

**The Second Apology  
of Justin Martyr:**

**with Text & Translation**

By Kyle Pope



**Ancient Road Publications™**

**The Second Apology of Justin Martyr:  
with Text and Translation.**

By Kyle Pope

© 2001 Kyle Pope.  
Ancient Road Publications™  
P.O. Box 20399  
Amarillo, TX 79114  
<http://www.ancientroadpublications.com>

## PREFACE

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

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

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

Kyle Pope, 2001

## 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 my thesis. From an original idea which would have proven to be overwhelming, Dr. Mirecki helped me to narrow my focus and to choose to begin a study dealing with Justin.

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

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

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

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

# INTRODUCTION

## A. THE LIFE AND DEATH OF JUSTIN.

...οὗτος γὰρ ὁ Ἰουστίνος Σαμαρείτης ἦν τὸ γένος, εἰς Χριστὸν δὲ πεπιστευκῶς καὶ μεγάλως ἐξασκηθεὶς ἀρετῆς τε βίον 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... (Eriphanus, *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” – Ἰουστίνος Πρίσκου τοῦ Βακχείου, τῶν ἀπὸ Φλαουίας 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.<sup>1</sup> Even so, Justin considers himself a Gentile (*Dial.* 29).<sup>2</sup>

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”

---

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.

– πολὺ κλέος (2.6), recently having come to Ephesus.<sup>3</sup> He spends a great deal of time with him:

καί με ἤρει σφόδρα ἡ τῶν ἀσωμάτων νόησις, καὶ ἡ θεωρία τῶν ἰδεῶν ἀνεπτέρου μοι τὴν φρόνησιν, ὀλίγου τε ἐντὸς χρόνου ᾧμην σοφὸς γεγονέναι, καὶ ὑπὸ βλακειᾶς ἠλπίζον 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 πολλῶ 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 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 zuzuordnen. Diese Einordnung läßt sich genau festlegen. Er gehört der sogenannt orthodoxen Richtung unter den Schulplatonikern an, wie sie vornehmlich durch Plutarch und Attikos repräsentiert wird.

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

As an “orthodox” middle Platonist, “rejoicing in the teachings of Plato” – τοῖς Πλάτωνος χαίρων διδάγμασι (2 *Apol.* 12.1), Justin claims that he met an old man while he was meditating near the sea.<sup>4</sup> 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).

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

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

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 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" – ἄσεβες 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" – λουσαμένω τὸ ὑπὲρ ἀφέσεως ἀμαρτιῶν 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.<sup>5</sup>

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

---

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

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



## B. JUSTIN'S WORKS.

Πλείστα δὲ οὗτος καταλέλοιπεν ἡμῖν πεπαιδευμένης διανοίας καὶ περὶ τὰ θεῖα ἔσπουδακίας 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 (ibid. 14.10). This matches the address with which the text known to us as the *First Apology* begins,<sup>9</sup> 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 Ἐλεγχον "a Refutation" (ibid., 4). In addition he discusses Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* (ibid., 6) as well as three other works, *Psalmes* (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.*

---

<sup>9</sup> Αὐτοκράτορι Τίτῳ Αἰλίῳ Ἀδριανῶ Ἀντωνίνῳ Εὐσεβεῖ Σεβαστῶ Καίσαρι, καὶ Οὐηρισσίμῳ υἱῶ Φιλοσόφῳ, καὶ Λουκίῳ Φιλοσόφῳ, Καίσαρος φύσει υἱῶ καὶ Εὐσεβοῦς εἰσποιητῶ, ἔραστῇ παιδείας, ἱερᾶ τε συγκλήτῳ καὶ δήμῳ παντὶ Ῥωμαίων "To the emperor, Titus Aelius Hadrianus Antoninus 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).

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

### C. CLASSIFICATION OF THE “SECOND APOLOGY.”

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

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

Others have challenged this conclusion. Marcovich argues:

As for internal evidence, each *Apology* displays a separate unity. For example, as a kind of Ringcomposition, 1 A. opens with the terms 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, τοῦσδε 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 ἀπολογία (*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 δεδηλωμένη ἀπολογία (*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.

---

<sup>10</sup> 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.

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 ἀυτοκράτορι 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 γεγεννησθαι τὸν Χριστὸν (1 *Apol.* 46.1). Sir Fredrick Kenyon was the first to narrow this from a reference in *The First Apology* 29.2 to an event involving L. Munatius Felix, who was Prefect of Egypt from 150-154 A.D. (*PIR*, v.2(1983) M723), which Justin claimed happened “presently” – 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 χθές δὲ καὶ πρῶην 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. 193<sup>r</sup> to f. 201<sup>r</sup> (*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 *Claramontanus 82*] (a) is a later manuscript dated to April 2, 1541, which is an apograph of *Parisinus gr. 450*. It was copied by a scribe named Georgios Kokolos (ibid., AC, p. 6).

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

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

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

---

**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.

## ABBREVIATIONS

1 *Apol.* = Justin. *First Apology*.

2 *Apol.* = Justin. *Second Apology*.

AC = Miroslav Marcovich. *Iustini Martyris Apologiae Pro Christianis*.

abr. = abridged.

AD = *Anno Domini*, in the year of the Lord.

*Ad Scap.* = Tertullian. *To Scapula*.

add. = *addit*, adds.

*Adv. Haer.* = Irenaeus. *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 Testament and Early Christian Literature*.

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 Martyris 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*.



## **TEXT & TRANSLATION**

**Endnotes**

**Bibliography & Suggested Reading**

## 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.

KMP

### SIGLA

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

### BREVIATA

- <\*> 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. – Heidelberg, 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 εἶη.

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

**3.1 (8.1) Κάγω 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 Ἰουστίνος εικότως καὶ ἀκολούθως ἄς προεμνηνεύσαμεν αὐτοῦ φωνὰς ἐπάγει λέγων “κάγω οὖν προσδοκῶ ὑπό τινος τῶν ὠνομασμένων ἐπιβουλευθῆναι” καὶ τὰ λοιπά.

**1** Καὶ τὰ χθὲς δὲ καὶ πρῶην ἐν τῇ πόλει ὑμῶν γενόμενα ἐπὶ Οὐρβίκου, [ὧ' Ῥωμαῖοι,] καὶ τὰ πανταχοῦ ὁμοίως ὑπὸ τῶν ἡγουμένων ἀλόγως πραττόμενα ἐξηνάγκασέ με ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, ὁμοιοπαθῶν ὄντων καὶ ἀδελφῶν, κἄν ἀγνοήτε  
5 καὶ μὴ θέλητε διὰ τὴν δόξαν τῶν νομιζομένων ἀξιομάτων, τὴν τῶνδε τῶν λόγων σύνκ'ταξιὺν ποιήσασθαι. **2** Πανταχοῦ γάρ, ὅς ἂν σωφρονίζηται ὑπὸ πατρὸς ἢ γείτονος ἢ τέκνου ἢ φίλου ἢ ἀδελφοῦ ἢ ἀνδρὸς ἢ γυναικὸς κατ'ὧ ἔλλειψιν, χωρὶς τῶν πεισθέντων τοὺς ἀδίκους καὶ ἀκολάστους ἐν αἰωνίῳ  
10 πυρὶ κολασθῆσασθαι, τοὺς δ'ὧ ἐναρέτους καὶ ὁμοίως Χριστῶ βιώσαντας ἐν ἀπαθείᾳ συγγενήσ'εσθαι τῶ θεῶ· λέγομεν δὲ τῶν γενομένων Χριστιανῶν, διὰ τὸ δυσμετάθετον καὶ  
15 φιλήδονον καὶ δυσκίνητον πρὸς τὸ καλὸν ὀρμῆσαι <\*) καὶ οἱ φαῦλοι δαίμονες, ἐχθραίνοντες ἡμῖν καὶ τοὺς τοιούτους δικαστὰς ἔχοντες ὑποχειρίους καὶ λατρεύοντας, ὡς οὖν ἄρχοντας δαιμονίωντας, φονεύειν ἡμᾶς παρασκευάζουσιν. **3** Ὅπως δὲ καὶ ἡ αἰτία τοῦ παντὸς γενομένου ἐπὶ Οὐρβίκου φανερὰ ὑμῖν γένηται, τὰ πεπραγμένα ἀπαγγελω.

A f. 193<sup>v</sup>

**2** Γυνὴ τις συνεβίου ἀνδρὶ ἀκολασταίνοντι, ἀκολασταίνουσα καὶ αὐτῇ πρότερον. **2** Ἐπεὶ δὲ τὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ διδάγματα ἔγνω αὐτὴ < ἔσωφρονίσθη καὶ τὸν ἄνδρα ὁμοίως σωφρονεῖν πείθειν ἐπειράτο, τὰ  
5 διδάγματα ἀναφέρουσα, τὴν 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 γαμετὴν·  
10 **4** ἀσεβὲς γὰρ ἡγουμένη τὸ λοιπὸν ἢ γυνὴ συγκατακλίεσθαι ἀνδρὶ, 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

A f. 193<sup>v</sup>

...

*Inscriptio* A: Ἰουστῖνος δεῦτερον ὑπὲρ τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς δογμάτων βιβλίον ἀναδούς τοῖς δεδηλωμένοις ἄρχουσιν *Eus. HE*, 4.16.1 **1.1** χθὲς δὲ A: χθὲς τε *Sylburg*, *Otto*, *Braun*, *Marcovich* **6** σύνταξις *Sylburg*, *Pearson*, *Marcovich* (*Dial.* 80.3 σύνταξις ποιήσομαι): σύνταξις A **11** συγγενήσασθαι *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 αὐτῇ A: ἔγνωσαν οὗτοι A mg: ἔγνω *Eus.* **3** ἔσωφρονίσθη ...ἐλεγχόμενον (55) *Eus.*: om. A a

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

**1** O Romans, the things which recently<sup>1</sup> 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*,<sup>2</sup> 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<sup>3</sup> 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> Idiomatic expression, lit. *both yesterday and the day before*. <sup>2</sup> Some scholars believe there is a gap here in the ms. <sup>3</sup> Or *self-controlled*.

## Ἀπολογία Δευτέρα - 2.6-2.14

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

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 ὁμοδαίτιος καὶ ὁμόκοιτος γινομένη, τὸ λεγόμενον παρῶ  
20 ὑμῖν ρεπούδιον δοῦσα ἐχωρίσθη. 7 Ὁ δὲ καλὸς κάγαθος  
ταύτης ἀνὴρ, δέον αὐτὸν χαίρειν ὅτι ἅ 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 ἀπαλλαγίσης κατηγορίαν  
πεποιήται, λέγων αὐτὴν Χριστιανὴν εἶναι. 8 Καὶ ἡ μὲν  
βιβλιδιὸν σοι τῶ ἀυτοκράτορι ἀνέδωκε, πρότερον  
συγκωρηθῆναι αὐτῇ διοικήσασθαι τὰ ἑαυτῆς ἀξιοῦσα, ἔπειτα  
ἀπολογησασθαι περὶ τοῦ κατηγορήματος μετὰ τὴν τῶν  
30 πραγμάτων αὐτῆς διοίκησιν· καὶ συνεχώρησας τοῦτο.

9 Ὁ δὲ ταύτης ποτὲ ἀνὴρ, πρὸς ἐκείνην [μὲν] μὴ δυνάμενος  
τανῦν ἔτι λέγειν, πρὸς Πτολεμαῖόν τινα ὄν Οὐρβικὸς  
ἐκολάσατο, διδάσκαλον ἐκείνης τῶν Χριστιανῶν μαθημά-  
των γενόμενον, ἐτράπετο διὰ τοῦδε τοῦ τρόπου.  
35 10 Ἐκατόνταρχον εἰς δεσμὰ ἐμβαλόντα τὸν Πτολεμαῖον,  
φίλον αὐτῶ ὑπάρχοντα, ἔπεισε λαβέσθαι τοῦ Πτολεμαίου  
καὶ ἀνερωτῆσαι εἰ, αὐτὸ τοῦτο μόνον, Χριστιανὸς ἐστί.  
11 Καὶ τὸν Πτολεμαῖον, φιλαλήθη ἄλλῳ οὐκ ἀπατηλὸν οὐδὲ  
ψευδολόγον τὴν γνώμην ὄντα, ὁμολογήσαντα ἑαυτὸν εἶναι  
40 Χριστιανόν, ἐν δεσμοῖς γενέσθαι ὁ ἐκατόνταρχος πεποιήκεν,  
καὶ ἐπὶ πολὺν χρόνον ἐν τῶ δεσμοτηρίῳ ἐκολάσατο.

12 Τελευταῖον δέ, ὅτε ἐπὶ Οὐρβικὸν ἤχθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος,  
ὁμοίως αὐτὸ τοῦτο μόνον ἐξητάσθη, εἰ εἶη Χριστιανός.  
13 Καὶ πάλιν, τὰ καλὰ ἑαυτῶ συνεπιστάμενος διὰ τὴν ἀπό-  
45 τοῦ Χριστοῦ διδαχὴν, τὸ διδασκαλεῖον τῆς θείας ἀρετῆς  
ὠμολόγησεν. 14 Ὁ γὰρ ἀρνούμενος ὅτιοῦν ἢ κατεγνωκῶς  
τοῦ πράγματος ἕξαρνος 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 ἢ 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 Οὐρβικίος *Eus.*

## JUSTIN'S SECOND APOLOGY - 2.6-2.14

**6** But, after her husband, who had gone into Alexandria, was reported doing worse things, in order that she would not become a partner in his unjust and impious deeds, staying in a marriage yoke with him, sharing both his table and his bed, she was separated from him, giving what you call a bill of repudiation.<sup>4</sup> **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<sup>5</sup> because of the teachings of Christ, confessed his schooling in divine virtue. **14** For one who denies something either denounces the thing which he denies or considering himself unworthy and wholly removed

---

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

## Ἀπολογία Δευτέρα - 2.15-3.3

- φεύγει· ὧν οὐδὲν πρόσσεστιν τῷ ἀληθινῷ Χριστιανῶ.
- 50 **15** Καὶ τοῦ Οὐρβίκου κελεύσαντος αὐτὸν ἀπαχθῆναι Λούκιος τις, καὶ αὐτὸς ὧν Χριστιανός, ὀρῶν τὴν ἀλόγως οὕτως γενομένην κρίσιν, πρὸς τὸν Οὐρβίκον ἔφη· **16** “Τίς ἡ αἰτία; τοῦ μήτε μοιχὸν μήτε πόρνον μήτε ἀνδροφόνον μήτε λωποδύτην μήτε ἄρπαγα μήτε ἀπλῶς ἀδίκημά τι πράξαντα ...
- 55 ἐλεγχόμενον, > ὀνόματος δὲ Χριστιανοῦ προσωνυμίαν ὁμολογοῦντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον τοῦτον ἐκολάσω; Οὐ πρόποντα Εὐσεβεῖ αὐτοκράτορι οὐδὲ φιλοσόφου Καίσαρος παιδι οὐδὲ τῇ ἱερᾷ συγκλήτῳ κρίνεις, ὧ Οὐρβικε.” **17** Καὶ ὅς οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἀποκρινάμενος [καὶ] πρὸς τὸν Λούκιον ἔφη· “Δοκεῖς μοι
- 60 καὶ σύ εἶναι τοιοῦτος.” **18** Καὶ τοῦ Λουκίου φήσαντος· “Μάλιστα,” πάλιν καὶ αὐτὸν ἀπαχθῆναι ἐκέλευσεν. **19** Ὁ δὲ καὶ χάριν εἶδέναι ὠμολόγει, πονηρῶν δεσποτῶν τῶν τοιούτων ἀπηλλάχθαι γινώσκων καὶ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα καὶ βασιλέα τῶν οὐρανῶν πορεύεσθαι. **20** Καὶ ἄλλος δὲ τρίτος
- 65 ἐπελθὼν κολασθῆναι προσετιμῆθη.
- 3** (8) Κάγῳ οὖν προσδοκῶ ὑπὸ τινος τῶν ὠνομασμένων ἐπιβουλευθῆναι καὶ ξύλω ἐμπαγῆναι, ἢ κἂν ὑπὸ Κρίσκεντος τοῦ φιλοσόφου καὶ φιλοκόμπου. **2** Οὐ γὰρ φιλόσοφον εἶπεν ἄξιον τὸν ἄνδρα, ὅς γε περὶ ἡμῶν ἂ μὴ
- 5 ἐπίσταται δημοσίᾳ καταμαρτυρεῖ, ὡς ἀθέων καὶ ἄσεβῶν Χριστιανῶν ὄντων, πρὸς χάριν καὶ ἡδονὴν τῶν πολλῶν τῶν πεπλανημένων ταῦτα πράττων. **3** Εἶτε γὰρ μὴ ἐντυχῶν τοῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ διδάγμασι κατατρέχει ἡμῶν, μαμπόνηρός ἐστι καὶ ἰδιωτῶν πολὺ χείρων, οἱ φυλάττονται πολλάκις περὶ
- 10 ὧν οὐκ ἐπίστανται διαλέγεσθαι καὶ ψευδομαρτυρεῖν· ἢ εἰ ἐντυχῶν, (μὴ συνῆκε) τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς μεγαλεῖον, ἢ συνεῖς, πρὸς τὸ μὴ ὑποπτευθῆναι τοιοῦτος ταῦτα ποιεῖ, πολὺ μᾶλλον

A f. 193V

A f. 196V

**55** ὀνόματος δὲ Χριστιανοῦ *Eus.*: παθήματος δὲ Χριστοῦ A, Steph. **57** Εὐσεβῆ A **58** τῆ A: om. *Eus.* **60** τοῦ *Eus.*: om. A **61** καί² A: om. *Eus.* **62** πονηρῶν A: πονηρῶν γὰρ *Eus.* **63** γινώσκων A: ἐπέπεν *Eus.* πρὸς τὸν πατέρα καὶ βασιλέα τῶν οὐρανῶν A: παρὰ ἀγαθὸν πατέρα καὶ βασιλέα τὸν θεὸν *Eus.* **65** ἐπελθὼν *Eus.*: ἀπελθὼν A **3.1** κάγῳ οὖν... post προσετιμῆθη (2.60) *Eus. HE*, 4.16,17, Maran: κάγῳ οὖν...ἀδιαφορίας (28) post ἐδίδαξε (8.19) A: οὖν om. *Pasch.* ὀνομασμένων A **2** ἐμπαγῆναι A, *Eus.Syg.*: ἐντιναγῆναι *Eus.*: ἐντιναχθῆναι *Pasch.* **3** Κρίσκεντος A: Κρήσκεντος *Eus.* φιλοσόφου A: ἀφιλοσόφου *Eus. Pasch.* **4** ἡμῶν ἂ A: ὧν *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

## JUSTIN'S SECOND APOLOGY - 2.15-3.3

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

**15** When Urbicus ordered him to be led away, a certain Lucius, who was also a Christian, seeing the unreasonable judgment that happened in this way, said to Urbicus, **16** "What is the charge? Why do you punish one who is neither an adulterer, nor fornicator, nor murderer, nor a thief, nor a plunderer, nor in fact, blamed in any matter except that of confessing to the proscription of the name Christian?<sup>6</sup> 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<sup>7</sup> 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,<sup>8</sup> 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.

---

**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.

## Ἄπολογία Δευτέρα - 3.4-4.4

ἀγεννῆς καὶ παμπόνηρος, ἰδιωτικῆς καὶ ἀλόγου δόξης καὶ φόβου ἐλάττων ὢν.

- 15 **4** Καὶ γὰρ προθέντα με καὶ ἐρωτήσαντα αὐτὸν ἐρωτήσεις  
τινάς τοιαύτας καὶ μαθεῖν καὶ ἐλέγξει, ὅτι ἀληθῶς μηδὲν  
ἐπίσταται, εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς βούλομαι. | **5** Καὶ ὅτι ἀληθῆ λέγω, A f. 197<sup>f</sup>  
εἰ μὴ ἀνηνέχθησαν ἡμῖν αἱ κοινωναὶ τῶν λόγων, ἔτοιμος  
καὶ ἐφῶ ὑμῶν κοινωνεῖν τῶν ἐρωτήσεων πάλιν· βασιλικὸν δῶ  
20 ἂν καὶ τοῦτο ἔργον εἶη. **6** Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐγνωσθησαν ὑμῖν αἱ  
ἐρωτήσεις μου καὶ αἱ ἐκείνου ἀποκρίσεις, φανερόν ὑμῖν ἐστίν  
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 μὴδὲ τὸ Σωκρατικόν, ἀξιέραστον ὄν, τιμᾶ· “Ἄλλῳ οὐτὶ γε  
πρὸ τῆς ἀληθείας τιμητέος ἀνὴρ.” **7** Ἀδύνατον δὲ Κυρικῶ,  
ἀδιάφορον τὸ τέλος προκθμεμένω, τὸ ἀγαθὸν εἰδέναι πλὴν  
ἀδιαφορίας.

A f. 197<sup>v</sup>

**4** (3) “Ὅπως δὲ μὴ τις εἶπῃ· “Πάντες οὖν ἑαυτοὺς  
A f. 193<sup>v</sup>  
φονεύσαντες πορεύεσθε ἤδη παρὰ τὸν θεὸν καὶ ἡμῖν  
πράγματα μὴ παρέχετε,” ἐρῶ διῶ ἦν αἰτίαποῦτο οὐ  
πράττομεν, καὶ διῶ ἦν | ἐξεταζόμενοι ἀφόβως ὁμολογ- A f. 194<sup>f</sup>  
5 οῦμεν. **2** Οὐκ εἰκῆ τὸν κόσμον πεποικέναι τὸν θεὸν  
δεδιδάγμεθα, ἀλλῶ ἢ διὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπειον γένος· χαίρειν τε  
τοῖς τὰ προσόντα αὐτῶ μιμουμένοις προέφημεν, ἀπαρ-  
έσκεσθαι δὲ τοῖς τὰ φαῦλα ἀσπαζομένοις ἢ λόγῳ ἢ ἔργῳ.

- 3** Εἰ οὖν πάντες ἑαυτοὺς φονεύσομεν, τοῦ μὴ γεννηθῆναι  
10 τινὰ καὶ μαθητευθῆναι εἰς τὰ θεῖα διδάγματα, ἢ καὶ μὴ  
εἶναι τὸ ἀνθρώπειον γένος, ὅσον ἐφῶ ἡμῖν, αἵτιοι ἐσόμεθα,  
ἐναντίον τῆ τοῦ θεοῦ βουλῆ 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** ἔτοιμος A *Eus.*: ἔτοιμος  
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 τιμᾶ A *Eus.*: ὅλως ἐπίσταται *Pasch.* **27** προθεμένω  
Nolte, Otto: προεμένω A **4.7** προέφημεν A: ὡς προέφημεν add. (cf. I  
*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



## JUSTIN'S SECOND APOLOGY - 3.4-4.4

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."<sup>9</sup> 7 But it is impossible for a Cynic, desiring indifference in the end, to know any good except indifference.

**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<sup>10</sup> 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

---

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Plato *Rep.* 10.595C. <sup>10</sup> In most instances where Justin uses this word, *as* is added before it, with the sense - *as we said before*. It is unclear in this verse if its absence is a scribal omission or not.

## Ἀπολογία Δευτέρα - 5.1-6.3

ὕμᾱς δὲ καὶ τῆς ἀδίκου προλήψεως ἀπαλλάξαι νῦν σπεύδοντες.

**5** (4) Εἰ δέ τινα ὑπέλθοι καὶ ἡ ἔν(κ)νοια αὕτη ὅτι, εἰ θεὸν ὠμολογοῦμεν βοηθόν, οὐκ ἂν, ὡς λέγομεν, ὑπὸ ἀδίκων ἐκρατούμεθα καὶ ἐτιμωρούμεθα, καὶ τοῦτο διαλύσω. **2** Ὁ θεὸς τὸν πάντα κόσμον ποιήσας καὶ τὰ ἐπίγεια ἀνθρώποις ὑποτάξας καὶ τὰ οὐράνια στοιχεῖα εἰς αὔξησιν καρπῶν καὶ ὠρῶν μεταβολὰς κοσμήσας καὶ θεῖον τούτοις νόμον τάξας, ἃ καὶ αὐτὰ διῶ ἀνθρώπους φαίνεται πεποικώς, τὴν μὲν τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τῶν ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν πρόνοιαν ἀγγέλοις, οὓς ἐπὶ τούτοις ἔταξε, παρέδωκεν.

**10** **3** Οἱ δὲ ἄγγελοι, παραβάντες τὴνδε τὴν τάξιν, γυναικῶν μίξεσιν ἠττήθησαν καὶ παῖδας ἐτέκνωσαν, οἳ εἰσιν οἱ λεγόμενοι δαίμονες. **4** Καὶ προσέτι λοιπὸν τὸ ἀνθρώπ(κ)ειον γένος ἑαυτοῖς ἐδούλωσαν· τὰ μὲν διὰ μαγικῶν γραφῶν, τὰ δὲ διὰ φόβων καὶ τιμωριῶν, (ῶν) ἐπέφερον, τὰ δὲ διὰ διδαχῆς **15** θυμάτων καὶ θυμιμάτων καὶ σπονδῶν, ὧν ἐνδεεῖς γεγόνασι μετὰ τὸ πάθεισιν 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 πρᾶξι εἰς ἄρρενας καὶ θηλείας καὶ πόλεις καὶ ἔθνη, ἅπερ συνέγραψαν, εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν θεὸν καὶ τοὺς ὡς ἀπῶ αὐτοῦ σπορᾶ γενομένους υἱοὺς καὶ τῶν λεχθέντων ἐκείνου ἀδελφῶν [καὶ τέκνων ὁμοίως τῶν ἀπῶ ἐκείνων] Ποσειδῶνος καὶ **25** Πλούτωνος, ἀνήνεγκαν. **6** Ὀνόματι γὰρ ἕκαστον, ὅπερ ἕκαστος ἑαυτῶ τῶν ἀγγέλων καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ἔθετο, προσηγόρευσαν.

**6** (5) Ὀνομα δὲ τῶ πάντων πατρὶ θετόν, ἀγεννήτω ὄντι, οὐκ ἔστιν· ῶ γὰρ ἂν καὶ ὄνομά τι προσ-αγορευῆται, πρεσβύτερον ἔχει τὸν θέμενον τὸ ὄνομα. **2** Τὸ δὲ “πατήρ” καὶ “θεὸς” καὶ “κτίστης” καὶ “κύριος” καὶ **5** “δεσπότης” οὐκ ὀνόματά ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ τῶν εὐποιῶν καὶ τῶν ἔργων προσρήσεις.

**3** Ὁ δὲ υἱὸς ἐκείνου, ὁ μόνος λεγόμενος κυρίως υἱός, ὁ Λόγος πρὸ τῶν ποιημάτων [καὶ] συνῶν καὶ γεννώμενος, A f. 195<sup>f</sup>

---

**5.1** ἔνοια A **6** μεταβολὰς Pearson, Thirlby, Marcovich, et al.: μεταβολαῖς A τούτοις Thirlby, Marcovich, et al.: τούτων A **12** ἀνθρώπιον A **14** ῶν Thirlby, Marcovich: om. A **6.2** ὄνομά τι Otto, Marcovich: ὄνοματι A: ὄνοματι τι Gildersleeve

## JUSTIN'S SECOND APOLOGY - 5.1-6.3

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 about which they wrote, attributed them to the god Zeus<sup>11</sup> 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,

---

<sup>11</sup> The ms. reads simply *the god himself*. The identification of Posidon and Pluto as his brothers make it clear Justin has Zeus in mind.

## Ἀπολογία Δευτέρα - 6.4-7.4

10 ὅτε τὴν ἀρχὴν διῶ αὐτοῦ πάντα ἔκτισε καὶ ἐκόσμησε, “Χριστὸς” μὲν κατὰ τὸ “κεχρῖσθαι” καὶ κοσμηῆσαι τὰ πάντα διῶ αὐτοῦ τὸν θεὸν λέγεται, ὄνομα καὶ αὐτὸ περιέχον ἄγνωστον σημασίαν, ὃν τρόπον καὶ τὸ “θεὸς” προσαγόρευμα οὐκ ὄνομά ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ πράγμα(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 βουλήν ἀποκυηθεὶς ὑπὲρ τῶν πιστευόντων ἀνθρώπων καὶ καταλύσει τῶν δαιμόνων, (ὡς) καὶ νῦν ἐκ τῶν ὑπῆρ 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 20 ἐπαστῶν καὶ φαρμακευτῶν μὴ ἰαθέντας, ἴασαντο 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 ἴνα καὶ οἱ φαῦλοι ἄγγελοι καὶ δαίμονες καὶ ἄνθρωποι μηκέτι ᾧσι, διὰ τὸ σπέρμα τῶν Χριστιανῶν, ὃ γινώσκει ἐν τῇ φύσει ὅτι αἰτίον 5 ἐστίν. 2 Ἐπεὶ εἰ μὴ τοῦτο ἦν, οὐκ ἂν οὐδὲ ὑμῖν ταῦτα ἔτι ποιεῖν καὶ ἐνεργεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν φαύλων δαιμόνων δυνατὸν ἦν, ἀλλὰ ἰ τὸ πῦρ τὸ τῆς κρίσεως κατελθὼν ἀνέδην πάντα A f. 195<sup>v</sup> διέκρινεν, ὡς καὶ πρότερον ὁ κατακλυσμὸς μηδένα λιπῶν ἀλλῶ ἢ τὸν μόνον σὺν τοῖς ἰδίοις παρῶ ἡμῖν καλούμενον Νῶε, παρῶ 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, ἀλλῶ οὐχ, ὡς οἱ Στωϊκοί, κατὰ τὸν τῆς εἰς ἄλληλα πάντων μεταβολῆς λόγον, ὃ αἰσχιστον ἐφάνη· Ἀλλῶ οὐδὲ καθῶ 15 εἵμαρμένην 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 πράγματος A 19 ὡς add. Otto, Gildersleeve, Marcovich, et al.: om. A

## JUSTIN'S SECOND APOLOGY - 6.4-7.4

was called "Christ" with reference to His being anointed and God having arranged<sup>12</sup> 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 judgment would come down unrestrained<sup>13</sup> 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 de-

---

12 Justin appears to suggest a two-fold etymology for the name *Christ*: 1. The word *kechristhai* meaning "to be anointed," and (the unusual suggestion,) 2. The word *kosmesai* meaning "to have arranged." 13 Or simply.

## Ἀπολογία Δευτέρα - 7.5-8.4

μη νοήσαντες οἱ Στωϊκοὶ καθῶ εἰμαρμένης ἀνάγκην πάντα γίνεσθαι ἀπεφήναντο.

5 Ἄλλῳ 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 ἤδε ἡ φύσις, κακίας καὶ ἀρετῆς δεκτικὸν εἶναι· οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἦν ἐπαινετὸν οὐδὲν αὐτῶν, εἰ οὐκ ἦν ἐπῶ ἀμφότερα τρέπεσθαι [καὶ] δύναμιν εἶχε.

7 Δεικνύουσι δὲ τοῦτο καὶ οἱ πανταχοῦ κατὰ λόγον τὸν  
30 ὀρθὸν νομοθετήσαντες καὶ φιλοσοφήσαντες ἄνθρωποι ἐκ τοῦ ὑπαγορεύειν τάδε μὲν πράττειν, τῶνδε δὲ ἀπέχεσθαι. A f. 196<sup>r</sup>

8 Καὶ οἱ Στωϊκοὶ φιλόσοφοι ἐν τῷ περὶ ἠθῶν λόγῳ τὰ αὐτὰ τιμῶσι καρτερῶς, ὡς δηλοῦσθαι ἐν τῷ περὶ ἀρχῶν καὶ ἀσωμάτων λόγῳ οὐκ εὐδοῦν αὐτούς. 9 Εἴτε γὰρ καθῶ  
35 εἰμαρμένην φήσουσι τὰ γινόμενα πρὸς ἀνθρώπων γίνεσθαι, ἢ μηδὲν εἶναι θεὸν παρὰ τρεπόμενα καὶ ἀλλοιούμενα καὶ ἀναλυόμενα εἰς τὰ αὐτὰ αἰεὶ, φθαρτῶν μόνων φανήσονται κατάληψιν ἐσχηκέναι καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν θεὸν διὰ τε τῶν μερῶν καὶ διὰ τοῦ ὅλου ἐν πάσῃ κακίᾳ γινόμενον ἢ μηδὲν εἶναι κακίαν  
40 μηδῶ ἀρετῆν· ὅπερ καὶ παρὰ πᾶσαν σῶφρονα ἔννοιαν καὶ λόγον καὶ νοῦν ἐστί.

**8** (7) Καὶ τοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν Στωϊκῶν δὲ δογμάτων, ἐπειδὴ  
κἂν τὸν ἠθικὸν λόγον κόσμιοι γεγόνασιν, ὡς καὶ ἐν τισὶν οἱ ποιηταὶ, διὰ τὸ ἐμφυτον παντὶ γένει ἀνθρώπων σπέρμα τοῦ Λόγου, μεμισῆσθαι [καὶ πεφονεῦσθαι] οἶδαμεν·  
5 Ἡράκλειτον μὲν, ὡς προέφημεν, καὶ Μουσώνιον δὲ ἐν τοῖς καθῶ ἡμᾶς καὶ ἄλλους [οἶδαμεν]. 2 Ὡς γὰρ ἐσημάναμεν, πάντα τοὺς κἂν ὀπωσδήποτε κατὰ Λόγον βιοῦν σπουδάζοντας καὶ κακίαν φεύγειν μισεῖσθαι αἰεὶ ἐνήργησαν οἱ δαίμονες. 3 Οὐδὲν δὲ θαυμαστόν, εἰ τοὺς κατὰ σπερματικῶ  
10 λόγου μέρος, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ παντὸς Λόγου, ὅ ἐστι Χριστοῦ γινώσκοντες καὶ θεωρίαν, πολὺ μᾶλλον μισεῖσθαι οἱ δαίμονες ἐλεγχόμενοι ἐνεργοῦσιν· οἱ τὴν ἀξίαν ἢ κόλασιν καὶ τιμωρίαν κομίσονται ἐν αἰωνίῳ πυρὶ ἐγκλεισθέντες. 4 Εἰ γὰρ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἤδη διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος Ἰησοῦ  
15 Χριστοῦ ἠτῶνται, διδαγμά ἐστι τῆς καὶ μελλούσης αὐτοῖς καὶ τοῖς λατρεύουσιν αὐτοῖς ἐσομένης ἐν πυρὶ αἰωνίῳ

A f. 196<sup>v</sup>

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

## JUSTIN'S SECOND APOLOGY - 7.5-8.4

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

5 But because God in the beginning made both the race of angels and of men with their own power<sup>14</sup> 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 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,<sup>15</sup> 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

---

14 Or *free will*. 15 Or *proven the cause*.

## Ἀπολογία Δευτέρα - 8.5-10.3

κολάσεως. 5 Οὕτως γὰρ καὶ οἱ προφηταὶ πάντες προεκήρυξαν γενήσεσθαι, καὶ Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἡμέτερος διδάσκαλος ἐδίδαξε.

**9** Ἴνα δὲ μὴ τις εἶπη τὸ λεγόμενον ὑπὸ τῶν νομιζομένων φιλοσόφων, ὅτι κόμπιοι καὶ φόβητρά ἐστι τὰ λεγόμενα ὑφ᾽ ἡμῶν ὅτι κολάζονται ἐν αἰωνίῳ πυρὶ οἱ ἄδικοι, καὶ διὰ φόβον ἀλλῶ οὐ διὰ τὸ καλὸν εἶναι καὶ ἀρεστὸν ἐναρέτως  
5 βιοῦν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀξιούμεν, βραχυεπῶς πρὸς τοῦτο ἀποκρινοῦμαι, ὅτι, εἰ μὴ τοῦτό ἐστιν, οὔτε ἔστι θεός, ἢ, εἰ ἔστιν, οὐ μέλει αὐτῷ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ οὐδὲν ἐστιν ἀρετὴ οὐδὲ κακία, καί, ὡς προέφημεν, ἀδίκως τιμωροῦσιν οἱ νομοθέται τοὺς παραβαίνοντας τὰ διατεταγμένα καλά. 2 Ἄλλῳ ἐπεὶ  
10 οὐκ ἄδικοι ἐκείνοι καὶ ὁ αὐτῶν πατήρ, τὰ αὐτὰ αὐτῷ πράττειν διὰ τοῦ Λόγου διδάσκων, οἱ τούτοις συντιθέμενοι οὐκ ἴ ἄδικοι.

**3** Ἐὰν δὲ τις τοὺς διαφόρους νόμους τῶν ἀνθρώπων προβάληται, λέγων ὅτι παρῶ οἷς μὲν ἀνθρώποις τάδε καλά,  
15 τὰ δὲ αἰσχρὰ νενόμισται, παρῶ ἄλλοις δὲ τὰ παρῶ ἐκείνοις αἰσχρὰ καλά, καὶ τὰ καλά αἰσχρὰ νομίζεται, ἀκουέσθαι καὶ τῶν εἰς τοῦτο λεγομένων. 4 Καὶ νόμους διατάξασθαι τῇ ἑαυτῶν κακίᾳ ὁμοίους τοὺς πονηροὺς ἀγγέλους ἐπιστάμεθα, οἷς χαίρουσιν οἱ ὅμοιοι γενόμενοι ἀνθρώποι, καὶ ὀρθὸς Λόγος  
20 παρελθὼν οὐ πάσας δόξας οὐδὲ πάντα δόγματα καλά ἀποδείκνυσιν, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν φαῦλα, τὰ δὲ ἀγαθὰ· ὥστε μοι καὶ πρὸς τοὺς τοιούτους τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ τὰ ὅμοια εἰρήσεται, καὶ λεχθήσεται διὰ πλειόνων, ἐὰν χρεῖα 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 διῶ ἡμᾶς Χριστὸν γεγενῆσθαι, καὶ σῶμα καὶ λόγον καὶ ψυχὴν. 2 Ὅσα γὰρ  
5 καλῶς αἰεὶ ἐφθέγγαντο καὶ εὔρον οἱ φιλοσοφήσαντες ἢ νομοθετήσαντες, κατὰ Λόγου μέρος εὐρέσεως καὶ θεωρίας ἐστὶ πονηθέντα αὐτοῖς. 3 Ἐπειδὴ 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: ἐαυτῷ 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** εὐρέσεως A: διῶ εὐρέσεως add. Otto, et.al.



## JUSTIN'S SECOND APOLOGY - 8.5-10.3

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.

**10** Therefore our teachings appear to be the most noble of all human teaching, because Christ became the whole Logos<sup>16</sup> manifested for our sake even body, mind,<sup>17</sup> 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,

---

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

## Ἀπολογία Δευτέρα - 10.4-11.4

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

10 **4** Καὶ οἱ προγεγραμμένοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον, λόγῳ πειραθέντες τὰ πράγματα θεωρῆσαι καὶ ἐλέγξαι, ὡς ἀσεβεῖς καὶ περιέργοι εἰς δικαστήρια ἤχθησαν.

**5** Ὁ πάντων δὲ αὐτῶν εὐτονώτερος πρὸς τοῦτο γενόμενος Ἰσωκράτης τὰ αὐτὰ ἡμῖν ἐνεκλήθη· καὶ γὰρ ἔφασαν αὐτὸν A f. 198<sup>f</sup>

15 καινὰ δαιμόνια εἰσφέρειν, καὶ οὖς ἡ πόλις νομίζει θεοὺς μὴ ἡγεῖσθαι [αὐτόν]. **6** Ὁ δὲ δαίμονας μὲν τοὺς φαύλους καὶ [τούς] πράξαντας ἅ ἔφασαν οἱ ποιηταί, ἐκβαλὼν τῆς πολιτείας καὶ Ὀμηρον καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ποιητάς, παραιτεῖσθαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐδίδαξε, πρὸς θεοῦ δὲ τοῦ **20** ἀγνώστου αὐτοῖς διὰ λόγου ζητήσεως ἐπίγνωσιν προὔτρεπετο, εἰπὼν· “Τὸν δὲ πατέρα καὶ δημιουργὸν πάντων οὐθῶ εὐρεῖν ῥάδιον, οὐθῶ εὐρόντα εἰς πάντα εἰπεῖν ἀσφαλές.”

**7** Ἄ 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 ὢν, καὶ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν προειπὼν τὰ μέλλοντα γίνεσθαι καὶ διῶ ἑαυτοῦ ὁμοιοπαθοῦς γενομένου [καὶ] διδάξαντος **30** ταῦτα, οὐ φιλόσοφοι οὐδὲ φιλόλογοι μόνον ἐπέισθησαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ χειροτέχνη καὶ παντελῶς ἰδιῶται, καὶ δόξης καὶ φόβου καὶ θανάτου καταφρονήσαντες· ἐπειδὴ δύναμις ἐστὶ τοῦ ἀρρήτου πατρὸς καὶ οὐχὶ ἀνθρωπέου λόγου τὰ σκευή.

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

5 **2** Καίτοι γε ἰ καὶ τὸ Ζενοφῶν(τ)ειον ἐκεῖνο νῦν πρὸς τε A f. 198<sup>v</sup> Κρίσκεντα καὶ τοὺς ὁμοίως αὐτῷ ἀφραίνοντας καλὸν καὶ εὐκαιρον εἰπεῖν ἡγοῦμεθα.

**3** Τὸν Ἡρακλέα ἐπὶ τρίοδόν τινα ἔφη ὁ Ζενοφῶν βαδίζοντα εὐρεῖν τὴν τε ἀρετὴν καὶ τὴν κακίαν, ἐν γυναικῶν **10** μορφαῖς φαινομένας. **4** Καὶ τὴν μὲν κακίαν, ἀβρᾶ ἔσθητι καὶ ἔρωτοπεποιημένῳ καὶ ἀνθοῦντι ἐκ τῶν τοιούτων προσώπῳ,

---

**10.10** προγεγραμμένοι A: προγεγεννημένοι Thirlby, Otto, Marcovich (cf. 1 *Apol.* 46.12) **25** ἐπιστεύθη A: ἐπέισθη Thirlby, Otto, Marcovich **33** τὰ σκευή A: κατασκευή Pearson (*Dial.* 58.1 κατασκευή λόγου), Marcovich **11.4** ὠφείλετο A **5** Ζενοφῶτειον A

## JUSTIN'S SECOND APOLOGY -10.4-11.4

(which is Christ), they often argued against themselves.

**4** And those written about before<sup>18</sup> Christ (as concerns His human nature), who tried by reason to observe and test things were dragged into the law courts as impious and meddling. **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."<sup>19</sup>

**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<sup>20</sup> 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.<sup>21</sup>

**3** Herakles, walking upon a threefold road, says Xenophon, found Virtue and Vice<sup>22</sup> 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

---

**18** Some scholars think this should be *born before*. **19** A paraphrase of Plato, *Tim.* 28C **20** I.e. *scholars*. **21** Xenophon, *Mem.* 2.1.21. **22** Or *wickedness*.

## Ἀπολογία Δευτέρα - 11.5-12.2

θελκτικὴν τε εὐθύς [πρὸς] τὰς ὄψεις οὔσαν, εἰπεῖν πρὸς τὸν Ἑρακλέα ὅτι, ἦν αὐτῇ ἔπηται, ἠδόμενόν τε καὶ κεκοσμημένον τῷ λαμπροτάτῳ καὶ ὁμοίῳ τῷ περὶ αὐτὴν κόσμῳ διαιτήσιν  
15 αἰεὶ ποιήσει. **5** Καὶ τὴν ἀρετὴν ἐν ἀύχημῶν μὲν τῷ προσώπῳ καὶ τῇ περιβολῇ οὔσαν εἰπεῖν· “Ἄλλῳ ἦν ἐμοὶ πείθη, οὐ κόσμῳ οὐδὲ κάλλει τῷ ρέοντι καὶ φθειρομένῳ ἑαυτὸν κοσμήσεις ἀλλὰ τοῖς αἰδίοις καὶ καλοῖς κόσμοις.”

**6** Καὶ πάντῳ ὄντινοῦν πεπεισμεθα, φεύγοντα τὰ δοκοῦντα  
20 καλὰ, 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· ὁ καὶ περὶ Χριστιανῶν καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄθλου καὶ τῶν ἰ ἀνθρώπων τῶν τοιαῦτα πραξάντων, ὅποια ἔφασαν οἱ ποιηταὶ περὶ τῶν νομιζομένων θεῶν, ὑπολαβεῖν δεῖ πάντα  
30 οὖν ἔχει, ἐκ τοῦ καὶ τοῦ φευκτοῦ καταφρονεῖν ἡμᾶς θανάτου λογισμὸν ἔλκοντα.

A f. 199<sup>r</sup>

**12** Καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐγώ, τοῖς Πλάτωνος χαίρων διδάγμασι, διαβαλλομένους ἀκούων Χριστιανούς, ὄρων 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 ἀκρατῆς καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων σαρκῶν βορὰν ἀγαθὸν ἠγούμενος δύναται ἂν θάνατον ἀσπάζεσθαι, ὅπως τῶν αὐτοῦ ἀγαθῶν στερηθῇ, ἀλλῶ οὐκ ἐκ παντὸς ζῆν μὲν αἰεὶ τὴν ἐνθάδε βιοτῆν καὶ λανθάνειν τοὺς ἄρχοντας ἐπειράτο, οὐχ ὅτι γε ἑαυτὸν  
10 κατήγγειλε φονευθσόμενον;

---

**19** πεπεισμεθα 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 κατανεοηκότες Schmid ex *Dam.*, Marcovich **26** ἄφθαρτοι A: ἄφθαρτα *Dam.*, Marcovich **28** ἔφθασαν A ante corr. **30** οὖν ἔχει A: νουνεχῆ Thirlby, Otto (cf. I *Apol.* 46. 5 ὁ νουνεχῆς καταλαβεῖν δυνήσεται), Marcovich: om. a **12.3** δὲ A, *Eus* Syr.: δὲ καὶ *Eus.* codd. **4** ἄλλα A: om. *Eus.* **6** ἀνθρωπίνων A: ἀνθρωπίων *Eus.* (cf. I *Apol.* 26.30) **7** ἀγαθὸν ἠγούμενος A: ἠγούμενος ἀγαθὸν *Eus.* **6** αὐτοῦ A: ἑαυτοῦ *Eus.* ἀγαθῶν στερηθῆ A: στερηθείη ἐπιθυμίων *Eus.* **8** μὲν A: om. *Eus.* **9** γε A: om. *Eus.*

## JUSTIN'S SECOND APOLOGY - 11.5-12.2

eyes,<sup>23</sup> said to Herakles that if he would follow her she would always attend closely to make things pleasurable and adorn him in splendor even similar to her own. **5** But Virtue, who was in poverty in appearance and in dress, said: "But, if you should obey me, you shall adorn yourself neither in dress nor beauty which melts away and is destroyed, but eternal and noble garments."

**6** And we are wholly persuaded therefore, that the one fleeing the things that seem beautiful and good, but pursuing the things that are considered hard and unreasonable shall receive happiness. **7** For Vice, putting around herself as a screen for her actions the things which belong to Virtue, which truly are beautiful and good, through an imitation using corruptible things (for she has nothing incorruptible nor is she able to make anything incorruptible), brings into slavery the rotten<sup>24</sup> 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?

---

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

## Ἀπολογία Δευτέρα - 12.3-13.2

3 Ἦδη καὶ τοῦτο ἐνήργησαν οἱ φαῦλοι δαίμονες διὰ τινων  
πονηρῶν ἀνθρώπων πραχθῆναι. 4 Φονεύοντες γὰρ αὐτοὶ  
τινας ἐπὶ συκοφαντίᾳ τῇ εἰς ἡμᾶς καὶ εἰς βασάνους εἴλκυσαν  
οἰκέτας τῶν ἡμετέρων ἢ παῖδας ἢ γυναῖκα, καὶ διῶ αἰκισμῶν  
15 φοβερῶν ἐξαναγκάζουσι κατεπιεῖν ταῦτα τὰ μυθο-  
λογούμενα, ἃ αὐτοὶ φανερώς πράττουσιν.

Ἵων 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 ὠμολογοῦμεν ἀγαθὰ ἢ καὶ φιλοσοφίαν θείαν  
αὐτὰ ἀπεδείκνυμεν, φάσκοντες Κρόνου μὲν μυστήρια τελεῖν  
ἐν τῷ ἀνδροφονεῖν, καὶ ἐν τῷ αἵματος ἐμπίπλασθαι, ὡς  
λέγεται, τὰ ἴσα τῷ παρῶ ἡμῖν τιμωμένῳ εἰδῶλω, ᾧ οὐ μόνον  
ἀλόγων ζώων αἵματα προσραίνεται ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀνθρώπεια,  
25 διὰ τοῦ παρῶ ἡμῖν ἐπισημοτάτου καὶ εὐγενεστάτου ἀνδρὸς  
τὴν πρόσχυσιν τοῦ 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 ἀπολογία 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· ἀλλῶ  
οὐ φροντίζομεν, ἐπεὶ θεὸν τῶν πάντων ἐπόπτην δίκαιον  
οἶδαμεν. 7 Εἰ δὲ καὶ νῦν τις ἦν τραγικῆ φωνῇ ἀνεβόησεν ἐπὶ  
35 τι βῆμα ὑψηλὸν ἀναβάς: “Αἰδέσθητε, αἰδέσθητε ἃ φανερώς  
πράττετε εἰς ἀναιτίους ἀναφέροντες, καὶ τὰ προσόντα καὶ  
ἑαυτοῖς καὶ τοῖς ὑμετέροις θεοῖς περιβάλλοντες τούτοις ὦν  
οὐδὲν οὐδῶ ἐπὶ ποσὸν μετουσία ἐστί. Μετάθεσθε, σωφ-  
ρονίσθητε.”

**13** Καὶ γὰρ ἐγώ, μαθὼν περίβλημα πονηρὸν εἰς  
ἀποστροφὴν τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων περιτεθει-  
μένον ὑπὸ τῶν φαύλων δαιμόνων τοῖς Χριστι-  
ανῶν θεοῖς διδάγμασι, καὶ ψευδολογουμένων ταῦτα καὶ τοῦ  
5 περιβλήματος κατεγέλασα καὶ τῆς παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς δόξης. 2 Χριστιανὸς εὐρεθῆναι καὶ εὐχόμενος καὶ παμμάχως  
ἀγωνιζόμενος ὁμολογῶ, οὐχ ὅτι ἀλλότρια ἐστί τὰ  
Πλάτωνος διδάγματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀλλῶ ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι πάντα  
ὅμοια, ὥσπερ οὐδὲ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων, Στωϊκῶν τε καὶ ποιητῶν  
10 καὶ συγγραφέων.

13.1 μαθὼν Α 4 ψευδολογουμένων Maran, Marcovich, et al.: ψευδο-  
λογούμενον Α

## JUSTIN'S SECOND APOLOGY - 12.3-13.2

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

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

**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.

### Ἀπολογία Δευτέρα - 13.3-15.3

3 Ἐκαστος γάρ τις ἀπὸ μέρους τοῦ σπερματικοῦ θείου Λόγου τὸ συγγενὲς ὄρων καλῶς ἐφθέγγετο· οἱ δὲ τάναντία ἐλαυτοῖς ἐν κυριωτέροις εἰρηκότες οὐκ ἐπιστήμην τὴν ἄποπτον καὶ γινῶσιν τὴν ἀνέλεγκτον φαίνονται ἐσχηκέαι.

15 4 Ὅσα οὖν παρὰ πᾶσι καλῶς εἴρηται, ἡμῶν τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἐστὶ· τὸν γὰρ ἀπὸ ἀγεννήτου καὶ ἀρρήτου θεοῦ Λόγον μετὰ τὸν θεὸν προσκυνοῦμεν καὶ ἀγαπῶμεν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ διῶ ἡμᾶς ἄνθρωπος γέγονεν, ὅπως [καὶ] τῶν παθῶν τῶν ἡμετέρων συμμέτοχος γενόμενος καὶ ἴσασιν ποιήσεται. 5 Οἱ γὰρ συγγραφεῖς πάντες διὰ τῆς ἐνούσης ἐμφύτου τοῦ Λόγου σποραῖς ἀμυδρῶς ἐδύνατο ὄραν τὰ ὄντα. 6 Ἐτερον γὰρ ἐστὶ σπέρμα τινὸς καὶ μίμημα κατὰ δύναμιν δοθέν, καὶ ἕτερον αὐτὸ οὐ κατὰ χάριν τὴν ἀπῶ ἐκείνου ἢ μετουσία καὶ μίμησις γίνεται.

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

5 | τὴν ἑαυτῶν αἰτίαν ὑπεύθυνοι ταῖς τιμωρίαις γίνονται, [εἰς τὸ γνωσθῆναι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ταῦτα], 2 διὸ ἐν τῇ φύσει τῇ τῶν ἀνθρώπων εἶναι τὸ γνωριστικὸν καλοῦ καὶ αἰσχροῦ, καὶ διὰ τὸ ἡμῶν, οὐς οὐκ ἐπίσταται τοιαῦτα ὅποια 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.

A f. 200<sup>v</sup>

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

5 μόνου χάριν τούσδε τοὺς λόγους συνετάξαμεν. 3 Οὐκ ἔστι δὲ ἡμῶν τὰ διδάγματα κατὰ κρίσιν σώφρονα αἰσχρὰ, ἀλλὰ πάσης μὲν φιλοσοφίας ἀνθρωπέου ὑπέρτερα· εἰ δὲ μὴ, κἂν

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



### JUSTIN'S SECOND APOLOGY - 13.3-15.3

**3** For each one spoke well seeing by the portion of the seminal divine Logos that was inborn; but those speaking things opposing themselves in the more principle things seem not to have had an understanding of what is seen dimly<sup>25</sup> 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<sup>26</sup> 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<sup>27</sup> for making these things known to men.<sup>28</sup> **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.)<sup>29</sup> **2** If you would publish this we would make it evident to all, in order that if possible they might be converted. Indeed, for this favor alone we have marshalled these arguments. **3** And it is not possible in accordance with sound minded judgment to consider our teachings shameful, but more noble than all human philosophy. And if not, at

---

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

## Ἀπολογία Δευτέρα - 15.4-15.5

Σωταδεῖοις καὶ Φιλαινιδεῖοις καὶ Ἀρχεστρατεῖοις καὶ Ἐπικουρεῖοις καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς τοιούτοις ποιητικοῖς  
10 διδάγμασιν οὐχ ὅμοια, οἷς ἐντυγχάνειν πᾶσι, καὶ γενομένοις  
καὶ γεγραμμένοις, συγκεχώρηται.

4 Καὶ παυσόμεθα λοιπόν, ὅσον ἐφῶ ἡμῖν ἦν πράξαντες, καὶ  
προσεπευξάμενοι τῆς ἀληθείας καταξιωθῆναι τοὺς πάντη  
πάντας ἀνθρώπους. 5 Εἴη οὖν ἰ καὶ ὑμᾶς ἀξίως εὐσεβείας A f. 201<sup>r</sup>  
15 καὶ φιλοσοφίας τὰ δίκαια ὑπὲρ ἑαυτῶν κρίναι.

---

8 Ἀρχεστρατεῖοις Leutsch, Otto, Marcovich: ὀρχηστικοῖς 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

## JUSTIN'S SECOND APOLOGY - 15.4-15.5

least they are not like the teachings of the Sotadists, and the Philaenidians, and the Arcestratians,<sup>30</sup> 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,<sup>31</sup> worthy of piety and the love of wisdom.

---

**30** Or, as the ms. reads *dancers*. **31** Cf. Hesiod, *Works and Days*, 263-265.



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

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

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

fornication” – παρεκτός 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.” – “Ὁ 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 μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ, μὴ ἀφιέτω αὐτήν· καὶ γυνὴ εἴ τις ἔχει ἄνδρα ἄπιστον, καὶ οὗτος συνευδοκεῖ οἰκεῖν μετ᾽ αὐτῆς, μὴ ἀφιέτω τὸν ἄνδρα. ἡγίασται γὰρ ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ ἄπιστος ἐν τῇ γυναικί, καὶ ἡγίασται ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἄπιστος ἐν τῷ ἀδελφῷ· ἐπεὶ ἅρα τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν ἀκάθαρτά ἐστιν, νῦν δὲ ἄγια 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 ἀμαρτίας αὐτοῦ (Mand. 4.1.9).

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

Grant suggests that part of the accusation the woman’s husband makes may have involved charges of previous indecent behavior with the servants, as in this same verse (p. 467). However, it is clear that the charge of being a Christian had been sufficient grounds for punishment since the days of Trajan. In the famous correspondence between Pliny and the Emperor he asks the question “...[should] the name [Christian] itself, if it is free from offenses [be immune], but offenses together with the name be punished?” – ...nomen ipsum, 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 ältesten Christentums in Rome” *ZNW* 70 (1979):97-114, speculates that the man who taught the woman, may be the Valentinian Gnostic of the same name referred to by 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 Schlege 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” – Τίτω Αιλίω Ἀδριανῶ Ἀντωνίνω Εὐσεβεῖ Σεβαστῶ, 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” – Οὐρησισίμω υἱῶ Φιλοσόφω. 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 παιδεραστία μὲν πάντας ὑπερήνεγκεν, φιλαργυρία δὲ πάνυ προσεχῆς ἦν. θανάτου δὲ ὁ καταφρονῶν οὕτως αὐτὸς ἐδεδίει τὸν θάνατον ὡς καὶ Ἰουστίνον καθάπερ καὶ ἐμὲ ὡς κακῶ τῶ 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 συσκευασθεῖς 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: “ὦ 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 καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς· ὅστις δ’ ἂν ἀρνήσῃται με ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀρνήσομαι καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρὸς 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 γαένῃ. (Mt 10:28).

Justin declares that suicide would be against the will of God. The Christian writer L. Caecilius Lacantius (250-317 AD) explicitly condemns suicide (7.89, 183). Augustine, in his work *The City of God*, discusses the suicide of Judas concluding: "...[Judas] giving up hope for the mercy of God, regretting the death, left no place for healing repentance for himself" – ...[Judas] Dei misericordiam desperando 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 Χριστιανοὶ εἰσι, κἄν ἄθεοι ἐνομίσθησαν, οἷον ἐν Ἑλλήσιν μὲν Σωκράτης καὶ Ἡράκλειτος καὶ οἱ ὅμοιοι αὐτοῖς, ἐν βαρβάροις δὲ Ἀβραάμ καὶ Ἀνανίας καὶ Ἀζαρίας καὶ Μισαήλ καὶ Ἡλίας καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοί... (46.3). Heraclitus' statements regarding the logos are very similar to Justin's own wording. In fr. 1 he claims "all things happen in accordance with this logos" – γινομένων γὰρ πάντων κατὰ τὸν λόγον τόνδε (Sextus *adv. Math.*, 7.132). In fr. 2 he claims, "Though the logos is common, many live as though they have a private understanding" – τοῦ λόγου δ' ἐόντος ξυνοῦ ζῶουσιν 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 opperendae mortis, pro incerta et trepida vita (Tac. *Ann.* 14.59, Grant).

### **The Binding of *Daimones***

Justin claims in 8.3 that the *daimones* would be confined in eternal fire. He does not seem to have believed this had yet occurred. In NT doctrine the angels who sinned had already been bound in Tartarus: “For if God did not spare the angels who sinned, but cast them down to hell and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved for judgment” – Εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἀγγέλων ἀμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλὰ 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 αἰδίοις 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 βελέεσι Τιτῆνας, καὶ τοὺς μὲν ὑπὸ χθονὸς εὐρυοδείης πέμψαν καὶ δεσμοῖσιν ἐν ἀργαλέοισιν ἔδησαν χερσὶν νικήσαντες ὑπερθύμους περ ἑόντας, τόσσον ἔνερθ' ὑπὸ γῆς, ὅσον οὐρανός ἐστ' ἀπὸ γαίης· τόσσον γάρ τ' ἀπὸ γῆς ἐς Τάρταρον ἠερόντα (Hesiod, *Theogony*, 716-721, Lombardo).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY & SUGGESTED READING

- Andresen, C. "Justin und der mittlere Platonismus." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche 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.
- 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.
- 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 ΖΥΛΟΥ." *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." *Church 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.
- Enslin, Morton S. "Justin Martyr: An Appreciation." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 34 (1943-1944): 179-205.
- Eusebius, Pamphilus. *The Ecclesiastical History (HE)*. Christian 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 Wichita 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.
- 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 Christianae* 18 (1964): 204-214.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Literary Genre of Justin's First Apology." *Vigiliae Christianae* 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 ältesten Christentums in Rom" *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. Iustini 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 the Doctrine of 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.
- 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 Apologetical Method.” *Fides et Historia* 27 (1995): 23-43.
- Vogel, C.J., “Problems Concerning Justin Martyr,” *Mnemosyne* 31 (1978): 360-88.
- 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.