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INTRODUCTION

In the first centuries following the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ, Christianity began to emerge throughout the Roman Empire. The men and women who converted to Christianity began with their experiences and then interpreted and articulated their experiences through their rituals, their understanding of the emerging scriptures, and their culture. These pioneering Christians and early Christian theologians struggled to define their own religious experiences within their own time. Justin Martyr, an early Church father is an example of one of these courageous and brilliant early Christian scholars. His Christological work helped to promote the dominating Logos Christology that has served to act as the metaphysical concept for the Christ experience.

Christianity did not emerge as the dominant religion of the Roman Empire right away. In fact, the church was persecuted for the early centuries of its development following the death of Jesus. With this persecution came the need for an articulation of the Christian faith, not only in order to explain and defend the faith to adversaries, but to also build a cohesive, common doctrine amongst Christians throughout the empire. Christianity is a religion based on historical experience of the Christ event. Therefore, the early followers of Christianity had to continually pass along the Christ story in order to keep the faith growing and authentically emerging throughout the empire. This meant that the church needed philosophically trained thinkers, ready to articulate the church, its formation and its theology. From this need came the Apologists, an umbrella term for the theologians of the time who worked hard to defend and explain the Christian faith to the skeptics. Their work, however, not only helped to preserve the church from external
persecution, but also from internal misunderstandings of the faith. The apologists, through their devotion and commitment to the church and its development, were able to articulate the Christ experience and thus gave a specific language to the Christian community, allowing for unity and understanding between the growing groups of Christians.¹

Christology is the discipline within theology that investigates the narrative of Christ, the person of Jesus Christ, and attempts to articulate the experience of Christ in history and in the present. The Logos Christology was one of the earliest philosophical understandings that was used by the early fathers to explain the experience of Jesus Christ as both human and divine; specifically how God became a human being. The Logos term was not new to the Christian community. It was a common Greek philosophical idea explaining the reason and rationality throughout the world. In the Jewish world, it meant the word, or spirit of God, acting in the world. It is present in both Pauline theology as well as John’s Gospel as a scriptural expression. The Christian fathers understood this term to fit their experience of Christ. Christ was the reason, rationality, word and spirit of God made flesh and manifested in the human being of Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus Christ is the Logos who through the incarnation became human.

The present worldview has shifted from the classical, Platonic philosophical view to a more modern and postmodern conceptualization of our world. The Logos concept, because of its culturally conditioned theological focus, may no longer work as our only concept to articulate how God became human in the person of Jesus Christ of Nazareth. The current challenge is not new. The philosophical movements since the eighteenth century have challenged the Logos Christology. Since the Enlightenment, historical
consciousness has challenged certain Christian beliefs concerning the life, death, and resurrection of Christ. Because of this new emphasis on the historical and its challenge to Christianity, there has been a movement within Christianity to reevaluate the historical Jesus, repainting the narrative of the human Jesus. The shift thus turned the question from how God became human, as the Logos concept addresses, to how was Jesus Christ God?2 This subtle, yet very different approach to the constant Christological question of Christ’s divinity and humanity inevitably involves new concepts and new language.

The incarnation, since the scientific revolution, has been challenged and we require new language to combat the challenges Christology is facing today. It is not the intention or meaning of the concepts that needs to be changed, it is the language. But in order to confront and change traditional concepts, we must know how they were developed, adopted and how they were understood if we are to stay true to the richness of their meanings.3 We can use the methodologies of the early church fathers to show us how Christianity was built within a certain historical milieu and continually needs to be reexamined and rearticulated in order to maintain its relevancy within the postmodern, more pluralistic world of today. Karl Rahner discusses this in his discussion on Mysterium Ecclesiae. He states,

The document [Mysterium Ecclesiae] establishes first of all transmission of divine revelation is impeded by historical situations. Even dogmatic formulations are conditioned by terms which are dependent on the language and total situation of a particular era of thought. . . . The declaration says explicitly that the Church’s Magisterium can under certain circumstances enunciate dogmatic truths in terms which bear traces of ‘the changeable conceptions of a given epoch.’4

Therefore it is important to explore the works of the early church fathers, not only for their wisdom but for their example as theologians. They allowed their understanding
of their worldview and culture to help give them the language to articulate their Christian experience. As Rahner also notes, we need to interpret the early church and what came out of the early church in order for it to speak and help us today. “We must acknowledge classical Christology and yet see that it is not the only possible one, in the sense that there could be no other orthodox statements of a Christological kind.”

Justin Martyr’s works serve as theological examples of what needs to be engaged and interpreted. Through exploration of his influences and his works, we can come to understand his worldview and how he developed his theological ideas. His development of the Logos Christology can serve as a model for how we can use our own philosophical understanding and language to articulate the Christ event, opening the door to new interpretations and new Christologies that more fully open the person of Christ and the gospel experience to our time. This thesis will explore the world of Justin, the influences on Justin, the works of Justin and will end with an analysis on how Justin’s theological approach can serve as an example today.
Christianity began to emerge as a legitimate minority religion during the second century, attracting the attention of different political, intellectual and religious movements throughout the Roman Empire. Affected by the political, social and cultural world of the second century Roman Empire, Christianity began to adopt terms and ideas in order to articulate more eloquently and cohesively the message of the Christian church. This chapter will explore the philosophical and religious influences the Roman Empire and cultures of the Roman Empire had on the development of the Christian church.

Politically the second century CE marked the golden period of the Roman Empire. Under the rule of the “Five Good Emperors“, the Empire experienced stability, extended boundaries, and secured relative peace compared to earlier times. What specifically underlay the success of these “Five Good Emperors” was the fact that each successor was chosen based on merit, not blood line. Each emperor was able to determine which man was to follow after his death. Thus, political stability ensued throughout the second century not necessarily because of static rulers, but because of a series of legitimate emperors, chosen by skill, who ruled with authority, and whose legitimacy was unchallenged. Although this did not completely remedy the chasm between the senate and the emperorship, it did help to spark some political stability between the two bodies of government. Such stability was a necessary component in Christianity’s growth.

Philosophy and Religion

The second century, because of the political stability, saw a rise in urban life
around the Roman Empire. More roads were being built, allowing more trade and commerce throughout the empire, especially in the port cities. Thus trade expanded to the outermost areas of the Roman Empire. With the growth of urban areas, not only did the trade of materials grow, but the trade of ideas throughout the Empire as well. This time period was remarkable for the increasing amount of philosophical scholarship throughout the Roman Empire. The growth in philosophical schools flourished, especially under the reign of the philosopher king, Marcus Aurelius, a stoic who wrote the famous philosophical work, *Meditations*. It was this growing influence of philosophy that contributed to the development of Christianity during the second century.

The theology and philosophy of Christianity did not develop overnight nor in a cultural vacuum. Christianity grew slowly affecting and affected by the Roman Empire’s philosophical and religious milieu. Although it is dangerous to say that Christianity was simply an amalgamation of the different forms of thought that were dominating the religious and philosophical landscape of Rome, it is important to note the effects the different sects and learning communities had upon the development and certainly the articulation of Christian teaching and theology. By coming into contact with these different elements, Christianity was forced to reject, accept, or adapt different modes of thinking about gods, wisdom, reason, and human beings.

There existed two dominating philosophies in the Roman Empire during the second century: Platonic thought and Stoicism. Platonism began to reemerge around the first century. Reemphasizing the teachings of Plato, this school of philosophy discussed the idea of a transcendent reality that exists in the world of forms. Platonism stresses eternal life and the existence of an eternal creator. One of the most influential Platonists
during the second century was the Jewish philosopher, Philo, who was writing around 70-80CE. His work had an incredible influence on the early church fathers, especially due to his idea of the Tri-Unitarian God. Platonism greatly influenced the development of Christianity because it offered a compatible philosophy to Christianity’s understanding of eternal and transcendent reality. It was a compelling philosophy that helped to incorporate Christianity into the Roman world.8

Stoicism had been developed by Zeno in the mid-3rd century BCE. There are three main parts to stoicism: physics, ethics and logic. The Stoics’ main idea was that the soul and body, while different, could not be understood separate from one another; therefore in this philosophy there is a focus on the reason of the body. Although not cynics, because there is a devotion to logic and other human beings, the Stoics move away from the Platonic and Aristotelian notion of forms and the goodness of the soul.9 The Stoics were very suspicious of emotions, or “passions” understanding emotions and passions to be the enemy of reason.10 This philosophy seemed to permeate the Roman Empire at the time of the rise of Christianity, especially through the Meditations of Marcus Aurelius.

Both Platonism and Stoicism played significant roles in the development of early Christianity. They will be discussed more in depth in a later chapter, but it is important to note that Christianity was in contact with different philosophies and often applied Greek concepts to Christian theology, like Justin did with the idea of the Logos as Christ.

Religion also played an important role in the everyday lives of Roman citizens, especially the less educated peasants. The Roman State religion was reintroduced by Augustus (27BCE-14CE) after the formation of the Roman Empire in order to promote a sense of unity between the different cultural and religious groups of the Roman Empire.
One major example of the importance of state religion took place in 17 BCE with Augustus' Secular Games. The intent of the games was to purify the Roman people, each day sacrificing to different gods. On the final day there was a large sacrifice to Apollo, Augustus' favorite god. As Prudence Jones and Nigel Pennick point out in their work, *A History of Pagan Europe*, "... the ceremonies cleansed and unified the Roman people, then placed them under the protection of three sets of divinities... It was a masterly ceremony, welding what was to become the Empire into a cohesive whole for the next two hundred years, and it was to provide the backbone of the old order during the disintegration of the two centuries after that." Having a Roman pantheon that demanded homage from all citizens helped to promote yet another form of unity. Everyone desired to be Roman, and when in Rome do as the Romans do: pray to their gods. The existence of a major state religion was one of the driving forces behind the persecution and purges of Christian groups. Christians refused to worship the Roman gods and this refusal, in the Roman mind, spit in the face of Roman unity. Thus the persecution of Christianity, at least the emperor's persecutions, were more political rather than theological.

Another consequence of state religion was that the different sects and pagan cults, which had dominated the different regions and cultures of the territories now belonging to the Roman Empire, began to disappear, blending into the religious pantheon of the Roman gods. At the same time, there was a rising sense of opposition to the Roman state religion, and the people began to find it lacking in personal relationship with the gods. Roman gods were not personal gods, but rather, as Frend points out, fitting to the model of a state religion. Therefore many sought after different religions with more of a focus on salvation and eternal life.
The personal relationships people desired with the gods came from their involvement in the mystery religions. These mystery cults mainly reemerged from past religious traditions that had dominated the cultural landscape of the territories of Rome, such as Persia and Egypt.

One of the main cults that dominated the religious sphere in Rome was the cult of Isis. This cult’s roots were in an Egyptian myth that then developed into a more sophisticated religion in Rome, dignifying the idea of a goddess as mother and nurturer. The Cult of Isis was very popular among different groups of women, as Isis was the central goddess from which life sprung. During the second century, the Zoroastrian religion of Mithras emerged in full force. The Cult of Mithras was one of the most popular Mystery cults in the Roman Empire, especially considering its intense secrecy and denial of women into the cult. With the idea of a god of evil and a god of good, the cult of Mithras encompassed the popular ideas of the dualistic nature in the thought process that the Gnostics, especially sects like Manichaeism favored.

At first these different mystery religions were not regarded with favor by the Roman government for similar reasons that Christianity and Judaism were deemed suspicious: they endangered the ability of the state to control a very important part of culture. Also, because Christianity shared a few commonalities with some of the concepts in mystery cults, like the idea of resurrection, Christians had to disassociate themselves from the mystery religions and also had to compete with and differ from the mystery religions. Similar ritual practices, like the ceremonial meals, also posed a challenge. The contact Christianity had with the mystery cults forced the Christian church to decide what and who they were, and what separated them from the popular pagan cults.
Gnosticism was beginning to emerge in the second century. Gnosticism, as a general term, applied to different religious groups that borrowed bits and pieces of different religious and philosophical traditions in order to fit their own religious understanding of the universe. Although there were many different groups, Gnostics did share similar religious views. For example Gnosticism was dualistic: there was a good force and an equally evil force at work in the universe. This evil force was derived from the material world, while the good lay in the spiritual. Focused on the idea of salvation, Gnostic groups understood salvation as the elevation of the spirit from the evil material world. But the Gnostics contended that human beings could not do this on their own, and thus a mediator was required, and this was where Christ fit the Gnostic religious ideas very well. Thus, the Gnostic groups adopted the person of Christ, yet they misrepresented the Christian doctrine, and because of this came into direct conflict with Christianity.15

There are three main problems Christianity had with the Gnostics. First of all, the idea of the material world as the creation of “evil” went completely against the Judeo-Christian idea of the goodness of creation and the creator. Another point of contention was the lack of acknowledgement of the resurrection of the body. The Gnostics thought the body was just a shell, and not only unimportant and unnecessary, but exactly the medium through which we ignore our potential. Thinking of the body as just a shell led to a Christological problem Christianity had to defend. The Gnostics did not believe in the complete incarnation of Christ, a core doctrine of Christianity. Instead it was only Christ’s body, not Christ himself, who was crucified and so the death and suffering were not possible. This went completely against the Christian doctrine, and yet the Gnostics were claiming it to be Christian doctrine.16
It would be an oversight to deny the importance Judaism continued to have upon Christianity during the second century. The Jews for the most part lived in relative peace within the Roman Empire, due in large part to their willingness to be a separate group, not outwardly proselytizing. Judaism did, however, find itself in conflict with Christianity. Despite this conflict Christianity still was very much affected by the roots that it shared with Judaism. During the second century, the Old Testament, or the Jewish scriptures, were challenged in light of Christian teachings and the question was asked if Christianity required the Old Testament in order to understand the teachings of Christ.

The Church Fathers, Justin included, deeply rooted in the Jewish context, valued the content of the Old Testament because of its parallels to the Christ story in the New Testament. It was necessary in order to give meaning to the New Testament. Jesus could not be understood outside of his experience as a Jew in a Jewish culture; therefore, there was recognition of the need for the Old Testament. This caused major conflict for the Jewish population as their sacred scriptures were being manipulated, it seemed to them, in order to fit this new blasphemous religion. Christianity reduced the importance of the law, especially circumcision, and law is central in Judaism. There was also the argument that Judaism and Christianity were competing for Gentile converts and their hostility towards one another stemmed from this competition. It is important to recognize that although the Christians and Jews did not get along, the Christian church was deeply affected by the Jewish tradition and heritage. Different philosophical ideas within Judaism also affected Christianity, and those, such as the work of Philo of Alexandria will be addressed later on.

Thus, the philosophical and religious milieu Christianity found itself in and the
challenges that Christianity had to respond to forced church fathers to articulate and defend the faith. Known as the Apologists, these different writers helped to solidify Christianity’s role as a legitimate religion in the Roman Empire.

The Need for Christian Apologetics

The second century proved to be a challenging time for the early Christian church. Persecuted and challenged not only by the Jewish communities, the church experienced lack of toleration from the popular sphere of the Roman world, and also had to deal with misrepresentations of the Christian faith from different Gnostic sects. It was during this tumultuous time that early Christian theologians began to explain and defend the faith. These Apologists, or defenders, played a very important part in the development of the Church. Not only did the Apologists defend the faith against the unbelievers, they managed to open the doors to the philosophical and theological exploration and explanation of the beliefs of the Christian church. They helped solidify certain doctrine and understandings of the Gospels for the Christian community itself.

During the reign of the “Five Good Emperors,” there was no specific law against Christianity. However, popular sentiment was quite clearly against the church. Because of their refusal to submit to the laws of the emperor and worship of the Roman gods, the Christians were feared and labeled as heretics and the cause of any natural catastrophes. Thus during this time many church leaders were executed by the Roman government. Under the reign of the Philosopher king, Marcus Aurelius, Christians were persecuted and executed at alarming rates. Both Bishop Polycarp in Smyrna and Justin Martyr in Rome were executed in 165CE. The time of prosperity and stability for Rome was a state
of turmoil for the Christian minority in the Empire.

In response to the evident misunderstandings and apparent lack of toleration for the Christian faith, many different church leaders and fathers began to write and articulate the theology and philosophy of Christianity within the context of the Roman and Greek world. Although their works may not have made any impact upon the leadership of the Roman Empire, they did help to stabilize and solidify the church and the people of the church during a time of chaos. Some Apologists, like Justin and Irenaeus, utilized their understandings of neo-Platonism in order to illustrate not only Christianity’s compatibility with Greek thought, but also the completeness of the philosophy found within Jesus Christ. The apologists also combatted the accusations of being a cult religion that sprung from misconceptions of the similarities with mystery cults by reaffirming Christianity’s parent religion of Judaism, using the Old Testament allegorically to create parallels with the New Testament. The Apologists also began to write down the sacramental practices in order to explain and create unity within the church’s understanding of the different sacraments, especially baptism. The articulation of the sacraments also illustrated that the sacramental practices were not seditious or immoral.

The second century was a time of turmoil for the Christian church, and yet it is arguable that without the writings coming out of this period, Christianity may not have subsequently developed as it did. The persecutions and misunderstandings of the second century forced the apologists to explain the faith: not just to their adversaries, but to the Christian community as a whole. This contributed to a more unified, though certainly not uniform, understanding of the teachings of Christ and the role the church was to play in the lives of the Christian community.
CHAPTER TWO
JUSTIN MARTYR: LIFE, PHILOSOPHICAL INFLUENCES, AND WORKS

The importance of the early Apologists and their effect on the development of the church is phenomenal. The Apologists helped, whether intentionally or not, to guide and direct future theologians through terminology, doctrine, and faith. Justin Martyr was one of the first to use Greek philosophy to explain Christianity.21 Using Platonic thought and his understanding of the Christian truth, Justin addressed not only the pagan culture persecuting the Christians, but also used his knowledge of the scriptures and philosophy to present an argument and discussion addressing the Jewish tradition.

Justin: His Life

Most of the information available about Justin comes to us through the three reliable works attributed to him: his first two apologies, and most importantly the semi-autobiographical Dialogue With Trypho. Other information about Justin comes from the famous Christian historian of the third century, Eusebius. Therefore, what is known about Justin is limited, although not impossible to decipher. His birth date is unknown, but it could be estimated around the year 100-110 CE.22 He was born near the biblical Shechem known as Flavius Neapolis in Palestine to a wealthy middle-class family.23 This is evident because his apparent education indicates wealth, yet perhaps not status. Although born near Palestine, Justin was not Jewish, nor is it evident that he knew much about Jewish thought in his early life. He was steeped in the philosophical milieu of the time early on in his life, and this contributed to his later vocation as a defender of the Christian
church against the pagan philosophies. In fact it was Justin’s ability to converse and articulate Christian ideas in philosophical terms that helped to begin the construction of bridges between the Christian faith and the philosophies of the time.

Justin was a philosopher. He was forever searching for the truth that he knew existed and that he wished to understand. He had an eclectic philosophical background in that he tried many different schools as a young man. Justin studied with a group of Stoics, Peripatetics, the Pythagoreans and the Platonists. Finding them unsatisfactory, Justin continued to search for a philosophy that fit what he was looking for. He found that “true” philosophy in Christianity and, according to sources, continued to wear the clothing of a philosopher even after his conversion to Christianity. Yet it is important to note that during his conversion Justin was studying with the Platonists and had found Platonic thought stimulating and resonating. This accounts for how Justin understood and explained Christian philosophy later on in his Apologies and the Dialogue With Trypho.

Justin’s conversion was recorded in his work, The Dialogue of Trypho. Justin meets the Jewish man Trypho and they have a conversation regarding the Old Testament, Judaism, Christianity and philosophy. He describes to Trypho what occurred during his conversion. He met a man by the sea who challenged his search for philosophical truth and presented the philosophy of Christianity. Justin writes, “…my spirit was immediately set on fire, and an affection for the prophets, and for those who are friends of Christ, took hold of me; while pondering on his words, I discovered that his was the only sure and useful philosophy.” Whether or not these events truly took place is debatable, but it is undeniable that Justin did convert fully to Christianity. He was baptized at Ephesus around 130CE and spent the rest of his life dedicated to defending and elucidating the
Christian religion, developing theology until he was executed in 165CE under the reign of Marcus Aurelius.\textsuperscript{28}

Three works exist that scholars agree can be attributed to Justin. There are two apologies, appropriately entitled the First and Second Apologies, and the prolific \textit{Dialogue With Trypho}. The Apologies were clearly intended to present and explain the religion of Christianity, defending it from the slander it received from the pagan society and empire. \textit{The Dialogue With Trypho}, on the other hand, addresses the Jewish tradition, explaining Christianity in light of Judaism. However, despite these two different approaches, Justin continually explains Christianity in light of his philosophic understanding and background. Therefore, in order to understand Justin’s theology and philosophy, it is essential to have a concept of Platonic and Middle Platonic thought.

\textbf{Greek Influences On Justin’s Thought}

One of the main features of the work of Justin Martyr is how comfortably he writes and speaks about the obvious fluidity between theology and philosophy. For Justin, Christianity is the one true philosophy and thus can be articulated through philosophical language and understanding. Because Middle Platonism dominated the philosophical scene at the time and Justin was well versed and educated in Platonic thought, it makes sense that the philosophy had a profound effect upon how Justin described and presented Christianity to the pagan community. Middle Platonism was, as noted by Barnard, an amalgamation of different schools on the works and thoughts of Plato.\textsuperscript{29} This eclectic formula is evident in the presentation of Justin in his younger days as a philosopher. As he jumped from philosophy to philosophy, Justin criticized one
against the other, trying to come to a way to the Truth.

Platonic philosophy played a key role in the Hellenistic world view. It also offered much to Christianity and its formation during this tumultuous era. Gonzales, in his overview of early Christian thought mentions four major themes from Platonic thought that influenced Christianity. These themes include Plato’s world view as a two world structure, his idea of the immortality of the soul, his view of knowledge and the imperfection of human senses, and finally, his philosophy concerning creation.30

The two-world structure of Plato gave early Christian scholars a link to philosophy by using this idea to explain their ideas of heaven and earth. The separation between the transcendent and the created world that Plato speaks of offered this language for early Christian scholars. The idea of the two worlds is that the material world is not necessarily all there is, but that the ultimate reality is in the other world, or to the Christians, with God. The Platonists thought that the body was negative and limiting to the soul’s spiritual potential. But unlike the Platonists, Christians did not see the body as a negative entity.31

Christians also used Plato’s idea of the immortality of the soul to prove that their belief in an afterlife was not to be scoffed at. However, the Platonic doctrine concerning the immortality of the soul also included a belief in the pre-existence of the soul, which later went against Christian teachings. During this time, however, the Christian belief concerning the soul was ambiguous and many Christian thinkers used this Platonic concept to parallel their belief of an afterlife with Plato’s assertion of the soul’s immortality.32

Following with Plato’s constant theme of the imperfection of the body and the
perfection of the soul, his idea of knowledge proposes that the human senses are not adequate to assess true reality. This also appealed to Christian thinkers as the idea of distrusting the senses could offer an explanation for sin and corruption within the human person.33

Plato also offered a creation account that at least paralleled and did not contradict the creation account in Genesis. Plato presents the idea of one Being creating and forming the material world. More importantly, unlike the Gnostic notion of creation being formed from evil, Plato held that creation came from an Idea of Good, which of course supported the Christian notion of God as a good God.34

These four major themes within Platonic thought were the main themes that early Christian scholars used to draw parallels between their own doctrine and the popular philosophy that dominated the Hellenistic world. We can see how they developed in the works attributed to Justin Martyr. Von Campenhausen, in his assessment of Justin Martyr writes, “…he [Justin] simplified the Platonic philosophy to suit the requirements for the new theology: the main--dualistically tinged--ideas of Platonism which were important for Justin were the pure truth of Being…God who is one, beyond the created world, and one with the Good and Beautiful.”35 We see this connection between Justin’s Christianity and Greek Philosophy in his First Apology. The First Apology, written to the Emperor in the mid-second century, was an effort to explain Christianity to curb the persecutions against the church. In the Chapter 46 of the apology Justin argues that philosophers before Christ who lived reasonably were Christians, because Christ was the Word, or Reason, and thus living reasonably meant living in Christ. Plato would have been among these philosophers.36
Justin also talks about the idea of Christ as Word in his most major work, *The Dialogue with Trypho*. In this work, Justin is discussing Christianity with a Jew, Trypho. Justin uses Plato’s dialogue format in order to prove his points regarding the Christian life and the truth found in Jesus Christ. In this work, although Justin criticizes philosophers, he also defends them as Christians before Christ, especially Plato. In one particular section Justin discusses how Plato’s view on creation seems to parallel Jewish and Christian thought because Plato asserts that because the world was created, it could also be destroyed by the same force that created it. Justin asserted that Plato, as well as other pre-Christian philosophers such as Socrates, wrote in the Christian spirit because of their commitment to the truth. Although they did not possess the whole truth, through their philosophical discussions, they had part of the truth. All they lacked was the Christian experience and revelation.

It is also important to note Stoicism as another dominating philosophy of the time, although Justin for the most part dismissed its legitimacy. However, one of stoicism’s most notable points became vital to Justin’s Christology discussed later in Chapter Three. In Stoicism, the idea of Logos was central to its philosophy. The Logos was seen as the divine reason that sparked all of human intellect and was what united and controlled the world. Stoics tried to tap into this divine reason through self-discipline and control. The idea of Logos, although present within Judaism and Platonic thought, was the central notion in Stoicism and contributed later to the early Apologists’ christologies, including Justin Martyr’s.

Therefore, Justin was able to bring the pagan and the Christian into dialogue with one another and still stay true to the core, fundamental experiences of the church. Justin
did not compromise the truth he found in Christianity according to his past understanding of philosophy. Rather, he tweaked Platonic thought so that it could fit the ideas of Christianity. He was able to remain a philosopher and a Christian at the same time, setting a precedent for centuries of theologians to follow. Barnard concludes, “Justin’s reverence for philosophy, as finding its consummation in Christ, was of great importance for the Church, for it meant that educated pagan converts were no longer obliged to deny the insights of their philosophical backgrounds. Platonism was now seen to be as valid a preparation for the Gospel as Judaism had been.”

Contact With and Response to Judaism

In light of Justin’s education, his dabbling in different philosophies as well as his obvious philosophic devotion to Platonism, it is understandable why he utilizes Platonic thought in order to explain Christianity to the pagan culture and philosophic schools of thought within his two Apologies. The purpose of The Dialogue With Trypho, however, is a bit harder to ascertain. Because the subject and the main character within the dialogue is Jewish, it would seem on the surface that Justin is trying to write a separate apology for the Jewish audience. However, The Dialogue with Trypho seems to continue Justin’s apologetic approach to philosophers, not to the Jews. He is using a different angle and starting point in order to assert the validity of Christianity. His point in the Dialogue is to show how Christianity is the continuation of God’s revelation as the Jews understand revelation, but he still utilizes Platonic philosophy to make many of his arguments for Christianity.40

The Dialogue with Trypho is a discussion between Justin and a Jewish rabbi
named Trypho. Throughout the *Dialogue*, the two discuss Christianity and Judaism through their understanding of scriptures, revelation, as well as philosophy. Whether or not the meeting actually took place, Justin used the situation to develop some sort of presentation of a projected discussion between the Jewish and Christian Doctrines, even though he was insistent of the truthfulness of Christianity over Judaism. What is made especially clear in the *Dialogue* is that Justin was aware and knowledgeable of Jewish Scriptures (although he read them in Greek) as well as the customs and traditions of Judaism. How Justin came to understand Jewish thought and tradition is not known and cannot be ascertained from his work, but he seems to follow the same allegorical approach found in Paul’s discussions of Judaism, including revelation and law.  

The *Dialogue*, instead of defending Christianity and his *Logos* Christology solely with Platonic philosophy, defends Christianity with Justin’s more allegorical approach to the Old Testament. Justin uses his understanding of the Old Testament to show how the idea of the coming of Christ and the revelation within the developing New Testament are predicted and referred to in the work of the Old Testament writers. Justin used his knowledge of the scriptures to draw the parallels of the Old Testament with the New, trying to prove to Trypho that Christianity is the culmination of the Jewish tradition. This is when he begins talking about Jesus as the Word. In Chapter 127, Justin discusses Christ as the ever-existing Word of God; the same word that spoke to both Moses and Abraham who then became Jesus Christ in flesh. This chapter indicates that Justin was well aware of Jewish Wisdom scripture as these passages are packed with imagery of the wisdom of God, or as Philo would call *Logos*, and this wisdom is how God reveals God’s self to the world.
The Wisdom literature of the Old Testament contributed themes that New Testament writers and later Christian commentators and apologists, including Justin, drew upon. The Wisdom Literature includes five books of the Old Testament. Throughout these books, the authors are incorporating new themes that had not yet been addressed in Jewish literature. The Wisdom literature was written later than much of the Old Testament and was greatly influenced by Hellenistic thought. This is evident in the questions and themes present in the Wisdom literature. The authors were interested in addressing the order of creation and the pragmatic way of living within the world. Thus, they began to question what the order of the universe was and how to explain different concepts in light of their belief in Yahweh. They asked questions concerning suffering (as seen in the book of Job), love, creation, and God's relationship in the everyday life of human beings. In many different places throughout the Wisdom literature, there are references to the idea of the Spirit of God working as the order of creation.

While the *Dialogue* does not indicate that Justin was drastically influenced by Jewish thought or Jewish scholars, it indicates that he had knowledge of Jewish tradition, recognized it as foundation for the continued revelation found within Christianity, and thus responded to the obvious connections within his *Dialogue*. His understanding of Jewish thought and scripture was solid and accurate, and thus the *Dialogue* offers insight into the discussions that perhaps were occurring between the Christian and Jewish communities. At any rate, it does suggest that a discussion was occurring, or at least that the two groups were somehow in contact with one another. But it is still debatable that the purpose of the *Dialogue* was to convert Jews as opposed to simply offering another apologetic work defending Christianity.
Perhaps what *The Dialogue* can offer us is insight into the commonality of language between the Jewish, Christian and Greek cultures. Judaism was also being influenced by Greek thought, and this then offered a bridge between the two religions. An important figure within Jewish philosophy to be used as an example of this Greek influence was Philo of Alexandria. Philo was Jewish philosopher writing just before and during the life of Christ and the beginning of Christianity. He was a Platonist and a Jew developing a philosophy in Alexandria, one of the main centers of learning during this period. Using both the Middle Platonic form of presentation and rhetoric, Philo was very loyal to the Jewish scriptures in his assessment of philosophy. Using an allegorical approach, Philo portrays his philosophy of creation with God as the creator of the forms and even develops a Trinitarian way of thinking: God the Father, Wisdom (also considered *Logos*), and the Spirit of God. This understanding of God parallels the Christian philosophic understanding of Christ.\textsuperscript{46} These parallels will later be discussed in chapter three. The important point here is that there were similar assertions and understandings of God articulated by both Justin and Philo.

These parallels and understandings, however, do not necessarily indicate that Philo had a direct influence on Justin. It is argued by Barnard that, despite disagreement from other scholars, Justin was probably not familiar with Philo.\textsuperscript{47} This goes against the older research of ER Goodenough who thought that Justin was intrinsically connected to Philo, especially in the *Logos* Christology.\textsuperscript{48} But the debate is less significant to the discussion about the *Dialogue*, its purpose, and its influences. The question does not need to be how Justin was influenced by Jewish thought. His work indicates knowledge of and an influence from the Philonic Jewish philosophy. Whether or not Justin read
Philo, he came into contact with the Philonic school of thought. During Justin’s time, different religions and philosophies were not in their own cultural vacuums. They came into contact and influenced one another. Justin, therefore, was a scholar, philosopher and religious man reflecting the world he lived in, influenced by different religious and philosophical languages and experiences.

The works of Justin and Philo illustrate this point well. Both were influenced greatly by Platonic thought and that is what is central to both of their philosophical approaches to their different religions. What is interesting about the two figures, living only about 50 years apart from each other, is that both were ardent Platonists and yet both were deeply devoted to their faith, one Christian, one Jewish. This suggests that the need for the link between Greek thought and the Judeo-Christian traditions was strong. Neither of these men saw the problem with allowing their religious philosophies to be expressed through the culture’s most central form of thought. Justin Martyr, and arguably Philo of Alexandria, were therefore not outside of the philosophical discussions of their times. Justin was not simply finding a way of explaining Christianity to a group of philosophers. He himself remained a philosopher. The importance of his work is that he did believe in the influence of Platonic thought upon Christianity. Platonic thought continued to resonate with later church fathers and theologians remaining vital to the understanding of Christianity until the time of Aquinas in the Middle Ages.
CHAPTER THREE
JUSTIN MARTYR AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF HIS LOGOS
CHRISTOLOGY

Justin Martyr, as previously discussed, was a Christian philosopher and apologist using known philosophical concepts to describe the Christian understandings and beliefs about Christ, the Trinity, and the practices of the church. One of the consistently mentioned philosophical concepts that Justin utilizes in his works is the idea of Christ as the Logos or “the word”. In order to understand this use of Logos it is important to explore the different concepts of Logos that existed within Justin’s world, and that contributed to the Church fathers’ and subsequently the church’s understanding of Logos. Philosophically, the Platonic and Stoic notions of Logos had influence on the Christian understanding of Logos as did the Jewish Wisdom literature found within the Old Testament. These influences permeated the Christian articulations of the Christian experience of Christ and remained foundational within the Church fathers', including Justin Martyr’s, Christologies.

Although the word Logos is a Greek term, the Christian meaning of Logos can be seen as an amalgamation of different Jewish and Greek notions in order to more fully explain and account for the Christian understanding of Christ’s incarnation as well as the Christian commitment to monotheism. It is easy to see why the term was endearing for Christian scholars and teachers. It fit into the world view, and could be used to defend the view of Christ being both human and God. But more than simply a tool to defend the Christian faith, the Logos Christology was a true understanding of the Christian experience for the church fathers. Their understanding of Christ was as the Logos: the personal incarnated Son of God, both eternal and begotten. The first notable apologist to
explain the Christ event with this idea of *Logos* was Justin Martyr. The goal of this chapter is to investigate the different ideas of *Logos* and how they influenced Justin’s Christological understanding of Christ as *Logos* as well as try to more fully understand Justin’s own view of the term.

**Logos: The Greek and Jewish Concepts**

As is evident in the *Dialogue With Trypho*, Justin was well versed in the Greek translation of the Old Testament. Using these texts as allegorically pointing towards the Christ event, Justin’s Christology was developed in light of the Jewish understanding of wisdom, or *Logos*. He was also familiar, obviously, with the Pauline and Johannine literature of the New Testament, both of which reflected a Jewish understanding of *Logos*. Therefore it is important to gain insight into the ideas of Wisdom found within the Old Testament texts, notably the Wisdom literature and how these ideas were interpreted by others like John and Paul before Justin. It is in these Old Testament texts that there becomes evidence of a Jewish understanding of the Spirit of the Lord, referred to as Wisdom, as the source for the order to the universe.

As discussed in Chapter Two, the Wisdom Literature includes five books of the Old Testament: Proverbs, Job, Ecclesiastes, Sirach, and the Wisdom of Solomon (the Book of Wisdom).\(^49\) One of the many repeated themes of the Wisdom literature is how the authors’ continually make reference to the Spirit of God, using this phrase to describe the Wisdom, or reason, that works as the force of order in the world. In many different places throughout the Wisdom literature, there are references to the idea of the Spirit of God working as the order of creation.\(^50\)
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Creation for the Jews did not happen only through the action of impersonal reason. Rather, the idea of Wisdom being the creator of Creation is more personally involved within the lives of human beings. The wisdom referred to in the Old Testament is understood as the “primeval world order”, meaning that without this driving force of wisdom being active in the lives of human beings, chaos would ensue upon the world. As Von Rad points out in his discussion of the Wisdom literature, “If one wishes to understand it as the Logos of the world...then one must simply remember that the texts do not exactly speak of an ideal, such as a principle or a rationality in the world, but of something created which is as real as other works of creation.”

The Jewish understanding of the Wisdom of the world was much more personal than simply an idea of rationality, and therefore, it fit the Christian notion of Christ as Wisdom because Jesus Christ was a personal, relational human being.

The understanding of the Spirit of the Lord within the Wisdom literature is not a clear and consistent notion throughout the books. However, there is a common idea especially within the Book of Wisdom that an order is working throughout the world—an order from God that is within this Spirit. Examples of this can be seen in Wisdom 1,6; 7, 22. This notion of wisdom as a Spirit of God, an intelligible being that works throughout the world, was later used as an image to help early Christians understand who Christ was/is. “...the figure of personified Wisdom was reinterpreted by early Christian theologians as they struggled to understand Jesus the Christ.”

These ideas found within the Wisdom literature of the Old Testament were known and drawn upon by future writers of the New Testament, specifically St. Paul and especially John in his gospel prologue, as they addressed Jewish audiences. As discussed
in Chapter two, the Hellenistic worldview was also very prevalent and influenced Paul and John and the later Church fathers as well. The New Testament writers used Platonic thought along with the Old Testament themes and Jewish thought to shape their understanding of the Christian experience. The Jewish philosopher Philo serves as an example of a Platonic philosopher applying the philosophy to Jewish ideas and beliefs, especially when it comes to the *Logos* and Spirit of God concepts.

**Philo’s Influence on Justin**

As previously discussed in the second chapter, there are discrepancies among scholars as to whether Justin had direct links to the work of Philo or not; but what is more important is to gain understanding of his notion of the *Logos* in order to see how it influenced many different Apologists of the time, as well as influencing the author of John’s gospel. Philo’s understanding of the *Logos* marks an important development for the Christian understanding of Christ.

Philo’s idea of *Logos* was what Wolfson calls a “Twofold Stage Theory of the *Logos*”, and illustrates Philo’s use of Hellenistic thought to build upon the Jewish notions of Wisdom. According to Philo, the *Logos* first existed as God’s thought, and therefore was eternal. The *Logos* was also created, or brought forth, by God into the world, acting as the order to creation and to the world. There seems to be within Philo an attempt to explain how this creation came forth within the created world, and yet he needed to maintain a strict monotheism.\(^5\) As within the Wisdom literature, this *Logos*, or Spirit of God, cannot be separated from God, the Father. But, also, if this *Logos* is the reason of the created universe, it must have been created. For Plato, this dilemma was not a
problem because according to Plato, the world, although created, was eternal. But this did not fit the Jewish, and later Christian, idea of creation. Creation was created in time, and therefore was not eternal. Philo’s “Twofold Stage Theory of the Logos” allowed recognition of the Logos, but maintained the strict monotheistic idea that God created all including the Logos.

Philo was very much influenced by Platonic thought, especially when it came to the question of the Logos, the ideas, and creation. Although Plato had not made it clear in Timaeus whether or not the world was eternal or created through this idea of Logos, Philo adopts his model of creation in order to illustrate how the ideas and Logos came into being. Philo takes Plato and builds an interpretation of the great philosopher’s work. Philo “declared that the matter in which the world was created and the matter from which the world was created were both themselves created by God.”54 This is where we begin to see the Platonic thought influencing Philo and why Philo is a good example of a Platonic philosopher using this thought to explain Jewish theology.

This prime understanding of the Logos made sense to early church apologists, including Justin Martyr. There was a need to explain the Christ event in a way explicable to the community. Understanding Christ as the begotten Logos allowed his humanity, thus incarnation, to be understood along with his eternal divinity. Thus Philo’s use of Logos was also used by the Christian fathers as a way to explain how the Word became Jesus Christ and how his divinity was not separated from God. Justin is the first of the Apologists to begin articulating this idea. Justin understood the Logos to first be the eternal thought of God, and then begotten by God within creation.55 With this understanding, Christ as the fulfillment of the promises in the Old Testament and through
the incarnation, was the emulation of the *Logos* within time, and yet Jesus Christ, as the *Logos* was still eternal with the Father.\(^{56}\)

Another important influence upon Justin’s *Logos* Christology, was the Stoic ideas of *Logos*. The Stoics thought of *Logos* as the “divine spark”. It was the reason that governs the universe, giving it order and intelligible, and then this *Logos* was within the human intellect. By tapping into this source of reason, human beings had the ability to develop through discipline in this *Logos* in an effort to shed all emotional thought and to simply live through rational thought.\(^{57}\)

**Logos: The New Testament Writings of Paul and John**

Jewish and Greek notions of *Logos* influenced New Testament writers, most notably Paul and the author of John’s gospel. When Paul begins writing his epistles and developing the first concept of Christology, the idea of Christ as this Wisdom or Spirit of God began to emerge. Paul was a Jewish scholar with great knowledge of the Jewish scripture and thus it makes sense that Christ began to represent this continuation of the promise of God. Jesus Christ was the fulfillment of the promises made within the Old Testament. In 1 Corinthians, 1 24.30 Paul explicitly points to the idea of the Spirit of God being emulated in the figure of Jesus Christ. Jesus is the incarnated Spirit of God that is referred to in the Wisdom Literature of the Old Testament.

The declaration of Jesus Christ as the Wisdom of God is more popularly and explicitly pointed out in the Prologue to John’s Gospel, as Christ is called the Word of God, or the *Logos*. There have been many discussions and hypothesis on whether John was influenced by Hellenistic or Jewish thought, but it is of the opinion of many scholars
that John’s gospel was influenced by Philo, the Jewish philosopher who had also articulated an understanding of the Wisdom of God working as reason throughout the world. It is possible that this Stoic notion of Logos had a direct impact on the word choice of the author of John’s gospel. But, if nothing else, John’s gospel was certainly read by the early church fathers as being of the Philonic school of thought.

It is important to look at the Gospel of John because he does take the idea of Christ as Logos further than even that of Paul. Actually using the concept Logos, John is attempting to stress the divinity of Christ rather than the humanity of Christ, as is found within the synoptic gospels of Mark, Luke and Matthew. Possibly speaking to a more Greek audience, the author of John’s gospel made the link between the idea of Reason, Wisdom, and Logos with Christ. “His [John’s] description of the Logos is modeled upon Paul’s description of the preexistent Christ, Philo’s description of the preexistent Logos, and the Wisdom of Solomon’s description of the preexistent wisdom.” Christ is the incarnation of this preexistent Logos that was first within God, and then willed by God. This Philonic notion of the Logos is stressed within the Prologue of John’s gospel, setting up his theological narrative that continually stresses the notion of Christ’s divinity. John’s continual emphasis on the divinity of Christ suggests that there were problems within the Christian church early on attempting to harmonize the divinity and the humanity of Christ.

John also moves away from the Pauline tradition of using the phrase the Spirit of God for Christ. This is the beginning of the idea that the Holy Spirit and the Logos of Christ are two different persons in God. Slowly, from this differentiation the Trinitarian theology began to emerge. Although one cannot say that Paul did not know or speak of a
Trinity, there is some ambiguity in whether or not his notion of Spirit was the same as his notion of the preexistent Christ. John’s gospel, although not fully articulating a Trinitarian theology, does make a distinction simply by his language between the idea of the Holy Spirit and the *Logos*. Thus, within the gospel there is a recognition of the distinction made between the *Logos* as Christ and the Jewish understanding of the logos as the Spirit of God. The *Logos* was now recognized in the Christian community as the Incarnate Word. The early apologists began to develop this Christology more fully throughout the early centuries of the church.

**Justin’s Logos Christology**

Justin’s understanding of the *Logos* ideas and concepts allowed him to use it to explain the Christ event within the pagan context. As Barnard states, “The doctrine of the divine *Logos* played an important part in the thought of the second-century Christian Apologists. By its use they were able to claim as ‘Christian’ anything that was good or noble in pagan literature and philosophy and to meet the pagan contention that what was good in Christianity was already found in Paganism...[However] it was also a theological necessity. It enabled them to solve, according to their own lights, the cosmological problem and to show that Christianity itself was as old as Creation.”

Within Justin’s three main writings, there is a consistent theme, namely his insistence on explaining and defending the role of Christ as savior, thus articulating the central point of Christianity. In order to do this and explain this religious experience that Christians had experienced through Christ, Justin used the idea of *Logos* and applied it to the person of Christ. Although not always soundly defined or consistently articulated,
Justin, throughout his writings, developed some unique insights into the *Logos* Christology. His use of the *Logos* seems to imply three distinct but connected goals. He wanted to emphasize that the separate personalities between the Logos and the Father were still of One God, that the Logos was not impersonal, but a personal being within the figure of Christ, and finally, moving beyond Philo, Justin insisted upon Christ being the only *Logos*, the only begotten, within God. Justin, using Old Testament allegories, Greek understanding of the terms, and new metaphors and titles to articulate his goals and conclusions, advanced the *Logos* Christology in the second century of the church.\(^{65}\)

A concern and criticism that the Christians received from the Jews was that with a belief in Christ came a polytheistic notion of God. How could there be a divine being in Christ separate from God? Justin, as also done by St. Paul, attempts in the *Dialogue With Trypho* to explain how Christ and God are distinct, but still one. Justin explains this through references to the Old Testament. Using the stories of Abraham and Moses, Justin discusses how these figures all encountered God within time and space, such as the burning bush. If the belief is that God cannot be contained within time and space, these experiences of God must be of a separate emulation of God.\(^{66}\) In these passages, Justin is attempting to use the Jewish idea of the Wisdom of God to later move into showing Christ as that Wisdom. He states in Chapter 61 of the *Dialogue*, “I shall now show from the Scriptures that God has begotten of Himself a certain rational Power as a Beginning before all other creatures. The Holy Spirit indicates this Power by various titles, sometimes the Glory of the Lord, at other times Son, or Wisdom, or Angel, or God, or Lord, or Word…”\(^{67}\) Thus, through the use of these Old Testament terms, Justin makes the point that this concept of the rationality of God does exist within Jewish understanding of
Justin often referred to Christ as the first begotten. The idea of the Logos as the first begotten is that the Logos was created from the mind of God, and thus being from and of God, is eternal. It is through this Logos, the rationality of God, that the world was created. And thus, according to Justin, belief in reason was really belief in Christ, and therefore, there were Christians before Jesus Christ was incarnated here on earth. Justin repeatedly used the phrase first begotten, in order to not only discuss the nature of the logos, but to also indicate that Christ is the only Logos, the reason of God. This idea of the first begotten can be seen in Paul’s Christology as well, and it is probably from the New Testament writer that Justin adopted and expanded upon this Christological understanding. Using the phrase first begotten helped Justin articulate the “numerical” difference between Christ and God because it showed Christ as a distinct person of God. However, he still maintained that there was one God, and God’s reason, the Logos, was manifested in the person of Christ.

In order to maintain this monotheistic conception of God while still holding on to the notion of Christ as distinct in person, Justin also used unique metaphors in order to illustrate his point. One of the metaphors he uses is the idea of sun and light for God the Father and Christ. The sun is the source of the light, but the beam of light can be discussed separately from the sun. However, the beam of light is solely dependent upon the source of the light, while the sun loses nothing of its nature by producing the beam of light. Justin also talks about the idea of the begotten Logos through the metaphor of the fire. A torch that is lit from another source of fire does not extinguish the source. They are of the same fire. “To illustrate this point [God is not divided, but distinct], I cited the
example of fires kindled from fire; the enkindled fires are indeed distinct form the original fire which, though it ignites many other fires, still remains the same undiminished fire.” Justin advanced the distinction between the persons within the Godhead, but maintaining they are of the same. Thus, he personalized this Logos, while he defended Christian monotheism.

Although Justin did not adhere to much of the philosophy of the Stoics, he did adopt one of their concepts within his discussion of the Logos. As previously discussed, the Stoics believed that there was a supreme reason that was the force within the world, and seeds of this reason is in each person, giving human beings the ability to tap into this supreme reason through discipline and strictly adhering to reasonable thought as opposed to emotional reactions. This ‘seed’ of reason was called the Spermatic Logos. Justin adopted this idea of the Logos, although his was of a spiritual and ethical nature, while the stoics did not apply a spiritual notion to their idea of reason. There are seeds of truth within each person, and it is these seeds that come from the Logos. “For Justin each thinker, inasmuch as he conformed to the truth and spoke well, partook of a portion of this Seminal or Spermatic Logos which in its entirety was Jesus Christ.” This was a new conception of how the Logos functioned through the persona of Christ, and also drew upon Justin’s desire to link Greek thinkers and philosophers within the realm of Christianity. These seeds of truth, from the Logos, are more developed as we come to know Jesus Christ, the source and complete Logos. Justin writes on the subject:

We have been taught that Christ was First-begotten of God and we have indicated above that He is the Word of whom all mankind partakes. Those who lived by reason are Christians, even though they have been considered atheists.... From all that has been said an intelligent man can understand why, through the power of the Word, in accordance with the will of God, the Father and Lord or all, He was born as a man of a virgin, was named Jesus, was crucified, died, rose again, and
ascended into Heaven. But, since the proof of this topic is not necessary at this time, we shall now proceed to the proof of more urgent matters.\textsuperscript{72}

This paragraph from the \textit{First Apology} sums up Justin’s logos Christology well. Christ is the reason, the \textit{Logos}, and we encounter this through Jesus Christ, the personal being, and we experience this truth through reason itself.

Justin Martyr’s development of the \textit{Logos} Christology cannot be separated from his love for Christianity. The \textit{Logos} was not simply an explanation for the divinity and still monotheistic concept of God. For Justin, the \textit{Logos} was a deep experience of a personal God, not limited to a vague notion of reason or wisdom. Unlike Philo and the other non-Christian philosophers, the \textit{Logos} was a personal manifestation of God within Justin’s writings because the \textit{Logos} did become flesh in the human being of Jesus Christ. Justin does not fall into the trap of many of the Gnostics of his time. The Christ is Jesus, fully divine, but Jesus Christ was a true human being. In fact, as Goodenough points out, Justin did not even differentiate between the terms preexistent Christ with Incarnate Christ, but uses the terms interchangeably. Whether consciously or not, Justin was asserting his belief that Christ and Jesus Christ were the same--not different in person.\textsuperscript{73}

Justin, as both Goodenough and Barnard point out, was a pioneer who began to articulate and form a more cohesive idea of Christ as \textit{Logos} in order to communicate the incarnation and idea of Christ as the begotten Son of God with both the Jewish and Greek communities. Although certainly not perfected and containing some theological discrepancies later refuted, Justin’s work shaped the theological and Christological language of the early church fathers’ investigation and articulation of the incarnation, life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Justin used his worldview to explain his
theological beliefs. The next chapter will explore how Justin’s works and Christology influenced future theologians, as well as what the present day church can gain from his works.
CHAPTER FOUR
THE LOGOS CHRISTOLOGY BEYOND JUSTIN

Justin Martyr as a pioneer within Christian thought, influenced, however indirectly, future church fathers. Christology remained a dominant point of discussion and Justin’s development of the Logos Christology helped pave the way for the next few centuries. Justin’s works certainly do not answer all questions and definitely contribute to some theological problems. For instance, his Christology suggests the subordination of Christ to God, and there is definite confusion concerning the relationship between the spirit and the Logos. However, more than the content of his works, it was Justin’s approach and his quest for the truth that influenced later fathers and theologians. This early Christian theologian offers us insight into how the Christian experience and the Christian narrative can and should be articulated in one’s historical context—thus making the Christian experience relevant without diminishing the original gospel narrative.

Looking beyond Justin, Christology became the main discussion of Christian theologians as the Christian faith continued to spread and gradually became more distant from the apostles’ experience at Calvary. The reality of Christ’s incarnation, life, death and resurrection required adequate language in order to express the experience. One constant concept throughout the Christological debates was the idea of Christ as Word. The Christian tradition carried forward Justin’s Logos Christology in its conciliar Christological debates of 325-451CE. Thus, Justin’s preliminary work remained within the Christological discussion, whether or not he was specifically acknowledged.

This chapter will explore how the Logos Christology of Justin influenced successive thinkers and where Christology is headed today. It is the example of Justin’s work and dedication to the truth, as well as his awareness of the world around him, that
Irenaeus and Origen: The Single-Stage Theory

Irenaeus of Lyon, just a generation after Justin, was definitely influenced by Justin’s works, and especially influenced by Justin’s Logos Christology and his use of the Old Testament as an example of the early work of the Word. Irenaeus’ works were written in order to combat the increasing numbers of Gnostics within the church, and Irenaeus’ Christology was his central argument: Christ is the true presence of God and the Word of God as a human being. Irenaeus refutes Justin’s use of Philo’s Two-stage theory, which, as discussed previously, was the idea that the Logos was the created reason of God, created before creation. In Justin’s Philonic Two-Stage-Theory, the Logos was not eternal. Irenaeus disagreed. For Irenaeus, the Word was always coexisting with the father. The use of “In the beginning...” in John’s gospel is to be interpreted as eternity, not simply before creation. Part of this reason for the shift from the Two-Stage theory to the One-stage theory was because Irenaeus was trying to refute the Gnostic tendency to deny the full divinity of Christ. If the Logos was created, how was the Logos, and thus Christ, fully divine and not subordinate to the Father? This is an example of how Justin’s Christology was not complete and required development.

Unlike Justin, Irenaeus was not as focused on the philosophical and metaphysical nature of Christ. Irenaeus focused on the actual incarnation, the physical and historical encounter with the Logos, or Christ. “Irenaeus reminds us that Christianity can... never be a mere philosophy....” However, Justin’s work provided an excellent foundation for Irenaeus and provided some of the language necessary to make his own contributions to
the Christological debate.

Origen of Alexandria, the prolific philosopher-theologian of the third century, stands out as a remarkably important figure of the early church’s history. His Christology was much more philosophically grounded compared to Irenaeus’ more pastorally-influenced concerns. Origen’s focus was on exegetical and scriptural work. Although he wrote a good deal more specific exegetical work than Justin, his typologies tend to follow the trend set by Justin, especially in the typology of Christ found within the Old Testament. Justin’s use of the Old Testament, although not completely original, influenced Origen’s interpretation and understanding in light of the New Testament.

Christologically, Origen, like Irenaeus, also stressed the importance of the co-eternity of Christ the Logos with God. However, the effort to preserve the divinity of Christ came at the expense of Christ’s humanity. This is first evident in Justin’s attempt to insure Christ’s divinity through his constant discussion of Christ as Logos. This precedent set by Justin and continued through Origen later caused problems for the church as it dealt with Christological heresies and questions throughout the third century concerning the two natures of Christ. In trying to either preserve Christ’s humanity or his divinity, theologians came in constant conflict leading to heretical developments. The first of these major heresies and conflicts within the church was the Arian Controversy, sparking centuries of Christological debate.

**The Arian Controversy and Beyond**

In the early fourth century, the church had become a tolerated religion under the rule of Constantine. As the church grew and developed, different understandings of the
scriptures, traditions, and metaphysical language of the church’s theology also developed. The Arian controversy developed as different Gnostic groups began to question the full humanity of Christ. In an effort to explain how Christ was both human and divine, certain groups asserted that Christ’s humanity was simply a shell like existence, as the divine lived in Christ. Some went even as far to assert that it was only Jesus the man who died on the cross, and not God. The separation of the two natures of Christ threatened the humanity of Christ as well as the monotheistic nature of God.

In an effort to preserve Christ’s human nature as well as monotheism, Arius, a presbyter in Alexandria, returned to the criticized notion of Justin, the Two-Stage theory of Christ, in an effort to maintain a monotheistic outlook on Christ. The Word was not co-eternal with the Creator, but from the source of the creator, and manifested and mediated in the person of Christ. Leo Davis writes, “Since the contingent world could not bear the direct impact of the all-powerful God, He needed an instrument of creation through which to mediate His power. This instrument is the Word, who is a creature, generated or made, perfect and beyond all other creatures, but a creature nonetheless because he has a source, while God himself has none. The Word had a beginning; though born outside of time, prior to his generation or creation he did not exist.”

This language sounds familiar to the earlier language of Justin, especially concerning the subordination of Christ or the Word, to God. However, Arius' time and place required a more in-depth look at how the humanity and divinity of Christ could co-exist. For Justin, this had not been a major concern. With the Gnostic groups growing and the humanity of Christ being threatened by the doctrine, Arius asserted that the son of God was always a creature, however perfect. The idea was that Christ was actually
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adopted by God, and was therefore fully human, but perfect in nature. It was his will rather than his nature that took on his divinity.\textsuperscript{81} This idea spread and was very convincing for many groups in an effort to explain and retain Christ’s humanity in the face of the Gnostic sects. However, the controversy began to emerge as different bishops, especially Alexander of Alexandria, contradicted Arius’ Christology. As tension grew, Constantine, who depended on the Church as a source of unity in the Empire, called the bishops together for the first Church council since that of Jerusalem in 70CE. The Council of Nicaea in 325 condemned Arianism as heretical. The council asserted that the son is co-eternal with the father and is of the same substance. Although this did not deal with the role of the Holy Spirit within the Trinity, or get at the notion of Christ’s humanity, it provided foundation for future councils discussing Christology. The Council of Nicaea refuted the idea that Christ, the Word, was created, but was actually of the Father and co-eternal with the Father.

The questions of Christ’s divinity and humanity, as both the Logos and the person of Jesus, in relation to the Trinity remained a central debate throughout the following centuries. It was at the Council of Chalcedon in 451CE that the decisive statement and language about Christ was established. Christ was of two natures, human and divine, but one person. The idea of Christ as the Logos, however, remained dominant when discussing his pre-existence. This notion resonated and remained the dominating Christology. Justin’s work influenced major theologians like Irenaeus, Origen and Arius and provided a strong foundation for the development of the current church’s Christology.

Throughout the Middle Ages, during the Scholastic era, the Logos concept
continued to dominate Christological discussion. Thomas Aquinas, the greatest thinker of the age, following the Anselmian tradition, used the Logos language consistently in his Christological discussions. Thus the Logos continued throughout the Middle Ages to the present.  

**Christology to the Present: The Debates Continue**

The Logos Christology was developed in order to explain and articulate a crucial Christian belief: the incarnation. The question behind faith in the incarnation is how did God become human. Justin and subsequent church fathers utilized the Logos to articulate this vital Christian element. However, since the Enlightenment, challenges have arisen concerning this central creedal assertion of Christianity. As James Dunn states in his work *Christology in the Making*, “…we cannot ignore the fact that since the Enlightenment the traditional doctrine of the incarnation has come under increasing pressure to explain and justify itself…In the twentieth century…the sharpest questioning has been directed not so much to the doctrine itself as to its origin.”

The historicity of the doctrine has to be examined, and thus a new language is required. With the development of historical consciousness as well, the Christ event requires a new language in order to explain it. Historical consciousness has, in turn, affected how theologians look at the different eras of Church history, including that of the historical Jesus, the patristic era, and the scholastic period. Although this turn to modern thought has been seen as threatening to Christianity, the intent of most theologians is not to negate the Christ event or the experience of the early Christians, but rather gain insight and come closer to God through our acknowledgement and the development of our own
time's understanding of the Christ event.

The *Logos* Christology remains a constant in Church language and understanding even today. The understanding of the divinity of Christ is that the Word is the Reason of God and that reason is manifested in the person of Christ, fully human and divine. However, it must be recognized that the *Logos* Christology was intended to articulate, through the Greek and Jewish philosophies and terms, the incarnation—a fundamental experience of Christianity. Attention to the *Logos* articulation is being replaced by attention to the resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth. Through examining the belief of the resurrection the question becomes how Jesus of Nazareth, *the man in history*, is God. Is it possible that Justin’s *Logos* notion no longer fits the worldview of today, and that this metaphysical language needs to be altered? The answer of many modern theologians is yes, but not because the *Logos* Christology is incorrect. It is simply because the classical, Platonic language of Justin’s time no longer resonates within the modern world. The question is what is the new language required to articulate our Christian experience?

Frederick Crowe outlines the basic problem in his 1978 work, *Theology of the Christian Word*. In chapter six he states:

...we are coming to a major turning point in the theology of the word...the situation, then, is as follows: After a long, tranquil, but uncritical period of simple possession of the truth, and a rather long period of reaching back to the word that was the source of the truth, there followed a short period of diverse programs and activities aimed at bringing those ancient sources forward into our own day, as truth relevant for me and a word to me putting a claim on my response. Correspondingly, the deficiencies in the programs and activities so far studied are twofold: They leave the word an ancient word that does not speak to my situation, and the word becomes objectified in such a way as not to challenge my response.
Crowe is articulating the new postmodern theological, philosophical, and also Christological problem: how do we now understand these historically conditioned concepts of the Christian experience and how do we articulate them in language that bears meaning to our current worldview and philosophical milieu? Changing language does not need to go against the Christian witness. In fact, it should illuminate it. One of Justin’s differences is that he was a pioneer; he was not limited to conciliar statements and established language. He chose to articulate his experience of Christ in language and concepts true and authentic to his understanding, inevitably shaped by second century philosophical categories. We must do the same today if we are to also express an authentic reflection of our own understanding of the Christian experience.

Today the Logos Christology is still the traditional way to articulate, within the Catholic tradition, the Christian event. It is often used in ancient prayers during the mass and other certain rites in the church. The Logos still speaks to the church, because the concept of God’s wisdom coming through Christ makes sense and still resonates within the community. But it is possible that the church does not understand the idea of Logos as Justin Martyr understood it.

With the philosophical shift of the Enlightenment and the Scientific Revolution to cultural questions, there has been a shift within Christological thinking. During the time of the Church Fathers, the question about Christ was how did the Logos become human? Today the question starts on the other side: how was this historical human, Jesus, also God? Both starting points lead to the belief that Jesus is divine and human, but the different starting questions require different language to articulate the Jesus Christ experience. If the question no longer starts with the logos, the Logos language may not be
relevant any longer. The new challenge is what language and concepts should be used.

Roger Haight’s Spirit Christology: An Alternative Approach

Roger Haight, in his controversial 1999 work, *Jesus Symbol of God*, proposes a new language to replace the *Logos*, and wants to move into what he calls a Spirit Christology. This Christology, which focuses on the Spirit of God rather than the Christo-centric *Logos*, still follows the tradition within scripture, but does not limit itself to the Greek understanding of *Logos*.

[H]e is therefore not suggesting moving away from the scriptures, but rather, like Justin and the early Greek fathers of the church, he is suggesting that we adopt language that fits both the Christian experience and our cultural understandings. The problem then becomes what are those understandings? Roger Haight’s Spirit Christology is just one of the many proposed methodologies and serves as an example as a developing christology today.

Haight’s Spirit Christology discusses the Christ event and the experience of Jesus of Nazareth in light of the work of the Spirit of God. Jesus is the historical medium in which Christians encounter God. But, as Haight qualifies, the Spirit Christology must be understood and articulated in two stages: Jesus’ lifetime while the Spirit is working.
through him and the second stage is the risen Christ. There is a “… conflation of Christ risen and the Spirit.” He desires to move forward from the understanding declared at Chalcedon. He states, “According to Chalcedon, Jesus has two natures which are distinct, unmixed, and unconfused: this is a dialectical conception. . . Spirit christology allows an analogous descriptive account. Jesus is the real symbol who bodies forth God as Spirit present and at work within him; Jesus as symbol participates in God as Spirit, mediates God, and makes God present. Thus the Christian act of worship directed to the human being Jesus is one that moves through Jesus to its mediated object which is God.”

According to Haight, Spirit Christology allows for a more inclusive Christology, meaning the language allows for openness to other discussions about Christ. The Spirit Christology also opens the language of Christology to the historical consciousness that is so prevalent today. While staying true to the New Testament’s witness of the Christ event and the conciliar tradition, Haight argues that the Spirit Christology is also true to the Christian experience of today. In the fifteenth chapter concerning the divinity of Jesus Christ, he lists his three objectives. He attempts to “…‘explain’ or construe Jesus’ divinity in terms that remain faithful to the witness of the New Testament and the classical conciliar doctrines, best portray this doctrine in a credible and intelligible way in present-day postmodern intellectual culture, and empower discipleship.” Haight does not refute the Logos Christology. He simply sees its limitations within the current cultural reality Christianity is in. Spirit Christology offers not only an alternative, but a more appropriate avenue for interpreting the New Testament and the Christian experience. Like Justin, Haight, wanting to stay true to the Gospel witness, uses a nuanced language suitable for the time in order to interpret that witness.
However, since its publication, *Jesus Symbol of God* has been under the critical eye of the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith (CDF), the Vatican’s doctrinal office. As of December 13, 2004, Haight has been forbidden to teach Catholic theology because of “serious doctrinal errors contrary to the divine and catholic faith of the Church.” This action of the CDF has caused quite a stir among theologians as many see this action as a threat against the fundamental work of theologians. If theologians are not allowed to do their speculative and critical work, as in the tradition of the early fathers like Justin, the church risks sacrificing its tradition of theological investigation and interpretation for the sake of static doctrinal statements. The Board of Directors of the Catholic Theological Society of America, in a recent statement, voiced their concerns after the CDF’s silencing of Haight. “…the Congregation’s intervention in this case gravely threatens the very process of serious, systematic, internal criticism which the Congregation and the bishops have long been encouraging among theologians. While this process of internal critique can never replace the proper teaching and disciplinary roles of the Magisterium, the intervention of the Magisterium should be a last resort, reserved for situations where this process has clearly failed.” The fear of some theologians is that if the CDF intervenes too quickly with regards to certain theological discussions, there is a risk that critical theological investigations and discussions will cease to function properly, as the Catholic tradition has encouraged and allowed since the time of the Apostles and notably the time of Justin Martyr.

The purpose of this study is not to analyze, defend, or critique Haight’s work or to propose a Christological language more appropriate for the time, but to illustrate how early theologians, like Justin Martyr, used their philosophical language to articulate their
experience without compromising the Christian witness: an to investigate the contributions and limitations of their theologies. Arguably, Haight, as a contemporary example, is acting in the true spirit of theological predecessors like Justin. He is attempting to articulate the Christ event as we understand it today, remaining open to criticism and the inevitable Christological debate his work instigates. However, this investigation and conversation can no longer occur if Haight’s work is pre-maturely put under suspicion. If theologians are denied their obligation to act as true witnesses and thinkers within the church, the church risks becoming irrelevant, and more frightening, inauthentic.

**Justin Martyr: An Example**

If the classical notions of Christology, specifically the *Logos*, are being called into question, why is Justin important to the Christological discussion? The answer lies in the new understanding of historical consciousness. These new Christological ideas could not have developed without the foundation and the groundwork of men and women like Justin. Whether or not Justin’s philosophical and theological language or ideas are still being used today, his approach should be. Justin Martyr is an example of a true theologian: seeking the truth and using terms and language that fit his worldview and his own understanding. This is the example Justin has laid out for modern times, and, arguably he still can remain a modern influence. He recognized and understood the Christian experience as the true philosophy, and articulated it within his own knowledge and philosophical background.

The Christian religion is one that begins with an experience of the Christ event. It
was and is first experienced through Christ's incarnation, life, ministry, death and resurrection. Language then articulates and explains these experiences. The articulations and explanations do not produce the narrative or the experience; they illuminate them. Justin followed this method as he adopted his culture to explain his newfound philosophy, Christianity. Justin not only served as a foundation for future theologians' Christologies, use of scripture, and metaphysical language, he also provides theologians an example of interpreting and articulating the Christian experience within a certain historical framework. If this approach is followed today, the language may change, but the heart of the experience should not. The new language should illuminate the experience just as the Logos concept illuminated the experience for Justin and those who followed.
CONCLUSION

Christianity did not spring into the religion it is today overnight. Christianity developed historically, through the cultural realities and religious reflections of the early Christian communities. It was this tradition and continual reflection on the Christ experience that has led Christianity where it is today. In order to continue an adequate discussion upon the Christian experience, historical reflection is required. Analyzing the history and the works of the early Christian fathers helps not only to illustrate their different experience, but also to help explain where and how our tradition was developed and understood within the early church.

The apologists of the first and second centuries offered their own reflection and articulation of the Christ event in an effort to react against the violent criticism and discrimination against the Christian communities and also to maintain an adequate and authentic discussion on the Scriptures for a more cohesive unity of the Christian communities. Justin Martyr, through his knowledge and understanding of Greek philosophy and the Jewish scriptures, articulated the Christian experience through his own cultural concepts and language. Christianity was his true philosophy, but his knowledge of the Greek philosophical concepts provided the language to articulate his reflection and experience.

As our own culture and worldview has shifted from the platonic worldview to a more rational, scientific and historically conscious view, our reflection and articulation of the Christ event requires constant evaluation and critical analysis, not in order to refute or negate the early articulations, but rather to maintain and cultivate their original meanings within our own language and philosophical understanding. If Christianity is to remain
relevant and authentic, Christology must be reexamined and opened up to new reflections. This argument's purpose is not to offer a more adequate Christology. The purpose is to call for a more open-minded approach to Christological reflection. It is essential that current Christological reflections be given consideration. This is certainly how Justin Martyr and his contemporaries acted in their own desire to discuss the Christ event and explain the deep mystery of the divinity and humanity of Christ. Thus we can continue to learn from these early models as we continue to develop and grow within the Christian experience.
NOTES
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43. The five books include Proverbs, Job, Ecclesiastes, Sirach, and the Wisdom of Solomon (the Book of Wisdom). It is important to note that some Psalms are also included in this list as well as the book of Songs of Songs. These are the five books, however, that are definitely included in the Wisdom list of the Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures. This is probably the translation Justin was reading at the time. However, Ecclesiastes, Sirach and the Wisdom of Solomon were not included in the Jewish Canon and subsequently the Protestant canon. Lawrence Boadt, *Reading the Old Testament: An Introduction* (New York: Paulist Press, 1984), 17, 473-474.
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63. St. Paul did not necessarily not have a Trinity theology. It is difficult to differentiate in his writings a separation between the Holy Spirit and what would later be articulated as the Logos of Christ. The differentiation seems to have come later when it was necessary for the Christian church to develop a theology and Christology that emphasized Christ’s divinity without separation from his humanity. Wolfson, 178-79, 242.
64. Barnard, 85.
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71. Ibid., 96.
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74. During this time there were five major cities or patriarchal cities that led the church. Antioch, Jerusalem, Rome, Constantinople and Alexandria. Alexandria and Antioch dominated the more eastern development of the church. Learning and education was very important in Alexandria, and for this reason it had a strong impact on the development of the theology of the Christian tradition.


76. As noted by Wolfson, this idea was not as explicitly located in Irenaeus, though his writings definitely laid the foundation for the movement from the Two-Stage theory and the work of Origen and other theologians solidified this idea. Harry Austryn Wolfson, The Philosophy of the Church Fathers: Faith, Trinity, Incarnation, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970), 198-199.

77. Campenhausen, The Fathers of the Greek Church, 23.

78. Origen's use of the allegorical method widened after Irenaeus and Clement. Both Justin and Origen, however, were influenced by the Philonic tradition of non-literal interpretation. Justin used it more in the Old Testament, while by Origen's time, the New
Testament was also interpreted this way. For a more in depth look at the relationship between their methods of interpreting scripture, seen Wolfson's work previously cited.
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85. Frederick Crowe does not capitalize "word" because he is speaking about the Scripture in this chapter, although, much of the book is discussing the idea of God within the Word, or Christ. Although his is not directly talking about the Logos, the concept within this section is still applicable to the current problems with the Logos today.


87. It is important to note that Roger Haight is not the pioneer of the Spirit christology. Many, including Paul W. Newman in his 1987 work, *A Spirit Christology: Recovering the Biblical Paradigm of Christian Faith* have discussed the idea and notion of Spirit Christology. However, at the present time it is Haight's work that is under scrutiny from the Vatican, and is on the cutting edge of this new developing Christology.


89. Another Christology, proposed and discussed by Jon Sorbino, is Liberation Christology that comes out of the Liberation theology movement of South America. This christology suggests completely different titles and language be used for our idea of Jesus Christ because our language now is limited not only historically but culturally and is not allowing the experience of current groups, specifically in South America, to develop their own language for their own Christian experience.

90. This is also discussed in James Dunn work, *Christology in the Making*. Refer to note 47 in *Jesus Symbol of God*, 450. Haight, *Jesus Symbol of God*, 450.
91. The idea of symbol is not to be mistaken for sign. His discussion of symbol is in line with the Rahnerian idea of real symbol. To see a discussion concerning Haight’s definition and symbol please refer to Jesus Symbol of God, 8-15. Haight, Jesus Symbol of God, 458.

92. Ibid., 424.
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