THE CONCEPT OF THE ΔΑΙΜΩΝ IN
JUSTIN'S SECOND APOLOGY:
with Text and Translation

By

Kyle Mark Pope
B.A., University of Alabama, 1997

Submitted to the Department of
Classics and the Faculty of
the Graduate School of the University
of Kansas in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Stanley Lombardo, Ph.D.
Chief Advisor

Anthony Corbeill, Ph.D.

Pamela Gordon, Ph.D.

Paul Mirecki, Ph.D.

Date Submitted: _____

ABSTRACT

Kyle Mark Pope
Department of Classics, May 2000
University of Kansas

The apologetic work of Justin served to articulate an appreciation of classical philosophy which was not present in the earliest stages of primitive Christianity. Yet, in the process of formulating this appreciation Justin brought with him a conception of the entities known to the Greeks, Hellenistic Jews, and Christians alike as *daimones* which reflects a departure from Biblical teaching, and a blending of non-Christian and Christian concepts.

DEDICATION

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 this 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 this 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 resourse. 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 this 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.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

1 *Apol.* = Justin. *First Apology.*
2 *Apol.* = Justin. *Second Apology.*
AC = Miroslav Marcovich. *Iustini Marty-*
    ris Apologiae Pro Christianis.
abr. = abridged.
AD = *Anno Domini,* in the year of the Lord.
Ad Scap. = Tertullian. *To Scapula.*
add. = *addit,* adds.
Adv. Haer. = Ireneas. *Against Heresies.*
Adv. Val. = Tertullian. *Against Valentinus*
AH = *The Augustan History*
Ann. = Tacitus. *Annals of Imperial Rome.*
Apol. = *Apology* (of Plato or Tertullian).
BAG = Bauer, Arnt & Gingrich: *Greek-*
    English Lexicon of the New Testa-
    ment and Early Christian Litera-
    ture.
BC = Before Christ.
BDB = Brown, Drivers & Briggs: *Hebrew*
    and English Lexicon of the Old
    Testament.
Chron. = Eusebius. *Chronicon.*
cf. = *confer*, compare.
codd. = codices.
corr. = corrected.
DC = Henry Chadwick. "Justin Martyr's
    Defence of Christianity." Bulletin
    of the John Rylands Library 47
    (1965).
DEC = Everett Ferguson. *Demonology*
    of the Early Christian World.
Dig. = Justinian. *Digesta.*
DT = Miroslav Marcovich. *Iustini Marty-*
    ris Dialogus cum Tryphone.
Dial. = Justin. *Dialogue with Trypho.*
eds. = editors.
et al = *et alia,* and others.
f. = folio.
Flor. = Joannes Stobaeus. *Florilegium.*

FS = L.W. Barnard. *St. Justin Martyr:*
    The First and Second Apologies.
gr. = *Graecus.*
Haer. = Epiphanius' *Heresies.*
HE = Eusebius. *Ecclesiastical History.*
Hist. = Tacitus. *Histories.*
HTR = *Harvard Theological Review.*
ibid. = *ibidem*, in the same place just
    mentioned.
i.e. = *id est*, that is.
Il. = Homer. *Iliad.*
Ill. = Jerome. *On the Lives of Illustrious*
    Men.
JML = Everett Ferguson. "Justin Martyr
    and the Liturgy." *Restoration*
    Quarterly 36 (1994).
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.
NT = New Testament.
Od. = Homer. *Odyssey.*
OLD = *Oxford Latin Dictionary,* 1983.
Oly. = Pindar. *Olympian Odes.*
om. = omit.
Orat. = Tatian. *Oration to the Greeks.*
OT = Old Testament.

OTJ = L.W. Barnard. "The Old Testament and Judaism in the Writings of Justin Martyr." *Vetus Testamentum* 14 (1964).

p. = page.

PIR = *Prosopographia Imperii Romani.*

pp. = pages.

r = *recto,* the front of a ms.

Refut.= Hippolytus. *Refutations.*

Tim. = Plato. *Timaeus.*

TJ = E.R. Goodenough, *The Theology of Justin Martyr.*

TR = *Textus Receptus.*

v = *verso*, the back of a ms.

VT = *Vetus Testamentum.*

WH = B.F. Westcott & F.J.A.Hort. *The New Testament in the Original Greek.* 1907.

ZNW = *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft.*

INTRODUCTION

A. THE LIFE AND DEATH OF JUSTIN.

…οὗτος γὰρ ὁ Ἰουστῖνος Σαμαρείτης ἦν τὸ γένος, εἰς Χριστὸν δὲ πεπιστευκὼς καὶ μεγάλως ἐξασκηθεὶς ἀρετῆς τε βίου ἐνδειξάμενος τὸ τέλος ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ μαρτυρήσας τελείου στεφάνου καταξιοῦται ἐπὶ τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐπὶ Ῥουστικοῦ ἡγεμόνος…

…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… (Epiphanius, *Haer.* 46.1).

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" – Ἰουστῖνος Πρίσκου τοῦ Βακχείου, τῶν ἀπὸ Φλαουΐας 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 ἐμοῦ, λέγω δὲ τῶν Σαμαρέων (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]

---

[1] P. R. Weis, "Some Samaritanisms of Justin Martyr," *JTS* 45 (1944):199-205.

[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.

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 ἐγίνετό 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" – πολὺ κλέος (2.6), recently having come to Ephesus.[3] He spends a great deal of time with him:

> καί με ᾕρει σφόδρα ἡ τῶν ἀσωμάτων νόησις, καὶ ἡ θεωρία τῶν ἰδεῶν ἀνεπτέρου μοι τὴν φρόνησιν, ὀλίγου τε ἐντὸς χρόνου ᾤμην σοφὸς γεγονέναι, καὶ ὑπὸ βλακείας ἤλπιζον αὐτίκα κατόψεσθαι τὸν θεόν· τοῦτο γὰρ τέλος τῆς Πλάτωνος φιλοσοφίας.

> 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" – ἄνδρα πολλῷ κρεῖττον 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

---

[3] The text reads ἡμετέρᾳ πόλει – "to our city." Eusebius claims the dialogue took place in Ephesus (*HE* 4.18.6).

3

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 Platinismus" *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 zuzuorden. Diese Einordnung läßt sich genau festlagen. 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" – τοῖς Πλάτωνος χαίρων διδάγμασι (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 (*Dial.* 3-7).

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 familiar convention of relating someone's adventures in passing from 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

---

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.

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" – ἀσεβὲς δὲ ἡγούμενοι μὴ κατὰ πάντα ἀληθεύειν (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" – λουσαμένῳ τὸ ὑπὲρ ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ εἰς ἀναγέννησιν λουτρόν (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

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 φερώνυμον δ᾽ οὗτος τῇ Κυνικῇ προσηγορίᾳ βίον τε
> καὶ τρόπον ἐζήλου) τὴν ἐπιβουλὴν αὐτῷ καττύσαντος, ἐπειδὴ πλεονάκις ἐν
> διαλόγοις ἀκροατῶν παρόντων εὐθύνας 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,"

---

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.
We would add to his lists the works of M.J. Edwards on this issue, cited in the bibliography.

6 The critical text of this work containing all three recensions is that of Herbert Musurillo, *Acts
of the Christian Martyrs* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972): 42-61.

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.

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 ῾Ρωμαίων ἐπὶ ῾Ρουστικοῦ ἡγεμόνος καὶ ᾿Αδριανοῦ 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.

B. JUSTIN'S WORKS.

Πλεῖστα δὲ οὗτος καταλέλοιπεν ἡμῖν πεπαιδευμένης διανοίας καὶ περὶ τὰ θεῖα ἐσπουδακυίας ὑπομνήματα, πάσης ὠφελείας ἔμπλεα·

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

---

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

(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 Ἕλληνας "to the Greeks" (ibid.), and a second (ἕτερον) which he entitled Ἔλεγχον "*a 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 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 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.

Stylistic issues or internal dating factors deny Justinian authorship of these works.[10] Modern scholars consider the three works known to us as *The First Apology, The Second Apology* and *The Dialogue with Trypho* as genuine.

---

9 Αὐτοκράτορι Τίτῳ Αἰλίῳ Ἀδριανῷ Ἀντωνίνῳ Εὐσεβεῖ Σεβαστῷ Καίσαρι, καὶ Οὐηρισσίμῳ υἱῷ Φιλοσόφῳ, καὶ Λουκίῳ Φιλοσόφῳ, Καίσαρος φύσει υἱῷ καὶ Εὐσεβοῦς εἰσποιητῷ, ἐραστῇ παιδείας, ἱερᾷ τε συγκλήτῳ καὶ δήμῳ παντὶ Ῥωμαίων "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).
10 For an example of this process of disqualification of texts see E.R. Goodenough, "The Pseudo-Justinian 'Oratio ad Graecos'" *HTR* 18 (1925): 187-200.

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 τὴν προσώνησιν καὶ ἔντυξιν (1.7) and closes with the terms τὴν προσφώνησιν καὶ ἐξήγησιν (68.11)… 2 *A.* too opens with the terms σύνταξις (1.5) and closes with the same term, τούσδε τοὺς λόγους συνετάξαμεν (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 *protreptic, 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 προτέρα 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.

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" – Ἐυσεβεῖ αὐτοκράτορι and then to "the philosopher, the child of Caesar" – φιλοσόφου Καίσαρος παιδὶ (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" – εἴπωσι πρὸ ἐτῶν ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα γεγεννῆσθαι τὸν Χριστόν (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" – ἤδη (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 χθὲς δὲ καὶ πρώην 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. 193r 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 Apologiae 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 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).

---

[11] We would also refer the reader to P. Philhofer "Harnack and Goodspeed: Two Readers of Codex Parisinus Graecus 450" *Second Century* 5 (1985-86): 233-242, for a review of some earlier collations of this manuscript.

Eusebius (*Eus*) provides a third textual source in his *Ecclesiatical 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.

I. KNOWLEDGE, DESTINY, AND THE BURIED DEAD –
THE ETYMOLOGY OF Δαίμων.

Δαίμων - "I. *Divine power, the deity,* II. *souls of men of the golden age,* acting as tutelary deities, 1. later of *departed souls, ghosts,* 2. generally *spiritual, semi-divine being* inferior to the gods, esp. *evil spirit, demon*"

(*LSJ*, pp. 365-6).

If we are to consider the use of δαίμων in Justin, we must begin with an understanding (as far as it is possible) of the background of the word itself and the concepts associated with it. An absolute etymology of the word δαὶμων remains elusive. However, there are two interesting speculations which we have from antiquity as well as a few possibilities which are offered by modern scholars. We will begin by presenting the ancient attempts to resolve this problem, then add to the contemporary speculations a few possibilities of our own.

Plato's *Cratylus*.

The first known attempt to determine the etymology of the word is found in Plato's *Cratylus*. As Hermogenes and Socrates discuss the nature and origin of the "gods" (θεοὶ) and then the nature and origin of δαίμονες, Socrates quotes Hesiod as he begins his discussion of *daimones* referring to those of the Golden Age, after death.

> οἱ μὲν δαίμονες ἀγνοὶ ὑποχθόνιοι καλέονται,
> ἐσθλοί, ἀλεξίκακοι, φύλακες θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων.
>
> They are called holy *daimones*, who dwell under the earth,
> noble watchers of mortal men, who keep away evil. (*Works and Days,* 122-23; *Cratylus,* 398a).

After the two briefly discuss why Hesiod considers this a Golden race, and whether or not these people were both wise and noble, Socrates offers his theory:

> τοῦτο τοίνυν παντὸς μᾶλλον λέγει, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, τοὺς δαίμονας· ὅτι φρόνιμοι καὶ δαήμονες ἦσαν, "δαίμοναςϛῷῷ αὐτοὺς ὠνόμασεν· καὶ ἔν γε τῇ ἀρχαίᾳ τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ φωνῇ αὐτὸ συμβαίνει τὸ ὄνομα.
>
> Now he says this about *daimones*, more than anything else,
> (as it seems to me), because they are wise and knowing (δαήμονες),

he calls them *daimones* (δαίμονας); and in the archaic form of our language they sound the same. (*Cratylus* , 398b).

Socrates suggests that the adjective δαήμων, -ον, meaning "*knowing, experienced in* a thing" (LSJ, p. 365), drawn from the unattested root δάω, meaning "*to learn*…abs. *one who knows*" (ibid., p. 371), is the root of δαίμων. Homer uses δαήμων to apply to a number of different things. It will describe a master ship builder (*Il.* 15.411); one capable in battle (*Il.* 23.671); an athlete (*Od.* 8.159); a dancer (*Od.* 8.263); and a meat carver (*Od.* 16.253). There is also an interesting instance in the *Iliad* where Homer uses the word αἵμων, "explained by grammarians as = δαίμων, for δαήμων, *skilful*" (*LSJ*, p. 39) -

> …υἱὸν δὲ Στροφίοιο Σκαμάνδριον, αἵμονα θήρης…
>
> …and Scamandarius, the son of Strophios, skilled in the hunt…(5.49).

The Lyric poet Archilochus uses δαίμων in a manner that could be understood as equivalent to δαήμων:

> Οὔ τοι πόλλ᾽ ἐπὶ τοξα τανύσσεται οὐδὲ θαμειναί
>   σφενδόναι, εὖτ᾽ ἂν δὴ μῶλον Ἄρης συνάγῃ
> ἐν πεδῷ· ξιφέων· δὲ πολύστονον ἔσσεται ἔργον
>   ταύτης γὰρ κεῖνοι δαίμονες εἰσὶ μάχης
> δεσπόται Εὐβοίης δουρικλυτοί.
>
> Indeed not too many have drawn bows or thick slings, in the event that now the toil of battle may be engaged on the plain; with swords; and it will be a mournful task; for these are the *daimones* of this battle [or skilled in battle]; the rulers of Euboea famed for the spear. (3.1-5).

Some take this to be an indication of the original sense of the word δαίμων (i.e. *those skilled*, μάχης "in battle"); "while others would write δαήμονες in Archilochus, and get rid of this sense altogether" (*LSJ*, p. 366). If we imagine δαήμων as synonymous with the Latin concept of the *genius* (i.e. an attending spirit which bestows abilities or fortune), Socrates' theory has some appeal. At any rate, it is evident that there is some conceptual connection, at the very least, in the Greek mind between an unseen entity and different types of knowledge or ability.

Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica*.

Centuries later this theory would not satisfy the Christian historian and apologist Eusebius Pamphilus. In his apology entitled *Praeparatio Evangelica* (προπαρασκευὴ εὐαγγελική) Eusebius offers "the division of theology according to the Greeks" – Η ΔΙΑΡΕΣΙΣ ΤΗΣ ΚΑΘ᾽ ΕΛΛΗΝΑΣ ΘΕΟΛΟΓΙΑΣ (4.1). After discussing the distinction between gods, *daimones*, and heroes he writes:

> …εἰ δὴ καὶ τούτων ἡμᾶς προσήκει τὴν
> ἐτυμολογίαν ἐξειπεῖν, οὐχ ᾗπερ Ἕλλησι δοκεῖ παρὰ τὸ δαήμονας εἶναι καὶ
> ἐπιστήμονας, ἀλλ᾽ ἢ παρὰ τὸ δειμαίνειν, ὅπερ ἐστὶ φοβεῖσθαι καὶ ἐκφοβεῖν,
> δαίμονάς τινας προσφυῶς ὀνομάζεσθαι.

> …and indeed if it should seem fitting to you to tell the etymology of these [*daimones*], it is not as it seems to the Greeks, from 'knowing' (δαήμονας) and 'wise' (ἐπιστήμονας), but instead from 'fearing' (δειμαίνειν), which is 'to be afraid' and 'frightened away,' some *daimones* being fittingly named. (4.1.4-5).

With this theory Eusebius tells us more about his Christian background than offers to us a compelling etymological possibility. The *daimones* which he envisions are not Hesiod's chthonic golden race but the trembling *daimones* in subjection to Jesus. His use of the passive infinitive φοβεῖσθαι "to be afraid" describes the kind of *daimones* who fear punishment from Jesus (Mt. 8:29); who beg Jesus to leave them alone (Lk 4:34); who are forbidden by him to speak (Lk 4:41); and who are subject to Jesus' disciples (Lk 10:20). James makes reference to this tendency to illustrate working faith, declaring…

> σὺ πιστεύεις ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς εἷς ἐστί· καλῶς ποιεῖς· καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια πιστεύουσι, καὶ φρίσσουσι

> You believe that there is one God. You do well. Even the demons believe--and tremble! (2:19).[1]

Although Eusebius' speculation is creative, it is anachronistically invalid and lacks any archaic evidence to support it. Foerster does offer some interesting example of frightening names which the Greeks gave to *daimones* such as Ἔμπουσα = "Bloodsucker," and Λαμία = Devourer (II.2), but these present the *daimones* as fearful, not afraid.

---

1 All Biblical translations are from the *New King James Version.* Nashville: Thomas Nelson Pub., 1985, unless otherwise noted.

Modern Explanations.

Modern scholars have, in general, rejected both Plato and Eusebius' theories, offering as a third possibility the root δαίω meaning "*to distribute destinies*" (*LSJ*, p. 366). Chantraine suggests:

> Tiré de δαίομαι, au sens de «puissance qui attribue» d'où «divinitè, destin.» Cf. aussi comme parallèle v. pers. *baga-...* «dieu»… skr. *bhága-* «part, destin, maître.» …
>
> Drawn from δαίομαι, in the sense of "force which assigns" whence "deity, destiny." Cf. also as parallel Old Persian *baga-* "god," along with … Sanskrit *bhága-* "share, destiny, master" … (Vol. 1, p. 247).

This etymology addresses the idea of *daimones* as distributors of one's condition in life. Similar to the *genius* conception, this goes beyond simply understanding *daimones* as the force behind some ability to envisioning it as the master of fate. *LSJ*, (after discussing Plato's theory) states - "More probably the root of δαίμων (*deity*) is δαίω *to distribute destinies*…" (p. 366). Riley agrees, suggesting that the word "could designate one's 'fate' or 'destiny' or the spirit controlling one's fate…" (p. 235). Foerster is less convinced, claiming - "The etymology of δαίμων is uncertain. The root ΔΑΙ is basic, and cf. δαίομαι though the sense is doubtful" (Vol. 2, p. 2).

Unfortunately Foerster does not expand on his claim that "ΔΑΙ is basic." Chantraine above suggests a parallel between δαίω and some Old Persian and Sanskrit words. It is surprising that he did not point out the most striking parallels between δαὶμων itself and the Old Persian word 𐎭𐎡𐎺 *daiva* meaning "*false deity, idol, demon*" (Brandenstein, p. 114). Obviously, given the ongoing contact between the Greeks and the Persians in Asia Minor, it becomes difficult to determine what may have been a loan word, and from which language it was borrowed. Yet even so the connection between these words seems inescapable. It is also interesting to note that in Hittite (the oldest known Indo-European language) we find the root 𒁕𒀀𒄿 - *da-a-i-* meaning "*place, put, bury*" (Sturtevant, p. 146). If there is any connection between this root and

δαὶμων, it leads us to wonder if the root concept of these words may have been a reference to "*those buried*."

Among the later entries in LSJ, in two instances the editors equate δαίμων with the Latin word *manes* (p. 366). In Latin, *manes* was understood to refer to "1.a. *the spirits of the dead* regarded as minor supernatural powers…" (*OLD,* p. 1072). While it may be that this connection comes rather late, Walde traces the etymology of *manes* back to the Phrygian word 𐤌𐤀𐤍 *man* which is defined as "abgeschiedene Seele" i.e. a departed soul (p. 27). The same word occurs in Etruscan as 𐌉𐌍𐌀𐌌 *mani,* defined simply as "*the dead*" (Bonafante, p. 144).

Summary.

Obviously Justin did not formulate his conception of *daimones* in light of Hittite, Phrygian, or Etruscan etymology. Yet, at the same time it is interesting to note that virtually all of the subtle concepts implied by the various etymological speculations will be incorporated into Justin's understanding of *daimones.* As we shall see, Justin's *daimones* (or specifically angels) were intended to be comparable to Hesiod's "noble watchers" – ἐσθλοί φύλακες. These not only have knowledge unavailable to mortals but, like Archilochus' fighting *daimones,* they motivate behavior in men. While Justin does not conceive of a *daimon* as simply an "abgeschiedene Seele,"[2] he does assign to *daimones* the blame for virtually every negative condition (i.e. destiny) in which the world finds itself. Justin will bring almost all of the pre-Christian ideas associated with the δαίμων with him into his view of faith and cosmology.

---

[2] In 1 *Apology* 18.4 Justin does claim that people call those seized by the spirits of the dead "*daimon*-possessed and maniacs" – δαιμονιολήπτους καὶ μαινομένους, yet this is offered to prove the widespread belief in life after death, not his own view of the nature and origin of *daimones.*

II. "NOBLE WATCHERS OF MORTAL MEN" –
Δαίμων IN GREEK THOUGHT.

πάντα τὸν ἀέρα ψυχῶν ἔμπλεων· καὶ ταύτας
δαίμονάς τε καὶ ἥρωας ὀνομάζεσθαι

All the air is full of souls; and these are called *daimones*
and heros. (Pythagoras, in Diogenes Laertius' *Lives of the Philosophers,* 8.32).

A lthough the decipherment of Linear B has revealed the fact that many of the gods of classical Greece were revered by the Mycenaean culture far back into the Bronze age, unfortunately it has yielded no clues with respect to any early concept of the *daimon*.[1] Instead, we must begin by looking to epic and lyric writers who already have a definite concept of the being they call the δαίμων.

Early Greek Concepts.

As we observed in the previous chapter, Hesiod's conception of *daimones*, is that they are the exalted souls of dead human beings from the Golden Age. These have become "noble watchers of mortal men, who keep away evil" – ἐσθλοί, ἀλεξίκακοι, φύλακες θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων (*Works and Days,* 123). In the same text Hesiod goes on to tells us more about them:

οἵ ῥα φυλάσσουσίν τε δίκας καὶ σχέτλια ἔργα
ἠέρα ἑσσάμενοι πάντη φοιτῶντες ἐπῷ αἶαν,
πλουτοδόται· καὶ τοῦτο γέρας βασιλήιον ἔσχον --

For these watch over both judgments and unbearable deeds
roaming everywhere over the earth clothed with the air,
givers of riches; and they received this [task as a] royal prize -- (ibid., 124-126).

Several points are important to notice from this text. First, *daimones* are said to "guard" or "watch over" (φυλάσσουσίν) good and evil. Next, Hesiod tells us that these are "clothed with the air," (ἠέρα ἑσσάμενοι) or "shrouded in mist" (Lombardo, p. 27). Finally, these are understood not only to guard mortals, but even bless them: these are

---

1   There are tablets with the names � *da-mi-ni-jo* (KN Df 1121+7689), thought to be a personal name, and ⊦⁊𐀀⊦ *da-mo-ko-ro* (PY Ta 711), thought to be some type of official, but we have no indication that there is any etymological link to δαίμων (Hooker, pp. 91; 128).

"givers of riches" (πλουτοδόται).

Regardless of any additional ideas about the δαίμων which will become associated with it in the Classical, Hellenistic, and Roman periods, it is clear that to one degree or another the idea persists that *daimones* were departed souls. In Euripides' *Alcestis* the chorus declares to Admetus that his wife is now a *daimon* (1003). The geographer Pausanius, a contemporary of Justin, relates a regional legend told by the people of Temesa about a member of Odysseus' crew stoned for violating a local girl. Pausanius says, "the *daimon* of the stoned man" – τοῦ καταλευσθέντος δὲ ἀνθρώπου τὸν δαίμονα frequently killed the inhabitants of the region, demanding yearly a young woman for his wife (6.6.8).

Another early voice who speaks in a less favorable fashion of the δαίμων is Heraclitus. Justin speaks of Heraclitus twice in his apologies (1 *Apol.* 46.3; 2 *Apol.* 8.1). Most studies tend to focus on the importance of Heraclitus' conception of the λόγος as a guiding force in human life; a concept much like the one which Justin himself adopted.[2] Equally important, if less prominent in the fragments, are the points he makes about the *daimon*. His most famous statement is found in fragment 119:

> ἦθος ἀνθρώπωι δαίμων.
>
> Character is for man a *daimon*
> or A man's character is his *daimon* (Stobaeus, *Anthology* IV, 40.23).

There are at least two ways that this fragment may be understood, depending upon how ἦθος *ethos* is defined. The definition of ἦθος is "*accustomed place,* II. *custom, usage... disposition, character... moral character...* pl. *traits, characteristics...*" (*LSJ*, p. 766). Heraclitus could be using *ethos* to refer to moral character and practice, or the

---

2 T. F. Glasson in his article "Heraclitus' Alleged Logos Doctrine." *JTS* 3 (1952): 231-238 down plays the idea that Heraclitus held a view of Logos like those of the philosophical schools which would come after him. For a good survey of this issue see Kevin Robb's "*Psyche* and *Logos* in the Fragments of Heraclitus." *The Monist* 69 (1986): 315-351.

intrinsic nature of the soul. Robb observes that…

> …in epic seldom (if ever) is significant action initiated by any person unless an external supernatural power, a deity, directly affects one of the organs of consciousness. (p. 339).

In this case, fr. 119 may reflect Heraclitus' belief in animism. Heraclitus, unlike Hesiod, who only considered the heroes of the Golden Age to be *daimones*, Heraclitus might be suggesting that man is simply a *daimon* housed in a mortal body.

This animistic understanding of the *daimon* is a significant element of Greek thought. Riley, recalling Hesiod and Pythagoras' air *daimones*, writes:

> Every occurrence in the world of the ancients had a spiritual as well as physical cause, determined by the gods. To enforce divine Law, to regulate the balance of blessing and curse in the human realm, and to ensure human mortality the gods employed, among other means, the *daimones* (cf. Hesiod, *Works and Days* 252-255). (p. 236).

Heraclitus does, however, conceive of the *daimon* as something separate from the individual. In Fragment 79 he claims:

> ἀνὴρ νήπιος ἤκουσε πρὸς δαίμονος ὅκωσπερ παῖς πρὸς ἀνδρός
>
> A man without forethought obeys a *daimon* just as a boy obeys a man.
> (Origen, *Against Celsus,* 6.12).

Early writers also used δαίμων in some other ways. At times δαίμων functions almost like an adjective to refer to a "divine thing" or power. Empedocles described a stage of biological evolution: "*daimon* mixed with *daimon*" – ἐμίσγετο δαίμονι δαίμων (Fr. 59.1). It can be used as a collective noun, to stand for the power of the gods as a whole. In the *Odyssey*, Athena tells Telemachus: "some things you will think through in your own mind, but others the *daimon* will lay down" – ἄλλα μὲν αὐτὸς ἐνὶ φρεσὶ σῆσι νοήσεις, ἄλλα δὲ καὶ δαίμων ὑποθήσεται (3.26-27). Herodotus understands δαίμων as virtually synonymous with τύχη "chance." Writing about a woman expecting a child he claims "she gave birth in accordance with the *daimon*" κατὰ δαίμονα τίκτει while her husband was away (1.111.1). Pindar uses both concepts in describing the victory of Alcemidon: "by the fate of the *daimon*" – τύχα μὲν δαίμονος (*Oly.* 8.67).

20

The Δαίμων of Socrates

Justin is quite vocal in his admiration for Socrates (see 1 *Apol.* 5.3,4; 18.5; 46.3; 2 *Apol.* 3.6; 7.3; 10.5, 8). At least two writers in antiquity, one before, and the other contemporary with Justin, devoted entire studies to "The God of Socrates" – Plutarch and Apuleius. This being the case, we turn next to the Platonic conception of the δαίμων.

Plato in the *Republic* offers a vision of the cycle of rebirth, claiming: "no *daimon* shall cast the lot for you, but you shall seize your own *daimon*" – οὐχ ὑμᾶς δαίμων λήξεται, ἀλλῷ ὑμεῖς δαίμονα αἱρήσεσθε(617e). This view of a time when *daimones* do not direct the choices of life stands in contrast to the way that Plato understood it to exist in his own time. In his work *Phaedo*, Plato speaks of the δαίμων as a guardian appointed to a person for his lifetime and who conducts a person through Hades after death (*Phaedo*, 107d,e).

It is significant to note that Socrates will speak of his own *daimon*, who hinders him from making mistakes. When faced with some possible danger, Socrates claims: "the *daimon* born in me hinders me" – τὸ γιγνόμενόν μοι δαιμόνιον ἀποκωλύει (*Theaetetus,* 151a). This claim is a pivotal issue in his trial. In the *Apology*, Socrates speaks with some surprise that his *daimon* had not deterred him from the very thing which could lead to his death…

> ἡ γὰρ εἰωθυῖά μοι μαντικὴ ἡ τοῦ δαιμονίου ἐν μὲν τῷ πρόσθεν χρόνῳ παντὶ πάνυ πυκνὴ ἀεὶ ἦν καὶ πάνυ ἐπὶ σμικροῖς ἐναντιουμένη, εἴ τι μέλλοιμι μὴ ὀρθῶς πράξειν.
>
> For my customary prophetic *daimon*, at all times in the past, always firmly opposed even very small things if I wanted to do something that was not right. (40a).

His conclusion from the silence of the *daimon* in this case is that he was doing the right thing, though it would lead to his death. It is tempting to interpret Plato purely meta-phorically here, but a bit later in the same text Socrates describes this "prophetic *daimon*" as giving him "a divine sign" – τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ σημεῖον (40b). Xenophon understands this literally, writing:

21

διετεθρύλητο γὰρ ὡς φαίη Σωκράτης τὸ δαιμόνιον ἑαυτῷ σημαίνειν·

For it is spread abroad that Socrates said the *daimon* gave signs to him. (*Mem.* 1.1.2).

Xenophon goes on to claim that this was why he was charged to begin with.[3]

One of the most significant texts which outlines Socrates' concept of *daimones* occurs in the *Apology,* as he defends himself. Socrates asks:

ἔσθ῾ῷ ὅστις δαιμόνια μὲν νομίζει πράγματῷ εἶναι, δαίμονας δὲ οὐ νομίζει;

Is there anyone who considers *daimon*-things to be real, but not *daimones*? (27c).

Here Plato plays upon the variable meaning of the word to demonstrate that "divine things" demand that one believe in divinities. In response to the accusation that he has brought in new *daimones*, he then proceeds to show that he merely believes in *daimones*, just as his accusers do. He asks the question:

τοὺς δὲ δαίμονας οὐχὶ ἤτοι θεούς γε ἡγούμεθα ἢ θεῶν παῖδας;

Do we not consider *daimones,* in fact, gods or children of the gods? (27c,d).

Unlike Hesiod's ghostly human watchers, Plato here describes δαίμονες as the off-spring of the gods. In fact he goes on to state, "the *daimones* are illegitimate children of the gods either by a nymph or some other" – οἱ δαίμονες θεῶν παῖδές εἰσιν νόθοι τινὲς ἢ ἐκ νυμφῶν ἢ ἔκ τινων ἄλλων (27d). This is very significant in light of not only Jewish concepts which will develop in the intertestamental period, but Justin's own views (as we shall see).

In the *Symposium* when Socrates' turn comes to discuss the subject of Love, he tells about his encounter with Diotima, who explains to him that Love is…

…δαίμων μέγας, ὦ Σώκρατες· καὶ γὰρ πᾶν τὸ δαιμόνιον μεταξύ ἐστι θεοῦ τε καὶ θνητοῦ.

…a great *daimon*, O Socrates; for in fact all of the force of *daimones* is between the divine and the mortal. (202d,e).

To which Socrates replies by asking what power τὸ δαιμόνιον possesses. She replies,

---

3 Apuleius seems to understand this more of the conscience. He equates the *daimon* with the Latin *genius,* so long as the soul is in the material body. (*The God of Socrates,* 15).

with a very significant claim:

> ἑρμηνεῦον καὶ διαπορθμεῦον θεοῖς τὰ παρῷ ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἀνθρώποις τὰ παρὰ θεῶν, τῶν μὲν τὰς δεήσεις καὶ θυσίας, τῶν δὲ τὰς ἐπιτάξεις τε καὶ ἀμοιβὰς τῶν θυσιῶν, ἐν μέσῳ δὲ ὂν ἀμφοτέρων συμπληροῖ, ὥστε τὸ πᾶν αὐτὸ αὑτῷ συνδεδέσθαι. διὰ τούτου καὶ ἡ μαντικὴ πᾶσα χωρεῖ καὶ ἡ τῶν ἱερέων τέχνη τῶν τε περὶ τὰς θυσίας καὶ τελετὰς

> Explaining and carrying over human things to the gods, and divine things to men; prayers and sacrifices, orders and even the repayment of the sacrifices, and being in between they complete both, so that all are bound in the same thing. Through [the power of the *daimon*] proceeds every prophet, and the craft of the priests concerning sacrifices and the celebrations of mysteries. (202d,e).

Diotima's claim reveals more important facts about the concept of the δαίμων as Plato understood it or, at the very least describes it in the understanding of others. First, *daimones* are described as intermediaries between the gods and humans. This role is understood to unite humanity with divinity. Next, *daimones* are held to be active in all religious functions. A particularly interesting element of the role Plato ascribes here to *daimones* is that of "explaining" – ἑρμηνεῦον divine things to humans. For Justin and other early Christian writers this notion would take on an ominous significance.

Δαίμων After Plato.

After Plato, Burkert sees an important change in the Greek concept of *daimones* brought to bear by Xenocrates. He writes:

> Nun ist allerdings klar, daß der Begriff des Dämons als eines niederen Geisterwesens vorwiegend gefährlichen und bösen Characters von Platon und seinem Schüler Xenokrates ausgegangen ist.

> Now it is clear however, that the concept of the demon as a low spiritual being, primarily dangerous and with an evil nature, is derived from Plato and his student Xenocrates. (pp. 278-279).

Before Xenocrates *daimones* were protectors, punishers, and mouthpieces for the gods. When a force was divine, but not personally assigned to a god, *daimones* were behind it. These were beings inferior to the gods but not necessarily morally inferior. This however, presented a theological problem as time went on. Ferguson writes:

> The reluctance to assign bad events to the gods meant that anything unpleasant was more

often attributed to the demons, but in Greek thought demons remained capable of being either good or bad, unlike Jewish and Christian belief which regularly considered them to be bad. (Ferguson, *DEC*, p. 325).

With Xenocrates we see, as Burkert points out, an attempt to resolve this problem. Xenocrates will class *daimones* as beings between gods and men, both physically and morally. Plutarch tells us that Xenocrates offered an enlightening illustration in an attempt to explain the geometric relationship between mortals and gods. He writes:

> Παράδειγμα δὲ τῷ λόγῳ Ξενοκράτης μὲν ὁ Πλάτωνος ἑταῖρος ἐποιήσατο τὸ τῶν τριγώνων, θείῳ μὲν ἀπεικάσας τὸ ἰσόπλευρον θνητῷ δὲ τὸ σκαληνὸν τὸ δ᾽ ἰσοσκελὲς δαιμονίῳ· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἴσον πάντῃ τὸ δ᾽ ἄνισον πάντῃ, τὸ δὲ πῇ μὲν ἴσον πῇ δ᾽ ἄνισον, ὥσπερ ἡ δαιμόνων φύσις ἔχουσα καὶ πάθος θνητοῦ καὶ θεοῦ δύναμιν.

> Xenocrates, the friend of Plato, made the illustration in his teaching of triangles, having compared god with an equilateral [i.e. all sides even], mortals to a scalene [i.e. all sides uneven], and *daimones* to an isosceles [i.e. two sides even]; for they are quite even, but quite uneven, and in some respects even and in some uneven; this is the nature of *daimones* having the passion of a mortal but the power of a god. (Plutarch, *Obsolescence of Oracles,* 416c).

Daimones here are colorfully described as "isosceles," better than humans, but still flawed. Following Xenocrates, Apuleius, a contemporary of Justin, describes *daimones* as beings subject to passions. He claims:

> Sunt enim inter nos ac deos ut loco regionis ita ingenio mentis intersiti, habentes communem cum superis inmortalitatem, cum inferis passionem.

> For they are between us and god as to the location of their territory and in just the same way in the disposition of their mind, having immortality in common with those above, and passion with those below. (*The God of Socrates,* 13).

Plutarch would even claim that the rapes and misdeeds of the gods in epic myths were in reality the work of *daimones* (*Obsolescence of Oracles,* 417e).

Summary.

Let us note a few of the principles we have observed which will prove helpful in the remainder of our study. The Greeks maintained that *daimones* were ever present and active in the affairs of men. These "watchers" were instrumental in explaining various religious rituals to men, and serving as intermediaries. They inspired good men, like Socrates, and in latter thought bore the blame for the misdeeds of the gods.

III. "SONS OF GOD" AND "DEMONS OF FALSEHOOD" –
Δαίμων IN JEWISH THOUGHT.

[...] בחרו בני ישראל אנפיהון [אנפי אלוהין]

[והוו דבח]ין לבניהון לשידי טעותא ורגז עליהון אלוהין וא[מר] למנתן

אנון ביד נב[וכדנזר מלך ב]בל...

…the children of Israel preferred their presence (i.e., that of the false gods) to the [presence of God.] [They were sacrific]ing their sons to the demons of falsehood, and God was angry at them and de[cided] to give them into the power of Nebu-[chadnessar the king of Ba]bylon…(*Pseudo-Daniel,* 4Q243-245.17-19, Eisenman).

Justin was not a Jew (*Dial.* 29). He did not know Hebrew.[1] Yet it is clear, from both the *Apologies* and the *Dialogue with Trypho,* that he knew the Old Testament. Barnard claims that Justin had, "a good knowledge of the [Septuagint] LXX, and of Jewish post-biblical practices, beliefs and exegetical methods" (*OTJ,* p. 406). As a result, to understand his conception of the δαίμων we must consider not only Greek views but also the Jewish conceptual environment from which Justin's views were drawn.

The Hebrew Old Testament.

Clearly, Judaism from the beginning has held that there exist other noncorporeal beings which are neither human nor divine. In Genesis 3:1-15, though referred to only as הַנָּחָשׁ *hᵃgachash* "the serpent," an entity speaks through an animal to the woman tempting her to violate the instruction of God. Later in Job 1:7 this same entity (so it seems) comes into the presence of God as הַשָּׂטָן *hᵃsatan* "the adversary," a word used in the plural in 2 Samuel 19:22 of human adversaries. In Genesis 24:7 when Abraham sends his servant to find a wife for Isaac, he promises that God will send מַלְאָכוֹ *mal'ako*

---

1 Barnard demonstrates in his article "The Old Testament and Judaism in Justin" *VT* 14 (1964): 395-406, from *Dial.* 113 that Justin has little or no knowledge of Hebrew. In commenting on the change of Abraham and Sarah's names, Justin describes it as an addition of *a* (Ἀβραάμ for Ἄβραμ) and *r* (Σάρρα for Σάρα) from the LXX. Barnard writes: "It is difficult to imagine that this could have been said by anyone who knew that the real change in Hebrew was the addition of the letter ה (h) in the name of Abraham and the י (i) into ה (h) in that of Sarah (i.e. Sarah for Sarai)" (p. 399).

"his messenger" who, unseen, assists in the matter. When the Old Testament speaks of evil entities, unlike the Greek conception, the primary determining factor for whether or not these entities are good or evil is whether other nations worship them. We see this in Deuteronomy 32:17 when God rebukes the Israelites for idolatry:

יִזְבְּחוּ לַשֵּׁדִים לֹא אֱלֹהַ אֱלֹהִים לֹא יְדָעוּם
חֲדָשִׁים מִקָּרֹב בָּאוּ לֹא שְׂעָרוּם אֲבֹתֵיכֶם:

They sacrificed to demons, not to God, to gods they did not know,
to new gods, new arrivals that your fathers did not fear.

The word שֵׁדִים *shedim* rendered "demons," comes into Hebrew from the Assyrian word *shedu* - meaning "protecting spirit" (*BDB*, p. 993). It is used only here and in Psalm 106:37:

וַיִּזְבְּחוּ אֶת־בְּנֵיהֶם וְאֶת־בְּנוֹתֵיהֶם לַשֵּׁדִים:

They even sacrificed their sons and their daughters to demons.

Another word, used in a similar way, is found in Leviticus 17:7 and 2 Chronicles 11:15 where both speak of sacrifices "to the goats" – לַשְּׂעִירִם *lᵃsʾirim*. This word is usually applied to literal goats or hairy creatures, yet in these texts it describes some type of "goat-like" deity, similar to the Greek σάτυρος - "*satyr.*" We must observe that in these references the text addresses what humans have done concerning the *shedim* or *sʾirim*. They have sacrificed to them rather than God (Dt. 32:17), even to the point of offering their children to them (Ps.106:37). There is no suggestion that the *shedim* or *sʾirim* actually carry out the various mythologies of the other nations. Instead, Elijah will mock the prophets of Baal suggesting that their god may be asleep, or on a journey unable to hear (1 Kings 18:27). Psalm 96:5 expresses the basic Old Testament position on the beings which the nations worship as gods:

כִּי ׀ כָּל־אֱלֹהֵי הָעַמִּים אֱלִילִים וַיהוָה שָׁמַיִם עָשָׂה:

For all the gods of the peoples are idols, But the LORD made the heavens.

26

The word אֱלִילִים *elilim*, translated here "idols," is defined as "*worthless, a thing of nought...*" (*BDB*, p.47). Clearly there are entities in the Old Testament which take action, such as the "evil spirit from the Lord" – רוּחַ־רָעָה מֵאֵת יְהֹוָה which troubled Saul, influencing him to try and kill David (1 Sam. 16:14;19:9); or the "angel" – מַלְאָךְ *mal'ak* sent from God to plague Jerusalem (2 Sam. 24:15-17). Yet more often than not, in the Old Testament entities which take action operate as messengers of divine punishment rather than independent agents, menacing or subduing humans.

The Septuagint.

It is in the Septuagint (LXX) that we see a different concept of non-corporeal entities emerge. This Greek translation of the Old Testament, composed in the second and third centuries before Christ for the library at Alexandria, subtly demonstrates a Hellenistic interpretation of certain Hebrew concepts. As we might expect the LXX renders שֵׁדִים *shedim* (Dt. 32:17; Ps. 105:37) and אֱלִילִים *elilim* (Ps. 96:5) with an alternate form of δαίμων: δαιμόνιον. שְׂעִירִם *s'irim* will be translated with the word μάταιος meaning, "*vain, empty, idle*" (*LSJ*, p. 1084). What is unexpected is the fact that the LXX will use δαιμόνιον where the Hebrew uses words referring to inanimate forces. The most striking example of this is in Psalm 91:5,6. As the text describes the confidence that can be enjoyed by the one who looks to God, the psalmist declares:

לֹא תִירָא מִפַּחַד לָיְלָה מֵחֵץ יָעוּ יוֹמָם׃
מִדֶּבֶר בָּאֹפֶל יַהֲלֹךְ מִקֶּטֶב יָשׁוּד צָהֳרָיִם׃

> You shall not be afraid of the terror by night, nor of the arrow that flies
> by day, nor of the pestilence that walks in darkness, nor of the destruction
> that lays waste at noonday.

The LXX renders this last phrase "from calamity and from a *daimon* at midday" – ἀπὸ συμπτώματος καὶ δαιμονίου μεσημβρινοῦ. The word קֶטֶב *quetev* in the Hebrew text means simply "*destruction, pestilence*" (*BDB*, p. 881). Here we see the translators

of the LXX bringing their own Hellenism into the text, drawing a connection between an inanimate or natural destructive force and *daimonia*. Foerster, commenting on this text, suggests:

> The only passage where there is possible reference to protection against demons is Ps. 91:6 if we follow the LXX… In general we may say the OT knows no demons with whom one may have dealings in magic even for the purpose of warding them off (v.2, p. 11).

This same tendency may come into play in the only use of the actual word δαίμων in the LXX. In Isaiah 65:11 it will stand for גַּד *gad* "the god of fortune" which seems to reflect this same type of Greek association between *daimones* and fate (*BDB*, p. 584).

The final text we must consider before we leave an examination of the LXX is Genesis 6:1-2 which reads in the Hebrew:

וַיְהִי כִּי־הֵחֵל הָאָדָם לָרֹב עַל־פְּנֵי הָאֲדָמָה וּבָנוֹת יֻלְּדוּ לָהֶם: וַיִּרְאוּ בְנֵי־הָאֱלֹהִים אֶת־בְּנוֹת הָאָדָם כִּי טֹבֹת הֵנָּה וַיִּקְחוּ לָהֶם נָשִׁים מִכֹּל אֲשֶׁר בָּחָרוּ:

> Now it came to pass, when men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born to them, that the sons of God saw the daughters of men, that they were beautiful; and they took wives for themselves of all whom they chose.

A significant variant of this text is represented in the Alexandrian manuscript, dated to the fifth century A.D. For the phrase "the sons of God" – בְנֵי־הָאֱלֹהִים *beni-hᵃelohim* it has οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ "the angels of God." Clearly there are times, such as Job 1:6, that *beni-hᵃelohim* seems to refer to angelic, nonhuman beings. The Hebrew does not specify whether these are human or angelic "sons of God." If the Alexandrian manuscript is more than just an anomaly, it represents a textual comment, importing into the translation angelic activity where the Hebrew does not demand it. This would prove to be a very important move in biblical exegesis for Justin and many others.

Extra-Biblical Literature.

In the intertestamental literature, most of which was either written in Greek, or preserved in Greek, the role of *daimonia* becomes much more pronounced. We see this

especially in two books of the Apocrypha. *The Book of Tobit* relates a story of a δαιμόνιον named Asmodeus, who kills seven husbands of a woman named Sara (3:8). She is given divine assistance against Asmodeus (3:17), and later a procedure is outlined to ward off *daimonia* (6.7-17). Ferguson commenting on this text suggests:

> Many motifs of folklore about demons are combined in this tale: a demon's love for a beautiful woman; the mysterious and dangerous qualities of a new bride, the use of magic as a protection against demons, and the terminology of "binding" demons (*DEC*, p. 78).

In the apocryphal *Book of Baruch* there is (as we shall see in the New Testament) a restatement of Deuteronomy 32:17 (4:7). Then later, in the same chapter δαιμόνιον is used like שְׂעִירִם *s'irim,* of beings in a desolate region (4:35).

There are many other extra-biblical texts that we could consider which deal with the concept of the δαίμων to one degree or another, but we will limit ourselves to two which relate the most directly to Justin's own views: *The Book of Enoch* (1 *Enoch*) and *The Book of Jubilees*. Both of these texts, believed to have been written 170-160 B.C. and 140-100 B.C. respectively, represent (or at least illustrate) a massive expansion of the role of both angels and *daimonia* in the theology of Hellenistic Judaism. Two points are of significance, both: 1. explain Genesis 6:1-2 in terms of an angelic sexual union with human women; and 2. describe the children born from this union as supernaturally instrumental in human affairs. The Ethiopic text of *The Book of Enoch* describes the angels as "sons of the heavens" who saw the daughters of men and lusted after them (6.1-2, Charles). In the Greek fragment of this text they are called ἐγρήγοροι "watchers" (cf. Dan. 4:13,17, 23). They impregnated women and begat "great giants" (7.2). The Greek adds that there were three classes of children born to the women: γίγαντες "giants," Ναφηλείμ from the Hebrew נְפִלִים *n^ephilim* "giants" (BDB, p. 658), and Ἐλιούδ from the Hebrew אֵל *el* "god" and הוֹד *hod* "glory" (Thayer, p. 204). Later in the text they are all classed as γίγαντες (9.9). *Enoch* also offers the names of the

angels, and the particular sins which they taught humanity (8.1-4). One of them, "Azazel," draws his name from the Hebrew word עֲזָאזֵל *azazel,* the name given to the scapegoat in Mosaic sacrificial ritual (Lev. 16:7-10, cf. *s'irim* above). *The Book of Jubilees* echoes this story (5.1,2), speaking of three classes of beings born to the women: Giants, Nephidim, and Eljo (7.22-23). A Hebrew fragment found at Qumran, possibly from *The Book of Jubilees,* uses the same term as *Enoch* calling them in Aramaic העירים "the Watchers" (*Pseudo-Jubilees,* 4Q227.4, Eisenman). These texts reflect a move away from primitive Judaism and a tendency toward speculation about demonic powers.

Philo and Josephus.

The last two figures which we shall consider stand as representatives of Hellenistic Judaism in the first century A.D. – Philo and Josephus. There has been a great deal written about the possible influence of Philo on the theology of Justin, particularly as it relates to his concept of the Λόγος.[2] While the extent of this influence remains in question, we should observe the fact that both Philo and Josephus demonstrate a reinterpretation of the expanded role of angels and *daimonia* which we observed in intertestamental literature. This reinterpretation reflects the influence of the intellectual Gentile environment in which both found themselves. Everett Ferguson in his book *Demonology of the Early Christian World* offers a concise summary of the views of both men, from which we will draw a number of points (pp. 81-86).

Ferguson observes that Philo, as one with "a Greek education who wrote for

---

2 Goodenough devotes the majority of his chapter entitled "The Logos," to Justin's views as they compare to Philo (*TJ,* pp. 139-175). More recent scholarship is less convinced of this relationship. Chadwick, in his article "Justin's Defence of Christianity" 47 (1965): 275-297, in reference to the assumption that Justin's Λόγος theology is directly influenced by Philo, writes, "the assumption is curiously unsupported by concrete evidence." Barnard in his article "The Logos Theology of Justin Martyr" 89 (1971):132-141, and in his own chapter entitled "The Logos" (*LT,* pp. 85-100), is highly critical of Goodenough's views, looking more to the Old Testament as the source of Justin's conception of the "Word of God." The reader should also note however, some interesting "parallels" which Drodge offers concerning Justin and Philo's similar views on the Mosaic origins of philosophy (p. 315).

Greeks," often uses δαίμων just as pagan authors would (p .82). He will quote Greek stories which refer to "some *daimon* or god" – δαίμων τις ἢ θεὸς (*Every Good Man Is Free,* 130); he will refer to Ares as a δαίμων (*Embassy to Gaius*, 112); and he will speak of those who "think and confess that the stars are gods" – νομίζουσι καὶ ὁμολογοῦσι τοὺς ἀστέρας θεοὺς εἶναι (*On the Eternity of the World*, 47). Regarding Philo's own views Ferguson observes:

> The most distinctive use of demons in Philo, however and the meaning which apparently was the most significant to him, was as equivalent to the biblical word "angels," further equated by him also (in good Greek fashion) with souls (p. 83).

In this regard we focus on Philo's interpretation of Genesis 6:1-2. In his work entitled *On the Giants* Philo draws an allegorical interpretation of the passage. While his own quote of Genesis 6:2 represents a reading in line with the Alexandrian manuscript of the LXX, (i.e. οἱ ἄγγελοι for οἱ υἱοί - 2.1), he understands this entire passage as an allegory of the conflict between seeking heavenly things and earthly things (see *On the Unchangeableness of God*, 1-4). Two things are however, quite significant about Philo's text. After quoting from Genesis 6:2 he writes:

> οὓς ἄλλοι φιλόσοφοι δαίμονας, ἀγγέλους Μωυσῆς εἴωθεν ὀνομάζειν· ψυχαὶ δῷ εἰσὶ κατὰ τὸν ἀέρα πετόμεναι. καὶ μηδεὶς ὑπολάβη μῦθον εἶναι τὸ εἰρημένον·
>
> Whom other philosophers call *daimones*, Moses is accustomed to call angels; and these are souls that fly in the air. And let no one take what is spoken to be a myth (*On the Giants,* 6-7).

First we should note here that (in spite of the fact that he interprets this whole affair allegorically) Philo equates the offspring of the angels and women with δαίμονας. In claiming that this is not a μῦθον he is not suggesting it is literal. He claims later that this is not referring to what the poets said about the Giants (58). Finally, we see in this text a broadening of the meaning of not only δαίμων but also "angels" and "souls." In a very significant text Philo claims:

> ψυχὰς οὖν καὶ δαίμονας καὶ ἀγγέλους ὀνόματα μὲν διαφέροντα, ἓν δὲ καὶ ταὐτὸν ὑποκείμενον διανοηθεὶς ἄχθος βαρύτατον ἀποθήση δεισιδαιμονίαν.

31

Therefore, when you understand that souls and *daimones*, and angels are different names, but one and the same underlying thing, you will remove the superstitious fear of *daimones*, which is a most heavy weight (ibid. 16).

Josephus, as Ferguson relates, "has if anything an even more varied usage of the 'demon' family of words but lacks the distinctive explanation comparable to Philo's" (*DE,* p. 84). Ferguson points out that Josephus will use δαιμόνιον to refer to divine providence (*Antiquities of the Jews,* 16.3.2); and he will also quote Gentiles in reference to "some *daimon*" – δαίμων τις as the cause of trouble (*War of the Jews,* 2.32.2). Ferguson suggests "often it is difficult to decide whether one should translate in the personal sense, 'the Deity,' or impersonally, 'Fortune'" (ibid.). Josephus accepts as a reality *daimon*-possession, even describing a root which can exorcise *daimones* (8.2.5). What is most significant for our purposes is Josephus' interpretation of Genesis 6:1-2.

πολλοὶ γὰρ ἄγγελοι θεοῦ γυναιξὶ συνιόντες ὑβριστὰς ἐγέννησαν παῖδας καὶ παντὸς ὑπερόπτας καλοῦ διὰ τὴν ἐπὶ τῇ δυνάμει πεποίθησιν· ὅμοια τοῖς ὑπὸ γιγάντων τετολμῆσθαι λεγομένοις ὑφῷ Ἑλλήνων καὶ οὗτοι δρᾶσαι παραδίδονται.

For many angels of God being with women, bore insolent children, who disdained all good because of their reliance in [their own] power, and it is handed down that these did similar things to those which are said by the Greeks to have been done by the Giants. (*Antiquities of the Jews,* 1.3.1).

Josephus then goes on to describe Noah trying to teach these descendents of the union of angels and women to correct their ways, to no avail (1.3.2). Several things are interesting about this text. First, unlike Philo, Josephus claims these beings did what the Greeks attribute to the giants (or at least similar things). Further, we should notice that Josephus refers to this not as something written, but something that "is handed down" – παραδίδονται, a word associated with the passing on of traditions. Finally, we notice that, while Josephus will frequently use both δαίμων and δαιμόνιον, neither is applied to these "insolent children." This may indicate that Josephus sees this as tradition, rather than canonical truth, and that he does not perceive of these as non-corporeal, demonic entities. These issues are important in light of Justin's conclusions.

IV. "THEY SACRIFICE TO DEMONS AND NOT TO GOD" –
Δαίμων IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

T he treatment of the subject of *daimones* in the New Testament is surprisingly small. *Daimones* are understood to be real entities capable of thought, speech, and the possession of both men and animals, yet their power to exercise control over humanity is limited. Apart from compounds, the New Testament uses four words in describing these beings and their activities.

Δαίμων

> "In Homer and others used in the sense of 'a divinity,' in NT *demon, evil spirit*" (*BAG*, p. 169).

The word δαίμων itself is used only five times in the New Testament.[1] The first three all come within the synoptic gospels in the description of the healing of two demon-possessed men from the region of the Gaderenes across the Sea of Galilee (Mt. 8:28).[2] In this account the *daimones* are described as causing the men to live unclothed among the tombs (Mt. 8:28; Mk. 5:2; Lk. 8:26). Although they had been bound with chains, the *daimones* had broken the chains (Mk. 5:2; Lk. 8:29). Matthew describes them as "exceedingly fierce" – χαλεποὶ λίαν (8:28). In all three accounts the *daimones* demonstrate a knowledge of Jesus' identity, and a fear of punishment (Mt. 8:29; Mk. 5:7; Lk. 8:28). Luke adds that they feared he would command them "to go out into the Abyss" – εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον ἀπελθεὶν (8:31). Matthew states that they feared punishment "before the time" – πρὸ καιροῦ (8:29). What is especially unique about this account is the fact that in Mark and Luke the *daimones* possessing at least one of the men[3] are described as telling their collective name (Mk. 5:9; Lk. 8:30). In Mark the *daimones*

---

1 Mt. 8:31; Mk. 5:12; Lk. 8:29; Rev. 16:14, & 18:2 in the TR. In WH only Mt. 8:31.

2 Mark and Luke do not refer to the second man.

3 Matthew does not record the *daimones* telling their name, which may account for Mark and Luke telling only about the man with the multitude of demons.

declare "my name is Legion; for we are many" – Λεγεών ὄνομά μοι, ὅτι πολλοί ἐσμεν (5:9). All three accounts describe the *daimones* begging Jesus to be allowed to go into a herd of pigs grazing on a nearby mountain. When they had done so, the pigs then rushed headlong into the sea and were drowned (Mt. 8:31,32; Mk. 5:11-13; Lk. 8:32,33).[4]

The other two references, found in the book of Revelation, both refer rather cryptographically to Rome. Ironically, the city of Justin's future death is referred to as "Babylon the great" – Βαβυλὼν ἡ μεγάλη, which became "a dwelling place of demons, a prison for every foul spirit" – κατοικητήριον δαιμόνων καὶ φυλακὴ παντὸς πνεύματος ἀκαθάρτου (18:2). The Tiber is referred to as "the great river Euphrates" – τὸν ποταμὸν τὸν μέγαν τὸν Εὐφράτην (16:12), which in the vision is dried up, after which unclean spirits go forth to deceive, "for they are spirits of demons, performing signs"– εἰσὶ γὰρ πνεύματα δαιμόνων ποιοῦντα σημεῖα (16:14).[5]

Δαιμόνιον

"1. *A deity, divinity;* 2. *demon, evil spirit,* of independent beings who occupy a position between the human and the divine" (*BAG*, p. 169).

Δαμονίζομαι

"*To be possessed by a demon; cruelly tormented by a demon*" (*BAG*, p. 169).

By far the most common word used in the New Testament is δαιμόνιον, together with the verb δαμονίζομαι which is used for the activities of these beings (or more precisely, the activities of those whom they possess.) Although this word is technically

---

4 Dr. Mirecki, in personal consultation, suggests the interesting possibility that this could be seen as a cryptographic reference to Rome. He notes: 1. The *daimones* speak Latin, 2. They identify themselves as a Roman army unit, and 3. They ask not to leave their country of occupation. We must note, however, that the accounts themselves present the event as literal narrative rather than a metaphorical parable.

5 Πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον can be used as a synonym for δαίμων (see. Mk 5:2 & 5:12). Rather than a simple possessive, which could be construed to suggest that *daimones* have some body within which a spirit resides, πνεύματα δαιμόνων may be a partitive genitive, i.e. "the spirits of some of the *daimones*."

a diminutive,[6] δαιμόνιον is used in the New Testament in the same sense as δαίμων. In all instances but one δαιμόνιον is used exactly as we have described the use of δαίμων above. *Daimonia* could cause people to be mute (Mt. 9:33; Lk. 11:14); they caused them to convulse (Lk. 4:33-35); they threw them down (Lk. 9:42); they caused various sicknesses (Mt. 17:8); they spoke to and recognized Jesus (Mr. 1:34; Lk. 4:41); they possessed children (Mr. 7:26-30); they were cast out by the Jews (Mt. 12:27); they were cast out by the disciples (Mt. 10:8); they would be cast out by false believers (Mt. 7:22); and finally, they had a ruler named Beelzebub (Mt. 12:24).

The one example of a distinct usage is found in Paul's speech to the Epicurean and Stoic philosophers in Athens. They initially desire to hear Paul because they conclude "He seems to be a proclaimer of foreign gods" – οἱ δέ, ξένων δαιμονίων δοκεῖ καταγγελεὺς εἶναι (Ac 17:18). Here the Biblical writer, in speaking for the non-Christian Athenians, uses δαιμόνιον just as the Greeks made use of δαίμων; i.e. in reference to deities.

It is in the writings of Paul that some of the most challenging instances of the use of this word are found. In discussing the importance of Christians removing themselves from any association with idolatry he makes reference to Deuteronomy 32:17:

> …ἃ θύει τὰ ἔθνη, δαιμονίοις θύει, καὶ οὐ Θεῷ· οὐ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς κοινωνοὺς τῶν δαιμονίων γίνεσθαι. οὐ δύνασθε ποτήριον Κυρίου πίνειν καὶ ποτήριον δαιμονίων· οὐ δύνασθε τραπέζης Κυρίου μετέχειν καὶ τραπέζης δαιμονίων.

> … the things which the Gentiles sacrifice they sacrifice to demons and not to God, and I do not want you to have fellowship with demons. You cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons; you cannot partake of the Lord's table and of the table of demons. (1 Cor 10:20-21).

Two questions arise in connection with this passage: 1. Is the apostle suggesting that *daimones* actually carried out the deeds associated with pagan worship? or 2. Is he

---

6 Tertullian in reference to emperor worship says - nescitis genios daemonas dici et inde diminuta voce daemonia? "Don't you know that [their] genii is called '*daimon*es' and thus the diminutive word '*daimonia*'?" (*Apol.* 32).

speaking on a purely spiritual level, suggesting that pagan worship is the worship of *daimones* in the same sense that any rebellion against God is service to Satan? Justin, as we shall see, would answer this first question in the affirmative. It is important however, not to filter New Testament statements through patristic notions. There is nothing in the Biblical text that demands a materialistic understanding of Paul's words. R. C. H. Lenski suggests:

> It is a great mistake to imagine that back of their idolatry and their idol sacrifices there is nothing but an empty vacuity. True enough, as 8:4 makes plain, ["we know that an idol is nothing in the world" – οἴδαμεν ὅτι οὐδὲν εἴδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ] the gods of the idols have no existence whatever; no being by the name of Jupiter exists, and this is true with respect to all other gods. All altars, all sacrifices, and all worship that are not intended to serve the true God are thus actually, though not necessarily consciously and intentionally, devoted to these demons (*I & II Corinthians,* p. 415).

Lenski's assertion that "no being by the name of Jupiter exists" is important to keep in mind in light of the kind of speculative conclusions we will observe on Justin's part. A passage similar to I Corinthians 10:20-21 is Revelation 9:20 which also speaks of the worship of *daimonia*, yet this text sheds no further light on the substantial questions on the issue; it simply asserts that it occurs.

Δαιμονιώδης

    "Like a demon, demonical, devilish; like a δαίμων*"* (*LSJ*, p. 365).

The final word used in the New Testament regarding *daimones* is δαιμονιώδης, used in contrast to "wisdom that is from above." James 3:15 states "This wisdom does not descend from above, but is earthly, sensual, demonic" – οὐκ ἔστιν αὕτη ἡ σοφία ἄνωθεν κατερχομένη, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπίγειος, ψυχική, δαιμονιώδης. As we observed with regard to I Corinthians 10:12 it is important to recognize that, while the writer suggests that there is a wisdom which is *daimon-*like*,* that does not necessarily mean *daimones* were the source of this wisdom. Justin will conclude that *daimones* taught falsehood, but he brings this into the Biblical conception, he does not draw it from the text.

36

Angels and *Daimones*.

While the focus of this study concerns the concept of *daimones* we cannot leave an examination of how New Testament texts apply this concept without making the observation that, as far as the New Testament is concerned, there is no apparent distinction between sinful angels and *daimones*. Satan is said to have angels that fight for him (Rev 12:7); these have (at some point in the past) been cast out of heaven with him (Rev 12:9); and hell is said to be a place prepared for the devil and his angels (Mt. 25:41). In regard to these points, there are two passages which would become very important to patristic concepts about *daimones*: 2 Peter 2:4 and Jude 6. Both speak of angels bound in "chains" (σειραῖς - 2 Peter; δεσμοῖς - Jude) awaiting final judgment. Peter adds that they were cast down to Tartarus.[7] Both texts speak of some type of sin on the part of these angels which led to their imprisonment. Peter simply speaks of them as "the angels who sinned" – ἀγγέλων ἁμαρτησάντων; Jude elaborates a bit more in speaking of "…angels who did not keep their proper domain, but left their own habitation" – ἀγγέλους … τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν, ἀλλὰ ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον. A few observations are in order which we will address later in the study. 1. Biblical texts do not specify either the time when this sin occurred, nor the nature of the offense. Whether this refers to a primordial mass rebellion or some other type of trespass is not addressed. 2. The Bible does not specify when this binding occurred. This could be a description of some ancient binding, or Christ's conquest of demonic power.[8] 3.) The Bible does not explicitly draw a connection between the "sons of God" in Genesis chapter 6:1-2, and the "angels who sinned."

---

7 This is similar to the Greek myth of the Titans in Tartarus (Hesiod, *Theogony,* 851).

8 We should note that in Luke 8:31 the *daimones* which speak to Jesus had not yet been bound or cast into the ἄβυσσον.

V. EVIL AND WORTHLESS *DAIMONES* – ANALYSIS OF
JUSTIN'S CONCEPT OF THE Δαίμων.

['Ιουστῖνος]…περὶ τῆς τῶν δαιμόνων διαλαμβάνει
φύσεως· ἃ οὐδὲν ἂν ἐπείγοι τὰ νῦν παρατίθεσθαι.

[Justin]…spoke clearly on the nature of demons; which it is probably
not pressing that it be discussed at the present. (Eusebius, *HE,* 4.18.3).

Although by the time of Eusebius, he may have felt that the distinct nature and operation of *daimones* was "probably not pressing at the present" – οὐδὲν ἂν ἐπείγοι τὰ νῦν, for Justin there was little that was more pressing. In Justin's mind, while persecution was the visible reason for drafting appeals to the emperors, behind it all was the direct and ominous operation of legions of *daimones*. Bringing into his faith some knowledge of Greek myth and philosophy, and mingling it with a Hellenized Judaism, which was itself influenced by Greek thought, Justin presents a view of *daimones* which was distinct from both the Old Testament treatment of the שֵׁדִים *shedim* and שְׂעִירִם *s'irim*, and the New Testament treatment of δαιμόνια.

We begin our analysis of Justin's view of the δαίμων with a brief overview of his treatment of the subject in the two other works that are attributed to him.

Δαίμων in Justin's *First Apology*.

Unlike the Second Apology, in his first appeal to Antoninus Pius, Justin does not introduce his concept of *daimon* activity until the fifth chapter. Here, with little elaboration, Justin claims that: 1. *Daimones* drive the political leaders to act as "the scourge of evil and worthless *daimones*" – μάστιγι δαιμόνων φαύλων (5.1); 2. In the past *daimones* had seduced young boys and women, revealing terrifying signs to them (5.2a); 3. Men call these *daimones* "gods" – θεούς (5:2b); and 4. When Socrates tried by "by the true Logos (or reason)" – λόγῳ ἀληθεῖ to turn men from these *daimones*, they worked through men to bring about his death (5.3). Throughout the remainder of

the *First Apology* Justin returns to these same points again and again. We can identify these basic themes:

Daimonic Influence upon Leaders. Since *daimones* seek to enslave people through dreams and magic, Justin warns the emperor and his sons not to allow *daimones* to deceive them and keep them from grasping the truth (14.1); *daimones* fabricate claims about Christians (23.3); *daimones* persuade people to kill Christians (57.1); and *daimones* persuaded the Jews to persecute Jesus (63.10).

The Myths of the Poets and False Religion. Justin believed that statues in pagan temples bear the actual image of *daimones* (9.1, 41.1); *daimones* demand sacrifice and service from humans (12.5); the myth of Zeus's murder of his father and seduction of Ganymede really occurred, but *daimones* committed such acts (21.6); while many myths really happened others have been invented by *daimones*, such as the myths of hundred handed monsters (23.3, 25.3); *daimones* have responded to Old Testament prophesies in myths about Dionysus (54.6); *daimones* have put forth Simon Magus and Menander to deceive people (26.2-4, 56.1); *daimones* have imitated practices like baptism and Moses' removal of his sandals in their own temples (54.1, 62.1,2); *daimones* have put forth Marcion as a god (58.1); those who accept the teachings of Marcion become "prey" (βορά) for *daimones* (58.2); *daimones* invented myths about the daughters of Zeus – Kore and Athena (64.1); and *daimones* have taught the imitation of the Lord's Supper in Mithra worship (66.4).

The Hindering Logos. Justin claims that *daimones* scattered falsehood and false accusations everywhere, hindering the enlightening force of the Logos, which Justin believed was in each person to a degree (10.6); *daimones* caused the prohibition of the reading of the books of Hystases, Sybil, and the prophets, which he claimed predicted the destruction of the world by fire (44.12); *daimones* seek to turn men away from God (58.3).

Justin also asserts the quite traditional claims that: the leader of the *daimones* is called the serpent, Satan and the devil (28.1); *daimones* have tried to escape the power of God (40.7); Christ will punish *daimones* in the end (45.1); and *daimones* will receive eternal punishment in fire (52.3).

In a rather unusual text Justin attempts to demonstrate the fact that life after death is a widespread belief.   Perhaps rhetorically, he claims that those who are seized by the souls of the dead are called "*daimon*-possessed and maniacs" – δαιμονιολήπτους καὶ μαινομένους (18.4). Even so, Justin does not seem to be taking the position that *daimones* are departed human souls.

Δαίμων in Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho*.

Although, the *Dialogue with Trypho* is generally believed to have been written after the apologies (c. 155-160 - Marcovich, *DT*, p.vii) there is no reason to believe that it reflects any change in Justin's understanding of the nature and role of the δαίμων. The subject of *daimones* plays a somewhat less significant role in the *Dialogue* than in either of his two apologetic works. Justin instead, is primarily concerned with persuading Trypho, a Hellenized Jew, that Jesus is the Messiah. In the course of this discussion we do find a number of times when Justin follows the popular intertestamental Jewish mythology, and a few times when Justin reads his own view of *daimones* into Old Testament texts.

First, we should notice where Justin follows the same claims made in the *First Apology*: *Daimones* contrive persecution against Christians (18.3, 131.3); Christians pray to God to preserve them from *daimones* (30.3); and in the end Christ will destroy *daimones* (131.5). The remaining references to *daimones* may be broken up into two categories: false worship and exorcism.

False Worship. Justin suggests there are "spirits and *daimones* of error" – τὰ τῆς πλάνης πνύματα καὶ δαιμόνια (7.3), much like the "demons of falsehood"

שירי מעותא from *Pseudo-Daniel* (see p.25); in the past, pagans and the Israelites sacrificed their children to *daimones* (19.6, 27.2, 73.6, 133.1); the gods of other nations are *daimones* – a direct quote from Ps 96:5 from the LXX (55.2, 73.2-3. 79.4, 83.4); conversion to Christ is turning from the worship of *daimones* (91:3); the erring Israelites sacrificed to *daimones* and not to God – a paraphrase of Deuteronomy 32:17 from the LXX (119.2); and the erring Israelites prepared a "table" for the worship of *daimones* – a reference to Isaiah 65:11.[1]

Exorcism. Justin writes that *daimones* feared Jesus and are cast out by his name (30.3. 49.8, 76.5); Christians were able to cast out *daimones* (76.6); *daimones* were subject to Jesus (85.2, 121.2); *daimones* were not subject to kings, prophets and patriarchs (85.3).

There is one final example that we should note which illustrates Justin's tendency to read *daimones* into the text where it does not demand them. In a reference to an Old Testament prophecy in Isaiah 8:4 against Damascus, which speaks of God overcoming the "the power of Damascus" – δύναμιν Δαμασκοῦ (LXX) Justin, after quoting this, interprets it as reference to "the wicked *daimon*" – τοῦ πονηροῦ δαίμονος which controlled the region.[2] He then proceeds to suggest that the adoration of the Magi at Jesus' birth proved that Jesus conquered the *daimon*, concluding that they had come from Damascus (78.9).

With the views expressed in the *First Apology* and the *Dialogue with Trypho* as a background let us now proceed to consider the nine short texts, arranged by subject

---

1 Justin does something unusual here. The Hebrew of Is 65:11 speaks of a table for גַּד *gad* "the god of Fortune" and a drink offering for מְנִי *meni* "the god of Fate." The LXX renders this respectively τῷ δαίμονι and τῇ τύχῃ "to chance." Justin however renders this τοῖς δαιμονίος and τῷ δαίμονι which either reflects another Greek translation of the text, or his own tendency to emphasize the δαίμων.

2 Justin really stretches this passage to draw this interpretation. The word translated δύναμιν in the LXX is חַיִל meaning "*strength, efficiency, wealth, army*" (BDB, p. 298). There is no textual reason to read demonic power into the text.

matter, in which Justin refers to *daimones* in the *Second Apology*.

Text One: 2 *Apology* 1.2 - (l. 12-16).

> …διὰ τὸ δυσμετάθετον καὶ φιλήδονον καὶ δυσκίνητον πρὸς τὸ καλὸν ὁρμῆσαι καὶ οἱ φαῦλοι δαίμονες, ἐχθραίνοντες ἡμῖν καὶ τοὺς τοιούτους δικαστὰς ἔχοντες ὑποχειρίους καὶ λατρεύοντας, ὡς οὖν ἄρχοντας δαιμονιῶντας, φονεύειν ἡμᾶς παρασκευάζουσιν.

> Through stubbornness, the love of pleasure, and an unwillingness to be moved towards what is good, evil and worthless *daimones*, hating us, hold these kinds of judges as subjects, worshippers, and therefore, as rulers guided by *daimones,* and they prepare to kill us.

Justin sees the operation of these entities as a very personal issue. The *daimones* act as they do because they hate Christians ("hating us" – ἐχθραίνοντες ἡμῖν). With his opening declaration the concept of Xenocrates' flawed spirits, subject to common human passions comes to mind (Plutarch, *Obsolescence of Oracles,* 416c). These are not "noble watchers" instead they are spiteful, "evil and worthless *daimones*" – φαῦλοι δαίμονες. Justin uses the adjective φαῦλος, meaning - "*worthless, bad, evil, base*" (*BAG*, p. 854), repeatedly in reference to *daimones* and angels. Given Justin's belief that angels originally were given the "oversight" (πρόνοια) of men and things under heaven, but "went beyond this arrangement" – παραβάντες τήνδε τὴν τάξιν (5.2-3), his use of this word must go beyond the simple meaning of "evil" or "wicked" even to suggest that these beings had fallen short of their duty or potential. Ferguson suggests that since Justin uses δαίμων, "a neutral word to the Greeks for superhuman activity, he usually qualifies it by the adjective 'wicked'" (*DJ*, p. 103).

Justin then makes the rather bold assertion that these men are δαιμονιῶντας "guided by *daimones*." It is interesting that Justin uses δαιμονιάω - "*to be possessed of a God* [i.e. *daimon*]" (*LSJ*, p. 365) here rather than δαιμονίζομαι "*tormented by a demon*" (*BAG*, p. 169), which is the word used exclusively in the New Testament (e.g. Mt. 4:24, Mk 1:32, Lk 8:35). The charge alone might not be offensive to the pagan mind, but by defining these *daimones* as φαῦλοι he is charging the leaders with the

same wickedness. Although this is the only time Justin uses the word, it expresses a major element of his cosmology; namely, that *daimones* are at the root of most human problems. As Barnard puts it, "the activity of this evil host of daemons was everywhere to be found in the universe" (*LT,* p.108). Pagels,[3] commenting on Justin's warning to the emperor in the *First Apology* (14.1), suggests that "Justin dares tell these emperors that he suspects that they, being subject to such evil influence, may be incapable of making rational judgments" (p. 306).

Text Two: 2 *Apology* 5.3-6 - (l. 10-27).

> **3** Οἱ δ δ ἄγγελοι, παραβάντεςτήνδε τὴν τάξιν, γυναικῶν μίξεσιν ἡττήθησαν καὶ παῖδας ἐτέκνωσαν, οἵ εἰσιν οἱ λεγόμενοι δαίμονες. **4** Καὶ προσέτι λοιπὸν τὸ ἀνθρώπ⟨ε⟩ιον γένος ἑαυτοῖς ἐδούλωσαν· τὰ μὲν διὰ μαγικῶν γραφῶν, τὰ δὲ διὰ φόβων καὶ τιμωριῶν, ⟨ὧν⟩ ἐπέφερον, τὰ δὲ διὰ διδαχῆς θυμάτων καὶ θυμιαμάτων καὶ σπονδῶν, ὧν ἐνδεεῖς γεγόνασι μετὰ τὸ πάθεσιν ἐπιθυμιῶν δουλωθῆναι. Καὶ εἰς ἀνθρώπους φόνους, πολέμους, μοιχείας, ἀκολασίας καὶ πᾶσαν κακίαν ἔσπειραν.

> **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.

In this text, Justin echoes the popular intertestamental interpretation of Genesis 6:1-2. Immediately before the text quoted above Justin claims that angels had originally been given "the oversight of the things under heaven" – τῶν ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν πρόνοιαν (5.2). Justin understands this as a failure in duty. Justin echoes the *Book of Enoch* (1 *Enoch*), in describing this as a seduction of women (6.1-2).[4] Like Socrates these *daimones* are considered children of heavenly beings (*Apol.* 27c,d). Yet unlike the

---

3 Pagels' article "Christian Apologists and 'The Fall of Angels': An Attack on Roman Imperial Power." *HTR*, 78 (1985):301-325, is a wonderful exploration of exactly how these kinds of accusations would challenge imperial power. It is important, however that we do not interpret Justin in a purely political vein; from all we can observe he truly believed these things.

4 Not all early writers held this interpretation of Genesis 6:1-2 (see John Chrysostom, *Homily on Genesis* 6,22.7; Origen, *Against Celsus,* 5.54-55).

Book of Enoch, as Goodenough suggests, Justin may be the first to substitute *daimones* for "giants" (*TJ*, p. 199). Justin practically quotes Diotima claiming that the *daimones* enslaved people "by the teachings regarding sacrifices, incense, and libations" – διὰ διδαχῆς θυμάτων καὶ θυμιαμάτων καὶ σπονδῶν. Diotima told Socrates that *daimones* explained "about prayers and sacrifices, and about orders and also the repayment of sacrifices" – τῶν μὲν τὰς δεήσεις καὶ θυσίας, τῶν δὲ τὰς ἐπιτάξεις τε καὶ ἀμοιβὰς τῶν θυσιῶν (*Symposium*, 202d,e). In Justin's claim that *daimones* sowed φόνους and πολέμους "murders" and "wars" we hear the echo of the *Book of Enoch* claiming that Azazel…

…ἐδίδαξε [ἀνθρώπους] ποιεῖν μαχαίρας καὶ θώρακας καὶ πᾶν σκεῦος πολεμικὸν…

…taught [men] to make daggers and breastplates and all weapons of war…(8.1).

The same text continues:

5 Ὅθεν καὶ ποιηταὶ καὶ μυθολόγοι, ἀγνοοῦντες τοὺς ἀγγέλους καὶ τοὺς ἐξ αὐτῶν γεννηθέντας δαίμονας ταῦτα πρᾶξαι εἰς ἄρρενας καὶ θηλείας καὶ πόλεις καὶ ἔθνη, ἅπερ συνέγραψαν, εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν θεὸν καὶ τοὺς ὡς ἀπ῾ αὐτοῦ σπορᾷ γενομένους υἱοὺς καὶ τῶν λεχθέντων ἐκείνου ἀδελφῶν [καὶ τέκνων ὁμοίως τῶν ἀπ῾ ἐκείνων] Ποσειδῶνος καὶ Πλούτωνος, ἀνήνεγκαν. **6** Ὀνόματι γὰρ ἕκαστον, ὅπερ ἕκαστος ἑαυτῷ τῶν ἀγγέλων καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ἔθετο, προσηγόρευσαν.

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. **6** For they addressed each by the name which each of the angels set for himself and for their offspring.

One of the most intriguing elements of Justin's belief in *daimones* is the claim offered here that "*daimones* did these things" – δαίμονας ταῦτα πρᾶξαι. Justin is not, however always consistent in this point, asserting at times that the deeds of myth were real and at others times that were invented by *daimones* (1 *Apol.* 25.3; 64.1). Unlike the allegorical approach of Philo (*Giants,* 6-7, 58), Justin, like Josephus, sees some pagan myths as historical (*Antiquities of the Jews,* 1.3.1). Plutarch reflects the

same sentiment, writing:

Καὶ μὴν ὅσας ἔν τε μύθοις καὶ ὕμνοις λέγουσι καὶ ᾄδουσι τοῦτο μὲν ἁρπαγὰς τοῦτο δὲ πλάνας θεῶν κρύψεις τε καὶ φυγὰς καὶ λατρείας, οὐ θεῶν εἰσιν ἀλλὰ δαιμόνων...

And as many things as they say speak in the myths and sing in the songs, this about rapes and that about going astray, about the disguises and labors of the gods, are not about the gods but *daimones... (Obsolescence of Oracles,* 417e).

Justin claims that *daimones* did these things "to males and females" – εἰς ἄρρενας καὶ θηλείας. Pagels observes that Justin suggests that "religious myths serve to sanction such common (and generally legal) practices as prostitution, sexual use of slaves, homosexuality, and even infanticide" (p. 310). Justin, as previously noted, describes the myth of Zeus's homosexual rape of Ganymede as a historical act of *daimones* (1 *Apology* 21.6). He is also critical of Hadrian's deification of his own homosexual lover, Antinous. Pagels sees such criticism as a bold attack upon the imperial family itself:

Pagan critics of government observe the convention of refraining from naming the names of rulers they criticize; Justin, on the contrary boldly reminds Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, and Lucius Verus of the notorious folly of Hadrian, their own revered adoptive father. When Hadrian, overcome with grief at the death of his male lover, instituted divine honors to deify the boy …(pp. 309-10, in ref. to 1 *Apol.* 29).

Text Three: 2 *Apology* 6.5-6 - (l. 16-27).

5 Καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἄνθρωπος, ὡς προέφημεν, γέγονε κατὰ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς βουλὴν ἀποκυηθεὶς ὑπὲρ τῶν πιστευόντων ἀνθρώπων καὶ καταλύσει τῶν δαιμόνων, ⟨ὡς⟩ καὶ νῦν ἐκ τῶν ὑπῷ ὄψιν γινομένων μαθεῖν δύνασθε. **6** Δαιμονιολήπτους γὰρ πολλοὺς κατὰ πάντα τὸν κόσμον καὶ ἐν τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ πόλει πολλοὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἀνθρώπων [τῶν Χριστιανῶν] ἐπορκίζοντες κατὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ σταυρωθέντος ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, ὑπὸ τῶν ἄλλων πάντων ἐπορκιστῶν καὶ ἐπαστῶν καὶ φαρμακευτῶν μὴ ἰαθέντας, ἰάσαντο καὶ ἔτι νῦν ἰῶνται, καταργοῦντες καὶ ἐκδιώκοντες τοὺς κατέχοντας τοὺς ἀνθρώπους δαίμονας.

5 In fact, as we said before, He [i.e. Jesus] 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*, as even now you can learn from the things that are observable. **6** For many *daimon* 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 *daimones* that held the men.

In this text Justin offers an essentially New Testament approach towards the subject. His assertion that Jesus came for "for the destruction of *daimones*" – καταλύσει τῶν δαιμόνων reiterates the very words of *daimones* themselves in the texts of the New Testament expressing fear of punishment "before the time" – πρὸ καιροῦ (Mt 8:29). Justin's use of κατάλυσις follows the pattern in the Gospels and the writings of Paul of using words for destruction in reference to eternal punishment. Justin does not have in mind annihilation (1 *Apol.* 52.3; and 2 *Apol.* 8.3).

With regard to *daimon* possession, Justin again takes a fairly traditional New Testament position in describing this issue. Asserting that Christians "have healed and still now heal" – ἰάσαντο καὶ ἔτι *νῦν* ἰῶνται while he does not claim to have had such powers himself he demonstrates a belief that they had continued unto his day. Ferguson, observing how frequently Justin refers to Pilate in his writings as a whole, comments:

> The way in which Justin regularly adds the phrase about "crucified under Pontius Pilate" to his statements about exorcism in the name of Jesus indicates that this was a regular exorcism formula (*DJ*, p. 108).

Text Four: 2 *Apology* 7.1-3 - (l. 1-20).

1 Ὅθεν καὶ ἐπιμένει ὁ θεὸς τὴν σύγχυσιν καὶ κατάλυσιν τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου μὴ ποιῆσαι ἵνα καὶ οἱ φαῦλοι ἄγγελοι καὶ δαίμονες καὶ ἄνθρωποι μηκέτι ὦσι, διὰ τὸ σπέρμα τῶν Χριστιανῶν, ὃ γινώσκει ἐν τῇ φύσει ὅτι αἴτιόν ἐστιν. **2** Ἐπεὶ εἰ μὴ τοῦτο ἦν, οὐκ ἂν οὐδὲ ὑμῖν ταῦτα ἔτι ποιεῖν καὶ ἐνεργεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν φαύλων δαιμόνων δυνατὸν ἦν, ἀλλὰ | τὸ πῦρ τὸ τῆς κρίσεως κατελθὸν ἀνέδην πάντα διέκρινεν, ὡς καὶ πρότερον ὁ κατακλυσμὸς μηδένα λιπὼν ἀλλῷ ἢ τὸν μόνον σὺν τοῖς ἰδίοις παρῷ ἡμῖν καλούμενον Νῶε, παρῷ ὑμῖν δὲ Δευκαλίωνα, ἐξ οὗ πάλιν οἱ τοσοῦτοι γεγόνασιν, ὧν οἱ μὲν φαῦλοι, οἱ δὲ σπουδαῖοι.

1 On account of which God waits and does not cause the blending together and disso-lution 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. **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 *daimones*, but the fire of judgment would come down unrestrained de-stroying 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.

Barnard feels that in the first part of this text Justin is viewing the delay of Christ's coming along the same lines as God's preservation of Sodom if a remnant of faithfulness could be found (cf. Gen. 18:23-33). He writes:

> He seems to have in mind the Old Testament idea that the destruction of a city will be postponed if there is a seed or small remnant of righteous people in it. (*FS*, p. 191)

The next part of the text continues:

> **3** Οὕτω γὰρ ἡμεῖς τὴν ἐκπύρωσίν φαμεν γενήσεσθαι, ἀλλῷ οὐχ, ὡς οἱ Στωϊκοί, κατὰ τὸν τῆς εἰς ἄλληλα πάντων μεταβολῆς λόγον, ὃ αἴσχιστον ἐφάνη· Ἀλλῷ οὐδὲ καθῷ εἱμαρμένην πράττειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἢ πάσχειν τὰ γινόμενα, ἀλλὰ κατὰ μὲν τὴν προαίρεσιν ἕκαστον κατορθοῦν ἢ ἁμαρτάνειν, καὶ κατὰ τὴν τῶν φαύλων δαιμόνων ἐνέργειαν τοὺς σπουδαίους, οἷον Σωκράτην καὶ τοὺς ὁμοίους, διώκεσθαι καὶ ἐν δεσμοῖς εἶναι, Σαρδανάπαλον δὲ καὶ Ἐπίκουρον καὶ τοὺς ὁμοίους ἐν ἀφθονίᾳ καὶ δόξῃ δοκεῖν εὐδαιμονεῖν.

> **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 happens according to what is fated, but according to their deliberate choice each either does right or sins. Further, by the influence of evil and worthless *daimones* diligent men, such as Socrates and those like him, are pursued and imprisoned but Sardanapalus, Epicurus, and those like them are considered blessed in abundance and glory.

It is in Justin's concepts regarding Socrates and *daimones* that he demonstrates the most overt attempts to alter both Christian doctrines and Greek literature. In the *First Apology* he asserted "those living in accordance with the Logos are Christians" – οἱ μετὰ λόγου βιώσαντες Χριστιανοί εἰσι, then he proceeded to list Socrates with other philosophers (46.3). The assertion is never made in Scripture that anyone was a "Christian" prior to Christ's coming. Further, Plato claims that Socrates was led by his own "prophetic *daimon*" – μαντικὴ ἡ τοῦ δαιμονίου (*Apol.* 40a). Justin is either ignorant of Plato's claim or offering his own reinterpretation of it. Justin equates Socrates' prophetic *daimon* with the Logos, and then makes *daimones* responsible for Socrates' death. Justin will address these matter again later in the text.

With regard to Justin's statements about free will, we must observe that Justin offers some of the most forceful statements about human free will that are to be found among early Christian writers. In this text he asserts "but according to their deliberate choice each either does right or sins" – ἀλλὰ κατὰ μὲν τὴν προαίρεσιν ἕκαστον κατορθοῦν ἢ ἁμαρτάνειν Barnard, in what is obviously a deliberate anachronism, in our judgment has somewhat missed the point when he claims:

> Justin, in spite of his failure to grasp the corporate nature of sin, was no Pelagian blindly believing in man's innate power to elevate himself. (*LT*, p. 156).

In referring to Pelagius, the British monk who long after Justin engaged Augustine in debate over issues of free will and determinism, Barnard seems to have missed the fact that Justin stands as a much earlier witness to a different (and perhaps more sound) understanding of the issue. Although Justin is rather confusing at times regarding his understanding of the effect of *daimones* on free will, we agree with Ferguson that…

> Demonic temptations to sin were not considered to overpower human beings … free will was preserved. The emphasis upon free will was consistently maintained in the early church fathers. Demons were simply seen as the source of the sin. (*DEC*, p. 119).

Ferguson cites Justin's own explanation from the *First Apology*:

> …φαῦλοι δαίμονες … σύμμαχον λαβόντες τὴν ἐν ἑκάστῳ κακὴν πρὸς πάντα καὶ ποικίλην φύσει ἐπιθυμίαν…

> …wicked demons … take as their ally, the desire which by nature is in each person for every different kind of evil (10.6, Ferguson).

While this may suggest that Justin believed in some type of innate depravity, it is clear that he did not believe that it prevented the operation of free will.

Text Five: 2 *Apology* 10.2-3 - (l. 6-14).

> **5** Ὁ πάντων δὲ αὐτῶν εὐτονώτερος πρὸς τοῦτο γενόμενος Σωκράτης τὰ αὐτὰ ἡμῖν ἐνεκλήθη· καὶ γὰρ ἔφασαν αὐτὸν καινὰ δαιμόνια εἰσφέρειν, καὶ οὓς ἡ πόλις νομίζει θεοὺς μὴ ἡγεῖσθαι [αὐτόν]. **6** Ὁ δὲ δαίμονας μὲν τοὺς φαύλους καὶ [τοὺς] πράξαντας ἃ ἔφασαν οἱ ποιηταί, ἐκβαλὼν τῆς πολιτείας καὶ Ὅμηρον καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ποιητάς, παραιτεῖσθαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐδίδαξε, πρὸς θεοῦ δὲ τοῦ ἀγνώστου αὐτοῖς διὰ λόγου ζητήσεως ἐπίγνωσιν προύτρέπετο, εἰπών· "Τὸν δὲ πατέρα καὶ

δημιουργὸν πάντων οὔθ῾ῷ εὑρεῖν ῥάδιον, οὔθ῾ῷ εὑρόντα εἰς πάντας εἰπεῖν ἀσφαλές."

5 And Socrates, being the strongest of all of those in this [i.e. using reason] was accused of the same things as we are; indeed they said he brought in new *daimones*, and that he did not regard those who 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."

Justin continues his praise of Socrates claiming he was "the strongest of all" in trying things by reason, but he also continues a reinterpretation. While we might agree that Socrates looked to different *daimones* than Homer and the other poets, we must remember the argument Socrates posed in Plato's *Apology*:

ἔσθ῾ῷ ὅστις δαιμόνια μὲν νομίζει πράγματ῾ῷ εἶναι, δαίμονας δὲ οὐ νομίζει;

Is there anyone who considers *daimon*-things to be real, but not *daimones*? (27c).

Plato illustrates Socrates' own beliefs with an appeal to common beliefs, he is not "casting out" the state *daimones*. In spite of the fact that Justin may misunderstand, or reinterpret Greek literature, his effort to reform a Greek icon into a Christian image illustrates the influence that Greek thought had upon his own beliefs.

Text Six: 2 *Apology* 11.1 - (l. 1-4).

1 Οὐκ ἂν δὲ οὐδὲ ἐφονευόμεθα οὐδὲ δυνατώτεροι ἡμῶν ἦσανοί τε ἄδικοι ἄνθρωποι καὶ δαίμονες, εἰ μὴ πάντως παντὶ γεννωμένῳ ἀνθρώπῳ καὶ θανεῖν ὠφείλετο· ὅθεν καὶ τὸ ὄφλημα ἀποδιδόντες εὐχαριστοῦμεν.

1 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.

Justin here addresses universal questions about why, if God is the ally of the Christian, He would allow persecution and suffering (see 2 *Apol.* 5.1). In chapter five, Justin explains this in terms of the rebellion of angelic beings (see Text Two above). Now he addresses what is a rather traditional Christian doctrine regarding death. In claiming that each person "is obligated to die" – θανεῖν ὠφείλετο he refers to the

49

Christian belief in both a spiritual death that man suffers when they sin (Rom. 6:23), and the physical death that comes as consequence of Adam's sin and separation from the tree of life (I Cor. 15:22; Gen 3:22). Apparently, Justin is simply stating that, while in fact Christians are stronger than *daimones* (as evidenced by exorcism), the payment of the debt of sin makes it look as if they are stronger. This is a rather unusual argument.

The remaining three texts all address the role of the *daimon* in the persecution of Christians. We will offer them for consideration, and comment only briefly:

Text Seven: 2 *Apology* 8.2-3 - (l. 6-14).

2 Ὡς γὰρ ἐσημάναμεν, πάντας τοὺς κἂν ὁπωσδήποτε κατὰ Λόγον βιοῦν σπουδάζοντας καὶ κακίαν φεύγειν μισεῖσθαι ἀεὶ ἐνήργησαν οἱ δαίμονες. **3** Οὐδὲν δὲ θαυμαστόν, εἰ τοὺς κατὰ σπερματικοῦ λόγου μέρος, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ παντὸς Λόγου, ὅ ἐστι Χριστοῦ γνῶσιν καὶ θεωρίαν, πολὺ μᾶλλον μισεῖσθαι οἱ δαίμονες ἐλεγχόμενοι ἐνεργοῦσιν· οἳ τὴν ἀξίαν κόλασιν καὶ τιμωρίαν κομίσονται ἐν αἰωνίῳ πυρὶ ἐγκλεισθέντες.

2 For as we indicated, *daimones* have influenced things such that all those in any place and at any time diligently living according to the Logos and fleeing wickedness, are always hated. **3** And this is no wonder if those living in accordance with a part of the seminal Logos are hated certainly those living in accordance with the whole Logos (which they know and behold is the Christ) the *daimones*, being convicted,[5] inspire them to be hated much more. These shall receive a deserved punishment and retribution, when they are shut up in eternal fire.

Text Eight: 2 *Apology* 12.3-4 - (l. 11-16).

3 Ἤδη καὶ τοῦτο ἐνήργησαν οἱ φαῦλοι δαίμονες διά τινων πονηρῶν ἀνθρώπων πραχθῆναι. **4** Φονεύοντες γὰρ αὐτοί τινας ἐπὶ συκοφαντίᾳ τῇ εἰς ἡμᾶς καὶ εἰς βασάνους εἵλκυσαν οἰκέτας τῶν ἡμετέρων ἢ παῖδας ἢ γύναια, καὶ διῷ αἰκισμῶν φοβερῶν ἐξαναγκάζουσι κατειπεῖν ταῦτα τὰ μυθολογούμενα, ἃ αὐτοὶ φανερῶς πράττουσιν.

3 Indeed, this [i.e.the execution of Christians] 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.

---

5 We have taken ἐλεγχόμενοι to refer to the punishment of the *daimones*, i.e. "being convicted." Barnard and Falls understand this instead "are proved to be the cause."

Text Nine: 2 *Apology* 13.1 - (l. 1-5).

> **1** Καὶ γὰρ ἐγώ, μαθὼν περίβλημα πονηρὸν εἰς ἀποστροφὴν τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων περιτεθειμένον ὑπὸ τῶν φαύλων δαιμόνων τοῖς Χριστιανῶν θείοις διδάγμασι, καὶ ψευδολογουμένων ταῦτα καὶ τοῦ περι∣βλήματος κατεγέλασα καὶ τῆς παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς δόξης.

> **1** 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.

Justin refers here, as in Text Eight to the false accusations that Christians were guilty of incest, and cannibalism because they referred to each other as brother and sister, and commemorated the Lord's Supper as representative of Christ's body and blood.

> We end our analysis of Justin with some final observations by Pagels:

> Christians share in common with pagans the conviction that invisible networks of superhuman beings energize human activity, and above all, empower the emperor and his subordinates to dominate the world. But there agreement ends. What pagans revere as assuring divine protection, Christians abhor as demonic tyranny. Justin launches … nothing less than a frontal attack upon the theology of imperial power – the massive official propaganda that the Antonine emperors inherited from their predecessors. (p. 304).

Pagels offers some insightful observations about Justin's approach to the emperors. In our final texts we see what is essentially a Christian interpretation of persecution – it was at every turn inspired by *daimones*. While we might assume that this view was exclusively Christian, if Pagels is correct, Justin simply accepted what the pagan world did in general, that actions were universally motivated by *daimones*. What Justin did that was unique was to focus in on this influence as it related to Christian persecution. He makes no attempt, as in the case of Socrates, to reinterpret the influence of the δαίμων as anything other than motivation "by evil and worthless *daimones*" – ὑπὸ τῶν φαύλων δαιμόνων.

VI. CONCLUSION.

συζῇ δὲ θεοῖς ὁ συνεχῶς δεικνὺς αὐτοῖς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν
ἀρεσκομένην μὲν τοῖς ἀπονεμομένοις, ποιοῦσαν δὲ ὅσα βούλεται
ὁ δαίμων, ὃν ἑκάστῳ προστάτην καὶ ἡγεμόνα ὁ Ζεὺς ἔδωκεν,
ἀπόσπασμα ἑαυτοῦ. οὗτος δέ ἐστιν ὁ ἑκάστου νοῦς καὶ λόγος.

He may live with the gods, who continually shows them his soul is
pleased with what the things allotted [to it], and who does as much as the
daimon wills, whom Zeus gave to each as a protector and guide, a shred of
himself, which is the mind and logos of each. (Marcus Aurelius,
Meditations, 5.27).

If we are correct in assigning the date of the writing of the *Second Apology* and the date of Justin's death to the reign of Marcus Aurelius, it is ironic that the emperor to whom he wrote would describe himself as having a *daimon* as "protector and guide" – προστάτην καὶ ἡγεμόνα, whom he speaks of as an ἀπόσπασμα, meaning - "*that which is torn off, a piece, a rag, a shred*" (*LSJ*, p.218) of Zeus. Further, he equates this with the "mind" (νοῦς) and λόγος. If we remember that Justin himself believed that those who were led by the "true logos" were Christians, it leads one to wonder how Justin would have viewed the writings of the emperor if they had been written before his own time.

Anthony Guerra, in his article "The Conversion of Marcus Aurelius and Justin Martyr: The Purpose, Genre, and Content of the First Apology,"[1] explores the concept that instead of merely offering an essay defending Christian belief, Justin's apologetic efforts had the evangelistic aim of converting the emperors themselves. He writes:

> …the professed allegiance of Marcus Aurelius to a recently maligned and persecuted philosophical movement [i.e. Stoicism] inspired Justin to believe that Marcus could be turned favorably towards Christianity, just as he himself had turned away from Greek philosophy to Christ. (p. 187).

While we cannot determine Justin's motives, nor do we have conclusive evidence that the emperor(s) actually ever saw either of the apologies, undoubtedly Justin had high

---

[1] Anthony J. Guerra. "The Conversion of Marcus Aurelius and Justin Martyr: The Purpose, Genre, and Content of the First Apology." *Second Century* 9 (1992): 171-187.

hopes in the composition of the apologies.

The question that must still be considered is from how much Greek thought and philosophy had Justin actually ever turned away? Clearly, he possessed a level of faith and conviction which allowed him to have the courage to go to his death for his convictions. It is easy to look back through the years of scholarship and analysis and draw conceptual connections which might not have been apparent at the time. After Justin, men like Tatian and Tertullian would shy away from accepting too readily associations between Christian doctrines and Greek philosophy, although they often held concepts of the δαίμων which, like Justin, blended Greek, and Hellenistic Jewish concepts into Biblical ideas.

We have seen in our study that Justin built his own views of the δαίμων on the Greek perception of, as Pagels put it "invisible networks of superhuman beings" which "energize human activity" (p. 304). While the Old and New Testament would warn of evil influences, Justin expands this to suggest that *daimones* motivated, and drove on persecution, false doctrine, and with respect to the myths of the Greek epics, "*daimones* did these things" – δαίμονας ταῦτα πρᾶξαι (2 *Apol.* 5.5). Justin's teachings about the origin of *daimones* echo Hellenistic Jewish literature such as the *Book of Enoch* and the *Book of Jubilees* which, we would argue, themselves show a Greek influence behind them. Aside from Jewish literature, Justin's own statements about men like Socrates and Heraclitus betray an overt reliance upon Platonic concepts as it relates to "the thought of incorporeal things" – ἡ τῶν ἀσωμάτων νόησις (*Dial.* 2.6). There can be little doubt that such concepts had an impact upon his own views of the δαίμων. While all of these factors do not take away from the important role that Justin played in early Christianity, they do remind us of the fact that beliefs are not formed in a conceptual vacuum but are always subject to other influences which must be taken into consideration.

APPENDIX

I. GREEK TEXT

II. ENGLISH TRANSLATION

III. NOTES

I. GREEK TEXT

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.

<div style="text-align: right">KMP</div>

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 complied in early 7th cent.; contains a portion of II *Apol.* 3.

BREVIATA

<*>   a conjectured gap in the manuscript

[αβγ]   erased (or destroyed) text

<αβγ>   text added by scholars

EDITIONS

Stephanus, R. – Paris, 1551	Ashton, C. – Cant., 1768
Périon, J. – Paris, 1554	Braun, J.W.J. – Bonn 1830-1883
Lange, J. – Basil.,1565	Otto, J.C. – Jena, 1876-1881.
Sylburg, F. – Heidelburg, 1593	Gildersleeve, B.L. – New York, 1877.
Grabe, J. E. – Oxford, 1714	Grundl, P.B. – August., 1891
Thirlby, S. – London, 1722.	Marcovich, M. – New York, 1994
Maran, P. – Paris, 1742	

OTHER WORKS

Nolte, J. H. – Notes in *Patrologia Graeca.*

Pearson, C. – Annotations to the edition of Thirlby.

Schwartz, E. – Editor of Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica.* Leipzig, 1903-1909.

Veil, H. – *Justinus … Rechtfertigung des Christentums* (*Apol.* I & II), Strassburg, 1894.

TEXTUAL NOTES

HEADING: Although the manuscript titles the work ΠΡΟΣ ΤΗΝ ΡΩΜΑΙΩΝ 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 εἴη.

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) **Κἀγὼ 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." – Τούτοις ὁ Ἰουστῖνος εἰκότως καὶ ἀκολούθως ἃς προεμνηονεύσαμεν αὐτοῦ φωνὰς ἐπάγει λέγων "κἀγὼ οὖν προσδοκῶ ὑπό τινος τῶν ὠνομασμένων ἐπιβουλευθῆναι" καὶ τὰ λοιπά.

ΤΟΥ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΑΓΙΟΥ ΙΟΥΣΤΙΝΟΥ
ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΜΑΡΤΥΡΟΣ
ΑΠΟΛΟΓΙΑ ΥΠΕΡ ΧΡΙΣΤΙΑΝΩΝ
ΠΡΟΣ ΤΗΝ ΡΩΜΑΙΩΝ ΣΥΓΚΛΗΤΟΝ

1 Καὶ τὰ χθὲς δὲ καὶ πρώην ἐν τῇ πόλει ὑμῶν γενόμενα
ἐπὶ Οὐρβίκου, [ὦ Ῥωμαῖοι,] καὶ τὰ πανταχοῦ ὁμοίως
ὑπὸ τῶν ἡγουμένων ἀλόγως πραττόμενα ἐξηνάγκασέ
με ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, ὁμοιοπαθῶν ὄντων καὶ ἀδελφῶν, κἂν ἀγνοῆτε
5 καὶ μὴ θέλητε διὰ τὴν δόξαν τῶν νομιζομένων ἀξιωμάτων,
τὴν τῶνδε τῶν λόγων σύν⟨τ⟩αξιν ποιήσασθαι. **2** Πανταχοῦ
γάρ, ὃς ἂν σωφρονίζηται ὑπὸ πατρὸς ἢ γείτονος ἢ τέκνου ἢ
φίλου ἢ ἀδελφοῦ ἢ ἀνδρὸς ἢ γυναικὸς κατῷ ἔλλειψιν, χωρὶς
τῶν πεισθέντων τοὺς ἀδίκους καὶ ἀκολάστους ἐν αἰωνίῳ
10 πυρὶ κολασθήσεσθαι, τοὺς δῷ ἐναρέτους καὶ ὁμοίως Χριστῷ
βιώσαντας ἐν ἀπαθείᾳ συγγεν⟨ήσ⟩εσθαι τῷ θεῷ· λέγομεν δὲ
τῶν γενομένων Χριστιανῶν, διὰ τὸ δυσμετάθετον καὶ |
φιλήδονον καὶ δυσκίνητον πρὸς τὸ καλὸν ὁρμῆσαι ⟨*⟩ καὶ οἱ
φαῦλοι δαίμονες, ἐχθραίνοντες ἡμῖν καὶ τοὺς τοιούτους
15 δικαστὰς ἔχοντες ὑποχειρίους καὶ λατρεύοντας, ὡς οὖν
ἄρχοντας δαιμονιῶντας, φονεύειν ἡμᾶς παρασκευάζουσιν.
3 Ὅπως δὲ καὶ ἡ αἰτία τοῦ παντὸς γενομένου ἐπὶ Οὐρβίκου
φανερὰ ὑμῖν γένηται, τὰ πεπραγμένα ἀπαγγελῶ.

2 Γυνή τις συνεβίου ἀνδρὶ ἀκολασταίνοντι,
ἀκολασταίνουσα καὶ αὐτὴ πρότερον. **2** Ἐπεὶ δὲ τὰ
τοῦ Χριστοῦ διδάγματα ἔγνω αὕτη < ἐσωφρονίσθη
καὶ τὸν ἄνδρα ὁμοίως σωφρονεῖν πείθειν ἐπειρᾶτο, τὰ ...
5 διδάγματα ἀναφέρουσα, τήν τε μέλλουσαν τοῖς οὐ
σωφρόνως καὶ μετὰ λόγου ὀρθοῦ βιοῦσιν ἔσεσθαι ἐν αἰωνίῳ
πυρὶ κόλασιν ἀπαγγέλλουσα. **3** Ὁ δὲ ταῖς αὐταῖς ἀσελγείαις
ἐπιμένων ἀλλοτρίαν διὰ τῶν πράξεων ἐποιεῖτο τὴν γαμετήν·
4 ἀσεβὲς γὰρ ἡγουμένη τὸ λοιπὸν ἡ γυνὴ συγκατακλίνεσθαι
10 ἀνδρί, παρὰ τὸν τῆς φύσεως νόμον καὶ παρὰ τὸ δίκαιον
πόρους ἡδονῆς ἐκ παντὸς πειρωμένῳ ποιεῖσθαι, τῆς συζυγίας
χωρισθῆναι ἐβουλήθη. **5** Καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἐξεδυσωπεῖτο ὑπὸ τῶν

Inscriptio A: Ἰουστῖνος δεύτερον ὑπὲρ τῶν καθ᾽ ἡμᾶς δογμάτων βιβλίον
ἀναδοὺς τοῖς δεδηλωμένοις ἄρχουσιν *Eus. HE,* 4.16.1   **1.1** χθὲς δὲ A:
χθὲς τε Sylburg, Otto, Braun, Marcovich   **6** σύνταξιν Sylburg, Pearson,
Marcovich (*Dial.* 80.3 σύνταξιν ποιήσομαι): σύναξιν A   **11** συγγενήσεσθαι
Périon, Marcovich: συγγενέσθαι A   **12** * "spatium vacuum unius versus in
A" Marcovich et al: "non videtur hiatus esse" Pearson   **2.2** ἐπεὶ A: ἐπειδὴ
Eus. ἔγνω αὐτή A: ἔγνωσαν οὗτοι A mg: ἔγνω *Eus.*   **3** ἐσωφρονίσθη
...ἐλεγχόμενον (55) *Eus.*: om. A a

αὐτῆς, ἔτι προσμένειν συμβουλευόντων, ὡς εἰς ἐλπίδα
μεταβολῆς ἥξοντός ποτε τοῦ ἀνδρός, βιαζομένη ἑαυτὴν
15 ἐπέμενεν.

6 Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ὁ ταύτης ἀνὴρ εἰς τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν πορευθεὶς
χαλεπώτερα πράττειν ἀπηγγέλθη, ὅπως μὴ κοινωνὸς τῶν
ἀδικημάτων καὶ ἀσεβημάτων γένηται, μένουσα ἐν τῇ συζυγίᾳ
καὶ ὁμοδίαιτος καὶ ὁμόκοιτος γινομένη, τὸ λεγόμενον παρῷ
20 ὑμῖν ῥεπούδιον δοῦσα ἐχωρίσθη. **7** Ὁ δὲ καλὸς κἀγαθὸς
ταύτης ἀνήρ, δέον αὐτὸν χαίρειν ὅτι ἃ πάλαι μετὰ τῶν
ὑπηρετῶν καὶ τῶν μισθοφόρων εὐχερῶς ἔπραττε, μέθαις
χαίρουσα καὶ κακίᾳ πάσῃ, τούτων μὲν τῶν πράξεων
πέπαυτο καὶ αὐτὸν τὰ αὐτὰ παύσασθαι πράττοντα
25 ἐβούλετο, μὴ βουλομένου ἀπαλλαγείσης κατηγορίαν
πεποίηται, λέγων αὐτὴν Χριστιανὴν εἶναι. **8** Καὶ ἡ μὲν
βιβλίδιόν σοι τῷ αὐτοκράτορι ἀνέδωκε, πρότερον
συγχωρηθῆναι αὐτῇ διοικήσασθαι τὰ ἑαυτῆς ἀξιοῦσα, ἔπειτα
ἀπολογήσασθαι περὶ τοῦ κατηγορήματος μετὰ τὴν τῶν
30 πραγμάτων αὐτῆς διοίκησιν· καὶ συνεχώρησας τοῦτο.

9 Ὁ δὲ ταύτης ποτὲ ἀνήρ, πρὸς ἐκείνην [μέν] μὴ δυνάμενος
τανῦν ἔτι λέγειν, πρὸς Πτολεμαῖόν τινα ὃν Οὔρβικος
ἐκολάσατο, διδάσκαλον ἐκείνης τῶν Χριστιανῶν μαθημά-
των γενόμενον, ἐτράπετο διὰ τοῦδε τοῦ τρόπου.
35 **10** Ἑκατόνταρχον εἰς δεσμὰ ἐμβαλόντα τὸν Πτολεμαῖον,
φίλον αὐτῷ ὑπάρχοντα, ἔπεισε λαβέσθαι τοῦ Πτολεμαίου
καὶ ἀνερωτῆσαι εἰ, αὐτὸ τοῦτο μόνον, Χριστιανός ἐστι.
11 Καὶ τὸν Πτολεμαῖον, φιλαλήθη ἀλλῷ οὐκ ἀπατηλὸν οὐδὲ
ψευδολόγον τὴν γνώμην ὄντα, ὁμολογήσαντα ἑαυτὸν εἶναι
40 Χριστιανόν, ἐν δεσμοῖς γενέσθαι ὁ ἑκατόνταρχος πεποίηκεν,
καὶ ἐπὶ πολὺν χρόνον ἐν τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ ἐκολάσατο.

12 Τελευταῖον δέ, ὅτε ἐπὶ Οὔρβικον ἤχθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος,
ὁμοίως αὐτὸ τοῦτο μόνον ἐξητάσθη, εἰ εἴη Χριστιανός.
13 Καὶ πάλιν, τὰ καλὰ ἑαυτῷ συνεπιστάμενος διὰ τὴν ἀπὸ
45 τοῦ Χριστοῦ διδαχήν, τὸ διδασκαλεῖον τῆς θείας ἀρετῆς
ὡμολόγησεν. **14** Ὁ γὰρ ἀρνούμενος ὁτιοῦν ἢ κατεγνωκὼς
τοῦ πράγματος ἔξαρνος γίνεται, ἢ ἑαυτὸν ἀνάξιον
ἐπιστάμενος καὶ ἀλλότριον τοῦ πράγματος τὴν ὁμολογίαν

---

20 ὑμῖν *Eus.* a B D M:ἡμῖν *Eus.* T E R   **22** εὐχερῶς *Eus.*: om. et post
ἔπραττε add. κυλιομένη ἡ γυνὴ *Eus.* T mg   **25** μὴ βουλομένου *Eus.* a T E
R M: om. B D, Syr.   **27** ἀνέδωκε *Eus.* codd.: ἀναδέδωκε *Eus.* B D   **30** διο-
ίκησιν *Eus.* codd.: διοίκησιν ὑποσχομένη *Eus.* T corr. E R: διοίκησιν
ὑπέσχετο *Eus.* a   **32** Οὐρβίκιος *Eus.*

φεύγει· ὧν οὐδὲν πρόσεστιν τῷ ἀληθινῷ Χριστιανῷ.

50 **15** Καὶ τοῦ Οὐρβίκου κελεύσαντος αὐτὸν ἀπαχθῆναι Λούκιός τις, καὶ αὐτὸς ὢν Χριστιανός, ὁρῶν τὴν ἀλόγως οὕτως γενομένην κρίσιν, πρὸς τὸν Οὔρβικον ἔφη· **16** "Τίς ἡ αἰτία; τοῦ μήτε μοιχὸν μήτε πόρνον μήτε ἀνδροφόνον μήτε λωποδύτην μήτε ἅρπαγα μήτε ἁπλῶς ἀδίκημά τι πράξαντα ... 55 ἐλεγχόμενον, > ὀνόματος δὲ Χριστιανοῦ προσωνυμίαν A f. 193ᵛ ὁμολογοῦντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον τοῦτον ἐκολάσω; Οὐ πρέποντα Εὐσεβεῖ αὐτοκράτορι οὐδὲ φιλοσόφου Καίσαρος παιδὶ οὐδὲ τῇ ἱερᾷ συγκλήτῳ κρίνεις, ὦ Οὔρβικε." **17** Καὶ ὃς οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἀποκρινάμενος [καὶ] πρὸς τὸν Λούκιον ἔφη· "Δοκεῖς μοι 60 καὶ σὺ εἶναι τοιοῦτος." **18** Καὶ τοῦ Λουκίου φήσαντος· "Μάλιστα," πάλιν καὶ αὐτὸν ἀπαχθῆναι ἐκέλευσεν. **19** Ὁ δὲ καὶ χάριν εἰδέναι ὡμολόγει, πονηρῶν δεσποτῶν τῶν τοιούτων ἀπηλλάχθαι γινώσκων καὶ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα καὶ βασιλέα τῶν οὐρανῶν πορεύεσθαι. **20** Καὶ ἄλλος δὲ τρίτος 65 ἐπελθὼν κολασθῆναι προσετιμήθη.

3 **(8)** Κἀγὼ οὖν προσδοκῶ ὑπό τινος τῶν ὠνομασμένων A f. 196ᵛ ἐπιβουλευθῆναικαὶ ξύλῳ ἐμπαγῆναι, ἢ κᾶν ὑπὸ Κρίσκεντος τοῦ φιλοψόφου καὶ φιλοκόμπου. **2** Οὐ γὰρ φιλόσοφον εἰπεῖν ἄξιον τὸν ἄνδρα, ὅς γε περὶ ἡμῶν ἃ μὴ 5 ἐπίσταται δημοσίᾳ καταμαρτυρεῖ, ὡς ἀθέων καὶ ἀσεβῶν Χριστιανῶν ὄντων, πρὸς χάριν καὶ ἡδονὴν τῶν πολλῶν τῶν πεπλανημένων ταῦτα πράττων. **3** Εἴτε γὰρ μὴ ἐντυχὼν τοῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ διδάγμασι κατατρέχει ἡμῶν, παμπόνηρός ἐστι καὶ ἰδιωτῶν πολὺ χείρων, οἳ φυλάττονται πολλάκις περὶ 10 ὧν οὐκ ἐπίστανται διαλέγεσθαι καὶ ψευδομαρτυρεῖν· ἢ εἰ ἐντυχών, ⟨μὴ συνῆκε⟩ τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς μεγαλεῖον, ἢ συνείς, πρὸς τὸ μὴ ὑποπτευθῆναι τοιοῦτος ταῦτα ποιεῖ, πολὺ μᾶλλον

---

55 ὀνόματος δὲ Χριστιανοῦ *Eus.*: παθήματος δὲ Χριστοῦ A, Steph. **57** Εὐσεβῆ A **58** τῇ A: om. *Eus.* **60** τοῦ *Eus.*: om. A **61** καὶ² A: om. *Eus.* **62** πονηρῶν A: πονηρῶν γὰρ *Eus.* **63** γινώσκων A: ἐπεῖπεν *Eus.* πρὸς τὸν πατέρα καὶ βασιλέα τῶν οὐρανῶν A: παρὰ ἀγαθὸν πατέρα καὶ βασιλέα τὸν θεὸν *Eus.* **65** ἐπελθὼν *Eus.*: ἀπελθὼν A **3.1** κἀγὼ οὖν... post προσετιμήθη (2.60) *Eus. HE,* 4.16,17, Maran: κἀγὼ οὖν...ἀδιαφορίας (28) post ἐδίδαξε (8.19) A: οὖν om. *Pasch.* ὀνομασμένων A **2** ἐμπαγῆναι A, *Eus.*Syr.: ἐντιναγῆναι *Eus.*: ἐντιναχθῆναι *Pasch.* **3** Κρίσκεντος A: Κρήσκεντος *Eus.* φιλοψόφου A: ἀφιλοσόφου *Eus. Pasch.* **4** ἡμῶν ἃ A: ὦν *Eus.* (περὶ ὧν μὴ ἐπίσταται om. *Pasch.*) **5** ἀθέων καὶ A *Eus.*: ἀθέων ἡμῶν καὶ *Pasch.* **7** ταῦτα A: τοῦτο *Eus.* **10** ἢ A: καὶ *Eus.* **11** μὴ συνῆκε *Eus.*, Sylburg: om. A μεγαλεῖον *Eus.*, Sylburg: μεγαλείῳ A

ἀγεννὴς καὶ παμπόνηρος, ἰδιωτικῆς καὶ ἀλόγου δόξης καὶ
φόβου ἐλάττων ὤν.

15   **4** Καὶ γὰρ προθέντα με καὶ ἐρωτήσαντα αὐτὸν ἐρωτήσεις
τινὰς τοιαύτας καὶ μαθεῖν καὶ ἐλέγξαι, ὅτι ἀληθῶς μηδὲν
ἐπίσταται, εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς   βούλομαι. | **5** Καὶ ὅτι ἀληθῆ λέγω,   A f. 197ʳ
εἰ μὴ ἀνηνέχθησαν ἡμῖν αἱ κοινωνίαι   τῶν λόγων, ἕτοιμος
καὶ ἐφ' ὑμῶν κοινωνεῖν τῶν ἐρωτήσεων πάλιν· βασιλικὸν δ'

20 ἂν καὶ τοῦτο ἔργον εἴη.   **6**   Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐγνώσθησαν ὑμῖν αἱ
ἐρωτήσεις μου καὶ αἱ ἐκείνου ἀποκρίσεις, φανερὸν ὑμῖν ἐστιν
ὅτι οὐδὲν ⟨τῶν ἡμετέρων⟩ ἐπίσταται· ἢ εἰ καὶ ἐπίσταται, διὰ
τοὺς ἀκούοντας δὲ οὐ τολμᾷ λέγειν, ὁμοίως Σωκράτει ὡς
προέφην, οὐ φιλόσοφος ἀλλὰ φιλόδοξος ἀνὴρ δείκνυται, ὅς

25 γε μηδὲ τὸ Σωκρατικόν, ἀξιέραστον ὄν, τιμᾷ· "'Αλλ' οὔτι γε
πρὸ τῆς ἀληθείας τιμητέος ἀνήρ." **7** Ἀδύνατον δὲ Κυνικῷ,
ἀδιάφορον τὸ τέλος προ⟨θ⟩εμένῳ, τὸ ἀγαθὸν εἰδέναι πλὴν
ἀδιαφορίας.   A f. 197ᵛ

4 (3) Ὅπως δὲ μή τις εἴπῃ· "Πάντες οὖν ἑαυτοὺς   A f. 193ᵛ
φονεύσαντες πορεύεσθε ἤδη παρὰ τὸν θεὸν καὶ ἡμῖν
πράγματα μὴ παρέχετε," ἐρῶ δι' ἣν αἰτίαν τοῦτο οὐ
πράττομεν, καὶ δι' ἣν | ἐξεταζόμενοι ἀφόβως ὁμολογ-   A f. 194ʳ

5 οῦμεν.   **2**   Οὐκ εἰκῆ τὸν κόσμον πεποιηκέναι τὸν θεὸν
δεδιδάγμεθα, ἀλλ' ἢ διὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπειον γένος· χαίρειν τε
τοῖς τὰ προσόντα αὐτῷ μιμουμένοις προέφημεν, ἀπαρ-
έσκεσθαι δὲ τοῖς τὰ φαῦλα ἀσπαζομένοις ἢ λόγῳ ἢ ἔργῳ.

3 Εἰ οὖν πάντες ἑαυτοὺς φονεύσομεν, τοῦ μὴ γεννηθῆναί
10 τινα καὶ μαθητευθῆναι εἰς τὰ θεῖα διδάγματα, ἢ καὶ μὴ
εἶναι τὸ ἀνθρώπειον γένος, ὅσον ἐφ' ἡμῖν, αἴτιοι ἐσόμεθα,
ἐναντίον τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ βουλῇ καὶ αὐτοὶ ποιοῦντες, ἐὰν τοῦτο
πράξωμεν.   **4** Ἐξεταζόμενοι δὲ οὐκ ἀρνούμεθα διὰ τὸ
συνεπίστασθαι ἑαυτοῖς μηδὲν φαῦλον, ἀσεβὲς δὲ ἡγούμενοι
15 μὴ κατὰ πάντα ἀληθεύειν, ὃ καὶ φίλον τῷ θεῷ γινώσκομεν,

---

15 προθέντα *Eus.*, Sylburg: προταθέντα A   **16** τοιαύτας καὶ A: τοιαύτας
Eus.: καὶ *Pasch.*   μηδὲν A *Eus.*: οὐδὲν *Pasch.*   **18** ἕτοιμος A *Eus.*: ἕτοιμος
εἰμι *Pasch.,* Ashton   **19** βασιλικὸν A *Eus.*: βασιλικὸν γὰρ *Pasch.*   **22** τῶν
ἡμετέρων *Eus.*, Sylburg: om. A   ἢ εἰ καὶ A: ἢ εἰ *Eus.*: εἰ δὲ καὶ *Pasch.*
23 ὁμοίως Σωκράτει ὡς προέφην A: ὡς πρότερον ἔφην *Eus.*
25 ἀξιέραστον ὄν τιμᾷ A *Eus.*: ὅλως ἐπίσταται *Pasch.*   **27** προθεμένῳ
Nolte, Otto: προεμένῳ A   **4.7** προέφημεν A: ὡς προέφημεν add. (cf. 1
Apol. 12.5; 21.6; 22:2; 32.11; 45.6; 54.5,7; 56.2; 58.1; 63.4; 67.5; 2 *Apol.* 6.5;
8.1; 9.1) Schwartz, Marcovich   **9** μὴ Périon, Sylburg (cf. v. 9 μὴ εἶναι)
Marcovich: καὶ A

ὑμᾶς δὲ καὶ τῆς ἀδίκου προλήψεως ἀπαλλάξαι νῦν
σπεύδοντες.

5 (4) Εἰ δέ τινα ὑπέλθοι καὶ ἡ ἔν⟨ν⟩οια αὕτη ὅτι, εἰ θεὸν
ὡμολογοῦμεν βοηθόν, οὐκ ἄν, ὡς λέγομεν, ὑπὸ ἀδίκων
ἐκρατούμεθα καὶ ἐτιμωρούμεθα, καὶ τοῦτο διαλύσω.
2 Ὁ θεὸς τὸν πάντα κόσμον ποιήσας καὶ τὰ ἐπίγεια
5 ἀνθρώποις ὑποτάξας καὶ τὰ οὐράνια στοιχεῖα εἰς αὔξησιν
καρπῶν καὶ ὡρῶν μεταβολὰς κοσμήσας καὶ θεῖον τούτοις
νόμον τάξας, ἃ καὶ αὐτὰ διῷ ἀνθρώπους φαίνεται πεποιηκώς,
τὴν μὲν τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τῶν ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν πρόνοιαν
ἀγγέλοις, οὓς ἐπὶ τούτοις ἔταξε, παρέδωκεν.
10 **3** Οἱ δῷ ἄγγελοι, παραβάντες τήνδε τὴν τάξιν, γυναικῶν ^{A f. 194ᵛ}
μίξεσιν ἡττήθησαν καὶ παῖδας ἐτέκνωσαν, οἵ εἰσιν οἱ λεγόμενοι
δαίμονες. **4** Καὶ προσέτι λοιπὸν τὸ ἀνθρώπ⟨ε⟩ιον γένος
ἑαυτοῖς ἐδούλωσαν· τὰ μὲν διὰ μαγικῶν γραφῶν, τὰ δὲ διὰ
φόβων καὶ τιμωριῶν, ⟨ὧν⟩ ἐπέφερον, τὰ δὲ διὰ διδαχῆς
15 θυμάτων καὶ θυμιαμάτων καὶ σπονδῶν, ὧν ἐνδεεῖς γεγόνασι
μετὰ τὸ πάθεσιν ἐπιθυμιῶν δουλωθῆναι. Καὶ εἰς ἀνθρώπους
φόνους, πολέμους, μοιχείας, ἀκολασίας καὶ πᾶσαν κακίαν
ἔσπειραν.
5 Ὅθεν καὶ ποιηταὶ καὶ μυθολόγοι, ἀγνοοῦντες τοὺς
20 ἀγγέλους καὶ τοὺς ἐξ αὐτῶν γεννηθέντας δαίμονας ταῦτα
πρᾶξαι εἰς ἄρρενας καὶ θηλείας καὶ πόλεις καὶ ἔθνη, ἅπερ
συνέγραψαν, εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν θεὸν καὶ τοὺς ὡς ἀπῷ αὐτοῦ
σπορᾷ γενομένους υἱοὺς καὶ τῶν λεχθέντων ἐκείνου ἀδελφῶν
[καὶ τέκνων ὁμοίως τῶν ἀπῷ ἐκείνων] Ποσειδῶνος καὶ
25 Πλούτωνος, ἀνήνεγκαν. **6** Ὀνόματι γὰρ ἕκαστον, ὅπερ
ἕκαστος ἑαυτῷ τῶν ἀγγέλων καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ἔθετο,
προσηγόρευσαν.

6 (5) Ὄνομα δὲ τῷ πάντων πατρὶ θετόν, ἀγεννήτῳ
ὄντι, οὐκ ἔστιν· ᾧ γὰρ ἂν καὶ ὄνομά τι προσ-
αγορεύηται, πρεσβύτερον ἔχει τὸν θέμενον τὸ ὄνομα.
2 Τὸ δὲ "πατὴρ" καὶ "θεὸς" καὶ "κτίστης" καὶ "κύριος" καὶ
5 "δεσπότης" οὐκ ὀνόματά ἐστιν, ἀλλᾷκ τῶν εὐποιïῶν καὶ
τῶν ἔργων προσρήσεις.
3 Ὁ δὲ υἱὸς ἐκείνου, ὁ μόνος λεγόμενος κυρίως υἱός, ὁ
Λόγος πρὸ τῶν ποι|ημάτων [καὶ] συνὼν καὶ γεννώμενος, ^{A f. 195ʳ}

5.1 ἔνοια A   **6** μεταβολὰς Pearson, Thirlby, Marcovich, et al.: μεταβολαῖς
A   τούτοις Thirlby, Marcovich, et al.: τοῦτον A   **12** ἀνθρώπιον A
14 ὧν Thirlby, Marcovich: om. A   **6.2** ὄνομά τι Otto, Marcovich: ὀνόματι
A: ὀνόματὶ τι Gildersleeve

ὅτε τὴν ἀρχὴν διῷ αὐτοῦ πάντα ἔκτισε καὶ ἐκόσμησε,
10 "Χριστὸς" μὲν κατὰ τὸ "κεχρῖσθαι" καὶ κοσμῆσαι τὰ πάντα
διῷ αὐτοῦ τὸν θεὸν λέγεται, ὄνομα καὶ αὐτὸ περιέχον
ἄγνωστον σημασίαν, ὃν τρόπον καὶ τὸ "θεὸς"
προσαγόρευμα οὐκ ὄνομά ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ πράγμ⟨α⟩τος
δυσεξηγήτου ἔμφυτος τῇ φύσει τῶν ἀνθρώπων δόξα.

15   **4** "Ἰησοῦς" δὲ καὶ ἀνθρώπου καὶ σωτῆρος ὄνομα καὶ
σημασίαν ἔχει. **5** Καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἄνθρωπος, ὡς προέφημεν,
γέγονε κατὰ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς βουλὴν ἀποκυηθεὶς
ὑπὲρ τῶν πιστευόντων ἀνθρώπων καὶ καταλύσει τῶν
δαιμόνων, ⟨ὡς⟩ καὶ νῦν ἐκ τῶν ὑπῷ ὄψιν γινομένων μαθεῖν
20 δύνασθε. **6** Δαιμονιολήπτους γὰρ πολλοὺς κατὰ πάντα
τὸν κόσμον καὶ ἐν τῇ ὑμετέρα πόλει πολλοὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων
ἀνθρώπων [τῶν Χριστιανῶν] ἐπορκίζοντες κατὰ τοῦ
ὀνόματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ σταυρωθέντος ἐπὶ Ποντίου
Πιλάτου, ὑπὸ τῶν ἄλλων πάντων ἐπορκιστῶν καὶ
25 ἐπᾳστῶν καὶ φαρμακευτῶν μὴ ἰαθέντας, ἰάσαντο καὶ ἔτι
νῦν ἰῶνται, καταργοῦντες καὶ ἐκδιώκοντες τοὺς κατέχοντας
τοὺς ἀνθρώπους δαίμονας.

7 **(6)** Ὅθεν καὶ ἐπιμένει ὁ θεὸς τὴν σύγχυσιν καὶ κατάλυσιν
τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου μὴ ποιῆσαι ἵνα καὶ οἱ φαῦλοι
ἄγγελοι καὶ δαίμονες καὶ ἄνθρωποι μηκέτι ὦσι, διὰ τὸ
σπέρμα τῶν Χριστιανῶν, ὃ γινώσκει ἐν τῇ φύσει ὅτι αἴτιόν
5 ἐστιν. **2** Ἐπεὶ εἰ μὴ τοῦτο ἦν, οὐκ ἂν οὐδὲ ὑμῖν ταῦτα ἔτι
ποιεῖν καὶ ἐνεργεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν φαύλων δαιμόνων δυνατὸν
ἦν, ἀλλὰ | τὸ πῦρ τὸ τῆς κρίσεως κατελθὸν ἀνέδην πάντα   A f. 195ᵛ
διέκρινεν, ὡς καὶ πρότερον ὁ κατακλυσμὸς μηδένα λιπὼν ἀλλῷ
ἢ τὸν μόνον σὺν τοῖς ἰδίοις παρῷ ἡμῖν καλούμενον Νῶε, παρῷ
10 ὑμῖν δὲ Δευκαλίωνα, ἐξ οὗ πάλιν οἱ τοσοῦτοι γεγόνασιν, ὧν
οἱ μὲν φαῦλοι, οἱ δὲ σπουδαῖοι.

    3 Οὕτω γὰρ ἡμεῖς τὴν ἐκπύρωσίν φαμεν γενήσεσθαι, ἀλλῷ
οὐχ, ὡς οἱ Στωϊκοί, κατὰ τὸν τῆς εἰς ἄλληλα πάντων
μεταβολῆς λόγον, ὃ αἴσχιστον ἐφάνη· Ἀλλῷ οὐδὲ καθῷ
15 εἱμαρμένην πράττειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἢ πάσχειν τὰ
γινόμενα, ἀλλὰ κατὰ μὲν τὴν προαίρεσιν ἕκαστον κατορθοῦν
ἢ ἁμαρτάνειν, καὶ κατὰ τὴν τῶν φαύλων δαιμόνων ἐνέργειαν
τοὺς σπουδαίους, οἷον Σωκράτην καὶ τοὺς ὁμοίους, διώκεσθαι
καὶ ἐν δεσμοῖς εἶναι, Σαρδανάπαλον δὲ καὶ Ἐπίκουρον καὶ
20 τοὺς ὁμοίους ἐν ἀφθονίᾳ καὶ δόξῃ δοκεῖν εὐδαιμονεῖν. **4** Ὅ

6.13 πράγμτος A   **19** ὡς add. Otto, Gildersleeve, Marcovich, et al.: om. A

μὴ νοήσαντες οἱ Στωϊκοὶ καθ῀ εἱμαρμένης ἀνάγκην πάντα
γίνεσθαι ἀπεφήναντο.

5 Ἀλλ῀ ὅτι αὐτεξούσιον τό τε τῶν ἀγγέλων γένος καὶ
τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός, δικαίως ὑπὲρ
25 ὧν ἂν πλημμελήσωσι τὴν τιμωρίαν ἐν αἰωνίῳ πυρὶ
κομίσονται. **6** Γεννητοῦ δὲ παντὸς ἥδε ἡ φύσις, κακίας καὶ
ἀρετῆς δεκτικὸν εἶναι· οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἦν ἐπαινετὸν οὐδὲν αὐτῶν,
εἰ οὐκ ἦν ἐπ῀ ἀμφότερα τρέπεσθαι [καὶ] δύναμιν εἶχε.
7 Δεικνύουσι δὲ τοῦτο καὶ οἱ πανταχοῦ κατὰ λόγον τὸν
30 ὀρθὸν νομοθετή|σαντες καὶ φιλοσοφήσαντες ἄνθρωποι ἐκ τοῦ A f. 196ʳ
ὑπαγορεύειν τάδε μὲν πράττειν, τῶνδε δὲ ἀπέχεσθαι.

8 Καὶ οἱ Στωϊκοὶ φιλόσοφοι ἐν τῷ περὶ ἠθῶν λόγῳ τὰ
αὐτὰ τιμῶσι καρτερῶς, ὡς δηλοῦσθαι ἐν τῷ περὶ ἀρχῶν
καὶ ἀσωμάτων λόγῳ οὐκ εὐοδοῦν αὐτούς. **9** Εἴτε γὰρ καθ῀
35 εἱμαρμένην φήσουσι τὰ γινόμενα πρὸς ἀνθρώπων γίνεσθαι,
ἢ μηδὲν εἶναι θεὸν παρὰ τρεπόμενα καὶ ἀλλοιούμενα καὶ
ἀναλυόμενα εἰς τὰ αὐτὰ ἀεί, φθαρτῶν μόνων φανήσονται
κατάληψιν ἐσχηκέναι καὶ αὐτὸν τὸ⟨ν⟩ θεὸν διά τε τῶν μερῶν
καὶ διὰ τοῦ ὅλου ἐν πάσῃ κακίᾳ γινόμενον ἢ μηδὲν εἶναι κακίαν
40 μηδ῀ ἀρετήν· ὅπερ καὶ παρὰ πᾶσαν σώφρονα ἔννοιαν καὶ
λόγον καὶ νοῦν ἐστι.

8 **(7)** Καὶ τοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν Στωϊκῶν δὲ δογμάτων, ἐπειδὴ
κἂν τὸν ἠθικὸν λόγον κόσμιοι γεγόνασιν, ὡς καὶ ἔν τισιν
οἱ ποιηταί, διὰ τὸ ἔμφυτον παντὶ γένει ἀνθρώπων
σπέρμα τοῦ Λόγου, μεμισῆσθαι [καὶ πεφονεῦσθαι] οἴδαμεν·
5 Ἡράκλειτον μέν, ὡς προέφημεν, καὶ Μουσώνιον δὲ ἐν τοῖς
καθ῀ ἡμᾶς καὶ ἄλλους [οἴδαμεν]. **2** Ὡς γὰρ ἐσημάναμεν,
πάντας τοὺς κἂν ὁπωσδήποτε κατὰ Λόγον βιοῦν
σπουδάζοντας καὶ κακίαν φεύγειν μισεῖσθαι ἀεὶ ἐνήργησαν
οἱ δαίμονες. **3** Οὐδὲν δὲ θαυμαστόν, εἰ τοὺς κατὰ σπερματικοῦ
10 λόγου μέρος, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ παντὸς Λόγου, ὅ ἐστι
Χριστοῦ γνῶσιν καὶ θεωρίαν, πολὺ μᾶλλον μισεῖσθαι οἱ
δαίμονες ἐλεγχόμενοι ἐνεργοῦσιν· οἳ τὴν ἀξίαν | κόλασιν καὶ A f. 196ᵛ
τιμωρίαν κομίσονται ἐν αἰωνίῳ πυρὶ ἐγκλεισθέντες. **4** Εἰ
γὰρ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἤδη διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος Ἰησοῦ
15 Χριστοῦ ἡττῶνται, δίδαγμά ἐστι τῆς καὶ μελλούσης αὐτοῖς
καὶ τοῖς λατρεύουσιν αὐτοῖς ἐσομένης ἐν πυρὶ αἰωνίῳ

---

26 γεννητοῦ A: γενητοῦ Ashton, Grundl, Marcovich **28** ἦν A: ἂν Thirlby,
Otto, Marcovich **36** παρὰ τρεπόμενα a: παρατρεπόμενα A **38** τὸν
Marcovich et al.: τὸ A **8.9** τοὺς κατὰ A: τοὺς οὐ κατὰ add. Sylburg, Otto,
Marcovich et al

κολάσεως.   **5**   Οὕτως γὰρ καὶ οἱ προφῆται πάντες προεκήρυξαν γενήσεσθαι, καὶ ᾽Ιησοῦς ὁ ἡμέτερος διδάσκαλος ἐδίδαξε.

9 ῞Ινα δὲ μή τις εἴπῃ τὸ λεγόμενον ὑπὸ τῶν νομιζομένων   A f. 197ʳ
φιλοσόφων, ὅτι κόμποι καὶ φόβητρά ἐστι τὰ λεγόμενα
ὑφῷ ἡμῶν ὅτι κολάζονται ἐν αἰωνίῳ πυρὶ οἱ ἄδικοι, καὶ
διὰ φόβον ἀλλῷ οὐ διὰ τὸ καλὸν εἶναι καὶ ἀρεστὸν ἐναρέτως
5 βιοῦν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀξιοῦμεν, βραχυεπῶς πρὸς τοῦτο
ἀποκρινοῦμαι, ὅτι, εἰ μὴ τοῦτό ἐστιν, οὔτε ἔστι θεός, ἤ, εἰ ἔστιν,
οὐ μέλει αὐτῷ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ οὐδέν ἐστιν ἀρετὴ οὐδὲ
κακία, καί, ὡς προέφημεν, ἀδίκως τιμωροῦσιν οἱ νομοθέται
τοὺς παραβαίνοντας τὰ διατεταγμένα καλά.   **2**   ᾽Αλλῷ ἐπεὶ
10 οὐκ ἄδικοι ἐκεῖνοι καὶ ὁ αὐτῶν πατήρ, τὰ αὐτὰ αὐτῷ
πράττειν διὰ τοῦ Λόγου διδάσκων, οἱ τούτοις συντιθέμενοι
οὐκ | ἄδικοι.   A f. 197ᵛ

   3   ᾽Εὰν δέ τις τοὺς διαφόρους νόμους τῶν ἀνθρώπων
προβάληται, λέγων ὅτι παρῷ οἷς μὲν ἀνθρώποις τάδε καλά,
15 τὰ δὲ αἰσχρὰ νενόμισται, παρῷ ἄλλοις δὲ τὰ παρῷ ἐκείνοις
αἰσχρὰ καλά, καὶ τὰ καλὰ αἰσχρὰ νομίζεται, ἀκουέτω καὶ
τῶν εἰς τοῦτο λεγομένων.   **4**   Καὶ νόμους διατάξασθαι τῇ
ἑαυτῶν κακίᾳ ὁμοίους τοὺς πονηροὺς ἀγγέλους ἐπιστάμεθα,
οἷς χαίρουσιν οἱ ὅμοιοι γενόμενοι ἄνθρωποι, καὶ ὀρθὸς Λόγος
20 παρελθὼν οὐ πάσας δόξας οὐδὲ πάντα δόγματα καλὰ
ἀποδείκνυσιν, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν φαῦλα, τὰ δὲ ἀγαθά· ὥστε μοι
καὶ πρὸς τοὺς τοιούτους τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ τὰ ὅμοια εἰρήσεται,
καὶ λεχθήσεται διὰ πλειόνων, ἐὰν χρεία ἦ.   **5**   Τανῦν δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ
προκείμενον ἀνέρχομαι.

10 Μεγαλειότερα μὲν οὖν πάσης ἀνθρωπείου
διδασκαλίας φαίνεται τὰ ἡμέτερα διὰ τοῦ τὸ
λογικὸν τὸ ὅλον τὸν φανέντα διῷ ἡμᾶς Χριστὸν
γεγονέναι, καὶ σῶμα καὶ λόγον καὶ ψυχήν.   **2**   ῞Οσα γὰρ
5 καλῶς ἀεὶ ἐφθέγξαντο καὶ εὗρον οἱ φιλοσοφήσαντες ἢ
νομοθετήσαντες, κατὰ Λόγου μέρος εὑρέσεως καὶ θεωρίας
ἐστὶ πονηθέντα αὐτοῖς.   **3**   ᾽Επειδὴ δὲ οὐ πάντα τὰ τοῦ Λόγου

9.3 καὶ διὰ A: καὶ ὅτι διὰ add. Marcovich   **5** βραχυεπῶς Steph.:
βραχυεποῖς A: βραχέσι λόγοις A mg   **10** αὐτῷ A: ἑαυτῷ Lange,
Marcovich: αὐτῷ Ashton   **14** προβάληται   Marcovich et al.: προβάληται
A   **19** καὶ ὀρθὸς A: καὶ ὀρθὸς Ashton, Marcovich   **10.2** τοῦ τὸ Grabe,
Grundl: τοῦτο A: τὸ Otto, Gildersleeve   **6** εὑρέσεως A: διῷυρέσεως add.
Otto, et.al.

65

ἐγνώρισαν, ὅς ἐστι Χριστός, καὶ ἐναντία ἑαυτοῖς πολλάκις
εἶπον.

10 **4** Καὶ οἱ προγεγραμμένοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ κατὰ τὸ
ἀνθρώπινον, λόγῳ πειραθέντες τὰ πράγματα θεωρῆσαι καὶ
ἐλέγξαι, ὡς ἀσεβεῖς καὶ περίεργοι εἰς δικαστήρια ἤχθησαν.
5 ῾Ο πάντων δὲ αὐτῶν εὐτονώτερος πρὸς τοῦτο γενόμενος
| Σωκράτης τὰ αὐτὰ ἡμῖν ἐνεκλήθη· καὶ γὰρ ἔφασαν αὐτὸν   A f. 198ʳ
15 καινὰ δαιμόνια εἰσφέρειν, καὶ οὓς ἡ πόλις νομίζει θεοὺς μὴ
ἡγεῖσθαι [αὐτόν]. **6** ῾Ο δὲ δαίμονας μὲν τοὺς φαύλους καὶ
[τοὺς] πράξαντας ἃ ἔφασαν οἱ ποιηταί, ἐκβαλὼν τῆς
πολιτείας καὶ ῞Ομηρον καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ποιητάς,
παραιτεῖσθαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐδίδαξε, πρὸς θεοῦ δὲ τοῦ
20 ἀγνώστου αὐτοῖς διὰ λόγου ζητήσεως ἐπίγνωσιν
προύτρέπετο, εἰπών· "Τὸν δὲ πατέρα καὶ δημιουργὸν
πάντων οὔθ῾ῷ εὑρεῖν ῥάδιον, οὔθ῾ῷ εὑρόντα εἰς πάντας εἰπεῖν
ἀσφαλές."
7 ῝Α ὁ ἡμέτερος Χριστὸς διὰ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ δυνάμεως ἔπραξε.
25 **8** Σωκράτει μὲν γὰρ οὐδεὶς ἐπιστεύθη ὑπὲρ τούτου τοῦ
δόγματος ἀποθνήσκειν· Χριστῷ δέ, τῷ καὶ ὑπὸ Σωκράτους
ἀπὸ μέρους γνωσθέντι, Λόγος γὰρ ἦν καὶ ἔστιν ὁ ἐν παντὶ
ὤν, καὶ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν προειπὼν τὰ μέλλοντα γίνεσθαι
καὶ δι῾ ἑαυτοῦ ὁμοιοπαθοῦς γενομένου [καὶ] διδάξαντος
30 ταῦτα, οὐ φιλόσοφοι οὐδὲ φιλόλογοι μόνον ἐπείσθησαν, ἀλλὰ
καὶ χειροτέχναι καὶ παντελῶς ἰδιῶται, καὶ δόξης καὶ φόβου
καὶ θανάτου καταφρονήσαντες· ἐπειδὴ δύναμίς ἐστι τοῦ
ἀρρήτου πατρὸς καὶ οὐχὶ ἀνθρωπείου λόγου τὰ σκεύη.

11 Οὐκ ἂν δὲ οὐδὲ ἐφονευόμεθα οὐδὲ δυνατώτεροι
ἡμῶν ἦσανοί τε ἄδικοι ἄνθρωποι καὶ δαίμονες, εἰ
μὴ πάντως παντὶ γεννωμένῳ ἀνθρώπῳ καὶ θανεῖν
ὠφείλετο· ὅθεν καὶ τὸ ὄφλημα ἀποδιδόντες εὐχαριστοῦμεν.
5 **2** Καίτοι γε | καὶ τὸ Ξενοφώ⟨ν⟩τειον ἐκεῖνο νῦν πρός τε   A f. 198ᵛ
Κρίσκεντα καὶ τοὺς ὁμοίως αὐτῷ ἀφραίνοντας καλὸν καὶ
εὔκαιρον εἰπεῖν ἡγούμεθα.
3 Τὸν ῾Ηρακλέα ἐπὶ τρίοδόν τινα ἔφη ὁ Ξενοφῶν
βαδίζοντα εὑρεῖν τήν τε ἀρετὴν καὶ τὴν κακίαν, ἐν γυναικῶν
10 μορφαῖς φαινομένας. **4** Καὶ τὴν μὲν κακίαν, ἁβρᾷ ἐσθῆτι καὶ
ἐρωτοπεποιημένῳ καὶ ἀνθοῦντι ἐκ τῶν τοιούτων προσώπῳ,

10.10 προγεγραμμένοι A: προγεγενημένοι Thirlby, Otto, Marcovich (cf. 1
Apol. 46.12) **25** ἐπιστεύθη A: ἐπείσθη Thirlby, Otto, Marcovich **33** τὰ
σκεύη A: κατασκευή Pearson (*Dial.* 58.1 κατασκευή λόγου), Marcovich
11.4 ὠφείλετο A **5** Ξενοφώτειον A

66

θελκτικήν τε εὐθὺς [πρὸς] τὰς ὄψεις οὖσαν, εἰπεῖν πρὸς τὸν
Ἡρακλέα ὅτι, ἢν αὐτῇ ἔπηται, ἡδόμενόν τε καὶ κεκοσμημένον
τῷ λαμπροτάτῳ καὶ ὁμοίῳ τῷ περὶ αὐτὴν κόσμῳ διαιτήσειν
15 ἀεὶ ποιήσει. **5** Καὶ τὴν ἀρετὴν ἐν αὐχμηρῷ μὲν τῷ προσώπῳ
καὶ τῇ περιβολῇ οὖσαν εἰπεῖν· "’Αλλῷ ἢν ἐμοὶ πείθῃ, οὐ κόσμῳ
οὐδὲ κάλλει τῷ ῥέοντι καὶ φθειρομένῳ ἑαυτὸν κοσμήσεις ἀλλὰ
τοῖς ἀϊδίοις καὶ καλοῖς κόσμοις."

6 Καὶ πάνθῷ ὁντινοῦν πεπείσμεθα, φεύγοντα τὰ δοκοῦντα
20 καλά, τὰ δὲ νομιζόμενα σκληρὰ καὶ ἄλογα μετερχόμενον,
εὐδαιμονίαν ἐκδέχεσθαι. **7** Ἡ γὰρ κακία, πρόβλημα ἑαυτῆς
τῶν πράξεων τὰ προσόντα τῇ ἀρετῇ καὶ ὄντως ὄντα καλὰ
διὰ μιμήσεως φθάρτων περιβαλλομένη ἄφθαρτον γὰρ οὐδὲν
ἔχει οὐδὲ ποιῆσαι δύνατα, δουλαγωγεῖ τοὺς χαμαιπετεῖς τῶν
25 ἀνθρώπων, τὰ προσόντα αὐτῇ φαῦλα τῇ ἀρετῇ περιθεῖσα.
8 Οἱ δὲ νενοηκότες τὰ προσόντα τῷ ὄντι καλὰ καὶ ἄφθαρτοι
τῇ ἀρετῇ· ὃ καὶ περὶ Χριστιανῶν καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄθλου καὶ
τῶν | ἀνθρώπων τῶν τοιαῦτα πραξάντων, ὁποῖα ἔφασαν   A f. 199ʳ
οἱ ποιηταὶ περὶ τῶν νομιζομένων θεῶν, ὑπολαβεῖν δεῖ πάντα
30 οὖν ἔχει , ἐκ τοῦ καὶ τοῦ φευκτοῦ καταφρονεῖν ἡμᾶς θανάτου
λογισμὸν ἕλκοντα.

12 Καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐγώ, τοῖς Πλάτωνος χαίρων
διδάγμασι, διαβαλλομένους ἀκούων Χριστιανούς,
ὁρῶν δὲ ἀφόβους πρὸς θάνατον καὶ πάντα τὰ
ἄλλα νομιζόμενα φοβερά, ἐνενόουν ἀδύνατον εἶναι ἐν κακίᾳ
5 καὶ φιληδονίᾳ ὑπάρχειν αὐτούς. **2** Τίς γὰρ φιλήδονος ἢ
ἀκρατὴς καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων σαρκῶν βορὰν ἀγαθὸν ἡγούμενος
δύναιτο ἂν θάνατον ἀσπάζεσθαι, ὅπως τῶν αὐτοῦ ἀγαθῶν
στερηθῇ, ἀλλῷ οὐκ ἐκ παντὸς ζῆν μὲν ἀεὶ τὴν ἐνθάδε βιοτὴν
καὶ λανθάνειν τοὺς ἄρχοντας ἐπειρᾶτο, οὐχ ὅτι γε ἑαυτὸν
10 κατήγγειλε φονευθησόμενον;

---

19 πεπείσμεθα A: πεπύσμεθα A mg.   **21** γὰρ A: om. *Dam.*   πρόβλημα
A*, Dam.*: περίβλημα Thirlby, Ashton, Marcovich   **23** φθάρτων A. *Dam.,*
Gildersleeve, Veil: ἀφθάρτων Pèrion, Maran, Marcovich   **26** οἱ δὲ
νενοηκότες A: ὧν καταπτύουσιν οἱ κατανενοηκότες Schmid ex *Dam.,*
Marcovich   **26** ἄφθαρτοι A: ἄφθαρτα *Dam.,* Marcovich   **28** ἔφθασαν A
ante corr.   **30** οὖν ἔχει A: νουνεχῆ Thirlby, Otto (cf. 1 *Apol.* 46. 5 ὁ νουνεχὴς
καταλαβεῖν δυνήσεται), Marcovich: om. a   **12.3** δὲ A, *Eus* Syr.: δὲ καὶ
Eus. codd.   **4** ἄλλα A: om. *Eus.*   **6** ἀνθρωπίνων A: ἀνθρωπείων *Eus.*
(cf. 1 *Apol.* 26.30)   **7** ἀγαθὸν ἡγούμενος A: ἡγούμενος ἀγαθὸν *Eus.*   **6**
αὐτοῦ A: ἑαυτοῦ *Eus.*   ἀγαθῶν στερηθῇ A: στερηθείη ἐπιθυμιῶν *Eus.*
8 μὲν A: om. *Eus.*   **9** γε A: om. *Eus.*

3 Ἤδη καὶ τοῦτο ἐνήργησαν οἱ φαῦλοι δαίμονες διά τινων πονηρῶν ἀνθρώπων πραχθῆναι. **4** Φονεύοντες γὰρ αὐτοί τινας ἐπὶ συκοφαντίᾳ τῇ εἰς ἡμᾶς καὶ εἰς βασάνους εἵλκυσαν οἰκέτας τῶν ἡμετέρων ἢ παῖδας ἢ γύναια, καὶ διῷ αἰκισμῶν
15 φοβερῶν ἐξαναγκάζουσι κατειπεῖν ταῦτα τὰ μυθολογούμενα, ἃ αὐτοὶ φανερῶς πράττουσιν.

῾Ὧν ἐπειδὴ οὐδὲν πρόσεστιν ἡμῖν, οὐ φροντίζομεν, θεὸν τὸν ἀγέννητον καὶ ἄρρητον μάρτυρα ἔχοντες τῶν τε λογισμῶν καὶ τῶν πράξεων. **5** Τίνος γὰρ χάριν οὐχὶ καὶ
20 ταῦτα δημοσίᾳ ὡμολογοῦμεν ἀγαθὰ | καὶ φιλοσοφίαν θείαν   A f. 199ᵛ
αὐτὰ ἀπεδείκνυμεν, φάσκοντες Κρόνου μὲν μυστήρια τελεῖν ἐν τῷ ἀνδροφονεῖν, καὶ ἐν τῷ αἵματος ἐμπίπλασθαι, ὡς λέγεται, τὰ ἴσα τῷ παρῷ ὑμῖν τιμωμένῳ εἰδώλῳ, ᾧ οὐ μόνον ἀλόγων ζῴων αἵματα προσραίνεται ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀνθρώπεια,
25 διὰ τοῦ παρῷ ὑμῖν ἐπισημοτάτου καὶ εὐγενεστάτου ἀνδρὸς τὴν πρόσχυσιντοῦ τῶν φονευθέντων αἵματος ποιούμενοι, Διὸς δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν μιμηταὶ γενόμενοι ἐν τῷ ἀνδροβατεῖν καὶ γυναιξὶν ἀδεῶς μίγνυσθαι, Ἐπικούρου μὲν καὶ τὰ τῶν ποιητῶν συγγράμματα ἀπολογίαν φέροντες;

30 **6** Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ταῦτα τὰ μαθήματα καὶ τοὺς ταῦτα πράξαντας καὶ μιμουμένους φεύγειν πείθομεν, ὡς καὶ νῦν διὰ τῶνδε τῶν λόγων ἠγωνίσμεθα, ποικίλως πολεμούμεθα· ἀλλῷ οὐ φροντίζομεν, ἐπεὶ θεὸν τῶν πάντων ἐπόπτην δίκαιον οἴδαμεν. **7** Εἰ δὲ καὶ νῦν τις ἦν τραγικῇ φωνῇ ἀνεβόησεν ἐπί
35 τι βῆμα ὑψηλὸν ἀναβάς· "Αἰδέσθητε, αἰδέσθητε ἃ φανερῶς πράττετε εἰς ἀναιτίους ἀναφέροντες, καὶ τὰ προσόντα καὶ ἑαυτοῖς καὶ τοῖς ὑμετέροις θεοῖς περιβάλλοντες τούτοις ὧν οὐδὲν οὐδῷ ἐπὶ ποσὸν μετουσία ἐστί. Μετάθεσθε, σωφρονίσθητε."

13 Καὶ γὰρ ἐγώ, μαθὼν περίβλημα πονηρὸν εἰς ἀποστροφὴν τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων περιτεθειμένον ὑπὸ τῶν φαύλων δαιμόνων τοῖς Χριστιανῶν θείοις διδάγμασι, καὶ ψευδολογουμένων ταῦτα καὶ τοῦ
5 περι|βλήματος κατεγέλασα καὶ τῆς παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς δόξης.   A f. 200ʳ
2 Χριστιανὸς εὑρεθῆναι καὶ εὐχόμενος καὶ παμμάχως ἀγωνιζόμενος ὁμολογῶ, οὐχ ὅτι ἀλλότριά ἐστι τὰ Πλάτωνος διδάγματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀλλῷ ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι πάντη ὅμοια, ὥσπερ οὐδὲ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων, Στωϊκῶν τε καὶ ποιητῶν
10 καὶ συγγραφέων.

13.1 μαθὸν A   **4** ψευδολογουμένων Maran, Marcovich, et al.: ψευδολογούμενον A

3 Ἕκαστος γάρ τις ἀπὸ μέρους τοῦ σπερματικοῦ θείου Λόγου τὸ συγγενὲς ὁρῶν καλῶς ἐφθέγξατο· οἱ δὲ τἀναντία ⟨ἑ⟩αυτοῖς ἐν κυριωτέροις εἰρηκότες οὐκ ἐπιστήμην τὴν ἄποπτον καὶ γνῶσιν τὴν ἀνέλεγκτον φαίνονται ἐσχηκέναι.

15 **4** Ὅσα οὖν παρὰ πᾶσι καλῶς εἴρηται, ἡμῶν τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἐστι· τὸν γὰρ ἀπὸ ἀγεννήτου καὶ ἀρρήτου θεοῦ Λόγον μετὰ τὸν θεὸν προσκυνοῦμεν καὶ ἀγαπῶμεν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ διῷ ἡμᾶς ἄνθρωπος γέγονεν, ὅπως [καὶ] τῶν παθῶν τῶν ἡμετέρων συμμέτοχος γενόμενος καὶ ἴασιν ποιήσηται. **5** Οἱ

20 γὰρ συγγραφεῖς πάντες διὰ τῆς ἐνούσης ἐμφύτου τοῦ Λόγου σπορᾶς ἀμυδρῶς ἐδύναντο ὁρᾶν τὰ ὄντα. **6** Ἕτερον γάρ ἐστι σπέρμα τινὸς καὶ μίμημα κατὰ δύναμιν δοθέν, καὶ ἕτερον αὐτὸ οὗ κατὰ χάριν τὴν ἀπῷ ἐκείνου ἡ μετουσία καὶ μίμησις γίνεται.

14 Καὶ ὑμᾶς οὖν ἀξιοῦμεν ὑπογράψαντας τὸ ὑμῖν δοκοῦν προθεῖναι τουτὶ τὸ βιβλίδιον, ὅπως καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τὰ ἡμέτερα γνωσθῇ καὶ δύνωνται τῆς ψευδοδοξίας καὶ ἀγνοίας τῶν καλῶν ἀπαλλαγῆναι, οἲ παρὰ

5 | τὴν ἑαυτῶν αἰτίαν ὑπεύθυνοι ταῖς τιμωρίαις γίνονται, [εἰς   A f. 200ᵛ
τὸ γνωσθῆναι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ταῦτα], **2** διὸ ἐν τῇ φύσει τῇ τῶν ἀνθρώπων εἶναι τὸ γνωριστ⟨ικ⟩ὸν καλοῦ καὶ αἰσχροῦ, καὶ διὰ τὸ ἡμῶν, οὓς οὐκ ἐπίστανται τοιαῦτα ὁποῖα λέγουσιν αἰσχρὰ πράττειν, καταψηφιζομένους, καὶ διὰ τὸ χαίρειν

10 τοιαῦτα πράξασι θεοῖς καὶ ἔτι νῦν ἀπαιτοῦσι παρὰ ἀνθρώπων τὰ ὅμοια, ἐκ τοῦ [καὶ] ἡμῖν, ὡς τοιαῦτα πράττουσι, θάνατον ἢ δεσμὰ ἢ ἄλλο τι τοιοῦτον πρόστιμον ἑαυτοὺς κατακρίνειν, ὡς μὴ δέεσθαι ἄλλων δικαστῶν.

15 [Καὶ τοῦ ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ ἔθνει, ἀσεβοῦς καὶ πλάνου Σιμωνιανοῦ διδάγματος κατεφρόνησα.] **2** Ἐὰν δὲ ὑμεῖς τοῦτο προγράψητε, ἡμεῖς τοῖς πᾶσι φανερὸν ποιήσαιμεν, ἵνα εἰ δύναιντο μεταθῶνται· τούτου γε

5 μόνου χάριν τούσδε τοὺς λόγους συνετάξαμεν. **3** Οὐκ ἔστι δὲ ἡμῶν τὰ διδάγματα κατὰ κρίσιν σώφρονα αἰσχρά, ἀλλὰ πάσης μὲν φιλοσοφίας ἀνθρωπείου ὑπέρτερα· εἰ δὲ μή, κἂν

13.13 ἑαυτοῖς Otto, Marcovich: αὐτοῖς A   **14** ἄποπτον Sylburg, Grabe, Grundl: ἄπωπτον A: ἄπτωτον Lange, Gildesleeve, Marcovich   **14.4** οἲ A: ἢ A mg   **5** εἰς... ταῦτα seclusit ut glossema Ashton   διὸ A: διὰ τὸ Périon: διὰ τε τὸ Marcovich   **7** γνωριστικὸν Sylburg, Maran, Marcovich: γνωρισὸν A   **11** ἐκ A: ὡς ἐκ add. Thirlby   **12** πρόστιμον A: προστιμᾶν Thirlby   **15.1** Καὶ ... κατεφρόνησα seclusit ut glossema Périon (cf. *Dial.* 120.6), Otto   **4** γε A: γὰρ Thirlby

Σωταδείοις καὶ Φιλαινιδείοις καὶ Ἀρχεστρατείοις καὶ
Ἐπικουρείοις καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς τοιούτοις ποιητικοῖς
10 διδάγμασιν οὐχ ὅμοια, οἶς ἐντυγχάνειν πᾶσι, καὶ γενομένοις
καὶ γεγραμμένοις, συγκεχώρηται.

4 Καὶ παυσόμεθα λοιπόν, ὅσον ἐφῷ ἡμῖν ἦν πράξαντες, καὶ
προσεπευξάμενοι τῆς ἀληθείας καταξιωθῆναι τοὺς πάντη
πάντας ἀνθρώπους. 5 Εἴη οὖν | καὶ ὑμᾶς ἀξίως εὐσεβείας   A f. 201ʳ
15 καὶ φιλοσοφίας τὰ δίκαια ὑπὲρ ἑαυτῶν κρῖναι.

---

8 Ἀρχεστρατείοις Leutsch, Otto, Marcovich: ὀρχησικοῖς A, Buecheler
(ὀρχηστικοῖς): ὀργιαστικοῖς Nolte   10 γενομένοις A, Grundl: λεγομένοις
Thirlby, Leutsch, Otto, Marcovich: γεινομένοις Buecheler   14 ἡμᾶς A:
ὑμᾶς Sylburg, Marcovich   15 ἑαυτῶν A: ἡμῶν Périon

II. ENGLISH TRANSLATION

THE APOLOGY OF SAINT JUSTIN:
THE PHILOSOPHER AND MARTYR
ON BEHALF OF CHRISTIANS
TO THE ROMAN SENATE

1 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 *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.

2 A certain woman lived with an unchaste husband, she herself having once lived unchaste. **2** But after she came to understand the teachings of Christ, she became sound-minded[3] and tried 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 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*.

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] **7** 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[5] 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 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

---

4 I.e. *a bill of divorcement.* **5** Or *the benefits he had gained.*

Christian?[6] 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." **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[7] 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,[8] 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 speaking and bearing false witness about what they do not understand; or if having read, he does not understand the greatness in them or understanding, in order not be suspected, he does these sorts of things he is far more than one low-born and utterly wicked, being made inferior to the untrained by unreasonable opinion and fear.

4 In fact, I want you to know that I put forth certain types of questions, and testing him, both learned and proved that he truly understands nothing. **5** And because I speak truly, if these discussions have not been brought to you, I am ready on your behalf to communicate with and question him again; and this would be the work of a king. **6** But if indeed my questions and his answers have been made known to you then it is clear to you that he understands nothing about our teachings; or if indeed he understands, because of those listening, he does not speak with boldness, like Socrates. As I said before, he is a man shown to be neither a lover of wisdom but a lover of glory, nor in any respect one who honors Socrates' admirable saying, "no one must honor a man before the truth."[9] **7** But it is impossible for a Cynic, desiring indifference in the end, to know any good except indifference.

---

6 Eusebius has - *of the name of Christian*; the ms. has instead - *of the suffering of Christ.*   **7** Referring either to crucifixion or burning at the stake. **8** I.e. *philosopher,* as throughout.   **9** Cf. Plato *Rep.* 10.595C.

4 **(3)** Never-the-less, lest someone should say,"All of you, then having killed yourselves go now before God and do not leave these matters for us," I will tell the reason why we do not do this, and why being examined we confess fearlessly. **2** We have been taught that God did not make the universe without purpose, but because of the human race; and we declare[10] that God rejoices in those imitating his attributes, but is displeased with those embracing evil things either in word or deed.

3 Therefore if we should all kill ourselves, we shall be the reason (as much as it depends upon us) that some are not born, and not instructed in divine teachings, or even that the human race might not exist. And if we should do this, we ourselves would even be acting against the will of God. **4** But under examination we do not deny because we are conscious of no evil thing within ourselves, but since we consider it impious not to be truthful in all things (which we know is dear to God), we are now eager to free you from this unjust preconception.

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

---

10 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 ommision or not.

about which they wrote, attributed them to the god Zeus[11] 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. **6** For they addressed each by the name which each of the angels set for himself and for their offspring.

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, was called "Christ" with reference to His being anointed and God having arranged[12] 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 *daimones*, as even now you can learn from the things that are observable. **6** For many *daimon* 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 *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. **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 *daimones*, but the fire of judg-

---

11 The ms. reads simply *the god himself.* The identification of Posidon and Pluto as his brothers make it clear Justin has Zeus in mind. **12** Justin appears to suggest a two-fold etymology for the name *Christ*: 1. The word *kechristhai* meaning "*to be annointed,*" and (the unusual suggestion,) 2. The word *kosmesai* meaning "*to have arranged.*"

ment would come down unrestrained[13] 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 *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. **4** Not having known this, the Stoics declared 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[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 dissolved into the same things (they appear to have an understanding of only corruptible things), and so God himself, through both the parts and the whole is in every wickedness; or that there is neither wickedness nor virtue – which is beyond all sound thought, reason, and good sense.

8 **(7)** And we know from the teachings of the Stoics (since at least they lived orderly with respect to their ethical reasoning), as also among some of the poets, through the implanted seed of the Logos in every race of men, they were hated and killed. We

---

13 Or *simply*.   **14** Or *free will.*

know Heraclitus, as we said before, and Musonius among those of our own and others. **2** For as we indicated, *daimones* have influenced things such that all those in any place and at any time diligently living according to the Logos and fleeing wickedness are always hated. **3** And this is no wonder, if those living in accordance with a part of the seminal Logos are hated, certainly those living in accordance with the whole Logos (which they know and behold is the Christ), the *daimones*, being convicted,[15] inspire them to be hated much more. These shall receive a deserved punishment and retribution when they are shut up in eternal fire. **4** For if they are already overcome by men through the name of Jesus Christ this is an illustration of both their future and of the coming punishment in eternal fire for those serving them. **5** So, in fact, all the prophets have announced beforehand that it shall happen, and Jesus our teacher has also taught the same thing.

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.

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 shameful 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, 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). **5** But now, I return to the subject we were discussing before.

---

15 Or *proven the cause*.

10 Therefore our teachings appear to be the most noble of all human teaching, because Christ became the whole Logos[16] manifested for our sake even body, mind,[17] 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, (which is Christ), they often argued against themselves.

4 And those written about before[18] Christ (as concerns His 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."[19]

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[20] 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.

11 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.[21]

---

16 The word *logikon* here refers to some aspect of the Logos. Some render it *rational-principle*. **17** Or *logos*. **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

3 Herakles, walking upon a threefold road, says Xenophon, found Virtue and Vice[22] 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 eyes,[23] 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 recieve 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[24] 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 are incorruptible in virtue; such persons whoever they may be whether Christians, or athletes, or men who have done such things (the sorts of things which the poets said about those considered gods), must grasp that Virtue possesses all things, as seen from the fact that with death being a thing that can be shunned we think lightly of it.

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 things, but not try by all means to always live this present life, and elude those ruling; to say nothing of the fact that being put to death, he would denounce himself?

3 Indeed, this already evil and worthless *daimones* have caused to be done through evil men. **4** For these men, having put some to

---

22 Or *wickedness.*   **23** Or *having enchanting eyes.*   **24** Lit. *falling to the ground*, used metaphorically of unprofitable endeavors. Some scholars suggest instead *earthly-minded.*

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.

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 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.

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[25] 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[26] 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[27] 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 themselves 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 least they are not like the teachings of the Sotadists, and the Philaenid-

---

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.

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 everywhere 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.

III. NOTES.

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 withrawing 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 fornication" – παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας (Matt. 5:32) or εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ (Matt. 19:9). With respect to all other causes, Jesus commands "Therefore what God has joined together, let not man separate." – Ὃ οὖν Θεὸς συνέζευξεν, ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω (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." – Τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς λέγω ἐγώ, οὐχ ὁ Κύριος· εἴ τις ἀδελφὸς γυναῖκα ἔχει ἄπιστον, καὶ αὕτη συνευδοκεῖ οἰκεῖν μετῴ αὐτοῦ, μὴ ἀφιέτω αὐτήν· καὶ γυνὴ εἴ τις ἔχει ἄνδρα ἄπιστον, καὶ οὗτος συνευδοκεῖ οἰκεῖν μετῴ αὐτῆς, μὴ ἀφιέτω τὸν ἄνδρα. ἡγίασται γὰρ ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ ἄπιστος ἐν τῇ γυναικί, καὶ ἡγίασται ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἄπιστος ἐν τῷ ἀδελφῷ· ἐπεὶ ἄρα τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν ἀκάθαρτά ἐστιν, νῦν δὲ ἅγιά 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 εἶ 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, etiamsi flagitas careat, an flagitia cohaerentia nomini 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 Geschichte des altesten 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 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 in the development of a Christian theology" – …Lehrer vom Schlage eines Ptolemäus, auch wenn sie später als Häretiker abgestempelt wurden, sich als Schrittmacher in der Ausbildung einer christlichen Theologie erwiesen haben (p. 114). Ferguson, while considering this "speculative," draws a comparison between Justin and the Gnostic Ptolemaeus' views on spiritual sacrifice (*JML* p. 278). There is not enough evidence to establish his identity.

The Emperors

In 1 *Apol.* 1.1 Justin addresses "Titus Aelius Hadrianus Antoninus Pius Augustus Caesar" – Τίτῳ Αἰλίῳ ᾿Αδριανῷ ᾿Αντωνίνῳ Εὐσεβεῖ 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" (Εὐσεβής = 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"– Οὐηρισσίμῳ 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 Virissimus" – 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 fratrem 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 surround both Justin and even me with death, as evil. Since [Justin] by declaring the truth, convicted the philosophers as greedy and deceitful" – Κρίσκης γοῦν ὁ ἐννεοττεύσας τῇ μεγάλῃ πόλει παιδεραστίᾳ μὲν πάντας ὑπερήνεγκεν, φιλαργυρίᾳ δὲ πάνυ προσεχὴς ἦν. θανάτου δὲ ὁ καταφρονῶν οὕτως αὐτὸς ἐδεδίει τὸν θάνατον ὡς καὶ Ἰουστῖνον καθάπερ καὶ ἐμὲ ὡς κακῷ τῷ θανάτῳ περιβαλεῖν πραγματεύσασθαι, διότι κηρύττων τὴν ἀλήθειαν λίχνους καὶ ἀπατεῶνας τοὺς φιλοσόφους συνήλεγχεν. (*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 πρόρρησιν πρὸς τοῦ Κρήσκεντος συσκευασθεὶς ἐτελειώθη (*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 LeMoine 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" – ἀδιαφορίας. 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 ἀδιαφορία 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, εἰ θέλετε ἀποθνήσκειν, κρημνοὺς ἢ βρόχους 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, him I will also deny before My Father who is in heaven" – Πᾶς οὖν ὅστις ὁμολογήσει ἐν ἐμοὶ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὁμολογήσω κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς· ὅστις δ' ἂν ἀρνήσηταί με ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀρνήσομαι κἀγὼ αὐτὸν ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς. (Mt 10:32-33); 2. The promise of judgment beyond this life. 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, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν μὴ δυναμένων ἀποκτεῖναι· φοβηθῆτε δὲ μᾶλλον τὸν δυνάμενον καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα ἀπολέσαι ἐν γεέννῃ. (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" – …[Iudas] Dei misericordiam desperando exitiabiliter 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, Mishael, Isaiah, and many others…" – καὶ οἱ μετὰ λόγου βιώσαντες Χριστιανοί εἰσι, κἂν ἄθεοι ἐνομίσθησαν, οἷον ἐν Ἕλλησι μὲν Σωκράτης καὶ Ἡράκλειτος καὶ οἱ ὅμοιοι αὐτοῖς, ἐν βαρβάροις δὲ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἀνανίας καὶ Ἀζαρίας καὶ Μισαὴλ καὶ Ἠλίας 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 δ' ἐόντος ξυνοῦ ζώουσιν οἱ πολλοὶ ὡς ἰδίαν 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 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 present argument: 1. He taught that death need not be

feared (Stobaeus, *Flor.* 117, 8); 2. Kings should be examples of justice and good philosophy to their subjects (Stob. 4.7.67), and 3. That "man alone is an image of deity" – ἄνθρωπος μίμημα θεοῦ μόνον τῶν ἐπιγείων (Stobaeus, *Flor.* 117,8.0, Arnold). Tacitus suggests that Musonius advocated "an imperturbable expectation of death rather than a hazardous anxious life" – constantiam opperiendae 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 ἁμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλὰ σειραῖς ζόφου ταρταρώσας παρέδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν τηρουμένους (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" – ἀγγέλους τε τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν ἀλλὰ ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας δεσμοῖς ἀϊδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφον τετήρηκεν (Jude 6, NKJV). Jude may refer to the condition of the angels including them together with Sodom and Gomorrah "as an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire" – δεῖγμα πυρὸς αἰωνίου δίκην ὑπέχουσαι (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 δ' ἐσκίασαν βελέεσσι Τιτῆνας, καὶ τοὺς μὲν ὑπὸ χθονὸς εὐρυοδείης πέμψαν καὶ δεσμοῖσιν ἐν ἀργαλέοισιν ἔδησαν χερσὶν νικήσαντες ὑπερθύμους περ ἐόντας, τόσσον ἔνερθ' ὑπὸ γῆς, ὅσον οὐρανός ἐστ' ἀπὸ γαίης· τόσσον γάρ τ' ἀπὸ γῆς ἐς Τάρταρον ἠερόεντα (Hesiod, *Theogony,* 716-721, Lombardo).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andresen, C. "Justin und der mittlere Platonismus." *Zeitschrift für die neutestament-liche Wissenschaft* 44 (1952-53): 157-195.

Arnold, E. Vernon. *Roman Stoicism.* New York: The Humanities Press, 1958.

Barnard, L.W. "Justin Martyr's Eschatology." *Vigiliae Christianae* 19 (1965):86-98.

_____. *Justin Martyr: His Life and Thought* (*LT*). Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1967.

_____. "The Logos Theology of Justin Martyr." (*LTJ*). *Downside Review* 89 (1971): 132-141.

_____. *St. Justin Martyr: The First and Second Apologies*. (*FS*). Ancient Christian Writers 56. New York: Paulist Press, 1996.

_____. "The Old Testament and Judaism in the Writings of Justin Martyr." (*OTJ*) *Vetus Testamentum* 14 (1964):395-406.

Bauer, Walter, William F. Arnt & F. Wilbur Gingrich. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.* 2nd ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Birley, Anthony. *Lives of the Later Caesars.* New York: Penguin Books, 1974.

Bisbee, G.A. "The Acts of Justin: A Form-Critical Study," *The Second Century* 3 (1983): 129-157.

Bonfante, Giuliano and Larissa Bonfante. *The Etruscan Language: An Introduction.* New York University Press: New York, 1983.

Brandenstein, Wilhem and Manfred Mayrhofer. *Handbuch Des Altpersischen.* Otto Harrassowitz: Wiesbaden, Germany, 1964.

Brown, Francis, S.R. Driver, & Charles A. Briggs. *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.

Burkert, Walter. "Daimon." *Griechische Religion: der archaischen und klassischen Epoche*. Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1960: 278-282.

Chadwick, H. *Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1966.

_____. "Justin Martyr's Defence of Christianity." (*DC*) *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 47 (1965): 275-297.

Chantraine, Pierre. *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Grecque.* Tome 1 A–Δ. Paris: Klinscksieck, 1968.

Charles, R. H. *The Book of Enoch.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1893.

Colson, F.H., "Notes on Justin Martyr, Apology I," *Journal of Theological Studies* 23 (1922):161-171.

Cosgrove, Charles, H. "Justin Martyr and the Emerging Christian Canon." *Vigiliae Christianae* 36 (1982):209-232.

Denning-Bolle, Sara. "Christian Dialogue as Apologetic: The Case of Justin Martyr Seen in Historical Context." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 69 (1987): 492-510.

Derrett, Duncan M. "Ο ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΕΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣΕΝ ΑΠΟ ΤΟΥ ΞΥΛΟΥ." *Vigiliae Christianae* 43 (1989):378-392.

Dodds, Marcus, George Reith & B. P. Pratten, trans. "Justin Martyr." Roberts, A. and J. Donaldson, eds., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers.* Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1885.

Drodge, A.J. "Justin Martyr and the Restoration of Philosophy." *Chruch History* (1987): 303-319.

Dudley, Donald R. *A History of Cynicism.* London: Hildesheim, 1967.

Edwards, M.J. "On the Platonic Schooling of Justin Martyr," *Journal of Theological Studies* 42 (1991): 17-34.

_____. "Justin's Logos and the Word of God." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 3 (1995): 261-280.

Eisenman, Robert, & Michael Wise. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered.* Rockport, Mass.: Element, 1992.

Enslin, Morton S. "Justin Martyr: An Appreciation." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 34 (1943-1944): 179-205.

Eusebius, Pamphilus. *The Ecclesiastical History* (*HE*). Chrsitian Fredrich Cruse, trans. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1989.

Eusebius, Pamphilus. *The Ecclesiastical History* (*HE*). vol. 1. Kirsopp Lake, trans. London: William Heinmann, 1926.

Falls, Thomas B. *Saint Justin Martyr*. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1948.

Ferguson, E. "Demons." *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*. 2nd. ed. Vol. 1. Everett Ferguson ed. New York: Garland Pub., 1997: 325-327.

_____. "The Demons According to Justin Martyr" (*DJ*). *The Man of the Messianic Reign and Other Essays: A Festschrift in Honor of Dr. Elza Huffard,* ed. W.C. Goodheer Witchita Falls: Western Christian Foundation, 1980: 103-112.

_____. *Demonology of the Early Christian World* (*DEC*). New York: Mellen, 1984.

_____. "Justin Martyr and the Liturgy" (*JML*). *Restoration Quarterly* 36 (1994):267-278.

Foerster, Werner, "δαίμων," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* ed. Gerhard Kittel Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1964, Vol. 2, 1-20.

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

Glasson, T.F. "Heraclitus' alleged Logos Doctrine." *Journal of Theological Studies* 3. (1952): 231-8.

Goodenough, E.R. The Pseudo-Justinian 'Oratio ad Graecos'" *Harvard Theological Review* 18 (1925): 187-200.

_____. *The Theology of Justin Martyr* (*TJ*). Jena: Frommann, 1923.

Goodspeed, E.J. *Index Apologeticus sive clavis Iustini Martyris Operum aliorumque apologetarum pristinorum.* Leipzig: J.C. Hinrich, 1912.

_____. *Die ältesten Apologeten.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1914.

Grant, Robert. "Aristotle and the Conversion of Justin." *Journal of Theological Studies* 7 (1956): 246-248.

_____. "A Woman of Rome: The Matron in Justin. 2 Apology 2.1-9." *Church History* 54 (1985):461-72.

Guerra, Anthony J. "The Conversion of Marcus Aurelius and Justin Martyr: The Purpose, Genre and Content of the First Apology." *The Second Century* 9 (1992): 171-187.

Hesiod. *Works and Days & Theogony.* Stanley Lombardo, trans. Indianapolis: Hackett Pub., 1993.

Holte, R. "Logos Spermatikos: Christianity and Ancient Philosophy according to St. Justin's Apologies," *Studia Theologica* 12 (1958): 109-168.

Hooker, J.T. *Linear B: An Introduction.* London: Bristol Classical Press, 1980.

Kenyon, F. "The Date of the Apology of Justin Martyr." *The Academy* 49 (1896): 98.

Keresztes, P. "Justin, Roman Law and the Logos." *Latomus* 45 (1986):339-346.

_____. "Law and Arbitrariness in the Persecution of the Christians and Justin's First Apology." *Vigiliae Chrsitianae* 18 (1964): 204-214.

_____. "The Literary Genre of Justin's First Apology." *Vigiliae Chrsitianae* 19 (1965): 99-110.

_____. "The 'so-called' Second Apology of Justin." *Latomus* 24 (1965): 858-69.

Kittel, Gerhard, et. al., "λέγω [λόγος]," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* ed. Gerhard Kittel. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1964, Vol. 4, 69-143.

Liddel, Henry George and Robert Scott ed., revised by Henry Stuart Jones. (*LSJ*) . *A Greek-English Lexicon.* 9th ed. Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1996.

Liddel, Henry George and Robert Scott ed. (*LS*). *Greek-English Lexicon,* abr. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.

Luedemann, Gerd. "Zur Geschichte des altesten Christentums in Rome" *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 70 (1979):97-114

Malherbe, A.J., "Justin and Crescens," *Christian Teaching: In Honor of LeMoine G. Lewis,* ed. E. Ferguson, Abilene:Abilene Christian University, 1981: 312-327.

Marcovich, M. *Iustini Martyris Apologiae Pro Christianis.* Patristiche Texte und Studien 38. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1994.

_____. *Iustini Martyris Dialogus cum Tryphone.* Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1997.

Migne, J.P. ed. *Patrologia Graeca.* Vol. 6. "S. P. N. Justini Philosophi et Martyris Opera Quae Exstant Omnia." P. Maran. ed. Belgium: Turnholt,

Musurillo, Herbert. *Acts of the Christian Martyrs.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.

Nahm, Charles, "The Debate on 'Platonism' of Justin Martyr," *The Second Century* 9 (1992): 129-151.

Osborn, E.F., "The Platonic Ideas in Second Century Christian Thought." *Prudentia* 12 (1980): 31-45.

Oxford Latin Dictionary (*OLD*). P. G. W. Glare, ed. Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1983.

Pagels, Elaine. "Christian Apologists and the 'Fall of Angels': An Attack on Roman Imperial Power." *Harvard Theological Review* 78 (1985): 301-325.

Philhofer, Peter. "Harnack and Goodspeed: Two Readers of Codex Parisinus Graecus 450" *Second Century* 5 (1985-86): 233-242.

Price, R.M. "Hellenisation and Logos in Doctrine in Justin Martyr." *Vigiliae Christianae* 42 (1988): 18-23.

Pryor, J.W. "Justin Martyr and the Fourth Gospel." *The Second Century* 9 (1992): 153-169.

Riley, G.J. "Demon." *The Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible* (DDD). Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking, & Pieter W. van der Horst eds. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999: 235-240.

Robb, Kevin. "*Psyche* and *Logos* in the Fragments of Heraclitus." *The Monist.* 69 (1986): 315-351.

Roberts, Alexander, and James Donaldson, eds. *Ante-Nicene Fathers.* vol. 1. "The Writings of Justin Martyr." Marcus Dods, George Reith, and B.P. Pratten, trans. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

Romanides, John S. "Justin Martyr and the Fourth Gospel." *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 4 (1958-1958): 115-134.

Schmid, Wolfgang. "Die Textüberlieferung der Apologie des Justin. *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 40 (1942):87-138.

Smith, William. *Dictionary of Greek & Roman Antiquities.* 2nd ed. Boston: Little & Brown, 1854.

Skarsaune, O. "The Conversion of Justin Martyr." *Studia Theologica* 30 (1976): 53-73.

Sturtevant, Edgar H. *A Hittite Glossary.* 2nd ed. University of Pennsylvania: Philadelphia, 1936.

Tacitus, Cornelius. *The Annals of Imperial Rome.* Michael Grant, trans. New York: Penguin Books, 1971.

Trakatellis, D. *The PreExistence of Christ in Justin Martyr.* Missoula: Scholars, 1976.

Troxel, Craig. "'All Things to All People': Justin Martyr's The Aplogetical Method." *Fides et Historia* 27 (1995): 23-43.

Vogel, C.J., "Problems Concerning Justin Martyr," *Mnemosyne* 31 (1978): 360-88.

Walde, A. *Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Zweiter Band, M-Z. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1954.

Waszink, J.H., "Bemerkungen zum Einfluss des Platonismus im Frühen Christentum." *Vigiliae Christianae* 19 (1964): 129-162.

Weiss. P.R. "Some Samaritanisms of Justin Martyr" *Journal of Theological Studies* 45 (1944): 199-205.