



BRILL

Justin Martyr and the Emerging Christian Canon. Observations on the Purpose and Destination of the Dialogue with Trypho

Author(s): Charles H. Cosgrove

Source: *Vigiliae Christianae*, Sep., 1982, Vol. 36, No. 3 (Sep., 1982), pp. 209-232

Published by: Brill

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1583381>

REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

https://www.jstor.org/stable/1583381?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Brill is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Vigiliae Christianae*

**JUSTIN MARTYR AND THE EMERGING CHRISTIAN CANON
OBSERVATIONS ON THE PURPOSE AND DESTINATION OF THE DIALOGUE
WITH TRYPHO**

BY

CHARLES H. COSGROVE

Research into the formation of the Christian canon has reached the conclusion that in the conception of Justin Martyr certain writings of the New Testament (most notably the synoptic Gospels) rank as “Scripture” on a par with the Old Testament, or at least are clearly ‘on the way’ to obtaining such status. For example, Isidor Frank, in his *Der Sinn der Kanonbildung* (1971), argues that the “memoirs of the apostles” are regarded by Justin and his community as “auf einer Stufe” with the Old Testament. According to Frank, Justin definitely includes the three synoptic Gospels within his designation “memoirs” but not John or Paul. He concludes:

Das Zwölfapostelkollegium ist für Justin der entscheidende Garant der rechten Lehre, die εὐαγγέλια sind als ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων Heilige Schrift der καινῆ διαθήκη.¹

There are those who would go further than Frank and include the Pauline letters or one of the Johannine writings.² Others are more reserved, maintaining that Justin’s view of the apostolic writings is representative of a growing tendency within the church in the direction of regarding those writings as possessing canonical authority.³

This general consensus that Justin regards certain apostolic writings as Scripture or ‘almost Scripture’ must be given up in the light of what will be shown to be the probable purpose and audience of the *Dialogue with Trypho*, the primary document upon which judgments concerning Justin’s ‘canon’ are based. It will be argued that not only are the apostolic writings not esteemed as Scripture by Justin, but that he is in fact moving in an opposite direction from regarding them as such. Indeed, Justin represents a reversal of the trend of the church in the second century toward regarding apostolic writings as canon.

I. *The Legitimacy of Joining the Canon Question with Respect to Justin*

Modern scholarship is generally agreed that we possess only three works of Justin Martyr. These are: 1) the *First Apology*, 2) the *Second Apology*, and 3) the *Dialogue with Trypho*.⁴ Frequently, discussions of Justin's opinions on the canon include the observation that because his writings were directed toward the non-Christian world, the need to discuss the internal church question of canon was not present. For instance, L. W. Barnard comments that Justin's failure to cite Paul's epistles is best explained "by his apologetic purpose which prevents his appealing to purely *Christian* teachers and writings as authorities."⁵ Sometimes a similar judgment is made with reference to Justin's use of the description "memoirs of the apostles" for the Gospels. This is said to be evidence that he writes to those outside the church (or, given the assumption of a non-Christian destination for the *Dialogue*, this usage is explained by that destination). However, the mere use of this phrase says nothing in and of itself about the identity of Justin's audience, for various conceivable reasons may be adduced for its employment in connection with any number of different audiences (see Part II below). Hence it appears to me that the significance of the use of this phrase will best be considered after conclusions regarding the destination of the *Dialogue* have been drawn on other grounds.

These considerations point up the critical importance that the question of the intended audiences of Justin's extant writings assumes in the evaluation of his notion of the Christian canon. The audience provides the broad context for interpreting his remarks. Is it indeed legitimate to ask the question of canon of Justin's works? If one of his writings is addressed to non-Christians, then a defense of the canon as such would not be expected of that writing. Consequently, if the *Dialogue with Trypho* is directed toward a Jewish audience, it is not surprising that scriptural common ground is the Jewish Scriptures (which both parties esteem) and that debate takes place concerning the meaning, text, and extent of these and not the Christian writings. Similarly, if the *First Apology* is aimed at the ears of Roman officials, it is not to be expected that a defense of the Christian *canon* would be offered. As evidence of this one could point to the attitude expressed in *I Apol* 8.5:

And if anyone says that this is incredible or impossible [referring to Christian teaching], this error of ours is one which concerns ourselves only, and no other person, so long as you cannot convict us of doing any harm.

In view of the foregoing the implications of a non-Christian destination of Justin's writings may be set forth as follows:

- 1) Statements about canon gain more weight by virtue of the fact that the global context militates against their introduction.
- 2) Absence of statements regarding canon are not an argument against the importance of the concept for the author. We simply do not know his views on the matter.

However, if a particular writing is addressed to Christians, different implications result:

- 1) Statements reflecting the author's conception of the canon tend to reflect more accurately his own opinions on the subject.
- 2) Absence of reference to the question of canon, where it would be expected in the light of the audience, does suggest something about the author's thinking on the topic.

With these considerations in mind, the problem of the audiences of Justin's three writings may be addressed.

The Destination of the Two *Apologies*

There is agreement about the audience toward which the two apologies of Justin are directed. The *First Apology* is addressed to Emperor Antoninus Pius and to his son Verissimus the philosopher, and to Lucius the philosopher. The *Second Apology*,⁶ being considerably shorter, apparently is intended to deal with some specific problems which had arisen since the composition of the *First Apology*.

The purpose of the *First Apology* is to persuade Rome to apply its policy of religious tolerance to Christianity, but there may be a wider audience in view.⁷ Indeed at points this apology has an almost evangelistic edge.

The Destination of the *Dialogue*

The question of the intended audience of Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* has received various answers. Ostensibly, the *Dialogue* is directed toward the Jewish community as a defense of the Christian faith (see *Dial* 80), and this was the traditional view until the twentieth century.⁸ This perspective continues to be affirmed rather uncritically in some recent literature,⁹ but the present trend is away from this classical position.

Adolf von Harnack first suggested a pagan readership for the *Dialogue*.¹⁰ He has been followed in this regard by E. R. Goodenough¹¹

and Niels Hyldahl.¹² Theodore Stylianopoulos has gathered the main arguments for a pagan destination in his book, *Justin Martyr and the Mosaic Law*,¹³ and these may be summarized as follows:

- 1) The strongly Roman name of the stated addressee, Marcus Pompeius, suggests a pagan rather than a Jewish destination.
- 2) Gentiles are addressed throughout the *Dialogue* (*Dial* 23.3; 24.3; 29.1; 32.5; and others).
- 3) The philosophical prologue and recurring philosophic themes imply pagan readers.
- 4) The literary form of the *Dialogue* favors cultured pagan readers.

There are a number of weaknesses in the pagan hypothesis. “Marcus Pompeius,” for example, occurs only once in the book (*Dial* 141.5; but cf. 8.3), and there is evidence that the work went through more than one edition. Furthermore, Marcus could as easily be a gentile Christian as a pagan, and a Jew bearing such a name is quite possible as well. With regard to the philosophic themes of the *Dialogue*, they may be construed as appropriate to a Jewish or Christian audience. Trypho is depicted by Justin as a Jew interested in philosophy, and Justin describes himself as a Christian wearing the philosopher’s cloak (*Dial* 1.2; cf. 8.2). The argument that the literary form of a “dialogue” would be employed only for a pagan audience falters upon the fact that Jews had already adopted Greek literary forms centuries prior to Justin’s *Dialogue*. Furthermore, Christians used such forms from the very first, as evidenced by the Greek epistolary style of the New Testament letters.¹⁴ Hence, gentile Christians, particularly educated ones such as Justin himself, would have found Greek literary models very appropriate for Christian discourse. The question of appeals to gentiles in the *Dialogue* is more complex and requires separate consideration of the individual texts involved.

Theodor Zahn first adduced *Dial* 23.3 and 24.3 as evidence of non-Christian gentile readers, represented by the “friends of Trypho,” whom he understood to be in the process of proselytism to Judaism. Zahn also claimed *Dial* 32.5 as evidence of gentiles who were students of Jewish teachers. Niels Hyldahl depends heavily upon Zahn at this point, although he argues that the gentile friends of Trypho are a literary construct representative of purely pagan readers of the *Dialogue*.¹⁵ Finally, Harnack has submitted *Dial* 29.1, 64.2e, and 119.4 as proof of a pagan readership.¹⁶ A close investigation of these passages reveals the inadequacy of the hypothesis held by these scholars:

1) *Dial* 23.3

“And when no one responded: ‘Wherefore, Trypho, I will proclaim to you, and to those who wish to become proselytes, the divine message which I heard from that man.’”¹⁷

Zahn identifies the potential “proselytes” (προσηλύτοις) in this passage with the friends of Trypho, viewing the term in a technical sense as designating exclusively gentile converts to Judaism. These converts are not yet full proselytes but only “God-fearers” (φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν, *Dial* 10.4). However, there is no evidence in the context or in the rest of the *Dialogue* that Justin uses either προσηλύτος or φοβούμενος τὸν θεόν in the way which Zahn alleges. Rather, they are used in a general sense to describe all converts to Christianity.¹⁸

2) *Dial* 24.3 and 29.1

Come then with me, all who fear God, who wish to see the good of Jerusalem. Come, let us go to the light of the Lord; for he has liberated His people, the house of Jacob. Come, all nations; let us gather ourselves together at Jerusalem.

and

Let us glorify God, all nations gathered; for He has also visited us. Let us glorify Him by the King of glory, by the Lord of hosts. For He has been gracious towards the Gentiles also; and our sacrifices He esteems more grateful than yours.

David Gill¹⁹ has pointed out the curious nature of *Dial* 29.1 and makes the observation that although the hortatory δοξάσωμεν (“let us glorify”) at first glance appears to include Trypho and his party, yet the passage closes with an our/your contrast which makes this unlikely. Furthermore, the term “gentiles” (ἔθνη)²⁰ hardly includes the Jew Trypho, and these particular gentiles are already converts. That is, the call of *Dial* 29.1 is not to conversion but to worship. This feature militates against construing the audience here as either Trypho or his friends (Zahn) or other pagan readers (Harnack and Hyldahl). The style and tone of the passage are markedly biblical, incorporating material from Ps 23:10 (LXX)²¹ and employing other typically psalmic phrases.²² The words δοξάσωμεν and ἔθνη are echoes of Justin’s previous quotation of Mal 1:10-12.²³ Consequently, Gill concludes that the original setting of the material was liturgical and that Justin uses it here because of its association, perhaps in the liturgy, with the Malachi passage. The Old Testament ring of the text is typical of early Christian hymns and prayers.²⁴ In view of these considerations, *Dial* 29.1 is best taken as addressed to gentile Christians. At least this remains a good possibility.

Dial 24.3 is judged by Stylianopoulos²⁵ to be a similar liturgical fragment. Here a number of septuagintal texts are reflected (Ps 127:1, 4-5; Jer 3:17 and Is 2:5-6). Once again, gentiles are addressed with the hortatory (here δεῦτε). Stylianopoulos suggests that both passages may be explained as a function of Justin's own 'kerygmatic' style, rather than in terms of previous liturgical provenance. He cites "I proclaim... the divine message" (*Dial* 23.3) and "I cry" (*Dial* 24.1) as evidence of this, adducing as well Justin's use of prophetic texts, which reflects a similar character. It is on the basis of *Dial* 29.1 and 24.3 that Stylianopoulos includes Christians within the intended audience of the *Dialogue*.²⁶

The remaining texts offered in support of the pagan hypothesis may be handled summarily. Zahn's construing of *Dial* 32.5 (with its reference to "those who hear you [Trypho]") as an instance of gentiles who are under Jewish teachers being summoned to the gospel by Justin is dependent upon his dubious theory regarding Trypho's companions as 'proselytes-in-process'. Harnack's claim that *Dial* 64.2e implies a pagan readership is especially forced. Justin does not address gentiles here. Rather, he indicates simply that despite Trypho's belligerence he will continue the discussion, just as he would do for any other person (64.2e). Finally, Harnack's contention that *Dial* 119.4 suggests pagan readers is contradicted by Justin's identification of himself with the group in view and the preceding context, where the ἡμεῖς clearly describes those who are already God's people ("But we are not only a people, but also a holy people...").

It must be concluded, then, that the pagan hypothesis is not proven by arguments from "Marcus Pompeius," the *Dialogue's* philosophical concerns, literary form, or appeals to gentiles. Recently, however, a case for a pagan audience has been made which stands somewhat outside the main discussion since Harnack. The proponent, Jon Nilson, claims to present a new version of Harnack's thesis, although in my judgment he is somewhat closer to Zahn (the theory of whom he does not appear to be aware).²⁷

Nilson posits as addressees of the *Dialogue* Roman pagans over whom Jewish and Christian missionaries are in competition. Together with *Dial* 23.3 (discussed above) he cites evidence such as the 'forgiveness theme' (*Dial* 94), as a Christian advantage over post-Temple Judaism, and Justin's arguments for the 'antiquity' of 'Judeo-Christian' faith. However, both of these factors carry significance for gentiles inside the church, hence a missionary setting is not the only con-

text which explains their presence in the *Dialogue*. Nilson also points to increased Jewish evangelism after the Bar Cochba revolt, but this only makes the competitive missionary context a possibility, not a probability. Furthermore, since Jews and Christians were a relatively small minority within the million-plus second-century population of the city of Rome, there were certainly plenty of pagans to go around! If it could be demonstrated that a particular slice of the Roman population was the special target of both Jews and Christians, then the situation which Nilson envisions for the *Dialogue* would be more plausible. This is really what Zahn is about when he suggests “God-fearers” as the target group of the *Dialogue*. Finally, Nilson argues that if Tertullian’s *Adversus Iudaeos* is dependent in part upon Justin’s *Dialogue*, and if the former is aimed at sympathetic pagans who are confused by missionaries from both Christians and Jews, then the *Dialogue* probably addresses a similar situation. However, even apart from the disputability which attaches to the first two “ifs,” the final inference follows as only a possibility, not as a probability. Indeed, Tertullian could have made use of any sources which he found helpful, regardless of their original purposes.²⁸

To this point it has been argued that the evidence offered for a pagan destination is not compelling. This in itself does not refute the possibility of a pagan audience. However, there are a number of considerations which do render the pagan hypothesis unlikely. They concern differences in approach to the readers between the *Apologies*, which are addressed explicitly to pagan readers, and the *Dialogue*. These differences occur in areas where the interests of political apology and evangelistic apology (assuming for the moment a pagan destination for the *Dialogue*) to pagan readers may be deemed to overlap,²⁹ thus affording a means of testing the likelihood of a pagan destination for the *Dialogue*:

- 1) Although in its full quotation of Old Testament Scripture and periodic explanation of Old Testament persons and authors the *Dialogue* appears to accommodate itself to non-Jewish readers,³⁰ by contrast with the *First* and *Second Apologies* these readers appear more likely to be Christian than pagan. For example, *Dial* 43.5 quotes the Isaiah passage regarding “Immanuel” (Is 7:14) but, unlike the same quotation in *I Apol* 33.2, does not translate this word. Similarly, in *Dial* 41 the eucharist is discussed with little ex-

planation as compared with *I Apol* 66. Although Christians might or might not need such explanations of Christian traditions, a pagan would definitely need them. It is precisely the presence of such in the *Apologies* and their comparative absence in the *Dialogue* which suggests a Christian (or Jewish, but see below) audience for the latter.³¹

- 2) Somewhat analogous to 1) is the contrast between the *First Apology* and the *Dialogue* on the question of Moses' priority over Greek philosophy and mythology. Justin maintains, following a traditional Jewish line of thinking which the Church took over, that the best of Greek philosophy is only that which demons in fact spirited away from the teaching of Moses and communicated, albeit in somewhat adulterated form, to pagan thinkers.³² In the *Dialogue* reference is made to this belief in a way which suggests that it is already accepted by Trypho and Justin's readers. It is not so much argued for as acknowledged (see *Dial* 69 and 70). By contrast the *First Apology* makes the explicit point in a number of places that Moses predates the pagan philosophers and is therefore to be regarded as the originator of all that has value in the latter. Moses is primary and pagan philosophy at best merely derivative (*I Apol* 44.8; 54.1-10; 59.1-6; and 60.1-11).
- 3) The *Apologies*, as examples of Justin's method of making apologetic appeal to pagan readers, display numerous instances of the establishment of "common ground" between the pagan and Christian standpoints. The doctrine of the Logos is frequently employed in this connection (and see the idea of the *logos spermatikos* in the *Second Apology*). Furthermore, Plato is said to have predicted Jesus' crucifixion (unwittingly, having borrowed the idea from Moses—*I Apol* 60), and Socrates and Christ are favorably compared (*II Apol* 10). Pagan analogies to the virgin birth, the divine sonship of Christ, etc., are also adduced in an attempt to make Christianity appear more credible to pagan readers. No such apologetic moves are made in the *Dialogue*. Rather, only the negative side of Justin's estimation of pagan ideas is presented.³³ The *Dialogue* does introduce the Logos concept in three passages (these apart from its use in connection with Old Testament "Scripture"—see below), but for the sake of christological proof from the Old Testament, not the establishment of philosophical common ground (*Dial* 61.1-3; 105.1; 128.2). The Logos never becomes the decisive category of apology that it does in

the *Apologies* (e.g., *I Apol* 5.3-4; 10.6; 12.7-8; 14.1; 21.1; 22.2; 23.2; 32.8; 33.6; 36.1; 46.2,5; 63.10,15).

- 4) The *Apologies*, although they make appeal to “predictive prophecy” to buttress the Christian case, rarely resort to “predictive allegorizing.” The reason for this is no doubt that the latter, as the critique of Christianity by the pagan Celsus indicates, was less persuasive to pagans, who did not grant from the outset the Old Testament’s inspiration by the Logos and therefore the possibility of its possessing hidden meaning.³⁴ The *Dialogue*, on the other hand, abounds in speculative allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament, and certainly such had an appeal for the second-century Church (Marcion being the exception that proves the rule).
- 5) The concept of the resurrection, a difficult one for Greeks, is defended quite carefully in *I Apol* 18 and 19. The *Dialogue* ignores the problem of the general resurrection and concentrates on Old Testament predictions of Christ’s resurrection alone. The only exceptions are *Dial* 80.4-5 and 81.1-4, where Justin attacks the views of *Christian* gnostics on the resurrection.
- 6) Pagan accusations against Christianity, which are naturally dealt with at length in the *Apologies*, are handled quite summarily in the *Dialogue* (*Dial* 10). This is rather odd if the *Dialogue* is intended for pagan readers.

Taken together these observations point away from a pagan destination for the *Dialogue*. Furthermore, if the pagan hypothesis is made unlikely on these grounds, then the Christian destination gains over the Jewish precisely in view of the addresses to gentiles no longer accounted for (i.e., the hortatory constructions at 29.1 and 24.3). Still, may it not be the case that the *Dialogue* is directed, as Stylianopoulos avers, toward Jews and Christians at the same time?³⁵ A number of considerations make such a combination of audiences and the hypothesis of a Jewish readership itself improbable:

- 1) Because the foregoing suggests the necessity of positing at least a partly Christian audience, the Jewish hypothesis is obviated by the fact that the *Dialogue*’s preoccupation with issues of Jewish/Christian debate is adequately explained by an exclusively Christian destination (see below).
- 2) The liturgically-styled addresses to gentile Christians in 29.1 and 24.3 would be very awkward for Jewish readers.

- 3) Justin's portrayal of Trypho and Jews in general makes it difficult to imagine that he writes the *Dialogue* as an evangelistic appeal to Jews. At points Trypho and his fellow Jews are cast in an extremely unfavorable light (e.g., *Dial* 14.2; 134.1; and 30.2).³⁶

This last feature gains in significance when a comparison is made with the *First Apology*. There we find diplomatic appeal (note the *captatio benevolentiae* at 2.2 and the stress on solidarity with the emperor at 12.9 and 17.3), imperial persecution excused as due to ignorance (3.4), accusations against Rome indirectly and delicately formulated (3.5), a tendency to soften attack even where it appears. The tone becomes caustic only at 5.1 and perhaps 16.4 (but observe here the textual problem with ὑμεῖς and ἡμεῖς). And these lose some of their force when it is realized that the *First Apology* is more probably directed toward the public than the emperor himself, who is challenged here.

It would appear, then, that the Christian destination is the most likely option just because it is the least problematic. The threat of Marcion to Justin's church at Rome³⁷ and the problem of law-keeping being foisted upon gentile Christians (see *Dial* 47) adequately explain the *Dialogue's* preoccupation with Old Testament matters. These two known internal situations, the Marcionite problem and the 'Judaizing' phenomenon, render more conjectural extra-church reconstructions for the context of the *Dialogue* unnecessary. Furthermore, even apart from these two internal situations, the Jewish/Old Testament focus of the *Dialogue* is not surprising in view of the church's perception of itself as the "true" or "new" Israel, its sense of its own place at the culmination of salvation history. This self-understanding created a profound need for self-definition in terms of the Old Testament and an *internal* urgency for the meeting of Jewish objections to Christianity.³⁸ Indeed the main themes of the *Dialogue* are among the most serious faced by the church of the second century: the problem of the Mosaic law,³⁹ that of the Old Testament as canon, and especially the question of Christian self-definition over against Judaism and yet in terms of the Old Testament. The internal relevance of Jewish matters is further evinced by the fact that 'apologies to the Jews' continued to be produced by the church down into the Middle Ages, long after the evangelistic motive had receded.⁴⁰ A little known but suggestive study by Victor Tcherikover, "Jewish Apologetic Literature Reconsidered," offers an analogous example. Tcherikover argues persuasively that Alexandrian-Jewish apologetic

literature “was created not in order to exhibit certain ideas to the outer world, but to give expression to intricate problems which developed within the Jewish community itself and which attracted the interest of its members.”⁴¹

The sociological consideration must be borne in mind. The need for a minority group to define and legitimate itself vis-à-vis the larger world is a critical factor in apologetic literature. The ethnocentrism of apology betrays its basically centripetal character, especially in a work such as the *Dialogue* where the protestation against the partner in debate carries such a searing edge (see above). The apology draws the outer world into its own inner circle for judgment as a way for the group to make sure of itself. The ostensibly centrifugal cast of apologetic literature may function as a mere foil for this more pressing internal process of self-identification; the dialogue with the outsider may represent no more than internal monologue. It is in this light that the *Dialogue* is best understood.

Finally, there may be mentioned a number of other church problems touched upon by the *Dialogue* that reflect its relevance for Christian readers: adoptionistic christology (*Dial* 88.6), docetism (observe the repeated emphasis upon Jesus’ incarnation and suffering “in reality,” at *Dial* 84.2; 98.1; 99.2; and 103.8), and the question of the millennial hope (*Dial* 80-81, contra the heretics).

The church at Rome, where Justin was a leading catechist, would have found the format and content of Justin’s debate with a philosophically-oriented Jew rather appealing, and one can imagine the *Dialogue* being put to use in a variety of ways within the church. No doubt it would have provided a helpful sourcebook for apology to Jews, even if it is not itself appropriate in its present form as such an apology. But such an employment would have by no means exhausted its usefulness.

II. Justin’s Canon

There is good reason to approach the question of Justin’s canon via the *Dialogue with Trypho*. The results of the foregoing suggest that here Justin writes for Christians, and we may expect that he does so with the special problem of canon at least to some extent in mind. The latter contention may appear surprising, but it follows from the internal and external contexts of the *Dialogue*. If the *Dialogue* was written for the

Roman church sometime after A.D. 153,⁴² it was produced at the height of Marcion's anti-Jewish program.⁴³ Since Marcion was the first, as far as can be ascertained, to promulgate a fixed written canon, and since the radical canon which he produced was a result of the theology for which he was excommunicated from the Roman church, Justin would have found it necessary to deal with the question of canon as posed by Marcion. This would be true whether or not the church had reflected on the canon issue or had come to any consensus on certain writings before Marcion. Justin's preoccupation in the *Dialogue* with the Jewish Scriptures and the Mosaic law is reflective of his struggle with Marcionism, hence it is quite instructive to compare the *Dialogue* with Tertullian's *Adversus Marcionem* (not as evidence of the *Dialogue*'s Christian destination over against the Jewish or pagan, but in the light of that destination). Some of the parallel arguments are the following (and I think it likely that Tertullian used the *Dialogue* in writing against Marcion):

- 1) On free will and the problem of evil (*Dial* 102 and *Adv Marc* II.6, 9).
- 2) On the two advents of Christ (*Dial* 52 and *Adv Marc* III.7).
- 3) On the connection between the names "Jesus" and "Joshua" and its christological implication (*Dial* 75 and *Adv Marc* III.16).
- 4) On the use of Ps 21 (LXX) as an Old Testament proof text for Christ's suffering (*Dial* 98 and *Adv Marc* III.19).
- 5) On the reality of the millennial hope in a restored Jerusalem (*Dial* 80-81, in a context which attacks Christian heretics, and *Adv Marc* III.24)

Further traces of anti-Marcionite polemic are perhaps the repeated stress on the reality of Christ's incarnation (recall above), Justin's fondness for divine appellatives which accent the 'creatorship' of God (e.g., "Father of the Universe," etc.; see *Dial* 108.3; 114.4; 115.4; 116.3; 117.5; 128.2; 133.6), his protestation against the Old Testament God's alleged ignorance (*Dial* 111.4; cf. 99.3 and *Adv Marc* II.25), and his addressing of the problem of Old Testament polygamy (*Dial* 134.3).

Stylianopoulos, however, on the basis of his research into Justin's view of the Mosaic law, understands the *Dialogue* to contain a set of arguments previously used against Christian heretics such as Marcion, now employed against Jews. Nevertheless, in the light of the previous audience analysis, these arguments are best construed as levelled against Jews and Marcionites within the context of intra-church monologue,

not Jewish/Christian dialogue. Justin addresses ‘orthodox’ Christians with polemics against two groups of ‘outsiders’, Jews and Marcionites. For the claims of both are of critical moment within the Roman church itself.

These observations regarding the *Dialogue* are of crucial importance in view of the earlier discussion of the implications which the matter of audience has for the question of canon. With respect to the *Dialogue*, the following statements obtain:

- 1) The author’s conception of the canon will be accurately reflected.
- 2) Absence of reference to canon issues where they would be expected suggests something about the author’s view of the canon on that point.

These two conclusions are not to be applied with unbending rigor. Since the subject is historical in nature, judgment is required with reference to the evidence as a whole, and these two expectations will be considered within the broad framework of that judgment. A methodological consequence of these observations concerning the *Dialogue* as over against the *First* and *Second Apologies* is that the latter will be used in an ancillary way, in view of their different audience and purpose.

Justin and the “Gospels”

Justin designates the apostolic writings, that is, the (synoptic) Gospels, “memoirs of the apostles” (ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων).⁴⁴ The predominance of this phrase has its negative corollary in Justin’s reluctance to apply the title “Gospel” (εὐαγγέλιον) to any book. The term appears only three times in his extant writings. In *Dial* 100.1 he uses the expression “it is written in the Gospel,” but it is not clear to which Gospel (if any) he refers.⁴⁵ The precedent for this passage is *Dial* 10.2, where Trypho speaks of “the precepts which are written ἐν τῷ λεγομένῳ εὐαγγελίῳ.” The latter phrase should probably be taken as “in the so-called Gospel” (cf. *Dial* 32.1 and 80.4), which would suggest a certain reticence on Justin’s part regarding the application of εὐαγγέλιον to an apostolic writing (cf. *I Apol* 66.3). The singular εὐαγγέλιον of *Dial* 10.2 is not a Gospel harmony, for Tatian’s *Diatessaron* represents the first harmony and had not yet been produced.⁴⁶ Nor would it be appropriate to read Irenaeus’ idea of the fourfold unity of the written Gospels back into the thinking of Justin. Rather, the singular is best considered reflective of Justin’s disinclination to equate the ‘gospel’

with the apostolic writings themselves.⁴⁷ The singular connotes a certain element of abstraction as regards the idea of the gospel itself over against discrete Gospels. In this connection Otto Piper⁴⁸ is no doubt correct when he explains Justin's avoidance of the designation 'Gospel' as a result of the dynamic sense in which the gospel is conceived by him, one of the evidences of which is the prevalence of the verb εὐαγγελίζεσθαι over the noun εὐαγγέλιον.

Piper rightly insists that Justin's conception of the gospel be considered in the light of his doctrine of the Logos:

For it is the Logos himself whom we encounter in the work of Jesus, and thus the εὐαγγέλιον is not a word of God once spoken (*Deus dixit*) but rather the Logos as he proclaims himself to us in the ongoing work of Jesus, just as he had done in the proclamation of the prophets.⁴⁹

Piper concludes that in the New Covenant the dynamic εὐαγγέλιον, in which the incarnate Logos continues to be present, usurps the place of the canonical writings of the Old Covenant and precludes the idea of a New Testament canon of books: "The Christian literature serves merely to describe the content of the εὐαγγέλιον but has no independent authority."⁵⁰ Unfortunately, such a statement is somewhat inconsonant with Justin's view of the Old Testament (see below). Furthermore, Piper fails to explain why Justin did not relate positively his understanding of the dynamic Logos to the written memoirs along the lines of his doctrine of inspiration for the Old Testament writings. Why does Justin refrain from moving to the position of Irenaeus, who would soon after him place the church's oral tradition and apostolic writings on the same par? Although Piper's perceptive analysis takes us a step closer to Justin's conception of the canon, an adequate understanding requires that Justin's disparate views on the 'Old Testament' and apostolic writings be considered.

The Contrast between the Old Testament and the Christian Writings

One can hardly improve upon Hans von Campenhausen's⁵¹ lucid discussion of Justin's view of the 'Old Testament'. Von Campenhausen demonstrates how in Justin's response to Marcion prediction-fulfillment,⁵² inspiration by the "prophetic Spirit,"⁵³ non-contradiction,⁵⁴ the appellation "the Scriptures,"⁵⁵ the doctrine of the Logos,⁵⁶ and a salvation-history solution to the problem of the Mosaic law⁵⁷ combine in "what may be called a 'doctrine of holy scripture'."⁵⁸

What is remarkable is that there is no similar defense in Justin of the apostolic writings, even though they were equally endangered by Marcion. The significance of this is accentuated in view of the church's general trend toward placing the apostolic writings on the level of the Old Testament by their use of them in the worship service, a practice attested by Justin himself.⁵⁹ Why then does he refrain from reinforcing this tendency by constructing for the memoirs a "doctrine of Scripture" commensurate with or approaching that which he formulates for the Old Testament?⁶⁰ Why does he neglect to rescue Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Paul from Marcionite rejection or unorthodox editing? Although the genre of a 'dialogue with a Jew' may have put some restraints on Justin's presentation, he does not hesitate to introduce considerations which are relevant to his Christian audience but not to a debate with a Jew. For example, Justin's defense against implicit charges that the Old Testament God displays instances of ignorance (*Dial* 111.4) hardly needs to be made before Trypho, but it is pertinent to the situation of the Roman church threatened by Marcionite aspersions against the Jewish God.⁶¹ Consequently, there is no reason why Justin could not have developed some theory of 'canon' for the Gospels, even if only implicitly. The fact is, he does less than fail to defend their authority; he actually dethrones them from what scriptural authority they may have been attaining by his use of the designation "memoirs."

Even Piper explains the use of the phrase "the memoirs of the apostles" as resultant from Justin's extra-church focus:

Having to deal with unbelievers, Justin could make but limited use of the Christian records. In particular, their Christian origins precluded their use as proofs of the deity of Jesus. As a keen philosopher, however, he sees that their origin does not render them completely valueless for apologetic purposes. By calling these documents ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων he vindicates their undeniable historical value.⁶²

Once it has been recognized that Justin was in fact writing to those within the church when he used this phrase, such observations on the function of the designation take on a different shading. Indeed the use of the Christian writings by Justin is for the sake of historical demonstration that what the prophets predicted of Christ did come to pass.⁶³ But the widespread use of the term "Gospel(s)" in the church during Justin's time and his own appellation, "memoirs,"⁶⁴ suggest that he conceives of them as purely historical documents and not as authorities.

Furthermore, even the designation “memoirs” is employed of evangelical tradition in a restricted sense. It is used only where Justin has the historical, factual dimension of the apostolic literature specifically in view, not where he quotes a word of Jesus in other connections. All of the thirteen instances of the phrase are concentrated in chapters 99-107, where Justin correlates the ‘predictions’ of Ps 21 (LXX) with the circumstances and events of Jesus’ crucifixion. Although there are other instances of this sort of predictive proof in the *Dialogue*,⁶⁵ chapters 99-107 include all of the proofs in which explicit ‘Gospel’ quotations are adduced. The complex comprises eight logia, six of which are said to derive from the memoirs,⁶⁶ and six narrative proofs, which do not involve explicit quotation.⁶⁷ There is only one example of a reference to the memoirs that is not directly related to prophetic proof, but this instance is itself confirmatory in an enlightening way of the picture drawn thus far of Justin’s conception of the apostolic writings. In *Dial* 100.4 Justin indicates that Jesus is recorded to be the “Son of God” in the memoirs. Here is the only instance of a reference to a theological opinion of the Gospel writers to be found in Justin.⁶⁸ Nevertheless, the memoirs are not the grounds of this Christian confession but are taken up *within* general Christian homology:

“And in having him described as Son of God in the memoirs of his apostles and in calling him Son, we have come to understand that he is before all creatures...” (my translation).

This confession is ultimately grounded in Old Testament prophecy as expounded by Christ himself (*Dial* 100.2). The memoirs do not represent independent authorities here but are rather subsumed under the first person plural of universal Christian confession of Jesus as Son of God.⁶⁹ Not the memoirs, but the words of Jesus possess potency:

“For they [the words of the Savior] possess a terrible power in themselves and are sufficient to inspire those who turn from rectitude with awe.” (*Dial* 8.2; cf. 83.4; 102.5; and 116.3)

Consequently, opponents need not be combatted with apostolic authority but only by the strong words of Jesus, taken from harmonies of his sayings or from ‘Gospels’, which constitute mere repositories of Jesus material.

These considerations regarding the Gospel writings combine with implications which may be drawn from the absence of Paul in Justin’s writings to suggest that he was moving in an opposite direction from

viewing Christian writings as approaching Old Testament Scripture in authority. The significance of Paul's absence in Justin is defined by the use he might have made of the apostle. An example is Justin's salvation-history approach to the law, which so parallels Paul's. This is particularly striking in *Dial* 95.1 and 96.1 where Deut 27:26 and 21:23 are used in a way that suggests dependence upon Gal 3:10-13. Another example is Justin's use of Abraham (Gen 15), which recalls Rom 4 (see *Dial* 11.5 and 23.4). Marcion's reliance on Paul no doubt explains such catholic failure to appeal to him even where he would be helpful.⁷⁰ Since Paul is not a source for sayings of Jesus or facts concerning his life, Justin avoids him. Justin, along with Hegesippus⁷¹ and perhaps Papias,⁷² represents a movement against the stream that celebrated Paul in the second century, namely, that of Polycarp⁷³ and the author of II Peter (II Pet 3:15-16). The latter solve the problem of 'unorthodox' use of Paul, whether Valentinian or Marcionite, by 'correctly' interpreting Paul against such 'false teachers'.

Justin solves the problem of Marcion's fixed, written canon threat, theologically-loaded as it is with apostolic *interpretation*, by retreating to the authority of the Logos alone, whether inscripturated in the Old Testament or found on the lips of Jesus. The emerging authority of "Gospel and Apostle" is resisted and the writings for which these stand are employed for their historical rather than their interpretive value. Perhaps *Dial* 48.4, standing as it does in a context where Christian heresy is at issue,⁷⁴ expresses Justin's opinion most precisely:

"We are commanded by Christ himself to trust not in human doctrines but in those proclaimed by the blessed prophets and taught by him." (my translation)

This formulation is not unlike that of Hegesippus: "...in each city things are as the law, the prophets, and the Lord preach."⁷⁵

III. Conclusion

The results of this study must be stated cautiously. The argument depends quite fundamentally upon the prior question of the destination of the *Dialogue with Trypho*, a question to which the answer proposed here should admittedly be received somewhat guardedly in view of our partial knowledge of Justin and second-century Christianity in general. Nevertheless, it must at least be stressed that *all* we know for certain is that Justin regarded the Old Testament and the words of Jesus as

possessing full authority. And at most the following may be suggested, even if a bit boldly, concerning his view as a whole.

Only that which the Logos taught (in the Old Testament or in Jesus) is included in Justin's canon. One can only conjecture about his opinion of Paul's theology or, if we may properly speak of it, that of a Gospel writer. There is no evidence that he had formed negative judgments of them, but they do stand outside his canon. Perhaps as 'interpretive writings' the letters of Paul are excluded in reaction to Marcion's exploitation of such 'secondary theologizing' for heretical purposes. The considerations which led to Justin's misgivings about the emerging canonical status of the Gospels were no doubt more complex. The second-century church tended not to conceive of the Gospels as discrete, theologically-shaped literary entities; this is a more modern notion of them. Narrative and sayings material even in Justin's day represented separate streams of oral tradition, and these strands of Gospel material continued to have a life of their own separate from their joint literary incorporation into written Gospels. Consequently, it is possible, even natural, for the second-century Church of Justin's time to think of the logia of Jesus or the events of his life quite apart from the evangelical literature and to conceive of the Gospels as mere guardians of such tradition. The 'orthodox' Gospel literature represents not so much right interpretation, although this is not entirely absent, as correct circumscription and preservation. It is Marcion who most accentuates the redactional issue, and to this extent he is the first *Tendenzkritiker*. Marcion challenges both the perimetrical and editorial integrity of the Gospels by drawing a closer circle of authentic narrative and logia (Luke) and by critically sifting the contents of that circle. This forces the issue of authority, and the Great Church ultimately followed Marcion's idea of apostolic authority, although it widened the circle and resisted his critical approach to the accepted materials. This meant that the authority of the Jesus tradition no longer stood on its own as dynamic and self-attesting. Now it was underpinned by apostolic authority in a way which it had not been, except perhaps ever so implicitly, up to that point. The Gospels are now viewed not only as literary guardians of the sacred tradition but as literary *guarantors* of that tradition. This is the decisive move and one which Justin apparently resists. The words of Jesus need no secondary props, for they possess intrinsic authority. They need not be defended apostolically, only adduced and allowed to go to work in their own strong way.

Justin moves the canon question, as it stands at a turning-point in the mid second century, in two directions. On the one hand, he advances the Old Testament to a more clearly-articulated canonical status, developing for it a full-blown doctrine of inspiration. On the other hand, he devalues the authority of the emerging New Testament canon, limiting himself to the teaching of Jesus. He was not followed in his views on the apostolic writings by subsequent generations, and his solution to the problem of canon was soon frustrated. At the moment of the composition of the *Dialogue*, however, nothing is so settled, the trajectory of canonization is not yet clearly plotted. Indeed to enter the canon stream at Rome in the mid second century is to wade into a big two-hearted river.

NOTES

¹ Isidor Frank, *Der Sinn der Kanonbildung* (Freiburg/Basel/Wien 1971) 130; similarly, L. W. Barnard, *Justin Martyr* (Cambridge 1967) 63.

² For example, W. G. Kümmel, Notwendigkeit und Grenze des neutestamentlichen Kanons, in *Das Neue Testament als Kanon*, ed. E. Käsemann (Göttingen 1970) 69; Robert M. Grant, *The Formation of the New Testament* (New York 1965) 136-137.

³ For example, Hans von Campenhausen, *The Formation of the Christian Bible*, trans. J. A. Baker (Philadelphia 1972) 167-169; Edgar J. Goodspeed, *The Formation of the New Testament* (Chicago 1926) 57; Apparently also C. F. D. Moule, *The Birth of the New Testament* (New York 1962) 197-198.

⁴ The Greek text used here is that prepared by E. J. Goodspeed, *Die ältesten Apologeten* (Göttingen 1914).

⁵ L. W. Barnard, *Justin Martyr*, 63. Robert Grant argues similarly that “in trying to understand his ideas about a canon (if he had one) we must bear in mind that his extant works are addressed to those outside the Church. He is not necessarily setting forth all he knows, and what he does set forth is not necessarily expressed in language always characteristic of the Christian community” (*The Formation of the New Testament*, 131-132).

⁶ The question of whether the second was originally part of the first need not be taken up here. On this, see E. R. Goodenough, *The Theology of Justin Martyr* (Jena 1923) 84-87.

⁷ The fact that the writing is addressed to the Emperor may reflect a simply formal characteristic taken over from Hellenistic Judaism, where it was not supposed that a letter would in fact reach the ruler. The *Apologies* were probably aimed at the wider public and constitute a written base for arguments which were no doubt delivered orally (we should hardly think of literary publication). There were good reasons for the Christians to make their case before the general public, aside from evangelistic interests. E. R. Dodds remarks that it “seems likely that many of the local persecutions in the second century were forced on reluctant Provincial Governors by popular feeling” (*Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety*) [Cambridge 1965] 110). There were no doubt internal needs for self-definition and self-justification vis-à-vis the Hellenistic world at work as well.

⁸ In Zahn a Jewish circle is addressed but one which includes gentiles in the early stages of proselytism (Theodor Zahn, Studien zu Justinus Martyr, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 8 [1886] 60).

⁹ See for example L. W. Barnard, who posits Judaism as the non-Christian world addressed by the *Dialogue* (Justin Martyr, 21-26 and 170); apparently also Willis A. Shotwell, *The Biblical Exegesis of Justin Martyr* (London 1965) 2; compare E. Flesseman-Van Leer, *Tradition and Scripture in the Early Church* (Assen 1954) 68-73.

¹⁰ Harnack suggested that pagans, Jews, and Christians were addressed in the *Dialogue: Judentum und Judenchristentum in Justins Dialog mit Tryphon* TU 39/1 (Leipzig 1913) 51-52.

¹¹ E. R. Goodenough, *The Theology of Justin Martyr*, 96-100.

¹² Niels Hyldahl, *Philosophie und Christentum: Eine Interpretation der Einleitung zum Dialog Justins* (Kopenhagen 1966) 16-22.

¹³ SBL Dissertation Series No. 20 (Missoula, Montana 1975) 169-170.

¹⁴ Of special interest in this connection is H. D. Betz's analysis of Paul's letter to the Galatians in terms of the Greco-Roman "apologetic-letter" genre: The Literary Composition and Function of Paul's Letter to the Galatians, *NTS* 21 (1975) 353-379.

¹⁵ Hyldahl, *Philosophie und Christentum*, 20.

¹⁶ Harnack, *Judentum und Judenchristentum*, 51-52, n. 2.

¹⁷ Unless otherwise indicated, all translations are from *Ante-Nicene Christian Library: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers*, vol. II: *Justin Martyr and Athenagoras*, ed. by A. Roberts and J. Donaldson (Edinburgh 1867).

¹⁸ See with regard to προσήλυτος and προσήλυσις *Dial* 28.2 and 122.5. On φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν, note especially *Dial* 106.1-2 (cf. 24.3 and 98.5).

¹⁹ David Gill, A Liturgical Fragment in Justin, *HTR* 59 (1966) 98-100.

²⁰ The term ἔθνη refers primarily to Christians in the *Dialogue*. It has apparently been taken over from septuagintal prophetic texts regarding the gentiles, which Justin applies to the church. Where the term designates pagans the context makes this clear. See Stylianopoulos, *Justin Martyr and the Mosaic Law*, 179.

²¹ The phrases τοῦ βασιλέως τῆς δόξης and τοῦ κυρίου τῶν δυνάμεων.

²² The construction δοξάσωμεν τὸν θεόν ... δοξάσωμεν αὐτόν recalls the Septuagint at, for example, Ps 116.1.

²³ Gill supplements his philological argument with the observation that the verbs ἐπισκέπτομαι and συνέρχομαι are rare in Justin and that in *Dial* 12.3 εὐδοκέω takes the construction ἐν plus the dative, as opposed to εἰς with the accusative here. What weight should be given these considerations is difficult to judge.

²⁴ In support of this he cites Oscar Cullman, *Urchristentum und Gottesdienst* (Zürich 1950) 24.

²⁵ Stylianopoulos, *Justin Martyr and the Mosaic Law*, 184.

²⁶ According to Goodenough (*The Theology of Justin Martyr*, 97), K. L. Grube suggested a Christian audience for the *Dialogue* in 1880 in his article, Die hermeneutischen Grundsätze Just. d. Märtyrers, *Der Katholik* I (Mainz 1880) 1-42. This essay was unavailable to me.

²⁷ Jon Nilson, To Whom Is Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* Addressed? *TS* 38/3 (1977) 538-546. Nilson's own version of the pagan hypothesis distinguishes itself from that of Harnack by its assumption that Roman Jews and Christians are in competition over these potential converts.

²⁸ Nilson also adduces what appear to me to be two inconsequential considerations in favor of his pagan theory. He sees Trypho as the type of Jew a gentile might well like to become, which fits his thesis but does not really advance it. He also appeals to a passage in Eusebius where *Dial* 17 is quoted with regard to Jewish slander against Christians being spread among the gentiles. The leap from Eusebius (as one who would “know” the circumstances and purpose of the *Dialogue* and from whose remarks we must infer that purpose as apology to gentiles) to this isolated text in the *Dialogue* as a clue to its purpose (unlike the *Apologies*, the *Dialogue* does not even take up defense against such accusations, pagan or Jewish; see below) is little short of herculean.

²⁹ This comparison is made all the more appropriate if it is true that the *Apologies* are directed toward a wider audience, as the speech style of the *First Apology* suggests. Unlike Cyril Richardson (*Early Christian Fathers* [New York 1970] 227), I am inclined to see this feature as reflective not so much of literary composition in the guise of a speech but of the oral character and function of this apology. Here is a written manuscript of what was for the most part undoubtedly communicated to the public orally.

³⁰ Quotations from the Minor Prophets are explained as such (e.g., “Hosea, one of the twelve prophets” in *Dial* 19.5, which is one of numerous instances), and the texts are reproduced in full. Goodenough rightly observes that Justin’s use of the Old Testament suggests that he is writing for those somewhat unfamiliar with the Jewish Scriptures (*The Theology of Justin Martyr*, 98-99), and Justin was probably heavily involved in the Roman catechetical program (see A. J. Bellinzoni, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr* [Leiden 1967] 141). Here an accommodation for the average layperson or new convert may be in evidence.

³¹ See also Stylianopoulos, *Justin Martyr and the Mosaic Law*, 192.

³² John Gager, *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism* (Nashville/New York 1972) 76-79.

³³ See Stylianopoulos, *Justin Martyr and the Mosaic Law*, 194.

³⁴ John Gager, *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism*, 99.

³⁵ Stylianopoulos, *Justin Martyr and the Mosaic Law*, 36.

³⁶ For example, *Dial* 30.1 reads: “But impute it to your own wickedness...” (Justin speaking to Trypho and company). Justin takes every opportunity to discredit the Jews on all moral and spiritual counts. In fact he goes so far as to explain the divine purpose in commanding circumcision for the Jews as the marking out of Israel for punishment (*Dial* 16.2-3; 92.2-3; see also 12.2; 14.2; 17.1; 19.2; 20.4; 27.4; 30.1; 55.3; 93.4; 123.4; 133.6; 136.2).

³⁷ Marcion’s anti-Jewish program was a crucial issue of Justin’s time. Both were at Rome, Marcion having already begun organizing his own churches before Justin arrived (see Goodspeed, *The Formation of the New Testament*, 50). Justin produced a full work against heresies, the *Syntagma* mentioned in *I Apol* 26.8, and Irenaeus (according to Eusebius, *HE* 4.18.9) refers to a work of Justin’s entitled *Against Marcion*. See Justin’s mention of Marcion at *I Apol* 26.5 and Marcionites at *Dial* 35.6.

³⁸ A statement of Justin’s in 29.2 reflects this: “They are contained in your Scriptures, or rather not yours, but ours.” The recourse of Jews and Christians to the same hagiographa made Jewish objections to Christianity of internal relevance to the church.

³⁹ See von Campenhausen on the law as a critical problem for the church of the second century (*The Formation of the Christian Bible*, 74).

⁴⁰ See Amos B. Hulén, ‘Dialogues with the Jews’ as Sources for the Early Jewish Argument against Christianity, *JBL* 51 (1932) 58-59.

⁴¹ Jewish Apologetic Literature Reconsidered, *Eos* 48 (1956) 169-193 (193). I would apply this consideration to the question of the destination of the *First Apology*, but the problem of persecution faced by the second-century church demands that a real external dialogue be regarded as the primary focus of this work (see above, esp. note 7).

⁴² This date is arrived at by means of the *First Apology*, which can be assigned to c. 153-155 on internal grounds (Goodenough, *The Theology of Justin Martyr*, 80-81), since the *Dialogue* refers to it (*Dial* 120.6). Justin was probably martyred between 163 and 167, hence the *Dialogue* was written sometime between 153 and 167.

⁴³ Marcion was excommunicated from the Roman church c. 144 and died c. 160. His influence was widespread by about 153, as Justin attests in *I Apol* 26.5.

⁴⁴ The phrase occurs twice in the *First Apology* (66.3 and 67.3). In the *Dialogue* it is more frequent, being used thirteen times (see below). Sometimes the phrase is sharpened to "memoirs of his apostles" (*Dial* 100.4).

⁴⁵ See Bellinzoni, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr*, 25-28.

⁴⁶ According to Bellinzoni, Justin himself probably assembled various logia into harmonistic written form, but he did not produce a complete Gospel harmony (*The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr*, 138 and 141-142).

⁴⁷ Only in the *First Apology* does he employ the plural (*I Apol* 66.3), and this exception is probably an accommodation for a pagan audience. Again Justin uses the impersonal construction: "the so-called Gospels." This is the common Christian designation for them, but Justin avoids a first-person verb.

⁴⁸ Otto Piper, *The Nature of the Gospel according to Justin Martyr*, *JR* 41 (1963) 155-168.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 162. The inspiration of the Old Testament by the Logos is reflected especially in Justin's penchant for terming the Old Testament Scriptures δ λόγος. Sometimes the designation is formulated in a relative fashion: "The word of prophecy says," etc. (*Dial* 30.2; 38.2; 58.4; 63.2,5). But the absolute δ λόγος is frequent (*Dial* 60.4,5; 62.4; 65.3; 67.7; 68.5; 69.4; 78.9). A number of these instances are particularly revealing, for they represent the Logos as a hypostasis who speaks through the prophet (*Dial* 62.4; 68.5; 87.3).

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 166.

⁵¹ Von Campenhausen, *The Formation of the Christian Bible*, 88-102.

⁵² Justin sees many parts of the Old Testament as predicting Christ, literally or typologically. The term prophet is broadened to include the whole range of Old Testament writers or speakers. The purpose is no longer merely to demonstrate the validity of Christ's messiahship from Scripture. Now Christ as the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecies becomes the vindication of the Old Testament as Scripture for the church.

⁵³ See *Dial* 34.1, which contains the words "...I will mention also another Psalm spoken to David by the Holy Spirit."

⁵⁴ *Dial* 65.2: "For I shall not dare to suppose or even say this that some passages of Scriptures contradict others." Justin prefers to attribute the appearance of contradiction to his own lack of insight.

⁵⁵ The terms δ λόγος (recall above) and η γραφή (or $\alpha\iota$ γραφαί) appear to be interchangeable designates for "the Scripture(s)" (see *Dial* 57.1-2).

⁵⁶ Justin's doctrine of the Logos is his theological bridge between the Old Testament and Christ. The Logos is the prophetic Spirit (*Dial* 68.5), and the Spirit-Logos incarnate is Jesus Christ (*I Apol* 33.6).

⁵⁷ Justin's salvation-history solution to the problem of the law rescues the Old Testament from Marcionite devaluation of it on the basis of its 'intolerable' legal parts.

⁵⁸ Von Campenhausen, *The Formation of the Christian Bible*, 88.

⁵⁹ See *I Apol* 67.3: "And on the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather to one place, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as time permits." The conjunction "or" that links the memoirs and the prophets militates against Shotwell's contention that the memoirs are used only for proof from prophecy (not in any sense as 'Scripture'). The idea here is not consecutive (see Shotwell, *The Biblical Exegesis of Justin Martyr*, 28).

⁶⁰ The only Christian writing described in terms of prophetic revelation is John's Apocalypse (*Dial* 81), mentioned in connection with the millennial hope. However, Justin prefaces his reference to John with Old Testament documentation of the future millennium, and the impression is given that John's prophecy receives its fundamental validation (given the problem of false prophecy mentioned in the near context) from its concurrence with Old Testament prophecy. This is confirmed by the continuation of the discussion in *Dial* 82.3, where the ultimate test of true prophecy is whether it is *κατὰ τὰς γραφάς* (observe the total context).

⁶¹ I think a similar evaluation is to be made of passages such as *Dial* 102.3 (the question of God's power over Herod).

⁶² Piper, *The Gospel according to Justin Martyr*, 159. See also Eric Osborn, *Justin Martyr* (Tübingen 1973) 123.

⁶³ See Shotwell, *The Biblical Exegesis of Justin Martyr*, 25; also Flessman-Van Leer, *Tradition and Scripture in the Early Church*, 76.

⁶⁴ It has been argued that Justin borrowed the term from Papias (R. G. Heard, *The Απομνημονεύματα* in Papias, Justin, and Irenaeus, *NTS* 1 [1954-55] 122-129). More probably he derives it from Xenophon, with whose *Memoirs* he is familiar (*II Apol* 11; cf. *I Apol* 5).

⁶⁵ For example, in *Dial* 85.7 a logion is alluded to as fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy, but no direct quotations are supplied for prediction or fulfillment. There are also instances where narrative material is alluded to as substantiation of prophetic fulfillment, but again no direct quotations are found (e.g., *Dial* 53.2,4; 88).

⁶⁶ The six are found in 101.3; 103.6,8; 105.5,6; and 107.1. The remaining two are in 100.1 and 101.2.

⁶⁷ These six are in 102.5; 104.1; 105.1; and 106.1,3,4. Some of these involve proofs related only tangentially to Ps 21.

⁶⁸ Although it may appear so at first glance, *Dial* 105.1 does not contain a reference to a theological statement of John (such as *Jn* 1:14 or 1:18). The construction *ὡς ἀπὸ ... ἐμάθομεν* must be taken strictly with *καὶ ὕστερον ... γενόμενος*. The verb *προεδήλωσα* makes this clear, for only the matter of the virgin birth has been "already shown" from the memoirs.

⁶⁹ It is possible to take *ἔχοντες* as "viewing" or "seeing" as opposed to the possessive idea (such as "having"), but the conjunctive *καὶ* suggests that the two be construed coordinately. The former is not the ground of the latter.

⁷⁰ See von Campenhausen, *The Formation of the Christian Bible*, 98.

⁷¹ Hegesippus omits Paul from his canon list (Eusebius, *HE* 4.22.3).

⁷² Papias, although he mentions Matthew, Mark, I John, and I Peter, apparently passes over Paul in silence. His preference is for the living oral tradition (Eusebius, *HE* 3.39.4).

⁷³ See Polycarp, *Phil* 3.2.

⁷⁴ Whether the reading ὑμετέρου (“our”) or ἡμετέρου (“your”) is preferred, the persons in view are Christians: ὁμολογοῦντες αὐτὸν Χριστὸν εἶναι.

⁷⁵ Eusebius, *HE* 4.22.3. Quoted from *The Ecclesiastical History*, vol. 1, trans. K. Lake. LCL (London 1926) 375.

Princeton, New Jersey 08540 USA, 306 Emmons Dr., 8 B