

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

6-1-1950

The Logos Concept of Justin Martyr-Relation to the Person, the Natures, and the States of Existence of the Logos

Marcus T. Lang

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_langm@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lang, Marcus T., "The Logos Concept of Justin Martyr-Relation to the Person, the Natures, and the States of Existence of the Logos" (1950). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 326.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/326>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

**THE LOGOS CONCEPT OF JUSTIN MARTYR - RELATING TO
THE PERSON, THE NATURES, AND THE STATES OF
EXISTENCE OF THE LOGOS**

**A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Philosophy
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Bachelor of Divinity**

by

Marcus T. Lang

June 1950

Approved by:

Paul M. Kretschmer
Advisor

W. C. Bush
Reader

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
INTRODUCTION. THE <u>LOGOS</u> CONCEPT AND JUSTIN'S REASON FOR USING IT	1
Justin's Reasons for Using the <u>Logos</u> Concept	1
The <u>Logos</u> Concept in the Ancient World	2
I. THE DIVINE SONSHIP OF THE <u>LOGOS</u>	6
It Establishes the Divinity of the <u>Logos</u>	6
It Establishes His Derivation from God the Father	7
II. THE GENERATION OF THE <u>LOGOS</u>	10
The Necessity of this Generation	10
An Eternal Generation	13
Generated by God the Father	16
The Personality of the <u>Logos</u>	20
The Relation of the <u>Logos</u> to the Holy Ghost	24
III. THE DIVINITY OF THE <u>LOGOS</u>	28
Based Primarily on His Sonship	28
Divine Names Ascribed to the <u>Logos</u>	28
Divine Attributes Ascribed to the <u>Logos</u>	29
Divine Works Ascribed to the <u>Logos</u>	31
Divine Honor and Glory Ascribed to the <u>Logos</u>	33
IV. THE HUMANITY OF THE <u>LOGOS</u>	35
Human Names and Human Descent Ascribed to the <u>Logos</u>	35
The Virgin Birth	36
The <u>Logos</u> Possessed the Complete Human Nature	37
He Endured All the Stages of Human Development	39
He Endured Human Suffering and Death	39
The <u>Logos</u> Different from All other Human Beings	41
V. THE COMMUNION OF NATURES IN THE <u>LOGOS</u>	43
The Mutual Participation of Human and Divine Natures	43
The Communication of Attributes	45
VI. THE STATES OF THE <u>LOGOS</u>	52
His Pre-existence Before Creation	52
His Pre-existence After Creation	52
His State of Humiliation	60
His State of Exaltation	63
CONCLUSION	67

INTRODUCTION

THE LOGOS CONCEPT AND JUSTIN'S REASON FOR USING IT

Justin's Reasons for Using the Logos Concept

The aim of the early Christian apologists in general, and of Justin Martyr in particular, was to present Christian Dogma in as palatable a form as possible to both pagans and Jews. In this effort they used terms and ideas with which their readers were acquainted. They couched Christian doctrine in philosophical terms and concepts for the purpose of striking a responsive chord in the minds of their readers or hearers.. Justin Martyr, in his first and second Apologies, addresses himself to the pagan world; and in his Dialogue with Trypho presents the cause of Christianity to the Jews. One word which he uses in these works constantly and repetitiously - in reference to Jesus Christ - is the word Logos. He well knew that this concept, being one which every cultured mind of the ancient world found challenging, would immediately gain an attentive audience for the person using it. Therefore, this concept has a very important place in Justin's apologies.

There is yet another reason for the prominent place that this and other philosophical terms have in Justin's theology. He himself was a philosopher of no mean ability. He had extensively studied the various schools of philosophical thought of his day before he became a Christian. And he accepted Christianity only after he was convinced that it offered the best solution to the problems posed by the philosophers. For himself, then, it had first been necessary to reconcile the doctrines of Christianity with his philosophical frame of mind and with the concepts

he had gained from the culture of his day. Or, vice versa, it was necessary for him to adjust his philosophical frame of reference and philosophical concepts to the body of Christian doctrine before he was willing to accept it.

The main purpose, of course, of the apologies in general, and of the use of the Logos concept in these apologies in particular, was to present to the unbelieving world a justification for the worship of Christ by the Christians. Since the Logos concept was a current and accepted one in both the pagan and Jewish world, if it could successfully be identified with the person of Jesus Christ, a great victory would be won. And, to a large degree, that attempt was eventually successful, as Dean Inge points out when he characterizes the Logos-doctrine as "the formula which converted the intellect of Europe to Christianity."¹

The Logos Concept in the Ancient World

Since the term Logos plays such an important part in the Christology of Justin Martyr, it will first be necessary to determine what meaning this term had in the ancient world. To people in that world a thought and the spoken word which expressed that thought were one and the same thing in different forms. The word, or expression of the thought, was merely an aspect of the thought itself. Since they thought of God as the supreme Mind or abstract Reason, the expression of this mind was called Logos. And, since the expression of that Mind was only a different form of the essential Mind, the term Logos could be used for and applied to the Supreme Mind, or God. The concept then was developed and

¹William Ralph Inge, Personal Idealism and Mysticism (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1924), p. 37.

elaborated as the various schools of philosophy made use of it. It seems to be found first in Heraclitus' system where it is used in the sense of the universal law and order in the universe, the immanent Reason of the world. Anaxagoras uses the term Logos as an intermediate principle between God and the world, it being the regulating principle of the universe, the divine intelligence. In stoic philosophy the Logos plays an important part. Here it is the principle (the immanent God) controlling the universe; the germ from which all else develops; and as such is called the seminal Logos. It is both a force (compelling action) and a law (regulating the universe). The Logos is the world-idea and as such is single and simple, though it assumes many forms. Philo, the Alexandrian Jewish philosopher, also uses this term and perhaps gives to it the widest meaning of all the philosophers. To him the Logos is an intermediary between God and the world. Through it God created the world and governs it. Through it men know God (He reveals Himself to men) and pray to Him. It is the whole mind of God, the Idea of Ideas. But to Philo, as well as to the other philosophers, this Logos had no personality. It was only an idea and power, not a person; only an aspect of God, not a distinct personality.²

Justin's concept of the Logos seems to include all these things just

²C. M. Bakewell, Source Book in Ancient Philosophy, "Fragments from Heraclitus," (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907), pp. 28-35.

B. A. G. Fuller, History of Greek Philosophy, Thales to Democritus (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1923), pp. 131-140.

Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, edited by James Hastings (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924), VIII, 133f.

The Catholic Encyclopedia (New York: The Encyclopedia Press, 1913), IX, 328f.

described. However, he gives an entirely different twist to the term. To him Christ is the Logos, the intermediary between God and man, the revealer of God to men, the creator of the universe, the first principle, etc. But this Christ, this Logos, is to Justin a personality distinct and separate from God. He, then, identifies the Logos with Christ, the Son of God and the Son of Man; with Jesus of Nazareth. J. A. Dorner makes the point that prior to the Christian era there had been two main lines or tendencies of thought with regard to the Logos. The one, the Jewish or Old Testament tendency, viewed the Logos as the Creative Word. The second, or Hellenic tendency, viewed the Logos as Divine Reason. Justin Martyr was the first of the Christian writers to unite these two tendencies into one. Justin viewed the Logos as the Divine Reason who is the Creator Word that became man. "Thus," Dorner says, "in fuller stream, and in one bed, thenceforward flowed on [from Justin Martyr onward] the more richly acknowledged Christian truth."³

That all of these ideas about the Logos are present in Justin's system we can easily see from the various names he ascribes to the Logos. From these alone it becomes evident that he combines the various concepts of the Logos, which preceded his, into a new and wider and all-inclusive concept; but one which is basically different from those which preceded and infinitely richer in content. Some of these titles which Justin gives to Him are: Word or Logos, Divine Word, Angel, the Angel of God the Angel of Great Counsel, Power (or Potency), the First Power after God, A Certain Rational Power, Wisdom, the Word of Wisdom, Beginning (or First

³J. A. Dorner, "History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ," Clark's Foreign Theological Library, Third Series, translated by William Lindsay Alexander (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1878), p. 264.

Principle), the First-Begotten of God, the First Begotten, the Only-Begotten, the Only Proper Son, Offspring, the Whole Word, the Seed of God, the Son of God, Glory, the Glory of the Lord, King, King of Glory, High Priest, Creator, Maker of Heaven and earth, Apostle, Christ, Jesus, Savior, Immanuel, the Just One, Man, Son of Man, the Suffering One, Day-Spring from on High, Stone, Corner Stone, Helper, Servant, Lawgiver, Star, Captain, Lord, Lord of Hosts, God, etc.

In the following pages we shall attempt to extract from Justin Martyr's writings his doctrine of the Logos. Since, of all the writings ascribed to Justin Martyr, there are only three which are generally conceded to be the work of his pen, this study is confined to these three works of his. They are: his First and Second Apologies, and his Dialogue with Trypho.⁴

This present study confines itself to Justin Martyr's conception of the person, the natures, and the states of the Logos. The work of the Logos (His work of creation, the exercise of His prophetic, priestly and regal offices) are not included in this study. In speaking of the person of the Logos, Justin goes to great lengths to show the exact relationship which exists between the Logos and God the Father, as far as Justin is able to understand this relationship. We will begin, therefore, by showing what Justin Martyr's conception of the relationship of the Logos with God the Father was, presenting first Justin's conception of the divine Sonship of the Logos, then his description of the generation of the Logos from the Father.

⁴Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, op. cit., p. 133f.

The Catholic Encyclopedia, loc. cit.

Edgar J. Goodspeed, A History of Early Christian Literature (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1942), p. 141f.

CHAPTER I

THE DIVINE SONSHIP OF THE LOGOS

It Establishes the Divinity of the Logos

Justin Martyr's object, in his Dialogue with Trypho, is to show that Jesus Christ, the Logos, the man who was crucified by the Jews, is true God, the Savior and promised Messiah. To this end, with constant reiteration, he calls Him the Son of God - the unique, eternal, only true Son of God. This unique sonship is the basis on which Justin establishes the divinity of Christ. And, therefore, his concept of the divine sonship of the Logos is an important and basic part of his theology.

Justin speaks of the Logos, or Christ, as being the Son of God in words such as these:

Now the Word Logos of God is His Son... Jesus the Christ is the Son of God and His Apostle, being of old the Word.¹ In these books of the prophets we found Jesus our Christ... being and being called, the Son of God.² The Son of God called Jesus... is worthy to be called the Son of God.³ He is the Son of God.⁴ We find it recorded in the memoirs of His apostles that He is the Son of God, and we call Him the Son.⁵ He who is both Son and Apostle of God the Father of all and the Ruler, Jesus Christ.⁶ He is the Son of the true God himself.⁷

¹I Apol. LXIII.

²Ibid., XXXI.

³Ibid., XXII.

⁴Trypho CXVIII.

⁵Ibid., C.

⁶I Apol. XII.

⁷Ibid., XIII.

It Establishes His Derivation From God the Father

The use of this term, the Son of God, for the Logos shows that He comes from God Himself and derives His existence from God. He is the "Offspring" of God, begotten and born of the only true God, the first born and only Son of God. This derivation from the Father Justin clearly states when he calls the Logos:

The Son (who came forth from Him [God, the Father]) and taught us these things.⁸ This Offspring, which was truly brought forth from the Father.⁹ God begat before all creatures a Beginning... who is called... the Son.¹⁰ He is the first-born of the unbegotten God.¹¹ We know Him to be the first-begotten of God.¹² Being the first-born of every creature.¹³ The only-begotten of the Father of all things.¹⁴ We assert that the Word of God was born of God.¹⁵ He proceeded before all creatures from the Father.¹⁶

If, then, Christ comes from the Father and proceeds from Him, we must know what the nature of the Father (God) is in order to understand what Christ is. Justin Tells us that the Father is: "The only, unbegotten, unutterable God;"¹⁷ to Whom no name is given;¹⁸ Who is unchangeable and the cause of all things, "God is that which always maintains the same nature, and in the same manner, and is the cause of all other things."¹⁹ He is, says Justin, alluding to and paraphrasing Plato,

That very Being who is the cause of all discerned by the mind, having no colour, no form, no greatness - nothing, indeed which

⁸Ibid., VI.

⁹Trypho LXII.

¹⁰Ibid., LXI.

¹¹I Apol. LIII.

¹²Trypho C

¹³Ibid., CXXXVIII.

¹⁴Ibid., CV.

¹⁵I Apol. XXII

¹⁶Trypho C

¹⁷Ibid., CXXVI.

¹⁸II Apol. VI.

¹⁹Trypho III.

the bodily eye looks upon; but it is... beyond all essence, unutterable and inexplicable, but alone honourable and good.²⁰

He is omniscient, omnipotent, omnipresent, unconfined, without local movement, eternal, the creator of all things, the transcendent God.

God remains ever in the supercelestial places, invisible to all men, holding personal intercourse with none, whom we believe to be Maker and Father of all things.²¹ For the ineffable Father and Lord of all neither has come to any place, however that is, quick to behold and quick to hear, having neither eyes nor ears, but being of indescribable might; and He sees all things, and knows all things, and none of us escapes His observation; and He is not moved or confined to a spot in the whole world, for He existed before the world was made.²²

The Son of this God, being a Son not only in an adopted sense, not as an emanation,²³ not as a mode of the Father's existence,²⁴ not as a distinct essence opposed to the Father,²⁵ is truly the Son of God and God Himself. His Sonship, like the Father's divinity, is not "derived from His good deeds and functions,"²⁶ nor is it a mere "appellation," nor is it derived merely from His attributes - such as wisdom.²⁷ But Christ is the Son of God in a unique and distinct sense of the word. He "alone is properly called Son;" the only-begotten Son of the Father; "the only proper Son who has been begotten by God, being His Word and first-begotten;²⁸ begotten in a peculiar manner."²⁹ He is the Son of God not merely because He appeared to be such when He performed miracles,³⁰ but because He is the same in essence with the Father, because He is the true God Himself, though

²⁰Ibid., IV.

²¹Ibid., LVI.

²²Ibid., GXXVII.

²³Ibid., GXXVIII.

²⁴I Apol. LXIII.

²⁵Trypho LXI.

²⁶II Apol. VI.

²⁷I Apol. XXII.

²⁸Ibid., XXIII.

²⁹Trypho CV.

³⁰I Apol. XXX.

He is a distinct and different person from the Father. This relation to the Father will be described in more detail when we later speak of the generation of the Logos.

By this doctrine of the divine Sonship of the Logos Justin thus establishes the fact that Jesus, the Christ, the Man, the Logos, is God. But this raises the question of how this fact came to be, how the Logos became the Son of God, what processes took place in that generation. Justin discusses this question at some length. We will now see how he views the generation of the Son from the Father.

CHAPTER II

THE GENERATION OF THE LOGOS

The Necessity of This Generation

According to Justin, it was necessary for God the Father to beget this only-begotten Son, to generate the Logos; since without such an intermediary being the Father would not have been able to deal with or communicate with men. This echo of Platonic philosophy is clearly stated by Justin. The Father is the "ineffable Father," the transcendent God, of such magnitude that He cannot confine Himself to any place on this earth. Such an action would be circumscribing His absolute divinity, as Justin points out to Trypho in the words:

Wherever God says, 'God went up from Abraham,' or, 'The Lord spake to Moses,' and 'The Lord came down to behold the tower which the sons of men had built,' or when 'God shut Hoah into the ark,' you must not imagine that the unbegotten God Himself came down or went up from any place. For the ineffable Father and Lord of all neither has come to any place, nor walks, nor sleeps, nor rises up, but remains in His own place, wherever that is, quick to behold and quick to hear, having neither eyes nor ears, but being of indescribable might; and He sees all things, and knows all things, and none of us escapes His observation; and He is not moved or confined to a spot in the whole world, for He existed before the world was made. How, then, could He talk with any one or be seen by any one, or appear on the smallest portion of the earth?¹

It would seem that Justin believed the generation of the Logos was necessary even for the creation of the universe... If the Father cannot be "moved or confined to a spot in the whole world, since He existed before the world was made," His very creation of the world would have been such a confinement. Therefore, the Logos was generated, through Whom the

¹Trypho CXXVII.

world was to be created. God, then, although the work of creation is ascribed to Him ("In the beginning He [the Father] made the human race;"² "God [the Father] having altered Matter which was shapeless, made the world;"³ "He [God the Father of all things] is the maker of heaven and earth;"⁴ "The Father and creator of the universe"⁵) did not directly intervene but formed all matter through His divine agent, the Logos.

Justin further establishes the need for such an intermediary being by showing that, when God appeared to the patriarchs and prophets, etc. of the Old Testament, it was not the Father but the Logos, or Christ, whom they saw:

Therefore neither Abraham, nor Isaac, nor Jacob, nor any other man, saw the Father and ineffable Lord of all..., but saw Him who was according to His will His Son, being God... Since, unless we thus comprehend the Scriptures, it must follow that the Father and Lord of all had not been in heaven when what Moses wrote took place: 'And the Lord rained upon Sodom fire and brimstone from the Lord out of heaven.'⁶

However, as Dorner points out, this position of Justin's that the absolute God could not communicate with men was only an echo of the Platonic and Philonian philosophy. It is stated thus because of God's inconceivability by men, because He is incomprehensible to us. To Justin God cannot be the abstract and "supersubstantial" God of Philo; since Christ, who is of the essence of God, could not then have communicated with men for the same reason that the Father could not communicate with them. To follow Dorner's line of thought:

Had Justin thought the objective essence of God after supersubstantial form of Philo, his doctrine of the Logos would have been unintelligible. For if God be the simply distinctionless,

²I Apol., XXVIII.

⁵I Apol., LXIII.

³Ibid., LIX.

⁶Trypho CXXVII.

⁴Trypho LXXIV.

abstract unity, then would such a preponderance be given to the Divine monarchy, that there would remain for the Logos only a higher creature nature, or a simply economic significance; the Logos must be viewed as necessarily outside the Divine essence, in the highest sense. But though in Justin's theology there are assonances to the Alexandrian theology, yet he asserts not God's objective want of attributes, but his unnameableness, - not God's abstract simplicity, but His unfathomableness and incomprehensibility by us... One may even say from I Apol. 62, that the inconceivability of God in Himself by men, formed a reason with Justin for His revelation in Christ.⁷

It might be well at this point to attend more closely to this attitude of Justin, for it indicates the attitude which lies behind his whole system. It is the attitude of submitting to Scriptures, of humility - the fact that ultimately the human mind cannot comprehend the nature of God. Although Justin believes that the Christian has the highest understanding and conception of God that is possible for a human being, in contrast to the fragmentary seeds of truth found in both pagans and Jews; yet, ultimately, even the Christian cannot fully comprehend the deity. Although Justin, in his opinion, presents God in the most correct and accurate manner possible for the human mind; yet our comprehension of God is limited by the limits of the human mind. This he states in his second Apology when he says that the Father has no name (only attributes - "appellations derived from His good deeds and functions") because He is of an "unknown significance." In the same way the Logos, or Christ, is of an "unknown significance" and His nature "can hardly be explained." He says:

And His Son, who alone is properly called Son, the Word,... is called Christ, in reference to His being anointed and God's ordering all things through Him; this name itself also containing an unknown significance; as also the appellation "God" is not a name, but an opinion implanted in the nature of men of

⁷J. A. Dorner, *op. cit.*, p. 265.

a thing that can hardly be explained. But "Jesús," His name as man and Savior, has also significance.⁸

Again Justin says that Christ "is a power of the ineffable Father, and not the mere instrument of human reason."⁹

An Eternal Generation

An intermediary being thus being necessary, in the first place, for the creation of the world and, in the second place, for communication with the world to be created; God generated the Logos from eternity, before all creatures. Of this eternal generation Justin says:

His Son, who alone is properly called Son, the Word, also was with Him and was begotten before the works.¹⁰ We know Him Logos to be the first-begotten of God, and to be before all creatures.¹¹ He proceeded before all creatures from the Father.¹² The Scripture has declared that this Offspring was begotten by the Father before all things created.¹³ But this Offspring, which was truly brought forth from the Father, was with the Father before all the creatures, and the Father communed with Him.¹⁴ It can be proved... that this Christ existed before the sun.¹⁵ God begat before all creatures a Beginning who was a certain rational power proceeding from Himself, who is called by the Holy Spirit, now the Glory of the Lord, now the Son.¹⁶ "In the splendors of Thy holiness have I begotten Thee from the womb, before the morning star..." [Ps. 110, 3], - does this not declare to you that He was from of old?¹⁷

The passage quoted above, where Justin calls the Logos a Beginning, presents a difficulty in apparently presenting the generation of the Logos as a Beginning - an event in time. But here again we are confronted, not by an inconsistency in Justin's system, but by the

⁸II Apol., VI.

⁹Ibid., I.

¹⁰Ibid., VI.

¹¹Trypho C.

¹²Ibid., C.

¹³Ibid., CXXIX.

¹⁴Ibid., LXII.

¹⁵Ibid., LXIV.

¹⁶Ibid., LXI.

¹⁷Ibid., LXIII.

inadequacy of the human mind. When Justin presents the generation of the Logos as happening in eternity, we must give him credit for at least having common sense and for realizing that eternity precludes space and time. Therefore, Justin says: "He was begotten in a peculiar manner."¹⁸ V. A. Spence Little explains Justin's terminology in this matter thus:

Justin's conception of the "generation" of the Logos indicates not an origination ab initio, but the hypostatization of the Logos, which, because of the limitations of human thought and language, was necessarily viewed as an event.¹⁹

Another difficulty in Justin's doctrine of the eternal generation of the Logos is found in one passage where he seems to predicate the pre-existence of Christ's human nature before creation. The passage reads:

And David predicted that He would be born from the womb before sun and moon, according to the Father's will, and made Him known, being Christ, as God strong and to be worshipped.²⁰

Here he seems to say that Christ would be born of the virgin before the creation of the world (the sun and moon). This, however, can be explained, as Dornier does, in this way, that the Logos was generated with the potency of incarnation. His generation made it possible for the Logos to become the incarnated Christ. He was not generated in eternity as the incarnated Christ but with the potency to become incarnated and assume a human nature. It was necessary, for the salvation of man, that the essential divinity be united with the carnal and become mortal. This was made possible in eternity already with the generation of the Logos, though the actual event took place in time at the time of the virgin birth. Dornier says on this point:

¹⁸Trypho CV.

¹⁹V. A. Spence Little, The Christology of the Apologist (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935), p. 108.

²⁰Trypho LXXVI.

In Trypho 123, he so places the earlier appearances of the Logos in conjunction with the incarnation, that whilst he calls them appearances ἐπιφάνειαι, the actual incarnation would be the ἐκδήσις of the earlier simple potency of the incarnation. When this is applied to the passage before us, it gives the meaning, that the Logos was with God before the creation, not simply as an attribute, but ἐπιφάνειαι, as potency; but that He came to ἐκδήσις when the world was made.²¹

That Justin does not view the human nature of Christ as existing from eternity is evident from a number of places where he states that the incarnation had not yet happened in the Old Testament dispensation. He says that "Christ the Son of God, was proclaimed as about to come to all the world."²² That this was from eternity merely a potency in the Logos he states in the words: Christ was "from of old, and the God and Father of all things intended Him [from of old] to be begotten by a human womb."²³ Again Justin quotes the prophets as prophesying His incarnation as something that would happen in the future and had not yet taken place:

And that He shall be first humble as a man, and then exalted, these words at the end of the Psalm show: "He shall drink of the brook in the way," and then, "Therefore shall He lift up the head."²⁴ The power enumerated by Isaiah would come upon Him [in the future].²⁵

There is one reference of Justin to the pre-incarnated Christ of the Old Testament which might, at first glance, be misconstrued; where he ascribes a human form to the Logos who appeared to Joshua: "And on another occasion He calls Himself Captain, when He appeared in human form to Joshua the Son of Nave (Nun)."^{25a} However Justin here merely says that He appeared to Joshua in human form. Angels also did that in the

²¹J. A. Dorner, op. cit., p. 271. ²⁴Ibid., XXXIII.

²²Trypho XLIII.

²⁵Ibid., LXXXVII.

²³Ibid., LXIII.

^{25a}Ibid., LXI.

Old Testament dispensation numerous times, but they were not incarnated creatures because of their having appeared in human form. Likewise, Christ would not have had to be incarnated to have "appeared in human form."

Generated by the Father

This Logos was brought into being by the Father, as was indicated when we spoke of His Sonship and of the fact that He was begotten of the Father. Justin states that God the Father generated the Logos or Son and caused Him to be or to come into existence. He says:

God begat before all creatures a Beginning who was a certain rational power proceeding from Himself.²⁶ This Offspring, which was truly brought forth from the Father,...²⁷ He proceeded before all creatures from the Father by His power and will.²⁸ For I have already proved that He was the only-begotten of the Father of all things, being begotten in a peculiar manner Word and Power by Him.²⁹ The Father is Lord of the Lord on earth, as He is Father and God; the cause of His power and of His being Lord and God.³⁰

Yet, this power of the Father, by which the Logos proceeds from Him, is the Logos Himself. From this it would follow that the Logos caused Himself, since He was caused by the Power of the Father and He Himself is that power. The Logos was:

Begotten in a peculiar manner Word and Power.³¹ He is the Angel of God, i.e., the Power of God sent to us through Jesus Christ.³² Forever the first in power.³³ It is wrong, therefore, to understand the Spirit and the power of God as

²⁶Ibid., LXI.

²⁷Ibid., LXII.

²⁸Ibid., C.

²⁹Ibid., CV.

³⁰Ibid., CXXIX.

³¹Irypho CV.

³²Ibid., CXVI.

³³Ibid., CXXXVIII.

anything else than Word, who is also the first-born of God.³⁴ Jesus Christ... being His Word and first-begotten, and power.³⁵

Yet this very power, which is the Logos and by which He proceeds, was in turn caused by the Father; for the Father is "cause of His the Logos!" power and of His being Lord and God.³⁶ So, although the power which produced the Logos is the Logos Himself, yet that power is caused by God the Father, finds its source in Him.

Justin elucidates this somewhat when he says that the Logos came into being by an act of the will on the part of the Father. He says: "He the Son of God proceeded... from the Father by His power and will..."³⁷ He speaks of "Him who was according to His will His Son."³⁸ Again Justin says: "He was begotten of the Father by an act of will."³⁹ This is stated in order to show that this procession of the Logos from the Father did not cause any change in God. God is absolute and even the begetting of the Son did not change this absoluteness of the Divinity. He did not diminish or change or decrease when He generated the Logos, because this was done by an act of will; just as, when we utter a word or thought, we form the word or thought but that does not take anything away from us. Or again, just as fire is not diminished and nothing is taken from it when another fire is kindled from it. To state this in Justin's own words:

He was begotten of the Father by an act of will; just as we see happening among ourselves: for when we give out some word, we beget the word which remains in us, when we give it out: and just as we see also happening in the case of fire, which is not lessened when it has kindled another, but remains the

³⁴I Apol., XXXIII.

³⁵Ibid., XLIII.

³⁶Trypho CXXIX.

³⁷Ibid., C.

³⁸Ibid., CXXVII.

³⁹Ibid., LXI.

same; and that which has been kindled by it likewise appears to exist by itself, not diminishing that from which it was kindled.⁴⁰

The Logos, then, is not distinct from the Father in essence.

Father and Logos are essentially the same - they are both God; and the generation of the Logos did not mean that a part of God was cut off from Him. Justin states this unequivocally when he says:

This power was begotten from the Father, by His power and will, but not by abscission, as if the essence of the Father were divided; as all other things partitioned and divided are not the same after as before they were divided; and, for the sake of example, I took the case of fires kindled from a fire, which we see to be distinct from it, and yet that from which many can be kindled is by no means made less, but remains the same.⁴¹

This essential unity of the Father and the Logos is also proved to Justin by the fact that the will of the Logos is always the same as the will of the Father. The Logos, He says, is:

Not distinct from the Father in will. For I affirm that He has never at any time done or said anything which He who made the world - above whom there is no other God - has not wished Him both to do and to engage Himself with.⁴²

Justin also distinguishes between the Father and the Son, or Logos, in His use of the name God. Generally speaking, when he speaks of the Father, he uses the term ὁ Θεός; and, when he names the Logos as God, he uses Θεός without the article. There are some exceptions to this, when he at times speaks of the Son as ὁ Θεός; but these exceptions occur only when he is quoting from Scripture. These exceptions, therefore, can be explained by the fact that Justin used the Septuagint in quoting from the Old Testament; and rather than change the wording of Scripture He

⁴⁰Trypho, LXI.

⁴¹Ibid., CXXVIII.

⁴²Ibid., LV.

keeps the article before θεός in such quotations, even though the word refers to Christ. However, whenever Justin himself speaks of the Father or the Son as God, he makes the distinction between ὁ θεός and θεός. Thereby he wishes to indicate that the Logos is not another ὁ θεός, since God is only one; but He is still God, θεός.⁴³

This person, the Logos, proceeding from the will of God is a rational being. Here again we find assonances of Hellenistic philosophy; or rather, the terminology of that philosophy; for Justin's is a philosophy turned on the wheel of Scriptural dogma. He calls the Logos "a Beginning" or First Principle, "a certain rational power [proceeding] from God." This Logos, then, which is formed by God's will is "Reason." As Little says:

Here, the Logos is referred to in the abstract sense; it is a meta-physical 'principle,' a cosmic force, and pure reason. For, since God is pure, eternal, absolute Mind, what type of Being could He generate but a Rational being? And since, according to Stoic teaching, the self-expression of Mind is rational speech or 'logos', therefore the Son or Being Whom God generates must be the Divine Logos or Rational Word. But whether the generated Being be called Angel, Wisdom, Logos, Potency, Son, Lord, or God, since it proceeded 'out of God,'⁴⁴ reduced to its essence, it can be but 'Reason.' From this conclusion, it follows that the generating Mind and the 'Offspring' are of identical essence or nature, and that the latter, being therefore Divine essentially, in fact, is 'God.'⁴⁵

We now quote this passage itself from the Dialogue with Trypho:

God begat before all creatures a Beginning [who was] a certain rational power [proceeding] from Himself, who is called by the Holy Spirit, now the Glory of the Lord, now the Son, and again Wisdom, and again an Angel, then God,

⁴³v. A. Spence Little, op. cit., p. 162.

⁴⁴Trypho LXI.

⁴⁵v. A. Spence Little, op. cit., p. 111-112.

and then lord and Logos...; For He can be called by all those names, since He ministers to the Father's will, and since He was begotten of the Father by an act of will.⁴⁶

To Justin Martyr, then, the LOGOS is a rational being, a person, who is essentially identical with and has the same qualities as God the Father, and is therefore God. The LOGOS is essentially "reason" (rational, not as in man in a partial sense or as an attribute, but rational in essence). God is essentially "reason". Therefore, the LOGOS is God.

The Personality of the LOGOS

But, though He is identical with the Father in essence, the LOGOS is a distinct and separate person from the Father. We have been dealing up to this point mostly with the abstract metaphysical terms which Justin applies to the LOGOS. But to Justin the LOGOS was not only an abstract metaphysical concept. He was also a person distinct and different from the Father. This personalizing of the LOGOS was a radical departure from the concept LOGOS as used by the philosophical schools of the time. To them the LOGOS was merely abstract reason or the First Principle, etc., but never a person. And, as Little points out, even to some Christians the "Logos remained a mere metaphysical conception - 'a Potency indivisible inseparable from the Father, like Light' which springs from and depends upon the sun... a mere mode of divine activity."⁴⁷ But to Justin the denial of the personality of the LOGOS is an error and a heresy. He says:

For they who affirm that the Son is the Father, are proved neither to have become acquainted with the Father, nor to

⁴⁶Trypho Ixi.

⁴⁷V. A. Spence Little, op. cit., p. 117.

know that the Father of the universe has a Son; who also, being the first-begotten Word of God, is even God.⁴⁸

This Logos is not a mere emanation of the Father, as the rays of the sun are to the sun itself, nor a mere manifestation of the Father's attributes. No, He is a separate and distinct person - Justin says:

But it is because I know that some wish to anticipate these remarks, and to say that the power sent from the Father of all which appeared to Moses, or to Abraham, or to Jacob, is called an Angel because He came to men (for by Him the commands of the Father have been proclaimed to men); is called glory, because He appears in a vision sometimes that cannot be born; is called a Man, and a human being, because He appears arrayed in such forms as the Father pleases; and they call Him the Word, because He carries tidings from the Father to men: but maintain that this power is indivisible and inseparable from the Father, just as they say that the light of the Sun on earth is indivisible and inseparable from the sun in the heavens; as when it sinks, the light sinks along with it; so the Father, when He chooses, say they, causes His power to spring forth, and when He chooses, He makes it return to Himself. In this way they teach, He made the angels. But it is proved that there are angels who always exist, and are never reduced to that form out of which they sprang. And that this power which the prophetic word calls God, as has been also amply demonstrated, and Angel, is not numbered /as different/ in name only like the light of the sun, but is indeed something numerically distinct, I have discussed briefly in what has gone before; when I asserted that this power was begotten from the Father, by His power and will, but not by abscission, as if the essence of the Father were divided; as all other things partitioned and divided are not the same after as before they were divided: and, for the sake of example, I took the case of fires kindled from a fire, which we see to be distinct from it, and yet that from which many can be kindled is by no means made less, but remains the same.⁴⁹

Again, the Logos is a separate person because He is called by various names:

The glory of the Lord, now the Son, and again Wisdom, and

⁴⁸I Apol., LXIII.

⁴⁹Trypho CXXVIII.

again an Angel, then, God, and then Lord and Logos; and on another occasion He calls Himself Captain, when He appeared in human form to Joshua.⁵⁰

These names indicate that He ministers to the Father's will and such ministrations could only be performed by a person, certainly not by a mode of divine activity. This personality is also proved by the fact that the Logos was begotten by an act of the Father's will just as a fire can be kindled from another fire, and, being of the same substance, yet exist by itself. Thus Justin says:

For He can be called by all these names, since He ministers to the Father's will, and since He was begotten of the Father by an act of will; just as we see happening among ourselves: for when we give out some word, we beget the word [which remains] in us, when we give it out: and just as we see also happening in the case of fire, which is not lessened when it has kindled [another], but remains the same; and that which has been kindled by it likewise appears to exist by itself, not diminishing that from which it was kindled.⁵¹

The personality of the Logos is also proved from the creation account. When, at creation, God said, "Let us make man," and, "Adam is become like one of us," He was communicating with someone and that someone had to be a person. Justin puts the argument in these words, stating that this person to Whom God spoke at creation was the Logos:

From which [creation account] we can indisputably learn that [God] conversed with some one who was numerically distinct from Himself, and also a rational Being... In saying, therefore, 'as one of us' [Moses] has declared that [there is a certain] number of persons associated with one another, and that they are at least two. For I would not say that the dogma of that heresy which is said to be among you is true, or that the teachers of it can prove that [God] spoke to angels, or that the human frame was the workmanship of angels. But this Offspring, which was truly brought forth from the Father, was with the Father before all the creatures, and

⁵⁰Ibid., LXI.

⁵¹Ibid., LXI.

the Father communed with Him; even as the Scripture by Solomon has made clear, that He whom Solomon calls Wisdom, was begotten as a Beginning before all His creatures and as Offspring by God, who has also declared this same thing in the revelation made by Joshua the son of Nave (Num).⁵²

The argument of the latter part of this passage is stated again in another place by Justin when He says:

The prophetic word indicates that there were two in number: One upon the earth, who, it says, descended to behold the cry of Sodom; Another in heaven, who also is Lord of the Lord on earth, as He is Father and God; the cause of His power and of His being Lord and God... Prov. 8, 22f. When I repeated these words, I added: You perceive, my hearers, if you bestow attention, that the Scripture has declared that this Offspring was begotten by the Father before all things created; and that that which is begotten is numerically distinct from that which begets, any one will admit.⁵³

Again, to Justin the personality of the Logos is proved by His appearances to men in the Old Testament. These appearances could not have been made by the Father, since the Father cannot thus confine Himself - so as to communicate directly with men here on this earth. And yet, whoever made these appearances is called Lord and God. Therefore, someone distinct from the Father, who is also God, must have appeared to these men. Justin states it thus:

Reverting to Scriptures, I shall endeavor to persuade you, that He who is said to have appeared to Abraham, and to Jacob, and to Moses, and who is called God, is distinct from Him who made all things, - numerically, I mean, not distinct in will. For I affirm that He has never at any time done or said anything which He who made the world - above whom there is no other God - has not wished Him both to do and to engage Himself with... It must be admitted absolutely that some other one is called Lord by the Holy

⁵²Trypho LXII.

⁵³Ibid., CXXIX.

Spirit besides Him who is considered maker of all things;... It must therefore necessarily be said that one of the two angels who came to Sodom, and is named by Moses in the scripture Lord, is different from Him who also is God, and appeared to Abraham.⁵⁴

In another place in his Dialogue Justin reiterates this reasoning:

Therefore neither Abraham, nor Isaac, nor Jacob, nor any other man, saw the Father and ineffable Lord of all, and also of Christ, but ∫aw∫ Him who was according to His will His Son, being God, and the Angel because He ministered to His will; whom also it pleased Him to be born man by the Virgin; who also was fire when He conversed with Moses from the bush. Since, unless we thus comprehend the Scriptures, it must follow that the Father and Lord of all had not been in heaven when what Moses wrote took place: 'And the Lord rained upon Sodom fire and brimstone from the Lord out of heaven;' and again when it is thus said by David: 'Lift up your gates, ye rulers; and be ye lift up, yet everlasting gates; and the King of glory shall enter.'⁵⁵

Thus Christ is a distinct and separate person, although He is actually God Himself. Thus there can be a plurality of persons in the Godhead but only one God in essence.

The Relation of the Logos to the Holy Ghost

While we are on this subject of the plurality of persons in the Godhead, it will be well to see what Justin says about the third person in the Godhead - the Holy Spirit - and what His relation to the Father and the Logos is. Justin speaks of the Trinity and of the Holy Spirit as God, but he does not dwell on the subject of the Holy Ghost at any length, merely mentioning the Spirit and briefly stating what His relation to the other two persons of the Trinity is. In several places He mentions all three persons of the Trinity in one breath or one passage. For

⁵⁴Ibid., LV.

⁵⁵Ibid., CXXVII.

Instance, he says: "God beget before all creatures a Beginning [who was] a certain rational power [proceeding] from Himself, who is called by the Holy Spirit..."⁵⁶ There He mentions the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Again, speaking of the Son as being numerically distinct from the Father, he says: "It must be admitted absolutely that some other one is called Lord by the Holy Spirit besides Him who is considered maker of all things."⁵⁷ In his first Apology He also says that the Spirit, as well as the Father and the Son is worthy to be worshipped and is worshipped by the Christians. The passage reads: "But both Him [God, the Father] and the Son... and the prophetic Spirit, we worship and adore, knowing them by reason and truth."⁵⁸ He even says that Plato grasped this doctrine of the third person of the Trinity, which he found in the Scriptural account of creation. He says:

And as to his [Plato's] speaking of the third, he did this because he read, as we said above, that which was spoken by Moses, 'that the Spirit of God moved over the waters.' For he gives the second place to the Logos which is with God, who he said was placed crosswise in the universe; and the third place to the Spirit who was said to be borne upon the water, saying, 'And the third around the third.'⁵⁹

From this and the following passage it can be seen that Justin clearly distinguishes the three persons according to rank and procession. Here he reiterates the fact that the Spirit is the third person of the Trinity:

Our teacher of these things is Jesus Christ... and that we reasonably worship Him, having learned that He is the Son of the true God Himself, and holding Him in second place, and the prophetic Spirit in the third, we will prove.⁶⁰

Again he mentions the three persons of the Trinity when he speaks of the

⁵⁶Ibid., LII.

⁵⁹Ibid., LII.

⁵⁷Ibid., LV.

⁶⁰Ibid., XIII.

⁵⁸1 Apol., VI.

baptism of Christ, when he speaks of "the descent of the Spirit like a dove;... then the Holy Ghost, and for man's sake, as I formerly stated, lighted on Him in the form of a dove, and there came at the same instant from the heavens a voice."⁶¹

Justin calls this third person of the Trinity "the Spirit of God," "the Holy Spirit," "the Divine Spirit,"⁶² "the Spirit of Prophecy," "Holy Ghost," etc. And from this it will be seen that Justin clearly distinguishes between the Holy Ghost and the other two persons of the Trinity. However, there is one passage in which he seems to contradict this flatly, when he says:

It is wrong, therefore, to understand the Spirit and the power of God as anything else than Word, who is also the first-born of God, as the foresaid prophet Moses declared; and it was this which, when it came upon the virgin and overshadowed her, caused her to conceive, not by intercourse, but by power.⁶³

In other places also he seems to contradict himself. For in numerous places he speaks of the Holy Spirit as the force which inspired the prophets of the Old Testament to write the Scriptures, saying that "The Divine Spirit through whom the prophet spoke;"⁶⁴ and "the Spirit of prophecy thus affirmed that the generation of Him who was to die... was such as could not be declared;"⁶⁵ and "The Holy Spirit affirms in the same Psalm that He was raised again...;"⁶⁶ and again, saying that "By the blessed David... the Lord is called the Christ by the Holy Spirit of prophecy."⁶⁷ On the other hand, he says in other places that these prophets spoke and

⁶¹Trypho LXXXVIII.

⁶²I Apol., XXII.

⁶³I Apol., XXXIII.

⁶⁴Ibid., XXI.

⁶⁵Trypho XLIII.

⁶⁶Ibid., LXXIII.

⁶⁷Ibid., XXXII.

were inspired by the "prophetic Word" and by the "Spermatic Logos." He speaks, for instance, of "The Word of Wisdom who is Himself this God begotten of the Father of all things, and Word, and Wisdom, and Power, and the Glory of the Begetter, will bear evidence to me, when He speaks by Solomon the following."⁶⁸ There seems to be some confusion here in Justin's mind; although, perhaps, if he had spoken at length on the person and work of the Holy Spirit, he would have arrived at clarity. However, it is evident that he does not confuse the person of Christ with the person of the Holy Ghost, as Dorner points out, but only the work which each is to perform. Dorner says this on the subject: "The old assertion, that Justin identifies the Logos and the Holy Ghost, must be given up, since Semisch's thorough investigation. It is only in respect of the work of both that the distinction is somewhat unsteady."⁶⁹

In the preceding we have seen how Justin Martyr viewed the relation of the Logos to the Father (and also, incidentally, His relation to the Holy Spirit) - His divine Sonship and His generation from God the Father. We wish now to delve more deeply into His conception of, and reasons for believing in, the Divinity of the Logos. He has much more to say on this subject than what he has said in the passages already alluded to, as the following section will show.

⁶⁸Ibid., LXI.

⁶⁹J. A. Dorner, op. cit., p. 274.

CHAPTER III

THE DIVINITY OF THE LOGOS

Based Primarily on His Sonship

We have seen that Justin bases the divinity of the Logos or Christ primarily on His Sonship and this essential relationship of the Logos to the Father. But he also presents other reasons why the Logos must be God. Although Justin does not present these reasons for Christ's divinity in a systematic order, in his two Apologies and the Dialogue with Trypho the following proofs of Christ's divinity are offered by Justin: To the Logos are ascribed divine names, divine attributes, divine works, and divine honor and glory.

Divine Names Ascribed to the Logos

Justin frequently calls the Logos God and Lord and often quotes the Old Testament where these divine titles are given to the Messiah, who is the Logos. Justin calls Him by these names when he says:

Christ [is] Lord, and God the Son of God.¹ He who is both Angel and God and Lord. My Lord Jesus Christ. He is and shall be God.² Who was God even before the creation of the world.³ [He is] the minister to God, who is above the world, above whom there is no other God.⁴ For Christ is King, and Priest, and God, and Lord.⁵

In stating that the Logos, or Christ, is God, Justin constantly refers

¹Irypho CXXVIII.

⁴Ibid., LXI.

²Ibid., LVIII.

⁵Ibid., XXXIV.

³Ibid., LVI.

to the Old Testament, from which he shows that the Scriptures themselves unmistakably call Him God and Lord. He who appeared to Moses and Abraham and Jacob and other patriarchs is called by divine names, and Justin affirms that this was not God the Father but the Logos that appeared to them. Furthermore, David and Solomon, and the prophets, in their prophecies of the Messiah, refer to the Messiah, who is the Logos, as God. There follow a few quotations from Justin to this effect:

He who is called God and appeared to the patriarchs is called both Angel and Lord.⁶ This power /the Logos/ the prophetic word calls God.⁷ He is called at one time the Angel of great God.⁸ He who is said to have appeared to Abraham, and to Jacob, and to Moses, and who is called God... and is named by Moses in the Scripture Lord.⁹ But now you will permit me first to recount the prophecies, which I wish to do in order to prove that Christ is called both God and Lord of hosts, and Jacob.¹⁰ Now assuredly, Trypho, I shall show that, in the vision of Moses, this same One alone is called an Angel, and who is God, appeared to and communed with Moses.¹¹ For I undertake to prove to you from Scriptures themselves, that He whom the Scripture calls Lord is not one of the two Angels that went to Sodom, but He who was with them, and is called God, that appeared to Abraham.¹²

Thus Justin ascribes to the Logos divine names and establishes the fact that Scripture itself does so.

Divine Attributes Ascribed to the Logos

Divine attributes are ascribed to the Logos when Justin says that He is eternal, omnipotent and omniscient. The attribute of eternity is ascribed to the Logos frequently by Justin and has received detailed

⁶Ibid., LVIII.

⁷Ibid., CXXVIII.

⁸Ibid., CXXVI.

⁹Ibid., LV.

¹⁰Ibid., XXXVI.

¹¹Ibid., LX.

¹²Ibid., LVI.

study before, when we looked at Justin's doctrine of the generation of the Logos. He is shown to be omnipotent when He is called the transcendent "power" and is identified with the power of God. Justin says of this Power or omnipotence:

He is the Power of God sent to us through Jesus Christ.¹³ Begotten in a peculiar manner Word and Power.¹⁴ Forever the first in power.¹⁵ It is wrong, therefore, to understand the Spirit and the power of God as anything else than Word, who is also the first-born of God.¹⁶ Jesus Christ... being His Word and first-begotten, and power.¹⁷

The Logos is also shown to be omniscient when He is called pure Reason, "a rational Power," the "First Principle," and "Wisdom." He is called "The Word of Wisdom, who is Himself this God begotten of the Father of all things, and Word, and Wisdom, and Power."¹⁸ "For He is addressed in the writings of the prophets... as Wisdom."¹⁹ In many other places the Logos is called the supreme Wisdom, which is, of course, a way of stating His omniscience. This omniscience is also posited by Justin in those statements where He calls the Logos pure Reason. Numerous passages to this effect will be found listed under Justin's doctrine of the divine generation, as found above. Again, Justin speaks of Christ's omniscience when He says: "We know that He foreknew all that would happen to us after His resurrection from the dead and ascension to heaven."²⁰

¹³Ibid., CXVI.

¹⁴Ibid., CV.

¹⁵Ibid., CXXXVIII.

¹⁶I Apol., XXXIII.

¹⁷Ibid., XXIII.

¹⁸Trypho LXI.

¹⁹Ibid., C.

²⁰Ibid., LXXXII.

Divine Works Ascribed to the Logos

The divine works which Justin ascribes to the Logos are Creation, Miracles, Resurrection and Ascension into heaven. The fact that His creating of the universe is proof of His divinity is stated several times by Justin. He says that the Psalmist, in Ps. 96, "bids [all Christians to] recognize that He is the Maker of heaven and earth, who effected this salvation in behalf of the human race, who also was crucified and was dead, and who was deemed worthy by Him (God) to reign over all the earth."²¹ This subject of His creative work has already been discussed in the preceding section on the generation of the Logos.

That the miracles which Christ performed were works which only the divinity could do is stated by Justin also. He states it negatively when he denies that Christ was a mere man and performed these miracles by magical arts, but that they were truly miracles that could be done only by the power of God. He says:

But lest any one should meet us with the question, What should prevent that He whom we call Christ, being a man born of men, performed what we call His mighty works by magical art, and by this appeared to be the Son of God? we will now offer proof.²²

Then he also states that the miracles of healing and exorcism of demons, which can only be done by God, are done and can be done by a Christian through the name of Christ only and by the power of the Logos. He says:

For numberless demoniacs throughout the whole world, and

²¹Ibid., LXXIV.

²²I Apol., XXX.

in your city, many of our Christian men exorcising them in the name of Jesus Christ who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, have healed and do heal, rendering helpless and driving the possessing devils out of the men, though they could not be cured by all the other exorcists, and those who used incantations and drugs.²³ For we call Him Helper and Redeemer, the power of whose name even the demons do fear; and at this day, when they are exorcised in the name of Christ Jesus, crucified under Pontius Pilate, governor of Judaea, they are overcome.²⁴ For every demon, when exorcised in the name of this very Son of God - who is the first born of every creature, who became man by the Virgin, who suffered, and was crucified under Pontius Pilate by your nation, who died, who rose from the dead, and ascended into heaven - is overcome and subdued.²⁵

Again, Justin adduces the divinity of Christ from His resurrection from the dead and ascension into heaven. Since He did not remain in Hades like some common mortal, He is more than man. He is God. These events are also typically prophesied by Noah and by Jonah, and these prophecies with their fulfillment in Christ should be proof to Trypho that He is the very God Himself. Justin speaks of the Logos as:

Christ alone... who is the Lord of hosts... who also rose from the dead, and ascended to heaven as the Psalm and the other Scriptures manifested when they announced Him to be Lord of hosts.²⁶ So likewise Christ declared that ignorance was not on His side, but on theirs, who thought that He was not the Christ, but fancied they would put Him to death and that He like some common mortal would remain in Hades.²⁷ For righteous Noah, along with the other mortals at the deluge... were a symbol of the eighth day, wherein Christ appeared when He rose from the dead, for ever the first in power.²⁸ And though Christ said amongst you that He would give the sign of Jonah, exhorting you to repent of your wicked deeds at least after He rose again from the dead, and to mourn before God as did the Ninevites... yet you not only have not repented.../but/ proclaim that... his disciples stole Him by night from the tomb... and now deceive

²³II Apol. VI.

²⁴Trypho XXX.

²⁵Ibid., LXXXV.

²⁶Ibid., LXXXV.

²⁷Ibid., XCIX.

²⁸Ibid., CXXXVIII.

men by asserting that He has risen from the dead and ascended to heaven.²⁹

Again Justin speaks of the resurrection and ascension of Christ, and of His foreknowledge and omniscience, in the same breath; thereby showing that in his opinion the former also are proof of His divinity. He says: "We know that He foreknew all that would happen to us after His resurrection from the dead and ascension into heaven."³⁰ At times Justin ascribes the work of resurrection and ascension to God the Father, as when He says:

The Lord, the Father of all, has brought Him again from the earth, setting Him at His own right hand, until He makes His enemies His footstool.³¹ And that God the Father of all would bring Christ to heaven after He had raised Him from the dead, and would keep Him there until he has subdued His enemies the devils.³² The remainder of the Psalm makes it manifest that He knew His Father would grant to Him all things which He asked, and would raise Him from the dead.³³

Although Justin thus at times ascribes the work of resurrection and ascension to the Father, as do Scriptures themselves; yet, since Christ is essentially identical to the Father, this can be the work of Christ Himself, as he has said it is in the passages quoted above.

Divine Honor and Glory Ascribed to the Logos

Finally, as proof of His divinity, Justin cites the fact that He is worthy of being worshipped and adored, and that glory is to be given to Him, which is something that should be reserved only for God. Justin quotes from the 45th Psalm, showing that the inspired writer says the Logos is to be worshipped, quoting among other things the words: "He is

²⁹Ibid., CVIII.

³²I Apol., XLV.

³⁰Trypho LXXXII.

³³Trypho CVI.

³¹Ibid., XXXII.

Thy Lord, they shall worship Him also.³⁴ Later, again referring to the same Psalm, he says: "Therefore these words testify explicitly that He is witness to by Him who established these things, as deserving to be worshipped, as God and as Christ."³⁵ In other places he expressly states the same thing, saying:

Scriptures... expressly prove that Christ was to suffer, to be worshipped, and to be called God... But they admit that He will come to suffer, and to reign, and to be worshipped.³⁶ He is called... Christ and God to be worshipped by David.³⁷ Our teacher of these things is Jesus Christ... and that we reasonably worship Him, having learned that He is the Son of the true God Himself, and holding Him in second place, and the prophetic Spirit in the third, we will prove.³⁸ But both Him God, the Father, and the Son, and the prophetic Spirit, we worship and adore.³⁹ David in Ps. 96 bids the inhabitants of all the earth... to recognise that He Christ is to be praised and feared.⁴⁰

Then too, Justin says that "God says He will give Him whom He has established as a light of the Gentiles, glory and to no other."⁴¹ And in a number of places he calls the Logos "glory" and "the glory of the Lord," etc. Thus he establishes, also from the fact that the Logos is to be worshipped and that men should give glory to Him, that the Logos is God.

In these ways does Justin Martyr very clearly and forthrightly declare his belief in the divinity of the Logos, who is Jesus Christ.

³⁴Ibid., XXXVIII.

³⁸I Apol., XIII.

³⁵Ibid., LXIII.

³⁹Ibid., VI.

³⁶Ibid., LXVIII.

⁴⁰Trypho LXXIV.

³⁷Ibid., CXXVI.

⁴¹Ibid., LXV.

CHAPTER IV

THE HUMANITY OF THE LOGOS

But Justin's conception of the Logos is not that of a divinity alone. The Logos is also true man. He is Jesus of Nazareth as well as the eternally generated Son of God. This second person of the Godhead, essentially God, had from eternity the potency to become man, and at the appointed time took upon himself the human body and became a man.

Human Names and Human Descent Ascribed to the Logos

That Justin accepts the true humanity of the Logos is evident, in the first place, from the fact that he calls Him true man. Jesus Christ is His human name. Justin says that "Logos Himself, who took shape, and became man, was called Jesus Christ."¹ Again he says: "But Jesus, His name as man and Saviour, has also significance. For He was made man also, we we before said."² In another place he tells Trypho: "Hear, then, how this man, of whom the Scriptures declare that He will come again in glory after His crucifixion..."³ Again, "Of Him [the Logos] we will relate how He took flesh and became man."⁴ There are, of course, many other passages in which Justin calls the Logos man, referring to His life on this earth. They are, however, too numerable to mention and these will suffice to establish that the point this was Justin's doctrine.

¹I Apol., V.

²II Apol., VI.

³Trypho LXXXVI.

⁴I Apol., XXXII.

Another evidence of Justin's acceptance of the humanity of Christ is the fact that he states that the Logos is descended from human beings and traces His descent from the patriarchs. He says: "He [the Logos] assumed flesh by the Virgin of their [the patriarchs'] family, and submitted to become a man."⁵ There are several other passages where he states this very clearly. They are:

Likewise [we know Him - Christ] to be the Son of the patriarchs, since He assumed flesh by the Virgin of their family, and submitted to become a man without comeliness, dishonoured, and subject to suffering... He said then that He was the Son of man, either because of His birth by the Virgin, who was, as I said, of the family of David, and Jacob, and Isaac, and Abraham; or because Adam was the Father both of Himself and of those who have been first enumerated from whom Mary derives her descent.⁶

He [the Logos] admits them to be His fathers, who trusted in God and were saved by Him, who also were the fathers of the Virgin, by whom He was born and became a man.⁷

Him [the Logos] who was born of a virgin, of the family of Abraham and tribe of Judah, and of David.⁸

For by the power of God He (Christ) was conceived by a virgin of the seed of Jacob, who was the Father of Judah, who, as we have shown, was the Father of the Jews; and Jesse was His forefather according to the oracle, and He was the son of Jacob and Judah according to lineal descent.⁹

The Virgin Birth

Closely connected with this argument from His lineage is Justin's statement of the doctrine of the virgin birth. He unequivocally and frequently states that the Logos became man via the miraculous conception and birth in and of the virgin Mary. Speaking of His human conception and birth in and of the virgin, Justin says:

⁵Trypho, G.

⁶Trypho, G.

⁷Ibid., CI.

⁸Ibid., XLIII.

⁹I Apol., XXXII.

And it was this Logos which, when it came upon the virgin and overshadowed her, caused her to conceive, not by intercourse, but by power.¹⁰ For He was made man also, as we before said, having been conceived according to the will of God the Father.¹¹ For by the power of God He was conceived by a virgin.¹²

In many other passages, also, he speaks of the virgin birth itself; when he for instance says:

He was born of a virgin... Now it is evident to all, that in the race of Abraham according to the flesh no one has been born of a virgin, or is said to have been born of a virgin, save this our Christ.¹³ And by her the Virgin Mary has He been born, to whom we have proved so many Scriptures refer.¹⁴ Whom also it pleased Him God the Father to be born man by the Virgin.¹⁵

He proves this also, as already indicated in the second of the passages just quoted, by appealing to the prophecies of the Old Testament, which foretell the fact that the Messiah would be born of a virgin. Quoting Psalm 110,3-4, Justin says: "Does this not declare to you that He was from of old, and that the God and Father of all things intended Him to be begotten by a human womb?"¹⁶

The Logos Possessed the Complete Human Nature

Justin clearly states his belief in the real humanity of the Logos by stating that He has become the whole rational being, the whole man, taking upon Himself a complete human nature and not just a part of it, having both human body and human soul. The passage where he states this

¹⁰Ibid., XXXIII.

¹¹II Apol., VI.

¹²I Apol., XXXII.

¹³Trypho LXVI.

¹⁴Ibid., G.

¹⁵Ibid., CXXVII.

¹⁶Ibid., LXIII.

reads: "Because Christ, who appeared for our sakes, became the whole rational being, both body and reason [Logos], and soul."¹⁷ There is some dispute about this passage - as to Justin's meaning here. The word that he uses here for soul is ψυχή, not πνεῦμα. Some believe that he refers, by ψυχή, to only the animal principle in the person of Christ and that he conceives of the Logos as taking the place of the soul in this person, Jesus Christ. However, Dorner's remarks on this passage seem to adequately refute this argument. He says:

On the negative side of this it has been urged, that whilst Justin conceives the human nature trichometrically, and accordingly ought to speak of four potencies in the God-man, he in one passage names only three, σῶμα, λόγος, and ψυχή. The soul ψυχή, according to his trichotomy, is only the animal principle; and hence it is inferred that Justin viewed the Logos as supplying the place of the human soul. But this proof is by no means conclusive. Justin is not so decidedly a trichotomist, that he might not also hold the twofold division, and under ψυχή include both the animal principle of life and the πνεῦμα, nay, by ψυχή might intend the πνεῦμα.¹⁸

Furthermore the whole tone of this passage would lead us to believe that Justin is here speaking of the human soul, for he here enumerates these constituent parts of Christ's human nature to prove that Christ became the whole man, the whole rational being; and we know that Justin conceived the soul as a constituent part of the rational being, man. Therefore, if this enumeration is to prove that Christ was true man, the ψυχή must refer to the soul and not merely to the animal principle. Finally, that Justin accepts the fact that the human Christ had a human soul is conclusively proved by his quoting the passage "Father, into Thy hands

¹⁷II Apol., I.

¹⁸J. A. Dorner, op. cit., pp. 277-278.

I commend My spirit."¹⁹ He applies this passage to Christ's human nature and so there is no doubt about the fact that he believes Christ had a human soul.

He Endured All the Stages of Human Development

As another proof of His humanity, Justin presents the fact that Christ went through all the stages of human development and growth of a human being, lived on this earth as a man for more than thirty years, and during this time experienced all the physical wants and needs of the human body. In a remarkably clear passage Justin speaks of these matters, saying:

As He grew up like all other men, by using the fitting means, He assigned its [the body's] own requirements to each development, and was sustained by all kinds of nourishment, and waited for thirty years, more or less, until John appeared before Him as the herald of His approach, and preceded Him in the way of baptism, as I have already shown.¹⁹

He Endured Human Suffering and Death

Finally, Justin proves the humanity of the Logos by presenting the facts of His humiliation. This humiliation, suffering and death could be endured only by man. Therefore, this Christ must have been true man. Only a true man is capable of suffering these things. Here follows some of the more lucid passages in which Justin states this argument. "He has truly become man capable of suffering," Justin says to Trypho.²⁰ To Trypho, again, Justin enumerates the facts of His being forsaken by

¹⁹Trypho LXXXVIII.

²⁰Ibid., XCVIII.

God, His crucifixion and the agony in Gethsemane. Then he states that these show and prove that "He [the Logos] had become truly a suffering man."²¹ Again, he says:

But that, having become man for our sakes, He endured to suffer and to be dishonoured... hear the prophecies which relate to this.²² And that He shall be first humble as a man, and then exalted, these words at the end of the Psalm show.²³

Also, in opposing the argument that Christ, being the Son of God, could not suffer, Justin states his belief in the humanity of the Logos, saying: "We may perceive that the Father wished His Son really to undergo such sufferings for our sakes and may not say that He, being the Son of God, did not feel what was happening to Him and inflicted on Him."²⁴

Then too, he states that the Logos became man and assumed flesh for the very purpose of suffering; showing that he believed it impossible for Him to suffer, if He had not become truly man. He says:

Likewise [we know Him - Christ] to be the Son of the patriarchs, since He assumed flesh by the virgin of their family, and submitted to become a man without comeliness, dishonoured, and subject to suffering.²⁵ He was both circumcised, and observed the other legal ceremonies ordained by Moses... He endured all these not as if He were justified by them, but completing the dispensation which His Father, the Maker of all things, and Lord and God, wished Him [to complete]. He endured crucifixion and death, and the incarnation, and the suffering of as many afflictions as your nation put upon Him.²⁶

And, against Trypho's argument that it would not be possible or proper for the Son of God to become a suffering man, Justin states unequivocally that He did do so:

²¹Ibid., XCIX.

²²I Apol., L.

²³Trypho XXXIII.

²⁴Ibid., CIII.

²⁵Ibid., G.

²⁶Ibid., LXVII.

If Christ was not to suffer and the prophets had not foretold that He would be led to death on account of the sins of the people, and be dishonoured and scourged, and reckoned among the transgressors, and as a sheep be led to the slaughter, whose generation, the prophet says, no man can declare, then you would have good cause to wonder.²⁷

But, Justin argues, the fact is that Christ did do all these things and that, therefore, He was truly man.

The Logos Different from All Other Human Beings

However, this human nature of the Logos, though truly human, was distinct and different from that of any other human being. This is evident first from what he says of the virgin birth, which shows Christ's generation to be not a natural one but by "the power and will of the Maker of the universe." As Little says, Justin considered that "the animate principle in Christ's body sprang, not from the Virgin, but from the Logos-Potency, by which it was transmitted through Mary."²⁸ It is evident also from the fact that, in distinction to all other human beings, this incarnated Logos, who was true man, was without sin, spotless and holy. There are only a few passages where Justin plainly states this fact but these few are very adequate to establish Justin's position on the sinlessness of Christ's human nature. He speaks of the incarnated Logos as "the most righteous, and only spotless and sinless Christ."²⁹ Again, he says, "For there was not even a single man to assist Him as

²⁷Ibid., LXXXIX.

²⁸v. A. Spence Little, op. cit., p. 155.

²⁹Trypho CX.

an innocent person."³⁰ Justin re-states this distinction to Trypho in these words:

Just as God commanded the sign to be made by the brazen serpent, and yet He is blameless; even so, though a curse lies in the law against persons who are crucified, yet no curse lies on the Christ of God, by whom all that have committed things worthy of a curse are saved.³¹

Here he states that Christ is blameless and undeserving of the curse even as God the Father was blameless in commanding the sign to be made by the brazen serpent; the important point here being that Christ is blameless or sinless, and thus different from every other human being in this respect.

And so, from the facts that He has human names, a human descent, was conceived and born as and of a human being, possessed all the constituent parts of a man, went through all the stages of human growth and development, experienced human suffering and humiliation and death; although He was unique both as to the manner of His birth and His sinlessness; Justin proves that the Logos was truly a man born of men.

³⁰Trypho CIII.

³¹Ibid., XCIV.

CHAPTER V

THE COMMUNION OF NATURES IN THE LOGOS

The Mutual Participation of Human and Divine Natures

We have now seen that Justin viewed the Logos as both divine and human. That he also believed in the communion of these two natures and the communication of divine and human attributes, is evident from a perusal of his writings. Though he never explicitly mentions the problem of the personal, twofold nature of the Logos, Justin does show that He is aware of this problem.

That Justin Martyr believed in the mutual participation of the divine and human natures of the Logos is evident from the fact that to Justin Christ, the man, is the whole Logos, that He calls Him man and God at the same time and in the same breath. Speaking of the fact that the man, Christ, is the whole or entire Logos, he says:

If the devils are proved to cause those to be much worse hated who live not according to a part only of the word diffused among men, but by the knowledge and contemplation of the whole Word, which is Christ.¹

There are many passages where Justin ascribes to the Logos, interchangeably, both divine and human names. The following are several of these:

He is called at one time the Angel of great counsel, and a Man by Ezekiel, and like the Son of man by Daniel, and a Child by Isaiah, and Christ and God to be worshipped by David, and Christ and a Stone by many, and Wisdom by Solomon, and Joseph and Judah and a Star by Moses, and the East by Zechariah, and the Suffering One and Jacob and Israel by Isaiah again, and a Rod, and Flower, and Corner-Stone, and Son of God. For if you had understood what has

¹III Apol., VIII.

been written by the prophets, you would not have denied that He was God, Son of the only, unbegotten, unutterable God.²

It is declared that He would come forth from the highest heavens, and again return to the same places, in order that you may recognise Him as God coming forth from above, and man living among men; and that He will again appear, and they who pierced Him shall see Him, and shall bewail Him.³

This intimate interpenetration of the divine and human in the Logos is also seen by his analogy of "the blood of the grape" to show that "Christ derives blood not from the seed of man, but from the power of God."

Justin mentions this several times both in his Dialogue and his first Apology.

His blood did not spring from the seed of man, but from the will of God.⁴

For the Holy Spirit called those who receive remission of sins through Him, His garments; amongst whom He is always present in power, but will be manifestly present at His second coming. That the Scripture mentions the blood of the grape has been evidently designed, because Christ derives blood not from the seed of man, but from the power of God. For as God, and not man, has produced the blood of the vine, so also the Scripture has predicted that the blood of Christ would be not of the seed of man, but of the power of God. But this prophecy, sirs, which I repeated, proves that Christ is not man of man, begotten in the ordinary course of humanity.⁵

For what is called by the Divine Spirit through the prophet "His robe," are those who believe in Him in whom abideth the seed of God, the Word. And what is spoken of as "the blood of the grape," signifies that He who should appear would have blood, though not of the seed of man, but of the power of God. And the first power after God the Father and Lord of all is the Word, who is also the Son; and of Him we will, in what follows, relate how He took flesh and became man. For as man did not make the blood of the vine, but God, so it was hereby intimated that the blood should not be of human seed, but of divine power.⁶

²Trypho CXXVI.

³Ibid., LXIV.

⁴Ibid., LXIII.

⁵Ibid., LIV.

⁶I Apol., XXXII.

Again, he identifies the "Spirit and the power of God" with the Logos who overshadowed the virgin and thus brought forth Christ, the Logos.

He says:

It is wrong, therefore, to understand the Spirit and power of God as anything else than Word, who is also the first-born of God, as the foresaid prophet Moses declared; and it was this which, when it came upon the virgin and overshadowed her, caused her to conceive, not by intercourse, but by power.⁷

In these passages Justin has tried to explain the two-fold nature of Christ by showing that His generation as a human being was extra-worldly, from the Father, divine. Thus he establishes a direct connection or identity between the Spiritual Logos and the Incarnate Christ. The Logos Himself is the power or potency that generated the human Christ in the virgin's womb. The animate principle in Christ's body thus comes not from the Virgin Mary but from the Logos, who is God, and the incarnated Christ is therefore divine.

Justin also frequently calls the pre-incarnated Logos Christ, or Jesus Christ; showing that in his mind there was a complete union or identity between the human and divine nature of the Logos.

The Communication of Attributes

That Justin believed in the communication of attributes of the divine and human natures in the Logos is evident from the fact that he in many passages (almost indiscriminately) applies human attributes and divine attributes to the same person - the Logos, or Christ. This can be demonstrated from the following two samples:

⁷Ibid., XXIII.

In these books, then of the prophets we found Jesus our Christ foretold as coming, born of a virgin, growing up to man's estate, and healing every disease and sickness, and raising the dead, and being hated, and unrecognised, and crucified, and dying, and rising again, and ascending into heaven, and being, and being called, the Son of God.⁸

This crucified man was with Moses and Aaron, and spoke to them in the pillar of the cloud; then that he became man, was crucified, and ascended up to heaven, and comes again to earth, and ought to be worshipped.⁹

In these we find Justin speaking of the Logos as having divine power over nature, illness, death; as having a human body and submitting to the natural process of human growth and development; as suffering contempt, crucifixion and death; as rising again in divine victory over death and ascending in His human body into heaven (a supernatural, divine act); as pre-existing his human birth, being present with Moses and Aaron; as the divine one who will come to earth again on judgment day to judge the world; as worthy of divine honor and glory.

Justin frequently attributes to this one and the same Logos, in one and the same breath or sentence, eternal generation from the Father, on the one hand, and a human birth (in time) of the woman Mary, on the other. Since both His divine and His human generation are experienced by the same person, this indicates that that one person had all the qualities or attributes of both His natures. Justin addresses these words to Trypho:

And since we find it recorded in the memoirs of His apostles that He is the Son of God, and since we call Him the Son, we have understood that He proceeded before all creatures from the Father by His power and will... and

⁸Ibid., XXXI.

⁹Trypho XXXVIII.

that He became man by the Virgin,¹⁰

For I have already proved that He was the only-begotten of the Father of all things, being begotten in a peculiar manner Word and Power by Him, and having afterwards become man through the Virgin, as we have learned from the memoirs.¹¹

[The Son of God] who is the first born of every creature, who became man by the virgin.¹²

Another evidence of Justin's belief in the communication of attributes is the fact that he frequently speaks of the Logos both as having the essential, eternal life of God and as submitting to human death and resurrection. He says, for instance:

Christ alone... who is the Lord of hosts, by the will of the Father who conferred on Him [the dignity]; who also rose from the dead, and ascended to heaven, as the Psalm and the other Scriptures manifested when they announced Him to be Lord of Hosts... who suffered, and was crucified under Pontius Pilate by your nation, who died, who rose from the dead, and ascended into heaven.¹³

Our teacher of these things is Jesus Christ, who also was born for this purpose, and was crucified under Pontius Pilate, procurator of Judaea, in the times of Tiberius Caesar; and that we reasonably worship Him, having learned that He is the Son of the true God Himself, and holding Him in second place, and the prophetic Spirit in the third we will prove.¹⁴

There are many passages in which Justin shows that the properties of the Logos' divine nature were really communicated to His human nature. He shows that the human Christ exhibited these divine powers to prove that He was the Logos, the God;¹⁵ that He had the divine power of exercising

¹⁰Ibid., C.

¹¹Ibid., CV.

¹²Ibid., LXXXV.

¹³Ibid., LXXXV.

¹⁴I Apol., XIII.

¹⁵Trypho LXXXVIII. The powers enumerated by Isaiah would come upon Him, not because He needed power, but because these would

devils;¹⁶ that He had the divine attributes of eternity and holiness;¹⁷ that He was worthy of divine honor and glory,¹⁸

not continue after Him. And let this be a proof to you, namely, what I told you was done by the Magi from Arabia, who as soon as the child was born came to worship Him, for even at His birth He was in possession of His power; and as He grew up like all other men, by using the fitting means, He assigned its own [requirements] to each development, and was sustained by all kinds of nourishment, and waited for thirty years, more or less, until John appeared before Him as the herald of His approach... Now we know that He did not go into the river because He stood in need of baptism, or of the descent of the Spirit like a dove; even as He submitted to be born and to be crucified, not because He needed such things, but because of the human race, which from Adam had fallen under the power of death and the guile of the serpent, and each one of which had committed personal transgression... For it was not His entrance into Jerusalem sitting on an ass, which we have showed was prophesied, that empowered Him to be Christ, but it furnished men with proof that He is Christ; just as it was necessary in the time of John that men have proof, that they might know who is Christ... but then the Holy Ghost, and for man's sake, as I formerly stated, lighted on Him in the form of a dove, and there came at the same instant from the heavens a voice.

Trypho LXXXVII. The Scripture says that these enumerated powers of the Spirit [powers of the Spirit with which the man Jesus was filled] have come on Him, not because He stood in need of them, but because they would rest in Him, i.e., would find their accomplishment in Him, so that there would be no more prophets in your nation after the ancient custom.

¹⁶Trypho CXXI. But if He so shone forth and was so mighty in His first advent (which was without honour and comeliness, and very contemptible), ... so that even demons were subject to His name, and all powers and kingdoms feared His name more than they feared all the dead, shall He not on His glorious advent destroy by all means all those who hated Him, and who unrighteously departed from Him?

Ibid., CXX. For we call Him Helper and Redeemer, the power of whose name even the demons do fear; and at this day, when they are exorcised in the name of Jesus Christ, crucified under Pontius Pilate, governor of Judaea, they are overcome. And thus it is manifest to all, that His Father has given Him so great power, by virtue of which demons are subdued to His name, and to the dispensation of His suffering.

¹⁷Ibid., LXXIII. And then, what is said by David, 'In the splendours of Thy holiness have I begotten Thee from the womb, before the morning star...' - does this not declare to you that

Finally, there are several passages from Justin's writings which explicitly show his belief in the fact that both natures of the Logos participated in the acts of the other. He says in the Dialogue that the Son of God did feel the sufferings inflicted upon the historical Christ, the man.

We may perceive that the Father wished His Son really to undergo such sufferings for our sakes, and may not say that He, being the Son of God, did not feel what was happening to Him and inflicted on Him. Further, the expression, 'My strength is dried up like a potsherd, and my tongue has cleaved to my throat,' was a prediction, as I previously remarked, of that silence, when He who convicted all your teachers of being unwise returned no answer at all.¹⁹

And he also states that the divine nature necessarily had to participate in these official acts of the human nature in order to give infinite value to them. He even leans over so far, in trying to explain this intimate communion of natures, as to say that the Logos Himself had to be saved by God; i.e., that Christ, by His human nature alone, could not have saved even Himself. This, it seems to me, shows clearly that Justin considers the participation of the divine nature of the Logos in His official human acts a necessity. He says:

He admits them to be His fathers, who trusted in God and were saved by Him, who also were the fathers of the Virgin, by whom He was born and became man; and He foretells that He shall be saved by the same God, but boasts not in accomplishing anything through His own will or might. For when on earth He acted in the very same manner, and answered to one who addressed Him as 'Good Master:' 'Why callest thou me

[He was] from of old, and that the God and Father of all things intended Him to be begotten by a human womb?

¹⁸I Apol., VI. But both Him [God, the Father], and the Son (who came forth from Him and taught us these things...), and the prophetic Spirit, we worship and adore, knowing them in reason and truth...

[Cf. also passages cited above, p. 33f.]

¹⁹Trypho CIII.

good? One is good, My Father who is in heaven.²⁰
 For if the Son of God evidently states that He can be saved,
~~neither~~ because He is a son, nor because He is strong or
 wise, but that without God He cannot be saved, even though
 He be sinless, as Isaiah declares in words to the effect
 that even in regard to His very language He committed no
 sin (for He committed no iniquity or guile with his mouth),
 how do you or others who expect to be saved without this
 hope, suppose that you are not deceiving yourselves?²¹

Justin also very frequently shows that Christ's human nature
 participates in the divine acts of the exalted Logos, that the Logos
 remains a man even in His state of exaltation. To cite only a few of
 such passages, the following are representative:

But if so great a power is shown to have followed and to
 be still following the dispensation of His suffering, how
 great shall that be which shall follow His glorious advent!
 For He shall come on the clouds as the Son of man, so Dan-
 iel foretold, and His angels shall come with Him.²²

From which you will perceive that the Lord, the Father of
 all, has brought Him again from the earth, setting Him at
 His own right hand, until He makes His enemies His foot-
 stool; which indeed happens from the time that our Lord
 Jesus Christ ascended to heaven, after He rose again from
 the dead.²³

For the prophets have proclaimed two advents of His: the
 one, that which is already past, when He came as a dishon-
 oured and suffering Man; but the second, when, according to
 prophecy, He shall come from heaven with glory, accompanied
 by His angelic host.²⁴

Again, the acts of the exalted Christ are consistently called the acts
 of the Logos, just as those acts of His performed before and during the
 incarnation are called the acts of the Logos.

Justin's teaching on the Eucharist also shows that he believes that
 Christ did not lay aside His humanity upon His exaltation, but that the

²⁰Ibid., CI.

²³Ibid., XXXII.

²¹Ibid., CII.

²⁴I Apol., LII.

²²Ibid., XXI.

entire Christ of the Incarnation is present in the elements of the Lord's Supper. He speaks thus of this matter in the first Apology:

But not as common bread and common drink do we receive these [the elements]; but in like manner as Jesus Christ our Savior, having been made flesh by the Word of God, had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so likewise have we been taught that the food which is blessed by the prayer of His word, and from which our blood and flesh by transmutation are nourished, is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh.²⁵

So we see that for Justin the Logos concept meant that the Logos was the true Son of God, true God Himself, eternally generated, of the same essence and personality as God, the second person of the Trinity; that He was also the Son of Man, born of the virgin Mary in time; and that these two natures are really and completely united into one person in the Logos. We will now proceed to show that Justin's Logos concept also included a distinction between the states of Christ. These include His state of existence before creation and after creation (including the concept of the spermatic Logos), His state of humiliation, and His state of exaltation.

²⁵Ibid., LXVI.

CHAPTER VI

THE STATES OF THE LOGOS

His Pre-existence Before Creation

Justin's conception of the state of the Logos' existence before the creation of the world, from eternity, has been amply described in a previous section which outlined Justin's conception of the generation of the Logos from the Father. There it was shown that he conceived of the Logos as being the same in essence, glory and power with the Father from eternity, prior to the beginning of time and the creation of the world.

His Pre-existence After Creation

But Justin's conception of the pre-existence of the Logos after creation, from the time of the creation of the world to His incarnation is an interesting characteristic of his view of the Logos which has not yet been presented. The following is an outline of this concept.

Justin refers every anthropomorphism of the Old Testament to the Logos. Wherever, in the Old Testament, God is said to come into contact with man or this material world; or whenever it attributes any physical act to God; there Justin says it is referring to the Logos. He does this on philosophical grounds, as was pointed out above.¹ If God is the ineffable and absolute being, He is immovable, nor can He be confined locally (so as to talk to or be seen by anyone) or appear on any part of

¹Gf. pp. 8-10.

the earth. Since this philosophical premise precludes the possibility of the Old Testament anthropomorphisms and appearances of God to be referring to God the Father; and since they are also ascribed to God; therefore, he concludes, they must refer to the Logos, who is also God. The clearest statement of Justin to this effect is found in his Dialogue with Trypho, which passage we now quote at greater length than before:

Wherever God says, 'God went up from Abraham,' or, 'The Lord spake to Moses,' and 'The Lord came down to behold the tower which the sons of man had built,' or when 'God shut Noah into the ark,' you must not imagine that the unbegotten God Himself came down or went up from any place, nor walks, nor sleeps, nor rises up, but remains in His own place, wherever that is, quick to behold and quick to hear, having neither eyes nor ear, but being of indescribable might; and He sees all things, and knows all things, and none of us escapes His observation; and He is not moved or confined to a spot in the whole world, for He existed before the world was made. How, then, could He talk with any one, or be seen by any one, or appear on the smallest portion of the earth, when the people at Sinai were not able to look even on the glory of Him who was sent from Him; and Moses himself could not enter into the tabernacle which he had erected, when it was filled with the glory of God; and the priest could not stand before the temple when Solomon conveyed the Ark into the house in Jerusalem which he had built for it? Therefore neither Abraham, nor Isaac, nor Jacob, nor any other man, saw the Father and ineffable Lord of all, and also of Christ, but say Him who was according to His will His Son, being God, and the Angel because He ministered to His will; whom also it pleased Him to be born man by the Virgin; who also was fire when He conversed with Moses from the bush. Since, unless we thus comprehend the Scriptures, it must follow that the Father and Lord of all had not been in heaven when what Moses wrote took place.²

Although this cannot be God the Father who is referred to anthropomorphically in the Old Testament, yet He is God, for "He who is called God and appeared to the patriarchs is called both Angel and Lord."³ Therefore, it can be no other than the Logos, who is also God.

²Trypho CXXVII.

³Ibid., LVIII.

Thus every appearance of God to the patriarchs is attributed to the Logos. Justin frequently refers to this in his writings. He says that the Logos who shut Noah up in the ark,⁴ who beheld the tower of Babel,⁵ who rained fire and brimstone down on Sodom and Gomorrah,⁶ who appeared to Abraham as an Angel,⁷ who wrestled with Jacob and was seen by him in his vision,⁸ who led the Jews out of the promised land

⁴Ibid., CXXVII.

⁵Ibid., CXXVII.

⁶Ibid., CXXVII. And that Christ being Lord, and God the Son of God, and appearing formerly in power as Man, and Angel, and in the glory of fire as at the bush, so also was manifested at the judgment executed on Sodom, has been fully demonstrated by what has been said.

⁷Ibid., CXXVI. He... is called at one time the Angel of great counsel, and Man by Ezekiel,... And thus again he says, 'A man wrestled with Jacob,' and asserts it was God; narrating that Jacob said, 'I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved...' And Moses says that God appeared also to Abraham near the oak in Mamre, when he was sitting at the door of his tent at mid-day.

⁸Ibid., LVIII. Moreover, I consider it necessary to repeat to you the words which narrate how He was as both Angel and God and Lord, and who appeared as a man to Abraham, and who wrestled in human form with Jacob, was seen by Him when he fled from his brother Esau.

Ibid., CVI. It was He [Christ] by whom Jacob was called Israel, and Oshea called Jesus (Joshua), under whose name the people who survived of those that came from Egypt were conducted into the land promised to the patriarchs.

and spoke to them from the pillar of fire and the cloud,⁹ who appeared to Moses in the form of fire.¹⁰ It is the Logos also from whom all the kings and anointed persons receive their office -- by sharing in that of the Logos.¹¹

This latter leads us to Justin's unique conception of the Logos as the spermatic Logos. Just as all the anointed persons shared in the Logos, so all people in the history of the world, philosophers and ignorant alike, pagan and Jew, all people who have discovered anything noble,

⁹Ibid., LXXV. Now understand that He who led your fathers into the land is called by this name Jesus, and first called Auses (Oshea). For if you shall understand this, you shall likewise perceive that the name of Him who said to Moses, 'for my name is in Him,' was Jesus. For indeed, he was also called Israel, and Jacob's name was changed to this also... We know then that God revealed Himself in so many forms to Abraham, and to Moses.

Ibid., CXX. And it is plain that this was spoken Gen. 49, 10 not of Judah, but of Christ. For all we out of all nations do expect not Judah, but Jesus, who led your fathers out of Egypt.

¹⁰Ibid., LXX. This same One, who is both Angel, and God and Lord, and man, and who appeared in human form to Abraham and Isaac, appeared in a flame of fire from the bush, and conversed with Moses.

I Apol., LXXIII. From the writings of Moses also this will be manifest; for thus it is written in them, 'And the Angel of God spake to Moses...' But so much is written for the sake of proving that Jesus the Christ is the Son of God and His apostle, being of old the Word, and appearing sometimes in the form of fire, and sometimes in the likeness of angels; but now, by the will of God, having become man for the human race.

Trypho XXIII. For I have proved that it was Jesus who appeared to and conversed with Moses, and Abraham, and all the other patriarchs without exception, ministering to the will of the Father; who also, I say, came to be born man by the Virgin Mary, and lives forever.

¹¹Trypho LXXXVI. For indeed all kings and anointed persons obtained from Him their share in the names of kings and anointed; just as He Himself received from the Father the titles of King, and Christ, and Priest, and Angels, and such like other titles which He bears and did bear.

righteous and good; have done so by sharing in the divine Logos, who is the active force or potency of God at work in the world from the beginning of the world to its destruction. The Logos is the rational seed that pervades the universe. Anything that conforms to the Logos is reasonable. Whatever does not conform to the Logos (Christ and His doctrine) is irrational. The Logos, then, is the source of all the rational ideas and life among all nations. Whatever in pagan philosophy conforms to Christian doctrine was received by the pagans from the spermatic Logos, from contemplating some part of the Logos. Thus he says in his second Apology:

For whatever either lawgivers or philosophers uttered well, they elaborated by finding and contemplating some part of the Word. But since they did not know the whole of the Word, which is Christ, they often contradicted themselves... But these things our Christ, having found and declaring the Father and maker of all, did through His own power. For no one trusted in Socrates so as to die for his doctrine. But in Christ, who was partially known even by Socrates (for He was and is the Word who is in every man, and who foretold the things that were to come to pass both through the prophets and in His own person when He was made of like passions, and taught these things), not only philosophers and scholars believed, but also artisans and people entirely uneducated, despising both glory and fear, and death; since He is a power of the ineffable Father, and not the mere instrument of human reason.¹²

Since the Logos, who is the source of all truth in the world, is in every man and every race of men, and all can share in this spermatic Logos; therefore it is possible for men to receive the true doctrine and philosophy outside of and apart from the revealed word of God, and for them to be saved or to be "Christians." At least this seems to be Justin's position as stated in his first Apology:

¹²II Apol., X.

We have been taught that Christ is the first-born of God, and we have declared above that He is the Word of whom every race of men were partakers; and those who lived reasonably *κατα λόγον* are Christians, even though they have been thought atheists; as, among the Greeks, Socrates and Heraclitus, and men like them; and among the barbarians, Abraham, and Ananias, and Azarias, and Misael, and Elias, and many others whose actions and names we now decline to recount, because we know it would be tedious.¹³

In this way, it appears, Justin tried to solve the conflict of our alii prae alii. However, though these pagans shared in the Logos and could thus be saved, yet Justin does not thereby make the Christian faith unnecessary. He expressly says that these pagans had and can have only a part of the truth. Only the Christian can have the whole truth or the completely true and correct philosophy. He says:

I strive to be found a Christian; not because the teachings of Plato are different from those of Christ, but because they are not in all respects similar, as neither are those of the others, Stoics, and poets, and historians. For each man spoke well in proportion to the share he had of the spermatie word, seeing what was related to it. But they who contradict themselves on the more important points appear not to have possessed the heavenly dimly seen at a distance wisdom, and the knowledge which cannot be spoken against. Whatever things were rightly said among all men, are the property of us Christians. For next to God, we worship and have the Word who is from the unbegotten and ineffable God... For all the writers were able to see realities darkly through the sowing of the implanted word that was in them. For the seed and imitation imparted according to capacity is one thing, and quite another is the thing itself, of which there is the participation and imitation according to the grace which is from Him.¹⁴

It is possible, then, according to Justin, for men to know the essential truths of salvation, of the true philosophy, by means of the spermatie Logos implanted in them; but revelation is still necessary to receive the complete knowledge and all the details of the true philosophy.

¹³I Apol., XLVI.

¹⁴II Apol., XIII.

Not only is the spermatic Logos the source of all that is true and good in the philosophy and thought of mankind. He is also the source of all the moral good. The seed of the Logos can cause men to live righteously, and to reprove sin, as Justin says in his second Apology:

And those of the Stoic school - since, so far as their moral teaching went, they were admirable, as were also the poets in some particulars, on account of the seed of reason /Logos/ implanted in every race of men - were, we know, hated and put to death, - Heraclitus for instance, and, among those of our own time, Musonius and others.¹⁵

And again he says:

For not only among the Greeks did reason /Logos/ prevail to condemn these things through Socrates, but also among the Barbarians were they condemned by Reason /Logos/ Himself, who took shape, and became man, and was called Jesus Christ.¹⁶ Whatever the Logos orders us not to choose, the thinking /Intelligent, full of Logos/ man will not choose.¹⁷

This, of course, goes beyond our concept of the natural knowledge of the Law. It means too that the Means of Grace are not absolutely necessary to salvation. Justin himself draws the logical conclusion that the Means of Grace are not necessary when he has Trypho ask the following question and answers in the affirmative:

'What affinity, then,' replied he /Trypho/, 'is there between us and God? Is the soul also divine and immortal, and a part of that very regal mind? And even as that sees God, so also is it attainable by us to conceive of the Deity in our mind, and thence to become happy?'
'Assuredly,' I said.¹⁸

And, it would logically follow from that, though Justin does not explicitly make that deduction, that man is not inherently and totally sinful. If

¹⁵Ibid., VIII.

¹⁶I Apol., V.

¹⁷Ibid., XII.

¹⁸Trypho IV.

Little is correct in supposing that Justin did not know of the doctrine of original sin,¹⁹ then it is possible that Justin did not see the unscriptural conclusions that would result from this doctrine of the seminal Logos. On the other hand, if he had been aware of that doctrine of original sin, and were not in sympathy with it, he might have deliberately avoided a discussion of the issue. When he affirms, in the last quoted passage, that the soul is divine and immortal, he is taking a position diametrically opposed to the doctrine of original sin.

By this he does not, however, maintain that there is no evil in man; but that man is not completely and totally depraved. He definitely does speak of the wickedness and evil of mankind, as when he speaks of "the wicked demons, taking as their ally the lust of wickedness which is in every man, and which draws variously to all manner of vice, scattered many false accusations."²⁰

This spermatic Logos, who pre-existed before his incarnation, was not only active among the gentiles but also among His chosen race through the prophets. All Prophecy is ascribed to the Logos. The Logos was the means of inspiration for these prophets even as it was the source of all truth among the pagans - and moved them to give utterance to His word. This follows logically from the premise that God the Father is absolute and immovable and as such can have no direct contact with the material world or be confined by such immediate contact. This contact is made through His servant, the Logos, who is also God. Justin speaks of this

¹⁹V. A. Spence Little, *op. cit.*, p. 152.

²⁰I Apol., X.

in his first Apology, when he says: "But when you hear the utterances of the prophets spoken as it were personally, you must not suppose that they are spoken by the inspired themselves, but by the Divine Word who moves them."²¹ And again in these words:

Whence [from Jesus Christ] we become more assured of all things He taught us, since whatever He beforehand foretold should come to pass, is seen in fact coming to pass; and this is the work of God, to tell of a thing before it happens, and as it was foretold so to show it happening.²²

These are the states of Christ, the Logos, that Justin speaks of prior to Christ's humiliation.

His State of Humiliation

As to the state of humiliation of the Logos, Justin is very clear in stating that He willingly became a man in order to undergo suffering, voluntarily assumed human form for the purpose of redeeming mankind; that, though He was true God, He was still capable of undergoing such humiliation, even while He retained His divine character and attributes.

Justin is fully aware of the philosophical problem involved in the humiliation and suffering of Christ, i.e. that of God suffering. It was by his conception of Christ as the Logos that he hoped to solve this problem. For, as previously shown, he believed that, though it was impossible for God the Father to assume human form and human flesh, it was possible for the Logos to do so.

He states, then, that the Logos assumed human form and became capable of suffering, by the will of the Father as well as by His own voluntary consent and will. "We may perceive," he says, "that the Father

²¹I Apol., XXXVI.

²²Ibid., XII.

wished His Son really to undergo such sufferings for our sakes."²³
 That He did this willingly is stated by Justin in his second Apology:
 "But these things our Christ did through His own power."²⁴

In assuming human form, the Logos actually became a true man, capable of and subject to suffering. Thus Justin asserts:

He assumed flesh by the Virgin of their [the patriarchs'] family, and submitted to become a man without comeliness, dishonoured, and subject to suffering.²⁵ He has truly become man capable of suffering.²⁶ Having become man for our sakes, He endured to suffer and to be dishonoured.²⁷ He shall be first humble as a man.²⁸

Justin opposes the argument that the Logos could not suffer humiliation, since He was the Son of God and the very God Himself.²⁹

He also enumerates the stages of the humiliation of the Logos, by which he wishes to prove explicitly that the Logos was capable of suffering and did suffer humiliation through all the stages of His life. Also that his conforming to the various legal ceremonies and observances of the Mosaic Law was a part of His humiliation. All the leading facts of Christ's life are enumerated. The Logos was conceived and born as a child. He grew and passed through all the stages of life as other men. He ate all kinds of food. He was capable of and subject to suffering as other human beings. He observed all the acts of the Mosaic Law, such as

²³Trypho CIII.

²⁷I Apol., L.

²⁴II Apol., I.

²⁸Trypho XXXIII.

²⁵Trypho C.

²⁹Cf. above, p. 40.

²⁶Ibid., XCVIII.

circumcision. He was baptized. He was crucified and buried.³⁰

The purpose of humiliating Himself thus was that, by becoming a man, He might become a partaker of our sufferings, substitute for us, and gain salvation for other human beings. This is stated in such passages as:

Since also He became man for our sakes, that, becoming a partaker of our sufferings, He might also bring us healing.³¹ He became man by the Virgin, in order that the disobedience which proceeded from the serpent might receive its destruction in the same manner in which it derived its origin.

³⁰Trypho LXVII. And Trypho said, "You admitted to us that He was both circumcised, and observed the other legal ceremonies ordained by Moses." I replied, "I have admitted it, and do admit it: yet I have admitted that He endured all these not as if He were justified by them, but completing the dispensation which His Father, the Maker of all things, and Lord and God wished Him to complete. For I admit that He endured crucifixion and death, and the incarnation, and the suffering of as many afflictions as your nation put upon Him.

Ibid., LXXXVIII. The Magi from Arabia, who as soon as the Child was born came to worship Him, for even at His birth He was in possession of His power; and as He grew up like all other men, by using the fitting means, He assigned to its own requirements to each development, and was sustained by all kinds of nourishment, and waited for thirty years, more or less, until John appeared before Him... and preceded Him in the way of baptism, as I have already shown.

Ibid., XCIX. The day on which He was crucified... He prayed in these words: "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me..." showing by this that He had become truly man.

³¹II Apol., XIII.

For Eve, who was a virgin and undefiled, having conceived the word of the Serpent, brought forth disobedience and death.³²

Thus He fulfilled the Law, not to justify Himself, but for us, "completing the dispensation [the Law] which His Father, the Maker of all things, and Lord and God, wished Him [to complete]."³³ He was baptised, not to receive divine power, but to make His power known among men.

His State of Exaltation

Justin labors at great length to present the state of exaltation of the Logos. As to whether he places the descent into hell into this state of exaltation or whether he considers it a part of the humiliation, he does not state. He speaks twice of the descent into hell, in these two passages:

So likewise Christ declared that ignorance was not on His side but on theirs, who thought that He was not the Christ, but fancied they would put Him to death, and that He, like some common mortal, would remain in hades.³⁴

And again, from the sayings of the same Jeremiah these have been cut out: 'The Lord God remembered His dead people of Israel who lay in the graves; and He descended to preach to them His own salvation.'³⁵

From the second of these passages it would seem that Justin would place His descent into hell in His state of exaltation but that Christ's purpose in descending into hell was to preach the Gospel, not the Law.

He speaks of the resurrection, ascension of the Logos, and of His sitting at the right hand of God, all in the same breath in numerous passages such as the following:

³²Trypho, C.

³³Ibid., LXVII.

³⁴Ibid., XCIX.

³⁵Ibid., LXXII.

But when our Christ rose from the dead and ascended to heaven, the rulers in heaven, under appointment of God, are commanded to open the gates of heaven, that He who is King of glory may enter in, and having ascended, may sit on the right hand of the Father until He makes the enemies His footstool.³⁶

The Lord, the Father of all, has brought Him again from the earth, setting Him at His own right hand, until He makes His enemies His footstool; which indeed happens from the time that our Lord Jesus Christ ascended to heaven, after He rose again from the dead.³⁷

And that God the Father of all would bring Christ to heaven after He had raised Him from the dead, and would keep Him there until He has subdued His enemies the devils, and until the number of those who are foreknown by Him as good and virtuous is complete... hear what was said by the prophet David.³⁸

The remainder of the Psalm makes it manifest that He knew His Father would grant to Him all things which He asked, and would raise Him from the dead.³⁹

And though Christ said amongst you that He would give the sign of Jonah, exhorting you to repent of your wicked deeds at least after He rose again from the dead.⁴⁰

It is declared in the Scriptures that Christ must suffer, and come again with glory and receive the eternal kingdom over all the nations, every kingdom being made subject to Him.⁴¹

Justin also very frequently speaks of the second advent of the Logos; that it will be a glorious advent, accompanied by the heavenly hosts, when He will raise the bodies of the dead, and shall judge the worthy men with immortality and the wicked with everlasting hell; as in the following passages:

His second advent, when He shall appear in glory and above the clouds; and your nation shall see and know Him whom they have pierced, as Hosea, one of the twelve prophets, and Daniel foretold.⁴²

[Hear] how also He should come again out of heaven with glory.⁴³

³⁶Ibid., XXXVI.

⁴⁰Ibid., CVIII.

³⁷Ibid., XXXII.

⁴¹Ibid., XXXIX.

³⁸I Apol., XLV.

⁴²Ibid., XIV.

³⁹Trypho CVI.

⁴³I Apol., LI.

How great shall that power be which shall follow His glorious advent! For He shall come on the clouds as the Son of man, so Daniel foretold, and His angels shall come with Him.⁴⁴

If I had not explained that there would be two advents of His, - one in which He was pierced by you; a second, when you shall know Him whom you have pierced, and your tribes shall mourn..., - then I must have been speaking dubious things.⁴⁵

For the prophets have proclaimed two advents of His:... but the second, when, according to prophecy, He shall come from heaven with glory, accompanied by His angelic host, when also He shall raise the bodies of all men who have lived, and shall clothe those of the worthy with immortality, and shall send those of the wicked, endued with eternal sensibility, into everlasting fire with the wicked devils.⁴⁶

This presentation of Justin's conception of the Logos' state of exaltation would be incomplete without reference to his belief in the millennial reign of Christ. Justin believed that Christ would reign on earth for a thousand years prior to the resurrection of the wicked dead and the judgment of the world. He bases this doctrine on the Revelation of St. John and on the prophecies of Ezekial and Isaiah. He says to Trypho on this point:

And further, there was a certain man with us, whose name was John, one of the apostles of Christ, who prophesied, by a revelation that was made to him, that those who believed in our Christ would dwell a thousand years in Jerusalem; and that thereafter the general, and, in short, the eternal resurrection and judgment of all men would likewise take place.⁴⁷

However, he makes special mention of the fact that the Christendom of his

⁴⁴Trypho, XXXI.

⁴⁵Trypho, XXXII.

⁴⁶I Apol., LII.

⁴⁷Trypho, LXXI.

time was not in agreement on this doctrine, that many true Christians did not believe in the millenium. Thus he says:

I admitted to you formerly, that I and many others are of this opinion, and believe that such will take place, as you assuredly are aware; but, on the other hand, I signified to you that many who belong to the pure and pious faith, and are true Christians, think otherwise... But I and others, who are right minded Christians on all points, are assured that there will be a resurrection of the dead, and a thousand years in Jerusalem, which will then be built, adorned and enlarged.⁴⁸

⁴⁸Ibid., LXXX.

CONCLUSION

From the above outline of Justin Martyr's Logos concept we can see the beginning of Christianity's influence on the Hellenistic world of intellect. We see how Justin uses the concepts current in his day and gives to them a new, a wider meaning than they formerly possessed, and a Christian interpretation. He attempts to make Christianity reasonable to non-Christian intellects. He attempts to bring about a marriage between Christianity and Hellenistic thought. We might say that Justin's attempt at this, which was the first serious attempt, constituted merely the engagement period. Already in this period some adjustments seem to have been necessary; for Justin already has (though perhaps unwittingly) compromised some of Christian doctrine in this attempt at union. He has implied a denial of original sin, the absolute necessity of the means of grace, and has falsely identified Christian "faith" with "reason." However, in general, he has not compromised Christianity to bring about this marriage. As the suit develops, though, in the following ages, more and more adjustments or compromises are made - until the original doctrines of Christ become quite obscure.

But at this point, yet, Justin bases his arguments or doctrines on Scripture (in all but a few points) and then tries to give these Scriptural doctrines a philosophical dress; instead of starting from the point of human reason and making logic the foundation for Christian doctrine. His successors, however, did not always follow him in this method.

Justin Martyr's concept of the Logos, then, is not (it seems to me) a departure from Christian doctrine (except at a few points) but a presentation of that doctrine in philosophical form; for, as we have seen

in this study, all the doctrines he presents, with few exceptions, are an expression of the orthodox Christian faith.

We regret that this study must be limited and that Justin's concept of the work of the Logos (which includes the core of Christian doctrine - His work of justification) cannot here be outlined. But that is a subject wide enough for a separate study and which would be more profitable in a more complete form than could be given to it as a mere addendum to or segment of the present study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Primary Sources

Justin Martyr. "The First Apology." The Ante-Nicene Fathers. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. I. New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1890.

Justin Martyr. "The Second Apology." The Ante-Nicene Fathers. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. I. New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1890.

Justin Martyr. "Dialogue with Trypho, A Jew." The Ante-Nicene Fathers. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. I. New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1890.

B. Secondary Sources

Bakewell, G. M. Source Book in Ancient Philosophy. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907.

Dorner, J. A. "History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ." Clark's Foreign Theological Library, Third Series. Translated by William Lindsay Alexander. XI. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1878.

Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. Edited by James Hastings. VIII. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924.

Fisher, George Park. History of Christian Doctrine. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1927.

Fuller, B. A. G. History of Greek Philosophy, Thales to Democritus. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1923.

Goodspeed, Edgar J. A History of Early Christian Literature. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1942.

Inge, William Ralph. Personal Idealism and Mysticism. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1924.

Little, V. A. Spence. The Christology of the Apologists. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935.

The Catholic Encyclopedia. IX. New York: The Encyclopedia Press, 1913.

The New Schaff Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge.