the world was made by the Logos, and that the Third Person in the Godhead, viz. the Spirit, was not unknown to him ;" and then adds, "that we take not our opinion from others, but others from us." This is express, that neither Justin nor any of the Christians derived the doctrine of the Logos's creating the world from the Platonic writings, but they from the writings of the prophets. Moreover, he declares before the Emperor and Senate, that this was no singular opinion of his own, but the doctrine of the Catholic Church ; and that this tremendous mystery was so commonly known to every Christian, that the most illiterate amongst them, such as could not read their alphabet, could discourse more clearly about it than even Plato himself. And from hence he justly concludes that the Christians learned this doctrine of the ever-blessed Trinity, *οὐ σοφία ἀνθρώπινα*, "not from the Platonists," etc., but *δυνάμει Θεοῦ*, "from the divinely-inspired writings," and what was taught everywhere in the churches.

¹ The Church, being founded by Christ as a society and corporation distinct from that of the Commonwealth, is by the nature of its constitution (had it no express warrant from Scripture) invested with an inherent power of its own, independent of the civil magistrate, of admitting, censuring, or excluding her members, and of doing whatever else is necessary for the peace and order of the Christian community.

us are true, and moreover take upon them to live accordingly, are taught to pray and ask of God with fasting for forgiveness of their former sins, we praying together, and fasting for and with them, and then, *and not till then*, they are brought to a place of water,¹ and there regenerated after the same manner with ourselves; for they are washed in the name of God the Father and Lord of all, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ; for Christ has said, "Unless you are born again, you cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven" (John iii. 3, 5).

Accordingly, faith and repentance are here required as necessary qualifications in persons adult before they can be admitted to church membership by baptism; and then, says Justin, they are brought to a place of water. Not presently (for you are not to look upon this as an exact account of all the particular circumstances either in baptism or the Eucharist), for the candidates for baptism were catechised all the forty days of Lent (which is the fasting, I believe, Justin refers to in this place), and then, upon approbation, baptized at Easter or Whitsuntide. These were the two stated times of baptism; not Easterday or Whitsunday precisely, but the whole intermediate space of the fifty days between them were in a manner accounted festival, and baptism administered the whole time; not but in a case of necessity, of sickness, and danger of death, they might be baptized at any time. But the persons so baptized were called clinics, because *ἐν τῇ κλίνῃ βαπτιζόμενοι*, "baptized in bed;" and this kind of baptism looked upon as less solemn and perfect, because it was done not by immersion but sprinkling, and because the persons were supposed at such a time to desire it out of a fear of death; for which reason, if they recovered, they were ordinarily made incapable by the Neocæsarian Council of being admitted to the degree of presbyters in the Church. *Can. 12.*

¹ "They were brought to a place of water." It is evident from this place of Justin, and that of Tertullian, *de Cor. Mil.* c. 3, that ponds and rivers were the only baptisteries or fonts the Church had for the first two hundred years. After the second century, baptisteries were erected at a little distance from churches, especially cathedrals, called therefore baptismal churches. The catechumen, or rather the competent, being brought to the baptistery, was placed with his face toward the west, the symbolical representation of the prince of darkness, and then commanded to spit at and renounce the service of his old master the devil, and was thus interrogated, "Dost thou renounce the devil and all his works?" etc.; to which the party answered, "I do renounce them." "Dost thou

But you all know it is impossible to enter a second time into our mother's womb. And in allusion to this, the prophet Isaiah, in the words below cited, speaks, when he prescribes the method by which repenting sinners may avoid the consequence of their sins: "Wash ye, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings; learn to do well; judge the fatherless, and plead for the widow. Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord: though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as

renounce the world and all its pomps and vanities?" Answer, "I do renounce them." *Ambr. de Sacram.* l. i. c. 2, tom. 4, p. 429; *Hier. in Amos* vi. Agreeable to this is that in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, lib. vii. Ἀποταύσμαι τῷ Σατανᾷ καὶ τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ, etc. Next he made an open confession of the faith, the bishop asking, "Dost thou believe in God?" etc.; to which the person answered, "I do believe." And this form of interrogation is the apostle thought to refer to when he styles baptism "The answer of a good conscience towards God." And our own Office of Baptism does exactly agree in this with the primitive practice. Then was he stripped of his garments, intimating thereby "the putting off the old man," and thrice plunged under water at the naming of the Three Persons in the blessed Trinity. The ancients carefully observed this trine immersion, as being so expressive a ceremony of the Three Persons in the Godhead; insomuch that by the Canons Apostolical, either bishop or presbyter who baptized without it was deposed from the ministry. *Can.* 50. Though this trine immersion, not being of absolute necessity, was laid aside in Spain by the Church, that they might not seem to gratify the Arians, who made use of it to denote the Persons in the Trinity to be three distinct substances, and gloried that the Catholics used it to denote the same. The person baptized, being come out of the water, was clothed with a white garment, hence that expression of putting on Christ; and from these white garments our Whitsunday. The putting on this white vesture, the exorcism, and the unction, are all in the Liturgy of Edward the Sixth, according to the custom of the ancients. Though we find none of these, nor many other things mentioned here by Justin, no not the cross in baptism, which we are sure was a constant ceremony; for Tertullian says that the devil signed his soldiers in the forehead, in imitation of the Christians, "Mithra signat illic in frontibus milites suos," *Ter. de Præscrip.* c. 40. And St. Augustin says that the cross and baptism were never parted, "Semper enim cruci baptismus jungitur," *Aug. Temp. Ser.* 101.

(76) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

wool. But if you refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword : for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it" (Isa. i. 16-20).

LXXX. The reason of this we have from the apostles ; for having nothing to do in our first birth, but being begotten by necessity, or without our own consent, and trained up also in vicious customs and company, to the end therefore we might continue no longer the children of necessity and ignorance, but of freedom and knowledge, and obtain remission of our past sins by virtue of this water, the penitent, who now makes his second birth an act of his own choice, has called over him the name of God the Father and Lord of all things ; (when we conduct the person to be baptized to the place of baptism we call God by no other name, because we have not any appellation for the ineffable majesty of God that can explain His nature ; and if any man pretends to that, we think him mad in the highest degree. This baptism is called illumination,¹ because the minds of the catechumens who are thus washed are illuminated ;) and moreover the person baptized and illuminated is baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, Who was

¹ "Illumination." Baptism was called by many names, as *χάρισμα*, *βάπτισμα*, *Ἀφθαρσίας ἔνδυμα*, *Λουτρὸν παλιγγεννησίας*, *Σφραγιδα*, *Φωτισμὸν*, etc. Grace, baptism, the vestment of incorruption, the laver of regeneration, the seal, illumination, etc., Nazian. *de Baptis.* ; the great variety of these denominations flowing from the several benefits occurring thereby. The most noble of these is what Justin calls here *Φωτισμὸν*, or Illumination, to which the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (vi. 4) is thought to refer in the word "enlightened." It is styled illumination, first, as Justin says, because the understandings of those who are catechised antecedent to it are enlightened. Secondly, Because it is our first entrance into Christianity, and Christ is *τὸ φῶς*, that supereminent Light "which lighteth every man that cometh into the world," those especially who are born again by baptism ; He being, as Nazianzen calls Him, "the same to the intellect as the sun to the sense." And, thirdly, because the prince of darkness was usually driven out by exorcism to make way for Christ, "the true Light."

crucified under Pontius Pilate,¹ and in the name of the Holy Ghost, Who spake by the prophets, and foretold everything concerning Christ.

LXXXI. The devils no sooner heard of this baptism spoken

¹ Ἐπονομάζεται ὄνομα, just before the parenthesis, and ἐπ' ὀνόματος λούεται, just after, are expressions which import the same. Now that which I remark from this passage of Justin Martyr is, that the very form of baptism instituted by our Lord Himself is here enlarged, for thus it runs—ἐπ' ὀνόματος τοῦ Πατρὸς ὄλον καὶ δεσπότην θεοῦ, καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ σταυροθέντος ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πίλατου καὶ πνεύματος Ἁγίου ὃ διὰ Προφητῶν προεκήρυξε τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν πάντα : “In the name of the Father of all things, the Lord God, and of Jesus Christ, Who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and of the Holy Ghost, Who foretold by the prophets all things concerning Christ.” In the Clementine Constitutions the form of baptism stands thus, ἐπ' ὀνόματος τοῦ ἀποστείλαντος Πατρὸς, τοῦ ἐλθόντος Χριστοῦ, τοῦ μαρτυρησέντος Παρακλήτου, Clem. *Constit.* lib. vii., “In the name of the Father, Who sent ; of Christ, Who came ; and of the Comforter, Who bore witness.” Now as different heresies arose, so they gave occasion for different paraphrases and enlargements, both in the form of baptism and the Creed. And this is the true reason why the Apostles' Creed is the simplest and shortest of any ; for it is evident that the Simonians, Cerinthians, Ebionites, etc., scattered their heresies not at Rome, but in the East, and mostly in Asia. And accordingly Ignatius, in his epistles to the Asiatic Churches, does everywhere almost inveigh against the heretics, but commends the Romans for the purity of their faith. And Tertullian, in his *Præscription*, c. 36, calls the Roman Church “*Statu fælicem Ecclesiam.*” From thence I cannot but take notice of the reasons of some great men against the antiquity of that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed. They say, “That none of the first writers agree in delivering their faith in a certain form of words, and that therefore from thence it is clear that there was no common form delivered to all the Churches ; and if there had been any tradition after the times of the Council of Nice, of such a Creed composed by the apostles, the Arians had certainly put the chief strength of their cause on this, that they adhered to the Apostles' Creed in opposition to the innovations of the Nicene Fathers. And that there is no reason therefore to believe that this Creed was prepared by the apostles, or that it was of any great antiquity.” The same sort of reasoning has Vossius made use of, *de tryb. Symbol.* But now it is confessed on all sides that in St. Paul's time there was a settled form in most Churches, which he calls

(78) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

of by the prophet,¹ but they too set up their baptisms, and made such as go to their temples, and officiate in their libations and meat-offerings, first sprinkle themselves with water by way of lustration ;² and they have now brought it to such a pass that the worshippers are washed from head to foot before they approach the sacred place where their images are kept. And whereas their adorers are commanded by priests to put off their shoes before they presume to enter the temples

“ the form of doctrine that was delivered ” (Rom. vi. 17), and in another place, “ the form of sound words ” (2 Tim. i. 13). It is certain also, that the Primitive Church, not far distant from the apostolic age, had a Creed resembling this, which passes for the Apostles’, as to most particulars, and the substance of the articles, though with some variation, as is evident from Tertullian’s *Regula Fidei*. Vide Tertul. *de vel. virg. et Cypr.* Epist. 7 and Epist. 70. And if we consider the manner of the Fathers, and Justin in particular, in citing even canonical Scripture, which was not always to consult the originals, but often to deliver it in such words as their memory suggested, provided they preserved the sense entire, we may conclude that from the same liberty in citing the Confession of Faith arose the diversity in creeds. And with all submission, I think that the men who argue against the antiquity of the Apostles’ Creed from the variations among the Fathers, may as well argue against a set form in baptism from this variation in Justin Martyr. As heresies grew, so did the Creed, and the Fathers may with as good reason be presumed to enlarge the Apostles’ Creed with explanatory additions only, as here we find the form of baptism, fixed by Christ Himself, enlarged in the time of this martyr ; but the form is the same in substance or essentials ; and the great Creed is called the Nicene, though many things were added to it by the Council of Constantinople, and some things since.

¹ Ezek. xxxvi. 25.

² That such mock-baptisms were set up by the contrivance of the devil in the Gentile world, we find not only asserted by Justin, but all the primitive writers, and particularly by Tertullian, *de Baptismo*, c. 5, “ Certe ludis Apollinaribus et Eleusiniis tinguntur, idque se in regenerationem et impunitatem perjuratorum suorum agere præsumunt.” Thus were men initiated into the mysteries of Eleusis, and he who initiated them was called ῥδρανός, the waterer ; ῥδρανός ὁ ἀγνιστής τῶν Ἐλευσινίων, Hesych. Thus again we learn from Tertullian that they initiated men into the rites of Isis and Mithra, “ Nam et sacris quibusdam per lavacrum initiantur Isidis

to worship these demons,¹ this is evidently done to mimic what they found commanded the prophet Moses ; for while Moses was feeding the sheep of his father-in-law in Arabia, he was commanded to go down into Egypt, and to bring out the people of Israel ; and our Christ talked with him out of the bush in the appearance of fire, and said, " Put off thy shoes, and come and hear " (Ex. iii. 5). And accordingly he put off his shoes, and went and heard that he was to go down into Egypt, and conduct the Israelites from thence ; and being appointed with prodigious power by that Christ Who conversed with him out of the bush of fire, he went and brought the people out, doing great and astonishing actions ; the particulars of which, if you have a mind to it, you may exactly see in his own writings.

LXXXII. But all the modern Jews teach that it was the unnameable God who thus conversed with Moses, upon which account the prophetic Spirit, by the mouth of the prophet Isaiah, reprehends them in these words already quoted, " The ox knoweth the owner, and the ass his master's crib ; but Israel doth not know me, My people hath not understood me " (Isa. i. 3). And because the Jews were ignorant what the Father and the Son were, Jesus Christ Himself thus corrects them, " No man knoweth the Father but the Son, nor the Son, but them to whom the Son will reveal Him " (Matt. xi. 27). But as I have said, the Logos of God is His Son, and is also called Angel and Apostle ; for He Himself did deliver, *alicujus et Mithræ,*" *de Bapt.* c. 5 ; the chief priest of that goddess (as Apuleius describes his own initiation), *Milesi.* II. *citat. a Seldeno de success. ad leg. Hæbr.* c. 26, leading the party to be initiated to the next bath, where having first delivered him to the usual washing, and asked pardon of the goddess, he sprinkled him all about, and bringing him back to the temple, after two parts of the day were spent, placed him before the feet of the goddess. See more on this subject in Grotius upon Matt. xxviii. 19.

¹ *Vid. Tertul. Apol.* c. 40.

(80) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

as an angel or messenger,¹ what the world was to know, and acted as an apostle, as one sent to interpret the divine will, as our Lord Himself has testified, "He that heareth me, heareth Him that sent me" (Matt. x. 40). The same is also evident from the Mosaic writings, where we have these words, "And the angel of God spake unto Moses in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush, and said, I Am that I Am, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, the God of your fathers; go down into Egypt, and bring up My people from thence" (Ex. iii. 2, 14, 15). If you are desirous of knowing what follows, I must refer you to the Scriptures themselves, for it is not possible to transcribe all into a discourse of this nature.

LXXXIII. But these words were spoken to demonstrate the Son of God and Apostle to be our Jesus Christ, who is the pre-existing Logos; Who appeared sometimes in the form of fire, sometimes in the likeness of angels, and in these last days was made man by the will of God for the salvation of mankind, and was contented to suffer what the devils could inflict upon Him by the infatuated Jews; who, notwithstanding they have these express words in the writings of Moses, "And the angel of the Lord spake with Moses in a flame of fire out of the bush, and said, I Am that I Am, the Self-existent, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob;" notwithstanding this, I say, they affirm these words to be spoken by God the Father and Maker of all things. For which oversight the prophetic Spirit thus charges them, "Israel hath not known me, My people have not understood me;" and as I have said, Jesus taxed them again for the same thing while He was amongst them, "No man hath known the

¹ Christ is called the Angel (Exod. iii. 2), but nowhere the Apostle (as Dr. Grabe observes), but in the Epistle to the Hebrews, iii. 1, from whence he justly concludes that this Epistle was known to, and approved by, Justin Martyr.

Father but the Son, nor the Son, but them to Whom the Son will reveal Him." The Jews therefore, for maintaining that it was the Father of the universe Who had the conference with Moses, when it was the very Son of God Who had it, and Who is styled both Angel and Apostle, are justly accused by the prophetic Spirit, and Christ Himself, for knowing neither the Father nor the Son ; for they who affirm the Son to be the Father are guilty of not knowing the Father, and likewise of being ignorant that the Father of the universe has a Son, Who being the Logos and First-begotten of God is God.¹ And He it is Who heretofore appeared to Moses and the rest of the prophets, sometimes in fire and sometimes in the form of angels ; but now, under your empire, as I mentioned, was born of a virgin, according to the will of His Father, to such as should believe in Him, and was content to be made of no reputation, and to suffer, that by His death and resurrection He might conquer death. And whereas it was said to Moses out of the bush, "I Am that I Am, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob, and the God of your fathers ;" the design of these words is to prove that, notwithstanding these men were dead, yet were they in a state of happiness ; and that Christ is the God of these men, and their mighty deliverer ; for these men of old sequestered themselves from the world to seek after God ; and as Moses relates, Abraham was the father of Isaac, and Isaac the father of Jacob.

LXXXIV. Moreover, that it was a contrivance of the devils to erect the image of Kóre upon fountains of water, whom they reported to be Jove's daughter, to ape Moses, you may easily collect from what I have quoted before : "In the beginning

¹ "Who being the Logos, and First-begotten of God, καὶ θεὸς ὑπάρχει, is God." I desire to know what the worst of Justin's adversaries can say to this ; whether words can be more express for the divinity of the Son than καὶ θεὸς ὑπάρχει, "He is the very God."

(82) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

God created the heaven and the earth, and the earth was without form, and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." In imitation of this Spirit moving upon the waters, they set up the idol Kóre or Proserpina upon the waters, and gave her out to be the daughter of Jove. Just such another forgery was the setting up Minerva for Jove's daughter, not by any carnal mixture, but because they found that God, reflecting upon Himself, made the world by His Logos or Wisdom, they framed this Minerva to be the issue of Jove's brain, or his first-begotten notion. Though I cannot but think it extremely ridiculous to represent the notion of a mind by the form of a woman. In like manner, the actions which are attributed to the sons of Jove evidently proves the sons to be of the same stamp with the daughters.

LXXXV. After the believer is baptized, and so incorporated or made one with us, we lead him to the congregation of the brethren, as we call them, and then with great fervency pour out our souls in common prayers¹ both for ourselves, for the

¹ Κοινὰς εὐχὰς ποιησάμενοι—πανταχοῦ πάντων ἐυτόνας. They are called common prayers, because the whole congregation did join with the bishop in them. This therefore must be a set form of prayer, or else they could not join in it; and therefore St. Cyprian, speaking of the Lord's Prayer, which was that form which the whole congregation repeated together, says, "Publica est nobis et communis oratio: a public and common prayer is in use among us." *Cypr. de Orat. Domin.* What this form of prayer was, Justin does not tell us, but he tells us in general, "that they prayed for themselves, for the person baptized, and for all others all the world over," etc. More particulars of this Liturgy you may see quoted out of the Apostolic Constitutions by Dr. Grabe in his notes upon this place. But I observe that Irenæus is as shy as Justin of publishing the forms in any of the Christian Offices, though he speaks both of baptism and of the Eucharist, and of the prayers and praises there in general. Only when some heretics had drawn false conclusions from the Doxology to support their own opinions he is forced to say, Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ τὰς εὐχαριστίας λέγοντας, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, "They allege that we in our thanksgivings do say, world without end." *Iren. ad adv. Her.* l. 1, c. i. p. 16.

person baptized, and for all others all the world over; that having embraced the truth, our conversation might be as becometh the Gospel, and that we may be found doers of the world, and so at length be saved with an everlasting salvation. Prayers being over, we salute each other with a kiss.¹ After

From hence we may conclude that in Irenæus's time, A.D. 179, the Christians praised God in public by this very form which we now use, "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost: as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen." And Tertullian, in his *Apology*, frequently says, "We pray for the emperors and their ministers, for secular potentates," etc. And Clement says, "Let the deacon pray for the universal Church, the whole world, for the priests and governors, for the chief priests and kings, and the general peace," *Constit.* l. 2, c. 51. And to mention but one more; Cyril, declaring the practice of his time at the celebration of the Eucharist, says thus, ἐπὶ τῆς εὐσίας ἐκείνης τοῦ ἰλασμοῦ, etc. "Over this propitiatory sacrifice we call upon God for the general peace of all Churches, for the tranquillity of the world, for emperors, their armies, and all that fight for them," *Catech.* 10. Now that which I would infer from these quotations is this, that the primitive Fathers could not have insisted upon these particulars, as a proof of the Christian loyalty, and universal charity, if they had not constantly made these things the subjects of their prayers; and if they had used no stated forms, extempore prayer had been too various and uncertain to have been a proof in this or any other case.

¹ The ἀγάπαι or love-feasts, which at first were always joined with the Eucharist, degenerating into abuse and scandal (which were the spots perhaps St. Jude alludes to), were soon laid aside in the Greek Church, and probably in the time of Justin, because he says nothing of them; and the Lord's Supper was celebrated in the morning fasting. Though it is certain these feasts continued in the African Church till Tertullian's time, as you will find in his *Apology*, c. 39. However, that the blessed communion might still lay claim to the title of a love-feast, it was attended with ceremonies of the like import; whence upon the entrance into this holy mystery the deacon was appointed to cry aloud, μή τις κατὰ τίνος, "Let no man be at strife one with another." And this proclamation once past, the holy kiss and embraces immediately followed, ἀλλήλους φιλήματι ἀσπαζόμεθα παυσάμενοι τῶν εὐχῶν, that is, "Prayers ended, we salute one another with an holy kiss;" but ἀλλήλους οἱ ἄνδρες, καὶ ἀλλήλας αἱ γυναῖκες, "Men salute men, and women women, and the clergy the bishop," as the Constitutions have it, l. ii. c. 57. And it could not

(84) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

this, bread and a cup of wine and water are brought to the president or bishop,¹ which he takes, and offers up praise and

indeed be well otherwise, considering the different apartments in the church for each sex. *Const. Apost.* l. ii. c. 57.

¹ Ἐπειτα προσφέρεται τῷ προστάτῳ τῶν ἀδελφῶν. The *προστώτης*, and the *Probati Seniores* in Tertullian, *Apol.* c. 39, and the *Majores Natu* in St. Cyprian, *Epist.* 75, were undoubtedly bishops, and so the *οἱ προστώταις πρεσβύτεροι* in St. Paul, *1 Tim.* v. 17, which we translate, though I think not well, “ruling elders,” were the same with *προστώτης* in Justin; such elders as had the power “Baptizandi et manuum imponendi et ordinandi: of baptizing, confirming, and ordaining,” as Cyprian assures us, privileges never pretended to at that time by lay elders. Nor were they presbyters as distinct from bishops, but bishops in chief, and presbyters in a fraternal consociation: for thus the same Father, *Epist.* 6, “à primordio Episcopatus mei statui nihil sine consilio vestro privatâ sententiâ gerere; from the beginning of my episcopate I resolved to do nothing of my own head without your advice;” which shows that the presbyters were admitted as joint-commissioners, but did nothing without leave from the bishop; for without his leave neither Presbyters nor deacons were permitted to baptize, except in cases of necessity, as not only Ignatius but Tertullian expressly tells us, *Epist. ad Smyrneos*, p. 6; *Tert. de Bapt.* c. 17, p. 230. And we find in Tertullian that they never received the sacrament but from the hand of the president, *de Cor. Mil.* c. 3, p. 102, which must either be understood of the particular custom of the African Church, or of consecration only. For here in Justin Martyr we find that when the bishop or president had consecrated the sacramental elements by solemn prayers and blessings, the custom was for the deacon to distribute them to the people, both to the absent as well as present. See more of the word *προστώτης* in that excellent treatise of Dean Hicke concerning “The Dignity of the Episcopal Order,” p. 182. *ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κρέματος*, etc. That wine mixed with water was constantly made use of by the primitive Christians is beyond dispute from this passage, and likewise from Dr. Grabe’s notes upon Irenæus, l. v. c. 2. The reason of this mixture was partly in imitation of our Saviour’s act in the first institution of the Eucharist, agreeable to the custom of that warm climate, which used to temper the heat of the wine with water; and partly because that when our Saviour’s side was pierced with a lance, there issued out both water and blood (*John xix.* 34). And agreeable to this primitive practice, “a little pure and clear water” was put into the chalice of wine at the Reformation, as you may see in the Rubric of the Communion Office of the first Common Prayer-Book of Edward VI. The bread and the wine and water, *προσφέρεται*

glory to the Father of all things, through the name of His Son and the Holy Spirit ; and this thanksgiving¹ to God for

τῷ προστάτῳ, “are brought to the bishop.” These words seem to me to make for that practice which Dr. Hickee, with such incomparable zeal and learning, argues for in his preface against “the Rights ;” for he tells us, “that in the alterations made in the Office for administering the Lord’s Supper, in King Edward VI.’s Service-Book, the Rubric was left out, which commanded the minister ‘to set the bread and wine upon the altar,’ as an offering ; but this Rubric was restored in the Office for the Church of Scotland; and likewise in the Office of Holy Communion of our present Liturgy, established by the Act of Uniformity after the Restoration.” And having justly censured the general neglect of this act, and the great indecency of having the bread and wine placed upon our Lord’s table by the clerk, sexton, or perhaps some unfitter person, he adds, “that this practice of the officiating priests setting the bread and wine in the sight of the people, with reverence upon the holy table, was so inviolably observed in ancient times, that they had in their churches a buffet or sideboard on the right or left hand of the altar, upon which a priest or deacon set the bread and wine, from whence they were carried by the deacon or priest, when there were two, to the officiating priest, who reverently placed them as an offering on the Lord’s table.” This sideboard for the elements and holy vessels was called in the Greek Church *πρόβεισις*, in the Latin Church *Paratorium*, and in Italy *Credenza*, in France *Credence*. And this ancient *Credenza* or side-table was made one article against Archbishop Laud, to prove that he endeavoured “to subvert God’s true religion by law established in this realm, and instead thereof to set up popish superstition and idolatry.” But I refer you to the excellent preface aforesaid, pp. 52, 53, etc., where you will find this at large, with many other discoveries truly valuable.

¹ Our blessed Saviour at the institution of the Sacrament is said to have taken bread and wine and blessed them, *εὐλογήσας, καὶ εὐχαριστήσας* (Matt. xxvi. 26, 27 ; Mark xiv. 22, 23), but the form of blessing is not recorded by the evangelists, nor any of the apostles. However, the primitive Fathers concluded that Christ did as the Jews were wont to do ; the Passover was a sacrifice, and therefore the viands here, as in all other feasts, were first offered to God. Now the bread and wine which our Saviour took, when He blessed and gave thanks, was the *Mincha*, or meat-offering of the Passover. If, then, Christ did as the Jews used to do, He agnized His Father, and blessed Him, by oblation of these His creatures unto Him ; using the like or the same form of words, “Blessed be Thou, O Lord our God, the King of the world, Which bringest forth bread out of the earth :”

vouchsafing us worthy of these His creatures, is a prayer of more than ordinary length. When the bishop has finished the prayers and the thanksgiving service,¹ all the people present and over the wine, "Blessed be Thou, O Lord our God, the King of the world, Which createst the fruit of the vine." *Vide* Mede, p. 375, and Dr. Grabe's notes upon this place. In the Christian sacrifice there were two distinct parts, the *εὐχαριστία*, "Thanksgiving" to God for His good creatures of bread and wine; and *εὐλογία*, "Invocation" of His blessing upon them. That these two were distinct things, the consecration of the elements made with thanksgiving, not by it, but with blessing joined with thanksgiving, in one continued prayer, or in two distinct forms; this, I say, is evident both from Justin in his *Dialogue with Trypho*, and from this place; in his *Dialogue* he describes the Eucharist or thanksgiving part thus, 'Ο κύριος παρέδωκε, ἵνα ἅμα τε εὐχαριστῶμεν τῷ θεῷ ὑπὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον ἐκτιθέναι σὺν πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν αὐτῷ διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς κακίας ἐν ἧ γεγόνεμεν ἐλευθερωθέναι ἡμᾶς, καὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς, καὶ τὰς ἰξουσίας, καταλειπέναι τελείαν κατάλυσιν διὰ τοῦ παθετοῦ γενομένου κατὰ τὴν βουλὴν αὐτοῦ, "The Lord hath commanded that together we should give thanks to God for the creation of the world, and all things therein for the benefit of man; and for delivering us from the misery wherein we were born, and for His destroying principalities and powers with a perfect destruction, by Him Who suffered according to His will." And elsewhere he says, "That prayers and thanksgivings made by those that are worthy are the only sacrifices that are perfect and acceptable." And these he says (speaking of the Eucharist) ἐπ' ἀνάμνησιν δὲ τῆς τροφῆς αὐτῶν ξηρᾶς τε καὶ ὑγρᾶς, ἐν ἧ καὶ τοῦ πάθους ὃ πέποιθε δι' αὐτοῦ ὁ θεὸς τοῦ θεοῦ μέμνηται. "In that thankful remembrance of their food both dry and wet, wherein also is commemorated the passion which the God of God suffered by Himself." And so again in this place of the *Apology*, εὐχαριστίαν πρὸ τοῦ κατηξιώσθαι τοῦτων, etc. "That God did vouchsafe them worthy of bread and wine." So that in the Eucharist we have a twofold commemoration; the one of our meat and drink, by agnizing and recording God to be the Lord and Giver of the same, in opposition to those heretics who denied Him to be the Maker of the world; the other an *Ἀνάμνησις*, or commemoration, in the same bread and wine, of the passion of the Son of God; but for a fuller explanation of this I refer to the *Great Duty of frequenting the Christian Sacrifice*, written by the author of *The Fasts and Festivals*. As to the *εὐλογία*, the invocation of a blessing or consecratory part, I shall speak of that presently.

¹ *Εὐχὰς καὶ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν.* Here, besides the thanksgiving or prayer Eucharistical, we find other prayers, but what they were Justin says not,

conclude with an audible voice, saying Amen.¹ Now Amen in the Hebrew tongue is, "So it be." The Eucharistical

but no doubt he means the prayer of consecration; for when Christ so solemnly took bread and wine, *εὐλογήσας*, "calling upon God for His blessing;" *καὶ εὐχαριστήσας*, "and giving thanks," and commanding this to be done in remembrance of Him until His second coming; it cannot be supposed, I say, that He used a common form of grace, as at other ordinary meals, but had a peculiar form, with relation to those ends for which He instituted this holy feast. Accordingly all the ancient Liturgies, not to mention that of Basil or Chrysostom; the Clementine Constitutions, elder than both, are very express to this purpose, where, having premised the words of institution, he adds: *Ἀξιῶμεν σε, ὅπως ἐμμενώ: ἐπιβλέψης ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα ἐνώπιον σου, σὺ δ' ἀνευδέης θεός· καὶ κατὰ τέμψης τὸ ἅγιον σου πνεῦμα ἐπὶ τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην μάρτυρα τῶν παθημάτων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ὅπως ἀποφῆνῃ τὸν ἄρτον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου*, etc. "We beseech Thee that Thou wouldest graciously be pleased to look down upon these oblations presented before Thee, Thou God that wantest nothing, and send down Thy Holy Spirit upon this sacrifice, commemorative of the sufferings of our Lord Jesus, that this bread may be unto us the body of Thy Christ, and this cup the blood of Thy Christ." Agreeable to this primitive form of invocation is that in the Scotch and English Liturgy in the First Book of Edward VI., where, after these words, "Hear us, O merciful Father, we beseech Thee," it follows, "And with Thy Holy Spirit and Word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these Thy creatures and gifts of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ, Who in the same night," etc.

¹ Πὰς ὁ λαὸς ἐπιεφθελει μέγαν Ἀμήν. Here we see that the president alone pronounced the prayer, and the people ended with the acclamation of Amen; which further proves it to be the consecrating prayer, which none but the minister had authority to pronounce. For, as Dr. Potter observes in his learned discourse of Church Government, p. 249, "In the former prayers the people repeated *κοινῇ πάντες*;" (as Justin has it), "all together," following the minister, and for a proof of this he refers to the ancient Liturgies, particularly to the Apostolic Constitutions, l. viii. c. 6, 8, 9, 11, and elsewhere. And moreover adds, that "this distinction seems to be made in Scripture, where, when our Lord consecrates the Eucharist, He alone is said to bless or to give thanks; whereas in the Acts iv. 24, when prayer is made, wherein the whole assembly are equally concerned, we are told, 'they lift up their voice with one accord.'" And this I the rather take notice of, because I generally find the common people

office being thus performed by the bishop, and concluded with the acclamation of all the people, those we call deacons distribute to every one present to partake of this Eucharistical bread and wine and water, and then they carry it to the absent.¹

LXXXVI. This food we call the Eucharist,² of which none are allowed to be partakers, but such only as are true benignantly joining not only in the consecration, but in the absolution also, both which are peculiarly appropriated to the priestly office.

¹ "The deacons distribute to every one present, and then carry it to the absent." The custom of turning their backs upon the Lord's Supper was not known among the faithful in time of old; and those who came to the sermon, and went out before the communion, were excommunicated; "Laici fideles Ecclesiam ingredientes et Scripturas audientes, si non permanent in Precatione, et Sacra Communionem egregantur," *Can. Apost. 9*. In the primitive Church so much bread and wine was taken from a large table as the officiating priest judged sufficient for the communicants. These elements thus separated from the rest were consecrated, and what remained after the communion was carried by the deacon to the sick, and sent about to absent friends, as pledges and tokens of love and agreement in the unity of the same faith. But because this carrying the sacramental elements up and down the world was thought not so well to comport with the reverence due to this sacred ordinance, it was abolished by the Laodicean Synod; and the Eulogiæ, or pieces of bread which remained of the offerings of the people, were appointed at Easter to be sent up and down in their room, *Can. 14*. One thing more is too obvious not to be noted in this place, namely, that the bread and wine, the communion in both kinds, was given to the laity, a practice so notorious, that even the patrons of dry communion have not the face to deny it.

² "This food we call the Eucharist, of which none are allowed to partake but true believers." It was called the Eucharist, because thanksgiving was made to God for these benefits, and not from any words constituting consecration, as is commonly supposed. Here likewise is another instance of "Imperii in Imperio," of Church authority independent on the civil magistrate, and visible in a state of persecution; which authority, therefore, as it must always enjoy, so the exercise of it must especially appear when it is resolved into such a state again; an authority of letting in and shutting out of Christian communion, according as the spiritual governors judge of the merits or demerits of the respective persons.

lievers, and have been baptized in the laver of regeneration for the remission of sins, and live according to Christ's precepts; for we do not take this as common bread and common wine;¹ but as Jesus Christ our Saviour was made flesh by the

¹ "We do not take this as common bread and wine," etc. Justin Martyr just before had called the Eucharistical food after consecration, barely bread and wine, and here he says it is not common bread and wine, which shows that he thought it was still so in substance; and then he goes on to illustrate the sanctification of the elements by the incarnation of Christ, in which the human nature did not lose its substance by its union with the divine; so the bread and wine, according to this illustration, do not lose their proper substance when they become the flesh and blood of Christ. It must be acknowledged that the ancient Fathers, Justin Martyr and Irenæus in particular, do teach that in the Eucharist the bread and wine are by or upon consecration made the body and blood of Christ; but then they explain themselves in such a manner as makes not the least for the doctrine of transubstantiation. Their notion in short was this, that as John the Baptist was said to be Elias because he was endued with the same spirit and power that Elias was, so upon the sacerdotal benediction the Spirit of Christ or a divine virtue descends upon the elements, and accompanies them to all worthy communicants, and therefore are said to be the body and blood of Christ; the same divinity which is hypostatically united to the body and blood of Christ in heaven being virtually united to the elements of bread and wine upon earth. And this I have already proved to be the sense of all the ancient Liturgies, wherein it is prayed, "that God would send down His Holy Spirit upon His creatures of bread and wine in the Eucharist." But that transubstantiation was a thing never dreamed of, is evident from this very passage of Justin, where he says, *ἐξ ἧς αἷμα καὶ σάρκες κατὰ μεταβολὴν τρέφονται ἡμεν*, "that our bodies are nourished, and that the bread and wine are turned into the substance of our bodies;" which to affirm of the glorified body of Christ is certainly impious blasphemy. Moreover, our Justin in his most excellent *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*, tells him that it was foretold by the prophets that the time was coming when they should no longer "offer upon the altar libations and sacrifices of blood," *ἀλλὰ ἀληθινούς καὶ πνευματικούς αἶνους καὶ εὐχαριστίας*, "but true and spiritual praises and thanksgiving," p. 346. And he says, likewise, that the bread and wine in the sacrament was *εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ σωματοποιήσασθαι—καὶ εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ αἵματος*, "in commemoration of His body and blood;" and that it was generally styled by the ancients *ἀναίμακτος θυσία*, "an unbloody sacrifice," is too notorious to be

Logos of God, and had real flesh and blood for our salvation, so are we taught that this food, which the very same Logos blessed by prayer and thanksgiving, is turned into the nourishment and substance of our flesh and blood,¹ and is in some sense the flesh and blood of the incarnate Jesus.² For the apostles, in their commentaries called the Gospels,³ have left this command upon record, "That Jesus took bread, and

denied; and if so, it is not possible they should conceive it to be the very body and blood of Christ. He that desires to see more upon this subject may consult Dr. Grabe's notes upon the place, and Bishop Bull's answer to the Bishop of Meaux's letter to Mr. Nelson.

¹ Τὴν δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφήν. This passage is something dark and difficult. Hamon l'Estrange translates it thus: "Those viands by which our flesh and blood are nourished being blessed by the prayer and thanksgiving of the priest," etc. But this cannot be the literal translation, for here is not one word of a priest mentioned, nor a title of the main difficulty explained, which is, the δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ. Dr. Grabe thinks τὴν τοῦ λόγου εὐχὴν signifies the Lord's Prayer, with which the sacrament was always concluded. *Vid.* note, p. 127. But the bread and wine was not consecrated by the Lord's Prayer, and these words seem to respect the very act of consecration. Justin immediately before had said, that Jesus Christ or the Logos was made flesh by the Logos of God, and here he says that the bread and wine was made the body and blood of Christ "by the prayer of the very same Logos," where the λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ seems to me to be the λόγος προφορικὸς, or external word issuing from the substantial Word or Logos Himself, and then the construction will be thus, δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ λόγου οὐσιώδους. And this way of speaking is very familiar with Justin, as you may see by Christ's being said to have been made flesh by the Logos in the words just before.

² Ἰησοῦ καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ἐδιδάκθημεν. Dr. Grabe upon these words observes that the Right Reverend the Bishop of Sarum says, "that it is not to be denied, but that very early both Justin Martyr and Irenæus thought that there was such a sanctification of the elements, that there was a divine virtue in them." *Artic.* xxviii. p. 334.

³ The commentaries of the apostles called Gospels. Ἀπομνημονεύματα, or commentaries, were such sayings of wise men as were got by heart and committed to memory, and the Gospels being a summary of the words and actions of our Saviour so committed and repeated to the amanuenses, were called Ἀπομνημονεύματα. *Vid.* Dr. Grabe, n. 58.

when He had given thanks, He said, Do this in commemoration of Me, for this is My body: and in like manner He took the cup, and when He had given thanks, He said, This is My blood," and delivered it to them only.¹ And this very solemnity, too, the evil spirits have introduced in the mysteries of Mithra;² for you do, or may know, that when any one is initiated into this religion, bread and a cup of water, with a certain form of words, are made use of in the sacrifice. After this sacrament is over, we remind each other of the obligations to his duty, and the rich relieve the poor; and upon such charitable accounts we visit some or other every day.

LXXXVII. And in every Eucharistical sacrifice we bless the Maker of all things through His Son Jesus Christ, and through the Holy Spirit.³ And upon the day called Sunday,⁴ all that

¹ Matt. xxvi. 26; Mark xiv. 22; Luke xxii. 19, etc.

² For a fuller explanation of the mysteries of Mithra or the Sun, I refer the reader not only to the references in Dr. Grabe's notes, but also to Dr. Hickes's *Christian Priesthood Asserted*, where he will find that the ministers of baptism and the Holy Eucharist were *παιδισται*, as Pollux calls priests, even as proper priests, as the priests of Mithra or the Sun, were by his worshippers to be, p. 55.

³ Hitherto Justin has described the rites of the first communion after baptism; he proceeds now in short to show that they observed the same order in every Eucharistical sacrifice, and therefore the same notes will in a great measure serve for both.

⁴ Τῆς τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένη ἡμέρα, "upon the day called Sunday." It was called Sunday by Justin and Tertullian, because it happened upon that day of the week which by the heathens was dedicated to the sun, and therefore as being best known to them by that name, the Fathers commonly made use of it in their Apologies to the heathen emperors; but the more proper and prevailing name was *κυριακὴ*, or the Lord's Day, as it is called by St. John himself (Rev. i. 10). This day was so strictly set apart by the ancients for public devotion, that the Synod of Illiberis ordained that if any man dwelling in a city (where churches were near at hand) should for three Lord's days keep from church, he should for some time be suspended the communion, *Can. xxi.* p. 28. And when Eustachius, Bishop of Sebastia, began to fling off the discipline of the Church, and to intro-

live either in city or country meet together at the same place, where the writings of the apostles and prophets are read, as much as time will give leave.¹ When the reader has done, the bishop makes a sermon,² wherein he instructs the people, and animates them to the practice of such lovely precepts. At the conclusion of this discourse, we all rise up together and pray;³ and prayers being over, as I now said, there is bread

duce some odd whimsies of his own, and among many others to fast on the Lord's day, and keep meetings in private houses, leading many away captive, but especially silly women, as Sozomen observes, l. iii. c. 14, p. 521; the bishops no sooner understood it, but meeting in council at Gangra, about the year 340, condemned and cast them out of the Church, passing these two canons among the rest, "If any one shall teach that the house of God is to be despised, and the assemblies that are held in it, let him be accursed. If any shall take upon him out of the church to preach privately at home, and making light of the church, shall do those things that belong only to the church, without the presence of the priest, and the leave and allowance of the bishop, let him be accursed." *Conc. Gangr. Can. 4, 5.*

¹ "The commentaries of the apostles and the writings of the prophets are read, as much as time will give leave." The Christian meetings were often disturbed and broken up by their heathen enemies; and so neither Justin nor Tertullian says what portions either of the Old or New Testament were read at one meeting; but afterwards set portions out of each were assigned, two lessons out of both, as we find it in the author of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, l. ii. c. 57, p. 875.

² "The bishop makes a sermon." The sermons in these times were nothing else but expositions of some part of the Scriptures then read, and exhortations to the people to obey the doctrines contained in them, and generally upon the lesson last read, as being freshest in their minds. According as opportunity served, these sermons were more or fewer, sometimes two or three at the same assembly, the presbyters first, and then the bishop, as is expressly affirmed in the *Apostolical Constitutions*. *Και ἕξῃς παρακαλείτωσεν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τὸν λαὸν ὁ καθὼς αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ μὴ ἅπαντες, καὶ τελευταῖος πάντων ὁ ἐπίσκοπος ὡς ἔοικε κυβερνήτην*, l. xi. c. 57, p. 263, edit. Cleric. "Then" (that is, after the reading of the Gospel) "let the presbyters exhort the people one by one, not all at once; and last of all the bishop, as it is fitting for the master to do."

³ "We all rise up together and pray." From this place of Justin, and from Tertullian, *de Coron.* c. 3, p. 102, it is evident that, whereas the

and wine and water offered, and the bishop, as before, sends up prayers and thanksgivings with all the fervency he is able,¹ and the people conclude all with the joyful acclamation of Amen. Then the consecrated elements are distributed to,

Christians upon other days prayed kneeling, yet upon Sundays they always prayed standing; and the reason of this we find in the author of the Questions and Answers in Justin Martyr, *Resp. ad Quest.* 115, p. 468. It is (says he) that by this posture we may be put in mind both of our fall by sin, and our restitution by the grace of Christ; that for six days we pray upon our knees is to remind us of our fall by sin; but that on the Lord's Day we pray standing, is to represent our restitution, by which, through the grace of Christ, we are delivered from our sins and the powers of death. And the great Council of Nicæa, taking notice that this custom began to be neglected, ordained that on the Lord's Day men should stand when they offered up their prayers to God. *Can.* 20.

¹ *Εὐχὰς ὁμοίως καὶ εὐχαριστίας ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ ἀναπέμπει.* "The bishop sends up prayers and thanksgivings with all the fervency he is able." This passage is greedily fastened upon by many of our dissenting brethren against stated forms of prayer in the primitive Church, and particularly by Mr. David Clarkson in his Discourse concerning Liturgies, and is cited twice over, p. 68 and p. 115, where he marvellously pleases himself, with very little reason, for near ten pages in quotations, to make this speak "for inventing words as the Spirit enabled them, or praying *ex tempore*." I cannot but observe from hence how much these old Fathers are made of by some men, if they can but be forced to cast a kind look towards them; and then again by fits, how musty and despicable they are, when they speak too plain to be misinterpreted. But to the case in hand. First, then, I say that ὅση δύναμις is a doubtful expression, and twice before in this *Apology* (as I have advertised the reader) is used in a sense quite different from this of Mr. Clarkson, and therefore at best can be but a doubtful proof, till he can make out his sense to be the plain and only sense of this phrase. Secondly, if this be the sense, it will not follow that because in Justin's age,—an age of casting out devils, and praying by the Spirit in order to proselytise the world,—therefore now, when the world is proselytised, and the gift of power and miracles is over, every private minister is enabled to pray by the same Spirit. But then, thirdly, I think it must signify otherwise in this very place, for ὅση δύναμις here plainly answers to *ἐπὶ νόως*, sect. lxxxv., where all the congregation is said to join in common prayers for the new baptized person, etc., *ἐπὶ νόως* "with all intention of mind and affections;" and by common prayers we can hardly understand anything else than set forms of prayer, in opposition to *ex tempore* effu-

94) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

and partaken of by all that are present, and sent to the absent by the hands of the deacons.

LXXXVIII. But the wealthy and the willing, for every one is at liberty, contribute as they think fitting; and this collection is deposited with the bishop, and out of this he relieves the orphan and the widow, and such as are reduced to want, by sickness or any other cause, and such as are in bonds, and strangers that come from far; and, in a word, he is the guardian and almoner to all the indigent.

LXXXIX. Upon Sunday we all assemble, that being the first day in which God set Himself to work upon the dark void, in order to make the world, and in which Jesus Christ our Saviour rose again from the dead; for the day before Saturday¹ He was crucified, and the day after, which is

sions. Besides, it is observable that this phrase does not follow (εὐχὰς) prayers, but (εὐχαριστίας) thanksgivings; so that it is chiefly to be restrained to the hymns in the Eucharist, which were known forms; and yet, says Justin, they were offered up ὅση δύναμις. And section xvi., where we have his phrase ἐφ' οἷς προσφερόμεθα πάνσιν, ὅση δύναμις αἰνοῦντες, “in all our oblations praising God to the best of our power,”—he deals very disingenuously, by leaving out the comma between πάνσιν and ὅση. Now this praising ὅση δύναμις cannot be applied to the bishop only, but to all the congregation who joined in the public hymns with all possible fervency and devotion. But of all the quotations this author has brought to wrest this phrase to his purpose of *ex tempore* prayer, that out of Gregory Nazianzen is the most unhappy one, Φέρε ὅση δύναμις τὸ ἐπινίκεον ἄδωμεν ἐκείνην ᾠδὴν, etc. “Come, let us with all intention of spirit chant that triumphant ode which sometime the Israelites sang upon the overthrow of the Egyptians in the Red Sea.” Nazianzen here sets down the words which he would have them sing upon Julian’s being cut off, and ὅση δύναμις being precisely limited to ἐκείνην ᾠδὴν, that song in Ex. xv.; this, I say, utterly shuts out all arbitrary conceptions, and determines the signification of this phrase, as, I think, beyond exception.

¹ “The day before Saturday.” Justin uses this circumlocution instead of Die Veneris, because he abhorred the very name of Venus; and the Fathers were so chaste in word as well as thought, that they would not

Sunday, He appeared to His apostles and disciples, and taught them what I have now proposed to your consideration.

XC. And so far as these things shall appear agreeable to truth and reason, so far we desire you would respect them accordingly, but if they seem trifling, despise them as trifles; however, do not proceed against the professors of them, who are people of the most inoffensive lives, as severely as against your professed enemies; for, tell you I must, that if you persist in this course of iniquity, you shall not escape the vengeance of God in the other world. But be this as it will, you shall hear us contentedly cry out, "God's will be done." And although we might produce the rescript of your father, the great and illustrious Emperor Adrian, to plead in our behalf for the moderating your proceedings according to that rule of equity we ourselves have proposed, yet we shall not insist so much upon the authority of Adrian as the justice of our demands, which was the reason of composing this Apology and Exposition of the Christian faith. However, we have subjoined a copy of Adrian's Epistle, to let you see the truth and justice of our cause. And the copy is this:—

THE

RESCRIPT OF ADRIAN FOR THE CHRISTIANS

TO

MINUTIUS FUNDANUS.¹

I RECEIVED a letter from the illustrious Serenus Granianus, your predecessor. It is an affair well worthy your consideration. Take the name of Venus within their lips, but in order to refute the heathen idolatry. See Dr. Grabe's notes upon this place.

¹ The *Apologies* of Aristides, but especially that of Quadratus, had so

(96) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

tion to put a stop to vexatious suits, and to give no handle to informers to carry on the trade of malice.¹ If, then, the people under your government have anything to say against Christians, and will prove it in public, so that Christians may answer for themselves in open court, it is your duty to hear them in a judicial way only, and not to be overborne by the petitions and tumultuary clamours of the people; for it is your place, and not the mob's, to judge of the merits of the cause. If, therefore, the informer shall make it appear that Christians have done anything contrary to law, punish them according to the quality of the crime; so verily on the other hand, if you find it to be a malicious charge only, take care to condemn and punish as the malice deserves.

good an effect upon the Emperor Adrian that they procured this rescript in favour of the Christians; for Serenus Granianus wrote to Adrian, as Pliny before had done to Trajan, concerning the intolerable and unjust persecutions of the Christian sect, and being either dead just after, or out of his office (which was but annual), Adrian directs this answer to Minutius Fundanus, his successor in the Proconsulship of Asia. This rescript was annexed by Justin to this *Apology* in the Latin tongue, and translated by Eusebius into Greek, as he himself tells us, l. iv. c. 8, *Hist. Eccl.* And, by the way, if St. Justin may be allowed Latin enough to understand this epistle, methinks it is hard not to allow him enough to understand the inscription upon the statue of Simon Magus. The Latin text preserved by that martyr is lost; however, it is famous, and much talked of by the ancients; it is cited by St. Melito, Euseb. l. iv. c. 26; by Sulpicius Severus, l. ii. c. 45; and by Orosius, l. vii. c. 12.

¹ The subject of Granianus's letter seems evidently omitted in this place, and the Emperor's order only mentioned. And if Lampridius may be credited, as I see no reason why he may not for anything Casaubon has urged to the contrary, Adrian had a design, as Tiberius had before him, to set up the worship of Christ, and built up therefore several temples without any image, and without consecrating them to any god of the heathen, which therefore went by the name of Adrian's temples. Lamprid. *Alex.* v. p. 129. *Vid. Memoirs, etc.,* par le Sieur D. Tillemont, tom. ii. p. 123.

THE LETTER OF ANTONINUS

TO THE

STATES OF ASIA.¹

THE Emperor Cæsar Titus Ælius Adrianus Antoninus Augustus Pius, chief pontiff, the fifteenth time tribune, thrice consul, father of the country, to the common Assembly of Asia, greeting. I am of opinion that the gods will be sufficiently careful not to let this sort of men escape, for it is much more their concern than yours to make those the examples of justice, if they can, who refuse to worship them; and while you thus harass them, and accuse them for atheists, and object other things against them, and are not able to

¹ We are told by an ancient ecclesiastical writer that this *Apology* of our martyr very much sweetened the spirit of Antoninus, *Oros.* l. vii. c. 14. And being also seconded by addresses, and hideous complaints from the faithful in Asia, produced this letter from the Emperor to the States of Asia, and to those of Larissa, Thessalonica, Athens, and all Greece. He sent letters also in behalf of the Christians, though this alone to the States of Asia is yet extant. *Vid.* Euseb. l. iv. c. 26. It is an answer to what the States had sent concerning the prosecution of Christians upon the account of earthquakes, which had then happened and were charged upon the Christians, as all misfortunes were. I am not ignorant that Scaliger, Valesius, and others would have this Imperial edict to be the decree of Marcus Aurelius, the son of Antoninus; the inscription, indeed, as it stands in Euseb. l. iv. c. 26, has Marcus Aurelius Antoninus; but then this is most undeniably corrupted; for just before, in the conclusion of the twenty-fifth chapter, he ascribes it to Antoninus Pius, and in the original inscription annexed to the *Apology* (and from whence Eusebius transcribed his) it is Titus Ælius Antoninus Pius. Besides, the tenor of the epistle itself seems plainly to give it to Antoninus; and Melito, Bishop of Sardis, who presented an *Apology* to his son and successor, tells him of the letters


(98) *The First Apology of Justin Martyr.*

make good the charge, you do but harden them in their opinion; for it makes mightily for them, or you cannot oblige them more, than to make them die for the religion they are accused of; for thus they triumph over you, by choosing rather to submit to death than to comply with your demands. As for earthquakes, either past or present, I advise you to be silent upon this head; you who are desponding immediately upon these occasions, and laying all your calamities upon them, whereas they are more erect and confident in God upon such accidents. But you all this time seem to be perfect strangers to the gods, and to neglect their worship, nay, the worship of the great God Himself, and therefore mortally hate those who do worship Him, and persecute them to death for so doing. Concerning this sort of men, several governors of provinces have formerly written to my father of sacred memory, to whom he returned this answer: That such men should not be molested, unless they were found to attempt

which his father, at the time he was his partner in the empire, wrote to the cities, that they should not raise any new troubles against the Christians. *Vid.* Dr. Cave's *Life of Justin*, in English, p. 147. The objections against this opinion you may find in Dr. Grabe's notes, and in the notes at the end of his edition.

This letter was sent, says Monsieur Tillemont, in the fifteenth year of Antoninus, that is, in the year of our Lord 152.—*Vid.* *Memoirs*, tom. ii. p. 390; says Dr. Cave in the year 140; and if it be objected that this seems not consistent with the year of his being tribune, said here to be the fifteenth, he answers that the tribunitian power did not always commence with the beginning of their reign, but was given sometimes to persons in a private capacity, and especially to such as were candidates for the empire. *Vid.* *Life of Justin*, p. 146. Valesius fixes the date of the rescript in the first year of Marcus Aurelius, for which he is animadverted upon by Bishop Pearson, who refers it to the fifteenth of Aurelius. *Vind. Ig. Epis.* p. 2, n. 404. See Dr. Grabe's notes. In this state of uncertainty I shall leave this rescript, with this observation only, that we ought not to conclude against the being of a thing because learned men dispute the time of its being, but just the contrary, viz. that such a thing really was, because there is so much dispute about it.

anything against the Roman Government. And I myself have received many letters upon the same subject, and I returned the same answer. So that if any one hereafter shall go on to inform against this sort of men, purely because they are Christians, let the persons accused be discharged, although they be found to be Christians, and let the informer himself undergo the punishment.



1 1012 01093 8878

Date Due

RESERVE	1977	
RESERVE	1977	
(L) Church	1977	
MY 6 - '43	NOV 8 1984	
RESERVE	RESERVE	
RESERVE	9601 AT NWC	
RESERVE		
(L) Church	1977	
F 27 '45		
RESERVE	RESERVE	
7 7 '46	RESERVE	
RESERVE	RESERVE	
RESERVE	RESERVE	
RESERVE	RESERVE	
RESERVE	RESERVE	
Oct 11 '62		
RESERVE		
Ⓟ		



