
The Angelic Spirit in Early Christianity: Justin, the Martyr and Philosopher*

Bogdan G. Bucur / Duquesne University

In the conclusion of his article entitled “The Angelic Spirit in Early Judaism,” John R. Levison invited the scholarly community to use his work as “a suitable foundation for discussion of the angelic spirit” in early Christianity.¹ A few years later, in his study of angelomorphic christology, Charles A. Gieschen highlighted the need for similar work in the field of early pneumatology.² The case for angelomorphic pneumatology has been argued at length with respect to the Book of Revelation, the *Shepherd of Hermas*, and Clement of Alexandria.³ This essay contributes to the discussion by pursuing the occurrence of the “angelic spirit” in the writings of Justin Martyr.⁴

* I am grateful to Fr. Michael Slusser, SJ, for his helpful critique of an earlier draft of this article.

¹ “Discussions of the spirit of God in Early Judaism and Christianity . . . ought to consider . . . interpretations of the spirit as an angelic presence. The texts included in the present analysis serve . . . to provide a suitable foundation for discussion of the angelic spirit in the Fourth Gospel, the Shepherd of Hermas, and the Ascension of Isaiah” (John R. Levison, “The Angelic Spirit in Early Judaism,” *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 34 [1995]: 464–93, 492), and see also *The Spirit in First Century Judaism*, *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums* 29 (Leiden: Brill, 1997).

² Charles A. Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence*, *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums* 42 (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 6: “Ignorance concerning the influence of angelomorphic traditions has also plagued scholarship on early Pneumatology. . . . The same or similar angelomorphic traditions also influenced teaching about the Holy Spirit.” See also the brief survey of early Jewish and Christian examples of angelomorphic pneumatology, 114–19.

³ The most important treatment of the problem is, in my judgment, that of Christian Oeyen, “Eine frühchristliche Engelpneumatologie bei Klemens von Alexandrien,” *Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift* 55 (1965): 102–20; 56 (1966): 27–47. See also Bogdan G. Bucur, “Hierarchy, Prophecy, and the Angelomorphic Spirit: A Contribution to the Study of the Book of Revelation’s *Wirkungsgeschichte*,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127 (2008): 183–204, “The Son of God and the Angelomorphic Holy Spirit: A Rereading of the *Shepherd*’s Christology,” *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 98 (2007): 120–43, and “Revisiting Christian Oeyen: ‘The Other Clement’ on Father, Son, and the Angelomorphic Spirit,” *Vigiliae Christianae* 61 (2007): 381–413.

⁴ Critical editions include Charles Munier, ed. and trans., *Justin: Apologie pour les chrétiens*,

© 2008 by The University of Chicago. All rights reserved.

0022-4189/2008/8802-0003\$10.00

The Angelic Spirit in Early Christianity

The fact that Justin Martyr articulated his trinitarian faith by means of a problematic trinitarian theology is a commonplace in scholarship. Some scholars go so far as to claim that there simply is no doctrine of the Trinity in the *Apologies* and the *Dialogue with Trypho*.⁵ Others prefer to speak of a “rudimentary” theology of the Trinity.⁶ Still other scholars argue that, since the very term “Trinity” had not yet been invented for Christian discourse, discussing Justin’s alleged “trinitarian theology” betrays a fundamentally misguided approach.⁷

The problem most often associated with Justin’s trinitarian theology is its subordinationism.⁸ Even more troubling is Justin’s view of the Holy Spirit. Erwin R. Goodenough’s observation, that “there is no doctrine of Justin more baffling than his doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and no doctrine which has been more differently understood,” remains as true today as it was in 1923.⁹ His writings contain numerous references to “the spirit,” “the holy spirit,” “the divine spirit,” “the prophetic spirit,” “the holy prophetic spirit,” “God’s prophetic spirit,” or “the divine, holy, prophetic spirit.”¹⁰ Nevertheless, Justin offers “very few clear ideas

Sources Chrétiennes 507 (Paris: Cerf, 2006); Philippe Bobichon, ed. and trans., *Justin Martyr: Dialogue avec Tryphon*, Paradosis 47/1–2 (Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg, 2003).

⁵ “Doctrine of the Trinity Justin had none. . . . The Logos was divine, but in the second place; the Holy Spirit was worthy of worship, but in the third place. Such words are entirely incompatible with a doctrine of the Trinity” (Erwin R. Goodenough, *The Theology of Justin Martyr* [Jena: Frommannsche Buchhandlung, 1923], 186). Compare Leslie W. Barnard, *Justin Martyr: His Life and Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 105: “Justin had no real doctrine of the Trinity,” because his statement about Father, Son, and Spirit are “the language of Christian experience rather than theological reflection.” For scholarship prior to 1923, see Goodenough, *Theology of Justin*, 176 n. 2.

⁶ Charles Munier, *L’apologie de Saint Justin Philosophie et Martyr*, Paradosis 37 (Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires Fribourg Suisse, 1994), 109. For similar positions, see José Pablo Martín, *El Espíritu Santo en los orígenes del Cristianismo: Estudio sobre I Clemente, Ignacio, II Clemente y Justino Martir* (Zurich: PAS Verlag, 1971), 253–54; Santos Sabugal, “El vocabulario pneumatológico en la obra de S. Justino y sus implicaciones teológicas,” *Augustinianum* 13 (1973): 459–67, 467.

⁷ For instance, Graham Stanton, “The Spirit in the Writings of Justin Martyr,” in *The Holy Spirit and Christian Origins Essays in Honor of James D. G. Dunn*, ed. G. N. Stanton, B. W. Longenecker, and S. C. Barton (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004), 308–20, at 321: “All too often . . . discussion of the teaching on the Spirit of this outstanding second-century Christian philosopher and martyr has been dominated by fourth-century rather than second-century agendas. Is Justin’s theology binitarian? Does Justin understand the Spirit in personal terms? Does Justin conceive the relationship among Father, Son, and Spirit in triadic or embryonic Trinitarian ways?”

⁸ According to Bobichon (*Dialogue avec Tryphon*, 5), Justin’s subordinationism may in fact explain the very meager manuscript tradition of this work.

⁹ Goodenough, *Theology of Justin*, 176. Sixty years later, Justin’s pneumatology was still viewed as “one of the most difficult features of his teaching to evaluate” (J. E. Morgan-Wynne, “The Holy Spirit and Christian Experience in Justin Martyr,” *Vigiliae Christianae* 38 [1984]: 172–77, 172).

¹⁰ Sabugal (“Vocabulario pneumatológico,” 460) counts thirty-three references in the first *Apology* and fifty-seven in the *Dialogue with Trypho*. For a list and classification of the relevant passages, see Martín, *Espíritu Santo*, 316–20.

The Journal of Religion

about the person and nature of the Prophetic Spirit.”¹¹ Even though verdicts about Justin’s pneumatology “se mantienen sensiblemente distanciadas,” especially on the issue of deciding whether πνεῦμα is a personal or an impersonal entity in the *Apologies* and the *Dialogue*,¹² scholars generally agree that, by contrast to his extensive discussion about the Father and the Son, Justin is quite “discreet” about the Spirit.¹³ In the words of André Wartelle, “one is tempted to write that Justin has the Spirit intervene only when he cannot do otherwise.”¹⁴ It has been said, again and again, that Justin’s all-encompassing theory of the seminal Logos precludes the articulation of a robust pneumatology: “in strict logic there is no place in Justin’s thought for the person of the Holy Spirit because the logos carries out his functions.”¹⁵

This observation, although true to a large extent, is not entirely fair to Justin. As José Pablo Martín has shown, since Justin’s thought is determined by several “conceptual schemes” or “systems,” a study of his christology cannot be reduced to the “Logos-scheme” but must also take into consideration his extensive speculations about notions such as the angels, the divine δύναμις, or the Messiah as bearer of the Spirit.¹⁶ Similarly, a study of Justin’s pneumatology cannot be reduced to the observation that the Logos framework allows almost no place for a theology of the Spirit. In what follows, I argue that Justin Martyr offers an illustration of the early Christian tradition of angelomorphic pneumatology. In doing so, I am treading in the footsteps of Christian Oeyen, who suggested this direction of research in a short but dense article published in 1972, entitled suggestively, “The Teaching about the Divine Powers in Justin.”¹⁷

¹¹ Goodenough, *Theology of Justin*, 180. For a similar formulation, see Willy Rordorf, “La Trinité dans les écrits de Justin Martyr,” *Augustinianum* 20 (1980): 285–97, 296.

¹² Sabugal, “Vocabulario pneumatológico,” 658 (with a survey of scholarly positions).

¹³ Munier, *L’apologie*, 108.

¹⁴ André Wartelle, ed. and trans., *Saint Justin: Apologies* (Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1987), 62. For Stanton (“The Spirit in the Writings of Justin Martyr,” 330), the “imbalance” between Justin’s rich Logos doctrine and relatively meager pneumatology is due to the fact that “Christian views of the Spirit were not the subject of ridicule, so elaboration was not called for.” Compare Goodenough, *Theology of Justin*, 188: the notion of the Holy Spirit “was too well known to need an introduction, was too traditional to need defence.”

¹⁵ Barnard, *Justin*, 106. Compare Munier, *L’apologie*, 109–10: “le christomonisme instauré par Justin tend inévitablement à oculter non seulement le rôle prophétique du l’Esprit-Saint . . . mais aussi son action même dans l’Eglise.” See also André Benoit, *Le baptême chrétien au second siècle: La théologie des pères* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1953), 171.

¹⁶ Martín, *Espíritu Santo*, 303–4: “Así nos encontramos con diversos ‘sistemas’ o esquemas conceptuales de cristología, en torno a conceptos como λόγος, ἄγγελος, χριστός, υἱός, δύναμις . . . Debemos tener en cuenta también el ‘sistema’ del ἄγγελος, el del χριστός, etc.”

¹⁷ Oeyen, “Die Lehre von den göttlichen Kräften bei Justin,” *Studia Patristica* 11 (1972): 214–21.

The Angelic Spirit in Early Christianity

Before moving on, however, some clarifications of the terms “angelomorphic” and “angelomorphism” are in order. According to Crispin Fletcher-Louis, these terms are to be used “wherever there are signs that an individual or community possesses specifically angelic characteristics or status, though for whom identity cannot be reduced to that of an angel.”¹⁸ The virtue of this definition—and the reason for my substituting the term “angelomorphic pneumatology” for Levison’s “angelic spirit”—is that it signals the use of angelic characteristics in descriptions of God or humans, while not necessarily implying that either are angels *stricto sensu*: neither “angelomorphic christology” nor “angelomorphic pneumatology” imply the simple identification of Christ or the Holy Spirit with angels.¹⁹

I. DIFFICULTIES WITH JUSTIN MARTYR’S USE OF ΠΝΕΥΜΑ

References to the Holy Spirit as a distinct entity occur several times in Justin’s works. In *Apol.* 1.67.2 Christians are said to “bless the Maker of all through his Son Jesus Christ, and through the Holy Spirit.” In *Apol.* 1.13.3 Justin states that Christ holds the second place after “the true God,” while “the prophetic Spirit” holds the third place. A similar subordinationist scheme occurs in *Apol.* 1.60.6–7, this time supported by a statement attributed to Plato: “And as to his [Plato’s] speaking of a third, he did this because he read, as we said above, that which was spoken by Moses, ‘that the Spirit of God moved over the waters.’ . . . For he gives the second place to the Logos which is with God . . . and the third place (τὴν δὲ τρίτην [χώραν]) to the Spirit who was said to be borne upon the waters, saying, ‘and the third things around the third’ (τὰ δὲ τρίτα περι τὸν τρίτον).”

Arthur Droge notes that “the statement about ‘the third’ comes not from the *Timaeus*, as Justin seems to imply, but from the Pseudo-Platonic *Second Epistle* 312e.”²⁰ There is no mention of πνεῦμα in *Ep.* 2; nevertheless, like many of the apologists (and their Jewish predecessors), Justin (*Apol.* 1.59.1–6) is convinced that Plato plagiarized the text

¹⁸ Crispin Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/94 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 14–15.

¹⁹ See Jean Daniélou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964), 118.

²⁰ Arthur J. Droge, “Justin Martyr and the Restoration of Philosophy,” *Church History* 56 (1987): 303–19, at 309. The *Second Epistle* reads καὶ τρίτον περι τὰ τρίτα; Justin has τὰ δὲ τρίτα περι τὸν τρίτον. The scholarly debate on the authenticity or inauthenticity of *Ep.* 2 is irrelevant to the topic at hand, since for Justin (and all ancients) the Platonic authorship of this writing is not questioned.

The Journal of Religion

of Genesis and that his reference to a third principle in *Ep.* 2 (312e) refers to the πνεῦμα of Gen. 1:2.²¹

Justin's references to the Holy Spirit occur mainly in biblical quotations or are borrowed from catechesis or liturgy. In other words, they always constitute "prefabricated" elements of received tradition.²² Such are the numerous references to the "prophetic spirit" or the various formulas related to baptismal rites, the Eucharist, or the blessing of food.²³ Even the use of the pseudoplatonic *Ep.* 2 is an established topos in both Middle Platonism and early Christian literature.²⁴

Sometimes, however, Justin attempts to give a more personal account of the received faith; this is when difficulties of all kinds start accumulating. Here are a few examples.

A. Justin generally affirms that the prophets are inspired by the Logos. He says so in *Apol.* 1.33.9 and even offers a rather technical explanation for the phenomenon: it is the divine Logos who speaks in the prophetic writings, speaking as from the "character" or "person" (ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου) of the Father, or Christ, or the people.²⁵ A few sentences later, however, in *Apol.* 1.38.11, Justin reverts to tradi-

²¹ On the issue of Jewish models for Christian apologetics, see the exhaustive study of Monique Alexandre, "Apologétique judéo-hellénistique et premières apologies chrétiennes," in *Les apologistes chrétiens et la culture grecque*, ed. Bernard Pouderon and Joseph Doré, *Théologie Historique* 105 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1998), 1–40.

²² In a more general study, Adalbert Gauthier Hamman ("La Trinidad en la catechesis de los Padres Griegos," *Estudios trinitarios* 12 [1978]: 73–85) outlines baptism, the Eucharistic anaphora, prayer, and martyrdom as the four areas in which trinitarian theology finds its existential rootedness in the life of the early church. Building on Hamman's article, Rordorf ("La Trinité dans les écrits de Justin Martyr") has demonstrated that this enumeration finds perfect confirmation in the writings of Justin and in the *Acts* of his martyrdom. The same opinion is voiced by Sabugal ("Vocabulario pneumatológico," 466); José Antonio de Aldama, "El Espíritu Santo y el Verbo en la exégesis de Lc 1, 35," in his *María en la patristica de los siglos I y II* (Madrid: BAC, 1970), 145 and n. 18; Martín (*Espíritu Santo*, 243); Wartelle (*Apologies*, 61); Munier (*L'apologie*, 108).

²³ *Apol.* 1.6.2; 1.13.3; 1.60.6–7; 1.61.3, 13; 1.65.3; 1.67.2.

²⁴ Édouard des Places, ed. and trans., *Numenius: Fragments* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1973), fragment 24, also thinks that "Socrates asserted the existence of three gods," and "the passage from the Second Epistle became one of the foundation texts of Neoplatonic theology" (Droge, "Justin Martyr and the Restoration of Philosophy," 310). Among Christian writers, references to "the third around the third" occur in Athenagoras, *Leg.* 24; Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 5.14.103; Origen, *Against Celsus* 6.18. For a more detailed discussion and relevant secondary literature, see Franz Dünzl, *Pneuma: Funktionen des theologischen Begriffs in frühchristlicher Literatur*, *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum Ergänzungsband* 30 (Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 2000), 143–44.

²⁵ *Apol.* 1.36.1. On Justin's "prosopographic" or "prosopological" exegesis, see Martín, *Espíritu Santo*, 291–97; Marie-Josèphe Rondeau, *Les commentaires patristiques du Psautier (3e–5e siècles)*, vol. 2, *Exégèse prosopologique et théologie*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 220 (Rome: Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1985), 21–29; Michael Slusser, "The Exegetical Roots of Trinitarian Theology," *Theological Studies* 49 (1988): 461–76, esp. 463–64, 470. For a comprehensive discussion, see Carl Andresen, "Zur Entstehung und Geschichte des trinitarischen Personenbegriffs," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 52 (1961): 1–39.

The Angelic Spirit in Early Christianity

tional language and ascribes everything to the “prophetic spirit.” Elsewhere (*Dial.* 25.1), it is “the Holy Spirit” who cries through the mouth of David.

B. Justin refers to Luke 1:35 several times. In *Dial.* 100.5, he substitutes πνεῦμα κυρίου for πνεῦμα ἅγιον in the biblical text: “the angel Gabriel announced to her [the virgin] the good tidings that the Spirit of the Lord would come upon her, and the Power of the Most High would overshadow her.” According to Raniero Cantalamessa, the alternative reading πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπελεύσεται occurs for the first time in Justin but is also witnessed to by Origen, Ps.-Hippolytus, and Epiphanius. Strangely enough, it is ignored by the critical editions of the New Testament.²⁶

In *Apol.* 1.33.4, Justin paraphrases Luke 1:35 (πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σὲ καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι) as follows: δύναμις θεοῦ ἐπελθοῦσα τῇ παρθένῳ ἐπεσκίασεν αὐτήν. As José Antonio de Aldama observes, Justin seems to reduce the divine presence at the conception from “Spirit and Power” to “Power.”²⁷ Finally, in *Apol.* 1.33.6, Justin furnishes an even more precise explanation of the Lukan verse: “It is wrong, therefore, to understand ‘the Spirit and the Power of God’ as anything else than the Word, who is also the first-born of God, as the foresaid prophet Moses declared; and it was this which, when it came upon the virgin and overshadowed her, caused her to conceive.”²⁸

Most scholars take these passages as evidence of a confusion between πνεῦμα and λόγος. According to Leslie W. Barnard, “on the surface . . . for Justin spirit and logos were two names for the same person.”²⁹ To be more precise, in fact, the equation is the following: πνεῦμα ἅγιον = δύναμις θεοῦ = λόγος.³⁰ Even José Pablo Martín, who is quite crit-

²⁶ Raniero Cantalamessa, “La primitiva esegesi cristologica di ‘Romani’ I, 3–4 e ‘Luca’ I, 35,” *Rivista di Storia e Letteratura Religiosa* 2 (1966): 69–80, at 73 and n. 13.

²⁷ De Aldama, “El Espíritu Santo y el Verbo,” 143.

²⁸ *Apol.* 1.33.6. This view is repeated elsewhere (*Apol.* 1.46.5, 1.66.2).

²⁹ Barnard, *Justin*, 104. Barnard qualifies this confusion of Word and Spirit as a confusion of their functions. See also De Aldama, “El Espíritu Santo y el Verbo,” 142–43; Wartelle, *Apologies*, 62; Rordorf, “La Trinité dans les écrits de Justin Martyr,” 293; Goodenough, *Theology of Justin*, 181–82, 185, 187, 188. Morgan-Wynne (“Holy Spirit and Christian Experience in Justin,” 174) refers to the fact that “in Christian *experience* the risen Christ and the Spirit are identical and interchangeable.” Sabugal (“Vocabulario pneumatológico,” 466 n. 31) attributes the overlap between λόγος and πνεῦμα to Stoic influence. For older scholarship, see Goodenough, *Theology of Justin*, 180–81; Martín, *Espíritu Santo*, 185; Joseph Barbel, *Christos Angelos: Die Anschauung von Christus als Bote und Engel in der gelehrten und volkstümlichen Literatur des christlichen Altertums; zugleich ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Ursprungs und der Fortdauer des Arianismus*, Theophaneia: Beiträge zur Religions—und Kirchengeschichte des Altertums 3 (Bonn: Peter Hannstein, [1941] 1964), 242 n. 268.

³⁰ De Aldama, “El Espíritu Santo y el Verbo,” 143.

The Journal of Religion

ical of such radical solutions, concedes that the text presents a real exegetical and theological difficulty.³¹ Graham Stanton instead seems to locate the problem halfway between muddled thought and clumsy expression: “Here Justin seems to have grafted his convictions concerning the Logos rather awkwardly onto traditional phraseology concerning the role of the Spirit.”³² This comment neither acknowledges the difficulty of the passage nor offers a satisfactory explanation. Why does Justin proceed in such an “awkward” way?

A possible answer is furnished by Justin’s use of πνεῦμα and πνεύματα for the intermediate beings—angels and demons. Martín has documented in detail that Justin establishes an antithetic parallelism among the phenomena of inhabitation, inspiration, and endowment with “powers” (δυνάμεις) associated with the divine πνεῦμα and the inhabitation, inspiration, and endowment with “powers” (δυνάμεις) associated with deceiving and impure πνεύματα.³³ Goodenough made a similar observation: “all the powers and demons, even the evil ones, were to Justin also πνεύματα [*Dial.* 7.3, 30.2, 35.2, 76.6]. . . . The Logos, like the lowest angel was ultimately a δύναμις of God [*Dial.* 61.1; *Apol.* 2.6.3]. . . . Since the Logos was of course a Spirit and Power of God, such an identification [πνεῦμα in Luke 1:35 as the Word] was perfectly legitimate, and in no way effects the fact that Justin might have believed in another Spirit which was properly *the* Spirit.”³⁴

In other words, the passage under discussion does not support the idea that Justin completely identifies πνεῦμα and λόγος, nor is it a case of occasional confusion between the two. It is rather the case that Justin uses πνεῦμα as a designation of the Logos, independently of any references to the third hypostasis.³⁵ This amounts to, as scholars have pointed out, “a self-incarnation of the Word.”³⁶ Strange as it may seem to the modern reader, this view is widespread in early Christianity. In fact, the idea that the πνεῦμα in Luke 1:35 was none other than the Logos also occurs in the *Protevangelium of James*, the *Epistula Apostolorum*, Origen, Tertullian, and Lactantius.³⁷

³¹ Martín, *Espíritu Santo*, 185–86.

³² Stanton, “The Spirit in the Writings of Justin Martyr,” 331.

³³ Martín, *Espíritu Santo*, 313–15. The passages discussed are *Dial.* 7.1–3, 30.2, 35.2, 39.6, 76.6, 82.3, 93.1.

³⁴ Goodenough, *Theology of Justin*, 196, 185, 182.

³⁵ “Justino . . . interpreta el τὸ πνεῦμα como un demonstrativo: ‘este espíritu’ que es el Logos” (Martín, *Espíritu Santo*, 185).

³⁶ De Aldama, “El Espíritu Santo y el Verbo,” 146 (“una explicación de la maternidad virginal que envuelve una autoencarnación del Verbo”); followed by Bobichon, *Dialogue avec Tryphon*, 780 n. 5.

³⁷ See Cantalamessa, “Primitiva esegesi,” 75–76; De Aldama, “El Espíritu Santo y el Verbo,” 155–63; Aloys Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, 2nd rev. ed. (Atlanta: John Knox, 1975),

The Angelic Spirit in Early Christianity

C. In *Dial.* 54.1, Justin comments on Gen. 49:11 (Jacob's prophecy about Judah, "He shall wash his robe in wine, and his garment in the blood of the grape"). According to Justin, this passage must be taken as a reference to Christ and the Christians: "the Holy Spirit called those whose sins were remitted by Christ, *his robe*, among whom he is always present in power [δυνάμει], but will be present manifestly [ἐναργῶς] in person at his second coming." Jacob's prophecy about Judah is here ascribed to the Holy Spirit. This is a perfect example of what *Apol.* 1.36.1 referred to as utterances of the Logos "in the person" of various biblical characters; this time, however, Justin refers to the Spirit.

More important, however, is the distinction between Christ's presence in the church "in power" and his eschatological manifestation ἐναργῶς. Goodenough suggests that Justin might have intended "a pun upon δυνάμει, and [to] imply that the Holy Spirit . . . is the presence of Christ δυνάμει."³⁸ He notes that Justin also uses δυνάμει when speaking of Christ's presence in the Old Testament theophanies (e.g., *Dial.* 128.1) and concludes that the meaning of the term δυνάμει remains uncertain because "the meaning of neither passage is clear, and each obscures the other."

This hypothesis is accepted by several major scholars.³⁹ In my opinion, more can be said about δυνάμει, as will become clear in my discussion of Justin's view of the angelic powers.

D. The following passage in *Apol.* 1.6.2 is notorious for its problematic reference to the angels:

ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνόν [the Father] τε καὶ τὸν παρ' αὐτοῦ υἱὸν ἐλθόντα καὶ διδάξαντα ἡμᾶς ταῦτα καὶ τὸν τῶν ἄλλων ἐπομένων καὶ ἑξομοιουμένων ἀγαθῶν ἀγγέλων στρατόν, πνεῦμα τε τὸ προφητικὸν σεβόμεθα καὶ προσκυνούμεν, λόγῳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ τιμῶντες καὶ παντὶ βουλομένῳ μαθεῖν, ὡς ἐδιδάχθημεν ἀφθόνως παραδιδόντες.

I propose the following translation of the passage: "But him [the Father], and the Son who came from him and taught us these things and the host of the other good angels that escort him and are being made

198–99; Paul McGuckin, "Spirit Christology: Lactantius and His Sources," *Heythrop Journal* 24 (1983): 141–48, at 144–45. The modern reader might wonder about the possible "modalistic" implications of this overlap between λόγος and πνεῦμα; for Justin, however, this type of exegesis only strengthens the thesis of a Logos distinct from the Father and is designed, in the words of De Aldama ("El Espíritu Santo y el Verbo," 144), "de suprimir todo posible sentido modalista." In fact, Tertullian (*Adv. Prax.* 26) also uses this interpretation of Luke 1:35 and the ensuing idea of a "self-incarnation" of the Word as an antimonarchian argument: the "Spirit of God" and the "Power of the Most High" are not "God" but God's distinctly existent Logos.

³⁸ Goodenough, *Theology of Justin*, 183.

³⁹ Benoit, *Le baptême chrétien*, 172; Morgan-Wynne, "Holy Spirit and Christian Experience in Justin," 177 n. 7; Bobichon, *Dialogue avec Tryphon*, 729.

The Journal of Religion

like him, and the prophetic spirit: [these] do we venerate and worship, paying [them] homage in reason and truth, and passing [them] on just as we have been taught—liberally—to anyone who wishes to learn.” It is important to note Justin’s claim to transmit further notions of the Christian faith that he has himself received through teaching: ὡς ἐδιδάχθημεν, ἀφθόνως παραδιδόντες. This phrase would fit very well with the setting of a Christian “school,” such as Justin is said to have presided over at Rome, in which such central doctrines were passed on “liberally” (ἀφθόνως) from the teacher to his disciples.⁴⁰ In *Dial.* 58.1, Justin refers to himself as a charismatic expositor of the Scriptures, who transmits the Christian faith ἀφθόνως: “God’s grace alone has been granted to me to the understanding of his Scriptures, of which grace I exhort all to become partakers freely and liberally [ἀφθόνως].” This statement recalls Clement of Alexandria’s description of the “Gnostic” teacher.⁴¹

After these preliminary observations, it is time to address the main difficulty of *Apol.* 1.6.2, namely, its inclusion of the angelic host in what might otherwise be a traditional triadic formula.⁴² Scholars have proposed several possible interpretations of this text.⁴³ According to Goodenough, “Justin is listing the divine objects of Christian worship . . . he puts the entire group of angelic personalities before the Holy Spirit, though in point of rank Justin ordinarily thought of the Spirit as before the other powers.”⁴⁴ For other scholars, *Apol.* 1.6.2 is, in fact, a traditional “Father, Son, Spirit” formula, in which the angels are nothing but an appendix of sorts, being the Son’s “bodyguards.”⁴⁵ A third opinion, advocated by Kretschmar, is that Justin illustrates here a primitive stage of trinitarian thought, namely “die Trias Gott—Christus—En-

⁴⁰ For Justin’s teaching activity at Rome, see Ulrich Neymeyr, *Die christlichen Lehrer im zweiten Jahrhundert: Ihre Lehrtätigkeit, ihr Selbstverständnis und ihre Geschichte*, Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae* 4 (Leiden: Brill, 1989), 16–35.

⁴¹ “As for jealousy (φθόνος δέ), far be it from the Gnostic! This is actually why he seeks (to determine) whether it be worse to give to the unworthy or not to hand down to the worthy; and out of (so) much love he runs the risk of sharing (knowledge) not only with the person fit (for such teaching), but—as it sometimes happens—also with some unworthy person that entreats him slickly” (*Eclgae* 27:7).

⁴² Martín, *Espíritu Santo*, 244.

⁴³ I follow the classification of scholarly positions offered by Martín, *Espíritu Santo*, 244–50. For early scholarship on this passage, see Barbel, *Christos Angelos*, 51 n. 27.

⁴⁴ Goodenough, *Theology of Justin*, 186. Other scholars who hold the same interpretation are mentioned in Martín, *Espíritu Santo*, 245.

⁴⁵ H. B. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church: A Study of Christian Teaching in the Age of the Fathers* (London: Macmillan, 1912), 37: “The angels find a place on this context as the bodyguards of the Son, reflecting His likeness.” So also Barbel, *Christos Angelos*, 62. For the angels as bodyguards of the Son, see Mark 8:38 (cf. 13:26–27, 14:62); Matt. 26:53.

The Angelic Spirit in Early Christianity

gel.”⁴⁶ There is, finally, another view, according to which the Spirit is numbered with the angels, either as one of the angels or as subordinated to the angels.⁴⁷

In my opinion, the phrase “the army of the other angels” is linked not to the Spirit but to the Son. Indeed, for Justin, the Son is “the angel of God” (e.g., *Dial.* 34.2, 61.1, 127.4, 128.1) and the commander-in-chief [ἀρχιστράτηγος] of all angels (*Dial.* 34.2, 61.1, 62.5, 56.22).⁴⁸ Moreover, according to *Dial.* 45.4, the Son and his good angels, who are being made like him [ἐξομοιουμένων] have their evil counterpart in “the serpent that sinned from the beginning and the angels that are made like him [ἐξομοιωθέντες αὐτῷ].”

Nevertheless, the reference to the angels remains problematic because the entire phrase is governed by σεβόμεθα and προσκυνούμεν.⁴⁹ Justin himself states clearly that God alone is the object of worship and honor (*Apol.* 1.16.6; *Dial.* 93.2). Father, Son, and Spirit are certainly included in Justin’s “scalar” exposition of Christian doctrine (see *Apol.* 1.13.3). What about the angels? Martín would like to apply only σεβόμεθα to the angels and reserve προσκυνούμεν for the Father, the Son, and the Spirit.⁵⁰ From a grammatical point of view, this proposal does not stand up to scrutiny. Theologically, a better solution can be found by considering Justin’s notion of the “powers of the Spirit.”

II. JUSTIN MARTYR ON “THE POWERS OF THE SPIRIT”

In *Dial.* 85 Justin maintains, against his Jewish opponents, that Ps. 23: 7 (LXX) (“Lift up your gates, O you princes, and be lifted up, O eternal gates, that the King of Glory may enter”) applies not to Hezekiah or Solomon but to Jesus Christ: “Then, too, some of you dare to explain the following words, ‘Lift up your gates, O you princes, and be lifted up, O eternal gates, that the King of Glory may enter,’ as if they referred to Hezekiah, while others of you apply them to Solomon. We can prove, to the contrary, that they are spoken . . . solely of this

⁴⁶ Georg Kretschmar, *Studien zur frühchristlichen Trinitätstheologie*, Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 21 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1956), 213.

⁴⁷ Benoit, *Le baptême chrétien*, 171. For a critique of this position, see Swete, *Holy Spirit*, 37; Martín, *Espíritu Santo*, 248–49.

⁴⁸ Justin exemplifies the Christian transformation of earlier Michael traditions. See the exhaustive treatment in Darrell D. Hannah, *Michael and Christ: Michael Traditions and Angel Christology in Early Christianity*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/109 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999). For Justin, see esp. 202–5, 215.

⁴⁹ Barbel, *Christos Angelos*, 53; Stanton, “The Spirit in the Writings of Justin Martyr,” 329.

⁵⁰ Martín, *Espíritu Santo*, 250.

The Journal of Religion

Christ of ours . . . who is Lord of the powers by the will of the Father.” Justin understands the verse in relation to the ascension of Christ.⁵¹ The reference to “the king of glory” and his superiority to the angelic “princes” can only apply to Jesus Christ, “the Lord of the powers.” Justin develops his argument further by referring to the practice of exorcism: Christians are able to cast out demons in the name of Christ, while Jewish exorcists are successful only when they invoke the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob. Implicitly, Justin equates the “Lord” of the Christians with the “Lord” revealed to the patriarchs, according to the biblical narrative.⁵² The “Lord” mentioned in Ps. 23:7 must be Jesus Christ, since “Christ alone . . . is the Lord of the powers [κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων], . . . who also rose from the dead, and ascended to heaven, as the Psalm and the other Scriptures manifested when they announced him to be ‘Lord of the powers.’”⁵³ The identity of Christ as “Lord of the powers” is further demonstrated by Ps. 148: 1–2, another passage depicting the angelic worship of YHWH: “The words of David also show that there are angels and powers whom the word of prophecy, through David, ordered to ‘lift up the gates in order that he’ who arose from the dead, Jesus Christ, ‘the Lord of the powers,’ should enter in accordance with the Father’s will. . . . Here is the passage from which I showed that God revealed to us that there are angels and powers in heaven: ‘Praise the Lord from the heavens, praise him in the high places. Praise him, all his angels, praise him, all his powers.’”⁵⁴ Justin consistently uses κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων, and not the prevalent LXX κύριος παντοκράτωρ and κύριος σαβαώθ. Oeyen’s thesis is that κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων was a fixed expression, with a precise referent: the “powers.” Justin might have been aware, like Origen later on, of a tradition—which Origen ascribes to his famous “Hebrew”—that derived the title κύριος σαβαώθ from a specific class of angelic beings, namely, the “Sabai.”⁵⁵

⁵¹ For early Christian exegesis of Psalms 23 (LXX) as a reference to the ascension of Christ, see Daniélou, *Jewish Christianity*, 259–62.

⁵² “Whereas, if any man among you should exorcise them [the demons] in the name of the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob they will in like manner (ἴσως) become subdued.” Bobichon (*Dialogue avec Tryphon*, 417) renders ἴσως by “sans doute.” He notes elsewhere (602 n. 24) that this use of the term is “strange,” albeit documented, according to Henri Estienne’s *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae* (Paris: Didot, 1831–65), in Plato, Aristotle, and Xenophon. I prefer to use the primary sense of the adverb (“equally,” “similarly,” or “in like manner”), which I understand to be describing the result of Jewish exorcisms that invoke the name of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as comparable to the results of Christian exorcisms in the name of Christ.

⁵³ *Dial.* 85.1.

⁵⁴ *Dial.* 85.4, 6.

⁵⁵ Origen, *Commentary on John* 1.31.215. Aside from “thrones,” “dominions,” “rulers,” and “powers” (cf. Col. 1:16), Origen is convinced that there exist many other heavenly beings,

The Angelic Spirit in Early Christianity

This tradition about the “powers” is not marginal for Justin’s theology but rather crucially important, since it is related to his theory of prophetic inspiration. The expression κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων, which in *Dial.* 85 is interpreted as a reference to Christ and the subordinated angelic powers, is further connected with the seven gifts of the Spirit in Isa. 11:2–3 (LXX), termed “powers of the Holy Spirit” (*Dial.* 87) or “powers” (*Dial.* 88.1) or even in the singular, “power” (*Dial.* 88.2). Justin’s equation of the “powers” of Christ with the seven “powers of the Holy Spirit” comes in response to the following challenge from Trypho:

the Scripture asserts by Isaiah: “There shall come forth a rod from the root of Jesse; and a flower shall grow up from the root of Jesse; and the Spirit of God shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and piety: and the spirit of the fear of the Lord shall fill him” [Isa. 11:1–2]. I grant you (he said) that these words are spoken of Christ. But you also maintain that he was preexistent as God. . . . Now, how can He be demonstrated to have been pre-existent, who is filled with the powers of the Holy Spirit, which the Scripture by Isaiah enumerates, as if He were in lack of them?

Here Trypho understands Isa. 11:1–3 as a text dealing with the reception of the seven “powers of the Holy Spirit,” which therefore would exclude Justin’s idea of a preexistent “Lord,” distinct from the Father and endowed with the “powers.” Justin responds by interpreting the Isaiah passage as a reference to the Jordan event: the seven powers of the Spirit rested on Jesus Christ when the Spirit “fluttered down on” him (ἐπιπτῆναι, *Dial.* 88.3) at the Jordan baptism.⁵⁶ In reaction, most likely, to contrary views, Justin insists that Jesus’ baptism was a theophany, which did not create Christ’s identity but revealed it to the world (cf. John 1:31, ἵνα φανερωθῆ τῷ Ἰσραήλ).⁵⁷ In support of his view, he states

“of which one kind the Hebrew called *Sabai*, from which was formed *Sabaoth*, their ruler, who is no other than God” (ὅν ἔν τι γένος ἐκάλει Σαβαὶ “ὁ” Ἐβραῖος, παρ’ ὃ ἐσχηματίσθαι τὸν Σαβαώθ, ἄρχοντα ἐκείνων τυγχάνοντα, οὐχ ἕτερον τοῦ θεοῦ). For the Greek text, I have used Cécile Blanc, ed. and trans., *Origène: Commentaire sur saint Jean*, Sources Chrétiennes 120 (Paris: Cerf, 1966).

⁵⁶ The connection between the sevenfold Spirit of Isa. 11:1–3 and the descent of the Spirit at the Jordan baptism also occurs in Irenaeus, who seems to view it as an element of church tradition: “Thus the Spirit of God is <active [in] manifold [ways]> (πολύεργος), and seven forms of service were counted by Isaias the prophet resting upon the Son of God, that is [on] the Word in his human advent (παρουσία) . . . for he says, ‘The Spirit shall rest upon him’ . . . [quotation from Isa. 11:2–3]” (St. Irenaeus of Lyons, *On the Apostolic Preaching*, trans. John Behr [Crestwood, NY: SVS Press, 1997], chap. 9).

⁵⁷ In fact, it is similar concerns over subordinationist interpretations of the Jordan event that explain why, after being an essential article of faith, the baptism of Jesus was eliminated from fourth-century creeds. See Gabriele Winkler, “A Remarkable Shift in Fourth-Century Creeds: An Analysis of the Armenian, Syriac, and Greek Evidence,” *Studia Patristica* 17, no. 3

The Journal of Religion

that a fire was kindled (πῦρ ἀνήφθη) in the Jordan at the moment of the baptism.⁵⁸ For Justin, therefore, Jesus Christ preexisted as bearer of the seven “powers of the Holy Spirit” or, as he had explained earlier, as “Lord of the powers.”

This theory of the “powers” proves serviceable for an account of Old Testament prophecy and New Testament charismatic endowment. According to Justin, each of the prophets received “some one or two powers from God”: καὶ ὅτι οἱ παρ’ ὑμῖν προφήται, ἕκαστος μίαν τινὰ ἢ καὶ δευτέραν δύναμιν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ λαμβάνοντες. Thus, Solomon had the spirit of wisdom; Daniel, that of understanding and counsel; Moses, that of strength and piety; Elijah, that of fear; Isaiah, that of knowledge. “The seven powers of the Spirit enumerated by Isaiah were later reassembled in Jesus Christ, ‘the Lord of the powers’” (*Dial.* 87.4). Specifically, the Spirit “ceased” (ἐπαύσατο) from being poured out fragmentarily upon the prophets when it is said to have “rested” (ἀνεπαύσατο) upon him (*Dial.* 87.3) at the Jordan baptism. After his ascension, Christ turns the prophetic powers of the Spirit into various δόματα or χαρίσματα to the church, thus fulfilling the prophecies of Joel 3:1 (“I shall pour out my Spirit over all flesh”) and Ps. 67:19 (LXX) (“He ascended on high, he led captivity captive, he gave gifts to the sons of men”).⁵⁹ Here Justin is most likely using a collection of *testimonia*.⁶⁰

(1982): 1396–1401. Indeed, while “it is clear from both Ignatius of Antioch and Ephrem that early authors used it as a way of speaking of the divine origins of Jesus,” it is equally clear that “the baptism of Jesus as a constitutive element in the Creeds did not survive the Christological controversies” (Killian McDonnell, “Jesus’ Baptism in the Jordan,” *Theological Studies* 56 [1995]: 209–36, at 213, 212). See also Robert L. Wilken, “The Interpretation of the Baptism of Jesus in the Later Fathers,” *Studia Patristica* 11 (1972): 268–77.

⁵⁸ The tradition about fire and light at the Jordan baptism is widespread in early Christianity (e.g., Gospel of the Ebionites, Proclus of Constantinople, Gregory of Nazianzus, Ephrem Syrus, Jacob of Serugh, Philoxenus of Mabbug). See McDonnell, “Jesus’ Baptism in the Jordan,” 231–32. Justin’s association of the Jordan event with Isa. 11:1–3 naturally leads to the idea that the Spirit “rested” over Christ at his baptism. This also is similar to a tradition preserved in Ephrem’s *Commentary on the Diatessaron*: according to what must have been an original Syriac version of John 1:32, the Spirit “descended and rested” upon Jesus—rather than “descended and dwelt,” as all Greek and Syriac witnesses have. It is, however, not the Syriac version of the *Commentary* that preserves this reading (most probably because later scribes adapted the New Testament quotations to the Peshitta, which here follows the Greek text) but the Armenian translation of the *Commentary*, where the quotation was “frozen” in its original form. For a detailed and extensive argumentation, see Gabriele Winkler, “Ein bedeutsamer Zusammenhang zwischen der Erkenntnis und Ruhe in Mt 11, 27–29 und dem Ruhem des Geistes auf Jesus am Jordan: Eine Analyse zur Geist-Christologie in Syrischen und Armenischen Quellen,” *Le Muséon* 96 (1983): 267–326.

⁵⁹ Δόματα: *Dial.* 39.2, 4, 5; 87.5–6; χαρίσματα: *Dial.* 82.1, 88.1. It may be that Justin’s reference to the Spirit as “third in rank” is not necessarily subordinationistic but rather a way of stating that the gifts of the Spirit became available only after the ascension, that is, chronologically last. See in this respect Stanton, “The Spirit in the Writings of Justin Martyr,” 330.

⁶⁰ See in this respect Bobichon, *Dialogue avec Tryphon*, 728 n. 2; Oskar Skarsaune, *The Proof*

The Angelic Spirit in Early Christianity

This pushes the use of Psalm 67 (LXX) in connection with Christ's ascension and the giving of spiritual gifts at least one generation prior to Justin.⁶¹

It is noteworthy that the gifts of the Spirit received by the church are also distributed fragmentarily "from the grace of the power of his Spirit to those who believe in him, to each one inasmuch as he deems him worthy."⁶² Although Justin admits a general spiritual endowment of the Christian people, those who are "deemed worthy" seem to represent a particular group within the community, as Justin suggests in the immediately subsequent passage: "now, if you look around, you can see among us Christians both male and female endowed with charismata from the Spirit of God" (*Dial.* 88.1).⁶³ Interestingly, in the report of his conversion, Justin seems to present himself as such a charismatic individual.⁶⁴ He may have seen himself as especially endowed with the πνεῦμα διδασκαλίας, one of the special gifts mentioned in *Dial.* 39.2.⁶⁵

from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition: Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile, Novum Testamentum Supplements 56 (Leiden: Brill, 1987), 100, 123; and Stanton, "The Spirit in the Writings of Justin Martyr," 330. Justin quotes Ps. 67:19 in a form closer to Eph. 4:8 than the LXX; his quotation from Joel 3:1 begins as in the LXX (καὶ ἔσται μετὰ ταῦτα) rather than Acts 2:17 (καὶ ἔσται ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις) but then speaks of "my servants," as in Acts 2:18, rather than "servants," as in Joel 3:2. Some of the gifts listed in *Dial.* 39.2, namely, "healing," "foreknowledge," and "teaching," echo 1 Corinthians 12, which also explains the shift from δόματα to χαρίσματα). Stanton ("The Spirit in the Writings of Justin Martyr," 332) has no doubt that the three Pauline terms are "woven into the list." Pierre Prigent (*Justin et l'Ancien Testament: L'argumentation scripturaire du traité de Justin contre toutes les hérésies comme source principale du Dialogue avec Tryphon et de la première Apologie* [Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1964], 112–13) and Martín (*Espíritu Santo*, 204) are more reserved, although both agree that the loose treatment of Isa. 11:2 allows Justin to incorporate certain "réminiscences paulines" into the list of spiritual gifts. Prigent (*Justin et l'Ancien Testament*, 114) shows that Justin's quotation from Ps. 67:19 is very close to Eph. 4:8, but he denies any influence from Acts 2.

⁶¹ This is therefore not (*pace* David J. Halperin, "Origen, Ezekiel's Merkabah, and the Ascension of Moses," *Church History* 50 [1981]: 261–75, at 275) a rabbinic tradition about Moses ascending to receive the Torah and other "gifts for men," which Origen, writing in Caesarea toward the middle of the third century, would have "thoroughly christianized."

⁶² *Dial.* 87.5. Compare ἀπὸ τῆς χάριτος τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ πνεύματος ἐκείνου . . . ὡς ἄξιον ἕκαστον ἐπίσταται with the statement about the "powers of the Spirit" received by the prophets: ἕκαστος μίαν τινὰ ἢ καὶ δευτέραν δύναμιν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ λαμβάνοντες.

⁶³ According to Morgan-Wynne ("Holy Spirit and Christian Experience in Justin," 176, 177 n. 13), "it is clear that Justin has in mind particular, specific, and special gifts" and "particular individuals," perhaps Christian exorcists.

⁶⁴ After meeting with the mysterious old man, who, as some scholars have argued, is none other than Christ (Andrew Hofer, "The Old Man as Christ in Justin *Dialogue with Trypho*," *Vigiliae Christianae* 57 [2003]: 1–21), "a fire was kindled (πῦρ ἀνήφθη) in my soul"—cf. the fire kindled (πῦρ ἀνήφθη) at the Jordan, accompanied by the Spirit's "fluttering down" (*Dial.* 88.3)—creating in him a passionate, possessive desire "for the prophets, and for those great men who are friends of Christ" (*Dial.* 8.1).

⁶⁵ In *Dial.* 119.1, Justin asserts the necessity of grace for the correct understanding of the

The Journal of Religion

Trypho finds nothing objectionable in Justin's pneumatology. This is not because "Trypho" would be nothing more than a literary construct of Justin's—a position that Timothy J. Horner has challenged quite convincingly.⁶⁶ It seems rather, as Michel René Barnes argues, that Justin and Trypho share a pneumatology.⁶⁷ As a case in point, Justin's interpretation of Isaiah 11 finds its counterpart in the ps.-Philonic synagogal homily "On Samson."⁶⁸ This text is at pains to explain how it was possible that Samson committed sins even though he was possessed by the Spirit. The argument is that the prophets only received one or the other of the "spirits" mentioned in Isa. 11:2. Moving away from the wording of the verse, the homilist gives some examples: Abraham received the spirit of righteousness, Joseph the spirit of self-restraint, Simeon and Levi the spirit of zeal, and Judah the spirit of discernment. As for Samson, he only received "the spirit of strength"—which explains his utter lack of wisdom.⁶⁹ Despite the fact that "On Samson" enumerates only six spirits in Isa. 11:2, the resemblance with Justin is obvious.⁷⁰

Justin's theory of a fragmentary giving of "one or two" powers to the prophets, as opposed to Christ's fullness of the sevenfold Spirit, also parallels the better-known distinction between the "fragmentary" man-

Scriptures, and in *Dial.* 58.1, he openly presents himself as such a grace-filled exegete: "this grace alone was given me from God to understand his Scriptures, in which grace I invite everyone to share freely and liberally (ἀφθόνως)." The reference to ἀφθόνως places him in line with those from whom he has also received instruction into the Christian faith (see my earlier discussion of ὡς ἐδιδάχθημεν, ἀφθόνως παραδιδόντες in *Apol.* 1.6.2). For Justin's self-understanding as a charismatic *didaskalos*, see Neymeyr, *Die christlichen Lehrer*, 33–34.

⁶⁶ Timothy J. Horner, *Listening to Trypho: Justin Martyr's Dialogue Reconsidered*, Biblical Exegesis and Theology 28 (Leuven and Paris: Peeters, 2001). This study demonstrates, in my opinion convincingly, that the current *Dialogue*, composed around 155–160 CE, is an expansion of an older document, dated around 135 CE, which is very likely to have documented a real encounter between Justin and a well-educated nonrabbinic Jew from Asia Minor.

⁶⁷ Michel René Barnes, "Early Christian Binitarianism: The Father and the Holy Spirit," paper presented at the North American Patristics Society, May 2001, Chicago, online at <http://www.mu.edu/maqom/barnes>: "Justin and Trypho regularly refer to the Holy Spirit, neither of them question this terminology, and they both seem to understand what the other means by this term. . . . Justin and Trypho don't argue over 'Spirit' because they share—in a broad but functional way—a pneumatology."

⁶⁸ This homily was most likely composed in Alexandria, in the first century CE. It survives in a very literal Armenian translation, dated to the early sixth century, alongside the genuine works of Philo. See Folker Siegert, Jacques de Roulet, with Jean-Jacques Aubert and Nicolas Cochand, eds. and trans., *Pseudo-Philon: Prédications synagogales*, Sources Chrétiennes 345 (Paris: Cerf, 1999), 19–20, 38–39, 41; Folker Siegert, ed. and trans., *Drei hellenistisch-jüdische Predigten: Ps.-Philon, "Über Jona", "Über Jona" (Fragment) und "Über Simson"*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 61 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 51.

⁶⁹ Ps.-Philo, "On Samson," 24 (see n. 68 for details).

⁷⁰ It should be noted that there are no literary connections between the homily and early Christian literature prior to the Armenian translation (Siegert, *Drei hellenistisch-jüdische Predigten*, 48; Siegert and de Roulet, *Pseudo-Philon*, 38–39).

The Angelic Spirit in Early Christianity

ifestation of the Logos to pre-Christian humanity and his “complete” manifestation at the Incarnation.⁷¹ Even though in this particular instance (*Dial.* 85–88) Justin retains the terms of “spirit,” “powers,” and “Lord of powers”—most likely because they are too traditional to change—he usually “translates” the scriptural πνεῦμα references into his own theological idiom, which gives preference to λόγος. Such is the case, as noted earlier, in his exegesis of Luke 1:35, where Justin takes the phrase “spirit and power” as a reference to the Logos.

At the term of this analysis of Justinian texts and their complex biblical exegesis, I conclude that Justin understands the Old Testament phrase κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων such that the “Lord” is Jesus Christ and the “powers” are, at the same time, certain angelic beings (*Dial.* 85) and the seven “powers of the Spirit” referred to in Isaiah 11 (*Dial.* 87). It is also significant that Justin can easily switch from the plural “Lord of the powers” and “powers of the Spirit” to the singular “power” (*Dial.* 88.2). Assuming that Justin is not simply collating distinct earlier traditions without any serious attempt at a synthesis, I conclude that the Logos and the Spirit are, for Justin, the same reality, which presents itself in a complex and paradoxical relation of simultaneous unity and multiplicity, and with definite angelomorphic traits.

III. JUSTIN’S ANGELOMORPHIC PNEUMATOLOGY IN THE CONTEXT OF EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

Justin’s language of δυνάμεις, δυνάμεις τοῦ πνεύματος, and κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων and the connection between the seven gifts of the Spirit (Isa. 11:2–3) and the “powers” are not accidental. This interplay between (angelic) “powers” and the notion of Holy Spirit is not uncommon in early Christian literature. Writing a few decades after Justin, Clement of Alexandria identifies the “seven spirits resting on the rod that springs from the root of Jesse” (Isa. 11:2–3, LXX), which he also refers to as “the heptad of the Spirit,”⁷² with “the seven eyes of the Lord” (Zech. 3:9, 4:10; Rev. 5:6),⁷³ with the “thrones” of Col. 1:16,

⁷¹ “Our religion is clearly more sublime than any teaching of man for this reason, that the Christ who has appeared for us men represents the Logos principle in its totality (τὸ λογικὸν τὸ ὅλον), that is, both body, and reason, and soul. For whatever either lawgivers or philosophers uttered well, they elaborated by finding and contemplating some part of the Word (κατὰ Λόγου μέρος) . . . but in Christ, who was partially (ἀπὸ μέρους) known even by Socrates . . . not only philosophers and scholars believed, but also artisans and people entirely uneducated” (*Apol.* 2.10.1). For a brief discussion of the topic, see Eric Francis Osborn, *Justin Martyr* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1973), 36–40; Charles Munier, “Introduction,” in his *Justin: Apologie pour les chrétiens*, Sources Chrétiennes 507 (Paris: Cerf, 2006), 59–62.

⁷² *Strom.* 5.6.35; *Paed.* 3.12.87.

⁷³ *Strom.* 5.6.35; *Eclogae* 57.1; *Excerpta* 10.

The Journal of Religion

and the “angels of the little ones” in Matt. 18:10. For Clement, all these passages are descriptions of the seven “first-born princes of the angels” (πρωτόγονοι ἀγγέλων ἄρχοντες), elsewhere called the seven πρωτόκτιστοι: “The golden lamp conveys another enigma as a symbol of Christ . . . in his casting light, ‘at sundry times and diverse manners’ [Heb. 1:1] on those who believe in Him and hope and see by means of the ministry of the *protoclists* (διὰ τῆς τῶν πρωτοκτίστων διακονίας). And they say that the seven eyes of the Lord are the seven spirits resting on the rod that springs from the root of Jesse.”⁷⁴ Of these celestial beings “first created” Clement says the following: “Among the seven, there has not been given more to the one and less to the other; nor is any of them lacking in advancement; [they] have received perfection from the beginning, at the first [moment of their] coming into being, from God through the Son; . . . their liturgy is common and undivided.”⁷⁵ There can be no doubt that Clement echoes Second Temple Jewish angelological speculations.⁷⁶ Among his direct Christian predecessors one should count not only the Marcosian “seven powers praising the Logos,”⁷⁷ which is simply reworking (in its own dualistic framework) a shared Christian tradition, but also the “first created ones” (πρώτοι κτισθέντες) in the *Shepherd of Hermas*,⁷⁸ and the seven spirits

⁷⁴ *Strom.* 5.6.35.

⁷⁵ *Excerpta* 10.3–4; 11.4.

⁷⁶ Ezek. 9:2–3; Tob. 12:15; *1 En.* 20; 90.21. The Prayer of Joseph seems to imply that Israel ranks higher than the seven archangels, as chief captain and first minister before the face of God. In *Jubilees*, the angels of the presence are “first created” (*Jub.* 2.2, 15.27). Other relevant passages are *T. Levi* 3.5, 4.2; *T. Jud.* 25.2; 1 QH 6.13. See also James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001), 87–89, 126–27; Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 124–51.

⁷⁷ Irenaeus of Lyon, *Adv. haer.* 1.14.8. This is part of Irenaeus’s larger presentation of Marcosian ritual practices, very possibly based on a tractate by Marcus Magus. See Niclas Förster, *Marcus Magus: Kult, Lehre und Gemeindeleben einer valentinianischen Gnostikerguppe; Sammlung der Quellen und Kommentar*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/114 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), esp. 229–92; François Sagnard, *La gnose valentinienne et le témoignage de Saint Irénée*, *Etudes de Philosophie Médiévale* 36 (Paris: Vrin, 1947), 358–69.

⁷⁸ The *Shepherd of Hermas* mentions a group of seven consisting of the six “first created ones” (πρώτοι κτισθέντες) who accompany the Son of God (*Vis.* 3.4.1; *Sim.* 5.5.3). The text mentions the Son and the first-created angels in the same breath (*Sim.* 5.2.6, 11; 5.6.4, 7), suggesting that, even though they are clearly subordinated to the Son of God and accompany him as a celestial escort (e.g., *Sim.* 9.12.7–8; cf. *Vis.* 3.4.1; *Sim.* 5.5.3), the six are his “friends” and fellow-counselors (*Sim.* 5.5.2–3). Robert Joly (“Le milieu complexe du Pasteur d’Hermas,” *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*, ed. Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993], pt. 2, 27.1, 524–51, at 542) refers to the Son of God as *primus inter pares* among the seven archangels. This depiction of the Son of God as one among the seven is not exceptional. According to the sermon *De centesima, sexagesima, tricesima*, God first created seven angelic princes out of fire (cf. *2 En.* 29.3) and later made one of the seven into his Son: “Angelos enim dominus cum ex igne principum numero vii . . . crearet, ex his unum filium sibi constituere, quem Isaias dominum Sabaot [ut] praeconaret disposuit.” For

The Angelic Spirit in Early Christianity

of Revelation.⁷⁹ Yet, the seven supreme angels occupy, in Clement, a theological area at the confluence of angelology and pneumatology, since they also carry a definite pneumatological content. In other words, the imagery is angelic, but Clement has in mind the Holy Spirit.⁸⁰

Justin Martyr's thought treads similar paths. He is well acquainted with the Christian trinitarian profession of faith. To give an account of the Son, he deploys a christological reading of biblical theophanies, which enables him to proclaim him as the "Lord" who appeared to the patriarchs and prophets before being incarnate from the Virgin. To speak about the Spirit, he adopts a variety of approaches, one of which is the adaptation of earlier Jewish and Christian angelological speculations. More specifically, he identifies the seven gifts of the Spirit (Isa. 11:2–3) with a select group of high angelic "powers." Similarly to Clement of Alexandria, Justin uses angelic imagery to convey his teaching about the Holy Spirit. In short, he is a witness to the early Christian tradition of angelomorphic pneumatology.

the text, see Richard Reitzenstein, "Eine frühchristliche Schrift von den dreierlei Früchten des christlichen Lebens," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 15 (1914): 60–90 (a new critical edition with English translation by Philip Sellew, *A Hundredfold Reward: Martyrdom and Sexual Renunciation in Christian North Africa* [Leiden: Brill], is to be published in the near future). The dating of this text is a matter of controversy, with verdicts ranging from the late second to the fourth centuries. The following scholarly treatments are directly relevant to the topic at hand: Barbel, *Christos Angelos*, 192–95; Daniélou, "Le traité 'De Centesima, Sexagesima, Tricesima' et le judéo-christianisme latin avant Tertullien," *Vigiliae Christianae* 25 (1971): 171–81, esp. 174–75; A. P. Orban, "Die Frage der ersten Zeugnisse des Christenlateins," *Vigiliae Christianae* 30 (1976): 214–38; Sellew, "The Hundredfold Reward for Martyrs and Ascetics: Ps.-Cyprian, *De centesima, sexagesima, tricesima*," *Studia Patristica* 36 (2001): 94–98.

⁷⁹ Rev. 1:4; 3:1; 4:5; 5:6; 8:2. The interpretation of the seven spirits in Revelation has been and still remains a matter of debate. For details, see Bucur, "Hierarchy, Prophecy, and the Angelomorphic Spirit." According to the majority of commentators, patristic and modern, Revelation connects the seven spirits/eyes/lamps of the Lord (Zech. 3:9; 4:10) with the rest of the seven spiritual gifts (Isa. 11:2–3; Prov. 8:12–16). A significant minority argues that Revelation connects the seven spirits/eyes/lamps of the Lord (Zech. 3:9, 4:10) with the seven angels of the presence (Tob. 12:15; *1 En.* 90:20–21): Joseph Michl, *Die Engelvorstellungen in der Apokalypse des hl. Johannes* (Munich: Max Hueber, 1937); David E. Aune, *Revelation*, 3 vols. (Dallas: Word Books, 1997), 1:33–35; Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 264–65; Gottfried Schimanowski, *Die himmlische Liturgie in der Apokalypse des Johannes*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/154 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 118. Among patristic writers, this is the explanation implicit in Cyprian (*Exhortation to Martyrdom, to Fortunatus*, 11), and favored by Oecumenius and Arethas, the latter also invoking Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria. I rely on the fragments from patristic commentaries provided by Albin Skrinjar ("Les sept esprits: Apoc. 1, 4; 3, 1; 4, 5; 5, 6," *Biblica* 16 [1935]: 2–24); H. B. Swete (*The Apocalypse of St. John: the Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Indices* [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1909], 5–6); Michl (*Engelvorstellungen*, 113–34).

⁸⁰ For further details in Clement of Alexandria's "angel pneumatology" or, more recently, "angelomorphic pneumatology," see Oeyen, *Engelpneumatologie*, and Bucur, "Revisiting Christian Oeyen."

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In the foregoing pages I have followed the direction of research suggested by Christian Oeyen in his article, "Die Lehre von den göttlichen Kräften bei Justin," published in 1972. I have argued that, like several other writers of the second century, Justin Martyr articulates his pneumatology by reworking early Jewish and Christian speculations on the seven supreme angelic powers. To paraphrase Martín, Justin's "angelomorphic pneumatology" is not the only "scheme" determining Justin's reflection on the topic.

I have also argued that Justin's angelomorphic pneumatology occurs in tandem with his Spirit christology, within a binitarian theological framework. This larger theological articulation suggests a quasi-trinitarian structure of the divine world, featuring the Father, the Son/Spirit, and the angelomorphic Spirit. From a history of ideas perspective, this illustrates the Second Temple roots of early Christian pneumatology and places Justin in a larger tradition illustrated by texts such as Revelation, the *Shepherd of Hermas*, and Clement of Alexandria's *Excerpta ex Theodoto*, *Eclogae Propheticae*, and *Adumbrationes*.