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## PREFACE

THIS is sometimes said to be an age of new theologies. It is at any rate an age when the old formulae and phraseology of theology are on their defence. On all sides the appeal is made, explicitly and implicitly, for an interpretation or re-interpretation of theological dogmas, in order to show the real truths involved in them, the conventional expression of which has to some extent ceased to carry a vital significance to modern minds. No theological student can be absolved from the attempt to satisfy this appeal. And few things can be of more value for such an object than the study of the Patristic writings of the second century; for in them we find Christian theology still in solution, and Christian thinkers still feeling their way towards systematic dogma; and we are enabled to gather what were the realities, of which they were looking for a suitable formulation. Among such writings the Apologies of Justin Martyr must hold an important place, just because they are in no sense a technical or esoteric treatise, but a plain statement in popular terms of Christian truth, such as a plain man in that age understood it.

The present edition conforms to the general plan of the series, to which it belongs. It is primarily intended for theological students; and it does not aim at doing more than giving general guidance for the understanding of the author's meaning. In preparing it, I have received constant and most valuable help from Dr Mason, the general editor of the series; and I am also indebted to a former colleague, Dr L. R Farnell, for supplying me with some references bearing upon passages, in which points of Pagan mythology and cultus were alluded to. To these I desire to express my cordial thanks.

A. W. F. BLUNT.

Carrington Vicarage. October 18th, 1910.
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## INTRODUCTION.

## I. Justin's life.

JUSTIN was a native of Flavia Neapolis (the ancient Sichem), and was probably of heathen descent ${ }^{1}$. The exact date of his birth is unknown, but it must have been near the end of the first century. He himself tells us ${ }^{2}$ that he was in his youth a zealous student of philosophy, and that he was converted in mature life to Christianity. Eusebius, who calls him $\gamma \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \tau o s ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s$
 version he continued to wear the philosopher's robe, and that he lived at Rome ${ }^{4}$; the latter fact is established by the evidence of the Apology itself. The details of his life are otherwise quite uncertain; but there is good reason for believing that he was martyred at Rome under the prefecture of Junius

[^0]Rusticus (A.D. $163-167)^{1}$, during the Principate of M. Aurelius ${ }^{2}$. Eusebius tells us that his death was due to the intrigues of Crescens, the Cynic; but the evidence adduced for this statement is very weak, consisting only of an ambiguous passage from Tatian ${ }^{3}$, which may itself be due, so far as it relates to Justin, to the passage where Justin states that he is anticipating persecution owing to the hostility of Crescens ${ }^{4}$. It has been suggested ${ }^{5}$ that a loculus in a gallery of the first floor of the catacomb of Priscilla may mark his burial-place, as it has painted on it the inscription MZOYCTINOC, where M perhaps stands for Mápzus.

## Justin's Apologies.

Justin must have been a prolific writer; but few of his works have survived, and many of those ascribed to him in the MSS are undoubtedly spurious. The Apologies and the Dialogue are certainly genuine;

[^1]but there are no others which can be confidently accepted as his work. The Apologies are the type of apologetic literature, and had a distinct influence on the writings of subsequent Apologists (though there is little to show that they were much read after Eusebius' time, if we except the citations in the Sacra Parallela of John of Damascus). In these Justin gives no formal or logical exposition, scarcely even an outline, of a complete Christian system. His purpose is merely to collect arguments to justify fair and equitable treatment of the Christians by the authorities, and to support his demand that they should not be condemned unheard. With this object he seeks to refute the popular calumnies against the Christians, he insists on the excellence and truth of the Christian teaching and on the effects which it produces, and he struggles to prove the claims of Christ, especially by the argument from the fulfilment of prophecy ${ }^{1}$. Thus, although he is dogmatic to a degree exceptional among Apologists, owing to the fact that he concentrates his argument round the Person of Christ, yet it is futile to seek in the Apologies for a formulated system of Christian theology.

His style has no artistic greatness, except a certain vein of sarcasm ${ }^{2}$; though he can sometimes rise to an occasion ${ }^{3}$. In general the style is, though fluent, yet careless and diffuse; his reasoning is sometimes rambling and fanciful, abounding in digressions, repetitions, and parentheses, which confuse the argument ; and the construction of his sentences is often clumsy. His merits as a writer are due to moral rather than artistic qualities.

[^2]The straightforward boldness of his language is remarkable; he gives a decided impression of earnestness, candour, and thoughtfulness; and his Christianity is tinged with a liberality of mind that produces in him a reverence for truth and nobility of character, wherever they are found. He is, however, not a deep thinker; he betrays many symptoms of an uncritical disposition ${ }^{1}$, though possibly he was not in this respect behind the standard of his age; nor is he entirely free from clear errors of fact ${ }^{2}$. In general he appears as a man of respectable rather than remarkable talent, well-read and well-educated (though far inferior in learning and scholarship to Clement of Alexandria), but with very few claims to be considered an original thinker, standing, as regards power and independence of mind, at a much lower level than his disciple Tatian.

## Place in history.

The importance and interest of Justin's writings are due to his historical position in the development of Christian thought. His writings were well known to and freely used by later authors such as Tatian, Athenagoras, Irenaeus, Tertullian. He was one of the first who tried to reconcile Christian theology with philosophy, and to justify Christianity to the ordinary world of Greek culture. He represents therefore the fusion of Christianity with the Greek spirit. He sees foreshadowings of the truth in the old mythology, and does not shirk the argument from comparative religion ${ }^{3}$; his treatment of heathenism is not bigoted, though he

[^3]holds that its immoralities and corruption show it to be a trick of the demons. He is to some extent influenced, on the ethical side, by Stoicism, but he insists upon the doctrine of free-will in opposition to the Stoic fatalism ${ }^{1}$. He disliked the Epicureans as licentious ${ }^{2}$, and the Cynics as unprincipled ${ }^{3}$. His chief mental prepossessions are Platonic. He was, by his philosophical training, an enthusiastic Platonist ${ }^{4}$. He probably did not get from Plato his Trinitarianism or his general conception of a personal God, though he often puts it in Platonic form ; and he is not incapable of unwittingly parodying Platonic thought, as he parodies Old Testament prophecies ${ }^{5}$. His Platonism is therefore not more profound than his general thought; but it shows itself in constant reminiscences, in frequent comparisons between Platonic and Christian doctrine, and in an open and whole-hearted admiration of Socrates ${ }^{6}$. He assumes that, so far as Christianity and philosophy are both true, they cannot be opposed to one another, but must be the product of the same Logos. But he considers that Christianity possesses the whole truth, whereas Greek philosophy possesses only a part, and a debased part, of the truth ${ }^{7}$.

It is a great mistake to represent Justin's theology as little more than popularized heathen philosophy ${ }^{8}$, or to lay equal stress upon the heathen and Christian elements in $\mathrm{it}^{9}$, just as it is a mistake to treat him as a Jewish Christian of the Ebionitic type ${ }^{10}$, or as a Vatican Romanist of the most developed orthodoxy ${ }^{11}$.
${ }^{1}$ Cf. ii 6 (7).
${ }^{2}$ Cf. ii ${ }^{15} \quad{ }^{3}$ Cf. ii 8 (3).
${ }^{4}$ Cf. ii 13 .
${ }^{5}$ Cf. i 60.
${ }^{6}$ Cf. i 5.
${ }^{7}$ Cf. ii ${ }^{13}$. And see Bardenhewer Altkirchl. Litt. § 18, 10.
8 As is done by Aubé. 9 This is what Engelhardt does.
${ }^{10}$ This was the theory of Credner and the Tübingen critics.
${ }_{11}$ The view adopted in Maran's edition.

He is rather a type of the 'plain man,' firmly believing in Christ, and yet at the same time reluctant to abandon the principles of secular philosophy, and attempting to find a formula which shall allow the two to be harmonized. Many of the subjects of later controversy do not come at all within his purview, and some of his language certainly contains potentialities of theories which were later condemned by the Church ${ }^{1}$. But his general standpoint is that of common-sense orthodoxy of the primitive type, combined with a distinct liberality and tolerance for imperfect approximations to Christian belief in pre-Christian systems, such as is a creditable characteristic in many of the early Fathers. At the same time his view of Christianity is not entirely the same as that which is most prominent in the Apostolic writings ; at least the emphasis is different. Justin has but small concern with doctrinal ideas. He makes little of Atonement and Redemption, compared to the function of Christianity as an attestation of rational truth. This may be partly due to the purpose which the Apologies were intended to serve; but it must also be due to the temper of the author's mind. He was rather a philosopher and a moralist than a theologian or a mystic; and so the chief interest which Christianity possessed for him was as the true philosophy theoretically, and the right law of life practically. In this respect he is representative of his age. As Dorner points out ${ }^{2}$, for all the early Christian writers Christianity is the philosophy кат' $\epsilon^{\prime} \xi_{o} \chi \eta \eta^{\prime} \nu$, and was only saved from evaporation in vague spiritual cmotion by the growth of a Canon giving an objective representation of Christian truth (as contrasted with the gnôsis and with Montanism, which

[^4]are definitely anti-historical). And so, while Justin is of little importance in the development of scientific Christian theology (his only notable contribution being the theory of the spermatic Logos), yet his writings are of abiding interest, as showing us the manner in which liberally-minded men of ordinary talent and culture were seeking, in the second century, to express the fundamentals of the Christian faith in terms which should commend themselves according to the canons of current philosophical thought. As an Apologist he was compelled to lay small stress upon the technical doctrines of Christian theology, and to present Christianity rather as a system of philosophy ${ }^{1}$ (philosophy being then treated as a rule of life and not as a mere intellectual system), than as a method of Redemption. But Justin was undoubtedly predisposed to this apologetic standpoint, not only by the general tendencies of his time, but also by the special quality of his own mental habit. The conditions, under which apologetic treatises had to be written, suited his own bent, and the bent of his time. His works therefore are not to be estimated so much by their anticipations of points of subsequent theological controversy, as by the picture, which they give, of the attitude of ordinary Christians of the second century towards the Christian faith, and of the method in which they approached the problem of reconciling Christian doctrine with secular thought. It was necessary to prove that Christianity was 'rational,' before the heathen world could accept it ; and not till that point had been disposed of, could Christian thinkers proceed to examine technically the dogmatic implications contained in the simple statements of the New Testament.

[^5]
## Christianity and the State.

The broad plea of the Apologies is that Christianity should be treated on the same lines as any other philosophy. It was not likely that this suggestion should be favourably received by the authorities. Christianity was the first system which was definitely antagonistic to the State religion. Other philosophers had acquiesced in the State gods as a political expedient, without necessarily believing in them. Christianity flouted them. It is true that Judaism had been similarly opposed to the State worship. But, though Jews were not averse from proselytism, yet their religion was exclusive rather than, like Christianity, aggressive. Moreover Judaism was a national religion ${ }^{1}$ and, as such, a fit subject for Roman toleration (which was a matter of high politics), whilst the Christians represented no particular nation. Thus we find that, despite occasional Jew-baiting, the Jews were on the whole tolerated in the East (though not to the same extent in the West) under the early Emperors, partly because the kings of Judaea were closely connected with the Imperial family, partly because Rome conceived herself to be carrying on what had been the general policy (with the exception of the interlude during the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes) of the Seleucid kings. Even after A.D. 70, when the Jewish State came to an end and the centralization of worship at Jerusalem was suppressed, and after the risings of A.D. 116 and 130 had been crushed, the [Jews were still released from such civil and military duties as were incompatible with their faith.] But the growth of Judaism in the West, and of

[^6]Christianity regarded as a Jewish sect, awoke the watchfulness of the authorities. Hadrian made circumcision penal, and Pius allowed it only to children of Jewish descent, i.e. conversion to Judaism was penalized, obviously as being an attack on the State religion. Christianity therefore stood in a different position from Judaism. Nevertheless the government, as such, was not on the whole bitterly hostile to the Christians in the early days of the Empire; as a rule it did not institute persecution against them, and tried to secure to them a fair trial. Where persecution arose, it was usually due either to considerations of political expediency or to popular clamour. Thus the Apologists' work was likely to do good among the people, by protesting the moral innocence of the Christians, by spreading a knowledge of the Christian position, and by refuting popular calumnies.
[At the same time Christianity was legally a religio illicita, and the confession of Christianity was a legal ground for punishment, being tantamount to a secession from the State cult; and this position of affairs was bound to continue, so long as the Emperors conceived it to be a part of their policy to maintain the State religion as revived by Augustus. Hence, though the practice of individual Emperors might vary, and though some might attempt to make the conditions more equitable to the Christians, the theoretical policy was always the same towards them. The Apologists ignore the existence of this political necessity; indeed, from their point of view, they had no option but to do so. But, so long as the necessity was an acknowledged maxim of State policy, Apologies could effect no amelioration in the legal position of the Christian religion.

Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius, the two

Emperors to whom the Apologies are addressed (Verus may be neglected as of subordinate importance), were among the best of the Roman Emperors. Antoninus was a man of simple and temperate life, of estimable and honourable character, and personally religious in temperament. It is to his credit that he infused a stronger spirit of equity and humanity into Roman law, and endeavoured to facilitate the enfranchisement of slaves. Though he did not discountenance the laying of informations against Christians, he was disposed to be tolerant towards them ; he did not encourage official inquisition for them, and at the end of his reign he intervened to stop persecution of them in the cities of Asia and Greece. In short, he discouraged the practical exercise of the law against Christianity. M. Aurelius is one of the best types of the neo-Stoicism of Rome; [he was animated with a sincere desire for moral perfection, regulated by the Stoic principle of obedience to duty; [and he had an earnest zeal for the service of mankind, based upon the principles of brotherly love and forgiveness. He continued the policy of Antoninus in legislation and in the administration of justice. But his doctrinaire sense of duty to society caused him to countenance the persecution of Christians, and to regard their refusal to worship the State gods as sheer obstinacy ( $\psi \wedge \lambda \grave{\eta} \pi a \rho a ́ \tau a \xi \iota s^{1}$ ). The rescript, which he issued in A.D. 177, providing for the punishment of new sects which excited popular feeling, led to an outbreak of popular animosity against the Christians at Lugdunum.

[^7]
## II. Justin's theology.

Although, as has been said, the Apologies are not intended to give a complete or systematic exposition of Christian doctrine, yet they contain in solution most of Justin's main ideas ; and the indications, which they afford, of his notions of Christian truth are numerous enough to enable us, by piecing them together, to make a general outline of his theological position.

The Father. Like the majority of early Christians, Justin is fundamentally and primarily a monotheist. The conception of One God is with him an axiom ; he does not argue in its favour, but merely assumes it as the basis of faith. In this point his Platonic training and his Christian belief are entirely at one. He is lavish of epithets to express the unique transcendence of the


 (ib.), $\dot{\alpha} \pi a \neq \eta \dot{\eta} s(\mathrm{i} 25,2), \gamma \in \nu \nu \dot{\eta} \tau \omega \rho \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{a} \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu(\mathrm{i} 13,4)$,


 67,2 ). It is difficult to decide whether Justin did or did not reject the belief in the eternity of matter. The passage in i Io, 2 is certainly ambiguous (see note $a d$ loc.). And it is possible that the influence of Plato might have affected his ideas on the subject (cf. i 59, I), though the problem of Plato's theory of matter is by no means an easy one. It is probable, however, that the distinction between a world made by God out of matter which He had not made, and a world made by God out of matter which He had made, scarcely suggested itself with any
definiteness to Justin. And there can be no question that in his view God was transcendently and uniquely supreme, unbegotten Himself and the begetter of all things. At the same time he does not treat God as abstractly or metaphysically simple and without attributes. [God is metaphysically incomprehensible, but Justin does not fail to emphasize His moral personality and His personal interest in the affairs of mankind. He calls Him татウ̀ $\delta \iota \kappa а \iota \sigma$ v́vךs каi $\sigma \omega \phi \rho о \sigma v ́ \nu \eta s$ каі
 speaks of $\sigma \omega \phi \rho о \sigma v ่ \nu \eta$ and $\delta \iota \kappa a \iota \sigma v \dot{\nu} \eta$ and $\phi \iota \lambda a \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi i ́ a$

 (ii 12,6 ), and His concern in human conduct is asserted (ii 3 (4), $2: 7$, I).

The Logos. So far then Justin's monotheism is quite simple to understand. It is a theory of One Supreme God, who transcends human comprehension, but nevertheless possesses a moral Will and exercises it in the supervision of terrestrial events. The problem, therefore, that lay before the Apologist was that of finding room in his monotheistic system for a second Divine Person, without falling into Ditheism on the one hand, or into materialistic views of a Son of God on the other, such as had been characteristic of heathen mythology. This difficulty Justin attempted to overcome by the theory of the Logos, which is the central pivot of his theology. He uses the word in a double sense ${ }^{1}$; the Logos is both the Creative Word, the agent in creation (i 64,5 : ii $5(6), 3$ ), and also the Divine Reason, the sum of Divine truth (ii IO, I). In this respect Justin's

[^8]conception is not quite the same as that of St John's Gospel, where the Logos is rather considered in the former aspect. It bears more analogies to Philo's use of the term. But there is no proof that Justin was consciously borrowing his ideas from Philo. He uses the Logos doctrine as if it were not novel, but fully naturalized in the Church, and a prevalent method of interpretation. It may be doubted whether he derived it from the fourth Gospel, though it is possible that that Gospel was held to sanction the use of the term in the thought of the Church ${ }^{1}$. But Justin's version of the Logos doctrine seems, in the process of exposition at any rate, to start from a general philosophic conception, such as was current in the schools of the time, especially among the Stoics.

It was a maxim of current philosophy that Reason,入ó oos, is what unites God and man, and allows man to know God; and here probably can be found Justin's starting-point. A very slight effort of personification was needed in order to avoid the pantheism to which this theory, when crudely stated, easily led. And the means for this was provided by the Church doctrine of Christ as the Incarnate Logos. According to this, the Logos represented a distinction in the Divine essence. He was diverse $\dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \theta \mu \hat{\omega}$, though not $\gamma \nu \omega \mu \hat{\eta}$, from the Father (cf. ii 5 (6), 3). But nevertheless He proceeded from the Father, and His mission in all ages had been to interpret the Father to man. Thus the Old Testament manifestations were given by the $\operatorname{Logos}$ (i 63, 10) ; and indeed all approximations to the truth, of which any man in any age had been capable, had been due to

[^9]His work (i 5, 4: ii 7 (8), i). In fact it is not always easy to decide whether Justin is using the word $\lambda$ óyos in the abstract sense, or as a title for a definitely-conceived Person (e.g. in i io, 6: 64, $5:$ ii 9,4 ). And so Justin arrives at his great theory of the $\lambda^{\prime} \gamma \mathbf{\gamma}$ s $\sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \mu a-$ тıкós. Previously to the advent of Christ, men had possessed seeds of the Logos, and so had been enabled to arrive at such fragments of truth as they could grasp (i $32,8: 46,3$ : ii $8,1: 10,2: 13,3$; cf. i 28,3 ). The Logos was thus the eternal and universal source of all
 such, would obey His commands (i i 2,8 ), and to that extent could even be called a Christian (i 46, 3).
[And now this Logos, formerly apprehended only in fragmentary fashion, had in entirety become incarnate in the historical Christ. The dispensation of the $\lambda$ ójos $\sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \mu a \tau \iota \kappa$ ós had now yielded to that of the خóyos $\mu \circ \rho \phi \omega \theta \epsilon i ́ s(i \operatorname{5}, 4)$. In Christ was embodied тò $\lambda o \gamma \iota \kappa o ̀ \nu$ тò ó $\bar{\lambda} o \nu$ ] (ii IO, I; cf. i 46,2 ). Thus, though a quantitative distinction could be drawn between the Persons of the Father and the Logos, yet the doctrine of their absolute and necessary moral unity precluded any ditheistic inferences. Father and Son were not separate parts of the Godhead. The Logos was the Logos of God, and not an unbegotten subsistence like the Father. Indeed Justin was so anxious to lay stress upon this point that he has been accused of subordinationist tendencies. So far as the Apologies are concerned, there are only four passages which give the slightest ground for such an accusation. Of one, viz. i 13, 3, it is possible to say at once that it may be dismissed as irrelevant. The assertion, which is there made, that Christ is honoured $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \delta \in v \tau \notin \rho a \quad \chi{ }^{\prime} \rho \rho a$, refers to the position of the Incarnate Word in liturgical worship,
and not to His position absolutely as a Person in the Godhead. The same is probably the case with regard to the passage in ii 13,4 . The phrase in i 32, Io denotes logical precedence rather than the absolute subordination of the Son to the Father ${ }^{1}$. But the words used in i 12,7 are less susceptible of being explained in a Nicene sense, though they are not so strongly tinged with subordinationist ideas as the passage in Tryph. I28. And there can be little doubt that Justin, in his anxiety to avoid any danger of representing God as qualitatively distinct from the Logos, or as suffering change by the procession of the Logos, tended to fall into an opposite error. He was so eager to escape all appearance of Ditheism that he can scarcely be held to lay sufficient stress upon the equality of Son and Father, as touching their Godhead. But it needed a longer process of reflexion and controversy, before the Christology of the Church could be properly formulated. And it is undeniable that Justin held firmly the doctrine, which is ultimately incompatible with strict Subordinationism, viz. that the Logos is of the essence of God and not parallel to a creature. This essential Divinity of the Son is unceasingly asserted in the Apologies. Justin calls Him ó $\pi a \rho ’ a u ̉ \tau o \hat{v}(\tau o \hat{v} ~ \theta \epsilon o \hat{v})$ viós (i 6, 2), $\theta \epsilon i ̂ o s ~(i ~ I o, ~ 6), ~$, viós $\tau 0 \hat{v} \theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$ (i 12, 9), or тov̂ oै $\downarrow \tau \omega \varsigma$, $\theta \in o \hat{v}$ (i I 3, 3). And other phrases are less vague ; He is $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau o \nu$ रév $\quad \eta \mu a$ тô

 (i 23,2 ; cf. also i 46,2 ), or again $\lambda$ óyos каі $\pi \rho \omega \tau$ т́токоs ஸ̀ע тô̂ $\theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$ кaì $\theta \epsilon o ̀ s ~ i ́ \pi a ́ \rho \chi \epsilon \iota ~(i ~ 63, ~ I ~ 5), ~ o r ~ l a s t l y ~ H e ~ i s ~$ цóvos $\lambda \epsilon \gamma o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o s ~ к v \rho i ́ \omega s ~ v i o ́ s, ~ o ́ ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma o s ~ \pi \rho o ̀ ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ \pi о \iota \eta \mu a ́ t \omega \nu$

[^10]$\kappa \alpha i ̀ \sigma \nu \nu \grave{\omega \nu} \kappa \alpha i ̀ \cdot \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \dot{\omega} \mu \in \nu о s \kappa \tau \lambda$. (ii $5(6), 3$ ). These passages make it clear that Justin did not regard the Logos as inferior in essential Divinity to the Father, although some occasional phrases, which he uses, show that he had not firmly grasped the complete implications of his own view.
[The Logos therefore, according to Justin's theology, is God's Creative Word and the Divine Reason, the first-begotten of God, God's agent in creation and His instrument in pre-Christian theophanies, the source of all human truth and goodness; He is quantitatively diverse from the Father, and is sometimes represented as subordinate to Him ; but at the same time He is regarded as the only and absolute Son of God, in a sense in which that title can be applied to no other person, for He is begotten, not created. In short the Logos 'was with God and was God.' It is open to doubt, however, whether Justin also believed that the Logos was 'in the beginning,' or whether he was inclined to actualize Him only as related to the world. The crucial passage bearing on this point in the Apologies is



 Sí aủtov тòv $\theta \epsilon \grave{\nu} \nu$ 入є́ $\gamma \epsilon \tau а \iota$, o้ $\nu о \mu a$ каі aủтò $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \epsilon ́ \chi о \nu ~$
 ov̉к oैроци́ є́ $\sigma \tau \iota \nu$. The usual interpretation of this passage, which conjoins the clause öтє...є́кó $\sigma \mu \eta \sigma \epsilon$ with $\gamma \in \nu \nu \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu o s$, has appeared to some to present a difficulty of theology, by making, apparently, the statement that the Logos was not begotten, until the world was created as a кóб $\mu o s$; He had existed before in some sense, $\pi \rho o ̀$ т. $\pi . \sigma u \nu \omega^{\prime} \nu$, where $\sigma v \nu(\dot{\omega} \nu$ can scarcely imply mere exist-
ence as an attribute ${ }^{1}$, but rather union in a common life or conception ; but His begotten existence, i.e. in diversity from the Father, began at the creation. This view appears to Dorner ${ }^{2}$ so inconsistent with the many passages, in which Justin asserts the begetting of the Son before the creation of the world, that, to avoid the inconsistency, he suggests the textual alteration of ótє to öть. And Donaldson ${ }^{3}$ suggests that the clause öтє... $\epsilon \in \kappa о \sigma \mu \eta \sigma \epsilon$ should be taken in conjunction with $\chi \rho \iota \sigma \tau o ̀ s$ $\lambda$ érєтal, the meaning then being that the Son was entitled $\chi \rho \iota \sigma$ тós at the creation. But this reading of the words seems somewhat unnatural. And it may be questioned whether the difficulty of theology suspected in the other method of interpretation is not fictitious. It is scarcely conceivable that Justin could ever have thought the generation of the Son to be coincident with the act of creation; nor could this passage be taken to have that meaning, which could only be given if Justin had written $\gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \eta \theta \epsilon i s$ instead of $\gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \epsilon^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \nu o s$. The öт $\epsilon$ clause must be attached, moreover, not only to $\gamma \in \nu \nu \omega$ $\mu \epsilon \nu \circ s$ but also and equally to $\sigma \nu \nu \omega \nu$; it simply interprets and develops $\pi \rho o ̀ ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi о \iota \eta \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$. The phrase каi $\sigma \nu \nu \omega ̀ \nu \kappa \alpha i \quad \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \omega \prime \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s$ expresses the same idea as was later expressed by Origen's phrase 'eternal generation.' It implies that He who 'is with' the Father is nevertheless in process of 'being begotten,' and that this was the state of things 'before the creatures were made,' 'when at the beginning God through Him created and ordered (or beautified) the universe.' It is plain that, though Justin may not have definitely put to himself the question how long the Logos had been with the Father, yet he

[^11]regarded Him as essentially Divine, begotten not made, and therefore holding a position quite unique and distinct from any creature. No doubt his Christology is not very clear, nor his view of the Logos free from confusion ${ }^{1}$. He was struggling with the difficulty of a conception, which the Church had not yet had time to discuss fully. No phrase of his is so definitely Arian as Tertullian's Fuit tempus cum filius non fuit (adu. Hermog. c. 3). He allows for a state of pre-existence of the Logos, though he tends to regard it rather as a potentiality until the creation ${ }^{2}$; and he seems to regard this state as having endured 'from the beginning.' But it is not wonderful that he could not clearly understand all the difficulties of Christological doctrine, nor anticipate all possible points of future controversy. At least he is firm to the great Christian doctrine that the Logos is essentially God, not a creature but a $\gamma \dot{v} \nu \nu \eta \mu a$, and so unique in the universe. And thus he saves his Christianity from Ditheism, by representing the Logos as always with God, quantitatively separated from the Father by process of begetting, but one in nature and will with Him, causing no break in the unity of the Godhead.

The Incarnation. And this Logos became incarnate in Jesus Christ (ii 10,8$)^{3}$, by the will of God (i 23.2 : 46 5: 63, 10: ii $5(6), 5)$. His birth was miraculous (i $32,11: 33,4: 46,5$ ), but His life was fully human (i 31,7 ). The purposes of the Incarnation are not systematically explained, but they are broadly alluded to as being ( 1 ) the salvation, transformation, purification, and restoration of the human race (i23,2:32,7:63, 16); (2) the conquest of death ( $\mathrm{i} 63, \mathrm{I} 6$ ) ; (3) the defeat of the

[^12]demons (ii $5(6), 5$ ) ; (4) the revelation of the unnameable God (i 63, 5). And this the Logos achieved by His teaching (i $6,2: 23,2: 63,5:$ ii 10,8 ), and by His sufferings (i $32,7: 63,10,16$ : ii 13,4 ). He is now reigning over the world and helping those who believe in $\operatorname{Him}(\mathrm{i} 4 \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{I}: 42,4: 50, \mathrm{I} 2$ ) ; and He shall come again to judge mankind (i 52,3 ). Justin's doctrine of the Incarnation, as stated in the Apologies, lays most stress upon its didactic purpose, and upon Redemption mainly as effected by its 'subjective' influence, as a redemption from sin rather than from guilt and punishment. There is no systematic treatment of the doctrine of the Atonement, no hint of a ransom to Satan, and scarcely any trace of a theory of 'satisfaction.' In this respect Justin is as primitive as he is in his Christology. But, as has been said, he was the creature of his age; his bent was not so much to theological speculation as to the highly practical philosophy of his time ${ }^{1}$; and the interest of his writings is due not so much to any expert discussion on points of controversial theology, as to the revelation of the ordinary attitude of a right-minded and well-educated Christian of the second century towards the fundamentals of the Christian faith.

The Holy Spirit. Justin has very little to say about the Holy Spirit as defined by scientific theology. In his language concerning Him he seems to vacillate between treating $H i m$ as a Person and as a mere attribute. He never speaks of Him , in the Apologies, as God, nor alludes to His mode of existence. He appears to have accepted Him as a distinct object of liturgical worship (i 6, 2: 13, $3: 60,7: 61,3,13: 67,2$ ), but not

[^13]to have concerned himself with speculations as to His being or distinct personality. Furthermore he scarcely draws any distinction, or at least draws it very unsteadily, between the Logos and the Spirit. Thus he commonly regards the Spirit as the instrument in Old Testament prophecy, the $\pi \rho о \phi \eta \tau \iota \kappa o ̀ \nu ~ \pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu a$, subordinate to God and under God's control (i 33, 2: 44, I I) ; and yet in i 36 , I: ii 10,8 this function is ascribed to the Logos. Similarly the ${ }^{\prime \prime} \gamma \iota o \nu \pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu a$ is spoken of in i 33,5 as the agent in the Incarnation; but in $\S 6$ of the same chapter (and again in i $46,5: 66,2$ ) the Logos is described as performing this work (and so the Incarnation is not only due to the Father's will, but is also a voluntary act on the part of the Logos). This can be explained as a mere confusion of functions ${ }^{1}$, though it looks remarkably like a real confusion of Persons. But the fact is that the early Church was very slow in grasping the full meaning of the idea of the Holy Spirit, and Justin himself plainly did not know, or had not considered, what to make of the conception. The Trinitarianism of the Apologies is therefore crude and unsettled. So far as the Third Person in the Trinity is concerned, Justin seems to have accepted Him on the authority of the Church's liturgical formulae, without thinking it necessary to speculate upon His relation to the Father and the Son or His distinct sphere of operation. It might even be possible, on the evidence of i 6,2 , to maintain that the Holy Spirit stood for Justin in no higher position than that of the angels. But that supposition is scarcely consistent with the place which he elsewhere assigns to Him, as next to the Father and the Son, in the baptismal and eucharistic formulae. The passage

[^14]quoted should not be strained to bear too definite a meaning. In that chapter Justin is seeking to show that the Christians are not atheists; he does so by simply enumerating the objects of their worship and reverence ; and though he names the Holy Spirit after the angels, it is yet an extreme inference that he therefore considered Him to be no more than, or even inferior to, the angels. Maran suggests that in that passage Justin intends the word $\sigma \epsilon \beta o ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a$ alone to refer to the angels, and $\sigma \epsilon \beta \dot{o} \mu \epsilon \theta a \kappa a i \quad \pi \rho о \sigma \kappa \nu \nu о \hat{\nu} \mu \epsilon \nu$ to refer to the Three Persons of the Godhead. This is not an impossible theory. But even if it be correct we must admit that Justin's expression is somewhat loose and untechnical, and it seems clear that he had not attained to any scientific conception of the Trinity, such as was the outcome of later theological controversy. The Logos doctrine occupied all his attention; and the doctrine of the ${ }_{a}^{a \prime} \gamma \iota \nu \nu \pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu a$ had to wait for its formulation by later theologians.

## Angels and demons.

It is scarcely disputable that St Paul, following the common Jewish view of his time, believed in a hierarchy of angels, though in the Epistle to the Colossians he makes a protest against angelolatry. In the Church of the second century the belief in angels was quite general ; but Justin's Apologies say very little concerning them. He mentions in $\mathrm{i} 33,5$ the angel of the Annunciation, and asserts in ii 6 (7), 5 that the angels were endowed with free-will. In ii 4 (5), 2 he states that the government of the world had been entrusted by God to angels, but that these had been unfaithful to their trust. He does not speak of prayers to or invocations
of angels, but in i 6, 2 he states that the Christians reverence and worship ( $\sigma \epsilon \beta \circ \dot{\prime} \mu \epsilon \theta a$ каi $\pi \rho о \sigma \kappa \nu \nu о \hat{v} \mu \epsilon \nu$ ) the Father, the Son, the angels, and the prophetic Spirit. The bearing of this passage upon the subject of Justin's view of the Holy Spirit has been already considered ${ }^{1}$. As regards the mention of the angels, it seems a natural, though not an inevitable interpretation, that Justin is giving to them a place in ordinary Christian worship; and the worship of angels was not unknown in certain districts of early Christendom ${ }^{2}$. At the same time the expression is, as has been said, careless and unscientific; and it is scarcely to be supposed that Justin put the angels upon a plane at all level with that of the Father and the Logos, nor probably with that of the Spirit.

Justin has not an elaborate demonology, as Origen has; but a theory of demons is fundamental in him, as in most of the Church Fathers. It cannot be ascertained whether Justin derived his views on the subject from the demonology of Plutarch and the philosophical schools of his time. At least we may be sure that his conception of $\delta$ aipoves would not have appeared singular to any contemporary thinker. All the evil in the world is ascribed to their agency. Their work is a general opposition to the Logos and all His works (i IO, 6: ii 8,2 ), their object is to enslave men to evil and falsehood (i 14, I: 58, 3: ii 4 (5), 4:9, 4). They were responsible for the heathen mythology (i 5,2 ), and the idols were copies of their shapes (i 9, 1). They had tried to forestall the New Testament and the rites of the Church (i $23,3: 62: 64: 66,4$ ), though their attempts

[^15]often showed an entire misunderstanding of the true meaning of the Old Testament prophecies (i 54). They had caused the human sufferings of Christ (i 44, 12); and they were the authors of calumny and violence against the Christians (i 10, 6: 23, 3: 57, I: ii 1,2 : 13, I), the opponents of Christian knowledge (i44, I2), the instigators of heretics (i $26: 56: 58$ ). They would undergo eternal punishment (i 28,1 ). This is not the place to enter upon a full discussion of demonology in general or of Justin's views in particular. It is sufficient to notice that the theory of the Apologies possesses a primitive crudity; but it is quite in line with the contemporary theory of the cause of evil, and it is a natural outcome of the views which are set forward in the Old Testament (perhaps under Oriental and Greek influences), and in the uncanonical literature such as the book of Enoch, and which were current in New Testament times.

Justin occasionally distinguishes between the evil angels and the demons. Thus in ii 4 (5), 2 he adopts the view that the angels fell by unnatural union with women, and that their offspring were the demons ${ }^{1}$. Similarly in ii 6 (7), I the same distinction is drawn. But usually the term $\delta a i \mu o v \epsilon s$ seems to include all the powers of evil. In the only reference in the Apologies to Satan, the Serpent, or the Devil (i 28, I), he is called the leader of the evil demons.

## Ethics and Eschatology.

Though Justin was much interested in the moral power and results of Christianity (i 14, 2: ii 10, 8), yet he gives no systematic theory of Christian ethics

[^16]in the Apologies, nor, as might be expected, does he touch on such delicate subjects as the morality of slavery. His chief ethical doctrine is that of human free-will (i 10, 4: 28, 3: 43: 44, 11: ii 6 (7), 3), which he attempts to reconcile with the belief in God's foreknowledge (i 43). Ethically considered, Christ's work is to effect a conversion of the will, to supplement free-will by imparting a bias towards good (i 61, io). Thus we are saved $\dot{\epsilon}_{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \tau \operatorname{ta\nu oias~(i~} 28,2$ ), and Gehenna is the punishment of immorality and unbelief in Christ's teaching (i 19, 8); Christian faith results in goodness. of life (i $65,1: 66,1:$ ii 3 (4), 2). Isolated details of conduct are touched upon; e.g. marriage and continence in i 15: 29; divorce in i 15, 5: ii 2, 5 ; the exposure of children in i 27: 29; obedience to constituted authority in i 17 . Suicide is condemried in ii 3 (4). The passage in ii 12,2 has been taken to imply a certain sympathy with the self-advertising desire for martyrdom, but it seems too vague to justify such an inference. It probably refers only to the public profession of Christian faith or the public championship of Christians, which entailed capital punishment. Justin does not attribute any special merit to virginity. In i 15, 6 ä $\phi \theta$ opo九 may mean 'virgins' (though it may simply mean 'chaste,' which would probably include legally married people), but even so virginity is not exalted to a higher position than wedlock.

Justin's esclatology is no more scientifically expounded than his ethical views. He believes that souls will possess perception after death (i 18,2 : 20 , 4: 52,3 ), and states that men will rise with the same bodies as they had on earth (i $8,5: 18,6: 19,4: 52,3$ ). His language is quite uncritical, but, so far as it goes, it seems to express a belief in the resurrection of the
natural body. Any theorizing on the subject would however have been quite out of place in the Apologies. After the Resurrection comes the judgment (i I2, I: I7, 4: 44, II ). The good will inherit eternal life and become indestructible and free from pain (i $8,2: 10,2: 12,2$ : $2 \mathrm{I}, 6: 52,3$ ), the wicked will suffer the pains of fire (i $44,5: 19,8$ ). This fire seems to be quite materially understood, and to be connected with the eventual conflagration of the world (i 20, 4: 57, I: ii 6 (7), I). No definition of eternity or eternal punishment is attempted, but it is stated to be an aicuía кó $\lambda \alpha \sigma \iota$, and not merely punishment for a period of a thousand years (i $8,4: 45$, 6 ), the $\pi \hat{v} \rho$ is aióviov (i $2 \mathrm{I}, 6$ etc.), and the punishment will last $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu$ áméf $a \nu \tau o \nu$ aí $\hat{\nu} \nu a$ (i 28 , I). It is also hinted that there will be no possibility of repentance after the judgment (i 28, $2: 40,7$ ).

## Justin and the N.T. Canon¹.

In Justin's time there was no fixed Canon of the New Testament, corresponding to that of the Old Testament. That there were Christian writings in existence is of course unquestionable, but the Church had not as yet compiled an official list of the books which best embodied its tradition. The process of selection of the fittest was not yet completed or approaching completion, and no doubt there were in use many Christian books (and probably many orally transmitted narratives) which varied both in text and in subject-matter from the books which eventually were

[^17]included in the Canon. It is quite possible that Justin was acquainted with such writings; but there are very few passages in the Apologies that give any clear indications of such an acquaintance. As a rule they are more naturally susceptible of a different explanation. (See notes on the separate passages i $16,5: 35,6: 50$, 12: 60, 3: 61, 4, 9.) There can be little question that Justin was acquainted with the chief books of the New Testament. Though he nowhere mentions St Paul, he must have known most of his epistles ; for not only do many passages in his works justify the supposition (see Index of Scripture quotations), but also the fact that he engaged in controversy with Marcion makes it incredible that he had not studied the Pauline literature. So far as the Synoptic Gospels are concerned, Justin quotes freely from them (though less, so far as can be traced, from St Mark than from the two others) in the Apologies; and he speaks of the $\dot{a} \pi о \mu \nu \eta \mu о \nu \epsilon \dot{v} \mu а \tau а \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{a} \pi о \sigma \tau o ́ \lambda \omega \nu$, ä калєitтa॰ єúayزє́ $\lambda \iota a^{1}$ in i 66, 3, and states that they were read at the Eucharistic meetings (i 67, 3). It seems impossible that these 'memoirs' should be any other than the Synoptic Gospels, from which Justin cites with such frequency, though it is not incredible that other writings, which did not at last obtain a place in the Canon, were still used in the public services of Churches in some places. Justin nowhere calls these writings inspired or quotes them as from God or the Spirit, and he supports the credibility of the New Testament by pointing to its accord with Old Testament prophecy (i 33,5 ); but he had no doubts of the Divine mission of the Apostles (i 39, 3: 50, 12), and he calls the Christian documents 'our writings' (i 28, 1). Their

[^18]liturgical use, alternative to or in company with the use of the prophetic Scriptures (i 67,3 ), would naturally produce, or be produced by, a belief in their inspiration.

Justin is, like most ancient authors, very careless in quotation. He misquotes, adapts, introduces glosses, combines passages, to suit his requirements; many of his variations from the text of the New Testament can also be explained as sheer lapses of memory, or as due to a variant text or to a divergence of oral tradition, or as influenced by a liturgical formula which differed from the Biblical text. But such phenomena are very frequent in ancient literature, and afford no proof that Justin possessed no text of the Synoptic Gospels. They appear similarly in his quotations from the Old Testament ${ }^{1}$ and from classical authors ${ }^{2}$.

The question whether he was acquainted with the Fourth Gospel can scarcely be answered with any certainty. The passages in i $6,2: 35,6: 52,12: 60$, 3 suggest reminiscences of that Gospel, but the inference in their case is exceedingly doubtful (see notes). In i I4, 5 he says that Christ's sayings were $\beta \rho a \chi$ єîऽ каì бúvто $о$ ои, which seems scarcely true of the teaching in the Fourth Gospel, and Veil argues therefore that Justin could not have known that Gospel. The argument however is not entirely convincing. Justin might have special reasons for quoting only from the Synoptists in his Apologies ${ }^{3}$.

[^19]And it would be quite possible to argue that even in the Fourth Gospel the teaching, though more continuous than it is in the Synoptic Gospels, is yet essentially gnomic in character. The passage in i 6I, 4, 5 seems to be an unquestionable, though inexact, citation from John iii 3-5 (see note ad loc.), but it is not outside the bounds of possibility that the phrase was a common formula in use at baptisms. If, leaving isolated passages, we turn to consider the Logos doctrine of Justin, we are met by a similar uncertainty. The phraseology, in which that doctrine is stated, is Johannine, and yet the underlying idea is not quite that of the Fourth Gospel. Furthermore it is quite possible that Justin is only expressing and developing views which had become the common property of the Church, or which were based upon the current philosophical teaching of the schools ${ }^{1}$. It cannot be confidently affirmed that Justin's theory must have been derived from a knowledge of the Fourth Gospel. When all the evidence is accumulated, the balance of probability may seem to incline in the direction of supposing that Justin was acquainted with this Gospel, but the supposition must be made tentatively, and the possibility of alternative explanations must be admitted.

## The Sacraments.

The Apologies give very little evidence for the system of Church organization with which Justin was acquainted. There is no mention of presbyters, and it is not stated whether the 'president' (o $\pi \rho o \epsilon \sigma \tau \omega ́ s$

[^20]i $65,3: 67,4$ ) at the Eucharistic service is a temporary or a regular official. But the 'deacons' of i $65,5: 67,5$ certainly seem to be permanent ministers. Justin however gives us exceedingly valuable descriptions of the Baptismal and Eucharistic services, and his account deserves detailed consideration.

Holy Baptism. No formulated creed is quoted, though it is not inconceivable that fragments of some such creed are found in i $13,3: 2 \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{I}: 3 \mathrm{I}, 7$; and it is admitted that the Roman Church had a Greek baptismal creed by the year i50. Nor is any definite allusion made to the custom of Infant Baptism. The passage in i 15,6 is often quoted as being such an allusion ${ }^{1}$, but it can, by itself, hardly be pressed to bear such a meaning. Oì $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \pi a i ́ \delta \omega \nu \dot{\epsilon} \mu a \theta \eta \tau \epsilon \dot{v} \theta \eta \sigma a \nu$ is far too vague a phrase to be invoked as definite evidence for the practice of Infant Baptism, though it is not hereby implied that the practice did not exist. But Justin's detailed description in i 6I is obviously meant to refer to the baptism of converts. So far as the form of administration is concerned, the following points should be noted; it is preceded by instruction, profession of faith ( $\pi \epsilon \iota \sigma \theta \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota$ ), and promise of obedience, by prayer and fasting in company with the converts' Christian instructors (2) ; the baptism is administered in the threefold Name (3, 10, 13), and Justin seems to speak only of immersion, using regularly the term 'bath' in reference to it²; nothing is said as to the person by whom the sacrament was administered, and it is not stated to be the privilege of any official person to perform the rite (cf. 10) ; after baptism the baptized person is introduced to the assembly of brethren, prayer
${ }^{1}$ E.g. in Gibson $X X X I X$ Articles. Article 27.
2 Whereas the Didaché (c. 7) allows affusion, where immersion is impossible.
is offered, and the worshippers kiss one another; the celebration of the Eucharist follows (i $6_{5}$, I-3). There is no mention of unction, or signing with the cross, or imposition of hands (though some suggest that the last ceremony may be implied in the mention of the prayers after baptism, and the coming to the $\pi \rho o \in \sigma \tau \dot{\omega} s$ very naturally falls in with this view ${ }^{1}$ ) ; and it is not made clear whether the kiss is the last baptismal or the first Eucharistic action. Warren (Ante-Nicene Liturgy p. 61) points out that in the Clementine liturgy the kiss of peace occurs at the beginning, as well as just before the offertory.

Justin's doctrine of the Sacrament is very simply stated, without any technical discussion of the various questions of later controversy. His statements may be summed up as follows: Baptism is firstly the completion of conversion (i $6 \mathrm{I}, 2$ ), involving self-dedication ( I ), public profession, repentance (2), and conscious recognition of a new ideal (i 65, i). Secondly it is regeneration (i $6 \mathrm{I}, 3,10$ ) and the beginning of a new life (каıдотоıך $\theta$ évтєя, i 61, 1). Those born in sin, the
 $\kappa а \grave{~ e ̀ \pi \iota \sigma \tau \eta ́ \mu \eta s(i ~ 6 I, ~ I O) . ~ T h i r d l y ~ i t ~ b r i n g s ~ r e m i s s i o n ~ o f ~}$ $\operatorname{sins}$ ( i I $, 2,10$ ). Fourthly it is an 'illumination' (i 6 I , 12), the seal of the enlightenment of those who have been taught the Christian faith. But Justin does not discuss in the Apologies the question whether the sacrament is merely symbolical or actually efficacious. His language is quite naive and untechnical, and could hardly have been otherwise in the conditions under which the Apologies were written, addressed as they are to heathen readers, and for the purpose of showing that the Christian rites are at any rate harmless.

[^21]The Eucharist. We have two descriptions of this service in the Apologies, one (i 65 ) giving the procedure after the baptism of converts, perhaps the Easter celebration, the other (i67) describing the ordinary Sunday Eucharist. The reasons for the observance of Sunday are stated in i 67,8 ; they are that on this day God dispelled darkness and created the world, and Christ rose from the dead ; there is no allusion to the Fourth Commandment.

The outline of the service is as follows: A reading from the 'memoirs' of the Apostles or the writings of the prophets is given (i 67,3 : this is the first reference to the liturgical use of Christian writings); the president delivers a homily (ib. 4); all stand up and pray in common (though no formulae of prayer are cited); then bread, wine, and water are brought to the president, who delivers over them a prayer (obviously not from a book), to which the congregation responds Amen (i 65, 3: 67, 5); then the elements are distributed to the worshippers, and taken to the absent by the deacons (i $65,5: 67,5$ ); the free-will offerings are presented to the president, who uses them to help those who are in need ( $\mathrm{i} 67,6$ ). This service is restricted to those who believe and have been baptized, and are living good lives (i 66, I) ; but Justin specifies no distinction between a missa catechumenorum and a missa fidelium. There is no mention of the use of the words of institution, though they are quoted in i 66, 3 ; nor are the words of administration given. Furthermore there is no mention of singing or of a benediction; though these ceremonies may have been in use at the time ${ }^{1}$.
${ }_{1}$ Thus the antiphonal singing of the Christians is mentioned by Pliny Ep. x 96 and a formula of blessing is given in the Apostolic Constitutions. Cf. Warren op. cit. p. 3 ro.

The carrying of the elements to the absent does not involve Reservation in the modern sense, nor is it suggested that the absent were only absent on grounds of sickness. It is perhaps a case of coincident administration ; or possibly the worshippers reserved for later use all or part of that which they received, and the absent similarly reserved for a convenient opportunity the consecrated elements brought to them ${ }^{1}$.

It is difficult to discover the precise nature of Justin's views on the Eucharistic sacrament, so far as they are stated in the Apologies ; and it seems to be a mistake to extract the dogmatic theories of later Sacramentalism from his vague and unscientific language. It is obvious that he regarded the Eucharist primarily as a service of praise (cf. i 13,2 : 10,1 ), a sacrifice ${ }^{2}$ of praise and thanksgiving ; his term for the elements is ci $^{\prime} \chi$ apıotia (i 66, r). And so he lays more stress upon it as an opportunity for corporate thanksgiving than as a memorial of Christ's death, a mystery, or a sacrament, or a social meal ${ }^{3}$. The crucial passage, in which he attempts to define the nature of the elements after consecration, is i 66, 2; and unfortunately the language of that passage is extraordinarily obscure, and admits of various interpretations. According to Otto's view, it means 'Just as by the word of God Christ became flesh, so by the word of prayer proceeding from Him the food is made the body and blood of the Incarnate Christ.' The 'word of prayer' is supposed by some to mean the Lord's Prayer ${ }^{4}$, which may have been thus used in the

[^22]Eucharist; Otto takes it to refer to Christ's words of institution, whilst Bishop Gore ${ }^{1}$ admits that 'any form of benediction of the elements, believed by the Church to be substantially what Christ used, or any form of prayer repeating His words of institution, would answer sufficiently to Justin's description.' This is also Donaldson's view ${ }^{2}$, though he translates $\delta i$ ' $\epsilon \dot{u} \chi \hat{\eta} s$ дórou ' by the prayer of reason,' i.e. any Christian prayer.

Another interpretation ${ }^{3}$ of the words, however, takes $\lambda o ́ \gamma o v$ as objective genitive; 'by prayer to (i.e. invocation of) the Logos which comes from God' (which may be identified with the Holy Spirit, cf. i 33, 6). This is a possible construction, for we find $\epsilon \dot{u} \chi a i \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu$ in classical Greek (cf. Luke vi 12). And it is perhaps impossible to decide which of the two renderings is the more plausible. In either case the phrase refers to the consecration of the elements by prayer. (See note ad loc.)

But what does Justin mean when he says that from these consecrated elements ai $\mu a \kappa \alpha i$ ба́ркєs катà $\mu \epsilon \tau a-$ $\beta o \lambda \eta ̀ \nu \tau \rho \epsilon ́ \phi о \nu \tau a \iota \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ ? The phrase has been taken to involve Transubstantiation in the fullest sense, but it is very dangerous to draw such definite inferences from the words of Justin. The general idea certainly seems to be that of a mysterious change in the elements, whereby they become more than коぃдòs ä $\rho \tau о$ о кои ко̀̀ то́ $\mu a$. And this change is compared to the Incarnation. Just as the Divine word effected the union of Divine and human in Christ, so the word of consecration effects a similar union in the elements. And this consecrated food operates upon our human nature ( $а \hat{i} \mu a \kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ \sigma \dot{\alpha} \rho \kappa є s$ is used in that general meaning, just as $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \rho \kappa \alpha \kappa а i ~ a i \mu a ~$

[^23]has been used of the nature which Christ assumed) кavà $\mu \epsilon \tau a \beta o \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \nu$, i.e. by process of assimilation. It seems obvious that Justin's language expresses a confused notion of Sacramental grace. The physical operation and the spiritual operation are both present in his thought, but he is not yet quite clear as to their relation. He explains the Eucharist by the Incarnation ; Christ became incarnate by the Word of God; so His incarnate nature is imparted in the Eucharist. But it is very doubtful whether he fully understood his own language. There is the germ of a Sacramental theory in his words, and his language may be taken to foreshadow later developments of such theory; but the time was not yet ripe for a full discussion of the methods by which Sacramental grace operated upon the recipient of the consecrated elements. Justin plainly believed that the bread and wine became Christ's body and blood, and by assimilation nourished the recipients; but it is very questionable whether he had considered the method of that change or the meaning of the 'assimilation' of which he speaks. He was, however, clearly convinced that the power of Christ's incarnate life was, through the medium of the consecrated elements, conveyed to the recipients, and he does not seem to have realized that the method of this communication was a point of difficulty, needing elucidation.

It has been suggested that the mention of wine as one of the Eucharistic elements is a later interpolation in Justin's works, and that he only knew of the use of bread and water. Harnack ${ }^{1}$, after emending oivov to šyov in i 54, 6, Tryph. 69, argues that there is no other mention of wine in Justin except in Apol. i 65: 67. He

[^24]points out that in i 66 Justin does not quote the passage ' I will not drink of the fruit of the vine'; further, that the phrase $\pi$ тоти́pıov v́ $\delta$ atos каi кра́натоs in i 65,3 is very suspicious, and that the words каi кра́натоs are absent in Cod. Ottob.; that therefore кра́натоs is to be regarded as a later correction for v̌סaros, which eventually got incorporated into the text. He then proceeds to excise the mention of wine in i $65,4: 67,5$, pointing out also that in the reference to the Mithras-cult in i 66, 4 water alone is spoken of. He thus arrives at the conclusion that the early Church used indifferently water or wine in the Eucharist, and attached the promise not to the specific elements but to the general act of eating and drinking in Christ's name. This theory is highly ingenious; but it seems dangerous thus to controvert the universal Church tradition, whereby bread and wine were regarded as the characteristic elements of the Eucharistic celebration. And Harnack's methods of dealing with the MS text are uncomfortably drastic. The references to the use of wine are too plain and simple to be thus ruthlessly deleted. The phrase v́daros каi кра́натоs is no doubt strange; but is it likely that the scribe, who ex hypothesi first corrupted the text into this form, would not have been conscious of its singularity? It is equally possible that Justin makes such special and repeated mention of water in order to refute the popular charge of drunkenness. The analogy of the Mithras-cult proves nothing. Justin has already pointed out that many anticipations of Christian usage showed plainly the ignorance of the demons who prompted them; and this might seem to him but another example of the same fact. The omissions of Cod. Ottob. are so numerous that it can scarcely be taken as a sufficiently authoritative guide in this matter. Nor can
much be inferred from Justin's omission to quote the passage referring to the 'fruit of the vine.' He might have quoted it, but he was under no necessity to do so. On the whole it may therefore be said that Harnack's arguments are more ingenious than convincing. Nor even is the emendation of oîvo to ővov to be accepted without hesitation ${ }^{1}$.

## III. The number of the Apologies.

So far the Apologies, which we possess, have been spoken of in the plural number. .But it is now necessary to discuss the question whether they are not really one single Apology. On this question authorities are divided in opinion. Thus Krüger ${ }^{2}$ declares that there are no grounds to suppose that these two Apologies were originally one. Cramer ${ }^{3}$ agrees with this view, but supposes them to have been united before the time of Eusebius. Harnack ${ }^{4}$ believes them to have been one, the second being an appendix to the first, and thinks it probable that Justin never wrote a second Apology, and that Eusebius, who says that he did, was attributing the work of Athenagoras to Justin. Similarly Bardenhewer ${ }^{5}$ points out that there is no evidence in later literature for another Apology by Justin. Finally Veil ${ }^{6}$ holds the extreme view that the two Apologies were always and organically one.-The external evidence is derived

[^25]entirely from Eusebius. (The mSS place the second Apology first and call the first ḋ $\pi$ тoдoyía $\delta \in u \tau \in ́ \rho a$.) Eusebius tells us ${ }^{1}$ that Justin wrote ${ }^{\text {dóyous } \dot{a} \pi o \lambda o \gamma i a v}$ é Xoytas, addressed to Antoninus Pius and the Senate; again ${ }^{2}$, that he wrote a $\lambda o ́ \gamma o s$ to Pius and his sons and the Senate, and a second $\dot{a} \pi$ oдororía to Antoninus Verus; again ${ }^{3}$, that he addressed a $\delta \epsilon \dot{\prime} \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu \quad \beta \iota \beta \lambda i ́ o \nu$ to Aurelius and L. Verus. These statements are by themselves somewhat vague and discrepant. But the confusion becomes worse, when we proceed to examine Eusebius' quotations from the Apologies. Thus in ii I3 he quotes Apol. i 26 as found $\grave{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \pi \rho o \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ ' A \nu \tau \omega \nu i ̂ \nu o \nu ~ a ̀ \pi o-~$
 $\dot{a} \pi$ тo 0 oría, but immediately afterwards quotes ii I 2 as $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$
 $\dot{a} \pi 0 \lambda o \gamma i a$, which might mean the first Apology or the סev́тєpod $\beta \iota \beta \lambda i ́ o \nu$ which he has just mentioned. In iv 17 he quotes ii 2 as $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \pi \rho o t \in ́ \rho a ~ a ̀ ~ a ̀ m o \lambda o x i ́ a . ~ . ~$

The inference seems obvious, that Eusebius' evidence is wholly untrustworthy. Perhaps he derived his quotations merely from a book of excerpts. But it is noteworthy that none of his quotations (with the doubtful exception of that in iv 16 ) is stated to come from the second Apology, and also that his statements in iv 16 and 18 as to the persons, to whom the second Apology was addressed, are almost certainly incorrect.-When we turn to the internal evidence of the Apologies themselves, we are faced with difficulties connected with the text. Thus in three passages of the second Apology there are references back to the first ${ }^{4}$; but Krüger

[^26]supposes two of these, and possibly all three, to be later glosses, and Cramer suggests that they were inserted by the man who put the two Apologies together. It is however a perilous habit to be too ready to discover glosses. Similarly the text in i i is doubtful; but at least it seems clear from i 3, 2 that the first Apology is addressed especially to a pious Caesar and to a philosophic Caesar; and the same seems to be the case with the second Apology (ii 2, 16: 15, 5). Finally it is possible to maintain that the.opening of the second Apology is strangely abrupt ${ }^{1}$, taking as it does the tone of an appeal to the Romans, whereas later the Apology is seen to be addressed to the Caesars. No doubt a certain amount of rhetorical licence might be allowed to Justin; but it seems incredible that in a formal document, addressed to the heads of the Roman State, he should begin in the tone of the opening words of ii I .The internal evidence is thus seen to be somewhat deficient in amount and strength ${ }^{2}$. And it is possible that complete agreement upon the point at issue will never be reached. But to the present writer it appears that the cumulative effect of the internal evidence, conjoined with the phenomena of Eusebius' quotations, and with a general feeling as to the line of argument pursued in the work, inclines the scale towards a belief in the unity of the two Apologies. It is possible that they were not originally one, and that the second Apology was added as an Appendix, when the event recorded in ii 2 occurred to excite Justin to a renewed effort; and that he then took the opportunity to answer certain

[^27]objections and to round off his arguments. This may be the explanation of the confusion visible in Eusebius' quotations. But it seems quite improbable that the two Apologies, which we possess, were wholly separate works. The probability in favour of the contrary view seems so strong that in the present edition the two have been printed as one continuous treatise. The disruption of the two may be explained as due to accident, or to the fact that the second was a later Appendix to the first ; the two editions (of the first separately, and of the first and second together) might have co-existed and thus caused confusion.

## Date of composition.

The date, at which this work was composed, is a matter of dispute. The question rests entirely upon internal evidence, and in order to understand the bearing of that evidence it is essential to be acquainted with the facts of Imperial adoptions under the Antonine Emperors.-In A.D. I 36 Hadrian adopted L. Ceionius Commodus Verus and gave to him the name of Caesar ; he thus became L. Aelius Verus Caesar. He died in A.D. I38 and Hadrian adopted T. Aurelius Fulvus Boionius Antoninus (later known as Antoninus Pius); at Hadrian's command Antoninus adopted M. Annius Verus or Verissimus, born A.D. I2I (who thus became M. Aurelius Antoninus), and the son of L. Verus, born A.D. I30, who thus became L. Aelius Aurelius Commodus. On Hadrian's death in 138 Antoninus Pius became Emperor. In I 39 M. Aurelius was given the title of Caesar, and he became co-regent in 147. L. Verus was received into the Senate in $153^{1}$. In I6I Pius died and

[^28]M. Aurelius became Emperor; he immediately made L. Verus Augustus and Princeps, i.e. fully equal to himself. In 162 L. Verus departed to the Parthian war.

If now we turn to the dedication of the 'first' Apology (i 1), we find that it is addressed to the Emperor Antoninus Pius, to his son Verissimus the philosopher, and to Lucius the philosopher, son of Caesar (i.e. of L. Aelius Verus Caesar) and adopted son of Pius. The text is probably corrupt. Thus viô by itself seems suspicious, and the insertion of $\sum_{\epsilon} \beta a \sigma \tau o \hat{v}$ before it would be an improvement. Some also would insert Kaíoapı with Oú $\eta \rho \iota \sigma \sigma i \mu \omega$, or insert Kaíбapı after Aùтокрáторь

 (omitting the subsequent comma) is also possible, as Spartian ${ }^{1}$ tells us that Lucius' father was eruditus in litteris. Veil suggests that the word $\phi \iota \lambda$ ooó $\phi o v$ (if accepted) is a mistaken gloss to designate Aurelius, L. Verus being confused with L. Commodus, Aurelius' own son. None, however, of these emendations affects the evidence as to the date, except the suggested insertion of Kaíoapc.

At first glance it certainly seems as if the date must be taken to be 138/i39, on the simple ground that Aurelius is called Verissimus, a name which he ceased to bear on his adoption, and is not called Caesar, a title which he received in I39. This evidence appears decisive to various authors ${ }^{2}$. And, though the omission of the title Caesar might certainly be due to textual corruption ${ }^{3}$, it may be admitted that the name Verissimus

[^29]is not such as could readily be supposed to be a later insertion, nor is it very probable that Justin was wrong in his nomenclature for the rulers whom he was addressing. At the same time it is fair to remark that the name Verissimus is in itself a species of nickname, such as might have clung to Aurelius all through life, as the epithet Pius clung to Antoninus.

And there are certain difficulties in the way of accepting this early date. Too much should not be made of the fact that in I39 Aurelius was only 18, and Lucius 9 years old, and therefore that the title of 'philosopher' is scarcely fitting to them. For we hear of Aurelius ${ }^{1}$ that philosophiae operam uehementer dedit et quidem adhuc puer. Nam duodecimum annum ingressus habitum philosophi sumpsit. Thus Lucius might be called philosophus even at the age of 9 (a point which does not need making, if $\phi \iota \lambda$ ooó $\phi o v$ be the right reading). But it is worth remarking that L. Verus was not taken into the Senate till 153, and yet is here addressed as if he were in public position and authority.

Hence many authors ${ }^{2}$ prefer to favour a later date than I 39 for the composition of the first Apology, and certain other passages agree with that theory. Thus in i 26 Justin says that he has already written a ov́v $\quad a \gamma \mu a$ against Marcion. The chronology of the Marcionite heresy is very uncertain, but it seems probable that Marcion came to Rome circ. A.D. I39. At first he was an orthodox Christian ; and he stood forward as an independent heresiarch only after some time, i.e. perhaps circ. A.D. I44And Justin's words attest the fact that he had attained some influence. Again in i 29, 3 the mention of Felix

[^30]naturally leads to the supposition that hereby is meant C. Munatius Felix, who, according to a papyrus, was prefect of Egypt A.D. 148-154. So too in i 46, I Justin tells us that he is writing about 150 years after Christ. No doubt that number is a round one, but it need not be entirely vague; and, if we adopt the chronology of St Luke, we should again have 147 - 154 as the date of the first Apology.

There are therefore many indications which favour the later date ; and, apart from the use of Oìpı $\sigma \sigma i \mu \omega$ in i I , there is nothing which conflicts with that date. It is true that in i 3I, 6 Justin refers to the revolt of Barcochba as $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \nu \hat{v} \nu \gamma \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \mu \epsilon \in \nu \omega \pi o \lambda \epsilon ́ \epsilon \varphi$ (the revolt having taken place in A.D. 132-135). But it is clear that his use of $\nu \hat{v} \nu$ is quite loose. Thus in i 29,4 he uses it with regard to Antinous, who was drowned A.D. I30; in i 42,4 he speaks of Christ as having been crucified $\kappa a \theta^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{a} \varsigma$, and in i 63,16 of Christ's advent as having been $\nu \hat{v} \nu$. Thus also in Tryph. I and 9 (which was written after the Apology, for he refers to it in c. 120) he speaks of the Judaic wars as only just over.

If the two Apologies are really one, they were probably (though not necessarily, if the second was an Appendix) written at the same or nearly the same time. And we find in ii I, I that the events narrated in ii 2 took place when Urbicus was prefect of the city. He is known to have held that office from A.D. 144-160. It has however been supposed, on the authority of Eusebius ${ }^{1}$, that the second Apology was addressed to Aurelius and L. Verus. But the internal evidence seems clearly against this view. Thus in ii 2,16 it seems inevitable to suppose that the reference is to Pius and

[^31]Aurelius. It is certainly strange that Verus should not be mentioned; but here again there is some insecurity of text, and Valesius, in his edition of Eusebius, suggests
 $\pi a i \delta i$, which Harnack and Schwartz accept. A more definite point is found in ii 2,8 , which presupposes the existence of only one autocrat, whereas in Aurelius' reign there were two Augusti. These arguments can be answered ; thus Ruinart and Otto, arguing for a date in Aurelius' reign, point out that Verus might have been absent at the Parthian war, to which he went in A.D. I62, and that therefore there would only have been one autocrat in Rome; again they suggest that Urbicus may have held office in Rome twice, and that the $\epsilon \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \beta \grave{\eta} s$ aùтокрát $\omega \rho$ of ii $2,16 \mathrm{might}$ be Aurelius (in which case the 'philosophic son of Caesar' of the same passage would have to be Commodus, who was not born till A.D. 161). But these arguments are obviously unconvincing, and Eusebius' statement is scarcely worth the trouble of defending. It seems inevitable to believe that the second Apology was written in Pius' reign, and probably after 152, for Crescens, according to Eusebius, did not become influential till that date, and in Apol. ii $8(3)$ he is represented as a dangerous enemy to Justin. The balance of evidence seems to be in favour of uniting the two Apologies ; and the internal evidence of the first Apology is mainly on the side of a date about A.D. I50153. The only alternative is to place the date of the first Apology about A.D. I39; in which case the second must have been written many years after the first, though even so there would be no impossibility in the way of supposing that Justin re-published the first, with the second added as an Appendix. But the bulk of the evidence is almost irreconcilable with the theory of so
early a date as A.D. I 39 for the first, and any date in Aurelius' reign for the second Apology. Nearly every indication is in the direction of bringing the dates of their composition closer to one another, and fixing them in a period very near to the year I 53.

## IV. MSS.

The text of the Apologies principally depends upon one Ms, Codex Regius Parisinus CDL, of the year A.D. I 364, in the National Library at Paris. It contains, besides other works, the Dialogue with Trypho and the Apologies, the so-called second Apology preceding the first. This text has been suspected of containing deliberate interpolations, as well as casual mistakes or additions; but it is our only guide of authority. This MS is symbolized in this edition, as in Otto's, by the letter A.

The Codex Claromontanus (LXXXII) or Fenzickianus (noted as B in Otto), of the year A.D. I54I, is an inferior copy of $A$, and is very seldom of any use for the correction of the text. It contains the Dialogue and the Apologies in the same order as A. According to Otto, this MS came into the possession of the Rev. J. A. Fenwick, of Cheltenham, in 1872.

Codex Ottobonianus graecus CCLXXIV, of the I 5 th century, containing Apology i 65-67, seems to represent a different tradition to that of $A$, but is very faulty. (Rome, Vatican Library.)

Codex Parisimus supplementi graeci $C X C$, of the 17 th century, contains excerpts. (Paris. National Library.)

Besides these, two MSS, Codex Ambrosianus H. I 42 infer. (Milan) of the year 1564, and Codex Monaconsis

CXXXII (Royal Library, Munich) of the year 1565, contain in Latin version i 65-67. Occasional help for the establishment of the text is also derived from the quotations in Eusebius Hist. Eccl.; the text of these has been taken from the edition of E. Schwartz (Leipzig, 1908). The quotations in John of Damascus' Sacra Parallela are valueless for critical purposes; they are collected in K. Holl Fragmente vornicänischer Kirchenväter aus den Sacra Parallela.
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## Analysis of the Apologies.

i I-5. Introductory. I claim for the Christians justice and a fair trial. The mere name of Christian is not a sufficient ground of punishment; it is the conduct of Christians that should be investigated. The ordinary procedure against us is due to the influence of the demons, who have always been opposed to the Logos.

6-12. Examination of popular complaints against the Christions. (a) Atheism. We are not atheists (6); some of us may indeed be malefactors, and if so, should be punished as such (7). Our doctrine has analogies with that of Plato (8). True, we do not worship idols (9), nor offer material oblations (io), but we believe in a God who desires moral conduct on the part of men. (b) Treason. The kingdom we look forward to is not one of this world. We are obedient to your authority (II), and are really your best allies in the cause of peace and virtue ( I 2 ).

## 13-67. Explanation of Christianity.

(a) The Christian faith is perfectly rational (I3), and produces purity of life (14), in obedience to Christ's injunctions ( $15-17$ ), and in accordance with our belief in immortality (18, 19). And this belief has its parallels in heathen writings (20), even as our doctrine of Christ is not dissimilar to, though it is more moral than, heathen mythology (2r). But we believe Christ to be the Son of God in a unique way (22). The truth of this shall now be proved (23).
(b) i. Christianity alone is true. For the Christians alone are persecuted (24), and yet persist in their faith (25). Even heretical Christians suffer immunity (26), and therefore it is plain that the opposition to us is the work of the demons. Moreover our lives are pure (27-29).
ii. Christ is really the Son of God. This is proved by the fulfilment of prophecy (30-53).
iii. The disbelief in Christ is due to the demons, who attempted to forestall His coming by propagating heathen myths ( 54,55 ), and since that time have instigated magicians and heretics ( $56-58$ ). Other antici-
pations of Christian doctrines can be found in the philosophers, who borrowed their ideas from the Bible (59, 60).
(c) The Christian cultus must be described, viz. Baptism (6I), a rite which has also been anticipated by the demons (62) [Cap. 63 is a digression], as they anticipated other Christian ideas (64), and the Eucharist (65-67).

68-ii 2. Appeal. I claim fair treatment. Hadrian's rescript shows that this would be no reversal of previous policy (68). And the necessity for such an appeal is proved by the persecutions of Christians at the hands of the demons' tools (ii 1 ), of which I can give you a recent example (2).

3 (4)-9. I may briefly answer certain objections: (a) Why Christians may not commit suicide, and must not deny their faith (3). (b) Why God allows persecution. It is due to the abuse of free-will by fallen angels (4), and the only power which enables men to use their freewill rightly is the power of Christ (5). But God's final judgment on life will come in time (6). All champions of righteousness have been persecuted (7), and I am anticipating a similar fate (8). (c) The doctrine of Divine retribution is not degrading, but true and moral (9).
10. Summary. The superiority of Christian doctrine is due to the very nature of Christ.

II-I 3. Personal challenge. We do not fear death (II), and this shows the nobility of our belief (I2), and our right to take a pride in it (I3).

I4, I5. Conclusion.

## Differences from Kriiger＇s text．

| page | line |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | 8 |  |
| 16 | 13 |  $\theta$ ov |
| 40 | 1 | ̇̇v raфaîs |
| 40 | 2 |  |
| 42 | 10 | $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \in \rho \gamma \eta \theta \in \epsilon \nu \tau \alpha$ каї aủtò |
| 43 | 7 | $\pi \epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota ⿺ 𠃊$ |
| 43 | 12 | oi oủ кolv $\omega \nu 0$ û̀t $\epsilon$ s $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ aủ $\frac{\omega}{\omega} \nu$ <br>  тò є́тькатךүорои́ $\mu \in \nu 0 \nu$ ő $\nu о \mu a$ <br>  $\sigma \iota \nu$ |
| 47 | 4 |  |
| 47 | 14 | סià фóßou |
| 57 | 16 | ảmò rov̂ |
| 58 | 6 | ámò $\tau 0 \hat{u}$ |
| 66 | 8 | ámò $\tau$ oû |
| 73 | 9 | $\mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \delta \nu \quad \pi \alpha \rho a \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \sigma \delta \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma \nu$, $\pi \alpha \rho a \gamma \epsilon \nu b \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \nu$ |
| 76 | 15 |  |
| 85 | I | $\theta \epsilon$ ds |
| 91 | 4 | $\gamma \in \nu o \mu e ́ \nu o u s$ |
| 92 | 6 | $\dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho \tau \iota \omega ิ \nu \stackrel{\omega}{\omega} \nu$ |
| 105 | 8 | $\sigma v \gamma \gamma \in \nu \in \sigma \theta \theta \iota$ |
| 106 | 16 | $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon \iota \dot{\eta}$ |
| 107 | 7 | $\alpha \nu \epsilon \delta \omega \kappa \kappa \nu$ |
| 107 | 12 |  |
| 107 | 15 | ［ $\epsilon$ is $\quad \delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \grave{\alpha} \quad \dot{\epsilon} \mu \beta a \lambda \delta{ }^{2} \tau \tau \alpha \quad$ то̀ $\nu$ II $\tau о \lambda \epsilon \mu \alpha \hat{\imath} о \nu]$ |
| 107 | 17 |  |
| 108 | 3 | бьঠабка入єîo |
| 109 | 4 | MS Caps．3－8 |
| 118 | 14 |  |
| 120 | 13 | ठıà тoû тò $\lambda$ ． |
| 124 | 12 | $\alpha{ }^{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi i \nu \omega \nu$ |

## K．

$\pi \rho 0 \lambda \epsilon \chi \theta \epsilon \in \tau \alpha s$
oú $\gamma$ à $\rho$ סıà．．．ádıко仑ิ $\sigma \iota \nu, \epsilon i \delta^{\prime}$

$\epsilon^{\prime} \nu \gamma \rho \alpha \phi a i s$
öт $\begin{array}{r}\text { 人à } \rho \text { oủ }\end{array}$
$\epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \rho \gamma \eta \theta \epsilon \in \nu \tau \alpha$ каi
$\pi \epsilon \pi о$ १ŋкє
ov̉ ко८้ $\omega \hat{\nu}{ }^{\delta} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ do $\gamma \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu \tau 0 i ̂$ фı入oбóфо८s tò Ė $\pi \iota \kappa a \lambda o u ́-$ $\mu \in \nu 0 \nu$ övo $\mu a$ т $\eta$ s $\phi i \lambda o \sigma o \phi i a s$

$\epsilon_{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \gamma \kappa \rho a \tau \epsilon \nu \delta \mu \epsilon \theta a$
ठıà $\phi$ b $\beta$ ov
à $\pi \grave{̀} \pi \rho 0 \sigma \omega ́ \pi o u ~ \tau o u ̂ ~$
ảm $\pi \rho \rho \sigma \sigma \dot{\omega} \pi o v \tau 0 \hat{u}$
à $\pi \dot{\delta} \pi \rho \circ \sigma \omega ̈ \pi o v ~ \tau o \hat{v}$
X $\rho \iota \sigma \tau \delta \nu, \pi a \rho a \gamma \in \nu \delta \mu \in \nu 0 \nu$
$\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \delta \epsilon\{\kappa \nu \cup \mu \epsilon \nu$
$\theta \in \dot{\partial} \nu$
$\gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \omega \mu \epsilon ́ \nu$ ous
$\dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \iota \omega \hat{\nu}[\dot{u} \pi \dot{d} \rho] \dot{\omega} \nu$
$\sigma v \gamma \gamma \epsilon \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$
$\epsilon \pi \epsilon i$
$\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \delta \epsilon \delta \omega \kappa \epsilon$

єis $\delta \epsilon \sigma \mu a ̀$ є́ $\mu \beta \alpha \lambda \delta \nu_{\tau} \tau$ тòv Пто－ $\lambda \epsilon \mu a i ̂ o \nu$
aủ兀ò тoûto $\mu$ óvoע，$\epsilon l$
$\delta \iota \delta a \sigma \kappa \alpha ́ \lambda \iota \varnothing \nu$
MS Caps．4－8， 3
om．
$\delta \iota \dot{\alpha} \tau \dot{\partial} \lambda$ ．
$\dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \epsilon i \omega \nu$

## TO؟ AГIO؟ IOTミTINO؟ ФIムOミОФО؟ KAI MAPTYPO乏 AПOAOГIA $\Upsilon \Pi E P$ XPIミTIAN $\Omega$ N MPO乏 ANTRNINON TON EYミEBH．






 тîvos Прíкои тov̂ Вакдєíov，т̂̂̀ àmò Фдаovías Néas
 $\pi \rho о \sigma \phi \dot{\omega} \nu \eta \sigma \iota \nu \kappa \alpha i ̀$ è $\nu \tau \epsilon \nu \xi \iota \nu \quad \pi \epsilon \pi \sigma$ ín $\mu a \iota$ ．

 $8 \stackrel{\omega}{\nu}$ Otto om A Eus

1．Dedication．See Intr．p．xlvii．
4．＇$\rho a \sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \pi a!\delta$.$] ＇lover of letters．＇$ Cf．2，2．In Plato we find $\epsilon$ € $\alpha \sigma \tau \tau \grave{\eta} s$ $\nu \circ \hat{v}, \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \eta \dot{\prime} \mu \eta s, \pi \epsilon \rho i \quad \tau o ̀ ~ \kappa \alpha \lambda o ̂ \nu, \dot{\epsilon} \pi i$ ooфiq．Maideia is the Platonic word for mental culture and accomplish－ ments，fairly equivalent to the Latin humanitas．
ib．$i \in \rho \hat{a}$ 位 $\tau \in \sigma \gamma \kappa$ ．］Cf．Cic．de Divin．i 12 ＇sanctus Senatus．＇Also in Verg．Aen．i 426 ．Juv．xi 29 has ＇sacri Senatus．＇Justin repeats the phrase i 56,2 ，ii 2,16 ．

5．Є̇к тavtòs $\gamma$ t́vous］possibly ＇hated by every race＇（cf．Matt．x 22 ，and for a similar use of $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa$ Thuc．iii 69）；but far more probably ＇out of every race，＇alluding to the wide spread of Christianity．Cf． Tryph．52，131，$A p$ ．i 25 ，I．

6．$\mu \iota \sigma o v \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu \omega \nu$ к．$̇ \pi \eta \rho$ ．］Cf． Luke vi 27， 28 ；Ep．ad Diogn． 5.

7．Прібкои ктл．］．The father＇s name is Latin，the grandfather＇s is Greek．Flavia Neapolis was near the old Sichem，and was organized as a Greek city in A．D．70；now called Nablous．The Roman pro－ vince lost its name of Judaea after the rebellion in Hadrian＇s reign and was officially called Syria Palaestina． This was the old name found in Herodotus $\Sigma v p i \eta \dot{\eta}$ Пa入aı $\sigma$ тiv $\eta$ i 105 ， ii ro6，iii 9r，iv 39．The article with Ma入a८бтivך is sometimes omitted on coins of Neapolis，ac－ cording to Otto．

8．aú $\omega \hat{\omega} \nu$ ］i．e．$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \mu \tau \sigma o u \mu \notin \nu \omega \nu$ $\kappa \tau \lambda$ ．

9．$\pi \rho \circ \sigma \phi \dot{\prime} \nu \eta \sigma \iota \nu \kappa \alpha i \nLeftarrow \nu \tau \epsilon \nu \xi \iota \nu]$ The

2．I．Toùs катà à $\lambda^{\prime} \theta \epsilon \iota a \nu \epsilon \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \beta \epsilon i \varsigma ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ \phi \iota \lambda о \sigma o ́ \phi o u s ~$ $\mu o ́ \nu o \nu ~ \tau a ̉ \lambda \eta \theta e ̀ s ~ \tau \iota \mu a ̂ \nu ~ \kappa а i ~ \sigma т є ́ p \gamma є \iota \nu ~ o ́ ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma o s ~ i ́ \pi a \gamma o p \epsilon v ́ є \iota, ~$







 3．ov̉ $\gamma \grave{a} \rho \kappa о \lambda a \kappa \epsilon v ́ \sigma o \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma ~ \dot{v} \mu a ̂ \varsigma ~ \delta ı a ̀ ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \epsilon \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ үра $\mu \mu \alpha ́-$ $\tau \omega \nu$ ov̉ס̀̀ $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \chi a ́ \rho \iota \nu ~ o ́ \mu i \lambda \eta ́ \sigma о \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma, ~ a ̀ \lambda \lambda ’ ~ a ̉ \pi a \iota \tau \eta ́ \sigma о \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma ~ \kappa а \tau \grave{\alpha}$


$3 \pi \alpha \lambda \alpha \iota \hat{\nu} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \xi \alpha \kappa$ ．A $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \omega \hat{\nu}$ áко入ovөєî̀ Sacr Parall Holl 94 ｜｜ 8 öть $\lambda \epsilon \in \gamma \sigma \theta \epsilon \mathrm{A}$ om Steph $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$ ör七 Trollope \｜ $\mathrm{I}_{4} \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \epsilon \lambda \eta \lambda \hat{\theta} \theta a \mu \epsilon \nu$ Otto $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \epsilon \lambda \eta \lambda \dot{u} \theta \epsilon \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu \mathrm{~A}$
former word is used meaning＇an address，＇Lat．oratio．＂E $2 \tau \epsilon \cup \xi$ is is a technical word for a＇petition．＇It is found in Böckh＇s C．I．，2829． 11 ． （See Liddell and Scott．）

2．Do not be led astray by bad precedent，prejudice，rumour，or superstition to prefer anything to truth．Be true to your reputation． We ask for a fair and diligent ex－ amination；do not condemn your－ selves by refusing it．We at any rate can suffer no hurt，even if you kill us，unless we be proved to be cvildocrs．

2．＇$\lambda$ boros］＇reason＇in general， the sense of right，feeling for truth． A Platonic use．It is caught up by ó $\sigma \dot{\prime} \phi \rho \omega \nu \lambda$ ．just below．

3．тapaırountévous］The word means＇to excuse oneself，decline．＇ Cf．Luke xiv 18，and，with in－ finitive，Heb．xii 19，Acts xxv ir．

5．ó $\sigma \dot{\omega} \phi \rho \omega \nu \lambda \hat{\gamma}$ ．］Cf．o dà $\eta \theta \dot{\eta} s$入óros in 3，1．The distinction between the two adjectives is not
very definite．The phrase here could be Latinized into sana ratio and the second phrase into uera ratio．
ib．є́к $\pi \alpha \nu \tau \grave{s} \tau \rho o ́ \pi$ ．］．．The phrase is found in Xen．An．iii 1， 43 and elsewhere．

6．$\pi \rho \delta$ ］＇in preference to，＇Lat． prae．For a similar sentiment cf． Plat．Ap． 28 13．－

8．$\overline{\delta \tau \iota \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon]}$ If retained，the sentence is ploonastic ；＇you have the reputation that you are called．＇ It is tempting to excise these two words as a gloss or to alter them so as to avoid the pleonasm．Otto suggests oij $\alpha$ instead of o $\hat{\nu} \nu$ ，but does not admit the conjecture into his text．

12．$\pi \rho o ̀ s \chi a ́ \rho \iota \nu \dot{o} \mu \iota \lambda$.$] ＇speaking to$ win your favour．＇

14．$\mu \grave{\eta} \pi \rho о \lambda \eta \dot{\psi} \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］＇asking you to judge us，not with prejudice， nor in obedience to a desire of pleasing the superstitious，not with urereasonable impetwosity，nor by （rcference to）the popular disfavour











 oî oủ крíбєє à $\lambda \lambda a ̀ ~ \pi a ́ \theta \epsilon \iota ~ \tau a ̀ ~ \pi \rho a ́ \gamma \mu a \tau a ~ \epsilon ̇ \pi a ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu ~ a ̀ \xi \iota ю v ̂ \tau \epsilon . ~$

 Bellios Otto
which has for a long time prejudiced our case; for so you will be condemning yourselves.' A somewhat slipshod sentence even if (as is not certain) all the datives depend on катєХо $\mu \notin \nu$ ous. The change from $\mu \eta \delta \hat{\delta}$ to $\hat{\eta}$ suggests that $\dot{\delta} \rho \mu \hat{\eta}$ and $\phi \dot{\eta} \mu \eta$ should be taken with $\phi$ épovias. Прокате́хш means 'to preoccupy' and so literally here 'which has preoccupied your minds, or the public mind.' The idea in $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$
 favourite one with Justin (e.g. c. 3, 1; 4, 2). Cf. also Plat. $A p$. 30 c .
3: $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon i ̂ s ~ \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \quad \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho] \quad \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ justifies $\kappa \alpha \theta$ ' $\dot{\epsilon} \alpha \tau \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$. 'The sentence will be against yourselves, not us; for we cannot be hurt.'
4. $\left.\eta_{\nu} \mu \dot{\eta}\right]$ Cf. I Pet. iv 15 .
5. ȧтоктєìval] Cf. Plat. loc. cit.
3. We ask for a fair inquiry and agree to punishment, if any charges are proved agninst us. But if tee are guiltless, it is irrational to punish us; if you judge from passion, you are wronging your-
selves. As subjects should be able to account for their lives, so rulers should obey the dictates of piety and philosophy; this is for the public good and is in accordance with old maxims. So we must explain our case; you must listen and judge fairly.
 'E E $\epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha} \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ and $\kappa о \lambda \alpha{ }^{\prime} \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ are both passive ; with the latter word aúvoús would strictly be required.
9. $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \delta \epsilon \iota \kappa \nu \dot{v} \omega \nu \tau a l]$ Note the plural verb with a neuter plural subject ; an exceptional use, generally found with nouns denoting persons.

Io. $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda \frac{\nu}{\nu} \delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ кo八.] It may conceivably be intended to mean 'we would feel called upon to punish ourrselves.' But the phrase seems dubious; it probably comes from the $\mu \hat{\lambda} \lambda \lambda o \nu \delta \dot{\delta}$ éautoús below, to which some one has added кo入á̧धı as an explanation.
14. $\tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \rho a ́ \gamma \mu a \tau \alpha$ ह̇ $\pi a ́ \gamma$.] Otto translates lites intendere, 'to set up

I-2
 $\sigma \omega \phi \rho о \nu \hat{\omega} \nu$ ảmoфаעєîtal，тò тov̀s ả $\rho \chi o \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o v s ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \epsilon u ̉ \theta u ́ \nu \eta \nu ~$









 Sacr Par Holl $95 \| 7$ Tov кai $\tau \iota s \kappa \tau \lambda$ A $\tau i s \pi o v \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi a \lambda a \omega \hat{\omega} \nu \cdot \eta_{\nu} \mu \grave{\eta}$ oi


aitiay Dem．277，12；275， 4 ； $\pi \rho a ́ \gamma \mu a \tau a \quad$ є̇ $\pi$ á $\gamma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ id． 1256 ，II． Otto cites Xen．Mem．ii 9， 1 ； Joseph．Antiq．xiv 10，7；1 Cor． vi I．It is perhaps more simple to translate＇to bring on us the trouble we mention＇（this being the force of $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ ），referring to dं $\nu a \iota \tau i o u s$ áoıкєiv．Cf．the common phrases $\pi \rho a ́ \gamma \mu a \tau a \quad \pi \alpha \rho \in ́ \chi \epsilon \iota \nu$ ，̇̇ $\pi a ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu \quad \kappa \iota \nu-$ סúvous．

1．$\pi$ ро́к $\lambda \eta \sigma \iota$ ］＇a legal challenge．＇ $\Pi \rho o ́ \sigma \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma \iota s$ means＇a judicial sum－ mons or citation．＇

2．єن́Ө́́v $\quad$ 〕］A legal word mean－ ing strictly＇an examination of ac－ counts＇at the expiration of a term of office．So $\epsilon \dot{v} \theta \dot{v} \nu \epsilon \iota \nu(4,6)$ means ＇to audit accounts，to call to account．＇

3．入ó $o \mathrm{ou}$ ］＇doctrine．＇＇Thus we have later $\beta$ iov каl $\mu a \theta \eta \mu a ́ t \omega \nu$ $\epsilon \pi i \sigma \kappa \epsilon \psi \iota \nu$ ．
ib．ä入 $\eta \pi$ rov＇＇not to be laid hold of＇，and so here＇offering no handle for reproof．＇The comparative is used in the sense of＇impregrable，＇ Thuc．i $37,143$.

4．$\epsilon \dot{\cup} \sigma \epsilon \beta \epsilon i \not q$ каl $\phi \iota \lambda$ ．］used with special reference to the description of Antoninus and Marcus．

7．$\dot{a} \nu \nu \dot{\eta} \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］An inaccurate reminiscence of Plat．Rep． 473 D，e，
 raîs $\pi$ ó $\epsilon \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu$ そ̈ oi $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \eta \hat{\eta}_{s} . . \phi i \lambda o \sigma o-$
 hear（Capit．Marc．27）that one of Aurelius＇favourite maxims was ＇florere ciuitates si aut philosophi imperarent aut imperatores philoso－ pharentur．＇

10．$\delta \quad \pi \omega s \mu \grave{\eta} \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］The idea is that it would be the Christians＇own fault if they allowed people to remain in ignorance of the principles of the Christian religion，and so suffered； if they did not speak for themselves， they were morally responsible for the injustice committed against them． The ms text is impossible．Otto＇s reading gives excellent sense．He translates $\dot{v} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho$ by corum causa＇on account of them．＇But its sense here perhaps is rather＇in place of．＇（So Veil has an Stelle derer．This sense is not unknown or uncommon in Attic．See Liddell and Scott．） The sentence is not thoroughlylucid， but can be translated＇so that rue may not－in place of those who live in ignorance（ $\nu$ ouisóvtet aj àocîv are





4．I．＇ $\mathrm{O} \nu$ of $\mu a \tau o s ~ \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ o u ̉ \nu ~ \pi \rho o \sigma \omega \nu v \mu i ́ a ~ o u ̛ т \epsilon ~ a ̉ \gamma a \theta o ̀ \nu ~ 5 ~$


 $5 \pi \rho \circ \sigma \omega \nu v \mu l a \mathrm{Grab} \pi \rho \circ \sigma \omega \nu v \mu i \neq \mathrm{A} \| 7$ öбov $\gamma \epsilon$ Otto örov $\tau \epsilon \mathrm{A}$
in the habit of ignorance）of our life and doctrines－bring on ourselves the punishment for the errors they com－ mit in blindness，＇i．e．＇if we do not enlighten them，we shall suffer in their place，on their behalf；for we shall be accountable for their ignorance．＇A good principle of missionary enterprise．

2．$\dot{\omega}$ s aipєî $\lambda o ́ \gamma$ ．］＇it stands to reason．＇The phrase is common in Herodotus．
3．àaто入ó $\eta \tau$ on кт入．］＇When once you have learnt the truth，if you do not act justly，you will have no excuse for the future before God．＇ The impersonal turn of the sentence is distinctly curious．

4．A name by itself is insig－ nificant；it is the conduct accom－ panying it which matters．You punish others for proved ill－deeds， but us merely for our name．Per－ hats some of us are evildoers，but it is unfair to treat us all on an equality．All philosophers have not the same theories，and some live very unworthily；some also teach atheism or degrade the moral character of the gods；and yet you do not punish them．

5．óvó $\mu a \tau o s ~ к \tau \lambda$ ．］Cf．I Pet．iv 14－16；Terr．Apol． 2 ＇illud solum expectatur quod odio publico neces－ sarium est，confessio nominis non examinatio criminis．＇Here is the regular distinction between the nomen ipsum and the Alagitia cohaerentia nomini，about which Pliny had in－
quire in his famous letter to Trajan （ $x$ 96）．Trajan（ib．97）had replied ＇Conquirendi non sunt；si deferantur et arguantur，puniendi suns，it amen ut qua negauerit se Christa－ nom esse idque re ipsa manifestum fecerit，id est supplicando dies nostris， quamuis suspectus in praeteritum， ueniam ex paenitentia impetret．Sine auctore aero propositi libelli in nolo crimine locum habere debent．＇Ter－ tullian $A p .2$ criticises this＇ O senten－ tam necessitate confusam；negat inquirendos ut innocentes et mandat puniri ut nocentes．＇This criticism is unfair．It was the ordinary Roman procedure to require an accuser；the Christians were not conquirendi，because they were not malefactors，and so inquisition for them by the State was unnecessary． But if they were accused and refused to abjure their faith，they were to be punished as Christians，ie．for the mere name．Pius on the whole followed Trajan＇s policy．

8．रрŋбто́тaтo九］It is hardly necessary to point out that Justin knew the real meaning of Christ＇s name．Cf．ii 5 （6），3．The play upon words here is such as the ancients were fond of．It seems to have been made possible by popular mispronunciation of the word．Cf．Suet．Claud． 25 ＇imp－ pulsore Chresto＇（unless the Chrestus there named is some other person than Christ）．Lect．iv 7， 5 ＇ex－
 aíтєî̀ ảфíє $\theta a \iota, \pi a ́ \lambda \iota \nu, \epsilon i \quad \mu \eta \delta \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ \delta \iota a ́ ~ \tau \epsilon ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \pi \rho о \sigma \eta \gamma o \rho i ́ a ̆ \nu$







 ỏ ขó $\mu a \tau о \varsigma, ~ \tau о и ̀ s ~ к а \tau \eta \gamma о \rho о и ิ \nu \tau а \varsigma ~ \mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda о \nu ~ к о \lambda a ́ \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu ~ o ́ \phi \epsilon i \lambda \epsilon \tau \epsilon . ~$
 $\mu \iota \sigma \epsilon i ̂ \sigma \theta a \iota$ ov ठíкаıov. 6. каі̆ $\pi a ́ \lambda \iota \nu, ~ \epsilon ่ a ̀ \nu ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \nu ~ \tau \iota \varsigma ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$




 $\nu \eta \tau \alpha \iota$. 7. òv үà $\rho$ т о́тоу тарадаßóvтєs тıעє̀s тарà

 $\tau \iota \mu \omega \rho \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota$ Sacr Par ib \| 16 tis $\dot{\delta} \mu 0 \lambda о \gamma \eta \dot{\sigma} \eta$ Otto $\tau \iota \dot{o} \mu 0 \lambda \mathrm{~A}$
ponenda huius nominis ratio est propter ignorantium crrorem qui eum immutata littera Chrestum solent dicere.' Tert. ad Nat. 3 'A uobis Chrestiani pronuntiamur, nam ne nominis quidem ipsius liquido certi estis.'
3. mo入ıteial] ratio uitae cinilis. Cf. Dem. 399, 6 ots $\epsilon \sigma \tau^{\prime} \epsilon \nu \lambda$ dóoss $\dot{\eta}$ $\pi о \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon l a=q u i$ in oratione versantur. Pautigny neatly translates here ' $S$ 'il est prouvé que notre genre de vie n'est pas plus coupable que notre nom.'
4. à $\omega \nu \iota a ̂ \sigma a \iota]$ A strong word, 'to be excecdingly anxious'; perhaps it might be rendered in Latin by
laborare.
7. ¿̇ข́ $\rho \epsilon \tau 0 \nu]$ 'virtuous.'
9. ' $\phi^{\phi}$ ' $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ ] probably not 'in your presence' (though that is a possible rendering), but 'in relation to yourselves,' i.e. non-Christians, parallel to the subsequent ' ' $\phi^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ ' in relation to us.'
16. $\delta i \dot{\alpha} ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{o} \mu o \lambda o \gamma[a \nu] \mathrm{Cf}$. the vivacious passage in Tert. Ap. 2.
 3, 2.
19. тарa入aßb$\nu \tau \epsilon s \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Cf. Matt. x 33 where ápveío0aı is used; in Mark viii 38 , Luke ix 26 we find $\epsilon \pi \pi \alpha \iota \sigma \chi$ v́v $\epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$.

 $\pi a \rho \epsilon ́ \chi \circ v \sigma \iota \tau 0 i ̂ s ~ a ̈ \lambda \lambda \omega \varsigma ~ \kappa a \tau a \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu \tau \omega ิ \nu \pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \iota a \nu \omega ิ \nu$



 $\kappa a i ̀ ~ \delta o \gamma \mu a \tau i ́ \sigma a \nu \tau \epsilon S ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi a \lambda a \iota \omega ิ \nu \tau \hat{\omega}$ évì ỏ $\nu o ́ \mu a \tau \iota ~ \pi \rho o \sigma a-$







2 di $\lambda \omega \omega_{s} \mathrm{~A}$ ä $\lambda \lambda o t s$ mult

courage one another' to follow Christ ; or, better, passive 'are encouraged,' as the omission of an object after тарак. (if middle) is harsh.
I. какиิs $\zeta \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon s]$ A general statement, perhaps with a special reference to the immoral Christian sects of the time, such as the Carpocratians.
2. ä $\lambda \lambda \omega s$ ] 'anyhow,' alioquin (Otto), auch olnnedem (Veil).
ib. кaтa入є́ $\gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ ] properly 'to tell at length, reckon up.' Here it seems used as equivalent to катךүорєiv, and takes a genit. of the person accused, and an accus. of the crime alleged.
5. ப́тобхє́ $\sigma \epsilon \omega s$ ] properly 'promise,' so here 'profession.' Cf. imıoxpou-
 in the same sense, e.g. in I Tim. ii 10.
8. $\dot{a} \theta \epsilon \dot{\sigma} \tau \eta \tau a]$ Under the early Empire Epicureanism and Cynicism grew in influence, especially among the educated, though the populace still preserved much of its old religious feeling. In the 2nd century the educated classes underwent a reaction towards religion, reaching
often to childish and fanatical superstition. Of this reaction Fronto and Plutarch are striking instances; Lucian and Galen are exceptions. 'A $\theta$ єór $\eta$ s was one of the main charges brought against the Christians.
9. $\Delta l a \dot{\alpha} \sigma \epsilon \lambda \gamma \hat{\eta}]$ Cf. the strictures of Heraclitus, Xenophanes, and Plato.
II. oi $\mu \in \tau \epsilon \rho \chi$ о́ $\left.\mu \in \nu_{0}\right]$ ' thase who attend to, pursue, follow after.'
12. roútous] i.e. Zeus and his children.
5. You are really urged on by evil demons, who in ages past committed abominations and frightened men into calling them gods, each with a special name. Socrates tried to recall men from this belief, but the demons procured his death; and similarly they are causing us too to be attacked as atheists and impious. Just as Socrates, by $\lambda o ́ \gamma o s$, refuted the belief in the so-called gods, so the Aóros incarnate in Christ teaches us that these are evil demons.
13. $\tau i \delta \dot{\eta}$ oĩ $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] A rhetorical question. 'Why should this be? what is the meaning of it?'
ib. ' $\begin{gathered} \\ \\ \text { ' } \dot{\mu} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \text { ] 'in our case.' }\end{gathered}$

















[^32]1. $\delta o \xi a j \xi \epsilon \nu]$ 'to hold an opinion'; so occasionally in Plato.
ib. oú крlбєเs $\epsilon \xi \in \tau$.] 'you do not investigate disputes.' This sense of крlots is a direct derivative from крірєб日aı. Cf. Plat. Rep. 379 E, where commentators cite in comparison Pind. Olymp. vii 80 крiбts $\dot{\alpha} \mu \phi^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \epsilon \theta \lambda o s s$ and Nem. x $23 \dot{\alpha} \dot{\epsilon} \theta \lambda \omega \nu$ крібו». Cf, also Plato Legg. 876 в тàs крiбєıs $\delta \iota a \delta \iota \kappa \alpha ́ \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$.
2. $\mu a ́ \sigma \tau \iota \gamma \iota \delta \alpha \iota \mu$.] Justin's demonology is treated Introd. p. xxx.
3. áкрitws] 'zuithout trial.' Cf. Dion. Halic. xi 43 áкрітыs áтоктєі$\nu \in \iota$.
4. Ėtiфaveias] The reference here is to the Grock myths, which Justin seems to accept as true records of daemonic manifestations, perhaps combined with Genesis vi.
5. Toùs oi] A rare, mainly Ionic, use of the definite article. Cf. T'ryph. $47 \tau \dot{\alpha}$ ठ̈ $\sigma a, 67 \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \partial ٌ \sigma a$.
6. $\dot{\nu} \delta{ }^{\prime} \mu a \tau \iota \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Cf. ii $4(5), \sigma$ where the fallen angels are represented as having given names to themselves and their children the demons.
 und Aufsätze, Socrates und die alte Kirche) points out that Justin, in his reverence for Socrates, set an example which the later Greek apologists, with the exception of Theophilus, generally followed. They regarded Christianity not as $a$, but as the religion, and so treated the condemnation of Christians as a continuation of Socrates' condemmation. Christianity was superior to Socraticism in purity, universality, comprehensibility, power; Socrates wasonly a tool of the Logos, whereas Christ was the Logos; but Socrates was on the side of Clirist, because he was on the side of truth.
7. каıvà $\epsilon l \sigma \phi . \delta \alpha \iota \mu$.] One of the



 таи̂та $\pi \rho a ́ \xi a \nu t a s ~ \delta a i \mu o \nu a s ~ o v ̉ ~ \mu o ́ \nu o \nu ~ \mu \eta ̀ ~ o ̉ \rho \theta o u ̀ s ~ є i ̂ \nu a i ́ ~ 5 ~ 5 ~$


 $\mu \epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ тоьov́т $\omega \nu$ ขо $\mu \iota \zeta о \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu ~ \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu$ ả $\theta \epsilon \circ \iota \epsilon i ̂ \nu a \iota, ~ a ̉ \lambda \lambda ’$ oủ $\chi i$







formal charges in Socrates' indictment. Cf. Xen. Mem. i i, Plat. Ap. 24 B.
I. $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ "E $\left.\mathrm{E} \lambda \eta \sigma_{l}\right] \quad \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ is not indispensable to the grammar, but the parallelism with è̀ $\beta$ ap $\beta$ áposs perhaps justifies its insertion.
2. únd $\lambda$ óyou] A hint of the Spermatic Logos. See Introd. p. xxii.
ib. $\dot{\epsilon \nu}$ ßapßáposs] This is the usual opposition between Greeks and non-Greeks. Cf. i 7,$3 ; 46,3$. See also Tat. Or. i $\mu \grave{\eta} \pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \nu \quad \phi \iota \lambda \epsilon \chi \theta \rho \omega \mathrm{s}$ $\delta \iota a \tau i \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$ т $\rho \grave{s}$ roùs $\beta a \rho \beta$ ápous, $\hat{\omega}$ ${ }^{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \epsilon s{ }^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E} \lambda \lambda \eta \nu \epsilon$.
5. op $\rho$ oús] Braun insists that Saimoves in the Church fathers is always used in a bad sense, that therefore $\delta \rho \theta$ ous $\delta a l \mu o \nu a s$ is an impossible expression here, and that $\theta$ eoús must be substituted for oj $\rho \theta$ oús. Braun's generalization may apply to later fathers, but Justin's use seems less definite; sometimes he uses סaluoves by itself for the evil demons (cf. $\dot{a} \pi a ́ \gamma \epsilon t \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \delta a \iota \mu \dot{o} \nu \omega \nu$ just above), sometimes he joins adjectives to the word, which, if his use were constant, would be
otiose (cf. סaimoves фav̂doc above, какоч̀s $\delta a i \mu \mathrm{\nu} a \mathrm{~s}$ i 23,3 ). In this context the reminiscence of Socrates (whose $\delta a u \mu \dot{\nu}$ oo Justin would doubtless have in mind and recognize as ó $\rho \theta$ óv ) would influence Justin's use of the word.
6. We are called atheists, because we do not worship such immoral gods. But we worship and revere the true God, father of all virtues, and His Son who came from Him and taught us our belief, the angels His followers, and the prophetic Spirit.
9. $\theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu$ ä $\theta \in o c]$ A grammatical genitive of separation.
II. àvєтьикктои как.] '七иmixed with evil,' 'purum a ritiositate' (Otto). Another genitive of separation.
13. taîta] The reference is general, to the body of Christian truth.
ib. тò̀ $\tau \omega ิ \nu$ ä $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$.] 'The army of angels also, who follow Him and are like Him.' T $\hat{\omega} \nu \ddot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ is probably used in the idiomatic sense of 'also.' This passage seems to put the angels, if not on an equality


 àфӨóvшs тарабıסóvтєs．

## 5

 бау какоиิруо．

2．каì үà $\pi$ то入入oùs то入入áкıs，ö́тav


 $\pi \rho o \lambda \epsilon \chi \theta \in \dot{\text { év ras }} \mathrm{A}$ Otto
with Christ，at any rate in pre－ cedence to the Holy Spirit．In consequence hopeless efforts have been made to take $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau o ́ v$ as the object of $\delta \iota \delta \dot{\xi} \xi a \nu \tau a$ ，either parallel to $\dot{\eta} \mu \mathrm{a} s$（＇who taught us，and taught the angels＇），or parallel to rav̂ta （＇who tauchtht us these beliefs，and （the belief in）the army of angels＇）． The emendation $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma o{ }^{2}$ is in－ tended to avoid the difficulty by transferring the reference to Christ as the＇chief of the angels．＇See Intr．p．xxviii．＇E $\xi_{0} \mu o \iota o u \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$ seems to imply the view that the angels are advancing towards a fuller like－ ness to Christ．No doubt the reason why Justin mentions the angels here is because of the foregoing passage about good and bad demons．

2．$\lambda o ́ \gamma \varphi \kappa \kappa \alpha$ ả $\eta \eta$ ．$\tau \iota \mu$ ．］Cf．John iv 24, v 23.

4．mapaסiסóvtєs］The object may be $\dot{\omega}$ s $\dot{\delta} \delta \dot{o}$ á $\chi \eta \eta \mu \in \nu$ ，used sub－ stantivally as equivalent to $\mu \dot{\alpha} \theta \eta \sigma \iota \nu$ or $\delta \iota \delta a \chi \dot{\eta} \nu$ ．So Otto，but the con－ struction may be quite normal－sc．


7．Some Christians have been condemned as malefactors；but that is no reason whiy all Christians should be condemmed．All Christians have not the same views，any more than all philosophers have．You must differentiate，and punish worongdoers as such，and not as Christians．

8．$\delta \iota a ̀ ~ \tau . ~ \pi \rho o є \lambda \epsilon \gamma \chi \theta \epsilon ́ \nu \tau \alpha s]$ Otto retains the MS $\pi \rho o \lambda \epsilon \chi \theta \epsilon \nu \tau a s$ and explains it＇you condemn many Christians for their crimes，but not by reason of those I have mentioned （viz．sincere Christians）＇i．e．they who do no wrong are not the cause of the condemnation of others ；bad Christians are condemned for their lives and not for their Christianity； therefore it is not the name that matters．The explanation is un－ convincing．＇You do not condemn criminal Christians by reason of true Christians＇is not equivalent to＇you do not condemm criminal Christians because their Christianity is the same as that of true Christians．＇ Nor is it casy to find a preceding passage to which roùs $\pi \rho \circ \lambda \epsilon \chi \theta$ év $\tau a s$ might plainly refer．The emenda－ tion $\pi \rho \circ \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \gamma \chi \theta \epsilon \in \tau \alpha$ makes excellent sense and the argument of the passage becomes simple and in－ telligible．＇Some Christians，you say，have been condemned as male－ factors．True；but you often con－ demn many people，when at any time you inquire into the lives of those who are being accused（the reference of $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda$ oús is thus general，and not to Christians specially），but you do not do so because other＇s have been con demned before．（Therefore the fact that some Christians have been con－ demned is no reason for condemning all Christians．）As a general fact





 $\pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa а т а \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \lambda о \mu \in ́ \nu \omega \nu$ ن́ $\mu i ̂ \nu \tau a ̀ s \pi \rho a ́ \xi \in \iota \varsigma \kappa \rho i \nu \in \sigma \theta a \iota$










we allow that "Christian" is a generic name applied to different people. (You must therefore differentiate.)'
 nomine Otto. I can find no other example of this use; but $\delta \iota \alpha$ a $\pi \alpha \nu \tau \partial s$ (=altogether) occurs in classical

4. ̇̇v $\beta a \rho \beta$ ápoıs] Cf.i 5, 4. The argument from the analogy of philosophy has been alluded to in c. 4. See Introd. p. xiv.
 name which is made a charge against them' (so Otto) or 'the name applied to them' (Maran). Cf. c. 26, 6.
10. oủ $\gamma \dot{a} \rho \tau$ oùs кат $\gamma, \kappa \tau \lambda$.] There may be a reference to the concluding phrase of Hadrian's rescript, quoted by Justin at the end of c. 68.
8. We defend ourselves in order to save you from error, and because we will not utter falsehood; for we desire the eternal life with God, and
believe that to confess our faith is a sign that we follow God and desire to be with Him. This teaching of Christ has analogies in some of Plato's doctrines. You may think it absurd; but, if it is a mistake, it hurts only ourselves, so long as we do no wrong.
13. ن̇াঁє̀ $\dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu]$ Cf. Plat. Apol.
 $\dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \lambda 0 \gamma \epsilon \hat{\imath} \sigma \theta a \iota \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \dot{v} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \dot{u} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \dot{\eta} \tau \iota$ є̇ $\xi п \mu \alpha ́ \rho \tau \eta \tau \epsilon$.
14. '̇ф' $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\nu}$ ] 'in our power.'
 tonic word; cf. Plat. Rep. 530 A. In neo-Platonic language it means the fabricator $\dot{\epsilon} \xi$ ő $\nu \tau \omega \nu$, as opposed to $\kappa \tau i \sigma \tau \eta s$, the Creator $\dot{\epsilon} \xi$ оט́к ö $\partial \tau \omega \nu$. In the Gnostic systems the Demiurge was the maker of the world and either the power opposed to God or a rebellious servant. Neither the neo-Platonic nor the Gnostic implications of the word can fairly be read into Justin's use of it.
ib. ávтıтоьov́ $\mu \epsilon \theta a]$ 'We seek after,




 $\kappa а i ̀ ~ \delta \iota \delta a ́ \sigma \kappa о \mu \epsilon \nu \tau а и ิ \tau \alpha ́ ~ \epsilon ̇ \sigma \tau \iota . ~ 4 . ~ П \lambda a ́ \tau \omega \nu ~ \delta ' ~ o ́ \mu о i ́ \omega s ~ є ้ ф \eta ~$
 є̇ $\lambda$ Өóvтаs．$\grave{\eta} \mu \epsilon i ̂ s ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon}$ тò av̉тò $\pi \rho a ̂ \gamma \mu a ́ ~ ф а \mu \epsilon \nu ~ \gamma є \nu \eta ́ \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota, ~$






 $\sigma a \nu \tau \epsilon$ Өєоѝs $\pi \rho о \sigma \omega \nu o ́ \mu a \sigma a \nu$, є่ $\pi \epsilon \grave{a}$ aै $\psi v \chi a$ каì עєкрà таv̂та





exert ourselves for the life with God．＇ $\Delta \iota a \gamma \omega \gamma \dot{\eta}$ absolutely or $\delta \iota a \gamma \omega \gamma \grave{\eta} \beta l o v$ is a Platonic phrase，equivalent to ratio uitae．
4．ávitivutê］＇resists，opposes．＇
6．IIतát $\omega \nu$ ］For Rhadamanthys and Minos cf．Gorg． 523 E．For the
 249 A．
9．кả̀ тoîs aủroîs кт入．］With rıvout̀ $\boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ must be supplied aủrติv as a genitive absolute．

12．$\pi \rho$ òs $\dot{\eta} \mu$ âs $\kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］＇This crror concerns us and nobody clse．＇For similar statements cf．Tert．Apol．38， Arnob．adu．Nat．ii 53，Athenag． Suppl． 3 6．

9．We do not zuorship idols，for they are merdy images representing demons in shape and name．God＇s form is not so；His ineffable likeness cannot be copied in destructible articles which need man＇s care．And the very men who make these articles and are their guardians are im－ moral．Cf．Isaiah xliv 9－17，Acts xvii 24,25 ．

18．$\left.\theta \epsilon o \hat{u} \mu о \rho \phi \eta_{\nu}\right]$ Cf．Phil．ii 6.
19．ク้̈ фa⿱亠 tives кт入．］＇zohich some say is fashioned to His honour，＇ or for the purpose of zuorship．

20．$\epsilon \kappa \epsilon \ell \nu \omega \nu \tau \omega \bar{\omega} \phi$ ．］refers to c． 5 above．







 Чєта८. 4. каї ӧть оі тои́т $\omega \nu \tau \epsilon \chi \nu і ̄ \tau a \iota ~ a ̉ \sigma \epsilon \lambda \gamma \epsilon i ̂ s ~ \epsilon i \sigma i ~ к а i ̀ ~$


 $\lambda a ́ \sigma \tau o u s ~ \theta \epsilon o u ̀ s ~ \epsilon i \varsigma ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \pi р о \sigma к v \nu \epsilon i ̂ \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \pi \lambda a ́ \sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu ~ \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota ~$




 $\pi a ́ \nu \tau a ~ o ́ p \omega ̂ \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma . ~ \epsilon ่ \kappa \epsilon i ́ v o u s ~ \delta \grave{̀ ~} \pi \rho \circ \sigma \delta \epsilon ́ \chi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota ~ a u ̉ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \mu o ́ \nu o \nu$
 $\epsilon i \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \phi a \mu \epsilon \nu$ Thalem Otto $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \epsilon \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \phi \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu \mathrm{A}$ (et infr) $\pi \rho \circ \epsilon \epsilon \lambda \eta_{\eta} \phi a \mu \epsilon \nu$ Stephan
2. â $\grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\nu} \lambda \eta \nu]$ a double accusative. 'What workmen fashion their material into, by planing and cutting and casting and hammering.'
4. $\dot{\alpha} i \not i \mu \omega \nu \quad \sigma \kappa \epsilon \omega \omega \nu$ ] Cf. Rom. ix 21.
7. òs ä́pŋŋтov кт入.] 'Who, though of ineffable glory and form, yet has His name set upon articles which are corruptible and need to be cared for.' Plato Tim. 28c tells us that God cannot be named. Cf. i $6 \mathrm{r}, \mathrm{II}$; ii 5 (6), r .
9. $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \in \lambda \gamma \epsilon \hat{i}$ єi $\sigma i]$ Cf. Orig. Cels. 15.
12. ' $\mu \beta \beta \rho o \nu \tau \eta \sigma$ ias] 'stupidity.' The adjective ${ }^{\dot{\epsilon}} \mu \beta \rho \bar{\rho} \boldsymbol{\tau} \eta \eta \tau=s$ is found in classical Greek.
14. $\mu \in \tau a \pi \circ \iota \epsilon \hat{\nu}]$ 'transform.' Ash-
ton suggests $\mu$ орфотoleîv.
15. $\dot{\alpha} \theta \epsilon \mu / \tau \circ \nu$ ] 'nefas.'
10. We do not believe that God requires material oblations, since He gives all; but He receives those who try to be like Him in character. He created the world for men's sake, and those who act worthily in His sight live and reign with Him. We had' no choice as to birth, but for the choice of our future we can use the rational powers He has given us. Human laws cannot incline men to do this, but the Divine reason could, were it not opposed by the demons.
18. $\pi \rho o \sigma \phi$ opâs] 'offering' or 'oblation.' It is used in the sense of 'present' in Theophrastus Char. xvii ( xxx ) ad fin. Cf. Acts xvii 25.






 $\sigma \tau \rho о \phi \hat{\eta} \kappa \kappa a \tau a \xi \iota \omega \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota \quad \pi a \rho \epsilon \iota \lambda \dot{\eta} \phi a \mu \epsilon \nu \quad \sigma \nu \mu \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \dot{v} о \nu \tau a \varsigma$,

 ठıà тò é é $\sigma \theta a \iota ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~ a i p o u \mu e ́ v o v s ~ \tau a ̀ ~ a u ̉ \tau \hat{̣}$ ả $\rho \in \sigma \tau a ̀ ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~$ $\grave{a} \phi \theta a \rho \sigma i a s ~ \kappa а i ~ \sigma v \nu o v \sigma i ́ a s ~ к а т а \xi \iota \omega \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a l$. 4. тò $\mu \grave{\iota} \nu$



I. $\tau \dot{a} \pi \rho \circ \sigma \delta \nu \tau a \ldots \dot{\alpha} \gamma$.] 'essential good qualities.'.
4. $\theta \in \tau \hat{\psi}]$ 'imposed.'
ib. Tì $\nu \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \dot{\eta} \nu$ ] probably 'in the beginning' (as in § 3 infr.), though Braun translates omnino. Cf. i 59, I.
5. á $\gamma a \theta \partial \nu$ ö ő $\tau$ к $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] Cf. Plat. Tim. 29D. The apparent dualism of language is found in the Timaezs, but it would be rash to infer that Justin held a theory of the eternity of matter. His point here is merely that God made the world out of matter, which is the common view of philosophers, though Justin adds, the Christian touch that it was $\delta i$ ${ }_{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \dot{\omega} \pi$ ous. $\quad$ ' $\mathbf{N} \xi \dot{\alpha} \mu$. vi $\lambda \eta s$ represents Gen. i 2.
6. aklous] with dative, either ' worthy in relation to His counsel,' or possilbly 'shoze themselves by His counsel worthy'; cf. $\delta i \omega^{\ddagger} \nu$ aủrùs $\epsilon \delta \omega р \eta$ ฑато кт $\lambda$. below.
8. $\left.\sigma v \mu \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon v_{0} \nu \tau a s\right]$ e.g. 2 Tim. ii 12 .

I3. $\tau \delta \delta^{\prime} \epsilon \xi$ दккод.кт入.] The sense required is 'We had no choice as to birth, but we have a choice as to
our life.' Otto translates 'ea uero sectari quae ipsi placent persuasionem generat et ad fidem nos ducit' and compares c. 53,12 , the idea being that to obey God generates confidence in us about the future. This seems scarcely to be the sense required. Maran translates 'ut sequamur...id ipse nobis persuadet et ad fidem nos adducit' ; i.e. 'God gave us no choice about being born, but He tries to persuade us (He gives us a choice) to do His will, and leads us to faith.' This is nearer the required sense, but the last clause comes in somewhat clumsily. Veil translates 'streben wir aber dem nach, was ihm lieb ist, so machen wir (ihns) ums gezoogen und gezvinnen (sein) Vertranen.' But it seems scarcely possible that $\epsilon$ is $\pi l \sigma \tau \iota \nu$ dyєє $\dot{\eta} \mu a ̂ s$ could mean 'leads us into being trusted by God,' nor, again, is the needed antithesis thus established. On the other hand cf. 8, 2 roùs tò 0. $\delta \iota^{\prime} \epsilon^{\prime} \rho \gamma \omega \nu \pi \epsilon / \sigma a \nu \tau a s$.
15. $\lambda о \gamma \iota \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu \delta v \nu \alpha \mu \epsilon \omega \nu]$ Note that Justin regards the exercise of free-






 $\epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \nu$ i $\mu \mathrm{i} \nu$.
 $\kappa \hat{\omega} \nu \tau a \varsigma \stackrel{i}{\eta} \mu a ̂ \varsigma, ~ a ̉ \kappa \rho i ́ \tau \omega \varsigma \dot{a} \nu \theta \rho \omega ́ \pi \iota \nu o \nu \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{a} \varsigma \dot{v} \pi \epsilon \iota \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \phi a \tau \epsilon$, 10




 $\lambda a \nu \theta$ ávє $\iota \nu$ є่ $\pi \epsilon \iota \rho \omega ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a$, őт $\omega \varsigma \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho о \sigma \delta о \kappa \omega \mu \in ́ v \omega \nu \tau \cup ́ \chi \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$.


$$
\text { I } \tau \grave{o ̀} \mu \dot{\eta} \epsilon i \not \rho \gamma \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota \text { Sylburg } \tau \hat{\omega} \mu \grave{\eta} \epsilon i \mathrm{~A}
$$

will for good as due to the use of the rational powers, i.e. the sanctified reason, which is the sphere of the Divine Logos' operation.
I. int ${ }^{\prime} \rho$ ] ' We consider' it to be for the benefit of all men.'
4. ó $\lambda$ óros $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] According to Otto this is a reference to the Logos divinuzs, i.e. Christ. In that case oi d. $\nu \dot{\mu} \mu \mathrm{o}$ might include the Jewish law (Rom. viii 3). But it may rather be a general reference to the Divine $\lambda$ boos in life, of which Christ is the incarnate manifestation. Eipy $\dot{\sigma} \sigma a \tau 0$ is conditional in its force, without ${ }^{\prime 2} \nu$.
6. катךүорпйата] This refers to the well-known charges of cannibalism and promiscuity, which were commonly levelled at the Christians. Cf.i 26; 27; ii 12. Tac. Ann. xv 44 'Christianos per flagitia inuisos.' Suet. Nero 16 'Christiani, genus hominum superstitionis nouae ac
maleficae.' Eus. Hist. Eccl.v i, I4.
7. $\hat{\omega}_{\nu}$ ] refers back to катท $\begin{gathered}\text { op } \\ \text { - }\end{gathered}$ $\mu a \tau a$.
11. We look forward to a kingdom; but it is not a humban one; if it were such, we should deny or conceal our faith, so that we might not lose by death what we hoped for. But our hope is not for this woorld, and therefore, since death is the lot of all, we care nothing for execution.
10. àкpitcss] 'without exercising. judgment,' 'uncritically.' Cf. above, 5,1 . Parallel uses of äкрıтos are quoted by Liddell and Scott.
12. $\gamma \iota \nu \omega \dot{\sigma} \kappa \circ \nu \tau \epsilon s]$ ought in strict grammar to be accusative. A similar anacoluthon is found in i $55,6 \delta \iota^{\prime}$ $\omega^{\omega} \nu$ al $\tau \epsilon \pi \rho \sigma o \delta o l$ í $\mu \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \gamma^{i \nu} \nu \nu \tau a l$, $\delta \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \nu \dot{y} \nu \tau \epsilon$. For the sentiment here expressed cf. John xviii 36 .
17. ávalpoúvtcu oủ $\pi$.] 'zve do not heed our executioners.' A common construction with $\phi \rho o \nu \tau i j \omega$.
où $\pi \epsilon \phi \rho о \nu \tau i ́ \kappa a \mu \epsilon \nu$ тô̂ каì $\pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega s ~ a ̀ \pi г \theta a \nu \epsilon i ̂ \nu ~ o ̀ \phi є \iota \lambda o-~$ $\mu$ évou．








 $\theta \epsilon o \hat{v} \tau u ́ \chi o \iota ~ a ̀ \gamma a \theta \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ к о \lambda a \sigma \tau \eta \rho i ́ \omega \nu ~ a ̉ \pi \eta \lambda \lambda a \gamma \mu e ́ v o s$

 A oủ $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \ldots \epsilon i \delta^{\prime}$ ér $\mu a \theta o \nu$ Otto Kriiger

Cf．i 39； 57 ，for similar expressions of fearlessness．

1．тои̂ каl $\pi a ́ v \tau \omega s ~ \kappa \tau \lambda] ~ ' s i n c e$. death is in any case the debt of nature．＇Similar phrases are found in i 57,2 ；ii $1 \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{I}$ ．Otto suggests that Justin may have in mind the common Euripidean phrase кат $\theta$－ $\nu \epsilon i \hat{\nu}$ ódeì $\epsilon \tau a l$ ，which occurs for instance in Eur．Alc．419，782， Androm． 1272.

12．We are your allies in the cause of peace．For we teach that no acts can escape the juagment of God．If all men knere this，they would be virthous；human lazus only cause them to conceal their crimes．Are you afraid that crime may cease to cxist，and the supply of criminals for you to punish run short？Such a fear is irrational， the inspiration of demons，unbe－ coming to pious and philosophic rulers．But if you still neglect the truth，you may do your worst，but you will not succeed；for rational men will not do what reason forbids． Christ prophesied persecution for us；and His foresight shows His Divinity．

4．$\dot{\omega} s \in[\nu a \iota]$ A mixed construc－ tion，combining $\dot{\omega} \dot{s} \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau$ and the infinitive without $\dot{\omega}$ s．It can be paralleled from classical Greek．


 aủroùs $\gamma \epsilon \nu \eta$ クे $\sigma \epsilon$ Oal：Soph．O．C． 385
 $\tau \nu \nu^{\prime} \epsilon \xi \epsilon \tau \nu$ ．
5．$\ddot{\eta}$ Évápetov］It is a little odd to throw this alternative in with simple $\ddot{\eta}$ ．Hence some emend to à $\nu \alpha \iota \rho \in ́ \tau \eta \nu$ ．
9．$\pi$ foòs oinǐou］＇for a little while．＇This use of $\pi \rho \sigma$ s is found in Plutarch and Lucian．

1о．катабโкпр］＇sentence＇；pro－ perly of the damages awarded．

12．ко入абтクрі（wv］＇punishments．＇
13．oi $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ j $\iota a ̀ k \tau \lambda$ ．］The sense is＇men norv seek to conceal their crimes becauss of the lazus，and they knoze they can do so ；if they weve to learn that they cannot evade God， they would not commit crimes．＇ This is a simple and logical state－ ment，and the alteration of the MS oú to or is a trivial change．Otto adopts Maran＇s explanation of the







 5．$\pi \epsilon \pi \epsilon і ' \sigma \mu \epsilon \theta a \delta^{\prime}$ є̀к $\delta a \iota \mu o ́ \nu \omega \nu$ фаú $\lambda \omega \nu$ ，ồ каі̀ $\pi a \rho a ̀ ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$

 є $\dot{\sigma} \epsilon \beta$ вías каì фıдобофías ó $\rho \in ́ \gamma \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$ ，äдоуóv $\tau \iota \pi \rho a ̂ \xi a \iota$
 $\tau \grave{a}$ धै $\theta \eta$ п $\pi \rho o ̀ ~ \tau \eta ̂ s ~ a ̀ \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon i ́ a s ~ \tau \iota \mu a ̂ \tau \epsilon, ~ \pi \rho a ́ т \tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon ~ o ̀ ~ \delta v ́ v a \sigma \theta \epsilon . ~$


7 ко入ásทтє Sylburg al ко入ásєтє A ко入á $\sigma \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ Thirlb
reading which he prefers；＇Justin is showing the superiority of Chris－ tianity to human laws；there is hope of evading the lawes，no hope of evading God．The desire to evade does not show the power of the lawes but their weakness；men seek secrecy for crime，not through fear of the lawes，but through hope of concealing their crime；take that hope away and crime will cease．＇The objections to this argument are（I）it is not true to human nature；the normal reason for seeking to conceal crime is fear of the laws；（2）it seems perilously like nonsense to say＇men seek secrecy for crime because they hope they can conceal their crime．＇ The question still remains，why men should trouble about secrecy at all， if it be not for fear of the laws．For the sentiment，Otto cites as parallels Tert．Ap．45，Lact．Inst．v 8.

4．кä̀ $\dot{\text { öcà }} \tau \dot{\alpha}$ èmıк．］＇at least because of the impending penalties＇ （if for no more noble reason）．Cf．

$\xi \alpha \sigma \theta \epsilon:$ i 26,7 ；ii 7 （8），I．This limiting use of $\kappa a ̈ \nu \nu$ is elliptical in nature．Cf．Soph．Electr． 1482
 Jebb（Appendix ad loc．）says that ＇in such instances $\kappa \ddot{\alpha} \nu$ can usually be resolved into кai $\epsilon \dot{\alpha} \nu$ ，with a sub－ junctive verb understood．＇＇So here we may insert $\hat{\omega} \sigma \iota$＇if they be so only because of the penalties．＇

 $\kappa x i$ ひ̈бтєроу $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \gamma \nu \hat{\rho} s$ ．Two possible constructions are thus combined for the sake of variety，though some－ times a faint shade of difference in meaning may be distinguished be－ tween them．
11．＇ंs $\pi \rho \circ \notin \phi \eta \mu \in \nu]$ c． 5 ．
ib．oi $\gamma \epsilon \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］referring to the epithets of the dedication in c．I．

14．$\tau \dot{a}$ e $\theta \eta$ ］＇the custom，＇i．e．of persecuting Christians．Or it may mean that conservatism was against the novelty of Christianity．

15．Toбoûtov．．．ठ̈ $\sigma$ ov］i．e．to kill us and no more．Cf．Luke xii 4.


















 $\epsilon \tau \pi \epsilon \mathrm{A}$

2．ка入入ıєр $\quad$ бєтє］＇you zuill pros－ per．
ib．$\dot{\text { o }}$ 入oros］Here undoubtedly Christ．Semisch and Pautigny see a trace of Subordinationism in the phrase $\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha}$ т $\partial_{\nu} \quad \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma a \nu \tau a \quad \theta \epsilon \sigma \nu$ ． See Introd．p．xxii．Note that in the next sentence ó $\nu$ ovve $\chi$ ńs is iden－ tified as the doer of what $\dot{o} \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ bros （reason or Christ）commands．
iv．ô̂ $\beta$ аб九入ıкढ́татоу ктл．］A genitive of comparison with a super－ lative．This is found in classical Greck with plural words，e．g．Thuc．
 $\nu \omega \nu$ ，where the genitive approxi－ mates to one of class．Here it is probably a symptom of the confusion between comparative and super－ lative，which is a feature of late Greek．Cf．John i． $15 \pi \rho \bar{\rho} \tau \sigma \delta{ }^{2} \mu \mathrm{ov}$ ．

5．ن́фaıpô̂̀тau］＇refugiunt＇Otto． The word means＇to purloin＇and so here，＇to filch oneself azvay from．＇．

7．$\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha]$ i．e．persecution and its failure．
ib．$\pi \rho o \in i \pi \epsilon]$ Cf．Matt．x 26， xxiv 9 ．

9．$\dot{\alpha} \pi b \sigma \tau 0 \lambda o s]$ Cf．i 63,5 ，and Heb．iii t ，the only place in the New Testament where the term is applied to Christ．

11．$\delta \theta \in \nu$ каi $\beta$ ．］Cf．Matt．xxiv ${ }^{25}$ ，John xvi 4 ．

13．$\theta \in o$ êe ëprov］Cf．Is．xli 22 f．
17．$\dot{\rho} \hat{o}{ }_{0} \nu$ ］This may be the comparative of $\dot{\rho} \dot{\alpha} \delta$ os，meaning ＇particularly easy＇；or it may be from an erroneous collateral form of pádoos，found in grammarians．See Liddell and Scott．

18．$\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon(\nu]$ probably in the













neuter sense. 'It is not easy for a soul enchained by ignorance to change quickly, but yet ignorance may be escaped from, if the truth is set over against it.' Quoted by Irenaeus iii 2,3 .
13. We are not atheists, for we worship God the Creator, though not with sacrifices, praising Him and praying to Him. Second to Him we hold Christ in reverence, and the prophetic Spirit in the third place. We shall shove that this is perfectly rational.
4. $\dot{\alpha} \nu \in \nu \delta \in \hat{\eta}]$ Cf. Acts xvii. 25. Braun cites Clem. Rom. ad Corinth.

 passages. The sentiment is a commonplace in Church writers, and is found in some heathen works, e.g. Eurip. H. F. ${ }_{1} 348$ deîral $\gamma$ àp o o $\theta \in \dot{\text { c̀ }}$
 by Braun).
5. $\lambda o ́ \gamma \omega$ єủxn̂s] Cf. i $66 \delta \iota^{\prime}$

6. $\epsilon \phi^{\prime}$ ' ots $\left.\pi \rho \circ \sigma \phi \epsilon \rho \sigma \mu \epsilon \theta a\right]$ Some translate 'at all our offerings'; but more probably it is a genuine middle 'for all that we receive.' So again in i 67,2 . Cf. also Liddell and Scott.
ib. ö ơ $\left.\delta \dot{v} v a \mu s{ }^{2}\right]$ Cf. i $55 ; 67$.
8. סıatpoфض̀v] 'sustenance.' Où $\pi v \rho l$ $\delta a \pi a \nu \hat{a} \nu$ of course refers to the sacrifices.
9. $\pi \rho 0 \sigma \phi \hat{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon \iota \nu$ ] 'contributte.' There may be an allusion to the Eucharistic distributions to the poor.
10. $\delta \grave{a} \lambda$ dó ov $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] Maran translates rationalibus pompis $=$ a reasonable service. Dia 入obou is better taken as $=$ ' in speech,' cf. i 55,8 ; i 67 , 4. $\Pi \circ \mu \pi \dot{\eta}$ nearly always means 'a solemn procession,' often in connexion with a religious ceremony. In this passage a contrast with the solemnities of heathen ritual is obviously intended. There could scarcely be any Christian processions in Justin's time. The phrase $\pi о \mu \pi a ̀ s ~ к a l ~ u ̈ \mu \nu o u s ~ s h o u l d ~ d ~$ probably be regarded as zeugmatic; 'We celebrate our solemnities, with hymns, in speech' (and not by ceremonial processions). There seems to be an allusion to the Eucharistic service.
II. T $\hat{\omega} \nu \in i s \in \dot{s} \rho \omega \sigma \tau i a, \nu \pi$. $\pi$.] 'all the means of health.'
 ties of things.'

I3. rồ $\pi \dot{a} \lambda \iota \nu]$ The genitive is dependent upon air $\eta \sigma \epsilon$ s.












14. I. Про入є́ $\gamma \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \dot{v} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu \phi v \lambda a ́ \xi a \sigma \theta a \iota, \mu \dot{\eta}$ oi $\pi \rho o-$ $\delta \iota a \beta \epsilon \beta \lambda \eta \mu \epsilon \in \nu \circ \iota \quad \dot{v} \phi^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \delta a i ́ \mu о \nu \epsilon \varsigma \epsilon_{\epsilon} \xi a \pi a \tau \eta \sigma \omega \sigma \iota \nu \dot{v} \mu \hat{a} s \kappa a \grave{\iota}$




5 vid̀ aủzò $\operatorname{Otto}$ al viòv aủzô̂ A || $10 \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{a} \pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$ Otto al $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu$ $\dot{a} \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu \mathrm{~A}$
i. tis oủ $\dot{o} \mu 0 \lambda o \gamma \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ ] Here at last we get the principal verb, upon which all that preceded, introduced by $\omega$ s, depends.
5. єंтıт $\bar{\sigma} \pi о \nu$ ] The regular Greek equivalent for the Latin procurator. Pilate is called procurator of Judaea, Tac. Ann. xv 44. Luke iii 1 has $\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \mu$ оуєúovtos IIovtiou II $\epsilon i \lambda a ́ \tau o u ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s$ 'Iovoalas, where D and other authorities read $\epsilon \pi$ irfooteúòtos, a correction made in order to mark Pilate's office with more precision. (So I'lummer, St Luke, note ad loc.)
6. $\epsilon^{\prime} \nu$ ô $\epsilon v \tau \epsilon \in \rho a \quad \chi$.] See Introd. p. xxii.
7. $\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{a} \lambda$ órou] 'rationally'; this phrase leads on at once to 'tviav̂0a
 Probably not 'with the Word,' as it is translated by Bethune-Baker

Early Hist. of Chr. Doctr. p. 199 note 4.
9. äт $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi \pi \tau \boldsymbol{\nu}]$ 'immutable.'
II. $\mu v \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \rho i o \nu]$ in the sense of 'mystery,' 'secret above human intelligence.'
14. Do not be deceived by the demons and hindered from reading our pleas. We have shaken off their despotism, and the reformation of our life proves the nirtue of our newo belief. To show that this is truly what we have learnt and teach, we will quote you some of Christ's sayings.
13. $\pi \rho 0 \delta \iota \alpha \beta \in \beta \lambda \eta \mu \epsilon \in \nu 0 l$ ] 'previously accused.'
15.-Évivðєî̀] 'rad.' This use of the word is mentioned in Liddell and Scott from Lucian, Plutarch, etc.
i6. $\sigma v \nu \in i v a l] 2$ aor. from $\sigma v \nu i \eta \mu$.






 $\kappa а і ̈ ~ к \tau \eta \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu ~ o i ~ \pi o ́ \rho o v s ~ \pi a \nu \tau o ̀ s ~ \mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda o \nu ~ \sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \gamma o \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma, ~ \nu \hat{v} \nu$








## $\sigma \nu \hat{v} \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \theta \hat{\varphi}$ Otto al $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \theta \hat{\varphi} \mathrm{A}$

I. $\sigma \tau \rho \circ \phi \hat{\omega} \nu$ ] 'dodges, tricks.'
ib. ov่к ${ }^{\prime \prime} \sigma \theta$ ' ötcws] 'plane non' Otto.
2. ठ̀ $\tau \rho \delta \dot{\pi} 0 \nu$ ] refers back to $\phi u \lambda a ́ \xi a \sigma \theta a \iota$.
3. $\tau \hat{\omega} \lambda \hat{\sigma} \gamma \omega]$ perhaps 'the Divine Logos' i.e. Christ.
4. $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \dot{\eta} \tau \omega]$ ' umbegotten.' Ashton and others insist that here $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \epsilon \nu \dot{\eta} \tau \omega$ 'uncreated' should be substituted, as also in all similar passages; and that, in like reference, $\gamma \in \gamma \in \nu \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota$ should be substituted for $\gamma \in \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota$. No doubt the two words could easily be confused in the mss. But Justin might reasonably call God 'unbegotten' in opposition to the heathen myths about Zeus or Jupiter, or to distinguish Him from the Son, who was begotten. Change of the text is therefore scarcely indispensable.
ib. ol $\pi$ á $\lambda a \iota \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Here Justin brings forward, as a proof of the power of Christianity, its efficacy in the reformation of individual
character. Cf. i r6, 4.
7. $\theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi}$ є́avtoùs ávar.] As Otto says, this seems to have been a regular formula. It recurs in i 25, $2 ; 49,5 ; 6$ I, I. Cf. Const. Apost. viii 6 є́autoùs $\tau \hat{\omega} \mu \delta \nu \omega$ à $\gamma \in \nu \nu \dot{\eta} \tau \omega$ $\theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi} \delta \iota \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \sigma \hat{\mathrm{U}} \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{v} a \cup \cup \tau o \hat{v} \pi a \rho \alpha \dot{\theta} \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$ (the formula for dismissing catechumens after a baptism).
10. $\kappa 0 \iota \nu \omega \nu 0 \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$ ] implying not communism, but general philanthropy.
II. $\delta i \dot{\alpha}$ $\tau \dot{\alpha} \quad \notin \theta \eta$ ] 'because of (difference in) customs.' Cf. 12, 6.
13. $\dot{\nu} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \chi \theta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \epsilon \dot{u} \chi$.] Cf. i 15,9 .
14. ó $\pi \omega$ coi] Maran would delete oi, and Otto suggests aúroi, in order that the reference may be more directly to roùs $\mu \iota \sigma o \hat{v} \nu \tau a s$. This is attractive but not absolutely necessary. The reference must in any case include roùs $\mu$ iбoûv $\tau a s$.
15. ímoө $\quad$ нобúvas] 'suggestions, advice.'




















 $\chi \eta \sigma a \nu \mathrm{~A}$
2. $\sigma o \phi i \xi \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha l]$ with accusative 'to deceive.' Liddell and Scott quote only two parallels, one from Anth. $P$. xii 25 , the other from Aretae. Caus. M. Diut. i 15.
4. $\pi \rho \delta$ $\tau \hat{\eta} s \quad \dot{a} \pi 0 \delta \epsilon i \zeta \epsilon \omega s]$ 'before zee embark on our promised demonstration' (c. I3) i.e. that it is reasonable to worship Christ.
5. סvעat $\hat{\nu}$ ] 'Since you have the power, it is your duty to find out whether this is in truth our doctrine.'
6. Bpaxєis] See Introd. p. xxxv; 'Nota Sophistarum loquacitas,' Otto.
8. ठúvapıs кт入.] 'His word was the power of God.' Cf. Matt. vii 29, ${ }_{1}$ Cor. 124.
15. Quotations to show Chvist's teaching on chastity, philanthropy, umzortdliness. On Justin's quotations see Introd. p. xxxiv.

1o. ôs $\begin{gathered} \\ \nu \\ \epsilon \\ \mu\end{gathered} \bar{\lambda} \epsilon^{\prime} \psi \eta$ ] Cf. Matt. v 28.
11. $\epsilon i \dot{o} \dot{o} \phi \theta a \lambda \mu \delta s$ ] Cf. Matt. v 29, 30 ; xviii 9; Mark ix 47. Aicuviov $\pi \hat{v} \rho$ is probably substituted as a Gentile equivalent for $\gamma^{\epsilon} \epsilon \nu \nu a \nu$ rov̂ $\pi$ upós.
15. $\delta$ s $\gamma \alpha \mu \epsilon i$ ] Cf. Matt. v 32 ; Luke xvi 18.
16. $\epsilon[\sigma \ell$ Tives] Cf. Matt. xix 12 , II.
20. Strauias] 'second marriases.' This might refer to (r) bigamy; (2) successive second marriage,
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(3) marriage after divorce. (i) Bigamy however can hardly be said to be permissible $\nu \delta \mu \omega \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi i \nu \omega$ (which must presumably refer to Roman law); and the ms text can hardly be taken in any way except - as those who, by human law, contract second marriages are sinners in the eyes of our teacher.' (2) Marriage after the death of a first wife was permitted by Roman law, and discouraged by some Church fathers on the authority of certain expressions of St Paul, e.g. by Athenagoras (Leg. 33), Origen, Theophilus, Tertullian (cf. Schaff Hist. of Ante-Nicene Christianity § 99). But no such view is found elsewhere in Justin, and the judgment of the Church never acquiesced in such a theory. (3) It seems then as if the reference here must probably be to marriage after divorce (so Thirlb., Otto) ; and so the three instances of unchastity mentioned are (I) looking on a woman lustfully, (2) marrying a clivorced woman, (3) marrying a second wife after divorcing a first. Donaldson (Hist. of Christ. Lit. and Doctr. vol. ii, chap. iii, § It ad fir., his whole discussion of this passage
is worth reading) suggests with some force that $\delta i \gamma \alpha \mu i a s$, to Justin's readers, would mean nothing but bigamy; and he proposes the reading $\dot{\omega} s \pi a f \dot{a} \quad \tau \hat{\omega} \quad \nu \delta \mu \omega \quad \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta$. $\delta \iota \gamma$. $\pi \circ \iota$. $\dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \omega \lambda о i, \pi \alpha \rho \dot{\alpha} \tau$. $\dot{\eta} \mu$. $\delta \iota \delta$. єiбi каi oi $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \beta \backslash \in ́ \pi о \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma \kappa \tau \lambda$. This gives the most obvious meaning to $\delta i \gamma a \mu i a s$, and excellent sense to the passage. If the as reading be retained, we must assume Justin to be using dirapias ecclesiastically, in the second or third sense, forgetting what meaning his Roman readers would attach to it, and that he means, 'Who avail themselves of human law to commit what is really ögamy.'
2. oủ $\gamma \dot{a} \rho \mu \dot{\alpha} \nu o \nu]$ Otto compares Iren. c. Haer. ii 32, I ' non solum qui moechatur expellitur sed et qui moechari uult.'
5. $̇$ èv $\theta \nu \mu \eta \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu]$ 'thoughts.' Heb. iv 12 has $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \theta \nu \mu \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \omega \nu$ in the same sense.
6. Є̇к $\pi \alpha i \delta \omega \nu$ ] See Int. p. xxxvii.
7. á $\phi \theta 0 \rho o \iota]$ may mean 'virgins' or, more simply, 'chaste.',
ib. єƯхомal] 'declare.'
13. ойк $\hat{\eta} \lambda \hat{\theta} \circ \mathrm{\nu}$ ] Cf. Matt. ix I3, Mark ii ${ }_{1} 7$, Luke v 32.

єis $\mu \epsilon \tau$ đ́volav. $\theta \epsilon ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ o ́ ~ \pi a \tau \eta ̀ \rho ~ o ́ ~ o u ̉ \rho a ́ v \iota o s ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \mu \epsilon \tau a ́-~$ עoเav тô̂ á $\mu a \rho \tau \omega \lambda o \hat{v} \hat{\eta} ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu ~ \kappa o ́ \lambda a \sigma \iota \nu ~ a u ̉ \tau o v ̂ . ~ 9 . ~ \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath}$


















I. $\theta \epsilon \lambda \in \iota \gamma$ d́ $\rho$ ] Cf. Ezek. xviii 23 , xxxiii 11 'nolo mortem impii sed ut conuertatur impius a uia sua et uiuat.' Similar ideas are expressed in 2 Pet. iii 9; I Tim. ii 4. Justin's phraseology here may be his own, based on Bible reminiscence; but he may possibly be quoting a traditional logion of Christ. ${ }^{\circ} 0 \pi$. $\dot{o}$ oúpáveos is clearly an echo of N.T. language, especially of St Matthew. ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{I}=$ = rather than.'
3. $\epsilon i \dot{a} \gamma a \pi a ̂ t \epsilon]$ Cf. Matt. v 4 6,
 is substituted for Matthew's riva
 and Luke's mola $\dot{\mu} \mu i ̂ \nu \quad \chi a ́ p i s ~ \epsilon ̇ \sigma \tau i \nu$. Cf. Plat. R'ep. 599 E oúôév yє каıע̀̀ $\nu$ $\pi o \iota o u ̂ \mu \in \nu$. In place of Justin's $\pi \sigma \rho \nu o \iota$ Matthew has $\tau \epsilon \lambda \omega ิ \nu \alpha \iota$, Luke $\dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \iota-$

入ot (hence Thirlb. suggests $\pi$ rov $\quad$ poi in place of $\pi \delta \rho \nu 0$, here).
 Luke vi 27,28 . It is variously quoted in various passages, e.g. Just. Tryph. $9^{6}$ árarẫє roùs $\dot{\epsilon} \chi \theta \rho o u ̀ s \dot{u} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu:$ Tert. Ap. 3 r 'Praeceptum est nobis etiam pro inimicis Deum orare et persecutoribus nostris bona precari' ; Iren. c. Haer. iii 18,5 ' Diligite inimicos uestros et orate pro cis qui uos oderunt.'
9. $\pi a \nu \tau i \tau \hat{\psi}$ airô̂vtı] Cf. Matt. v 42,46 ; Luke vi 30,34 .
13. ن́ $\mu \in i ̂ s ~ \delta \grave{~} \mu \dot{\eta}]$ Cf. Matt. vi 19 , 20.
16. $\tau!\gamma \dot{a} \rho \dot{\omega} \phi \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i \not \tau a l] \quad$ Cf. Matt. xvi 26 , vi 20.
20. $\gamma(\nu \in \sigma \theta \epsilon \delta \epsilon]$ Cf. Matt. v 48 , 45; Luke vi 35, 36. Justin Tryph.










 є่ $\nu$ тoîs oủpavoîs．





2．òs $\delta^{\prime}$ à $\nu$


 тòv $\pi a \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a$ ú $\mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ тòv ধ̀v тoîs oủpavoîs．3．ov̉ $\gamma a ̀ \rho 20$
 $\nu)$ exciderit Otto

 $\gamma \dot{a} \rho$ тòv та⿱亠䒑окра́тора $\theta$ єò $\nu$ хр $\eta \sigma \tau o ̀ \nu$
 aủrô àvaté $\lambda \lambda о \nu \tau \alpha ~ \epsilon ̇ \pi i ~ a ́ \chi a \rho i ́ \sigma t o u s ~$
 каi $\pi$ ovppoús．Hence Thirlb．would read here $\dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \omega \lambda$ oùs каi＜$\dot{\alpha} \gamma a \theta$ oùs каi $\beta \rho \epsilon ́ \chi \epsilon \iota ~ \dot{\epsilon} \pi i>\delta \iota \kappa a i o u s$ ．And Otto каi סıкаious＜каi $\beta \rho \epsilon \in \chi \epsilon \iota$ Є̇ $\pi i$ ȯбious＞ каi moдทpoús．The triplet of the ms text is certainly very clumsy．

2．$\mu \grave{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho \iota \mu \nu a ̂ \tau \epsilon]$ Cf．Matt．vi ${ }_{2} 5$ ff． 3 I－ 33 ；Luke xii 22 ff．29－3I， 34；Matt．vi 21.

10．$\mu \grave{\eta} \pi o \neq \eta$ $\tau \epsilon]$ Cf．Matt．vi I． This answers to the $\pi \rho \partial{ }^{2}$ sógav molєîv above．

16．Quotations to showe Christ＇s teaching on patience，readiness to help others，freedom from wrath， truth－speaking，worship of God， practice of religion．

14．$\tau \hat{\omega}$ тú $\pi \tau \sigma \nu \tau \iota]$ Cf．Luke vi 29，Matt．v 39．Eıaүóva literally ＇jaw．＇

16．ôs $\left.\delta^{\prime} \ddot{a}^{\nu} \nu \dot{o} \rho \gamma \iota \sigma \theta \hat{\eta}\right]$ Cf．Matt． v 22 ；the phrase $\gamma \in \epsilon \in \nu \nu a \nu$ тoû $\pi v \rho o ́ s$ is again simplified as in c． $15,2$. Tò $\pi \hat{v} \rho=\tau \grave{\partial}$ aíwntov $\pi \hat{v} \rho$ ．

17．，$\pi a \nu t i \delta e ̀ ~ a ̀ \gamma \gamma a \rho.] ~ C f . ~ M a t t . ~$ v．4r．＇Ayrapeúc literally＇to press into service as a courier．＇

I8．$\lambda a \mu \psi a ́ \tau \omega \delta \epsilon \in]$ Cf．Matt．vi6．
20．oủ $\gamma \dot{a} \rho \dot{a} \nu \tau a i \rho \epsilon \iota \nu]$ Cf．Matt． v 39．＇Avtaipєı＝＇withstand．＇






 $\sigma a \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$ ク̈ $\sigma \nu \mu \pi \rho a \gamma \mu a \tau \epsilon v o \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu \pi \epsilon \iota \rho a \theta \epsilon ́ \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma . \quad$ 5. $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath}$ $\delta \epsilon ̀ ~ \tau o \hat{v} \mu \eta ̀ ~ o ̉ \mu \nu v ́ \nu a \iota ~ o ̋ \lambda \omega s, \tau a ̉ \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \delta \grave{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ ảєí, ov̋ $\tau \omega \varsigma \pi a \rho \epsilon-$
 $\kappa a i ̀ \tau o ̀ ~ o u ̈ ~ o u ̉ . ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \delta e ̀ ~ \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma o ̀ \nu ~ \tau о и ́ \tau \omega \nu ~ \epsilon ُ \kappa ~ \tau o ̂ ̂ ~ \pi o \nu \eta \rho o v ̂ . ~$
 $\epsilon i \pi \omega ́ \nu . ~ М є \gamma i ́ \sigma \tau \eta ~ \epsilon ่ \nu \tau o \lambda \eta ́ ~ \epsilon ̇ \sigma \tau \iota . ~ K u ́ p ı o \nu ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \theta \epsilon o ́ \nu ~ \sigma o v ~ \pi \rho o \sigma-~$




$$
4 \dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu \gamma \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \mu \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu \omega \nu \text { Otto } \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\mu} \nu \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \nu \eta \mu \epsilon \nu \omega \omega \nu \mathrm{A}
$$

1. $\beta \epsilon \beta$ oú $\eta \tau \tau a \iota \ldots \pi$... $\pi$ роєт $\rho \in ́ \psi a \tau 0]$ The subject is Christ, understood.
2. $\delta \gamma \dot{a} \rho \kappa \alpha l] \quad \gamma \alpha ́ \rho=\gamma \epsilon \not ̈ \rho \alpha$. 'T $\omega \hat{\nu}$ $\pi a \rho$ ' $\dot{\nu} \mu \bar{\nu} \gamma \in \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \mu \epsilon \in \nu \omega \nu=$ 'those who were of your side,' i.e. heathens. ' $\mathrm{E} \pi i=$ ' in the case of.'
3. $\dot{\eta} \tau \tau \eta \theta \epsilon \in \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma ~ \kappa \tau \lambda$.] 'conquered, either by the constancy of life which they traced in (Christian) neighbours, or by the strange endurance which they noticed in defrauded fellow-travellers or experienced in those with whom they had dealings.' II $\lambda \epsilon \circ \nu \epsilon \kappa \tau 0 \cup \mu \epsilon \nu \omega \nu$ is a pure passive, and is found in classical Greek. Here again Justin supports Christianity by an appeal to its ethical influence as in c. 14, 2.
4. $\mu \dot{\eta} \dot{\delta} \mu \delta \sigma \eta \tau \epsilon]$ Cf. Matt. v 34, 37 ; James v 12 . In Clem. Hom., xix 2, the quotation occurs in the same form as here: $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \omega$
 ably the form was traditional ; it is that found in James, loc. cit. (with
$\eta \eta \tau \omega$ instead of $\epsilon \sigma \tau \omega)$, and, as Westcott points out (N.T. Canon, ad loc.), in Clem. Strom. v 14, 100 ; Epiph. adu. Haer. i 20, 6.
5. $\mu \epsilon \gamma i \sigma \tau \eta \epsilon \in ̇ \nu \tau 0 \lambda \dot{\prime}]$ Cf. Mark xii 29, 30 ; Luke x 27 ; though Justin's phraseology differs considerably from that of the two Evangelists. The last clause кúpıov tò $\nu$ $\theta \epsilon \delta \nu$ тò $\nu \pi o \not v \dot{\eta} \sigma \nu \tau a ́ \sigma \epsilon$ may perhaps be added to combat the Ginostic distinction between the Creator of Judaism and the God of Christianity. Justin Tryph. 93 cites the same passage more in accordance with the N.T. text ; a $\gamma a \pi \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota s$ кúpıov тòv $0 \epsilon o ́ \nu ~ \sigma o v ~ \epsilon ' \xi ~ ठ ̈ \lambda \eta s ~ \tau \eta ̂ s ~ к а \rho \delta l a s ~ \sigma o u ~$
 $\pi \lambda \eta \sigma i o \nu \sigma o v \dot{\omega} \sigma \sigma \epsilon a v \tau \delta \nu$.
6. каi $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \epsilon \lambda \theta$ б $\nu \tau 0 s]$ Cf. Mark x 17, 18; Luke xviii 18, 19;
 is again an addition. Clem. Hom. xviii 3 has $\mu \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \dot{a} \gamma a 0 \delta \nu$ 'ó $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$






















 $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{a} \xi \iota o \hat{v} \mu \epsilon \nu$.

## 16 $\pi \epsilon \in \mu \psi \omega \nu \tau a \iota$ Otto $\pi \epsilon ́ \mu \pi \omega \nu \tau \alpha \iota$ A

oủpavoîs. Justin Tryph. ioı quotes


7. oúx ${ }^{i} \pi a ̂ s$ ó $\lambda \epsilon \epsilon \gamma$.] Cf. Matt. vii 2 I .
9. ís $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ d̀кои́ $\epsilon]$ Cf. Matt. vii 24 ; Luke x 16 ; Matt. x 40 ; John xiv 24. Justin's phrase may be from an unwritten logion of Christ or may be a rough synopsis, composed by himself, of Christian precepts.
 vii 22,23 ; xiii $4^{2}, 43$; Luke xiii 26-28. Justin Tryph. 76 has $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda$ ol



 'A $\nu a \chi \omega \rho \epsilon i ̄ \tau \epsilon \dot{\alpha} \pi$ ' $\dot{\epsilon} \mu 0 \hat{v}$.
16. $\pi \epsilon \epsilon \mu \psi \omega \nu \tau \alpha \iota]$ a middle aorist, used in a passive sense, parallel to $\lambda \alpha \dot{\mu} \psi \omega \sigma \tau \nu$.
ib. $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda o l$ रà $\rho \ddot{\eta} \xi$.] Cp. Matt. vii $15,16,19$; xxiv 5 . Justin


入и́коя äртаяєs.

17. I. Sópous $\delta \in ̀ ~ к a i ̀ ~ \epsilon i \sigma \phi o \rho a ̀ s ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ i ́ \phi ' ~ v i \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon \tau a \gamma-$ $\mu \epsilon ́ \nu o \iota s ~ \pi а \nu \tau a \chi o \hat{v} \pi \rho o ̀ ~ \pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu ~ \pi \epsilon \iota \rho \omega ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a ~ \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon \iota \nu, ~ \omega ่ s$

 5 тє $\epsilon \epsilon \hat{\nu}$. каì àтєкрі́vато. Eïтатє́ нои, тívos єiкóva тò
 àעтатєкрірато aưтoî. 'Атóסoтє oû̀ тà Kaíбapos т $\hat{\iota}$
 بóvov $\pi \rho о \sigma \kappa v \nu o \hat{v} \mu \epsilon \nu$, í $\mu i ̂ \nu ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon} \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau a ̀ ~ a ̆ \lambda \lambda a ~ \chi a i ́ \rho o \nu \tau \epsilon s ~$

 $\sigma \omega ́ \phi \rho о \nu a$ тòv $\lambda о \gamma \iota \sigma \mu o ̀ \nu$ єै $\chi о \nu \tau a s ~ \dot{v} \mu a ̂ s ~ \epsilon \dot{v} \rho \epsilon \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota$. 4. $\epsilon i$





17. Christ taught us to be obedient citizens; we pay all taxes, and, though we worship God alone, we pray for our rulers. However, if you will not listen to us, yours is the responsibility, in proportion to the greatness of the powers entrusted to your.

The early Christians certainly acknowledged the claims of civil law and government to their obedience; but they were reluctant to take an active share in politics. They were peaceable subjects, and some served in the legions, though others refused to do so ; but they were indifferent to, and partially averse from, the civil grovernment of an 'idolatrous' state. They obeyed the laws, except in regard to religion, but they did not seek for office in a state, whose political ceremonial was closely connected with a religion which they repudiated. Cf. Tert. Apol. 38 ' Nec ulla res aliena magis quam publica.'

This followed necessarily from the intimate union of religion and politics which the Augustan system had established.

1. фópous... $\epsilon i \sigma \phi o \rho a ́ s]$ The former word refers to the regular taxation usually assessed on the census; the latter to special taxes.
2. $\pi \alpha \rho^{\prime}$ aủrov̂] i.e. Christ. Justin makes nc reference to Rom. xiii $\mathrm{I}-7$, because he is only quoting Christ's words.
ib. кат' є́кєìo] Cf. Matt. xxii 17-21; Luke xx 21 - 25 .
3. $\theta \epsilon \partial \nu \nu \mu \dot{\nu} \nu 0 \nu \pi \rho о \sigma \kappa v \nu 0 \hat{\jmath} \mu \epsilon \nu$ ] The great test of the Christians on trial was the order to sacrifice to the Emperor.
 ${ }^{1}$ Tim. ii $\mathrm{r}, 2$, and the prayer in Clem. Rom. ad Corinth. c. 61, quoted by schaff, Hist. of anteNic. Christianity, § 66, note ad fin.
 xxv 15.



18．I．＇$А \pi о \beta \lambda \epsilon ́ \psi a \tau \epsilon \gamma a ̀ \rho \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \tau \epsilon ́ \lambda o s ~ є ́ \kappa a ́ \sigma \tau o v ~ \tau \hat{\omega \nu}$ $\gamma \epsilon \nu о \mu \in ́ \nu \omega \nu \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon ́ \omega \nu$ ，öт८ тòv коıvòv тâб८ $\theta a ́ \nu a \tau о \nu ~ a ̉ \pi \epsilon ́-~$



 3．$\nu \epsilon \kappa v о \mu a \nu \tau \epsilon i ̂ a \iota ~ \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ к а i ~ a i ~ a ̀ \delta ı a \phi \theta o ́ p \omega \nu ~ \pi a i ́ \delta \omega \nu ~$



$9 \dot{\alpha} \delta \iota a \phi \theta \dot{o} \rho \omega \nu$ marg $\mathrm{A} \delta \iota \alpha \phi \theta \delta \rho \omega \nu \mathrm{A}$

1．$\dot{\psi} \pi \lambda$ éov $]$ Cf．Luke xii $4^{8 .}$ Otto refers to Clem．Strow．ii，p．
 $\dot{\alpha} \pi a \iota \tau \eta$ өं $\sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$ ．

18．Life is eternal；extinction would indeed be a boon to the wicked； but sense remains and punishment awaits．The customs of Gentile religions and the teaching of your philosophers and poets would attest this for you．Listen then to our teaching，as you do to theirs．We believe in a God，no less than others believe；we even hold that He will be able to effect a resurrection of bodies．

5．ठ̈тєр $\epsilon i \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］A reminiscence of Plato Phaedo rot c $\epsilon i \mu \hat{e} \nu$ rà $\rho$ inv ó Oávaros fou $\pi a \nu \tau o ̀ s ~ \dot{a} \pi a \lambda \lambda a \gamma \dot{\eta}$ ，
 Id．Apol． 40 єi＇t $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon \mu$ ia al $\sigma \eta \sigma i$ is
 $\kappa \in ́ \rho \delta o s ~ a ̀ \nu ~ \epsilon ⿱ ⺌ 兀 口 ~ i ̀ ~ o ́ ~ \theta a ́ v a \tau o s . ~ J u s t i n ~$


 properly＇$a$ gift of Hermes，＇i．e． ＇a godsend．＇

6．$\pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \iota \quad \gamma \epsilon \nu 0 \mu \hat{v} \nu \circ \iota s]$＇all men that have been．＇
9．עєкиона⿱тєіिаи $\kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］The and century after Christ saw a general return to religion ；super－
station prevailed and miracles were fashionable，as the story of Apol－ lonius of Tyana shows ；astrology was encouraged，as can be seen from Tacitus＇reference to the mathematici in Hist．i 22，＇genus hominum quod in ciuitate nostra et uetabitur semper et retinebitur．＇ Nєкиомадтєía are＇oracles of the dead，＇like that near lake Aornos in Thesprotia．Cf．Herod．v 92， § 7.
ib．ai ad $\delta \iota a \phi \theta \dot{\rho} \rho \omega \nu \pi$ ．er．］Ac－ cording to Socrates H．E．iii 13， this refers to the sacrifice of innocent children and the inspection of their entrails．Presumably this was a way of taking special omens．Cf． Dion．Al．apud Euseb．H．E．vii


 $\sigma \pi \lambda \alpha \dot{\gamma} \chi^{\nu \alpha} \nu \epsilon \sigma \gamma \epsilon \nu \hat{\eta} \delta c a u \rho \epsilon \hat{\nu}$ ，and Els． viii $I_{4}$（of Maxentius）$\mu a \gamma \iota \alpha \alpha i ̂ s$

 $\chi \nu a \quad \beta \rho \epsilon \notin \omega ิ \nu \quad \delta \iota \epsilon \rho \epsilon \nu \nu \omega \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu 0 \nu$. Sic． in Vat．6， $\mathrm{I}_{4}$＇cum puerorum extis dos manes mactare soleas．＇

10．$\psi \nu \chi \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho$ ．$\kappa \lambda$.$] Necro－$ many．＇Summoning of human sorts．＇
if．$\dot{\nu} \epsilon \iota \rho о \pi о \mu \pi o i]$ A general






 каі ПuӨaүópov, Пла́тшуо́s тє каi इшкра́тоvя, каì ó тар’




term for spirits which send dreams. $\Pi \alpha ́ \rho \epsilon \delta \rho o l$, familiar spirits in particular. The same collocation (doubtless with reference to this passage) occurs in Iren. i 23, 4. See also Eus. Hist. Eccl. iv 7.
I. $\pi \epsilon \iota \sigma \dot{a} \tau \omega \sigma \alpha \nu$ ] Justin does not commit himself to any positive assertion about the genuineness of these oracular deliverances. He merely asks that his readers should believe that there is a survival after death on the authority of their own religious customs, and so be ready to listen to Christian teaching on the subject.
4. $\delta a \mu \mu_{\nu}(0 \lambda \dot{\eta} \pi \pi$ тovs] Cf. ii 5 (6), 6. Joseph. Bell. Iud. vii 6, 3 mentions a herb, supposed to be efficacious for driving away demons ' which are no other than the spirits of the wicked, that enter into men that are alive and kill them, unless they can oltain some help against them ' (Whiston's translation).
5. 'A 1 фф $\lambda$ óxou] son of Amphiaraus. His oracle at Mallos in Cilicia was famous in Pausanias' time, circ. A.D. 180.
6. $\Delta \omega \delta \dot{\omega} \dot{\omega} \eta \mathrm{s}]$ oracle of Zeus, where omens were given from the groves of oak and beech-trees.
ib. Hu $\begin{aligned} & \text { ous }] ~ o r a c l e ~ o f ~ A p o l l o ~\end{aligned}$ at Delphi, where the prophetess sat
on a tripod over a chasm whence fumes arose.
7. 'Е $\mu \pi \epsilon \delta$ ок $\lambda$ є́ous $]$ circ. 450 в.с. He taught that all living souls had once been divine spirits, who had been banished to earth for some crime, but could be restored by abstinence and expiatory rites.
8. IIv $\theta a \gamma \delta \rho o v]$ 6th century b.c. He taught that souls are embodied because of $\sin$, and after death will go into Kosmos or Tartarus according to their deserts, or have to pass through life again as men or animals.
ib. IIגát $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ ós $\tau$. к. इ. $\omega \kappa \kappa \rho$.] Socrates regards a future life as probable. Plato seems on the whole to believe in it, and in an eventual incorporeal immortality. Probably the reference here is to the myth which closes the de Republica.
ib. $\dot{\delta} \pi a \rho$ ' ' $O \mu \eta \eta^{\prime} \rho \boldsymbol{\beta} \beta \delta \theta \rho$.] Homer Od. xi 25 etc.
 view the things in Hades.'
10. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \epsilon i \pi \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu]$ refers back to
 'Оঠ. єis т. т. є̇াiбк. is, somewhat a wk wardly, iuserted as a parenthesis.
11. кä̀ $\dot{\partial} \mu o i \omega s]$ Cf. c. 12, 3, note ad loc., and 2 Cor. xi 16 кä̀ $\dot{\omega}$ shфpova $\delta \dot{\delta} \xi \alpha \sigma \theta \epsilon \not \mu \epsilon$. So here it is 'reccive us, even if you receive us only on an equality zuith them.'













 тoloûje $\tau$ oóóv $\delta \epsilon$ oîò $\tau \epsilon$ Otto
I. $\sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau \alpha]$ A clear profession of belief in a resurrection of the body. See Introd., p. xxxii. Cf. Justin Apol. i 52, 3; Tryph. 80 каi баркòs à $\nu \alpha ́ \sigma \tau a \sigma \iota \nu ~ \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \in ̇ \pi \iota-$ $\sigma \tau \alpha ́ \mu \in \theta a$ : Vet. Eccl. Rom. Symb. барко̀s ává $\alpha \tau \alpha \sigma \iota \nu$.
19. Without evidence, we should find the process of human generation incredible. Similarly, resurrection is difficult for you to believe in, because you have never seen a dead man come to life again. But the processes maybe considered analogous. It is dishonouring to God to say that He cannot raise the dead; and Christ has taught us that God can do what man cannot.
5. $\dot{\rho} a \nu[\delta o s]$ ' $d r o p$.' A similar argument is found in Tat. Or. 6, Athenag. de Resurr. 17.
7. '̇ф' $\dot{u} \pi \circ \theta \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \omega s$ ] 'by way of supposition.'
8. $\mu \grave{\eta}$ ov̂ $\iota \iota$ тoloútols $\mu . \tau$.] ' not being such nor sprung from such (as you are).' Toloút $\omega$, is genitive of origin. Perion. inserts $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa$.
11. oủk ä $\tau \iota s \tau 0 \lambda \mu$. $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau$.] 'Would
you believe? No one would dare to contradict (and say that you would disbelieve).' Such a confusion of elliptical phraseology seems to be due to the negative assertion involved in the question: 'You would not believe, would you? Nor will anyone dare to contradict me and say you would.' Similar confusions are found in Plato, e.g. Rep. 336 E $\mu \grave{\eta} \gamma$ à $\rho$ $\delta \grave{\eta}$ oilov $\dot{\eta} \mu a ̂ s$ ou $\sigma \pi o v \delta a ́ \zeta \epsilon \epsilon \nu^{*}$ olou $\gamma \dot{\epsilon} \sigma v$, ${ }^{\tilde{\omega}}$ фì $\lambda \epsilon$ (Stallbaum emends to $\mu \dot{\eta}$ olov $\sigma \dot{v}$ ), where the affirmative $\sigma \pi o v \delta a ́ \zeta \varepsilon \iota \nu$ has to be understood with olou $\gamma \epsilon$. Phaedo 68 в oúк
 $\chi \rho \eta$. A fairly parallel case is seen in Justin Tryph. 33 iєpєùs סє̀ öть
 $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \epsilon \iota \pi \epsilon i ̂ \nu$ то $\lambda \mu \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, 'That Hezekiah was not a priest, you will not be able to contradict (and say that he was).' Otto also quotes
 $\epsilon \in \pi o l \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu$, oủ $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ vi $\mu \epsilon i ̂ ̀ ~ \tau о \lambda \mu \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \epsilon i \pi \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu$. But that is a perfectly normal use of two paratactic sentences.
















 $\mu \in \nu \mathrm{A}$
5. á $\phi \theta a \rho \sigma i a \nu ~ \epsilon ̇ \nu \delta u ́ \sigma.] ~ C f . ~ I ~ C o r . ~$ xv 53. The $\delta \ell \kappa \eta \nu \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \mu \alpha \dot{\tau} \omega \nu$ makes it the more probable that this text was in Justin's mind.
7. oi фáбкоутєs] This is the Stoic theory of orthodox Pantheism, according to which the whole universe is permeated by the anima mundi, into which the nature of human beings, after purgation, is eventually resolved. Cf. Virg. Georg. iv 2I9 ff.; Aen. vi 724 ff.
8. mapà raûta] 'beyond this.'
 Otto translates 'quae et sua natura et hominibus sume impossibilia.' This seems an impossible rendering; even in an uncritical age, the belief in things, which are by their nature impossible, is scarcely widespread; nor did Christ urge such credulity. Maran translates with more regard to natural probability, ' Quae et nostrae naturae et aliorum
hominum uires superant.' So too Veil, 'Dinge die unserer eigenen Natur und ïberhaupt den Menschen unmöglich sind.'
15. Tà á $\delta \dot{v} v a \tau a]$ Cf. Luke xviii 27; Matt. xix 26; Mark x ${ }^{27}$. Otto quotes here Celsus' objection, ap. Orig. v 14, oúסèv モ̇ $\chi o \nu \tau \epsilon s$
 $\dot{\alpha} \tau о \pi \omega \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \eta \nu \quad \dot{\alpha} \nu a \chi \omega ́ \rho \eta \sigma \iota \nu \quad$ ö $\tau \iota \pi \hat{\alpha} \nu$ $\delta \nu \nu a \tau \partial \nu \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \quad \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega}^{\cdot} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ oủ $\tau \iota \gamma \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha}$
 фúбıע ßoúлєtaı. Both of Celsus' limitations are perfectly valid. God cannot be false to His own moral character ; nor does He act in defiance of His own natural laws. But the force of this second limitation depends on (1) our knowledge of natural law; (2) the extent to which we must presume our knowledge to be defective, as, for instance, in cases postulated to be unique.










7 ＇ఇ $\sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi \pi \eta s$ Otto＇ఇ $\sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi \iota s \mathrm{~A}$

1．$\mu \grave{\eta}$ фoßeî $\sigma \epsilon \epsilon$ Cf．Luke xii 4， 5 ；Matt．x 28.

4．रध́є $\nu \nu a]$ See Hastings Dict． of the Bib．s．v．＇Gehenna．＇

20．Your ozun oracles and phi－ losophers foretell a fiery end to the world．And many of our viezes resemble those of poets and others whom you honour，or only differ from them in being nobler and more divine，and demonstratively proved．

7．$\left.\sum i \beta u \lambda \lambda \alpha\right]$ The Sibylline oracles are a medley of Jewish and Christian fictions about a golden age，the future of Rome，the end of the world．They are the work． of various authors in various cen－ turies，and were arranged in a con－ nected series in the Middle Ages． （Clf．Hastings Dict．Bibl．s．v．； Milman Hist．of Christ．ii 7， Geffcken＇s edition ；Texte und Un－ tersuchungen Bd xxiii．）＇They are quoted by many of the early Christian fathers．The passages here alluded to may be Orac．Sibyll．ii 196 ff． каi тótє ठ̀̀ тотанós тє $\mu \epsilon ́ \gamma a s ~ \pi u \rho o ̀ s$ ai $\theta$ о $\mu \notin \nu$ оぃo
 $\delta a \pi \alpha \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$
（unless Bk ii is rightly supposed to date from the 3 rd cent．）；or iv 172 ff ．$\pi \hat{u} \rho$ है $\frac{1}{\sigma} \sigma a \iota$ катà $\gamma \alpha i ̂ a \nu ~ к \tau \lambda . ~$ （ Pl iv is said to be of the reign of Titus．）
ib．＇గ $\sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi \eta s$ ］A Persian Magus，
supposed to have lived in Zoroaster＇s time and to have issued oracles． He is quoted by Clem．Alex．and Lactant．＇A $\nu a ́ \lambda \omega \sigma \omega=$＇consumption．＇

9．$\Sigma \tau \omega і ̈ к о$ i $]$ Cf．ii 6 （7），3． Many Stoics regarded the $\kappa 6 \sigma \mu \circ$ as immortal，and Justin＇s statement here does not give what is generally supposed to have been the orthodox Stoic idea，though the Stoics did assert the ultimate resolution of the world into fire．Yet Justin can hardly have misconceived entirely the Stoic position，nor have falsified it in a treatise addressed to $M$ ． Aurelius．It is possible that，as Stoicism was based on Pantheism and identified God with the universe， it might go further and identify this God with fire，borrowing the Hera－ clitean notion of fire as the primal element of the universe．Cf．August． de Ciu．D．viii 5 ＇Stoici in igne cau－ sam principiumque rerum esse dixe－ runt＇；and he adds that they call this principle＇uiuens et sapic ns et mundi fabricator＇；Plut．de Placit． Philos．1， 6 （p． 879 c）ópí̧ovtaı тウ̀v toû $\theta$ єiou oứíà oi $\Sigma \tau \omega i ̈ x o i ~ o u ̈ t \omega . ~$
 $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \mu о \rho \phi \dot{\eta} \nu, \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \frac{\nu}{\lambda} \delta \dot{\epsilon}$ єis ä阝ои́入єtal：ib．7，I7 oi $\Sigma \tau \omega і ̈ к о$ ： коьขótєроу $\theta$ єò $\nu$ ả $\pi о ф а i \nu о \nu \tau \alpha \iota ~ \pi \hat{v} \rho$
 кбб $\mu о$ 。


 3. $\epsilon i$ oûv каì ó $\mu \circ i ́ \omega s ~ \tau \iota \nu a ̀ ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ \pi a \rho ’ ~ i ́ \mu i ̂ \nu ~ \tau \iota \mu \omega \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o \iota s ~$


 $\kappa є к о \sigma \mu \eta ̄ \sigma \theta a \iota ~ к а і ~ \gamma є \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \hat{\sigma} \theta a \iota ~ \Pi \lambda a ́ \tau \omega \nu о s ~ \delta o ́ \xi о \mu \epsilon \nu ~ \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$
 ıо $\zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \epsilon ่ \nu ~ a i \sigma \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota ~ к а i ̀ ~ \mu \epsilon \tau a ̀ ~ \theta a ́ \nu a \tau o \nu ~ o v ̉ \sigma a s ~ \tau a ̀ s ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$








 $\dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega ́ \pi o u s$ Stephan $\chi \epsilon i \rho o \nu \iota \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega ́ \pi o u s$ Maran
6. $\theta \epsilon i \omega s$ ] i.e. 'suitably to God.'
ib. $\mu \dot{o} \nu o l \mu \epsilon \tau^{\prime}$ à $\left.\pi o \delta \in \epsilon i \xi \epsilon \omega s\right]$ Christianity alone can prove its dogmas about God, by the revelation of Christ.
ib. Tapà $\pi$ áptas] 'beyond all others.'
8. IIतár $\omega$ vos] Certainly this is the general idea of Plato's philosophy.
 punished.'
14. $\pi$ пооккveiv] with dative. This is found in late Greek. Cf. Matt. ii 2, 11 ; John iv 23 . Justin uses it with the accusative also; cf. c. 17, 3, and many other passages.
ib. Mevávop $]$ ] He is quoted in pseudo-Justin de Monarch. 5, and these or similar passages may be in mind here: (quoted as from the Hiereia)

 $\dot{o}$ тои̂то $\pi о \iota \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i ́ \mu \epsilon i \zeta \omega \nu \tau o \hat{v} \theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$ : and (quoted as from the Diphilus)

 $\mu \delta \nu o \nu$

21. Our story of Christ is in many respects analogous to heathen stories about Zens' various sons, and to your owen belief in deified Emperors. Of course the immoralities of Zeus and others are the zoork of evil demons. Only the good are immortal, as we teach; the wicked are punished in eternal fire.

Justin's argument in this clapter is perhaps partly ad captandum; partly however it arises from his view of the Divine preparation for Christ in heathendom, the work of the Spermatic Logos.

 ởpavóv, oủ $\pi a \rho a ̀ ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~ \pi a \rho ’ ~ \dot{v} \mu i ̂ \nu ~ \lambda \epsilon \gamma o \mu e ́ v o u s ~ v i o u ̀ s ~ \tau \hat{c}$


 'А $\sigma \kappa \lambda \eta \pi i o ̀ \nu ~ \delta ́ \epsilon ́, ~ к а і ̈ ~ \theta \epsilon \rho a \pi \epsilon v \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \gamma \epsilon \nu o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o \nu, ~ к є \rho a v \nu \omega \theta \epsilon ́ \nu \tau a ~$








I2 juolws Otto ómolous $\mathrm{A} \| 14$ aủrookáropas oùs Thirlb om oùs A
3. oú тapà toùs кт入.] 'We bring forward nothing new, as compared with those whom you call sons of Zeus.' The dative $\tau \hat{\omega} \Delta t t$ is influenced by $\lambda \in \gamma o \mu \epsilon \nu o u s$, 'ascribed to Zeus as sons.'
6. 'E $\rho \mu \hat{\eta} \nu$ ] The symbolical explanation of Hermes as the interpretative word, and teacher of all, was the work of the later Rationalistic school. Cf. i 22, 2 ; Clem. Al. Strom. vi 15 .
7. 'A $\sigma \kappa \lambda \eta \pi \iota o ́ \nu$ ] Asclepius was traditionally held to have been struck with thunder by Zeus, because he had been bribed to recall a dead man to life. Cf. Pind. Pyth. iii 55 ; Plat. Rep. 408 B; Eur. Alc. 3 ; Virg. Aen. vii 770. His most famous shrine was at Epidaurus.
8. $\Delta$ cóvvoov] This refers to the myth of Dionysus Zagreus, which originated in Crete (Diod. Sic. v 75,4 ) and was connected with Orphism ; we hear of it mainly in late authors. The myth was that Dionysus was lured from the charge of the Kouretes by the Titans, who tore him in pieces. Zeus punished
${ }^{t}$ hem and restored him to life. Cf. Harrison Proleg. to Gk Relig. c. 10. 9. 'Hраклє́a] Herakles burnt himself to put an end to the pains caused by Nessus' shirt (Soph. Trachin.). חóv $\omega \nu$ here probably $=$ dolores (Otto). Most however take it as =labours. The dative $\phi v \gamma \hat{n}$ is a little strange.

Io. $\Delta \iota o \sigma \kappa$ ои́pous] Castor and Pollux.
ib. Mєрбє́a] Cf. i 54, 8. Justin is probably thinking of the story that Perseus and Andromeda were placed among the stars after death.

1. B $\in \lambda \lambda \epsilon \rho \circ \phi \dot{\delta} \nu \tau \eta \nu]$ ' $\phi$ ' ' $\pi \pi \pi o u$ $\Pi \eta \gamma \alpha \dot{\sigma} o u$ goes with $\dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \lambda \eta \lambda u \theta \in \in \nu a l$ єis oúparbv, which must be supplied throughout. According to Hor. Od. iv ir, 26 , Pind. Isthm. vi 44 , his ride to heaven on Pegasus failed. Either Justin knew some other myth on the subject, or his memory is here at fault.
2. кат $\quad \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho[\sigma \theta a l]$ ' to have been placed among the stars.'
ib. каi $\tau i \not \gamma \alpha ́ \rho] \quad \lambda \epsilon \in \gamma o \mu \epsilon \nu$ must be understood.
3. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \theta a \nu a \tau \ell \xi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota \dot{\alpha} \xi$.] Either
 à $\nu \in \rho \chi$ ó $\mu \in \nu о \nu$ єis тò̀ oủpavò̀ тò̀ катакає́vтa Kaíбapa;
















'claiming that they are immortal' or 'thinking right to deify.'
4. $\dot{\mu} \nu \dot{v} \nu \tau a$ tivá] This is known to have happened in the cases of Romulus and Julius Caesar; and at the funeral of Augustus ' nec defuit uir praetorius qui se effigiem cremati cuntem in caelum uidisse iuraret' (Suet. Aug. ioo). The idea is burlesqued in the Apocolocyntosis.
5. סıaфopá ] 'advantage, profit.' II ротрот $\dot{\nu} \nu$ 'instruction.' The context here is presumably ironical.
6. ̀́s каl... $\pi a p a \delta \epsilon \xi a \sigma \theta a l]$ 'as to believe that he, who is according to them (кал' aúroús) the head and father of all,' etc.
7. татрофб́vт $\eta \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$.] The usual story was that Zeus mutilated and deposed Kronos, as Kronos had treated Uranus. There was no story of successive murder; the word $\pi a \tau \rho \circ \phi b \nu \tau \eta s$ only applies roughly. The same condemnation
of Greek mythology as Justin here expresses is found in Plato Kep. ii, iii.
8. $\dot{\omega} s \pi \rho \circ \epsilon \phi \eta \mu \epsilon \nu$ ] c. 5.
9. $\dot{a} \pi a \theta a \nu a \tau i \xi \epsilon \sigma \theta a l]$ is used of a happy immortality. There is no hint here of conditional immortality, for the wicked are said to suffer eternal pumishment.

I6. toùs á $\delta i \kappa \kappa \omega s]$ sc. $\beta \iota o$ ûvtas.
22. If Christ were mere man, He would be worthy of being called 'Son of God' because of His zuisdom. But zoe say that He was the Word of God born in a spccial way, like your lesrend of Hermes;-He was crucified; and many of your sons of Zeus suffered; -Me zens born of a virgin; so was Perseus;-He healed the sick and raised the dead; so did Asclepizes.

Justin has no fear of the 'argument from comparative religion.' The heathen fables, according to






 $\pi \rho о к а т \eta \rho \iota \theta \mu \eta \mu$ évoıs $\pi a \theta o \hat{v} \sigma \iota \nu$ vioîs ка $\theta^{\prime}$ v́ $\mu \hat{\varsigma} \varsigma ~ \tau о \hat{v} ~ \Delta i o ̀ s ~$







him, are the work of the demons' cunning (cf. c. 54 , etc.). But they ought at any rate to predispose the heathen to find nothing ridiculous in the Christian creed.
r. $\kappa o \iota \nu \hat{\omega} s]$ contrasted with $i \delta i \omega s$ later.
2. $\pi a \tau \epsilon \rho \alpha \quad \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho]$ i.e. it is not incongruous to call a man 'the son of God.'
3. $\pi \alpha \rho \dot{\alpha} \quad \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \kappa 0 \iota \nu \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \gamma \epsilon \ell \varepsilon \sigma \omega \nu]$ 'contrasted with, different from, the ordinary method of birth.' The reference is probably to the eternal generation of the Logos, as indicated by the comparison with Hermes. The Virgin-birth is later compared with the Perseus-myth.
5. ís $\pi \rho \circ \hat{\epsilon} \phi \eta \mu \in \nu]$ Cf. ă $\nu \in \nu$ è $\pi \iota-$ $\mu$ kias c. 2I, I.
ib. 'E $\rho \mu \hat{\eta} \nu]$ Cf. i $2 \mathrm{I}, 2$.
 21.- Yioîs кa日' ùmâs toû $\Delta i o ́ s ~ i s ~ a ~$ single phrase 'those whom you call sons of Zeus.'
9. oủx ö $\mu o \iota a]$ They did not all suffer the same death; therefore Christ is not inferior to them, because His death was of a special nature.
ro. $\tau$ ó iolov $\tau . \pi$.] The accusative of that in respect of which he might be thought $\ddot{\eta} \tau \tau \omega \nu$.
11. $\dot{\omega} \dot{\text { v̇ } \pi \epsilon \sigma \chi o ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a] ~ C f . ~ c . ~} 13$.
13. $\dot{\alpha} \pi o \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \delta \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \tau a \iota]$ This may refer, as Otto suggests, to the quotations from Christ's teaching in cc. $\mathrm{I}_{5}-\mathrm{r} 7$; but perhaps better to the $\pi \rho a ́ \xi \epsilon \epsilon s$ of Christ, i.e. His miracles, and the moral effects of Christianity. The sentence ó $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ $\kappa \rho \epsilon i \tau \tau \omega \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$. is caught up again by Iren. ii 30,5 .
14. $\delta \iota a ̀ ~ \pi a \rho \theta \in ́ v o u] ~ J e r o m e ~ o b-~$ jected to this use of $\delta \dot{\alpha}$ as tainted with Valentinian heresy. The Valentinians denied the $\epsilon \kappa \pi \alpha \rho \theta \epsilon \nu \nu \nu$. According to them, as Tertullian puts it, Christ was born transmeatorio potius quam generatorio more, i.e. He was not very man of the substance of His mother. But Jerome's criticism is too subtle. The Church fathers use $\delta i a ̀$ or per in no heretical sense, and Justin
 distinction of significance.
15. חє $\left.\rho \sigma \epsilon^{\prime} \alpha\right]$ Son of Jupiter and Danae.


 фа́бкє८ข $\delta o ́ \xi о \mu \epsilon \nu$.

 $\pi \rho о є \lambda \theta$ óv $\tau \omega \nu$ aủтоv̂ $\pi \rho \circ \phi \eta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu$ о́va ả $\lambda \eta \theta \hat{\eta}$ є̇ $\sigma \tau \iota$ каі̀ $\pi \rho \epsilon \sigma-$ $\beta v ́ \tau \epsilon \rho a \pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu \tau \omega ิ \nu \gamma \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu \sigma v \gamma \rho a \phi \epsilon \in \omega \nu$, каi oủ $\chi \grave{\iota}$
 10 őт८ тò ả入ך $\theta$ ès $\lambda \in ́ \gamma о \mu \in \nu$.
2. каì 'I $\eta \sigma o v ̂$ Х X








 ...єiтєîv Veil
I. $\pi$ ovppoús] if genuine, must mean 'infirm'; but perhaps we should read $\pi \eta$ poús. Cf. Tiryph. 69. For the confusion between the two words, see Robinson Eip. to the Ephes. p. 2\%2. Паралитько́s is a N.T. word, found in Matthew and Mark. Luke has the more technical $\pi \alpha \rho a \lambda \epsilon \lambda \nu \mu \epsilon \in \nu 0 s$.
23. I shall nowe prove (1) that Christianity is alone true and its creed anterior to heathen myths; (2) that Fesus Christ was the Son of God in a unique sense; (3) that the heathen myths are due to demons.

This order is not strictly adhered to in the following chapters; Justin's method is not carefully systematic ; but his three arguments may be roughly arranged as follows: (1) cc. $24^{-29}$; (2) cc. 30-53; (3) cc. 54-60. 6. $\tau \hat{\nu} \nu \pi \rho \circ \epsilon \lambda 0$. aủтoû $\pi \rho \circ \phi$.]
'The prophets who preceded Him.' Av̉rô is genitive after $\pi \rho o$ in composition. Liddell and Scott quote Xen. Cyr. ii 2, 7, as a case of a similar usage. II $\rho \circ \notin \rho \chi \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ is found with the accusative in N.T., e.g. Mark vi 33 .
9. aúтoîs] refers to $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \sigma v \gamma \gamma \rho a-$ $\phi \epsilon \epsilon^{\prime} \nu$.
10. каi' I $\eta \sigma o u ̂ s]$ ठтт is understood. ' $\Upsilon \pi \alpha ́ \rho \chi \omega \nu=$ ' being beforchand.'
12. $\pi \rho \omega \tau$ о́токоs] Cf. 33, 6; 53, 2 ; 63, 15 ; Col. i 15 ; and Lightfoot's note ad loc.
ib. Súvauss] Cf. ı Cor. i 24.
ib. $\tau \hat{\eta} \beta$ où $\hat{n}$ aúrô̂] Christ was incarnate loy the will of God. See Introd., p. xxvi.
13. $\epsilon \pi$ ' $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda a \gamma \hat{n} \kappa \tau \lambda$.$] 'for the$ conversion and restoration of the human race.' See Introd., p. xxvi.
15. $\phi 0$ á $\sigma \nu \tau \epsilon \in s \tau . \kappa \tau \lambda$.] This sen-



 тоьпоо́ $\mu \in \Theta$.




 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ aỉт $\hat{\omega} \nu$ ن́тò $\pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu \tau \iota \mu \omega \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$ ả $\lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ ă $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ ả $\lambda \lambda o \chi o ́ \sigma \epsilon$,

 тoùs aủtoùs $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu ~ \sigma \epsilon ́ \beta o \mu \epsilon \nu ~ \theta \epsilon o u ́ s, ~ \mu \eta \delta \grave{\epsilon} \tau 0 i ̂ \varsigma ~ a ̉ \pi o \theta a \nu o v ̂ \sigma \iota ~ \chi o a ̀ s ~$
tence is exceedingly confused. The subject of Evinp $\eta_{\eta \sigma a \nu}$ must be the demons, in which case it seems natural to make them also the subject of $\varepsilon i \pi o \nu$; but this is forbidden by the $\delta \dot{\alpha} \tau \ldots \delta \alpha i \mu o \nu a s$. Who then are the tives? Otto explains the reference as being to the mythologi, and compares ii $4(5), 5$ and i $54, \mathrm{I}$; though in the first of these parallels no distinction is drawn between poets and mythologists, and the second has no reference to mythologists at all. Still it is possible that Justin regards the myth-makers as being prior to the poets (by whom he especially means Homer), and therefore one step nearer to the demons, the original influences, the poets being thus in a rough sense the prophets of the myth-makers (Otto's alteration of $\delta i \grave{\alpha} \tau \omega ิ \nu$ to $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ is unnecessary). Tives therefore would be the original makers of the myths, the direct mouthpieces of the demons; but in the second half of the sentence the demons come into more prominence, and they are the subjects of è $\nu \eta \dot{\eta} \rho \gamma \eta \sigma a \nu$. Maran's reading avoids the difficulty, but it seems to give an unnatural turn of
expression. The simplest emendation, if any is required, would be to omit the second $\delta \iota^{\alpha}$, making $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\pi<\imath \eta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ depend upon $\tau \iota \nu \epsilon \epsilon$. Veil considers the whole sentence to have been originally in the accus. and infin., and to have been corrected into nomin. and indic., the two readings being subsequently contaminated by an unintelligent scribe.
I. $\pi \rho \rho \in \epsilon \rho \eta \mu \epsilon \ell \circ u s]$ Cf. cc. $5 ; 21$.
3. Ėvíprnoav] 'they brought about the slanderous impieties which are alleged against us,' i.e. caused the slanderous allegation of impiety. Justin may have had in mind the N.T. conception of $\bar{\varepsilon} \nu \epsilon \rho \gamma \epsilon \hat{\nu}$ as meaning spiritual influence within men, cf. 26, I ; Mark vi 14; I Cor. xii 6, II, etc.
24. Firstly; though various people worship various gods, yet we alone are persecuted for our particular form of worship.

This is Justin's first proof that Christianity is alone true.
8. ä $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu \dot{d} \lambda \lambda \alpha \alpha \chi o \hat{v}]$ There seems to be an especial reference here to Egyptian cultus.
13. $\mu \grave{\eta}$ roùs aủroús] The use of $\mu \eta$ instead of ov̉ in indirect quotation

каi кขíааs каì є̀v тафаîs бтєфávous каi $\theta v \sigma i ́ a s ~ \phi \epsilon ́ \rho о \mu \epsilon \nu . ~$

 є่ $\pi i \sigma \tau a \sigma \theta \epsilon$.
 oi $\pi a ́ \lambda a \iota ~ \sigma \epsilon \beta o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu о \iota ~ \Delta \iota o ́ \nu v \sigma o \nu ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \Sigma \epsilon \mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \eta s ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ ’ A \pi o ́ \lambda \lambda \omega \nu a$








 Krüger || 6 oi $\pi \alpha \dot{d} \lambda a \iota$ Otto oi $\pi a \lambda a \iota o i ~ A ~$
after verbs of saying and thinking is common in late Greek.
I. $\epsilon \nu \tau \tau \phi \alpha i s]$ This emendation seems almost inevitable. Maran urges the retention of $\gamma \rho a \phi a i s$, which, he maintains, might mean 'statues,' though the parallels which he quotes hardly prove his case. But, whether the word could be so translated here, or would have to be taken in its usual sense of 'pictures,' the preposition $\epsilon^{\prime} \nu$ seems very objectionable.
2. ठ̈Tı $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ oû $\nu$ ] The MS reading could give a conceivable sense, if oú $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ aútá were taken together as equivalent to 'different, various things.' But the emendation ouv is a very slight alteration and greatly improves the sentence. An alternative would be to omit ov altogether.
3. iepeîa] 'victıms.'
25. Secondly; in spite of the danger of death were have turned aside from your impure grods to the unbegotten, impassible, pure Goot.

This is the second proof that Christianity is alone true.
5. Є̇к тavтòs $\gamma$ '́vous] Cf. c. I.
8. II $\rho \sigma \sigma \epsilon \phi \dot{\prime} \nu \eta \nu]$ There is no reference here to the rape of Proserpine by Pluto. The story here alluded to, told by Apollodorus, is that Aphrodite gave the infant Adonis to Persephone to keep in safety. She admired him and refused to give him up. The consequent dispute between the two goddesses was appeased by Zeus, who decided that Adonis should remain for one-third of each year by himself, and should spend the rest of the year in equal portions with Aphrodite and Persephone.
9. oiбтpŋ $\theta$ єí $a \mathrm{as}$ ] 'stung to madness.' Otatpos literally = 'rradfly.'
12. $\dot{a} \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \dot{\eta} \tau \psi, \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \theta \in i \in]$ As Otto. remarks, the former epithet is to be contrasted with $\tau \delta \nu \sum \epsilon \mu \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \eta s$ and тò $\nu \Lambda \eta \tau o t o \partial \nu$, the latter with $\tau$ às oí $\tau \rho \eta \theta \epsilon i \sigma a s$.
13. Éautoùs $\dot{\alpha} \nu \in$ O.] Cf. c. 14, 2.





26. I. Tрі́тоע $\delta$ ' őть каì $\mu \epsilon \tau \grave{a} ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu ~ a ̉ \nu \epsilon ่ \lambda \epsilon v \sigma \iota \nu ~ \tau о \hat{v}$
 tıvàs $\lambda$ éyoutas éautoùs єîvaı $\theta$ єoús, oî oủ $\mu$ óvov oủk $\epsilon \in \delta \iota \omega ́ \chi \theta \eta \sigma a \nu \quad \dot{\psi} \phi^{\prime} \quad \dot{\jmath} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, ả $\lambda \lambda a ̀$ каi $\tau \iota \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa a \tau \eta \xi \iota \omega \prime \theta \eta \sigma a \nu$.







 Briareus.
2. $\mu \epsilon \rho \iota \mu \nu \hat{\omega} \nu \tau a \kappa \tau \lambda$.$] 'nor because$ of this (i.e. of Thetis' assistance) was anxious that Achilles should destroy many of the Greeks.' Mepu $\mu \nu \hat{\omega} \nu \tau a$ should be in the infinitive, but may be considered to be influenced by the preceding $\tau u \chi \boldsymbol{b}^{2} \boldsymbol{\tau} a$. In any case the grammar is slovenly. The passage in Hom. Il. ii 3, 4 runs
$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ ö $\gamma \epsilon$ (Zeus) $\mu \epsilon \rho \mu \eta \dot{\eta} \iota \zeta \epsilon \kappa \alpha \tau \dot{\alpha}$ $\phi \rho \in ́ v a$ wis 'A $\bar{\prime} \lambda \hat{\eta} a$
$\tau \iota \mu \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ ' $\lambda \lambda \epsilon ́ \sigma \alpha \iota$ ठ̀̀ $\pi 0 \lambda \epsilon \in a s \quad \grave{\epsilon} \pi i$ $\nu \eta v \sigma i \nu$ ' $A \chi a \iota \omega ิ \nu$.
Hence Ashton proffers the emendation here oúdè $\mu \epsilon \rho \iota \mu \nu \omega \bar{\omega} \tau \alpha \tau \iota \mu \eta \bar{\eta} \alpha \iota$ тò̀ $\tau$. Ө. 'A $\chi$. каì $\delta \iota \grave{\alpha} \kappa \tau \lambda$. Certainly the ms text appears suspicious; but סià rov̂to should probably be retained.
5. $\quad \gamma \nu \omega \mathrm{pi} 50 \mu \epsilon \nu]$ 'we recognize.'
26. Thirdly; the demons have inspired men who claim to be gods; their followers are called 'Christians'; and perhap's it is through them that the slanders against us arise. And
doctrines.

The third proof that Christianity is true is that those who at the demons' bidding corrupt Christianity are not punished for their doctrines (whilst true Christians are) ; therefore plainly the demons, the enemies of truth, are the authors of the persecutions.

The following passage is quoted by Eus. H. E. ii 13 .
ir. Г $\iota \tau \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ] The name was Gitta or Gittae, not far from Flavia Neapolis, Justin's own birthplace. Simon appears to have come forward, in Claudius' reign, as a magician, and to have propounded a system mixed up of Jewish and Syro-Babylonian elements; he apparently represented himself as a kind of emanation of the deity, and may have been honoured (in Samaria, if nowhere else) as an embodiment of God's highest power. A woman named Helena appeared in his system as the world-creating
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thought of God. But it is difficult to know how far Simon's doctrines and the history of his life have not been elaborated and garnished by the later heretics (there was a sect of Simonians in Justin's time) and by Catholics who treated Simon as the first heresiarch. The account in Acts viii +ff . seems to justify the belief that there was at least some tinge of rudimentary Gnosticism in his system (especially verse 1o). It is not certain that Simon ever came to Rome.

1. $̇$ èv $\tau \hat{\omega}$ 'Tiß $\beta \rho \iota \kappa \tau \lambda$.] 'In insula Tiberina.'
2. Simoni Deo Sancto] Subsequent authors, probably deriving their information from Justin, mention this statuc, e.g. Iren. c. Haer. i 23, Tert. Ap. 13, Augustin. de Hacr. I , and it is possible that statues in Simon's honour may have been crected at Samaria, and at Rome. This would not be singular, for Lucian de-cribes extravagant honours that were paid to a similar
charlatan called Alexander. But it is, at the least, a curious coincidence that in the island of the Tiber was found the base of a statue inscribed Semoni Sanco Deo Fidio. Such dedications to the Sabine god Semo Sancus have been found elsewhere. And it is possible that Justin was deceived by such an inscription, and read it as a dedication Simoni Sancto Deo Filio. The ignorance of Latin on his part, which is thus supposed, would not be at all incredible. But we need not therefore doubt Justin's accuracy in respect of the honours paid to Simon at Samaria.
3. $\bar{\epsilon} \pi i \quad \tau \in$ そrous $\sigma$.] According to Euselins, she had been a prostitute at Tyre.
4. 'vyoauy] 'thought' or 'conception.'
5. Mévav $\delta \rho o \nu]$ a follower of Simon, he laptized in his own name, professing to confer a resurrection to eternal life and youth.
6. Ėve $\rho \gamma \eta \theta$. к.] Aúrò̀ is almost
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 Eus Kriiger
unavoidably necessary after каl, and is supported by the reading in Eusebius.
7. j $\mu о \lambda о \gamma 0 \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \epsilon$ ] 'professing.'
8. Maркí $\nu$ a] Also governed by $\pi \rho о є \beta a ́ \lambda \lambda о \nu \tau 0$. Marcion's system conceived of two gods: one, the demiurge, was the God of the O.T., which Marcion rejected together with all Judaism: the other was the First God, who was found in the N.T., especially in the Pauline writings.

Cramer (Theol. Stud.) believes this passage and c. 58 to be later insertions: this one, he says, breaks the connexion, and Marcion did not call himself a god, as did Simon and Menander. But such a theory is doubtful. Justin would not be unlikely to take a chance of attacking Marcion, nor reluctant to
bracket him with other heresiarchs.
7. $\sigma v \lambda \lambda \eta \dot{\psi} \epsilon \omega \mathrm{~s}]$ 'assistance.'
II. $\left.\dot{\omega}{ }^{\prime} \epsilon \neq \eta \mu \epsilon \nu\right]$ c. 7,3 .
ib. ©̀ toótov oi] 'even as those philosophers (accepting Otto's insertion of $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ ) who do not share the same vierus are yet all called by one common name.' Otto, following Eusebius, alters $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \kappa a \tau \eta \gamma$. to $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota-$ $\kappa \alpha \lambda о u^{\mu} \epsilon \nu \circ \nu$, regarding the former word as being inserted from c. 7, where, in his opinion, it means 'adduced as an accusation.' But the word can mean, and normally does mean, simply 'predicated of somebody or something.' The Eusebian version of this passage is certainly more fluent, and may be correct. But it looks rather like a correction of an already corrupted text.



 $5 \kappa \hat{a} \nu \delta \iota a ̀ \tau \grave{a} \delta_{o ́ \gamma} \mu a \tau a, \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a$ ．8．$\quad$ Єै $\sigma \tau \iota \delta \grave{\epsilon} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu \kappa \alpha \grave{\iota}$ $\sigma ט ́ \nu \tau a \gamma \mu a$ кат̀̀ $\pi a \sigma \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \omega ิ \nu \quad \gamma \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$ ai $\rho \in ́ \sigma \epsilon \omega \nu \quad \sigma \nu \nu-$






 $\delta \omega_{\kappa} \kappa \omega \mu \boldsymbol{\jmath} \mathrm{A}$

1．$\tau$ à $\delta$ ó $\sigma \phi \eta \mu a]$ especially pro． miscuity and cannibalism．Avұvias $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \tau \rho 0 \pi \eta \dot{\nu}$ refers to the scandal that， at Christian meetings，a dog was tied to the lamp and excited．The lamp being thus overturned and extinguished，chance concubinage ensued．Cf．Min．Fel．Octau．p． 87.

3．àvédnv］＇promiscuously，with－ out restraint．＇

4．öт $\mu \dot{\prime}]$ for $\partial ٌ \tau \iota$ oủ．Cf．c． $2_{4}$ ， 2，ii 8 （3）， 2.

5．кằ סı̀̀ т．ס．］＇at least for their opinions，＇i．e．if they are punished at all，it is for their crimes． Christians alonc are punished for their opinions．On $\kappa \ddot{\alpha} \nu$ cf．c．i2， 3 note．

6．$\sigma \dot{v} \nu \tau a \gamma \mu a]$ This work was probably known to Irenaeus．It is now lost．

7．＇̇עтvхєîข］＇read＇as in c．14， 1.

27．We prohibit the exposure of children；（1）beiause such children are taken for vile uses，such as are practised commonly and openly among you，and even under the sanction of religion；whilst you
falsely accuse us of practising them in secret．

Justin does not make clear the comnexion of cc．27－29 with the preceding arguments．Possibly he inserted this point with regard to the exposure of children，because it seemed to him important，without making any definite attempt to con－ nect it with his general argument． But the point strengthens his argument for the unique truth of Christianity，by showing the moral purity of Christian practice in one notable example．

The exposure of children is de－ nounced by many Church writers． Emperors like Trajan，Pius，Septi－ mius Severus，tried to diminish this and similar evils，and to provide for the education of poor children． Constantine promulgated in A．D． 315 a law to restrain the practice in Italy．

9．$\pi ⿰ 丿 𠃌 ⿱ 亠 䒑 \eta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$ єival］Cf．Didache
 $\gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \eta 0 \notin \nu \tau a \dot{a} \pi о к \tau \epsilon \nu \in i ̂ s$.
 ＇growing up．＇
 $\nu \hat{\nu}$ каì таîठas єis тò aí $\chi \rho \hat{\omega} \varsigma ~ \chi \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \mu o ́ \nu о \nu \cdot \kappa a i ̀ ~ o ́ \mu o i ́ \omega s ~$







 $\mu \eta \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a \quad \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu \tau a ̀ ~ \mu v \sigma \tau \eta ́ \rho \iota a ~ a ̀ \nu a \phi \epsilon ́ \rho о v \sigma \iota, ~ к а i ~ \pi a \rho a ̀ ~ \pi a \nu \tau i ̀ ~$






28. I. Пар’ $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu \quad \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ \gamma \grave{a} \rho$ ò ả $\rho \chi \eta \gamma \epsilon ́ \tau \eta \varsigma \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \alpha \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu$
 $\theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \mathrm{A}$

1. $\phi \circ \rho \beta a ́ \delta \omega \nu]$ 'grazing with the herd.'
ib. оüт $\omega \mathrm{s} \nu$. к. $\pi a i ̂ \delta a s] ~ \tau \rho \epsilon ́ \phi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ understood.
2. Є่ $\pi i ̀$ roútou тô̂ ärous] 'with a vieze to this abomination.'
3. $\mu \omega \theta$ oús] Cf. Suet. Calig. 40. These were abolished by Justinian.
4. $\pi \rho \circ \alpha \gamma \omega \gamma \epsilon \operatorname{cio\nu } \tau \alpha l]$ 'prostitute.'

Io. єis кıvaıoià кт入.] Referring to the worship of the Asiatic mother of the gods and the eunuch priests of that cult.
12. ö $\phi \iota$ ] This hint is taken up in the next chapter. The snake played a prominent part in paganism, as the familiar genius of heroes and demigods, as the guardian of shrines, and in connexion with the cult of the dead.
15. $\phi \omega \tau$ òs $\theta$ eiov] Pautigny
brackets $\theta \epsilon l o v$, and it certainly seems out of place and unnecessary, if the phrase goes with $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu \pi \rho o \sigma-$ $\gamma \rho a ́ \phi$. It is possible however that the clause ws... $\theta$ ciou ought to go with $\pi \rho a \tau \tau$. к. $\tau \iota \mu \dot{\omega} \mu$. and that the sense is that the heathen commit these sins openly, because the Divine light (i.e. of the Spirit) is perverted and absent in them. In that case there would be a sarcastic play upon words in $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \tau \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha \mu \mu \hat{\nu} \nu 0 v$, which bears an allusion to the charge made against the Christians of $\lambda u \chi \nu i a s ~ a \nu a \tau \rho o \pi \dot{\eta} \quad(26,7)$. The Christians are charged with overturning the material lamp for purposes of $\sin$; but the heathen sin openly, because the spiritual light is overturned in their case.
28. The snake which you rever-

















ence is with us the leader of the evil demons，who shall be punished eter－ nally．This event is postponed at present so as to give man a chance of repentance；for we have reason and intelligence and therefore no excuse for sin．To deny that God cares for man is equivalent to denying His existence，His character，or His nature，and removes any absolute－ ness of distinction between good and evil．

1．$\quad \delta \phi i s]$ Cf．Revel．xii 9 ó
 калои́нєдоs $\Delta$ cá $\beta$ олоs каi ó इatavâs． ib．xx．2；Genes．iii 1．The first trace of an explicit identification of Satan with the Serpent of the Fall narrative is found in Wisd．ii 24.

2．$\dot{\eta} \mu \in \tau \epsilon \in \rho \omega \nu]$ i．c．Christian．
4．ко入aбө $\quad \sigma \sigma \mu$ évous］A not un－ common constructio ad sensum．

5．$\pi \rho \circ \epsilon \mu \dot{\eta} \nu v \sigma \epsilon \nu$ Cf．Matt．xxv 41.

6．$\dot{\eta} \epsilon \pi \iota \mu \circ \nu \dot{\eta} \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］The same
idea recurs in ii 6 （7）．
9．т $\boldsymbol{\eta} \nu \dot{a} \rho \chi \dot{\eta} \nu]$＇originally．＇The same notion as in c．Io， 4 ．

10．$\epsilon \hat{u} \pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu]$ may mean，as Otto takes it，＇to act rightly，＇or ＇to fare well，＇кal having the sense of＇and so．＇
 20，21．For the construction cf． c． 3,5 ．

12．入оүוкоl，$\theta \in \omega \rho \eta \tau \iota к о$ ！］＇capable of exercising reason and intelligence．＇

13．$\left.\mu \hat{\lambda} \lambda_{\epsilon \tau \nu} \tau о и ́ \tau \omega \nu\right]$ i．e．$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\alpha^{\alpha} \nu \theta \omega \dot{\pi} \pi \omega \nu$ ．
 dosis begins at ทे．＇If he denies God＇s care for men，either he will by some artifice deny＇His existence，or，while allowing His existence，he will assert that He rejoices in cvil，or that He remains unmoved like a stone，and etc．＇

15．$\mu \eta \delta\{\nu \quad$ єival кт入．］This is the Sophistic view，which Socrates and Plato attacked．Justin main－











 є่ $\pi \iota \mu \nu \eta \sigma \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota$ є̀ $\nu$ тои́тoıs $\grave{\eta} \gamma \eta \sigma a ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a$ каi 'A $\nu \tau \iota \nu o ́ o v ~ \tau о \hat{v}$




tains that to deny God's interest in human affairs removes the only absolute sanction for the distinction between good and evil.
29. We do not expose children (2) for fear they may consequently die. In fact, we marry to bring up children, or we do not marry and are continent. Contrast with our purity your deification of the profigate Antinous.

The first reason for not exposing children was given in c. 27 .
6. $\dot{\eta} \alpha \nu \epsilon \delta \delta \eta \nu \mu[\xi \leqslant s]$ Cf. c. 25,7 .
ib. Bı $\beta \lambda i \dot{\partial} \iota o \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \in \hat{\delta} \omega \kappa \kappa \nu$ ] libellum obtulit (Otto).
7. Фй $\lambda \iota \kappa \iota$ ] Felix was Praefectus Augustalis in Egypt. A papyrus records one C. Munatius Felix as prefect of Egypt in A.D. $148-154$. For the bearing of this fact on the date of the Apology, see Introd. p. 1.
9. '̇̇াเтроли̂s] 'permission.' Castration was forbidden by Roman law in the times of Nerva, Hadrian,
and Domitian.
10. imorpáчac] 'to subscribe,' i.e. to approve the request by his signature.
1r. ク̄ркє́ $\sigma \theta \eta \kappa \tau \lambda$.] ‘was satisfied with the testimony of his own conscience and that of his fellowbelievers.'
13. 'Avtivóou] was a favourite of Hadrian, drowned in the Nile A.D. I 30 ( $\nu \hat{\nu} \nu$ ). Hadrian deified him.
14. סià $\phi o b \beta o v]$ Eusebius' reading, $\delta i a ̀ ~ \phi o ́ \beta o \nu$, is supported by Athanas. c. Gent. 9, who says men honour Antinous dià фósov toû тробтákavtos. Athenagoras however (Leg. 30, āddressed to Aurelius and Commodus) says it was dune $\phi \iota \lambda \alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi i q \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{v} \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \rho \omega \nu \pi \rho \sigma \gamma^{\dot{\sigma}} \nu \omega \nu$. The difference of reading here is not important, but סíà фóßov can stand as ='rwith fear,' i.e. 'they feared and reverenced' Antinous. Cf. $\delta i$ aiōoûs 'respectfullly.' After all, too, it would not be specially to Justin's purpose to assert that
 ท̂p $\chi \in \nu$.

















## $3 \in \ell \pi \eta$ Otto om A

Antinous was reverenced only out of fear of Hadrian.

1. $\tau$ is $\tau \epsilon \dot{\eta} \nu$ ] So Athanas. loc.
 oủ $\sigma \epsilon \mu \nu \grave{o} \nu \dot{a} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \dot{a} \sigma \epsilon \lambda \gamma \epsilon i ́ a s{ }^{\epsilon} \mu \pi \lambda \epsilon \omega$.
2. You may say that Christ was a mere man, and a masician, but the argument from prophecy will disprove that theory.

Here Justin passes to the second subject announced in c. 23 , viz. that Christ Jesus is the Son of God.
7. toîs $\lambda$ érovat ] i.e. not trusting to those who tell about Christ Itimself.
8. toîs $\pi \rho о ф \eta \tau \epsilon$ ט́ovą This is the argument from prophecy in the most literal sense, which points to the correspondence between foreeast and event. Note that Justin does not refer to Christ's miracles as a proof of His Divinity, because
it was possible to retort that miraculous works could be the product of magic; but true prophecy was admitted by the pagans to be a sure sign of Divine inspiration.
31. A short sketch of Hebreze prophecy and of the LXX translation. In these prophecies are plain foretellings of Christ's life and of the Christian Church's expansion.
18. $\pi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \epsilon i \pi \pi \nu$ ] 'treated veith great heed, "from $\pi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \in \pi \omega$.
ib. IIroגє $\mu a i o s$ ] Ptolemy Philadelphus B.C. $285-247$. The insertion of Herod's mame is a plain anachronism. Aitempts have been made to exempt Justin from the charge of error by altering the text, or by treating 'Hpẃo $\eta$ and 'Hpẃjŋs as the glosses of an ignorant annotator (in which case $\dot{o} \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon$ 's would be the high-priest); it has also been sug-
 $\pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$ à $\nu \theta \rho \omega ́ \pi \omega \nu ~ \sigma v \gamma \gamma \rho a ́ \mu \mu a \tau a ~ \sigma v \nu a ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu ~ \epsilon ่ \pi \epsilon \iota \rho a ́ \theta \eta$, $\pi v \theta$ Ó$\mu \epsilon \nu$ оऽ каi $\pi \epsilon \rho i ̀ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho о \phi \eta \tau \epsilon \iota \hat{\omega} \nu \tau о и ́ \tau \omega \nu, \pi \rho о \sigma \epsilon \in \pi \epsilon \mu \psi \epsilon \tau \tilde{\omega}$




 aủtòv $\grave{\eta} \xi i \omega \sigma \epsilon \pi \epsilon ́ \mu \psi a \varsigma ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~ \mu \epsilon \tau a \beta a \lambda o v ̂ \nu \tau a \varsigma ~ a u ̉ \tau a ̀ s ~ \epsilon i s ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$

 тồ $\delta \in \hat{v} \rho о$, каi таעта $\chi$ v̂ $\pi a \rho a ̀ ~ \pi a ̂ \sigma i ́ \nu ~ \epsilon i \sigma \iota \nu ~ ' I o v \delta a i o ı s, ~ o i ̂ ~$







 $\mu \epsilon \nu \pi \rho о к \eta \rho v \sigma \sigma o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu \circ \nu \pi a \rho a \gamma \iota \nu o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu \circ \nu, \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \omega ́ \mu \epsilon \nu \circ \nu$ ठıà $\pi a \rho=$

 $\chi 0 \chi \epsilon \in \beta a s$ A $\| 20 \dot{\alpha} \pi a ́ \gamma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ A ä $\gamma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ Eus
gested that Justin has confused Ptolemy's foundation of the library with Cleopatra's restoration of it in the Serapeum. Perhaps it is most simple to suppose Justin to be guilty either of ignorance or of a lapse of memory. Justin's account of the LXX translation (excluding the reference to Herod) seems based upon the well-known story of Aristeas, though he does not mention the romantic and miraculous details which formed part of the usual version.
17. Ba $\rho \chi \omega \chi \notin \beta a s]$ The revolt of Barcochba took place A.D. ${ }^{132-135}{ }^{\circ}$ Justin's use of $\nu \hat{\nu} \nu$ is quite loose. Cf. 29, 4 'A $\nu \tau \iota \nu$ óou тô̂ $\nu$ û̀ $\gamma \in \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta$ $\mu \in \nu o u$, and $42,4 \dot{\delta} \kappa \alpha \theta^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \mu a ̂ s$ 'I $\eta \sigma o u ̂ s$ Xpıテтòs $\sigma \tau a v \rho \omega \theta \in i s, 63$, 10 ขû̀ « $\nu \theta \rho \omega \pi$ os $\gamma \in \nu \dot{\prime} \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s$.
20. ЄU'pouє ] 'we have found.' The aorist is not easy to account for.
21. $\pi \rho о к \eta \rho \cup \sigma \sigma b \mu \in \nu о \nu \pi \alpha \rho a \gamma \iota \nu b-$ $\mu \in \nu 0 \nu]$ 'foretold as coming.'
22. Өєратє́́ovta $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] Cf. Matt. iv 23 ; ix 35 ; x 1.
$\pi a ̂ \sigma a \nu$ налакíà каì vєкроѝs àvєүєípovтa, кaì фӨорой-










32. I. $\mathrm{M} \omega \ddot{u} \sigma \hat{\eta} \varsigma \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ o \hat{v} \nu, \pi \rho \omega \hat{\omega} о \varsigma \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho \circ \phi \eta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \gamma \in \nu o ́-$











## 

 i.c. than the Jews.
 dates are obviously intended to be merely approximate. The earliest may be intended for Moses (whom Justin calls the first of the prophets in c. 32, 1) or Adam. It is not worth while to attempt to fix the reference of the later dates to any particular prophets.
10. катd $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \tau \dot{\alpha} s \delta_{1} \delta_{0}$.] 'in successive generations.'
32. U.'. pussages prophetic of Christ.
13. aúto $\lambda \epsilon \xi \epsilon \ell$ ] 'in express terms.' The quotation is from Gen. xlix 10, 11.
14. $\dot{\oplus} \dot{\alpha} \pi \delta \kappa \epsilon \iota \tau a \iota]$ sc. тठ $\beta a \sigma i \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$, as Justin subsequently explains. Cf. Tryph. izo, where he insists that this is the correct reading, as opposed to the normal LXX text та̀ àтокєєце́va айтبิ.
$19 \mu \epsilon \in \chi \rho \iota T \eta ̂ s \phi a \nu$.] Justin traces a providential commexion between the subjngation of Judaca and the birth of Christ, and similarly between the crucitixion of Christ and the fall of the Jewish state.
äp $\beta a \sigma i \lambda \epsilon \iota o \nu . \quad$ 3. 'Iov́ $\delta a s ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ \pi \rho о \pi a ́ t \omega \rho ~ ' I o v \delta a i ́ \omega \nu, ~ a ̀ \phi ' ~$



 $\tau \omega \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \grave{\epsilon} \theta \nu \nu \omega ิ \nu \pi \rho \circ \sigma \delta o \kappa \eta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \nu \sigma \iota \nu$ aùtòv $\pi a ́ \lambda \iota \nu \quad \pi a \rho a \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \sigma o ́-$


 $\gamma \hat{\eta}$ 'lovסaíw $\pi a \rho \epsilon \delta o ́ \theta \eta$. 5. тò $\delta \dot{\epsilon}\langle\epsilon \sigma \mu \epsilon \dot{v} \omega \nu \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ a ̈ \mu-$

 $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \omega \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \hat{\omega}$ каì $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ í $\pi^{\prime}$ aù $\tau o \hat{v} \pi \rho a \chi \theta \eta \sigma o \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$.













15. $\pi \hat{\omega} \lambda \frac{\sigma}{} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \kappa \tau \lambda$.] The reference is plainly to Matt. xxi I ff., but the fact recorded in $\pi \rho \dot{\partial} s \dot{\alpha} \mu \pi \epsilon \lambda 0 \nu$ $\delta \epsilon \delta \epsilon \mu \notin \nu=s$ does not occur in the canonical Gospels, nor does Justin include this particular in Tryph. 53, where the same passage of Genesis is similarly interpreted. The detail may be traditional, or may be a
gloss of Justin's, suggested to him by the O. T. passage.
20. $\tau \dot{o}$ रєimov] Cf. 52, $2 \tau \dot{\alpha}$

23. $\delta \iota^{\prime}$ all $^{\prime \prime}$ atos $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] A reference to the atoning power of Christ's death.
26. тd $\sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \mu \alpha$, ò $\lambda o ́ \gamma o s]$ Cf. I John ii 14 ; iii 9 .

 тòv $\pi a \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a ~ \pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu ~ \kappa а i ̀ ~ \delta \epsilon \sigma \pi о ́ т \eta \nu ~ \theta \epsilon o ̀ \nu ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ v i o ̀ s ~ o ́ ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma o s ~$










 15 $\sigma \pi \epsilon ́ \rho \mu a \tau o s ~ ' І а \kappa \omega ́ \beta, ~ \tau о \hat{v} ~ \gamma є \nu о \mu є ́ \nu o v ~ \pi a \tau \rho o ̀ s ~ ' l o v ́ \delta a, ~ \tau o ̂ ̂ ~$ $\delta \epsilon \delta \eta \lambda \omega \mu \epsilon \in \nu o v ~ ' I o v \delta a i ́ \omega \nu ~ \pi а т \rho o ́ s, ~ \delta i a ̀ ~ \delta u \nu a ́ \mu \epsilon \omega \varsigma ~ \theta \epsilon o ̂ ~ a ̉ \pi \epsilon-~$

 viós $\dot{v} \pi \hat{\eta} \rho \chi \in \nu$.
20 33. I. Kai $\pi a ́ \lambda \iota \nu$ ف́s aủto $\lambda \epsilon \xi \epsilon i \delta_{i a ̀ ~}^{\pi a \rho \theta \epsilon ́ \nu o v ~} \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu$ $\tau \epsilon \chi \theta \eta \sigma o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o s ~ \delta i a ̀ ~ \tau o \hat{v} ~ ' H \sigma a i ̂ o u ~ \pi \rho о є \phi \eta \tau \epsilon u ́ \theta \eta$, àкоv́батє.






2. $\dot{\eta} \pi \rho \dot{\omega} \tau \eta$ $\delta \dot{v} \nu a \mu / s]$ This is a case of logical precedence. It is unfair to read any Arian idea in it. Sce Introd., p. xxii.
10. $\dot{\alpha} \nu a \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath} \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Cf. Numb. xxiv 17 ; Isa. xi 1 , 10 ; li 5 . Justin has here contaminated a prophecy of Isaiah with a passage from the I'entateuch.
33. O. T. prophecies of the Virgin-Birth. The Virgin-Birth explained and distinguished from pagan myths.
22. i(ové] Cf. Isa. vii 14 ; Matt: i 23.
26. iva öт $\tau \nu \quad \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Cf. John xiv 29 and above c. 12, 10.
3. őт $\quad \omega \varsigma \delta є ̀ ~ \mu \eta ́ ~ \tau \iota \nu \epsilon \varsigma, ~ \mu \grave{\eta} \nu o \eta ́ \sigma a \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \delta \in \delta \eta \lambda \omega \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \eta \nu \pi \rho o-$













 'In $\sigma o \hat{v} \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{v}$ є́ $\delta i ́ \delta a \xi a \nu$, oîs є́ $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon v ́ \sigma a \mu \epsilon \nu$, є่ $\pi \epsilon \iota \delta \grave{\eta} \kappa a i ̂ ~ \delta \iota a ̀ ~$
 $\gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \eta \sigma o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu \circ \nu, \dot{\omega} \varsigma \pi \rho о є \mu \eta \nu v ́ \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu$, єौ $\phi$. 6. тò $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu a$




 $21 \mathrm{M} \omega \ddot{\sigma} \sigma \hat{\eta} s \dot{o} \pi \rho o \delta \epsilon \delta \eta \lambda \omega \mu \epsilon \in \nu$ os edd ( $\mathrm{M} \omega \sigma \hat{\eta} s \dot{o} \pi$. A) $\dot{\omega} \mathrm{s} \mathrm{M} \omega \ddot{u} \sigma \hat{\eta} s \dot{o} \pi \rho o \delta$. Otto is ${ }^{\circ}$ Hoatas ó $\pi \rho o \delta$. Grab al
6. $\sigma u \lambda \lambda a \beta \epsilon i \nu]$ A technical word for 'to conceive.'
8. '̇ं $\pi \epsilon \sigma \kappa\{a \sigma \sigma \nu]$ Cf. Luke i 35 .
 dative of the person preached to is found in classical Greek ; the accusative is common in the N. T., e.g. Luke iii 18; Acts viii 25 , and the passive, meaning 'to have the Gospel preached to one,' occurs in Matt. xi 5 ; Heb. iv $2,6$.
ib. i $\delta 0 \dot{0} \sigma u \lambda \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \psi \eta]$ Cf. Luke i 31, $3^{2}$; Matt. i 20, 21. There is possibly, but not necessarily, a
reference to the Protevangel. ix 14, where a similar combination is given.
18. $\gamma \in \nu \nu \eta \sigma \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \nu \nu]$ used in the passive sense. Liddell and Scott refer to a parallel in Diod. xix 2

ib. Tò $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{\nu} \mu a]$ Justin does not clearly discriminate between the $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu a$ and the $\lambda 6$ ros. See Introd., p. xxviii.
20. трштбтокоs] See above c. 23.

2I. M $\omega \dot{\ddot{j}} \sigma \hat{\eta} s]$ If this reading is kept, the infinitive $\epsilon$ Tva must be understood with $\theta \epsilon \mu \mu$ s indeclinable.
















 є̇ $\pi \iota \tau \rho \dot{т} т о$.


The reference is to c. $32,9,10$, where from the Mosaic passage it was inferred that the $\lambda$ óros was the סúvapis of God (not that he was $\pi \rho \omega \tau \sigma \tau о к о s$, so that the reading $\dot{\omega}$ M $\omega \ddot{\sigma} \sigma \hat{\eta} s$ is incorrect). There is no reference here to the passage of Isaiah, so that there is no need to accept the ingenious suggestion that ws $\hat{\eta}$ (abbreviated for joatas) was the original reading, and was changed into $\mathbf{M} \omega \sigma \hat{\eta} s$.
2. $\tau \grave{\partial} \delta \hat{\text { én }}$ Inбoûs] Cf. ii 5 (0), 4 .
8. $\lambda \dot{\delta} \gamma \varphi \quad \theta \epsilon[\psi]$ In the broad sense of 'God's word.'
34. O. T. prophecy as to the place of Christ's birth.

1. каi ou B $\eta \theta \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \mu]$ Cf. Mic. v 2; Matt. ii 6. The quotation follows so closely the interpretative form of St Matthew that it cannot be referred to any other source.
2. $\kappa \dot{\mu} \mu \eta \delta \hat{\prime} \tau i s \in \sigma \tau \iota \nu]$ Bethlehem
is about five miles south of Jerusalem. Thirty-five stades is about four English miles.
3. $\dot{\alpha} \pi o \gamma \rho a \phi \hat{\omega} \nu$ ] The $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \gamma \rho a \phi a l$ are the census returns, which would probably be preserved in the Roman archives.
4. Kvpクulov] Quirinius was legatus of Syria (not procurator of Judaea, so that $\dot{\epsilon \pi \iota r \rho \delta \pi o v ~ i s ~ n o t ~}$ technically correct) in A.D. 6, but had helld some post in Syria previously, perhaps B.C. 5-3 or earlier. Cf. Luke ii 2, and Ramsay, Was Christ born at Bethlehem?, where the whole sulbject, which bristles with chronological difficulties, is discussed. The $\pi$ rétou looks as if Justin read $\pi \rho \dot{\cos } \boldsymbol{0} \boldsymbol{v}$ (not $\pi \rho \omega ́ \tau \eta$ )

5. O. T. prophecies about Christ's sufferings.



















${ }^{1} 4 \Delta$ aut $\delta$ edd $\delta \bar{\alpha} \delta \mathrm{A}$

I．ä $\chi \rho \stackrel{s}{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \omega \theta \hat{\eta}]$＇until He had become a man，＇i．e．up to His Cruci－ fixion；not up to His Baptism，for the account of the Crucifixion follows immediately．＂A $\chi \rho \iota s \dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \omega \theta \hat{\eta}$ means ＇up to manhood and into it．＇It is somewhat strange，however，that the suggestion of $\lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu$ is not worked out by quoting Isa．liii 1，2， or similar passages．

3．$\pi$ aíठоу кт入．］Cf．Isa．ix 6.
8．Є่ $\gamma \dot{\omega} \quad \dot{\epsilon} \xi \in \pi \epsilon ́ \tau \alpha \sigma \alpha \quad \kappa \tau \lambda$.$] \quad Cf．$ Isa．lxv 2 ；lviii 2.

12．$\delta i$＇̇ $\tau \in ́ \rho o v \pi \rho \circ \phi$ ．$\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota$ ］sc． то̀ $\pi \rho \circ ф \eta \tau \iota \kappa \grave{o} \nu \pi \nu \epsilon \hat{\imath} \mu \alpha$ ．
ib．aútoi кт入．］Cf．Ps．xxi i7， 19 （xxii 16，18）．

14．ó $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \Delta a v t \delta]$ Only the last quotation was from＇David．＇It is a natural piece of carelessness．

15．Є＇$\epsilon \tau \alpha \dot{\theta} \eta \eta$ ràs $\chi \in i ̂ p a s] ~ ' h a d ~ H i s ~$
hands stretched out．＇
18．ठ८a⿱宀́povtєs aút．Є̇кá $\theta \iota \sigma a \nu]$ ＇in mockery they set Him on the． judgment seat．＇This detail is found not in the canonical Gospels but in a fragment of the＇Gospel of Peter＇



 тô̂＇I $\sigma \rho a \eta$＇$\lambda$ ，where see Dr Swete＇s note，and his discussion on p．xxxiii f． Harnack contends that Justin used this gospel，Kriiger（Early Christ． Lit．§ 16）declares it to be＇quite improbable．＇Justin＇s statement here might be a traditional account，or， if he used the 4 th Gospel，might be an interpretation of $\epsilon \kappa \alpha \dot{\theta} \theta \iota \sigma \epsilon \nu$ in John xix 13 ．
$\mu o v \chi є i ̂ p a s \kappa a i ̀ ~ \pi o ́ \delta a s ~ \epsilon ̇ \xi \eta ่ \gamma \eta \sigma \iota \varsigma ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \sigma \tau a \nu \rho \hat{\omega} \pi a-$













 Oeíou 入óyou. 2. $\pi$.



$8 \pi \rho о є \pi \epsilon \phi \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon \cup \tau о$ Thalemann $\pi \rho о є \phi \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon \cup \tau о \mathrm{~A}$

1. $̇ \xi \dot{\eta} \eta \eta \sigma \iota s]$ Cf. Matt. xxvii 35 and parallel passages.
2. áкт $\omega \nu$ ] The Acta of Pontius l'ilate (referred to also in c. 48,3 ) would be an official document, probably not seen by Justin, but supposed by him to be in the official archives. It has nothing to do with the apocryphal Acts of Pilate. But see the discussion in Stanton Gosp. as Hist. Docs. I p. 102 .
3. $\dot{\rho} \eta \tau \hat{\omega}$ s] 'expressly.'
4. Eopovlou] The quotation is not from Zephaniah but from Zech. ix 9. Cf. Matt. xxi 5. It is a slip of memory, and the same quotation is rightly ascribed to Zechariah in Tryph. 53.
5. Inspired prophecies are given
in different ways. Sometimes the Spirit prophesies in person, sometimes as in God's person, or Christ's, or man's. The Jezus failed to recor. nize this.

A parenthetic chapter to explain that, though prophecies may differ in the manner of their presentation, they are all the work of the same Spirit, here called ó $\theta \epsilon$ îos $\lambda$ dóros. See Introd., p. xxviil.
14. $\dot{\omega} \dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\delta} \pi \rho o \sigma \omega \dot{\pi} \sigma v$ ] 'as in the person of someone.'
16. $\pi \rho \circ a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \tau \iota \kappa \omega ิ s]$ i. e. prophetic declarations of the Spirit Himself. Cf. c. 39 .
17. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{o} \pi \rho \sigma \sigma . ~ \tau o \hat{v} \theta \in o \hat{u}]$ сc. 37 , 44.
19. a. $\pi$. r. X $\rho$ เбтой] сс. $38,49$.
ib. á. $\pi . \lambda a \omega \hat{\nu}]$ cc. 47,53 .






 $\tau a \varsigma ~ \epsilon ̇ \sigma \tau a u p \hat{\omega} \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \dot{v} \pi ’$ aùt $\hat{\omega} \nu \mu \iota \sigma o \hat{v} \sigma \iota \nu$.

 $\epsilon \iota \rho \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o v \pi \rho о ф \eta$ тои oíסє oi $\lambda o ́ \gamma o \iota . ~ " Е \gamma \nu \omega ~ \beta o v ̂ s ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ к т \eta \sigma a ́-~$

 á $\mu \alpha \rho \tau \omega \lambda o ́ \nu, ~ \lambda a o ̀ s ~ \pi \lambda \eta ́ \rho \eta s ~ \dot{a} \mu a \rho \tau \iota \omega \nu, \sigma \pi \epsilon ́ \rho \mu a \pi о \nu \eta \rho o ́ \nu$, vioì



 5. каì $\pi a ́ \lambda \iota \nu ~ \dot{a} \lambda \lambda a \chi o \hat{v}$. Tàs vov $\mu \eta \nu i a s ~ \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \alpha \grave{\imath} \tau \grave{a}$ $\sigma a ́ \beta \beta a \tau a, \mu \iota \sigma \epsilon \hat{\imath} \dot{\eta} \psi v \chi \eta \dot{\eta} \mu о \nu, \kappa а i ̀ \mu \epsilon \gamma a ́ \lambda \eta \nu$ $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon ́ \rho a \nu \nu \eta \sigma \tau \epsilon i ́ a s ~ 20$
 $\epsilon і \sigma а к о \dot{v} \sigma о \mu a \iota \quad \dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\omega}$. 6. $\pi \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \rho \iota \varsigma$, аї $\mu а т о \varsigma$ ai $\chi \in \bar{i} \rho \in \varsigma$

 $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \dot{\omega} \pi$ ov $\tau 0 \hat{v} \pi a \tau \rho$ ós Otto Kriiger
2. E゙va $\mu \dot{\nu} \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$.] 'The composer of the whole work is one man, but he brings forvard character conversing.'
5. oú $\delta$ є̀ $\pi a \rho \alpha \gamma \in \nu \delta \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \nu$ ] ' not even after His advent.'
8. $\mu \iota \sigma 0 \hat{\sigma} \iota \nu$ ] Cf. c. $3 \mathrm{I}, 5$.
37. Instances of prophecies spoken by the Logos through a prophet as in the person of God.
II. єै $\gamma \nu \omega \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Cf. Isaiah i $3,4$.
16. ámò тố $\pi a \tau \rho \delta s]$ The change which Otto suggests is an obvious one, and corruption would have
been easy from the homoioteleuton $\pi \rho o \sigma \omega \dot{\pi} o v \tau o \hat{v}$. But it is not absolutely certain that Justin might not
 after his first use of ámò $\pi \rho o \sigma \omega$ $\pi o u$ in the beginning of the chapter.

I7. $\pi$ ồov кт入.] Cf. Isaiah lxvi .
19. $\tau \grave{\alpha} s \nu^{\nu} \nu u \eta \nu i a s ~ \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Cf. Isaiah i. II-I5, lviii. 6, 7. Apparently a quotation from memory, in which two passages are combined.
23., $\sigma \epsilon \mu i \delta a \lambda \iota \nu]$ 'fine wheaten flour.'
$\mu о i ́ ~ \epsilon ̇ \sigma \tau \iota . ~ \sigma \tau \epsilon ́ a \rho ~ a ̀ \rho \nu \hat{\omega} \nu ~ к а i ~ a i ̂ \mu a ~ \tau a v ́ \rho \omega \nu ~ o v ̉ ~ \beta o v ́ \lambda о \mu a \iota . ~$


 5 Өриттє $\pi \epsilon \iota \nu \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \iota ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ a ̆ \rho \tau o \nu ~ \sigma o v . ~ 9 . ~ o ́ \pi o i ̂ a ~ \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ o u ̂ \nu ~ \epsilon ่ \sigma \tau \iota ~$ $\kappa a i ̀ \tau \grave{a} \delta \iota \delta a \sigma \kappa o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu a \delta \iota a ̀ \tau \omega \hat{\omega} \pi \rho \circ \phi \eta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ảmò $\tau 0 \hat{v} \theta \epsilon 0 \hat{v}, \nu о \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$ $\delta v ́ v a \sigma \theta \epsilon$.







 $\omega \pi o ́ \nu ~ \mu o v ~ ळ \varsigma ~ \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \epsilon a ̀ ̀ ~ \pi \epsilon ́ \tau \rho a \nu, \kappa \alpha i ~ \epsilon ้ \gamma \nu \omega \nu ~ o ̈ \tau \iota ~ o u ̉ ~ \mu \eta ̀ ~$








 Otto oun örı A refovèvac Gral)
3. $\sigma \tau \rho a \gamma \gamma a \lambda \iota a ́ s]$ a late form of orparra入is 'a knot,' 'the knots of violent dealings.'
6. anò roû $\theta \in o \hat{v}]$ See note above.
38. Prophecies spoken as in Christ's person.
9. Є் $\gamma \dot{\omega} \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Isaiah lxv. 2.
II. $\tau \dot{\partial} \nu \nu \omega ̄ \tau o \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Isaiah 1. $6-8$.
18. aủtol кт入.] Ps. xxi. 19, 17 (xxii 18,16 ).
19. $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\omega} \delta \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Ps. iii 6 (5).
 (xxii 7,8 ).
22. ärıva $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \alpha \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Cf. Matt. xxvii $39-43$.
23. $\mu a \theta \epsilon i ̂ \nu \delta v ́ v a \sigma 0 \epsilon]$ Presumably he means from the Acta of Pilate.
24. $\{\xi \in \sigma \tau \rho \in \phi \circ \nu]$ 'they twisted.'
$\chi \epsilon i ́ \lambda \eta$ каì є̇кívov̀ тàs кєфалàs $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma о \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$. 'O עєкроѝs à $\nu \epsilon$ $\gamma \in i ́ p a s ~ \rho ́ v \sigma a ́ \sigma \theta \omega$ éautóv.
39. I. "Otav $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ ف́ $\pi \rho \circ \phi \eta \tau \epsilon \hat{v} o \nu ~ \tau a ̀ ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \lambda o \nu \tau a ~ \gamma i-~$













 $\sigma \kappa о \mu \epsilon \nu . \quad 4 . \quad \delta v \nu a \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ \eta ̉ \nu ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \lambda \epsilon \gamma о ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o \nu ~$

## 'Н $\gamma \lambda \hat{\omega} \sigma \sigma$ ' о’ $\mu \dot{\omega} \mu о к є \nu, \dot{\eta}$ ठє̀ фрŋ̀ $\nu \dot{a} \nu \omega \prime \mu о \tau о \varsigma$

## $19 \gamma \lambda \hat{\omega} \sigma \sigma^{\prime}$ edd. $\gamma \lambda \omega \bar{\omega} \sigma \alpha \mathrm{A}$

39. A prophecy of the future, spoken directly by the Spirit Himself, and fulfilled in the spread and influence of Christianity.
40. $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \sum \iota \omega \dot{\omega} \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Cf. Isaiah ii $3,+$; Mic. iv 2.
41. sıßúvas] 'spears.' The ordinary form is $\sigma \iota \beta \dot{v} \eta \eta$.

Ir. \&̈ $\nu \delta \rho \epsilon s$ $\delta \epsilon \kappa a \delta \dot{o} o$ ] The number is used as an official title for the Twelve, who were the original heads of the Church. The omission of St Paul's name is therefore quite natural ; some have explained it by the fact that Justin chiefly used the gospel record; some have supposed that St Paul is tacitly included in the Twelve in place of St James who was killed by Herod; Veil suggests that the early Church was unable to understand the Pauline theology
and made little of its author. But these surmises are unnecessary in the case of Justin.
12. $i \delta \iota \hat{\omega} \tau \alpha \iota]$ Cf. Acts iv 53.
13. á $\pi \epsilon \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\lambda} \eta \sigma \alpha \nu \ldots \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau a s] \quad \mathrm{Cf}$. Matt. xxviii 19.
14. Tò $\nu$ тồ $\theta \epsilon 0 \hat{v} \lambda$ brov] 'The word of God,' meaning the gospel. Cf. Acts vi 2.
15. oi $\pi \dot{d} \lambda a \iota k \tau \lambda$.] Cf. c. 14, 2, 3 .
16. ப் $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \tau o \hat{u} \mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \lambda$.] 'in order not to utter falsehood or deceive our inquisitors.'
19. ذ $\quad \gamma \lambda \hat{\omega} \sigma \sigma^{\prime}$ о́ $\mu \dot{\omega} \mu о к є \nu \quad \kappa \tau \lambda$.] The quotation is from Eur. Hipp. 612 (of course the last syllable of $\delta \mu \omega \dot{\mu} \mu \sigma \kappa \varepsilon \nu$ ought to be elided) and the sentiment had already been burlesqued in Aristoph. Ran. 101, 147 I ; Thesmoph. 275.





 тоӨои́ $\mu \in \nu a$ тарà той $\delta v \nu a \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o v ~ \delta o v ̂ \nu a \iota ~ \lambda a \beta \epsilon i ̂ \nu . ~$
40. I. 'Акоv́батє $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \pi \hat{\omega} s ~ \kappa а i ̀ ~ \pi \epsilon \rho i ̀ ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \eta \rho v \xi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$



 2. oủk єíбi $\lambda a \lambda \iota a i ~ o u ̉ \delta e ̀ ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma o \iota, ~ ต ̂ \nu ~ o v ̉ \chi i ~ a ̉ \kappa о v ́ o \nu t a \iota ~ a i ~$ $\phi \omega \nu a i ̀ a u ̉ t \omega \hat{\nu}$. 3. єis $\pi \hat{a} \sigma a \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \gamma \hat{\eta} \nu$ є’ $\xi \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu$ ó $\phi \theta o ́ \gamma \gamma o s$


耳íyas $\delta \rho a \mu \epsilon i ̂ \nu ~ o ̛ \delta o ́ \nu . ~ 5 . ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ т о и ́ т о \iota s ~ \delta є ̀ ~ к а i ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma \omega \nu ~$ є́тє́ $\rho \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho \circ \phi \eta \tau \epsilon \nu \theta \in ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$ $\delta i$ aủ $\tau o \hat{v}$ тô̂ $\Delta a v i \delta \kappa \kappa a \lambda \omega \hat{\varsigma}$

 $\pi \rho \circ ф \eta \tau \iota \kappa \grave{\nu} \pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu a$, 6. каi $\pi \hat{\omega} \varsigma ~ \mu \eta \nu \cup ́ \epsilon \iota ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu ~ \gamma \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta-$

I ${ }^{\eta} \nu \delta \dot{\eta}$ Otto $\eta \not \partial \eta \mathrm{A}$
2. Toùs $\sigma u \nu \tau i \theta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \in \nu o u s, \kappa \tau \lambda$. 'covenanted and enrolled.' The reference is to the military sacramentum. Cf. Aul. Gell. xvi 4 for the formula. Suet. Calig. 15 says Gaius added to the oath ' neque me liberosque meos cariores habebo quam Gaium habeo et sorores eius.' Veil sees here a reminiscence of Socrates' argument in Plat. Ap. 28 B , where Socrates draws an analogy between his loyalty to earthly generals and his loyalty to his divine cominander.
3. matpióos] The word is unexpected and may be wrong. Ashton
suggests $\pi \alpha i \delta \omega \nu$.
40. O.T. prophecies of the preaching of the Apostles. Also a gencral forecast of certain Christian facts.
10. то̂́ $\pi \rho \circ \in \iota \rho \eta \mu \in ́ \nu \circ u)$ in c. $35,6$.
II. 白 $\mu \notin \rho a \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Cf. Ps. xviii 3 (xix 2) ff., Rom. x 18.
13. oủk єiбi $\lambda a \lambda \iota a l ~ к \tau \lambda$.] 'There are no languastes nor words, in which their voices are not heard.'
17. $\pi a \sigma \tau 0 \hat{1}]$ 'bridal chamber.'
ib. wis rizas] Similarly quoted in Tryph. 64. In Ap. i 54,9 it is lozupds $\dot{\omega}$ s rizas. Emendation is uncalled for.

 є่тıтро́тои $\sigma$ ùv тоîs aủтô̂ бтратью́таıৎ катà то̂ $\mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau о \hat{v}$


 $\kappa а i ̀ \pi \omega \hat{\varsigma}$ oi $\delta a i ́ \mu о \nu \epsilon \varsigma, ~ o ̈ \sigma o \nu ~ \epsilon ่ \pi ' ~ a v ่ \tau o i ̂ s, ~ \tau \eta ́ \nu ~ \tau \epsilon ~ \tau о \hat{v} \pi a \tau \rho o ̀ s ~$







 $\mu \epsilon ́ \nu o \nu ~ \pi a \rho a ̀ ~ \tau a ̀ s ~ \delta \iota \epsilon \xi o ́ \delta o u s ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ v ́ \delta a ́ \tau \omega \nu, ~ o ̀ ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \kappa a \rho \pi o ̀ \nu ~$








3．Є̇ $\pi \iota \tau \rho \dot{\pi} \pi o v$ ］Cf．c． $13,3$.
4．$\sigma v \nu \hat{\lambda} \ell \epsilon \cup \sigma \iota \nu$ ］Cf．Acts iv 27.
ib．$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ढ́к $\pi a \nu \tau o ̀ s ~ \gamma \epsilon ́ \nu o u s] ~ C f . ~$ c． 1.

6．$̇ \pi \dot{\eta} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \tau \alpha l]$＇has promised．＇
7．oi $\delta a i \mu o \nu \epsilon s$ ］Presumably Justin reads an allusion to them in the $\hat{\epsilon}^{*} \theta \nu \eta, \lambda a o l, \beta a \sigma i \lambda \epsilon i \frac{1}{s}$ and áp $\propto ⿰ 冫 欠=$ of the following quota－ tion．

II．мака́pıos кт入．］Cf．Ps．i，ii， which are treated as one Psalm． Cf．Acts xiii 33 and Tischendorf＇s critical note．

13．$\lambda o \iota \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ ］from the adjective $\lambda o \mu \mu s=$＇pestilent．＇
ib．á $\lambda \lambda$＇$\left.{ }^{\prime}\right]$ literally＇except＇；＋ Liddell and Scott derive it from $\ddot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \quad \ddot{\eta}$ ，the accent of $\ddot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o$ having been lost．It comes to mean simply ＇but，＇as here and in § 10 à $\lambda \lambda^{\prime} \ddot{\eta}$ $\dot{\omega} \sigma \epsilon i \quad \chi \nu 0$ ûs．

18．катєvodw日ウ́ $\sigma \epsilon \tau a l]$＇shall be prospered．＇

19．$\chi$ ขoûs］＇foam，＇the＇fine down＇on flower or fruit（but also ＇dust，＇see L．and Sc．）．

23．̇́фри́aそ̌av］Фрvátroual is a classical word meaning＇to neigh， to be wanton．＇The active is found only in LXX and N．T．
$\lambda a o i$ є́ $\mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon ́ \tau \eta \sigma a \nu \kappa a \iota \nu a ́ ; ~ \pi a \rho \epsilon ́ \sigma \tau \eta \sigma a \nu$ oi $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon i ̂ \varsigma ~ \tau \eta ิ \varsigma ~ \gamma \eta ̂ \varsigma$,






 є̇ $\pi i$ इ



 $\sigma \iota \delta \eta \rho a ̂, ~ \omega ̀ s ~ \sigma \kappa \epsilon u ́ \eta ~ \kappa \epsilon \rho a \mu \epsilon ́ \omega s ~ \sigma \nu \nu \tau \rho i ́ \psi \epsilon \iota \varsigma ~ a u ̀ \tau o u ́ s . ~ I 6 . ~ к а i ̀ ~$






41. 1. Kaì $\pi a ́ \lambda \iota \nu ~ \delta \imath ~ a ̉ \lambda \lambda \eta \varsigma ~ \pi \rho о ф \eta \tau \epsilon i a s ~ \mu \eta \nu v i o \nu ~ \tau o ̀ ~$ $\pi \rho о \phi \eta \tau \iota \kappa o ̀ v ~ \pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu a \delta i ’ a v ̉ \tau o \hat{v} \Delta a v i ̂ \delta, ~ o ̀ \tau \iota ~ \mu \epsilon \tau a ̀ ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \sigma \tau a v \rho \omega-~$



I. каıvá] The accepted reading is $\kappa \in \nu$ a, but eight mss of the LXX have каıдd́.
41. An O.T. prophecy of the reign of Christ.
23. ф̣̈ $\sigma a \tau \epsilon \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Cf. I Chron. xvi 23, 25-3I and Ps. xev (xcri) 1, 2. 4-10. The psalm is quoted fully in Tryph.73. Justin's text exhibits many variations from the text of I Chronicles; thus he has $\epsilon i \delta \omega \lambda a$ $\delta a \iota \mu o \nu i \omega \nu$ for $\epsilon i n ̃ \omega \lambda a$ (the LXX version of the psalm gives $\delta a \iota \mu \delta \nu i a$
in verse 5), $\tau \hat{\omega} \pi \alpha \tau \rho l \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ aić $\nu \omega \nu$ for ai $\pi a \tau \rho l a l ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \theta \nu \hat{\omega} \nu, \chi \alpha ́ \rho \iota \nu$ for $\delta \omega \hat{\rho} a$, and ánò $\tau 0 u$ gúdou is added. Veil considers these differences, especially the last, too significant to be slips of memory, and summises that an edition of this psahm was used, with these alterations, in Christian worship. It is worth remarking that, according to Eus. $I I \mathrm{~L}$. iv 18 , Justin edited a $\psi a ́ \lambda$ $\tau \eta$ s.






 $\pi a ̂ \sigma a \dot{\eta} \gamma \hat{\eta} \kappa \alpha \grave{\iota} \kappa a \tau о \rho \theta \omega \theta \dot{\eta} \tau \omega \kappa \alpha i \mu \grave{\eta} \sigma a \lambda \epsilon \nu \theta \dot{\eta} \tau \omega$. 4. $\epsilon \dot{u}-\frac{-1}{}$
 тô̂ $\xi v i \lambda o u$.











7. $\phi о \beta \eta \theta \dot{\eta} \tau \omega \kappa \kappa \lambda$.$] ' let the$ whole earth fear before His face and be set right and not be moved.' The verse following in the original, which describes the joy of nature at God's advent, is here omitted; thus the idea becomes ethical, a summons to repentance ( $\kappa \alpha \tau о \rho \theta \omega$ $\theta \dot{\eta} \tau \omega)$ as a condition of not being disturbed.
42. You note that in some of these passages the future is spoken of in the past tense; but the fulfilment comes only in Christ. A parenthesis to explain the wording of some prophecies.
13. ämo入oyiav] 'an excuse' for misunderstanding and therefore disbelieving in Christian teaching. The
idea is the same as in c. 3,4 .
15. $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \alpha \alpha \quad \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \sigma \dot{b} \mu \nu \alpha$ ] going together, 'known as future.'
16. '̇vatєviбate] 'look carefully.'
17. Ё $\tau \in \sigma \iota \kappa \tau \lambda$.] David's reign may roughly be dated 1000 B.C. There may be some mistake in the figures of Justin's text, and some emend $\pi \epsilon \nu \tau а к о \sigma$ ioss to $\pi \epsilon \nu \tau \dot{\jmath} \kappa о \nu \tau a$. But Justin's chronology is very loose.
19. єن́фробúv $\nu \mathrm{\nu}$ ] referring back to $\epsilon \dot{\cup} \phi \rho \alpha \nu \theta \dot{\eta} \tau \omega \sigma \alpha \nu$ in c. $4 \mathrm{r}, 4$.
20. $\left.\dot{\text { o }} \kappa \alpha \theta^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{a} s\right] \quad \operatorname{Noster}$ (Otto). In unserer Zeit (Veil). The latter seems more natural; it is a careless chronological expression, but quite in keeping with Justin's manner.


 $\mu \in ́ \nu \eta \nu$ vi $\pi^{\prime}$ aủtô̂ à $\phi \theta a \rho \sigma i a \nu$.







 $\mu a \rho \tau a \iota ~ \tau o ́ v \delta \epsilon ~ \tau \iota \nu a ̀ ~ a ̉ \gamma a \theta o ̀ \nu ~ \epsilon i ̂ \nu a \iota ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ \tau o ́ v \delta \epsilon ~ \phi a u ̂ \lambda o \nu, ~ o u ̋ \theta ’$





## 

43. Nor does Divine foreknowledge lessen human responsibility or do away with human freewill. We see men acting inconsistently, which is not compatible with the action of fate. And, if all actions were predestined, moral judgments would be a matter of mire convention, which viezu reason rejects as immoral. The consequences of actions are fated, but the actions themselves are free.

Justin is led on from c. $42(\xi \kappa \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\pi \rho o \lambda \in \lambda \epsilon \gamma \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$ ) to anticipate and refute Fatalistic inferences from the belief in Divine foreknowledge. His arguments may be summed up as follows: (1) Fatalism means the renunciation of all human responsibility, and all moral judgments. (2) Men act inconsistently, which is scarcely possible except by the excrcise of free-will. (3) Keason
declares an essential distinction between right and wrong. (4) Ineluctable fate decrees the rewards and punishments of actions, not the actions themselves.-Thus Justin scarcely reconciles Divine foreknowledge with human free-will, but confines himself to refuting Fatalism.
7. $\pi \rho о \epsilon \iota \pi \epsilon i \nu \quad \pi \rho о \epsilon \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \mu \epsilon ́ \nu a]$ 'foretell things forcknozon.'
8. $\tau \iota \mu \omega \rho i ́ a s . . . к о \lambda a ́ \sigma \epsilon \iota s]$ According to Aristot. Rhet. i 10 o $\tau \mu \omega \rho i a$ is vindictive, кó入aбıs is corrective in idea.
 learn from the prophets and assert as true.'
12. $\tau \delta$ द' $\phi$ ' $\dot{\eta} \mu i \nu]$ ' free choice.'
ib. $e l \gamma \dot{a} \rho \in i \mu a \rho \tau a \iota \kappa \tau \lambda$.] This is the first of the four arguments enumerated above.


















 $\nu o i \mu \epsilon \theta a$ Sylburg $\dot{\alpha} \pi о ф а \iota \nu b \mu \epsilon \theta a$ A $\|$ I 4 oú $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \kappa \tau \lambda$. A oủx $\ddot{\sigma} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$





2. oüт $\omega \mathrm{S} \dot{\alpha} \pi o \delta \epsilon i \kappa \nu \nu \mu \epsilon \nu$ ] ' we prove as follows.' There follows the second argument, from the inconsistencies of human action.
3. $\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \in \lambda \epsilon v \sigma \iota \nu]$ 'pursuit.'
4. oủk ă้ $\pi$ тот $\epsilon$ This deduction is not logical; inconsistency might be predestined, as much as consistency. $\Delta \epsilon \kappa т \iota \kappa b s=$ 'capable of,' Lat. capax.
8. ג́ $\pi \circ \phi \alpha\llcorner\nu о i \mu \epsilon \theta a]$ 'we should have to affirm.' A conditional optative, like $\delta \delta \xi \alpha$, , below.
ib. ÉKєivo Tò $\pi \rho 0 \in \iota \rho \eta \mu \hat{\nu} \nu 0 \nu$ ] in c. 28,4 .
II. $\dot{o} \dot{d} \lambda \eta \theta \grave{\eta} s \lambda^{\prime} \gamma \sigma$ os] The third argument, an appeal to reason.

I2. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ єi $\mu \alpha \rho \mu \hat{v} \nu \eta \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$.] The fourth argument.
14. '̇ $\pi i \chi \in \iota \rho a]$ 'reward,' usually of punishment, as here.
ib. oú $\gamma \alpha \rho$ ] The text here, as quoted in the Sacra Parallela, is given in full in the critical note.
18. тоиิтo $\gamma \in \nu \delta \mu \in \nu \circ s$ ] 'having been born so,' i.e. aja日bs.















 үàp $\sigma$ то́ $\mu a$ кирíov є̀ $\lambda a ́ \lambda \eta \sigma \epsilon ~ \tau а и ̂ \tau а . ~$
5. тò $\delta$ є̀ $\pi \rho о є \iota \rho \eta-$ $\mu \in ́ v o \nu ~ М a ́ \chi a \iota \rho a ~ u ́ \mu a ̂ s ~ к а \tau є ́ \delta \epsilon \tau а \iota ~ o u ̉ ~ \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota ~ \delta \iota ̀ ̀ ~ \mu а \chi a \iota \rho \omega ̂ \nu ~$







44. Moses and Tsaiah each assume the fact of free-rwill; as does Plato, zuho, like other Greek philosophers and poets, derived some of his ideas from the Old Testament. The demons have instigated the prohibition to read the books of prophecy. But we Christians read them and try to persuade you by their means.
5. iôoù кт入.] Cf. Deut. $x \times x$ 15, 19, but the command is not there addressed to Adam. Possibly Justin is confusing it with Gen. i1. 16, 17.
7. ís à $\pi \delta$ тoû $\pi a \tau \rho b s]$ For the reading cf. c. 37, 3 and note.
8. Eis roûto] 'with this object,' - in this sense.
9. $\left.\lambda_{\epsilon} \chi \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a l\right]$ Justin has probably forgotten how his sentence began.
i). 入ov́ $\sigma a \sigma 0 \epsilon \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Cf. Isaiah i 16-20.
20. tò $\pi \hat{u} \rho]$ So Clem. Alex. Protrept. 95 quotes the passage

23. ä $\pi a \lambda \lambda a \sigma \sigma o u ́ \sigma \eta s]$ According to Veil the sense is 'zohitch cuts and



 ö $\sigma a \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{a}$ à $\theta a v a \sigma i a s ~ \psi u \chi \hat{\eta} s \hat{\eta} \tau \iota \mu \omega \rho \iota \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \epsilon \tau \grave{a}$ Oávatov 5




 $\gamma \omega \sigma \iota \nu$. II. $̈ \sigma \sigma \tau \epsilon$ ö $\phi a \mu \epsilon \nu, \pi \epsilon \pi \rho \circ \phi \eta \tau \epsilon \hat{v} \sigma \theta a \iota \tau a ̀ ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \lambda-$





so alters life at once'; according to Maran 'which cuts and then at once lets go.' The latter is far more natural. The contrast on either rendering is between the quick action of a $\mu a ́ \chi a l \rho \alpha$ and the gradual process implied in кат $\delta \in \tau \tau a$.
I. $\Pi \lambda \alpha \tau \omega \nu$ ] Rep. x 6I7 e, but without the $\delta^{\prime}$.
3. $\lambda \alpha \beta \grave{\omega} \nu \epsilon i \pi \epsilon]$ This theory had previously heen suggested by the Jewish Peripatetic Aristobulus and Philo. In some moods Justin adopts the view of the Spermatic Logos existing among the heathen (e.g. ii 10,2 ); but he seems unconscious of any inconsistency.
6. $\theta \in \omega \rho i a s ~ o u ́ p a \nu i \omega \nu]$ ' the contemplation of celestial things,' with special reference to the myth in the Phaedrus.
14. Só $\boldsymbol{\mu a \tau o s ~ o ̋ \nu \tau o s ~} \kappa \tau \lambda$.] A very awkward sentence. The usual interpretation is 'since it is God's decree, as He intends to reward... that His rewards should be equivalent to the merit of the deeds';
though Veil suggests that $\mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \frac{\lambda \tau \alpha}{}$ should go with Éкaбrov, 'each man that is to be.' But the whole sentence, so taken, seems very unnatural. It may be simpler to read $\pi a \rho \prime$ aúroû (instead of $\pi a \rho^{\prime}$ aú $\tau \grave{\partial} \nu$ ) going with what follows, and render 'since it is one of our tenets that each man shall receive from Him according to his deeds.' The next clause might conceivably mean ' and (that each man shall) meet the things which proceed from himself' (cf. 2 Cor. v 10), though I can find no parallel to such an accus. with $\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \nu \tau \hat{\alpha} \nu$; or ' that God's awards shall occur according to the merit of the deeds.' For the absolute use of $\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \nu \tau \hat{\alpha} \nu$ in this last rendering cp . Clem. Al. Strom. vii p. $870 \pi \rho o{ }^{\prime}$
 not uncommon in Origen; e.g. Philoc. xviii 3 (Robinson) $\tau i s ~ \gamma \dot{a} \rho . .$. $\hat{\rho} \ell \pi \tau \epsilon \iota \quad \tau \grave{a} \quad \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \rho \mu a \tau a \quad \epsilon \pi i \quad \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \gamma \hat{\eta} \nu$,
 $\sigma \in \sigma \theta a \iota ;$ In any case the sentence is somewhat tautologous.
 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho a \tau \tau о \mu \epsilon \in \nu \omega \nu \dot{a} \pi a \nu \tau \eta \eta \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota, \delta \iota a ̀ ~ \tau о \hat{v} \pi \rho \circ \phi \eta \tau \iota \kappa o v ̂ \pi \nu \epsilon u ́-$


















$$
3 \epsilon ่ \pi i \sigma \tau a \sigma \iota \nu \text { Otto } ̇ \text { '̇ } \pi i \tau \alpha \sigma \iota \nu \mathrm{~A}
$$

3. '̇ $\pi i \sigma \tau a \sigma \iota \nu]$ 'consideration, thought.' The ms $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \tau a \sigma \iota \nu$ ('tightening') could scarcely mean 'mental attention.'
4. $\left.\mu \hat{c}^{\prime} \lambda_{o \nu}\right]$ Cf. 28, 4 .
5. кат' $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \rho \gamma$.] Cf. $̇ \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \rho \gamma \eta \sigma a \nu$, 23, 3 .
6. Oávaros $\dot{\omega} \rho$.] This probably refers to a law of Tiberius' time, which made it a capital crime to consult diviners about the life of Caesar or future history. The mathematici were constantly being banished from Rome, but were never extirpated. Cf. Tac. Ann. ii 32 , xii $5^{2}$, Hist. i 22, ii 62. Justin seems here to be guilty of some exaggeration of the facts. Veil suggests that after the Judaean war or the revolt of Barcochba Jewish
prophecies may have been discouraged.
ib. '「न $\sigma a ́ \sigma \pi 0 v]$ c. 20.
7. $\Sigma\left(\beta \dot{u} \lambda \lambda \eta{ }^{2}\right]$ c. 20. The official Sibylline books, deposited in the Capitol, could be consulted only by the quindecimuiri. But the reference here must be to the popular Sibylline prophecies.
8. aं $\pi \sigma \sigma \tau \rho \epsilon \epsilon \psi \omega \sigma \iota \nu . . \lambda a \beta \epsilon i \nu] \quad T o \hat{v}$ $\lambda \alpha \beta \epsilon i v$ would be the normal construction.
ib. '̇vtvरхávovtas] 'reading.' So in 14,$1 ; 26,8$.
9. $\epsilon \dot{u} \alpha \rho \epsilon \sigma \tau \alpha]$ i.e. the contents of the books.
10. O. T: prophecy of Christ's session in heaven, future triumph and judsment.
11. кат' $\chi \epsilon \iota \nu]$ 'keep' in heaven.



 $\mu o v, ~ \not ้ \omega \varsigma ~ a ̀ \nu ~ \theta \hat{\omega}$ тoùs Є̇ $\chi \theta \rho o u ́ s ~ \sigma o v ~ ن ீ \pi o \pi o ́ \delta \iota o \nu ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ \pi o \delta \hat{\omega} \nu ~ 5$


 $\lambda a \mu \pi \rho o ́ \tau \eta \sigma \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ á $\gamma i \omega \nu$ $\sigma o v \cdot$ є̇к $\gamma a \sigma \tau \rho$ ós $\pi \rho o ̀ ~ e ́ \omega \sigma \phi o ́ \rho o v ~$












$$
13 \text { каi каiтtє Thirlb om каl A }
$$

I．$\delta i$＇oús каi $\kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］＇for whose sake He has not consummated His decree＇（of judgment）．See above， 28， 2.

4．$\epsilon โ \pi \epsilon \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］Cf．Ps．cix（cx）I －3；Matt．xxii 44 ；Acts ii 34,35 ； I Cor．xv 25 ；Heb．i 13 ，x 12 ， 13. Compare also Acts iii 21.

8．$\mu \in \tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma 0 \hat{\eta} \dot{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \dot{\eta}]$＇The rule belongs to thee，on the day of thy power，in the glory of thy saints； I begat thee before the morning star．＇ The text has a great place in the history of the Arian controversy． The Latin versions have prin－ cipium，and they represent the usual manner of understanding the text； the rendering given above is an attempt to bring out a sense from
the words，but is not necessarily what Justin understood them to mean．

II．$\tau 0 \hat{v}$ 入bovou $\tau$ ．i $\sigma \chi$ ．］i．e．the gospel．

12．oi á $\pi \delta \delta \sigma \tau 0 \lambda 01]$ Cf．Mark xvi 20.

16．̇̇̀ $\tau \epsilon \cup \in \in \sigma \theta \epsilon]$＇you will read．＇ Cf．44， 13 ．

17．$\dot{\omega} s \pi \rho o \epsilon ́ \phi \eta \mu \in \nu$ ］In c．2， 4 ； II， 2.

46．You may object that those who lived before Christ cannot be considered responsible．But Christ is the Logos and every man has a share of it－those who have lived $\mu \in T \dot{a}$ 入órou were Christians，those who lived ävev 入órou were Christ＇s enemies．


 Kvpクvíov，$\delta \epsilon \delta \iota \delta a \chi \epsilon ́ v a \iota ~ \delta \epsilon ̀ ~ a ̈ ́ ~ \phi a \mu \epsilon \nu ~ \delta \iota \delta a ́ \xi a \iota ~ a u ̉ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ v ̛ \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu ~$

 фӨá⿱avtєs тท̀v ámopíav $\lambda v \sigma o ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a$ ．2．тòv X X $\pi \rho \omega т о ́ т о к о \nu ~ т о \hat{v} \theta \epsilon о \hat{v} \epsilon i \nu a \iota ~ \epsilon ่ \delta \iota \delta a ́ \chi \theta \eta \mu \epsilon \nu$ каі троє $\mu \eta \nu \cup \cup \sigma a \mu \epsilon \nu$










 $20 \delta \nu \nu a ́ \mu \epsilon \omega \varsigma$ то仑 $\lambda o ́ \gamma o y, \kappa а \tau a ̀ ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \tau o v ~ \pi a \tau \rho o ̀ s ~ \pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu ~ \kappa a i ~$


## 7 入vббнє $\theta a$ Otto $\lambda \nu \sigma \omega ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a \mathrm{~A}$

1．dंगоү८т．］＇reasoning $a b$－ surdly＇；not found in classical Greek．
ib．$\epsilon$ is à $\pi 0$ orporin $]$＇with a view to refuting．＇

2．є́катдे $\pi \epsilon \nu \tau \dot{\eta} \kappa о \nu \tau a]$ Obviously a round number．

4．Üбтєроу $\chi$ рóvocs］＇somezohat later．＇Cf．Lysias 99， 40.

5．Єं $\pi \iota \kappa a \lambda \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu]$ used absolutely， in the sense of＇object，＇much like ＇$\gamma к а \lambda \epsilon i \nu=$＇to bring in opposition．＇
ib．àvev0iv $\omega \nu$ ］＇nol account－ ablc．＇

8．$\pi \rho о є \mu \eta \nu \dot{\sigma} \sigma \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu$ ］in c．${ }^{2} 3$.
10．oi $\mu \in \tau$ à $\lambda$ bovou $\kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］The possibility of＇Christians before Christ＇is definitely allowed for by

Justin．See Introd．p．xxii．
11．इ $\omega \kappa \rho a ́ \tau \eta s]$ Cf．c． 5.
ib．＇Нра́клєєтоs］Heraclitus attempted to spiritualize religious ideas，whence probably arises Jus－ tin＇s reverence for him．

12．$̇ \in \nu \quad \beta a \rho \beta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho o c s]$ i．e．non－ Greeks．

13．＇Avavias к．＇A乡．к．Mıб．］The Three Children of Dan．i 7 and its Apocryphal supplement．

15；тараитои́ $\mu \in \theta a$ ］＇ze for－ bear．＇

16．á $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \tau o l]$ There may be a hint of the same play upon words as in c．4，1． 5 ．

21．兄 $\nu 0 \rho$ ．ärєкvウ́0 $\eta$ ］Probably $a \ddot{ } 00 \rho$ ．is to be taken as predicate，




 таро̀ $\chi \omega \rho \eta$ $\sigma \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu$ ．
















and the subject of $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \kappa$ ．is $\dot{o}$入oros，in spite of $\delta \iota a ̀$ ouv．$\tau$ ．入o $\quad$ ov．

2． $\bar{\epsilon} \kappa$ т $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ס．$\tau \sigma \sigma$ ．єip $\eta \mu \notin \nu \omega \nu]$ The reasons so far given for the Incarnation are：to refute the de－ mons（c．5），to teach the true belief in God（c．6）and true worship （c．13），to warn of eternity and judgment（c．8），to effect a moral regeneration（c． $1_{5}$ ），to make atonement for man（c．32，7）．$\Delta c^{\prime}$ ท̂̀ aitià ктл．is the object of ката－ $\lambda a \beta \in i v$.

4．тov̂ $\pi \epsilon \rho i \quad \kappa \tau \lambda$.$] ＇the argument$ concerned with the demonstration of this point，＇taking roúrou as genitive
after $\dot{\alpha} \pi o \delta \in i \xi \epsilon \omega \mathrm{~s}$（Otto，Maran）． Perhaps $\tau$ oút $\omega \boldsymbol{\nu}$ should be read．

47．Prophecies of the fate of Ferusalem．

10．$\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \in \nu \dot{\eta} \theta \eta \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］Cf．Isaiah lxiv 10－12．

16．ís $\pi \rho \circ \in i \rho \eta \tau 0 \gamma \in \gamma \epsilon \nu \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota]$＇as it had been foretold to have hap－ pened，＇i．e．Justin interprets $\begin{gathered} \\ \gamma \\ \gamma \\ \text {－}\end{gathered}$ $\nu \dot{\eta} \theta \eta$ as a prophetic past tense（cf． c．42）．The pluperfect $\dot{\eta} \rho \dot{\eta} \mu \omega \tau$ o is perhaps influenced by $\pi$ роєі $\rho \eta$ тo．

18．$\mu \eta \delta \dot{\delta} \nu a \operatorname{aút} \bar{\omega} \nu$ ］＇none of the people．＇

19．$\dot{\eta} \gamma \hat{\eta} \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］Cf．Isaiah i 7； Jer．ii $1_{5}, 13$ ．

2I．ö́cı $\delta \hat{\epsilon}$ фu入áбनєтal］After

 є่тібтаб $\theta \epsilon$.















49. I. Kaì $\pi a ́ \lambda \iota \nu ~ \pi \omega ̂ s ~ \delta \iota ’ ~ a u ̀ \tau o v ̂ ~ ‘ H \sigma a l o v ~ \lambda e ́ \lambda \epsilon \kappa \tau a \iota ~$



the rebellion of Barcochba, in which Judaea was almost depopulated, the Jews were forbidden by Hadrian to set foot in Jerusalem, under penalty of death.
48. Prophecies of Christ's miracles and death.
6. $\tau \hat{\eta} \pi$ rapougía $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] Cf. Isaiah xxxv 5, 6; Matt. xi 5 .
 later form of $\tau \rho a \nu \eta$ 's, $-\in s=$ 'clear, distinct.'
11. äкт $\boldsymbol{\text { an }}$ ] Cf. 35, 9. Justin probably had not seen them, and is merely surmising that they contained details of Christ's history.
14. Yố $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] Cf. Isaialı lvii I ff.
 and $118 \dot{\eta}$ тaф̀̀ aùrov̂ $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \rho \tau a \iota ~ \dot{\epsilon} \kappa$ rov̂ $\mu \epsilon \in \sigma o v$ is quoted as a prophecy of Christ's resurrection ; and Otto therefore puts here a colon after eip $\eta \dot{\nu} \eta$, removing trat after au̇ouv. This, however, s not necessary. There is no question here of the resurrection, but only of the death ; and Justin frequently quotes passages in different ways.
49. Prophecies of Christ's rejection by the Jerus and acceptance by the Gentiles.
19. каi $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \nu \quad \pi \omega ̂ s]$ sc. d́кov́. бате.










 $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon ̀ \nu$ ảкои́баעтєऽ $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ то仑 $\mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau о \hat{v}, \mu \epsilon ́ \chi \rho \iota \varsigma ~ o \hat{v}$ oi ảmò



 $\vec{\delta} \grave{\epsilon} \pi \rho о є \gamma \iota \nu \omega ́ \sigma \kappa \epsilon \tau о$ тà $\delta$ v́ $\sigma \phi \eta \mu a$ таи̂та $\lambda \epsilon \chi Ө \eta \sigma o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu a \kappa а \tau \grave{a}$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ тòv $\mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau o ̀ \nu$ ó $\mu o \lambda o \gamma o v ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$ ，кai $\omega$ ¢ є $i ̂ \in \nu$ tá $\lambda a \nu \epsilon \varsigma$ oí


 каі̀ тò тぃкро̀̀ $\gamma \lambda \cup \kappa ⿱ ㇒ ⿻ 二 乚 力 。 ~ . ~$

 $\pi a \rho a \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \tau a \iota, \dot{\alpha} \kappa о$ и́ $\sigma a \tau \epsilon \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \epsilon i \rho \eta \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu \in i \varsigma ~ \tau о \hat{v} \tau о ~ \pi \rho \circ \phi \eta-25$

 $\pi a \rho a \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \sigma \delta \mu \epsilon \nu \nu \nu, \pi a \rho a \gamma \epsilon \nu b \mu \epsilon \nu \circ \nu$ Sylb om $\pi a \rho a \gamma \epsilon \nu \delta \mu \epsilon \nu \circ \nu$ A $\chi \rho \iota \sigma \tau \delta \nu, \pi \alpha \rho a-$ $\gamma \in \nu 0 \mu \in \nu=\nu$ Otto

2．$\epsilon \mu \phi a \nu \eta े s ~ \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］Cf．Isaiah 1 xv $1-3$ ．
8．＇Iovoaiol ráp］Cf．Acts xiii 27， 48.

11．тарєХрウ்баขто］＇misused．＇
15．$\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha} \xi a \nu \tau 0]$＇bade adieu to．＇
ib．$\tau \hat{\varphi} \dot{a} \gamma$ ．$\theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \hat{a} \dot{a} \nu \epsilon \theta \eta \kappa a \nu] \quad \mathrm{Cf}$ ． c． 14,2 ．

17．$\tau \grave{\alpha}$ 文 $\delta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \phi \eta \mu a]$ The popular charges against Christians．

21．oủaik $\kappa \lambda$ ．］Cf．Isaiah $v 20$ ．
50．Prophecy of Christ＇s suffer－ ings and death for man．
26．$\left.\alpha^{\nu} \nu \theta^{\prime} \omega \nu \kappa \tau \lambda.\right] \quad$ Cf．Isaiah lii 12，lii ${ }_{13}$－liii 8.


























 8 öчoutat LXX Otto om A
8. ö $\psi o \nu \tau a l]$ The insertion of this word from the LXX text is not absolutely necessary, but the homoioteleuton -tal, кai makes the omission explicable. Justin quotes the same passage with $8 \psi$ ovtac in Tryph. 13, 118.
20. $\pi a \iota \delta \epsilon i a$ єip $\dot{\nu} \eta s$ ] The LXX text adds $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, which perhaps ought
to be inserted here.
 judgment was lifted up,' perhaps Justin understood it as meaning 'taken azvay,' or else 'exalted,' i.e., His humiliation was His kingly exaltation (on the Cross). Cf. c. 41, 4.







 $\eta \gamma o \rho \epsilon \dot{v} \theta \eta \sigma a \nu$ ．



 $\tau \hat{\nu} \nu$ ảעо $\mu \iota \hat{\omega} \nu$ aủ $\omega \hat{\omega} \nu$ グкєє єis $\theta a ́ \nu a \tau o \nu . ~ 2 . ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ \delta \omega ं \sigma \omega ~$



 тías，$\dot{\eta} \psi v \chi \eta ̀ ~ \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ oै $\psi \epsilon \tau а \iota ~ \sigma \pi \epsilon ́ \rho \mu а ~ \mu а к р о ́ \beta ь о \nu . ~ 4 . ~ к а i ~$




1．$\mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha}$ oûv $\kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］Cf．Matt． xxvi 3I；Zech．xiii 7．In Tryph． 53 Justin repeats $\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ тò $\sigma \tau \alpha v$－ $\rho \omega \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota$ aủtòv oi $\sigma \dot{v} \nu$ aủt $\hat{\psi}$ ő $\nu \tau \epsilon$ s $\mu a \theta \eta \tau a i$ aủzoû $\delta \iota \epsilon \sigma \kappa \epsilon \delta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \eta \sigma a \nu \mu \epsilon ́ \chi \rho \iota s$ ö $\tau \epsilon \dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \eta \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \nu \epsilon \kappa \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$ as a fulfilment of Zechariah．And in Tryph． 106 he says that after the Resurrection the disciples $\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \nu \delta \eta \sigma \alpha \nu \quad \epsilon \pi i \quad \tau \hat{\psi}$ áфiбтaбөą aúzoû öтє є่ $\sigma \tau a v \rho \omega ́ \theta \eta$ ． Harnack traces here the influence of the Gospel of Peter vv．26， 27 ， 59，where the grief and desertion of the Twelve after the Crucifixion are spoken of．The canonical record， however，gives by itself sufficient ground for Justin＇s statements，
which are roughly true．
3．シ̈ $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho 0 \nu \delta \epsilon \in]$ Cf．Luke xxiv 25，26，44－46；Acts i 8， 9 ．

4．$\epsilon \searrow \nu \tau v \chi \epsilon i ้ \nu]$＇read，＇as previ－ ously in many passages．

51．Prophecies of Christ＇s gene－ ration，triumph，ascension，second advent．

12．$\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \grave{\alpha} \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］Isaiah liii 8－12．

15．toùs movppoús］Referred probably by Justin to the destruc－ tion of Jerusalem．

18．$\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\alpha} \nu \nu \delta \hat{\omega} \tau \epsilon]$ sc．$a \dot{u} \tau \delta \nu$ ，＇if ye give Him．＇The LXX has $\epsilon \dot{\alpha} \nu$ $\delta \omega \hat{\omega} a \iota=$＇if He gives Himself．＇

 $\kappa a i ̀ ~ a u ̛ \tau o ̀ s ~ a ́ \mu а \rho т i ́ a s ~ \pi о \lambda \lambda \omega ̂ \nu ~ a ̀ \nu \eta ं \nu \epsilon \gamma к є ~ к а i ̀ ~ \delta ı a ̀ ~ \tau a ̀ s ~ a ̉ \nu о \mu i a s ~$








 aùtoû $\sigma$ v̀v aủt $\hat{\omega}$.










7. ä $\rho a \tau \epsilon \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Ps. xxiii (xxiv) 7, 8.
10. $\left.\mu \in \tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \delta \xi_{\eta} \bar{s}\right]$ So in the 'Nicene' Creed. It was not in the Creed adopted at the Council of Nicaea. But the Creed of Caesarea had $\epsilon \nu \delta \delta \xi \eta$; and Epiphanius' version of the Nicene Creed has $\mu \in \tau \dot{\alpha}$ $\delta \delta \xi \eta s$.
II. 'I $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \mu$ iov $]$ A mistake. The quotation is in the main from Dan. vii 13 , but with words from Zech. xiv 5 attached (cf. Matt. xxv 3r). It is rightly ascribed in Tryph. 76.
52. The fulfilment of such prophecies leads us to believe that similar prophecies as to the future, the second coming of Christ, and the punishment of the wicked, shall also be fulfilled.
19. каi ả $\gamma \nu o o v ́ \mu \epsilon \nu a]$ Otto's suggestion $\kappa \not \partial \nu \dot{a} \gamma \nu o o v ́ \mu \epsilon \nu a$ may be right.
21. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \beta \dot{\eta} \sigma o \nu \tau a l]$ Note the plural with a neuter plural subject, as in 3, 1 .
23. $\pi \alpha \theta \eta \tau o \hat{v}$ à $\nu \theta \rho \omega ́ \pi \pi o v$ ] 'a man of suffering.'




















4 Є̇ $\nu \delta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ Maran $\epsilon ้ \nu \delta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \eta \mathrm{~A}$

4. $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \delta \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \iota \quad \dot{a} \phi \theta a \rho \sigma\{\alpha \nu]$ I Cor. xv 53. So previously $\epsilon \downarrow \delta \dot{v} \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta a \iota$ $\dot{\alpha} \phi \theta a \rho \sigma i \alpha \nu$ in c. 19, 4. With $\dot{\alpha} \xi i \omega \nu$ and $\dot{\alpha} \delta \dot{i} \kappa \omega \nu$ must be understood $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ $\sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau \alpha$.
ib. $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ ai $\sigma \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ ai $\omega \nu i(\alpha]$ So in c. 20,4 .
5. $\sigma \nu \nu a \chi \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau u \iota \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Ezek. xxxvii 7,8 ; Isaiah xlv 23; Rom. xiv Ir. 'Appovia = 'joint.'
6. eis roûto] 'to this purport.' Cf. above 44, 2.
7. ó $\sigma \kappa \omega ́ \lambda \eta \xi \quad \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Isaiah lxvi 24 ; Mark ix 48. The LXX text of Isaiah has $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon v \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$, the Greek text of Mark has $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon v \tau \hat{q}$. Justin quotes the passage with $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \cup \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ in Tryph. 44, with maúбєтal in Tryph. 140.
8. каi $\tau \dot{\sigma} \tau \epsilon \kappa \tau \lambda$.] This somewhat resembles Prov. i 28, but may
not be intended as a quotation at all.
9. Zaxapiou] The following quotation is very composite ; cf. Zech. ii 6 ; Isaiah xliii 5,6 , xi 12 ; Zech. xii 10-12; Joel ii 13 ; Isaiah lxiii ${ }_{1}$, lxiv 11 . The LXX reading of Zech. xii 10 is $\epsilon \pi \iota \beta \lambda \epsilon \dot{\psi}$ ov $\alpha \alpha \iota$ $\pi \rho o ́ s \quad \mu \epsilon \quad \dot{a} \nu \theta^{\prime} \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \kappa a \tau \omega \rho \chi \dot{\eta} \sigma \alpha \nu \tau o$. Justin's version may be derived from John xix 37 ö $\psi o \nu \tau a l$ єis $\delta \nu$
 be the product of oral tradition. The whole quotation looks like a cento of O.T. passages, somewhat like the exhortation in the Commination Service of the English Prayer-book. Justin in Tryph. 14 quotes as from Hosea oै $\psi \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota \dot{\delta}$
 кє́vт $\eta \sigma \alpha \nu$.

 $\sigma \tau о \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu \grave{\eta} \chi \epsilon i \lambda \epsilon \omega \nu$, à $\lambda \lambda a ̀$ котєтòs карঠías, каì ой $\mu \grave{\eta}$



 $\nu \dot{\eta} \theta \eta$ $\dot{\eta} \mu i \nu$ єis oै $\nu \epsilon i \delta i o s$.



















$$
\text { I9 } \dot{\epsilon} \omega \rho \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu \dot{O} \text { Oto } \dot{\partial} \rho \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu \mathrm{A}
$$

> 53. This fulfilment of prophecy causes us to believe that Christ is the Son of God. And prophecy also has foretold the belief of the Gentiles and the unbelief of all but a small remnant of the Jews.
> II. áкоvбтıкд̀ к. עоєрà ẅ $\tau \alpha]$ Cf. Matt. xiii $9,13 \mathrm{ff}$.
> 12. oú $\chi \dot{\delta} \mu \ldots \mu \dot{\partial} \nu o \nu \lambda \hat{\gamma} \gamma \circ \mu \epsilon \nu$ ] ' vve
do not...only assert without being able to demonstrate.'
23. Є́autoùs $\dot{\eta} \mu a ̂ s ~ o j \rho$.] referring to the Gentile Christians. Justin, though born at Flavia Neapolis, cannot have been a Samaritan by descent. It is very remarkable that he should join the Samaritans so closely with the Jews.















 íторо̂̂̀тaı vimò $\mathrm{M} \omega u ̈ \sigma \epsilon ́ \omega s ~ \gamma \epsilon \nu o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu a \iota, ~ a ̀ s ~ \pi v \rho i ̀ ~ к а i ̀ ~ \theta \epsilon i ́ \varphi ~$











## ${ }_{17} \mathrm{M} \omega \ddot{\sigma} \sigma \hat{\epsilon} \omega \mathrm{s}$ edd $\mathrm{M} \omega \sigma \hat{\epsilon} \omega \mathrm{\omega} \mathrm{~A}$

5. Єย่фрávөךтı кт入.] Isaiah liv I. Genes. xix.

Cf. Gal. iv 27.
II. $\pi \rho о \sigma \delta о к \eta \dot{\eta} \alpha \nu \tau \epsilon s]$ Cf. above, 49, I.
14. $\dot{\omega} s \dot{a} \pi \dot{\delta} \pi \rho o \sigma \dot{\omega} \pi o v ~ a u ̉ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu]$ ' as in the person of the Jezos.'
ib. $\epsilon i \mu \dot{\eta}$ ки́рıоs кт入.] Isaiah i 9 .
16. इóঠона $\gamma$. к. Го́цор’’̊a] Сf.
25. 'I $\sigma \rho a \grave{\eta} \lambda \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Jerem. ix 26. The attribution of the passage to Isaiah is a mistake. Justin quotes it also in Tryph. 28, and apparently as from Jeremiah. 'Israel is uncircumcised in heart, but the Gentiles only in the foreskin.'







 $\theta \eta \sigma o \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o v s ~ \delta i a ̀ ~ \pi v \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~ a ̀ \sigma \epsilon \beta \epsilon i ̂ s ~ \tau \hat{\imath} \nu ~ a ̀ \nu \theta \omega ́ \pi \tau \nu$,

 $\sigma a \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~ a ̀ \nu \theta \rho \omega ́ т \pi o u s ~ \tau a ̀ ~ \pi \epsilon \rho i ̀ ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ X \rho \iota \sigma \tau o ̀ \nu ~ к а i ~ o ̋ ~ o ̈ \mu ь \iota a ~$ тоîs $\dot{v} \pi o ̀ ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi o \circ \eta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \lambda \epsilon \chi \theta \epsilon i ̂ \sigma \iota$ ．3．каì таи̂тa $\delta^{\prime}$



 $\mu \epsilon \nu о \iota$ є́ $\mu \iota \mu \eta \dot{\sigma} \alpha \nu \tau о$ тà $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{~ \tau o ̀ ̀ ~} \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon ́ \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \nu \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau o ́ \nu, \delta \iota a \sigma a \phi \eta^{-}$



ı $\lambda \epsilon \chi \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota ~ \gamma \epsilon \nu o \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o u s ~ M a r a n ~ \lambda \epsilon \chi \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota ~ \lambda \epsilon \gamma o \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o u s ~ A ~ \tau \epsilon \chi \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota ~ \lambda \epsilon \gamma o-$


2．＇̇ $\mu \phi \circ \rho \hat{\sigma} \sigma a \iota]$＇to implant．＇ Sylb．suggests the more usual word $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi о \iota \hat{\eta} \sigma a \iota$ ．

54．The demons，noticing the prophecies of Christ，tried to fore－ stall them by the heathen myths，but in so doing showed misunderstanding and ignorance of the true meaning of the prophecies．

Here Justin passes to the third topic forecasted in c．23，viz．，that the beathen myths are due to the demons．
 ＇put forward many to be called，
caused many to be called．＇Cf． below，то̀⿱ IIє $\epsilon \sigma \epsilon \in \alpha$ $\lambda \in \chi \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota ~ \pi \rho о-$ $\epsilon \beta$ á入入оуто．
 ing they would lie able to cause men to believe that the statements about Christ were fabulous，like the as－ sertions of poets．＇

14．óттои $\left.\mu \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \frac{\nu}{\kappa} \kappa \tau \lambda.\right]$＇where they（the demons）heard the prophets foretelling that Christ would be especially believed in．＇

19．ذ́s $\pi \rho 0 \notin \phi \quad \eta \mu \in \nu$ ］in c． $44,8$.
20．$\dot{\omega} s \pi \rho о є \mu \eta \nu \dot{v} \sigma a \mu \epsilon \nu$ ］in c． 32 ， I．Genes．xlix 10 ， 1 ．
















## 

3. Tòv $\pi \omega \hat{\omega} 0 \nu$ aúroû] In Tryph. 52 Justin adds the next clause of
 $\tau \eta$ रे ỏvov aủroû. Here he omits it, perhaps from forgetfulness, and so can continue his argument as if the foal of either horse or ass might equally be intended.
4. oivov] The emendation őpov is supported by many commentators. Of course wine was sacred to Dionysus, but so was the ass. Grab. quotes Plin. H. N. xxiv I - Ferulae asinis gratissimo sunt in pabulo, ceteris uero iumentis praesentaneo ueneno; qua de causa id animal Libero Patri assignatur, cui et ferula.' Certainly, if the MS had read orov, the corruption to oivov would have been very easy, as Dionysus was the god especially of wine. But in Tryph. 69 the same idea recurs, where the ms text reads otvov (marg. ơvov) èv roîs $\mu \nu \sigma \tau \eta \rho i o u s$ aútov̂ $\pi a \rho a \phi \in ́ \rho \omega \sigma \iota \nu$; and, as Veil points out, $\pi \alpha \rho a \phi \hat{\rho} \rho \omega \sigma \tau$ in that passage would go more naturally
with oivov than with opov. On the whole it may be doubted whether the change to ơvov in this passage of the Apology carries conviction. Nothing as yet has been said by Iustin on the subject of the foal; that comes later. And Justin is giving instances in which the demons misunderstood the prophecies; to refer firstly to Dionysus' ass and then to Bellerophon's horse would be merely an admission that the demons provided for either contingency, and not a demonstration that they made a complete mistake.
ib. àvayódouv九] 'ascribe.' On the myth of Dionysus cf. note on p. 35 , line 8 .
5. єїTє vibs] єїтє is generally used in the case of alternatives, but not always.
6. $\sigma \dot{v} \mu \beta o \lambda o \nu$ ] accus. in apposition to $\pi \hat{\omega} \lambda o \nu$. The word $\not \partial \gamma \omega \nu$ seems to be chosen with reference to the representations of Dionysus; it is inappropriate to Christ.














 $\mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu \pi a ́ v \tau \omega \nu \quad \lambda \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \gamma \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$. 2. ő $\pi \epsilon \rho$, $\dot{\omega} \varsigma \pi \rho \sigma \in i \pi \epsilon \nu$ ó




## I $\tilde{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \dot{\omega} \pi$ ov Otto om A \| $2 \dot{\epsilon} \xi \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \dot{\omega} \pi \omega \nu$ Otto $\epsilon \xi \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \dot{\omega} \pi o v$ A


#### Abstract

1. $\dot{\omega} s \pi \rho \circ \notin \phi \eta \mu \in \nu$ ] Cf.c. $2 \mathrm{r}, 2$; 32, 10. ib. B $\epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon \rho \circ \phi \dot{\sigma} \nu \tau \eta \nu]$ Cf. note on p. 35 , line 11 . 4. 'Hoatov] Cf. Isaiah vii 14, quoted in c. 33, I. The passage in


 Isaiah has no bearing on the Ascension, but that had been alluded to in cc. $45 ; 51,6$.5. סi' éavrồ] 'by His own pozeer,' and not on horseback.
6. ròv II $\epsilon \rho \sigma \notin a]$ 'They caused Perseus to be said' (to have done the same). Sce notes on p. 35, line ro, and P. 37 , line 15.
 Cf. Ps. xviii 6 (xix 5).
7. $\pi \rho \circ \phi \eta \tau \epsilon \cup \theta \in \ell \tau a]$ neuter plural, according to Otto. But it is much better taken with aúrbv.
8. $\theta \epsilon \rho \alpha \pi \epsilon \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu \kappa \lambda$.] Cf. 48 , I.
9. 'А $\sigma \kappa \lambda \eta \pi i o ́ \nu$ ] c. 21,$2 ; 22,6$.
10. But the demons never anticipated the Crucifixion, not grasping. the symbolism of prophetic language. The Cross is the symbol of Christ's power, and its form reappears in every circumstance of life.
11. $\dot{\omega} s \pi \rho o \delta \epsilon \delta \dot{\eta} \lambda \omega \tau \alpha l]$ in c. 35. The passage of Isaiah (ix 6) there referred to must be intended in $\dot{\omega}$ $\pi \rho о \epsilon і ̈ \pi \epsilon \nu \dot{\text { oे }} \pi \rho о \phi$.
 ment from the symbolism of the Cross is followed by other writers, e.g. Tertullian adu. Marc. iii 18 ; Minucius Oct. 29. Its value is sentimental rather than logical, and it serves as an answer to the ignominy of the Cross, as Maran points









 $\hat{\eta}$ тò $\sigma \chi \hat{\eta} \mu a$ тố $\sigma \tau a v \rho o v$. 5. каi $\delta \iota a ̀ ~ \tau o \hat{v} \pi \rho \circ \phi$ ท́tov





 lacunam suppletur vi $\xi i$ in marg $B$ secund mana)
out. It is interesting as a literary parallel to the symbolic art of early Christianity.
12. тоûto тò трótaloע] 'this token of victory' (the Cross). The allusion is to the yards of a ship. The metaphor of $\tau \rho 6 \pi a c o \nu$ is very frequent in early Christian hymns; from Justin's way of introducing the word it would seem as if the use was already familiar. Cf. Tert. Apo. 16.
13. бкатaveis] 'ditchers.' Bavauoovproi = 'craftsmen.'
14. 'op $\alpha$ a $\epsilon$ ci $\omega \nu$ ] 'tools.'
15. $\mu \nu \xi \omega \tau \hat{\eta} \rho a]$ 'nose,' rare in singular ; used in plural for 'nostrill.'
II. $\delta i a ̀ ~ \tau o u ̂ ~ \pi \rho o ф \eta ́ r o v] ~ L a m . ~ i v ~$ 20. The LXX text does not read $\pi \rho b$, and the passage is generally quoted elsewhere without it. It is possible that Justin's language was
influenced by the memory of Deut. xxviii. 66, a passage which was similarly interpreted. Justin obviously means that as the nose, which is cross-shaped (i.e., at right angles with the brows), is necessary for breath, so the crucified Christ is necessary for the breath of our spirit.

It. $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega \delta \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Otto's emmendation is one among many suggestions for completing the lacuna. It is based on the similar passages in Minucius and Tertullian, l.c.
ib. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ out $\grave{i \lambda \lambda \omega \nu] \text { See Dict. }}$ Antiq. on Signa Militaria. The eagle with outspread wings is not unlike a cross.
15. тоотаi $\omega \nu$ ] The tropaeum was a pole with captured weapons hung upon it.
ib. $\delta_{l}$ ' $\hat{\omega} \nu$ ] 'under which,' 'to the accompaniment of which.'
















 K $\lambda a v \delta i ́ o v ~ K a i ́ \sigma a \rho o s ~ \gamma є \nu o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu о s ~ o ́ ~ \sum i ́ \mu \omega \nu ~ к а i ̀ ~ \tau \grave{\nu \nu ~ i є \rho a ̀ \nu ~ \sigma u ́ \gamma-~}$


## $6 \dot{\alpha} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon$ Otto $\dot{\alpha} \pi \downarrow \sigma \tau \epsilon i \tau \epsilon \mathrm{~A}$

1. $\delta \epsilon \iota \kappa \nu \dot{v} \nu \tau \epsilon \mathrm{~s}$ ] Used by anacoluthon for $\delta \epsilon \iota \kappa \nu \dot{v} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ agreeing with $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$. Сf. с. і і, і, $\gamma เ \nu \omega ́ \sigma \kappa о \nu \tau \epsilon s$.
2. $\tau$ às $\epsilon i k \delta \nu a s]$ This may refer to the images of the emperors, which were put, as a sort of medallion, on the eagles of the legions. In this case $\bar{\epsilon} \pi i$ тоút $\varphi \tau \hat{\psi} \sigma \chi \eta \dot{\eta} \mu a \tau \iota$ would mean practically 'upon a cruciform standard.' Cavedoni (quoted by Otto) suggests, however, that the reference may be to the pictures of emperors' apotheoses, in which they were represented as being carried to heaven by an eagle or by their genius with outspread wings or arms.
3. ठı̀̀ $\gamma \rho a \mu \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu]$ 'in inscriptions.'
4. $\delta \iota \dot{\alpha}$ 入byou кт入.] 'we have tried our best to convince you both by argument and by this obvious symbol.'
5. ö $\sigma \eta \delta\left\langle v_{\nu}\right.$.] Cf. c. 13 .
ib. àcúvvvot] For the idea, cf. c. 3,4 .
6. Even after Christ's coming, the demons tried to deceive mankind by magicians like Simon and Menander.
 sentence is the object of $\xi^{\prime} \mu a \theta o \nu$.
7. $\dot{\omega} s \pi \rho o \epsilon \delta \eta \lambda \omega \dot{\sigma} \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu]$ in c. 26.
8. $\pi \rho \circ \epsilon \beta a ́ \lambda \lambda о \nu \tau o$ Cf. above, c. 26 .
9. $\tau \grave{\eta \nu} \nu i \in \rho \dot{a} \nu$ $\sigma \dot{\prime} \gamma \kappa \lambda \eta \tau o \nu]$ The same phrase as in the dedication, c. 1 .







 $\lambda a ́ \sigma \epsilon \iota ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ a ̀ \sigma \epsilon \beta \hat{\omega} \nu$ oí фav̂入oı סaíhovєs $\pi \epsilon i ̂ \sigma a \iota ~ \delta u ́ v a \nu \tau a \iota, ~$




 $\mu \epsilon \tau a \theta \in ́ \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \pi \epsilon i ̂ \sigma a \iota ~ \beta o u \lambda o ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a$. 2. oủ $\gamma$ à $\rho \delta \epsilon \delta o i ́ \kappa \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu{ }_{15}$





I $\theta \epsilon$ òs $\mathrm{A} \theta \epsilon \dot{\partial} \nu$ Otto $\|$ r $8 \epsilon i \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ Otto $\epsilon i \mu \dot{\eta} \mathrm{~A}$

I. $\theta \epsilon o ́ s]$ ís $\theta \epsilon o ̀ s ~ \nu$. is correct Greek, and the change to $\theta \epsilon \partial \partial \nu$ is unjustified.
3. $\sigma v \nu \epsilon \pi \iota \gamma \nu \omega ́ \mu o \nu a s ~ \kappa \tau \lambda] ~ ' j u d g r e s$. with you of our plea.'
7. $\epsilon i \beta o u ́ \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon]$ Otto cites Theoph. ad Aut. 1 I4, 11130.
57. (We zuish to save you from error and its punishment.) For, in spite of the demons, punishment is a certainty. The demons can cause our death, but that is no hardship. All must die and life soon palls; but our faith saves from suffering and lack. And if death is annihilation, it is a boon to kill us, though they do not mean it so.

This chapter is an appendix to the preceding one, Justin seizing the opportunity to reiterate that his
object is really to save those whom he is addressing from error and the certain punishment of error.
8. $\mu \eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota$ ] A timeless aorist, ' that there is not.'
12. $\epsilon \mu \pi a \theta \hat{\omega} s$ ] 'subject to passions.' Opposed to a $\pi a \theta \epsilon i \hat{s}$ below.
ib. $\phi i \lambda 0 \delta 0 \xi 0 \hat{v} \nu \tau a s]$ perhaps in the usual sense of 'vainglorious.' But more probably (cf. 12,6 )' deluded,' ' $u n d e r ~ i l l u s i o n s . ' ~ '$
16. $\tau o \hat{v} \pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega s \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Cf. с. I I, 2.
ib. $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon \nu \grave{o}$ ả à ov $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] Cf. Eccles. i 9. On $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ cf. note p. 61, 1. 13. 'There is nothing new, but everything is the same in this dispensation of life.'
18. $\omega \mathfrak{\omega} \nu \epsilon i{ }^{\mu} \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$.] ' And since satiety befalls after only a year's enjoyment of them.'
$\delta \iota \delta a \gamma \mu a ́ \sigma \iota \pi \rho o \sigma \epsilon ́ \chi \epsilon \iota \nu \quad \delta \epsilon \hat{\imath} . \quad$ 3．$\epsilon i \delta^{\prime}$ àmıбто̂$\sigma \iota \mu \eta \delta \not ̀ \nu$ єî̀a८ $\mu \in \tau a ̀ ~ \theta a ́ \nu a \tau o \nu, ~ a ̀ \lambda \lambda ’ ~ \epsilon i s ~ a ̉ \nu a \iota \sigma \theta \eta \sigma i ́ a \nu ~ \chi \omega \rho \in i ̀ \nu ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~$



 گんฑ̂ऽ каì ทंסоขท̂ऽ фоขєúovб८．








 $\mu \epsilon ́ \nu o \iota \beta о \rho a ̀ ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ a ̉ \theta \epsilon ́ \omega \nu ~ \delta о \gamma \mu a ́ t \omega \nu ~ к а i ~ \delta a \iota \mu o ́ \nu \omega \nu ~ \gamma i ́ \nu o \nu \tau a \iota . ~$ 3．oủ $\gamma a ̀ \rho$ ä $\lambda \lambda 0$ т८ ả $\gamma \omega \nu i \zeta о \nu \tau a \iota ~ o i ~ \lambda \epsilon \gamma o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o \iota ~ \delta a i \mu о \nu \epsilon \varsigma, ~ \eta ̀ ~$





3．$\pi \alpha \theta \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \epsilon \nu \tau a \hat{v} \theta a \quad \kappa \tau \lambda$. The same idea is found in Plat．， Ap． 41 D．
58．Again，Marcion was in－ spired by the demons and has caused many to go astray．For the demons wish to lead men away from God and Christ ；instead of raising men from earth they impel them to wor－ ship earthly things，whilst those who try to contemplate celestial things they try to drive into impiety．

8．这 $\pi \rho \circ \neq \phi \eta \mu \epsilon \nu$ ］in c．26．Mar－ cion maintained that Christ（non－ incarnate）was the son of the First God，and that therefore the Demi－ urge must have another son．

12．ä入入ov $\delta \epsilon \quad \tau \iota \nu a \kappa \tau \lambda$.$] ＇ \mathrm{He}$ declares that there is another God besides the Maker of all．＇

20．Toùs $\mu \grave{\nu} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} s \gamma \hat{\eta} s \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］＇Those who cannot raise themselves from earth they have pinned and pin to earthly and manufactured things，＇ i．e．instead of lifting them up they fix them in degraded servitude．The rendering here given to $\dot{\epsilon \pi \alpha i \rho \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota}$ is possible，as $\epsilon \pi a i \rho \epsilon \iota \nu$ regularly means＇to raise，＇and $\tau \hat{\eta} s \gamma \hat{\eta} s$ could be a genit．of separation．But $\xi \xi$－
 certainly be a more satisfactory word．

入ovoı $\nu$ ．

 П入áт $\omega \nu a \quad \mu \dot{a} \theta \eta \tau \epsilon$ тò $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \epsilon \hat{\nu}$ ，v́̀ $\eta \nu$ ä $\mu o \rho \phi o \nu$ ov̂бa $\sigma \tau \rho \epsilon ́-$













$8 \mathrm{M} \omega \ddot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \in \omega s$ edd $\mathrm{M} \omega \sigma \epsilon \in \omega s \mathrm{~A}$（et infra）\｜ 18 тaủrà Thirlb Otto $\tau a \hat{v} \tau a \mathrm{~A}$

1．பंтєккрои́oутєs］〔subtly caus－32，I；44， 8 ． ing to wander＇or＇tripping up．＇ The word is not elsewhere found； but $\dot{\epsilon \kappa \kappa \rho о и ́ \omega ~ i s ~ a ~ v e r y ~ c o m m o n ~ w o r d, ~}$ and the addition of $\dot{v} \pi \dot{6}$ is easily intelligible．Liddell and Scott men－ tion a use of $\dot{\text { úтє́ккроибıs by Ire－}}$ naeus．

59．Plato and others got their theories of Creation from our teachers．
 $\rho v \chi \theta \epsilon \nu \tau$ os or some similar word must be supplied．

6．v̌ $\lambda \eta \nu$ ä $\mu$ ．oủбà кт入．］Cf． c．10，2．This is no definite quo－ tation from Plato，but roughly ex－ presses the sense of various passages in the Timaeus，e．g． $30,53,69$.

8．тoû $\pi \rho o \delta \epsilon \delta \eta \lambda \omega \mu \epsilon \in \nu o u]$ Cf．c．

10．$\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \dot{a} \rho \chi \dot{\eta} \nu]$＇originally．＇
12．$\epsilon \nu \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \hat{n} \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］Cf．Genes．i I－3．

16．$̈ \sigma \tau \epsilon ~ \lambda 6 \gamma \omega \kappa \tau \lambda$.$] ＇So that$ both Plato and his followers and we ourselves have learnt，and you may learn，that the whole world came into being by the word of God out of the existing subject－matter which Moses previously spoke of．＇T $\omega \bar{\nu}$ $\dot{v} \pi о к$ ．refers to oujpaעbs and $\gamma \hat{\eta}$ ，i．e． unformed heaven and earth．Cf． I 64 ，II 5 （6）．Justin seems in this passage to avoid the belief in the eternity of matter．For he regards oúpapós and $\gamma \hat{\eta}$ as the $\dot{v} \pi о к \epsilon l \mu \epsilon \nu a$ of the $\kappa \delta \sigma \mu o s$ ，and these had been created by God．
 $\tau \in \rho o \nu$ ímò $\mathrm{M} \omega u ̈ \sigma \epsilon ́ \omega \varsigma ~ o u ̋ \delta a \mu \epsilon \nu$.










 $\lambda \epsilon \gamma о \mu \in ́ \nu \eta \nu \mathrm{~A}$

1．＂E $\rho \in \beta$ ßos］Cf．Hes．Theog． 123 ＇Ек Xáєos $\delta^{\prime}{ }^{*} \mathrm{E} \rho \in \beta$ bs tє $\mu \epsilon ́-$ $\lambda a \iota \nu a ́ \tau \epsilon \mathrm{~N} \dot{v} \xi \in{ }^{\epsilon} \gamma \in \in \nu 0 \nu \tau o$ ．The reference may be to the $\sigma \kappa \delta \tau 0$ of the above quotation，or perhaps to Deut．xxxii 22，quoted in c．6o．It is not impossible，however，that Justin intended to connect the word with the Hebrew＇ereb，＇evening，＇which occurs in Gen．i 5 ，etc．

60．So too Plato has borrowed from Moses（though misunderstand－ ing it）the idea of the Cross and of a Trinity．Thus our doctrines have been the models for others；and the most ignorant among us can teach them，for it is not man＇s wisdom but God＇s power which inspires them．

4．Ex\｛a⿱㇒日勺 $\kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］This is no verbally accurate quotation；but Plat．Tim．36， 13 has taút $\eta$ oû̀ $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \xi \cup ́ \sigma \tau a \sigma \iota \nu \quad \pi \hat{a} \sigma a \nu \quad \delta \iota \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \nu \quad \kappa a \tau \dot{a}$ $\mu \hat{\eta} \kappa о s ~ \sigma \chi i \sigma \alpha s, \mu \notin \sigma \eta \nu \pi \rho \partial े s \mu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \eta \nu$ є́ка－
 катє́канчєข $\epsilon$ ls ки́клор，where the idea is of a cruciform distribution of the anima mundi throughout the universe．Justin＇s citation is typically loose．It means＇God set

Him（His Son）in the form of a $\chi$ in the universe．＇
 tin quotes very loosely and inserts his own commentary．In Numb． xxi 6 ff ．we are not told that Moses made a cross，but a brazen serpent，
 seems plain that Justin understood $\sigma \eta \mu \in i o u$ as of a cross．The same idea is found in Barnabas xi $7 \mathrm{M} \omega$－ $\sigma \hat{\eta} s$ тolє̂̂ $\tau$ útod $\tau 0 \hat{u}$＇I Inooû．Nor are we told that Moses placed the serpent upon the Tabernacle．Again， the quotation $\epsilon \dot{\alpha} \nu \quad \pi \rho o \sigma \beta \lambda \epsilon \in \pi \eta \tau \epsilon \kappa \tau \lambda$ ． is incxact．The LXX version of the passage in Numbers has $\epsilon^{\boldsymbol{\gamma} \ell \nu \in \tau o}$

 каi $\begin{gathered}\text { ぞ } \\ \eta\end{gathered}$ ．In John iii I4 we read



 Justin＇s choice of words may show a knowledge of the text in St John＇s Gospel，but we can hardily infer it with any confidence．In Tryph． 94 he has è $\pi i$ $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon \hat{i} o \nu$ ¿̇ $\sigma \tau \eta \sigma \epsilon$ ，


 4．каì $\gamma \epsilon \nu 0 \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o v ~ \tau o u ́ t o v ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~ \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ o ̋ \phi \epsilon \iota s ~ a ̉ \pi o \theta a \nu \epsilon i ̂ \nu ~ a ̉ \nu c ́-~$















 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ oú $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ тoùs $\chi a \rho a \kappa \tau \eta \hat{p} a \varsigma ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\sigma \tau o \iota \chi \epsilon i ́ \omega \nu$ є́ $\pi \iota \sigma \tau a \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu, 20$


4 $\theta$ ávatov oüt $\omega$ s $\pi a \rho \epsilon ́ \delta \omega \kappa \epsilon \nu$ ．ä ả $\nu a \gamma \nu o u ̀ s ~ O t t o ~ \theta a ́ \nu a \tau o \nu . ~ o u ̈ \tau \omega s ~ \pi a \rho \epsilon ́ \delta \omega \kappa \epsilon \nu$ àvarvoùs A
and later éкท́puб⿱㇒日ध $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho \dot{a} a \nu$ тoîs


 otavpov̀ $\theta a \nu a \tau o \hat{v} \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \mu e ̀ \lambda \lambda o \nu \tau a)$ ，and again каi $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \beta \lambda \epsilon \in \pi \epsilon \iota \nu$ aủтд̀ $\tau$ т̀̀s


3．$\tau o$ ơs $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \nu$ ơ．$\dot{\alpha} \pi \pi o \theta$ ．］This again is an addition to the Bible narra－ tive．

6．xiarua］＇two lines placed cross－zuise．＇With $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha}$ т $\quad$ ข $\nu$


8．каi тд єiтєì кт入．］＇As to his speaking of a third subsistence （this also he borrowed from Moses）
since．＇• Supply $\pi$ apà M $\omega \dot{\partial} \sigma$ éws ${ }^{\epsilon} \lambda \alpha \beta \epsilon$ ，or the like，from the be－ ginning of the chapter．
ib．ìs $\pi \rho o \epsilon i \pi \rho \mu \epsilon \nu]$ in c． 59,3 ．
 ＇third place to the third．＇Pseudo－ Plat．Epist．ii 3 I 2 E has кai tpítov $\pi \varepsilon \rho \grave{\imath} \tau \grave{a}$ r $\tau i \tau \alpha$ ．Justin＇s quotation is also found in Proclus Theol．Plat． ii ir．The explanation of the meaning of Plato＇s phrase is in－ ordinately difficult．Justin，like other Fathers after him，obviously applies it to the Trinitarian theory．

16．катаßウ̇бєтає ктл．］Deut． xxxii 22.

 ả入入à סvvá $\mu \epsilon \iota$ өєòv $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ ．


 $\gamma \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ ．2．ö öо८ à̀ $\pi \epsilon \iota \sigma \theta \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota$ каї $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon v ́ \omega \sigma \iota \nu \dot{a} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\eta}$










$$
\text { Io ע } \eta \sigma \tau \epsilon \text { úo } \nu \tau \epsilon \mathrm{B} \nu \eta \sigma \tau \epsilon \text { úo } \mathrm{D} \tau \mathrm{a} \mathrm{~A}
$$

1．$\pi \eta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu]$＇maimed，＇and so perhaps more generally＇infirm．＇ Or he may mean＇blind．＇Cf． Tryph．69，and see Robinson Ep． to the Ephesians（referred to in note above，c．22）．Justin seems to be carrying on the idea of oú $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ тous रaрактйраs ктл．，＇who have lost the power of reading if they once had it．＇Being＇maimed＇（ex－ cept in sight）would have no special point．
ib．$\chi \mathfrak{\eta} \rho \omega \nu$ tàs ö $\psi \in \iota s]$＇deprived of sight．＇

ib．oủ $\sigma 0 \phi i ́ q k \pi \lambda$ ．］Cf．I Cor． ii 5 ．

61．An exposition of Christian Baptism．See Introd．p．xxxvii．
4．$\dot{\alpha} \varphi \epsilon \theta \dot{\eta} \kappa \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu$ є่．$\tau$ ．0．］Cf．c． 14， 2.

6．Toр $\eta \rho \epsilon \in \in \epsilon \iota \nu$ ］＇act wrongly．＇ The middle form is occasionally found in classical Greek，but not the active；it may be directly tran－ sitive＇ 10 falsify something．＇

10．$\nu \eta \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{v} 0 \nu \tau \epsilon \mathrm{~S}$ ．．．$\sigma \nu \nu \nu \eta \sigma \tau \epsilon \cup \dot{\nu} \nu-$
 $\beta a \pi \tau i \sigma \mu a \tau o s ~ \pi \rho о \nu \eta \sigma \tau \epsilon \cup \sigma a ́ \tau \omega$ ó $\beta a \pi$－ $\tau i \zeta \omega \nu$ каi ó $\beta a \pi \tau \iota \zeta o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu$ оs каi $\epsilon \ell$ тıves ä入入oı סúvàtaı．Cf．Tert．de Bapt． 20.

12．${ }^{\epsilon} \nu \theta a \quad \ddot{v} \delta \omega \rho$ غ．］This appears to imply that as a rule baptisms took place out of doors，by river， lake，or sea．Cf．Tert．de Bapt． 4．The Didache 1．c．prescribes $\dot{v} \delta \omega \rho$ $\zeta \hat{\omega} \nu$ if obtainable．

13．ávє $\gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \dot{\prime} \theta \eta \mu \epsilon \nu]$ I Pct．i 3， 23.

14．$̇ \pi^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ óv $\delta \mu a \tau o s ~ \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］Baptism in the threefold Name seems to be the only practice known to Justin， as is the case also in Didach． $7 \cdot$ Cf．Matt．xxviii 19 ，though in the other N．T．references to Baptism the use of the threefold Name is not explicitly referred to．

16．$\pi \nu$ ．$\dot{a} \gamma\left[\begin{array}{l}\text { ou }] ~ T h e ~ a b s e n c e ~ o f ~\end{array}\right.$ the article（here and below）is a little curious．
















## 

1．à $\nu \mu \grave{\eta} \kappa \tau \lambda$.$] Cf．John iii 3-5$ ； Matt．xviii 3．（Cod．D in the passage of St John＇s Gospel reads á $\nu a \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon$ ．Cf．Westcott N．T． Canon P． 1.54 ，note 2．）This seems an unquestionable reference to the Fourth Gospel，especially when taken in connexion with the men－ tion of Nicodemus＇difficulty．Some commentators compare Ps．－Clem． Hom．xi 26 ả $\mu \grave{\eta} \nu$ v́ $\mu i ̀ \nu \quad \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega$ 白 $\nu$ $\mu \dot{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \nu a \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon \dot{u} \delta a \tau \iota \zeta \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \iota$ єis

 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ oujpav $\hat{\omega} \nu$ ，and suggest that both citations come from an apocryphal Gospel．But that seems gratuitous． Variation of text，oral tradition， looseness of quotation can all ac－ count for Justin＇s differences from the Gospel version．

5．$\dot{\omega} s \pi \rho o \epsilon \gamma \rho a ́ \psi a \mu \epsilon \nu$ ］In c．44， 3．The quotation is from Isaiah i 16 － 20 ．

14．入órov єis тoûto кт入．］Re－ ferring to the following explanation． Zahn（Zeitschr．f．Kirchengesch．viii

1886，66－84）considers toûto here to be out of place，as not introducing a definite citation．He therefore would excise the word，and see in this sentence（referring back to the exposition of the baptismal cere－ monies）a definite acknowledgment of dependence on Didach．7．The reason for such an emendation is inadequate，though it is quite pos－ sible that Justin was acquainted with the Didache．

15．$\epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota \delta \dot{\eta} \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］The following sentences give a synopsis of apos－ tolic teaching on the subject，and give what was doubtless the current doctrine of the Church．Some N．T．passages bearing upon the several points are：Eph．v 8；i Pet． i I4（we are born in ignorance （ $\alpha \gamma \nu 00 \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \epsilon s$ ）and become by re－ generation $\tau \epsilon \in \kappa \nu a \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \mu \eta s)$ ：Rom． vi 4 ，viii 2 ，ix 8 ；Gal．iv 26 ，v i （we are born кат＇$\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha ́ \gamma \kappa \eta \nu$ and be－ come $\tau \in ́ \kappa \nu a \pi \rho \circ a \iota \rho \in ́ \sigma \epsilon \omega \varsigma)$ ；Acts ii 38 ； xxii 16 （we are born in $\sin$ and obtain the remission of sins）．












 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau a \hat{\tau} \tau a \quad \mu a \nu \theta a \nu o ́ v \tau \omega \nu$. 13. каї ё $\pi^{\prime}$ ỏvó $\mu a \tau o s ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon}$


入ои́єта.



9. aúto toûto $\mu \dot{\partial} \nu 0 \nu$ ] i.e. no name (for, as Justin immediately goes on to remark, God is ineffable) but only, for the sake of distinction, the title 'Father.'
ib. тô tò $\lambda$. áyovtos] Is this the sponsor, who attests the faith of the candidate? See the difficult passage in Tert. de Bapt. 6, with Lupton's note. More probably it is the deacon or other person who superintends and administers the baptism, repeating the threefold Name as he does so. P'erhaps the phrase á $\gamma \in \iota \nu \in \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \tau$. $\lambda$. is used rather than $\beta a \pi \tau i \xi o \nu \tau o s$ or the like, because, as the word $\lambda$ ovabouevov implies, and as many passages in the N. 'T. indicate in like manner, the candidate for admission to the

Church dipped himself in the water; it was his own act, to which others might bring him, but which they did not perform for him.
 ii 5 (6), I.
II. є $โ$ [val] sc. ò $\nu о \mu a$.
 x 32; and see Suicer s.v. There is an obvious analogy to the mysteries of the heathen, where such a word was used.
14. $\mu a \nu \theta a \nu \delta \nu \tau \omega \nu]$ referring to the instruction of catechumens.
62. The demons have anticipated Christian baptism by heathen. sprinklings and lustrations; and the taking-off of shoes is borrczed from Moses' experience.

















 Braun aủroîs Pautigny \|| $8 \mathrm{M} \omega \ddot{i} \sigma \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ edd $\mathrm{M} \omega \sigma \epsilon \hat{\imath} \mathrm{A}$ (ita infra $\mathrm{M} \omega \ddot{u} \sigma \hat{\eta} s$ )

1. $\tau 0 \hat{u} \pi \rho \circ \phi \dot{\eta} \tau o u]$ i.e. in Isaiah i 16-20, quoted c. 61, 7.
2. $\dot{\rho} a \nu \tau i \xi \epsilon \iota \nu]$ Sprinklings were common in heathen cultus. Cf. Tert. de Bapt. v, with Lupton's and Oehler's notes. For a complete lustration before mysteries ( $\tau \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \circ \nu$ $\lambda o v ́ \varepsilon \sigma \theta a \iota)$ cf. Paus. xiv 20, 4, who tells us that the women of Tanagra bathed before the orgies of Dionysus.
3. тò _ ن́moǹú $\epsilon \theta a \iota]$ For the taking-off of shoes cf. Pythagoras' precept ả $\nu v \pi o ́ \delta \eta \tau о s ~ \theta \hat{v} є ~ к а i ̀ ~ \pi \rho о \sigma к и ́ v є \iota . ~$ See also Tert. Apol. 40 ; de Ieiun. 16.
4. кal тoîs aủtoîs $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] The Greek of the MS text is strange. Toùs is out of place with $\theta \rho \eta \sigma \kappa \epsilon \dot{v} о \nu-$ ras, and roîs aúroîs seems harsh. If retained it must be translated 'those who serve them (i.e. the
demons), 'though Maran renders it 'iisdem rebus daemones colunt.' Liddell and Scott quote a parallel for the use of $\theta \rho \eta \sigma \kappa \epsilon \cup \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ with dative. If emendation be considered necessary, it might be the most simple course to insert an $\epsilon \nu \nu$ before $\tau o i ̂ s$ aủroîs.
5. тồ $\pi$. $\mu$. $\theta$ étov] A mistake. Jethro was Moses' father-in-law. It may be a mere slip of memory, or (Thirlb.) Justin may have confused the story of Moses' vision with that of Jacob's, when he was feeding the flocks of his uncle Laban.
6. $\dot{\pi} \pi \grave{\lambda} \lambda v \sigma a \iota \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Cf. Exod. iii 5. Notice the identification of 'the angel of the Lord,' 'the Lord,' 'God,' with Christ.
7. גंкท่коє к.] 'was told to go down.' .
 тòv $\lambda a o ̀ \nu ~ \pi o ı \eta ŋ \sigma a s ~ \mu \epsilon \gamma a ́ \lambda a ~ к a i ̀ ~ \theta a v \mu a ́ \sigma \iota a, ~ a ̀ ~ є i ̉ ~ \beta o u ́ \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon ~$

8. I. 'Iovסaîoı ס̀̀ $\pi a ́ \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma ~ \kappa a \grave{~ \nu v ̂ \nu ~ \delta \iota \delta a ́ \sigma \kappa о v \sigma \iota ~ \tau o ̀ \nu}$
















## $5 \mathrm{M} \omega \ddot{u} \sigma \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ edd $\mathrm{M} \omega \sigma \epsilon \hat{\imath} \mathrm{A}$ (ita infr et $\mathrm{M} \omega \ddot{u} \sigma \epsilon \in \omega s, \mathrm{M} \omega \ddot{\sigma} \sigma \hat{\eta} s$ )

63. The Jews suppose it was God who spoke to Moses, but it was really Christ.

This is a chapter of digression. Justin is anxious to avoid anthropomorphism. The ineffable God needs a medium of communication with men.
4. $\tau \grave{\partial} \nu \dot{a} \nu \omega \nu .0$.$] Cf. 6I, II.$
7. $\dot{\omega}$ s $\pi \rho о є \gamma \rho \alpha ́ \psi a \mu \epsilon \nu$ ] in c. 37, I. Cf. Isaiah i 3 .
12. oủ $\delta \epsilon i$ is $^{\epsilon} \gamma \nu \omega \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Matt. xi 27 ; Luke x 22 ; John viii 19 , xvi 3. The quotation appears to come from the Synoptic Gospels, but the comment, with its somewhat curious
 vibs), scems to betray the influence of St John. Irenaeus iv 6 also quotes the words as forming part
of an argument against the Jews. In Tryph. oo the quotation reappears with $\gamma \iota \nu \omega$ ब́бкєь instead of '̇ $\gamma \nu \omega$. As Westcott (N.T. Canon p. 137) points out, the variations in the wording of this quotation in our orthodox authorities are striking. Both the use of ${ }^{\varepsilon} \gamma \nu \omega$ and the transposition of clauses can be paralleled from writers who admitted the four Canonical Gospels exchusively, e.g. Irenaeus, Origen, Epiphanius.
14. $\dot{\omega} \boldsymbol{s} \pi \rho 0^{\prime} \notin \eta \mu \epsilon \nu$ ] in c. $2 \mathrm{I}, \mathbf{I}$; 22, 1, 2; 23, 2; 32, 10.
15. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \delta \sigma \tau 0 \lambda o s]$ Cf. c. 12, 9 ; Heb. iii 1.
 Matt. x 40 ; Luke x 16 ; John xiv 24.











 $\delta \iota a \tau \epsilon \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota$ viтò $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ à $\nu o \eta ं \tau \omega \nu$ ’Iovסaí $\omega \nu$. II. oïтıves





 $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \nu$. 'I $\sigma \rho a \grave{\eta} \lambda$ ठ' $\mu \epsilon$ ov̉к є้ $\gamma \nu \omega$, каi ó $\lambda a o ́ s ~ \mu \epsilon ~ o v ่ ~ \sigma \nu \nu \eta ̂ \kappa \epsilon . ~ 20 ~$ 13. каì $\pi a ́ \lambda \iota \nu ~ o ́ ~ ' I \eta \sigma o v ̂ \varsigma, ~ \omega ́ s ~ \epsilon ́ \delta \eta \lambda \omega ́ \sigma a \mu \epsilon \nu, \pi a \rho ' ~ a u ̉ \tau o i ̂ s ~ \omega ̀ \nu ~$

 ठaîo८ oûv ท̂ $\eta \eta \sigma a ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o \iota ~ a ̉ \epsilon i ̀ ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \pi a \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ o ̋ \lambda \omega \nu ~ \lambda \epsilon \lambda a \lambda \eta-$



 I 5. oi $\gamma a ̀ \rho ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ v i o ̀ \nu ~ \pi a \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a ~ \phi a ́ \sigma к о \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma ~ \epsilon i ̂ \nu a \iota ~ \epsilon ่ \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \chi о \nu \tau а \iota ~$
I. каi є $\lambda \alpha \lambda \eta \eta \sigma \kappa \kappa \lambda$.] Exod. iii 2, 6, 10, 14, 15 . Justin's argument, though he does not make it quite explicit, turns on the fact that the same speaker who says 'I am the God of Abraham' is
described also as 'the angel of the Lord.' Cf. Hil. de Trin. iv 32.
5. $\grave{\epsilon} \xi \epsilon^{\prime} \kappa \epsilon(\nu \omega \nu]$ i.e. from Moses' writings.
10. $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \in \mathfrak{\epsilon} \kappa \dot{b} \nu \iota \dot{\alpha} \sigma \omega \mu \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu]$ i.e. as an angel.


 тиро̀s $\mu о \rho \phi \hat{\eta}$ каì єiко́vos à $\sigma \omega \mu a ́ \tau о ⿱ ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \mathrm{M} \omega \ddot{\mathrm{u} \sigma \epsilon \hat{\imath} \kappa а i ̀ ~ \tau о i ̂ s ~}$

















2 ôs $\lambda$ b́ros каi Otto ôs каi $\lambda$ óros $\mathrm{A} \| 20 \mathrm{M} \omega \ddot{\sigma} \sigma \hat{\epsilon} \omega \mathrm{s}$ edd $\mathrm{M} \omega \sigma^{\epsilon} \omega \mathrm{\omega}$ A（ita infra M $\omega \ddot{̈} \sigma \hat{\eta} s$ ）

2．ós $\lambda$ óvos ктл．］Cf．John i I ； Phil．ii 6.

4．єiкbuos à $\sigma \omega \mu$ átov］＇image of an incorporeal being，＇or else＇in－ corporeal form．＇

6．$\dot{\omega} s \pi \rho o \epsilon i \pi \rho \mu \in \nu$ ］in c． $32,14$.
13．$\mu \epsilon \in \in[\nu]$ Cf．Matt．xxii 32.
15．ウ＇$\sigma \chi 0 \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \eta \sigma \alpha \nu$ ］busied them－ selves．＇

64．The demons anticipated the doctrine of the Spirit in the myth of Kore，and of creation in the myth of Athena．

17．$\tau \mathrm{d} \dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \gamma \epsilon i \rho \epsilon \iota \nu \kappa \pi \lambda$ ．］＇to raise an image of Kore over the springs of water．＇It is not easy，in our
present state of knowledge，to see the resemblance between the posi－ tion of Kore and that which is ascribed to the Spirit．In Diod． Sic．$v+$ we read $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \mathrm{K} b \rho \eta \nu$ 入aхєî
 $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \mu \in \gamma \alpha \lambda \eta \nu$ aủ $\hat{\eta} \kappa \alpha \theta \iota \in \rho \omega \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{n}$
 $\nu \eta \nu$ ．Moreover in the record con－ cerning the mysteries of Andania she is called＇$A \gamma \nu \dot{\eta}$＇and a stream is named after her．（Cf．Farnell Greek Cults iii，Demeter－Kore； 246．）There seems to be no other evidence to suggest a comnexion between Kore and springs．
$\nu o \eta ̄ \sigma a \iota \quad \delta u ́ v a \sigma \theta \epsilon$.










 $\mu о \rho \phi \dot{\eta} \nu$. 6. каì on $\mu$ oi $\omega \mathrm{s}$ тoùs ä̀ $\lambda \lambda$ aus $\lambda \in \gamma o \mu$ évous vioùs тov̂ $\Delta$ loos ai $\pi \rho a ́ \xi \epsilon \iota s$ è $\lambda \in ́ \gamma \chi o v \sigma \iota \nu$.








## $5 \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \phi \epsilon \rho \circ \mu \epsilon \in \nu \circ \cup \mathrm{~A} \notin \pi \iota \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ Otto

1. $\dot{\omega} s \pi \rho 0 \in \gamma \rho \alpha \psi \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu]$ in c. $59,2$.
 trickery.' Cf. 61, 1 .
2. є่ $\pi \epsilon \epsilon \delta \grave{\eta} \epsilon ่ \nu \nu . \kappa \tau \lambda$.$] 'Since they$ knew that God conceived and made the world by the Logos (or by Reason).'
3. $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi \rho \omega ́ \tau \eta \nu \quad \nLeftarrow \nu \nu 0 \alpha a \nu]$ Cf. c. 26,3 . The reference here is to the myth of Athena springing fullgrown from the brain of Zeus.
4. $\gamma \in$ 入otó $\alpha$ avo $]$ The absurdity consists in imagining an incorporeal thing in bodily form. Otto quotes Prudent. c. Sym. ii 58.
5. ai $\pi \rho a ́ \xi \epsilon \iota s]$ 'their actions.'
6. An account of the Christian Eucharist following Baptism. Cf.

Pliny Ep. x 96 ; Didach. 9, 1 о. This account resembles that in c. 67 ; but the early part of the service as given in c. 67 is here left out, because Justin is describing only the admission of a convert. Justin's account is very simple and naive, perhaps purposely, on account of his heathen readers.
14. oüt $\omega$ s] as described in c. 6I.
15. бטүкататє $\theta є \mu$ и́vov] ' who has assented.'
ib. ad $\delta \epsilon \lambda \phi$ oús] Cf. Matt. xxiii 8. See Tent. Apol. 39.
19. ar $\boldsymbol{\gamma} . \pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon v \tau \alpha l]$ 'good livers.' The word is not, so far as I know, found elsewhere in this sense. But cf. $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon \mathfrak{l} \alpha \nu, 4,20$.












 $\pi a \rho o v ̂ \sigma \iota \nu$ àmoф́́pov







1. фi入ض́matı] Cf. Tert. de Orat. 14 ; Cyr. Jer. Catch. Myst. v 3.
2. $\tau \hat{\omega} \pi \rho о \epsilon \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \tau \iota$ Cf. I Tim. v 17. The word is pagan and not only Christian. The fact that the $\pi \rho \circ \in \sigma \tau \omega$ 's was not present at the actual baptism, and only received the neophyte afterwards, is in accordance with the apostolic practice. Acts xix 5, 6 (cf. I Cor. i 14), and x 48 .
3. кal кра́ $\mu a \tau o s] ~ к \rho \hat{a} \mu \alpha='$ mixed wine and water.' On the reading see Introd. p. xiii. Could крâ $\mu \alpha$ mean 'vine to mix it with' or ' wine mixed with it'?
4. tour $\omega \nu$ ] i.e. 'these gifts.'
5. $\epsilon \pi i \pi 0 \lambda \dot{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ ' at length.
6. єं $\pi \epsilon v \phi \eta \mu \epsilon i$ ] 'assents.' So in Homer, Il. i 22.
ib. 'A $\mu \eta{ }^{\prime} \nu$ ] Taken from the syngogue worship. Cf. i Cor. xiv 16.
 not a priestly duty to distribute the sacrament.
7. є́̀ $\chi a \rho \iota \sigma \tau \eta \theta$ '́vtos] 'dedicated with thanks.' The transitive use recurs in 67,4 . Cf. also Iran. I

8. Explanation of the term Eucharist and of the belief associated with the elements.
9. خेंs out $\delta \epsilon \nu$ l aid $\lambda \omega \kappa \kappa \lambda$.] The qualifications for admission to the Eucharist are (1) faith, (2) baptism, (3) obedience. Cf., Didach. 9-
10. iss ко七д̀̀ ä.] Cf. Iran. Iv xviii 5 (a passage plainly recalling
 $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \epsilon \dot{u} \chi \alpha \rho \iota \sigma \tau i a$.














 тоûтє́のть т. $\sigma$. A
I. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \delta \nu \tau \rho \delta \pi \sigma \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$.] On this passage see Introd. p. xli.
ib. סıà $\lambda$ dóou $\theta \in o \hat{0}]$ Cf. c. 46,5 .
11. $\delta \iota^{\prime} \epsilon \dot{\chi} \chi \hat{\eta} s$ तó $\gamma o u$ ] A com-
 єùzapıбtias makes it seem improbable that $\lambda$ orou should depend upon єủरीs ('prayer to the Word') instead of $\epsilon \dot{u} \chi \hat{\eta} s$ depending upon入órov. Otto well says 'nempe $\delta \dot{\alpha}$,
 aưтoû (scil. रpıбтoû) sibi inuicem respondent, ita quidem, ut precationis uerbo a Christo profecto Iustinus diuinam uim tribuat, qualis in dei $\lambda o ́ \gamma \omega$ insit.'
12. ¿̇ калєitaı є $\dot{\jmath} \gamma \gamma$.] There is not the least reason for thinking that these words are a gloss, for the heathen would not have inserted them, and the Christians would not have required them, as they had no gospel that competed with the four of the Canon. Cf.


and roo (where also the word $\dot{\alpha} \pi 0$ $\mu \nu \eta \mu о \nu \varepsilon \dot{u} \mu a \tau a$ for the gospels recurs)
 The plural form shows that Justin knew of at least two 'Gospels'; the singular may denote some kind of 'harmony' of them.
13. $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu$ 'I $\eta \sigma o u ̂ \nu ~ к \tau \lambda.] ~ C f . ~ L u k e ~$ xxii 19 ff.; Mark xiv 22; Matt. xxvi 26; i Cor. xi 23.
14. $\mu$ bjocs] The words prepare for the reference to 'mysteries' in the next sentence; and, like the clause ${ }_{\eta}{ }^{\circ} s$ ovj $\delta \epsilon \nu l$ ä $\lambda \lambda \omega \kappa \tau \lambda$. above, they tacitly meet the objection that the Christian worship was for bad reasons concealed from observation.
15. Mitpa] Cf. Cumont Culte de Mithras p. ${ }^{176}$. Tert. de Praescr. Haer. 40 says of the Mithras-communicant 'celebrat et panis oblationem.' Justin speaks again of the mysteries of Mithras in Tryph. 70.

 $\sigma \tau a \sigma \theta \epsilon \hat{\eta} \mu a \theta \epsilon i ̄ \nu$ dúvaб $\theta \epsilon$.



 $\tau \omega ิ \nu \pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$ סià $\tau o \hat{v}$ viô aùtồ 'I $\eta \sigma o \hat{\mathrm{X}} \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{v} \kappa a i ̀ ~ \delta i a ̀ ~$








16. $\mu \epsilon \tau$ ' $̇ \pi \iota \lambda b \gamma \omega \nu \quad \tau \iota \nu \hat{\omega} \nu]$ 'with some words said over them.'
17. An account of the Sunday Eucharist.
18. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda$ ous $\dot{\alpha} \nu a \mu$.] Cf. Heb. x 24 f .
ib. of exoytes] as in 1 Cor. xi 22.
19. $\sigma \dot{v} \nu \in \sigma \mu \in \nu$ ] Cf. Tert. Ap. 39.
20. $\pi \rho о \sigma \phi є \rho о ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a]$ 'we receive.' Cf. 13, I, and for the custom see ${ }^{1}$ Tim. iv 3 f .
21. $\tau \hat{\eta} \tau . \dot{\eta} \lambda$ iou $\lambda . \dot{\eta}$.] The usual Christian term is $\dot{\eta}$ кирьакウ̀ $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon ́ \rho \alpha$. On the heathen week and days of the week see Dict. of Chr. Antig. s.v. 'Week.' Cf. also Tert. Ap. ı6, ad Nat. i 13. Clem. Al. Strom. vii 12 (p. 877 , Potter) refers to the days of Hermes (Wednesday) and Aphrodite (Friday).
22. árooús] An indication of the spread of Christianity. Cf. Pliny Ep. x 96 'neque ciuitates tantum sed uicos etiam atque agros contagio peruagata est.'
23. $\sigma v \nu e ́ \lambda \epsilon v \sigma \iota s]$ Cf. Acta $S$.

Fustini 3.
ib. $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ á $\pi о \mu \nu \eta \mu$.] The first hint in Christian literature of a liturgical reading of the Gospels. For the public reading of other Christian writings at this period see Dionysius of Corinth ap. Eus. H. E. iv 23 .
13. $\mu \epsilon ́ \chi \rho \iota s{ }^{\prime} \gamma \chi$.] 'as long as there is time for.' Cf. Tryph. 118 ws $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \chi \omega \rho \in \hat{\imath}$.
ib. $\tau 0 \hat{u}$ d $\nu a \gamma$.] So the $\pi \rho o \varepsilon$ $\sigma \tau$ és did not read.
14. $\delta \dot{\alpha} \lambda$ 人 $\gamma o v$ ] 'in a speech.'
16. ávı $\sigma \tau \alpha \mu \epsilon \theta a$ ] The usual attitude for prayer. Apparently they sat to hear the reading. Were these prayers silent prayers, or private extempore prayers uttered aloud, or fixed prayers that all knew and could join in with their voices? It is perhaps impossible to decide; but from Clem. Rom. ad Corinth. 59-61, Didach. 9, 10 we see that liturgical prayers may have been in use in the Christian Church by now.
 $\pi \rho о \sigma \phi \in ́ \rho \epsilon \tau а \iota ~ \kappa а і ̈ ~ о i \nu o s ~ к а і ~ v ̋ \delta \omega \rho, ~ к а і ~ o ́ ~ \pi \rho о є \sigma \tau \grave{\omega s ~ \epsilon v ̉ \chi a ̀ s ~}$










 $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \sigma v \nu \epsilon ́ \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu$ тоьov́ $\mu \epsilon \theta a$, є่ $\pi \epsilon \iota \delta \grave{\eta} \pi \rho \omega ́ \tau \eta$ Є่ $\sigma \tau і \nu$






I. $\dot{\omega} \boldsymbol{s} \pi \rho \circ \epsilon ́ \phi \eta \mu \epsilon \nu$ ] in 65,3 .
2. $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \phi \epsilon \rho \in \tau \alpha L$ i.e. to the president. Cf. 65,3 . It does not refer to an oblation of the elements.
3. ö $\sigma \eta$ ठúv.] Cf. 13,1 ; 55, 8; Tryph. 8o, and the Eucharistic formula in Const. Apost. viii J 2

 $\mu \in \theta a$. See also Didach. io toîs


 Tert. Ap. 39 ' nemo compellitur sed sponte confert.'
13. $\kappa \eta \delta \epsilon \mu \omega \dot{\nu}]$ 'curator' (Otto). Hatch Organiz. p. 39 f. makes great use of this passage to support his theory of the origin of the
episcopate.
ib. $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \tau . \dot{\eta} \lambda i ́ o v \dot{\eta}$.] Cf. I Cor. xvi 2. There is no reference to the fourth commandment.
17. $\pi \rho \grave{o}$ $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ к $\rho о \nu ⿺ \kappa \hat{\eta} s]$ Friday was called dies Veneris. Some have supposed, perhaps over-fancifully, that this paraphrase is here adopted in order to avoid using the name of Venus.
19. фaveis $\kappa \tau \lambda$.$] Probably no$ special discourse is alluded to. The passage need not be understood to mean that Justin knew of no appearance after the first day, though this might be imagined from St Luke's Gospel, if it stood alone, The words $\tau \hat{n} \mu \in \tau \dot{\alpha} \quad \tau, \kappa \rho$. are perhaps to be attached only to $\phi a$ $\nu \in i$.

 $\delta \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho a \gamma \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$ катафрорท́батє, каi $\mu \eta$ ̀̀s кат’ є’ $\chi \theta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$











 є́ $\sigma \tau \iota$ тò ả้тíypaфоข тойто.

Мıขочкị́ Фоидбаข@̂.

## Hadrianus Minucio Fundano.

6. $\grave{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau o \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \delta \epsilon \xi \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$ accepi litteras ad me $20 \gamma \rho a \phi \epsilon i ̂ \sigma a ́ \nu \mu o \iota$ ảmò $\sum \epsilon \rho \eta \nu i ́ o u$ scriptas a decessore tuo




 $\Sigma$ єpévvıou Eus $H$ E iv 9
7. If you think our story true, respect it; if not, treat it as nonsense, but do not put to death those who do no ill; for you will be punished by God, if you persist in injustice. There follozes Hadrian's rescript to Fundanus.
8. $\ell \chi \in \sigma \theta a \iota]$ used as in Heb. vi 9.
9. т $\grave{\eta} \nu$ кр $[\sigma \iota \nu]$ Cf. Wisd. vi 3 f.
10. $\delta$ фiגov кт入.] Cf. Plat. Crit. 43 D el raúry roîs 0 єoîs $\phi i \lambda o \nu$, $\tau a u ́ \tau \eta$ ह̈б $\sigma \omega$ (the reading of marg. A
is nearer to the Platonic form). Kai $\dot{\eta} \mu \mathrm{i}$ is seems to imply that the saying had become proverbial. Variant forms of it appear in Plat. Ap. 19 A, Phaedr. 24 D ; Epict. Enchir. 50 (79).
11. тố $\pi a \tau \rho \partial{ }^{2}$ ن.] See Introd. p. xlvii.
12. $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi \rho o \sigma \phi \dot{\omega} \nu$.$] as in c. 1$.
13. Mıроикіч Ф.] Eus. H. E. iv 8 says that Justin aúrウ̀v $\pi \alpha \rho a \tau \epsilon \theta \epsilon \iota \tau \alpha \iota$

 Sрós，ővtıva бù $\delta \iota \epsilon \delta \epsilon ́ \xi \omega$ ． 7．ou่ ठокє̂̂ oủv $\mu$ о८ тò $\pi \rho a ̂ \gamma \mu a$ ăそ́тŋто⿱ ката入८－ $\pi \epsilon i ̂ \nu$ ，＂̈עa $\mu \eta \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon$ oi aै $\nu \theta \rho \omega \pi о \iota$ тара́ттшутає каі̀ тоі̂ऽ бико－ фа́yтаıs Хорךуía какоир－才ías тараб $\chi \theta \hat{\eta}$ ．8．à $\nu$ ov̂v $\sigma a \phi \hat{\omega} s$ єis тaút $\eta \nu$ тทे $\nu$
 $\nu \omega \nu \tau a \iota \delta \iota \ddot{\sigma} \chi \nu \rho i \zeta \in \sigma \dot{\theta} a \iota \kappa a \tau \alpha \dot{a}$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu, \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \iota a \nu \hat{\omega} \nu, \dot{\omega} s$ каі̀ $\pi \rho o ̀$ ßグィатоя д̀токрірєб $\theta a \iota$ ，є̇ті тоиิто $\mu$ о́vоข т $\rho a \pi \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu, \dot{a} \lambda \lambda$ ’ oủk à $\xi \iota \omega ́ \sigma \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu$ oủס̀̀ $\mu$ о́vaıs乃oaî̀．

9．$\pi o \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega}$ रà $\rho$ $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu \pi \rho \circ \sigma \hat{\eta} \kappa \epsilon \nu, \epsilon_{l}^{\prime \prime} \tau \iota \varsigma$ катทүорєî̀ ßоú入оוто，тоиิтó $\sigma \epsilon \delta \iota a \gamma \iota \nu \omega ́ \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$ ．IO．$\epsilon і ̈$ т८ऽ ô̂̀ катךүорєî каі̀ סєíк－

Serennio Graniano，clarissi－ mo uiro，et non placet mihi relationem silentio prae－ terire，ne et innoxii per－ turbentur et calumniatori－ 5 bus latrocinandi tribuatur occasio．itaque si euidenter prouinciales huic petitioni suae adesse ualent aduer－ sum Christianos，ut pro io tribunali eos in aliquo argu－ ant，hoc eis exequi non prohibeo．precibus autem in hoc solis et adclamatio－ nibus uti eis non permitto． 15 etenim multo aequius est， si quis uolet accusare，te cognoscere de obiectis．si quis igitur accusat et pro－ bat aduersum leges quic－ 20
 крivéөaı A àm окрìaбөaı Eus
 $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \iota \lambda \dot{\eta} \phi a \mu \epsilon \nu$ ．The MSS of Justin have it in Greek ；but what appears to be the Latin original is preserved in Rufinus＇translation of Euseb．Eccl．Hist．and is inserted above，as it stands in Mommsen＇s text．On the authenticity of the rescript and the position implied by it see Appendix II．It is to be noted that in some places the Latin seems to be stronger than the Greek，e．g．oi a $\alpha \Delta \theta \omega \pi$ ol repre－ sents＇innoxii，＇סьópı广є＇supplicia
 suppliciis seuerioribus uindices＇； mistranslation may account for this．

C．Minucius Fundanus was consul

A．D．107，proconsul of Asia pro－ bably about A．D．125．Q．Licinius Silvanus Granianus was consul A．D． To6，proconsul of Asia about A．D． 123，124．The mistake Serenius for Silvanus is at least as old as Eusebius， and may be due to a scribe．

3．тò $\pi \rho \hat{a} \gamma \mu \alpha]$ i．e．＇the matter referred to me＇（relationem）．

7．Хорŋүia как．］＇facility for wrongdoing．＇

10．oi $̇ \pi \alpha \rho \chi$ ．］＇the provincials．＇
15．u．Boaîs］Cf．Tert．Apol． 40 ＇statim Christianos ad leonem accla－ matur．＇

18．тои̂тó $\sigma \epsilon \delta \iota a \gamma$ ．］＇you must judge＇（and not be led away by mere clamour）．
$\nu v \sigma^{\prime}$ т८ тарà $\tau 0$ ùs $\nu o ́ \mu o v s$ $\pi \rho a ́ \tau т о \nu \tau а \varsigma, ~$ ойт $\omega \varsigma$ סоо́рı५є $\kappa а \tau a ̀ ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu ~ \delta ́ ́ v a \mu \nu \nu ~ \tau o v ̂ ~ a ́ \mu a \rho-$
 $5 \kappa \lambda$ éa, єì тıs бvкофадтías


 $\grave{\alpha} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \delta \iota \kappa \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota a \varsigma$.
quam agere memoratos homines, pro merito peccatorum etiam supplicia statues. illud mehercule magnopere curabis, ut si quis calumniae gratia quemquam horum postulauerit reum, in hunc pro sui nequitia suppliciis seuerioribus uindices.






1. $\pi$ a $\rho \dot{a}$ roùs $\nu \dot{\delta} \mu o v s]$ The language is quite vague. Christianity was already illegal, and is not hereby legalised. See below.
2. Sa $\alpha$ á $\mu \beta a \nu \epsilon$ к $\kappa \lambda$. .] 'arrest him for his villainy.' For this use of
 615 e.

The four points in this edict, according to-Ramsay (Ch. in Rom. Emp. p. $3^{22}$ ), are (1) the desire to prevent public trouble and to check the licence of false accusers; (2) the provincials may prosecute, but must bring evidence; (3) there must be proof of illegality; (4) the prosecutor who fails must be punished. The vagueness of the third point is probably deliberate ; it is practically left open to any governor to consider the mere name of Christian an offence, if proved (as Trajan's letter had admitted), or to require proof of some more definite crime, according to his own bias in the matter.

1. I must for your own sake write this account. What happened under Urbicus is only a specimen of what
is done to us everywhere. Sinners, whom Christian friends have reproved, and the demons, who use judge and magistrate as their tools, are combined to procure our death.

On the connexion between this and the preceding A pology cf. Introd. p. xliv.
II. $\chi \theta \in s \delta \epsilon]$ It has been argued from this $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ that these words could not have formed the beginning of an independent treatise. But Otto points out that Xenophon begins his Occonomicus and his Apologia Socratis (he might have added his Conuiuium in a similar manner.
12. Oúp $\beta$ ikou] Q. Lollius Urbicus, a man of distinction; he had been consul, legatus in Germany and Britain, and was praefectus Urbi from A.D. 144 (at the earliest) till 160.
ib. $\hat{\omega}^{\text {' }} \mathrm{P} \omega \mu a i \hat{\imath}$ ] This may be, as Veil suggests, an interpolation, inserted after the separation of this part from the first. But it is not impossible to regard it as a mere rhetorical expression.













I $\dot{\mu} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \mathrm{A} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ Otto $\| 3 \sigma_{\dot{\nu} \nu \tau a \xi ̆ \nu \nu}$ edd $\sigma \dot{\nu} \nu \alpha \xi \iota \nu \mathrm{A} \| 8 \sigma_{\nu \gamma \gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota} \mathrm{~A}$ $\sigma \nu \gamma \gamma \epsilon \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ Otto Kriiger
I. $\dot{u} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu]$ This is in accordance with Justin's usual idea. Cf. i 3,4 . Otto's emendation is an obvious suggestion, and may be correct.
ib. кä̀ à $\gamma \nu 0 \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon]$ '(You are our brothers), even if you are ignorant of the fact and repudiate it on account of the splendour of their position' (i.e. of the $\dot{\eta} \gamma \circ \dot{\mu} \mu \in \nu=$ above).
3. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \epsilon \tau$. 入ó $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega \nu$ óv $\nu \tau$.] Veil suggests that this phrase indicates the two Apologies to be a collection of various $\lambda$ óyou, and attempts to break them up into three fairly equal parts, supposing the two Apologies (treated as one) to have been written on three rolls. These suppositions are not impossible, but the phrase here is too vague to justify such definiteness; it means either 'the composition of these arguments, of this address,' or, referring only to what follows, 'the composition of this story.' Aóroc is a mere collective plural, and does not imply that the Apologies are a compilation of definitely separable
$\lambda$ д́́ot.
4. ô's à $\nu \quad \kappa \tau \lambda$.] A very clumsy. sentence. There is a double subject to the verb mapaбкєvájovolv, viz. (I) ôs à $\nu \sigma \omega \phi$ роví̧ $\eta \tau a l$, (2) oi $\phi a \hat{\lambda} \lambda o l$ daluoves. The enemies of Christianity are therefore ( 1 ) any who have been reproved for their sins $\left({ }^{\prime \prime} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \psi(s=d e l i c t u m)\right.$, -that is, everyone except such as are Chris-tians;-their hostility is caused by their obstinacy and love of pleasure and unreadiness to embrace what is good; (2) the demons, who can control the judges. It should be observed, however, that the ms has left a space before кai oi $\phi$. $\delta$., as if some words had been lost.
8. $\sigma v \gamma \gamma \in \nu \in \epsilon \theta \alpha \iota]$ The change to $\sigma v \gamma \gamma \epsilon \nu \eta^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ marks the parallelism with ко入a $\sigma \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a l$, but is not necessary.

I2. Toùs toooúrous] i.e. such as Urbicus. 'The judges are their servants and slaves, just as the rulers (or magistrates) are their tools,' i.e. both judicial and administrative officials are under the demons' power.


 $\mu \epsilon ́ v a \dot{a} \pi a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \hat{\omega}$.
5 2. I. Гvขض́ $\tau \iota \varsigma ~ \sigma \nu \nu \epsilon \beta i o v ~ a ̉ \nu \delta \rho i ̀ ~ a ̉ к о \lambda а \sigma \tau а і \nu о \nu \tau \iota, ~ a ̀ к о-~$ $\lambda a ̈ \sigma \tau a i ́ \nu o v \sigma a ~ к а \grave{~ a u ̉ \tau \grave{~} \pi \rho o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu . ~ 2 . ~ \grave{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \grave{l} \delta_{\epsilon} \tau a ̀ ~ \tau o \hat{v}}$




















2. Story of a Christian martyrdom.
10. $\lambda$ óouv $\delta \rho \theta$ oû] a Platonic phrase = 'right reason.' Cf. ii 6 (7), 7; 9, 4.
 pleasure.'
16. $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \in \delta \cup \sigma \omega \pi \epsilon i ̂ \tau 0]$ 'she was intreated earnestly.' Joseph. Ant. xv iv 1 .
17. т $\hat{\omega} \nu$ au่t $\hat{s}]$ 'her Christian friends.'
20. 'A入є $\xi$ á $\nu \delta \rho \epsilon \epsilon a \nu]$ Alexandria was a notoriously licentious city.
24. $\rho \in \pi o u ́ \delta \iota o \nu]$ Lat. repudium. Ashton points out that Roman law allowed women to divorce their husbands, whilst Mosaic law only allowed men to divorce their wives. Cf. I Cor. vii 13 foll.





 бо九 $\tau \hat{\omega}$ aviok







 aùtê vimáp








 separation after $\dot{\alpha} \pi a \lambda \lambda a \gamma \epsilon i \sigma \eta s$ ，agree－ ing with aủtoû understood．＇When she had separated from him since he refused to alter his ways．＇

6．$\beta \iota \beta \lambda i \delta i o \nu]$ Lat．libellus．
7．$\sigma \circ \iota \tau \hat{\psi}$ aúтокра́торı］There is apparently only one aútoкрàt concerned．See Introd．p．li．

12．$\delta \nu 0 \ddot{\rho} \rho \beta$ ．є́ко入．］These words certainly look like a gloss，though they were probably already inserted in Justin＇s text by the time of Eusebius．

14．غ́катóv $\left.\alpha \rho \rho \chi{ }^{2}\right]$ On the ques－ tion how＇centurions＇came to dosuch duty，see Le Blant Les Persécuteurs et les Martyrs ch．xxv，esp．p． 300 f．

15．єis $\delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \dot{\alpha} \quad \epsilon \mu \beta$ ．т．Птто入．］ These words may be retained，the sense being＇to imprison Ptolemy and，arresting him，to ask．＇But they read like a gloss to explain $\lambda a \beta \epsilon \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ ．They are found in Eusebius＇version．

17．aủtò тoûto $\mu$ b̌ขov］Cf．i 4. Eusebius＇text may quite well stand．
 Xpıбтьavós. I3. каì $\pi a ́ \lambda \iota \nu, ~ \tau a ̀ ~ \kappa а \lambda a ̀ ~ є ́ a v \tau ஸ ̣ ~ \sigma v \nu є \pi \iota-~$ $\sigma \tau a ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o s ~ \delta ı a ̀ ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ ảmò тô $\mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau o \hat{v}$ $\delta \iota \delta a \chi \eta{ }^{\prime} \nu$, тò $\delta \iota \delta a-$














 $\sigma u ̀ ~ \epsilon i ̂ \nu a \iota ~ \tau o \iota o u ̂ t o s . ~ I 8 . ~ к а i ̀ ~ \tau o ̂ ̂ ~ \Lambda o v к i ́ o v ~ \phi \eta ́ \sigma a \nu \tau o s . ~$ $20 \mathrm{Má} \mathrm{\lambda} \mathrm{\iota} \mathrm{\sigma} \mathrm{\tau a}, \mathrm{\pi á} \mathrm{\lambda} \mathrm{\iota} \mathrm{\nu} \mathrm{каì} \mathrm{aù} \mathrm{\tau ò} \mathrm{\nu} \mathrm{ả} \mathrm{\pi a} \mathrm{\chi} \chi \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota ~ \epsilon ’ \kappa \epsilon ́ \lambda \epsilon ย \sigma \epsilon \nu . ~ 19 . ~ o ́ ~$


 Eus || 19 тoû $\Lambda o v \kappa i o v$ Eus $\Lambda o u k i o v ~ A ~||~ 21 ~ к а i ̀ ~ \chi a ́ \rho ı \nu ~ A ~ \chi a ́ \rho ı \nu ~ E u s ~|| ~ \pi о \nu \eta p \hat{\nu} \nu$
 $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu \theta \epsilon \partial \partial \nu \pi o \rho$. Eus
2. $\tau \dot{\alpha} \quad \kappa \alpha \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ є่aut $\hat{\varphi} \quad \sigma v \nu \epsilon \pi \iota \sigma \tau$.] 'conscious of the good which he owed to the teaching which proceeded from Christ, he confessed the doctrine of divine virtue.'
4. ó $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ á $\rho \nu 0$ и́ $\mu \in \nu 0 s \kappa \tau \lambda$.] 'For he who denies anything either denies it because he has condemned it, or shrinks from confessing it, because he knozes himself to be unzeorthy of and alien to it.'
7. $\stackrel{\uparrow}{\omega} \nu$ oú $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Cf. Plin. EPp. x
$96^{\text {' }}$ quorum nihil posse cogi dicuntur qui sunt re uera Christiani.'
9. $\dot{\alpha} \pi a \chi \theta \hat{\eta} v a \iota]$ Lat. duci, as in Pliny l.c. Cf. Acts xii 19.
11. Tis $\dot{\eta} a i \tau i a$; $\tau 0 \hat{v}]$ 'Toû stands for rivos ( रápiv). C'f. Tryph. 20, $^{2}$ то仑̂ $\mu \grave{\eta}$ ג́кои́бє $\sigma \theta \epsilon$;
15. $\epsilon \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \beta \epsilon i \hat{\imath} \kappa \tau \lambda$.] The omission of Verus' name seems strange. See Introd. p. li.
16. $\langle\epsilon \rho \hat{q} \sigma v \gamma \kappa \lambda \dot{\eta} \tau \omega]$ Сf. і і.

тоьои́т $\omega \nu$ à $\pi \eta \lambda \lambda a ́ \chi \theta a \iota ~ \gamma \iota \nu \dot{\omega} \sigma \kappa \omega \nu \kappa а i ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \pi а т є ́ \rho а ~ к а \grave{~}$
 $\tau \rho i \tau о \varsigma ~ є ่ \pi \epsilon \lambda \theta \grave{\omega} \nu \kappa о \lambda a \sigma \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota \pi \rho о \sigma \epsilon \tau \iota \mu \eta{ }^{\prime} \theta \eta$.

## 

$3 \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \lambda \theta \dot{\omega} \nu$ Eus $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \lambda \theta \dot{\omega} \nu \mathrm{A}$

3. к. $\pi \rho о \sigma \epsilon \tau \iota \mu \dot{\eta} \theta \eta]$ 'was also sentenced to be punished.'

3 (4). You may ask 'why doyou not all commit suicide and so go at once to heaven? The answer is that to commit suicide is to shirk our duty to man and is therefore contrary to God's zuill; and we do not deny our Christianity, when accused, because to do so would be untrue, and because we wish to free you from your prejudices asainst Christianity.

In the text the order of chapters as it stands in the mss has been preserved. In most editions (e.g. Maran, Otto, Braun, Krüger) c. viii has been taken out of its place and put after c. ii, and this chapter appears therefore as c. iv. The reasons for this transposition are twofold; (1) Euseb. H. E. iv 17 , after quoting the second chapter of this Apology, adds тoútocs ó'Iovatîvos єіко́т $\quad$ к каi $\dot{\alpha} \kappa о \lambda о и ́ \theta \omega s$ às $\pi \rho о є \mu \nu \eta$ $\mu 0 \nu \in u ́ \sigma a \mu \in \nu$ (in $H$. E. iv 16) aủtoû


 Eusebius is so inaccurate in his quotations that such words can scarcely entitle us to neglect the MS order; nor need $\dot{\alpha} к о \lambda o u ́ \theta \omega s$ mean 'immediately following,' though certainly that is the more natural meaning to assign to it. (2) It is said that the transposition gives a better consecutiveness of ideas, that c. viii interferes with the sequence of cc. vii and ix. This argument, even if true, is hardly convincing in the case of a thinker so inconsecutive as Justin. But it may even he doubted whether the argument is true. (a) Chapter iii certainly seems to follow c. ii very
naturally; the heathen opponent wishes the Christians would all do like the $\tau \rho i \tau o s$ just mentioned, and $\pi$ opév$\epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$ in c. iv § i picks up the idea in $\pi о \rho \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ c. iii § 19. (b) Chapter viii follows very naturally on c. vii. In c. vii Justin shows how the demons have caused attacks upon philosophers. In c. viii he adds that he himself (a philosopher) expects the same fate $\dot{v} \pi o ́ ~ \tau i \nu o s ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\omega} \nu o \mu \alpha \sigma \mu \notin \nu \omega \nu$ (i.e. one of the demons' servants).

If c. viii followed on c. ii it would not be very clear who were referred to in $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\omega} \nu o \mu a \sigma \mu \epsilon \in \nu \omega \nu$. We should have to hark back to c. i and find the reference there. (c) In c. ix Justin takes up the idea that eternal fire is a vain threat. This perhaps would follow better on c. vii than c. viii would. But it is to be noted that in c. ix he is definitely turning to a new objection in the words
 a sort of parenthesis, Justin taking the opportunity for a hit at Crescens and for a personal explanation.

It seems therefore that the reasons for the transposition are scarcely strong enough to justify so entire a desertion of the ms order. There is no possible explanation of the way in which the chapters could have been altered to the order in which they now stand in the MSS, except the improbable theory of sheer error. The transposition would never have been suggested but for Eusebius' words. And his statement is not decisive enough, nor is his authority sufficiently strong, to entitle us to make the change.
4. $\pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \epsilon s$ ô̂ $\nu$ ] All editors quote Tert. ad Scap. 5 'Arrius




















$$
8 \text { тô̂ } \mu \grave{~ P e r i o n ~ S y l b u r g ~ \tau o ̂ ̂ ~ к а i ~ A ~}
$$

Antoninus in Asia cum persequeretur instanter, omnes illius ciuitatis Christiani ante tribunalia eius se manu facta obtulerunt. Tum ille, paucis duci iussis, reliquis ait $\dot{\omega} \delta \epsilon \iota \lambda o l, \epsilon i \quad \theta \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \tau \epsilon \dot{a} \pi о \theta \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu, \kappa \rho \eta \mu$ עoùs $\hat{\eta}$ ßpóxous ' Є̇ $\chi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$.' To court martyrdom in fanatical zeal, or presumption, or morbid ambition, was not unknown in the days of Christian persecution, and is censured by many Church fathers.
6. $\pi \rho \circ \notin \phi \eta \mu \in \nu$ ] Cf. i 10, I. Some eclitors suspect $\pi \rho o \neq \phi \eta \mu \epsilon \nu$ here to be a gloss, and certainly it might easily have been inserted. But no one would have suspected it except on a priori grounds.
ib. $\alpha \pi a \rho \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \kappa \in \sigma \theta \alpha \iota]$ The middle is used by classical writers in the sense of 'to be displeased'; but this
may be passive.
7. $\epsilon i$ oûv $\kappa \tau \lambda$.]. Justin's view of suicide is that it is a shirking of the responsibility belonging to a member of corporate humanity, and as such contrary to the will of God.
15. $\pi \rho \rho \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \psi \epsilon \omega s]$ 'prejudice.'

4 (5). You ask why God allows us to be persecuted. The answer is that God intrusted the government of the world to angels; these by unnatural union with reomen produced the demons who enslaved mankind. Poets and mythologists ignorantly ascribe this result to their God and the sons and brothers of their God.
16. $\dot{\eta}$ èvvola aür $\eta$ ] This was a common argument against Christianity. Maran quotes Clem. Strom. iv II § 80 סıà $\tau i ́$ $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ oú $\beta o \eta \theta \epsilon i ̂ \sigma \theta \epsilon$ $\delta \iota \omega \kappa \dot{\partial} \mu \in \nu \circ \iota ; ~ ф а \sigma \ell$.


 $\kappa \grave{\omega} \varsigma \tau \eta ̀ \nu \quad \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ a ̀ \nu \theta \rho \omega ́ \pi \omega \nu ~ \kappa \alpha i ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ \dot{v} \pi o ̀ ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ o u ́ p a \nu o ̀ \nu . ~$
 3. oi $\delta^{\prime}$ ä $\gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda o \iota, \pi a \rho a \beta a ́ \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma ~ \tau \eta ं \nu \delta \epsilon \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \tau a ́ \xi \iota \nu, \gamma v \nu a \iota \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu$













[^33]1. Tà oúpávia $\sigma \tau o \backslash \chi \in i ̂ a]$ 'The celestial elements' i.e. the sun, moon, and stars (object of коб $\mu \eta \sigma \alpha s$ ). They are called $\tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau о \chi \in i a$ in Tryph. 23, Ep. ad Diogn. 7, Theoph. ad Autol. i 4.
2. $\left.\dot{\omega} \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \epsilon \tau_{\text {. }}\right]$ Cf. i I $3,2$.
3. oi $\delta^{\prime}$ ä $\gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda 0 \iota$ ] Cf. Gen. vi $1-4$, a piece of ' unassimilated mythology' (Delitzsch) intended to explain a legendary race of giants. The oldest interpretation treated the phrase there used, 'the sons of God,' as referring to semi-divine beings. (So the LXX and the book of Enoch vi 2 ; cf. Jude 6.) The Targums supposed it to denote the young men of the upper classes, who married maidens of the lower classes. Many Christian expositors have taken it to mean a union be-
tween sons of Seth and daughters of Cain. See Driver Genesis ad loc. Justin's theory reappears in many Church fathers (the list is given in Turmel Hist. de la théologie positive c. 9) but is rejected by Origen and others. Cf. also Joseph. Ant. i 3 .
ib. $\gamma^{\nu \nu a \iota \kappa \omega ิ \nu ~ \mu i \xi \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu] ~ C f . ~ i ~ 5, ~} 2$
 But here he speaks of the fathers of the $\delta$ aímoves.
II. $\epsilon \nu \delta \epsilon \epsilon i ̂ s ~ \gamma \epsilon \gamma \delta \nu$.$] i.e. the de-$ mons. Thirlb. quotes Porphyry de Abstin. ii p. $20+$ to a similar effect.


4. $\pi$. кal $\mu \nu \theta$.] Cf. above i 23, 54.
 ipsum Deum (i.e. Zeus) ac in eos qui




5 5 (6). I. " $О \nu о \mu a$ ठє̀ $\tau \hat{\iota} \pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu \pi a \tau \rho i ̀ ~ \theta \epsilon \tau o ́ \nu, ~ a ̉ \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \eta ́-$




 6 ővo $\mu \alpha ́ \tau \iota$ Otto ob $\nu o ́ \mu a \tau \iota A$
tum ipsius satu geniti, tum ex eius fratribus Neptuno et Plutone corumque filiis procreati ferebantuer, ea transtulere' (Maran). 'A $\delta \epsilon \lambda \phi \hat{\omega} \nu$ and $\tau \epsilon \kappa \nu \omega \nu$ are parallel to av่ $\tau \hat{v}$, governed by $\dot{a} \pi \dot{\sigma}$, but the whole sentence is decidedly clumsy.
5. $\quad$ vó $\mu a \tau \iota \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Cf. i 5, 2, where it is said that the 'demons' (the word is probably used in the wider sense, including fallen angels as well as their offspring) call themselves by name.

5 (6). God has no name, but only a title. The Son has no name before the Incamation, but only the title Christ, as agent in Creation; at the Incarnation He is named Jesus, which means Saviour; and His power is still to be seen in miraculous cures.
 same idea is found in P'lat. Tim. 28 c .
ib. $\theta \epsilon \tau \delta \nu$ ] explained by $\tau \delta \nu \theta \epsilon$ $\mu \epsilon \nu 0 \nu$ below.

Io. $\dot{o}$. vids кт入.] For a discussion of this passage see Introd. p. xxiv. 'But His Son, who is alone properly called Son, the Word who is with God and is (not $\gamma \in \nu \nu \eta \theta \epsilon i s$ ) begrotten before the Creation, when in the beginning God created and set in order everything through Him, is called Christ...the name Christ also containing an incomprehensible
meaning, just as the title "God" is not a name, but the opinion, innate in human nature, of an inexpressible reality.' Cf. Col. i i 5 ff. and John i I - 3. Justin takes the title Christ as referring not merely to the Messianic office, but to the office of agent in Creation. The words кard $\tau \delta \kappa \in \chi \rho i \sigma \theta a \iota \kappa \tau \lambda$. are translated by Otto 'quia unctus est et per eum deus omnia ornanit.' But the construction of the Greek, so rendered, is very awkward; and the sense is not good; Christ's being anointed has nothing obvious to do with His part in Creation. It is possible that Grabe and others are right in making $\kappa \in \chi \rho \hat{\imath} \sigma \theta a \iota$ here active in meaning (like $\pi \epsilon \pi o \imath \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota$ and other words), though I know of no parallel use of this word. There is a close connexion between $\chi \rho i \epsilon t \nu$ and коб$\mu \epsilon i ̂ v . ~ K o \sigma \mu \epsilon i ̂ v ~ c l e a r l y ~ b e a r s, ~ a l o n g ~$ with the thought of order, the notion of adornment ; and for the use of xplect in this sense cf. Theoph. ad Autol. i 12, a passage which also suggests that etymological exactness is not to be expected in such cases. And this use of $\kappa \in \chi \rho \hat{\sigma} \theta \theta a \iota$ is the more possible, because the active form кє $\chi \rho \iota \kappa$ évai would be a clumsy word. If this theory be rejected, Scaliger's emendation or something like it seems very possible.

кирíws viós，ó 入ójos $\pi \rho o ̀ ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ \pi о \iota \eta \mu a ́ t \omega \nu ~ к а i ~ \sigma v \nu \grave{\omega \nu} \kappa а i$
 є́ко́ $\sigma \mu \eta \epsilon$ ， $\mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma \tau o ̀ s ~ \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ \kappa а \tau a ̀ ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \kappa \epsilon \chi р i ̂ \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \kappa а і ̀ ~ к о \sigma \mu \eta ̂ \sigma a \iota ~$ тà тávтa $\delta i$ aủtov̂ тòv $\theta \epsilon o ̀ \nu ~ \lambda є ́ \gamma є є \tau a \iota, ~ o ้ \nu о \mu a ~ к а i ̀ ~ a u ̉ \tau o ̀ ~$


 $\kappa а i ~ a ̀ \nu \theta \rho \omega ́ т т о v ~ к а i ~ \sigma \omega \tau \eta ̂ \rho о s ~ o ै \nu о \mu а ~ к а i ~ \sigma \eta \mu а \sigma i ́ a \nu ~ є ́ \chi є є . ~$







 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ a้ $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu$ є́ $\pi о \rho \kappa \iota \sigma \tau \hat{\nu}$ каі є่ $\pi a \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ каі фар－

 Saípovas．
 Perion Otto катади́бєє A \｜｜ 12 каì $\nu \hat{\nu} \nu \mathrm{A}$ ús каl $\nu \hat{\nu} \nu$ Otto

7．＇Invoûs］Cf．i 33，7，Matt．i 21．Possibly also there is a play upon the resemblance between＇I $\boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma$ ouvs and iáopal，such as is found in Clem． Paedag．iii 12 § 98，Eus．Dem．Eur． iv io § 19，Cyr．Jer．Catech．x 4 and I 3 （Otto）．
9．ìs $\pi \rho 0 \epsilon \in \phi \eta \mu \in \nu$ ］Cf．i 23， 2 ； $63,10,16$.
12．каi עûv кт入．］Cf．Tryph． 85.
18．iáбavтo кт入．］This phe－ nomenon of the expulsion of demons by Christian exorcism is frequently referred to by the Church fathers． （See Tryph．30，49，76， 85 and Otto＇s note at the last－mentioned passage，as well as here．Otto also refers to Tert．$A p .{ }^{2} 3,27,32,37$ ，

Iren．c．Haer．ii 32， 4 ff．，Cypr．ad Demetr．15，Orig．Cels．i 46，67， August．de Ciu．Dei xxii 8．）It seems antecedently probable that the power of exorcism，if it ever existed in apostolic times，con－ tinued for some time in the Church； and the consensus of patristic opinion is general．But it is not denied that the fact of exorcism can be explained scientifically．

6 （7）．It is for the Christians＇ sake that God delays the end of the world；which however will happen， though not by necessity，as the Stoics assert；nor is human conduct fated， but men have free－will and responsi－ bility．The Stoic ethic allows for
















this, but their metaphysic does away either with God or with the distinction between virtue and vice.

1. $\delta \theta \theta \epsilon \nu$ ] A vague term, poin ting back to the beginning of $+(5)$ $\epsilon l$ $\delta \epsilon \quad \tau \iota \nu a$, and subsequently explained in $\delta \iota \dot{\alpha} \tau o ̀ \sigma \pi . \tau$. X. For the idea cf. i 28 and 45 .
2. ठ $\gamma \iota \nu \dot{\omega} \sigma \kappa \neq \iota$ кт入.] an ambiguous phrase. It might mean ' which He (God) knows is the reason in nature' i.e. 'is the reason why nature is not destroyed'; but this explanation of Otto's seems feeble. Duncker (quoted by Veil) explains it 'which Me recogrnizes as the cause in nature,' i.c. as the efficient cause of all true life. This is not convincing; and possibly a better explanation is to be found in taking y८ш $\dot{\sigma} \kappa \in \iota$ (by comparison with i 28 and 4.5) to include the iden of $\pi \rho о \gamma \iota \nu \omega \dot{\sigma} \kappa \epsilon \iota$. The object of $\gamma \iota \nu \dot{\omega}-$ $\sigma \kappa \in \iota$ will then be not $\partial \circ \tau \iota$ but directly $\delta=\tau \delta \delta \pi t \rho \mu \alpha \tau$. X $\rho$. The verb would be used in the same kind of sense
as in I Cor. viii 3; Gal. iv 9; Matt. vii 23 ; God 'knows' the seed of the Christians $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \phi \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon$, which might mean 'in the race' or 'in its place in nature.' Because of the place which it occupies in history or in nature, God delays the end. After this ö́c might be taken as $=$ 'because' or as secondary object to $\gamma \iota \nu \omega ́ \sigma \kappa є \iota$.
3. таиิтa $\begin{gathered}\text { ti } \iota ~ \kappa \tau \lambda .] ~ ' t o ~ d o ~ a n d ~\end{gathered}$ be impelled to these things.'
4. катє $\lambda \theta \delta \nu$ ] Probably based on Gen. xix 24.
5. N $\hat{\omega} \epsilon$ ] Identified with Deucalion by Philo (de Praem. et Poen. p. 4I2, Mangey), Theophilus (ad Autol. ii 30) and others.
6. oüt $\omega$ ] 'in the manner just described,' including God's will.
7. oi इ̇тшїко!] Cf. i. 20.
ib. ката̀ $\tau \delta \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$.] 'by a law of the permutation of all thingrs into one another.'
8. катор 0 oû $\nu$ ] a favourite word with the Stoics.


















 $\mu \dot{\nu} \nu$ Thirlb $\tau \delta \delta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \mathrm{A}$
9. इఉкрátク C ]. i 5,46 .
 Assyria, celebrated for his effeminacy, who at last burnt himself with his treasures.
10. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ ö $\left.\tau \iota \kappa \tau \lambda.\right]$ The theory of free-will alone justifies the punishment of the wicked. Cf. i 28.
11. каi סúvaulv] The кai 'also' is curiously out of its place.
12. $\left.{ }_{\epsilon} \dot{\prime} \nu \hat{\omega} \pi \epsilon \rho \dot{\eta} \dot{\eta} \theta \hat{\omega} \nu \lambda \delta \gamma \omega\right]$ The Stoic ethic is inconsistent with the Fatalism of the Stoic metaphysic.
13. $\dot{d} \rho \chi \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \alpha i \dot{\alpha} \sigma$.] i.e. that $\sigma \dot{\omega}$ $\mu a \tau a$ are the d $\rho \chi \alpha i$ of everything, by necessity, and that there are no such things as $\dot{a} \sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau a$. Ashton cites Plut. Plac. Phil. i 28 and II ; Laert. 7, 149 and 134; Orig. Cels. p. 325; Eus. Praep. Eu. 15,14 and 15 .
14. єن̉ooov̂̀] 'to be right.' In classical Greek the passive is more usual in this sense.
ib. $\epsilon i \not \tau \epsilon \quad \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Maran supposes the apodosis to begin at $\ddot{\eta}$ $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\delta} \nu$ eival $\theta \in \dot{\partial} \nu$, and inserts кai before $\phi \theta a \rho \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$. ' If human actions are due to fate, either there is no God except transitory matter, and so the Stoics only acknowledge corruptible things and involve God with evil, or there is no virtue and vice.' This makes good sense, but it not only requires the insertion of kai, but also treats єi'te as if it were simply $\epsilon$ i. It would indeed be in some cases possible to understand the alternative to $\epsilon$ 'T $\tau-\cdots$ or (if they deny this, understood).' But it would be harsh to do this when there are alternatives expressed, as








7 (8). I. Kaì $\tau o v ̀ s ~ a ̀ \pi o ̀ ~ \tau \omega ̀ ~ \Sigma \tau \omega і ̈ к \omega ̀ \nu ~ \delta e ̀ ~ \delta o \gamma \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu, ~$

 $\sigma \pi \epsilon ́ \rho \mu a$ тov̂ $\lambda o ́ y o v, \mu \epsilon \mu \iota \sigma \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ \pi \epsilon \phi о \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \sigma \theta a \iota$ oì $\delta a \mu \epsilon \nu$.


here. According to the existing text, the apodosis begins at $\phi \theta a \rho \tau \omega \bar{\nu}$ ' whether they will say that human actions are due to fate, or whether they say that God is nothing but transitory matter, the Stoics will either be found to acknowledge only corruptible things and to teach that God, etc.' On Maran's interpretation à $\nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \kappa \eta$ or $\phi \dot{\eta} \sigma$ ova must be understood with $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\delta} \nu \nu$ є $i v a \iota ~ \theta \epsilon \partial \nu$ and $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\text { è } \nu \text { elval кakià; on the other }}$ interpretation we must understand
 $\tau \partial \nu \theta \epsilon \dot{\partial} \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$. and with $\mu \eta \delta \bar{t} \nu \in \tau \bar{\nu} a \iota$ какià. The similar passage in i 43 , 6 should be compared.
7 (8). The nobility of the Stoic ethic, which is due to the Logos, caused the persecution of men like Heraclitus and Musonius, at the enstigation of the demons; and the persecution of Christians is a piece of the same policy. But the day of punishment zvill come.
9. к $\hat{\nu} \nu]$ See note p. 17 line 4: -because they were honourable, at any rate in their ethical teaching.'
II. $\sigma \pi t \rho \mu a$ rồ $\lambda$ brou] See $1 n$ trod. p. xxii.
ib. $\pi \in \phi \quad \nu \in \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a l]$ Justin is in error. Heraclitus (ob. circ. 470 B.c.)
was not a Stoic, but a predecessor of Zeno, the founder of the Stoic school ; there is, however, a relation of thought between them. He was banished from Ephesus on political grounds, not executed. Musonius Rufus, a Stoic, was banished by Nero in A.D. 65 (Tac. Ann. xv 71 ), but returned after his death (Tac. Hist. iii 81), and apparently lived to be known to Pliny (Ep, iii 11). $\Pi \epsilon \phi о \nu \in \hat{\sigma} \sigma \theta a \iota$ is therefore an exaggeration so far as these two men are concerned. But it is scarcely necessary to emend the text to $\pi \in \phi v \gamma a \delta \epsilon \hat{v} \sigma \theta a$, as suggested by Veil.
12. is $\pi \rho \circ \notin \phi \eta \mu \nu \nu$ ] Cf. i 46 , though there is there but the vaguest of hints that Heraclitus suffered for
 $\mu i \sigma \theta \eta \sigma a \nu(\$ 3)$ and $\phi \quad \nu \epsilon i \bar{i} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha}$

 § 3). The words $\dot{\omega} \boldsymbol{s} \pi \rho o \neq \phi \eta \mu \in \nu$ here have therefore been suspected of being a gloss; but the case is hardly strong enough to justify their excision.
 6 (7) among many other passages.




















 $\pi а \mu \pi o ́ v \eta \rho o ́ s ~ \epsilon ̇ \sigma т \iota ~ к а i ̀ ~ i \delta \iota \omega \tau \omega ิ \nu ~ \pi о \lambda \grave{v} \chi \epsilon i \rho \omega \nu$, оî фидáт-

 Eus || $17 \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\eta} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{a}$ A $\pi \epsilon \rho i{ }_{\omega} \nu$ Eus $\| 20 \tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha \pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \omega \nu$ A $\tau 0 \hat{\tau} \tau o \pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \omega \nu$ Eus
8. $\epsilon i \gamma \dot{a} \rho$ ú $\pi \grave{o} \kappa \tau \lambda$.] i.e. in cures of demoniacs. Cf. ii 5 (6), 6.

8 (3). I am expecting similar persecution, perluaps from Crescens, whom I have already confuted and am ready to confute again publicly before you.
14. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \dot{\omega} \nu o \mu \alpha \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \omega \nu]$ i.e. one of those whom the demons instigate.
${ }^{15}$. $\left.\xi \dot{u} \lambda \omega\right]$ Unless there is something in the context to determine otherwise, $\xi$. seems always to $=$
neruus, 'stocks' of various kinds; Le Blant Les Persécuteurs p. 282 ; Allard Dix Leçons sur le Martyre p. 243 .
16. Kрiбкєעтоs] Tatian Or. 19 also has a very bad opinion of Crescens, who was a leading Cynic in Justin's time. See Introd. p. x.

2 I. кататрє $\chi \in \epsilon$ ] 'inveighsagainst,' 'runs us down.'
32. i $i \iota \omega \tau \hat{\omega} \nu]$ 'inexperienced peo$p l e, '$ as contrasted with experts.


















 $\mu a \theta \epsilon i ̂ \nu$ A $\mu a \theta \epsilon i ̂ \nu$ Eus $\| \frac{13}{} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \in \rho \omega \nu$ Eus om A \｜$\ddot{\eta} \epsilon i$ каì A $\hat{\eta}$
 Eus

2．$\hat{\eta} \quad \epsilon i \quad \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau v \chi \grave{\omega} \nu \quad \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］Otto holds that катат $\rho \dot{\epsilon} \chi \in \iota \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ is here understood，and，that therefore $\mu \dot{\eta}$ $\sigma \nu \nu \hat{\eta} \kappa \epsilon \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．is an apodosis．This is possible，but the sentence seems to run stiffly．It is perhaps better to take $\sigma u \nu \hat{\eta} \kappa \epsilon$ with $\epsilon i$ ，and make $\pi 0 \lambda \dot{v} \mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda \frac{\nu}{\nu} \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．the only apodosis． In that case the apodosis only refers directly to the second alternative ； but that is no serious objection to this method of taking the sentence．

3．$\mu \in \gamma a \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath} \circ \mathrm{D}]$＇magnitude，ma－ jesty．＇
ib．totoûtos］i．e．a Christian．
4．iठıんтькर今s］＇popular，＇＇vul－ gar．＇

6．$\epsilon \rho \omega \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \epsilon s]$ In later times a tract called Quaestiones et Kespon－ siones was attributed to Justin．
 infinitives depend on eiסéval，and go with $\mu \epsilon$ ．
ib．$\mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \quad \notin \pi[\sigma \tau \alpha \tau a t]$ Cf．note p．39，line 13.

10．$\left.\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \iota \kappa \delta \nu \delta^{\prime}\right]$ Cf．i．14， 4.
14．juoíws इ̀шкрátєı］＇as So－ crates did dare＇i． 5 ．

15．$\dot{\omega} \pi \rho \circ \epsilon^{\prime} \phi \eta \nu$ ］in the beginning of the chapter．
ib．фi人ódoğos］Cf．i 57.
 admirable saying of Socrates．＇Cf． Plat．R＇cp． 595 C ．
 єi̇ס́v̀aı $\pi \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu$ à̉ıaфорías.













 aủrà aủvoîs Sylburg Kriiger qà aủtà aủrw A Otto

1. á $\delta \iota \dot{\text { á }}$ opov] ' indifferent.' The Cynic philosophy considered the summzum bonzum to be ádıáфopov, i.e. not to be absolute, but to be merely relative to circumstances.
2. Some so-called philosophers call our threats of punishment degrading terrors. But if there is no punishment, there is no God who cares for men, and no right or wrong, and the punishments of human law are uniujst. It may be urged that laws differ in various places; but this is due to the demons, and right reason by itself speaks decisively about right and wrong in general.
3. $\delta \iota \dot{\alpha}$ $\phi \dot{\beta} \beta \circ \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$.] A common accusation, made even nowadays, that Christians are good from mere fear of hell, a charge not entirely unjustified by some popular theology and homiletics. Justin does not go deeply into the matter, but simply reasserts the truth of punishment.
4. $\dot{\omega} s \pi \rho \circ \notin \phi \eta \mu \epsilon \nu]$ Cf. i 28, 4, ii $6(7), 5$.
5. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ ' є́ $\pi \epsilon i \kappa \tau \lambda$.] 'But since lazogivers are not unjust (in inflicting punishments), nor their father (i.e. God), who teaches by reason (or by the Logos) the same conduct as they require, those who agree with them are not unjust either,' i.e. the Christians are not unjust in proclaiming eternal punishment. So Veil explains the sense. The other explanation, which Otto gives, is 'those who listen to them are not unjust'; but this seems very weak. Otto's text must be translated 'who teaches even by reason that they ought to act like Him' (cf. Matt. v 48 ). For Justin's use of $\sigma u \nu \tau$. cf. Tryph. 123, 130 and elsewhere.
6. $\dot{o}$ aút $\hat{\omega} \nu$ тarinp] Maran quotes Philo de Sacrif. Abel 152 $\nu о \mu о \theta \epsilon \in \tau \eta s$ रà $\rho$ каi $\pi \eta \gamma \grave{\eta} \nu \delta \mu \omega \nu$ aủrós, ن́ $\phi^{\prime}$ ô̂ $\pi a ́ v \tau \epsilon s$ oi катà $\mu \notin \rho o s ~ \nu о \mu о \theta \in ́ \tau \tau a \iota$.
7. $\epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \dot{a} \nu \delta \dot{\epsilon} \tau i s \kappa \tau \lambda$.] This is the argument from the variations of the moral code. Cf. Plat. de Legg. ii 661 D.
$\beta a ̉ \lambda \eta \tau a \iota, \lambda \in ́ \gamma \omega \nu$ öть $\pi a \rho$ ’ oîs $\mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ a ̉ \nu \theta \rho \omega ́ \pi т о \iota s ~ \tau a ́ \delta \epsilon \kappa а \lambda a ́, \tau a ̀$

 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ € is тoûto $\lambda \epsilon \gamma о \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$ ．4．каì עó $\mu$ avs $\delta \iota a \tau a ́ \xi a \sigma \theta a \iota$ 5 т $\hat{\eta}$ éaut $\hat{\nu} \nu \kappa \kappa \kappa i ́ a ~ o ́ \mu o i ́ o u s ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~ \pi o \nu \eta p o u ̀ s ~ a ̉ \gamma \gamma є ́ \lambda o u s ~ є ̇ \pi \iota \sigma \tau \alpha ́-~$
 ob $\theta$ òs $\lambda o ́ \gamma o s ~ \pi a \rho є \lambda \theta \grave{\omega} \nu$ out $\pi a ́ \sigma a s ~ \delta o ́ \xi a s ~ o u ̉ \delta e ̀ ~ \pi a ́ \nu \tau a ~ \delta o ́ \gamma-~$





10．I．Мєүа入єוótєрa $\mu \epsilon ̀ \nu$ oûv $\pi a ́ \sigma \eta s ~ a ̉ \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \epsilon i ́ o v ~$



## 

7．óp日̀̀s $\lambda$ bros］Mara under－ stands this to refer to the Incarnate Logos．It seems a possible inference from the use of the word $\pi x \rho \in \lambda \theta \omega \nu$ ， but it is not unavoidable．It may be a mere appeal to the moral reason of mankind．＇When the truth（incarnate or not）comes to men（undisturbed by the demons）．＇

10．Our teaching surpasses all other，because in Christ the zuhole Logos became incarnate，which had previously been known only fragmen－ tavily；and those who then used it were punished．But they persuaded none to die for their belief；Christ persuades not only philosophers，but all classes of men，to do so．

13．ठıă тoû т̀े $\lambda о \gamma \iota \kappa \partial \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］Otto translates＇quid torus logos exstitit Christus，quip proper nos apparuit， nempe corpus et logos at anima，＇i．e． ＇because Christ runs，etc．＇The notion then is that the Incarnate Christ was the whole Logos．If，however， $\gamma \in \gamma \quad \nu$ ever be taken to mean＇became， or＇was made，＇the rendering of Dormer（Person of Christ Per．i

Ep． 2 § I）and Veil must be right ； ＇because the whole of the rational principle（of the universe）became the Christ who appeared for our sakes，body，logos，and soul．＇Otto＇s omission of an article with the in－ finitive $\gamma \in \gamma \sigma \nu \in \nu a \epsilon$ is surely wrong． Dià tout to must be read．Donner （loo．cit．）discusses the question whether Justin conceived of Christ as having a human soul．Since $\psi v x \eta$ means＇the animal principle，＇ it would seem as if $\lambda$ drop meant the Divine Logos in place of a human $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{\nu} \mu a$ ．But it is a mistake thus to read back the subject－matter of later controversy into Justin＇s words． $\Sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a, \lambda o f o s, \psi \cup \chi \dot{\eta}$ ，are the three departments in which the $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \alpha \nu \theta \rho \dot{\omega}-$ $\pi \eta \sigma$ os took place．The division is in the main a dichotomy；the words are not all three in the ascending scale．In the invisible half Justin begins with＇reason，＇the rational soul，and then adds the animal soul． All that he means is that $\tau 6$ 入oyıкoे became wholly man．

каì 入óyov каi $\psi u \chi \eta$ vt
 $\xi а \nu \tau о ~ к а i ~ \epsilon \hat{u} \rho o \nu$ oi $\phi \iota \lambda о \sigma о \phi \dot{\eta} \sigma a \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma ~ \hat{\eta} \nu о \mu о \theta \epsilon \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$,



















 $\omega ้ \nu, \kappa a i ~ \delta \iota a ̀ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho \circ \phi \eta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho о \epsilon \iota \pi \grave{\omega} \nu \tau a ̀ \mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \lambda o \nu \tau a$, five $\tau-$



3. $\pi 0 \nu \eta \theta \in \nu \tau \alpha]$ 'elaborated.'
9. єu่тоע $\omega$ т $\epsilon \rho$ os] 'more firm, forcible.'
10. ̇̇ขєк $\lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \eta$ ] 'was accused.' Cf. Plat. Apol. 24 B, and see above i 5 . 12. oj סè $\kappa \tau \lambda$.$] ' But he, by eject-$ ing Homer and other poets from his ideal state (cf. Plat. Rep. Bks ii and x , taught men to renounce the evil demons, who had done the deeds of which the poets spoke, and urged them to know the God, whom they
did not know, by rational inquiry.' Cf. note p. 8, line ir.
16. тô̂áa $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{2}$.] Acts xvii 23 .
17. $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu \delta e ̀ ~ \pi a \tau \epsilon ́ p a \kappa \tau \lambda$.] A verbally incorrect quotation from Plat. Tim. 28 c .
22. $\lambda$ ob jos $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \hat{\eta} \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$.$] ' For \mathrm{He}$ was and is the Logos, who is in everybody, and who foretold the future by the prophets and in person when He became, etc.' The last clause каi $\delta \iota^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon}$. is not regularly logical.



 5 катабкєขŋ'.















$4 \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \epsilon i o u$ edd $\dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi i o v$ A || 5 катабкєчй Thalem $\tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \epsilon u ́ \eta$ A || $10 \xi \epsilon \nu 0 \phi \dot{\nu} \nu \tau \epsilon \iota \circ$ Thirlb $\xi \in \nu 0 \phi \dot{\prime} \tau \epsilon \iota \circ \nu \mathrm{~A}$
3. $\epsilon \pi \epsilon เ \delta \grave{\eta} \kappa \tau \lambda$.$] 'Since it (namely,$ the doctrine of Christ, implied in $\delta \iota \delta \dot{\alpha} \xi a \nu \tau o s ~ r a \hat{v} \tau a)$ is the power of the ineffable Father, and not an artifice of human reason.' See above 14, 5; 60, 11. Cf. Ep. ad Diogn. 7 raûra à $\nu \theta \rho \omega \dot{\pi}$ ou oủ ठокєî $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ ép $\rho \gamma a$, таûta סóvaцis $̇ \sigma \tau \iota ~ \theta \epsilon o \hat{v . ~ C f . ~ a l s o ~}$ 1 Cor. i 18 ; Rom. i 16 . Another rendering is 'since Ile was the power, etc.,' but in this case the word ката$\sigma \kappa \in \cup \eta$ would be unsuitable.
11. Death is the debt of nature, and we do not mind paying the delt. But we are like all who folloze virlue, in that we despise pleasure and have
no fear of death.
8. кai $\theta a \nu \epsilon i ้]$ Cf. note, $\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{I} 6$, line I. Otto suggests that кат $\theta a-$ $\nu \in i ̂ \nu$ may be the right reading.
10. জєעоф由́vтєiov] Cf. Xen. Mem. ii 1 .

Ir. áфpaivovias] A poetic word, used later as a philosophic term.
15. '̇ $\rho \omega \tau 0 \pi \epsilon \pi о \iota \eta \mu \epsilon ้ \nu \omega \quad \kappa \tau \lambda$.] I know of no other instance of this word. Its formation is very curious. - Ad amorem eliciendum apto et florescente ex illis omamentis uultu.' (Otto.)
16. $\theta \epsilon \lambda \kappa \tau \iota \kappa \grave{\eta} \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$.] 'immediately seductive to the eyes.'


 6. каі̀ $\pi a ́ \nu \theta^{\prime}$ óvтıvov̂v $\pi \epsilon \pi \epsilon i \sigma \mu \epsilon \theta a$, фєúyovтa тà סокои̂ขта







$8 \mu \mu \mu$. $\dot{\alpha} \phi \theta \dot{\alpha} \rho \tau \omega \nu$ Maran Geez Otto $\mu \mu \mu$. $\phi \theta a \rho \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ A Sack Par Moll io


I. $\tau \hat{\eta} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \rho \beta \circ \lambda \hat{\eta}]$ 'vesture.'
2. $\tau \hat{\omega} \hat{\rho} \dot{\epsilon}$ on $\tau \iota$ ] 'transitory.'
+-ai- $\pi \dot{d} \nu \theta$ ' $\dot{\text { ont. }}$.] 'And we are persuaded that everyone, who flees what is superficially fair and follows what is thought hard and foolish, finds happiness awaiting him (eúdau$\mu o v i a v$ is the subject of $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \delta \dot{\epsilon} \chi$.). For Vice, veiling her actions in the beauties which properly belong to Virtue and are genuine (though only by imitation of incorruptible things, for she possesses and can produce nothing which is incorruptible) enslaves grovelling men, clothing Virtue in the ugliness which properly belongs to herself, The idea is that Vice offers all the attractions which properly belong to Virtue, and deceives men into seeing Virtue clad in all the unattractiveness which properly belongs to Vice. But her assumed attractions are a mere copy of the true attractions of Virtue, and are impermanent. Justin's thought may be influenced by passages like Plat. Rep. ii 361 and ix 591, where the question of the benefits of Virtue, apart from rewards, is considered. Veil retains $\mu c \mu \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \omega s \phi \theta a \rho \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$, supposing Justin
to distinguish between the corruptible and the incorruptible attractions of Virtue (e.g. practical advantages on the one hand and spiritual blessing on the other) ; Vice assumes the former but not the latter. This is possible, but seems somewhat too subtle. And could it be said that Vice veiled herself with $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ ob $\nu \tau \omega \mathrm{c}$ by $\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ кала́, if she merely assumed corruptible attractions? The point surely is, that Vice makes a show of giving all the blessings, which Virtue really can give, but that her attractions are delusive and transitory, whilst those of Virtue are permanent.
II. oi $\delta \epsilon ̀ ~ \nu \epsilon \nu о \eta к о ́ т \epsilon s ~ к \tau \lambda] ~ ' B u t$. they who perceive the true beauties that belong to Virtue are also incorruptible through her help.' Perhaps, however, it is simpler to make $\tau \hat{\omega}$ óvть the direct dat. after $\pi \rho o \sigma$ дитa. We are now a long way from $\tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \rho$. $\tau \hat{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \tau \hat{\eta}$, and another $\tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \rho$. has occurred meanwhile. It would also suit the argument, 'Those who have caught the beauties belonging to true existence become themselves incormptible by means of virtue.'




 є $\lambda$ коита.
12. I. Kaì yà $\rho$ aù $\tau o ̀ s ~ \epsilon ̇ \gamma \omega ́, ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ \Pi \lambda a ́ \tau \omega \nu o s ~ \chi a i ́ \rho \omega \nu ~$













 $15 \gamma \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} a v \tau \grave{\partial} \nu \mathrm{~A} \dot{\epsilon} a u \tau \delta \nu$ Eus li I 6 кат $\eta \dot{\gamma} \gamma \epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon$ Eus катท่ $\gamma \gamma \epsilon \iota \lambda \epsilon \mathrm{A}$
2. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \pi \delta$ т $\tau \hat{u} \dot{\alpha} \theta \lambda o v]$ 'athletes,' as types of men who choose labour, without caring for death, and renounce pleasure. The Greek phrase is a curious one. It looks as if $\alpha 0 \lambda$ ou must be used in the sense of 'arena,' from $\dot{\alpha} \theta \lambda$ os, not $\dot{\alpha} \theta \lambda o \nu$.
ib. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega ́ \pi \omega \nu \quad \kappa \tau \lambda$.] i.c. heroes, like Hercules, not those demigods of another character, referred to in i 2 I .
5. $\lambda о \gamma \iota \sigma \mu \grave{\nu} \nu$ Є̀ $\lambda \kappa$.] 'arguing from the fact, elc.'; groing with $\pi$ áv $\alpha a$ vouv $\in \chi \hat{\eta}$.
12. Even when $I$ zas a Platonist, I used to disbelieve the popular charges against Christians, because their lives and their readiness for
death seemed inconsistent with those accusations. But, if Christians did the acts alleged against them, they might call them mysteries of Cronos or Jupiter, and show that their conduct was only like to what is done openly by pagans.
12. $\dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi i \nu \omega \nu \quad \sigma \alpha \rho \kappa \omega ิ \nu \quad \beta о \rho \alpha ̀ \nu]$ Cf. i 26, 7.

I3. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ au่тô̂ $\dot{\alpha} \gamma$.] Cf. Luke xvi 25.
15. ои่ $\chi$ ठ̈ть $\gamma \epsilon$ ] 'nedum.' The Christian does this when he confesses himself to be a Christian.
16. そुठך каі тои̂то] тои̂то refers to what follows. $\Delta \iota \alpha \in \tau \iota \nu \omega \nu \pi o \nu \eta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\dot{\alpha} \nu 0 \rho \omega \omega^{\prime} \pi \omega$ refers probably to the anti-Christian agitators, like Cres-
 $\pi \rho a \chi \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a l$. 4. фovev́ovtes yà aủtoí tıvas èmì ovкo-










cent. Aúroi must refer to the $\pi o \nu \eta$ pol all $\nu \theta \rho \omega \pi o l$, though grammatically it should refer to the $\delta a i \mu o \nu \epsilon s$. Veil suspects the whole passage $\eta \delta \delta \eta$
 a later writer, who was influenced by a reminiscence of the Epist. Vienne. et Lugd. (ap. Bus. H.E. v I), where it is said $\sigma v \nu \epsilon \lambda \alpha \mu \beta a \operatorname{vo\nu } \tau o$
 $\tau \epsilon \in \rho \omega \nu, \ldots$ oi.. no $\beta \eta \theta \in \in \nu \tau \epsilon s$ тàs $\beta a \sigma a ́ \nu o u s$
 каi Oíıллобєious $\mu i \xi \epsilon \iota s$. Veil's reasons for suspicion are partly that $\hat{a}$ aúroi $\phi a \nu \in \rho \hat{\omega} s$ $\pi \rho a \dot{a} \tau \tau 0 \cup \sigma \iota \nu$ is impossibly rude, being an insult to the rulers, to whom the Apology is addressed; but I see no reason for thinking that the rulers are meant by aúzoi; and partly that Athenagoras (Leg. 25) definitely says $\delta 0 \hat{u} \lambda o i \in i \sigma \iota \nu \dot{\eta} \mu i ̂ \nu \ldots$..ours
 оủס ais ка $\theta^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ тà т $\tau \lambda \iota \kappa \alpha u ̂ \tau a ~ o u ̉ \delta \grave{~}$ $\kappa а \tau \epsilon \psi \epsilon \dot{\sigma} \sigma a \tau$. The contradiction with Athenagoras seems strange; there is nothing to show (as Ashton suggests) that Athenagoras is referring only to Christian slaves, whilst Justin is speaking of Gentile slaves (whom the Epistle quoted above definitely specifies). But Athenagoras may quite well have been ignorant of facts which were known
to Justin ; or he may be exaggrating his case. The case for treating the passage as a gloss is really frivolous; and if a gloss is to be discovered, it should be carried down to $\pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \xi \in \omega \nu$; for, if it be cut short at $\pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau o v \sigma \iota \nu$, it is not easy to see what $\dot{\omega} \nu$ oú $\delta \dot{\text { ct }} \nu$ refers to ; prosumably it would have to be to $\phi i \lambda \eta^{\prime}-$ סovos кт $\lambda$.
II. K $\rho$ óvou $\mu v \sigma \tau \eta ́ \rho \iota a]$ The avidance for human sacrifice in the cult of Crones is strong; for that reason he was later identified with Moloch. The Latin Saturnues corresponds to the Greek Cronos. For the authorities cf. Farnell Greek Cults vol. i c. 3.
12. $\tau \dot{a}$ il $\sigma \sigma$ ] governed by $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i \nu$. This is a reference to the worship of Jupiter Latiaris ; many Christian writers allude to the practice of human sacrifice as existing in this cult, e.g. Tent. Apo! 9, but Wissowa (Religion der Römer p. IO9 n. 3) is emphatically sceptical on the point. It is not mentioned by any heathen writer, except Porphyry (de Abstin.
 $\kappa a \tau \grave{a} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \mu \epsilon \gamma a \dot{\lambda} \eta \nu \quad \pi b \lambda \iota \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \tau 0 \hat{v}$
 ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi 0 \nu$;















 5. $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \dot{\theta} \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon, \sigma \omega \phi \rho о \nu і ́ \sigma \theta \eta \tau \epsilon$.


## 

 $\epsilon l$ ठदे Kai $\nu \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \tau s \hat{\eta}_{\nu} \mathrm{A}$3. $\left.\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \ldots \dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \partial{ }_{\delta}\right]$ i.e. consul or prefect.
 fighters with wild beasts, as we learn from Tert. Apol. 9 .
4. $\theta \in \dot{\varrho} \nu \ldots \delta i \kappa$. oíd.] Cf. I Pet. ii 23 .
5. є $\ell \theta \in \kappa \kappa a l \nu \hat{\nu} \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$.] The text here is uncertain. The use of ${ }_{\alpha} \nu$ in a wish is not normal, and possibly $\epsilon \ell \theta \epsilon \tilde{\eta}^{\nu} \dot{\alpha} \nu a \beta o \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \nu$ would be better. Veil prefers a suggestion of Buecheler, who reads $\epsilon i \delta \epsilon \ldots \hat{\eta}_{\nu}$ (according to the MS) and $\hat{\alpha} \nu \quad(\beta \sigma \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu$, translating 'but if there were one (some $\epsilon \pi \dot{\delta} \pi \tau \eta$ s $\delta i \kappa a \omega o s$ ), he zoould, elc.,' thus making the sentence a covert appeal to the rulers. But this expansion of tis seems harsh, and possibly Otto's text is open to least objection. Otto compares

Plat. Clitoph. 407 A, where Socrates is represented $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho ~ \epsilon \pi i \quad \mu \eta \chi \alpha \nu \hat{\eta} s$ $\tau \rho a \gamma \iota \hat{\eta} s$ $\theta \epsilon 6 s$, exclaiming $\pi$ ô̂ $\phi \hat{\epsilon}$ -


15. $\left.\pi \epsilon \rho \rho \beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \frac{\nu}{}{ }^{2} \epsilon s\right]$ Cf. above ii 11,7 .
16. Toúrous $\dot{\omega}^{\circ} \mathrm{l}$ ] 'to these, who have no part in them.' Certainly, as Veil suggests, ois $\tau o u ́ \tau \omega \nu$ would be more natural.
13. Ithink scom of the demons' falsehoods about ues. I declare that in Christianity all past truth is summed up. Previous thinkers had only a seed of the Logros; we have in Christ the zuhole Logos.
18. $\mu a 0 \dot{\omega} \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$.$] " perceiving that$ discredit had been cast by the demons over the Divine doctrines of Christianity, in order to avert other men
$\dot{a} \pi \sigma \sigma \tau \rho \circ \phi \grave{\eta} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ä $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu \dot{a} \nu \theta \rho \omega ́ \pi \omega \nu \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau \epsilon \theta \epsilon \iota \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o \nu$ v́mò $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\phi a u ́ \lambda \omega \nu \delta a \iota \mu o ́ \nu \omega \nu$ тоîs Xpıбтıav$\omega \nu$ Өєíoıs $\delta \iota \delta a ́ \gamma \mu a \sigma \iota$, каi


 $\lambda о \gamma \omega \hat{\omega}$, ои̉ $\chi$ öт८ ả $\lambda \lambda о ́ т \rho \iota a ́ ~ \epsilon ̇ \sigma \tau \iota ~ \tau a ̀ ~ П \lambda a ́ \tau \omega \nu o s ~ \delta \iota \delta a ́ \gamma \mu a \tau a ~ \tau о \hat{~}$

 3. є̈кабтоs уáp тıs àmò $\mu \epsilon ́ \rho o v s ~ \tau 七 \hat{v} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \mu a \tau \iota \kappa о \hat{v}$ Өєíou


 4. ő $\sigma a$ ov̂v $\pi a \rho a ̀ ~ \pi a ̂ \sigma \iota ~ \kappa а \lambda \hat{\omega} s ~ \epsilon i ้ \rho \eta \tau a \iota, ~ \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mathrm{X} \rho \iota \sigma-$

 $\kappa a \grave{~} \delta \iota ’ \grave{\eta} \mu \hat{a} \varsigma \stackrel{a}{a} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi$ оऽ $\gamma \in ́ \gamma o \nu \epsilon \nu$, ő $\pi \omega \varsigma \kappa \alpha \grave{\iota} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi a \theta \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$

$3 \psi \in \nu \delta o \lambda o \gamma o v \mu \notin \nu \omega \nu$ Otto $\psi \in v \delta o \lambda o \gamma o u ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o \nu \mathrm{~A} \|$ I | éauroîs Otto aủroîs $\mathrm{A} \\|$ |
| :---: | ä $\pi$ o $\pi \tau 0 \nu$ edd $\ddot{a} \pi \omega \pi \tau o \nu \mathrm{~A}$

from them.' For $\pi \epsilon \rho(\beta \lambda \eta \mu a$ cf. ii II, 7.
3. $\psi \in \nu \delta o \lambda o \gamma o v \mu \notin \nu \omega \nu]$ governed by катє $\epsilon \epsilon \lambda a \sigma a$.
4. Xpıбт८ajòs ктл.] EüXomaı may mean 'boast' or 'declare' as in i ${ }_{15}, 6$, and this suits the sense well. But here, being joined by the double $\kappa a i$ with $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \omega \nu \iota \zeta \zeta_{0} \mu \in \nu 0$ s, it may be more naturally taken to mean 'pray.' For the sentiment cf. Phil. iii 9 f. Ign. Eph. r iva $\delta \nu \nu \eta \theta \hat{\omega} \mu a \theta \eta \tau \eta \eta^{\prime}$ єival with Lightfoot's note.
 not altogether the same,' i.e. as Christ's teaching.
9. ėкабтоs $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \tau \tau s \kappa \tau \lambda$.] 'for each, by having a share in the Divine Logos, spoke well, whenever he saw what was congruous to it.' Or could $\tau \delta \quad \sigma v \gamma \gamma \in \nu$ 's shere mean 'homogeneous' (as in Aristotle), as contrasted with what follows? For the idea cf. ii 8 and ro. Note that
grammatically $\dot{a} \pi \delta \mu$. belongs to ض̀ $\omega \bar{\nu}$.
10. Tảvavtía é.] Cf. i 44, Io; ii 10,3 .
II. äтолтov] probably means 'hidden.'
13. ö $\sigma a$ oîv $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] A fine claim of the summing up of all things in Clurist. Cf. I Cor. iii 21 f. Aubé (S. Justin p. 100) points out that Seneca makessimilar claims; 'Quidquid hene dictum est ab ullo, meum est' (Epist. ad Lucil. xvi sub fin.) ; 'quod uerum est, meum est' (Epist. xii). But Seneca only claims all discovered truth as his heritage. The Christian claim is that all truth is actually his possession, as being the revelation of the Logos, and so that all truth is Christian truth.
15. $\mu \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha}$ rò $\nu \theta \epsilon \dot{o} \nu]$ The Logos is second in liturgical precedence. See Introd. p. xxii.




 $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \tau о ⿱ \sigma i ́ a ~ к а і ̈ ~ \mu i ́ \mu \eta \sigma \iota \varsigma ~ \gamma i \nu е \tau а \iota . ~$


 $10 \kappa a i ̀ a ̀ \gamma \nu o i ́ a s ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa a \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{a} \pi a \lambda \lambda a \gamma \eta ̂ \nu a \iota$ ，oil $\pi a \rho a ̀ ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \dot{~} a v \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ aitià ímevi日uvò tais tu $\mu \omega$ píaıs gívovtaı［ais тò $\gamma \nu \omega$－
 $\tau \hat{\eta} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ à $\nu \theta \rho \omega ́ \pi \omega \nu$ єîvaı тò $\gamma \nu \omega \rho \iota \sigma \tau \iota \kappa o ̀ \nu ~ \kappa a \lambda o \hat{v} \kappa a i ̀ ~ a i ̈ \sigma \chi \rho o v, ~$,


II $\epsilon i s \tau . \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \theta \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota \tau$ ．ar．$\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha$ A $\| 12 \delta \iota \dot{\alpha} \tau \grave{\partial} \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \phi \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ Prion $\delta \iota \grave{~ \epsilon ̇ \nu}$ $\tau \hat{\jmath} \phi \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ A｜｜ $13 \quad \gamma \nu \omega \rho \iota \sigma \tau \iota \kappa o ̀ \nu$ Sylb Otto $\gamma \nu \omega \rho \iota \sigma \tau \partial \nu \mathrm{A}$

2．$\delta \iota \grave{a} \tau \eta ̂ s ~ \epsilon ̇ \nu o u ́ \sigma \eta s ~ к \tau \lambda] ~ D o e s$. $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \phi$ ．belong to $\lambda$ of ${ }^{\prime}{ }^{\circ}$ or to $\sigma \pi$ opals？ A comparison with James i 21 might favour the former view，and it may be correct，though above ii 8 ，i we

 this passage the addition of $\epsilon \nu$ over $\eta$ s somewhat alters the turn of the phrase．

3．$\dot{\alpha} \mu \nu \delta \rho \hat{\omega} s$ ］＇dimly．＇
4．Є゙тєроу $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］explaining $\dot{\alpha} \mu \nu \delta \rho \omega \bar{s}$ ．＇It is one thing to have the seed of a thing and to be enabled to imitate it according to one＇s capacity；the thing itself，so partaken in and imitated by virtue of its oren favour，is quite another．＇＇The prin－ ciple is stated in general terms；but of course the point is that there is a difference between the $\sigma \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \mu a$ of the Logos and the Logos itself，i．e． Christ sums up all the truth of past times．

14．We ask you to publish this address，that others may know our
doctrines and be saved from the punishment，to which their persecu－ ton of us makes them liable．

7．v́moरpáభavtas］A libellus was presented to the rulers，who， if they wished，placed a comment at the end and had it published， cf．i 29，3．See e．g．the libelli from the Decian persecution．

10．$\pi \alpha \rho \grave{a} ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ є́aut $\hat{\nu} \nu$ aitiav］ ＇through their own fault．＇Cf． Tryph． 88.

II．$\epsilon$ is $\tau \dot{\partial} \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \theta \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］These words are intolerably tautologous．

12．$\delta i \dot{\alpha} \tau \grave{\partial} \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．］The reasons why the persecutors are liable to punishment（from God）are：（I） There is in man a capacity for recognizing right and wrong；（2） They condemn men on mere sur－ picion without knowledge ；（3） They worship gods who commit and permit，nay demand（data－ rover）the immoralities which are charged against Christians．










 ar $\lambda \lambda a ̀ ~ \pi a ́ \sigma \eta s ~ \mu e ̀ \nu ~ \phi \iota \lambda o \sigma o \phi i ́ a s ~ a ̀ \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \epsilon i ́ o v ~ v i \pi \epsilon ́ \rho \tau \epsilon \rho a \cdot ~ \epsilon i ̉ ~ \delta e ̀ ~$





 брхŋбтєкоîs A
3. ís є̇к $\tau \circ \hat{u} \kappa \tau \lambda$.] Since Christians are punished on suspicion of doing deeds which the heathen themselves commit, the heathen are condemning themselves.
15. We pray that our apology, may become known ; for our teaching is better than any human philosophy, or, at least, than the poems which you allow anyone to read.
6. каi той $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] These words are obviously out of place, and must be a marginal note which has strayed into the text. Their proper place seems to be in ii 13 , after $\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi a \rho \dot{a}$ т. $\pi . \delta 6 \xi \eta s$. Cf. Tryph. 120.
8. $\pi \rho \circ \gamma \rho a \dot{\psi} \eta \tau \epsilon]$ either 'to publish,' in the sense that the emperors put it forth officially; or else 'to proscribe.' The latter fits the context, which contrasts the $j \mu \epsilon i s$ with the $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon i \bar{s}$.
ib. $\pi 0 \iota \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \alpha \iota \epsilon \subset \nu$ ] without ${ }_{\alpha} \nu \nu$ must be a wish, which would be very strange in this place. Otto transbates (without inserting ${ }^{\prime} \nu \nu$ ) ' nos ut in omnium notitiam uniat curdbimue,' which is a paraphrase, scarcely justified by the ms reading.
13. $\sigma \omega \tau a \delta \epsilon$ lo cs] Sotades of Maronea was the author of obscene verses.
ib. $\phi \iota \lambda a \iota \nu \iota \delta \epsilon$ io ts] Philaenis of Leucatlia was the authoress of a poem $\pi \epsilon \rho i \dot{\alpha} \phi \rho о \delta \iota \sigma i \omega \nu$.
ib. $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \in \sigma \tau \rho a \tau \epsilon$ lo cs] Archestratus of Gela wrote a gastronomic poem called 'H $\delta u \pi \dot{\alpha} \theta \epsilon \iota a$. Some prefer to retain here the MS $\delta \rho \chi \eta \sigma \tau \iota \kappa o i s$ as referring to ballets, and $\gamma \in \nu o \mu \epsilon \in \nu o s s$, meaning 'acted.' But evidently a proper name was wanted.
14. $\epsilon \pi \iota \kappa o u p \epsilon i o \iota s]$ the teachings. of Epicurus.
$\lambda є \gamma о \mu \epsilon ́ \nu о \iota s ~ к а і ~ \gamma є \gamma р а \mu \mu є ́ \nu о \iota я, ~ \sigma v \gamma к є \chi$ $р \eta т а \iota . ~ 4 . ~ к а і ̀ ~$





I. $\lambda \in \gamma^{\prime} \mu$ évocs] It is, of course, only by a kind of zeugma that this can go with è viva ${ }^{\text {adv et }}$ 'to read.'
2. $\delta \sigma \sigma \nu \dot{\epsilon} \phi{ }^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \mu$.] Cf. i $55,8$.
3. roùs $\pi \alpha \dot{\nu} \nu \tau \eta \pi$. ar.] Cf. r Tim. ii 4 .
4. $\dot{a} \xi(\omega s) \kappa \tau \lambda$.$] refers back to$ the epithets of the dedication i r.
5. غ่avt $\hat{\nu}$ ] This is in accordance with Justin's general idea, that the rulers' own case, ie. the case of their own salvation, is in question. Cf. i 8, r, Pert. ad Scape. r 'Hunc libellum non nobs timentes misimus, sed uobis et omnibus inimicis nostris.'

## APPENDIX I.

The following letters appear in the mSS after i 68. But there is every reason to doubt their authenticity. The first appears in Eus. H.E. iv 13 in a very different version, as written by Marcus Aurelius. It cannot have been extant in Justin's time, though it may have been added to the Apology before the time of Eusebius. It is needless to discuss whether it proceeds from Pius or Aurelius, as it is almost certainly a forgery. It is not referred to by Melito in Eus. H. E. iv 26 (though he enumerates the rescripts of Hadrian and Pius on the subject of the Christians), and it is quite an unsuitable and unconvincing composition. The view which it takes of the gods is wholly frivolous and unbecoming to Pius or Aurelius, its laudation of the Christians as innocent models of religious fidelity and zeal, and the facts suggested in $\mu \eta \delta \grave{\tau} \nu$ óx $\lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$., are unhistorical and untrue.

The second letter cannot have been inserted by Justin, who was long dead, since it refers to events that must have taken place about A.D. 174. It is an obvious forgery. Eus. H.E. v 5 only knows of its existence from Tertullian ${ }^{1}$. The Greek is barbarous, and the circumstances a palpable absurdity. The fact referred to seems to be the deliverance of the Roman army in Hungary, during the campaign against the Quadi, by a sudden shower, as pictured in a sculpture on the column of Aurelius. This was attributed by the heathen to the gods of Rome, to an Egyptian sorcerer, or to the Emperor's own prayers. The Christian legend of the Legio Fulminata is a mere fiction. The name was an old one, being known in Augustus' time, and, though the event related in the legend

[^34]was said to have diverted Aurelius from his purposes of cruelty towards the Christians, the Gallic persecution of A.D. 177 is a proof that such a supposition was equally fictitious ${ }^{1}$.

The text of the subjoined epistles is that of Otto.
'A $\nu \tau \omega \nu i v o v ~ ' E \pi \iota \sigma \tau о \lambda \grave{\eta} \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o ̀ ~ к о \iota \nu o ̀ v ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s ~ ' A \sigma i a s . ~$









 $\vec{\alpha} \xi \iota o v ิ \tau \epsilon \pi \rho \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu$ av̉тov́s. $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{~} \delta \grave{\epsilon} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \sigma \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \omega \bar{\nu} \gamma \epsilon \gamma \sigma \nu o ́ \tau \omega \nu$ каì










I. кoıv $\delta \nu$ ] The common council of Asia, which supervised the provincial affairs and the cult of Caesar.
3. $\delta \eta \mu \alpha \rho \chi \iota \kappa \hat{\eta} s$ є̇ $\xi$. тд ка́, ข̋л. $\tau \delta \delta^{\prime}, \pi$. $\left.\pi a \tau \rho i \delta o s\right]$ Mommsen (=A.D. ${ }^{158)} . \quad \delta \eta \mu$. $\epsilon \xi . \quad \cup ̈ \pi a \tau o s ~ \pi \delta^{\prime}$, $\pi a \tau$. $\pi \alpha \tau \rho(\delta o s ~ \tau o ̀ ~ к а ́ ~ A . ~ . ~$
5. ठ̈т九... $\left.{ }^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota\right]$ A similar anacoluthon in Tryph. 45 is pointed
out by Otto.
ib. tou's roloúrous] i.e. the Christians.
14. $\pi \alpha \rho a \beta a ́ \lambda \lambda o \nu \tau \alpha s]$ edd. $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha-$ $\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ ovetes A .
20. $\mu \eta \delta \grave{\epsilon} \nu$ ob $\chi \lambda \epsilon \hat{\iota} \nu]$ See Hadrian's rescript at the end of i 68 . The provisions of that rescript are not at all as here stated.
${ }^{1}$ See the discussion of the whole subject in Lightfoot Ignatius i 465 foll. (ed. i).






А










 тòv каì тò $\pi \lambda \eta \eta_{\eta}{ }_{o s} \tau o ̀ ~ \epsilon ́ \mu o ̀ v ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \theta o s ~ \tau \omega ̂ \nu ~ \beta \alpha \rho \beta \alpha ́ \rho \omega \nu ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~$






9. $\sigma к о \pi о \hat{u} \mu \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \theta \eta$ ] i.e. his plans against Marcomannia and Sarmatia.
 vantages as $I$ won out of the danger of being surrounded.'
11. ка $\mu \dot{\nu} \nu к а і ~ \pi \alpha \theta \dot{\omega} \nu$ ] Scalig. ка $\mu$. каі $\sigma \pi a \theta \omega \dot{\omega} \mathrm{~A}$ A.
ib. Kap ớvтч] Otto, котіעч A. Aurelius had his headquarters for three years at Carnuntum during the Marcomannic war.
12. $\delta \rho a \kappa 6 \nu \tau \omega \nu]$ Mythical, unless it refers figuratively to the enemy.

Or the idea may be of 7 legions, each with 10 standards with dragons thereon (Salmasius). Scaliger suggests $\delta$ рoú $\gamma \kappa \omega \nu$, drungus being a late Latin name for a barbarian cohort.
 Aurelius and his general in Rhaetia and Noricum.
16. $\gamma \in \mu i v a s, \phi \rho \epsilon \nu \tau \eta \sigma i a s$ Otto, $\gamma \epsilon \mu \nu \nu \alpha \phi \rho \epsilon \nu \tau \eta \sigma i \alpha$ A. $\quad \phi \rho \epsilon \nu \tau \eta \sigma^{\prime} \circ \nu=$ fretense.
25. $\partial \theta \theta \varepsilon \nu$ ả $\rho \bar{j} \dot{\mu} \mu \in \nu 0$ oc] As it stands, the sentence is evidently defective.


























 $\pi \alpha \rho^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$.

Perhaps the original verb is concealed in $\pi$ ара́ $\rho \tau \eta \sigma \iota \nu$, or $\epsilon \pi \sigma i \eta \sigma a \nu$ is lost after it.
8. ä $\mu a$ ò $\bar{\epsilon} \tau \hat{\omega}$ Toúrous] Ottò, ä $\mu a$ $\delta e ̀ t \hat{\varphi}$ тoútous A.
 סo $\mu \epsilon \nu$, or some such verb.
17. $\pi \rho \sigma \delta \partial \lambda$ о⿱ $\kappa \tau \lambda$.] 'become clear that he is accused for no other cause.'
 Dan. iii 29, vi 24 .
20. $\sigma v \nu a \sigma \phi a \lambda \iota \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \epsilon \nu \nu \nu]$ ' proving.'
22. $\dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\nu} \in \epsilon \in \theta \in \rho i a \nu]$ either 'loss of freedom' or 'dishonesty' (by abjuring his faith).
25. Bitpáolos] Brisson, Otto. Bqpáaos A. Vitrasius Pollio was prefect of the practorians from A.D. 172.
27. $\chi \rho \hat{\rho} \sigma \theta a \iota$ каi $\notin \chi \epsilon \iota \nu]$ sc. a copy of the decree.

## APPENDIX II.

HADRIAN'S RESCRIPT TO MINUCIUS FUNDANUS. (i 68.)
The genuineness of this rescript has been much disputed, e.g. by Baur, Keim, Aubé, Veil, Lipsius, Overbeck, by whom it is regarded as a Christian forgery of a later generation. On the other hand Neander, Wieseler, Funk, Renan, Mommsen, Lightfoot, Ramsay defend its authenticity without hesitation ; and it seems open to question whether the doubts about it are not due to a false view of the Roman government's relations to Christianity. The arguments may be summarized as follows:
( 1 ) It is maintained that the rescript is an anti-climax in its present position, and that the appeal to it is unworthy of Justin. But this seems over-fanciful. There is no unworthiness involved in quoting it, as Justin does, with the statement that the Christians might claim a fair trial as their legal right in accordance with it, but preferred to base their plea on considerations of abstract justice.
(2) It is pointed out that Tatian, Athenagoras, Minucius Felix, and Tertullian make no reference to it. But this argument is quite inconclusive. Neither Justin nor Athenagoras quotes Trajan's earlier and undoubtedly authentic rescript; and Melito (A.D. 172 ) mentions Hadrian's rescript (Eus. H. E. iv 26 ).
(3) It is said to be out of accord with Hadrian's character. But that is quite untrue. Hadrian was a thorough sceptic, and this rescript, as Ramsay says (Ch. in Rom. Emp. p. 324), 'was a sarcasm.' Trajan's principle, that the Name of Christianity is a crime, is neither asserted nor rescinded by him ; the State religion is left unaltered, but the practical application in the case of Christianity is left to the personal
bias of individual governors by the studied vagueness of the language, e.g. $\epsilon \iota ้ ~ \tau \iota s ~ \delta \epsilon i ́ k v v \sigma i ́ ~ \tau \iota ~ \pi \alpha \rho a ̀ ~ \tau o v ̀ s ~ v o ́ \mu o v s ~ \pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau o v \tau a s ~$ might be interpreted either to include the mere proof of being a Christian or to include only definite crimes.
(4) The heading is said to be informal. But, as Allard points out (Hist. des perséc. p. 249), Trajan's letters to Pliny are headed simply Traianus Plinio $S$.
(5) It is said that there was no need for a change of administration ; that Trajan's letter had fixed the procedure. But the situation was now changed. In Trajan's time the Christians were subject to anonymous denunciations ; now they are the objects of popular clamour ; and this rescript is an ordinance to protect public order.
(6) It is pointed out that the Latin text is more severe than the Greek, and it is argued that the Christians would not have weakened the Latin in a Greek translation; but that a Christian translator into Latin of a Christian forgery in Greek might colour the phrases. But the differences are after all very slight, and may be due to mere ignorance or carelessness. On the whole the rescript seems quite in the line of Roman State policy. Christianity was always a religio illicita, and so Pliny assumed it to be ; the Christians disturbed the public peace and denied the State religion, and as such could be put to death. But their numbers caused anxiety as to the expediency of a general persecution of Christianity. Trajan therefore prescribed mildness in the exercise of administrative power against them. Hadrian's rescript is on similar lines. But that in no way justifies a theory that this rescript was a forgery, imitated from Trajan's. And it is very dangerous to reject not only this quotation of Justin, but also Melito's and Eusebius' quite distinct and unequivocal statements, as due to forgery or ignorance. No doubt the rescript was originally. private, but it would soon have become known, like other official rescripts.

## INDEX I.

## SUBJECTS.

## A

Abraham, a Christian before Christ, 70, 12
Achilles, story of, 4I, 3
Acta of Pilate, see Pontius Pilate
Adonis, myth of, 40, 8
Agapé, possible allusion to, 100, 6
Amphilochus, oracle of, 30,5
Ananias, Azarias, and Misael, Christians before Christ, 70, 13
Angels, xxix sq.; 9, 13 ; III, 5 ; fall of, xxxi; ini, 6
Antinous, deification of, 47, 13
Antiope, myth of, 40 , 13
Antoninus Pius, adoption of, xlvii ; character of, xvii ; 2, 8; rescript of, 13 I
Aphrodite, $4^{0}, 8$
Apollo, 40, 6
A pologies, characteristics of Justin's, xi; date of, xlvii; editions of, liii; mss of, lii ; number of, xlix
Archestratus, 129, 13
Ariadne, myth of, 35,12
Arianism, possible, in Apologies, xxii; 52, 2
Asclepius, myth of, 35,$7 ; 38,3$; 40,$10 ; 82$, 10
Athena, birth of, 97,7
Aurelius, M., adoption of, xlvii; character of, xvii; 2, 8; letter of, I3I

## B

Baptism, Justin's account of, xxxvii; ${ }_{2} 3,6 ; 90,3$; fasting before, 90 , 10
Barcochba, ill-treatment of Christians by, 49, 17

Bellerophon, myth of, 35, II ; 82, I
Bethlehem, 54, II
Body, Resurrection of, 31, 2; 32,
3; 77, 2; see Eschatology
Briareus, Thetis and, 4I, I
Briseis, Achilles and, 4I, 3

## C

Canon, Justin's evidence to, xxxiii ; see Non-canonical books
Carnuntum, Aurelius at, I33, II
Christ, name of, 5,$8 ; 113,3$
Christians, popular charges against, 9, 8; 15, 5, 10; 44, 1; 73, 17; 117, 18; 124, 11 ; before Christ, 70 , 10
Church organization, Justin's evidence on, xxxvi
Crescens, x ; li; $\mathrm{II}_{7}$, r 6
Cronos, cult of, 125 , 11 ; myth of, 36, 9
Cross, symbolism of, 55,$4 ; 82,16$; 88, 12
Cynics, views of, 119 , I

## D

David, date of, 63,17
Demonology, Justin's, xxix and references
Deucalion identified with Noah, I I4, 10
Dionysus, myth of, 35, 8 ; 40, 6; 81, 5.
Dioscuri, 35, 10
Divorce, Justin's views on, 22, 15
Dodona, oracle at, 30, 6

## E

Elias, a Christian before Christ, 70, 13
Empedocles, eschatology of, 30, 7
Emperors, apotheosis of, 36, I; 84 , I
Epicurus, Justin's views on, xiii; 145, 3; 126, 6; 129, 14
Erebus, 88, I
Eschatology, Justin's, xxxii and references; causes of a delay of end of world, 46,5 ; 114 , 1; see Body, Resurrection of
Ethics, Justin's views on, xxxi ; 16, $3 ; 21,4 ; 22,19 ; 26,6 ; 44,8$; 59, 5
Eucharist, Justin's evidence on, xxxix ; 98, 2,15 ; 100, 10 ; wine or water in, xlii
Eusebius, evidence of, about Apologies, xlv
Exorcisms, Christian, II3, 18
Exposure of children, Justin's views on, 44, 8; 47, I

## F

Fasting before Baptism, 90, 10
Felix, Munatius, xlix ; 47, 7
Free-will, Justin's views on, xxxii ; 14,$13 ; 46,9 ; 64,8 ; 114,15$; and Divine foreknowledge, 63 , 14; 67 , 11

## G

Ganymede, 36 , 11 ; 40, 14
Gehenna, 33, 4
Gitta, Simon of; see Simon
God, Justin's doctrine of, xix sq. ; 9, 10; 11, 17; 13, 7; 14, 2; 20, 9; 21, 4; 34, 2; 112, 8
Gospels, 99, 6; Justin's quotations from, xxxv; knowledge of Fourth Gospel, xxi ; xxxv; 91, 1; use of, in Eucharistic service, 100, 11
Granianus, 102, 20

## H

Hadrian, character of, $\mathbf{1 3 5}$; rescript of, 102, 15; 135
Helena, Marcion and, 42, 6

Heraclitus, a Christian before Christ, 70,11 ; fate of, 116 , 12
Herakles, choice of, 122, [2; story of, 35,$9 ; 82,8$
Hermes, myth of, 35,$6 ; 37,5$
Herod, 49, 4 ; 61, I
Holy Ghost, Justin's doctrine of, xxvii and references
Homer, referred to, 30,8 ; 4 I , I
Hystaspes, eschatology of, 33, 7; forbidden to be read, 68,6

## I

Idolatry, Justin's views on, 12, 17
Incarnation, Justin's doctrine of, xxii; xxvi; 38, 12; 71, 2; 96, 6; 113, 9; 127, 16; Virgin-Birth, 37, 14; 51, 26; 52, 20

## J

Jerusalem, fate of, 7r, 21
Jesus, name of, 54,$2 ; 113,7$
Judah, 5I, 2
Junius Rusticus, ix
Jupiter Latiaris, cult of, 125,12
Justin, life of, ix; 124, 7; martyrdom of, ix; methods of quotation of, xxxv; 24, 1, 3; 26, 10, 13; 27, 9; 62, 23; origin of, ix; 1, 7; place in history of, xii sq.; style of, xi; Apologies; Demonology; doctrine of Angels, God, Holy Ghost, Incarnation, Logos; Eschatology; Ethics; evidence on Baptism, Canon, Church organization, Eucharist, Sunday; knowledge of Fourth Gospel, non-canonical books; possible Arianism in, Subordinationism in; possible belief in eternity of matter; relation to Plato; views on Free-will, see separate headings

## K

Koré, myth of, 96,18
L
Legio fulminata, 13 I
Logos, Justin's doctrine of, xx and references

Lot, 79, 19
Lucius, a Christian martyr, 108, 9

## M

Marcion, xlix; 43, 4; 86, 8
Marriage, Justin's views on, 47, 3; see Divorce
Matter, Justin's views on eternity of, xix; 14,$5 ; 87,16$
Menander the poet, 34,14
Menander the heretic, 42,$9 ; 84$, 14
Minos, 12, 7
Minucius Fundanus, 102, 17
Mithras, mysteries of, 99, 13
Moses, first of prophets, 50,$12 ; 67$, 3 ; 80, 19; 87, 8; and Brazen Serpent, 88, 6
Musonius, fate of, 116,12

## N

Noah, 114, 10
Non-canonical books, Justin's knowledge of, xxxiii ; 53, ri; 55, 18; 75, r; 9r, r

## O

Oracles, pagan, 30, r

## P

Paganism under Empire, 7, 8; 29, $9 ; 39,8 ; 40,9 ; 45,10$; analogies to Christianity, 34,$7 ; 35,3 ; 36$, 18; 8r, 7; 92, r9; 96, r7; 99, 13; II4, 10
Persephone, myth of, 40,8
Perseus, myth of, 35, 10; 37, 15 ; 82, 6
Philaenis, 129,13
Philo, Justin and, xxi
Philosophy, Christianity regarded as, xiv; 7, 4; 11, 4
Pius, see Antoninus
Plato, borrowings of, from Moses, 67,$3 ; 87,4 ; 88,3$; Justin's relation to, xiii, xix; quoted, 4 , 7 ; 12, 6; 30,$8 ; 34,8 ; 67,2$; 88,4 ; 118,17 ; $121,10,12,17$; teaching of, compared to Christ's, 127, 6
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Pontius Pilate, 20, 4; 6I, 2; 70, 5;
Acta of, 56, $5 ; 72$, 10
Prophecy, argument from, 48,8 ; methods of, 56,$13 ; 63$, II
Ptolemaeus, a Christian martyr, 107, 12
Ptolemy and the Septuagint, 48, 18
Pythagoras, 30, 8
Pytho, oracle of, 30,6
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Quirinius, 54, 17; 70, 3

## R

Reservation, xl
Resurrection of body, see Body Rhadamanthys, 12, 7
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## S

Sardanapalus, II5, 3
Satan, xxxi; 45, 18
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Semo Sancus, statue of, 42, 3
Septuagint, 49, 7
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Sibyl, eschatology of, 33, 7; forbidden to be read, 68, 7
Simon of Gitta, 41, II; 84, 14
Socrates, Justin's view of, 8, II; 30,8 ; 70, 11; 115, 2 ; 118, 14; 121, 9
Sodom and Gomorrah, 79, 16
Sotades, 129, 13
Spirit, Holy, see Holy Ghost
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Stoicism, Justin's views on, xiii; $3^{2}$, $7 ; 33,9$ 114, 13; 116, 8
Subordinationism, possible, in Justin, xxii ; 18, 2; 20, 6
Sunday, xxxix; ror, 13
T
Thetis, 41 , r
Tiberius Caesar, 20, 5
Trajan, 5, 5; 136

U
Urbicus, 1; 104, 12

V
Verissimus, name of Aurelius, xlviii
Virgin-Birth, see Incarnation Vitrasius Pollio, 134, 25

Worship, Christian, 13, 17; 19, 4, Iо

Xenophon, quoted, 122, 10
Z
Zeus, myth of, and Cronos, 36,9
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## INDEX III．

## GREEK WORDS．

ă $\beta$ v $\sigma \sigma 0$ S 87,$14 ; 89,17$
à үа入入ıáoual 60，17；62， 17
áramáw 24，3，4，6；127， 15
à $\gamma \quad$ apeúc $\quad 25,17$
à $\gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda_{\text {ıко́s } 77 \text { ，}}$
à $\gamma \gamma \epsilon$ خos 10,$1 ; 53$ ， $10 ; 54,4 ; 76$ ， 13 ； $95,2,15$ ；III，5，6，15； 112，3；114，3；115，7；120，5； （of Christ） 94,$15 ; 95,26$
$\dot{a} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \tau \iota \kappa$ bs 37,6
$\dot{a} \gamma \in \nu \nu \eta^{\prime}=118,4$
à $\gamma^{\epsilon} \nu \nu \eta \operatorname{tos} 21,4,7 ; 40,12 ; 73,15$ ； 78 ，16；112， 5 ；125，7；127， 14
à үіабна $6_{3}, 4$
 79,$12 ; 90,16 ; 98,5 ; 100,9$
à $\gamma \nu \omega \sigma$ тоs 113,$5 ; 121$ ， 16
à $\gamma \omega \nu \iota a ́ \omega$ 6， 4
à $\omega \nu$ l\}oual 20, $16 ; 21,2 ; 86,18$ ； 126，10；127， 5
$\dot{\alpha} \delta \in \lambda \phi$ ol（of the Christians） 97,15 ； 98， 3
ádıaфopia 119， 2
ádáфopos irg，I
ádád $\theta$ Oopos 29， 9
ả $\delta 0 \xi \notin \omega 74,5$
ácí̧wos 89， 16
à $\theta a \nu a \sigma i a ~ 67,5$
á $\theta$ é $\mu$ וтоs $13,{ }^{15}$
ateos 8,$1 ; 8,15 ; 9,8 ; 9,9 ; 15$ ， $5 ; 19,3 ; 45,7 ; 70,10 ; 86,17$ ； 117， 18
á $\theta \epsilon \delta \dot{\tau} \eta \mathrm{s} 7,8$
$\dot{a} \theta \lambda_{0 \nu}^{7,11 ; ~ 124,2}$
átolos 123,3
aipeois 44,6
aloөךणts 29，6；30，2；34，10；77， 5， 11
alt

aíúvios II，15；נ2， $10 ; 16,6,10$ 22， $14 ; 27,16 ; 28,16 ; 29,7$ ； 36，17；69，20；77，5；97，20； 105， 7 ；106，10；115， 9 ；117，7， II；I19， 5
áкатабкєи́aбтоs 87,$13 ; 97,3$
$\dot{\alpha} \kappa о \cup \sigma \tau \iota \kappa$＇s 78 ， 11
áкріт $\omega$ s 8,3 ； 15,10
áкроßибтía 79， 26
äкта 56，6；72，II
ä $\lambda \eta \pi$ тos 4,3
á入入arń 38， 13
à $\lambda \lambda a ́ \tau \tau \omega 13,5$
$\alpha^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$＇ु 61，13， 19
ả入入ク入офóvos 21 ， 10
$\alpha \lambda \lambda \eta \lambda 0 \phi \dot{\nu} \nu \tau \eta$ s 59,15
à $\lambda \lambda$ oє $\theta \nu \eta$＇s 79， 19
ả入入otó 116,2
$d \lambda \lambda \omega s 7,2$
ả入oyเซтaive 70， 1
ä入oरos $3,1,7 ; 8,2 ; 13,6 ; 17,10$ ， 12； 83,$7 ; 85,1$ 1； 86,$16 ; 104$ ， I3；108， 10 ； 118,5 ； 123,5 ； 126，I
д́ $\mu \alpha \rho \tau i a ~ 53, ~ 14 ; 54, ~ 6 ; 57,14 ; 66, ~$ 13；73，7；74，2，17，20，23；75， 18，22；76，4；91，6，11；92，6； 98， 18
$\dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \omega \lambda$ ós 22，20；23，13；24， 2 ； 25,$2 ; 39,8 ; 57,14 ; 61,12$ ， 21
＇$A \mu \eta^{\prime} \nu$ 98，8， 9 ；Ior， 4
ӑ $\mu$ орфоя 14,$5 ; 87,6$
$\alpha^{\alpha} \mu \nu \delta \rho \bar{\omega}$ s 128,3
à $\nu a \gamma \gamma \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \omega 60,12 ; 62,24 ; 74,8$ ， 10
ávarє ${ }^{2} \nu d \omega$ 90，13，14；91，1；92， 7
à $\nu a \gamma \in ́ \nu \nu \eta \sigma \iota s ~ 90, ~ 13 ; 98,18$
ávarpáфف 45,$13 ; 81,7 ; 88,6 ; 89$ ， $3 ; 95,7 ; 96,16$
àva $\delta \delta \omega \mu \mu$ 47，6；101，20；107， 7 ávaıpé $\omega$ I5，I5，I7；33，I；39，8； 49,$14 ; 72,12 ; 85,13 ; 86,6$

áva入a $\mu \beta \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$ 47，I
áva入oү\｛a 28， 16
àva入úw 34，I ；II6， 3
àvá入 $\omega \sigma$ เs 33,8
à á $\mu \nu \eta$ ъs 68，3；99， 10
àvaாย́ $\mu \pi \omega$ 98，5；IOI， 3
àvaाvoń 83，10
ávamo入ó $\gamma \eta$ тos 5,$3 ; 46$ ，I I
àvaбтрофウ́ 14,$7 ; 92,3$
ávaтiӨŋ $\mu \mathrm{I} 3, \mathrm{I}_{4} ; 2 \mathrm{I}, 7 ; 40,13 ; 73$ ， $16 ; 84,3 ; 90,4$
ávaтporí 44， 2
à aтpoфท́ 47， 3
 2；I18， 9 ；I26，I4
ảvaфú ${ }^{77,9} 9$
à $\nu \delta \rho \beta \beta a \tau \epsilon \in \omega$ I26， 5
à $\delta \rho \circ \phi 0 \nu \varepsilon ́ \omega$ 125，I I
$\dot{a} \nu \delta \rho \circ \phi$ óvos 47,$2 ; 108,12$
$\alpha \nu \delta \rho o ́ \omega, 49,22 ; 55,1$
$\dot{\alpha} \nu \in \gamma \in i \rho \omega 38,2 ; 42,1 ; 50,1,3 ; 59$ ，
1； 72,$5 ; 77,3 ; 82$ ，ІІ ；96， 17
ávéSŋข 44，3；47，6；114， 8
àvєкסıท＇$\gamma \eta$ TOS 75，II
àvé入єүктos II，9；127，I2
àขé入єvбıs $4 \mathrm{I}, 6$

àvє lкакоs 25，$^{1} 3$
$\alpha \nu \in \pi l \mu ⿺ \kappa \tau$ оs 9, II
ảข $ย \rho \chi \mu a \iota 35,2,8 ; 36,2 ; 50,4$ ；
64，1；71，2；75，5；81，8，12；
$82,3,5$ ；120，I 1
àvєтá\}ouaı I5, II
àvєú年vos 70， $5 ; 84,5$
àv $\theta \rho \omega \pi \alpha \rho \epsilon \sigma \kappa \in i a 2,14$
ä้єєนє 76， 6
a่ขı́ $\sigma т \eta \mu \iota ~ 3 ~ І, ~ 13 ; ~ 32,5 ; 35,2 ; 58, ~$ $20 ; 61,21 ; 64$, 1；68，17；71，2； 72,$9 ; 75,3 ; 96,9 ; 100,16$ ； 1OI， 17
ávoula 27，14；74，19；75，14，16； 76， 4
àvaip $\omega$ 26，I
à $\nu \tau \dot{\text { á } \lambda \lambda} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \mu$ 24， 18
ávтípaфоу IO2，I4，16
a่ $\nu \tau \iota \pi$ оьov̂ $\mu \alpha \iota$ II，I7
а่ขтıт $0 \eta \mu \iota 48$ ， 3
a่ขтıтvாє́ $\omega$ 12， 4
à $\nu \omega \nu \delta \mu a \sigma \operatorname{Tos} 94,5$
áぞє́paбтоs 118， 16
d $\xi \cos (\mathrm{w}$ ．dative） $\mathrm{I} 4,6$
$\dot{\alpha} \xi(\omega \sigma \iota$ เs 85,4 ；103， 10,15
ábpatos 87,$13 ; 97,3$

$\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\alpha} \gamma \omega \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{I} 3 ; 49,20 ; 86,19 ; 108$ ， 9， 20

àma日avatǐoual 35,$14 ; 36,14$
ãaөєía 1о5， 8
àmän＇s 14,$9 ; 40,12 ; 85,19 ; 87,2$
ȧாa入入áтт $\omega 16,12 ; 34,11 ; 45,15$ ；
66,$23 ; 86,6$ ；109，І；110，15； I28， 10
ȧтаvт́́ $\omega 68,2 ; 88,8$
àmapáßaros $6_{5},{ }^{12}$
ärapṫбк 1 Iо， 6
д̇тєраитоs 46,5
$\dot{\alpha} \pi \in \rho i \tau \mu \eta \tau o s \quad 79,25$
$\dot{\alpha \pi} \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{\omega} 3^{2}, 14 ; 46,13 ; 52,27 ; 76$ ， 21； 8 4，6；86，I

ätotos 12，12；31，3；52， 24
dँтоүраф＇ 54, I6

6，10；71，4，5；80，4；86，15；
95， 7
$\dot{a} \pi \dot{\sigma} \delta \epsilon \kappa т о 6_{4}, 14$
ג̇токали́лтш 74，10；94，13；95， 23
а̇токо́ттомає 45， 10
$\dot{\alpha} \pi \delta \kappa p \iota \sigma$ ıs 118,12


ảmo入úw II， 9


äтоттоs 127, II
ä $\pi \delta \sigma \tau 0 \lambda$ os（of Christ） 18,9 ；94， 15 ；
95，8， 26 ；（of the Apostles） $6_{4}, 2$ ；
69,$12 ; 73,13 ; 75,8 ; 78,21$ ；
91,$15 ; 99,7 ; 100,12 ; 101$, 19
а̇тобтрофウ́ 127,1
алтота́ббоцаи 73， 15
äтотє $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \epsilon \boldsymbol{\omega} \omega$ 93， 3
аітотротй 70，I
décotós 11，2；14，11；119， 7
а́puovia 77， 8


14
à $\rho \chi \eta \gamma$ ย́т $\eta$ s 45,$18 ; 49,17$

47,$2 ; 87,10 ; 113,1 ; 115,8$
$\dot{\alpha} \sigma \chi 0 \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega 96,15$
á $\sigma \dot{\prime} \mu a \operatorname{tos} 95,10 ; 96,4 ;$ II5， 18
ä $\sigma \omega T 0$ S $9^{2,} 12$
äт $\rho \in \pi$ тos 20， 9
a゙̛ちそうしs III，I
aủtє乡ov́alos II5， 7
aúтокра́т $\omega \rho \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{I} ; 35, \mathrm{I} 4 ; 8_{4}, 2$ ； 107，7；108， 15
аüто入є૬є 50,$13 ; 52,20 ; 87,7$

«фөapola 14，12；19，13；32，5； 60，6；64，4；77， 4
äфөaptos 14，9；60，5；123，8； 124，I
áф日opos 23， 7
$\dot{\alpha} \phi p a i \nu \omega$ 122，II
áфроขтьनтє́ف 28， 14
« $\psi v \chi$ OS 12,17
ßavavoovp ${ }^{\circ}$ s 83， 5
ßápßapol 9，2；11，4；70，12
$\beta a \sigma i \lambda \epsilon i a 15,9,14$ ；（of heaven）22， 13,$18 ; 25,7 ; 27,8 ; 91,2$
$\beta x \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon$＇́s（ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ oủpav $\omega \nu$ ）109， 2
$\beta \delta \epsilon \in \lambda v \gamma \mu a$ 57， 23
$\beta \iota \beta \backslash$ ใס८ov 47，6；107，6；128， 8
$\beta \iota \beta \lambda \iota \circ \theta \dot{\eta} \kappa \eta$ 49， 1
$\beta \lambda a \sigma \phi \eta \mu \epsilon \in \omega$ 49， 19
阝入абфŋмia 37， 7
$\beta 6 \theta \rho o s 30,9$
ßоúлєvда 14， 6
ß $\rho a \chi \cup \epsilon \pi \hat{\omega}$ s 73，20；119， 7
Bpuyuós 27， 14
$\beta \rho \hat{\omega} \sigma$ เs $24,14,16$
$\alpha \mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\eta}$ Iо6， 12
$\gamma \epsilon \in \nu \nu a 33,3,4$
$\gamma_{\text {Éveols }} 37,4 ; 92$ ，I
$\gamma \in \nu \in T \eta \eta^{38}, 1$
रєข $\quad$ тós 115,10
$\gamma \in \nu \nu$ á $\omega$（of Christ）20，3；37，14； 38， 11 ；49， 21 ；53， 18 ；54，9，
15；55，1；70，3；（of the Logos）
18，3；34，18；37，4；113， 2
रє́ $\downarrow \nu \eta \mu \alpha 34$ ， 17
$\gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \dot{\prime} \tau \omega \rho$ 20，10；36， 8
रグïvos 86，IO， 2 I
үしょผ́бк $\omega$ II4， 4
$\gamma^{\nu} \dot{\rho}$ ецоз 49，8；51，17；75， 2
रेшрьотєкós 128， 13
үра́ц $\mu \boldsymbol{\mu}$ 2， 11 ；84， 3
סaıцоvıá $\omega$ IO6，I


סal $\mu \omega \nu$ 8，2，5，9，11，13；9，5，6；
13，1；15， $5 ; 17,9 ; 20,14 ; 36$ ，
14；39， $1 ; 41,5,7,12 ; 43,7$ ；
46，І；6І，7；68，6，19；77，5；
8 о，7；8ı，5；84，8；85，9；86，
$9,17,18 ; 92,19 ; 93,9 ; 95,12$ ；
96，19；100，1；105，ІІ；1ıा，8，
16；II3，II， 20 ；II4， 3,6 ；II5，
1；117，3，6；121，12；122，7；
125，1；127， 2
бєเขótทs IO4， 8
$\delta \epsilon \iota \sigma \iota a l \mu \omega \nu$ 3，I
бєктıко́s 65,5 ； 1 I5，II
$\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi b \zeta \omega$ 22，1；68， 15
$\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi \delta \tau \eta$ s（ $\theta$ єós） 18,$9 ; 52,3 ; 56$ ，
$18 ; 61,8 ; 66,8 ; 70,21 ; 90,15$ ；
92，8；112， 8
$\delta \eta \lambda \omega \tau \iota \kappa$ b́s 5 I， 13


43,$6 ; 86,13 ; 95, \mathrm{I} 8$ ； $12 \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{I} 7$
סıaßєßaıô̂maı 3 I，IO
סıáßòos 46，I
$\delta ı a \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega \quad 6_{2}, 9$
$\delta \iota a ́ \gamma \omega 34,12$
$\delta<a \gamma \omega \gamma \dot{\eta}$ II， 17 ；I2， 3

סıádoбıs IOI， 4
סıaӨpúmтн 58， 4

$\delta \iota \alpha \kappa \rho i \nu \omega$ II4， 8
ठıaбaфє́ $\omega$ 53，4；63，14；80， 18
$\delta \iota a \sigma \pi a ́ \omega$ 58， 3
ס८a．
סєатіөךнє 13，2；95，13
бıaтрофи́ 19， 8
бıафорá 36， 5
jırapia 22， 20
$\delta i \delta a \gamma \mu a 7,10 ; 22,3 ; 27,5,21$ ； 30,$7 ; 85,5 ; 86$, г；1о6， 7,8 ；
110，9；117，9， 2 I；124， 8 ；127， 6；129，7，11， 15
ठьбабкалєiò 108， 4
jıбaбка入ía 120，I3
бıठáбкалоs 18,$8 ; 20,2 ; 23,1 ; 27$ ， I； 32,$15 ; 35,1,6 ; 50,20 ; 87$ ， 4；107，I3；I17，I3
 II
סt $\epsilon$ Go 0 os 6I， 16
סı7
ঠıкаıотрадє́ш І 7,6
סıкаเów 58，17；75，21；9！， 9
бьоікпбєя 85，17；107， 10
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סоүиаті广出 2，5；7，7；11， 2
бо६а́乡ढ 7，6；8，1；16，4；63，13； $6+6 ; 74,4 ; 89,18$
סoplá入んtos $5 \mathrm{I}, 10$
$\delta_{0 \nu \lambda \lambda \gamma \omega \gamma \epsilon \omega}$ I 23， 9
סра́ббоцаı 62， 17
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そ̌oos 17,14 ； 21 ，11；73，19；78，23； 85，12；92， 3
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t＇к mavtbs II， 2
ใктацбєúc 36， 5
Єкктєрเขобтє́ш 82， 9
 114， 12
$\epsilon \epsilon \sigma \tau \rho \epsilon \not \phi \omega$ 58， 24
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 4I，II；42，10；80，II；93，I，5； 95,$12 ; 96,18 ; 114,6 ; 117,2,6$ ； 124,16
є̀ $\nu \theta \dot{u} \mu \eta \mu a$ 23， 5
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є́ $\pi \iota \phi a ́ v \epsilon \iota a 8,5 ; 20,17 ; 21,12 ;$ 60， 9
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єúbúvous 7， 12
 IOI，5；122， 9
єưðapıбтia 19， 6 ； $98,6,7,15$ ；ror， 3
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Өavaтóm 47， 2 ；88， 10
$\theta$ өîos 108， 4 ；110， 9 ； 111,2 ； 125 ，
10；127， $2 ;\left(\theta\right.$ ．入ó $\begin{array}{l}\text { os }) ~ \\ 15,4 ; 54,\end{array}$
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катá入voıs II3，II；II4， 2
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катат $\rho \in ́ \chi \omega$ II7， 2 I
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$\mu \epsilon \mu \pi \tau$ є́os 64， 14
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$\mu \nu \xi \omega \tau \dot{\eta} \rho 83,9$

47，6；81，7；99，14；125，II
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тapovala 72，6；76，22；81，15
$\pi a \sigma \tau 6 s 60$ ， 17
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Apol. i i. Cf. i 53.
    2 Tryph. 2 ff . Some suggest that this account is fictitious or at least trimmed up for artistic purposes. But we cannot be sure that it is not genuine. Events in life sometimes take place with artistic propriety. His conversion may have occurred at Ephesus, where (Eus. H.E. iv i8) the dialogue with Trypho is said to have taken place; but the claims of Flavia Neapolis, Corinth, or Alexandria have supporters.
    ${ }^{3}$ H.E. iv 8.
    ${ }^{4}$ H.E. iv ir. He is described there as $\pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \epsilon \cup \dot{u} \omega \nu$ тò $\nu \theta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu \nu$ 入órov, which may mean that he acted as an itinerant evangelist.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ His martyrdom is attested by the title commonly given to him in Church literature. The Acta S. Justini philosophi (Ruinart, edition of 1859 p. 105) is now usually acknowledged to be an authentic account of the Apologist's fate, and it ascribes the event to the prefecture of Rusticus. The Paschal Chronicle gives the date as A.D. 165. Epiphanius (Haer. xlvi I) says it occurred when Rusticus was $\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \mu \dot{\omega} \nu$, though he is wrong in placing it under the Principate of Hadrian. His statement that Justin was 30 years old at the time is probably mistaken; but he may have meant that Justin had been a Christian for 30 years. Cf. Harnack Chronol. Altchristl. Litt. i p. 282 ff.
    ${ }^{2}$ Eus. $I$.E. iv ${ }_{1} 6$.
    ${ }^{3}$ Eus. l.c. The passage (from 'lat. Or. 19) runs in Eusebius K $\rho \eta \sigma \kappa \eta s . .$.
    
    
    ${ }^{4}$ Apol. ii 8 (3).
    ${ }^{5}$ Allard IIist. des persécutions pendant les deux premiers siedles (edition of 1903 ), p. 390 note.

[^2]:    1 The popular belief in daemonic miracles and magic probably induced him to avoid using the argument from miracles; and he only mentions miracles of exorcism.
    ${ }^{2}$ e.g. i $9: 2 \mathrm{I}:$ ii 12 . ${ }^{3}$ e.g. i14.
    B.

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ e.g. in i $20: 44: 59$, and in his treatment of O.T. prophecy.
    ${ }^{2}$ e.g. in i $31: 62$, possibly also in i 26 .
    ${ }^{3}$ Cf. i 21: 22.

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ See later, p. xxii.
    ${ }^{2}$ Person of Christ. Period i, Epoch 2, § I.

[^5]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. $\mathrm{i}_{4}$ : 7.

[^6]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Mommsen Roman provinces Bk viii, c. xi.

[^7]:    ${ }^{1}$ Med. xi 3. The sole reference to Christianity in the Meditations.

[^8]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Dorner Person of Christ, Period i, Epoch ii, § 1, who refers us to Tryph. 61.

[^9]:    ${ }^{1}$ On the point whether Justin was acquainted with the fourth Gospel, see later, p. xxxv.

[^10]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Dorner op. cit. Div. i, vol. i, note tttt, and his discussion in the text, to which the note refers.

[^11]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Dorner loc. cit. Donaldson Hist. of Chr. lit. and doctr. Vol. ii, c. 3, p. 22 I .

    2 loc. cit. ${ }^{3}$ loc. cit.

[^12]:    ${ }^{1}$ Other symptoms of confusion are noted later, p. xxviii.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. Dorner loc. cit.
    ${ }^{3}$ Cf. ii 10, i note.

[^13]:    ${ }^{1}$ E.g. it was a commonplace with Roman writers on education that women ought to study philosophy as an aid to virtue and to the proper conduct of household affairs.
    B.

[^14]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Semisch Justin der Märtyrer ii 303 ff.

[^15]:    ${ }^{1}$ See p. xxviii.
    ${ }^{2}$ See Lightfoot's edition of Colossians, Introd.

[^16]:    ${ }^{1}$ See note ad loc.

[^17]:    ${ }^{1}$ The whole subject is fully discussed in W'estcott N.T. Canon, and in Stanton The Gospels as Historical Documents i p. 76 foll., to which the student is referred.

[^18]:    ${ }^{1}$ See note ad loc.

[^19]:    ${ }^{1}$ He even ascribes passages to their wrong authors in i $35,10: 5 \mathrm{r}$, 8: $\mathbf{5 3}$, 10. His quotations bear most resemblance to the LXX version, but Credner (Beiträge z. Einleit. in die bibl. Schriften) suggests that he is quoting from a sort of Ur-evangelium, consisting of a corpus of O.T. prophecies about Christ, in which the oldest parts depended on the Hebrew version, though it followed principally the LXX.
    ${ }^{2}$ E.g. he misquotes Plato in i 3, 3: 60, r.
    ${ }^{3}$ As Westcott (op. cit.) puts it, Justin is only laying a foundation, and not building up the Christian faith.

[^20]:    ${ }^{1}$ Paul (Jahrb. f. prot. Theol., 1886, 690, and $\mathbf{1 8 9 1} \mathbf{1} \mathbf{1}+7$ ) concludes that Justin is not dependent on the Fourth Gospel, but that he is philosophizing on parallel lines to it, being however more closely related to the philosophic ideas of his time than is the author of the Gospel.

[^21]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Mason Confirmation and Baptism p. 319.

[^22]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Bethune-Baker Hist. of Chr. Doctr. p. 420.
    2 The Apologies say nothing about the Eucharist as a sacrifice in the technical sense.
    ${ }^{3}$ On the question whether Justin understood the words moteitc roûto in a sacrificial sense, see Gore Body of Christ Appended note 20.
    ${ }^{4}$ E.g. Wordsworth /Ioly Commumion p. 62.

[^23]:    ${ }^{1}$ Body of Christ Appended note 1.
    ${ }^{2}$ op. cit. p. 314. ${ }^{3}$ Bethune-Baker op. cit. p. 399.

[^24]:    ${ }^{1}$ Texte und Untersuch. vii 2, 1891.

[^25]:    ${ }^{1}$ See note ad loc. The most complete refutation of Harnack's theory is provided by Zahn Brod und Wein im Abendmahl der alten Kirche.
    ${ }^{2}$ Theol. Lit. Zeit. xvii, 1892, p. 298; Dic Apologieen J. d. M. p. xiv.
    ${ }^{3}$ Theol. Siud., 1892.
    ${ }^{4}$ Altchristl. Litt. Chronol. i p. 274.
    ${ }^{5}$ Altkirchl. Litt. p. 202.
    ${ }^{6}$ Justinus Rechefertigung des Christentums.

[^26]:    ${ }^{1}$ H.E. iv 1 r.
    ${ }^{2} i b$. iv 18.
    ${ }^{3}$ ib. iv 16 (cf. iv 15 ).
    ${ }^{4}$ ii $3(4), 2$ to i ro, 1 ; ii $5(6), 5$ to i $23,2: 63,10,16$; and ii 7 (8), 1 to i $46,3,4$. See notes ad loc.

[^27]:    ${ }^{1}$ But see note ad loc.
    ${ }^{2}$ Veil would see in i 46,5 a hint of a future discussion of the subject. there mentioned, such a discussion being found in ii 5 (6) and 10. But certainly the hint is far from clear; and the suggestion seems over-fanciful.

[^28]:    ${ }^{1}$ Capitolinus Verus 3.

[^29]:    ${ }^{1}$ Ael. Ver. 5.
    ${ }^{2}$ Dorner, Ramsay, Otto, Krüger (Theol. Lit. Zeit., xvii, 1892, p. 298), Cramer (Theol. Stud., $189^{2}$ ).
    ${ }^{3}$ Cf. Harnack op. cit. p. 275.

[^30]:    ${ }^{1}$ Capitol. Marc. 2.
    ${ }^{2}$ Bury (Student's Roman Empire c. 30) suggests 148. Harnack (Theol. Lit. Zeit. xxii p. 77) $150-153$. Veil $153-155$.

[^31]:    1 II.E. iv 16.

[^32]:     Otto àтоктєivaı A

[^33]:    $2 \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \beta o \lambda a ̀ s ~ e d d ~ \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \beta o \lambda a i ̂ s ~ A ~\|~ \tau o u ́ \tau o \iota s ~ \nu o ́ \mu o \nu ~ T h i r l b ~ \tau o v ̂ \tau o \nu ~ \nu o ́ \mu o \nu ~ A ~\| ~$ IO $\dot{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \in \phi \epsilon \rho \circ \nu$ Thirlb $\epsilon \in \epsilon \epsilon \phi \epsilon \rho \circ \nu \mathrm{A}$

[^34]:    ${ }^{1}$ But Eusebius also quotes, with reference to the alleged miracle, the testimony of Apollinaris. See Al-

