

# JUSTIN MARTYR'S USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

DAVID E. AUNE, M.A.

## I. Introduction

Justin Martyr (d. A.D. 165), in addition to being the first great apologist of the Church, also has the honor of being the first comprehensive Christian interpreter of the Old Testament.<sup>1</sup> In spite of the extensive use of the Old Testament in the *I Apology* and the *Dialogue with Trypho*, no thorough study of Justin's exegetical method had been published until Willis A. Shotwell's book, *The Biblical Exegesis of Justin Martyr*, appeared in the spring of 1965.<sup>2</sup> The last word on Justin's exegetical procedures, however, remains to be spoken. The present article is an attempt at a fresh appraisal of Justin's use of the Old Testament through the use of the most recent literature on the subject. The study of various phases of early patristic exegesis reveals, among other things, the qualitative line which must be drawn between the canonical literature of the New Testament and later writings of the Church.<sup>3</sup> Justin's own use of early Christian exegetical traditions may be subsumed under three categories: 1. Justin sometimes uses the New Testament exegesis of the Old—whether literal or typological—without alteration. 2. At other times he uses the New Testament exegetical tradition as a basis for his own investigation of Old Testament passages. In these instances his own contributions are liable to lean in the direction of allegory. 3. Frequently Justin attempts his own interpretation of the Old Testament, or relies on earlier non-canonical exegetical tradition such as that embodied in the writings of Clement of Rome or Pseudo-Barnabas. It is here that allegory has free rein.

### A. Controlling Factor: Received Tradition

The chief factor which determined the results of Justin's exegesis of the Old Testament was that body of Christian tradition which he inherited from his Christian predecessors and which he maintained virtually without alteration. This Christological concern plays the same essential

1. This statement must be qualified by the admission that by "comprehensive" we simply mean that he attempted to relate his interpretation of individual proof-texts to their wider context. In consequence his Biblical quotations are often laboriously long.
2. Willis A. Shotwell, *The Biblical Exegesis of Justin Martyr* (London: S.P.C.K., 1965). This book is a substantially unaltered version of the author's Ph.D. dissertation at the University of Chicago in 1954. Of the twenty bibliographical items which date from 1955 to the present, only two are actually used or cited within the book itself. See the review by Arthur J. Bellinzoni in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXXV (1966), pp. 124-25.
3. John Warwick Montgomery, in a review of R. M. Grant, *The Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary*, *Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society*, VIII (1965), p. 117. A polemical defense of the type of viewpoint which Grant espouses may be seen in article by Allen P. Wikgren, "History and Scripture," *Early Christian Origins*, ed. Allen P. Wikgren (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1961), pp. 139-49.

role in Justin's exegesis as does the *regula fidei* in that of Irenaeus and Tertullian.<sup>4</sup> Since his philosophic terminology was a cloak for practical and apologetic purposes,<sup>5</sup> his doctrinal understanding of Christianity was not modified by an attempt to unite it organically with his "philosophy."<sup>6</sup> His alignment with tradition precluded the possibility of his developing a truly systematic hermeneutic.<sup>7</sup> Although Justin cannot be called a particularly profound or original student of the Old Testament,<sup>8</sup> his work did consist in more than a mere collection and utilization of previously existing Messianic testimonia. One of his more permanent contributions was his Christological interpretation of Old Testament theophanies.<sup>9</sup>

If we designate Justin's approach to the Old Testament as Christological or Christo-centric, by that we must understand that Justin sought to find symbolic and prophetic anticipations of the entire content of Christian tradition. Justin makes this explicit in *I Apology* 31:7-8:

We find it predicted in the books of the prophets that Jesus our Christ would come, born of a virgin, born to manhood, healing every sickness and every disease and raising the dead, hated and unacknowledged and crucified, dying and rising again and ascending into heaven, both really being and being called Son of God. [We find also that] men sent by him would proclaim these things to every race of mankind, and that men of the Gentiles especially would believe in him.

This summary contains the essence, though by no means the totality, of what Justin expected to find in the writings of the Old Testament. It was inevitable that the apologetic challenge to produce Scriptural evidence for the Gospel events should lead to forced and stilted exegesis—at least in the eyes of modern critics. Some of Justin's interpretations of the Old Testament got no farther than his own writings, while others lived on in the writings of Irenaeus, Tertullian and later Christian authors.<sup>10</sup>

### B. Justin's View of the Old Testament

Justin held a view of the inspiration of the Old Testament writings

4. Gregory T. Armstrong, *Die Genesis in der Alten Kirche* (Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1962), p. 51. Note also Justin's great awareness of heresy in such passages as *Dialogue* 35 and 82.
5. Erwin R. Goodenough, *The Theology of Justin Martyr* (Jena: Frommannsche Buchhandlung, 1923), p. 138. Although old, this book is still the single best volume on the theology of Justin Martyr rightly set in its philosophical and cultural background. It contains a full bibliography of works on Justin to 1923.
6. Hans Lietzmann, *A History of the Early Church*, Vol. II: *The Founding of the Church Universal*, trans. Bertram Lee Woolf (Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Company, 1961), p. 184.
7. Cf. Armstrong, p. 20.
8. Goodenough, p. 98.
9. Benedict Kominiak, *The Theophanies of the Old Testament in the Writings of St. Justin*, The Catholic University of America, Studies in Sacred Theology (Second Series), No. 14 (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1948).
10. M. F. Wiles, "The Old Testament in Controversy with the Jews," *Scottish Journal of Theology*, VIII (1955), p. 116.

which was in harmony with his Christian and Jewish contemporaries.<sup>11</sup> This basic agreement on the inspired nature of Scripture was the starting point for Justin's anti-Jewish polemic. In addition, there was great respect and reverence for inspired oracular utterances in the Roman world of Justin's day.<sup>12</sup> This was the factor which provided common ground for Justin and his Gentile opponents. An important source for Justin's view of inspiration is the great number of introductory formulas which he uses to attribute the words of Scripture to a divine source (*Dial.* 34:1, 74:2, *I Apology* 44:1, 47:1). He also affirms their verbal infallibility:

... but if you imagined that you could throw doubt on the passage, in order that I might say the Scriptures contradicted each other, you have erred. But I shall not venture to suppose or to say such a thing; and if a Scripture which appears to be of such a kind be brought forward, and if there be a pretext that it is contrary, since I am entirely convinced that no Scripture contradicts another, I shall rather admit that I do not understand what is recorded.<sup>13</sup>

A corollary of Justin's view of Scripture is the great importance which he gave to every word of the text. Everything contained in the Old Testament becomes immensely significant.

Most of Justin's Scriptural quotations were derived from our canonical Old Testament, though it is doubtful whether Justin himself had any such conception of a closed canon. It was his view that the prophetic gifts had been transferred from Israel to the Church, and were even active up to his own time (*Dial.* 82:1). The only book of the New Testament to which Justin explicitly refers, the Apocalypse of John, was viewed by Justin as equally inspired with other books of the Old Testament, for he speaks of John as prophesying (*Dial.* 81:4), and is convinced of a literal thousand year age of restoration which he certainly derived from Revelation 20 (*Dial.* 80). Justin also refers a number of times to the Synoptic gospels as the "memoirs" of the Apostles (*I Apol.* 66:3), and he is also an important witness to the growth of the New Testament canon.<sup>14</sup>

How then did Justin view the quality of his own teaching? After he

11. Benjamin B. Warfield, *The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible*, edited by Samuel C. Craig (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1948), p. 230, and R. C. P. Hanson, *Allegory and Event: A study of the Sources and Significance of Origen's Interpretation of Scripture* (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1959), p. 11. These writers discuss the view of verbal inspiration held by Jews contemporary with the New Testament and the patristic writers respectively.
12. Goodenough, p. 177; Arthur Darby Nock, *Conversion: The Old and the New in Religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo* (Oxford: The University Press, 1933), p. 107ff.; Frederick C. Grant, *Roman Hellenism and the New Testament* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962), p. 102ff., in which Dr. Grant discusses the appeal of the Greek Old Testament to first century pagans.
13. *Dialogue* 65:2.
14. Paul Feine and Johannes Behm, *Introduction to the New Testament*, reedited by Werner Georg Kummel, 14th revised edition, trans. A. J. Mattill, Jr. (New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965), pp. 341-42.

has informed Trypho that the prophetic gifts have been transferred to "us," i.e., the Church, he makes use of an interesting analogy. "And just as there were false prophets contemporaneous with your holy prophets, so there are now many false teachers amongst us . . ." <sup>15</sup> The false teachers stand in opposition to true teachers (= true prophets), of which Justin himself was one. He stands as a counterpart of the Old Testament prophet and is able to perceive the true intent of their writings by means of charismatic illumination.

Justin, who knew no Hebrew, used the Septuagint in all of his Biblical interpretation and was convinced of its inspiration (*Dial.* 71:1). <sup>16</sup> "Justin is the first extant Christian writer," observes Sundberg, "to notice a variation between the Christian Old Testament and the Jewish Scriptures."<sup>17</sup> In reply to Trypho's query, he cites a number of specific passages which he claims have been altered by the Jews (*Dial.* 70-73). Justin and other early Christian writers generally accepted the Septuagint without question and also without any reference to the Hebrew original or other Greek translations. The lack of unity between early Greek translations of the Old Testament together with probable emendation by Christians themselves indicate that Justin's charge was largely unfounded. <sup>18</sup>

Although the Old Testament was implicitly regarded as the possession of the Christian Church from early in its history, Justin is only the second author to claim explicitly that it belongs to the Church alone and not to the Jews (*Dial.* 29:2), with Pseudo-Barnabas as the first (*Barnabas* 4:7-8). Justin's proof that the Old Testament is distinctively a Christian book is that Christians understand the true import of the Scriptures, while the Jews do not. The only part that belongs to Jews is the law spoken from Horeb (*Dial.* 11:2).

### C. Influential Factors

A serious consideration of Justin's exegetical procedure must take into account those historical and cultural influences which both unconsciously molded his thought and consciously served as models for his own manner of interpreting the Old Testament. Goodenough observes that Justin not only makes use of those methods which are characteristic of Greek Judaism as we know it, but that he also shows acquaintance with Philonic hermeneutics. <sup>19</sup> The chief influences which we will consider to have affected Justin's approach to the interpretation of the Old Testament are Judaism, Philo and Hellenism, and Christianity.

15. *Dialogue* 82:1.

16. Justin's quotations of the Greek Old Testament are being systematically investigated as a witness to the mid-second century Septuagint by Joost Smit Sibinga, *The Old Testament Text of Justin Martyr*, Vol. I: The Pentateuch (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963).

17. Albert C. Sundberg, *The Old Testament of the Early Church*, Vol. XX of *Harvard Theological Studies* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964), p. 159.

18. A notable exception is the use of the Greek word *parthenos* ("virgin"), to render the Hebrew word *almah* in Isaiah 7:14, which originated with Jewish translators and was later rejected by Jews as a wrong translation (cf. *Dial.* 71).

19. Goodenough, p. 113.

It has been quite generally agreed that Justin's picture of post-Christian Judaism is surprisingly correct.<sup>20</sup> The apparently casual remarks of Trypho reflect traditional sayings of Jewish rabbinical schools quite accurately.<sup>21</sup> Harnack has listed eight hermeneutical principles which Justin and his opponent have in common.<sup>22</sup> In a detailed study of the elements of the *Dialogue* which reflect an acquaintance with post-Christian Judaism, Shotwell has adequately shown the extent to which Justin was acquainted with Judaism.<sup>23</sup> Not only is he familiar with Jewish methods and traditions of Biblical interpretation, but he himself makes use of those same methods:<sup>24</sup>

Holding to the same concept of the inspiration of the Scriptures, the Jews, like Justin, held to the importance of the very letters of the Scripture (*Dialogue* lxxv: 2). Hence, the Jewish teachers were concerned about the change of Abram's and Sarah's names just as Justin was about the change of Joshua's name (*Dialogue* lxxv: 2). Justin even seems to quote passages of Scripture in the Jewish order of ascending importance, Hagiographa, Prophets, and Law (*Dialogue* xxix: 2).<sup>25</sup>

Shotwell's own study has convinced him that Justin used the Seven Rules of Hillel as some of the basic guides for the explication of the Old Testament.<sup>26</sup>

The Seven Rules of Hillel approach the text of Scripture very literally and logically, but their results depend on the basic intention of the exegete.<sup>27</sup> According to Ellis, "These rules are a type of reasonable inference which is as old as logic, and they find parallels in all literature; but the casuistical use to which the rabbis put them produced conclusions far beyond the 'reasonable inference' of most minds."<sup>28</sup> In brief summary, the rules are: 1. *a fortiori*, 2. analogy of expressions, 3. and 4. generalizations, 5. general and particular, 6. analogy of a similar passage, and 7. contextual explanation.<sup>29</sup>

Shotwell further justifiably objects to the division of the Jewish

20. Armstrong, p. 19, and Leonhard Goppelt, *Christentum und Judentum im ersten und zweiten Jahrhundert* (Gutersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1954), p. 289.

21. Goodenough, p. 95.

22. Adolf Harnack, "Judentum und Judenchristentum in Justins Dialog mit Trypho," *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literature*, XXXIX, pp. 71-72.

23. Shotwell, pp. 71-90.

24. *Ibid.*, p. 90.

25. *Ibid.*, pp. 89-90.

26. *Ibid.*, p. 93.

27. Robert M. Grant, *The Letter and the Spirit* (London: S.P.C.K., 1957), p. 39.

28. E. Earle Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1957), p. 42.

29. *Ibid.*, p. 41.

world into two distinct groups: Palestinian and Diaspora Judaism.<sup>30</sup> He believes that it is quite possible that the Judaism that Justin knew would furnish him with his knowledge of Palestinian Judaism as well as a knowledge of Hellenized Judaism similar to that of Philo.<sup>31</sup> Goodenough, on the other hand, views the *Dialogue* as a hypothetical situation imagined by Justin and destined to appeal to Gentiles as well as Jews. Trypho is not regarded by Goodenough as a real individual of Justin's experience, but as a composite of both Hellenistic and Palestinian schools of Judaism.<sup>32</sup> While Shotwell does consider Justin's Samaritan background, he neglects an important consideration which sheds light on Justin's acquaintance with Judaism. Justin records Trypho as saying at one point, "You seem to me to have come out of a great conflict with many persons about all the points we have been searching into, and therefore quite ready to return answers to all questions put to you."<sup>33</sup> A great deal of Justin's knowledge of contemporary Judaism, both Palestinian and Hellenistic, was gained as a result of numbers of debates with Jews representing various schools of thought and tradition. As a result of this kaleidoscopic exposure to Judaism, Justin may have been unable to draw a consistent picture of any one single school of Jewish thought.

Barthelemy has recently shown that Justin's rather "loose" quotations of the Septuagint have marked affinities with some fragments of the Minor Prophets in Greek found in Palestine.<sup>34</sup> Justin often cites the Minor Prophets, and when he does he generally uses the recension examined by Barthelemy.<sup>35</sup> Sundberg calls our attention to the important fact that a Christian of the mid-second century used a Greek text almost identical with a Palestinian revision of the Septuagint. "Thus it seems probable that Justin's text of the Septuagint, at least of the Minor Prophets came into Christian usage from Palestinian Judaism."<sup>36</sup>

In considering the relationship between Justin and Philo, Goodenough was convinced that Justin was "unmistakably a follower of Alexandrine tradition."<sup>37</sup> Six parallels between Justin's and Philo's exegetical methods are evident: 1. Contradictions indicate hidden meanings, 2. Reduplicated expressions are important, 3. Omissions are significant, 4. Words have consistent allegorical meanings, 5. Ambiguities

30. A. D. Nock, *Early Gentile Christianity and Its Hellenistic Background* (New York, Evanston and London: Harper & Row, Publishers; Harper Torchbooks, 1964), p. x, where he writes in September of 1962: "A point of special interest is that among the very numerous Biblical texts belonging to the sect [Qumran] there are some in Greek. This is one more indication that we must not draw too sharp a distinction between Judaism of the Holy Land and the Judaism of the Dispersion."

31. Shotwell, p. 103.

32. Goodenough, p. 95.

33. *Dialogue* 50:1.

34. Dominique Barthelemy, *Les Devanciers D'Aquila: Premiere Publication Integrale du Texte des Fragments du Dodecapropheton* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963), pp. 203-12.

35. *Ibid.*, p. 212.

36. Sundberg, p. 92.

37. Goodenough, p. 116.

should conform to general Scriptural teaching, and 6. Numbers, events, things and names have symbolic meanings.<sup>38</sup> Goodenough finds Justin's allegorical treatment to be a weak reflection of Philonic exegesis,<sup>39</sup> and he even finds instances of Justin's direct dependence on Philo.<sup>40</sup> In Shotwell's detailed discussion of the relationship between Philo and Justin,<sup>41</sup> he shows quite decisively that it is no longer necessary to assume a direct dependence of Justin on Philo.<sup>42</sup> A. Harnack, A. Feder and J. Lebreton had previously warned against seeing too direct a connection between Philo and Justin.<sup>43</sup>

Justin was greatly influenced by Christian exegetical tradition in a number of ways. He was, first of all, familiar with a number of the writings of the New Testament, especially the Gospels, the epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse of John. Familiarity with the Gospels gave Justin a knowledge of the historical details of Jesus' life and ministry which he sought to substantiate by reference to predictive portions of the Old Testament. Knowledge of the Gospels, or "Memoirs of the Apostles," also meant that he would know the Messianic proof-texts used by the Evangelists together with their exegetical methodology. Justin's methods are a stage in the line of development from the earliest apologists. If he is to be understood at all, he must be understood in continuity with his predecessors.<sup>44</sup> Justin gives no exegesis or interpretation of the Gospels themselves, for as historical works they need none.<sup>45</sup> He does, however, give certain suggestive interpretations to what he considers to be symbolic action on the part of Jesus. The plows and yokes which Jesus made while he was a carpenter are interpreted as symbols of righteousness and of an active life (*Dial.* 88:8). Justin's assertion that Jesus made plows may have come to him in either the form of a written or oral tradition, or it may have been his own inference of what a Palestinian *tekton* did. C. C. McCown concludes that a *tekton* was a carpenter who confined himself to working with wood.<sup>46</sup> W. Bauer cites Maximus of Tyre to the effect that a *tekton* makes *arotra*.<sup>47</sup> What Cullmann has entitled "The Infancy Story of Thomas," (formerly referred to as the Gospel of Thomas, Recension A), and which he provisionally dates before the end of the second century, contains a statement in 13:1 to the effect that "His [Jesus']

38. Grant, pp. 76-77.

39. Goodenough, pp. 113ff.

40. *Ibid.*

41. Shotwell, pp. 93-113.

42. For an opposing position, see Arthur J. Bellinzoni, Jr., *Review of The Biblical Exegesis of Justin Martyr*, by Willis A. Shotwell, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXXV (1966), pp. 124-25.

43. Kominiak, p. 13.

44. Armstrong, p. 49.

45. Grant, pp. 77-78.

46. C. C. McCown, "Ho Tekton," *Studies in Early Christianity*, edited by Shirley Jackson Case (New York and London: The Century Company, 1928), p. 189.

47. Walter Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, translated and adapted by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 816.

father was a carpenter and made at that time [Syr., Lat. variant: only] plows and yokes."<sup>48</sup> The date of this writing may lend credence to the view that Justin was familiar with a tradition to this effect. How then does Justin construe these objects as "symbols of righteousness?" It would appear that Justin's familiarity with the Synoptic gospels would mean that he would be acquainted with Jesus' own metaphorical use of the "yoke" to signify the obligation incumbent on his disciples in Matthew 11:29-30. A parallel saying is logion 90 of the Gospel of Thomas. Two early patristic writings, *Didache* 6:2 and *I Clement* 16:17, have picked up this metaphorical use of the "yoke" from this Matthaean passage (cf. *Barnabas* 2:6, where the new law of Jesus is said to be without the yoke of necessity). In addition to the yoke, Jesus also uses the "plow" in a saying in Luke 9:62, which was undoubtedly interpreted as metaphorical later on: "No man who puts his hand to the plow and looks back is fit for the kingdom of God." Since both the plow and the yoke are used figuratively in a context of response to the message of the kingdom, it is quite easy to see how Justin construed them to be "symbols of righteousness."

In response to the question of whether or not Justin was dependent on an early collection of Messianic Testimonia—undoubtedly oral—we may assume that he is, without delving into that knotty problem within the context of this paper.<sup>49</sup>

## II. Justin's Exegetical Method

### A. Justin's Conception of His Own Method

An important part of our evaluation and examination of Justin's exegetical approach to the Old Testament may be gained from his own explicit statements concerning his own approach to Biblical exegesis. These conscious statements may or may not be substantiated by an inductive study of the application of his methods.

Justin contends that only Christians can really understand the message of the Old Testament through charismatic illumination.<sup>50</sup> In numerous passages Justin claims to owe his knowledge of the true import of Scripture to gift of divine grace (*Dial.* 7:3, 58:1, 92:1, 100:2, 119:1). Along with the prophetic and other gifts, this has been transferred to the Church from Israel, for the former has become the true Israel of

48. Edgar Hennecke, *New Testament Apocrypha*, Vol. I, edited by Wilhelm Schneemelcher, trans. R. McL. Wilson (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963), p. 396.

49. A recent and complete summary of the state of the question of Testimonia may be found in Pierre Prigent, *L'Épître de Barnabé I-XVI et ses Sources: Les Testimonia dans le Christianisme Primitif* (Paris: J. Gabalda et Compagnie, 1961), pp. 16-23. The author himself finds that Pseudo-Barnabas was dependent for his Messianic proof-texts on a written document. That this thesis is proved is dubious.

50. Armstrong, p. 20.

God (*Dial.* 78:10, 82:1).<sup>51</sup> This gift of enlightenment with the subsequent deliverance from error had been foretold by the prophets (*Dial.* 39:4). A corollary of the charismatic illumination of the Christians is the judicial blindness of Israel which prevents them from understanding their own Scriptures (*Dial.* 70:5, *I Apol.* 31:5). Justin also recognizes that demons are actively attacking and deceiving those who are confronted with the proper interpretation of the Scriptures (*I Apol.* 14:1). Justin charges that the Jews were wrong to understand literally the ceremonial elements of Mosaic legislation: "...you have understood all things in a carnal sense."<sup>52</sup> Here Justin bears marked similarity to the Epistle of Barnabas, in that the latter author makes an ethical interpretation of some of the dietary laws and concludes, "So then the ordinance of God is not abstinence from eating, but Moses spoke spiritually [*ἐν πνεύματι*]." <sup>53</sup> Though Barnabas nowhere mentions the "gift of grace" as an aid to understanding the Scriptures, he does appeal to divine illumination (*Barn.* 10:12), as well as to a "secret gnosis."

In *Dialogue* 44:2, Justin expresses his concept of a three-fold division of the Law: "For I say that one command was ordained for piety and righteousness and another command and action similarly spoke either concerning the mystery of Christ or because of the hardness of your people's heart." Justin believed that men were saved by performing the eternal and natural acts of righteousness and piety, some of which were embodied in the Mosaic Law (*Dial.* 45:3-4). In *Dialogue* 93:3 he says that all righteousness is divided into two branches, righteousness toward God and righteousness toward man. He traces this view back to Jesus' statement of the greatest commandment in Luke 10:27 and parallels (*Dial.* 93:2); Perhaps this division of the Law into three parts was wholly derived by Justin from various statements contained in the Gospels (cf. Luke 24:25-27 and Matthew 19:18). The purpose of the *Dialogue* shifts Justin's attention to the last two divisions of the Law throughout the remainder of the treatise. It is here alone that Justin will admit figurative interpretation, either typological or allegorical. The original significance of the Law was literal, but to Justin it retained only figurative truths relating to the "mystery of Christ."

The overwhelming proof of the truth of Christianity for Justin was the fulfillment of prophecy. Before his conversion he was actively engaged in a pursuit after the true knowledge of God, and it was in divine revelation authenticated by the fulfillment of prophecy that he found this knowledge (*I Apol.* 12:10). According to Justin in *I Apology* 30P:

51. If the *sina qua non* of Dispensationalism is the distinction between Israel and the Church based on a "literal" approach to the Old Testament, then Justin cannot in any sense be styled a precursor of Dispensationalism. See Charles Ryrie, *Dispensationalism Today* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1965), pp. 43-47 and 65-66. In the sense that Ryrie has defined the distinctive stance of Dispensationalists, none of the early fathers can be claimed to have espoused a nascent form of Dispensationalism, despite the irrelevant occurrence of the word *oikonomia*.

52. *Dialogue* 14:2.

53. *Barnabas* 10:1-2.

We do not trust in mere hearsay, but are forced to believe those who prophesied these things before they happened, because we actually see things that have happened and are happening as was predicted. This will, as we think, be the greatest and surest demonstration for you too.

In *I Apology* 36:1ff., Justin is careful to explain how God speaks in various passages of Scripture. Whenever the prophets speak as a certain person, this person is not to be thought of as the prophet himself, but as the Divine Logos who moves him. "For sometimes he speaks as predicting the things that are to happen, sometimes he speaks in the character of God the Master and Father of all, sometimes as in the character of Christ, sometimes in the character of the people answering the Lord or his Father."<sup>54</sup> Each of these points is subsequently illustrated by Justin in the following few chapters of the *Dialogue*, which may be considered the first conscious statement of hermeneutical principles for the interpretation of prophecy. Though he knew only the Greek text of the Old Testament, Justin was the first person—to my knowledge—to explain the difficulty of prophecy in the past tense by referring to what Gesenius called the *perfectum propheticum*:<sup>55</sup>

Now when the prophetic Spirit speaks of things to come as already having happened, as is illustrated in the passages quoted—I will explain this too so that those who come on it will have no excuse for not understanding. Things he fully knows are to happen he speaks of in advance as if they had already occurred.<sup>56</sup>

Justin has a large hermeneutical vocabulary which he uses to describe the predictive element of the Old Testament.<sup>57</sup> This vocabulary includes the terms "mystery" (occurring 45 times), "announcement" (three different words occurring a total of 12 times), "sign" (35 times), "parable" (12 times), "symbol" (28 times), and "type" (18 times).<sup>58</sup> After a comprehensive study of these terms, Shotwell concludes that they are all more or less synonymous, although signs and symbols refer to things having a predictive element, types to people or actions which are predictive, and parables refer to sayings with a predictive note.<sup>59</sup> In *Dialogue* 30:1, Justin makes the interesting observation that "... the prophecy which was announced subsequent to the death of Moses is everlasting." Justin's view of the Old Testament economy, then, was that it was divided into two periods, the first being the Mosaic economy in which predictions of Christ were largely in terms of types and symbols.<sup>60</sup> These types and symbols themselves were intended by God to be only temporary (*Dial.* 40:1, 113:4), and have significance only for the Church if their figurative

54. *I Apology* 26:1.

55. E. Kautzsch, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, trans. A. E. Cowley (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1910), par. 106a.

56. *I Apology* 42:1.

57. Cf. Grant, pp. 120-42.

58. Shotwell, p. 13.

59. *Ibid.*, p. 19.

60. *Dialogue* 40:4.

significance is rightly understood. The prophets themselves often explained figurative or obscure predictions made before their time (*Dial.* 68:6). Prophecy itself is obscure and enigmatical by nature as well as by the express intention of the prophets themselves (*Dial.* 90:1).

### B. Verbal Interpretation

It would be well for us at this juncture to consider whether or not Justin held to a double method of interpretation as some scholars have concluded. Goodenough has insisted that Justin had to insure his right to read Scripture in the allegorical rather than the literal sense.<sup>61</sup> Armstrong refers to Justin's Christological view of the Scriptures:

Naturally this conception of the Old Testament, that it contains the whole truth and prophecy of Christ, led to a double method of interpretation. The Scriptures have a literal sense and a spiritual one. Only thus will one understand all that has been written in parables, types, symbols and mysteries. This spiritual interpretation had entrenched itself so deeply in Judaism and Christianity that Trypho never tries to contest the exegetical method itself.<sup>62</sup>

In treating Justin's methods of exegesis, Shotwell too distinguishes between Justin's treatment of the literal fulfillment of prophecy and his use of allegory, analogy, lesser to greater, and so on.<sup>63</sup> To Justin himself, however, no such distinction would have been apparent. He did not feel himself to be allegorizing, but rather to be "literally" interpreting what was actually to be found in the texts themselves.<sup>64</sup> The only exception to this was the non-ethical portion of the Pentateuch, as well as a limited number of historical persons or things which he viewed typologically. Shotwell's analysis may be quite acceptable from a modern point of view, but it fails to convey Justin's own approach toward the Scriptures. Whatever passages he may have "literally" interpreted were so interpreted because their plain teaching (isolated from the context, of course) happened to conform to what Justin wanted to find there. Justin, in short, interpreted a given passage in a single way. This is in contrast to later fathers, notably Origen, who gave more than one level of meaning to a single passage.<sup>65</sup> The two approaches are quite different.

Especially in connection with the interpretation of the Psalms, Justin displays a method which is a development of that found in Acts 2:29-35 and 13:35-36.<sup>66</sup> In these passages the contemporary Jewish interpretation of the Psalms is shown to be impossible, and a new application supplied by the interpreter.<sup>67</sup> In *Dialogue* 56, where Justin quotes Psalm

61. Goodenough, pp. 112-13.

62. Armstrong, p. 21.

63. Shotwell, pp. 29-47.

64. Cf. Grant, p. 30.

65. Wiles, p. 121.

66. Grant, p. 46.

67. O. Linton, "Interpretation of the Psalms in the Early Church," *Texte und Untersuchungen*, LXXIX (1961), p. 144.

110:1 ("The Lord said unto my Lord"), he stresses this phrase and says to Trypho: "You must acknowledge, that besides the creator of all, the incomprehensible God, another is also called Lord." In *I Apology* 35:6, after quoting Psalm 22:16, 18, he states that "...David, the king and prophet, who said this, suffered none of these things." He goes on to apply the psalm prophetically to Christ. Although Psalm 110 is applied to Hezekiah by the Jews, Justin shows that this actually refers to Christ rather than to Solomon (*Dial.* 36 and 34). Trypho cannot win an argument with Justin even when he refers to a Psalm title (*Dial.* 64:5).

Even though Justin has the honor of being the first comprehensive interpreter of the Old Testament, his use of context proves to exercise no restraint on his exegesis.<sup>68</sup> Whereas previous Christian authors had been content with quoting more or less isolated proof-texts, Justin attempted to give a more coherent interpretation of many passages within their larger contexts.<sup>69</sup> Chapters 99 through 106 of the *Dialogue*, for instance, form an extended running commentary on Psalm 22. At the beginning of his discussion, in *Dialogue* 99:1, he says "Therefore I will demonstrate to you that the whole Psalm speaks of Christ." An example is his irrelevant use of the context of Daniel 7:9-28 in *Dialogue* 31, when both *Dialogue* 31:1 and 32:1 clearly inform us that Justin and Trypho are concerned only with Daniel 7:13-14 (which he attributes to Jeremiah in *I Apology* 51:9).

### C. Figurative Interpretation

Most of the material which Justin interpreted figuratively was drawn from Mosaic legislation. These "temporary" accommodations of God to Israel are interpreted by Justin in accordance with what he considers to be their "eternal" counterparts. It is at this point where the distinction between allegory and typology is difficult to maintain. Danielou finds in Justin an important witness to the progress of typology in the early Church,<sup>70</sup> which he certainly is, and Clavier considers the *Dialogue* to be a "model of allegorical typology rarely surpassed, even by the Alexandrians."<sup>71</sup> Where a distinction between the two figurative methods of interpretation is maintained, it is generally held that typology recognizes the historicity of the type, while allegory disregards completely the original historical significance of the text and gives it a timeless, symbolic quality. In Justin, a really clear distinction between the two terms cannot be maintained. Clavier's term "allegorical typology" may be the best, since the use of the word "typology" links Justin's method to Christian exegetical tradition, which is certainly the case. Wolfson has called

68. Armstrong, p. 18.

69. Linton, pp. 148-49.

70. Jean Danielou, *From Shadow to Reality: Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers* (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1960), p. 1.

71. H. Clavier, "Esquisse de Typologie comparee, dans le Nouveau Testament et chez quelques ecrivains patristiques," *Texte und Untersuchungen*, LXXIX (1961), pp. 41-42.

Justin's use of the figurative method "predictive allegory," in distinction to the "philosophical allegory" of Philo.<sup>72</sup> Their difference lies in the purpose to which they were applied; in Justin the validation of certain historical events, while in Philo to find philosophical and ethical principles. Unlike Barnabas, whose allegorism includes the ethical as well as the predictive (*Barn.* 10:1-2), Justin's allegory is strictly predictive. In an interesting passage in *Dialogue* 42:1, Justin's use of this method may be seen:

Moreover, the prescription that twelve bells be attached to the robe of the high priest which hung to the feet, was a symbol of the twelve apostles, who depend on the power of Christ, the eternal Priest; and through their voice it is that all the earth has been filled with the glory and grace of God and of his Christ.

Barnabas' method of finding allegorical references to the New Covenant is much more obvious than Justin's. In 11:1 the author remarks, "But let us inquire if the Lord took pains to foretell the water of baptism and the cross." From the ensuing discussion it is evident that he has made any reference to water or wood in the Old Testament to refer to the cross and baptism. He is especially delighted to find both mentioned in the same Scriptural passage (*Barn.* 11:6-8).

Justin's dependence on collections or traditions of Messianic testimonia naturally preserved some of the original typological interpretation associated with those texts. We could expect that his own contributions to interpretation would partake more of allegory than of typology, and that is precisely what we find. It is evident, for example, that Justin makes use of an Adam-Christ parallelism in *Dialogue* 79 and 103. In *Dialogue* 100:4 we find Justin's use of this parallelism which was later used and more systematically developed by Irenaeus in his theory of recapitulation: "...and that he [Christ] became a man by the virgin, in order that the disobedience which proceeded from the serpent might receive its destruction in the same manner in which it derived its origin."<sup>73</sup> This underlying stratum of typological exegesis is further found in Justin's reference to Satan's attempt to deceive Christ as he had Adam (*Dial.* 103:6). This variety of typology is suggested also by *Barnabas* 12:5-7.

#### D. Interpretive Alteration

Since the technique of interpretive alteration of the Biblical text is found not only in the Qumran commentaries which are designated "pesharim,"<sup>74</sup> but also in the writings of early Christians,<sup>75</sup> we should inquire whether Justin himself has any occasion to alter the text of the Old Testament in order that the meaning he sees in it might better be

72. Grant, p. 40.

73. The dependence of Irenaeus on Justin is thoroughly treated by Pierre Prigent, *Justin et L'Ancien Testament* (Paris: J. Gabalda et Compagnie, Publishers, 1964), and especially in chapter one: "La 'Recapitulation,'" pp. 19-73.

74. F. F. Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1959), pp. 70f.

75. Ellis, pp. 145-47.

conveyed. Since Justin is conscious of Jewish alteration of the text and strongly disapproves of it, we should *a priori* expect him to be free from such textual manipulation.

Psalm 110:2, quoted six times by Justin, shows considerable textual variation.<sup>76</sup> The lengthy quotation of the psalm which occurs in *Dialogue* 32 may have been corrected by a standard text of the Septuagint.<sup>77</sup> There the phrase ἐκ Σιών occurs when Psalm 110:2 is quoted, in agreement with the Septuagint. In I *Apology* 45:3 and 5, on the other hand, the corresponding phrase is twice quoted as ἐξ Ἱερουσαλήμ, in agreement with his interpretation: "That which he says, 'He shall send to thee the rod of power out of Jerusalem' is predictive of the mighty word, which his apostles, going forth from Jerusalem, preached everywhere" (I *Apol.* 45:5). In *Dialogue* 83:3-4, the phrase εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ is found three times, and is interpreted by Justin to mean that "...our Jesus has sent into Jerusalem a rod of power, namely the word of calling and repentance for all nations over which demons held sway." These three variants of the same phrase are a strong indication that Justin has altered the passage in question, or else has unconsciously read the parallelism of Micah 4:2 ("For from Zion shall go out the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem") into Psalm 110:2.

The *Epistle of Barnabas* contains a particularly good example of this type of textual alteration. In *Barnabas* 5:11-12, this observation is made:

So then the Son of God came in the flesh for this reason, that he might complete the total of the sins of those who persecuted his prophets to death. For this cause he endured. For God says of the chastisement of his flesh that it is from them: 'When they shall smite their shepherd, then the sheep of the flock shall be destroyed.'

The Septuagint version of Zechariah 13:7, the source of Barnabas' quotation, shows that two important interpretive changes have been made: 1. A second plural imperative ("strike the shepherd"), has been changed to a third plural subjunctive ("When *they* strike the shepherd"), in keeping with Barnabas' desire to make Israel the subject of the verb. 2. A verb with the meaning to "disperse, scatter," (LXX: ἐκπασατε; Matthew 26:31 and Justin *Dial.* 53:6: διασκορπισθήσονται), has been changed to one meaning to "kill, destroy," (ἀπόλειται). Thus, while Matthew and Justin interpret Zechariah 13:7 as the scattering of the disciples upon the crucifixion of Jesus, Barnabas, with the aid of some drastic textual alteration, interprets the same Old Testament passage as the destruction of Israel upon their crucifixion of Jesus.

76. Prigent, *L'Épître* . . . , p. 85, n. 1.

77. Smit Sibinga, p. 149: "Moreover, before any such results [i.e. Justin as a witness to second century LXX texts] can be aimed at, one has to evaluate all the evidence concerning the alteration of lemma's and citations during the history of Justin's own text."

Justin felt so strongly that Old Testament prophecies regarding the coming Messiah had to be fulfilled, that he sometimes read details from the Scriptural narrative into aspects of Gospel history. In his quotation of Genesis 49:10-11, for example, Justin makes this comment: "Binding his foal to the vine and washing his robe in the blood of the grape is a symbolic exhibition of the things that would happen to Christ, and his actions. For an ass's foal was standing at the entrance of a village bound to a vine" (*I Apol.* 32:5-6). This detail of the ass being bound to a vine at the outskirts of the village is not found in any of the canonical Gospel accounts, and Justin neglects to mention this factor in *Dialogue* 53, when he quotes the same passage.

In *I Apology* 32, Justin interprets Genesis 49:10 ("The ruler shall not depart from Judah, nor a leader from between his feet until he come for whom it is reserved."), by saying that the Jews had their own ruler and king until the Messiah came (*I Apol.* 32:2). Justin has allowed his interpretation of this prophetic passage to supplement his own lack of historical knowledge. In addition to these two possible examples, Danielou suggests that Justin's reference to a "cave" near Bethlehem as the place of Jesus' birth (*Dial.* 78:5), was included because of the influence of Isaiah 33:16.<sup>78</sup> Justin himself says that the cave was foreshadowed by a sign in Isaiah (*Dial.* 78:6). Against Danielou's conjecture it may be noted that there was apparently a rather extensive tradition to the effect that Jesus was born in a cave near Bethlehem. This tradition is expressed a number of times in the *Protevangelium of James* 18, 19 and 21:3, thought to have been written after the middle of the second century. Sedulius Scotus, in his commentary on Matthew, quotes the *Gospel According to the Hebrews* as saying that Christ was born in a cave.<sup>79</sup> W. Bauer refers to the cave as an oral tradition concerning the early life of Jesus,<sup>80</sup> and the *Pseudo-Gospel of Matthew* also refers to a cave as the place of Jesus' birth.<sup>81</sup> In view of these references in apocryphal literature, it seems evident that Justin was dependent upon the same stream of tradition which he conveniently found prefigured in the Old Testament.

### III. Justin's Exegetical Themes

No real insight may be gained into Justin's interpretive methods unless we attempt to stand within the framework of his thought and view the relationship between the Old and the New Covenants as he did. His exegetical themes reveal his basic view of their relationship. In the broad sense, every point of Justin's exegesis has its Christological point; whether it refers to Christ and his Passion or to the Church and her Sacraments.<sup>82</sup>

78. J. Danielou, *Les Divers Sens de l'Écriture dans la Tradition Chrétienne Primitif* (Louvain: E. Nauwelaerts, 1948), p. 121.

79. Hennecke, p. 151.

80. *Ibid.*, p. 372.

81. *Ibid.*, p. 410.

82. Armstrong, p. 50.

A. *Proskairos* and *Aionios*

*Proskairos* and *aionios* are Greek adjectives which mean "temporal" and "eternal" respectively. They have been selected to title this section of the paper in that they reveal one of Justin's basic approaches to the Old Testament.

In chapters 10 to 29 of the *Dialogue*, Justin proposes an interpretation of the ritual laws of the Old Testament in which he contends that the Sabbath ordinances, circumcision, the feasts and fasting were the temporary expressions of the will of God adapted and accommodated to the unfaithfulness of Israel (*Dial.* 19:6).<sup>83</sup> Justin is convinced of the temporary significance of the Law, not only because it has subsequently been superseded by Christ, but also because it was a temporary measure within the context of the Old Testament dispensation itself. A parenthesis, one could say, in that economy. His frequent use of the book of Genesis in quotation, second only to his use of Isaiah and the Psalms, may be partially accounted for by the fact that it portrays both individual men and the beginning of Israel as a people of God before the Mosaic Law.<sup>84</sup> In accordance with his principle of interpreting symbols, types, and announcements by the prophets who expounded their meaning,<sup>85</sup> he makes frequent reference to the prophetic invectives against Israel's outward conformity but inward disobedience to the true intent of the Law of God. The subsequent destruction of the Temple and the impossibility of fulfilling the sacrificial demands of the Law as a result of the Edict of Hadrian (A.D. 138), was a third way in which Justin proved the temporal character of the Law.

Justin does not deny the literal meaning of the Law, though he does see deeper symbolic and typological significance—the "mystery of Christ" (*Dial.* 44:2). If his approach to the Law of Moses seems less radical than that of Barnabas, it is only because he does grant a temporary validity to that Law, though in details of exegesis it is often very difficult to find any real distinction between Justin and Barnabas.<sup>86</sup> Pseudo-Barnabas contends that the Law was never intended to be understood literally (*Barn.* 10:9), and he never speaks of two Covenants, for to his mind there was only one: Israel was not ready to receive it because of her sins (*Barn.* 14:1). The Covenant was thus inherited by the Church through the default of Israel (*Barn.* 14:4-5), and belongs to the Church alone (*Barn.* 4:6-7).

Justin frequently refers to Jesus as the "New Law" (*Dial.* 11:4, 34:1), as does Barnabas in 2:6, the "New Lawgiver" (*Dial.* 12:2, 14:3, 18:3), the "New Covenant" (*Dial.* 11:4, 34:1), and the "Everlasting Law and New Covenant" (*Dial.* 43:1). This typological relation between the old and the new is succinctly expressed by Justin in *Dialogue* 11:2:

83. Prigent, *Justin* . . . , p. 74.

84. Armstrong, pp. 21-22.

85. *Dialogue* 68:6.

86. For example, their ethical interpretation of some of the ritual laws.

For the law promulgated on Horeb is now old, and belongs to yourselves alone; but his is for all universally. Now, law placed against law has abrogated that which is before it, and a covenant which comes after in like manner has put an end to the previous one; and an eternal and final law—namely Christ—has been given to us, and the covenant is trustworthy, after which there shall be no law, no commandment, no ordinance.

The confirmation that Jesus was indeed the New Law and New Covenant was provided for Justin through the deeds and miracles performed by Jesus (*Dial.* 11:4).<sup>87</sup> When Justin is faced with the difficulty that even the prophets occasionally reiterate the Mosaic Law, he replies that it was on account of Israel's hardness of heart and their ingratitude toward Him that he kept on proclaiming them (*Dial.* 27:2). In his interpretation of Psalm 19:7, "The law of the Lord is perfect," he makes this perfect law equivalent to Christ (*Dial.* 34:1).

Most of the important elements of the ceremonial law are given spiritual and eternal counterparts by Justin in their relation to Christ and the Church. In *Dialogue* 43:2 he speaks of circumcision according to the flesh (*kata sarka*) and spiritual circumcision (*pneumatike*). He often qualified the word circumcision by the prepositional phrase *kata sarka* (*Dial.* 16:2, 18:2, 19:3-4, 23:1). That ritual circumcision was a type of the true circumcision "by which we are circumcised from deceit and iniquity," (*Dial.* 41:4). Pseudo-Barnabas recognizes no such typological import for the rite. Israel misunderstood the rite to be of the flesh because an evil angel misled them (*Barn.* 9:4). Israel was originally given circumcision, according to Justin, as a sign to set them apart from other nations so that they could suffer (*Dial.* 19:1). The Sabbath too was given to Israel as a sign to set them apart from others so that God's name should not be profaned (*Dial.* 21:1). Barnabas, in keeping with his denial of any originally literal meaning of the law, has a rather interesting allegorical interpretation of the Sabbath (*Barn.* 15). Since the Creation account speaks of God's resting on the seventh day, and Psalm 90:4 states that "the day of the Lord is as a thousand years," Barnabas concludes that after 6,000 years of history, everything will be completed and God will truly rest on the seventh day, a day of a thousand years duration.

Justin frequently refers to the Church as the "true Israelite race" (*Dial.* 135:3), the "true high priestly nation" (*Dial.* 116:3), the "true children of God" (*Dial.* 123:9), and the "true spiritual Israel" (*Dial.* 11:5). Justin found a rather novel way of combining the concept of a new people of God with the millennium through the use of analogy. In Isaiah 65:22, which is quoted by Justin in *Dialogue* 81:3, he finds the expression "According to the days of the tree shall be the days of my people." Since he realizes that the "people" can be none other than the Church, he seeks to define the tree as the tree of life in the Garden of Eden. Since Adam was told that on the day he ate of the fruit of the tree he would die, and

87. The same thought is expressed in *Barnabas* 2:6.

he lived to be almost a thousand years old, he did in fact die the same "day" he ate, for Psalm 90:4 informs us that a day with the Lord is as a thousand years. The expression "days of my people" in Isaiah 65:22, therefore, refers to the 1,000 year period predicted by John that the people of God would dwell in Jerusalem.

### B. Jesus the Messiah

In anti-Jewish polemic,<sup>88</sup> Christians were forced to develop an apology based on the Old Testament which would answer certain questions arising out of the kerygma: 1. Messiah is a suffering Messiah, 2. Messiah is to rise from the dead, and 3. salvation is to be proclaimed to the Gentiles as well as the Jews.<sup>89</sup> Three other closely related subjects are the divinity, pre-existence and virgin birth of the Messiah.<sup>90</sup> Justin deals at great length with all of these matters. To the problem of a suffering Messiah, brought up by Trypho in *Dialogue* 32:1, Justin used the traditional Christian view of two comings.<sup>91</sup> In *Dialogue* 99 to 106, as we have previously mentioned, Justin gives an extended commentary on Psalm 22 in which he finds a rather complete account of Christ's passion, based on the New Testament Messianic exegesis of the Psalm.

One method which Justin uses to demonstrate prophetic anticipation of Jesus is in terms of a typological person or action, which must be derived from events happening to a "righteous" person (*Dial.* 86:1). One typological relationship which is not found fully developed in the New Testament (cf. Hebrews 4:8-9 and context), but is first found in the *Epistle of Barnabas* is that of Joshua and Jesus. Joshua's importance in post-apostolic Christianity explains his lack of popularity in Jewish circles: he is contrasted to Moses who did not bring the people of God into the promised land, while Joshua did.<sup>92</sup> Undoubtedly it was the equivalence of their names in their Greek form which first suggested this type.<sup>93</sup> In Justin as in Barnabas we find three main themes that are symbolically interpreted: 1. The victory over Amalek, a type of Satan (*Barn.* 12:2, *Dial.* 49:8, 75:2), 2. Moses' outstretched arms as a type of the cross (*Barn.* 12:2-3, 8, *Dial.* 90:4, 111:1), and 3. Joshua's name is a type of Jesus (*Barn.* 6:8, 12:8-10, *Dial.* 90:4, 111:2, 113:2). Both Barnabas and Justin place stress on the fact that Joshua's name was changed (*Dial.* 113:2, *Barn.* 12:9). Through the use of analogy, Justin applied Exodus 23:20-21 ("Behold I send my angel before you . . . give heed to him . . . for my name is in him."), to Joshua, who led the people into the promised land (*Dial.* 75:2), thus proving the divinity of Jesus.

88. On this whole question see Marcel Simon, *Verus Israel: Etude sur les Relations entre Chretiens et Juifs dans l'Empire Romain* (Paris: E. De Boccard, Editeur, 1948).

89. Wiles, pp. 113-14, essentially a rephrasing of C. H. Dodd.

90. *Ibid.*, p. 114.

91. Prigent, *Justin . . .*, p. 80, and Justin *Dialogue* 14:8.

92. Danielou, *From Shadow . . .*, p. 229f.

93. *Ibid.*, p. 231.

In chapters 32 to 110 of the *Dialogue*, Justin gives a great deal of space to the elaboration of the Scriptural evidence for the divinity of Jesus. He refers to the plural pronouns in Genesis 1:26-27 and Genesis 3:22 to show that the Father communed with the Son before the latter's incarnation (*Dial.* 62). This interpretation is also assumed by *Barnabas* 6:12-13. Among the exegetical traditions common to the early Fathers is that of the "scarlet cord." Clement, in one of the few really allegorical passages in his epistle to the Corinthians, mentions the scarlet cord hung from the house of Rahab the Harlot as a foreshadowing of redemption through the blood of Christ (*I Clement* 12:7). The same significance is seen by Justin in *Dialogue* 111:4, which is obviously in dependence to Clement's letter. The redemptive type of the brazen serpent first found in John 3:14, stands in marked contrast to the allegorism of Clement. Justin, relying wholly on John at this point, uses an apparent contradiction in the original narrative to underline the Messianic significance of the type. In *Dialogue* 94:1 and 112:1, Justin asks Trypho why Moses was commanded by God to make an image of a serpent, since God himself had expressly forbade the making of graven images. This apparent contradiction validates the typological interpretation in the view of both Justin and Pseudo-Barnabas (*Barn.* 12:6).

#### IV. Conclusion

Once one has moved from the study of the use of the Old Testament in the New to the study of Biblical exegesis in early patristic literature, one becomes very aware of the great gap which separates the two. In our study of Justin we have seen that the farther he departs from New Testament exegetical tradition, the closer he gets to allegory. Unfortunately, he rarely is satisfied with taking over the valid New Testament teachings about the Old Testament without adding to, and thus almost inevitably detracting from those teachings. The study of patristic exegesis is the study of the decline of literal and typological interpretation of the Old Testament until allegorical interpretation reigned supreme from Augustine to the Reformation. Justin, in spite of his philosopher's cloak, was in reality a zealous missionary who sought by all the means at his disposal to persuade Jews and Gentiles to believe in the true God through the revelation of the incarnate Logos, Jesus Christ. In the midst of some bizarre interpretations of the Old Testament Justin still maintains a core of exegetical tradition which can be traced back to the New Testament itself.

Chicago, Illinois