

## **“Is Jesus YHWH?: Two De-Judaizing Trajectories of Marcion and Justin”**

**David E. Wilhite (David\_Wilhite@baylor.edu)**

**Westar Institute - March 2019**

### **Introduction**

The opposing views of Jesus found in Marcion and Justin have long been known. Even in light of recent critical re-thinking of Marcion, wherein the older paradigm of orthodoxy-vs.-heresy is replaced with Walter Bauer’s view of diversity among early Christianity (or even “Christianities”), we are left with a picture of Marcion and Justin as diametrically opposed trajectories. While this is true in many ways, there is one commonality they share in their depiction of Jesus: they both understand Jesus in such a way that results in Jesus’ followers needing to distance themselves from second century Jews.<sup>1</sup>

In what follows I will begin with Marcion and present his Jesus as known from the primary sources, but to do so I will first have to correct some misunderstandings about Marcion. Only then can one see Marcion’s primary teachings about Jesus, which has to do with distancing Jesus from the God of Israel. Next, I will discuss Justin’s Jesus, but to do so I will first need to correct the undue weight given to Justin’s Logos Christology by most modern scholars. Only then can one see Justin’s primary understanding of Jesus, which results in distancing Jesus’ followers from the descendants of Israel.

### **1. Marcion’s Jesus**

Like most second century “heretics,” all that is known about Marcion’s life comes from his opponents, the “orthodox” or “proto-orthodox” (categories we will henceforth avoid). The picture painted by these opponents is not pleasant. Fortunately, Marcionism was enough of a threat that a number of his anti-Marcionite writings survive that allows us to triangulate the sources and separate some fact from fiction, or at least what is plausible to what is clearly libel. For example, Tertullian mocks Marcion’s homeland, Pontus, for its barbarism, but the later claims that Marcion was from the specific town of Sinope, where his own father the bishop who excommunicated

---

<sup>1</sup> The definition of *Judaioi* in early Christian studies is problematic to be sure, but since both Marcion and Justin use this term to mean descendants of the tribe of Judah whose ancestral homeland is Judaea and yet who do not accept Jesus as the messiah, I will follow their usage in this paper.

him for raping a virgin, is almost certainly data fabricated by his enemies to further discredit him.<sup>2</sup>

Some of Marcion's specific teachings have now been called into question because a critical reading of the sources shows them to be either mistaken misunderstandings or intentional misrepresentations. In what follows we will treat the three major accusations: (1) the charge of docetism, which can be addressed briefly; (2) the charge of editing the scriptures, which will require more lengthy discussion; and (3) the charge of theological dualism, which we will claim is the primary concern of Marcion's opponents during Marcion's own lifetime.

### 1.1 Marcion's Alleged Docetism

One of the major accusations about Marcion, and one pertinent for this seminar on the various Jesuses of the second century, has to do with Marcion's alleged docetism. Because I have recently argued this point in detail,<sup>3</sup> I will briefly summarize this point here. Whereas most of the later heresiologists assume that Marcion's Christ was a phantasm, the second century sources are unanimous in their silence on the issue. Even Tertullian, in his early works, says nothing about Marcion's docetism. It is only when he portrays Marcion to be the archetypal heretic that Valentinus and all other "Gnostics" follow that he begins to describe Marcion's Christ as a phantasm. Marcion pits Christ against the Demiurge, and all Gnostics (who also add convoluted theogonies and cosmogonies) make this same Marcionite mistake. Marcion, in this light, can be assumed to think of flesh as an evil substance created by the Demiurge. Since Marcion's *Euangelion* had no birth narratives (Marcion's text begins with Luke 4:31, where Jesus "comes down" to Capernaum), Tertullian can think of Marcion's Jesus as descending from heaven without a true incarnation. However, he does so even though he knows that Marcion's gospel retains descriptions of Jesus' flesh undergoing suffering and death. Marcion's Christ even has "bones" after the resurrection (but not "flesh," which

---

<sup>2</sup> Sebastian Moll, "Three Against Tertullian: The Second Tradition About Marcion's Life," *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 59 91 (2008), 169-80, demonstrates the unreliability of this tradition, and offers reasons why Epiphanius would invent Sinope. Pseudo-Tertullian, *Against All Heresies* 6.2; Epiphanius, *Pan.* 42.1.3-2.8; Philastrius 45. This information was not known to Tertullian himself, who certainly would have capitalized on it (see where Tertullian makes similar claims against Apelles in *The Prescription Against Heretics* 30.6: he abandoned the encratism of Marcion and joined himself to a certain Philumene, who seduced him and heresy later became a prostitute). The same can certainly be said of Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria, if not also Justin.

<sup>3</sup> Wilhite "Was Marcion a Docetist? The Body of Evidence vs. Tertullian's Argument" *Vigiliae Christianae* 70 (2016), 1-36.

makes Tertullian apoplectic).<sup>4</sup> Therefore it is also possible that Marcion's Christ has only a spiritual body in the resurrection (cf., 1 Cor. 15.44), as Irenaeus claims.<sup>5</sup> From this depiction of Christ's unborn body descended from heaven and from his spiritual body in the resurrection, Tertullian deduces that Marcion's Christ had a phantasmal body all along. I think it is more plausible that Marcion thought of his Christ like many people from around the Mediterranean thought of their gods: deities metamorphosize as needed, and their bodies are as tangible and material as mortals' for the time they remain in that form.

It is worth mentioning here that this kind of polymorphism is often identified by scholars as "Hellenistic" when found in early Christian sources, in contrast to a Jewish understanding of human bodies.<sup>6</sup> To be sure, this is a tenuous claim because of the interaction of Greco-Roman and Jewish thought for the previous centuries before Marcion, and because many would think of the God of the Hebrew scriptures in metamorphic terms. Even so, there is at least a tendency in the Hebraic tradition that is aniconic and seeks to emphasize God's transcendence or at least God's otherness. There is no indication that Marcion would think in terms of transcendence in relation to the God known in Jesus, for which Tertullian mocks him mercilessly.<sup>7</sup> This non-Jewish aspect of his thought can be seen more clearly in the next accusation made against him regarding his treatment of the scriptures.

### 1.2 Marcion's Alleged Editing of the Canon

Another of the major accusations leveled against Marcion is that he made drastic changes to the Christian canon: he rejected the entire Old Testament, and only retained Luke and a selection of Paul's letters. Even these texts were heavily edited, with all references to the Old Testament removed. Marcion, in Tertullian's telling, edited "with a sword instead of a stylus."<sup>8</sup> Of course, no scholar today would put it so sharply. For

---

<sup>4</sup> *Marc.* 4.43.6; cf., Luke 24.29.

<sup>5</sup> Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 1.27.2; Hippolytus, *Refutation of Heretics* 10.15. Even this is a problematic view given the fact that Marcion's Christ does have "bones" (see previous note) and the fact that Codex Bezae has the same reading of Luke 24.29 so that Jesus says "bones" but not "flesh" (see Carter, "Marcion's Christology and its possible influence on Codex Bezae," *Journal Of Theological Studies* 61 [October 1, 2010], 550-582).

<sup>6</sup> See the argument that metamorphic theophanies from Graeco-Roman literature helps explain passages in Johannine literature made by Pamela E. Kinlaw, *The Christ Is Jesus: Metamorphosis, Possession and Johannine Christology* (Society of Biblical Literature 18; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005).

<sup>7</sup> Esp. throughout *Marc.* 1-2.

<sup>8</sup> *Praescr.* 38.9: *machaera, non stilo.*

one thing, there is no set canon for Christians at this time. For the “Old Testament,”<sup>9</sup> rather than reject it outright, Marcion may not have known it, as is the case with other Christian groups from around this time.<sup>10</sup> This is especially the case for sources that are, like Marcion of Pontus, from Asia Minor.<sup>11</sup> For the Catholic Epistles and Revelation, we can easily recognize many Christian sources from Marcion’s time do not reference them at all, and so likely do not accept them or even know them.

When it comes to the Gospels and Acts, it is now widely accepted that few if any Christians in the first half of the second century knew of a four-fold Gospel collection.<sup>12</sup> Rather than rejecting other Gospels,<sup>13</sup> Marcion likely only knew (some version of) Luke. Even if one accepts Luke-Acts as a literary whole, the texts did not circulate together, and so Marcion could have a copy of one without the other.<sup>14</sup> To focus on Luke, the traditional claim is that Marcion removed all references to the Old Testament to fit his

---

<sup>9</sup> Wolfram Kinzig, “Καινή διαθήκη: The Title of the New Testament in the Second and Third Centuries,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 45 (1994), 519-44, thinks Marcion coined the usage of “Old Testament” and “New Testament.” Based on van der Geest, *Le Christ et l’Ancien Testament chez Tertullien*, 30-32, who notes Tertullian’s shift from using *testamentum* to mean “ordinance” until his *Adv. Marc.*, at which point he begins using it to mean a collection of books (see esp. *Marc.* 4.1.1, the first instance, as well as instances where he quotes Marcion’s wording: *Marc.* 4.6.1; 5.11.4; *Praescr.* 30.9). It is worth noting, however, that Kinzig’s argument is not without problems: he thinks Tertullian is citing the *Antitheses* in 30.8-10 (which is likely), but then believes that he can verify the view with the many Marcionites who have spread into North Africa (p.541), but this is not the case since there is no evidence of Marcionism in North Africa (see Wilhite, “Marcionites in Africa: What did Tertullian Know and When did he Invent it?” *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 43 [4 2016], 437-52). Nevertheless, I think Kinzig is ultimately correct and that Marcion (or Marcionites) likely did influence this concept, a point I will elaborate below. For earlier Christians, “Old Covenant” did not refer to texts (e.g., 2 Cor. 3:12-16).

<sup>10</sup> E.g., the Scillitan martyrs, who c. 180 only have “books and letters of Paul” (*Acta Scillitanorum* 12: *libri et epistulae Pauli*). While some have concluded that they were Marcionites (e.g., Richard I. Pervo, *The Making of Paul: Constructions of the Apostle in Early Christianity* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2010], 1), there are too many indications otherwise (see Wilhite, “Marcionites in North Africa,” 440-41).

<sup>11</sup> Ignatius of Antioch travelled through Asia Minor on his way to Rome. When in Marcion’s region, Ignatius knows but does not use the Jewish scriptures in his seven letters. Perhaps, he placed little value himself on what would become known as “the Old Testament.” Or, perhaps, he simply did not feel inclined to use these texts due to the occasional nature of his letters. Or, perhaps, he knew that these Jewish texts were unfamiliar to gentile Christians in this area. Similarly, Polycarp’s only known letter – also in Asia Minor – makes no use of Jewish scriptures.

<sup>12</sup> Justin only knows three, but his student, Tatian, as well as late second century writers like Irenaeus, Clement, and Tertullian, know the fourfold collection.

<sup>13</sup> Cf., Tertullian, *Marc.* 4.2.4.

<sup>14</sup> See discussion and bibliography in C.K. Rowe, “Literary Unity and Reception History: Reading Luke-Acts as Luke and Acts,” *JSNT* 29 (2007), 449-457; and Andrew Gregory, “The Reception of Luke and Acts and the Unity of Luke-Acts,” *JSNT* 29 (2007) 459-472.

theological view. However, the numerous instances of Old Testament material that remains in Marcion's text requires that this claim be reconsidered. There is no consistent editorial rationale that fits any Marcionite theology, which has caused many scholars to conclude that Marcion did not edit Luke; instead, Marcion's *Euangelion* is prior to canonical Luke.<sup>15</sup> For one thing, Marcion's gospel does not even have the name "Luke" attached to it, and there is no clear reason why Marcion would want to disassociate from a known associate of Paul.<sup>16</sup> Furthermore, of the 500 variants from Luke in Marcion's text, over three-fourths of them can be found in other manuscripts.<sup>17</sup> Therefore, the many times when his enemies accuse him of editing Luke, it is now clear that many (if not all) belong to the textual tradition that pre-dates Marcion. However, while I think it is correct to say that Marcion's *Euangelion* predates Marcion, I am not convinced that this text is proto-Luke or an original text on which the synoptics and John were based, as has recently been argued by Matthias Klinghardt.<sup>18</sup> The widespread reception of Luke by the end of the second century would be difficult to explain if Marcion's gospel was already known and accepted.<sup>19</sup>

I find the most compelling explanation for Marcion's *Euangelion* to be found in light of its relationship to the Jewish scriptures. Whereas the traditional view claimed that Marcion intentionally excised references to them from his texts (except for the exceptions), there is another explanation that can better account for what is and what is

---

<sup>15</sup> Recent advocates of this view include Joseph Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acrts: A Defining Struggle* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2006); and Matthias Klinghardt, "Markion vs. Lukas: Plädoyer für die Wiederaufnahme eines alten Falles," *New Testament Studies* 52 (2006): 213-32; Klinghardt, "'Gesetz' bei Markion und Lukas," in M. Konradt and D. Sänger (eds.), *Das Gesetz im Neuen Testament und im früehh CHristentum* (NTOA 57; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006), 102-03; and Klinghardt, "The Marcionite Gospel and the Synoptic Problem: A New Suggestion," *Novum Testamentum* 50 (2008), 1-27; and Judith Lieu, *Marcion and the Making of a Heretic: God and Scripture in the Second Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015). Markus Vinzent, *Marcion and the Dating of the Synoptic Gospels* (Leuven: Peeters 2014), takes this further and argues that Marcion himself wrote the first gospel, on which the others were based. M. Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium und die Entstehung der kanonischen Evangelien* (2 vols.; TANZ 60/1-2; Tübingen: Francke, 2015) (cited above), does not agree that Marcion wrote the gospel, but he does argue for its priority over the synoptics. For bibliography of early modern proponents of this view, see Roth, "Marion's Gospel and Luke: The History of Research in Current Debate," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127 (3 2008), 513-27; Roth, "Matthean Texts," 580-81; R. Joseph Hoffman, *Marcion: On the Restitution of Christianity* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1984), xi-xiii. And for a more in depth of the history of research, see Roth, *The Texts of Marcion's Gospel* (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 7-45.

<sup>16</sup> Tertullian, *Marc.* 4.2.3.

<sup>17</sup> Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium*, I:72-113; 2:1209-79.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>19</sup> Christopher M. Hayes, "M. vs. the 'Plädoyer' of Matthias Klinghardt," *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 99 (2 2008), 213-32.

not in his *Euangelion*. In a 1987 study of the Lord's prayer in Luke and in Marcion's Gospel, Christian-Bernard Amphoux claims that Marcion's version of the Lord's prayer (Luke 11.2-4) is a de-Judaizing text in that the vocabulary is changed to better suit Gentile petitioners.<sup>20</sup> In her 2011 essay entitled, "Marcion and the Synoptic Problem," Judith Lieu follows Amphoux on this point and asserts that his conclusion has wider ramifications for understanding Marcion's *Euangelion*.<sup>21</sup> Acknowledging the growing number of scholars who find the variants in Marcion's text to match other known variants, she does not assert Marcion's text to be Proto-Luke, but rather she finds that it provides "further evidence of the fluidity of the textual tradition."<sup>22</sup> Similarly, Jason BeDuhn is convinced by Klinghardt and others that Marcion's Gospel predated Marcion, and yet he does not think there is sufficient evidence to see Luke as an anti-Marcionite redaction. BeDuhn thinks Marcion's Luke is earlier, and likely belongs to the synoptic tradition the same way Luke has been understood to by modern scholars. Nevertheless, he thinks the theology or "ideology" is the same in both texts, the only difference is that Marcion's Gospel "was suitable for use in Gentile-dominated communities."<sup>23</sup> BeDuhn uses the Hellenistic context to explain much in Marcion, such the specific terms and function of charter documents that become fixed or canonized, as one would find in Greco-Roman cultic associations.<sup>24</sup> This de-Judaizing tendency in Marcion's text shows the most promise for explaining the evidence. It is indicative of a larger pattern with Marcion. On the one hand, Marcion's version of Luke was not edited by Marcion, since no editorial rationale based on Marcion's theology can explain what remains in it. On the other hand, Marcion's version of Luke is likely not proto-Luke, since the canonical

---

<sup>20</sup> *La revision du 'Notre Père' de Luc (11,2-4) et sa place dans l'histoire du tete*, in *Recherches sur l'Histoire de la Bible Latine*, ed. R. Gryson and P.-M. Bogaert (Cahiers de la Revue Théologie de Louvain 19; Louvain: Faculté de Théologie, 1987), 105-121 [non vidi/OSOFASTED].

<sup>21</sup> "Marcion and the Synoptic Problem," in *New Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, ed. Paul Foster, Andrew f. Gregory, John S. Kloppenborg, and Joseph Verheyden (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), [739-44] 738.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid*, 739. Later, in a short discussion of the scholarship (in dialogue with Klinghardt and BeDuhn), Lieu further addresses how the revised picture of Marcion's Gospel only further illustrates the chaotic and fluid nature early Christian texts, and then she adds, "On this model, the hypothesis that Marcion received, and probably edited, a predecessor of canonical Luke seems most likely" ("Marcion's Gospel and the New Testament: Catalyst or Consequence?" *New Testament Studies* 63 [2 2017], [318-34] 332).

<sup>23</sup> Klinghardt, BeDuhn, and Lieu, "Marcion's Gospel and the New Testament," 326. See further discussion and bibliography in BeDuhn, *The First New Testament: Marcion's Scriptural Canon* (Salem, OR: Polebridge Press, 2013), 78-92, esp. (91-92) where he concludes, "...the two gospels [Luke and Marcion's version] could be alternative versions adapted for primarily Jewish and primarily Gentile readers, respectively. In other words, the differences served practical, mission-related purposes rather than ideological, sectarian ones."

<sup>24</sup> Klinghardt, BeDuhn, and Lieu. "Marcion's Gospel and the New Testament," 328.

form of Luke is widely known by the second half of the second century.<sup>25</sup> I propose that Marcion's version is a redaction of Luke, but one made by someone taking Christianity into a non-Jewish context, such as Pontus. The early material in Luke, such as Jesus' genealogy, would make little sense to Gentiles who had little to know contact with the synagogue.<sup>26</sup> This explanation also helps us understand Marcion's version of Paul's letters.

With Paul's letters the questions are manifold. Irenaeus and virtually all later heresiologists claimed that Marcion edited Paul's letters to suite his theological agenda.<sup>27</sup> Marcion's *Apostolikon* consisted of Galatians, 1 & 2 Corinthians, Romans, 1 & 2 Thessalonians, Laodiceans, Colossians, Philemon, and Philippians. Marcion's opponents claimed that Marcion rejected the Pastoral Epistles, but it is equally plausible that these were later and Marcion simply did not know them.<sup>28</sup> The claim made by some

---

<sup>25</sup> E.g., by Justin, Tatian, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian.

<sup>26</sup> BeDuhn, *The First New Testament*, 6, suggests, "It is quite possible that he came from a community where Christianity had reached a non-Jewish audience and from the beginning caught on in a form only tenuously connected to its Jewish heritage." As far as the specific region of Pontus, there must have been a Jewish community there, but the evidence is slim (see Aquila of Acts 18:2, 1 Pet. 1:1, and the convert to Judaism, Aquila the Sinope; discussed in Heikki Räisänen, "Marcion," in *A Companion to Second-Century Christian "Heretics"*, ed. Antti Marjanen and Petri Luomanen [Leiden: Brill, 2005], 102). The wider region of Asia Minor with a lower percentage of its population consisting of Jews (than say Alexandria, Antioch and even Rome; cf. Josephus, *Antiquities* 14.7.2) birthed forms of Christianity less familiar with and certain of the Jewish scriptures. BeDuhn, *The First New Testament*, 20, correctly stipulates, "We have no way of knowing whether Marcion was raised in a Christian community already disconnected from its Jewish roots, or later joined such a community, or whether he was himself an innovator in that direction." Given the inability to prove any option, in what follows I suggest the first option as a hypothesis that best fits the context and explains the evidence.

<sup>27</sup> Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.27.2; cf., Tertullian, *Marc.* 4.2.4. It is worth noting that Justin Martyr makes no mention of Marcion's editorial work.

<sup>28</sup> Against Pauline authorship, classically, see P.N. Harrison, *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles* (Oxford: Humphrey Milford, 1921), who does allow for "fragments of Paul." For full discussion, see I. Howard Marshall, *The Pastoral Epistles* (International Critical Commentary; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999), who concludes them to be pseudonymous or "allonymous." The pseudonymity of the Pastorals have gained a large consensus among New Testament scholars (see Bart D. Ehrman, *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings* [New York: Oxford University Press, 2008], 396-402). However, the alleged consensus faces a growing number of detractors: see arguments in favor of Pauline authorship in J.N.D. Kelly, *The Pastoral Epistles: 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus* (Harper's New Testament Commentaries; New York: Harper & Row, 1963); Luke Timothy Johnson, *Letters to Paul's Delegates: 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy and Titus* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press, 1996); and Johnson, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy* (The Anchor Bible 35A; New York: Doubleday, 2001); William D. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* (Word Biblical Commentary 46; Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2000); and Ben Witherington III, *Letters and Homilies for Hellenized Christians* vol. 1: *A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on Titus, 1-2*

that these are written in response to Marcion is to my mind unconvincing because there is very little that one would expect if the Pastorals were in anyway responding to Marcionites.<sup>29</sup> It can be generally agreed that Paul's letters must have circulated in various forms (cf. Col. 4.16), and so there is no certainty as to the dating of these texts based on Marcion's knowledge of them. The letter to the Laodiceans is admitted by Tertullian to be canonical Ephesians, only with a different title.<sup>30</sup> In terms of the order of the *Apostolikon*, this arrangement may appear odd when compared with the later canon, but it turns out that scholars have in fact found evidence of pre-Marcion collections of Paul's letters that match the same order and number of letters that Marcion had.<sup>31</sup> This could indicate that Marcion received a common corpus of Pauline letters; he did not select them out of a pre-existing canon.

As for the claim that Marcion edited his version of these epistles, a large amount of the instances where Marcion is said to have edited Paul's letters these are shown upon closer comparison to align with the variants known to circulate in Rome.<sup>32</sup> Also, there are numerous instances where Marcion did not edit out references to the Old Testament, which calls into question the notion that he intentionally excised any references to the Old Testament because of a theological agenda.<sup>33</sup> As was shown to be the case with his *Euangelion*, Marcion's *Apostolikon* is better explained as a de-Judaized version of Paul's letters received by Marcion and his community, rather than Marcion's own attempt to expunge the Old Testament from these letters because of theological objections. The Old

---

*Timothy and 1-3 John* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2006); Philip H. Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus* (The New International Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2006). See discussion of general trends in I. Howard Marshall, "Some Recent Commentaries on the Pastoral Epistles," *Expository Times* 117 (4 2006): 140-143; and Stanley E. Porter (ed.), *The Pauline Canon* (Leiden: Brill, 2004).

<sup>29</sup> The one viable datum is 1 Tim. 6.20, which warns against ἀντιθέσεις. However, even if this were late, the ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως would not normally apply to Marcion, but to other "Gnostic" groups who think of their theology as in "opposition" of the Demiurge.

<sup>30</sup> *Marc.* 5.17.1; cf., Eph. 1.1 in variant mss. and Col. 4.16.

<sup>31</sup> See Todd Still, "Shadow and Light: Marcion's (Mis)Construal of the Apostle Paul," in *Paul and the Second Century*, ed. Michael F. Bird and Joseph R. Dodson (London: T&T Clark, 2011), [91-107] 101 n.59, for the bibliography of this growing consensus.

<sup>32</sup> See Gilles Quispel, "Marcion and the Text of the New Testament," *Vigiliae Christianae* 52 (4 1998), 349-360, following the study by J.J. Clabeaux, "The Lost Edition of the Letters of Paul: A Reassessment of the Text of the Pauline Corpus Attested by Marcion," (PhD Diss.; Harvard University, 1989), and Ulrid Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos: Rekonstruktion und historische Einordnung der marcionitischen Paulusbrieffausgabe* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1995); also, see the numerous uses of Marcionite material in H.A.G. Houghton, *The Latin New Testament: A Guide to its Early History, Texts, and Manuscripts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), *passim*.

<sup>33</sup> Examples include those discussed in Tertullian, *Marc.* 5.4.8, ref. Gal. 4.22-24; and 5.14.10; ref. Rom. 11:34 and Is. 40:13.

Testament material that does remain in the *Apostolikon*, simply did not need to be removed because it still makes sense within Paul's letters, even if the now thoroughly gentile audience does not know that the material come from the Old Testament itself. In other words, Marcion's so-called "editing" of Paul's letters is better understood as a de-Judaized version handed to him.

As for Marcion's canon overall, many scholars still assume Marcion to have edited some parts of Luke and Paul. But at this point the question arises: how do we know? Perhaps, later Marcionites further edited Paul's letters. One could easily imagine the following scenario: Marcion arrives in Rome with the only draft of the only Gospel he knows as well as the only version of the only letters of Paul he knows. When questioned about his teachings, he points to his texts. His opponents point to their texts, which are longer and peppered with references to Jewish scriptures. When that party sees the different versions, they accuse Marcion of "circumcising" the original text.<sup>34</sup> When Marcion sees the different versions, he accuses them of including "Jewish interpolations."<sup>35</sup>

In other words, Marcion may have encountered the Jewish scriptures for the first time in Rome, and at his discovery of Christians who embrace them, he insists that the two corpora are incompatible. It seems likely that this is the point at which he writes his *Antitheses*, which consists of examples of their incompatibility. Tertullian's citations of this work only allow scholars to reconstruct stark contrasting quotes between Old Testament and New Testament verses with little else that can be learned from about this text or Marcion's teaching therein.<sup>36</sup> One other piece of the evidence to consider is how later anti-Marcionite writers find even more deletions from the Marcionite scriptures

---

<sup>34</sup> Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.27.2.

<sup>35</sup> John Knox, *Marcion and the New Testament: An Essay in the Early History of the Canon* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942), 17.

<sup>36</sup> See W. Löhr, "Markion," *RAC*, ed. G. Schöllgen et al (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 2012), 24:[147-73] 152-55; and further discussion in Eric W. Scherbenske, "Marcion's Antitheses and the Isagogic Genre," *Vigiliae Christianae* 64 (3 2010), 255-79. Although statements like that found in *Marc.* 3.3.3: ("...the same miracles which are the only evidence you lay claim to for belief in your Christ" [*quas solas ad fidem Christo tuo vindicas*]; Evans 174-5) may imply that Tertullian has firsthand knowledge of Marcion's teachings from his *Antitheses*, the numerous conditional clauses of the paragraph leaves the matter ambiguous at best. Moreover, when Tertullian reports what the *Antitheses* consisted of (*Marc.* 1.19), he nowhere explicitly claims that he has a copy of Marcion's work. The one possible instance where Tertullian makes such a claim (*Adv. Marc.* 4.9.7) would indicate that the *Antitheses* is a commentary. Adolf von Harnack, *Marcion: The Gospel of the Alien God*, trans. J.E. Steely and L.D. Bierma (Durham, N.C.: Labyrinth, 1990), 54, uses this passage as the basis of his understanding of Marcion's original document. Harnack's understanding, however, has been questioned (see Moll, *The Arch-Heretic Marcion* [WUNT 250; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010], 107-11). See the recent discussion of Lieu, *Marcion*, 272-88.

than Tertullian.<sup>37</sup> I posit that later Marcionites, when prompted by polemic to closer inspection, found more indebtedness to the “Old Testament” in Paul’s letters and Luke’s Gospel (even in Marcion’s version of them) they cut out more material (a process which apparently went on for generations).

I call this phenomenon de-Judaizing rather than anti-Semitic, because it looks to be the product of distance from Jewish Christianity, and not the intentional distancing thereof from Judaism per se. Marcion, I contend, likely did not know anything that later Christians would call Judaism (however defined). John G. Gager and Heikki Räisänen have both written about the fact that Marcion blames the God of the Jews, and not the Jews themselves, for the theological mistakes in the Old Testament scriptures, and therefore there is no ground left on which to accuse him of anti-Semitism.<sup>38</sup> His is more *a*-Semitism than *anti*-Semitism. Additionally, it helps my case to note that in the immediate aftermath of the Jewish revolts (66-140) where Jews were finally expelled from Jerusalem and Judea (renamed at this time Palestine), there would be many Christians who further proselytize gentiles, and in so doing it would be expedient to provide an abridged (that is, a de-Judaized) set of scriptures.<sup>39</sup> Marcion’s scriptures emerge in the historical record at exactly this time.

By absolving Marcion from the charge of editing the scriptures to suite his theological agenda (which cannot be substantiated by the evidence), his view of Jesus comes into sharper relief. The oldest and most consistent concern that his opponents

---

<sup>37</sup> A specific example is likely found in Gal. 1.1: according to Tertullian, Paul speaks of himself as an apostle “by Jesus Christ and through God the Father,” but Jerome claims that “through God the Father” was deleted by Marcion (*Commentary on Galatians*). Why would Tertullian miss this opportunity to correct Marcion? It is more plausible that Marcion’s text retained the phrase, and later Marcionites saw the need to delete for theological reasons. Jerome then found not Marcion’s *Apostolikon* but a later Marcionite revision of it. Further examples of this sort of discrepancy in the heresiologists are legion and too numerous to list. At the same time, we should admit that the evidence is complex: there are signs that Marcion’s Gospel is not simply redacted Luke, because it shows signs of agreements with Matthew and Mark; furthermore, there are instances where later writers like Epiphanius know of passages that were added when compared to passages Tertullian claims were missing. In short, a complete explanation of all of the micro-data is still needed in the scholarship; see Roth, *The Text of Marcion’s Gospel*, 437-40.

<sup>38</sup> John G. Gager, *The Origins of Anti-Semitism: Attitudes toward Judaism in Pagan and Christian Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), 171-72; and Heikki Räisänen, “Marcion and the Origins of Christian Anti-Judaism: A Reappraisal,” *Temenos* 33 (1997): 121-35. Cf., the scene recorded in Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 1.27.3; Epiphanius, *Panarion* 42.4.4.

<sup>39</sup> As was argued by Robert M. Gant, *Heresy and Criticism: The Search for Authenticity in Early Christian Literature* (Louisville, KY: Westminster-John Knox Press, 1993), 33-47. Lieu, *Marcion and the Making of a Heretic*, 321, agrees, only stipulating that the subject belongs to the wider discussion of “other demiurgical (or ‘gnostic’) movements.”

raise against him is Marcion's theological dualism. That is, he understands Jesus to be an "alien God," entirely unassociated with the God found in the Jewish scriptures.

### 1.3 Marcion's Theological Dualism

Marcion's primary mistake, according to the earliest sources,<sup>40</sup> like Justin Martyr, is to "deny God the Maker of this universe and confess some other who is greater, beyond him."<sup>41</sup> Eusebius says that Justin wrote a work against Marcion,<sup>42</sup> but all that survives is fragments of Justin; even so, in said fragments Marcion is merely said to view Christ as another god.<sup>43</sup> Eusebius records other anti-Marcionite sources from the second century, but in each instance the only accusation is that of theological dualism: Marcion's Christ is other than and opposed to the Creator/Demiurge.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> There is debate as to whether Polycarp knew and opposed Marcion. Some scholars believe that he did, based on his anti-docetic remarks; e.g., P. Meinhold, "Polykarpos (1)," in *PRE* 21 (1952), 1685-1687 (C. Marksches in the latest edition also suggests Marcion is in view); and T. Aono, *Die Entwicklung des paulinischen Gerichtsgedankens bei den Apostolischen Vätern* (Bern: Peter Lang 1979), 384-97. However, most studies have found this to be incorrect; e.g., J.B. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers* (London: Macmillan, 1889), 2.2:918; L.W. Barnard, "The Problem of St Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians," in *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and their Background* (Oxford 1966), 33-35; Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 23-26; Dehandschutter, "The Epistle of Polycarp," 121; H. Paulsen, *Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia und der Brief des Polykarp von Smyrna* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1985), 120-21; Kenneth Berding, *Polycarp and Paul: An Analysis of Their Literary and Theological Relationship in Light of Polycarp's Use of Biblical and Extra-Biblical Literature* (Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae*; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 18-25; Peter Oakes, "Leadership and Suffering in the Letters of Polycarp and Paul to the Philippians," in *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*, ed. Andrew Gregory and Christopher Tuckett (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 358; M.W. Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Press, 2009), 276; and P.A. Hartog, *Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians and the Martyrdom of Polycarp: Introduction, Text, and Commentary* (Oxford Apostolic Fathers; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).

<sup>41</sup> *1 Apol.* 26.5 (trans. D. Minns and P. Parvis, *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: Apologies* [Oxford: Oxford University Press], 151). See Lieu, *Marcion and the Making of a Heretic*, 323-66.

<sup>42</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 4.11.8; however, he then only cites *1 Apol.* 26 (in 4.11.9).

<sup>43</sup> *Hist. eccl.* 4.18.9 (NPNF 2-1:197), "And the discourses of the man were thought so worthy of study even by the ancients, that Irenaeus quotes his words: for instance, in the fourth book of his work *Against Heresies*, where he writes as follows: "And Justin well says in his work against Marcion, that he would not have believed the Lord himself if he had preached another God besides the Creator"; and again in the fifth book of the same work he says: "And Justin well said that before the coming of the Lord Satan never dared to blaspheme God, because he did not yet know his condemnation"; ref. *Adv. haer.* 4.6.2; 5.26.2.

<sup>44</sup> Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 5.13.3, on Rhodo (c.180-190) claim that Marcion teaches two first principles. *Hist. eccl.* 5.14.2, on an anonymous anti-Montanist writer (cf., Jerome, *De vir. ill.* 37, who claims it was Rhodo) who simply claimed that Marcionites did not "confess Christ himself in truth." Minns and Parvis, *Justin*, 151, interpret the statement to be an opposition of Christ to the Creator, based on Eusebius' other information about Marcion.

Irenaeus also only knows Marcion's heresy to be that of separating the God of the Law and the Prophets from Christ.<sup>45</sup> Marcion claims the demiurge is evil, while Jesus' father is a higher god – a charge Irenaeus will repeat at least fourteen other times throughout his work, twice citing Justin as witness.<sup>46</sup> Third century sources continue to make this accusation of theological dualism against Marcion as the primary error.<sup>47</sup> Two authors comment on Marcion at great length, and so cannot be treated in full here. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that both Tertullian and Epiphanius speak of Marcion's primary error as that of theological dualism, and they only add other charges, like docetism and editing the scriptures, when exegeting Marcion's texts wherein these additional charges serve as rhetorical devices, inventions of what Marcion had in mind when editing/reading any given passage.<sup>48</sup>

The other accusations need not be denied entirely here for my argument to stand. My primary observation at this point is that the opposition of Christ as an "alien God" to the Creator/Demiurge of the Old Testament is the primary concern of Marcion's opponents.<sup>49</sup> Marcion cannot reconcile the Jesus seen in his scriptures with the God who says (in Is. 45.7), "I create evil."<sup>50</sup> I suggest that this polemic arises for Marcion and the Marcionites only in the encounter (probably in Rome) with Christian groups who do use the Jewish scriptures and who identify Jesus with this God. There is to my mind no credible evidence that Marcion concerns himself with (never mind *believing* in) the God

---

<sup>45</sup> *Adv. haer.* 1.27.2

<sup>46</sup> *Adv. haer.* 2.1.2, 2.1.4, 2.3.1, 2.28.6, 2.30.9, 2.31.1, 3.11.2, 3.11.7, 3.12.12; 3.25.3, 4.2.2, 4.4.2 (citing Justin), 4.4.4, 5.26.2 (citing Justin). He also accuses Marcion of editing the scriptures, and denying the bodily resurrection (both were discussed above). For two instances in which Irenaeus may possibly refer to Marcion's docetism, see Wilhite, "Was Marcion a Docetist?", 11-14, where I argue that this is a generalization of all "Gnostics," and not a claim about Marcion specifically.

<sup>47</sup> Pseudo-Hippolytus, *Haer.* 7.29, repeats the claim that Marcion believed in two first-principles (δύο ἀρχαίς); only later he claims there were three first-principles in Marcion's thought, goodness, evil, and matter (10.19). Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 3.3.12, 3.3.18, 3.3.22, repeats the common knowledge about Marcion's theological dualism and his denial of a materially resurrected body, and also (3.17.102) reports that Marcion denied Christ's birth (which Clement likens unto other docetic teachers). Origen, *Princ.* 2.7.1, 2.9.5; *Cels.* 5.54, 6.74, likewise faults Marcion for denying the oneness of God and rejecting the Old Testament God. Cyprian, *Ep.* 73.5.2, claims Marcion does not worship the same Creator God as other Christians.

<sup>48</sup> See full discussion in Wilhite, "Was Marcion a Docetist," 18-30; and Wilhite, "Marcionites in Africa: What did Tertullian Know and When did he Invent it?" *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 43 (4 2016), 437-52.

<sup>49</sup> Even Tertullian, who is eager to accuse Marcion of numerous errors, declares this to be most substantial one and the basis for the other heretical teachings (e.g., *Marc.* 1.2; 2.27).

<sup>50</sup> Tertullian, *Marc.* 1.2.2.

of the Old Testament.<sup>51</sup> Instead, Marcion has accepted Jesus as the God of the de-Judaized *Euangelion* and *Apostolikon*, and when other Christians insist on linking Jesus with the God of the Jewish scriptures, Marcion finds that the latter – if he exists and is the Demiurge of this cosmos – to be antithetical to the former. This leads him and/or his followers to additional de-Judaizing tactics whenever polemic emerges. Otherwise, it appears that Marcionite churches carried on with routine gentile Christian practices so that they looked like any other gentile church.<sup>52</sup>

In sum, Marcion's Jesus is an alien God who descended without warning to this world in order to rescue tormented souls from this imperfect world. He was crucified and killed, but he rose in a spiritual body. Any who believe in him can be saved. All this he concludes without any reference to or need for the Jewish scriptures. When he encounters those who do insist on linking Jesus with the God of Israel, Marcion rejects the link to what appears to him as a judgmental deity who is antithetical to the Gospel of Christ.<sup>53</sup>

One teacher who opposed Marcion was Justin Martyr. Even though both would admit to having antithetical views of the Creator/Demiurge, Justin understands Jesus' identification with the Creator in such a way that he too embarks on a systemic de-Judaizing theology.

## 2. Justin Martyr

In looking to Justin's<sup>54</sup> Jesus, there are two common tenets to which the standard reference works point.<sup>55</sup> The first is Justin's Logos Christology, found especially in his

<sup>51</sup> To my mind an unproven assumption of many scholars is the notion that Marcion actually believed in the God of Israel and its history; e.g., Moll, *The Arch-Heretic Marcion*; Moll, "Justin and the Pontic Wolf," in *Justin Martyr and His Worlds*, ed. Sara Parvis, and Paul Foster (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2007), 145-51; and Andrew Hayes: *Justin Against Marcion: Defining the Christian Philosophy* (Minneapolis (Fortress Press) 2017), who states, "The relationship of Marcion to the canon is not a topic Justin discusses, and neither will I do so. Justin is my primary concern, and so, I assume, the portrayal of Marcion as told by Justin and Irenaeus, the other witnesses in close proximity to him, is relatively accurate, although always in need of careful critical analysis." (xii). I find this concession to an uncritical reading of Marcion's opponents – despite acknowledging the "need" for a critical reading – to be an untenable premise.

<sup>52</sup> Which is why Cyril of Jerusalem has to warn Christians that Marcionites look like "orthodox" Christians (*Catech.* 4.4).

<sup>53</sup> On recent attempts to retrieve Marcionism for contemporary Christianity, see Ludger Schwienhorst-Schonberger, "Marcion on the Bible," *First Things* (December 2018), 21-26. For further theological ramifications of Marcion's Christology, see Wilhite, *The Gospel According to Heresy* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2015), 21-39.

<sup>54</sup> Although now dated, for helpful introductions to Justin, see Leslie W. Barnard, *Justin Martyr: His Life and Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967); and Eric Francis Osborn, *Justin Martyr* (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1973). For more recent bibliography, see Denis

*Apology* (c.153).<sup>56</sup> Secondly, it is well known that Justin Martyr believed Jesus to be the one prophesied throughout the Jewish scriptures so that any who do not recognize him there must belong to a false faith, stated especially starkly in his *Dialogue with Trypho, the Jew* (c.165).<sup>57</sup> The former, it is widely assumed, represents Justin's primary Christology, which places him in the Platonic (and/or Stoic) tradition. This in turn leads Justin to follow Plato's allegorizing of Homer and Philo's allegorizing of Moses so that Justin likewise allegorizes the Jewish scriptures in such a way that they are Christo-centric; that is, he reads them so that they contain foreshadowing and figurative images of Jesus throughout.<sup>58</sup> In so doing, Justin famously (or infamously) sets up an inevitable supersessionist posture<sup>59</sup> for Christians in his community: the church replaces Israel; the new covenant replaces the old; the Gospel replaces the Law; the Eucharist replaces the sacrifice; baptism replaces circumcision; and so on and so forth.<sup>60</sup>

While I do not outright dispute any of the particular items in the prior paragraph, I do wish to supplement and nuance this portrait of Justin by returning to his understanding of Jesus. Let me first identify one oddity about this portrait of Justin's theology that is problematic. Justin in no way follows Marcion in rejecting the Jewish scriptures/Old Testament nor claims they were replaced with the New Testament/Christian scriptures.<sup>61</sup> He insists, "...there never will be, nor has there ever been from eternity, any other God except him who created and formed this

Minns and P. M. Parvis, *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: Apologies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009). In what follows, I have consulted Miroslav Marcovich, *Iustini Martyris Apologiae pro Christianis* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994); but I follow Charles Munier, *Apologie pour les Chrétiens* (SC 507; Paris: Éditions de Cerf, 2006).

<sup>55</sup> Beyond the reference works, see the following studies: E. Goodenough, *The Theology of Justin Martyr* (Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1968); and L.W. Barnard, *Justin Martyr: His Life and Thought* (Cambridge: University Press, 1967); E. Osborn, *Justin Martyr* (Tübingen: JCB, 1973).

<sup>56</sup> One example will suffice: Johannes Quasten, *Patrology* (Utrecht, Spectrum, 1949), 1:209, avers, "The doctrine of the Logos is the most important doctrine for Justin..."

<sup>57</sup> As for the historicity and context of this work, see discussion in Michael Mach, "Justin Martyr's *Dialogus cum Tryphone Iudaeo* and the Development of Christian Anti-Judaism," in *Contra Iudaeos: Ancient and Medieval Polemics between Christians and Jews*, ed. Ora Limor and Guy G. Stroumsa (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), [27-47], 35; Judith M. Lieu, *Image and Reality: The Jews in the World of the Christians in the Second Century* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), esp. 104-09.

<sup>58</sup> William A. Shotwell, *The Biblical Exegesis of Justin Martyr* (London: SPCK, 1965).

<sup>59</sup> David Rokéah, *Justin Martyr and the Jews* (Jewish and Christian Perspectives Series 5; Leiden: Brill, 2002).

<sup>60</sup> Examples of his supersessionist/replacement motif is found throughout the *Dial.*, but in most instances the explicit claim is that Christians have in fact *not* replaced the old, but rightly interpreted it in its spiritual sense (cf., *Dial.* 14.2; 29.2). Instances of explicit replacement include a new Law (*Dial.* 11.2; 38.1) and a new circumcision (*Dial.* 16.2, but cf. 15.7, with ref. to Jer. 4.4, and cf. the rationale stated in *Dial.* 23.4-5).

<sup>61</sup> See Lieu, *Marcion and the Making of a Heretic*, 23-25.

universe...<sup>62</sup> This could have been spoken to Marcion!<sup>63</sup> But unlike Marcion, Justin identifies Jesus with the God of Israel. This identification in contrast to Marcion is an important point of comparison for the current study, since most scholars now agree that Justin wrote this treatise in Rome approximately one decade after Marcion left that city.<sup>64</sup> In light of this, this strict replacement theology is not consistent in his thinking, because even though some practices have been replaced (sabbath, sacrifices, etc.), the God who commanded those practices is in no way replaced or even supplemented (as is often assumed – more on this will be said below). In fact, the replacement maneuver is probably not the best, or at least not the primary explanation Justin would give, even though there is a de-Judaizing telos that results from his logic (and often an anti-Semitic stance displayed in his rhetoric<sup>65</sup>). This tension between what appears to be on the one hand a linking of Jesus' followers with Israel and on the other hand a distancing of his community from the synagogue<sup>66</sup> can be understood in light of one often overlooked aspect of his Christology.

---

<sup>62</sup> *Dial.* 11.1. On the need for the spiritual interpretation of the Law, Justin contends, "If we do not accept these conclusion, then we shall fall into absurd ideas, as the nonsense either that our God is not the same God who existed in the days of Enoch and all others..., or that God does not wish each succeeding generation of humanity always to perform the same acts of righteousness" (*Dial.* 23.1). Trypho hears Justin as teaching "another God besides the Creator of the world" (*Dial.* 50.1; repeated at *Dial.* 55.1).

<sup>63</sup> Matthijs den Dulk, *Between Jews and Heretics: Refiguring Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho* (2018), 52-68, argues that the entire text is written against "demiurgical forms of Christianity" (i.e., those who believe in a lower deity, the Demiurge, who created the world, like the Marcionites and the "Gnostics"). Likewise, Hayes, *Justin Against Marcion*, 89-162, argues that Marcion in particular is the main target of attack.

<sup>64</sup> Thomas P. Halton, "Introduction," in Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho*, trans. Thomas B. Falls, ed. Michael Slusser, *Selections from the Fathers of the Church 3* (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2003), xi-xii.

<sup>65</sup> Justin repeatedly generalizes and stereotypes all Jews: e.g., "you" murdered Christ (*Dial.* 16.4); "you" sacrificed children to idols (*Dial.* 19.6); "you" are stupid, blind, and faithless (*Dial.* 27.4); "your" hearts are hardened (*Dial.* 18.2; 44.2; 46.5). Alternatively, it should also be acknowledged that at times (when pressed) Justin does differentiate between the Jews who remain righteous and do not persecute Christians (*Dial.* 26.1; cf. 16.4 and 17.1), and it is possible for them to be saved (*Dial.* 44.4). He also knows there is a spectrum of Jews and Jewish Christians (e.g., *Dial.* 47.1-4; cf. 48.4).

<sup>66</sup> See further discussion of this tension in Daniel Boyarin, "Justin Martyr Invents Judaism," *Church History* 70 (2001), 427-61; Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004); and Nina E. Livesey, "Theological Identity Making: Justin's Use of Circumcision to Create Jews and Christians," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 18 (2010), 51-79. It should be noted that my argument above about Marcion's encounter with Christians in Rome who continue using the Jewish scriptures would require some alterations to the arguments being made Boyarin and Livesey.

Jesus, for Justin, is understood in terms of Logos Christology, and yet I contend that we should not think of this as Justin's only or primary way of describing Jesus. The philosophical use of Logos to explain Christ may in fact be a diplomatic tactic employed when speaking to gentiles (which is not to say that the notion is not fully embraced by Justin). Alternatively, there is another motif employed most explicitly in Justin's *Dialogue*, and while not entirely incompatible with Logos Christology, it is one that has received little attention from scholars (probably because it is eclipsed by discussions of his Logos Christology, which is assumed to be his primary category for understanding Jesus).<sup>67</sup> In what follows, I will show that Justin's Christology is one that first identifies Jesus as the YHWH of Israel.<sup>68</sup>

Whereas most contemporary Christians (both scholars and practitioners) assume that the God found in Israel's scriptures is primarily the Father, with Jesus being present in the Old Testament in a figurative way, Justin Martyr made the opposite assumption. For Justin, the primary persona encountered in the Old Testament God is the pre-incarnate Christ. In other words, Jesus is the "Lord" found in Justin's Septuagint, with the Greek title, Κύριος, given as a known substitute for the divine name, the Tetragrammaton.<sup>69</sup> In short, Jesus is the YHWH of Israel incarnate, something I am here calling YHWH Christology (as distinct from but not necessarily contrary to Logos Christology). Therefore, when Justin and his community read their Old Testament, they understand the "Lord" of Israel to be the pre-incarnate Christ.

To illustrate, I will carefully exegete Justin's argument with Trypho in the following paragraphs, but first it is worth acknowledging the discrepancy in methodology between the treatment of Marcion above and the treatment of Justin in

---

<sup>67</sup> Following José Pablo Martín, *El Espíritu Santo en los orígenes del Cristianismo: Estudio sobre I Clemente, Ignacio, II Clemente y Justino Martir* (Zürich: PAS, 1971), 303-04, Bogdan G. Bucur, "The Angelic Spirit in Early Christianity: Justin, the Martyr and Philosopher," *Journal of Religion* 88 (2008), 190-208 (esp. 192), contends that the notion of "Justin's all-encompassing theory of the seminal Logos," is too simplistic because he in fact utilizes several "conceptual schemes" or "systems." I suspect that Justin himself is to blame for setting up the assumption that the philosophical category of Logos was primary for him, since even in his *Dial.* he begins by telling how he first discovered true philosophy, viz. Christ's teachings (*Dial.* 2-8). On the identity of this old man as Christ, see A. Hofer, "The Old Man as Christ in Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho*," *Vigiliae Christianae* 57 (1 2003), 1-21.

<sup>68</sup> Cf., recent scholarship on "Early High Christology," that finds where some New Testament authors identify Jesus "with" – but not "as" – the God of Israel. Important studies include Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the God of Israel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008); Larry Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003); Richard Hays, *Reading Backwards: Figural Readings in the Fourfold Gospel Witness* (London: SPCK, 2015).

<sup>69</sup> Robert J. Wilkinson, *Tetragrammaton: Western Christians and the Hebrew Name of God* (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 136-38.

what follows. The former's writings survive only in fragmentary form, and so most of the work in the first half of this paper has had to be devoted to the way in which scholars interpret the primary sources written in opposition to Marcion, and then address the need to configure the best scholarly paradigm that can account for the surviving evidence. However, with Justin two (or three<sup>70</sup>) of his significant works survive,<sup>71</sup> and so our most fruitful avenue to understanding Justin is to analyze his argument in full. Since Justin's Logos Christology is well known and well researched,<sup>72</sup> I will first set it aside and focus on the Jesus described in his *Dialogue*, and then return for a brief comparison of my findings with the standard reading of his *Apology* for further insights.

### 2.1 Jesus in Justin's Dialogue

To see how Justin understands Jesus, let us follow his logic in the debate with Trypho.<sup>73</sup> After first telling of his own discovery of Christ's truth as a philosopher (*Dial.* 1-8), Justin debates Trypho about the spiritual as opposed to the carnal interpretation of the Law (*Dial.* 9-30). Then, Justin proves to Trypho that the scriptures prophesied that the messiah would first have to suffer, only later to appear in glory (*Dial.* 31-36). Trypho accepts Justin's interpretations about the messiah in principle but asks for proof that said prophecies were about Jesus in particular.<sup>74</sup> Justin, somewhat surprisingly, refuses to do so. Or, rather, he refuses to do so immediately.

Justin insists that he must first explain how the scriptures do more than speak of Jesus prophetically. They speak of Jesus in various ways, especially by speaking of him as God, that is as "the Lord (Κύριος [i.e., YHWH as trans. in the LXX]). He states, "I will

---

<sup>70</sup> For the debate over the number and order of Justin's apologies, see Runar M. Thorsteinsson, "The Literary Genre and Purpose of Justin's Second Apology: a Critical Review with Insights from Ancient Epistolography," *Harvard Theological Review* 105 (1 2012), 91-114; and Hayes: *Justin Against Marcion*, xcvi-xcii n.4.

<sup>71</sup> Justin refers to a book he wrote "against all heresies" (*1 Apol.* 1.26); Eusebius mentions several other works (*Hist. Eccl.* 4.18.3-5).

<sup>72</sup> Alois Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition: From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451)*, rev. ed., trans. John Stephen Bowden (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975), 89-94, is still a helpful study for this focus.

<sup>73</sup> For discussion and bibliography about Justin's audience, see den Dulk, *Between Jews and Heretics*, 38-51, who concludes that the texts is aimed toward Justin's own community intended to educate his people against heretical (not Jewish) views. I do not think that my analysis is affected by the historicity of Trypho or the intended audience of the dialogue. My argument pertains to Justin's description of Jesus; then, further study will be required for the implication of his view of Jesus for his immediate context.

<sup>74</sup> *Dial.* 36.1, "But prove to us that Jesus Christ is the one about whom these prophecies were spoken" (Falls, Halton, and Slusser, *St. Justin Martyr*, 56; Bobichon, *Justin*, 272: εἰ οὗτος δέ ἐστι περὶ οὗ ταῦτα προεφητεύθη, ἀπόδειξον).

supply the proofs you wish, but for the present permit me to quote the following prophecies to show that the Holy Spirit by parable called Christ *God*, and *Lord of hosts* and (*Lord*) of *Jacob*.”<sup>75</sup> In order to prove his case, Justin first turns to Psalm 24/23LXX, which speaks of ascending the hill of the “Lord (Κύριος)” (24:3/23:3). According to Justin, this “Lord (Κύριος) of hosts” (24:10/23:10) is not Solomon – as Trypho and his party claimed – but Christ.<sup>76</sup> Justin then offers similar readings of the “Lord” found in Psalms 47/46LXX and 99/98LXX.

Trypho responds with astonishment at the apparent blasphemy, of which he says he had heard rumor. For Christians allegedly claim the “crucified man was with Moses and Aaron, and spoke with them in the pillar of the cloud; that he became man, was crucified, and ascended into heaven...”<sup>77</sup> In other words, Trypho knows Christians often hold to a YHWH Christology. Justin admits to believing in those “teachings, which to you seem paradoxical.”<sup>78</sup>

Much later, after returning to his promise to demonstrate that the Hebrew prophecies of the messiah were fulfilled by Jesus, Justin again takes up our theme. Trypho again asks how Christians can defend the claim “that this Christ existed as God before all ages, and then that he consented to be born and become a man...”<sup>79</sup> Once again, Justin acknowledges the teaching as “paradoxical (παράδοξος).”<sup>80</sup> He next distances his view from some who accept that Jesus is the messiah but deny his divine status.<sup>81</sup> That view, Justin insists, is a minority one, because it does not align with the scriptures.<sup>82</sup> Here it is important to note how Justin admits to various Christian views about this issue. Nevertheless, Justin’s position, he thinks, represents a significant majority of Christians.

---

<sup>75</sup> *Dial.* 36.2 (Falls, Halton, and Slusser, *St. Justin Martyr*, 56, original italics, indicating citation of scripture; Bobichon, *Justin*, 272: ἐλεύσομαι πρὸς ἃς βούλει ταύτας ἀποδείξειζ ἐν τῷ ἀρμόζοντι τόπῳ ἔφηγν. τὰ νῦν δὲ συγχωρήσεις μοι πρῶτον ἐπιμνησθῆναι ὧνπερ βούλομαι προφητειῶν, εἰς ἐπίδειξιν ὅτι καὶ Θεὸς καὶ κύριος τῶν δυνάμενων ὁ Χριστὸς καὶ Ἰακώβ καλεῖται ἐν παραβολῇ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος).

<sup>76</sup> *Dial.* 36.5.

<sup>77</sup> *Dial.* 38.1 (Falls, Halton, and Slusser, *St. Justin Martyr*, 58; Bobichon, *Justin*, 276: τὸν σταυρωξέντα τοῦτον ἀξιῶν πείθειν ἡμᾶς γεγενῆσθαι μετὰ Μωϋέως καὶ Ἀαρὼν καὶ λελαληκέναι αὐτοῖς ἐν στύλῳ νεξέλης, εἶτα ἄνθρωπον γενόμενον σταυρωθῆναι, καὶ ἀναβεβηκέναι εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν).

<sup>78</sup> *Dial.* 38.2 (Falls, Halton, and Slusser, *St. Justin Martyr*, 58; Bobichon, *Justin*, 278: ὅπως τὰ παράδοξα ἡμῶν ταῦτα νοήσητε).

<sup>79</sup> *Dial.* 48.1 (Falls, Halton, and Slusser, *St. Justin Martyr*, 73; Bobichon, *Justin*, 302: προὔπαρχειν Θεὸν ὄντα πρὸ αἰῶνων τοῦτον τὸν Χριστὸν εἶτα καὶ γεννηθῆναι ἄνθρωπον γενόμενον ὑπομεῖναι).

<sup>80</sup> *Dial.* 48.2 (Falls, Halton, and Slusser, *St. Justin Martyr*, 73; Bobichon, *Justin*, 304).

<sup>81</sup> *Dial.* 48.4.

<sup>82</sup> *Dial.* 49.

In response Trypho does not hear Justin to say that Christians worship Jesus alone (and thereby adhere to some sort of modalistic monarchianism). He instead believes that Christians must think in terms of “another God besides the Creator of the world.”<sup>83</sup> Note how this would be an ironic mirror image of Marcion’s belief. If Trypho (or Justin’s audience) knew of Marcion, this would be an opportunity to explain that Marcionites makes this mistake, but Justin’s community does not. Justin, however, does not make any explicit reference to Marcion at this point. Nor does he address Trypho’s claim. Instead, Justin defers his answer once more until after reviewing more scriptures,<sup>84</sup> but then Trypho again asks about how he can justify belief in “another God, besides the Creator of all things...”<sup>85</sup> Justin this time answers the objection by pointing to scenes from Genesis 18 and 19 where the “Lord” appeared to Abraham.<sup>86</sup> This turns out to be the Angel of the Lord who is also called the “Lord.” At this point in the debate, one of Trypho’s companions is convinced and concedes, “We have to admit that the one of the two angels who went down to Sodom, and whom Moses in the scripture named *Lord* is one, other than God himself, who appeared to Abraham.”<sup>87</sup>

Following this concession from Trypho’s party, Justin next offers additional evidence. Justin turns to Psalm 110:1/109:1LXX, where “The Lord said to my Lord: Sit at my right hand...”<sup>88</sup> Of course, in the Septuagint Κύριος is used in this verse twice (ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου). Therefore, for Justin and his fellow Greek-speaking Christians (as well as Jewish readers of the LXX), both the Father and the Messiah can be named “Lord.”

Justin reassures Trypho that Christians do not worship two divine beings, and he explains the nuances of his position.<sup>89</sup> Trypho concedes to Justin’s arguments, and then Justin returns to the prior request and shows that the scriptures did speak of the messiah in such a way that they clearly apply to Jesus.<sup>90</sup> This is followed by a treatment of the

---

<sup>83</sup> *Dial.* 50.1 (Falls, Halton, and Slusser, *St. Justin Martyr*, 76; Bobichon, *Justin*, 310: ἄλλος Θεὸς παρὰ τὸν ποιητὴν τῶν ὅλων).

<sup>84</sup> *Dial.* 50.2.

<sup>85</sup> *Dial.* 55.1 (Falls, Halton, and Slusser, *St. Justin Martyr*, 82; Bobichon, *Justin*, 320: ἕτερος Θεὸς παρὰ τὸν ποιητὴν τῶν ὅλων).

<sup>86</sup> *Dial.* 56.

<sup>87</sup> *Dial.* 56.13 (Falls, Halton, and Slusser, *St. Justin Martyr*, 86; Bobichon, *Justin*, 331: Ὅν οὖν ὁ Λόγος διὰ Μωσέως τῶν δύο ἀγγέλων κατελθόντων εἰς Σόδομα καὶ κύριον ἕνα ὠνόμασε, παρὰ τοῦτον καὶ τὸν Θεὸν αὐτὸν τὸν ὀφθέντα τῷ Ἀβραάμ λέγειν ἀνάξκη). I have altered the translation (from “the Word through Moses”) to fit the context and better illustrate the point being made in this paragraph; see the secondary literature to support this reading in Bobichon, *Justin*, 736-38.

<sup>88</sup> *Dial.* 56.14 (Falls, Halton, and Slusser, *St. Justin Martyr*, 86).

<sup>89</sup> *Dial.* 50-62.

<sup>90</sup> *Dial.* 63-79.

shared eschatological hope in Jerusalem's restoration,<sup>91</sup> followed by further discussions of scriptures which Justin understands to be speaking about Jesus.<sup>92</sup> The discussion next turns to the shame of the crucifixion, which Justin shows was also foretold by the prophets,<sup>93</sup> and Justin then shifts to show how the prophets even foretold of the Gentiles being brought into relationship with God through Jesus.<sup>94</sup> The concluding sections address the final miscellanea before the two parties depart on good terms.<sup>95</sup>

## 2.2 Assessment and Comparison with Apology

At this point, we can assess Justin's YHWH Christology found in this text. To be sure, whenever a scripture passage speaks of "the Lord" and any other immanent expression of God, Justin and his community identified the Father with the former and the Son with the latter. Examples would include "the Glory of the Lord,... Son, or Wisdom, or Angel, or God, or Lord, or Word."<sup>96</sup> In these instances, Justin could insert a Logos Christology (explaining that the Logos is the Angel, Spirit, Wisdom, etc.), a view that would not be entirely unique at this time given the Rabbinic concerns with the "two powers in heaven" heresy.<sup>97</sup> In other words, the Logos is one prominent name for the second Power in Heaven, but for Justin both Powers are most properly called YHWH/Κύριος, making Logos Christology a subset of YHWH Christology. This can be seen by the fact that in passages which simply speak of the Κύριος (i.e., with no other immanent expression or qualifications) Justin simply assumes that this was the pre-incarnate Christ. This is an especially important claim for Justin to make in dialogue with Jews: "For we Christians, who have gained knowledge of the true worship of God from the Law and from the Word which went forth from Jerusalem by way of the apostles of Jesus, have run for protection to the God of Jacob and the God of Israel."<sup>98</sup> In other words, for Justin and his community, Jesus is the Lord of Israel.

---

<sup>91</sup> *Dial.* 80-81.

<sup>92</sup> *Dial.* 82-88.

<sup>93</sup> *Dial.* 89-107.

<sup>94</sup> *Dial.* 108-35.

<sup>95</sup> *Dial.* 136-42.

<sup>96</sup> *Dial.* 61.1 (Falls, Halton, and Slusser, *St. Justin Martyr*, 94; Bobichon, *Justin*, 346: δόξα κυρίου...υἱός, ποτέ δὲ σοφία, ποτέ δὲ ἄξξελος, ποτέ δὲ Θεός, ποτέ δὲ κύριος καὶ λόγος).

<sup>97</sup> Alan F. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports About Christianity and Gnosticism* (Boston: Brill, 2002).

<sup>98</sup> 110.2 [FC 3:164]. *Dial.* 110.2 (Falls, Halton, and Slusser, *St. Justin Martyr*, 164; Bobichon, *Justin*, 478: οἵτινες, ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ ἐπελθόντος ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ διὰ τῶν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἀποστόλων τὴν θεοσέβειαν ἐπιγνόντες, ἐπὶ τὸν Θεὸν Ἰακώβ καὶ Θεὸν Ἰσραὴλ κατεξύγομεν).

It should be noted that Justin's YHWH Christology is not simply an anomaly found in his polemic against "Trypho the Jew." In his *1 Apology*, written earlier around 153, Justin provides his audience with a noteworthy distinction between his community and the Jewish community when it comes to reading the Law and the Prophets.<sup>99</sup> One difference is how each group interprets the divine person encountered by the ancients: the Jews believe this is the "unnamable God (τὸν ἀνωνόμαστον Θεὸν),"<sup>100</sup> that is, "the Father of all (τὸν πατέρα τῶν ὅλων),"<sup>101</sup> but the Christians believe that it is "our Christ (ὁ ἡμέτερος Χριστός)"<sup>102</sup> who appeared in various forms such as fire and a burning bush. Justin's explanation is worth quoting in full:

The Jews, therefore, having always supposed that the Father of all spoke to Moses when really it was the Son of God, who is called angel and apostle, who spoke to him, are rightly refuted, both through the prophetic Spirit and through Christ himself, as knowing neither the Father nor the Son. For those who say the Son is the Father are refuted as not having known the Father nor knowing that the Father of all has a Son who also, being the first-born Logos of God, is also God. And previously he appeared through the form of fire and an incorporeal image to Moses and to the other prophets, but now, in the time of your empire, he has become a human being through a virgin, as we said before, according to the will of the Father for the salvation of those who believe in him.<sup>103</sup>

In sum, when Justin reads the "Old Testament" passages about the Lord who appeared to Moses and the other prophets, he and his Christian community interprets them as describing Jesus pre-incarnate. This passage demonstrates three important points about Justin's view of Jesus. First, his YHWH Christology is not a late addition to this

---

<sup>99</sup> Here we have used the text and translation from Denis Minns and P. M. Parvis, *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: Apologies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009); cf. Miroslav Marcovich, *Iustini Martyris Apologiae pro Christianis* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994); and Charles Munier, *Apologie pour les Chrétiens* (SC 507; Paris: Éditions de Cerf, 2006).

<sup>100</sup> *1 Apol.* 63.1 (Minns and Parvis 244-45).

<sup>101</sup> *1 Apol.* 63.14 (Minns and Parvis 248-49).

<sup>102</sup> *1 Apol.* 62.3 (Minns and Parvis 244-45).

<sup>103</sup> *1 Apol.* 63.14-16 (Minns and Parvis 248-49): Ἰουδαῖοι οὖν, ἡγησάμενοι αἰεὶ τὸν πατέρα τῶν ὅλων λελαληκέναι τῷ Μωυσεῖ, τοῦ λαλήσαντος αὐτῷ ὄντος υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὃς καὶ ἄγγελος καὶ ἀπόστολος κέκληται, δικαίως ἐλέγχονται καὶ διὰ τοῦ προφητικοῦ πνεύματος καὶ διὰ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὡς οὔτε τὸν πατέρα οὔτε τὸν υἱὸν ἔγνωσαν. οἱ γὰρ τὸν υἱὸν πατέρα φάσκοντες εἶναι ἐλέγχονται, μῆτε τὸν πατέρα ἐπιστάμενοι, μῆθ' ὅτι ἐστὶν υἱὸς τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων γινώσκοντες, ὃς, καὶ λόγος πρωτότοκος ὢν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ Θεὸς ὑπάρκει. καὶ πρότερον διὰ τῆς τοῦ πυρὸς μορφῆς καὶ εἰκόνος ἀσωμάτου τῷ Μωυσεῖ καὶ τοῖς ἑτέροις προφήταις ἐφάνη, νῦν δ' ἐν χρόνοις τῆς ἡμετέρας ἀρχῆς, ὡς προείπομεν, διὰ παρθένου ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος κατὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς βουλὴν ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας τῶν πιστευόντων αὐτῷ).

thinking, but present from his earliest known writing. Second, Justin explicitly situates Logos Christology as a sub-set of YHWH Christology; only when understanding Jesus as the God of Israel, the primary persona encountered in the Jewish scriptures, can one then understand his relationship to the Father God as one who is the Word spoken forth to act immanently in the cosmos. Third, this passage, as it is ostensibly used to explain to a non-Christian audience of persecutors what Christians believe, serves as an indication that one important tactic for Justin is to distance his community from his Jewish contemporaries. We need to say more about this third point.

What did Justin's YHWH Christology imply about the relationship between Justin's community and his Jewish contemporaries? With Marcion, we noted the context of his time period in that after the Bar Kokhba revolt and in regions far removed from Palestine, there was likely an impetus to de-Judaize the Christian message for a gentile audience with no connection to ancient Israel.<sup>104</sup> Likewise, Justin places his *Dialogue* in the immediate aftermath of Bar Kokhba: in the first chapter, Trypho introduces himself as a "Hebrew" refugee from this war. Therefore, the significance of this text for Justin's community and its relationship with their Jewish contemporaries is something that must be considered. I will offer preliminary answers here as hypotheses that need further study. First, because Justin can claim to understand the God of Israel correctly, more correctly than Trypho's party, Justin can then claim to understand his Lord's intentions about the works of the Law. These were always meant to be understood spiritually, not carnally. Secondly, Justin deduces that a carnal interpretation and application of the Law indicates a "hardness of heart" on the part of the interpreter (both in the times before Christ and by Justin's Jewish contemporaries). This anti-Semitic generalization about all Jews prompts Justin to a posture of de-Judaizing; that is, a justification of further distancing his community from the Jews. To Justin, the synagogue represents the heirs to the ancient carnal Israelites, while the gentile church consists of the heirs to the true Israel, the elect. In other words, Justin's view of Jesus not only severs ties between the growing gentile church and their contemporary Jews (as does Marcion), Justin's YHWH Christology even severs (in Justin's mind) Jews from Israel.

Justin's specific conclusions about the implications of YHWH Christology may be a unique development, but his YHWH Christology itself, it should be noted, is not unique to Justin. Because of his debate with Trypho (fictive or otherwise) and the Jewish community, Justin had to articulate this pattern of reading the Old Testament explicitly, whereas this same pattern can be found in other Christian writers implicitly. Even so,

---

<sup>104</sup> See Andrew Hayes: *Justin Against Marcion: Defining the Christian Philosophy* (Minneapolis (Fortress Press) 2017), 16-22, 83-87, for the importance of Bar Kokhba for Justin's text. Also, see Dulk, *Between Jews and Heretics*, 81-83 (= his section entitled, "The shadow of Bar Kochba") for further discussion and n.55 for the secondary literature on the matter.

Justin would not understand his position as innovative. Justin's position represents a school of thought that can be found in a variety of sources, such as *The Epistle of Barnabas*,<sup>105</sup> second and third century Christian manuscripts,<sup>106</sup> and even material images from Dura-Europos.<sup>107</sup> The background and prior development of this tradition is a matter for further study elsewhere.<sup>108</sup>

## Conclusion

In conclusion, Marcion's Jesus and Justin's Jesus are in a sense mirror images. This image in Marcion is of a God who descends into the world as a stranger to save those trapped in the cosmos. The same image in Justin is of the God who created this world and then descends into it to redeem its inhabitants. Both Marcion and Justin

---

<sup>105</sup> While Justin made his YHWH Christology explicit in order to convince Trypho's party, Ps.-Barnabas used the same YHWH-Christology when reading the Jewish scriptures, only his is an implicit assumption. Key passages include *Barn.* 5.3-5; 7.1-7; 12.10-11; 14.3-4; 21.3. Also, the trajectory from Paul's statements in 1 Cor. 9.9-10 to *Barn.* to Justin is an interesting pattern, especially since 1 Cor. 9.6 mentions Barnabas, and since 1 Cor. 9.11 differentiates the material from the spiritual.

<sup>106</sup> In particular, I have in mind the way that the name Jesus (and other references to him) became one of the *nomina sacra*. While there is some debate as to whether or not Hellenistic Jews invented this practice, the general consensus among scholars is that the Christian practice reflected the same kind of reverence for divine names that can be found in Second Temple Judaism for the Tetragrammaton; see A.H.R.E. Paap, *Nomina Sacra in the Greek Papyri of the First Five Centuries AD: The Sources and Some Deductions* (Leiden: Brill, 1959), 124; Colin H. Roberts, *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt* (London: Oxford University Press, 1979), 28-29; Harry Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 75, surveys the diverse views in the secondary literature, but still concludes, "...there is broad agreement that it has something to do with Jewish reverence for the Tetragram, the name of God, but it has proved difficult to say exactly what." One exception to this consensus is Christopher Tuckett, "'Nomina Sacra': Yes and No?," in *The Biblical Canons*, ed. J.-M. Auwers and H.J. de Jonge (Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 431-58, who claims the practice originated simply as a helpful tool for reading texts. For a rebuttal, see Jane Heath, "Nomina Sacra and Sacra Memoria Before the Monastic Age," *Journal of Theological Studies* 61 (2010), 516-49. I would also point to the indiscriminate use of *Κύριος* in Christian letters from Oxyrhynchus; see AnneMarie Luijendijk, *Greetings in the Lord: Early Christians and the Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (Harvard University Press, 2008), esp. 60-61.

<sup>107</sup> The "Good Shepherd" image from this house church, which has numerous parallels in other material remains from early Christianity, draws from Old Testament imagery about the Lord God to depict Jesus; see Michael Peppard, *The World's Oldest Church: Bible, Art, and Ritual at Dura-Europos, Syria* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016), 87, and 102-04.

<sup>108</sup> In another project, I and Adam Winn (University of Mary-Hardin Baylor) are pursuing this line of research to see what precedents for YHWH Christology can be found in the literature from the Second Temple period, including the New Testament. Examples include the use of Is. 45.23 in Phil. 2.6-11; the use of Exod. 33.19, 22; 34.6; Job 9.8; 38.16; Sir. 24.4-5 in Mark 6.45-52; and also the use of the phrase *χριστὸς κύριος* in *Ps.Sol.* 17.32; Luke 2.11; 2 *Clem.* 9.5.

respond to groups who use the Jewish scriptures in such a way as to prompt their own communities to further de-Judaize Jesus. Marcion did so because his *Euangelion* and *Apostolikon* had already been de-Judaized for him, and so he could not reconcile Jesus with the God of Israel because the two appeared to be antithetical. Justin did so because his community embraced Israel's scriptures but did not keep the Law when it came to sabbath, circumcision, and dietary restrictions, and so he claimed to do so in a spiritual way so that Jesus is the God of both ancient Israel and the spiritual heirs to Israel.

Both Marcion and Justin de-Judaized Jesus and their respective communities, only they did so in differing directions. Marcion believed Jesus and his followers had no connection to ancient Israel and so eschewed any attempt to identify Jesus with the God of Israel. Justin believed that Jesus and his true followers were connected to ancient Israel and so eschewed any contact with contemporary Jews who – he believed – had forfeited their connection to ancient Israel. The two tactics differ based on how each answered the question, “Is Jesus YHWH?”