1

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS
STANDARD REFERENCE MATERIAL 1010a
(ANSI and ISO TEST CHART No. 2)

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file - Votre référence

Our file - Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

**THE POWER OF DEMONS: DEMONOLOGY IN JUSTIN MARTYR'S
APOLOGETIC**

by

JAMES C. POPE, B.A.

**A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of**

Master of Arts

Department of Religion

**Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario
K1S 5B6
September 3, 1993
copyright
1993, James C. Pope**

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file *Votre référence*

Our file *Notre référence*

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-89796-1

Canada

Name

James C. Pope

Dissertation Abstracts International is arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

HISTORY OF RELIGION

SUBJECT TERM

0320

SUBJECT CODE

U·M·I

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS

Architecture 0729
Art History 0377
Cinema 0900
Dance 0378
Fine Arts 0357
Information Science 0723
Journalism 0391
Library Science 0399
Mass Communications 0708
Music 0413
Speech Communication 0459
Theater 0465

EDUCATION

General 0515
Administration 0514
Adult and Continuing 0516
Agricultural 0517
Art 0273
Bilingual and Multicultural 0282
Business 0688
Community College 0275
Curriculum and Instruction 0727
Early Childhood 0518
Elementary 0524
Finance 0277
Guidance and Counseling 0519
Health 0680
Higher 0745
History of 0520
Home Economics 0278
Industrial 0521
Language and Literature 0279
Mathematics 0280
Music 0522
Philosophy of 0998
Physical 0523

Psychology 0525
Reading 0535
Religious 0527
Sciences 0714
Secondary 0533
Social Sciences 0534
Sociology of 0340
Special 0529
Teacher Training 0530
Technology 0710
Tests and Measurements 0288
Vocational 0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

Language 0679
General 0289
Ancient 0290
Linguistics 0291
Modern
Literature 0401
General 0294
Classical 0295
Comparative 0297
Medieval 0298
Modern 0316
African 0591
American 0305
Asian 0352
Canadian (English) 0355
Canadian (French) 0593
English 0311
Germanic 0312
Latin American 0315
Middle Eastern 0313
Romance 0314
Slavic and East European

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

Philosophy 0422
Religion
General 0318
Biblical Studies 0321
Clergy 0319
History of 0320
Philosophy of 0322
Theology 0469

SOCIAL SCIENCES

American Studies 0323
Anthropology
Archaeology 0324
Cultural 0326
Physical 0327
Business Administration
General 0310
Accounting 0272
Banking 0770
Management 0454
Marketing 0338
Canadian Studies 0385
Economics
General 0501
Agricultural 0503
Commerce-Business 0505
Finance 0508
History 0509
Labor 0510
Theory 0511
Folklore 0358
Geography 0366
Gerontology 0351
History
General 0578

Ancient 0579
Medieval 0581
Modern 0582
Block 0328
African 0331
Asia, Australia and Oceania 0332
Canadian 0334
European 0335
Latin American 0336
Middle Eastern 0333
United States 0337
History of Science 0585
Law 0398
Political Science
General 0615
International Law and Relations 0616
Public Administration 0617
Recreation 0814
Social Work 0452
Sociology
General 0626
Criminology and Penology 0627
Demography 0938
Ethnic and Racial Studies 0631
Individual and Family Studies 0628
Industrial and Labor Relations 0629
Public and Social Welfare 0630
Social Structure and Development 0700
Theory and Methods 0344
Transportation 0709
Urban and Regional Planning 0999
Women's Studies 0453

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Agriculture
General 0473
Agronomy 0285
Animal Culture and Nutrition 0475
Animal Pathology 0476
Food Science and Technology 0359
Forestry and Wildlife 0478
Plant Culture 0479
Plant Pathology 0480
Plant Physiology 0817
Range Management 0777
Wood Technology 0746
Biology
General 0306
Anatomy 0287
Biostatistics 0308
Botany 0309
Cell 0379
Ecology 0329
Entomology 0353
Genetics 0369
Limnology 0793
Microbiology 0410
Molecular 0307
Neuroscience 0317
Oceanography 0416
Physiology 0433
Radiation 0821
Veterinary Science 0778
Zoology 0472
Biophysics
General 0786
Medical 0760

EARTH SCIENCES

Biogeochemistry 0425
Geochemistry 0996

Geodesy 0370
Geology 0372
Geophysics 0373
Hydrology 0388
Mineralogy 0411
Paleobotany 0345
Paleoecology 0426
Paleontology 0418
Paleozoology 0985
Palynology 0427
Physical Geography 0368
Physical Oceanography 0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Environmental Sciences 0768
Health Sciences
General 0566
Audiology 0300
Chemotherapy 0992
Dentistry 0567
Education 0350
Hospital Management 0769
Human Development 0758
Immunology 0982
Medicine and Surgery 0564
Mental Health 0347
Nursing 0569
Nutrition 0570
Obstetrics and Gynecology 0380
Occupational Health and Therapy 0354
Ophthalmology 0381
Pathology 0571
Pharmacology 0419
Pharmacy 0572
Physical Therapy 0382
Public Health 0573
Radiology 0574
Recreation 0575

Speech Pathology 0460
Toxicology 0383
Home Economics 0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences
Chemistry
General 0485
Agricultural 0749
Analytical 0486
Biochemistry 0487
Inorganic 0488
Nuclear 0738
Organic 0490
Pharmaceutical 0491
Physical 0494
Polymer 0495
Radiation 0754
Mathematics 0405
Physics
General 0605
Acoustics 0986
Astronomy and Astrophysics 0606
Atmospheric Science 0608
Atomic 0748
Electronics and Electricity 0607
Elementary Particles and High Energy 0798
Fluid and Plasma 0759
Molecular 0609
Nuclear 0610
Optics 0752
Radiation 0756
Solid State 0611
Statistics 0463

Applied Sciences

Applied Mechanics 0346
Computer Science 0984

Engineering
General 0537
Aerospace 0538
Agricultural 0539
Automotive 0540
Biomedical 0541
Chemical 0542
Civil 0543
Electronics and Electrical 0544
Heat and Thermodynamics 0348
Hydraulic 0545
Industrial 0546
Marine 0547
Materials Science 0794
Mechanical 0548
Metallurgy 0743
Mining 0551
Nuclear 0552
Packaging 0549
Petroleum 0765
Sanitary and Municipal System Science 0554
Geotechnology 0790
Operations Research 0428
Plastics Technology 0796
Textile Technology 0795
0994

PSYCHOLOGY

General 0621
Behavioral 0384
Clinical 0622
Developmental 0620
Experimental 0623
Industrial 0624
Personality 0625
Physiological 0989
Psychobiology 0349
Psychometrics 0632
Social 0451

**Thesis Acceptance Form
M.A. CANDIDATE**

The undersigned recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
and Research acceptance of the thesis

**THE POWER OF DEMONS: DEMONOLOGY IN
JUSTIN MARTYR'S APOLOGETIC**

submitted by James C. Pope
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Thesis Supervisor

Chair, Department of Religion

Carleton University

Sept 3, 1993
date

ABSTRACT

Justin Martyr's three works; the first and second apologies and the *Dialogue*, contain contradictory notions of evil demons. A survey of the demonological notions which were common to Greco-Romans, Jews and Christians, coupled with insights from the sociology of knowledge, determines how Justin selectively used those notions which best suited his pagan audience in the apologies, and his Christian-Jewish audience in the *Dialogue*. Such comparisons, illuminate the attractiveness of demonology in second century religious debate and its power to explain the violent pagan opposition to the Christian message. The recognition of the persuasive power of demonological notions and Justin's selective use of them demonstrates both the coherent nature of Justin's demonology and the need for a reassessment of its contribution to the success of the Christian mission.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank all my instructors in the Department of Religion, they have given me a love for the study of religion. Particularly, I thank Dr. Leonard Librande and Dr. Antonio Gualtieri for their steadfast support over the years, Dr. Nalini Devdas for bringing religion alive in her person and in her teaching, and Dr. Stephen Wilson for encouraging me to pursue graduate studies in Early Christianity and for his assistance in completing this thesis. I thank my parents, Jim and Margo Pope, and especially my wife, Kathleen, for the love that made this a labour of love.

I am an historian... of beliefs. I try to recapture not simply the fact that people at one time believed something or other, but the reason and the logic behind their belief. It does not matter if the belief was wrong, or seems wrong to us today; it is the fact of the belief that concerns me. You see, I don't think that people are foolish and believe wholly stupid things, they may believe what is untrue, but they have a *need* to believe the untruth - it fills a gap in the fabric of what they want to know, or think that they ought to know. We often throw such beliefs aside without having truly understood them.

Robertson Davies, *The Rebel Angels*

Table of Contents

	Page
Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Epigraph	iv
Table of Contents	v
 INTRODUCTION	 1
 CHAPTER ONE - DEMONOLOGICAL BACKGROUNDS OF THE SECOND CENTURY	 16
Part 1 Greco-Roman Demonology	11
1.1.1 Trends in Greco-Roman Demonology B.C.E.	12
1.1.2 Demonology in the Common Era	14
1.1.3 Summary	16
 Part 2 Jewish Demonology	
1.2.1 Demonology of the Hebrew Bible	17
1.2.2 Apocalyptic Demonology	20
1.2.3 <i>1 Enoch</i> and <i>Jubilees</i>	23
1.2.4 Later Trends in Apocalyptic Demonology	26
1.2.5 Rabbinic Demonology	28
1.2.6 Hellenistic Jewish Demonology	30
1.2.7 Summary	31
 Part 3 Christian Demonology before Justin	
1.3.1 Satan	32
1.3.2 The Social Element of Demonology in the New Testament	37
1.3.3 The Apostolic Fathers	38
1.3.4 Summary	39
 Summary of Chapter One	 40

Contents (cont'd)

	Page
CHAPTER TWO - JUSTIN'S DEMONOLOGY	
Part 1 The Context of Justin's Apologetic	43
2.1.1 Apologetic and the Sociology of Knowledge	44
2.1.2 Opposition to Christianity	48
2.1.3 Second Century Pagan-Christian Debate	49
2.1.4 Justin's Use of Demonological Strains in Apocalyptic Thought	53
2.1.5 Summary	55
Part 2 Justin's Demonology in Recent Scholarship	
2.2.1 Goodenough	56
2.2.2 Barnard	58
2.2.3 Skarsaune	61
 CHAPTER THREE - THE DEMONOLOGY OF JUSTIN'S WORKS	
Part 1 The <i>First Apology</i>	
3.1.1 "The One Complaint": The Need for Christian Apology	65
3.1.2 Points of Contact	67
3.1.3 Demonology in <i>1 Apol</i> 5	70
3.1.4 The Use of Common Demonological Notions	76
3.1.5 The Four Phases of Spiritual Warfare	78
3.1.6 Human Roles in Spiritual Warfare: The Demons and Free Will	84
3.1.7 Social Enemies in <i>1 Apol</i>	86
3.1.8 The Lack of Satan	87
3.1.9 Summary	89
Part 2 The <i>Second Apology</i>	
3.2.1 The Circumstances	91
3.2.2 Points of Contact	93
3.2.3 The Demonology of <i>2 Apol</i> 5	95
3.2.4 The Use of Common Demonology	99
3.2.5 The Four Phases of Spiritual Warfare	102
3.2.6 Social Enemies in <i>2 Apol</i>	104
3.2.7 Human Roles in Spiritual Warfare: The Demons and Free Will	106

Contents (cont'd)

	Page
3.2.8 Summary	108
Part 3 The <i>Dialogue with Trypho the Jew</i>	
3.3.1 Points of Contact	113
3.3.2 The Demonology of the <i>Dialogue</i>	115
3.3.3 The Four Phases of Spiritual Warfare	122
3.3.4 The Use of Common Demonology	126
3.3.5 Human Roles in Spiritual Warfare: Satan and Free Will	132
3.3.6 Social Enemies in the <i>Dialogue</i>	134
3.3.7 Summary	136
3.3.8 A Comparison of Justin's Demonologies	138
Part 4 Demonology and the Question of the Audience of the <i>Dialogue</i>	
3.4.1 The State of the Question	139
3.4.2 The Contribution of Demonology	144
CONCLUSIONS - THE POWER OF DEMONS: JUSTIN'S APOLOGETIC RECONSIDERED	
4.1 Evaluations of the Value of Justin's Apologetic	150
4.2 Justin's Contribution to Apologetic Reconsidered	152

Bibliography

Introduction

In the first chapters of the *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*, the second century Christian apologist Justin Martyr recounted the story of his quest for truth that took him through the Stoic, Peripatetic, Pythagorean and Middle Platonic schools. Finally, in a sea-side encounter with a mysterious old man, he was introduced to Christianity. The question of the historicity of these experiences, as well as the accuracy of Justin's portraits of the philosophical schools have been thoroughly debated.¹ However, these debates have stopped short of the climax of the story, the purpose of its telling; namely, to bring Justin to ask of the old man in exasperation, "If those philosophers do not know the truth, what teacher or method should one follow?" (7.1²). This was the question a Christian apologist like Justin wanted to pose. His answer³ was a summary of his basic apologetic kerygma:

¹ See the studies cited and the discussion of Justin's conversion account in Harold Remus, *Pagan-Christian Conflict Over Miracle in the Second Century* (Cambridge, MA: The Patristic Foundation, 1983), 144-53. The general consensus is summed up by Chadwick: the *Dialogue* "owes something to literary embellishment but may well have a substratum of truth", Henry Chadwick, *The Early Church* (London: Penguin Books, Ltd., 1967), 75.

² Bracketed numbers refer to chapters in the text under discussion. Emboldened letters signify long vowels.

³ It can properly be described as such without denying the historicity of the story, for Justin may have merely appropriated it as his own apologetic. "The Old Man is saying what Justin himself at this point in his work wanted to say to his readers", Oskar Skarsaune, "The Conversion of Justin Martyr" *Studia Theologica* 36 (1976), 53-73, 68. See also Harold Remus, "Justin Martyr's Arguments with Judaism", in S.G. Wilson (ed.) *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity vol. 2: Separation and Polemic* (Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1986), 59-80, 71.

"A long time ago," he replied, "long before the time of those reputed philosophers, there lived blessed men who were just and loved by God, men who spoke through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit and predicted events that would take place in the future, which events are now taking place. We call these men Prophets. They alone knew the truth and communicated it to men, whom they neither deferred to nor feared. With no desire for personal glory, they reiterated only what they heard and saw when inspired by the Holy Spirit. Their writings are still extant, and whoever reads them with the proper faith will profit greatly in his knowledge of the origin and end of things, and of any other matter that a philosopher should know. In their writings they gave no proof at the time of their statements, for, as reliable witnesses of the truth, they were beyond proof; but the happenings that have taken place and are now taking place force you to believe in their words. They also are worthy of belief because of the miracles which they performed, for they exalted God, the Father and Creator of all things, and made known Christ, His Son, who was sent by Him. This the false prophets, who are filled with an erring and unclean spirit, have never done nor even do now, but they undertake to perform certain wonders to astound men and they glorify the demons and spirits of error. Above all, beseech God to open to you the gates of light, for no one can understand or perceive these truths unless he has been enlightened by God and His Christ. (7)⁴

The antiquity of the prophets and the arguments from prophecy and miracle have long been acknowledged as elements of Justin's apologetic.⁵ However, the emphasis on false prophets, spirits of error and demons has not received as much attention from scholars seeking to identify Justin's contribution to Christian thought and apologetic. Why would the old man

⁴ English translations of Justin are from *Writings of Justin Martyr* trans. Thomas B. Falls (New York: Christian Heritage, Inc., 1948).

⁵ Evaluations of Justin's contribution to Christian thought are summarized in section in 136-8, below.

introduce a philosophically-minded pagan to a Jesus who was the centre of a conflict between prophets who glorified him and false prophets who glorified demons and spirits of error? The answer lies in the popular notions of evil demons; malevolent beings which exercised supernatural powers over the lives of people. Many of these enduring beliefs were held in common by Jews, Christians and pagans and were especially prominent during times of social conflict and polarization.

Justin was a Christian "philosopher" who wrote during such turbulent times (shortly after 150 C.E. for the apologies and between 155-165 C.E. for the *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*) and was martyred together with six other Christians between 162-168 C.E. As an apologist, Justin was on the front lines of the Christians' battle to carve out theological and social space in Imperial society. He answered the attacks of Greco-Roman intellectuals, the state, Jews and other Christian opponents,⁶ and, by doing so, helped Christians define who they were. These attacks called for a rapid and extensive apologetic which included answers to questions about the origin and nature of evil demons.

Many who have studied early Christian demonology have made what at first might seem extravagant claims for its powers within early Christian communities:

⁶ Eric Francis Osborn, *Justin Martyr* (Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1973), 13.

"I am persuaded that an important factor in the Christian success in the Roman world was the promise which it made of deliverance from demons... A religion which offered victory over the daemonic would have had a powerful appeal - especially if that religion could offer convincing evidence of its power over demons".⁷

"Hence, perhaps, the snowball effect of the rapid rise of Christianity. Men joined the new community to be delivered from the demons; and the new community in turn, resolved its tensions by projecting them in the form of an ever greater demonic menace from outside".⁸

Demonology had powers not only as attractive apologetic to the pagan world, but also as a means of holding the early Christian communities together by helping them resolve "tensions". Explaining non-Christian attitudes and practices by referring to demonic influence served the purposes of self-definition, distinguishing "us" from "them".⁹ Beliefs in evil demons are "an element in the way which men [sic] have frequently attempted to conceptualize their social relationships and to relate themselves to the problem of evil".¹⁰ The demonic, or "them", implies something

⁷ Everett Ferguson, *Demonology of the Early Christian World* (New York and Toronto: Edwin Mellen Press, 1984), 129.

⁸ Peter Brown, "Sorcery, Demons and the Rise of Christianity from Late Antiquity into the Middle Ages" *Witchcraft, Confessions and Accusations* (ed.) Mary Douglas (London: Tavistock, 1970), 17-43, 33.

⁹ Jonathan Z. Smith, "Towards Interpreting Demonic Powers in Hellenistic and Roman Antiquity" *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* II.16.2 (1979), 425-439, 429.

¹⁰ Brown, "Sorcery, Demons", 18.

deviant, rebellious and outside the place where it properly belongs. The study of the evil demons is thus the study of relational categories and boundaries.¹¹

This paper will follow up some of these insights with reference to the appeal of Justin Martyr's demonology for both Christians and the Jews and pagans they sought to convert. Its broad context is the historical and religious problem of explaining the rise of Christianity in Imperial society despite its antagonistic stance to much of Greco-Roman culture and history. For our purposes, we will look at Satan and demons not as the "principle of evil"¹², nor as a narrative character used by the early Christian writers who were consciously acting as interpreters in the Midrashic sense and as tellers of stories,¹³ but principally as religious symbols imparting world views and value systems which, in turn, induced and expressed Christian identity.¹⁴

Satan and his evil demons functioned as religious symbols by interpreting and shaping the experience of Christians. The war between Jesus and Satan

¹¹ Smith, "Towards Interpreting", 429.

¹² See Jeffrey Burton Russell's "history of concepts" approach, *The Devil: Perceptions of Evil from Antiquity to Primitive Christianity* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977).

¹³ Neil Forsyth, *The Old Enemy: Satan and the Combat Myth* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), xiv.

¹⁴ My debt here is to Antonio Gualtieri's phenomenological approach to the study of religiousness. See "Religious Cosmologies as Justifications of Moralities" *Studies in Religion* 22/1 (1993), 22-35 for his expansion of Geertz's "models of" and "models for" approach beyond the normal emphasis on intellectual "conceptions" as the primary constituents of a world view. His insights have aided me in an evaluation of Justin's contribution to early Christian apologetic which is not primarily focused on philosophical ideas.

was not merely escapism and vengeful fantasy, it taught Christians how to *be*, how to interpret and give expression to the suffering caused by heresy and persecution: the growing pains of second century Christianity.¹⁵

"[R]eligious symbols provide a cosmic guarantee not only for their ability to comprehend the world, but also, comprehending it, to give a precision to their feelings, a definition to their emotions".¹⁶

Gualtieri summarized this interaction between being and doing: "a religious tradition changes one's acting by changing one's being or selfhood...The result is both a psychological bias and a rational obligation to act in a way commensurate with the basic life stance entailed in the tradition's ontological assumptions, that is, morally".¹⁷ This spiritual warfare was, therefore, apocalyptic demonology internalized as Christian identity ("psychological bias") and externalized as morality ("rational obligation") the latter of which included dispositional outlooks on pagan culture and history.

¹⁵ See Peter Brown, *The Making of Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978), 75: "For Justin and his contemporaries, the story of the mating of the angels with the daughters of men and of its dire consequences for the peace of society was not a distant myth; it was a map on which they plotted the disruptions and tensions around them".

¹⁶ Clifford Geertz, "Religion as a Cultural System" in Michael Banton, ed., *Anthropological Approaches to the Study of Religion* (London: Tavistock, 1965), 89-119, 104. Such precision and definition of feeling was shown in the refusal of Christians to sacrifice to the gods.

¹⁷ Gualtieri, "Religious Cosmologies", 29-30.

This recognition of the power of religious symbols in shaping identity and morality, combined with similar insights from the sociology of knowledge, will aid in the pursuit of the lines of enquiry of this paper: the appraisal of the persuasive power (or attractiveness) of Justin's demonology in the larger context of demonological beliefs common to Greco-Romans, Jews and Christians, and the ability of demonology to reveal the social situation of his Christian community in Rome.

In the first chapter the demonological context of second century Christianity will be outlined, establishing the common notions of the demonic realm that Justin shared with Jews and pagans and which he used as material to argue for the superiority of Christianity over all other religions and philosophies.

The second chapter will use a conceptual model of the sociology of knowledge theory to detail Justin's situation as a second century apologist engaged in theological and social conflict with other Christian groups, pagans and Jews, and the Imperial government. A summary of Justin's apocalyptic¹⁷ demonology (derived from the Second Temple Jewish

¹⁷ The word "apocalyptic" has several meanings in studies of Judaism between the Bible and the Mishnah, which have been surveyed by Richard Sturm, "Defining the Word *Apocalyptic*: A Problem in Biblical Criticism", *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn*. Joel Marcus and Marion L. Soards (eds.) (Worcester, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 17-48. Sturm used Hanson's distinctions of the uses of the word "apocalyptic": (i) "apocalypse" referring to a particular literary genre incorporating ideas of revelation through a heavenly intermediary; (ii) "apocalyptic eschatology" referring to a way of viewing the world related to divine providence; and (iii) "apocalypticism" referring to the religious community's codification of its identity centred around its eschatology, 35. For our purposes, the second and third meanings of "apocalyptic", those referring to the world view (second meaning) and a religious movement (third meaning), will

apocalyptic texts) and the scholarly evaluations of its place in his thought will also be presented.

In the third chapter, a reading of Justin's works will be undertaken with particular attention paid to: (1) his use of demonology as apologetic, (2) the importance of symbols of spiritual warfare in Christian self-definition, and (3) how this spiritual warfare reveals the social world of Justin's community.

These readings are undertaken following Sumney's argument that texts within the same corpus must first be treated separately (in order to avoid excessive use of parallels, mirroring, etc.) before being considered the product of one mind.¹⁸ This methodology is necessary for a number of reasons. Only by isolating the demonology of each text can we compare them and discover what additions and omissions Justin made. Placing these

be used. Sturm has convincingly argued that it is only as a vision of the cosmos that apocalyptic can be understood in its full reality, and not merely as a characteristic of a literary genre or a theological concept which is a "component" of eschatology (25-6).

Scholarly interpretations of apocalyptic literature have shifted away from early evaluations of the genre as a pessimistic and debased form of prophecy based on threats and promises regarding the end time, to recognizing the value of its hermeneutic and its comprehensive vision of history. (A recent exception is Forsyth, 257, who sees the emergence of apocalyptic as a corruption of the more psychically integrated divine antinomy of the Hebrew Bible, see 21, n. 41). Though some, like Hanson, argue for apocalyptic's ahistorical character (Paul Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), 17 and 26 in Sturm, 35) others, like Pagels (Elaine Pagels, "The Social History of Satan, The 'Intimate Enemy': A Preliminary Sketch" *Harvard Theological Review* 84/2 (1991), 105-128, 115) argue that its comprehensive vision of the history of the universe was rooted in Israel's political and social history, see 19, n.28, below.

¹⁸ Jerry L. Sumney, *Identifying Paul's Opponents: The Question of Method in 2 Corinthians* (Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the New Testament Press, 1990). Other than Sumney's proposition, I have tried to follow the broad dictum of Yourcenar: "Strive to read a text of the second century with the eyes, soul, and feelings of the second century; let it steep in that mother solution which the facts of its own time provide". Marguerite Yourcenar, *Memoirs of Hadrian*, trans. Grace Frick (New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 1951), 331.

differences within the context of the common demonological notions outlined in the first chapter, will allow insight into the intended audience of each text. This analysis of *what* Justin said about demons *to whom* can then elucidate the social position of Justin's Christianity with special regard to its enemies, on the premise that by looking at *who* was being demonized, one can find the predominant social enemy being encountered.

Separate readings of Justin's works (with attention paid to his demonology) will aid in rectifying two current opinions about the nature of Justin's thought: namely that Justin's was an uncritical mind which combined contradictory strains of apocalyptic demonology; and that Justin's spermatic logos doctrine was the most persuasive element of his apologetic.

It will be argued that the value of Justin's apologetic resided in the precision of its knowledge regarding the origin, nature and functioning of the evil demons and in its claims to possess the only power that would provide a way of escape from their tyrannical domination. In the words of the epigraph, Justin's demonology "filled a gap" in the fabric of the second century, a gap which - judging by the prominence of demonology in Justin's works - desperately needed filling by pagans, Jews and Christians alike. The filling of this demonological gap was a powerful source of the Christians' new religious and social imagination and a guide for their new brand of social commitment.

CHAPTER ONE

DEMONOLOGICAL BACKGROUNDS OF THE SECOND CENTURY

Peoples of the Roman Empire, if not "demon possessed" or rather demon influenced (as the Christian apologists suggested), were certainly demon conscious".¹

Christian apologists like Justin had to explain their new faith in an environment pervaded with beliefs in demons, spirits and heavenly powers. This chapter on the backgrounds of Justin's demonology will detail this popular "demon consciousness". It will summarize the demonological "material" that Justin had to work with as an apologist who used ideas regarding evil demons as a means of encouraging people to convert to Christianity. It begins with the wider context of Hellenistic religion and culture in which he lived, and then focuses on the Jewish and early Christian demonology which formed his particular matrix. This material will become especially important for four reasons. First, it is only when the popularity and importance of demonology is recognized that the persuasive power of Justin's apologetic can be seen and evaluated in its proper context. Second, it is only when the demonological material at Justin's disposal is known that his use or neglect of it can be demonstrated. Knowledge of this material allows a fuller picture of his selective use of the demonological traditions

¹ Everett Ferguson, *Backgrounds of Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1987), 134.

which best suited his audiences. Such selective use has formerly been misunderstood as uncritical thinking.² Third, awareness of this same selective use of demonological traditions can help us determine the intended audiences of his works, especially the *Dialogue*. Fourth, knowledge of the intended audiences of Justin's works is necessary to illuminate his social situation.

PART ONE - GRECO-ROMAN DEMONOLOGY³

Beliefs in spirits - some of which were hostile to the living - is the earliest and most common form of religious beliefs.⁴ They were the benign spirits of the field, stream and harvest as well as malevolent spirits of disease, epilepsy and hysteria. Other spirits had animal or human forms, or both, or were personifications of the perceived evils of lust or anger. Most evil spirits were fond of desolate places and of the night. Demons were commonly

² See 50-2, below.

³ I shall follow the suggestion of Brenk that *daimonology* is proper to the Greek philosophical tradition, and "demonology" is proper to material from folk traditions which are rarely attested outside the philosophical literature's condemnation of them. Neither word refers to any systematic tradition of thought, the differentiation is based both upon the source of the material and its content. Frederick E. Brenk, "In the Light of the Moon: Demonology in the Early Imperial Period", *ANRW* II.16.3 (1986), 2068-2145, 2074.

⁴ Edward Langton, *Essentials of Demonology: A Study of Jewish and Christian doctrine. Its Origin and Development* (London: Epworth Press, 1949), 219, attributes the cross-cultural similarity in these beliefs both to borrowing and to similar reactions of the human mind to the common facts of life. See also *TDNT* vol. 2, "Daimon, daimonion", 6.

associated with possession and magic, the latter being a means of controlling the demons in order to avoid harm or procure benefits.

A study of the demonology of ancient Greek writings is the story of the suppression of these demons on the part of philosophical and poetic writers. Though popular use of the word *daimon*, like that of the modern word "divinity", was varied and ambiguous - having religious, philosophical, literary, ideological, visionary and emotional connotations - it maintained the notion of the power of supernatural spirit(s) over the lives of people.

By the early Imperial period, *daemones* had been further defined as spirits existing between the gods or God and people. From this time, the notion of *daemones* as souls of the dead was to hold the popular, and to some extent the philosophical, imagination through the time of Justin and beyond.

1.1.1 Trends in Greco-Roman Demonology B.C.E.

Folk demons were incorporated into Greek philosophy and poetry, though always in ways consistent with their roots as unknown powers or spirits of the dead involved in magic and "cruder" cultic practices. Homer's *daemones*, for example, influenced important speeches, caused illnesses, decided battles, or led people to their beloved or their death; but they always remained unidentifiable and evil.⁵ They were extra-personal, mysterious and

⁵ Brenk, "In the Light of the Moon", 2074.

malevolent dispensers of fate who figured largely in the lives of his characters.⁶

The other notion of *daemones*, held by Hesiod and the philosophers, avoided folk notions of their evil origins and elevated them to the rank of aerial, intermediary beings. However, they were still associated with the dead and with cults, for they were thought of as dead heroes who acted as representatives of the gods by means of the popular cults. Whether as souls of the deceased or as intermediary beings, the *daemones* were considered higher than humans on the ladder to the Divine, but still associated with the material realm to the point that they risked falling back into mortal bodies if they became too sensual.

The notion of intermediary beings developed into a guardian angel figure for individuals and cities in Plato.⁷ Plato⁸ and Xenocrates (396-314 B.C.E.) distinguished between higher forms of piety and cruder, more material religious practices with which the demons were associated. Xenocrates once again divorced the *daemones* from the gods and associated them with the souls of the deceased who were responsible for evil phenomena.⁹ By the fourth century B.C.E., evil *daemones* were taking the blame for all sorts of

⁶ As is attested by the fact that in *The Odyssey* Homer uses the word *daimon* once in his own narrative, while his characters refer to them 33 times, *ibid.*, 2078.

⁷ *Phaedo* 107D; *Republic* 617D; *Statesman* 271D, 272E in Ferguson, *Backgrounds*, 185. This "watcher" notion had parallels in Jewish demonology, see 20-5, below.

⁸ *Symposium* 202d-203a, in Brenk, "In the Light of the Moon", 2086.

⁹ *Moralia* 360E in Everett Ferguson, *Demonology*, 48.

happenings, from natural disasters to personal misfortune. *Daemon* became synonymous with concepts of "luck", "chance" and "fate",¹⁰ reminiscent of the Homeric *daemones*.

In the Hellenistic period (331 B.C.E.-31 B.C.E.) Greco-Roman religion began to turn inwards and seek consolation through personal contemplation, ritual purification and ecstatic rites. The mood of the age was syncretistic and the gap between popular cultic piety and philosophy narrowed. This period saw an increase in the philosophical writers' comments on popular beliefs in *daemones*. Increasingly, natural disasters, superstitions, and the unpalatable morality of the gods was blamed on the *daemones*. *Daemones* took on an avenging role; accusing, punishing and executing those who had done wrong.¹¹

1.1.2 Demonology in the Common Era

Plutarch (50-120 C.E.) is our best example of the philosophical scorn of popular beliefs in *daemones*. He recorded that in the first century C.E. people were able to escape lynch mobs by feigning possession while they lurched through and away from the crowds assembled to see their execution.¹² His own demonology was as varied as that of the age in

¹⁰ Ferguson, *Backgrounds*, 185.

¹¹ *Moralia* 458C in Ferguson, *Demonology*, 50.

¹² *Lives* 309, *ibid.*, 53.

which he lived. The *daemones* could be: aerial intermediaries; souls of the departed - as in an analogy comparing them to ex-athletes "who are done with the contests of life, and who, from prowess of soul, have become *daemones*";¹³ and the incorruptible and eternal element of the soul, the *nous* - whose extra-corporeal existence was a star in the firmament.¹⁴ The intermediary *daemones* could abuse their power and were punished for doing so by further reincarnation in a physical body.¹⁵

The impression given by Plutarch is of the omnipresence of *daemones* in people's lives and of their deification when honours were ascribed to them in cultic practices, the latter so unpalatable to the philosophic worship of immaterial divinity: "In general[,] like Homer, Plato, and Philo, he [Plutarch] belongs to the rationalistic, philosophical tradition hostile to the Xenocratic or Oriental [animistic] type *daemon*".¹⁶

Second century folk demonology involved vampires, *daemones* lusting after mortals to reconnect with a human body, and other traditions. Lucian (120 C.E.-?) and Apuleius (123 C.E.-?) each relate numerous tales, Lucian dismissing *daemones* as superstition and Apuleius reflecting more popular notions of *daemones* inhabiting the air and being subject to human

¹³ *Moralia* 593c, in Brenk, "In the Light of the Moon", 2124.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 2126.

¹⁵ *De facie in orbe lunae* 944d, *ibid.*, 2127.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 2130.

feelings.¹⁷ By the second century folk demonology and philosophical demonology had substantially intermixed. There was no consensus on the origin of these evil spirits - whether they be souls of the dead or evil spirits - but there was agreement on their presence behind magic, possession, "lower" forms of piety and all instances of suffering and misfortune.

1.1.3 Summary

Whether as unidentifiable evil spirits, dead heroes, or deputies of the gods, three dominant characteristics had always been attached to the concept of *daemon*: they were involved in the determination of one's destiny, they were invisible aerial beings inclined towards human sensuality, and they were associated with magic and the popular sacrificial cults. Justin was to appropriate each of these ideas in his Christian re-orientation of demonology. He also capitalized on a growing consensus regarding their evil, avenging intents towards humans and their responsibility for all misfortune. Even the uncertainty regarding their origins was to work in his favour, for he offered an explanation of demonic origins which explained their dominant characteristics mentioned above.

¹⁷ Ibid., 2134.

PART TWO - JEWISH DEMONOLOGY

Justin was also aware of Jewish beliefs in demons. Indeed, he demonstrated an active knowledge of second century Judaism, including demonology.¹⁸ By outlining the developments in Jewish demonology we can discover both the similarities and the differences between it and Greco-Roman demonology. Knowledge of these will contribute to both our analysis of the critical calibre of Justin's use of demonological beliefs in his apologies and in the resolution of the question of the audience of the *Dialogue*.

1.2.1 Demonology of the Hebrew Bible

Popular demonology was peripheral in the Jewish scriptures themselves because of their strict monotheism. In pre-Exilic Hebrew religion Yahweh was the source of both good and evil. He was the morally ambivalent¹⁹ God of war and annihilator of the Canaanites. The Hebrew *Satan* (accuser) was "the personification of the dark side of God, that element in Yahweh

¹⁸ See discussion of *Dial* 79, 107-10, below.

¹⁹ The ethical monotheism of the Hebrew scriptures seems diametrically opposed to the amoral lives of the Greek gods. However, beneath the explicit commandments of the Mosaic law, Polzin has argued, lies the implicit message that it is never clear why the Hebrew God punishes and forgives: "The mystery of God's dealings with man [sic] and the comedy of man's efforts to overpower and master the events that make up his existence form the core theme of the Deuteronomistic History up to this point [the end of Judges]". *Moses and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomical History* (New York: The Seabury Press, 1980), 211. Thus the experience of the ancient Hebrews was not as remote from that expressed in Greek cosmology, as the differences in their theologies might suggest.

which obstructs the good";²⁰ a member of the heavenly court whose evil powers were allowed limited functioning by God. The few references in the Jewish scriptures to Satan (Job 1-2; Zech 3:1f; 1 Chr 21) reveal a transition from the divine antinomy of Yahwism to a recognition of an evil purpose which is outside the will of God.

Already in Job Satan was the instigator of an evil which struck Job without cause (*Job* 2:3) and pointed to an external source of his sufferings.²¹ *1 Chr* 21:1-7 presented the next stage where Satan appeared as the one who incited King David to disobey the Lord by taking a census of Israel, and then was given the task of destroying most of Jerusalem as divine punishment for this act. Satan violated the bounds of his orders, as God had to restrain him from destroying the whole of Jerusalem. In the words of Forsyth, Satan had gone from "a shady but necessary member of the Politburo" in Job, to a figure in Chronicles that God was having problems controlling.²² These developments paralleled others regarding Israel's demonization of the gods of the surrounding tribes: "They sacrificed unto demons, which were not God,/ To gods whom they knew not" (*Deut.* 32:17). *Psalm* 106:37 also mentioned that the heathens "sacrificed their

²⁰ Russell, *The Devil*, 176-7.

²¹ Trevor O. Ling, *The Significance of Satan: New Testament Demonology and Its Contemporary Relevance* (London: SPCK, 1961), 5-6.

²² Forsyth, 112. Forsyth likens Satan in Chronicles to the hard-to-control J. Edgar Hoover of the Kennedy administration.

sons and daughters unto demons". The notion that the heathen deities were demonic beings subordinate to Yahweh and somehow opposed to Him was to become an element of apocalyptic demonology. Demons became more individualized in the exilic and post-exilic periods (519-300 B.C.E.),²³ as the pre-Exilic Yahweh disappeared in favour of a wholly good God at war with Satan. God's sovereignty was now embattled, for there were forces acting outside His will. Against the transcendent holiness of the Yahwist's God, popular notions of evil demons readily suggested themselves as the explanations for evil within and without the person.

These beliefs surface more concretely in the book of *Tobit* (125 B.C.E.²⁴). Asmodeus' ("that worst of demons", 3:8) jealous infliction of death on Sara's husbands and his expulsion through the burning of a fish's innards (6:8; 8:3) are examples of folk beliefs common to Jews, Babylonians and Assyrians; "survivals from the popular beliefs which existed in the remote pre-Mosaic period".²⁵

²³ Harold B. Kuhn, "The Angelology of the Non-Canonical Jewish Apocalypses", *JBL* 67 (1948), 217-32, 228.

²⁴ Langton, *Essentials*, 120, n. 54.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 220. See further discussion, 26, n. 45, below.

1.2.2 Apocalyptic Demonology

Jewish apocalyptic eschatology²⁶ from 200 B.C.E. until the time of Justin had followed two broad strains, as evident in the apocalyptic texts. Each of these expanded the prophetic tradition from its former prognostications regarding Israel, to divine revelations about the beginning and end of the universe, the existence of life after death and the expectation of a new aeon after the immanent end of the present aeon. Each vector also contained revelations explaining the nature and origin of all instances of evil, from plagues and war to the personal realms of disease, lust, insanity and death.

The first strain, which Justin reflected in some of his works, contained revelations that evil angels or powers had brought sin into the world and initiated a spiritual war in the heavens and on earth. An "age to come" would replace "this age" through the victorious ending of this cosmic conflict by divine intervention. The second strain argued that each human being sins by denying God, and that these sins are themselves the cause of pain and death. The books of this strain made no mention of the evil angels and considered the "age to come" a final judgement by God in which all will

²⁶ The apocalyptic world view is most often portrayed as a compound of influences both internal and external to the religion of Israel. The continuation of the Hebraic prophetic tradition, the influence of post-exilic (400-200 B.C.E.) Persian cosmological dualism on sectarian, anti-accommodationist Jews, the influence of folklore and esoteric rabbinic literature and the influence of the Wisdom tradition are considered to be the major influences at work, Philipp Vielhauer, "Introduction to Apocalypses and Related Subjects", *New Testament Apocrypha II*, Wilson, R. McL. (ed.) (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965), 581-607, in Sturm, 23.

be awarded or condemned according to their actions. Both strains contained the "realization that there is in man [sic] a will which resists the attempted fulfilment of the Law".²⁷ However, they differed on whether this rebellious will originated inside or outside the human person.

Jewish beliefs regarding evil angels stemmed from Genesis 6:1-4:

When men had begun to be plentiful on the earth, and daughters had been born to them, the sons of God (*bene elohim*), looking at the daughters of men, saw they were pleasing, so they married as many as they chose...and had children by them. These are the heroes of days gone by, the famous men.

The LXX translated "sons of God" as "angels of God" which set the stage for apocalyptic Judaism's speculations.

Apocalyptic demonology was the triumph of popular²⁸ demonology -

²⁷ TDNT, "Daimon", 16.

²⁸ Early studies of apocalyptic characterized its demonology as "a popular attempt to deal with problems", Kuhn, "Angelology", 231. According to Russell, the problems were of an existential-theological nature and books like *1 Enoch* were written by mainstream Israelites to assure themselves of evil's limited reign on earth. The type of warfare depicted in the texts is mythological and cosmic rather than earthly, *The Devil*, 187. Forsyth felt the revival of the Ancient Near Eastern combat myth during the Hellenistic period of foreign domination helped Jews answer the question of how they had come to this point in their religio-political existence. Tailoring this myth to their situation, they (unconsciously) grouped the whole host of demonic figures under the figure of Satan and used this figure to explain their plight. This plight has been explored by Pagels' approach which she describes as a "social history of Satan", Elaine Pagels, "The Social History of Satan, The 'Intimate Enemy': A Preliminary Sketch" *Harvard Theological Review* 84/2 (1991), 105-128. It seeks to go beyond the theological and literary uses of the devil explored by Russell and Forsyth, to its uses for the purposes of social boundary-making within a more sectarian Judaism. According to Pagels' thesis, the myths about the origins of Satan as a lustful or rebellious angel that dissident groups shared during the last two centuries B.C.E., paralleled a split within Judaism caused by the foreign domination of Antiochus Epiphanes (Cf. Forsyth, 116-

influenced by the surrounding cultures of Persia and Babylonia, but distinctively Jewish in that it adopted only those strains for which the ground was already prepared by its patterns of thought. These influences were probably absorbed unconsciously and perceived by the Jews themselves as developments of the angelology and eschatology of their tradition.²⁹ What is important to note is the overwhelming concern about the power of evil which was now seen to lie *outside* the realm of God's will.

7). The accommodationist groups of Jews were labelled evil by the dissident groups who were marginalized by the priestly classes and angered by their cooperation with foreign conquerors. A battle had arisen *within* Israel and the enemy was now "intimate". Demonology was now involved in the creation of relational boundaries *within* Judaism. The splitting of the Hebrews' religion into the ritual-Temple cult and the eschatological hopes of the marginalized was, according to this theory, paralleled in the splitting of the divine into a wholly good God and the wholly evil Satan and its hosts. Pagels' thesis is a speculative attempt to use the taxonomical functions of demonology for the purposes of the reconstruction of the social world of the apocalyptic writers. However, it rests upon the assumption that those who write apocalyptic are socially disadvantaged. Since this correlation cannot be assumed (see Lester L. Grabbe, "The Social Setting of Early Jewish Apocalypticism", *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 4 (1989), 27-47), apocalyptic thought must be linked to other considerations besides socio-economic factors, and the thesis remains ingenious conjecture.

²⁹ TDNT, "Daimon", 15. Langton raised the question that if foreign influences (Persian, Babylonian) were to be acknowledged, how was it that they were so slight?, 58. The question of foreign influence on apocalyptic demonology depends on how "slight" the influences are felt to be and to what degree they are adapted by Hebraic patterns of thought. Glasson has argued that the primary influence on Jewish thought in this period was Hellenistic culture, citing literary parallels from Greek mythology which might have influenced later midrashes of Genesis 6:2, Francis T. Glasson, *Greek Influence on Jewish Eschatology* (London: SPCK, 1961). Others emphasize the ever-present cultures (and past conquerors) of Persia and Babylonia. Langton credits the figure of Satan to distinctly Hebrew thought, albeit influenced by Babylonian demonology and Persian dualism, 77. Hierarchically organized hosts of demons and angels, each headed by a prince, are also of Persian origin, as is cosmic dualism, D.S. Russell, *The Method and Message of Jewish Apologetic 200 B.C. - 100 A.D.* (Philadelphia, 1964), 258. Hanson represents the question of influences on canonical apocalyptic eschatology with the analogy of the girl-child of a Jewish mother and a Persian-Egyptian father: "Though never abandoning the basic belief of her mother that Yahweh would finally act to save his people, increasingly she came to express that belief in the mythic modes of thought which were favoured by her father", Paul Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), 403.

1.2.3 *1 Enoch and Jubilees*

The prime example of the first vector of Jewish apocalyptic - new ideas of "evil angels" and Satan introducing evil into the world - was the apocalyptic text *1 Enoch*. Enoch was an attractive figure for apocalyptic writers because of his intimacy with God (he "walked with God"), his length of days (365 years) and the manner in which he simply disappeared from the earth rather than dying (Gen 5:24). This text from the second century B.C.E. to the first century C.E.³⁰ turned the story from Genesis 6:1-4 into an account of angels who abandon their celestial duties by mating with women, thereby creating giants who caused havoc on the earth until the four archangels were sent down from the heavenly court to imprison them. In the midrash of *1 Enoch* however, what seemed a mere weakness on the part of these angels in Genesis, turned into a planned conspiracy to subvert the divine order:

In those days, when the children of man had multiplied, it happened that there were born unto them handsome and beautiful daughters. And the angels, the children of heaven, saw them and desired them; and they said to one another, "Come, let us choose wives for ourselves from among the daughters of man and beget us children." And Semyaz, being their leader, said unto them, "I fear that perhaps you will not consent that this deed should be done, and I alone will become (responsible) for this great sin." But they all responded to him,

³⁰ E. Isaac, "1 Enoch: Introduction" *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* vol. 1, (ed.) James H. Charlesworth (Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1983), 5-12, 7.

"Let us all swear an oath and bind everyone among us by a curse not to abandon this suggestion but to do the deed"... And they took wives unto themselves, and everyone chose one woman for himself, and they began to go unto them. And they taught them magical medicine, incantations... And the women became pregnant and gave birth to great giants whose heights were three hundred cubits... the giants turned against (the people) in order to eat them... And there were many wicked ones (people) and they committed adultery and erred, and all their conduct became corrupt... And to Gabriel the Lord said, "Proceed against the bastards and the reprobates and against the children of adultery; and destroy the children of adultery and expel the children of the Watchers from among the people... And to Michael God said, "Make known to Semyaz and the others who are with him, who fornicated with the women, that they will die together with them in all their defilement... in the prison they will be locked up forever. (1 *Enoch* 6:1-4, 7:1-3, 8:2, 10:9, 10:11)

Chapter 15 returned to the "giant" offspring of the Watchers and the women, stating that from the bodies of the giants proceeded "evil spirits" (15:8-9) or "spirits of the earth" (15:10) or "spirits of the giants" (15:11), who roamed the earth even after the giants killed each other off. These were purely spiritual beings, "They eat no food, nor become thirsty, nor find (physical) obstacles" (15:11). They would cause corruption, oppression and sorrow (15:11) until "the day of the great conclusion" (16:1) and they would not suffer punishment for the things they did before that time (16:1). Before the functioning of the evil spirits was elaborated, it was forewarned that Satan alone was responsible for all sin: "write upon him [Satan] all sin" (10:9).

Similar to the biblical Satan, the evil spirits were seen as performing the task assigned to them by God, and were not acting out of personal hatred for humankind. Their main job as supernatural beings was to capitalize on and exploit the human capacity for sin (98:4),³¹ always with the understanding that they would one day be defeated and condemned.³² In 19:1 and again in 99:7 comes the assertion that the fallen angels will lead the people to "offer sacrifices to the demons as unto gods". In *Jubilees*³³ (10:9; 11:4ff) people were also led into idolatry and transgression, "And the prince, Mastema, acted forcefully to do all of this. And he sent other spirits to those who were set under his hand to practice all error and sin and transgression..." (11:5).

Jubilees' rewriting of the history of Israel was marked by "the writer's tendency to attribute to Mastema ["one who is adverse"³⁴] actions which in the canonical writings were ascribed to God Himself, but which might well be thought to be unworthy of Him".³⁵ Whether the name be Mastema or Satan or Beliar, a single personality in charge of all evil demons and

³¹ Ferguson, *Demonology*, 20.

³² See *Jubilees* 4:22, 5:1; 2 *Enoch* 18; *T. Reuben* 5:6 for parallels.

³³ Langton dates it 135-105 B.C.E., *Essentials*, 110, n. 8. O.S. Wintermute, "Jubilees: Introduction" *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* vol. 2, (ed.) James H. Charlesworth (Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1985), 35-50, sets the date prior to 100 B.C.E., 43.

³⁴ Langton, *Essentials*, 125.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 124.

responsible for all moral suffering and sin was emerging in the second century before Jesus.

In summary, we can enumerate the following additions of the second century B.C.E. apocalypses to the biblical fall of the angels story: the introduction of the leader or prince of the angels, the description of the fall as consciously chosen sin, the angels' teaching of magic to humans, the sexual licentiousness resulting from the fall, the condemnation of both the angels and their human cooperators, the origins of evil spirits located in the giants,³⁶ the punishing role of the evil spirits, the responsibility of Satan for all sin, and the angels' leading people to deify demons.

It would be these additions that would form the framework of Justin's own story of the fall of the angels written three centuries later.

1.2.4 Later Trends in Apocalyptic Demonology

Later apocalyptic works further developed the notions of the fall of the angels and the prince of the angels who engineered it. The first century C.E. "Book of the Similitudes" (*1 Enoch* 37-71) introduced the figure of the prince of demons who brought about the fall of Eve (69:6), thereby pushing back the fall of the prince *before* the time of the Genesis 6 and *1 Enoch* 6-16 versions of the fall which was *after* the creation of humans.

³⁶ Exactly how the giants beget demons is unclear. According to 15:8, evil spirits either proceed from the giants when they die, or the departed spirits of the giants themselves are evil spirits. Langton inclines towards the second explanation due to its affinity to the demonology of primal cultures, *ibid.* 109.

Other common era texts opted for a rebellion based not on lust, but on pride. They differed on the source of that pride: be it "the impossible idea...that he might become equal to my [God's] power" (2 *Enoch* [late first century C.E.] 29:4 and 18), or the angels' refusal to worship the humanity of Adam (*Life of Adam* [late first century C.E.] 12-17).³⁷ Either way, the fall was again pushed back in time to before the creation of humanity and thereby removed from any lustful desires for the daughters of men.³⁸

As the apocalyptic tradition continued into the Common Era, two more trends become visible in the texts. One was that the warfare between God and Satan became increasingly moral. The second trend, following from the first's accent on the individual, was that the warfare also became more social. Nowhere is this more evident than in the Qumran literature (170 B.C.E. - 68 C.E.) where the demons are shown to be increasingly involved in personal sin, to the point of being present in the battle in the heart of every Jew. Sin was no longer a weakness, but an active serving of and capitulation to the Angel of Darkness which was at odds with God.³⁹

³⁷ Parallels to this are found in *Wisdom* 2:24 and Josephus' *Antiquities* 1.41f, in Ferguson, *Demonology*, 76.

³⁸ In 29:4, Satanail rebels on the second day of creation and then, in 31: 3-6 seduces Eve after he has been condemned. References to Satan's role in the fall of Adam and Eve: 1 *Enoch* 69:6; 2 *Enoch* 31:6; *Apocalypse of Abraham* 23; *Lives of Adam and Eve* 16:4; 2 *Baruch* 4:8, 9:7; *Apocalypse of Moses* 21:3.

³⁹ Langton, *Essentials*, 135.

In the Qumran literature, Satan was also clearly identified with certain humans who were his willing representatives or mouthpieces.⁴⁰ Against the true remnant of the Qumran community, the *War Scroll* says, "the angel of darkness and all allotted to him strive to make the sons of light stumble".⁴¹ Pagels summarizes the centrality of spiritual warfare for the Qumran world view: "[T]hey place at the very centre of their theology, cosmology, and anthropology the cosmic war between God and His allies and Satan or Belial along with its allies, both angelic and human".⁴²

The four later trends of apocalyptic demonology outlined in this section: (i) the fall due to pride that was (ii) prior to the creation of humankind, and the more (iii) personal and (iv) social dimensions of demonic activity - were also to be part of Justin's demonological arguments which he used to convince some of his readers to convert to Christianity.

1.2.5 Rabbinic Demonology

Concern with demons causing physical harm is widely attested in Rabbinic writings. These demons were angel-like spirits opposed to God and were especially associated with sickness and seduction. They remained very

⁴⁰ Forsyth, *The Old Enemy*, 210. Forsyth's attribution of this to the "common tendency of Judaism to project political expression onto the cosmic stage - and to work out the fantasy of revenge in a combination of military and symbolic visions", 257, however, does not do full justice to the cosmology of apocalyptic eschatology, and evinces the dangers of an excessively political or social interpretation of the texts.

⁴¹ Pagels, "The Social History of Satan, part 1", 126.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 127.

close to their animistic roots and retained their independence from both apocalyptic and Greek notions of intermediaries.⁴³ They could interfere with Jewish religious practices in many ways, such as extinguishing the Sabbath lamp.⁴⁴ Such a demon was presented in Tobit, where a *daimonion* kills Sara's first seven husbands and the angel Raphael gave Tobias a specific remedy for its defeat. Thus the Jewish tradition could incorporate a conflictual element between the God and *daemones* which was non-apocalyptic and still foreign to Greek notions.⁴⁵ Rabbinic texts explicitly rejected apocalyptic demonology. R. b. Jochai (early second century) cursed anyone who translated the *bene elohim* of Genesis 6:2 as "sons of God" rather than "sons of the judges".⁴⁶ This early Rabbinic view is correctly portrayed by Justin's Trypho (*Dial* 79). Other rabbinic texts accept the existence of demons, but held that they were created by God and were responsible for all illness, sin and destruction.⁴⁷

⁴³ TDNT, "Daimon", 13.

⁴⁴ b.Shab., 2, 5, *ibid*.

⁴⁵ Brenk, 2084.

⁴⁶ Ber. rabba 26 in R.H. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1902), 33. Charles dated this early due to the evidence from Justin and other early Christian sources.

⁴⁷ Ferguson, *Demonology*, 88.

1.2.6 Hellenistic Jewish Demonology

Philo's (30 B.C.E.- 45 C.E.) philosophical apologetic to Middle Platonism could not incorporate a battle between Satan and God and he dismissed the demonology of the apocalypses as the crude beliefs of the unphilosophical. He never referred to popular notions of demons, preferring - like his Greek counterpart Galen - to exhort his readers to rise above such superstition.⁴⁸ Like Trypho after him, Philo could not conceive of a fallen angel.⁴⁹ He referred to *daemones* in typical Hellenistic fashion, as angels or departed souls "which fly and hover in the air", some waiting to enter into bodies for the first time and some waiting between ensoulments.⁵⁰ As such they were exclusively good mediators between God and people and what Jewish scripture called "evil angels" were really men given to evil actions.⁵¹

Josephus (37-100 C.E.) also reflected many of the different meanings given the word *daemon* in Hellenistic thought, most often referring to them as departed souls. They could be good spirits or bad; they could be indifferent to the affairs of humans or involved in them by spells "for

⁴⁸ Samuel Sandmel, *Philo of Alexandria: An Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), 150.

⁴⁹ *On the Giants* 6.16. Cf. J. Danielou, *Philon d'Alexandrie, Coll. Les temps et les destins* (Paris: 1957), 163-168, in Brenk, 2100.

⁵⁰ *On the Giants* 11.6 in Ferguson, *Demonology*, 83.

⁵¹ *On the Giants* 17.16-19, in Brenk, "In the Light of the Moon", 2105-6.

purposes alien to divinity".⁵² Besides spells and curses, *daemones* were not prayed to or worshipped by any Jew, but they could communicate with people through dreams and prophetic utterances.

1.2.7 Summary

Jewish demonology reflected the developments of Judaism itself. The development of the biblical figure of Satan reflected a growing perception of an evil purpose - outside the will of God - which was identified with popular notions of demons. The animistic demonology of some rabbinic writings held that freedom from evil demons was given by God, though this was not conceived within the framework of apocalyptic dualism. Rabbinic Judaism held that demons were created by God to fulfil the less savory workings of His will. The Hellenistic Judaism of Philo and Josephus placed Greek demonology within the framework of Jewish monotheism, dismissing both animistic and apocalyptic demonologies.

Apocalyptic demonology explained the evil purpose by means of angels who rebelled against God's will through lust and, later, pride. These angels were associated with evil, magic, adultery and fornication, and all manners of misfortune. Eventually the evil angels and demons were united under a prince or leader: Satan. This figure of Satan came to be seen as existing before humanity and causing its fall, with the result that personal sin was

⁵² Ramsay MacMullen, "Two types of Conversion to Early Christianity" *Vigiliae Christianae* 37 (1983), 174-192, 176.

increasingly seen as apostasy. Apocalyptic demonology was united in its claim that a time would come when Satan, his angels and their human counterparts would be eternally punished and righteousness would reign. Initially the evil angels were aligned only with that part of the world which was at conflict with God: the Gentile world. Increasingly, however, they were seen at work within the social world of Israel itself.

Justin was aware of all these demonological differences and made use of most of them, choosing one or the other of contradictory traditions, i.e. either a tradition of a lustful fall or one of a disobedient one; or mentioning or omitting Satan depending on whether he was writing to Jews or pagans.

PART THREE - CHRISTIAN DEMONOLOGY BEFORE JUSTIN

1.3.1 Satan

The demonology of the New Testament reflected the state of first century C.E. apocalyptic demonology, which had modified the ancient story of fallen angels who had mated with women to beget evil demons. A survey of these changes will allow us to distinguish the peculiarities of Justin's Christian demonology. In some instances Justin *reversed* many of the changes that the New Testament writers reflected and assumed, and in other instances he affirmed them.

Christian demonology intensified the later apocalyptic strains (see 1.2.4) which located the power of evil, at odds with the will of God, in Israel itself

and consolidated this demonic rebellion under the personality of Satan.⁵³ Jesus attributed demons, diseases and defilements of various kinds to the tyranny of Satan.⁵⁴ Yet nowhere in the Christian canon was the origin of Satan and the *daemones* explained as it was in the apocalyptic texts like *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*. The existence of Satan as the prince of demons, the adversarial relationship between Jesus and the demons,⁵⁵ and the eventual defeat of the demons are all assumed by the writers as common knowledge in no need of explanation. There are references to the Watcher angels as they who "did not keep their own position but left their proper dwelling" (Jude 6:13, cf. 2 Peter 2:4), and who will be banished to the fire prepared for them when Jesus returns (Matthew 25:41), but, for the most part, Christians dispensed with the *lustful* fall of the angels and continued the later apocalyptic trends attesting to Satan's prior fall from grace through

⁵³ Jeffrey Burton Russell, *Satan: The Early Christian Tradition* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981), 237; *TDNT*, "Daimon", 17. Russell states that never before had the immediacy of evil in the world been so directly dealt with, 222. He also notes Morton's comparison of 568 references to the devil in the New Testament as compared with 304 references to the Holy Spirit and 604 to the miraculous. Kelsey Morton, *Encounter with God* (Minneapolis, 1972).

⁵⁴ Hence, Jesus' logic that since there is only one source of all evil, it is meaningless to speak of Satan driving himself out of people, see Ling on Mark 3:20, *Significance of Satan*, 18-24.

⁵⁵ On the adversarial relationship between Jesus and Satan see Russell, *Satan*, 243, "The essential point, one on which there is complete consistency, is that the new eon brought by Christ is irreconcilably and eternally at war with the old eon of Satan".

pride before the fall of humanity. Paul wrote that all humans fell through the sin of Adam, though he did not link Satan with the first sin of Adam.⁵⁶

As the "prince of this world" Satan's personality and function in the New Testament reflected a more dualistic world view. His lordship over "this world" was evident in his ability to cause death and disease and to possess people. However, the early Christians made it clear that with the advent of Jesus the Messiah, the prince of heaven had planted himself in the middle of the enemy's territory; for only he who was "not of this world" could break Satan's stranglehold.⁵⁷

The role of Satan as the opponent of Jesus was vital to the New Testament cosmology, for it was the power of Satan over people which necessitated the incarnation: "If the power of the Devil is dismissed, then Christ's saving mission becomes meaningless".⁵⁸ The main arena of combat between the two foes are souls, which explains the critical importance of the expulsion of demons for early Christians.

Pagans, Jews and Christians shared some beliefs about demon possession: the possibility of healing by a spiritual authority and the

⁵⁶ Forsyth, *The Old Enemy*, 277. This connection was made by Revelation, which was included in the canon because it provided the crucial link of Satan to the serpent of Genesis, explaining how Satan was responsible for death and necessitating Jesus' redemptive defeat of sin and death, 257. The importance of connecting Satan with the serpent of Genesis is apparent in Justin, see discussion below, 106-7.

⁵⁷ Ling, 32.

⁵⁸ Russell, *Satan*, 229.

dramatic change in the person's manner and lifestyle after the healing.⁵⁹ Greco-Roman and Jewish exorcists usually demanded a fee, and many ordered the departing demon to visibly manifest its departure as proof of the efficacy of their treatment.⁶⁰ Though such possession and madness were commonly associated with the demons in the Greco-Roman folk traditions, the figure of the "prince of demons" uniting and coordinating the efforts of the *daemones* against the gods or the God is unparalleled in the Greco-Roman tradition: "A prince of evil *daimones*...certainly is quite unknown among Greek thinkers of this period [first century C.E.]".⁶¹ Christians like Justin thought that possessions and exorcisms proved the existence of Satan, his adversarial stance towards God, and the power of Jesus over him: in short the Christian world view!⁶²

⁵⁹ Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius IV*, 20 in Ferguson, *Demonology*, 56, fn. 97.

⁶⁰ Common proofs were the knocking over of jars placed a distance away or the swaying of trees.

⁶¹ Brenk, "In the Light of the Moon", 2108. See also *ibid.*, 2106-7, "Satan and Beelzebub must like Michael and Gabriel have been folk heroes of evil and good. They do not, however, correspond much with traditional Greek religious and philosophical conceptions...and [are] possibly absent from even the Greek folk tradition".

⁶² Russell wrote of the importance of the exorcism of demons to the Christian world view: "The exorcism of demons is no quirk in the gospels, no strange and irrelevant accretion introduced from contemporary superstition. It is central to the war against Satan and therefore an integral part of the gospel's meaning", *Satan*, 237-239. Forsyth's evaluation was similar: "[E]xorcism is nevertheless a central, even dominating concern for the synoptic gospels, and the topic may not be dismissed or excused on the grounds of its popularity", *The Old Enemy*, 285. Thus, in examining early Christian demonology, we are not dealing with "unessential apocalyptic scaffolding, but...[with] the very substance of the faith", Stewart, James, "On a Neglected Emphasis in New Testament Theology" *Scottish Journal of Theology* 4 (1951), 300, in Ling, *Significance of Satan*, 2.

In the New Testament *daimon* and *daimonion* signified "always an evil working spirit; that is, a spirit that produces some effect in the life of man which is regarded as evil, though not necessarily in a moral sense".⁶³ The possibility of demonic possession which had only physical effects on the unfortunate victim changed the emphasis which the apocalypses had placed on immorality and sin.⁶⁴

For all the Jewish idiosyncrasies of New Testament demonology, Paul's references to Satan as "the prince of the power of the air" (Eph 2:2) and to "spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places" (Eph 6:12) are examples of notions that Christians, Jews and Greeks shared regarding the demons' population of the lower heavens.⁶⁵ However, the apocalyptic context of Christian demonology continued the biblical idea that the gods of the pagans were not what their worshippers thought them to be, but were demons (1 Cor 10:19-22).⁶⁶

⁶³ Langton, *Essentials*, 147.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 149.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 185. In 2 *Enoch*, the angels who fell are cast out of heaven and are left "flying in the air continuously". The aerial home of demons was originally a Greek conception, though in appropriating it Jews like Paul made this their home *as a result of the fall*. Though the Greco-Romans did not share ideas of a prince of demons, see 31, n. 61.

⁶⁶ See 16-7, above.

1.3.2 The Social Element of Demonology in the New Testament

New Testament demonology divided society between those saved by Christ and those under the power of Satan and his angelic powers. Jesus, and later his disciples⁶⁷ were engaged in a war with Satan and his demons who worked both in Jews and pagans. The tone of the warfare increased from Mark to John,⁶⁸ Luke and John even having Satan "enter" into Judas - one of Jesus' intimate disciples. Even Johannine demonology, though bereft of exorcisms, is characterized by the evil monism of "the world": both human society and other cosmic forces which are opposed to Christ.

Pagels asserted that the gospels were written in the same tradition of *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* which sought to explain the rise of "intimate enemies" within Judaism.⁶⁹ That Pagels' thesis over-emphasizes the intra-Jewish element of spiritual warfare, is shown by other strains of Christian demonology. Paul accepted the idea that up until the advent of Christ, the

⁶⁷ Acts 5:16, 8:7, 13:10; Revelation 2:9, 3:9; 1 John 3:8, 12. Exorcism, within a few generations, became a social struggle between Christians and Jews and/or pagans, which was part of the struggle between Jesus and Satan, Brenk, "In the Light of the Moon", 2115.

⁶⁸ Russell, *Satan*, 230. For an in depth analysis see Pagels, "The Social History of Satan, part 2: The Human Face(s) of Satan in the Gospels" *SBL Seminar Papers* 1992, 32-45.

⁶⁹ The gospels, however, represent a significant shift of blame from pagan nations to other Jews and effectively exempt Rome from "enemy" status in the cosmic war, Pagels, "Human Face", 320-45, 323. For example, Matthew's recounting of the slaughter of the innocents of Bethlehem, paralleling the Egyptian pharaoh's murderous designs on the infant Moses, casts the Jewish King Herod in the role of the evil pagan king, and Egypt as the place of the holy family's sanctuary!, 328. This shift beyond rhetorical vituperation to cosmic/spiritual warfare *between Jews* appears only in the Essenes and the Christians, Luke T. Johnson, "The New Testament: Anti-Jewish Slander and the Convention of Ancient Polemic" *JBL* 108/3 (1989) 419-441, *ibid.*, 330.

nations were ruled by "authorities and powers" (1 Cor 15:24) who originated the "darkness of this world" (Eph 6:10), which were akin to the Watchers of the apocalypses. By the power of the cross Jesus superseded these powers, but they still persisted and sought to prevent people from converting to Christ. Thus Paul assured the Ephesians that though their immediate struggle was with human opponents (perhaps the Imperial government when it was hostile), the true foes were the "sovereignities and powers" (Eph 6:10-12). Similarly, in *Revelation*, the Empire (or Emperor) and the pagan priesthood are seen as spiritual forces acting as Satan's instruments (13), but they can pass away while Satan lives (19:19-20).

1.3.3 The Apostolic Fathers

The Apostolic Fathers continued the canonical silence regarding demonological origins, nomenclature, dwellings etc, and used terminology from the canon exclusively.⁷⁰ They were moralists concerned with the internal problems of an emerging religious group: schisms, heresy and immorality. Yet, Satan the heretic is never portrayed as operating through the agency of demons. In fact, the Fathers never use the word *daimon*,⁷¹ implying that Satan operated alone.

⁷⁰ Gokey, *Terminology*, 175.

⁷¹ Ibid., 176; Russell, *Satan*, 41.

For the most part, Jewish Christian writers like Barnabas fused the concept of the Two Ways (cf. the *Didache* and *Hermas*) with vices personified as evil spirits of "wandering". To deviate from the Way of Truth was to follow these "spirits of wandering" (*ta pneuma tes planes*), a term also used in *Test. XII*.⁷² In a similar vein, *Hermas*' "Two Way" pedagogy personified sins and vices as "spirits" or "demons".

1.3.4 Summary

Christian demonology intensified the later apocalyptic strains which consolidated all demonic activity and rebellion under the personality of Satan. Wholly within the apocalyptic framework, the New Testament writers assumed Satan's fall, enmity and eventual defeat. No mention was made of the cause or manner of the fall, nor of the origins of demons (as distinct from fallen angels). This demonology differed from apocalyptic demonology, and was more similar to the demonology of the rabbinic writings in its emphasis on possession and the evil physical effects of demons rather than on their role in provoking sin.

Certain aspects of New Testament demonology were common to Greco-Roman demonology. Exorcism, so central to the Christians as evidence of the reality of spiritual warfare and proof of Jesus' victory in it, was a phenomenon known to pagans and Jews alike. However, the conflict

⁷² Ibid., 178.

dualism and the figure of Satan remained foreign to the Greco-Roman world view.

The New Testament sharply divided the world between Christians and those under the power of Satan and his angelic powers. The latter could include anyone: one of Jesus' disciples, other Jews hostile to Jesus, the Imperial government or pagan religious authorities. The Apostolic Fathers continued to operate within these parameters; magnifying the personality of Satan to the point that the demons are not mentioned. Satan became responsible for the problems of heresy, schisms, and immorality in the early Christian communities.

SUMMARY OF CHAPTER ONE

To conclude this chapter, let us compare the Greco-Roman and Jewish demonologies. These two cultures shared these six beliefs regarding demons: they were involved in the influencing of one's destiny; they were bodiless, aerial beings; they were inclined towards material sensuality; they were associated with magic and divination; they were responsible for all types of misfortune; and they were the punishers and accusers of those who had done wrong. Both traditions remained unclear regarding the origins of demons. Pagans thought them intermediaries of the gods or souls of the dead. Jews thought they were created by God and were opposed to Him

(rabbinic) or were the offspring of evil angels which had rebelled against God (apocalyptic).

The chief differences between Greco-Roman and Jewish/Christian demonologies lay in the figure of Satan and the consolidation of all demons under him as part of his opposition to God. Such a role for demons - even at the less conflictual level of some of the rabbinic writings - was totally foreign to Greek demonology.⁷³

Within apocalyptic demonology itself were contradictory strains. The manner of the fall of Satan and the angels could either be one of pride or lust and the time of the fall could be before or after the creation of humanity. Later developments in apocalyptic demonology stressed the more personal and social nature of the demons' activities.

Christian demonology before Justin continued these trends, locating demonic influence within all opposition to Jesus, be it Jewish, pagan or on the part of a hostile Imperial government. Unlike the apocalypses, however, New Testament demonology minimized the moral effects of demonic possession. The personality of Satan was behind all demonic activity and exorcism was seen as the demonstration of the reality of spiritual warfare and Jesus' power over Satan and the demons.

This was the common demon consciousness, the "demonization" of all religions in the Hellenistic age referred to by Brenk in this chapter's epigraph.

⁷³ Brenk, "In Light of the Moon", 2094.

It can be seen as a product of many characteristics of the Hellenistic age: its syncretism, its worship of supernatural powers revealed in the forces of nature and in human events, the personification and deification of principles such as "conscience" or "fate" and the widespread uses of magic and astrology to influence this fate.⁷⁴

Justin used all the disparate ideas summarized above: the ideas regarding demons shared by Jews and Greco-Romans, the different strains of apocalyptic thought and the Christian emphases on Satan, exorcism and the demonization of pagan gods and their adherents. How was this so? Simply because of his knowledge of paganism and Judaism and his ability as an apologist to adapt the content of his message according to the demonological beliefs of those he intended to address. As we shall see in the next section, during the second century, the argument would no longer be over the nature of the evil demons, but over which group had succeeded in overcoming its influences. Spiritual warfare would become both the context and the content of religious debate.

⁷⁴ Ferguson, *Backgrounds*, 134.

CHAPTER TWO - JUSTIN'S DEMONOLOGY

Part One - The Context of Justin's Apologetic

[T]he formation of Christianity took place in a time of heightened consciousness about the nature and role of spirits. Whether we regard demonology in that period as a great triumph or a great failure of the human mind, its importance for Western civilization has been immense.¹

Only when we can isolate and compare the use of the demonological ideas (outlined in the preceding chapter) in each of Justin's works can we establish the audience he intended these works to reach. But before this can be done, Justin's position as a second century apologist must be sketched in order that the persuasive power or attractiveness of his apologetic might be properly evaluated. After this, a summary of scholarly interpretations of Justin's demonology will be presented in order to demonstrate how a proper understanding of the demonologies of each of Justin's works, which affects the evaluation of his contribution to Christian thought, has yet to be undertaken.

Justin was Samaritan; born in Flavia Neapolis (1 *Apol* 1) late in the first century or early in the second century.² His few references to his family suggest a normal Hellenistic education and family life (*Dial* 2). His autobiographical references present the picture of a philosophical youth imbued with the religious yearnings common to Middle Platonism. Until the time of his

¹ Brenk, "In the Light of the Moon", 2142.

² Based on Epiphanius' dating of his death during the reign of Marcus Aurelius, *Haer* 46.1.

conversion, sometime before the Bar Kochba rebellion (*Dial* 2), he had no knowledge of either Christianity or Judaism. After his conversion and during the reign of Antoninus Pius (138-161 C.E.), Justin went to Rome for some time and "in the guise of a philosopher, preached the truth of God"³ in his own school which has been described as "something between an advanced catechetical centre and a one-man philosophical hall".⁴ His works bear witness to a firm resolve to prove the superiority of his Christianity to other philosophers, Jews and other Christians with whom he differed. He was later martyred under Marcus Aurelius between 163-167,⁵ perhaps due to the public nature of his work, involving clashes with rival philosophers (2 *Apol* 3).

2.1.1 Apologetic and the Sociology of Knowledge

Justin's works are a mine of information about how second century Christians borrowed from Jewish scriptures and Greek philosophy to explain Christian beliefs to their Jewish and pagan neighbours and to Christians *who had themselves* converted from paganism or (to a much lesser extent)

³ Eusebius, *HE* 4.11.

⁴ George Hunston Williams, "Justin Glimpsed as Martyr Among his Roman Contemporaries", in A.J. McKelway and E.D. Willis (eds.) *The Context of Contemporary Theology: Essays in Honor of Paul Lehmann* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1974), 108, in Harold Remus, "Justin Martyr's Arguments with Judaism", in S.G. Wilson (ed.) *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity vol. 2: Separation and Polemic* (Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1986), 59-80, 71.

⁵ L.W. Barnard, *Justin Martyr: His Life and Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 13.

Judaism⁶ and were in need of clear expressions of who they were. As an apologist, Justin reordered and reoriented the Jewish and pagan cultural worlds to fit his experience of what it was to be a Christian.⁷

Every religious tradition develops means by which individuals are kept within its symbolic universe. Berger and Luckmann termed these means "legitimation".⁸ Legitimation deals with deviations of heretical groups from the "official" version of the symbolic universe; deviations which pose a theological and social threat to religious communities. These communities must develop "conceptual machineries" which will help them account for the deviations and reinforce their threatened reality.⁹

However, with Justin another type of conceptual machinery was used, one which was involved not only in the repression of deviant views within a symbolic universe, but also with the confrontation with other symbolic universes. Such a machinery is more sophisticated than heresiology because it is primarily a result of social conflict between the religious group and other

⁶ On the remnant of Jews who were still converting see n. 52, 102, below.

⁷ Remus, 60. "The apology draws the outer world into its own inner circle for judgement as a way for the group to make sense of itself", Charles H. Cosgrove, "Justin Martyr and the Emerging Christian Canon" *Vigiliae Christianae* 36 (1982), 209-32, 219.

⁸ Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise on the Sociology of Knowledge* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1966), 98-107.

⁹ This conceptual machinery consists of: (1) a theory of deviance (e.g. demonic possession), (2) an apparatus allowing the diagnosis of deviance (e.g. a symptomology of possession), and (3) a curative process (e.g. exorcism). If the deviant person internalizes this machinery, they will remain within the official definition of the symbolic universe and recant the errors. I am grateful to Ritva Williams for introducing me to this conceptual model, Ritva Williams, *Not of the Father's Planting* (MA Thesis, Carleton University, 1993).

groups in society with competing symbolic universes and not the product of the inner workings of the group itself.¹⁰

This type of machinery was also involved in the legitimation of the group's symbolic universe, though in a "negative" way. This negative legitimation, or nihilation, sought to affirm the symbolic universe by liquidating everything *outside* it.

Legitimation *maintains* the reality of the socially constructed universe; nihilation *denies* the reality of whatever phenomena or interpretations of phenomena do not fit into that universe.¹¹

Such a denial may be done in one of two ways. First, a negative or inferior ontological status is given to the competing universe, imputing their holders "congenitally befuddled about the right order of things, dwellers in a hopeless cognitive darkness".¹² The second type of nihilation involves the more ambitious attempt to account for all deviant definitions of reality in terms of concepts *belonging to one's own universe*.

In a theological frame of reference, this entails the transition from heresiology to apologetics. The deviant definitions are not merely

¹⁰ Berger and Luckmann, *Social Construction*, 100.

¹¹ Ibid., 106.

¹² Ibid. New Testament writers and the Apostolic Fathers engaged in this type of nihilation. An example is *Diognetus* 2-3 and 9, where the author tells of the madness of pagan idolatry and morality, which renders them unable to know anything of God.

assigned a negative ontological status, they are grappled with theoretically in detail. The final goal of the procedure is to *incorporate* the deviant conceptions within one's own universe, and thereby to liquidate them ultimately. The deviant conceptions must, therefore, be *translated* into concepts derived from one's own universe. In this manner, the negation of one's universe is subtly changed into an affirmation of it...the devil unwittingly glorifies God.¹³

This type of nihilation, therefore, involves a coming-to-terms with all other competing symbolic universes or world views. Christianity before Justin was crystallizing its world view. Indeed, apologetic presupposes this fact because until the basic terms of a world view are defined, it cannot engage in the translation of other world views into concepts belonging to its own.

Justin's argument that Christianity began in a culture older than paganism, the latter of which is derived from and, through the work of demons, imitative of the former, is the first example in the Christian tradition of such an apologetic of nihilation. The emergence of this type of nihilation and of apologists like Justin ("full-time personnel for universe legitimation" ¹⁴) are the product of, and themselves resulted in, social conflict (often "between rival coteries of experts"¹⁵). Rival definitions of reality involved rival social

¹³ Ibid., 106-7.

¹⁴ Ibid., 109.

¹⁵ Ibid., 110. Justin's public clashes with the Cynic philosopher Crescens, who he predicts might be the agent of his death, are particularly notable in this context. Often clashing debaters "resort to various sturdier supports for the frail power of mere argument- such as, say, getting the authorities to employ armed might to enforce one argument against its competitors", *ibid.*

interests, and Christians threatened many social interests precisely because they set out to realize their social interests *within* society and not as a "holy remnant" removed from society.

2.1.2 Opposition to Christianity

As a second century apologist, Justin had his work cut out for him. Christianity was spreading throughout the Empire and exciting opposition from pagans and Jews alike. It was perceived as a new, foreign and irrational superstition. Above all, it was considered potentially dangerous because Christians refused to sacrifice to the gods; an act that was thought to maintain the proper relationship between the people and the gods, and to ensure the continued prosperity of the Empire.¹⁶ Christianity's exclusivism was also distasteful to the tolerant Greco-Roman polytheism which lacked any competition between the cults for the sole adherence of the person, a concept of heresy, a missionary program and a desire to exclude all other cults.¹⁷

Second century Christians had also inherited the charges of infanticide and

¹⁶ "All the prosperity and achievement of ancient cultures -the pyramids and temples of Egypt, the canals and temple towers of Babylonia, the Mayan remains, and the *pax Romana*- was absolutely fixed to a ritual form from which it could not be separated", Christopher Dawson, *Progress and Religion: An Historical Enquiry* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1931), 117. See G.E.M. de St. Croix, "Why Were the Early Christians Persecuted?" in M.I. Finley (ed.) *Studies in Ancient Society* (London: 1974) for the classic argument that Christian "atheism" was the source of persecution.

¹⁷ Robin Lane Fox, *Pagans and Christians* (London: Penguin Books, 1988), 31-6. Ramsay MacMullen, *Christianizing the Roman Empire* (London: Yale University Press, 1984), 18; Stephen Benko, *Pagan Rome and the Early Christians* (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1984), 58; and J.J. Walsh, "On Christian Atheism" *Vigiliae Christianae* 45 (1991), 255-277, 256 all argued that it was this fanatical dogmatism which was the chief cause of persecution of which atheism was but a symptom.

sexual licentiousness which had been thrown at the Jews. Besides attempting simply to deny the charges by arguing that Christianity's superior moral and sexual codes precluded such acts,¹⁸ Justin borrowed some techniques from Hellenistic Jewish apologetic. However, whereas Philo and Josephus defended Judaism as a superior religion *by Greco-Roman standards*, Justin went beyond this defensive stance to an outright nihilation of popular cultic piety. Such a hostile polemic may well be explained by the nature of religious debate in the second century.

2.1.3 Second Century Pagan-Christian Debate

As we saw in the first chapter, there was a "common fund" of demonology which contained the following notions: demons as bodiless, aerial beings who had fearful powers over one's fate, who were associated with magic, sacrifices and other sensual cravings (notably lusting after mortals) and who, because of the abuse of their powers, were associated with suffering and immorality. In the second century, Greco-Roman paganism, Judaism and Christianity all sought to answer popular concerns about these negative powers of the evil demons.

In addition to being socialized in the Greco-Roman tradition, Justin was well

¹⁸ 1 Apol 12, 17, 29.

versed in Christian,¹⁹ and Jewish sources. He had a good working knowledge of second century Judaism,²⁰ and his knowledge of the LXX was formidable.²¹ He was thus well-positioned to use these common demonological notions to engage in apologetic and develop novel lines of persuasion and polemic. He would have known which ideas could be exploited when talking to Jews, and which were to be downplayed or even ignored in order to best argue his case with pagans.

Because of the concerns about the powers of evil demons, second century religious debate revolved around "the knowledge of God, the successful evasion of daemonological influence, and the locus of divine truth and power".²² This debate involved mutual claims to divine truth through the fulfilment of prophecy and mutual attacks on the opponent's claims as being the result of the deceit of demons.²³ In this context, Justin's goal as an apologist was offensive. For it was not enough to claim that Jesus had come

¹⁹ He knew the gospels as the "memoirs" (*ta apomne moneumata*) of the apostles (1 *Apol* 66), avoiding the Fourth gospel (though he knew it), perhaps due to its popularity with Gnostic Christians, Barnard, 60-63.

²⁰ Barnard, *Life and Thought*, 45-53.

²¹ No doubt aided by the proof text tract he worked from. Skarsaune postulates that Justin worked from a missionary tract detailing Plato and other philosophers' debt to Moses, Oskar Skarsaune, *The Proof from Prophecy. A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof Text Tradition: Text Type, Provenance, Theological Profile* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1987), 226. On Justin's use of the LXX see esp. *Dial* 68, 71-3, 84, 120.

²² Robert J. Hauck, *The More Divine Proof: Prophecy and Inspiration in Celsus and Origen* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 50.

²³ Note that in both the apologies and the *Dialogue* Justin must answer charges that Jesus worked his miracles through magic, 1 *Apol* 30 and *Dial* 69.

in the fullness of time. Justin had to assert that Jesus had broken through the demonic forces which had been deceiving all of humanity!²⁴ Thus, the debate had become one over *power*: "the question was that of which side possessed the spiritual power and knowledge to overcome the forces limiting human life".²⁵

It has been said of *adversos Judaeos* writers like Melito that the anti-Judaic elements in his thought was "the reverse side of his attempt to articulate Christian belief" - notably, his Christology.²⁶ It may be fairly stated that Justin's demonology functioned in the same way, that is, as the reverse side of his attempt to articulate his belief that Jesus was the Logos Incarnate. For with this Logos doctrine he not only appropriated the Jewish covenant, but all that was true (according to Justin) in Greek culture. The question remained, however, what were Christians to do with all that was *not* true and which contradicted Christian truth? How were Christians to explain and order the existence of other beliefs, some of which were perilously similar to theirs? Justin found an answer in demonology. Using notions of *daimones* common to the Greco-Roman world of the time, he redefined them from good, bad or indifferent beings to beings that were evil without exception by identifying them with the offspring of fallen angels. Next, he redefined the gods

²⁴ Hauck, *More Divine Proof*, 55.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 142-3.

²⁶ Stephen G. Wilson, "Passover, Easter, and Anti-Judaism: Melito of Sardis and Others" in *To See Ourselves as Others See Us* (Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1985), 337-355, 349.

themselves by identifying them with these evil demons who sought to alienate people from God and His Christ by using the pagan cults to imitate Christian truth.²⁷ Thus, if the spearhead of Justin's apologetic was his Logos doctrine, its "reverse side" was this "campaign of demotion".²⁸ In terms of the model of "nihilation", or negative legitimation, this campaign sought to nihilate the pagan gods by incorporating them into the Christian world view as evil demons in disguise, thereby liquidating them.

Justin's demonology incorporated popular notions of demonic influence within the context of the apocalyptic, Christian cosmology and extended this redefined notion into the personal, ethical and social lives of Christians. For Justin saw Christians as living according to a spiritual power won by Christ on the cross which alone allowed for the correct vision of a world that had become hopelessly obscured due to the workings of the demons.

Christian morality, for Justin, meant acting in such a way as to escape from the demonic powers and open oneself to the power of Jesus Christ, through whom one could personally defeat Satan (in the microcosmic warfare of one's soul) before Satan's final defeat and eternal punishment in the parousia.

²⁷ This reordering of common demonological notions is another example of what Meeks has termed Christianity's "triumph from within". Whether it was existing "avenues of access and support *within* the old structures of the Roman social world" [Wayne Meeks, *The First Urban Christians* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1983), 85], notions of sexual morality [Ramsay MacMullen, "What Difference Did Christianity Make?" *Historia* 35/3 (1986), 322-343], or theology [Ramsay MacMullen, "Two Types of Conversion to Christianity" *Vigiliae Christianae* 37 (1983), 174-192], Christians worked within existing structures and beliefs to reorient them, first in their own communities, and later, outside them. Justin's demonology was another "triumph from within" using apocalyptic demonology to reshape common demonological notions.

²⁸ The term is MacMullen's, *Christianizing*, 28.

Fortified by the certainties of the provisional and eternal defeat of Satan, early Christians like Justin envisioned the coming of a new aeon characterized by a reversal of fortune, and regarded the cross as the axis of this turn of the ages.²⁹

2.1.4 Justin's Use of Demonological Strains in Apocalyptic Thought

Justin's nihilation of Judaism and paganism returned to the fall of the angels stories elaborated by the traditions of *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*. He explained where demons came from and when, what they could do and why they did it. In an environment hungry for information about demons, Justin unveiled the reality of the cosmic warfare and offered information on who the opponents were, what they were fighting over, and where the battle was raging most fiercely.

Justin had other reasons for this return to demonology. Christians had only to look at the "memoirs" of the apostles to see how Jesus and his apostles had powers over demons and evil spirits. However, because the New Testament writers showed little interest in recording their (or Jesus') beliefs regarding the *origins* of these demons, it was left to the second century Christians to answer the questions the developing canon could not. Questions such as: Who is Satan? Why did he "fall" in the first place? When did this fall occur? What

²⁹ Thomas E. Boomershine, "Epistemology at the Turn of the Ages in Paul, Jesus and Mark: Rhetoric and Dialectic" *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn*. Marcus Joel and Marion L. Soards (eds.) (Worcester, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 17-48.

were demons? What role did they play in the eschaton?³⁰ All needed answers.

The question of evil had come into the forefront of apologetic for another reason: the radical dualism of Marcion and other Gnostic Christians demanded a coherent response from other Christian groups. The notion of the fall of the angels had opened the floodgates of speculation, allowing many different redemption theories.³¹ The philosophical and moral revulsion with which many second century Greco-Romans viewed the material realm was projected by the Gnostics onto its maker, the Demiurge (world-maker). In the most dramatic shift in the Gnostic "fall of the angels" narratives, the Demiurge served not as the God rebelled against by the angels, but is himself the cause and origin of deception.³² The focus is thereby taken off human sinfulness and placed on the malevolence of the Demiurge.

Justin's emphasis on the free will of the angels and of humans was his attempt to counter such Gnostic ideas of spiritual warfare which deny human freedom and project all malevolence onto the Demiurge. His catholic Christianity fought the gnostic Christian groups' division of God into the evil Demiurge and

³⁰ Russell, *Satan*, 31, for the last question.

³¹ Indeed, Forsyth has characterized second century Christianity as "nothing but a confusion of sects, orthodoxies and heresies replacing each other with bewildering rapidity, all competing with each other to offer the one true version of the central [combat] myth", *The Old Enemy*, 72.

³² *The Apocryphon of John*, 28.32-29.12, *ibid.*, 320.

the God of Jesus by appropriating the Jewish name (*Dial* 137) and covenant (*Dial* 135), often at the expense of the Jewish people themselves.³³

2.1.5 Summary

Christians in the middle of the second century were turning their gaze to the culture in which they lived and in which most of them had been raised. Justin explained to them how to interpret this culture from the Christian point of view.³⁴ He also had to explain the opposition and occasional persecution that Christians experienced - both to Christians and to their persecutors. In doing so, he both followed tradition and created it for future generations.³⁵ His new line of argument used the "fall of the angels" myths developed in Jewish and Christian apocalyptic thought to redefine common notions of demons. He had many reasons to do so: pagan-Christian debate was over whose belief had the power to defeat demons, Christians themselves needed answers to questions about demons that the developing canon could not answer, and the demonologies of rival Christian groups needed to be countered.

³³ Stephen G. Wilson, "Marcion and the Jews" in Stephen G. Wilson (ed.) *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity vol.2: Separation and Polemic* (Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1986), 45-58, 57.

³⁴ "There were no doubt internal needs for self-definition and self-justification vis-a-vis the Hellenistic world at work" in Justin's works which served as "a written base for arguments which were no doubt delivered orally", Cosgrove, "Justin Martyr", 211, n. 7.

³⁵ Tertullian, *Apology* 22, accepted Justin's argument from *2 Apol* regarding the origin of demons as the offspring of fallen angels and human women.

Part Two - Justin's Demonology in Recent Scholarship

2.2.1 Goodenough

E.R. Goodenough, in *The Theology of Justin Martyr* (1923), recognized the importance of demonology in the second century: "He [Justin], like most people of his time, was almost animistic in his belief that the universe was swarming with superhuman, invisible powers, some weak, others strong".³⁶ Indeed, second century Christianity was so influenced by these ideas that it was moulded by Christians to answer the needs they created: "The chief attention of the Christianity of Justin's day was centred upon winning in the never ending fight against the actual incursions and seductions of the demonic hosts".³⁷

Despite this recognition of demonology as the "chief attention" of the Christianity of the time, it did not receive such attention in Goodenough's evaluation of Justin's theology. This omission is reflected in Goodenough's evaluation of Justin's eschatology. He characterized Justin as one of the "simple Christians"³⁸ of his day who reflected the rather "irrational and contradictory"³⁹ nature of his faith by retaining a number of discrete

³⁶ E.R. Goodenough, *The Theology of Justin Martyr* (Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1968, 1st ed. Jena: Frommanische Buchhandlung, 1923), 176.

³⁷ Ibid., 205.

³⁸ Ibid., 185, 279.

³⁹ Ibid., 292.

demonological traditions.⁴⁰ He thought it paradoxical that though Justin was willing to die for these beliefs, he did not seem willing to organize them.⁴¹ Because of these traditions, he considered Justin's eschatology to be an uncritical amalgam of contradictory beliefs which he (Goodenough) summarized as "an increase of good things, at the same time [as] a terrible riot of evil".⁴² That both dominion and heresy will be widespread before the second advent further complicated the question of whether evil will increase or decrease before the eschaton. Goodenough's resolution was that there was a provisional defeat of the demons through exorcism.⁴³ Surveying the apologies and the *Dialogue*, he cites other such contradictions.

How is it, he asked together with Barnard,⁴⁴ that Justin can write in the *Dialogue* that the second coming will be the triumph over demons,⁴⁵ and in *1 Apol* that the demons must be defeated before the second coming?⁴⁶ Will evil be wiped from the earth when the evil demons are condemned (*1 Apol* 28, 52), or is it only in heaven that the Christian will totally escape evil (*1 Apol* 8)?

⁴⁰ Ibid., 288.

⁴¹ Ibid., 292.

⁴² Ibid., 291.

⁴³ *Dial* 28 and 32, *ibid.*, 286.

⁴⁴ Barnard, *Life and Thought*, 159.

⁴⁵ "For this power is and was and shall be the attribute of One only, at whose name every power shudders and suffers agonizing pain because it is to be destroyed by Him", *Dial* 111.

⁴⁶ "That God the Father of the universe would bring Christ to Heaven after His resurrection from the dead, and would keep him there until He struck His enemies, the demons..." *1 Apol* 45.

Goodenough's treatment was limited by his assertion that Justin's ideas came from the Christian canon alone.⁴⁷ Like Philo (*De Gigant* 6-27) and Josephus (*Ant* 1.3) before him, Justin returned to the fall of the angels story and made the changes suited to his time, which were rejected by a later time.⁴⁸ These changes gave the vague notions of demons a concrete, Christian form.⁴⁹

2.2.2 Barnard

Barnard's *Justin Martyr: His Life and Thought* (1967) was more positive in its evaluation of Justin's knowledge of philosophy and of his contribution to Christian thought. He also recognized the centrality of demonology for the apologist: "consciousness of the demonic element in the universe was central to Justin's world view" and "we do him an injustice if we minimize it".⁵⁰

In delineating the picture of Justin as an apologist to the Greek world it should not be forgotten that his main practical concern, as with his fellow Christians, lay in winning the increasing fight

⁴⁷ Goodenough, *Theology*, 205.

⁴⁸ Origen (*Contra Celsum* 5.54), Irenaeus (*Preaching* 16); (*Against Heresies* IV. 40.3), Gregory of Nyssa (*Catechetical Oration* 6) and Augustine (*City of God* 15.23) all were to later reject Justin's vision of the origins of the demons, though all maintained their connection with the cults. Tertullian accepted it in his *Apology* 22, but then rejected it in *On Patience* 5, in Ferguson, *Demonology* 115.

⁴⁹ Goodenough, *Theology*, 185.

⁵⁰ Barnard, *Life and Thought*, 107.

against evil spirits which were seeking to win control of the universe and the souls of men.⁵¹

However, like Goodenough, Barnard does not organize his study of Justin in such a way that this "main practical concern" of "the demonic element" was central. And like Goodenough he does not admit any extra-canonical influence on his demonology (though he does with regards to his millennial thinking⁵²). He argued that Justin's philosophical presuppositions modified the biblical basis of his logos doctrine to "too great an extent", but that the same could not be said of his eschatology.⁵³ Instead, he argued that Justin's Christology was at the heart of his demonology, though he admitted that Justin himself did not make any connection between Christology and the fall of the angels.⁵⁴

However, unlike Goodenough, Barnard did not conclude that Justin was merely an unconscious cataloguer of contradictory beliefs. He cautioned that allowance must be taken into account for the different audiences to which Justin was writing. For example, the notion of the two advents is noted once in the apologies and seven times in the *Dialogue*.⁵⁵ In speaking with the pagans, it seemed that Justin relegated the eschaton to the background and

⁵¹ Ibid., 110.

⁵² Ibid., 165.

⁵³ Ibid., 168.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 108.

⁵⁵ 1 *Apol* 52; *Dial* 32, 33, 40, 45, 49, 110, and 111, *ibid.*, 158, n.4.

emphasized individual responsibility and choosing good and evil. "[T]o have stated boldly the collapse of all earthly power and the rule of Christians under Christ in a rebuilt Jerusalem would not have been very tactful, to say the least, in an *apologia* intended primarily for the non-Christian world".⁵⁶ Barnard also noted that Justin's millennialism appeared only in the *Dialogue* (80-1, 113), while the apologies spoke of a final conflagration (2 *Apol* 7): "Justin can use apocalyptic and non-apocalyptic language according to his theme, not according to the stages of his development as a Christian philosopher..."⁵⁷

Thus, Barnard made allowance for the apologetic context when evaluating the "inconsistencies" in Justin's writings. In the *Dialogue* Justin moved within the thought world of the New Testament, while in the apologies he emphasized the rationality of the Christian position.⁵⁸ Barnard quoted Moule on the justification for such an approach to Justin: "different formulations have to be enlisted in the service of different affirmations, all of which may prove to be simultaneous aspects of a single great conviction too large to be expressed coherently or singly".⁵⁹

⁵⁶ Ibid., 165.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 163.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 165-7. Osborn also recognized the differences and sought to explain them by grounding the demonology of the apologies in the apocalyptic traditions of Enoch and Jubilees, and that of the *Dialogue* in the canonical writings, *Justin Martyr*, 57.

⁵⁹ Moule, "The Influence of Circumstances on the Use of Eschatological Terms" *Journal of Theological Studies* 15 n. 1 (1964), 1-15, 9, *ibid.*, 163.

2.2.3 Skarsaune

It was Skarsaune who fully recognized the extent to which demonology had not only become the context of the proclamation of Christian truth, but the content as well:

"We have seen that the battle between God and the demons is the great cosmic framework of Justin's sayings about the prophets of Christ... It is by his birth, passion and ascension that Christ subdues all the powers that are against God. The prophets *proclaimed* in advance this victory of Christ. *That is the central content of their message.*"⁶⁰

According to Justin, the prophets did not teach monotheism, virtue and eternal life in an abstract way. They proclaimed these truths by announcing the approaching defeat of the demons in the life of Jesus. In this way they "foretold those things of the future, which indeed have come to pass" (*Dial* 7). "The fulfilment of the prophecies [about the defeat of demons] is therefore *precisely at the centre and heart of the Christian message... This is not an authentication of the Christian message, this is the message.*"⁶¹

Justin describes himself as a convert to Christianity but the conversion is not described in a traditional way. It is described as conversion from pseudo-philosophy to True Philosophy. The pre-eminent task of True Philosophy is to reveal the real nature of the

⁶⁰ Skarsaune, *Conversion*", 62-3 referring to *Dial* 78.9, second italicization mine.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*

demons and to lead men to the only true God. This the prophets had already done, speaking in the power of the pre-existent Logos - yes, even Socrates unveiled the pseudogods to the best of his ability. The final victory over the demons was won by the Incarnate Logos on the cross. This final victory was predicted by the prophets, and so Christ and the prophets confirm one another.⁶²

Demonology has not become the means of spreading the message, it was the message. Indeed, Jesus the Saviour from Demons is more prominent in Justin than Jesus the Teacher.⁶³

We have traced the evaluations of Justin's demonology from its early characterizations as the product of uncritical combining of contradictory strains of eschatological thought (in Goodenough), to the recognition of the possibility that inconsistencies may be the result of tailoring of his thought according to his audience (in Barnard), to a recent recognition of the importance of demonology in the *Dialogue*. The purpose of the examination of Justin's works that follows is twofold: (i) to combine the last two observations, regarding the influence of the intended audience on the use of eschatological thought and of demonology becoming the content of his Christian message; and (ii) to do this through a reading of his works which examines each work individually. Only then will the resulting demonologies be examined as the coherent product of one mind.

⁶² Ibid., 72.

⁶³ Jesus referred to as *didaskalos* only twice in the *dial*; 76 and 108, *ibid.*, 63.

An attempt will be made to demonstrate that Justin's demonology was not an uncritical collage of traditions, but a coherent polemic which employed different demonological notions against both paganism and Judaism. As such it reveals important information about the social enemies of Christians in the middle second century.

CHAPTER THREE - A READING OF JUSTIN'S WORKS

Part 1 The *First Apology* (1 *Apol*)

Drawing upon the knowledge of common and uncommon demonological beliefs (Chapter One) and upon the knowledge of the context of Justin's apologetic efforts (Chapter Two), this examination of Justin's works will clarify Justin's use of contradictory demonological beliefs to address different audiences. The findings will then be applied to the questions of the audience of the *Dialogue*, the social position of Christians in second century Rome, and, later in Chapter Four, the place of demonology in the evaluation of Justin's contribution to the success of the Christian mission.

Eusebius (*HE* 4.18) reported that Justin wrote two apologies; the first of which was 1 *Apol*. It functioned as an "open letter", publicly expressing the views of a person or group in a text addressed to a figure of authority.¹ It is dated to 150-155 C.E. at Rome, based on its address to the Emperor Antoninus Pius, his son Verissimus (Marcus Aurelius), Lucius (Commodus, the philosopher) and the Roman people.

In the first section, Justin demanded the fair treatment of Christians (3-4), refuted the popular charges against Christians (atheism, 6, 13; immorality, 2-4; and disloyalty, 11, 17), and presented some of Jesus' ethical teachings and argued for their rationality (13-21). The second section, chapters 22-30, contained the polemic that Christianity was older than paganism, the latter of

¹ Barnard, 15; Goodenough 82. A literary analysis of the work is Paul Keresztes, "The Literary Genre of Justin's *First Apology*" *Vigiliae Christianae* 19 (1965), 99-110.

which was instigated by the demons. The longest section consisted of proofs from prophecy ("the greatest and truest proof", 30) and miracle from the Jewish scriptures (31-53) which sought to offer the empirical proofs of Christianity's claims which the pagan cults did not offer. Justin returned to the polemic of the second section again in chapters 54-67, detailing the pagan myths that were imitations of the predictions of Christ's birth and life (54-8) that were intended to lure people away from Him. Christian truths and practices such as the Eucharist and baptism were also imitated by the demons in the cults for the same reason (61-67). Justin ended with a brief appeal to justice and attached the letter of Hadrian to Minucius Fundanus ordering the proper trial of Christians (68).

3.1.1 "The One Complaint": The Need for Christian Apologetic

Justin's aim in *1 Apol* was to argue for the cessation of the persecution of Christians. His means were three: to prove that Christian truth was older than Greek philosophy; to prove that Jesus alone was the Son of God; and to prove that the evil demons had worked through the Greco-Roman cults to imitate the Christian gospel, and presently work by persecuting Christians (23). That Christian doctrines such as the virgin birth and the resurrection of the body were merely the excuse for persecution and not the source of the "general

hatred" of Christians was borne out in Justin's approach to apologetic.² Justin was well aware that the root cause of the persecution of Christians which prompted the apology (3), lay not in the realm of beliefs - many which had Greco-Roman parallels (24-26) - but in that of worship, i.e. how those beliefs affected the social behaviour of Christians observable by their pagan neighbours:

Yet this is the one complaint you have against us, that we do not worship (*sebomen*) the same gods that you do, and do not bring libations and offerings of fat to the dead, crowns for their statues, and sacrifices (24.4).³

Justin's apologetic served purposes both internal and external to the Christian community. Externally, it explained to pagans why Christians did not participate in the cults by explaining the beliefs which prompted this refusal. The purpose of this was to quell the persecutions which prompted *1 Apol.*

Internal to the Christian community, the whole apology was an extended answer to the question of why the Christians were persecuted. Justin explained that it was not because of their teachings, for others had similar teachings (20.3-4, 24). It was also not because of their morality, which was flawless (15-17, 25) - and besides, Christian heretics and the pagans themselves behaved

² See 42-4, above, regarding the question of whether atheism or the content of Christian beliefs themselves was the cause of persecution. Goodenough, 101, cited Justin as proof that atheism, the refusal to sacrifice to the gods, was the flash-point of pagan-Christian relations.

³ The Greek text used is Andre Wartelle (trans.), *Justin Martyr* (Paris: Etudes Augustiniennes, 1987).

immorally without being executed (26). No, the true reason was that of the eternal enmity between the evil demons and Christ in which the weapons of the demons were the pagan cults and the evil inclinations of irrational people. Distaste for the cults had been expressed by many Greco-Romans themselves (4.15), but it had never been based on an interpretation of the nature of the cults such as Justin was to unfold in this apology.

3.1.2 Points of Contact

Justin sought to represent the Christian world view and value system to people who did not subscribe to it. Because of the alien nature of many Christian beliefs, he had to explain from the known to the unknown. Justin had to establish points of contact with pagan culture *while simultaneously* differentiating Christianity from it. An example of this dialectic lay in his treatment of pagan miracle claims and how they related to similar claims made by Christians for Jesus.⁴

First, Justin sought to align Christian miracle claims about the virgin birth and the death of Christ with those of the "so called" sons of Jupiter (21)⁵, in order to show that in this respect, Christianity was "nothing new or different" from other religious beliefs. Thus, Jesus was the Logos of God like Mercury was claimed to announce the logos of God (22.2). He suffered like the sons of

⁴ An excellent treatment of this is Remus, *Pagan-Christian Conflict*, 136-158.

⁵ Mercury, Asclepius, Bacchus, Hercules, Perseus and Bellerophon.

Jupiter (though in a different manner, 22.3). He was born of a virgin as Perseus was claimed to have been (22.6), and he healed like the pagans believed Asclepius healed (22.7). Justin established points of contact with popular cultic piety by arguing that "we hold teachings similar to the Greeks" (24.1), and "we speak the same things as the writers [of the myths]" (23.1). He also quoted from pagan writers who served his purposes: Plato,⁶ other philosophers who denied the existence of the gods (4.14) and poets who denounced the licentiousness of the gods (4.15).

The points of contact were not only on the philosophical plane, they extended into the realms of cultic piety and other facets of daily existence. Justin argued that the power of the cross was undeniable because of its prominence in human life. Without it ships could not navigate the seas in military victories,⁷ the earth could not be ploughed nor could artisans and workers do their work. The cruciform figure itself is what distinguishes the human from the rest of the "irrational animals". More conspicuously, the cross itself appeared on the banners and trophies of popular processions and was even used as a symbol of Imperial power and the post-mortem divinity of emperors (55).

Another point of contact which Justin mentioned was the idea of the "seed

⁶ *Republic* 5.18, 3.5.

⁷ Justin's use of ship imagery is particularly interesting because the ship was a common metaphor for the Empire, Demosthenes, *Olynthiacs*, 2.10 in William R. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 67, n. 19.

of God" (*tou theou sperma*) which was the Logos (32.8), or the "seeds of truth" (*spermata aletheias*). In chapter 44.9, Justin claimed that Moses was more ancient than all the Greek authors and everything they and the poets said about the immortality of the soul, or judgement after death, or any spiritual matter they learned from Moses and the prophets. "Thus" he wrote, "the seeds of truth seem to be among all men..." (44.10). This term refers to the ability of those who were not Jews or Christians, and thus did not recognize their scriptures, to apprehend the truth without the revelation of Christ. An example of such a "seed" might be how pagan oracles and necromancy point to the truth of the continued existence of the soul after death (18).

In 46 Justin expanded upon this idea, claiming that Christ was the Logos "of whom all mankind partakes" (*logou onta ou pan nenos anthropon metesche*, 46.2). All those who lived "by reason" (*hoi meta logou biosantes*, 46.3) before the time of Christ were in fact Christians. Among the Greeks, Socrates and Heraclitus; among the Jews, Abraham, Elias and the three young men in the furnace (Dan. 3:20-93) were all followers of Christ.

The few points of contact made with pagan thought, ritual and daily life were not innocent matters of coincidence, however. Though these points of contact allowed Christians to align themselves with the noblest elements of the pagan tradition, they existed within a violently polarized environment. For those devoid of reason (*aneu logou*) were "enemies of Christ, and murderers of those who lived by reason" (46.4). Thus, despite their being a universal seed of truth

in humanity, people had always been divided into antagonistic groups centred around Christ. While pagans and Christians shared common ideas and common symbols, these mutual possessions masked profound divergence between the two social groups. Though he had taken pains to point out these similarities, the bulk of the apology concentrated on what differentiated Christianity from paganism: the shamefulness of the Greek myths, the unique truth of Christianity, and the demonic origin of the cults (23).

3.1.3 Demonology of *1 Apol* 5

"What can all this mean?" Justin questioned at the beginning of the apology (5). By "all this" he was referring to the fact that some Christians were giving others a bad name by their immoral actions, with the result that confessing Christianity was now considered criminal (4). This immorality, together with "irrational impulse and long established evil rumours" (2) were kindling "tyrannical violence" (3) against Christians - even by local Imperial officials. How was it, the apologist asked, that all justice and reason were ignored when Christians stood accused? There was only one explanation why passion and evil were triumphing over reason and innocence: the persecutors were "driven by unreasoning passion *and the whips of evil demons (daimonon phaulon)*". Justin continued, revealing the truth of how and when the warfare centred around Christ had begun:

The truth must be told. In old times evil demons (*daimones phauloi*) manifested themselves, seducing women, corrupting boys and showing terrifying sights to men - so that those who did not judge these occurrences rationally were filled with awe. Taken captive by fear and not understanding that these were evil demons, they called them gods and gave each of them the name which each of the demons had chosen for himself. When Socrates tried by true reason (*logoi alethei*) and with due enquiry to make these things clear and to draw men away from the demons, they, working through men who delighted in wickedness, managed to have him put to death as godless and impious (*atheon kai aebe*), saying that he was bringing in new divinities (*daimonia*). And now they do the same kind of thing to us. For these errors were not only condemned among the Greeks by reason, through Socrates, but among the barbarians, by Reason himself (*Logou morphothentos*), who took form and became man and was called Jesus Christ. In obedience to him we say that the demons who did such things are not only rightly not called gods, but in fact are evil and unholy demons, whose actions are in no way like those of men who long after virtue.

Justin's astounding explanation of what "all this" meant was nothing less than a total re-ordering of Greek history and culture containing four claims: (1) the gods are demons, (2) the demons are at war with reason, (3) humans are involved in this war against reason, (4) Jesus is reason incarnate. These claims constitute a skilful redefinition of the Greek *daimon* as wholly evil, and the identification of these evil demons with the gods. Though the notions of *daimones* and gods had been closely related since Homer,⁸ Justin's equating of them was a return to the ancient biblical polemic of Deut 32:17 and Ps 106:37 (quoted by Paul in 1 Cor 10:20).

On the question of the origins of these demons, Justin remained vague stating that they "manifested themselves" in time immemorial. On the nature

⁸ See 11, above.

of the demons he was much clearer. They were irrational, lustful and tyrannical. The traits of irrationality and lustfulness were often attributed to the demons as the sensual means by which they hindered progress along the philosophical path.⁹ Rabbinic and apocalyptic demonology were also familiar with demons or evil angels who had sexual designs on humans, particularly women.¹⁰ The punishing role of the demons and their association with cultic piety were also known to Greeks.¹¹ However, it is the context of the battle between the demons and those, like Socrates, who attempt to live by true reason, which is Christ, that is uncommon. This apocalyptic battle centred around the Incarnate Logos points to Justin's translation of Christian notions into the terms of the Greco-Roman world view.

Justin asserted that there existed a battle of "true reason" and "due enquiry", embodied in Socrates, to reveal the gods for what they were. This battle was on both the human and supernatural planes, for the demons used "men who delighted in wickedness" as their instruments to kill Socrates, who threatened to reveal the true nature and purpose of the cults. Now came the gist of Justin's demonological context: this same battle of reason and philosophy against the irrational tyranny of the demons continued to that day

⁹ See 36-7, above and Hauck, *More Divine Proof*, 142-3.

¹⁰ The reference to the corruption of "boys" (paidas) in 5 was novel, occurring nowhere in the apocalyptic texts and seems particularly targeted towards Greco-Roman sexual practices. It may also be directed at Hadrian's relations with the boy Antinous.

¹¹ MacMullen, "Two Types", 181.

in the persecution of Christians. Christians continued to expose the nature of the demons in order to help humankind ascend to the true God, which was the proper task of philosophy.¹² For this battle had not only been taking place in Greece but also among the "barbarians" - the Jews and Christians. Christians did not have to represent reason as did Socrates, for Reason had embodied himself in Jesus. As the incarnation of Reason, He Himself revealed the true nature of the gods as "evil and unholy demons" (*kakous kai anosious daimonas*).

This demonology was a nihilation of pagan cultic piety (45-48), but what is arresting is that Justin attempted it not through terms belonging to the Christian symbolic universe, but through the use of common figures such as Socrates and common notions of "true reason" and demons. Though Justin's demonology is the incorporation and translation of pagan polytheism into the Christian world view, all specifically Christian symbols Justin used were related to similar pagan beliefs and practices. Such avoidance of certain elements of the Christian universe, like the figure of Satan, and translation of other elements into common terms was only to be expected in a text written for a pagan audience.

The demonology of *1 Apol* 5 was Justin's deliberate editing of the "fall of

¹² See Skarsaune, "Conversion", 54-5, above.

the angels" story of the apocalyptic writings.¹³ The demons are removed from their apocalyptic, i.e. Jewish, context and appear on earth as an evil *fait accompli*. They are not originally good creations of God who have fallen from heaven out of lust or pride, but appear as evil (and particularly lustful) by nature. All references to God, Satan and the war in the heavens have been expunged from the narrative. The whole history of the demons has been transplanted outside the religious history of Israel to the soil of Greece, and the Christian apocalyptic world view is couched in terms of common notions of reason and demons. Though this redefinition of the task of philosophy as the revelation of the gods as demons would have struck the Greeks as unphilosophical,¹⁴ it reveals the extent to which the apologist is willing to go in order to make his arguments on terms suited to a pagan audience.

Justin's social situation favoured a focussing on the deceit wrought by the gods as both the nihilation of popular cultic piety and, more immediately, as an explanation of the persecution Christians were undergoing. Justin felt he had sound warrant to take this idea of the "fall of the angels" and turn it into the story of the "genesis of the gods". Perhaps, as he recorded (21.4), he was himself as a schoolboy taught the stories of the gods and instructed in the value of imitating them. After his reading of the apocalyptic texts, or of the

¹³ A similar case of the deliberate editing of traditions appeared in 10.2, where Justin stated that God created the world out of "shapeless matter" (*eks amorphou hules*), which contradicts the traditional creation *ex nihilo* teaching clearly enunciated in 2 *Apol* 5.2.

¹⁴ Skarsaune, "Conversion", 65.

Genesis 6 story, he could not resist the parallels between the fall of the angels story and the stories of the gods. He cites Zeus who "descended upon Ganymede and the many women who he violated" (21.5). Bacchus, Proserpina, Apollo and Venus are also brought to task by Justin for their sexual behaviour (25.1). The God of the Christians, by contrast, "never descended with sexual desire on any woman" (25.2). Christians pitied those who believed these tales, "but we know that the real instigators are the demons" (25.3). Indeed, Justin goes to great lengths to ensure that such immoral things could not be said of the God of the Christians (33). Upon reading the lustful descent of the fallen angels from the apocalyptic works of Enoch and Jubilees, it was a small step to arguing that similar Greek myths were nothing but the demons' fanciful camouflaging of their fall.

Justin might also have considered himself to be picking up from where *1 Enoch's* story of the demons who proceeded from the giants left off. *1 Enoch* 15: 8-12 tells how the giants were to be called "evil spirits", and 19:1 describes how they "have defiled the people and will lead them into error so that they (the people) will offer sacrifices to the demons as unto gods..."¹⁵ That Justin considered himself to be describing exactly *how* the evil spirits accomplished this deception in the pagan cults might explain the variations he made to the Enoch tradition.

The final authority on the subject was the Logos incarnate. It was in

¹⁵ Cf. parallels in *Jubilees* 10:9 and 11:4.

obedience to Him that Justin voiced such bizarre notions about the gods. It is testimony to the importance of the equation of the gods with demons that Justin regards this equation as coming from the lips of Jesus himself.

3.1.4 The Use of Common Demonological Notions

When Justin promised to explain just how Christians could believe that a crucified man was God (13.4), he began with a solemn warning:

Indeed, we warn you to be careful lest the demons, previously accused by us, should mislead you and turn you from reading and understanding thoroughly what we have said.

For the story of the demons is the story of their use of the cults of the gods to enslave those who try to rise to the truth:

For they [the demons] struggle to have you as their slaves and servants, and now by manifestations in dreams, now by magic tricks (*dia magikon stophon*), they get hold of all who do not struggle to their utmost for their own salvation as we do who, after being persuaded by the Word, renounced them and now follow the only unbegotten God through His Son. (14.1)¹⁶

¹⁶ Goodenough cites this passage as an example of the contradictory statements Justin makes regarding exactly when the demons will be defeated by God. This instance of "defeat" is set against common apocalyptic expectations of defeat at the eschaton. However, seen in context, no claim of defeat is being made here in the same sense of eternal binding and damnation. Justin refers only to personal renunciation.

That Justin was arguing in terms of the second century religious debate (outlined in 2.1.3) is clear. A number of his ideas were common in the Hellenistic world: the notions of demons preventing the ascent of the soul to God, their use of magic, common notions of prophecy,¹⁷ and their "need of [the] bloody sacrifices"(13) of the popular cults were popular ideas.¹⁸ Justin argues in terms of a choice for or against the power to overcome demons. The choice was between slavery and ignorance in a culture deluded by demons, and the knowledge and freedom brought by Jesus. For Jesus was born to enable humanity to rise to everlasting life (13.3), which is equated with the defeat of demons.¹⁹

Justin was also answering charges levelled at Christians. The twenty chapters devoted to the proofs from prophecy were undertaken, he wrote, to counter the charge that Jesus worked his miracles by magic (30). It was not enough, however, to assert that the danger lay only in the cults and magical practices. Even those who aimed at philosophy, unless their lives were "free from passion", were inexorably caught in the demons' grasp:

¹⁷ Justin wrote that it was the habit of God "to speak of something before it takes place and then to show it taking place just as He predicted" (12.10). See Hauck, *The More Divine Proof* for an extended treatment of second century notions of prophecy used by Celsus and Origen.

¹⁸ See 36-7, above.

¹⁹ Hauck, *More Divine Proof*, 76. References to conversion as the renunciation of demons: *1 Apol* 9, 11, 16, 25, 29, 49, 53; *Dial* 63, 91, 119, 123, 134.

For those who are called demons strive for nothing else than to draw men away from God who made [them] and from Christ his First-Begotten. Those who cannot rise above the earth they have nailed down by [the worship of] earthly things and the work of mens' hands. They even push back those who aim at the contemplation of things divine, unless their thinking is prudent and pure and their life free from passion, and drive them into ungodliness (58.3).

The message was clear: whether it was Greco-Roman religion or philosophy, the demons had all the bases covered. Such was Justin's use of common understandings of the demonic realm to forcibly proclaim the freedom to be found in Jesus the Logos.²⁰

3.1.5 The Four Phases of Spiritual Warfare

Justin not only equated the gods with demons, but argued that the pagan cults were designed to lure people away from Christ. For the demons had read and imitated the prophecies. This helped Christians deal with another threat to their world view: the existence of similarities between them and the vilified cults. How could certain practices be demonic when the Christians themselves had similar practices?

Justin's answer was to argue that the demons, having read with dread the ancient Jewish prophecies regarding the coming of the Messiah (31-53), attempted in their earthly and crude manner to inspire the Greek poets to write

²⁰ Ibid., 138.

stories which were copies of this true prophecy. This was done in the hopes that when the Messiah did come, it would be impossible to recognize him. That many of these copies were not faithful to the original prophecies did not point to the weakness of this argument, but only demonstrated how little the demons were able to understand the sublime truths of Christianity (54.4).

For when they [the demons] heard it predicted through the prophets that Christ was to come, and that impious (*asebeis*) men would be punished by fire, they put forward a number of so called sons of Zeus (22-24), thinking that they could thus make men suppose that what was said about Christ was a mere tale of wonders (*teratologian*) like the stories told by the poets (54.2).

This was the first "phase" of the spiritual warfare. The common points elucidated by Justin at the beginning of the apology (regarding the sons of Zeus, 21-24) are truly seen as the demons' response to the prophecies of the coming of Christ and other truths announced by the prophets. In this manner Justin both dismisses the similarities between some gods who had "virginal" births, or were a "son" of a god, or who ascended to heaven after their death, as pathetic imitations of Christian truths,²¹ and at the same time reinforced the demonic nature of all non-Christian religion, which nevertheless was perversely centred around the negation of the Christian religion! Any potential

²¹ 1 Apol 54.

negations of the Christian world view were, in this way, turned into affirmations.

So it is not that we hold the same opinions as others, but that what all others say is an imitation of ours (60.10).

Thus, any accusation that Christian beliefs were simply tales²² only pointed to the fact that the accuser had been fooled by the demons. According to Berger and Luckmann, this was the goal of nihilation.²³

It is within this context of the unveiling of the imitative nature of the cults that Justin also repeats the charge that Plato learned (*mathete*, 59.1, *emathomen*, 59.6) of creation *ex nihilo* from the prophets. He similarly borrowed (*labon*, 60.1) from Moses the chiasmic structure of the universe (Timaeus 36B) after reading, and misinterpreting the story of the bronze serpent (Num. 21:6-9). Therefore, Justin argued, all questions of similarity between Christian teachings and those of the philosophers were really questions of the imitation (*mimoumenoi*, 60.10) of Christian truth. Therefore, similarities both established contact with pagan culture and drew relational boundaries between Christians and pagans.

No doubt Justin was challenged with the question as to why the central Christian symbol was not imitated by the demons. He answered that despite

²² Such as Trypho levels in *Dial* 67.

²³ See 4C, n. 9, above.

their knowledge of the prophecies and their efforts to obscure the coming of the Christ through the "tall tales" of cultic piety and the philosophic ideas borrowed from the prophets, the demons were blind to God's secret weapon, "the greatest sign of His power and dominion" (55): the cross. Similar to Ignatius' notion that Mary's virginity and God's incarnation and death on the cross were the three mysteries that the "prince of this world" could not detect (*Ephesians* 19.1), Justin argued that the demons were unable to understand the sublime nature of the crucifixion and could not thereby imitate it in their cults (55).

According to Justin, the power of the demons was total. Pagan religion was a demonic facade whose sole purpose was to keep people away from the freedom that Jesus Christ alone could give them. Pagan philosophy, though not demonically inspired, had borrowed all of its best tenets from the Christian prophets, and had made many mistakes. Though all people possessed the "seeds of truth", the Christians alone shared in the full Logos - Jesus the Christ, who was available to anyone:

Among us you can hear and learn these things from those who do not even know the letters of the alphabet - uneducated and barbarous in speech, but wise and faithful in mind - even from cripples and the blind. So you can see that these things are not the product of human wisdom, but are spoken by the power of God (60.10-11).

This was the first phase of the spiritual warfare which served to explain all threats to Justin's world view which came from without Christianity. However,

though the demons did everything they could to prevent each soul from coming to God through His Son, they did not relax their efforts by any means once Jesus had come. The second phase of their activities, after the coming of Jesus, was more of the same; the creating of new "gods" for the pagans after the ascension of Christ (26.1). A fellow Samaritan, Simon Magus, is singled out by Justin as a man who "through the force of the demons working in him, performed works of magic" (*energounton daimonon technes dunameis poiesas magikas*). Simon was worshipped as a god by the Romans and many Samaritans (26.3). His disciple Menander, another Samaritan, likewise deceived many in Antioch through demonic magic (26.4). At the end of the apology, after revealing the spiritual warfare, Justin can reveal the true context of the magicians Simon and Menander. They were part of the renewed efforts of the demons to keep souls away from Jesus after He had come:

It was not enough for the evil demons to proclaim, before the coming of Christ, that the so-called sons of Zeus were really born to him. But after Christ appeared and lived among men... they [the demons] once more, as stated above [26], produced other men, such as Simon and Menander of Samaria, who by mighty deeds of magic (*magikas dunameis poiesantas*) misled and still mislead many (56).

The demons were not only creating new gods, but were imitating the practices of the Church in new practices of the cults. Christian baptism took the children of "necessity and ignorance" who were characterized by "bad

habits and wicked behaviour", and made them children "of free choice and knowledge" (61). Scared by this power of baptism to liberate people from their workings, the demons imitated baptism within their own cults using ritual sprinklings and ablutions (62.1). Mithraic "mysteries" also imitated the Christian Eucharist (66.4). The removal of shoes upon entering the temple imitated God's injunction to Moses at the burning bush (62.2-4). The statuary of Kore (Proserpine) at fountains imitated the spirit of God which hovered over the waters at creation, and her designation as the daughter of Zeus imitated the Christian notion of the son of God (64).

The third phase was for those who had heard the Christian message and had converted. Unable to keep everyone from converting, the demons resorted to working within the Christian movement by fomenting heresy. The most influential of these teachers is Marcion, who "the evil demons also introduced (*proeballonto*)" (58.1). He had led and continued to lead many who "are irrationally snatched away, like lambs by a wolf. and are victimized by the demons and their godless teachings" (58.2). It is for those who follow Marcion that Justin reserves his strongest words, stopping just short of attributing the charges of promiscuity and cannibalism to them (26).

Completely frustrated in their attempts to stop the spreading of the Christian message by means of imitation and heresy, the demons changed tactics and resorted to their final weapon, which was a rather simple means of stopping the Christian message, the persecution and killing of those who were

spreading it: "The only thing they [the demons] could do was cause us to be hated and by put to death by unreasonable-living men, who were taught to indulge their passions in evil ways" (57.1).

These four types of warfare against Christ and His followers all involved humans. This raised the question of how and why people fought against God on the side of the demons. For Justin the answer was simple; humans had free will.

3.1.6 Human Roles in Spiritual Warfare: The Demons and Free Will

Despite Osborn's contention that "free will and the power of the demons are two different explanations of evil",²⁴ the question of free will was intimately related to the demons. Immediately after summarizing the defeat of Satan and the demons, Justin stated that there is yet time for repentance:

Indeed in the beginning when He created man, He endowed him with the power of understanding (*noeron*), of choosing the truth, and of doing right; consequently, before God man has no excuse if he does evil, for all men have been created with the power to reason and to reflect" (28.3).

Those who deny this freedom, or deny the existence of virtue and vice are guilty of the "height of blasphemy and injustice" (28.4). Though God did know what was going to happen before it did, this was not analogous to fate. Fate

²⁴ Osborn, *Justin Martyr*, 201.

was not the cause of good and evil (43.6), humans were free to choose between them (43).

Justin was unambiguous on the question of the relationship between this freedom to do evil and the evil demons. Unlike the Jewish apocalypses²⁵ and the later gnostic Christian versions of the fall of the angels²⁶ which ascribed all sin to Satan or the Demiurge, Justin did not renounce all responsibility for sin by attributing it solely to the demons. Nor did he deny the existence of the demons by attributing sin solely to the evil inclinations of humans. Instead, he affirmed both:

For what human laws could not do [give eternal life], that the Word, being divine, would have brought about, if the evil demons (*phauloi daimones*) had not scattered abroad many false and godless accusations, with the help of the evil desire (*kaken epithumian*) that is in every man by nature in all kinds of ways (10.6, my emphasis).

Humans were not forced into service by the demons, they became subject to them by acting like them, that is, irrationally and lustfully.²⁷ This was implied by his first reference to the persecutors of Christians being "driven by unreasonable passion and the whips of evil demons" (2). Therefore, the

²⁵ See 1 Enoch 10.9, 22, above.

²⁶ See the Apocryphon of John, 48, n. 32, above.

²⁷ It is fitting to remark here how anyone involved with the demons is also characterized by lustful personalities. The orgiastic rites of the cults - and even of some Christians - and the shameful passions of Emperors are evidence in Justin's eyes for the presence of the demons. He hints, for example, that Marcionites are involved in the upsetting of the lamp (26) and later, after his reference to Satan, he alludes to Hadrian's infatuation with his lover Antinous (29).

demons, through their inflammation and exploitation of the evil inclination, are ultimately accountable for all heresy and persecution.²⁸

3.1.7 Social Enemies in *1 Apol*

Though Justin was more willing than Paul to admit that the Christian battle involves flesh and blood, he did not suggest that the battle be fought on this level. According to the rescript of Hadrian he appended to his work, Christians could ask for the punishment of their false accusers; an option Justin declined (7.5). For him, part of the miracle of conversion was that Christians "do not wage war on our enemies (*echthrous*), 39.3). These enemies were both Jews and pagans who killed and punished Christians (31.5). Justin specifically mentioned the persecutions of Christians by Bar Kochba (31.6). However, given that the address was to the Emperor, in response to persecutions by Imperial officers, one would have to put the threat of persecution more in the hands of the pagans than those of the Jews. Nevertheless, the Jews were still a substantial threat to Christians.

²⁸ Justin's notion of the human person as the instrument of supernatural beings is not restricted to those who do the demons' bidding, for God also uses people like the prophets, whose words are not "spoken by the inspired men themselves, but by the divine word that moved them" (36).

2 of/de 2

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS
STANDARD REFERENCE MATERIAL 1010a
(ANSI and ISO TEST CHART No. 2)

3.1.8 The Lack of Satan

The glaring difference between the demonology of *1 Apol* and that of Christian literature before it is its lack of focus on Satan. While the New Testament consolidated all demons under Satan and the apostolic Fathers forewent all reference to demons in favour of ascribing all heresy to Satan, Justin reversed this and concentrates in *1 Apol* almost exclusively on the demons.

That Justin elaborates the entire four-fold war against Christ without reference to Satan was a deliberate omission. When quoting Matt. 5:34, 37 on not swearing "for whatever is beyond these is from the evil one (*tou ponērou*, 16.5), he did not explain who the "evil one" was. Again when he quoted Lk. 12:4-5: "Fear not those who put you to death and after that can do no more, but fear him who after death is able to cast both body and soul into Gehenna", he did not reveal who it is who had this power, perhaps for the reason that it is not Satan but Jesus, who in 8 is the one who dealt out both eternal life and eternal punishment.²⁹

The conspicuous absence of Satan is evident in passages regarding eternal damnation (8, 19) and heresy (26). Justin's most explicit passage regarding the second coming of Jesus described his return together with his angelic hosts from heaven, the bodily resurrection and the eternal fire for wicked men "together with the evil demons" (52.3).

²⁹ "[I]t will be Christ who will assign the punishment to sinners" (8.2).

The one mention of the "chief of the evil demons [who] is called the serpent and Satan and the devil (*ho archegetes ton kakon daimonou ophis kaleitai kai satanas kai diabolos*, 28.1)" refers the Emperor/reader to "our writings" should they desire further information. The only further information Justin gives about Satan is that Jesus foretold that he would be cast into the eternal fire "with his host and the men who follow him". Note that Justin had added Satan's human counterparts where Jesus had only mentioned "the devil and his angels" (Mt 25:41). This points to the increasingly human arena of the spiritual warfare.³⁰

Yet the question remains why Justin would avoid mentioning Satan. The answer lies in that the use of common notions of demons and charges of demonic influence would have been more palatable than the rather foreign Jewish notion of the uniting of all demons under the one personality of Satan who had betrayed the One God.

By avoiding Satan, Justin presents the Christian notion of spiritual warfare in terms of the Greco-Roman world view. That the gods were demons eternally at war with the Christian God was enough to digest for the average person without the strange Jewish idea of a "prince" of demons who had rebelled against God.

³⁰ Cf. also chapter 52 on both demons and evil people suffering eternal punishment.

3.1.9 Summary

Justin wrote *1 Apol* to explain both to pagans and to the Christian community itself why Christians were being persecuted (3.1.1). He argued that it was not because of their teachings, because many of them had pagan parallels, but because of a war between those who lived according to reason and those who did not (3.1.2). In the beginning of the apology he claimed that the pagan gods were truly demons in disguise who were at war with reason and that Reason had become incarnate in the person of Jesus Christ (3.1.3). These claims involved expression of the Christian apocalyptic world view through the use of common demonological notions such as the associations of demons with: the sacrificial cults, material sensuality, magic, misfortune and with roles as punishers (3.1.4). That other notions, such as fallen angels and the figure of Satan, are avoided also point to a pagan audience which would have found them too peculiar (3.1.8).

Justin argued within the terms of second century debate, claiming that all - even philosophers - were inexorably enslaved by the magic of the demons and true freedom from their powers lay in Jesus alone. He also answered the same charges that Jesus worked his miracles through magic (3.1.4).

Justin unveiled four phases of spiritual attack that the demons had engaged in to enslave the human race and prevent them from gaining access to the liberating power of Christ. The first was their imitation of the prophecies of the coming of the Messiah in their own cults which would make Christian beliefs

look like more tall tales amidst the stories of the gods. In the second phase, after the coming of Christ, new gods such as Simon Magus were initiated and new practices were begun which imitated the life-giving practices of the church. The third and fourth phases attacked Christians more directly with heresy and persecution. This fourfold polemic against the gods functioned for the Christian community as the nihilation of the competing universe of pagan polytheism, turning all threats to the validity of the Christian world view into affirmations (3.1.5).

These threats were the result of people who were subject to the demons by virtue of their own immorality and irrationality (3.1.6). The result of this human and demonic alliance was the persecution by pagans which prompted the apology, though Justin was aware of cases of Jewish persecution in recent history (3.1.7). The apology itself and the complex demonological nihilation of pagan polytheism it contains, evince the attempts of second century Roman Christians to manage the theological and social threats posed by pagan society.

Part 2 Justin's Second Apology

3.2.1 The Circumstances

The things that have lately taken place in your city under Urbicus, and the evil deeds that are likewise being perpetrated without reason by your governors, have forced me to compose this address for you Romans...

Thus began Justin's second apology, written to the Roman Senate between 155-160 C.E. in tones of such outrage that, compared to *1 Apol*, it seems more a short outburst. In the wake of the killings of three local Christians (1.1), Justin took up the task of answering two threats to Christian identity: internal to the Christian community, the question of how Christianity could claim to be the truth when it excited opposition from all quarters (5.1); and externally, the threat of immanent persecution. No mention was made of heresy or of persecution by the Jews in *2 Apol*. For unlike its predecessor, it was not designed to engage in apologetic and polemic on all the fronts the Christians were fighting on.³¹ Here Justin is more focussed on the problem of persecution and the charges which contributed to it.

Like *1 Apol*, Christians stood accused of being "atheists and irreligious" (*atheon kai asebon*, 3.2) who engaged in cannibalism (12.2) and sexual licentiousness (12.5). However, the apology was sparked by a particular incident detailed by Justin as a step-by-step account of a Christian martyrdom.

The circumstances were thus: a woman who converted to Christianity wished

³¹ Justin referred the readers to *1 Apol* at points to emphasize that he was summarizing arguments that were elsewhere more carefully argued; 4.2, 6.5, 8.2, 9.1.

to divorce her dissolute husband (2.1-4).³² Convinced by her Christian friends, she remained with him and prayed for his conversion (2.5). But when he increased the fervour of his pleasure-loving ways (in Alexandria, of course) she left him (2.6). The husband then denounced her as a Christian and she received a stay from the Emperor to get her affairs in order before answering the charge (2.7-8). Impatient, the husband denounced Ptolemaeus, her Christian teacher, to a Roman centurion who approached the man and, after ascertaining that he was a Christian, arrested him (2.9-11). He was put to death (along with two other Christians in the courtroom who protested the unjust verdict of such "evil rulers") for confessing to be a Christian. He does not mention any refusal to sacrifice to the gods or to the genius of the emperor (2.12-20).³³

³² On Justin's treatment of women see Pagels, "The Fall of the Angels", 320. The apologists' teachings regarding women "directly contradicts philosophic views derived from Aristotle, which assume the superior intellectual capacity - and hence the natural right to rule - of an elite few over the mass of their natural inferiors, including slaves, barbarians and women". Justin's views in *2 Apol* 10.8 regarding the ability of anyone to receive the Christian message conforms to this appraisal. Justin did imply that Christianity was to be distinguished from both paganism and Judaism in its treatment of women. He criticized of the myths of the gods which involved the rape of women (*1 Apol* 25), the exposure of infants (most of which were female), and prostitution (*1 Apol* 21). That women could not be circumcised was a sign for Justin that circumcision was no longer a worthy sign of election: "For God also bestowed upon women the capability of performing every good and virtuous act" (*Dial* 23). Salvation was no longer dependent upon the conditions of one's birth, be they as a Jew or as a man. "We see that the physical formulation of male and female is different, but it is equally evident that the bodily form is not what makes either of them good or evil. Their [humans'] righteousness is determined by their acts of piety and justice" (*Dial* 23). Thus, unlike Judaism, Christianity was comprised of "both men and women endowed with gifts from the Spirit of God" (88). However, one should note that women did not preside over Justin's community for the purposes of the Eucharist: the presider being male (*taí proestoti ton adelphon* 65.3, 67.6; also referred to as the masculine *houtos*, 65.3, 67.7). There is no evidence in Justin that he attacked rival Christian groups because of their views about women, though his own views might have contributed to Jewish and pagan antagonism.

³³ For a full description of this incident see Robert Grant, "A Woman of Rome: Justin *Apol* 2, 2." *Church History* 54 (1985), 461-72.

Whether it be his anger at the murder of fellow Christians, confidence due to their growth in numbers, or the conviction that it was time to lay all his apocalyptic cards on the table, Justin decided to go further than he had in the first apology and reveal the full story of why Christians were persecuted. The spiritual warfare had become more deadly and Justin was to respond in kind, wilfully pointed the finger at the human instruments of the demons.

3.2.2 Points of Contact

Justin's apologetic tool by means of which he could identify with some elements of the pagan traditions remained the "seed of reason implanted in all humanity" (*tou emphuton panti genei anthropon sperma tou Logou*, 8.1) which he had referred to in *1 Apol* 44 and 46. This allowed him to reject the Stoics' notions of fate (7), while praising their ethics (8.1).³⁴ Again, as in *1 Apol* 46, the spiritual warfare was centred around the Logos. Those who lived according to part of (*meros*) the *spermatikou logou* were persecuted by the demons. Justin now added that it should only be expected that the Christians, who lived according to the whole Logos (*tou pantos Logou*), which *is* Christ, would be even more hated and persecuted (8.3).

In *2 Apol* Justin meditated at greater length on the difference between those who partake in part of the Logos and those who had it whole, "body and soul" (*soma kai psychen*, 10.1) in Christ. Again he referred to Socrates, who

³⁴ In both apologies the idea of the "seed of God" or "seed of reason" is introduced in the context of the rejection of Stoic notions of fate, cf. *1 Apol* 44.

had a "vague knowledge" (*merous gnosthenti*, 10.8) of Christ, "for He was and is the Logos who is in every person, and who predicted things to come first through the prophets and then in person when He assumed our human nature and feelings, and taught us these doctrines" (10.8). Because Christ the whole Logos was in every person, everyone, the working classes (*cheirotechnai*) and the uneducated (*pantelos idiotai*) can know the truth because it is not dependent on human reason (*anthropou logou*, 10.9).

This confidence in the possession of the whole Logos in Christ, allowed Justin to assert that the distinction between Christians and pagans was one of degree. He was a Christian,

not because the teachings of Plato are different (*ouch hoti allotria esti*) from those of Christ, but because they are not in every way similar (*alla hoti ouch esti pante homoia*), neither are those of the other writers, the Stoics, the poets, and the historians (13.2).

The differences between Christianity and paganism were not such that the two are wholly antagonistic. It was merely the case that pagan philosophers and poets were hampered by two things: (i) their partial participation in the Logos, and (ii) the limits of their own human capacities. Therefore, at their best, their strivings for truth lack the completeness of Christianity and, at their worst, they are themselves self-contradictory (10.3, 13.3). Both of these faults are of course due to their incomplete participation in the "seminal Divine Word" (*tou spermatikou theiou Logou*, 13.3). Even such incomplete truths reached by the

pagans' strivings belong to the Christians (13.4,6) by virtue of their full reception of the Logos and the grace of God needed to go beyond human capacities.

In *2 Apol*, the apologist also extended those who partake in part of the Logos from philosophers and poets to legislators (*nomothetesantes*, 10.2), which indicates that he was seeking to widen the range of re-orientation and appropriation of pagan culture beyond the pale of philosophy to the legal and more concretely social realms. Not only contradictory philosophy and morality, but contradictory laws were now being ascribed to partial apprehension of the Logos - no doubt due to the actions of evil judges like Urbicus.

3.2.3 The Demonology of *2 Apol* 5

If Justin seemed more relaxed in his evaluation of the incompleteness of pagan philosophy, morality and legislation, this was inversely proportionate to his denunciation of the pagan cults. After describing the execution of the three Christians (2) and blaming the hatred of Christians on people like the Cynic philosopher Crescens who propagate the rumours of Christian atheism (3.2), Justin turned to specific problems that arose because of persecution. First he explained that although Christians were happy to die for God, they did not kill themselves for God because His will was that the world should be saved by Christians.

The next question was critical because it was a question that Christians themselves were grappling with. If Christians were living the whole truth, why were they persecuted? Full reception of the Logos was not enough of an explanation, so Justin once again turned to demons, armed with some new information.

But if anyone should think that, if we profess God to be our protector, we should not as we admit, be over-powered and molested by unjust persons - this difficulty, too, I will remove. When God made the universe and put all earthly things under man's dominion, and arranged the heavenly bodies for the increase of fruits and the change of seasons, and decreed a divine law for these, which He apparently also created for man's sake, He appointed His angels (*aggeloi*), whom He placed over mankind, to look after men and all things under heaven. But the angels violated their charge, fell into sin with women and begot children who are called demons (*daimones*). Moreover, they subsequently subjected the human race to themselves, partly by magic writings (*magikon graphon*), partly by the fear they instilled into them and the punishments they inflicted upon them, and partly by instructing them in the use of sacrifices, incense, and libations, which they really needed after becoming slaves of their lustful passions; and among men they engendered murders, wars, adulteries, all sorts of dissipation, and every species of sin. Thus it was that the poets and writers of legends, unaware that the bad angels and demons begotten by them did those things to men and women, to cities and nations, ascribed them to god himself [Jupiter] and to those whom they thought were sons of his seed and the children of those whom they called his brothers, Neptune and Pluto, and to the children of their children. For they called them by the name each of the bad angels had bestowed upon himself and his children. (5)

This was the most complete statement of Justin's demonology advanced in one instance. In it he expanded upon, modified and contradicted his previous statements regarding demons in *1 Apol* 5.

In *1 Apol*, the origin of the demons remained vague. They simply "manifested themselves" as lustful demons bent upon subjecting the human race to themselves by means of the pagan cults. Now, prompted by the urgency of the situation, Justin allowed a fuller Christian world view to unfold, complete with apocalyptic terminology that was absent from the first apology. Going back to the creation of the universe, Justin revealed that the evil demons were the offspring of Watcher angels who were originally given dominion over individuals, cities and nations. They had fallen from their place in God's government of the universe, and seduced human women. Their lustfulness, so evident in *1 Apol* 5, was now significant not only because it explained the nature of Greek mythology and religion (recorded by the poets), but because it was the cause of their fall: the violation of the charge given them by God when the universe was created. This represented some adaptations to the traditions of *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*.

In effect, what Justin had done was to move from the mating of the bad angels and women (*1 Enoch* 6-10) to the production of evil spirits or demons (*1 Enoch* 15:9-16:1; *Jubilees* 10.9), eliminating all reference to the giants (*Genesis* 6:3; *1 Enoch* 9:9). Why Justin did this is not certain, but the most likely reason is that any reference to giants would be too similar to the Greek titans. Why Justin could not simply attribute this similarity to the imitative deceptions of the demons is also unclear.

Justin was much more direct in his attributing the genesis of the cults to the demons. In *1 Apol* 62-66³⁶ Justin asserted that certain particulars of the cults (libations, ablutions, the use of bread and cups) were initiated by the demons. Now he further revealed that the demons "instructed" (*dia didachēs*) the pagans in the uses of sacrifice, incense and libations. Thus, the nature of pagan religion derived from the nature of demons who were in dire need of the meat and wine offered to them "after becoming slaves of their lustful passions".

Justin developed a few allusions given in *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees* and other books³⁶ to the point where it becomes the backdrop for all their activity: the creation of the cults by and for the demons for the purposes of enslaving the human race. This differed from *1 Enoch* in which the demons did not subject humans to themselves, preferring to inflict them with sufferings and incite them to sin. It also reflected the influence of the "demon consciousness" of the second century.

In *1 Apol* 5, the people, "seized by fear" and "terrifying sights", call the demons gods. In *2 Apol* 5, Justin's demons immediately set about subjecting people to themselves through magic, war, and immorality. Like the fallen angels

³⁶ See 74, above.

³⁶ Based, perhaps on references such as *1 Enoch* 99:7; *Jubilees* 4.22; *2 Enoch* 18 and *T. Reuben* 5.6 regarding the spirits leading people to worship demons.

and their giant/evil spirit children in *1 Enoch* 7.2,³⁷ they were responsible for "every species of sin: murders, war, adulteries, all sorts of dissipation".³⁸

One contradiction was regarding the names of the demons. Justin stated in *1 Apol* 5 that the demons name themselves, now he maintained that they were named by their bad angel fathers. This was most likely due to Justin's reticence in *1 Apol* regarding the origins of the demons. In any case, the contradiction remains an example of the apologist altering his information based on the situation.

3.2.4 The Use of Common Demonology

2 Apol is a fuller revelation not only of the Christian world view that lay behind Justin's demonology, it also allows an expanded examination of his use of common demonology. His use of the fall of the angels, here in its Christian context, still would have been recognizable by pagans as the *daimones* who were guardian beings watching over the cities and nations.³⁹ Their abuse of their authority and punishment of humanity were also elements of later Greco-Roman demonology.⁴⁰ Justin intensified his emphasis on the demons' use of magic. "Magical writings" not only mislead people, but were instruments in the

³⁷ See 21, above.

³⁸ Justin collapsed the activities of the bad angels, giants and evil spirits into the demons of *1 Enoch*, though this was very close to an interchangeability evident in the text itself.

³⁹ See 12, n. 7, above.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

hands of the demons for the initial and ongoing subjection of the human race (5). More explicit than in the reference in *1 Apol* 5 was the popular and philosophical association of the demons with the sacrificial cults, which Justin tailored with particular attention paid not only to sexual longings, but to other corporeal desires for sacrifices, incense and libations. This was in contrast to the more apocalyptic demonology of *1 Enoch* in which the evil spirits "eat no food, nor become thirsty" (15:11). The increasing tendency to attribute to the demons all human disasters and sins is also more fully reflected in *2 Apol*.

The portrait of bad angels and their demonic offspring in *2 Apol* 5 utilized all of the common demonological elements isolated in our summary of the "common demonological fund" (1.1.3), as well as the apocalyptic alterations to the Genesis story of the fall of the sons of God (1.2.3),⁴¹ except for the exclusion of Satan and the giants.

Appropriate to second century debate, Justin asserted that though people could innately (*te phusei*, 14.2) know good and evil, they stood in need of deliverance (*apallagenai*) from false beliefs and ignorance (14.1) which were tools of the demons. Pagans were no longer excusably foolish for worshipping the demons, but accountable and worthy of punishment for persisting in the worship of God's enemies.

⁴¹ Which were: the fall described as consciously chosen sin, the teaching of magic as a means of engendering sin, the engendering of all sin from adultery to war, the punishing role of the angels, the deification of demons, and the introduction of the prince of the demons and his responsibility for all sin.

Thus, Jesus was emphasized not as the Teacher⁴² or Messiah as he was in *1 Apol*, but as the Saviour (*soter*os, 6.4), born for the defeat of demons (*epi katalusei ton daimonon*, 6.5). Jesus the Saviour from demons does not replace Jesus the Teacher or Messiah, as much as he shows the manner in which the Christian message was proclaimed in the second century. This aspect of Jesus also shows what Christians took solace in and proclaimed in times of persecution. The visible proof (*hup' opsin*) of Jesus' power over demons was exorcism in his name, especially when all other exorcists had failed (6.6).⁴³

What unquestionably points to Justin's catering to common Hellenistic demonology was what he *left out* of *2 Apol*. He refrained from mentioning the giants from whom the demons came, possibly because this connection was not made in the Greek lore regarding the titans.

However, the most glaring omission, as in *1 Apol*, was that of Satan. Even in the first apology, whose demonology was stripped of all references to the fall of the angels, Satan was mentioned briefly as the chief of the evil spirits (*1 Apol* 28). Yet, in his elaboration of the fall of the angels in the second apology, Satan remains totally absent, without even a cursory mention referring the reader to the Christian scriptures. The simplest explanation for Justin's marked avoidance of Satan is that he had no parallels in Greco-Roman demonology. It was simply too foreign. Justin's reordering of common demonology according

⁴² *1 Apol* 12.9, 13.3, 19.6, 32.2.

⁴³ Of this claim Osborn wrote, "Here is the heart of the gospel", *Justin Martyr*, 63. References to exorcism: *2 Apol* 6; *Dial* 30, 69, 76, 85, 111, 121.

to the Christian world view was itself foreign enough without Satan.⁴⁴ With both bad angels and their demonic offspring crowding the demonic realm in 2 *Apol*, the figure of Satan might have complicated Justin's elaboration of the fall of the angels beyond credibility.

3.2.5 The Four Phases of Spiritual Warfare

The fall of the angels that resulted in demons was placed in the larger context of the spiritual warfare centred around the Logos. Those doing "unreasonable deeds" (*alogos prattomena*, 1.1) were set against those who "live like Christ" (1.2). The war was both moral and social and Christianity was for Justin the "school of divine virtue" (2.13) fighting against the judgements of evil judges, the arguments of "positively wicked" philosophers like Crescens and the stubborn attitudes of ordinary people.

For the purposes of this specific and abbreviated apology, Justin revealed his apocalyptic notions of the demonic origins and nature of the cults. He briefly summarized the first phase of the warfare, the argument regarding the demonic imitation of Christian prophecy, when he referred to the "evil camouflage (*periblema poneron*) which the evil demons had thrown around the divine doctrines of the Christians to defer them from following them" (13.1).

⁴⁴ "The dualism, the resulting warfare in supernatural realms, and the implied necessity that you should choose up sides and hate the one and love the other just as you in turn were loved and hated by the divine powers, was absolutely new and strange outside the Christian community; and it was perceived as such", MacMullen, "Two Types", 183.

Regarding the second phase of the "new gods", Justin refers in one sentence to his rejection of Simon Magus' "impious and deceitful teachings" (15.1). No mention is made of Christian heretics, not even for the purpose of ascribing the rumours of cannibalism and sexual licentiousness to them. Instead, the whole apology is concerned with explaining the last phase of the war which had become the most pressing: persecution.

What we are faced with in *2 Apol* is a fuller admission of Justin's Christian apocalyptic world view. Prompted by persecution, he revealed the following: the existence of the Watcher angels who had fallen through lust and created demons; the exact manner in which these demons (similarly lustful after the manner of their birth) had subjected the human race by teaching people magic and the use of sacrifices to satiate their lusts; the responsibility of the demons for engendering all sin; and their reign - together with their fathers the bad angels - over cities and nations.

The reframing of demonological notions by Justin served the purpose of making sense, or speaking to, the situation he and his fellow Christians faced at that moment in Rome. Thus Justin's apocalyptic said as much about the Christian need for reassurance in the face of persecution as it did about Christian attitudes toward pagan society.

Early Christians, still thinking in terms of the apocalyptic tradition of these texts, could have regarded references to the demons leading people to worship falsely as the perfect explanation for the rise of the cults. The assertions that

the bad angels and the demons also ruled over the cities and nations would help them account for the curious alliance between the cults and the Imperial government for the purposes of persecution.

3.2.6 Social Enemies in 2 *Apol*

The purpose of the second apology for the Christian community was to transform the threat of immanent persecution into an affirmation of the Christian world view. Justin did so by arguing that this present time of the influence of evil demons (*energeisthai hupo ton phaulon daimonon*, 7.2) was only possible because of the delay of the second coming granted to the world due to the Christian seed (*tou sperma ton Christianon*, 7.1).⁴⁵ Were it not for their presence in the world, the final conflagration would immediately come. Thus, the Christians, though persecuted and hated by many, were in reality the few good souls sustaining the universe.

Justin then detailed the social realities involved in persecution. According to the apologist, the range of those involved in the persecution of Christians has become more personal: "Everywhere, indeed, whoever is chastened by father, or neighbour, or child, or friend, or brother, or husband, or wife for any shortcoming, such as being stubborn, and pleasure-loving, and difficult to urge to good..."(1). Families, neighbours, and friends; each Christian encountered opposition among those with whom they lived and worked. Besides such

⁴⁵ Cf. 1 *Apol* 28; *Dial* 32.

intimate opposition, there were the public actions of unjust (*adikoi*, 11.1) officials like Urbicus and philosophers like Crescens (11.2) against Christians. The apologist was now more willing to explicitly point to these people as instruments of the demons:

...these [people] and the wicked demons (*phauloi daimones*) who hate us so, and have as their slaves and worshippers such men as the above mentioned judges [Urbicus], compel them, *like rulers under demonical influence* (*hos oun archontes daimoniontas*), to put us to death (1.2, my emphasis).

Christians did not merely follow in the tradition of Socrates, but fulfilled it. For he too used "true reason" to expose the gods as demons. Justin spelled out in concrete social terms what this involved: "what he did was to ostracize Homer and the other poets, and instruct men to expel [from the city] the evil demons and those who perpetrated the deeds narrated by the poets" (10.6). In addition to the case of the woman of Rome (2), Justin also described the torture of women and children used to extract false charges against the Christians (12.4). Yet despite the increased emphasis on the unjust rulers as influenced by the demons, the true enemy remained the demons: "the evil demons have caused (energesan) these things to be effected by wicked men" (12.4).

The demons were not only involved in cultic piety and philosophy, but also in the realm of the *polis* itself: legislation.⁴⁶ Justin turned to demonic influence as the source of immoral laws: "We realize that the bad angels made laws suited to their own iniquity, which are pleasing to their counterparts among men" (9.4). Two things are of note here: (i) that he referred to "bad angels" instead of demons, and (ii) that the bad angels have the ability to make laws. An earthly authority seems implied here and may also be alluded to by the term "counterparts among men". Once again, Justin seems to be tailoring the tradition of apocalyptic demonology to suit his needs, for there is no mention made of morality or laws in *1 Enoch's* list of things which the bad angels taught humanity.

3.2.7 Human Roles in Spiritual Warfare: The Demons and Free Will

More evidence regarding Justin's refashioning of Jewish apocalyptic demonology for the needs of the Church in Rome comes from his emphasis on free will. As in *1 Apol* (3.1.6), Justin quite consciously sought to correct the notion that humans were the passive victims of demonic powers. For him, there were no innocent bystanders in this war. Both human and demonic cooperation were involved in the persecution of Christians. The demons were truly the

⁴⁶ See 85, above.

source of evil, but humans, through the abuse of their free will, were their instruments:⁴⁷

Nor do we teach (as do the Stoics) that men act and suffer according to the dictates of fate, but that by his own free will each man acts either well or evilly; and that through the influence of evil demons (*phaulon daimonon*) good men, such as Socrates and the like, are persecuted and imprisoned, while Sardanapalus, Epicurus, and the like seem to be endowed with wealth and glory. But the Stoics, ignorant of this [demonological] influence, claimed that everything takes place by the necessity of fate. But, since God from the very beginning created the race of angels and men with free will, they will justly pay the penalty in everlasting fire for the sins they have committed. Indeed, every creature is capable, by nature, of vice and virtue.(7)

Even though humans were subjected to the powerful negative influences of the demons, this was not "fate". Justin now revealed that both humans *and* demons had free will, which they could abuse. Free will accounted for the possibility of evil in humans, the *reality* of demoniacal transgression by the bad angels and was yet another explanation of the combination of these in the persecution of the Christians.

Yet the basic apocalyptic apprehension remained: that though the time of justice and judgement was postponed, some provisional victory over evil was possible. *1 Enoch* 10:7 and 12, and *Jubilees* 5:7-11 and 10:7-14 told of the binding of the demons until the judgement, though *Jubilees* admits that a tenth

⁴⁷ Speaking of the extraction of false charges against Christians from their slaves, Justin wrote: "The evil demons have caused these things to be effected by wicked men" (2 *Apol* 12).

of them were still allowed to roam the earth. For Justin, the binding of the demons was of a different sort:

But these demons shall suffer just punishment and torments, confined to everlasting fire; for the fact that they are overcome even now by men in the name of Jesus Christ is a sign that they and their followers will be punished in eternal fire. All the prophets foretold that it would happen thus, and so taught Jesus, our Teacher.(8)

That Justin considers the "prophets" having taught this is an unusual claim, unless he considered Enoch a prophet, which he might have done based on the references to him in the *Dialogue*.⁴⁸

3.2.8 Summary

Justin's second apology was his response to the persecution of Christians in Rome. As such it did not deal with questions of heresy or the Jews, but sought to explain to Christians and pagans why these persecutions were taking place (3.2.1, 3.2.4). The first explanation repeated the idea from *1 Apol* that a war existed between those who lived according to the "seed of reason" implanted in them and those who did not. Certain pagans had part of the "seed

⁴⁸ See 108, below. Indeed, there are similarities between Justin's declarations in *2 Apol* and *1 Enoch*. In chapter ten of the latter, God speaks of the coming Deluge (10:2) which the "seed" of Noah will survive before the "fire on the great day of judgement" (10:6). Before the Deluge, God orders the expulsion of "the children of the Watchers from among the people" (10:9). In chapter 7 Justin explains that God refrains from destroying the earth by the "fire of judgement" because of the "seed" of the Christians. Otherwise, as in the days of Noah, he would destroy the demons and those they influence. Both writers share the desire that pleasure-loving souls under the influence of the children of the Watchers will be destroyed along with all injustice and a time of unblemished joy will begin.

of reason", but were also limited in their apprehension of the truth by their human limitations. Christians had the whole of the "seed of reason" in Jesus and could transcend their limitations by the grace of God. Because of this full reception of reason, they were persecuted more fiercely than pagans like Socrates who had only part of the seed of reason (3.2.2).

Justin expanded his demonology of *1 Apol*, or rather admitted the Christian symbolic universe behind it, by locating the origins of this war in the fall of bad Watcher angels who had intercourse with human women which resulted in demonic offspring (3.2.3). Though he was translating Greco-Roman demonology into its own symbols, Justin made use of only those elements which were common, as well as apocalyptic notions, while eliminating all references to the giants and Satan from the apocalyptic myths. Justin's demonology also reflected the "demon consciousness" of the second century by presenting Jesus as the Saviour, born for the defeat of demons. This was considered clearly visible in exorcism (3.2.5).

The apology reflects the social reality of persecution. The identification of Imperial judges and rulers as slaves of the demons and the concern with legislation that is demonically inspired point to the social enemies of the Christians. Justin offered a second explanation for persecution; that Christians were the few people staving off God's destruction of the universe, in order that by their efforts more people might be saved from endless torture in the company of the demons (3.2.6). The last explanation was the most

fundamental: the fall of the angels was able to happen in the first place because God from the beginning made angels and humans free to do good or evil (3.2.7).

Despite the adaptations and the contradiction (regarding the names) between the demonologies of the two apologies, they are compatible. *1 Apol* was the expression of the Christian apocalyptic world view in Greco-Roman terms. This meant editing out the specifically Christian aspects without parallel in Greco-Roman demonology, namely: God's creation of the universe, and the existence and fall of the angels, and, for the most part, Satan. In *2 Apol*, Justin *reversed* this process, incorporating and translating Greco-Roman demonology into the Christian apocalyptic world view. However, Satan and the concept of the giant offspring of the angel-human mating are still avoided for the sake of the pagan audience. Justin began where the narrative of *1 Enoch* left off, i.e. with the activities of the evil spirits which proceeded from the giants (*1 Enoch* 15:8-9) and led people to sacrifice to demons.

Justin's identification of certain people (Urbicus) and elements (legislation) of pagan society as under the influence of evil demons and his more finely graded distinctions between Christians and pagans in his elaborations on the Logos theory may seem incompatible until one realizes that apologetic and nihilation exist in a symbiotic relationship. If the scope of the spiritual warfare widened and Justin found demonic influence in different areas of pagan culture, this was only because of his explicit delineation of the Spermatic Logos theory.

Therefore, though the cults were inherently demonic and hostile to God, Justin felt perfectly confident in arguing that Christians, like the best of the pagans (athletes, Hercules), scorned death (11). And while the Stoics' notion of fate was the height of blasphemy, their morality was praiseworthy (7.7, 8.1).

Such is the manner in which Justin used both apocalyptic demonology to reject the cults while affirming certain philosophies and Greek heroes through his Spermatic Logos theory. Thus can he refer to "the evil camouflage which the wicked demons had thrown around the divine doctrines of the Christians to defer others from following them", (13) while at the same time recognizing that "all writers, by means of the engrafted seed of the Word which was implanted in them, had a dim glimpse of the truth" (13).

Part 3 *The Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*

The *Dialogue* is a verbose and digressive work,⁴⁹ written sometime after *1 Apol* (160 C.E.) as a discussion he had with Trypho, a Jew he met in Ephesus who had fled to Corinth during the Bar Kochba rebellion. The issues discussed were divided into three sections. The first part dealt with the validity of the Mosaic Law (11-31, esp. 8-10, 19, and also 46-7). The second part (32-110) dealt with Christology, including the idea of a crucified Messiah (32, 36, 38-9, 48, 89-90), current Jewish beliefs in the Messiah (50), the virgin birth (50, 63), millennial beliefs (80) and angelology (79). Questions of exegesis consumed much of the text (58, 60, 65, 67, 71, 73), as do lengthy quotes from proof texts. The third part (111-142) dealt with the conversion of the Gentiles. Trypho is heard from or mentioned 39 times, sometimes not speaking for many chapters, and then only to be asked by Justin not to interrupt!

After the brief autobiographical account of Justin,⁵⁰ he and Trypho aired the opinion that the other is "ensnared by false teachings" (8). Trypho then brushed aside the common rumours of cannibalism and orgiastic rites as "not worthy of belief, for they are too repulsive to human nature" (10) and the two settled down to their discussion.

⁴⁹ Its 142 chapters more than double the length of *1 Apol*.

⁵⁰ Summarized in the introduction.

3.3.1 Points of Contact

Justin did not use the Logos theory to establish points of contact between Christianity and Judaism. Given this, how was he to explain similarities between them? He did so through a tripartite division of the Mosaic Law.⁵¹ The first part was a universally valid ethical teaching practised by the hallowed pre-Mosaic figures of Enoch and Noah. This universal teaching could also be found outside the Mosaic Law. Justin appealed to this part to argue against the necessity for circumcision. The second part was the commandments - temporarily valid rules laid down by God due to the obstinate nature of the Jews. The third part of the Law was the prophecies of the coming return to a universal epoch inaugurated by the first advent of Christ.

This division allowed the apologist to discount all Trypho's appeals to the necessity for the observance of the Law by referring to the righteousness of the pre-Mosaic servants of God in the first part and to the temporary and punitive nature of the Law in the second part. The three divisions gave Christians a framework which justified their selective sampling of Jewish scripture: all those passages which suited Christian purposes were in the third part.

Justin also did not attribute similarities between Jewish and Christian practices to the demons, but resorted to "prototype" language to explain how Passover (40), the offering of flour (41), circumcision (41), and "all other

⁵¹ Theodore Stylianopolous, *Justin Martyr and the Mosaic Law*, Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, no. 20 (Missoula, Montana: Society of Biblical Literature and Scholars Press, 1975), 51-6.

Mosaic precepts" (42) prefigured Christian realities. In other cases such as baptism, Justin only offered that there was "no connection at all" with Christian baptism (19).

As for the threat that the continued existence of the Jewish religion posed to Christianity's supersessionary claims, Justin explained that the only reason God allowed the Jews to remain alive was because of the small "seed" of Jews who were reserved for everlasting salvation" (32) of Christian conversion.⁵² Most Jews, however, did not convert because of the fear of persecution (39), spiritual blindness (55), and their inherent rebellion against God (136). The paucity of Jewish converts was no threat to the validity of Christianity because it was God's plan from the time of Isaac and Jacob that the unbelieving Jews would be "vast and exhaustive", "like the sand on the beach" (120).

Justin's criticism of the Jews was no doubt coloured by his battle with Marcion.⁵³ Like a good debater, Justin adapted the arguments of Marcion to his purposes: "The fact that God can be falsely accused by the foolish of not always having taught the same truthful doctrines to all, you can blame on your own sinfulness" (30). An example is the inconsistency of the command to fashion the bronze serpent which went against the prohibition of graven images (94.1), but which was necessary because of the obstinate nature of the

⁵² Other references to the Jewish seed: 39, 55, 120, 136.

⁵³ References to Marcion in the *Dialogue* 35, 80, 82. Allusions to gnostic thought: 23, 30, 92.

Jews.⁵⁴ Other exegetical problems were used to underscore the Jews' inability to understand their own scriptures, which one of Trypho's companions lamentably admits (94.4). Justin's recasting of the Law as temporary legislation for the Jews which Jesus had rendered useless, safeguarded both the unity of God and the authority of scripture.

3.3.2 The Demonology of the *Dialogue*

As would be expected in an account of Justin's conversation with a Jew,⁵⁵ the demonology of the *Dialogue* is fundamentally different from that of the apologies. In this work, Justin further expanded his presentation of the Christian world view, modifying and supplementing it as well as exercising the editorial control appropriate to the putative audience.

The first noticeable change was that, besides the demons, other figures made up the demonic hosts. Differentiated from the demons were the "spirits of error" (7), or "strange, that is, evil and deceitful spirits" (30) who led Christians astray. Some led believers away from true practice by enticing them to eat meat sacrificed to idols (35), while others promoted the false teaching of the Marcionites, Valentinians, Basilidians and Saturnilians (35). Other figures such as "devils" (76) and "unclean spirits" (93) are synonymous with demons. Whether as spirits or demons, these beings did the will of their leader: Satan.

⁵⁴ Stylianopolous, *Justin Martyr*, 30.

⁵⁵ The issue of the intended audience of the *Dialogue* will be dealt with in 125-34, below.

The most significant change in the demonology of the *Dialogue* was its total reversal of the tendency in the apologies to avoid the mention of Satan. Whereas in the apologies the focus was on the demons (1 *Apol*) or the demons and the bad angels (2 *Apol*), now the emphasis was placed on the Satan. In 2 *Apol*, Christ became human for the defeat of demons (6.5). Now, he deigned to become incarnate

in order that by this dispensation He might conquer the serpent, that first sinner, and the angels who followed his example, and that he might thwart death and bring it to an end, so that, at the second Advent of Christ, it would no longer have any power over those who believe in Him and live according to his principles. At this second Advent of Christ, some will be condemned to suffer eternally in the fires of Hell, while others will be eternally free from suffering, corruption, and sorrow. (45)

Though there is no lengthy explanation of demonic origins as is found in the fifth chapter of each of the apologies, this first reference to Satan as the serpent is sufficient to reveal how the whole demonological landscape had changed. Satan now replaced the demons as the enemy of Christ. The bad angels who had formerly initiated the fall from heaven, were now seen as following Satan's example. Conspicuously absent from the whole account were the demons.

Who was Satan? He was "the Devil": the inspirer of the Greek myths (69) and heretical teachings (82), the instigator of persecution (131), as well as the tempter of Jesus (103, 125) who opposed Christians and sought to ensnare

them (116). He was also the "man of sin" (Dan 7:25, 32), the "man of apostasy" (2 Thess 2:3, 110) and the one Jesus called "*Satanas*" (103).

However, for Justin Satan was foremost "the serpent" (39, 45, 88, 91, 94, 100, 103, 112, 124-5). Justin's equation of the serpent of Genesis with Satan did not assume that Jewish scriptures themselves made this connection.⁵⁶ He argued that what Moses called the serpent, and Job and Zecharias called the Devil (LXX), Jesus called Satan (103). Zechariah 3:1-2 was regarded as proof of Satan's opposition to Jesus ("Jesus" being the true meaning of "Joshua") (115-6).

As the serpent, Satan was "that first sinner" (45, above). Not only had the serpent replaced the fallen angels and eliminated their demonic offspring, but even the cause of his fall was different. It was no longer a lustful fall which happened after the creation of humanity, but a *prior* fall of pride. Thus, though mention is made of the angels who followed Satan in this disobedience (45, 76), all references to the mating of these angels with women, and to the demonic offspring of these unions - so important to the demonology of the apologies - are avoided. These changes reflect the later apocalyptic trends (1.2.4) of the prior fall of Satan due to pride.

All of Justin's references to Satan as the serpent, save one (dealing with persecution, 39), are to the one who deceived Adam and Eve (45, 88, 100, 124) by prompting (94) their sin of disobedience (102, 112). At times Justin

⁵⁶ "[T]he Prophetic Spirit, through Moses, did not instruct us to believe in a serpent, since He announces that the serpent was cursed by God from the beginning", *Dial* 91.

seemed to imply a simultaneous fall of Adam and Eve with the serpent "who fell with a great fall *because* he deceived Eve" (124). However, as Justin explicitly stated, in this context he was speaking of Adam and Eve's abuse of their free will in allowing themselves to be deceived by the serpent. Justin was attempting to emphasize that the serpent did not cause the fall of Adam and Eve, as they freely chose to disobey God and thereby "brought death on themselves" (124).

It was essential that Justin equate Satan and the serpent precisely because the Jewish scriptures did not do so. Justin was the first writer to refer to Revelation as scripture (*Dial* 81), and it soon became apparent why; it was a means of equating the figure of Satan with the figure of the serpent in the Genesis story which did not rely upon the Jewish apocalyptic texts. Exclusion of the apocalyptic texts was essential, as unfailing reliance upon Scripture was cited by both Trypho and Justin as the common source for all arguments within the debate (32, 56, 65, 67-8, 85, 120). Trypho would not have accepted Revelation as Scripture, but locating this identification of Satan with the serpent in the memoirs of the apostles renders it another Christian interpretation to debate, rather than a disagreement over Jewish Scripture such as the references in *Barnabas* would have generated.⁶⁷

This reference to the prior fall of Satan reflected developments in first century C.E. apocalyptic Judaism which dispensed with the earlier lustful fall

⁶⁷ See n. 62, below.

of the angels and posited a prior revolt in heaven due to the pride of the prince of demons.⁵⁸ The first century "Similitudes of Enoch" (*1 Enoch* 37-71) introduced the figure of Satan who existed *before* the fall of the angels and is responsible for it (40:7). This prince of demons figure is also said to have brought about the fall of Adam and Eve (69:6). *2 Enoch* 29:4 specifies the sin of the leader aspiring to be equal to God. This leader is thrown out of heaven with all his followers. Again, 31: 3-6 describes the "devil" who then seduces Eve after he has been condemned.⁵⁹

Why Justin had to omit any interpretation of the "lustful fall" becomes apparent in chapter 79. In the preceding chapters, Justin explained Jesus' advent in the context of apocalyptic thought. He was God in the flesh, come to disclose the reality of both spiritual warfare and its resolution in the judgement of God. "For He alone openly taught the great counsels that the Father intended for those who either were or shall be pleasing to Him, *as well as for those men or angels who withdrew from His will*" (76, my italics). Using the words of Jesus from the "memoirs" of the apostles,⁶⁰ which refer to the devil and his angels cast out into external darkness, Justin returned to the enticing claim that Christians had power over these rebellious angels: "Indeed, we believers in Jesus our Lord, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, cast out

⁵⁸ Cf. *1 En* 40:7, 69:6; *2 En* 29:4, 31:3-6. See 23-4, above.

⁵⁹ Other references to Satan's role in the fall of Adam and Eve: *Apocalypse of Abraham* 23; *Lives of Adam and Eve* 16:4; *3 Baruch* 4:8, 9:7; *Apocalypse of Moses* 21:3.

⁶⁰ *Matt.* 8:11-12, 7:22-23, 25:41 and *Luke* 10:19.

all devils and other evil spirits and thus have them in our power" (76).

After this narrative, Trypho reacts in his most heated moment in the debate. While formerly he had argued that Justin's proof texts were more ambiguous than he presented them (51-6), now he attacked his interpretation:

Then Trypho, showing by his countenance that he was rather angry, yet retaining a great reverence for the Scriptures, said to me, "The words of God are indeed holy, but your interpretations are not only artificial, as is evident from those you have given, but evidently blasphemous, for you affirm that the angels have sinned and have fallen away from God". (79)

Trypho's angry words reflect how quickly late first century and early second century Judaism had moved away from the "fall of the angels" myths - regardless of whether the fall was lustful or *disobedient*.⁶¹ As to why second century Jews were rejecting their own apocalyptic traditions, it can only be posited as a reaction against both Christian interpretations and against any conflict dualism which might result in another rebellion like that of Bar Kochba.

Justin took great care not to base his views on apocalyptic texts and/or traditions derived from them, and hence had to make the most of what references the Jewish scriptures provided.⁶² In response to Trypho, he refers to *Isaiah* 30:1-5 regarding the "rulers in Tanis" who are "bad angels", *Zechariah* 3:1-2, in which Joshua is accused by the *satan*, *Job* 1:6 which also refers to

⁶¹ See 26, n.46, above.

⁶² Unlike *Barnabas*, who quotes *Enoch* three times, two of these as scripture, 4:3 and 16:4.

the *satan*, the serpent in the garden (without trying to prove from Scripture that this serpent was Satan), Egyptian magicians who tried to imitate the miracles God worked through Moses, and Psalm 95:5, "The gods of the Gentiles are devils".⁶³

Trypho then changed the subject with words suggesting that the issue of reliance on apocalyptic texts was in the background: "Sir", said Trypho, "as I already remarked, you are very careful to keep close to the Scriptures in all your statements" (80). And careful Justin was. Though influenced, directly or indirectly, by the apocalyptic demonologies, he never referred to them. The closest he came were his four references to Enoch (19, 23, 43, 92), usually as an example of uncircumcised righteous men before the time of Moses.⁶⁴ Trypho also has great admiration for Enoch, shown when he asked Justin whether Jews would "live again with Jacob, Henoch, and Noah in the resurrection of the dead" (45).

Whether or not Trypho's lauding of Justin's knowledge of scripture pertaining to fallen angels is mere apologetic, it demonstrates what the Christians perceived as a need for preparedness when it came to answering such a fundamental question. Justin thought this belief was well grounded, based on these citations from the Scriptures, and perhaps represented a

⁶³ Trypho does not consider Psalm 95 to refer to actual demons, but to non-existent and foolish practices (55, 69). Justin changes his wording in talking with Trypho, referring to the "demons" of Psalm 95 as "idols of demons" (73). Other times he refers to "vain idols and demons" (91).

⁶⁴ E.g., "We, indeed, who have come to god through Jesus Christ, have received not a carnal, but a spiritual circumcision, as did Henoch and those like him" (43).

Christian confidence in the security of their apocalyptic beliefs. For he was by no means this confident in all his beliefs, openly admitting in the next chapter (80) that his millennial hopes were not shared by all "pure and pious Christians".

The question remains, how did Justin reconcile the "lustful fall" of the angels who mated with women to produce the demons with the prior fall of disobedience on the part of Satan and angels? The answer lies in the apologetic context of the *Dialogue*. Like his strategic omission of the Christian apocalyptic world view from *1 Apol*, and the continued omission of Satan from the fall of the angels story of *2 Apol*, Justin simply referred to the demons without referring to their origins.

3.3.3 The Four Phases of Spiritual Warfare

A look at the four phases of spiritual warfare as presented in the apologies reveals how this different demonology of the *Dialogue* functioned in the legitimation of Justin's world view and in the nihilation of competing world views. Despite the prominence of Satan, and the replacement of the lustful fall of the angels, Justin still maintained that the gods of the Gentiles were demons: "We constantly ask God through Jesus Christ to keep us safe from those demons who, while they are strangers to the worshippers of God, were once adored by us" (30). Christian conversion was presented as the

renunciation of the demons, as Jesus "compelled many to abandon the demons who they used to obey" (83).⁶⁵

Justin also maintained, albeit more briefly, the first "phase" of the demonic camouflage of the Greek myths:

"You must rest assured, Trypho," I went on, "that my knowledge in the Scriptures and my faith in them have been well confirmed by the things which he who is called the Devil counterfeited in the fictions circulated among the Greeks (just as he accomplished them through the Egyptian magicians and the false prophets in the days of Elias). (69)

Two changes to the demonic camouflage presented in the apologies are to be noted. First, Satan and not the demons are responsible for the imitations of Greek mythology. The same myths of Bacchus, Hercules, Perseus and Asclepius (*1 Apoñ*) that were attributed to the demons are now the work of Satan. (70). Yet while Satan was responsible for the creation of the myths, the demons were still involved in the cultic practices: "For the demons urged the priests of Mithras to exhort their followers to perform righteous acts [in imitation of the prophecies of Isaiah]" (70). Yet in chapter 78 he attributes other Mithraic rites to the Devil alone. However, given that the gods were still considered by Justin to be demons, it stands to reason that they are involved in the cults.

⁶⁵ Other references to conversion as the renouncing of demons: 69, 91, 119, 123, 134.

Second, Justin revealed that the camouflage that competing religions sought to throw around the divine doctrines did not begin with the Greek myths. They dated back to the efforts of Egyptian magicians to imitate the miraculous deeds of Moses (69, 79), and the presence of false prophets within Israel itself (69). No mention of this demonic pre-history was made in the apologies; Egyptian theriolatry was simply dismissed in *1 Apol* 24 as foolishness. That Satan had transferred his actions from Egyptian magic to the Greek myths and magical practices only demonstrated that he followed God's transference of the covenant to the Christians. Also of note is the continuing efficacy of this nihilation: Justin's faith is "well confirmed" (69, above) by the imitations of Satan.

The second phase of the spiritual warfare, the instigation of new gods and practices, involved Simon Magus, who was raised by the Gentiles "above every principality, authority and power" (120).⁶⁶ The cave in which Jesus was born and in where the Magi adored him was so threatening to the demons that "the priests who performed the mysteries of Mithras were urged by the Devil to declare that they were initiated by Mithras himself in a place they call a cave" (78). Such imitation sought to divert the pagans from discovering what truly happened in the cave, i.e. their defeat.

The third phase was Christian heresy which arose between the two advents (51), in which the demons are also absent (51, 67, 72), replaced by the direct

⁶⁶ Cf. *2 Apol* 15.1.

influence of Satan:

Many have disseminated atheistic, blasphemous, and wicked doctrines, falsely stamping them with His name, and they have taught, and still do, whatever that unclean spirit of the Devil has suggested to their minds". (82)

One exception to Satan's responsibility for heresy was again in the realm of cultic practice. Justin attributed the heretical practice of eating meat sacrificed to the gods to "spirits of error" (35). Again, Justin explicitly mentioned his confidence that even such practices carried out by people who called themselves Christians "only tends to make us adherents of the pure and true Christian doctrine more ardent in our faith and more firm in the hope He announced to us" (35). Heresy also reinforced Justin's world view because it was seen as the fulfilment of the predictions of Jesus regarding false prophets (Matt 7:15 and 24:11, 35).

Much more attention was paid by Justin to the last phase of the spiritual war: persecution. Here the demons once assume a position analogous to that of the apologies. Christians were persecuted by "evil men and demons" (18), though the demons are now a part of the "host of the Devil" (131). When it came to human instruments, both the Jews (16-7, 95, 108, 133) and "officials" are "influenced by the serpent (that evil and treacherous spirit)" (39) to abuse Christians. Like the imitations of pagan religion and heresies, persecutions also reinforce Justin's beliefs because Jesus predicted these trials

(35). In what was the closest parallel to the Logos doctrine of the apologies (1 *Apol* 46; 2 *Apol* 10,

13), Justin declared the idea that the persecutions were centred on the person of Christ and those "instructed in His whole truth" (39).

3.3.4 The Use of Common Demonology

Despite this reduced stature of the demons due to the prominence of Satan, they remained an important proof for Justin because of his continued use of demonological notions common to religious debate in the second century. As we have seen, escaping from the enslaving power of demons was a common promise of the Hellenistic religions. Thus, Jesus did not only come into the world to announce the truth, but to save all from "the captivity of error" (39). Error was not merely being wrong, it was the result of having been deceived. To follow Christ was to be circumcised from such error (41).

Justin capitalized on Israel's history in order to further his arguments that the Jews had turned away from God. He often supported his assertions of the Jews' obstinate and rebellious nature by reminding Trypho that they had sacrificed their children to demons (19, 27, 46, 73, 133). He also felt that the Devil could be seen with the eyes, though one had to be "in ecstasy" (115).

Magic remained a locus of demonic activity and Justin both answered and levelled charges about the use of magical arts. Justin revealed that the Jews, "dared to call Him [Jesus] a magician who misled the people" (69). Yet in the

same chapter he related how the Devil inspired Egyptian magicians to imitate the miracles of Moses. He also accused the Jews of using magical "fumigations and amulets" (85) in their exorcisms. Justin also answered charges that Christian beliefs in the virgin birth were "tales". In response he revealed the demonic facade of the Greek myths which sought to deceive people like Trypho into making such accusations.⁶⁷

However, the most significant argument from common demonology was the recasting of Jesus as the Saviour from demons. Justin presented Christian conversion as the liberation from the enslaving powers of the demons through the power of Jesus and his death on the cross.

We call Him our Helper and Redeemer, by the power of whose name even the demons shudder; even to this day they are overcome by us when we exorcise them in the name of Jesus Christ, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, the Governor of Judaea. Thus, it is clear to all that His Father bestowed on Him such a great power that even the demons are subject both to His name and to His pre-ordained manner of suffering (30).

Christians, by the strength of their own free will and the "great power" of Jesus, were beating the demons at their own game! They were rebelling against those who had rebelled against God, by returning to Him. An example of how Justin was influenced by these demonological notions, and used them to his advantage, was his depiction of the infancy narrative. Justin related the

⁶⁷ See 70-1, above, for the elaboration of this response to the charges of Christian beliefs being *teratologian*.

story of the census of Quirinus and how it fulfilled the prophecy of the birth of the Messiah in Bethlehem (*Micah* 5:2 in *Matt.* 2:5-6), the Magi who came to Herod, Joseph's dream telling him of Mary's conception through the Holy Spirit, and the birth of Jesus in a cave. Of special interest to Justin were these Magi who came to adore the new-born Jesus:

And the words of Isaias, "He shall take the power of Damascus and the spoils of Samaria",⁶⁸ meant that the power of the wicked demon that dwelt in Damascus should be crushed by Christ at His birth. This is shown to have taken place. For the Magi, held in servitude (as spoils) for the commission of every wicked deed through the power of that demon, by coming and worshipping Christ, *openly revolted against the power that had held them as spoils*, which power the Scripture indicated by parable to be located in Damascus. And in the parables [of Isaias] that sinful and wicked power is fittingly called Samaria (78, my italics).

Not only was the infancy narrative now placed within the framework of apocalyptic demonology, it proved the existence of the demons who were holding people as "spoils", and the power of Jesus to break this hold. Justin's infancy narrative is an excellent example of how demonology was not only the context of his apology, but had become the content as well. The Christian message was one of a return to the freedom announced by Jesus who sent the

⁶⁸ Justin here is responding to the promise he made Trypho in chapter 68 to prove that *Isaiah* 8:4, "Before he had known how to call father or mother, he received the power of Damascus and the spoils of Samaria in the presence of the king of Assyria", referred to Christ and not Hezekiah, as the Jews held.

apostles out from Jerusalem to preach "the call of repentance to all the nations over which the demons used to rule" (83).

Common to both the *Dialogue* and the apologies is this vision of a demonic agency ruling over the nations. In *2 Apol* it had been the fallen angels who had abandoned their posts as servants of God without abandoning their positions of power over the nations. Now Justin asserted without explanation that the demons occupied these positions. This was probably due to the Jewish objection to any notion of fallen angels so angrily voiced by Trypho (79).

Whereas in both the Jewish scriptures and apocalyptic texts the *Satan* served to incite, accuse and punish, Justin's Christian re-ordering of this story involved a *Satan* whose motives are to oppose and ensnare and a Jesus who subdues him and his assistants.

Justin frequently mentions the power of Jesus over the demons, especially in the context of exorcism. At Jesus' name "every demon shudders and suffers agonizing pain because it is to be destroyed by Him" (111). Exorcism not only proved the power of Jesus, but the veracity of the whole Christian world view over that of the pagans and the Jews, which might account for the creedal character of his references to exorcism:

Every demon is vanquished and subdued when exorcised in the name of this true Son of God, who was the First Born, of all creatures, who was born of a virgin, who suffered and was crucified by your people under Pontius Pilate, who died and then, after His resurrection from the dead, ascended into Heaven" (85).

Exorcism also proved the superiority of Christianity over Judaism:

But, when you [Jews] attempt to exorcize them in the name of any man born among you (whether kings, just men, prophets or patriarchs), not one of the demons will be subject to you. If any man among you should exorcize them in the name of the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, they will, perhaps, become subject to you. But some of your exorcists, as I have already noted, adjure the demons by employing the magical art of the Gentiles, using fumigations and amulets (85).

Of such importance was the power over demons that it was, in Justin's eyes, the distinguishing mark of the Christian. This is evident in his etymology of "Israel":

The name Israel, then, means a man who overcomes power, for "Isra" is "a man who overcomes", and "El" is "power". That Christ would do this when He...was approached by the Devil (that power which is also called serpent and Satan), who tempted Him and tried to overcome Him by demanding that He worship him. But he was utterly crushed and overcome by Christ, who convicted him of his wickedness when, in violation of the Scriptures, he asked to be adored as God, thus becoming an apostate from the will of God. (125)

Since Justin argues that the Church is the new Israel, his identity as a Christian relies on being "Israel" - one overcoming the power of Satan. This is what it meant to be Christian.

Goodenough listed the defeat of Satan by Jesus in the desert as contradictory to other references to his defeat upon Christ's birth (*Dial* 78, 116; *2 Apol* 6) or by Jesus' passion and death (*2 Apol* 6; *Dial* 30, 76, 85). These contradictions are only apparent and are due to a lack of awareness of the apocalyptic framework of notions of the provisional victory over demons during the time allotted between the two advents. To say that Christ was born for the defeat of demons is not to argue that this defeat was universally effected at the moment of the birth itself (though it was for the Magi). Justin hinted that Jesus' birth defeated the demons in that they could not understand the prophecies referring to it and were thus unable to imitate it in the cults (*1 Apol* 55).

The defeat of Satan in the desert is Jesus' personal defeat of this attempt to derail his plans for a suffering Messiahship. With the crucifixion, Jesus released the power to defeat Satan personally and provisionally to his apostles and followers (*Dial* 116). The crucifixion is not the "once and for all" defeat of the demonic hosts, but the initiation of this process through the liberation of Christians "from the total destruction of the powers and principalities of evil" (*Dial* 41). Finally, at the second coming this defeat will be made universal and final, resulting in eternal punishment for the evil hosts and their human followers.

3.3.5 Human Roles in Spiritual Warfare: Satan and Free Will

In *1 Apol*, Justin wrote of how the demons act "with the help of the evil desire that is in every man by nature in all kinds of ways" (10). In the *Dialogue* this notion of both angels and humans falling from grace is given a different emphasis in keeping with the "fall of disobedience". Instead of stressing how the demons work by inciting and inflaming the evil inclinations, Justin emphasized Satan and Adam and Eve's free choice to introduce sin into human history. How was this possible?

For God, in His desire to have the angels and men (who were endowed with the personal power of free will) do whatever He enabled them to do, created them such that, if they chose to do things pleasing to Him, He would preserve them immortal and free from punishment, but, if they preferred to do evil, He would punish each one as He pleased. (88)

That humans and angels were created free to sin,⁶⁹ and that God knew that they would sin before He created them,⁷⁰ did not exempt either from full responsibility. God did not create any human or angel "incorrigibly sinful" (140), yet he did hold all accountable for sin (141).⁷¹

Though the serpent "was the cause of man's sin of disobedience" (112), as much as the word "cause" might be emphasized, humanity shouldered part

⁶⁹ See also 102, 141.

See 140, "they who were foreknown as future sinners, whether men or angels, do become so, not through God's fault, but each through his own fault".

⁷¹ On this last point Justin refers to "you [Jews] and others like you" who showed antinomian tendencies. Falls identifies these as Christian Gnostics, *Justin Martyr*, 364.

of the blame. It was therefore up to humans to remedy the situation. However, as humans freely chose to fall, so would they freely choose to be redeemed.

He is born of the Virgin, in order that the disobedience caused by the serpent might be destroyed in the same manner in which it had originated. For Eve, an undefiled virgin, conceived the word of the serpent, and brought forth disobedience and death. But the Virgin Mary, filled with faith and joy...answered: "Be it done unto me according to Thy word". And, indeed, she gave birth to Him...by whom God destroys both the serpent and those angels and men who have become like the serpent, but frees from death those who repent of their sins and believe in Christ. (100)

Free will is, in this way, integral to Justin's world view. It explains why Satan fell, why humans fell and were now vulnerable to his promptings, and how to gain power over him by pleasing God. For all of these notions, so central for Justin's world view to be true, it was necessary that the serpent be identified with Satan. In order to do this, he was busy extricating the most favourable allegorical interpretations possible from the scriptures, as well as engaging in some rather questionable etymological arguments.

For when speaking of why it was God's will that humans, angels, and even Jesus would have free will (102-3), Justin then defined "Satan":

[T]he Devil himself, that is, the one whom Moses called the serpent, Job and Zecharias the Devil, and Jesus addressed as *Satanas*, indicating that he had a compound name made up of the actions which he performed; for the word "Sata" in the Jewish and Syrian tongue means "apostate", while "nas" is the word which means in translation "serpent"; thus, from both parts is formed the one word "*Satanas*". (103)⁷²

⁷² This definition was followed by Irenaeus *Adv Haer* V.21.2 and *Preaching* 16, in Barnard, *The Life and Thought of Justin Martyr*, 108.

This etymology revealed more about Christian self-definition than it did about the meaning of "Satan". It was an apt summary of the demonology of the *Dialogue*; referring to a disobedient fall which is pushed back in time and superimposed on the serpent.

3.3.6 Social Enemies in the *Dialogue*

Like those of the apologies, the demonology of the *Dialogue* reveals a picture of second century Christianity emerging from internal debates and confronting its cultural context. As we have seen, Justin believed that the pagan nations were ruled by demons who spread evil not only along the personal lines of possession by an "unclean spirit", but also through "bad education and evil habits and wicked laws" (93). Like 2 *Apol*, evil had taken on wider cultural dimensions.⁷³

Justin wrote that Christians thanked God during the Eucharist "for the total destruction of the powers and principalities of evil through Him who suffered in accordance with His will" (41). Who were these "powers and principalities"? They were not the demons, for Justin also wrote that "the demons and shortly [at the second coming] all the powers and authorities of the earth tremble"

⁷³ See 93-5, above.

(49).⁷⁴ Indeed, "powers and kingdoms" feared the name of Jesus more than they feared all the dead! (121). This reference to the fear of the dead points to pagan beliefs in demons as the souls of the dead.⁷⁵ "Powers and kingdoms" would appear to refer to the pagan authorities.

Justin also referred to persecution at the hands of the Jews, though always implying that the time was past when the Jews were able to attack Christians "because of those who are in power" (16).⁷⁶ In the past, the Jews had molested the Christians more than other nations, and even now, the persecutions of these nations were fuelled by the rumour-mongering of the Jews (17, 108). Presently, the Jews cursed the Christians in the synagogues while the pagans "put into effect your curse by killing all those who merely admit they are Christians" (96). Justin spoke of Christians being put to death "by the demons and by the host of the Devil, through the service rendered them by you [the Jews]" (131). So virulent were they that their pagan proselytes, trying to be "good Jews", persecuted Christians twice as much as the Jews themselves! (122).

Therefore, Justin's attention was turning to the threats posed to the Christian community by pagan culture. Despite this, Christianity's relationship to Judaism was very important because its identity was derived from Judaism.

⁷⁴ See 131 where all "authorities and kingdoms" do the trembling.

⁷⁵ See 11-14, above.

⁷⁶ See 95 and 133 for repeated assertions that the Jews were not in the position (presently, at least) to persecute Christians.

This was necessary because of the Marcionite threat and because Christianity's legitimacy in pagan eyes was derived from Judaism. Justin felt that the Jews were still able to cast a negative light on Christians, and did so at every opportunity.

3.3.7 Summary

The *Dialogue* dealt with the threat that Judaism continued to pose to Christians. Justin dealt with similarities between Christian and Jewish practice by using the language of prototypes or by the denial of any significance to the similarity. The tripartite division of the Mosaic law dismissed it as a temporary measure and explained the non-conversion of most Jews as God's plan - though a "seed" of Jews still were converting (3.3.1). The demonological landscape of the *Dialogue* was almost a complete reversal of that of the apologies. Satan replaced the demons and bad angels as the enemy of Christ. The fall of the angels myth was replaced by a fall due to pride and disobedience of Satan which was followed by the bad angels. This fall took place *before* the fall of Adam and Eve (3.3.2). Satan replaced the demons as the instigator of the four phases of spiritual warfare, inspiring the facade of the Greco-Roman cults, new practices in these cults which imitated the Christian sacraments, heresies and persecution. Justin continued to hold that the pagan gods were demons, though he did not explain their origins in relation to Satan and the

fallen angels. The demons still controlled or were involved in (as the agents of Satan) the operation of the cults and in persecution (3.3.3).

Both how Justin argued and what he argued reflected the demon consciousness of the second century. Jesus was presented as the Saviour from the captivity of error and the oppression of demons. Magic loomed large in this debate and Justin characterized pagan piety as satanic magic and answered similar charges levelled by Jews as well. Such accusations of Jesus' magical powers were one of the earliest polemical strains against Christians.⁷⁷ He also answered charges that Christian beliefs were tall tales like those of the gods. Exorcism was highly valued as the proof of Christianity's superior power over the demons, as compared with Judaism and pagan cultic piety (3.3.4).

Justin explained the rebellion against God and the persecution of Christians by arguing that both the angels and humans had free will. Satan exercised his free will in the fall and now tempted humans to similarly abuse their free will (3.2.5). The problems addressed in the *Dialogue* reflected the fact that the primary social threat was the persecution of Christians by the pagans, aided by the ill will of the Jews who were no longer in the position to persecute Christians (3.3.6).

⁷⁷ This, however, would not support the argument for a Jewish audience of the *Dialogue* because magic and magical writings also figured prominently in the apologies, see 69 and 89, above.

3.3.8 A Comparison of Justin's Demonologies

There are many elements common to Justin's demonologies. His use of common demonological strains, the four phases of spiritual warfare and the emphasis on free will are all common to both the apologies and the *Dialogue*. All of his works also contain a consistent portrait of the social position of Christianity in mid-second century Rome. *1 Apol* was written specifically because of the persecution of Christians in the Empire. It also mentioned Jewish persecutions of recent memory, but none in the present. *2 Apol* was written after an incident of Christian martyrdom in Rome itself at the hands of Imperial authorities and no mention was made of Jewish persecution. The *Dialogue* again mentioned the pagan persecutions and repeated the position reflected in *1 Apol* that Jews were no longer in the position to persecute Christians -except through their ill will.

What does change are his inclusions or omissions of demonological strains that are peculiar to the Christian world view. As we have seen this was because of the intended audience of each work. *1 Apol* used common demonological notions to express the Christian apocalyptic world view. All mention of fallen angels and Satan were avoided due to the pagan audience addressed. In *2 Apol*, Justin reversed this process, incorporating and translating pagan polytheism into the Christian apocalyptic world view by means of a complex demonological nihilation. Justin again avoided all mention of Satan because of the pagan audience. In the *Dialogue*, the demonological

landscape changed. Satan became the enemy of Christ behind the four-phase spiritual warfare that Justin used to nihilate pagan polytheism. His fall was not sexual but one of pride and disobedience and all references to angels mating with humans are avoided. The demons remain as agents of Satan involved in persecution and the cults.

Part Four - Demonology and the Question of the Audience of the *Dialogue*

3.4.1 The State of the Question

The effort to carve out theological and social space dominated both the apologies. Many have considered these same concerns to have continued in the *Dialogue* and argue that despite its literary setting in a Jewish-Christian debate, it was written for a pagan audience.⁷⁸ The evidence for such a reading of the *Dialogue* falls into four main areas:⁷⁹

- (1) the name of the addressee, Marcus Pompeius (141.5) is strongly Roman, suggesting a pagan audience;
- (2) references and appeals to Gentiles are made throughout the work;
- (3) the philosophical prologue as well as Justin's notion of Christianity as True Philosophy would appeal to pagan readers, and
- (4) the literary form of the *Dialogue* also favours educated pagans.

⁷⁸ Goodenough, 96-100. Also A. Harnack, *Judentum und Judenchristentum in Justins Dialog mit Tryphon Texte und Untersuchungen* 39 (1913), 47-98; N. Hyldahl, *Philosophie und Christientum: eine Interpretation der Einleitung zum Dialog Justins* (Copenhagen, 1966), 16-22; Reiner Voss, *Der Dialog in der fruhchristlichen Literatur* (Munich, 1970), 38; in Stylianopolous, *Justin Martyr*, 169.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 12-3.

Stylianopolous has treated each of these points at length, arguing that the name Marcus Pompeius reveals nothing for certain because the adoption of Greek and Roman names by Jews in the Hellenistic age was common (e.g. Josephus Flavius), and the inclusion of the name at the end of the work was a small gesture lost in the massive work.⁸⁰

Gill has argued that 29.1⁸¹ was a liturgical fragment that Justin worked into the text.⁸² However, as Stylianopolous noted, "If Gill is of course entirely right, it is all the more plain that the addressees here are not pagans, but gentiles who are Christians, the worshipping Church".⁸³

The third argument depends mostly on the interpretation of the philosophical prologue as the key to the purpose of the work. Goodenough felt that the resolution of the discontinuity between the prologue and the remaining 134 chapters could only be resolved by positing pagan readership.⁸⁴ Justin wrote the *Dialogue* to prove "that the writings of the Jews and the doctrines of the Christians are a unified production of the single Spirit of Inspiration and

⁸⁰ Ibid., 170, n. 10.

⁸¹ "Let us come together, O Gentiles, and glorify God, for He has deigned to look down on us also. Let us glorify Him through the King of glory and the Lord of hosts. For He has shown His benevolence towards us Gentiles, too, and He accepts our sacrifices more willingly that He does yours".

⁸² David Gill, "A Liturgical Fragment in Justin" *Harvard Theological Review* 59 (1966), 98-100.

⁸³ Stylianopolous, *Justin Martyr*, 178. See 173-187 for a treatment of each possible reference or appeal to Gentiles which confirmed that they are directed towards Trypho and his companions (23.3), Christian Gentiles (24.3, 29.1, 119.4), non-Christian Gentiles leaning towards Judaism (32.5, without suggesting that they were the intended audience), all people (64.2e), Christians or gnostic opponents (80.3b) and not a pagan readership.

⁸⁴ Goodenough, *Theology*, 99.

Revelation".⁸⁵ It was necessary to prove this because the wrangling of these two groups were jeopardizing Christian claims of the superiority of revelation over pagan philosophy.

Emphasizing the apparent inconsistency between the philosophical prologue and the rest of the work is unnecessary. Justin's and Trypho's interest in philosophy, which initiated their conversation (1.2-3) adequately explains Justin's message that the pagan philosophies pale beside divinely inspired Scripture.⁸⁶ Justin's first advice to Trypho, that Moses was superior to Plato (1.3) "is also the connection between the prologue and the rest of the *Dialogue*: Scripture is the only guarantee of the truth, whereas philosophy has failed".⁸⁷

The fourth claim confuses the cultural setting of the Hellenistic world with the addressees. Just as Christians and Jews were interested in philosophy, so too were they enamoured of pagan literary forms. One only has to look at Ignatius' and especially Melito's use of the Second Sophistic to confirm this.

These four arguments are insufficient evidence for a pagan audience of the *Dialogue*. Stylianopolous argued for a Jewish audience for the *Dialogue* based on the following factors:

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Stylianopolous, *Justin Martyr*, 190, n. 60.

⁸⁷ Ibid. Skarsaune has confirmed this aspect of the prologue, establishing that "[t]he prominent place of Platonic philosophy is not that of a "bridge", it is that of the only serious rival to True Philosophy (i.e. Christianity). It is not Platonism itself but *its destruction* that prepared Justin for conversion", "Conversion", 56, my italics.

(1) the interpretation of the Law is cast in the context of a Jewish-Christian debate involving knowledge of issues like circumcision, observation of the Sabbath, fasting, festivals and the use of offerings, which cannot be presupposed of - or be relevant to - a wider Greco-Roman audience;

(2) the authority of the Jewish scriptures is the "exclusive court of appeals", favouring an immediate Jewish-Christian audience,⁸⁸ and

(3) "[a]bove all, Justin's conviction that an eschatological remnant of Jews is still being saved by conversion to Christianity in the Apologist's very days (25.1, 32.2, 55.3, 64.2-3 [to which we have been added 39, 120, 136]) indicates that the *Dialogue* is a writing for Jews".⁸⁹

This is not to deny that the "specific focus" of the work might be a missionary one in a context where Gentile Christians and Jewish Christians were discussing the value of the Law. "Proselytic encounters" like those of 8.2-4⁹⁰ and 47.1-4⁹¹ demonstrate Justin's openness to the possibility of

⁸⁸ Even though *1 Apo!* has a lengthy section involving the proofs from scripture, they are peppered with references which attempted to establish common ground with the pagans. Justin asked the readers to consult the "acts of Pontius Pilate" (35.9, 48.3), or a census taken by Quirinus (34.2) to verify certain facts of the life of Jesus. Other prophecies appeal to the Romans as the conquerors of Judaea (32, 47). All such references are absent from the *Dialogue* and Justin mentions the conquering of Judaea *without* referring to the Romans (52, 108). These differences strengthen the case for the rejection of a pagan audience for the *Dialogue*.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 39-42.

⁹⁰ "Thus, if you have any regard for your soul, and if you believe in God, you may have the chance, since I know you are no stranger to the matter, of attaining a knowledge of the Christ of God, and, having become perfect [converting], of enjoying a happy life".

⁹¹ Here Justin gave his opinion that Jewish converts who desired to keep the Law would be saved as long as they did not convince others to do the same.

Jews converting - a trait distinguishing Justin from other *adversos Judaeos* writers.

Cosgrove has more recently enumerated differences between the *Dialogue* and the apologies which mitigate against a pagan audience for the former. Explanations of such practices as the Eucharist given in *1 Apol* 66 are absent from *Dial* 41.⁹² Lengthy arguments regarding the demonic imitation of Mosaic truths (*1 Apol* 54-60) are merely acknowledged in a way which suggests they were already accepted by the reader.⁹³ Arguments which attempted to establish a common ground between pagans and Christians in the apologies, such as the Logos theory, are absent from the *Dialogue*.⁹⁴ The resurrection, in need of cautious defence in *1 Apol* 18-9, is ignored in the *Dialogue* in favour of predictions of Christ's resurrection.⁹⁵ Pagan accusations against

Christianity which are handled at length in the apologies are mentioned only

⁹² Cosgrove, "Justin Martyr", 216.

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ This may not be wholly the case. In 39 Justin wrote that the Christians who "have been well instructed in His whole truth, honor Them [God and His Christ] with our actions, our knowledge, and our hearts, even unto death." Falls felt that this reference was to the distinction between "orthodox Christians and heretics, or between Christians and Jews", *Justin Martyr*, ch. 39, n. 4. However, it was more likely an allusion to the spiritual warfare that was centred on Christ and those who received his full truth. In the apologies, this warfare centred around Christ was presented by means of the Logos theory (*1 Apol* 44, 46; *2 Apol* 8, 10, 13). Here the same notion is presented, though without reference to the Logos theory. For to confess Christ was to risk "the harsh persecution of the officials, who, influenced by the serpent (that evil and treacherous spirit) will not cease to persecute and slaughter those who acknowledge the name of Christ until He shall come again to destroy them all and to distribute rewards according to merit". All references to demons persecuting those who lived according to reason are replaced by Satan's battle against Christ.

⁹⁵ Cosgrove, "Justin Martyr", 217.

briefly in the *Dialogue*.⁹⁶

Yet Cosgrove rejects the Jewish-Christian audience posited by Stylianopolous⁹⁷ and argues for an exclusively Christian readership based on the awkwardness of the liturgical addresses like 29.1 for a Jewish audience and the instances of harsh words against the Jews.⁹⁸ The Christian need for self-definition over against Judaism that was in terms of the Jewish scriptures (due to the Marcionite threat) were what accounted for the Jewishness of the subject matter. "[T]he *Dialogue* with the outsider may represent no more than internal monologue".⁹⁹

3.4.2 The Contribution of Demonology

We have seen how opinions regarding the audience of the *Dialogue* have moved from a Jewish audience, to twentieth century readings of the work as written for Christians and pagans or pagans alone, and finally to ideas of the *Dialogue* as a work strictly internal to the Christian community which answered the urgent need for self-definition. What follows will be an examination of the contribution our study of Justin's demonology makes to this question.

Young has argued that only in the *Dialogue* was Justin free to reveal his

⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁷ Osborn also posited a primarily Jewish audience, though the debate had something to say to philosophers, heretics and pagans in general "who were always interested in sacred books", *Justin Martyr*, 199.

⁹⁸ 14.2; 134.1; and 30.2. 218.

⁹⁹ Cosgrove, "Justin Martyr", 219.

true opinion regarding philosophy. While in the apologies he used the Logos theory to establish common ground with the pagans, in the safety of a text written for Christians and Jews, he could in the prologue proclaim the worthlessness of philosophy.¹⁰⁰

It could be similarly argued that Justin only felt it safe to speak of Satan to the pagans under the pretext of a conversation with a Jew. If this were the case, one would expect to find explanations (similar to those of *1 Apol* 5 and *2 Apol* 5) of how Satan fits into the story of the fall of the angels who mate with women to beget the demons. However, this is improbable because there is no such idea in the *Dialogue*! The lustful fall of the angels is replaced by the disobedient, rebellious fall of Satan and some angels and makes no mention of the origins of the demons.

Perhaps, it could be argued, Justin - in a calmer period after the persecutions which sparked writing of *2 Apol* - was retreating back to his position in *1 Apol*. This might explain the lack of clarity regarding the origins of demons in both the *Dialogue* and *1 Apol*. There are difficulties with this idea also. First, if Justin was returning to the demonology of *1 Apol*, why did he not return to detailing the fundamental character of the demons: their lustful nature? For not only is the lustful fall avoided, all references to the lustful nature or activities of the demons are also lacking. Even Justin's favourite

¹⁰⁰ Merrill Young, *The Argument and Meaning of Justin Martyr's Conversion Story* (Harvard Dissertation, 1971), 194, in Stylianopolous, *Justin Martyr*, 14. On Justin's view of philosophy in the *Dialogue* see Skarsaune, "Conversion".

theme of the demons' penchant for adultery and the seduction of youths was now presented as human immorality, and not caused by the influence of the demons (35).

As it stood, the demons of the *Dialogue* were different in origin (part of Satan's horde) and nature than those of *1 Apol*, ruling out the return of the demonology of the former to that of the latter. Therefore, no plausible explanations have been offered that would demonstrate how the *Dialogue* as written to a pagan audience would correspond with the apologies. The alterations of the demonologies clearly point to a different audience for the *Dialogue*. Indeed, Goodenough's charges of Justin's muddled thinking derive from the assumption of a common pagan audience for the apologies and the *Dialogue*.

Only when the separate audiences are taken into account does Justin's demonology become coherent. Conversely, only if we are willing to argue that Justin was unable to get his thoughts straight (a characteristic he derided among the philosophers¹⁰¹), can we argue that the *Dialogue* was for a Christian audience only. For there is no resolution between the differing aspects of the demonologies. It would be expected that in an internal work Justin would explain the differences between the demonologies of the apologies. That he does not points to the fact that Justin was once again adjusting Christian beliefs to argue on non-Christian (in this case Jewish) grounds, which included

¹⁰¹ *1 Apol* 44; *2 Apol* 10.3, 13.3.

beliefs in Satan, an uneasiness with the fall of the angels myth, and a total rejection of the lustful fall of the angels which produced demons.

Might not this adjustment be made not for the sake of a Jewish audience, but for that of the Christian community itself? In other words, was the lustful fall of the angels and the begetting of demons just a polemical tool, used by Justin against pagans rather than an actual Christian belief, and thus simply ignored when he wrote of true Christian beliefs regarding Satan and the angels' rebellious fall in the *Dialogue*?

This is possible, but ignores the fact that Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Minucius Felix and Lactantius all shared similar beliefs in the demons as offspring of the fallen angels who were behind the pagan cults.¹⁰² A more complete explanation that corresponds to the demonological beliefs of the day, would be that in the *Dialogue* Justin was once again engaging in polemic on grounds other than his own. Like his use of a demonology suited to a Greco-Roman context in the apologies, in the *Dialogue* Justin could highlight those beliefs minimized or ignored altogether in the apologies precisely because they were *too Jewish* and would not have been understood outside the Jewish and Christian world views.

Engaging in apologetic with two cultures that were dissimilar in their beliefs

¹⁰² Tatian, *Address* 18; *Dissetarion* 14; Athenagoras, *Legatio* 24-26; Theophilus *To Autolytus* 1.9, 11.3; Tertullian, *Apology* 23, 35; *On Idolatry* 9; Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* V.1.10; Origen, *Against Celsus* 4.93, 7.3, 8.69; Minucius Felix, *Octavius* 26-7; Lactantius, *Divine Institutes* 2.17, in Ferguson, *Demonology*, 113.

necessitated that Justin would highlight some elements of Christian demonology and minimize or eliminate others. This goes beyond the needs for self-definition to an active engagement with the other cultures. Indeed, as Berger and Luckmann pointed out, this type of nihilation was grounded in the social conflict and sought publicly to engage in apologetics.

This situation is not unrealistic given the amount of interaction between proselytizing Jews, Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians that Justin attested to (46-7). In *Dial* 46-7, it is clear that those who promulgated Jewish observance had persuasive arguments that were convincing some Gentile Christian "apostates" to convert to Judaism.¹⁰³ This threat cut at the very *raison d'être* of the Christian community,¹⁰⁴ and lends credence to the argument for the Jewish audience of the *Dialogue*.

Satan's absence from the apologies to the pagans is easily explained by the fact that they were expected to reach pagan hands. That the lustful fall of the angels, the mating with women to beget demons, and the lustful nature of these demons were eliminated from the *Dialogue* similarly points to an expectation that it would reach Jewish hands. Therefore, Cosgrove's argument that the *Dialogue* was intended for Christians only can be rejected on the

¹⁰³ Wilson cites this as the only unambiguous reference to Gentile Christians who convert (*metabaino*, 47.4) to Judaism in early Christian sources, Stephen G. Wilson, "Gentile Judaizers" *New Testament Studies* 38 (1992), 605-616, 610.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 616.

grounds that its demonology is altered to meet the needs of a Jewish audience.

CONCLUSIONS - THE POWER OF DEMONS: JUSTIN'S APOLOGETIC RECONSIDERED

4.1 Evaluations of the Value of Justin's Apologetic

Scholars have devalued the full scope and intention of Justin's demonology because of a lack of sympathy regarding the demon consciousness of the second century. A liberal Christian outlook, uncomfortable with such "irrational" beliefs co-existing in the same mind that generated the Spermatic Logos theory, has coloured the treatment of Justin until recently.¹ Indeed, Bultmannian scholarship has performed incredible contortions to existentialize early Christian demonology and eschatology.²

Focus on the value of Justin's apologetic has instead remained upon the Spermatic Logos theory. Goodenough was of the opinion that Justin's apologetic "added little to the strength of apologetic arguments".³ Justin was the first to present the pagan myths as demonically inspired (though Goodenough cautions that he could have taken this from Dionysius of Halicarnassus⁴). He also initiated the argument that all truth and reason is Christian. "Christ is the Right in the ethical realm, the principle of truth in the metaphysical realm".⁵ Goodenough felt that his greatest contribution to

¹ Skarsaune article "Conversion" being a notable exception.

² See Ling's *The Significance of Satan* and Langton's *Essentials of Demonology* for examples of various theories of accommodation.

³ Goodenough, *Theology*, 105.

⁴ Ibid., 109.

⁵ Ibid., 120.

apologetic was the idea that revelation completes reason. At this point the Christian apologetic goes on the offensive: "It is not toleration but recognition he demands, and it is to instill conviction of the moral and metaphysical truth of Christianity that he is really striving".⁶

Chadwick presents Justin as a popular apologist in the sense that he is trying to eliminate prejudices preventing the fair evaluation of Christian beliefs, and trying then to present them as clearly as possible with an eye to moral responsibility.⁷ His main proofs are from prophecy, from the success of the Christian mission⁸ and from miracles and exorcisms.⁹ He characterized Justin's innovations as the argument for free will and responsibility in an atmosphere which denied human responsibility for sin, and the notions of resurrection and judgement which together were a "frontal attack" on pagan religiosity and "a violent and even irreligious overthrow of ancestral traditions".¹⁰ Justin's greatest contribution was his "theology of history" which was attractive in its completeness and comprehensiveness.

⁶ Goodenough, *ibid.*

⁷ Henry Chadwick, "Justin Martyr's Defence of Christianity" *Bulletin of the Rylands Library* 47 (1965), 275-297, 293.

⁸ 1 *Apol* 39, 53; *Dial* 53, 83, 91, 117, 121 in Chadwick, "Defence", 281.

⁹ 2 *Apol* 6; *Dial* 30, 69, 76, 85, 111, and 121, *ibid.*, 281.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 284-85.

Barnard agreed, claiming that Justin's interpretation of the logos as the culmination of human history was his apologetic victory.¹¹ Osborn felt that Justin's strength was that he argued from common notions (the notion of reason) and common teachers (Plato) to demonstrate one belief: that Jesus is the Logos incarnate.¹²

There is no doubt that all of these evaluations are to some extent true. However, they remain incomplete without the consideration of demonology. For revelation did not only complete pagan reason, it destroyed the demonic falsehood of the pagan cults. *This* is what was truly offensive to pagan sensibilities, and not the specific content of Christian beliefs or morality. Similarly, we have seen how prophecy, miracles and exorcisms, free will, judgement, resurrection and all of history are summed up in Justin's vision of spiritual warfare. And while Justin used common notions like reason and common figures like Socrates, the most prominent common denominator of his apologetic is the use of the notions of demons.

4.2 Justin's Contribution to Apologetic Reconsidered

Justin used common notions of demons for a good reason which has yet to be fully integrated into studies of the value of his apologetic: by far, most of those who converted to Christianity were what MacMullen called "ancients

¹¹ Barnard, *Life and Thought*, 169.

¹² Osborn, *Justin Martyr*, 14.

without PhD's".¹³ It was to them that Justin wrote concerning the demons. While Justin's use of philosophy no doubt showed that Christians were not entirely ill-disposed towards all things outside their group, it had appeal to a much smaller audience than did his demonology.

The Logos theory is not the main apologetic thrust of all his works , notably the *Dialogue*.¹⁴ In this work all argument is in terms of the Jewish Scriptures. However, even though the context of the debate has changed, demonology remains integral. This should not be surprising, for, given the demon consciousness of Christianity and its rivals, "for many early Christians more important than the promise of forgiveness of sins was the promise of deliverance from demons".¹⁵

Once this need for the deliverance from demons is recognized, the connection between Justin's demonology and the Logos theory become clear. The Logos theory functioned as a hermeneutical principle, giving Christians guidelines for determining what was of value in pagan culture. All that was rejected was then ascribed to the demons.¹⁶

¹³ Ramsay MacMullen, "Conversion: A Historian's View" *Second Century* 5/2 (1985/86), 67-81, 75. In this article MacMullen comments on the biases of scholars studying early Christianity, who tend to disregard more popular notions in favour of intellectual ones. Such, I believe, is the case with the evaluations of Justin's thought with regards to his demonology.

¹⁴ Cosgrove, "Justin Martyr", 216.

¹⁵ Ferguson, *Demonology*, 127.

¹⁶ Remus, "Justin Martyr's", 148. Thus, we can reject Osborn's contention that the Logos theory and the demonization of the gods are incompatible. "Either God has given the seeds of truth or the Greeks have stolen them. Both accounts cannot be true", Osborn, *Justin Martyr*, 200.

The Logos theory alone also failed to account for persecution. It served as a tool to judge the value of pagan thought and culture, but what Christians needed besides this were ways of dealing with competing world views and practices, heresies and persecutions.

That Justin's demonological apologetic was persuasive is seen in Celsus, who wrote a generation after Justin and probably was aware of his writings. He simply reversed Justin's arguments; claiming that it was the Christians and not the Greeks who had been deceived and enslaved by *daemones*. Thus, Justin had succeeded in shifting the terms of the religious debate such that a Greek intellectual of the Middle Platonic was now arguing on his terms:

Unlike many of his predecessors, Celsus agrees that the daemonic realm can be a source of confusion and deception for the soul. Aware of the attacks of Christian apologetic upon Greek culture, Celsus replies in kind.¹⁷

Justin's apologetic efforts were not politically successful and there are hints that he did not entertain the hope that they would be.¹⁸ The increased persecutions of 177 C.E. under Marcus Aurelius which sparked the efforts of

Melito, Athenagoras and Theophilus demonstrate the continued hostility to the

¹⁷ Hauck, *More Divine Proof*, 140.

¹⁸ See 2 *Apol* 2, where Justin openly admits the possibility of his meeting with a violent death.

Christians.¹⁹

The true success of Justin's apologetic lay in its example to Christians of how to transform the state of religious debate from within; using pagan materials to confront pagans with the radical Christian demand for a choice to be made for or against Jesus.²⁰ This tactic met Christian needs for self-definition, helping Christians define who they were in the face of numerous other religious groups, some of whose practices were uncomfortably similar to theirs. Demonology also allowed for the proper diagnosis of the problems of Judaizing, heresy and, above all, persecution.²¹

Looking at the demonological apologetic of Justin it is not hard to see why the hostility which fuelled persecution remained. For when the Christian communities began to turn their gaze towards Imperial society and evaluate its merits, it was not in a passive manner which sought tolerance and understanding. Justin's occasional pleas for such tolerance were overshadowed by the torrent of hostile judgements of pagan culture.

As we have seen, Justin revealed not just a new religion, but a new understanding of religion. True Philosophy, i.e. True Religion, was the

¹⁹ On this note see Robert M. Grant, "Five Apologists and Marcus Aurelius" *Vigiliae Christianae* 42 (1988), 1-17.

²⁰ On this ability of "prophetic" religions [notably Christianity] to use familiar beliefs to construct their own cosmology see Dawson, *Progress and Religion*, 57: "We do not regard the dependence of the artist on his material as a sign of weakness and lack of skill. On the contrary, the greater the artist, the more fully does he enter into his material, and the more completely does his work conform itself to the qualities of the medium in which it is embodied". This seems an apt thought for Justin's use of demonological notions.

²¹ Carlos A. Contreras, "Christian Views of Paganism" *ANRW* II.16.2, 974-1021.

denunciation of all other religions. It was this Christian intolerance, so foreign to Greco-Roman religiousness, which ensured even fiercer persecution in the years ahead. This persecution, painful as it was, only served to reinforce and justify the Christian world view. Some argue that, in this way, demonology became necessary for Christians: "If Satan had not already existed, the church would have had to invent him".²² Satan and the demons had become the means of conversion.

[T]he Christian church offered an explanation of misfortune that both embraced all the phenomena previously ascribed to sorcery, and armed the individual with weapons of satisfying precision and efficacy against its supra-human agents".²³

To close in terms of the epigraph, Justin's demonological apologetic filled a very large gap in the fabric of the second century Christian thought, and, because of the common demon consciousness of the time, was persuasive to non-Christians to an extent which has yet to be recognized.

²² Forsyth, *Old Enemy*, 317.

²³ Brown, "Sorcery", 28.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Justin Martyr. *Justin Martyr*. Andre Wartelle (trans.) (Paris: Etudes Augustiniennes, 1987). (Greek text)

Justin Martyr. Writings of Justin Martyr Thomas B. Falls (trans.) (New York: Christian Heritage, Inc., 1948). (English translation)

Secondary Sources

Barnard, L.W. *Justin Martyr: His Life and Thought* (Cambridge: University Press, 1967).

Benko, Stephen. *Pagan Rome and the Early Christians* (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1984).

Boomershine, Thomas E. "Epistemology at the Turn of the Ages in Paul, Jesus and Mark: Rhetoric and Dialectic" *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn*. Marcus Joel and Marion L. Soards (eds.) (Worcester, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 17-48.

Brenk, Frederick E. "In the Light of the Moon: Demonology in the Early Imperial Period", *ANRW* 16.3 (1986), 2068-2145.

Brown, Peter. "Sorcery, Demons, and the Rise of Christianity from Late Antiquity into the Middle Ages" *Witchcraft, Confessions and Accusations* ed. Mary Douglas (London: Tavistock, 1970), 17-43.

----- . *The Making of Late Antiquity* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1978).

Berger, Peter and Luckmann, Thomas. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise on the Sociology of Knowledge* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1966).

Chadwick, Henry. "Justin Martyr's Defence of Christianity" *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 47 (1965), 275-297.

----- . *The Early Church* (London: Penguin Books, Ltd., 1967).

- Charles, R.H. *The Book of Jubilees* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1902).
- Conreras, Carlos A. "Christian Views of Paganism" *ANRW* II.16.2, 974-1021.
- Conybeare, F.C. "The Demonology of the New Testament" *Jewish Quarterly Review* 8 (1895-6), 597-99.
- Cosgrove, Charles, H. "Justin Martyr and the Emerging Christian Canon: observations on the purpose and destination of *The Dialogue with Trypho*" *Vigiliae Christianae* 36 (1983), 209-232.
- "Daimon, Daimonion". *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*.
- Danielou, J. *Philon d'Alexandrie, Coll. Les temps et les destins* (Paris: 1957), 163-168.
- Dawson, Christopher. *Progress and Religio. : An Historical Enquiry* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1931).
- Ferguson, Everett. *Demonology of the Early Christian World* (New York and Toronto: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1984).
- *Backgrounds of Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans's Publishing Company, 1987).
- Forsyth, Neil. *The Old Enemy: Satan and the Combat Myth* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987).
- Fox, Robin Lane. *Pagans and Christians* (London: Penguin Books, 1988).
- Geertz, Clifford. "Religion as a Cultural System" in Michael Banton, ed., *Anthropological Approaches to the Study of Religion* (London: Tavistock, 1965), 89-119.
- Gill, David. "A Liturgical Fragment in Justin" *Harvard Theological Review* 59 (1966), 98-100.
- Glasson, Thomas Francis. *Greek Influences in Jewish Eschatology with Special Reference to the Apocalypses and Pseudapigrapha* (London: 1971).
- Gokey, F.X. *The Terminology for the Devil and Evil Spirits in the Apostolic Fathers* (Washington: Catholic University Press, 1961).

- Goodenough, Erwin R. *The Theology of Justin Martyr* (Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1968, 1st ed. Jena: Frommanische Buchhandlung, 1923).
- Grant, R.M. *Greek Apologists of the Second Century* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1988).
- "A Woman of Rome: Justin Apol 2, 2." *Church History* 54 (1985), 461-72.
- "Five Apologists and Marcus Aurelius" *Vigiliae Christianae* 42 (1988), 1-17.
- Gualtieri, Antonio. "Religious Cosmologies as Justifications of Moralities" *Studies in Religion* 22/1 (1993), 22-35.
- Grabbe, Lester L. "The Social Setting of Early Jewish Apocalypticism", *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 4 (1989), 27-47.
- Hanson, Paul. *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975).
- Hauck, Robert J. *The More Divine Proof: Prophecy and Inspiration in Celsus and Origen* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989).
- Isaac, E. "1 Enoch: Introduction" *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* vol. 1, (ed.) James H. Charlesworth (Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1983), 5-12.
- James, Stewart. "On a Neglected Emphasis in New Testament Theology" *Scottish Journal of Theology* 4 (1951), 289-307.
- Johnson, Luke T. "The New Testament: Anti-Jewish Slander and the Convention of Ancient Polemic" *JBL* 108/3 (1989) 419-441.
- de Jonge, Marinus. "The pre-Mosaic Servants of God in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* and in the writings of Justin and Irenaeus" *Vigiliae Christianae* 39 (1985), 157-70.
- Keresztes, Paul. "The Literary Genre of Justin's *First Apology*" *Vigiliae Christianae* 19 (1965), 99-110.
- Kuhn, Harold B. "The Angelology of the Non-Canonical Jewish Apocalypses" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 67 (1948), 217-232.
- Lane Fox, Robin. *Pagans and Christians* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1987).

- Langton, Edward. *Essentials of Demonology: A Study of Jewish and Christian Doctrine, Its Origin and Development* (London: Epworth Press, 1949).
- Ling, Trevor O. *The Significance of Satan: New Testament Demonology and its Contemporary Relevance* (London: SPCK, 1961).
- MacMullen, Ramsay. "What Difference Did Christianity Make?" *Historia* 35/3 (1986), 322-343.
- *Christianizing the Roman Empire* (London: Yale University Press, 1984).
- "Two Types of Conversion to Early Christianity" *Vigiliae Christianae* 37 (1983), 174-192.
- Meeks, Wayne. *The First Urban Christians* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1983).
- Morton, Kelsey. *Encounter with God* (Minneapolis, 1972).
- Osborn, Eric Francis. *Justin Martyr* (Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1973).
- Pagels, Elaine. "The Social History of Satan, The "Intimate Enemy": A Preliminary Sketch" *Harvard Theological Review* 84/2 (1991), 105-128.
- "The Social History of Satan, part 2: The Human Face(s) of Satan in the Gospels" *SBL Seminar Papers* 1992, 32-45.
- "Christian apologists and "the fall of the angels": an attack on Roman Imperial power?" *Harvard Theological Review* 3-4: 301-325.
- Polzin, Robert. *Moses and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomical History* (New York: The Seabury Press, 1980).
- Remus, Harold. *Pagan-Christian Conflict Over Miracle in the Second Century* (Cambridge, MA: The Patristic Foundation, 1983).
- "Justin Martyr's Arguments with Judaism", in S.G. Wilson (ed.) *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity vol. 2: Separation and Polemic* (Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1986), 59-80.
- Russell, David S. *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic 200 B.C. -A.D. 100* (Philadelphia: 1964).

Russell, Jeffrey Burton. *The Devil: Perceptions of Evil from Antiquity to Primitive Christianity* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977).

----- *Satan: The Early Christian Tradition* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981).

de St. Croix, G.E.M. "Why Were the Early Christians Persecuted?" M.I. Finley (ed.) *Studies in Ancient Society* (London: 1974).

Sandmel, Samuel. *Philo of Alexandria: An Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979).

Schoedel, William R. *Ignatius of Antioch* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985).

Skarsaune, Oskar. *The Proof from Prophecy. A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof Text Tradition: Text Type, Provenance, Theological Profile* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1987).

----- "The Conversion of Justin Martyr" *Studia Theologica* 36 (1976), 53-73.

Sturm, Richard. "Defining the Word *Apocalyptic*: A Problem in Biblical Criticism", *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn*. Joel Marcus and Marion L. Soards (eds.) (Worcester, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 17-48.

Stylianopolous, Theodore. *Justin Martyr and the Mosaic Law*, Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, no. 20 (Missoula, Montana: Society of Biblical Literature and Scholars Press, 1975).

Smith, J.Z. "Towards Interpreting Demonic Powers in Hellenistic and Roman Antiquity" *Aufstieg und Niedertang der Romanischen Welt* ed. H. Temporini and W. Haase vol. 16.2 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1978), 425-439.

Sumney, Jerry L. *Identifying Paul's Opponents: The Question of Method in 2 Corinthians* (Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the New Testament Press, 1990).

Trakatellis, Demetrius. "Justin Martyr's Trypho" *Harvard Theological Review* 79: 287-97.

Vielhauer, Philipp. "Introduction to Apocalypses and Related Subjects", *New Testament Apocrypha II*, Wilson, R. McL. (ed.) (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965), 581-607.

Walsh, J.J. "On Christian Atheism" *Vigiliae Christianae* 45 (1991), 255-77.

Wilken, Robert L. *The Christians as the Romans saw Them* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1984).

Williams, Ritva. *Not of the Father's Planting: Ignatius of Antioch and His Opponents* (MA Thesis, Carleton University, 1993).

Wilson, Stephen G. "Marcion and the Jews" in Stephen G. Wilson (ed.) *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity vol.2: Separation and Polemic* (Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1986), 45-58.

----- "Passover, Easter, and Anti-Judaism: Melito of Sardis and Others" in *To See Ourselves as Others See Us* (Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1985), 337-355.

----- "Gentile Judaizers" *New Testament Studies* 38 (1992), 605-616.

Wintermute, O.S. "Jubilees: Introduction" *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* vol. 2, (ed.) James H. Charlesworth (Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1985), 35-50.

Yourcenar, Marguerite. *Memoirs of Hadrian*, trans. Grace Frick (New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 1951).

END

1 9-07-94

FIN