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PREFACE

The present work is taken from my Masters Thesis completed in the summer of 2000 through the classics department of the University of Kansas. That work, entitled *The Concept of the Daimon in Justin’s Second Apology: with Text and Translation*, focused specifically upon Justin’s view that all evil was directly influenced by demonic activity in the world. My thesis examined the extent to which pre-Christian Classical, Hebrew and Hellenistic concepts influenced Justin’s own views.

The text, translation and endnotes which make up this booklet were contained in the appendix of the thesis. The introduction to the life and death of Justin and his works served also as the introduction to the same work. The bibliography of the thesis is for the most part identical to the present bibliography and list of suggested readings, with the exception a few works which relate specifically to the content of the thesis that have not been included. The following dedication and acknowledgments are also taken from the thesis, with no alteration. While those mentioned have not directly supervised this “abridged” version of the larger work, their contribution was invaluable to its production.

It is hoped that this text and translation will make available to students of history, classics and religion a work that has in my estimation received far too little consideration. Justin played a unique role in the early history of Christianity. The more we can understand about him and his contemporaries the more we can understand about this period.

Kyle Pope, 2001
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This work is dedicated to my wife Toni, and my children Torhi, Caleb, and Nathan, who together with me have sacrificed so much to allow for its completion.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to acknowledge the work of a number of different individuals, without whom this study would not have been possible.

First, I wish to acknowledge the efforts of those on my Thesis committee. My chief advisor, Dr. Stanley Lombardo has served as both my instructor and “creative consultant” throughout the completion of this work. I so appreciate the hours which he spent on this project and the objective, nonreligious appraisal which he was able to provide to a work that had a very strong religious component.

Dr. Anthony Corbeill, my personal advisor throughout my years at the University of Kansas.

Dr. Pamela Gordon, the chair of the Classics department, my supervising instructor in the first Greek classes which I taught, and the first Latin teacher that led me to understand the “gerund.”

Dr. Paul Mirecki, my Coptic teacher, and my initial advisor when I first began work on my thesis. From an original idea which would have proven to be overwhelming, Dr. Mirecki helped me to narrow my focus and to choose to begin a study dealing with Justin.

Beyond these I also wish to acknowledge the professional efforts of so many scholars, most of whom I have never met, but without whose scholarship my thesis would not have been possible.

Dr. Miroslav Marcovich and the monumental work which he did on his critical text of Justin’s Apologies served as the bedrock for the textual work carried out in this paper. Although I have taken a bit different approach in terms of textual criticism than Dr. Marcovich, I must acknowledge that, without access to the manuscripts themselves, it is only thanks to his painstakingly thorough work that my efforts were even attainable.

Dr. Everett Ferguson, is the primary scholar working in English who has addressed the issue of Justin’s concept of daimones. In addition, the journal Second Century, which he edited for a number of years, proved to be an invaluable resource. Although I briefly attended Abilene Christian University, from which he recently retired, I never had the occasion to meet him face to face. I did speak with him briefly over the phone in the preparation of the paper in order to secure an article which he had written on the subject.

Finally, Dr. L.W. Barnard has done, in my judgment, the best overall work analyzing Justin as a whole. His numerous writings, which explore Justin’s life, teachings, and thought, allow the student to understand this early apologist as a real and complete man of faith, beyond simply the isolated doctrines which he espoused.


classes Jews and Samaritans as distinct from Gentiles.

Justin classes himself among the Gentiles while talking to a Jew; in 1 Dial. 2 (1943-1944): 179-205.


Gildersleeve, Basil L. The Apologies of Justin Martyr to which is Appended the Epistle to Diogpetus. New York: Harber Brothers, 1877.


INTRODUCTION

A. THE LIFE AND DEATH OF JUSTIN.

In the text which is known to us as the First Apology, Justin introduces himself to the emperor Antoninus Pius and his sons as “Justin, the son of Priscus, grandson of Bacchius, of those from Flavia Neapolis, in Syria, of Palestine” – Ἰουστινὸς Πρίσκου τοῦ Βακχίου, τῶν ἀπὸ Φλαυνίας Νέας πόλεως τῆς Συρίας Παλαιστίνης (1.1). This is our only source for Justin’s background. Flavia Neapolis, modern Nablus, was a Greek colony named after Vespasian and organized in 70 A.D. (Goodenough, TJ, p. 57). The name Syria Palestina dates to 132 A.D. after the close of the Second Jewish war when Hadrian renamed the province of Judea (Appian, Syriaca 1.7.8).

Barnard suggests that both the names of Justin’s father and grandfather are Greek, while his own is Latin (LT, p. 5). Goodenough feels this may indicate that they were colonists (TJ, p. 57). Justin in his Dialogue with Trypho, in speaking of the Samaritans of this region, refers to them as “of my race. I say of the Samaritans” – τοῦ γένους τοῦ ἔμου, λέγω δὲ τῶν Σαμαρείων (120.6). While Barnard and Goodenough see no evidence in Justin’s writings of any Samaritan religious training, P.R. Weis has outlined some compelling examples of what he calls “Samaritanisms” in religious customs to which Justin refers.1 Even so, Justin considers himself a Gentile (DiaL 29).2

In the Dialogue with Trypho Justin describes himself as a convert to Christianity after first turning to a number of different philosophical schools. First, he tells us that he followed a Stoic teacher for some time, yet claims that “nothing satisfactory came to me concerning God” – οὐδὲν πλέον ἐγνώσεῖν μοι πέρι θεοῦ (2.3), and that the Stoic considered such things unnecessary. Next, Justin found a Peripatetic, until he was offended by his request for a fee (2.3). Third, he pursued a teacher of Pythagoreanism, only to turn away when he was told that he must first learn music, astronomy, and geometry (2.4). At last, he encountered a Platonist whom he describes as “very famous”


2 In Dial. 29 Justin classes himself among the Gentiles while talking to a Jew; in 1 Apol. 53 he classes Jews and Samaritans as distinct from Gentiles.
He spends a great deal of time with him:

καὶ μὲ ήρει αφέδρα ἢ τῶν ἀσωμάτων νόσησες, καὶ ἡ θεωρία τῶν ἱδεῶν ἀνεπτέρου μοί τὴν φρονίμην, ὄλγου τὸ ἐντὸς χρόνου ὡμίν σοφὸς γεγονέων, καὶ ὑπὸ βλακείας ἥλπιν αὐτίκα κατόμπθησαι τὸν θεω — τοῦ γάρ τέλος τῆς Πλάτωνος

And the thought of incorporeal things greatly aroused me and the contemplation of ideas gave wings to my mind, and in a short time I thought I had become a wise man and in stupidity hoped at once to look upon God, for this is the goal of the philosophy of Plato. (2.6).

Some scholars have attempted to identify this teacher with Numenius, a Pythagorean whom Origen claimed was “a man very strong in declaring Platonics” – ἀνδρὰ πολλὰ κρείττων διηγησάμενον Πλάτωνα (Cont. Cels., 4.51). Arthur Drodge defends an association between Justin and Numenius because both argued that the origins of Platonic thought were to be found in Mosaic or oriental sources (p. 318). There has been a great deal of scholarly debate over the extent of Justin’s training and the nature of his “Platonism.” Was his training formal or informal? Did he accept classical Platonism or some variant? Some have suggested that the evidence suggests that Justin had no more knowledge of Platonism than could be attained from handbooks of the day (Drodge, p. 305, commenting on Geffcken’s views). Others have identified Justin’s Platonism with similar ideas of Albinus (Andresen, p. 168); or of Philo (Goodenough, pp. 65; 139-147). Ever since the important work of Carl Andresen, “Justin und der mittlere Platonismus” ZNW 44 (1952-53): 157-195, it is generally agreed that Justin accepted what is classified as Middle Platonism, an understanding of Platonic doctrine which emphasized deity. Andresen writes:

Justin ist philosophiegeschichtlich dem mittleren Platonismus zuzuordnen. Diese Einordnung läßt sich genau festlegen. Er gehört der sogenannt orthodoxen Richtung unter den Schulplatonikern an, wie sie vornehmlich durch Plutarch und Attikos repräsentiert wird.

Justin is to be categorized in the historical philosophy of middle Platonism. This classification allows the matter to be settled precisely. He belonged to the so-called orthodox movement under the school of Plato, as they were particularly represented by Plutarch and Atticus (p. 194).

As an “orthodox” middle Platonist, “rejoicing in the teachings of Plato” – τὸς Πλάτωνος χαίρων διδάγομαι (2 Apol. 12.1), Justin claims that he met an old man while he was meditating near the sea.4 The man explains to him that the Old Testament prophets preceded the Greek philosophers and had predicted the coming of Jesus. This ultimately turns Justin’s affections away from Platonism alone as the source of truth and towards a faith in Jesus (Diai. 3-7).

---

3 The text reads ἡμετέρα πόλει — “to our city.” Eusebius claims the dialogue took place in Ephesus (HE 4.18.6).

4 Paul Mirecki, in the editing of this paper, observes the similarity between Justin’s encounter and ancient visionary experiences in which the sea often serves as a place of revelation.
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There are at least two positions scholars take regarding Justin’s account of the philosophical path leading to his conversion. The first suggests that Justin creates an idealized fiction as a didactic tool and a rhetorical device. Representative of this position Goodenough writes:

Justin, in the entire passage, is dramatizing the relations between Christianity and philosophy, and has here adopted the... school to school, and finally to the Christian school, in order to criticize each school by the adventures related (TJ, pp. 60-1).

Drodge adds, “there can be little doubt that Justin described his conversion from Platonism to Christianity in a stylized, literary manner” (p. 304). In opposition to this view are those who view all or part of Justin’s conversion narrative as historical. Chadwick suggests, “It is much more probable than not that we are being given an essentially veracious autobiography, even if Justin’s memory, looking back some twenty years, is likely to have foreshortened and compressed the story” (DC, p. 280). Barnard suggests, “...it is precisely Justin’s account of his actual conversion at the hands of an old man which has the ring of truth about it and gives an adequate explanation of his later work as a Christian philosopher” (LT, p. 8). Although Justin may employ a literary technique, it seems highly unlikely that he would offer an absolute fiction when he also claimed that Christians “consider it impious not to be truthful in all things” – αποτρόπησις θεου μόνου των ἐπιγείων (Stobaeus, Flor. 117.8.0, Arnold). Tacitus suggests that Musonius advocated “an imperturbable expectation of death rather than a hazardous anxious life” – constantiam opperendiæ mortis, pro incerta et trepida vita (Tac. Ann. 14.59, Grant).

The Binding of Daimones

Justin claims in 8.3 that the daimones would be confined in eternal fire. He does not seem to have believed this had yet occurred. In NT doctrine the angels who sinned had already been bound in Tartarus: “For if God did not spare the angels who sinned, but cast them down to hell and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved for judgment” – Εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἀγγέλων ἀμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλὰ σειράς ζόφου ταρταρώσας παρέδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν τηρομένους (II Peter 2:4, NKJV). Jude echoes the same idea declaring, “And the angels who did not keep their proper domain, but left their own abode, He has reserved in everlasting chains under darkness for the judgment of the great day” – δείγμα πυρὸς αἰωνίου δίκην ὑπέκχουσα (7, NKJV). This, of course, parallels the binding of the Titans in Greek myth. The hundred handed creatures Kottos, Briareos and Gyges who assist the Olympians in their battle with the Titans are said to have “Overshadowed the Titans, and they sent them under the wide-pathed earth and bound them with cruel bonds- having beaten them down despite their daring- as far under earth as the sky is above, for it is that far from earth down to misty Tartaros” – κατὰ δὲ ἐκκίνησαν βελέσας Τητήρας, καὶ τοὺς μὲν ὑπὸ χθόνος εὐρυθέντας πέμμαν καὶ δειμόσιν ἐν ἀργάλειον ἐδίησαν χειρῖν νικήσαντες ὑπὲρθύμιοι περ ἐόντας, τόσον ἐνεργὸν ὑπὸ γῆς, ὅσον οὐρανός ἐστὶ ἀπὸ γᾶτας, τόσον γὰρ τ’ ἀπὸ γῆς ἑς Τάρταρον ἠρέσεντα (Hesiod, Theogony, 716-721, Lombardo).
of Greek philosophy always filtering it through Christian teachings.5

The epithet “Martyr,” which has become attached to his name almost as a cognomen, is naturally drawn from the death which he suffered on account of his faith. Sources vary slightly with regard to the date and circumstances of his death. Eusebius places the death of Justin during the joint reign of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus (ibid. 18.2). He understands, as Justin predicted (2 Apol. 3:1), the cause of his martyrdom to arise from a conflict with the Cynic Crescens. He writes:

…φιλοσόφου Κρήσκευτος (τὸν φερόμενον δ’ οὖσα τῇ Κυνικῇ προσηγορίᾳ βίον τε και τρόπον ζήλου) τῆς ἐπιβολής αὐτῷ κατταυσάσθαι, ἐπειδὴ πλεονάς ἐν διάλογοις ἄκροτοι παρώντες εὐθύναι αὐτὸν, τὰ νικητῆρας τελευτῶν…

…the philosopher Crescens (who tried both in life and custom to bear the name Cynic) contriving a plan against him, since often in discussions with him with those present who were listening and taking account, he was victorious…” (ibid. 4.16.1).

In his Chronicon Eusebius places the date a little too early at 155 A.D. Antoninus died in A.D. 161. The primary account of Justin’s death is recorded in The Acts of Justin and Seven Companions.6 an early text representing both the tradition of the early church and, as some have argued, the court records of the day.7 This text dates the martyrdom of Justin to the time when Q. Iunius Rusticus was Urban Prefect, A.D. 163-168 (PIR, 2.535). Rusticus was one of Marcus Aurelius’ Stoic teachers (HA, “Marcus Antoninus,” 3). The two variant text-forms, which Bisbee believes are younger than the first, claim that Justin was beheaded (B.6, C.6) on the first day of June (C.6). Some scholars have found it difficult to reconcile the two accounts because no mention is made of Crescens; the issue is simply whether or not Justin and his companions are Christians. This may not be as problematic as it seems. In Justin’s own account of an earlier trial we see that the man who manipulated the events leading to a trial on the question of Christian identity is not mentioned at the trial itself (2 Apol. 2.1-18). Epiphanius (c. 315-405), writing slightly after Eusebius, somewhat confirms the dating of The Acts, claiming that Justin was martyred “by the Romans, under the governor Rusticus and the emperor Hadrian” – ἐπὶ τῆς Ἑρωμαίων ἐπὶ Ρωστικοῦ ἡγεμόνος καὶ Ἀδριανοῦ βασιλέως (Haer. 46.1). Epiphanius is either mistaken about who was emperor at the time or he uses the identification of “Hadrian” as one of his family names.8 Our final source, the 7th century Chronicon Paschale, offers a date generally agreed upon by scholars of 165 AD.

5 Not all of the issues surrounding Justin’s Platonism concern us in this study. Even so, we highly recommend Nahm’s article, “The Debate on the ‘Platonism’ of Justin Martyr” Second Century 9 (1992): 129-151, as an excellent starting point for the consideration of these issues.


7 Gary Bisbee, in his work “The Acts of Justin Martyr: A Form-Critical Study” The Second Century 3 (1983):129-157, has done some valuable work on this text, analyzing the variant manuscripts and the style of court records during this period.

8 His full name was Marcus Aelius Aurelius Antoninus, the “Aelius” from Hadrian.

Jesus declared: “…do not fear those who kill the body but cannot kill the soul. But rather fear Him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell” – καὶ μὴ φοβηθῆτε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτεινόντων τὸ σῶμα, την δὲ σειρὰν μὴ δυναμένων ἀποκτεῖναι: φοβηθῆτε δὲ μάλλον τὸν δυνάμενον καὶ σειρὰν καὶ σῶμα ἀπολέσαι ἐν γένεισιν. (Mt 10:28).

Justin declares that suicide would be against the will of God. The Christian writer L. Caecelius Lacantius (250-317 AD) explicitly condemns suicide (7.89, 183). Augustine, in his work The City of God, discusses the suicide of Judas concluding: “…[Judas] giving up hope for the mercy of God, regretting the death, left no place for healing repentance for himself” – “…[Judas] Dei misericordiam desperando eutilabiliter paenitens, nullum sibi salubris paenitentiae locum reliquit (1.17). The Bible is silent on the issue, apart from the general condemnation of murder (Exodus 20:13, Deuteronomy 5:17), and (as Augustine observed) the logical conclusion that it deprives one of the opportunity for repentance (see Acts 8:22; 26:20).

Heraclitus

Heraclitus, the pre-Socratic Ephesian philosopher (c. 544-484 B.C.), had a significant influence upon Justin’s beliefs. In I Apol. Justin claims, “Those who have lived in accordance with the Logos, were Christians, even though they were considered godless, such as, among the Greeks Socrates, Heraclitus, and those like them, and among the barbarians Abraham, Hananiah, Azariah, Michaela, Isaiah, and many others…” – καὶ οἱ μετὰ λόγου βιώσαντες Χριστιανοὶ εἰς, κἂν ἄθεοι ἐνοικηθήσαντο, οἷον ἐν “Ελλησι μὲν Σωκράτης καὶ Ἡράκλειτος καὶ οἱ οἵμοιοι αὐτῶν, ἐν βαρβάροις δὲ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἀνασίας καὶ Ἀζαρίας καὶ Μισαήλ καὶ Ἡλίας καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοὶ… (46.3). Heraclitus’ statements regarding the logos are very similar to Justin’s own wording. In fr. 1 he claims “all things happen in accordance with this logos” – γινομένων γὰρ πάντων κατὰ τὸν λόγον τόνδε (Sextus adv. Math., 7.132). In fr. 2 he claims, “Though the logos is common, many live as though they have a private understanding” – τοῦ λόγου δὲ ἐνότος ξυνὸς ξώσουν οἱ πολλοὶ ὡς ἰδίους ἔχοντες φρόνησιν (ibid.). Wilcox understands Heraclitus to suggest that “logos is the same as divine law” (p. 629).

Musonius

C. Musonius Rufus, the Etruscan Stoic philosopher (c. 65 A.D.), was a friend of Rubellius Plautus who was banished by Nero in 65 A.D. as a teacher of philosophy and rhetoric (Tacitus, Ann. 15.71; Dio Cassius, 62.27). In 69 A.D. he acted as an envoy of Vitellius to the troops of Antonius (Tacitus, Hist. 3.81). When Vespasian banned the philosophers in 71 A.D. Musonius was not included (Dio. Cass. 66.13). He was still in Rome in 93 A.D. (Pliny, 3.11.).

Of the fragments of his teachings which remain, three issues relate to Justin’s
All that we know about Crescens comes from either Justin (2 Apol. 3.1; 11.2), or his disciple Tatian (Orat. 19), and then Eusebius (HE, 4.16; Chron. 156 A.D.), and Jerome (Ill. 23) who draw from them. Abraham Malherbe offers us a wonderful exploration of Justin’s encounter with Crescens in his article “Justin and Crescens,” Christian Teaching: In Honor of LeMoi Ne G. Lewis, ed. E. Ferguson, (Abilene: Abilene Christian University, 1981):312-327.

The Christians’ refusal to acknowledge the pagan gods, often led to the charge that Christians were “godless.” It may be that Crescens himself advanced these same charges against Christians. Malherbe finds it “ironic that the Cynic would accuse the Christians of crimes so frequently laid at the door of Cynics themselves” (p. 316). For a further discussion of this see Donald R. Dudley, “Cynicism in the Second Century A.D.” The History of Cynicism (Hildesheim:London, 1967): 143-185.

Justin claims that Crescens wanted to avoid suspicion. Malherbe suggests, “Both Justin’s reasons for doing so and Crescens’ for opposing the Christians may be due to the fact that the Cynics and Christians were beginning to be lumped together by opponents of both” (p. 316).

Justin accuses Crescens of indifference. Justin is making an overt attack upon a basic tenet of Cynic doctrine: “indifference” – ἀδιάφορία. Attempting to live life “in accordance with nature” – κατὰ φύσιν with “self-sufficiency” – αὐτάρκεια, Cynics were indifferent to some social norms of dress, decency, and custom, yet probably not as extreme as Justin would characterize them. Cf. Cicero’s Academic Questions where with regard to ἀδιάφορία the claim is made “summum bonum est” (2.130).

Suicide

In chapter four, Justin responds to a taunt that Christians should commit suicide. Tertullian preserves a similar taunt: “When Arrius Antoninus was vehemently pursuing in Asia, all those Christians of the province brought themselves before his judgment seat. Then he, when he ordered a few to be lead away [to execution], said to the rest, ‘O, wretched men, if you wish to die, you have cliffs and nooses’” – Arrius Antoninus in Asia cum persequeretur instanter, omnes illius civitatis Christiani ante tribunalia eius se manu facta obtulerunt. Tum ille, paucis duci iussis, reliquis ait: “‘Ω δειλοί, εἴ θέλετε ἀποθνῄσκειν, κρίμνους ή βρέχους ἔχετε.’ (Ad Scap. 5.2).

It was their fearlessness in the face of death that led the critics to imagine that Christians were suicidal. On the contrary, two teachings inspired this courage: 1. The necessity of confession of Christ. Jesus taught: “Therefore whoever confesses Me before men, him I will also confess before My Father who is in heaven. But whoever denies Me before men, I will also deny before My Father who is in heaven” – Πάσας οὖν ὅσιις ὁμολογήσειν ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐμπροσθέν τῶν ἄνθρωπων, ὁμολογήσεις κάγω ἐν αὐτῷ ἐμπροσθέν τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς; ὅσις δ’ ἂν ἀρνησθῇ ἐν εἰμπροσθέν τῶν ἄνθρωπων, ἀρνησόμαι κάγω αὐτὸν ἐμπροσθέν τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς. (Mt 10:32-33); 2. The promise of judgment beyond this life.

B. JUSTIN’S WORKS.

Πλέοντα δὲ οὕτως καταλέλοιπην ἡμῶν πεπαιδευμένης διανοίας καὶ πρὶν τὰ θεία ἐσπουδασκάλως ὑπομνήματα, πάσης ὁφελείας ἐμπέλας.

This [Justin] has left us many monuments of a mind well stored with learning, and devoted to sacred things, replete with matter profitable in every respect. (Eusebius, HE 4.18.1, Cruse).

The great respect with which Justin was held among early Christians is well reflected in the quote above, with which Eusebius begins his list of the works of Justin. He claims first that Justin wrote one text (Λόγος) to Antoninus Pius, his children, and the Roman senate (ibid.). He then claims that he composed a second (δευτέρα) to Pius’ successor Antoninus Verus (ibid.), when he ruled jointly with Marcus Aurelius (ibid. 14.10). This matches the address with which the text known to us as the First Apology begins, yet however the text of the Second Apology does not start with an address. Eusebius goes on to add that Justin wrote a work πρὸς Ἐλλήνας “to the Greeks” (ibid.), and a second (ἐπτέρον) which he entitled Ἑλέγχου ἡ Refutation (ibid., 4). In addition he discusses Justin’s Dialogue with Trypho (ibid., 6) as well as three other works, Psaltes (ibid., 5); Περὶ Ψυχῆς “On the Soul” (ibid.); and a Treatise against Macion which he both refers to and quotes (ibid., 9).

With the exception of the apologetic works and the Dialogue with Trypho, most of Justin’s other works have been lost to us. There are a number of works attributed to Justin which are considered spurious. Roberts and Donaldson have classified these works into two categories:

1.) Those that are probably spurious -
- An Address to the Greeks; Hortatory Address to the Greeks;
- On the Sole Government of God;
- An Epistle to Diognetus;
- A Fragment on the Resurrection;
- Other Fragments, and,

2.) Those which are unquestionably spurious -
- An Exposition of the True Faith;
- Replies to the Orthodox;
- Christian Questions to the Gentiles;
- Epistle to Zenas and Seranus; and
- A refutation of certain Doctrines of Aristotle.
With respect to the work we know as the *Second Apology*, a number of problems present themselves which have led scholars to question whether or not it actually represents the second (*δεύτερα*) work to which Eusebius refers. First, some see the shorter work called the *Second Apology* as incomplete. Goodenough claims:

> The chapters which we have are obviously a fragment, for there is no introductory address, and the first sentence begins abruptly with a “but” (*TJ*, p. 84).

Others have challenged this conclusion. Marcovich argues:

> As for internal evidence, each Apology displays a separate unity. For example, as a kind of ring-composition, 1 A. opens with the terms τῆς προσώπου καὶ ἑντύσεως (1.7) and closes with the terms τῆς προσώπου καὶ ἑξήγησιν (68.11). ... 2 A. too opens with the terms σύνταξις (1.5) and closes with the same term, τούτοις τὸς λόγος συντακτέον (15.4). (*AC*, p. 8).

In the same spirit Keresztes sees the “So-called” *Second Apology* as a “work of rhetoric” having “all the signs of independence and completeness in itself.” He writes:

> Its purpose, as expressed in the exordium, proposition, and peroration, is carried out in the confirmation; pagans must change their attitude toward Christians. The Second Apology is, evidently, not an apology in either the rhetorical or forensic sense. It is a product of the proreptic, deliberative rhetoric sent to the ruling Emperor as an application (*p. 867*).

A second problem comes from the fact that Eusebius, just before he quotes from what is known to us as the *Second Apology*, cites the text as “in the first apology” – ἐν τῇ πρότερᾳ ἁπολογίᾳ (*HE*, 4.17.1). This has led many to classify the work as a part of the *First Apology*, calling it the Appendix. Yet, the difficulty with this conclusion is the fact that Eusebius in another passage, after referring to a “second book” – δεύτερα βιβλίον (*HE*, 4.16.1), proceeds to quote from the *Second Apology* (3.1), identifying it as “in the indicated apology” – ἐν τῇ δεξιάλωμενῃ ἁπολογίᾳ (*HE*, 4.16.2).

Thirdly, three times in the *Second Apology* Justin uses the phrase “as we said before” – ὡς προέφημεν (6.5; 8.1; 9.1) and once simply προέφημεν (4.2), which could be understood to refer to statements from the *First Apology*. This is by no means conclusively indicative of a unity of the two works. It could be that Justin is simply calling their attention to what he had previously written, or simply declaring that the point in question he had taught on other occasions.

---

fornication” – παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας (Matt. 5:32) or εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνεία (Matt. 19:9). With respect to all other causes, Jesus commands “Therefore what God has joined together, let not man separate.” – ὁ δὲ Θεὸς συνέζεύξεν, ἀνθρώπος μὴ χωρίζεται (Matt 19:6). There is no sin in sustaining the marriage. On the contrary, Paul writes “But to the rest I, not the Lord, say: If any brother has a wife who does not believe, and she is willing to live with him, let him not divorce her. And a woman who has a husband who does not believe, if he is willing to live with her, let her not divorce him. For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband; otherwise your children would be unclean, but now they are holy.” – Τοις δὲ λοιποῖς λέγω ἐγώ, σὺς ὁ Κύριος: εἰ τῆς ἀδέλφου γυναίκα ἔχει ἄπιστον, καὶ αὐτὴ συνευδοκεῖ οἶκεν μετώπαυστο, μή ἀφεῖται ἄνδρα καὶ γυνὴ εἰ τῆς ἔχει ἄνδρα ἄπιστον, καὶ οὕτος συνευδοκεῖ οἶκεν μετὼ ἄυτῆς, μή ἀφεῖται τὸν ἄνδρα. ἤγιασται γὰρ ὁ ἄνδρος ἐὰν τῇ γυναικείᾳ, καὶ ἥγιασται ἡ γυνὴ ἢ ἄπιστος ἐν τῇ ἀδέλφῳ ἐπεὶ ἄρα τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν ἀκάθαρτα ἐστίν, νῦν δὲ ἀγία ἐστίν. (1 Corinthians 7:12-14).

In spite of the NT teachings, it is clear that among 2nd Century Christians these ideas were becoming prominent. Grant suggests the woman may have been influenced by teachings such as we have preserved in Shepherd of Hermas (p. 465). This text claims that if one remains with an immoral mate “even you yourself are a participant in his sin” – καὶ σὺ μέτοχος εἰ τῆς ἀμαρτίας αὐτοῦ (Mand. 4.1.9).

Justin tells us the woman submitted a repudium. This is a Latin term used for a particular type of divorce procedure. Although it can (as in this case) refer to an actual divorce, generally repudium applied to marriages that had only been contracted (Smith, p. 419). Under the Lex Julia, enacted by Augustus, a repudium was required to take place in the presence of seven witnesses of full age who were Roman citizens (Dig. 24.2.9). Under Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius the Roman jurist Gaius records that a repudium declared the words “have your things for yourself” – tuas res tibi habeto, or “conduct your own affairs” – tuas res tibi agito (Dig. 24.2.2).

Grant suggests that part of the accusation the woman’s husband makes may have involved charges of previous indecent behavior with the servants, as in this same verse (p.467). However, it is clear that the charge of being a Christian had been sufficient grounds for punishment since the days of Trajan. In the famous correspondence between Pliny and the Emperor he asks the question “…[should] the name [Christian] itself, if it is free from offenses [be immune], but offenses together with the name be punished?” – …nomen ipsum, etiamis flagitas careat, an flagitia cohaerentia nominis punitur? (10.96). To which the Emperor replies that one shown to be a Christian should be punished, unless “he denies that he is a Christian” – negaverit se Christianum esse (10.97).

Gerd Luedemann, in his article “Zur Geschichte des ältesten Christentums in Rome” ZNW 70 (1979):97-114, speculates that the man who taught the woman, may be the Valentinian Gnostic of the same name referred to by Irenaeus (Adv. Haer. 1.2) and Tertullian (Adv. Val. 4). Luedemann concludes, “…teachers of the type such as Ptolemaeus, even if they later were stamped as heretics, proved themselves as pacemakers.

Finally, some have argued that both works are addressed to the same figures: Antoninus Pius and his sons in the First Apology (1.1); then, when narrating the condemnation of some Christians he quotes a reference to “the emperor Pius” – ὁ ἐνοποιεὶ αὐτοκράτορι and then to “the philosopher, the child of Caesar” – ὁ φιλόσοφος Καίσαρα παιδί (2.16). While there is little doubt that these references both refer to Antoninus Pius and his adopted son Marcus Aurelius, the second is not an address (see Goodenough above) but a historical marker indicating when the trial took place.

Although certainly questions remain with respect to the identity of the smaller apologetic work of Justin which has come down to our time, for the purposes of the present study we will simply identify it as The Second Apology.

The date of the writing of The First Apology is fairly well established. Justin himself declares: “they say Christ was born one hundred and fifty years ago” – εἶποσί πρὸ ἐτῶν ἐκάτων πεντήκοντα γεγεννησαί τὸν Χριστὸν (1 Apol. 46.1). Sir Fredrick Kenyon was the first to narrow this from a reference in The First Apology 29.2 to an event involving L. Munatius Felix, who was Prefect of Egypt from 150-154 A.D. (PIR, v.2[1983] M723), which Justin claimed happened “presently” – ἀκόμη (p.98).

The dating of the Second Apology is a little less clear. If it was, in fact, addressed to Marcus Aurelius as emperor he took this position in 161 A.D. after the death of Antoninus Pius. The text refers to events having taken place “recently” – καὶ τὰ χρῆς δὲ καὶ πρόηνυμι under Q. Lollius Urbicus, the urban prefect from 146-160 A.D. (PIR, v.1[1970] L 327). What we may have then in the Second Apology is either an appeal to Pius and Marcus Aurelius shortly before Pius’ death and the end of Urbicus tenure as Urban prefect – perhaps 158-160; or (if Eusebius is correct) an early appeal to the new Emperor Marcus Aurelius, commenting on the conduct of Urbicus after he no longer held office – around 161 A.D.

D. SOURCES FOR THE TEXT OF JUSTIN.

The manuscript evidence for the works of Justin and the Second Apology specifically relies upon one manuscript: Parisinus graecus 450 (A), which dates to September 11, 1363 (= 6872), and is housed in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris (Marcovich, AC, p. 5). This manuscript, comprised of 467 folios, contains both apologetic works, the Dialogue with Trypho, and a number of the spurious works attributed to Justin (ibid., DT, p. 1). The portion of this manuscript which contains the Second Apology runs from f. 193v to f. 201r (ibid., p. 2). Miroslav Marcovich has done the most recent critical examination of this manuscript in connection with the publication of his Iustini Martyris Apologieae Pro Christianis (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1994), and Iustini Martyris Dialogus Cum Tryphone (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1997). We rely upon his descriptions of the manuscript for all manuscript notations in our own critical text in the
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7
While *Parisinus gr. 450* is the primary manuscript, there are four other secondary sources, all of which appear to rely upon the manuscript *Parisinus gr. 450*. 

*British Museum Loan 36* [or *Claromontanus 82*] (a) is a later manuscript dated to April 2, 1541, which is an apograph of *Parisinus gr. 450*. It was copied by a scribe named Georgios Kokolos (ibid., AC, p. 6).

Eusebius (*Eus*) provides a third textual source in his *Ecclesiastical History*, written around 325 AD. He quotes directly from a text of Justin as he had it in his day. Marcovich (ibid., 1) outlines the portions of the *Second Apology* preserved in Eusebius as follows:

| 2.1-19 | HE 4.17.2-13 |
| 3.1-6  | HE 4.16.3-6 |
| 12.1,2 | HE 4.8.5 |

The two final sources are a small segment found in the *Sacra parallela* of John of Damascus (*Dam*) Nrr. 96-5.37.12 containing part of 2 Apol.11.7; and a small portion of 2 Apol. 3.1-6 contained in the Byzantine *Chronicon Paschale* (*Pasc*) 482.11-483.7.

---

NOTES

The Praefectus Urb

The *Praefectus Urb* was a position that had been established by Augustus to “discipline the slaves and those other inhabitants who need threats of force to keep them in order” – *coerceret servitia et quod civium audacia turbidum nisi vim metuat* (Tacitus, *Annals of Imperial Rome*, 6.11, Grant). He heard cases referred to him from other magistrates, and those involving a death penalty (*Dio Cassius* 52.21). His jurisdiction originally extended one hundred miles outside the city of Rome (ibid.), yet by the time of Alexander Severus (c. 222-35 A.D.) it encompassed all of Italy (*Dig*, 1.12.1). Those brought before the *Praefectus Urb* could appeal only to the Emperor (*Dio Cassius* 52.33; *Dig*, 4.4.38). Q. Lollius Urbicus was the urban Prefect of Rome from 146-160 A.D. (*PIR*, v.1 [1970] L 327). Urbicus had served as legate to Antoninus Pius in the wars in Britain (*HA*, “Antoninus Pius,” 5.4), and the governor of Britain from 139-143 A.D.

Divorce

Robert Grant in his creative, informative (and somewhat speculative) article “A Woman of Rome: The Matron in Justin,” *Church History* 54 (1985): 461-72, relates Justin’s narrative concerning the woman accused by her husband of being a Christian giving the woman a name sometimes applied to Rome: Flora. In spite of the liberties he takes with the account, this work offers some valuable insights into religious, social, and political issues related to this situation.

Justin suggests that the unnamed woman of chapter two believed it would be impious to stay with an immoral husband. This is not a Scriptural concept. In the New Testament it is not considered impius for a Christian mate to stay with an unbeliever who may be immoral, assuming that the unbeliever does not attempt to involve the Christian in such practices. The woman may have misunderstood the doctrines of both withdrawing from a rebellious believer (e.g. II Thess. 3:6-15), and avoidance of a false teacher (II John 10,11) which both forbid eating with such individuals. Neither of these would apply to the woman’s husband because he was neither a believer nor a false teacher.

Grant thinks Justin is suggesting that the man was compelling his wife to pursue immorality. He renders this “She considered it sinful to lie with her husband from then on, since he insisted on procuring passages for pleasure contrary to the law of nature and to what is right.” (p. 461). The text doesn’t indicate that he was compelling her to act in these ways. “Who sought in every way” (Falls, Dodds); Lat. “vias exquireret” (Maran).

Unlike the Law of Moses, the Law of Christ made concession for a woman to put away an unfaithful husband. Divorce could not occur “except for the cause of
et al = et alia, and others.
f. = folio.
gr. = Graecus.
Haer. = Epiphanius’ Heresies.
HE = Eusebius. Ecclesiastical History.
HTR = Harvard Theological Review.
ibid. = ibidem, in the same place just mentioned.
i.e. = id est, that is.
Il. = Homer. Iliad.
JTS = Journal of Theological Studies.
l. = line.
LS = Liddel & Scott, Greek-English Lexicon, abridged.
LSJ = Liddell, Scott & Jones, Greek English Lexicon.
LT = L.W. Barnard, Justin Martyr: His Life and Thought.
LXX = The Septuagint: Greek translation of the Old Testament.
Mem. = Xenophon. Memorabilia.
mg = in the margin.
ms. = manuscript.
mss. = manuscripts.
NKJV = The New King James Version of the Holy Bible.
Od. = Homer. Odyssey.
om. = omit.
OT = Old Testament.
p. = page.
PIR = Prosopographia Imperii Romani.
pp. = pages.
r = recto, the front of a ms.
TR = Textus Receptus.
v = verso, the back of a ms.
VT = Vetus Testamentum.
ZNW = Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft.
least they are not like the teachings of the Sotadists, and the Philaenid-
ians, and the Archestratians,30 and Epicurians, and other such poets
which all may encounter both acted and written.

4 And we shall leave off the rest, having done all that was
possible for us, and having prayed in addition that all men every-
where be counted worthy of the truth. 5 And may it be that you,
therefore, on behalf of yourselves render just judgments,31 worthy
of piety and the love of wisdom.

30 Or, as the ms. reads dancers. 31 Cf. Hesiod, Works and Days, 263-265.
'Απολογία Δευτέρα - 15.4-15.5

Σωταδείοι καὶ Φιλαινδείοι καὶ 'Αρχεστρατείοι καὶ 'Επικουρείοι καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς τοιούτοις ποιητικοῖς διδάγμασιν οὕχ ὡμοία, οἷς ἐντυγχάνειν πάσι, καὶ γενομένοις καὶ γεγραμμένοις, συγκεχώρηται. 4 Καὶ πανομεθα λοιπὸν, ὃσον ἐφ' ἡμῖν ἢ πράξαντες, καὶ προσεπτευόμενοι τῆς ἀληθείας καταξιωθήναι τοὺς πάντη πάντας ἀνθρώπους. 5 Εἶνος οὖν καὶ ἡμᾶς ἀξίως εὐσεβείας καὶ φιλοσοφίας τὰ δίκαια ὑπὲρ ἑαυτῶν κρίναι.


TEXT & TRANSLATION

Endnotes
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KEY TO THE TEXTUAL APPARATUS

The following text was arranged by a comparison of a number of critical editions of the Greek text of the Second Apology, relying most heavily on that of Marcovich (1994). I have attempted to offer the reader a simplified critical apparatus, and a text which presents the reading of Parisinus gr. 450 (A) whenever possible. I have chosen not to suggest corrections or modifications to the text unless it is quite apparent that the reading of the manuscript represents an overt or common scribal error (e.g. see 10.2 - τοῦ τῷ for τοῦτο). I have avoided attempts to correct stylistic problems.

SIGLA

A     Codex A: Parisinus gr. 450; the primary source for the writings of Justin, dated to 1363.
a     Codex a: British Museum Loan 36, believed to have been copied from mss. A, dated to 1541.
Eus.  Eusebius’ Historia Ecclesiastica.
Syr.  Syriac version of Historia Ecclesiastica.
Dam.  John of Damascus’ Sacris Parallelis - quotes II Apol. 11.7-8
Pasch. Chronicon Paschale - Byzantine chronicle compiled in early 7th cent.; contains a portion of II Apol. 3.

BREVIATA
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[αβγ]   erased (or destroyed) text
<αβγ>   text added by scholars
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Gildersleeve, B.L. – New York, 1877.
Grundl, P.B. – August., 1891
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JUSTIN’S SECOND APOLOGY - 13.3-15.3

3 For each one spoke well seeing by the portion of the seminal divine Logos that was inborn; but those speaking things opposing themselves in the more principle things seem not to have had an understanding of what is seen dimly and unrefuted knowledge.
4 Therefore as many things as may be spoken well by all belong to we who are Christians; for we love and worship with God, the Logos from the unbegotten and indescribable God, since He became man for our sake, and so that by becoming a participant in our sufferings He might provide the cure. 5 For all writers through the implanted seed of the Logos present in them were able too see reality only dimly.
6 For the seed and the imitation (according to the ability that each is given) is one thing but the participation and imitation of the Logos (which is in accordance to the gift which is from Him), is another thing which is not the same.

14 And we think it fit therefore that you set forth this little book, adding to it whatever seems best to you and thus our views may be known to others and they may be able to be set free from false opinions and ignorance of good things, who to their own blame are responsible for these retributions for making these things known to men.28 2 Because it is in the nature of men to be capable of knowing what is good and what is shameful, and both as a consequence of our condemnation (whom they do not understand, yet they say do such sorts of shameful things), and because they rejoice in such things in the deeds of the gods, even now they still demand the same things from men and from us (while they do such things), they require death, or chains, or some other sort of thing which they prefer, condemning us ourselves with no need for other judges.

15 (And of the one in my nation, I despise the teaching of the impious and deceitful Simon.)29 2 If you would publish this we would make it evident to all, in order that if possible they might be converted. Indeed, for this favor alone we have marshalled these arguments. 3 And it is not possible in accordance with sound minded judgment to consider our teachings shameful, but more noble than all human philosophy. And if not, at

25 Some scholars suggest instead unfailing. 26 Or grace. 27 Or worthy of punishment. 28 Some scholars consider the phrase for making these things known to men to be a scribal gloss. 29 Believed to refer to Simon Magus, also from Samaria. Some consider verse a scribal gloss from Dial. 120.6.
OTHER WORKS

Nolte, J. H. – Notes in Patrologia Graeca.
Pearson, C. – Annotations to the edition of Thirlby.

TEXTUAL NOTES

HEADING: Although the manuscript titles the work ΠΡΟΣ ΤΗΝ ΡΩΜΑΙΩΝ ΣΥΓΚΛΗΣΟΝ, internal evidence indicates that it was addressed to the emperor as well. In 3.5 Justin asks for a fair examination of his debates with Crescens claiming “and this would be the work of a king” – βασιλικόν δ’ ἀν καὶ τούτῳ ἔργον εἶ.

3.1 (8.1) Κάγω οὖν… - This entire chapter follows chapter seven in the manuscript. However, “Eusebius assisted us in identifying a textual dislocation in cod. A and in restoring the original order of chapters (chapter 8 belongs between chapters 2 and 3)” (Marcovich, p. 4). In H. E. 4.17 after quoting the entire text of chapter two, Eusebius writes: “To these things Justin reasonably and suitably adds his words which we recollected before [i.e. H.E. 4.16 where he quotes almost all of II Apol. 3.1-6], saying ‘I also, therefore, expect to be conspired against by some of those named.’ and the rest.” – Τούτους δ’ ἱσομοίως εἰκότως καὶ ἀκολούθως ἃς προεμφυσεύσαμεν αὐτοῦ φωνῆς ἐπάγει λέγον “κάγω οὖν προσδοκῶ ὑπὸ τινὸς τῶν ὁμοιασμένων ἐπιβουλευθῆναι” καὶ τὰ λοιπά.
1 Kaτά τά χρής δε καὶ πρώπην εν τῇ πόλει υμῶν γενόμενα εἵπη Οὐρβίκου. [Ω’ Ρωμαίοι,] καὶ τά πανταχόο όμως ύπο τῶν ἁγιομένων ἁλόγως πραγμάτων εξηνάγακας με ὑπὲρ υμῶν, όμοιοπαθῶν ὑπέρ καὶ ἀδελφῶν, καὶ χάνεσθε καὶ μὴ θελήτε διὰ τήν δόξαν τῶν νομιζομένων ἁλόγων τῆς εἴσοδος τῶν ἁλόγων σύνταξιν ποιήσασθαι. 2 Πανταχόο γάρ, ὡς ἂν σωφρονιστεῖται ὑπὸ πατρὸς ἢ γείτονος ἢ τέκνου ἢ φίλου ἢ ἀδελφοῦ ἢ ἀνδρὸς ἢ γυναῖκας κατὸ ἔλεησιν, χωρίς τῶν πειθόντων τῶν ἁδικοὺς καὶ ἀκόλουθος ἐν αἰείνω πυρὶ κοιλαθήσεσθαι, τοὺς δὲ ἐναρέτοις καὶ όμοιώς Χριστῷ βιώσαντας ἐν ἀπαθείᾳ συγγενίζεσθαι τῷ θεῷ· λέγομεν δὲ τῶν γενόμενων Χριστιανῶν, διὰ τὸ δυσμεθέθετον καὶ 1 φηλίδον καὶ δυσκίνητον πρὸς τὸ καλὸν ὀρμήσαι (ο’’) καὶ οἱ φαύλοι δαῖμονες, ἔχθραίνοντες ἤμιν καὶ τοὺς τοιούτους δικαστά ἔχοντες ὑποχείρισθαι καὶ λατρεύουσας, ἡς οὖν ἄρχουσας δαμασίωνουσας, φονευεῖν ἤμισις παρασκευάζουσιν. 3 Ὄπως δὲ καὶ ἡ αἰτία τοῦ παντός γενόμενον ἐπί Οὐρβίκου φανερὰ υμῖν γένεται, τὰ παραγιγέμενα ἀπαγγέλω.

2 Τοίς τῆς συνεβίου ἀνδρὶ ἀκολασώνται, ἀκολασάντοσα καὶ οὕτω πρότερον. 2 Ἐπεὶ δὲ τά τοῦ Χριστοῦ διδάγματα ἔγγο αὐτὴ < ἐσωφρονισθῇ καὶ τῶν ἁνδρῶν όμοιως σωφρονεῖν πείθει εἰπεράτο, τά διδάγματα ἀναφέρουσα, τήν τε μέλλουσαν τοὺς ὑπὸ σωφρόνως καὶ μετὰ λόγους ὧν ἐξηθέναι ἐν αἰωνίῳ πυρὶ κόλασιν ἀπαγγέλλουσα. 3 Ὁ δὲ ταύτας ἀσκείας ἐπιμέλειας ἐπέρεμναν ἀλλοτρίαν διὰ τῶν πράξεων ἐποιεῖτο τὴν γαμετήν 4 ἀσβέθες γάρ ἡγουμένη τὸ λοιπὸν ἡ γυνὴ συγκατακλίνεσθαι ἀνδρί, παρὰ τῆς τοῦ φύσεως νόμον καὶ παρὰ τὸ δίκαιον πόρου ἡζονυς ἐκ παντὸς πειράματος ποιεῖσθαι, τῆς συζύγος χωρισθήναι ἐρωτηθή. 5 Καὶ ἐπείθη ἐξευθεσύπτει ὑπὸ τῶν...

JUSTIN'S SECOND APOLOGY - 12.3-13.2

3 Indeed, this already evil and worthless daimones have caused to be done through evil men. 4 For these men, having put some to death on the false accusation made against us, dragged away our household servants to be tortured, whether children or helpless women. Through fearful mistreatment, they compelled them to make these fanciful charges concerning things which they themselves do openly.

None of which apply to us, nor do we concern ourselves with this, since we have as a witness of our thoughts and actions, the unbegotten and indescribable God. 5 For whose sake would we not confess in public that we proved such to be good things and divine philosophy, pretending that the mysteries of Cronos were accomplished in the killing of a man, and in drinking our fill of blood as it is said of us? These are the same things done by you in the honoring of an idol in which the blood, not only of unreasoning animals, but also of men is sprinkled around it. By which one of the most distinguished and well born men among you, makes a libation with the blood of the one who was killed. And so, becoming imitators of Zeus and the other gods, in sexual relations with men and shameless intercourse with women, the writings of Epicurus and those of the poets are brought as a defense.

But since we persuade people to flee these teachings, both with respect to those having done these things and those imitating them, as even now we have contended, struggling in different ways through these arguments. But we are not concerned, since we know God is the just watcher of all things. 7 And if even now someone having gone up on some high platform, cried out, speaking in a tragic voice: “Be ashamed, be ashamed, you who attribute unto the blameless what you do openly, and putting the things belonging to yourselves and to your gods around those to whom not a single thing belongs nor is there any degree of participation. Change yourselves, and become sound-minded!”

13 I in fact, learning about the evil disguise which had been thrown around the godly teachings of the Christians by the evil and worthless daimones to divert other men, laughed at the one spreading the lies, at the disguise and at the opinion held by many. 2 I confess striving both prayerfully and triumphantly to be found a Christian. Not because the teachings of Christ are foreign to those of Plato, but because they are not everywhere the same, just as neither are those of the others, the Stoics, and even the poets and historians.
O Romans, the things which recently have taken place in your city in the presence of Urbicus, and the things everywhere in the same way unreasonably done by those ruling, make it necessary for me to marshal these arguments on your behalf. For we are of common sympathies and brothers, even if you do not know that we are nor wish to acknowledge this out of consideration for the glory of your rank. 2 For everywhere, whoever is chastised by father, or neighbor, or child, or friend, or brother, or husband, or wife is punished in accordance with their shortcoming; except for those persuaded that the unjust and undisciplined shall be punished in eternal fire, but those pleasing and having lived like Christ shall associate with God in freedom from suffering — I am referring to those who have become Christians. Through stubbornness, the love of pleasure, and an unwillingness to be moved towards what is good, evil and worthless daimones, 2 hating us, hold these kinds of judges as subjects, worshippers, and therefore, as rulers guided by right reason.

A certain woman lived with an unchaste husband, she herself having once lived unchaste. 2 But when he persisted in the same excesses, he alienated his wife, sharing bed and board with a husband who was the sort of man trying to find avenues of pleasure from all that is beyond the law of nature and what is right, wanted to be freed from their marriage yoke. But since she considered it impious to remain a wife, trying to persuade her husband, in the same way to be soundminded, setting forth the teachings and declaring the future punishment in eternal fire for those not living sound-minded and by right reason. 3 But when he persisted in the same excesses, he alienated his wife by these actions. 4 But since she considered it impious to remain a wife, sharing bed and board with a husband who was the sort of man trying to find avenues of pleasure from all that is beyond the law of nature and what is right, wanted to be freed from their marriage yoke. 5 But, after she was dissuaded by her people, counseling her to stay with him longer in the hope that a change might come to her husband at some point, she forced herself to stay.

1 Idiom. exp. lit. both yesterday and the day before. 2 Some scholars believe there is a gap here in the ms. 3 Or self-controlled.
JUSTIN'S SECOND APOLOGY - 11.5-12.2

eyes, said to Herakles that if he would follow her she would always attend closely to make things pleasurable and adorn him in splendor even similar to her own. 5 But Virtue, who was in poverty in appearance and in dress, said: “But, if you should obey me, you shall adorn yourself neither in dress nor beauty which melts away and is destroyed, but eternal and noble garments.”

6 And we are wholly persuaded therefore, that the one fleeing the things that seem beautiful and good, but pursuing the things that are considered hard and unreasonable shall receive happiness. 7 For Vice, putting around herself as a screen for her actions the things which belong to Virtue, which truly are beautiful and good, through an imitation using corruptible things (for she has nothing incorruptible nor is she able to make anything incorruptible), brings into slavery the rotten, from among men having placed around Virtue her own evil and worthless things. 8 But those who have realized that the things which belong to Virtue are in reality beautiful and good, through an imitation using corruptible things (for she has nothing incorruptible nor is she able to make anything incorruptible), brings into slavery the rotten, from among men having placed around Virtue her own evil and worthless things. 8 But those who have realized that the things which belong to Virtue are in reality beautiful and good, through an imitation using corruptible things (for she has nothing incorruptible nor is she able to make anything incorruptible), brings into slavery the rotten, from among men having placed around Virtue her own evil and worthless things. 8 But those who have realized that the things which belong to Virtue are in reality beautiful and good, through an imitation using corruptible things (for she has nothing incorruptible nor is she able to make anything incorruptible), brings into slavery the rotten, from among men having placed around Virtue her own evil and worthless things. 8 But those who have realized that the things which belong to Virtue are in reality beautiful and good, through an imitation using corruptible things (for she has nothing incorruptible nor is she able to make anything incorruptible), brings into slavery the rotten, from among men having placed around Virtue her own evil and worthless things.
Justin’s Second Apology - 2.6-2.14

6 But, after her husband, who had gone into Alexandria, was reported doing worse things, in order that she would not become a partner in his unjust and impious deeds, staying in a marriage yoke with him, sharing both his table and his bed, she was separated from him, giving what you call a bill of repudiation.4 But her husband, that fine fellow, who ought to have rejoiced that she who formerly acted recklessly with the servants and the hirelings, rejoicing in drunkenness and in all wickedness, not only stopped doing these things but wanted him to stop the same things. But when he was unwillingly released, he made an accusation claiming that she was a Christian. She then presented a paper to you the emperor, intending first to be allowed to arrange her household affairs, and then after the affairs of her household were arranged to answer the accusation. And you permitted this.

9 But her former husband, now no longer able to speak against her, turned in the following manner against a certain man named Ptolemaeus, who was her teacher of Christian doctrines (this is the man whom Urbicus punished.)10 The centurion who had thrown Ptolemaeus into prison, being his friend, he persuaded him to take Ptolemaeus and to interrogate him on this alone - if he was a Christian.

11 And Ptolemaeus, a lover of truth but neither deceitful nor dishonest in thought, when he confessed that he was a Christian, the centurion had him put in chains, and he was punished in prison for a long time.

12 But finally, when the man was led to Urbicus, in the same way he was examined on this alone – if he was a Christian. And once more, since he understood his own moral responsibilities5 because of the teachings of Christ, confessed his schooling in divine virtue. 14 For one who denies something either denounces the thing which he denies or considering himself unworthy and wholly removed


4 i.e. a bill of divorcement. 5 Or the benefits he had gained.
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Plato, Tim. 28C 20 i.e. scholars. 21 Xenophon, Mem. 2.1.21. 22 Or
wickedness.
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from the thing flees the confession; neither of which belongs to the true Christian.

15 When Urbicus ordered him to be led away, a certain Lucius, who was also a Christian, seeing the unreasonable judgment that happened in this way, said to Urbicus, 16 “What is the charge? Why do you punish one who is neither an adulterer, nor fornicator, nor murderer, nor a thief, nor a plunderer, nor in fact, blamed in any matter except that of confessing to the proscription of the name Christian? 17 O Urbicus, this is not a judgment befitting to the Emperor Pius, nor of the Philosopher, the child of Caesar, nor to the sacred senate.” 18 And he, answering nothing, said to Lucius, “You seem to me also to be one of this sort.” 18 And when Lucius said, “most certainly,” once more he gave orders for him to be led away. 19 But he professed to be grateful, knowing that he was to be delivered from these sorts of evil rulers, and was going to the Father and King of the heavens. 20 And a third man, coming up, was also condemned to be punished.

3 (8) I also, therefore, expect to be conspired against and fixed to wood by some of those named or even perhaps by Crescens himself, a lover of chattering and a lover of boasting.
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4 If there is any dispute about what is noble and what is shameful, let him listen to our teachings also.

5 We understand that evil angels have drawn up laws similar to their own wickedness in which similar men rejoice. And the true Logos, which has come, shows that not all opinions nor all teachings are noble, but some are worthless and some good. Just as I shall even explain to such men the same things and similar things, and it shall be discussed further (if it should be necessary).

9 But lest someone should say, what is said by those considered lovers of wisdom, that our statements that the unjust shall be punished in eternal fire are simply big words inspiring terror, and that we think it fitting that men live properly acceptable lives through fear but not because it is morally beautiful, I will answer this in a few words. Namely, that if this is not so either there is no God, or if there is, there is no care of men in Him, and neither virtue nor wickedness is anything and, as we said before, lawmakers unjustly avenge those who go beyond the noble law codes. 2 But since these men are not unjust, and their Father is teaching through the Logos the same things which He Himself does, those observing these things are not unjust.

10 Therefore our teachings appear to be the most noble of all human teaching, because Christ became the whole Logos manifest for our sake even body, mind, and soul. For as much as the lovers-of-wisdom and lawmakers ever uttered and discovered well, was accomplished in accordance with the discovery and observation of the part of the Logos within them. 3 But since they were not acquainted with all things about the Logos,

15 ἁγεννής καὶ παμπόνηρος, ἰδιωτικῆς καὶ ἀλόγου δόξης καὶ φόβου ἐλάττων ὑμῶν.

20 Ἐκ τιαίταις καὶ μαθεῖν καὶ ἐλέγχει, ότι ἄλληδε μηθὲν ἐπίσταται, εἴθενα ύμᾶς βουλομαι. I 5 Καὶ ὅτι ἄληθεν γένος, εἴ μη ἀνυπόκρισιν ἡμῖν ἢ αὐτοὺς ἐπέγνωσαν, ἐπεί οὐκ ἔρχεται ἡμῖν διὰ τις ἀκοῦσται δὲ ὅτι τις ἀκοῦσται δὲ οὐκ ἠκούσαται, ὁμοίως Ἀπόκρατεῖς ὡς πρόερχοντα, οὐ γινόμενος ἄλλη ἀλλοιώσεως ἀνὴρ ἐκεῖνος, ὅ τι καὶ τοῦτο ἔργον εἰπα. 6 Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐγνώκησαν ύμῖν αἱ ἐπιστήμους μου καὶ ἐκείνους ἀποκρίσεις, φαινομένων ύμών ἐστιν ὅτι οὐκ ἔρχεται τῶν ἡμιτερῶν ἐπίσταται: ἐὰν ἐκτὸς ἐπίσταται, διὰ τις ἀκοῦσται δὲ οὐκ ἠκούσαται, ὁμοίως Ἀπόκρατεῖς ὡς πρόερχοντα, οὐ γινόμενος ἄλλη ἀλλοιώσεως ἀνὴρ ἐκεῖνος, ὅ τι καὶ τοῦτο ἔργον εἰπα.
...this verse if its absence is a scribal omission or not. It is unclear in as we said before...as the sense - as we said before. It is unclear in this verse if its absence is a scribal omission or not.

In most instances where Justin uses this word, as is added before it, with the sense - as we said before. It is unclear in this verse if its absence is a scribal omission or not.
clarded plainly that all things happen according to the necessity of fate.

5 But because God in the beginning made both the race of angels and of men with their own power they shall justly receive retribution in eternal fire because of the things in which they may have erred. 6 And this is the nature of all that is begotten, to be capable of wickedness and of virtue; for neither would any one of them be praise-worthy, if they did not have the power to turn themselves towards both. 7 And those who everywhere make laws and love-wisdom in accordance with true reason show this by commanding to do this thing, but to abstain from that thing.

8 Even the Stoic philosophers, in their concept concerning morals, staunchly honor the same things, so that it is clear in their argument about principles and incorporeal things that they are not taking the right path. 9 For if they say that the things that happen to men happen according to what is fated, either God is nothing except the things always being turned and altered and...wickedness; or that there is neither wickedness nor virtue– which is beyond all sound thought, reason, and good sense.
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Justin's Second Apology - 5.1-6.3

But if someone should entertain the thought that if we confess God as ally we should not, as we say, be seized and punished by unjust men, even this I will resolve for you. 2 God, having made all the universe and having put in subjection earthly things unto men, and arranging the heavenly elements for the growing of crops and the changing seasons, even marshalled a divine law for these (which likewise it appears He had made for the sake of men). But the oversight of men and the things under heaven, he committed to angels, whom he set over them. 3 Now the angels, going beyond this arrangement, were overcome by intercourse with women and they produced children, which are called daimones. 4 And besides the rest, they enslaved the human race to themselves, partly by magic writings and partly by the fears and the punishments they brought upon them, and partly by the teachings regarding sacrifices, incense, and libations (which they had come to need after being enslaved to the passion of desires). And among men they sowed murders, wars, adulteries, unrestraint, and all evil. 5 From which both the poets and those telling legendary tales, not knowing that the angels and those daimones brought forth from them did these things unto males and females, cities and nations about which they wrote, attributed them to the god Zeus himself and their sons as coming from his sown seed. 6 But if someone should entertain the thought that if we confess God as ally we should not, as we say, be seized and punished by unjust men, even this I will resolve for you. 2 God, having made all the universe and having put in subjection earthly things unto men, and arranging the heavenly elements for the growing of crops and the changing seasons, even marshalled a divine law for these (which likewise it appears He had made for the sake of men). But the oversight of men and the things under heaven, he committed to angels, whom he set over them. 3 Now the angels, going beyond this arrangement, were overcome by intercourse with women and they produced children, which are called daimones. 4 And besides the rest, they enslaved the human race to themselves, partly by magic writings and partly by the fears and the punishments they brought upon them, and partly by the teachings regarding sacrifices, incense, and libations (which they had come to need after being enslaved to the passion of desires). And among men they sowed murders, wars, adulteries, unrestraint, and all evil. 5 From which both the poets and those telling legendary tales, not knowing that the angels and those daimones brought forth from them did these things unto males and females, cities and nations about which they wrote, attributed them to the god Zeus himself and their sons as coming from his sown seed. 6 But if someone should entertain the thought that if we confess God as ally we should not, as we say, be seized and punished by unjust men, even this I will resolve for you. 2 God, having made all the universe and having put in subjection earthly things unto men, and arranging the heavenly elements for the growing of crops and the changing seasons, even marshalled a divine law for these (which likewise it appears He had made for the sake of men). But the oversight of men and the things under heaven, he committed to angels, whom he set over them. 3 Now the angels, going beyond this arrangement, were overcome by intercourse with women and they produced children, which are called daimones. 4 And besides the rest, they enslaved the human race to themselves, partly by magic writings and partly by the fears and the punishments they brought upon them, and partly by the teachings regarding sacrifices, incense, and libations (which they had come to need after being enslaved to the passion of desires). And among men they sowed murders, wars, adulteries, unrestraint, and all evil. 5 From which both the poets and those telling legendary tales, not knowing that the angels and those daimones brought forth from them did these things unto males and females, cities and nations about which they wrote, attributed them to the god Zeus himself and their sons as coming from his sown seed. And those called his brothers (and the children in the same way brought forth from them) they referred to as Poseidon and Pluto.

\[\text{The ms. reads simply the god himself. The identification of Poseidon and Pluto as his brothers make it clear Justin has Zeus in mind.}\]
Justin's Second Apology - 6.4-7.4

was called “Christ” with reference to His being anointed and God having arranged all things through Him. The name itself holds an unknown significance, just as the title “God” is not a name but a notion about a thing hard to describe implanted in the nature of men.

4 Yet “Jesus,” the name of both the Man and the Savior, holds a significance. In fact, as we said before He became a man in accordance with the will of God the Father, being brought forth on behalf of those men who believe and for the destruction of daimones, even now you can learn from the things that are observable. For many daimones possessed people in all the world and in your city many of our Christian men, adorning them in the name of Jesus Christ (crucified under Pontius Pilate), although not healed by all other adjuers and incantations and drugs, have healed and now still heal, setting free and driving out the daimones that held the men.

7 (6) On account of which, God waits and does not cause the blending together and dissolution of all the world (so that both the evil and worthless angels and daimones and men might no longer exist), for the sake of the seed of Christians, which He knows is the cause in nature for His delay. For if this was not so, neither would it be possible for you still to do these things, nor further to be influenced by the evil and worthless daimones, but the fire of judgment would come down unrestrained, destroying all things, as earlier the flood, having left no one but one alone with his own family who is called by us Noah, and by you Deucalion, from whom so many in turn are born, some worthless, others diligent.

3 For in the same way, we say there shall be a burning to ashes, not as the Stoics in accordance with the idea of the change of all things into one another, which seems shameful. Nor do we say that the things men do or suffer happen according to what is fated, but according to their deliberate choice each either does right or sins, and by the influence of evil and worthless daimones diligent men such as Socrates and those like him are pursued and imprisoned, yet Sardanapalus, Epicurus, and those like them are considered blessed in abundance and glory. Not having known this, the Stoics de-

---

12 Justin appears to suggest a two-fold etymology for the name Christ: 1. The word kechrisai meaning “to be anointed,” and the unusual suggestion, 2. The word kosmesai meaning “to have arranged.” 13 Or simply.
Justin's Second Apology - 6.4-7.4

was called “Christ” with reference to His being anointed and God having arranged all things through Him. The name itself holds an unknown significance, just as the title “God” is not a name but a notion about a thing hard to describe implanted in the nature of men.

4 Yet “Jesus,” the name of both the Man and the Savior, holds a significance. 5 In fact, as we said before He became a man in accordance with the will of God the Father, being brought forth on behalf of those men who believe and for the destruction of daïmones, even now you can learn from the things that are observable. 6 For many daïmon possessed people in all the world and in your city many of our Christian men, adjuring them in the name of Jesus Christ (crucified under Pontius Pilate), although not healed by all other adjurers and incantations and drugs, have healed and now still heal, setting free and driving out the daïmones that held the men.

7 (6) On account of which, God waits and does not cause the blending together and dissolution of all the world (so that both the evil and worthless angels and daïmones and men might no longer exist), for the sake of the seed of Christians, which He knows is the cause in nature for His delay. 2 For if this was not so, neither would it be possible for you still to do these things, nor further to be influenced by the evil and worthless daïmones, but the fire of judgment would come down unrestrained destroying all things, as earlier the flood, having left no one but one alone with his own family who is called by us Noah, and by you Deucalion, from whom so many in turn are born, some worthless, others diligent.

3 For in the same way, we say there shall be a burning to ashes, but not as the Stoics in accordance with the idea of the change of all things into one another, which seems shameful. Nor do we say that the things men do or suffer happen according to what is fated, but according to their deliberate choice each either does right or sins, and by the influence of evil and worthless daïmones diligent men such as Socrates and those like him are pursued and imprisoned, yet Sardanapalus, Epicurus, and those like them are considered blessed in abundance and glory. 4 Not having known this, the Stoics de-

justin's second apology - 5.1-6.3

5 (4) But if someone should entertain the thought that if we confess God as ally we should not, as we say, be seized and punished by unjust men, even this I will resolve for you. 2 God, having made all the universe and having put in subjection earthly things unto men, and arranging the heavenly elements for the growing of crops and the changing seasons, even marshalled a divine law for these (which likewise it appears He had made for the sake of men). But the oversight of men and the things under heaven, he committed to angels, whom he set over them.

3 Now the angels, going beyond this arrangement, were overcome by intercourse with women and they produced children, which are called daimones. 4 And besides the rest, they enslaved the human race to themselves, partly by magic writings and partly by the fears and the punishments they brought upon them, and partly by the teachings regarding sacrifices, incense, and libations (which they had come to need after being enslaved to the passion of desires). And among men they sowed murders, wars, adulteries, unrestraint, and all evil.

5 From which both the poets and those telling legendary tales, not knowing that the angels and those daimones brought forth from them did these things unto males and females, cities and nations about which they wrote, attributed them to the god Zeus himself and their sons as coming from his sown seed. And those called his brothers (and the children in the same way brought forth) they referred to as Poseidon and Pluto.

6 (5) But for the Father of all, being unborn, there is no set name; for whoever has a name has an older person who gave them the name. 2 But the word “Father,” and “God,” and “Creator,” and “Lord,” and “Master,” are not names, but designations drawn from His beneficial acts.

3 But His Son, the only one rightfully called “Son,” — the Logos, existing with Him and being brought forth before the things made — when He had created and arranged all things through Him,
justin’s second apology - 7.5-8.4

clared plainly that all things happen according to the necessity of fate.

5 But because God in the beginning made both the race of angels and of men with their own power\(^\text{14}\) they shall justly receive retribution in eternal fire because of the things in which they may have erred. 6 And this is the nature of all that is begotten, to be capable of wickedness and of virtue; for neither would any one of them be praise-worthy, if they did not have the power to turn themselves towards both. 7 And those who everywhere make laws and love-wisdom in accordance with true reason show this by commanding to do this thing, but to abstain from that thing.

8 Even the Stoic philosophers, in their concept concerning morals, staunchly honor the same things, so that it is clear in their argument about principles and incorporeal things that they are not taking the right path. 9 For if they say that the things that happen to men happen according to what is fated, either God is nothing except the things always being turned and altered and... wickedness; or that there is neither wickedness nor virtue– which is beyond all sound thought, reason, and good sense.

9 And those who everywhere make laws and love-wisdom in accordance with true reason show this by commanding to do this thing, but to abstain from that thing.

And those who everywhere make laws and love-wisdom in accordance with true reason show this by commanding to do this thing, but to abstain from that thing.

9 And those who everywhere make laws and love-wisdom in accordance with true reason show this by commanding to do this thing, but to abstain from that thing.

10 Othein and pietai and muthulgoi, agnouontes toues aggelous and toues ies autous geniathentes daimones tautes pragei eis dierneias and theliais and poleis and ethi, atper synengrammoi, eis auton tou theou and toues ws apdo autous stoper gennomousious ious kai tou exethontos ekion anothelews [kai tou exethentos ekion anothelews] kai eis anubrposous phous, polleys, mouxiath, akolasia kai pasas kakian exeipna.

5 4 3 2 1 10 9 8 7 6 5 4

22
In most instances where Justin uses this word, as is added before it, with the sense - as we said before. It is unclear in this verse if its absence is a scribal omission or not.
4 But lest someone should say, what is said by those considered
lovers of wisdom, that our statements that the unjust shall be
punished in eternal fire are simply big words inspiring terror,
and that we think it fitting that men live properly acceptable lives
through fear but not because it is morally beautiful, I will answer this
in a few words. Namely, that if this is not so either there is no God,
or if there is, there is no care of men in Him, and neither virtue nor
wisdom is anything and, as we said before, lawmakers unjustly
avenge those who go beyond the noble law codes. But since these
men are not unjust, and their Father is teaching through the Logos
the same things which He Himself does, those observing these things
are not unjust.

3 And if someone should put forward the different laws of
men saying that among some men these laws are considered noble,
but those shameful, yet among others the things considered shame-
ful are noble and the things considered noble are shameful, let him
listen also to what is said to this. 4 We understand that evil angels
have drawn up laws similar to their own wickedness in which similar
men rejoice. And the true Logos, which has come, . . . explain to such men the same things and
similar things, and it shall be discussed further (if it should be neces-
sary). 5 But now, I return to the subject we were discussing before.

Therefore our teachings appear to be the most noble of
all human teaching, because Christ became the whole
Logos manifested for our sake even body, mind, and soul.
2 For as much as the lovers-of-wisdom and lawmakers ever
uttered and discovered well, was accomplished in accordance with the
discovery and observation of the part of the Logos within them.
3 But since they were not acquainted with all things about the Logos,

The word logikon here refers to some aspect of the Logos. Some render it rational-principle.

Marcovich: cf. v. 9 μη είλαι
Marcovich: καί A

The word logikon here refers to some aspect of the Logos. Some render it rational-principle.

Or logos.
JUSTIN'S SECOND APOLOGY - 2.15-3.3

from the thing flees the confession; neither of which belongs to the true Christian.

15 When Urbicus ordered him to be led away, a certain Lucius, who was also a Christian, seeing the unreasonable judgment that happened in this way, said to Urbicus, 16 “What is the charge? Why do you punish one who is neither an adulterer, nor fornicator, nor murderer, nor a thief, nor a plunderer, nor in fact, blamed in any matter except that of confessing to the proscription of the name Christian?” O Urbicus, this is not a judgment befiting to the Emperor Pius, nor of the Philosopher, the child of Caesar, nor to the sacred senate.” 17 And he, answering nothing, said to Lucius, “You seem to me also to be one of this sort.” 18 And when Lucius said, “most certainly,” once more he gave orders for him to be led away.

19 But he professed to be grateful, knowing that he was to be delivered from these sorts of evil rulers, and was going to the Father and King of the heavens. 20 And a third man, coming up, was also condemned to be punished.

3 (8) I also, therefore, expect to be conspired against and fixed to wood by some of those named or even perhaps by Crescens himself, a lover of chattering and a lover of boasting. 2 For the man is not worthy to be called a lover of wisdom, who testifies about us publicly what he does not understand, that Christians are atheists and impious, doing these things for the favor and pleasure of the misguided mobs. 3 For, if he runs us down, not having read the teachings of Christ, he is utterly wicked and worse than many of the untrained people, who often guard themselves from the thing flees the confession; neither of which belongs to the true Christian.

15 When Urbicus ordered him to be led away, a certain Lucius, who was also a Christian, seeing the unreasonable judgment that happened in this way, said to Urbicus, 16 “What is the charge? Why do you punish one who is neither an adulterer, nor fornicator, nor murderer, nor a thief, nor a plunderer, nor in fact, blamed in any matter except that of confessing to the proscription of the name Christian?” O Urbicus, this is not a judgment befiting to the Emperor Pius, nor of the Philosopher, the child of Caesar, nor to the sacred senate.” 17 And he, answering nothing, said to Lucius, “You seem to me also to be one of this sort.” 18 And when Lucius said, “most certainly,” once more he gave orders for him to be led away.

19 But he professed to be grateful, knowing that he was to be delivered from these sorts of evil rulers, and was going to the Father and King of the heavens. 20 And a third man, coming up, was also condemned to be punished.

3 (8) I also, therefore, expect to be conspired against and fixed to wood by some of those named or even perhaps by Crescens himself, a lover of chattering and a lover of boasting. 2 For the man is not worthy to be called a lover of wisdom, who testifies about us publicly what he does not understand, that Christians are atheists and impious, doing these things for the favor and pleasure of the misguided mobs. 3 For, if he runs us down, not having read the teachings of Christ, he is utterly wicked and worse than many of the untrained people, who often guard themselves from the thing flees the confession; neither of which belongs to the true Christian.
Justus’s second apology - 10.4-11.4

Neither would we be put to death nor would unjust men and daimones be more powerful than us except for the fact that absolutely every man that is born is obliged to die; because of which we rejoice, giving back what is owed. 2 And indeed to both Crescens and foolish men like him we consider it good and well-timed now to tell here what Xenophon said.

3 Heracles, walking upon a threefold road, says Xenophon, found virtue and vice having appeared in the form of women. 4 And vice, in a luxurious garment, and with an alluring appearance, glowing from such things being immediately enchanting to the human nature, who tried by reason to observe and test things were dragged into the law courts as impious and meddlesome. 5 And Socrates, being the strongest of all of those in this was accused of the same things as we are; indeed they said he brought in new daimones and that he did not regard those whom the city recognized as gods. 6 But he taught men to abandon the evil-worthless daimones and those having done what the poets described, casting out of the state both Homer and the other poets. He instructed men through the investigation of reason to come to full knowledge of the god unknown to them, saying, “it is neither easy to find the Father and Maker of all, nor finding Him is it safe to declare Him unto all.”

7 Our Christ did these things through His own power. 8 For, while no one trusted in Socrates so much as to die on behalf of His teachings; but in Christ, who was known in part even by Socrates (for He was and is the Logos which is in all, and speaking through the prophets the things that were about to happen and through Himself, being of like passions, teachings these things also), not only lovers-of-wisdom, or lovers of words trusted, but both craftsmen and those entirely uneducated, disregarding glory and fear and death since He is the force of the indescribable Father, and not the vessels of human reason.


18 Some scholars think this should be born before. 19 A paraphrase of Plato, Tim. 28C 20 I.e. scholars. 21 Xenophon, Mem. 2.1.21. 22 Or wickedness.
6 But, after her husband, who had gone into Alexandria, was reported doing worse things, in order that she would not become a partner in his unjust and impious deeds, staying in a marriage yoke with him, sharing both his table and his bed, she was separated from him, giving what you call a bill of repudiation. 4 But her husband, that fine fellow, who ought to have rejoiced that she who formerly acted recklessly with the servants and the hirelings, rejoicing in drunkenness and in all wickedness, not only stopped doing these things but wanted him to stop the same things. But when he was unwillingly released, he made an accusation claiming that she was a Christian. 8 She then presented a paper to you the emperor, intending first to be allowed to arrange her household affairs, and then after the affairs of her household were arranged to answer the accusation. And you permitted this.

9 But her former husband, now no longer able to speak against her, turned in the following manner against a certain man named Ptolemaeus, who was her teacher of Christian doctrines (this is the man whom Urbicus punished.) 10 The centurion who had thrown Ptolemaeus into prison, being his friend, he persuaded him to take Ptolemaeus and to interrogate him on this alone – if he was a Christian. 11 And Ptolemaeus, a lover of truth but neither deceitful nor dishonest in thought, when he confessed that he was a Christian, the centurion had him put in chains, and he was punished in prison for a long time.

12 But finally, when the man was led to Urbicus, in the same way he was examined on this alone – if he was a Christian. 13 And once more, since he understood his own moral responsibilities, because of the teachings of Christ, confessed his schooling in divine virtue. 14 For one who denies something either denounces the thing which he denies or considering himself unworthy and wholly removed from the benefits he had gained.
JUSTIN'S SECOND APOLOGY - 11.5-12.2

eyes, said to Herakles that if he would follow her she would always attend closely to make things pleasurable and adorn him in splender even similar to her own. 5 But Virtue, who was in poverty in appearance and in dress, said: “But, if you should obey me, you shall adorn yourself neither in dress nor beauty which melts away and is destroyed, but eternal and noble garments.”

6 And we are wholly persuaded therefore, that the one fleeing the things that seem beautiful and good, but pursuing the things that are considered hard and unreasonable shall receive happiness. 7 For Vice, putting around herself as a screen for her actions the things which belong to Virtue, which truly are beautiful and good, through an imitation using corruptible things (for she has nothing incorruptible nor is she able to make anything incorruptible), brings into slavery the rotten, from among men having placed around Virtue her own evil and worthless things. 8 But those who have realized that the things which belong to Virtue are in reality beautiful and good, through an imitation using corruptible things (for she has nothing incorruptible nor is she able to make anything incorruptible), brings into slavery the rotten, from among men having placed around Virtue her own evil and worthless things. 8 But those who have realized that the things which belong to Virtue are in reality beautiful and good, through an imitation using corruptible things (for she has nothing incorruptible nor is she able to make anything incorruptible), brings into slavery the rotten, from among men having placed around Virtue her own evil and worthless things. 8 But those who have realized that the things which belong to Virtue are in reality beautiful and good, through an imitation using corruptible things (for she has nothing incorruptible nor is she able to make anything incorruptible), brings into slavery the rotten, from among men having placed around Virtue her own evil and worthless things. 8 But those who have realized that the things which belong to Virtue are in reality beautiful and good, through an imitation using corruptible things (for she has nothing incorruptible nor is she able to make anything incorruptible), brings into slavery the rotten, from among men having placed around Virtue her own evil and worthless things.

12 Indeed I myself, when I rejoiced in the teachings of Plato, hearing Christians slandered and seeing them fearless in the face of death and all other things considered fearful, understood that it was impossible for them to act in wickedness and love of pleasure. 2 For what lover of pleasure, or person without self control who considers it a good to eat human flesh, would be able to greet death and thus be deprived of his good ... present life, and elude those ruling; to say nothing of the fact that being put to death, he would denounce himself?
O Romans, the things which recently\(^1\) have taken place in your city in the presence of Urbicus, and the things everywhere in the same way unreasonably done by those ruling, make it necessary for me to marshal these arguments on your behalf. For we are of common sympathies and brothers, even if you do not know that we are nor wish to acknowledge this out of consideration for the glory of your rank. \(^2\) For everywhere, whoever is chastised by father, or neighbor, or child, or friend, or brother, or husband, or wife is punished in accordance with their shortcoming; except for those persuaded that the unjust and undisciplined shall be punished in eternal fire, but those pleasing and having lived like Christ shall associate with God in freedom from suffering – I am referring to those who have become Christians. Through stubbornness, the love of pleasure, and an unwillingness to be moved towards what is good, evil and worthless \(^3\) daimones,\(^2\) hating us, hold these kinds of judges as subjects, worshippers, and therefore, as rulers guided by daimones, and they prepare to kill us. \(^3\) And so, in order that the cause of all that took place in the presence of Urbicus might become evident, I will declare the things that have been done.

A certain woman lived with an unchaste husband, she herself having once lived unchaste. \(^2\) But when he persisted in the same excesses, he alienated his wife, sharing bed and board with a husband who was the sort of man trying to find avenues of pleasure from all that is beyond the law of nature and what is right, wanted to be freed from their marriage yoke. \(^4\) By these actions.

But, after she was dissuaded by her people, counseling her to stay with him longer in the hope that a change might come to her husband at some point, she forced herself to stay.

For everywhere, whoever is chastised by father, or neighbor, or child, or friend, or brother, or husband, or wife is punished in accordance with their shortcoming; except for those persuaded that the unjust and undisciplined shall be punished in eternal fire, but those pleasing and having lived like Christ shall associate with God in freedom from suffering – I am referring to those who have become Christians. Through stubbornness, the love of pleasure, and an unwillingness to be moved towards what is good, evil and worthless daimones,\(^2\) hating us, hold these kinds of judges as subjects, worshippers, and therefore, as rulers guided by daimones, and they prepare to kill us. \(^3\) And so, in order that the cause of all that took place in the presence of Urbicus might become evident, I will declare the things that have been done.

\(^1\) Idiomatic expression, lit. both yesterday and the day before.  
\(^2\) Some scholars believe there is a gap here in the ms.  
\(^3\) Or self-controlled.
JUSTIN'S SECOND APOLOGY - 12.3-13.2

3 Indeed, this already evil and worthless daimones have caused to be done through evil men. 4 For these men, having put some to death on the false accusation made against us, dragged away our household servants to be tortured, whether children or helpless women. Through fearful mistreatment, they compelled them to make these fanciful charges concerning things which they themselves do openly.

None of which apply to us, nor do we concern ourselves with this, since we have as a witness of our thoughts and actions, the unbegotten and indescribable God. 5 For whose sake would we not confess in public that we proved such to be good things and divine philosophy, pretending that the mysteries of Cronos were accomplished in the killing of a man, and in drinking our fill of blood as it is said of us? These are the same things done by you in the honoring of an idol in which the blood, not only of unreasonable animals, but also of men is sprinkled around it. By which one of the most distinguished and well born men among you, makes a libation with the blood of the one who was killed. And so, becoming imitators of Zeus and the other gods, in sexual relations with men and shameless intercourse with women, the writings of Epicurus and those of the poets are brought as a defense.

6 But since we persuade people to flee these teachings, both with respect to those having done these things and those imitating them, as even now we have contended, struggling in different ways through these arguments. But we are not concerned, since we know God is the just watcher of all things. 7 And if even now someone having gone up on some high platform, cried out, speaking in a tragic voice: “Be ashamed, be ashamed, you who attribute ... to whom not a single thing belongs nor is there any degree of participation. Change yourselves, and become sound-minded!”

13 I in fact, learning about the evil disguise which had been thrown around the godly teachings of the Christians by the evil and worthless daimones to divert other men, laughed at the one spreading the lies, at the disguise and at the opinion held by many. 2 I confess striving both prayerfully and triumphantly to be found a Christian. Not because the teachings of Christ are foreign to those of Plato, but because they are not everywhere the same, just as neither are those of the others, the Stoics, and even the poets and historians.
OTHER WORKS

Nolte, J. H. – Notes in Patrologia Graeca.
Pearson, C. – Annotations to the edition of Thirlby.

TEXTUAL NOTES

HEADING: Although the manuscript titles the work ΠΡΟΣ ΤΗΝ ΡΩΜΑΙΟΝ ΣΥΓΚΛΗΤΟΝ, internal evidence indicates that it was addressed to the emperor as well. In 3.5 Justin asks for a fair examination of his debates with Crescens claiming “and this would be the work of a king” – βασιλικὸν δ’ ἂν καὶ τοῦτο ἔργον εἶη.

2.2 (l. 3) ἐσωφρονίσθη - Both manuscript A and a omit ἐσωφρονίσθη through ἐλεγχόμενον (l. 55) “due to the loss of one folio in an example of cod. A - between the words αὕτη and παθήματος on folio 193v, line 10, of cod. A” (Marcovich, p. 1). Our only source for this section is Eusebius’ H. E. 4.17.2-12.

3.1 (8.1) Κάγω ὦν… - This entire chapter follows chapter seven in the manuscript. However, “Eusebius assisted us in identifying a textual dislocation in cod. A and in restoring the original order of chapters (chapter 8 belongs between chapters 2 and 3)” (Marcovich, p. 4). In H. E. 4.17 after quoting the entire text of chapter two, Eusebius writes: “To these things Justin reasonably and suitably adds his words which we recollected before [i.e. H.E. 4.16 where he quotes almost all of II Apol. 3.1-6], saying ‘I also, therefore, expect to be addressed’.” – Τούτοις ὁ Ἰουστινὸς εἰκότως καὶ ἀκολουθῶς ἂς προεμνεύεσθαι αὐτοῦ φωνὰς ἐπάγει λέγον “κάγω ὦν προσδοκόω ὑπὸ τινὸς τῶν ὁμολογημένων ἐπιβουλευθῆναι” καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ.
KEY TO THE TEXTUAL APPARATUS

The following text was arranged by a comparison of a number of critical editions of the Greek text of the Second Apology, relying most heavily on that of Marcovich (1994). I have attempted to offer the reader a simplified critical apparatus, and a text which presents the reading of Parisinus gr. 450 (A) whenever possible. I have chosen not to suggest corrections or modifications to the text unless it is quite apparent that the reading of the manuscript represents an overt or common scribal error (e.g. see 10.2 - τοῦ τὸ for τοῦτο). I have avoided attempts to correct stylistic problems.
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JUSTIN'S SECOND APOLOGY - 13.3-15.3

3 For each one spoke well seeing by the portion of the seminal divine Logos that was inborn; but those speaking things opposing themselves in the more principle things seem not to have had an understanding of what is seen dimly25 and unrefuted knowledge.
4 Therefore as many things as may be spoken well by all belong to we who are Christians; for we love and worship with God, the Logos from the unbegotten and indescribable God, since He became man for our sake, and so that by becoming a participant in our sufferings He might provide the cure. 5 For all writers through the implanted seed of the Logos present in them were able too see reality only dimly.
6 For the seed and the imitation (according to the ability that each is given) is one thing but the participation and imitation of the Logos (which is in accordance to the gift26 which is from Him), is another thing which is not the same.

14 And we think it fit therefore that you set forth this little book, adding to it whatever seems best to you and thus our views may be known to others and they may be able to be set free from false opinions and ignorance of good things, who to their own blame are responsible for these retributions27 for making these things known to men.28 2 Because it is in the nature of men to be capable of knowing what is good and what is shameful, and both as a consequence of our condemnation (whom they do not understand, yet they say do such sorts of shameful things), and because they rejoice in such things in the deeds of the gods, even now they still demand the same things from men and from us (while they do such things), they require death, or chains, or some other sort of thing which they prefer, condemning us ourselves with no need for other judges.

15 (And of the one in my nation, I despise the teaching of the impious and deceitful Simon.)29 2 If you would publish this we would make it evident to all, in order that if possible they might be converted. Indeed, for this favor alone we have marshalled these arguments. 3 And it is not possible in accordance with sound minded judgment to consider our teachings shameful, but more noble than all human philosophy. And if not, at

25 Some scholars suggest instead unfailing. 26 Or grace. 27 Or worthy of punishment. 28 Some scholars consider the phrase for making these things known to men to be a scribal gloss. 29 Believed to refer to Simon Magus, also from Samaria. Some consider verse a scribal gloss from Dial. 120.6.
Ἀπολογία Δευτέρα - 15.4-15.5

Σωτάδειοι καὶ Φιλανδείοι καὶ Ἀρχαστρατείοι καὶ Ἐπικουρείοι καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς τοιούτοις ποιητικοῖς διδάγμασιν οὕς ὅμοια, οἷς ἐνυγχάνειν πάσι, καὶ γενομένοις καὶ γεγραμμένοις, συγκεκριμένοι.

4 Καὶ πανομέθα λοιπόν, ὡσον ἐφώ ἡμῖν ἢ πράξαντες, καὶ προσεπευξάμενοι τῆς ἁληθείας καταξιωθήσατε τοὺς πάντες πάντας ἀνθρώπους. 5 Εἰς οὖν καὶ ἡμᾶς ἄξιος εὐσεβείας καὶ φιλοσοφίας τὰ δίκαια ὑπὲρ ἑαυτῶν κρίναι.  

8 Ἀρχαστρατείοι: Leutsch, Otto, Marcovich: ὀρχηστικὸς Α. Buecheler (ὁρχηστικός); ὀργανιστικὸς Nolte  
10 γενομένοις A, Grundl: λεγομένοις Thirlby, Leutsch, Otto, Marcovich: γενομένοις Buecheler  
14 ἡμᾶς Α: ἡμᾶς Sylburg, Marcovich  
15 ἑαυτῶν Α: ἡμᾶς Périon
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least they are not like the teachings of the Sotadists, and the Philaenid-
ians, and the Archestratians, and Epicurians, and other such poets
which all may encounter both acted and written.

4 And we shall leave off the rest, having done all that was
possible for us, and having prayed in addition that all men every-
where be counted worthy of the truth. 5 And may it be that you,
therefore, on behalf of yourselves render just judgments, worthy
of piety and the love of wisdom.

30 Or, as the ms. reads dancers. 31 Cf. Hesiod, Works and Days, 263-265.
et al = et alia, and others.
f. = folio.
gr. = Graecus.
Haer. = Epiphanius’ Heresies.
HE = Eusebius. Ecclesiastical History.
HTR = Harvard Theological Review.
ibid. = ibidem, in the same place just mentioned.
i.e. = id est, that is.
Il. = Homer. Iliad.
JTS = Journal of Theological Studies.
l. = line.
LS = Liddel & Scott, Greek-English Lexicon, abridged.
LSJ = Liddell, Scott & Jones, Greek English Lexicon.
LT = L.W. Barnard, Justin Martyr: His Life and Thought.
LXX = The Septuagint: Greek translation of the Old Testament.
Mem. = Xenophon. Memorabilia.
mg = in the margin.
ms. = manuscript.
mss. = manuscripts.
NKJV = The New King James Version of the Holy Bible.
Od. = Homer. Odyssey.
om. = omit.
OT = Old Testament.
p. = page.
PIR = Prosopographia Imperii Romani.
pp. = pages.
r = recto, the front of a ms.
TR = Textus Receptus.
v = verso, the back of a ms.
VT = Vetus Testamentum.
ZNW = Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft.
Appendix.11 While Parisinus gr. 450 is the primary manuscript, there are four other secondary sources, all of which appear to rely upon the manuscript Parisinus gr. 450. British Museum Loan 36 [or Claromontanus 82] (a) is a later manuscript dated to April 2, 1541, which is an apograph of Parisinus gr. 450. It was copied by a scribe named Georgios Kokolos (ibid., AC, p. 6).

Eusebius (Eus) provides a third textual source in his Ecclesiastical History, written around 325 AD. He quotes directly from a text of Justin as he had it in his day. Marcovich (ibid., 1) outlines the portions of the Second Apology preserved in Eusebius as follows:

| 2.1-19 | HE 4.17.2-13 |
| 3.1-6 | HE 4.16.3-6 |
| 12.1,2 | HE 4.8.5 |

The two final sources are a small segment found in the Sacra parallela of John of Damascus (Dian) Nrr. 96-5.37.12 containing part of 2 Apol.11.7; and a small portion of 2 Apol. 3.1-6 contained in the Byzantine Chronicon Paschale (Pasc) 482.11 -483.7.

NOTES

The Praefectus Urbi

The Praefectus Urbi was a position that had been established by Augustus to “discipline the slaves and those other inhabitants who need threats of force to keep them in order” – coerceret servitia et quod civium audacia turbidum nisi vim metuat (Tacitus, Annals of Imperial Rome, 6.11, Grant). He heard cases referred to him from other magistrates, and those involving a death penalty (Dio Cassius 52.21). His jurisdiction originally extended one hundred miles outside the city of Rome (ibid.), yet by the time of Alexander Severus (c. 222-35 A.D.) it encompassed all of Italy (Dig. 1.12.1). Those brought before the Praefectus Urbi could appeal only to the Emperor (Dio Cassius 52.33; Dig. 4.4.38). Q. Lollius Urbicus was the urban Prefect of Rome from 146-160 A.D. (PIR, v.1 [1970] L 327). Urbicus had served as legate to Antoninus Pius in the wars in Britain (HA, “Antoninus Pius,” 5.4), and the governor of Britain from 139-143 A.D.

Divorce

Robert Grant in his creative, informative (and somewhat speculative) article “A Woman of Rome: The Matron in Justin. 2 Apology 2.1-9” Church History 54 (1985):461-72, relates Justin’s narrative concerning the woman accused by her husband of being a Christian giving the woman a name sometimes applied to Rome: Flora. In spite of the liberties he takes with the account, this work offers some valuable insights into religious, social, and political issues related to this situation.

Justin suggests that the unnamed woman of chapter two believed it would be impious to stay with an immoral husband. This is not a Scriptural concept. In the New Testament it is not considered impius for a Christian mate to stay with an unbeliever who may be immoral, assuming that the unbeliever does not attempt to involve the Christian in such practices. The woman may have misunderstood the doctrines of both withdrawing from a rebellious believer (e.g. II Thess. 3:6-15), and avoidance of a false teacher (II John 10,11) which both forbid eating with such individuals. Neither of these would apply to the woman’s husband because he was neither a believer nor a false teacher.

Grant thinks Justin is suggesting that the man was compelling his wife to pursue immorality. He renders this “She considered it sinful to lie with her husband from then on, since he insisted on procuring passages for pleasure contrary to the law of nature and to what is right.” (p. 461). The text doesn’t indicate that he was compelling her to act in these ways. “Who sought in every way” (Falls, Dodds); Lat. “vias exquireret” (Maran).

Unlike the Law of Moses, the Law of Christ made concession for a woman to put away an unfaithful husband. Divorce could not occur “except for the cause of

ABREVIATIONS

1 Apol. = Justin, First Apology.
2 Apol. = Justin, Second Apology.
AC = Miroslav Marcovich, Justini Martyris Apologiae Pro Christianis.
abr. = abridged.
AD = Anno Domini, in the year of the Lord.
Ad Scap. = Tertullian, To Scapula.
add. = addit, adds.
Adv. Val. = Tertullian, Against Valentinus
AH = The Augustan History
Apol. = Apology (of Plato or Tertullian).
BC = Before Christ.
Chron. = Eusebius, Chronicon.
cf. = confer, compare.
codd. = codices.
corr. = corrected.
Dig. = Justinian, Digesta.
DT = Miroslav Marcovich, Iustini Martyris Dialogus cum Trypho.
Dial. = Justin, Dialogue with Trypho.
edts. = editors.
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fornication” – παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας (Matt. 5:32) or εἰ μὴ ἐπί πορνεία (Matt. 19:9). With respect to all other causes, Jesus commands “Therefore what God has joined together, let not man separate.” – “Ὁ οὖν Θεὸς συνέζεξεν, ἀνθρώπους μὴ χωρίζετω” (Matt 19:6). There is no sin in sustaining the marriage. On the contrary, Paul writes “But to the rest I, not the Lord, say: If any brother has a wife who does not believe, and she is willing to live with him, let him not divorce her. And a woman who has a husband who does not believe, if he is willing to live with her, let her not divorce him. For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband; otherwise your children would be unclean, but now they are holy.” – Τοις δὲ λοιποῖς λέγω ἔγω, σὺς ὁ Κύριος: εἰ τὰς ἀδελφὰς γυναῖκα ἦχει ἀπίστω, καὶ αὐτὴν συνευδοκεῖ οἰκεῖν μετὰ αὐτοῦ, μὴ ἀφεῖται αὐτήν καὶ γυνὴ εἰ τὰς ἀδελφὰς ἦχει ἀπίστω, καὶ οὗτος συνευδοκεῖ οἰκεῖν μετὰ αὐτῆς, μὴ ἀφεῖται τὸν ἄνδρα. ἤγιασα γὰρ ὁ ἄνδρος ἐν τῇ γυναίκῃ, καὶ ἤγιασα ἡ γυνὴ ἢ ἄνδρα ἦχει ἀπίστω, ἢ ἔπει ἄρα τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν ἁγαθάκασιν ἐστίν, νῦν δὲ ἁγιά ἐστιν. (1 Corinthians 7:12-14).

In spite of the NT teachings, it is clear that among 2nd Century Christians these ideas were becoming prominent. Grant suggests the woman may have been influenced by teachings such as we have preserved in Shepherd of Hermas (p. 465). This text claims that if one remains with an immoral mate “even you yourself are a participant in his sin” – καὶ σὺ μέτοχος εἰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας αὐτοῦ (Mand. 4.1.9).

Justin tells us the woman submitted a repudium. This is a Latin term used for a particular type of divorce procedure. Although it can (as in this case) refer to an actual divorce, generally repudium applied to marriages that had only been contracted (Smith, p. 419). Under the Lex Julia, enacted by Augustus, a repudium was required to take place in the presence of seven witnesses of full age who were Roman citizens (Dig. 24.2.9). Under Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius the Roman jurist Gaius records that a repudium declared the words “have your things for yourself” – tuas res tibi habeto, or “conduct your own affairs” – tuas res tibi agito (Dig. 24.2.2).

Grant suggests that part of the accusation the woman’s husband makes may have involved charges of previous indecent behavior with the servants, as in this same verse (p.467). However, it is clear that the charge of being a Christian had been sufficient grounds for punishment since the days of Trajan. In the famous correspondence between Pliny and the Emperor he asks the question “…[should] the name [Christian] itself, if it is free from offenses [be immune], but offenses together with the name be punished?” – …nomen ipsum, etiamis flagitas careat, an flagitia cohaerenta nominis puniantur? (10.96). To which the Emperor replies that one shown to be a Christian should be punished, unless “he denies that he is a Christian” – negaverit se Christianum esse (10.97). Gerd Luedemann, in his article “Zur Geschicht des ältesten Christentums in Rom” ZNW 70 (1979):97-114, speculates that the man who taught the woman, may be the Valentian Gnostic of the same name referred to by Ireneas (Adv. Haer. 1.2) and Tertullian (Adv. Val. 4). Luedemann concludes, “…teachers of the type such as Ptolemaeus, even if they later were stamped as heretics, proved themselves as pacemakers

Finally, some have argued that both works are addressed to the same figures: Antoninus Pius and his sons in the First Apology (1.1); then, when narrating the condemnation of some Christians he quotes a reference to “the emperor Pius” – ἔνοβετ αὐτοκράτορι and then to “the philosopher, the child of Caesar” – φιλόσοφου Καίσαρος παῖδι (2.16). While there is little doubt that these references both refer to Antoninus Pius and his adopted son Marcus Aurelius, the second is not an address (see Goodenough above) but a historical marker indicating when the trial took place. Although certainly questions remain with respect to the identity of the smaller apologetic work of Justin which has come down to our time, for the purposes of the present study we will simply identify it as The Second Apology.

The date of the writing of The First Apology is fairly well established. Justin himself declares: “they say Christ was born one hundred and fifty years ago” – εἶποσ πρὸ ἑτῶν ἑκατὸν και λίγαρια ἡγενενησαθα τὸν Χριστὸν (1 Apol. 46.1). Sir Fredrick Kenyon was the first to narrow this from a reference in The First Apology 29.2 to an event involving L. Munatius Felix, who was Prefect of Egypt from 150-154 A.D. (PIR, v.2(1983) M723), which Justin claimed happened “presently” – ἡδη (p.98).

The dating of the Second Apology is a little less clear. If it was, in fact, addressed to Marcus Aurelius as emperor he took this position in 161 A.D. after the death of Antoninus Pius. The text refers to events having taken place “recently” – τὰ τελά τοῦ Βασιλείου αὐτοῦ ἤπειρον ἐν τῷ ἀδελφῷ ἀντί παρὰ τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν ἁγαθάκασιν ἐστίν, νῦν δὲ ἁγιά ἐστιν. (1 Corinthians 7:12-14).}

D. SOURCES FOR THE TEXT OF JUSTIN.

T

he manuscript evidence for the works of Justin and the Second Apology specifically relies upon one manuscript: Parisinus graecus 450 (A), which dates to September 11, 1363 (= 6872), and is housed in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris (Marcovich, AC, p. 5). This manuscript, comprised of 467 folios, contains both apologetic works, the Dialogue with Trypho, and a number of the spurious works attributed to Justin (ibid., DT, p. 1). The portion of this manuscript which contains the Second Apology runs from f. 193v to f. 201v (ibid., p. 2). Miroslav Marcovich has done the most recent critical examination of this manuscript in connection with the publication of his Justinis Martyris Usolapologoe Pro Christiansis (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1994), and Justinis Martyris Dialogus Cum Tryphone (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1997). We rely upon his descriptions of the manuscript for all manuscript notations in our own critical text in the
Stylistic issues or internal dating factors deny Justinian authorship of these works. Modern scholars consider the three works known to us as The First Apology, The Second Apology and The Dialogue with Trypho as genuine.

C. CLASSIFICATION OF THE “SECOND APOLOGY.”

With respect to the work we know as the Second Apology a number of problems present themselves which have led scholars to question whether or not it actually represents the second (δευτέρα) work to which Eusebius refers. First, some see the shorter work called the Second Apology as incomplete. Goodenough claims:

The chapters which we have are obviously a fragment, for there is no introductory address, and the first sentence begins abruptly with a “but” (TJ, p. 84).

Others have challenged this conclusion. Marcovich argues:

As for internal evidence, each Apology displays a separate unity. For example, as a kind of Ringcomposition, 1 A. opens with the terms τήν προσώπησιν καὶ ἐντυμοῦ (1.7) and closes with the terms τήν προσφώνησιν καὶ ἐξήγησιν (68.11)… 2 A. too opens with the terms σύνταξις (1.5) and closes with the same term, τούτῳ τοῦ λόγους συνταξαμένος (15.4). (AC, p. 8).

In the same spirit Keresztes sees the “So-called” Second Apology as a “work of rhetoric” having “all the signs of independence and completeness in itself.” He writes:

Its purpose, as expressed in the exordium, proposition, and peroration, is carried out in the confirmation: pagans must change their attitude toward Christians… The Second Apology is, evidently, not an apology in either the rhetorical or forensic sense. It is a product of the proreptic, deliberative rhetoric sent to the ruling Emperor as an application (p. 867).

A second problem comes from the fact that Eusebius, just before he quotes from what is known to us as the Second Apology, cites the text as “in the first apology” – ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἀπολογίᾳ (HE, 4.17.1). This has led many to classify the work as a part of the First Apology, calling it the Appendix. Yet, the difficulty with this conclusion is the fact that Eusebius in another passage, after referring to a “second book” – δεύτερα βιβλίον (HE, 4.16.1), proceeds to quote from the Second Apology (3.1), identifying it as “in the indicated apology” – ἐν τῇ δεδηλωμένῃ ἀπολογίᾳ (HE, 4.16.2).

Thirdly, three times in the Second Apology Justin uses the phrase “as we said before” – ὡς προέφημεν (6.5; 8.1; 9.1) and once simply προέφημεν (4.2), which could be understood to refer to statements from the First Apology. This is by no means conclusively indicative of a unity of the two works. It could be that Justin is simply calling their attention to what he had previously written, or simply declaring that the point in question he had taught on other occasions.

The Emperors

In 1 Apol. 1.1 Justin addresses “Titus Aelius Hadrianus Antoninus Pius Augustus Caesar” – Τίττω Αἰλίῳ Ἀδριανῷ Ἀντωνίνῳ Εὐσέβεις Σεβαστῷ, Καίσαρι. This is the emperor identified in the Augustan History as Antoninus Pius, the adopted son of Hadrian (“Antoninus Pius,” iv). He was named “Pius” (Εὐσέβης = Lat. Pius) by the Senate: “he was called Pius by the Senate – Pius cognominatus est a senatu (ibid., ii.3). He reigned from 138 A.D. (HA, “Hadrian,” xxv.7, Birley) to 161 A.D. (“Antoninus Pius,”12, Birley).

In 1 Apol. 1.1 Justin also addresses “Verrissimus the Philosopher, his son” – Οὖρισσίμῳ υἱῷ Φιλοσόφῳ. Hadrian called Marcus Aurelius, Verissimus (i.e. “most true”): “he was educated in the bosom of Hadrian, who (as we said above) used to call him Verissimus” – Educatus esset in Hadriani gremio, qui illum, ut supra diximus, Verissimum nominabat (HA, “Marcus Antoninus,” 4.1). Justin identifies him by this nickname. After the death of Antoninus Pius Marcus and Lucius Verus became joint emperors – post excessum divi Pii a senatu coactus regimen publicum capere fratem sibi participem in imperio designavit (ibid., vii.5). A condition of Pius’ adoption was that he also adopt Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus, the son of the emperor Aelius (H. A., “Aelius,” vi.9).

Crescens

Tatian writes, “Anyway, Crescens who nested in the great city, surpassed all in pederasty and was totally held by the love of money. And while scorning death, he so feared death that he worked to … even me with death, as evil. Since [Justin] by declaring the truth, convicted the philosophers as greedy and deceitful” – Κρίσικης γούν ὁ ἐννοετεύχας τῇ μεγάλῃ πόλις παιδεραστία μὲν πάντας ὑπερήχυγκεν, φιλαργυρία δὲ πάνω προσχέχετ ἢν, βανατόν ὑς ὁ καταφρονών ὄντως αὐτὸ εὐδείᾳ τὸν βανατον ὑς καὶ Ιουστίνου καθάπερ καὶ ἕμε ὡς κακὸ τῷ βανατῷ περιβαλέω πραγματευσαθαι, διὸ κηρύττων τὴν ἀλήθειαν λόγιον καὶ ἀπατεώνος τούς φιλοσόφους συνήρξεν (Orat. 19). Eusebius quotes Tatian, adding that Justin “according to his prediction was contrived against by Crescens and brought to an end” – κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ πρόθροιν πρὸς τοῦ Κρίσικντος συσκευασθείς ἐπελεύξη (HE, 4.16.7). No mention is made, however of Crescens’ role in the work which describes Justin’s martyrdom, the Acts of Justin and his Seven Companions.

All that we know about Crescens comes from either Justin (2 Apol. 3.1; 11.2), or his disciple Tatian (Orat. 19), and then Eusebius (HE, 4.16; Chron. 156 A.D.), and Jerome (Ill. 23) who draw from them. Abraham Malherbe offers us a wonderful exploration of Justin’s encounter with Crescens in his article “Justin and Crescens,” *Christian Teaching: In Honor of LeMoiine G. Lewis,* ed. E. Ferguson, (Abilene: Abilene Christian University, 1981): 312-327.

The Christians’ refusal to acknowledge the pagan gods, often led to the charge that Christians were "godless." It may be that Crescens himself advanced these same charges against Christians. Malherbe finds it "ironic that the Cynic would accuse the Christians of crimes so frequently laid at the door of Cynics themselves" (p. 316). For a further discussion of this see Donald R. Dudley, “Cynicism in the Second Century A.D.” *The History of Cynicism* (Hildesheim:London, 1967): 143-185.

Justin claims that Crescens wanted to avoid suspicion. Malherbe suggests, “Both Justin’s reasons for doing so and Crescens’ for opposing the Christians may be due to the fact that the Cynics and Christians were beginning to be lumped together by opponents of both” (p. 316).

Justin accuses Crescens of indifference. Justin is making an overt attack upon a basic tenet of Cynic doctrine: “indifference” – ἀδιάφορία ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁπάντων. Attempting to live life in accordance with nature – κατὰ φύσιν with “self-sufficiency” – αὐτάρκεια, Cynics were indifferent to some common social norms of dress, decency, and custom, yet probably not as extreme as Justin would characterize them. Cf. Cicero’s *Academic Questions* where with regard to ἀδιάφορία the claim is made “sumnum bonum est” (2.130).

**Suicide**

In chapter four, Justin responds to a taunt that Christians should commit suicide. Tertullian preserves a similar taunt: “When Arrius Antoninus was vehemently pursuing in Asia, all those Christians of the province brought themselves before his judgment seat. Then he, when he ordered a few to be lead away [to execution], said to the rest, ‘O, wretched men, if you wish to die, you have cliffs and nooses’” – Arrius Antoninus in Asia cam persequeretur instanter, omnes illius civitatis Christiani ante tribunalia eius se manu facta obtulerunt. Tum ille, paucis duci iussis, reliquis ait: “”Ω δειλοί, εί θέλετε ἀποθνῄσκειν, κριμνούς ἢ βρέχους ἔχετε.” (Ad Scap. 5.2).

It was their fearlessness in the face of death that led the critics to imagine that Christians were suicidal. On the contrary, two teachings inspired this courage: 1. The necessity of confession of Christ. Jesus taught: “Therefore whoever confesses Me before men, him I will also confess before My Father who is in heaven. But whoever denies Me before men, I will also deny before My Father who is in heaven” – Πάς οὖν ὁ ὁπιστεύσαν εἰς ἐμοί ἐμπροσθεν τῶν ἄνθρωπων, ὁμολογήσατε κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς: ὅστις δὲ ἀν ἀρνηθητα ἐν ἐμπροσθεν τῶν ἄνθρωπων, ἀρνηθήσεται κἀγώ ἐν ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς. (Mt 10:32-33); 2. The promise of judgment beyond this life.

**B. JUSTIN’S WORKS.**

Πλείστα δὲ οὕτως καταλληλοῦσι ἡμῖν πεπαιδευμένης διανοίας καὶ περὶ τὰ θεία ἐστοιχεῖα υπομνήματα, πάσης ὑφελίας ἐμπλέκει.

This [Justin] has left us many monuments of a mind well stored with learning, and devoted to sacred things, replete with matter profitable in every respect. (Eusebius, HE 4.18.1, Cruse).

The great respect with which Justin was held among early Christians is well reflected in the quote above, with which Eusebius begins his list of the works of Justin. He claims first that Justin wrote one text (Λόγος) to Antoninus Pius, his children, and the Roman senate (ibid.). He then claims that he composed a second (διευθέρα) to Pius’ successor Antoninus Verus (ibid.). He then ruled jointly with Marcus Aurelius (ibid. 14.10). This matches the address with which the text known to us as the *First Apology* begins,9 however the text of the *Second Apology* does not start with an address. Eusebius goes on to add that Justin wrote a work πρὸς Ἑλλήνας “to the Greeks” (ibid.), and a second (ἐπίθετον) which he entitled Ἑλέγχον “a Refutation” (ibid., 4). In addition he discusses Justin’s *Dialogue with Trypho* (ibid., 6) as well as three other works, *Psaltes* (ibid., 5); Πέρι Ψυχῆς “On the Soul” (ibid.); and a *Treatise against Marcion* which he both refers to and quotes (ibid., 9).

With the exception of the apologetic works and the *Dialogue with Trypho*, most of Justin’s other works have been lost to us. There are a number of works attributed to Justin which are considered spurious. Roberts and Donaldson have classified these works into two categories:

1.) Those that are probably spurious -

*An Address to the Greeks; Hortatory Address to the Greeks; On the Sole Government of God; An Epistle to Diogonetus; A Fragment on the Resurrection; Other Fragments,* and,

2.) Those which are unquestionably spurious -

*An Exposition of the True Faith; Replies to the Orthodox; Christian Questions to the Gentiles; Epistle to Zenas and Seranus; and A refutation of Certain Doctrines of Aristotle.*

---

9 Αὐτοκράτωρ Τίτω Αἰλίῳ Ἀδριανῷ Ἀντωνίνῳ Εὐσέβει Σεβαστῷ Καίσαρι, καὶ Οὐρανοῦσίμῳ υἱῷ Φιλάθλῳ, καὶ Λουκίῳ Φιλόσοφῳ. Καίσαρος φύει υἱῷ καὶ Εὐσέβειος εἰσποίηται, ἐρατή θεατήες, ἱερά τε συγκλήτω καὶ δήμω παντι Ρωμαίων. -To the emperor, Titus Aelius Hadrianus Antoninis Pius Augustus Caesar, and Verissimus the philosopher his son, and Lucius the philosopher, the son of Caesar by birth and adopted son of Pius, a lover of discipline, and to the Sacred Senate, and to all the people of the Romans” (1.1).
of Greek philosophy always filtering it through Christian teachings.5 The epithet “Martyr,” which has become attached to his name almost as a cognomen, is naturally drawn from the death which he suffered on account of his faith. Sources vary slightly with regard to the date and circumstances of his death. Eusebius places the death of Justin during the joint reign of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus (ibid. 18.2). He understands, as Justin predicted (2 Apol. 3:1), the cause of his martyrdom to arise from a conflict with the Cynic Crescens. He writes:

...φιλοσόφου Κρήσκεντος (τὸν φερόμενον δε ούτως τῇ Κυνικῇ προσφυγίᾳ βίον τε καὶ τρόπον ἐξίτου) τὴν ἐπιθύμησιν αὐτῷ κατταφανοῦντα, ἐπεθαύμαζεν εἰς διάλογος ἀκρωτῶν παρώντων εὐθύνα αὐτόν, τὰ νικητήρια τελευτῶν...

...the philosopher Crescens (who tried both in life and custom to bear the name Cynic) contriving a plan against him, since often in discussions with him with those present who were listening and taking account, he was victorious....” (ibid. 4.16.1).

In his Chronicon Eusebius places the date a little too early at 155 A.D. Antoninus died in A.D. 161. The primary account of Justin’s death is recorded in The Acts of Justin and Seven Companions:6 an early text representing both the tradition of the early church and, as some have argued, the court records of the day.7 This text dates the martyrdom of Justin to the time when Q. Iunius Rusticus was Urban Prefect, A.D. 163-168 (PIR, 2.535). Rusticus was one of Marcus Aurelius’ Stoic teachers (HA, “Marcus Antoninus,” 3). The two variant text-forms, which Bisbee believes are younger than the first, claim that Justin was beheaded (B.6, C.6) on the first day of June (C.6). Some scholars have found it difficult to reconcile the two accounts because no mention is made of Crescens; the issue is simply whether or not Justin and his companions are Christians. This may not be as problematic as it seems. In Justin’s own account of an earlier trial we see that the man who manipulated the events leading to a trial on the question of Christian identity is not mentioned at the trial itself (2 Apol. 2.1-18). Epiphanius (c. 315-405), writing slightly after Eusebius, somewhat confirms the dating of The Acts, claiming that Justin was martyred “by the Romans, under the governor Rusticus and the emperor Hadrian” – εἰς τὺς Ἠρακλεῖους εἰς ἔτος ἤκουσαν καὶ Πολίτες ἢκουσαν καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι ἤκουσαν (HA. 46.1). Epiphanius is either mistaken about who was emperor at the time or he uses the identification of “Hadrian” as one of his family names.8 Our final source, the 7th century Chronicon Paschale, offers a date generally agreed upon by scholars of 165 AD.

5 Not all of the issues surrounding Justin’s Platonism concern us in this study. Even so, we highly recommend Nahim’s article, “The Debate on the ‘Platonism’ of Justin Martyr” Second Century 9 (1992): 129-151, as an excellent starting point for the consideration of these issues. We would add to his lists the works of M.J. Edwards on this issue, cited in the bibliography.


7 Gary Bisbee, in his work “The Acts of Justin Martyr: A Form-Critical Study” The Second Century 3 (1983):129-157, has done some valuable work on this text, analyzing the variant manuscripts and the style of court records during this period.

8 His full name was Marcus Aelius Aurelius Antoninus, the “Aelius” from Hadrian.

Jesus declared: “…do not fear those who kill the body but cannot kill the soul. But rather fear Him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell” – καὶ μὴ φοβήθητε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτεινόντων τὸ σῶμα, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν μὴ δυναμένων ἀποκτείναι: φοβήθητε δὲ τὸν ἁμαρτωλόν τὸν δυνάμενον καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ σωμάτων ἀπολέσαι εἰς γένεσιν. (Mt 10:28).

Justin declares that suicide would be against the will of God. The Christian writer L. Caecilius Lacantius (250-317 AD) explicitly condemns suicide (7.89, 183). Augustine, in his work The City of God, discusses the suicide of Judas concluding: “…[Judas] giving up hope for the mercy of God, regretting the death, left no place for healing repentance for himself” – “…[Judas] Dei misericordiam desperando exitialibat paenitens, nullum sibi salubris paenitentiae locum reliquit (1.17). The Bible is silent on the issue, apart from the general condemnation of murder (Exodus 20:13, Deuteronomy 5:17), and (as Augustine observed) the logical conclusion that it deprives one of the opportunity for repentance (see Acts 8:22; 26:20).

Heraclitus

Heraclitus, the pre-Socratic Ephesian philosopher (c. 544-484 B.C.), had a significant influence upon Justin’s beliefs. In I Apol. Justin claims, “Those who have lived in accordance with the Logos, were Christians, even though they were considered godless, such as, among the Greeks Socrates, Heraclitus, and those like them, and among the barbarians Abraham, Hananah, Azariah, Michael, Isaiah, and many others…” – καὶ οἱ μετὰ λόγων βιώσαντες Χριστιανοί εἰς, καὶ ἄθεοι εὐνύμισθησαν, οὖν ἐν Ἐλλησὶ μὲν ὕσκρατης καὶ Ἐράκλειος καὶ οἱ ὀμοίοι αὐτῶν, ἐν βαρβάροις δὲ Ἀβραάμ καὶ Ἀνανίας καὶ Ἀζαρίας καὶ Μισαήλ καὶ Ἡλίας καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοί… (46.3). Heraclitus’ statements regarding the logos are very similar to Justin’s own wording. In fr. 1 he claims “all things happen in accordance with this logos” – γινομένων γὰρ πάντων κατὰ τὸν λόγον τόνδε (Sextus adv. Math., 7.132). In fr. 2 he claims, “Though the logos is common, many live as though they have a private understanding” – τοῦ λόγου δὲ έντος ξυνοῦ ζωούσιν οἱ πολλοὶ ὡς ιδίως ξυνοῦσι φρόνησιν (ibid.). Wilcox understands Heraclitus to suggest that “logos is the same as divine law” (p. 629).

Musonius

C. Musonius Rufus, the Etruscan Stoic philosopher (c. 65 A.D.), was a friend of Rubellius Plautus who was banished by Nero in 65 A.D. as a teacher of philosophy and rhetoric (Tatius, Ann. 15.71; Dio Cassius, 62.27). In 69 A.D. he acted as an envoy of Vitellius to the troops of Antoninus (Tatius, Hist. 3.81). When Vespasian banished the philosophers in 71 A.D. Musonius was not included (Dio. Cass. 66.13). He was still in Rome in 93 A.D. (Pliny, 3.11.).

Of the fragments of his teachings which remain, three issues relate to Justin’s
There are at least two positions scholars take regarding Justin’s account of the philosophical path leading to his conversion. The first suggests that Justin creates an idealized fiction as a didactic tool and a rhetorical device. Representative of this position Goodenough writes:

Justin, in the entire passage, is dramatizing the relations between Christianity and philosophy, and has here adopted the ... school to school, and finally to the Christian school, in order to criticize each school by the adventures related (TJ, pp. 60-1).

Drodge adds, “there can be little doubt that Justin described his conversion from Platonism to Christianity in a stylized, literary manner” (p. 304). In opposition to this view are those who view all or part of Justin’s conversion narrative as historical. Chadwick suggests, “It is much more probable than not that we are being given an essentially veracious autobiography, even if Justin’s memory, looking back some twenty years, is likely to have foreshortened and compressed the story” (DC, p. 280). Barnard suggests, “…it is precisely Justin’s account of his actual conversion at the hands of an old man which has the ring of truth about it and gives an adequate explanation of his later work as a Christian philosopher” (LT, p. 8). Although Justin may employ a literary technique, it seems highly unlikely that he would offer an absolute fiction when he also claimed that Christians “consider it impious not to be truthful in all things” – äπβ ὑτ αὖ ἁπλόμενον (2 Apol. 4.4).

After this we know very little about Justin’s actual conversion. We may infer from his own descriptions of conversion that he “washed himself with the bath for the forgiveness of sins and for regeneration” – ἰλρπ ᾑκο πο ἀκτιμόνει να σφιρήσαται (1 Apol. 66.1). Which is to say he was baptized.

After his conversion he continues to wear the philosopher’s cloak (Dial. 1.1). At some point he is in Rome for the writing of two apologetic works, and in Ephesus for the occasion of a dialogue with a Jew named Trypho. It is clear that he conducted some type of school of religious philosophy. One of his most famous students was the Syrian Tatian (Ireneas. Adv. Haer. 1.28.1; Hippolytus Refut. 8.9). Justin taught a type of Christian philosophy which made use of Greek philosophy in one form or another. Over the past century much of the scholarship done on the works of Justin has concerned his exact relationship to Greek philosophy. Far removed from the New Testament concept, articulated by Paul, that philosophy is dangerous and deceptive (Col. 2:8), Justin used it freely. Charles Nahm has chronicled the scholarship on this issue, dividing the schools of interpretation into three categories: 1. Total assimilation – the view that Justin sought to harmonize Greek philosophy with Christian doctrine; 2. Total rejection – the view that all of Justin’s references to philosophy stem from an attempt to prove its weakness; 3. Partial assimilation with a critical reserve – the view that Justin accepts some aspects

The Binding of Daimones

Justin claims in 8.3 that the daimones would be confined in eternal fire. He does not seem to have believed this had yet occurred. In NT doctrine the angels who sinned had already been bound in Tartarus: “For if God did not spare the angels who sinned, but cast them down to hell and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved for judgment” – Ει γάρ ὁ θεός ἀγγέλων ἀμαρτησόντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλὰ σειρὰς ζόφου ταρταρώσας παρέδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν τηρομένους (II Peter 2:4, NKJV). Jude echoes the same idea declaring, “And the angels who did not keep their proper domain, but left their own abode, He has reserved in everlasting chains under darkness for the judgment of the great day” – δείγμα πυρός αἰωνίου δίκην ὑπέχοσαι (7, NKJV). This, of course, parallels the binding of the Titans in Greek myth. The hundred handed creatures Kottos, Briareos and Gyges who assist the Olympians in their battle with the Titans are said to have “Overshadowed the Titans, and they sent them under the wide-earthed earth and bound them with cruel bonds- having beaten them down despite their daring- as far under earth as the sky is above, for it is that far from earth down to misty Tartaros” – κατὰ δ’ ἐσκίσασαν βελέσας Τιτήρας, καὶ τοὺς μὲν ὑπὸ χθῶνος εὐρυδείης πέμμαν καὶ δεισώσαν ἐν ἀγραλείας ἐθέσαν χαράν νικήσαντες ὑπερθύμιοι πέρ’ ἐόντας, τόσον ἐνεργ’ ὑπὸ γῆς, ὃσον οὐρίανὸς ἐστ’ ἀπὸ γαίης τόσον γάρ τ’ ἀπὸ γῆς ἐς Τάρπταρον ἠρέόντα (Hesiod, Theogony, 716-721, Lombardo).
Paul Mirecki, in the editing of this paper, observes the similarity between Justin’s encounter and ancient visionary experiences in which the sea often serves as a place of revelation.

Some scholars have attempted to identify this teacher with Numenius, a Pythagorean whom Origen claimed was “a man very strong in declaring Platonics” – άνδρα πολλά κρείττον διηγομένου Πλάτωνα (Cont. Cels., 4.51). Arthur Drodge defends an association between Justin and Numenius because both argued that the origins of Platonic thought were to be found in Mosaic or oriental sources (p. 318). There has been a great deal of scholarly debate over the extent of Justin’s training and the nature of his “Platonism.” Was his training formal or informal? Did he accept classical Platonism or some variant? Some have suggested that the evidence suggests that Justin had no more knowledge of Platonism than could be attained from handbooks of the day (Drodge, p. 305, commenting on Geffcken’s views). Others have identified Justin’s Platonism with similar ideas of Albinus (Andresen, p. 168); or of Philo (Goodenough, pp. 65; 139-147). Ever since the important work of Carl Andresen, “Justin und der mittlere Platonismus” ZNW 44 (1952-53): 157-195, it is generally agreed that Justin accepted what is classified as Middle Platonism, an understanding of Platonic doctrine which emphasized deity. Andresen writes:

Justin ist philosophiegeschichtlich dem mittleren Platonismus zuzuordnen. Diese Einordnung läßt sich genau festlegen. Er gehört der sogenannten orthodoxen Richtung unter den Schulplatonikern an, wie sie vornehmlich durch Plutarch und Attikos repräsentiert wird.

Justin ist to be categorized in the historical philosophy of middle Platonism. This classification allows the matter to be settled precisely. He belonged to the so-called orthodox movement under the school of Plato, as they were particularly represented by Plutarch and Atticus (p. 194).

As an “orthodox” middle Platonist, “rejoicing in the teachings of Plato” – τοῦ Ἀθηναίων χαίρειν διδάγμασι (2 Apol. 12.1). Justin claims that he met an old man while he was meditating near the sea. The man explains to him that the Old Testament prophets preceded the Greek philosophers and had predicted the coming of Jesus. This ultimately turns Justin’s affections away from Platonism alone as the source of truth and towards a faith in Jesus (Dial. 3-7).

---

\footnote{The text reads ἡμετέρα πόλει – “to our city.” Eusebius claims the dialogue took place in Ephesus (HE 4.18.6).

4 Paul Mirecki, in the editing of this paper, observes the similarity between Justin’s encounter and ancient visionary experiences in which the sea often serves as a place of revelation.

---
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A. THE LIFE AND DEATH OF JUSTIN.

In the text which is known to us as the First Apology, Justin introduces himself to the emperor Antoninus Pius and his sons as “Justin, the son of Priscus, grandson of Bacchius, of those from Flavia Neapolis, in Syria, of Palestine” – Ἰουστίνου Πρίσκου τοῦ Βακχίου, τῶν ἀπὸ Φλαβίας Νέας πόλεως τῆς Συρίας Παλαιστίνης (1.1). This is our only source for Justin’s background. Flavia Neapolis, modern Nablus, was a Greek colony named after Vespasian and organized in 70 A.D. (Goodenough, TJ, p. 57). The name Syria Palestina dates to 132 A.D. after the close of the Second Jewish war when Hadrian renamed the province of Judea (Appian, Syriaca 1.7.8).

Barnard suggests that both the names of Justin’s father and grandfather are Greek, while his own is Latin (LT, p. 5). Goodenough feels this may indicate that they were colonists (TJ, p. 57). Justin in his Dialogue with Trypho, in speaking of the Samaritans of this region, refers to them as “of my race, I say of the Samaritans” – ὡς Ἄρματος τῆς Ἰουστίνου Σαμαραίτης ἢ τοῦ γένους, εἰς Χριστοῦ δὲ πεπιστευκόμενος καὶ μεγάλας ἐξασκήσεως ἀρετῆς τὸ βίον ἐνδεικνύων τὸ τέλος ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ μαρτυρίας τελείου στεφάνου καταξιώται ἐπὶ τῆς Ἰουσαίου ἐπὶ Ρουσικοῦ ηγεμόνος…

…For this Justin was of the race of the Samaritans, and having believed in Christ and being highly trained in virtue and having proven his life to the end was counted worthy by the Romans, under the governor Rusticus, of the crown of a martyr for the sake of Christ… (Epiphaniius, Haer. 46.1).

In the Dialogue with Trypho Justin describes himself as a convert to Christianity after first turning to a number of different philosophical schools. First, he tells us that he followed a Stoic teacher for some time, yet claims that “nothing satisfactory came to me concerning God” – οὐδενὶ πλεόν ἐγγίνετο μοι περὶ θεοῦ (2.3), and that the Stoic considered such things unnecessary. Next, Justin found a Peripatetic, until he was offended by his request for a fee (2.3). Third, he pursued a teacher of Pythagoreanism, only to turn away when he was told that he must first learn music, astronomy, and geometry (2.4). At last, he encountered a Platonist whom he describes as “very famous”

2 In Dial. 29 Justin classes himself among the Gentiles while talking to a Jew; in 1 Apol. 53 he classes Jews and Samaritans as distinct from Gentiles.
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PREFACE

The present work is taken from my Masters Thesis completed in the summer of 2000 through the classics department of the University of Kansas. That work, entitled The Concept of the Daimon in Justin's Second Apology: with Text and Translation, focused specifically upon Justin’s view that all evil was directly influenced by demonic activity in the world. My thesis examined the extent to which pre-Christian Classical, Hebrew and Hellenistic concepts influenced Justin's own views.

The text, translation and endnotes which make up this booklet were contained in the appendix of the thesis. The introduction to the life and death of Justin and his works served also as the introduction to the same work. The bibliography of the thesis is for the most part identical to the present bibliography and list of suggested readings, with the exception a few works which relate specifically to the content of the thesis that have not been included. The following dedication and acknowledgments are also taken from the thesis, with no alteration. While those mentioned have not directly supervised this “abridged” version of the larger work, their contribution was invaluable to its production.

It is hoped that this text and translation will make available to students of history, classics and religion a work that has in my estimation received far too little consideration. Justin played a unique role in the early history of Christianity. The more we can understand about him and his contemporaries the more we can understand about this period.
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