

A LOFTIER DOCTRINE: THE USE OF SCRIPTURE IN JUSTIN MARTYR'S *SECOND APOLOGY*

STEPHEN O. PRESLEY*

Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

ABSTRACT. Over the past century many scholars have questioned integrity and composition of Justin Martyr's *Second Apology*. One frequent criticism is that Justin quotes from a variety of sources in Greco-Roman philosophy, but never once quotes scripture. As a result scholars assume that the *Second Apology* reveals Justin's real indebtedness to philosophy that diverges from his broader theological and scriptural concerns expressed in his other works. This article challenges these notions by arguing that scripture is essential Justin's *Second Apology* and that the lack of any extended quotations of scripture is no basis to disparage his theological perspective. Careful analysis of Justin's *Second Apology* demonstrates that he regularly appeals to the authority of scripture and provides numerous echoes and allusions to scriptural passages. Furthermore, in terms of his theological framework, these echoes and allusions are actually more important than mere quotations. They demonstrate that Justin does not simply quote scripture, but absorbs the scriptural content and applies it to particular theological debates and particular issues of Christian practice.

KEY WORDS: Justin Martyr, Second Apology, Scripture, Second Century, Biblical Interpretation

Introduction

In his *Ecclesiastical History*, Eusebius reports that Justin Martyr, the second century apologist, composed two separate works defending the Christian faith (2009: 2.13.2; 4.16.1; 4.18.2).¹ Eusebius praises Justin's contributions and remarks that they are exceedingly profitable for the church. He even comments that many other church fathers, such as Irenaeus, are reading his works and quoting him

* STEPHEN O. PRESLEY (PhD 2012, University of St. Andrews) is Assistant Professor of Biblical Interpretation at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Fort Worth, Texas, United States of America. Email: spresley@swbts.edu

1 Most scholars doubt that the two apologies mentioned by Eusebius are the same two that we now have. As a result, there is significant debate over the relationship between what are commonly known as the *First* and *Second Apology*. Over the past century three distinct positions have developed; see Thorsteinsson (2012: 92), as well as Minns and Parvis (2009: 21-24). Parvis describes these views concisely saying, 'There are those who think that there are in fact two apologies, those who think that there is really only one, and those who compromise by opting for one and a half—or rather, for an apology with an appendix' (2007: 23). The debate is highly involved and often speculative due to fact that the manuscript evidence is 'very late, scanty, and corrupt' (Thorsteinsson, 2012: 92).

profusely (2009: 4.18.1, 8-9). However, beginning with Harnack modern scholars have debated the integrity and composition of Justin's works, especially the *Second Apology*. It is rather conventional to argue that the *Second Apology* discloses Justin's true philosophical persuasions that are not in keeping with his broader theological and scriptural concerns expressed in the *First Apology* and *Dialogue with Trypho*.

To support this conclusion, scholars regularly point out that scripture is essentially absent from Justin's *Second Apology*. At the same time, not only is scripture immaterial to his arguments, but the *Second Apology* is replete with quotations from a variety of ancient philosophers. In other words, Justin is much more interested in quoting classical philosophy than he is in quoting scripture. For example, Parvis summarizes this view saying, 'The *Second Apology* alludes to Plato and Xenophon but contains not a single quotation from scripture... those who stress the positive side of Justin's relationship to philosophy usually start from 2. They usually allow the *Second Apology*—consciously or unconsciously—to control their reading of the *First*.' (2007: 24). In their recent critical edition of Justin's apologies, Parvis and Minns reiterate the point saying, '[w]hile the *First* is full of quotations from scripture—especially the prophets and the "memoirs of the apostles", the *Second* has not a single scriptural citation' (2009: 21-2). More recently Runar Thorsteinsson, though he argues for the uniqueness and integrity of the *Second Apology* as a private petition, distinguishes the use of scripture in both apologies saying, 'One such difference is the fact that whereas *1 Apol.* is replete with "proofs" from the Christian scriptures, sometimes in the form of endless repetitions of the same passages, there is no quotation whatsoever from the Christian scriptures in *2 Apol.* The latter work contains quotations from "pagan" writings only' (2012: 96). Grant, however, is even more critical of the paucity of scripture in the work and emphasizes the philosophical tone saying that the *Second Apology* is 'more favorable to philosophy than the earlier one—there is hardly any Christian theology' (1986: 216). Therefore, in terms of Justin's use of scripture in the *Second Apology*, scholars agree that Justin does not quote scripture and imply that Justin's quotation of pagan philosophers is evidence of his lack of appreciation for scripture in this work.

I think there is good reason to question these assumptions. I want to argue that Justin's *Second Apology* contains numerous echoes and allusions to scripture thought out the text that communicate a weightily dependence upon scripture. Depending upon certain definitions, some of these allusions might be considered loose quotations.² But my purpose is not to debate terminology and quibble over

2 Stanley Porter, for example, distinguishes between echo, allusion, and citation. An 'echo' is any language that is thematically related to a particular text of scripture. An 'allusion', on the other hand, has a greater degree of specificity in relationship to particular terms or concepts in scripture. A 'citation' has even more specificity through an identifiable grouping of parallel

competing definitions of a 'citation'. Instead, I want to make the more fundamental argument that these echoes and allusions to scripture are even *more significant* than quotations or citations, because they demonstrate the absorption of scriptural terms, images, and concepts into Justin theological thought patterns. In his analysis of Justin's use of scripture, Verheyden has already observed that the diversity of references in his works reveals that Justin felt a certain amount of 'authorial freedom' when using scriptural terms and imagery (2012: 318; 335). The complexity of Justin's scriptural allusions and citations leave the reader with the complete confidence that he is quite capable of citing passages from their original sources, but citations were not always essential to his polemic and he was much more interested in using and applying scripture to the particular issues of his day. When Justin reasons with philosophers or Roman officials, he draws on a wealth of scripture knowledge and education that has been honed through catechetical instruction and theological debate. The scripture terms and images in the *Second Apology* are evidence that Justin's reasoning is thoroughly scriptural and dependent upon the sacred texts of the Christian faith.³

This study of Justin's use of scripture in the *Second Apology* will begin with an analysis of the general references to 'scripture', or the teachings of the prophets and apostles, in order to demonstrate how his arguments rely upon the authority of these texts. Justin repeatedly appeals to the sacred teaching of the Christian community throughout the text in order to explain and defend his theological framework. In the second part, I survey the various echoes and allusions of scripture that pervade the *Second Apology*. The allusions and echoes are the warp and woof of Justin's arguments that disclose the function of scripture in his apology and refutes any criticism of the lack of 'quotations' or 'citations' in the *Second Apology*.

Authority of Scripture in the *Second Apology*

Justin's dependence upon scripture in the *Second Apology* is evidenced, first of all, in various references to scripture as an authoritative body of teaching for the Christian community and the basis for his theological arguments. In his apologies, Justin once uses the language 'writing' or 'scripture' [γραφή] in reference to the 'writings of Moses' in *1 Apology* 60.2 and once to refer to the 'magical writings' [μαγικῶν γραφῶν] (*2 Apology* 5.4) of the pagan philosophers (though Minns and

terms. The label of citation is often applied to passages with any more than three parallel terms, and there are several of these in the *Second Apology* (2007; 2008). These classifications are located on a spectrum of identifiability that is rather fluid and often difficult to determine in many contexts (Tull Willey, 1997).

3 Scholars debate the contents of Justin's 'bible' and any comment on this is well beyond the scope of this study. For a helpful summary of this debate see the article by Skarsaune (2007), who argues that Justin had access to the Jewish scriptures and most of the texts that would later be assembled into the New Testament.

Parvis, following Thirlby, amend the text to read ‘magical changes’.⁴ But the most consistent term for scripture as a body of teaching or instruction in the *Second Apology* is διδασκαλία translated ‘teaching’ or ‘lesson’ (Liddell and Scott, 1996: 421). Occasionally he uses the term διδάσκαλος, though it is much more common in his *Dialogue with Trypho*. These terms are prevalent in classical education and training and, in the case of διδάσκαλος common in scripture.

In the Greco-Roman context, the term διδασκαλία has a range of meanings that focus on particular lesson or instruction performed in a specific setting. For example, Plutarch uses this term to describe a public demonstration of the ineptitude leadership of Vinus, who was a Roman General during the short reign of Galba, while Xenophon also uses the term in his work on horsemanship to describe the methods of training horses (Liddell and Scott, 1996: 421). In his work *Cleitophon*, Plato uses διδασκαλία specially in a scholastic context to refer to ‘a doctrine or a teaching’ that is shared by the members of a particular philosophical school (Davis, 2011: 169).

In Justin’s *First* and *Second Apology*, the term διδασκαλία either refers to the teachings of the various Greco-Roman philosophers or heretics (*1 Apology* 4.9, 18.5, 56.3, *2 Apology* 12.1, 13.2, 15.3), or the teachings of Christ (*1 Apology* 14.3, 16.8, 14, 40.1, 57.2, *2 Apology* 2.2, 3.3, 8.4, 13.1) and the church (*1 Apology* 57.2, *2 Apology* 2.2, 4.3, 15.3).⁵ In the *First Apology*, for example, refers to the ‘teachings of the writers’ [τῶν συγγραφέων διδάγματα] including the writings of Empedocles, Pythagoras, Plato, and Socrates (*1 Apology* 18.5). Then, in *1 Apology* 56.3, Justin warns against the teachings of the heretic Simon and his summaries of the Christian faith (see Acts 8:9-24). More often, however, he refers directly to the words of the Lord or the ‘teachings of Christ’. The term is used twice in *1 Apology* 16.8 and *1 Apology* 16.14 in reference Christ’s words in Matthew 7:15-19 and Matthew 24:5 and especially the parable of the rich young ruler who called Christ ‘good teacher’ [Διδάκτε ἀγαθέ] in Mark 10:17 and Luke 18:18. Then, in *1 Apology* 14.3, Justin uses the term in the context of a formal defense [ἀποδείξις] of his Christology.

4 In their recent translation and commentary Minns and Parvis determined that Justin’s *Second Apology* is a collection of disconnected fragments taken from the ‘cutting room floor’ of earlier drafts of Justin’s writings (2009: 27). They also determined that several excerpts should be inserted into the *First Apology*. The most significant change includes adding the final two chapters of the *Second Apology* (*2 Apology* 14-15) on to the end of the *First Apology* (*1 Apol.* 69-70). I agree with Thorsteinsson that this step raises significant questions about the criteria and standard for such textual amending in critical editions of the fathers (2012: 92-3, n. 4). In this article, all the references to Justin’s *First* and *Second Apology* follow the numbering in Marcovich’s critical edition (1994) and the English translations are adapted from Barnard’s translation (1997). At times I have altered his language based upon the Greek text of Marcovich or Minns and Parvis’ translation.

5 The term is used in same way the *Dialogue with Trypho*. See *Dialogue* 30.1, 35.2, 48.4, 49.4, 68.1, 69.7, 78.10, 80.3, 94.4, 112.5, 120.2, and 134.1.

In Justin's *Second Apology*, the term is used much more extensively to contrast the doctrines of the philosophical schools with the teachings of Christ. It is also clear from his polemical use in *2 Apology* 15.4 that it refers to both oral and written mediums of communication. In *2 Apology* 4.2, Justin responds to the popular rhetorical argument that Christians should commit suicide and ascend immediately to God. He begins his response appealing to what Christians 'have been taught [δεδιδάγμεθα]...', which must include instruction in a theology of creation since that is the basis of his response. A parallel use in *1 Apology* 10.1 describes the transition from the formal instruction in the faith to the firm conviction and belief in the doctrines of the faith saying, 'we have been taught and have been persuaded and do believe...' [δεδιδάγμεθα καὶ πεπείσμεθα καὶ πιστεύομεν]. A few lines later in *2 Apology* 4.3, Justin remarks that 'no one should be born, or instructed in the divine teachings' and want to take their own life because they would be acting contrary to the will of God who is providential over creation. The reference to 'being born' [γεννηθῆναι] is demonstrative of the Christian conversion experience (cf. John 3:3ff) and the entry into faith and life of the community (see also *Dialogue* 123.9, 135.3-6).⁶ The Christian convert who is 'born' into the faith is concurrently instructed in the 'divine teachings' [θεῖα διδάγματα], which naturally refers to the catechetical formation in scriptures that is essential to the life of the early church.⁷ The reference to this teaching as 'divine' emphasized the sacredness of this catechetical instruction and communicates the inspiration of the teachings of Christ. Justin uses the same language in *2 Apology* 2 amid his discussion of the troubled unnamed 'woman of Rome' who converted to the faith. He describes how this woman changed her lifestyle after she 'learnt the teachings of Christ' [τοῦ Χριστοῦ διδάγματα ἔγνων] through a church leader named Ptolemy (*2 Apology* 2.2). Grant postulates that Ptolemy was her catechist who instructed her in the basic doctrines of the faith (1985: 464). The basis of the accusations against the woman and Ptolemy, who was brought before Urbicus, were their confessions as Christians and adherence to the teachings of Christ (*2 Apology* 2.13; see also *2 Apology* 2.16). This qualification further narrows the general 'divine teaching' to the particular instruction concerning Christ. The phrase 'teaching of Christ' is the most frequent descriptor of basic doctrine of the Christian faith in the *Second Apology*, and used even more extensively than in the *First Apology*.

Justin is more specific about the authority of the scriptures when he refers directly to the teaching of the prophets in correspondence to the teachings of

6 There is a longstanding debate about Justin's use of the fourth Gospel. For a concise summary of the debate that makes a convincing argument for Justin's use of the Gospel of John, see the article by Hill (2007).

7 Early catechetical works include the *Didache*, *Epistle of Barnabas*, and Irenaeus' *Epideixis*, or *Demonstration of Apostolic Preaching*. These texts are replete with scriptural echoes, allusions, and citations, which communicates the centrality of scripture in catechetical formation in the second century.

Christ. In *2 Apology* 8, he warns that the pagan philosophers and the Stoics who reject Christ will face the impending judgment that ‘both the prophets foretell, and Jesus our own teacher teach’ (*2 Apology* 8.5). The two-fold designation of ‘prophets... and Jesus’ is common for Justin who is thoroughly invested in proving Christological fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy (see Skarsaune, 1987). The same two-fold designation is also evident in *2 Apology* 10.8 when Justin writes, ‘he [Logos]... foretold the things that were to come to pass both through the prophets and in His own person, when he assumed our nature and taught these things’. In harmonious agreement, the prophet and the person of Christ communicate and fullness of the divine will for the people of God. In *2 Apology* 9.2, Justin responds to pagan philosophers who, in his view, have derived their teachings of postmortem divine punishment from the writings of the prophets. He argues that this divine legislation is given from the ‘Father who teaches by the Logos’. It is the Father who ‘teaches’ through the Word of God (cf. *1 Apology* 44.9). Therefore, these general references to the teachings of God, Christ, and the Christians must assume an authoritative basis sourced in the Old Testament and the apostolic writings.

His appeal to the authority of scriptural teaching is also evident in the way he contrasts the ‘divine teaching’ of the church with the teaching of Plato and other philosophical writers both in oral and written form (*2 Apology* 15.4). For example, he contrasts the teachings of Socrates, which was only partially true and revealing, with the teachings of the Logos through the prophets and the person of Christ that communicated the will of God (*2 Apology* 10). In another instance Justin remarks that the scripture will be found true for anyone who applies ‘sober judgment’ [κρίσειν σώφρονα]. In contrast to the classical philosopher, Justin writes that, ‘our doctrines are not shameful, according to sober judgment, but indeed more lofty than every human philosophy’ (*2 Apology* 15.3; cf. Romans 12:3). The descriptor that the teachings of Christ are ‘not shameful’ [οὐχ αἰσχρά], is a negative way of affirming their truthfulness in contrast to the teachings of the classical philosophers.

Furthermore, the doctrines of the philosophers ‘contradict themselves on more important points’ and, unlike the doctrines of the Christians, they do not have ‘the hidden secure understanding and the irrefutable knowledge’ (*2 Apology* 13.3). The writings of Plato and the other philosophers bear some resemblance to the teachings of the scriptures but they are ‘not in all ways the same’ (*2 Apology* 13.1-5). For Justin anything right or good spoken by the philosophers is only good to the degree that it corresponds to the true *logos* (*2 Apology* 13.5). These general allusions to the authority of scripture are part of Justin’s doctrine of the *logos spermatikos* that has been an essential aspect of discussions on his Christology. While there is a longstanding debate about the philosophical nature and background of his use of the spermatik *logos*, it is relatively clear that Justin envisioned that the whole human race had some means of rational inquiry. It is likely that Justin developed this

doctrine from his reading of the parable of the sower in Matthew 13:4-9, Mark 4:1-20, and Luke 8:4-15 (Holte, 1958). Justin realizes that not everyone will find the scriptures authoritative or convincing, because the demonic activity has suppressed true interpretation and understanding. In *2 Apology* 10 and *2 Apology* 13.1 he describes how the logos predicted the things that would come to pass through the prophets, but demonic activity placed a 'wicked disguise... over the divine doctrines of the Christians' to divert their minds and pursue philosophical reflection.

Justin's most developed reference to the authority and inspiration of the scriptures is located in his remarks against Crescens, a cynic philosopher who, according to Eusebius and Tatian, plotted the death of Justin (Minns and Parvis, 2009: 42-43; see also 54-55). Little is known of the background, but clearly Justin is disturbed with Crescens lack of understanding and hypocrisy and the essence of his condemnation is as follows:

For the man [Crescens] is unworthy of the name philosopher who publicly bears witness against us in matters which he does not understand, saying that Christians are godless and impious, and doing so to win favor with the deluded mob, and so please them. For if he runs us down without having read the teachings of Christ, he is thoroughly evil, and far worse than the inexperienced people, who often refrain from discussing or bearing false witness about matters they do not understand. Of, if he has read them and does not understand the majesty that is in them or, understanding it, acts so that he may not be suspected of being a Christian, he is far more base and thoroughly depraved, being conquered by vulgar and unreasonable opinion and fear' (*2 Apology* 3.3).

The basis of Justin's polemic hinges upon Crescens' encounter with the teachings of Christ. Either Crescens has read the scriptures, or he has not, and either way Justin is confident that he has exposed Crescens hypocrisy and ignorance of the teachings of the scriptures. Justin even regards the teachings of Christ as having 'majesty' [μεγαλείον], which is a reverential adjective meaning 'magnificent' or 'splendid' (Liddell and Scott, 1996: 1086). In classical thought the term could be used for noble persons or even as a title meaning 'Highness' (Liddell and Scott, 1996: 1086). In scripture the term is only found in the Septuagint in Deuteronomy 11:2, Psalm 70:19, Jeremiah 40:9, and Acts 2:11. In each case these terms refer to the glory and majesty of God and the mighty works of God. Justin applies this term in a similar manner to refer to all of God's teaching and the work of Christ as praiseworthy far above any human philosophy. He uses the same term in *2 Apology* 10.1, where he again remarks that the teachings of Christ are 'more majestic' [μεγαλειότερα] than any other human teaching.

From these general references and allusions to the authority of scripture, it is evident that Justin's rational arguments are based upon his instruction in the faith and the 'teachings of Christ'. He is persuaded by the close correspondence between the prophets of the Old Testament and the person and work of Christ de-

scribed in the apostolic writings. Justin also carefully distinguishes between the sacred writings of the Christians with the human teaching of the philosophers. Therefore, while Justin may not offer extensive ‘quotations’ of scripture, his reverence for the ‘teachings of Christ’ and the function of scripture in his apologetic and the faith life of the community are evident throughout his *Second Apology*.

Justin’s Use of Scriptural Allusions and Echoes in the Second Apology

Having established Justin’s general dependence upon the doctrines of the scriptures in the *Second Apology*, careful analysis of this text also reveals that particular echoes and allusions pervade the work. These allusions, which include both Old Testament and New Testament references, are not incidental or peripheral, but even *more significant* than mere citations. Each one shows how scripture has been received and incorporated into the life and faith of the early Christian community. These allusions to scripture include Justin’s use and application of Paul’s teaching on marriage and divorce in 1 Corinthians 7 (*2 Apology* 2:1-20), his reading of the creation account in Genesis 1-2, the Nephilim in Genesis 6:2-5, and the Noahic account in Genesis 7:23 (*2 Apology* 4-7), his theological reflection on the nature of the Father and the Son in Colossians 1:15, John 1:1-3, and John 1:13-14 (*2 Apology* 6), his eschatology and views on divine judgment in Genesis 19:24 and Matthew 25:41 (*2 Apology* 7-9), his application of the ordinary nature of the apostles and Paul’s sermon on the Areopagus in Acts 4:13 and Acts 17:23 (*2 Apology* 10), and his closing allusion to the work of God in Christ and the proclamation of the gospel in 1 Timothy 2:4 (*2 Apology* 13-15).⁸ While some of these uses approach modern definitions of a ‘quotation’, all of them demonstrate that Justin is incorporating scripture imagery and language into the arguments of his *Second Apology*.

Justin on Marriage and Divorce: 1 Corinthians 7 in Second Apology 2.1-20

The first significant use of scripture in Justin’s *Second Apology* is his description of the case of the ‘woman from Rome’ in *2 Apology* 2.1-20 that includes the application of Paul’s commands in 1 Corinthians 7. The narrative describes an unnamed licentious woman who converted to Christianity and abandoned the immorality of her previous life. Her husband, however, did not celebrate her newfound faith. He rejected Christianity and acted even more corruptly. This marital tension raises the issue of Paul’s commands in 1 Corinthians 7 and the question of converts who are married to unbelievers. He alludes to 1 Corinthians 7:13 (see also 1 Corinthians 7:27) that states, ‘If any woman has a husband who is an unbeliever, and he consents to live with her, she should not divorce him’ (ESV). Then, in 1 Corinthians 7:16, Paul also implies that the husband might even be ‘saved’ [σώσεις],

8 There is a significant debate about Justin’s use of the Gospels and if he was even aware of the Gospel of John. For a more developed discussion see the work by Verheyden (2012), who begins with a brief survey of literature on Justin’s reception of the four-fold gospel canon.

though the faith and ministry of the spouse. Justin's woman of Rome finds herself in the precise situation and he reports that she wanted to remove herself from the marriage. But her community was following the teaching of Paul in 1 Corinthians 7:13 and 'she was entreated earnestly by her friends, who advised her still to continue with him, with the thought that some time or other her husband might show hope of amendment, she did violence to her own inclinations and remained with him' (*2 Apology* 2.5).

Based upon this account, it is easy to imagine Ptolemy, the woman's catechist, or other members of her community reminding her of Paul's teaching and encouraging her to remain married in hopes that her husband might come to accept the teachings of Christ. Eventually, however, the husband's behavior become so reprehensible that she felt she had no other choice but to divorce him in order that she not become 'a sharer also in his evil and impieties' (*2 Apology* 2.6). Justin reports that the husband spent time in Alexandria, which may be an allusion to his abandonment in order to justify the grounds for the divorce. In attempts to avoid personal shame, the husband responds to the woman's request for divorce by accusing her and other members of her church of being a Christian. Upon investigation, Justin reports that the woman's catechist Ptolemy and several others are martyred for their faith. In general, this narrative of martyrdom sets the tone of the whole work and reveals the degree to which Paul's teaching on marriage and divorce has infiltrated the life of the community. The allusion to 1 Corinthians 7:13 in *2 Apology* 2 is not a direct quotation, but an even more profound and direct application of this text to a specific situation in Justin's community. These early Christians are not merely quoting scripture, but allowing it to guide their Christian practice.

Justin's Reading of Creation: Genesis 1-2 and Genesis 6:2-5 in 2 Apology 4-5

The narrative of the woman in Rome in *2 Apology* 2 introduces a series of responses to objections levied against Christianity. Justin's answers to these accusations frequently draw on his theology of creation and cosmology expressed in Genesis 1-7. Beginning in *2 Apology* 3-4 Justin defends God's sovereignty in spite of the influence of demons and the oppression of the followers of Christ. For Justin, the extent of creaturely life is dependent solely upon God's providential care and he defends his view through a theological reading of creation saying, '[w]e [Christians] have been taught that God has not made the world aimlessly, but for the sake of the human race (Genesis 1:28; 2:8, 15)' (*2 Apology* 4.2). The particular elements of this summary clearly allude to the creation accounts and provide an anthropocentric gloss on Genesis 1-2 with special attention given to the God's initial creation of the first parents in Genesis 1:26-28 (Genesis 2:8, 15). In Justin's reading, the formation of the world establishes God's providential care over creation and the elevated role of humanity as the beneficiaries of God's good creation. At the same time, Justin implies that the role of the viceroy is to 'imitate his attrib-

utes' [τά προσόντα αὐτῶ μιμοθμένοις] (see Genesis 1:26), or rule over creation in a manner that is in keeping with God's justice and righteousness (*2 Apology* 4.2).⁹ There is a long tradition of the study of mimesis as it relates to cosmology in classical thought and the New Testament and especially the relationship between mimesis and the *imago dei* (Jennings, 2010: 67-72). It is reasonable to assume that Justin's reading of the *imago dei* in Genesis 1:26 includes the aspect of *mimesis* though there may be some influence from the *imitation dei* in the New Testament. Justin's use of 'imitate' [μιμοθμένοις] is associated with creaturely representation of divine attributes or virtues or the demonic impersonation or distortion of these attributes (*1 Apology* 9.1, 10.1, 55.1, 60.11, 62.2, 64.1, 66.4). In this sense, Justin interprets the image of God in active or moral sense, where imaging or imitating God is living according to will of God and rejecting sin in either word or deed. This use of imitation shows that Justin has received a particular anthropocentric reading of creation and is now applying it to a particular theological debate over divine providence.

In another instance Justin also describes the broader contours of his cosmology and angelology that explains the act of the angels transgressing the divine law in the Nephilim account in Genesis 6:2-5. His summary (*2 Apology* 5.2-4) includes echoes of the creation accounts and the same anthropocentric reading of creation saying:

God, when He had made the whole world (Genesis 1:1), and subjected earthly things to men and women (Genesis 1:28, cf. Genesis 2:15), and arranged the heavenly elements for the increase of fruits and change of the seasons (Genesis 1:14-19), and ordered the divine law for them—these things also He made for people to see—and entrusted the care of men and women and of things under heaven to angels whom He appointed over them. But the angels transgressed this order, and were captivated by love of women, and produced children who are called demons (Genesis 6:2, 4). And besides later they enslaved the human race to themselves (Galatians 4:3), partly by magical writings, and partly by fears and punishments which they occasioned, and partly by teaching them to offer sacrifices and incense and libations, which they needed after they were enslaved with lustful passions; and among people they showed murders, wars, adulteries, intemperate deeds, and every evil (Genesis 6:5).

The transition from the echoes and allusions to Genesis 1-2 to the discussion of Genesis 6 explains how sin becomes so pervasive before the deluge. The corresponding echoes and allusions to Genesis 1-2 and Genesis 6 validates that Justin has these creation events in view and his theological interpretation is a brief inter-

9 The actual terms for image and likeness in the Septuagint are εἰκὼν and ὁμοίωσις. The fact that Justin has the creation accounts in view is even more apparent when compared with the other discussions of creation that use similar terminology and imagery. See also Justin (*1 Apology* 10.2, *2 Apology* 5.2, and *Dialogue* 41.1).

pretive gloss of these accounts. In the next chapter, Justin reiterates this same conviction about the demonic forces deceiving humanity in Genesis 6:2-5 (*2 Apology* 7.2). For Justin, God gave angels the authority over the heavenly bodies, but some rebelled and tormented humankind to the point that some were enslaved. This enslavement alludes to Paul's statement in Galatians 4:3 concerning when the people of God 'were children, we were enslaved to the elementary principles of the world' (ESV). Justin's reading of demonic enslavement [δεδοθλωμένοι] appears congruent with Paul application of enslavement to the 'elementary principles of the world', and the same concept of begetting children is also present in Galatians 4:3, and Genesis 6:4. Justin believed intensively in the presence of demonic activity in the world and their role in promulgating sin and depravity among people. Similar allusions to the Noahic account in Genesis 6-7 resurface in *2 Apology* 7, where Justin acknowledges that God has delayed from destroying the whole world for a time, but those who do evil will be judged and God will rain of fire and judgment upon them (Genesis 19:24). Like Sodom and Gomorrah he notes that 'as formerly the flood left no one but one only with his family who is called Noah (Genesis 7:23)' (*2 Apology* 7). In the same way the depravity inflicted by these demons continues in the pagan philosophers and sorcerers of his day. Once again, the allusions to scripture (Genesis 1-2; 6:2-5; 7:23; and Galatians 4:3) are expressed amid the theological reasoning in his theology of creation and angelology. Justin certainly could have quoted these passages, but it was not necessary for his polemic.

Justin on the Father and the Son: John 1:3, 14, Colossians 1:15-16, Galatians 1:4 in 2 Apology 6

In addition to his use of 1 Corinthians 7:13 and the creation accounts, in *2 Apology* 6, Justin records an early creedal summary of the nature of the Father and the Son. He weaves together the logos imagery of John 1:3 and John 1:14, the preexistence of Christ in Colossians 1:15-16, and the appeal to the divine will in Galatians 1:4. The intensity of the Christological terms and concepts communicates the complexity of early Christian theological formation. Justin is not beholden to quote specific passages, but instead interlaces together various terms and concepts that resonate with the basic theology of the apostolic teaching.

Justin observes that God the Father is known by several titles derived from his activity with creation including 'Father' [πατήρ], 'God' [θεός], 'Creator' [κτίστης], 'Lord' [κύριος], and 'Master' [δеспότης] (*2 Apology* 6.2). These titles pervade scripture as common appellations for God. Each of these titles, according to Justin, characterizes aspects of God's divine attributes that are revealed through the 'good deeds and works' of God (*2 Apology* 6.2). These works of God include the various acts of God's gracious providential care recorded throughout scripture.

Then concerning Christ, Justin gives more analysis of his preexistence and incarnation. He writes that the Son 'who is alone properly called Son, the Logos who is with God and is begotten before the creation, when in the beginning God

created and set in order everything through him [John 1:1-3, see also Colossians 1:15], is called Christ with reference to his being anointed and God's ordering all things through him [Colossians 1:16, John 1:3]' (*2 Apology* 6.3). Minns and Parvis reject the significant phrase 'when in the beginning God created and set in order everything through him' on textual grounds and suggest that the important Johannine prepositional phrase 'through him' is not typical Justin, but despite some awkward phrasing there does not seem to be enough evidence to remove the clause (2009: 63-64). Together, these elements echo the language of preexistence and Son's role in creation in John 1:1-3 and Colossians 1:15-16. The reference to the presence of the Son with the Father and the Son's role in the mediation of the Father's creative will are parallel with the same imagery in John 1:1-3 and Colossians 1:15-16. These Christological references are also conjoined with allusions to the incarnation and references to the meaning of the name Jesus as 'savior' (Matthew 1:21, Luke 1:31, and Luke 2:21).

Justin concludes this theological account with a loose quotation of Galatians 1:4 saying, 'For He was made man (John 1:14), as we said before, having been conceived according to the will of the God the Father, for the sake of believing men and women, and for the destruction of the demons' (*2 Apology* 6.5). The reference to becoming a human being [ἄνθρωπος γέγονε], is a theological rendering of the logos becoming flesh in John 1:14. In addition, the reference to the birth of the Christ 'according to the will of the God and Father' [κατὰ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς βουλὴν] is a loose quotation of Paul's words in Galatians 1:4 that describes how Christ gave of himself to deliver humanity from the evil age 'according to the will of our God and Father' [κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς]. The terms βουλὴν and θέλημα have significant semantic overlap. At the same time the phrase 'God and Father' is language common to the introduction of several New Testament letters (Ephesians 1:3; 2 Corinthians 1:3; 1 Peter 1:3; see also 1 Corinthians 15:24). While Justin's use of the language places a stronger emphasis on the incarnation than Paul, ultimately both references describe the role of Christ as the deliverer from evil in the world.

This Christological summary in *2 Apology* 6 reveals how scriptural language and imagery is knit together within Justin's theological arguments. The Son was preexistent with the Father, and all things have been made through him. This same Son became incarnate in the person of Christ who is called Jesus, because he has come to save his people from their sins. This work of salvation was done according to the will of the one true God and Father. This Christological summary weaves together a tapestry of biblical imagery and allusions that show Justin has received and absorbed the content of the apostolic preaching. Justin is not dependent upon quotations, even though some of these uses approach that designation, but freely describes the Christology narrative with a variety of scriptural terminology.

Justin on Divine Judgment: Matthew 25:41 in 2 Apology 7-9

As in the discussion of Genesis 6-7 mentioned above, Justin does not avoid describing God's judgment upon evil. He references the 'eternal fire' of judgment six times in the *Second Apology* (1.2; 2.2; 7.6; 8.3; 8.5; and 9.1), which is a much higher percentage than similar allusions in the *First Apology* (15.2; 16.12; 17.4; 21.6; 52.3; 52.8). Each of these references to the 'eternal fire' allude to Christ's apocalyptic imagery in Matthew 25:41 where Christ warns of 'the eternal fire' [τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον] prepared for the devil and his angels. For example, in *2 Apology* 7.6 he states that those who do not live according to the spermatic logos will suffer in an 'eternal fire' [αἰώνιῳ πυρὶ]. A few lines later he reiterates this warning saying that those who call upon the name of the Lord overpower the demons as an indication of the punishment in 'eternal fire' [πυρὶ αἰώνιῳ] which will come to them and to those who serve them (*2 Apology* 8.4). Finally, in *2 Apology* 9.3 Justin once again states that those who reject God will be judged and suffer in the 'eternal fire'. In the context of this last quote, he observes that threat of eternal punishment is not intended to produce fear, but express the reality of offending the divine law. Those who follow the 'laws' of the demons become like them in their wickedness and received the due penalty of their rebellion (*2 Apology* 9.4). Justin's reiteration of the warning applies the words of Christ to his own context and extends the implication of the text for the people of his day. He does not need to quote the passage in full, but simply reiterates the basic content of Christ's warning.

*Justin on Diversity and Gospel Proclamation in the Early Church:**Acts 4:13 and Acts 17:23 in 2 Apology 10*

The section *2 Apology* 10 is well known for its appeal to the writings and example of Socrates as one who knew Christ only 'partially' (*2 Apology* 10.7). Justin uses the example of Socrates to point out the hypocrisy of the Roman officials and show that whenever a philosopher or prophet describes the teachings of God, especially the 'God who was to them unknown' (Acts 17:23), they are repeatedly rejected. Justin quotes a famous line from Plato's *Timaeus* saying, 'that it is neither easy to find the Father and Maker of all, nor having found Him, it is safe to declare Him to all' (*2 Apology* 10.6). The fact that Justin *quotes* this text does not imply in any way that this passage is more important than scripture, since he concludes this quote saying, 'But these things our Christ did through His own power' (*2 Apology* 10.7). While Socrates and the other philosophers often 'contradicted themselves' (*2 Apology* 10.3), Christ is the true logos that 'spoke through the prophets' and fulfilled their promises 'in his own person' (*2 Apology* 10.7). Justin's reading of Acts 17:23, therefore, is a contemporary application of Paul's illustration in his sermon at the Areopagus. Just as Socrates explained the nature of the Creator of all things that was unknown and was rejected, so also Christ, Paul, and rest of persecuted church when they confess the one true God, who was unknown to their accusers, they are also rejected.

Justin also uses Acts 4:13 to characterize the diversity of the members of the church who have responded to the apostolic preaching. Not all who have received the teachings of the prophets and apostles are ‘philosophers and scholars’, but many were ‘artisans and people entirely uneducated [χειροτέχνη καὶ παντελῶς ἰδιῶται]’ (2 *Apology* 10.8). These people are like the apostles who were ‘unschooled and common men [ἀγράμματοί καὶ ἰδιῶται]’ (Acts 4:13). Justin demonstrates the diversity of converts in the early church that includes intellectuals, as well as those who, like the apostles, are ordinary people that have come to understand the power of God. Justin extends the use of this allusion from a simple description of the apostles to characterize the diversity of the community of the early church.

Justin’s Prayer for Salvation: 1 Timothy 2:4 in 2 Apology 15

Finally, Justin closes his work with a petition and prayer that implores his readers to consider what he has written with all seriousness. He believes that he has responded faithfully to several objections against the Christian faith and closes with a prayer that hopes that ‘all people everywhere will be made worthy of the truth [τῆς ἀληθείας καταξιωθῆναι τοὺς πάντας ἀνθρώπους]’ (2 *Apology* 15.4). The nature of this plea captures the remarks of 1 Timothy 2:4 that prays for the hope that ‘all people everywhere [πάντας ἀνθρώπους] will be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth [ἀληθείας]’ (ESV). Justin applies the Pauline plea to those reading his apology and prays that ‘all people everywhere’ would come to an understanding the contents of the Christian faith. Justin does not merely quote the text, but instead applies the passage to his own context, and uses the words to encourage those who might read his apology. In this context, the use of 1 Timothy 2:4 is more significant than a mere quotation, because it expresses Justin’s own evangelistic efforts that resonate with the Pauline text.

Conclusion

From this analysis of the general and particular aspects of Justin’s use of scripture in the *Second Apology*, it should be clear that scripture is essential to his arguments. Justin consistently emphasizes the truthfulness of the teachings [δίδαγμα] of Christ or the church in contrast to the teachings of the philosophers. Justin also provides echoes and allusions to scriptural passages, several of which might even be considered ‘citations’. These allusions to scripture include Justin’s use of Genesis 1-2; 6:2-5; 7:23; Matthew 25:41, John 1:1-3, John 1:13-14, Acts 4:13, Acts 17:23, 1 Corinthians 7, Colossians 1:15, and 1 Timothy 2:4. The extensive use of references to scripture and the numerous echoes and allusions demonstrates that scripture has already been absorbed and synthesized into Justin apologetic arguments. As a result, his use of the ‘teachings of Christ’ actually proves an even greater dependence upon the witness of the prophets and apostles than what has been recognized in previous works. The lack of extended scriptural quotations, therefore, is no basis to elevate his admiration for classical philosophy over his appreciation for

scripture. For Justin, it is apparent, even in the *Second Apology*, that the scriptures contain a 'loftier doctrine' (2 *Apology* 15.3).

Bibliography

- Aune, D (1966) Justin Martyr's use of the Old Testament. *Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society* 9(4): 179-197.
- Barnard, LM (1997) *St. Justin Martyr the First and Second Apologies*. New York, NY: Paulist Press.
- Barnard, LM (1964) The Old Testament and Judaism in the Writings of Justin Martyr. *Vetus Testamentum* 14(4): 395-406.
- Bellinzoni, AJ (1967) *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr*. Leiden: Brill.
- Bingham, DJ (2000) Justin and Isaiah 53. *Vigiliae Christianae* 54(3): 248-261.
- Buck, PL (2002) The Pagan Husband in Justin, 2 *Apology* 2:1-20. *Journal of Theological Studies* 53(2): 541-546.
- Buck, PL (2003) Justin Martyr's Apologies: Their Number, Destination, and Form. *Journal of Theological Studies* 54(1): 45-59.
- Chilton, B (2008) Early Christian Interpretation: The Case of Justin Martyr. In Neusner, J and Chilton, BD and Levine BA (eds) *Torah Revealed, Torah Fulfilled: Scriptural Laws In Formative Judaism and Earliest Christianity*. New York, NY: T&T Clark.
- Chilton, B (2009) Justin and Israelite Prophecy. In Parvis, S and Foster, P (eds) *Justin Martyr and His World*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress.
- Cosgrove, C (1982) Justin Martyr and the Emerging Christian Canon: Observations on the Purpose and Destination of the Dialogue with Trypho. *Vigiliae Christianae* 36(3): 209-232.
- Davis, M (2011) *The Soul of the Greeks: An Inquiry*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Ehrhardt, A (1953) Justin Martyr's Two Apologies. *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 4(1): 1-12.
- Eusebius (2009) *Ecclesiastical History*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Grant, RM (1985) A Woman of Rome: The Matron in Justin, 2 *Apology* 2.1-9. *Church History* 54(4): 461-472.
- Grant, R (1986) Forms and Occasions of the Greek Apologists. *Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni* 52: 213-26.
- Grant, R (1988) *Greek Apologists of the Second Century*. London: SCM Press.
- Hill, CE (2007) Was John's Gospel among Justin's Apostolic Memoirs? In Parvis, S and Foster, P (eds) *Justin Martyr and His World*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress.
- Holte, R (1958) *Logos Spermatikos: Christianity and Ancient Philosophy according to St. Justin's Apologies*. *Studia Theologica* 12(2): 109-68.
- Jennings, N (2010) *Theology as Ascetic Act: Disciplining Christian Discourse*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

- Liddell, HG and Scott, R (1996) *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Marcovich, M (1994) *Iustini Martyris Apologiae pro Christianis*. New York, NY: Walter de Gruyter.
- Minns, D (2010) The Text of Justin's Apologies. *Studia Patristica* 45: 355-360.
- Minns, D and Parvis, P (2009) *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: Apologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Munier, C (1987) A Propos des Apologies de Justin. *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 61: 177-86.
- Munier, C (2006) *Justin Apologie pour Les Chrétiens: Introduction, Texte Critique, Traduction et Notes*. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf.
- Parvis, P (2001) The Textual Tradition of Justin's Apologies: A Modest Proposal. *Studia Patristica* 36: 54-60.
- Parvis, P (2007) Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: The Posthumous Creation of the *Second Apology*. In Parvis, S and Foster, P (eds) *Justin Martyr and His World*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress.
- Pryor, JW (1992) Justin Martyr and the Fourth Gospel. *Second Century* 9(3): 153-169.
- Porter, SE (2007) Further Comments on the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament. In Broder, TL; MacDonald, DR and Porter, SE (eds) *The Intertextuality of the Epistles: Explorations of Theory and Practice*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press.
- Porter, S (2008) Allusions and Echoes. In Porter, SE and Stanley, CD (eds) *As It Is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture*. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Skarsaune, O (1987) *The Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof Text Tradition Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile*. Leiden: Brill.
- Skarsaune, O (2007) Justin and His Bible. In Parvis, S and Foster, P (eds) *Justin Martyr and His World*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress.
- Shotwell, WA (1965) *The Biblical Exegesis of Justin Martyr*. London: SPCK.
- Thorsteinsson, R (2012) The Literary Genre and Purpose of Justin's Second Apology: A Critical Review with Insights from Ancient Epistolography. *Harvard Theological Review* 105(1): 91-114.
- Tull Willey, P (1997) *Remember the Former Things: The Recollection of Previous Texts in Second Isaiah*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.
- Verheyden, J (2012) Justin's Text of the Gospels: Another Look at the Citations in *1 Apol.* 15.1-8. In Hill, CE and Kruger, MJ (eds) *The Early Text of the New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.