The Intimate and Ultimate Adversary: Satanology in Early Second-Century Christian Literature

THOMAS J. FARRAR

ABSTRACT

Much scholarship has recently been done on the Satanology (Satan-concept) of New Testament books or writers. This study attends to the Satanology of early "non-canonical" Christian writings, which have been comparatively under-researched. The literature examined includes the so-called Apostolic Fathers and other texts that can be reliably dated to c. 100-150 C.E., namely *Ascension of Isaiah*, *Apocalypse of Peter*, *Odes of Solomon*, *Gospel of Truth*, Ptolemy's *Letter to Flora* and Justin Martyr's writings. Over 160 certain or probable references to Satan, under various designations, are identified. Analysis of this data set proceeds in two directions. The first looks at the concept's explanatory power: for what kinds of evil did Satanology help to account? The discussion traverses various loci of perceived satanic activity, from the human heart to community boundaries to earthly political authorities to a dualistic cosmos to the abstract realm of ideas. The second analytical section explores ways that Christian writers and communities incorporated Satanology into their religious life through liturgical forms, hermeneutics for reading the Jewish Scriptures, and theological debates about the nature of God and evil. Satanology is found to have been a pervasive and distinctive feature of Christianity in the early subapostolic period.

INTRODUCTION

Numerous recent publications have studied Satan and related topics in early Judaism and

Christianity.[1] However, early "non-canonical" Christian texts have received

disproportionately little attention.[2] This article studies Satan in the earliest extant non-

[1] E.g., Ida Fröhlich and Erkki Koskenniemi (eds.), *Evil and the Devil* (Library of New Testament studies [hereafter, LNTS] 481; London: Bloomsbury, 2013); Miryam T. Brand, *Evil within and without: The Source of Sin and Its Nature as Portrayed in Second Temple Literature* (Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements 9; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013); Derek R. Brown, *The God of This Age: Satan in the Churches and Letters of the Apostle Paul* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament [hereafter, WUNT] 2/409; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015); Chris Keith and Loren T. Stuckenbruck (eds.), *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity* (WUNT 2/417; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016); Jan Dochhorn, Susanne Rudnig-Zelt and Benjamin Wold (eds.), *Das Böse, der Teufel und Dämonen* (WUNT 2/412; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016); Michael Tilly, Matthias Morgenstern and Volker Henning Drecoll (eds.), *L'Adversaire de Dieu—der Widersacher Gottes* (WUNT 364; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016); Thomas J. Farrar and Guy J. Williams, "Diabolical Data: A Critical Inventory of New Testament Satanology," *JSNT* 39 (2016): 40-71; Thomas J. Farrar and Guy J. Williams, "Talk of the Devil: Unpacking the Language of New Testament Satanology," *JSNT* 39 (2016): 72-96.

[2] On Satanology in early post-apostolic Christian literature, standard works are Francis X. Gokey, *The Terminology for the Devil and Evil Spirits in the Apostolic Fathers* (Patristic Studies 93; Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1961) and Jeffrey Burton Russell, *Satan: The Early Christian Tradition* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981), 30-72; see also K. Schäferdiek, "σατανᾶς: Satan in the Post-Apostolic Fathers," in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, 10 vols. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), 7:163-65. The Satanology of Polycarp's *Letter to the Philippians* and *Martyrdom of Polycarp* have received recent attention from Jan Dochhorn, "Mit Kain kam der Tod in die Welt. Zur Auslegung von SapSal 2,24 in 1 Clem 3,4; 4,1-7, mit einem Seitenblick auf Polykarp, Phil. 7,1 und Theophilus, Ad Autol. II, 29,3-4," *ZNW* 98 (2007): 150-59; Paul Anthony Hartog, "The Devil's in the Details: The Apocalyptic 'Adversary' in the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* and the *Martyrs of Lyons*," in *Studies on the Text of the New Testament and Early Christianity: Essays in Honour of Michael W. Holmes on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday,* ed. Daniel M. Gurtner, Juan Hernández, Jr., and Paul Foster (New Testament Tools and Studies 50; Leiden: Brill, 2015), 432-52; Paul Middleton, "Overcoming the Devil in the *Acts of the Martyrs,*" in Keith and Stuckenbruck, *Evil,* 357-74. A recent study by Jonathan Burke is disappointing ("Satan and Demons in the Apostolic Fathers: A Minority Report," *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 81 [2016]: 127-68). Burke seeks to demonstrate that Satanology is far less prevalent in the Apostolic Fathers than generally believed. His methodology consists largely of arguments from silence combined with a false dichotomy between cosmological and anthropological aetiologies of evil (on which see James P. Davies, "Evil's Aetiology and False Dichotomies in Jewish Apocalyptic and Paul," in Keith and Stuckenbruck, *Evil*, 169-89).

canonical Christian literature (c. 100-150 C.E.)[3] to glean religion-historical insights and

rectify this research imbalance.[4] Most of the Apostolic Fathers "corpus" is included,[5] as are

Ascension of Isaiah, *Apocalypse of Peter*, *Odes of Solomon*, Ptolemy's *Letter to Flora*,

Justin's writings and *Gospel of Truth*. Three other Christian texts likely written before 150

but lacking explicit reference to Satan are *Gospel of Thomas*,[6] *Apology of Aristides* and

Epistula Apostolorum.[7] Concerning Jewish-Christian gospels we can say little, but some

---

[3] Certain texts may be slightly earlier (*Didache*, *1 Clement*, *Ascension of Isaiah* 6-11) or later (Justin's writings, *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, Ptolemy's *Letter to Flora*, *Gospel of Truth*). Justin's *1 Apology* can be dated to c. 151-54, which places the *Dialogue with Trypho* (which cites the apology at 120.6) in its extant form between c. 154-67; so Craig D. Allert, *Revelation, Truth, Canon, and Interpretation: Studies in Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho* (Vigiliae Christianae Supplements [hereafter, VCSup] 64; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 32-34. Timothy J. Horner posits an earlier edition of the *Dialogue* based on a real conversation, composed c. 135 (*Listening to Trypho: Justin's 'Dialogue with Trypho' Reconsidered* [Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 28; Leuven: Peeters, 2001]). "Probably the majority of scholars" date *Martyrdom of Polycarp* to the mid-150s (Bart D. Ehrman, *The Apostolic Fathers,* 2 vols. [LCL; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003], 1:362). Ptolemy's *Letter to Flora* can be dated c. 150-160 C.E. if the author is the Ptolemy mentioned by Justin (*2 Apol.* 2.9-14), which many scholars regard as probable (for arguments respectively for and against, see Sebastian Moll, *The Arch-Heretic Marcion* [WUNT 250; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010], 14-16; Christoph Markschies, "New Research on Ptolemaeus Gnosticus," *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum* 4 [2000]: 246-49). Ptolemy's claim to "apostolic tradition that we *also* have received by succession" (*Ep.* 7.9; text in Quispel, *Ptolémée*, 68) may presuppose Hegesippus's succession doctrine, which was probably not in circulation before c. 160 (see Eusebius, *H.E.* 4.11.7; 4.22.3). Irenaeus's focus on Ptolemy's followers in *Haer.* 1 suggests Ptolemy himself was a past figure by c. 180. Based on its opening words and other features, numerous scholars identify NHC I,3 with the Valentinian "Gospel of Truth" mentioned by Irenaeus (*Haer.* 3.11.9); some even attribute it to Valentinus (see Harold W. Attridge and George W. MacRae, "The Gospel of Truth," in *Nag Hammadi Codex I (The Jung Codex)*, ed. Harold W. Attridge, 2 vols. [NHS 23; Leiden: Brill, 1985], 1:65-66; Bentley Layton, *The Gnostic Scriptures: A New Translation with Annotations and Introduction* [New York: Doubleday, 1987], 251; Birger A. Pearson, *Ancient Gnosticism: Traditions and Literature* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007], 152-53). For criticism of these respective claims, see Katrine Brix, "Two Witnesses, One Valentinian Gospel? The *Gospel of Truth* in Nag Hammadi Codices I and XII," in *Snapshots of Evolving Traditions: Jewish and Christian Manuscript Culture, Textual Fluidity, and New Philology*, ed. Liv Ingeborg Lied and Hugo Lundhaug (TU 175; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2017), 126-45; Christoph Markschies, *Valentinus Gnosticus? Untersuchungen zur valentinianischen Gnosis mit einem Kommentar zu den Fragmenten Valentins* (WUNT 65; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 339-56.

[4] This imbalance, and not any religion-historical significance assigned to canonicity, is why New Testament writings arguably belonging to this period (e.g., Pastoral Epistles) are excluded here.

[5] Those not discussed are the *Letter to Diognetus* (usually dated late second century) and the *Apology of Quadratus,* of which only a 49-word fragment survives.

[6] While this gospel never explicitly mentions Satan, it does contain *logia* that are interpreted in Synoptic gospel parallels as allegorical references to Satan: birds (*GThom* 9 cp. Mark 4.15 par.), the strong man (*GThom* 35 cp. Mark 3.27 par.) and the enemy (*GThom* 57 cp. Matt 13.24-30, 38-39). As Simon J. Gathercole rightly notes, the *Gospel of Thomas* contains insufficient contextual information to determine how the author interpreted these figures (*The Gospel of Thomas: Introduction and Commentary* [Texts and Editions for New Testament Study 11; Leiden: Brill, 2014], 354). The same applies for the thief (*GThom* 21), nobleman (*GThom* 98) and brigands (*GThom* 103).

[7] This text probably never mentions Satan, though it does refer to archons from whose chains Christ delivers people (*Ep. Ap.* 28) and wolves (Coptic) or a wolf (Ethiopic) that devour(s) those outside the shepherd's fold (*Ep. Ap.* 44; cf. John 10.12).

probably narrated Jesus' wilderness temptation by the devil.[8] Various other writings that *might* fall within our religion-historical scope are excluded on grounds of disputed provenance or date.[9]

This study consists of three sections. The first catalogues references to Satan with exegetical notes.[10] The second analyzes the explanatory power of Satanology for our writers and their communities. The third explores applications of Satanology in liturgy, biblical interpretation and theological debates. The term "Satan" herein denotes a leading transcendent opponent of God and/or his people, regardless of designation.[11] This study presupposes a fairly cohesive Satan-concept in early Christianity: a mid-second-century Christian reader would have perceived a unified reality behind various literary references to a leading transcendent opponent, notwithstanding terminological and conceptual diversity. Indeed, early Christian Satanological terminology is remarkably consistent: all pre-150 C.E. Christian texts that indisputably mention Satan use at least one transliteration and/or translation of השטן (ὁ σατανᾶς, ὁ διάβολος, ὁ ἀντικείμενος). Moreover, that early Christian writers consistently assume Satan's existence without argument suggests the idea was uncontroversial among Christians. Hence, just as one may speak of a text's Christology, so may one speak of its "Satanology."

CATALOGUING REFERENCES TO SATAN

References to Satan in the selected literature are shown in table 1.

---

[8] The ninth-century manuscript 566 contains a scholion at Matt 4.5 that the "Jewish gospel," identified by Bart D. Ehrman and Zlatko Pleše as the *Gospel of the Nazarenes,* reads "Jerusalem" rather than "the holy city" (*The Apocryphal Gospels: Texts and Translations* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011], 208). A reference to Jesus being carried to Mount Tabor by the Holy Spirit in the *Gospel of the Hebrews* (Origen, *Comm. in Jo.* 2.12.87; cf. *Hom. in Jer.* 15.4) may also pertain to a temptation narrative.

[9] These include various pseudepigrapha, apocryphal acts and Nag Hammadi texts.

[10] Compare Farrar and Williams, "Diabolical Data," who undertake a similar catalogue of the NT.

[11] By referring to "Satan" and "the devil," this study follows English-language conventions reluctantly, since differences in capitalization and presence of the article mask that ὁ σατανᾶς and ὁ διάβολος are virtually synonymous in early Christian texts.

Table 1. Putative references to Satan in early second-century Christian literature

Document	Designation[12]	Probability of satanic referent[13]
1 Clement[14]	ὁ ἀντικείμενος ("the adversary," 51.1)	Certain[15]
2 Clement[16]	ὁ διάβολος ("the devil," 18.2)	Certain[17]
	πνεῦμα μὴ ὂν δίκαιον ("a/the spirit that is not just," 20.4)	Possible[18]
Epistles of Ignatius[19]	ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ("the prince of this age," *Eph.* 17.1; 19.1; *Magn.* 1.2; *Trall.* 4.2; *Rom.* 7.1; *Philad.* 6.2)	Certain[20]

---

[12] Designations (apart from proper names) are retroverted to Greek (in square brackets) where only a version survives (it is, however, disputed whether *Odes of Solomon* was composed in Greek or Syriac). Designations are expressed in the nominative unless case is critical to identifying the referent.

[13] Probabilities are classified on a four-point scale as certain, probable, possible or doubtful.

[14] Text in Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1:34-150.

[15] On the background of this term—which Origen says translates the Hebrew שטן (*Cels.* 6.44)—see G. J. M. Bartelink, "ΑΝΤΙΚΕΙΜΕΝΟΣ (Widersacher) als Teufels- und Dämonenbezeichnung," *Sacris Erudiri* 30 (1987): 205-24. Nearly all scholars agree that Satan is the referent, e.g., Schäferdiek, "σατανᾶς," 7:165; Andreas Lindemann, *Die Clemensbriefe* (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 17; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 149; Horacio E. Lona, *Der erste Clemensbrief* (Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vätern [hereafter, KAV] 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 542. Burke proposes a human referent but offers minimal argumentation ("Satan and Demons," 142).

[16] Text in Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1:164-98.

[17] By the second century, ὁ διάβολος was an established *terminus technicus* (Madeleine Wieger, "«Celui qu'on appelle διάβολος» (Apocalypse 12,9): L'Histoire du Nom Grec de l'Adversaire," in Tilly, Morgenstern, and Drecoll, *L'Adversaire de Dieu*, 201-218). *Contra* Burke ("Satan and Demons," 155), ὁ διάβολος in *2 Clem.* 18.2 unquestionably refers to Satan.

[18] Several scholars suggest Satan as one possible referent of this obscure phrase (Charles E. Hill, *Regnum Caeolorum: Patterns of Future Hope in Early Christianity* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1992], 89; Christopher M. Tuckett, *2 Clement: Introduction, Text, and Commentary* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012], 301; Wilhelm Pratscher, *Der zweite Clemensbrief* [KAV 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007], 232-33). Other options include a member of the community or a Watcher. Lindemann thinks the idea parallels 1 Cor 11.29-32 (*Clemensbriefe,* 260).

[19] Text in Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1:218-320.

[20] English-language scholarship usually translates ἄρχων "ruler" when the referent is Satan; "prince" herein reflects the background of this term in Hebrew שר (Dan 10.13 [where Θ translates שר with ἄρχων], 4Q225 2 i 9, 1QM 17.5). The medieval *Book of Asaph the Physician* preserves שר המשטמה as "Mastema's" original designation in *Jub.* 10; so Michael Segal, *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology* (Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplements [hereafter, JSJSup] 117; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 171-74. Despite similarity of Ignatius's term to ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου (John 12.31; 16.11; cf. 14.30), the Pauline οἱ ἄρχοντες τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου (1 Cor 2.6-8; cf. 2 Cor 4.4) provides a more exact parallel, differing only in number (Gokey, *Terminology,* 75n2). Pauline influence on Ignatius's term is suggested by the close conceptual parallel between 1 Cor 2.6-8 and *Eph.* 19.1 (William R. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch* [Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985], 81n1, 89).

	ὁ διάβολος (*Eph.* 10.3; *Trall.* 8.1; *Rom.* 5.3; *Smyrn.* 9.1)	Certain
	ὁ σατανᾶς ("[the] Satan," *Eph.* 13.1)	Certain
Polycarp's *Letter to the Philippians*[21]	ὁ διάβολος (7.1)	Certain
	ὁ σατανᾶς (7.1)	Certain
Martyrdom of Polycarp[22]	ὁ διάβολος (2.4[3.1])	Certain[23]
	ὁ ἀντίζηλος καὶ βάσκανος πονηρός ("the jealous and envious evil one," 17.1)	Certain[24]
	ὁ ἀντικείμενος τῷ γένει τῶν δικαίων ("the adversary of the race of the just," 17.1)	Certain
	ὁ ἄδικος ἄρχων ("the unjust prince," 19.2)	Probable[25]
Didache[26]	τοῦ πονηροῦ ("[the] evil [one]," 8.2)	Probable[27]

---

[21] Text in Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1:332-52.

[22] Text in Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1:366-400.

[23] Some MSS supply no subject for τρέψῃ in the previous sentence; others supply ὁ τύραννος. Probably we should omit the subject: *lectio difficilior potior* (Hartog, "Devil's in the Details," 452; cf. Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers,* 1:371; Michael W. Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*, 3rd ed. [Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007], 309). Τρέψῃ refers cataphorically—albeit awkwardly—to ὁ διάβολος.

[24] Notwithstanding minor textual variants in the subject's designations in *M. Polyc.* 17.1, this is undoubtedly a supernatural figure: he had *seen* Polycarp's "blameless conduct from the beginning" (86 years in Christ's service, according to 9.3) and his "having been crowned with the crown of incorruptibility." The referent is clearly Satan, *contra* E. Leigh Gibson, "The Jews and Christians in the Martyrdom of Polycarp," in *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Adam H. Becker & Annette Yoshiko Reed (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 95; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 154, and Burke, "Satan and Demons," 154.

[25] Recognizing a satanic referent here are Gerd Buschmann (*Das Martyrium des Polykarp: Ubersetzt und Erklart* [KAV 6; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998], 352) and Hartog ("Devil's in the Details," 447-49). The *Martyrdom* has already identified the devil as the ultimate cause of persecution, and ἄρχων is a common Satanological designation (see n91). The clincher is τὸν τῆς ἀφθαρσίας στέφανον, a phrase intended to recall 17.1.

[26] Text in Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1:416-42.

[27] Τοῦ πονηροῦ is syntactically ambiguous in this petition and could refer to "evil" (neuter) or "the evil one" (masculine). Belial is called "the evil one" ([ע]הרש) in 4Q286 7 ii 5. Ὁ πονηρός is a common early Christian Satanological designation (Matt 13.19; 1 John 2.13-14; 5.18; *Barn.* 2.10; *M. Polyc.* 17.1; probably Matt 5.37; 6.13; 13.38; John 17.15; Eph 6.16; 2 Thess 3.3; 1 John 3.12; 5.19; *Barn.* 21.3). For exegesis of syntactically ambiguous NT cases, most importantly Matt 6.13b, see Farrar and Williams, "Diabolical Data," 43-46. An "emerging consensus" holds that the *Didache* has no literary dependence on Matthew (Aaron Milavec, "A Rejoinder," *JECS* 13 [2005]: 523). The agreements in this prayer probably "rest on a common liturgical tradition" (Kurt Niederwimmer, *The Didache,* trans. Linda M. Maloney [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress,

	ὁ κοσμοπλανής ("the world-deceiver," 16.4)	Possible[28]
	ὁ κοσμοπλάνος διάβολος ("the world-deceiving devil," lost ending from *Const. App.* 7.32.4)	Doubtful[29]
Barnabas[30]	ὁ ἐνεργῶν ("the agent," 2.1)[31]	Certain
	ὁ πονηρός (2.10; 19.11; 21.3)	2.10 certain; 21.3 probable; 19.11 doubtful[32]

1998], 136). Nevertheless, *ceteris paribus* Matthew's and the Didache's communities probably understood τοῦ πονηροῦ equivalently. *Contra* Burke ("Satan and Demons," 137), references to "all evil" (παντὸς πονηροῦ, 3.1; 10.5) do not support an abstract interpretation of τοῦ πονηροῦ but, conversely, illustrate the *different* syntax the *Didache* uses for abstract evil (cf. syntactic argument in Anton Vögtle, "The Lord's Prayer: A Prayer for Jews and Christians?," in *The Lord's Prayer and Jewish Liturgy,* ed. Jakob J. Petuchowski and Michael Brocke [London: Burns & Oates, 1978], 101). Scholars are divided on the meaning of τοῦ πονηροῦ in *Did.* 8.2; many simply acknowledge the ambiguity.

[28] Some scholars believe the author deliberately *avoids* linking ὁ κοσμοπλανής to Satan (Aaron E. Milavec, *The Didache: Faith, Hope and Life of the Earliest Christian Communities* [Mahwah: Paulist, 2003], 332, 648; Simon Tugwell, *The Apostolic Fathers* [London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1989], 6). Others opine that ὁ κοσμοπλανής is a human with implicit satanic associations (Jonathan A. Draper, *A Commentary on the Didache in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents* [Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1983], 308n28; Gregory C. Jenks, *The Origins and Early Development of the Antichrist Myth* [Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 59; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990], 310-12) or even Satan himself (Lambertus J. Lietaert Peerbolte, *The Antecedents of Antichrist: A Traditio-Historical Study of the Earliest Christian Views on Eschatological Opponents* [JSJSup 49; Leiden: Brill, 1996], 181). The last two possibilities are little different, since a person idiomatically "is" the spirit that possesses him/her (Farrar and Williams, "Diabolical Data," 50-51). Among roughly contemporaneous texts with an individualized antichrist, the figure's relatedness to Satan varies (2 Thess 2.8-9; Rev 13.2; *Asc. Isa.* 4.2-4; *Apoc. Pet.* 2.10-13). Supporting a link between *Didache's* ὁ κοσμοπλανής and Satan are (1) close conceptual parallels between *Did.* 16 and *Asc. Isa.* 3-4 (on which see Enrico Norelli, *Ascensio Isaiae: Commentarius* [CCA 8; Turnhout: Brepols, 1995], 172-76), (2) the terminological parallel with ὁ πλανῶν τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην in Rev 12.9 and (3) the overtly mythological language: ὁ κοσμοπλανής "will appear like a son of God" (φανήσεται. . .ὡς υἱὸς θεοῦ; text in Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 442)—a phrase with epiphanic connotations (cf. Matt 24.30; Ign. *Mag.* 6.1)—and "do signs and wonders." Nevertheless, one must concede that "The relation between Satan and the antichrist called κοσμοπλανής in *Did.* 16.4 is not clear" (Schäferdiek, "σατανᾶς," 7:164).

[29] The *Didache's* ending in the Bryennios manuscript seems obviously incomplete, and Robert E. Aldridge argues that *Const. App.* 7.32 "is the Didache's true ending (approximately)" ("The Lost Ending of the Didache," *VC* 53 [1999]: 5; similarly, Draper, *Commentary on the Didache,* 326). Others regard the *Didache's* ending as beyond recovery (Niederwimmer, *Didache,* 227; Huub van de Sandt and David Flusser, *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity* [Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 5; Assen: Royal Van Gorcum, 2002], 27, 36-37). Either way, διάβολος in *Const. App.* 7.32.4 is probably an interpretative gloss on the Didache's κοσμοπλανής (Lietaert Peerbolte, *Antecedents of Antichrist,* 181; Alan J. P. Garrow, *The Gospel of Matthew's Dependence on the Didache* [LNTS 254; London: T&T Clark, 2004], 56-57).

[30] Text in Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers,* 2:12-82.

[31] Trans. Gokey, *Terminology,* 103n1. Ἐνεργέω and ἐνέργεια are used elsewhere of activity associated with Satan (Eph 2.2; 2 Thess 2.7-9; Herm. *Mand.* 5.1.7; 5.2.1; 6.2.1; 6.2.6; cf. 5.1.3). Gokey claims that in the NT ἐνέργεια "always refers to the mystic supernatural power of divine or evil origin."

[32] Masculine ὁ πονηρὸς occurs in 2.10. Τῷ πονηρῷ in 21.3 could be masculine or neuter; it is the complement of the neuter πάντα and so could mean "evil," "the evildoer" or "the Evil One." The usage in 2.10 favours a Satanological interpretation in 21.3 (so Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2:83; Holmes, *Apostolic Fathers*, 441;

	ὁ μέλας ("the black one,"(4.10; 20.1)	4.10 certain; 20.1 possible[33]
	ὁ πονηρός ἄρχων (4.13)	Certain
	ἄγγελος πονηρὸς ("[an] evil angel," 9.4)	Possible[34]
	ὁ ἄνομος ("the transgressor/lawless one," 15.5)	Probable[35]
	ὁ σατανᾶς (18.1)	Certain
	ὁ ἄρχων καιροῦ τοῦ νῦν τῆς ἀνομίας ("the prince of the present time of lawlessness," 18.2)	Certain

Ferdinand R. Prostmeier, *Der Barnabasbrief* [KAV 8; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999], 359). Gay L. Byron suggests that "the evil one" in *Barnabas* may refer to Trajan (*Symbolic Blackness and Ethnic Difference in Early Christian Literature* [London: Routledge, 2002], 64, 155n68). He observes that Trajan is referred to as הרשע ("the evil one") in *y. Sukkah* 5.1 (55b). Indeed, rabbinic literature also refers to Titus as הרשע for entering the Holy of Holies (*b. Giṭṭin* 56a). However, in both cases הרשע modifies the emperor's name and may be an attributive adjective ("the evil Trajan"; "Trajan the Wicked") rather that an individualizing substantive like ὁ πονηρὸς in *Barnabas*. Thus *Barn.* 2.10 and 21.3 surely refer to Satan. Holmes finds a third reference to "the evil one" in *Barn.* 19.11 (*Apostolic Fathers*, 436-37), but other editions have the neuter article τὸ here without noting a masculine variant (Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2:79; Prostmeier, *Barnabasbrief*, 532). All other objects of hatred enjoined in *Barnabas* are abstract (4.1; 4.10; 19.2); the correct reading here is "evil."

[33] In *Barn.* 4.10 ὁ μέλας undoubtedly denotes Satan, but in 20.1, ἡ τοῦ μέλανος ὁδός could be masculine ("the way of the black one") or neuter ("the way of [the] blackness"). Most scholars follow the first option (Gokey, *Terminology*, 101; Prostmeier, *Barnabasbrief*, 360). However, the abstract reading, synonymous with ἡ [ὁδὸς] τοῦ σκότους (*Barn.* 18.1; cf. 1QS 3.21), is more likely considering the antithesis with ἡ ὁδὸς τοῦ φωτός ("the way of the light," *Barn.* 19.1, 12). The different word order in 20.1 merely emphasizes the antithesis with 19.12 (cf. *Did.* 4.14-5.1). Byron suggests that *Barnabas*'s use of ὁ μέλας may be a "trope" "influenced by the real or imaginative 'presence' of Ethiopians and Blacks in Alexandria" (*Symbolic Blackness*, 63-65), but this is purely speculative: *Barnabas* never mentions Ethiopians or skin tone. Gokey notes that "The color black had associations with moral evil for the pagans and Jews alike" (*Terminology*, 112n9). Blackness symbolizes evil in Herm. *Vis.* 4.1.10, 4.3.2, *Sim.* 9.15.3, 9.19.1. Given the antithesis between φῶς and μέλας in Barn. 19.12-20.1, dualistic light/darkness imagery adequately explains this Satanological designation.

[34] James Carleton Paget identifies this angel as Satan (*The Epistle of Barnabas: Outlook and Background* [WUNT 2/64; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994], 183), but this is unlikely since the term is anarthrous (Russell, *Satan*, 39n23). The terminology is probably drawn from Ps 77.49 LXX.

[35] Prostmeier translates, "die Zeit der Gesetzlosigkeit" (*Barnabasbrief*, 474). However, ἄνομος in τὸν καιρὸν τοῦ ἀνόμου is concrete; "lawlessness" would have been denoted with ἀνόμια (cf. *Barn.* 18.2; *T. Dan* 6.6). Ὁ ἄνομος could be generic (cf. Ezek 18.24; 33.8), but generic evildoers are syntactically plural in the very next phrase (κρινεῖ τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς), highlighting τοῦ ἀνόμου as "the transgressor" *par excellence*. This could be an antichrist figure (cf. 2 Thess 2.8), but since Satan—for this author—*already* rules "the present time of lawlessness" (*Barn.* 18.1-2), ὁ ἄνομος is an appropriate designation for him. Perhaps we have "a coalescence of the concept of the Antichrist with the devil" (Gokey, *Terminology,* 111n8).

Papias[36]	Paraphrase of Rev 12.9 (*Frg.* 11 under Holmes's numbering, from Andrew of Caesarea's *Apoc.* 34.129-30)	Doubtful[37]
	Unnamed referent subsequently identified with dragon and Satan of Rev 12 (*Frg.* 24 under Holmes's numbering, from Andrew of Caesarea's *Apoc.* 34, Armenian version)	Possible[38]
Shepherd of Hermas[39]	ὁ διάβολος (*Mand.* 4.3.4; 4.3.6; 5.1.3; 7.2 [twice]; 7.3 [twice]; 9.9; 9.11; 11.3; 11.17; 12.2.2; 12.4.6 [twice]; 12.4.7; 12.5.1; 12.5.2 [twice]; 12.5.4; 12.6.1; 12.6.2 [twice]; 12.6.4; *Sim.* 8.3.6; 9.31.2 [*nequissimo diabolo* = "the most wicked devil," extant only in Latin])	*Mand.* 7.3 (second occurrence), *Sim.* 8.3.6 probable;[40] others certain

[36] Text in Holmes, *Apostolic Fathers*, 748, 762.

[37] Holmes's text incorrectly includes this paraphrase within the fragment. Rather, it introduces the next portion of Andrew's commentary (Monte A. Shanks, *Papias and the New Testament* [Eugene: Pickwick, 2013], 229-30). The actual quotation contains only plural referents, making it doubtful whether Papias originally referred to Satan (Papias, Enrico Norelli, *Papia di Hierapolis: Esposizione degli oracoli del Signore; I frammenti, Introduzione, testo, traduzione e note* [Letture Cristiane del Primo Millennio 36; Paoline: Milano, 2005], 399-400).

[38] This passage refers to an unnamed, singular figure—probably Satan—who fell from heaven to earth and subsequently led humans astray. However, the authenticity of this fragment, published by Folker Siegert ("Unbeachtete Papiaszitate bei armenischen Schriftstdllern," *NTS* 27 [1981]: 605-614), is disputed. For arguments for and against authenticity, see respectively Basil Lourié, "A Quotation from Papias within the Armenian Version of the Commentary on Apocalypse of St Andrew of Caesarea: Translation and Study in the History of Exegesis," in *Writings of the Apostolic Fathers* [in Russian], ed. Alexey G. Dunaev (Moscow: Editorial Council of the Russian Orthodox Church, 2002; rpt. 2008), 511-32 and Norelli, *Papia*, 406-407.

[39] Text in Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2:174-472. Since only *Mandates* and *Similitudes* mention the devil and most scholars believe the author composed *Visions* 1-4 decades earlier, Burke proposes that Hermas disbelieved in the devil when he wrote *Visions* 1-4 but subsequently adopted such belief ("Satan and Demons", 148). Positing diachronic inconsistency in a writer's worldview is, *contra* Burke, not a "simple," "efficient" explanation. Satanological terminology is distributed heterogeneously even in Hermas's later compositions. *Mandates* mentions Satan at least 23 times and *Similitudes* at most five, despite *Similitudes* being 2½ times the length of *Mandates*. Moreover, Hermas already regarded the *Book of Eldad and Modad* as prophecy when he wrote *Visions* 1-4 (so *Vis.* 2.3.4) and this work was likely a source for his Satanology (see n82). The Satanological silence in *Visions* 1-4 may reflect the author's theological immaturity at the time. In *Vis.* 4 one detects reluctance to discuss the nature of evil: the black colour on the mythological beast's head is interpreted very tersely, unlike the gold and white. On supernatural evil as an esoteric topic, see n99.

[40] These two instances are text-critically uncertain but retained by Ehrman (*Apostolic Fathers* 2:266, 2:364) and Holmes (*Apostolic Fathers*, 526, 604).

	ὁ ἄγγελος τῆς πονηρίας ("the angel of wickedness," *Mand.* 6.2.1; 6.2.4; 6.2.5; 6.2.7; 6.2.9; 6.2.10)	Probable (albeit indirect)[41]
	ὁ κύριος/δεσπότης τῆς πόλεως/χώρας ταύτης ("the lord/master of this city/country," *Sim.* 1.3; 1.4; 1.6)	Probable[42]
	ἄγγελος τρυφῆς καὶ ἀπάτης ("angel of revelry and seduction," *Sim.* 6.2.1)	Doubtful[43]
Justin, *Dialogue with Trypho*[44]	(ὁ) ὄφις = ("[the] serpent," 39.6; 45.4; 70.5 [adds adjective πλάνος, "deceitful"]; 79.4; 88.4; 91.4 [twice]; 94.2 [twice]; 100.4; 100.5; 100.6; 102.3; 103.5 [twice]; 112.2; 124.3; 125.4)	Certain
	(ὁ) διάβολος (69.1; 78.6; 79.4 [twice]; 82.3; 103.5 [twice]; 103.6; 115.2 [twice]; 115.3; 116.1; 116.2; 116.3; 125.4 [twice]; 131.2)	Certain

[41] While some scholars identify the angel of wickedness as the devil (e.g., Gokey, *Terminology*, 133n8; James W. Boyd, *Satan and Māra: Christian and Buddhist Symbols of Evil* [Studies in the History of Religions, Supplements to Numen 27; Leiden: Brill, 1975], 33), this angel is more likely the devil's *spirit* (cf. *Mand.* 11.3), while the angel of righteousness is the holy spirit (cf. *Mand.* 11.9). For Hermas, the holy spirit opposes "another, evil spirit" (*Mand.* 5.1.2-3; text in Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2:254), while the devil's dualistic counterpart is God (*Mand.* 7.2-3; 12.6.1-3). Ἄγγελος and πνεῦμα are interchangeable terms for Hermas; so Bogdan G. Bucur, "The Son of God and the Angelomorphic Holy Spirit: A Rereading of the *Shepherd's* Christology," *ZNW* 98 (2007): 122; J. Reiling, *Hermas and Christian Prophecy: A Study of the Eleventh Mandate* (Novum Testamentum Supplements [hereafter, NovTSup] 37; Leiden: Brill, 1973), 87.

[42] Identifying this figure as Satan are Gokey (*Terminology*, 131, 174n100), Hill (*Regnum Caelorum*, 82-83) and, cautiously, Norbert Brox (*Der Hirt des Hermas* [KAV 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991], 286-87). Carolyn Osiek rules out an allegorical reference to the devil since Hermas's worldview is too optimistic "to imply here that the devil controls the world" (*Shepherd of Hermas* [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999], 158-59). She concludes that this "lord" contributes to the flow of the story without having a specific allegorical correspondence. However, Osiek underestimates the character's importance. He is mentioned thrice, always with a singular, arthrous designation that varies stylistically. "This city" is repeatedly linked to him: it is ὑπ' ἐξουσίαν ἑτέρου and τῆς πόλεως αὐτοῦ. He is an active, speaking character. An intended allegorical referent is therefore likely. Satan, not the emperor, is the obvious choice, since this lord's banishment is a cosmic metaphor for martyrdom resulting in *going to one's own city* (cf. martyrdom as "Kampf mit dem Teufel" in *Sim.* 8.3.6 [Brox, *Hirt*, 366]). Moreover, the lord's laws match the devil's commandments (*Mand.* 12.4.6), and the lord is God's dualistic opposite—both are called κύριος and δεσπότης in this passage. Satan as ruler is a pervasive image in early Christianity (see n91).

[43] This anarthrous angel is "a demonic figure" (Osiek, *Hermas*, 188), but Hermas places the devil on a higher plane of existence than angels/spirits.

[44] Text in Philippe Bobichon, *Justin Martyr, Dialogue avec Tryphon: Introduction, Texte Grec, Traduction Commentaires, Appendices, Indices*, 2 vols. (Fribourg: Université de Fribourg, 2003).

	(ὁ) σατανᾶς (76.5; 103.5 [twice]; 103.6; 125.4)	Certain
	τὸ (πλάνον/πονηρὸν καὶ) ἀκάθαρτον/πλάνον πνεῦμα ("the [deceitful/evil and] unclean/deceitful spirit," 7.3; 39.6; 82.3)	Probable[45]
	ὁ ἐχθρός ("the enemy," 76.6, par. Luke 10.19)	Certain
Justin, *1 Apology*[46]	ὁ ἀρχηγέτης τῶν κακῶν δαιμόνων ("the leader of the evil demons," 28.1)	Certain
	ὄφις (28.1)	Certain
	σατανᾶς (28.1)	Certain
	διάβολος (28.1)	Certain
Justin, fragment	ὁ σατανᾶς (Irenaeus, *Haer.* 5.26.2)[47]	Certain
Apocalypse of Peter[48]	ὁ ἐν Ἅιδου ("the one who is in Hades," 14.4 Rainer fragment)	Probable[49]
	[(ὁ) σατανᾶς] (16.8 Ethiopic)	Certain
	ὁ ἀντικείμενος (3.2; 3.5; 7.5; 7.6; 7.7)	Certain

---

[45] The "deceitful and unclean spirit" of *Dial.* 7.3 is anonymous, but similar expressions are associated with Satan in 39.6 and 82.3. Evil spirits are elsewhere mentioned only in the plural (7.3; 30.2; 35.2) or anarthrous singular (93.1). The evil spirit's relationship to Satan in 39.6 and 82.3 is ambiguous. The genitives τοῦ ὄφεως and διαβόλου could be possessive (the spirit *of* the serpent/devil) or epexegetical (the spirit, *namely* the serpent/devil). The parallel with Herm. *Mand.* 11.3 supports a possessive construction. However, *Dial.* 39.6 is Justin's first mention of the serpent, so it makes sense for him to define the term: "the evil and deceitful spirit, the serpent." This increases the likelihood that διαβόλου in 82.3 is also epexegetical, and that the (as yet unnamed) spirit in 7.3 is also Satan (cf. *Barn.* 2.1, where Satan likewise remains anonymous initially).

[46] Denis Minns and Paul Parvis, *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: Apologies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

[47] Eusebius preserves the Greek of this passage (*H.E.* 4.18.9).

[48] Text in Dennis D. Buchholz, *Your Eyes Will Be Opened: A Study of the Greek (Ethiopic) Apocalypse of Peter* (SBL Dissertation Series 97; Atlanta: Scholars, 1988).

[49] Jesus predicts Peter's death "at the hands of the son of the One who is in Hades" (trans. Buchholz, *Apocalypse of Peter*, 228; note that the Ethiopic text is completely different and applies the title "Son" to Jesus here!) No referent besides Satan seems plausible. Which deceased human could be described as ὁ ἐν Ἅιδου *par excellence*? The angel of death, although a good fit cosmologically (cf. *Asc. Isa.* 9.16), nowhere else relates to humans via paternal/filial imagery, whereas Satan frequently does (Matt 13.38; John 8.44; Acts 13.10; 1 John 3.10-12; Polyc. *Ep.* 7.1; *y. Yeb.* 1.6, 3a).

Ptolemy, *Letter to Flora*[50]	(ὁ) (φθοροποιός) διάβολος ("the [corrupting] devil," 3.2; 7.3)	Certain
Ascension of Isaiah 1-5.16, 11.41-43[51]	[ὁ ἄρ]χων/[βασιλεὺς] [τοῦ κόσμου τούτου][52] ("the prince/king [of this world]," 1.3, 4.2, 4.4)	Probable[53]
	(ὁ) [Σ]αμαήλ ("Samael," 1.8, 1.11, 2.1, 3.13, 5.15, 5.16, 11.41)	Certain[54]
	(ὁ) Βελιὰρ ("Beliar," 1.8, 1.9, 2.4 [twice], 3.11 [twice Cˢ], 3.13, 4.2, 4.14, 4.16, 4.18, 5.1, 5.4, 5.15)	3.11 (second occurrence) possible; 5.4 probable;[55] others certain[56]

[50] Text in Gilles Quispel, *Ptolémée: Lettre à Flora; Texte, Traduction et Introduction* (SC 24; Paris: Cerf, 1949).

[51] This study assumes the majority position that this Jewish-Christian apocalypse was finalized in the period 70-120 C.E., with chapters 6-11 having been written first and chapters 1-5 (and 11.41-43) added second (see Jonathan Knight, "The Portrayal of Evil in the *Ascension of Isaiah*," in Keith and Stuckenbruck, *Evil*, 299, and sources cited there.) Text for both parts in Paolo Bettiolo, A. Giambelluca Kossova, C. Leonardi, E. Norelli and L. Perrone, *Ascensio Isaiae: Textus* (CCA 7; Turnhout: Brepols, 1995).

[52] The Greek fragment partially preserves ἄρχων at *Asc. Is.* 4.4 while its Coptic cognate is preserved at 1.3.

[53] At 1.3 the Ethiopic refers to the "place of punishment" rather than the "prince" of this world. However, "prince," supported by Cⁱ, fits the context better (Norelli, *Textus*, 44n3).

[54] The name is partially preserved in Greek at 3.13. The double name "Samael Satan" occurs in the epilogue at 11.41, showing that the author of chs. 1-5 equated Samael and Satan. The most likely etymological meaning for Samael (written here with one "m" to transliterate the Greek) is "blind god" or "god of the blind," from סמא and אל. However, the name's development was influenced by סמל, used in 2 Chr 33.7, 15 for Manasseh's idol (Bernard Barc, "Samaèl-Saklas-Yaldabaôth: Recherche sur la Genèse d'un Mythe Gnostique," in *Colloque International sur les Textes de Nag Hammadi, Québec 22-25 août 1978*, ed. Bernard Barc [Quebec and Louvain: Laval University Press, 1981], 136-38; cf. Ezek 8.3-6).

[55] On text-critical uncertainties in 3.11 and 5.4 see Norelli, *Commentarius*, 166, 294.

[56] The Hebrew noun בליעל ("worthlessness") occurs frequently at Qumran as the proper name of a satanic figure (as also in 2 Cor 6.15 and *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*). That Beliar/Mekembekus is identical with Samael/Satan/Malkira is not entirely clear, but "Beliar" seems to be interchangeable with "Satan" (2.2-7) and "Samael" (3.13; 5.15). Hence Jonathan Knight avers that these names all "identify the same opponent" (*Disciples of the Beloved One: The Christology, Social Setting and Theological Context of the Ascension of Isaiah* [Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplements 18; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996], 16n17).

	Malkira (1.8, 5.3, 5.8)	1.8 certain; 5.3, 5.8 probable[57]
	[(ὁ) σατανᾶς] (2.2, 2.7, 5.16, 11.41, 11.43)	Certain
	[ὁ ἄγγελος τῆς ἀνομίας] ("the angel of lawlessness," 2.4)	Probable[58]
	[ὁ ἄγγελος ὁ μέγας] ("the great angel," 4.2)	Certain
	Maṭanbekus/Mekēmbēkus (2.4; 5.3)	Probable[59]
Ascension of Isaiah 6.1-11.40	[(ὁ) Σαμαήλ] (7.9)	Possible[60]
	[(ὁ) σατανᾶς] (7.9, 11.23)	7.9 certain; 11.23 probable[61]
	[(ὁ) διάβολος] (7.12)	Doubtful[62]
	[ὁ περὶ οὖ ἐλέγου] ("the one of whom you have been told," 9.26)	Possible[63]

---

[57] The double name "Samael Malkira" (1.8) explicitly equates these two figures. "Malkira" is text-critically uncertain in 5.3 and 5.8, but is Norelli's preferred reading (*Commentarius*, 293-97). This name is equivalent to Melki-rešaʿ (מלכי רשע, "king of wickedness," 4Q280 2.2; 4Q544 2.13).

[58] Ἀνομία characterizes Satan in *Barnabas* (15.5; 18.2), the Freer logion (an "alternate ending" of Mark's gospel) and possibly *GTr.* 33.24-25.

[59] This otherwise unattested name varies in 2.4 between Ethiopic MSS. In 5.3 all MSS read Mekēmbēkus, which Norelli thinks is the original form, meaning "creator of tears" (from Hebrew מכין and בכי; *Commentarius*, 111-12). This figure is explicitly identified as Beliar in 2.4. In 5.3, Norelli considers Malkira and Mekēmbēkus "duo ipostasi dello stesso personaggio diabolico" (*Textus*, 72n1).

[60] In 7.9-12 SL[2], Isaiah sees Satan and his power(s) refusing to worship God. In EL[1], Isaiah sees Samael and his power(s) as well as the angels of Satan (E: "words" of Satan, a corruption). Possibly Samael and Satan were distinct figures in the original and the SL[2] text-family deleted Samael for theological reasons (so Norelli, *Commentarius*, 15-21 and 380-81). Admittedly, SL[2] seemingly reflects other Satanological "corrections" in 10.12 and 11.23. However, since the SL[2] recension derives from the Second Vision (6.1-11.40) as an independent work—one containing no other reference to Samael—Samael was probably introduced at 7.9 by the author of chs. 1-5 as part of his programme of equating Samael and Satan (cf. 11.41). Since "Samael" likely evolved through reflection on the word סמל used for Manasseh's idol in 2 Chr 33 (see n54), this name is much more at home in *Asc. Is.* 1-5 (and 11.41-43), where Manasseh's idolatry features prominently, than 6.1-11.40, where Manasseh is never mentioned.

[61] Only E mentions Satan among the worshippers of the ascending Beloved. SL[2] probably reflect a theologically motivated excision of Satan from the text (so Norelli, *Commentarius*, 20).

[62] SL[2] refer to the devil as the source of the conflict in the firmament, while EL[1] and C[i] state that the conflict has existed since the world has existed—a theologically "rischiosa clausola" that would have invited alteration (Norelli, *Commentarius*, 380). Thus the EL[1] text is probably nearer the original. It too predicts the eschatological demise of a singular being, who is unnamed but probably Satan (7.9).

[63] The text is very difficult here (Norelli, *Commentarius*, 480). Norelli, following S, suggests a reading like, "Of these garments many of that world deprive themselves, believing the words of the one of whom you have been

	[ὁ θεὸς τοῦ κόσμου ἐκείνου] ("the god of that world," 9.14)	Certain[64]
	[ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου ἐκείνου/τούτου] ("the prince of that/this world," 10.12, 10.29)	10.29 certain;[65] 10.12 doubtful[66]
	[ὁ ἀλλότριος][67] ("the stranger," 11.19)	Certain
Odes of Solomon[68]	[τοῦ πονηροῦ; (ὁ) πονηρός] ("[the] evil [one]," 14.5; 33.4)	Possible[69]
	[ὁ δράκων/ὄφις ἔχων κεφαλὰς ἑπτὰ] ("the seven-headed dragon/serpent," 22.5)	Probable[70]
	[ἡ φθορά/ὁ τὴν φθορὰν (δια)φθείρων][71] ("Corruption"/"the Archcorruptor," 33.1, 7; 38.9)	33.1, 7 doubtful[72]; 38.9 possible[73]

---

told," but some Slavonic MSS have "*not* believing the words," implying that the referent is the Beloved, as in L[2] and E.

[64] Deciding between "prince" (SL[2]) and "god" (E) is difficult. Since SL[2] show evidence of "orthodox" theological revision, perhaps θεὸς was the original reading and some copyists/translators assimilated the term to 10.29 to deny Satan this title. A similar textual problem, in the plural, occurs at 10.12.

[65] The agreement of E and S assures the prince's place in the text despite his absence in L[2].

[66] E's "princes" are to be preferred to SL[2]'s "prince" (cf. 10.15; Norelli, *Commentarius*, 520).

[67] Greek reconstruction proposed by Norelli, *Commentarius*, 573; cf. Justin's interpretation of this word (plural) in Ps 18.14 LXX (*Dial.* 30.2-3).

[68] Text in Majella Franzmann, *The Odes of Solomon: An Analysis of the Poetical Structure and Form* (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 20; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991). The *Odes* are dated by scholarly consensus to "the early second century" (James H. Charlesworth, *The Earliest Christian Hymnbook: The* Odes of Solomon [Eugene: Cascade, 2009], xxii; cf. Michael Lattke, *Odes of Solomon: A Commentary*, trans. Marianne Ehrhardt [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009], 9-10).

[69] In 14.5, ܒܝܫܐ is equivalent to τοῦ πονηροῦ and, as in Matt 6.13 and *Did.* 8.2, could mean "the evil one" (Satan) or "evil" (Lattke, *Odes of Solomon,* 202). ܒܝܫܐ is also ambiguous in 33.4, where it could be an adjective (=πονηρός) or a substantive (=ὁ πονηρός) (Lattke, *Odes of Solomon,* 454).

[70] Both Syriac MSS have "dragon" (ܬܢܝܢܐ) while the Coptic has "serpent" (ϩⲟϥ). Lattke identifies this mythological reptile with the devil (*Odes of Solomon*, 314-15), based on the parallel with Rev 12.3-10 (cf. *T. Ash.* 7.3).

[71] One of several possible retroversions suggested by Lattke, *Odes of Solomon*, 523.

[72] Charlesworth translates ܚܒܠܐ in *Ode* 33.1, 7 as "the Corruptor" (=Satan?) (*Earliest Christian Hymnbook*, 97). However, Lattke avers that the vocalisation in both MSS requires the reading "Corruption" (*Odes of Solomon*, 450n20). This sense also better explains the antithesis with "Grace" (another personified *abstraction*) and the reference to "incorruption" in 33.12 (Franzmann, *Odes of Solomon*, 235).

[73] In 38.9, ܡܚܒܠܢܐ ܕܚܒܠܐ literally translates as "the corruptor of corruption," which Lattke takes as an idiomatic superlative, "the Archcorruptor," possibly denoting the devil (*Odes of Solomon*, 523). Supporting this interpretation are the Satanological designation "destroyer" in 1 Cor 10.10 and Heb 11.28 (see n105; the Peshitta translates ὁ ὀλοθρευτής with ܡܚܒܠܢܐ in 1 Cor 10.10) and Ptolemy's use of the φθορ- word group to

	[ὁ νυμφίος] ("the Bridegroom," 38.9)	Possible
	[ὁ πλάνος] ("the Deceiver," 38.10)	Possible[74]
Gospel of Truth[75]	[ὁ διάβολος] (33.20)	Certain
	[ὁ ἄνομός] ("the transgressor/lawless one," 33.24-25)	Possible[76]

THEORETICAL SATANOLOGY: THE EXPLANATORY POWER OF THE CONCEPT

Combining the 162 certain or probable references to Satan listed above with the 137

identified in the NT by Farrar and Williams ("Diabolical Data," 61), we have about three

hundred references to Satan using over forty distinct designations in extant Christian

literature through the mid-second century. This prevalence and diversity of Satanological

language begs the question, "Why?" The origin of Christian Satanology is a first-century

phenomenon beyond our scope,[77] but its persistence in early second-century Christianity

demonstrates the explanatory power it held in Christian communities during this period. We

will explore this explanatory power by surveying the loci of satanic activity identified by our

texts.

---

describe the devil (*Ep.* 3.2; 7.7). Franzmann, however, noting the pattern of final nouns in each line of 38.8-9a ("of Error," "of Death," "of Corruption"), translates, "the corrupting of Corruption" (*Odes of Solomon*, 255, 257, 261-62). This places the emphasis on Corruption as a personified abstraction in agreement with *Ode* 33. Even then, "Corruption" could be a de-apocalypticized version of the devil (see below).

[74] The Bridegroom, "Deceiver" (whom Lattke identifies with the Archcorruptor of 38.9a) may seem an active personal figure (cf. Rev 12.9; *Did.* 16.4; *Apoc. Pet.* 2.12) in contrast to the Bride "Error," but Error's role in this elaborate allegory is as active as the Deceiver's. The ⲙⲉⲧⲗⲁ/ⲙⲁ ⲑⲗⲁ (πλάνος/πλάνη) contrast is probably just a poetic construct to match word gender with wedding role.

[75] Text in Attridge and MacRae, "Gospel of Truth," 1:55-122.

[76] Attridge and MacRae take ⲡⲓⲁⲧⲅⲉⲛ as translating [ὁ] ἄνομος ("Gospel of Truth," 2:98; cf. *Barn.* 15.5). The antithesis could be between "the Lawless One" and "the Just One" *par excellence* (the devil and Christ), or generic lawless and just persons. Interpreters have favoured the latter, but the similarly belittling reference to the devil just prior supports the former. Moreover, Kendrick Grobel suggests that ⲥⲟⲣⲉ in 33.23 translates διαβολή, which created a play on διάβολος (*The Gospel of Truth: A Valentinian Meditation on the Gospel; Translation from the Coptic and Commentary* [New York: Abingdon, 1960], 145). If so, ⲅⲁⲣ relates 33.24 to a preceding sentence where the devil is still implicitly in view.

[77] On this, see Thomas J. Farrar, "New Testament Satanology and Leading Suprahuman Opponents in Second Temple Jewish Literature: A Religion-Historical Analysis," *JTS* (forthcoming).

Satan within the Individual

The traditional idea of Satan as tempter is transmitted in several texts. The author of *1 Clement* implores his readers, "Therefore, however we may have failed and whatever we may have done through any of the [designs] of the adversary, let us ask to be forgiven" (51.1).[78] The author avoids inflammatory dualistic language (e.g., associating one Corinthian faction with the devil). By using first-person plural verbs he includes himself among those susceptible to satanic seduction. The author's silence on Satan elsewhere—most notably in *1 Clem.* 3.4[79]—is also attributable to his delicate rhetorical task.[80] *2 Clement*'s author is even more self-effacing: "For even I myself am utterly sinful and have not yet escaped temptation, but am still in the midst of the devil's instruments" (18.2; text in Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1:194). Diabolical temptation threatens the faithful, not only the ungodly. Even Peter is not exempt, according to *Apoc. Pet.* 16.8 (an amalgamation of Matt 16.23 and 17.4): "And [Jesus] said to me in wrath, 'Satan wages war against you and has veiled your understanding'" (trans. Buchholz, *Apocalypse of Peter*, 240).

The Shepherd of Hermas also implicates the devil in πειρασμός of believers (*Mand.* 4.3.4-6; 12.5.4; *Sim.* 9.31.2) and employs the "two angels" motif to vivify the cosmic warfare waged in each human heart (*Mand.* 6.2). Ishay Rosen-Zvi observes that Hermas represents an "intermediate stage" in "the process of internalization of dualistic forces" that, in rabbinic

---

[78] Text in Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1:126. "Designs" translates an elliptical plural word. In citing this text, Clement of Alexandria supplies a word explicitly (παρεμπτώσεις, "incursions," *Strom.* 4.18); the Latin and Coptic versions of *1 Clement* follow him.

[79] Rebuking the Corinthians for "unjust jealousy," the author quotes the last five words of Wis 2.24a, omitting διάβολος from his quotation and commentary and attributing jealousy to "the lusts of [one's] evil heart" (text in Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1:40). He attributes φθόνος to Cain (4.7), as Wis 2.24 does to διάβολος, so he may have interpreted Wisdom's διάβολος as Cain (perhaps correctly—see Henry Ansgar Kelly, *Satan: A Biography* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006], 78-79). However, that our author focused exclusively on human envy here does not rule out his having interpreted Wisdom's διάβολος as the devil (Dochhorn, "Mit Kain kam der Tod," 153).

[80] "The author of the letter knows that he must appeal to the good-will of his audience. . .He avoids the use of the imperative" (Andrew Gregory, "I Clement: An Introduction," *The Expository Times* 117 [2006]: 226).

Judaism, culminated in the evil *yeşer* doctrine.[81] Godliness entails fighting the devil, who can

be vanquished by faith (*Mand.* 9.11) and keeping God's commandments with a pure heart

(*Mand.* 12.6.3-5; similarly, Ignatius, *Trall.* 4.2). Hermas attributes several character attributes

to the devil, including craftiness (*Mand.* 4.3.4), irritability (*Mand.* 5.1.3) and hardness (*Mand.*

12.5.1). His ethically oriented Satanology was probably influenced by the lost *Book of Eldad

and Modad.*[82]

Satan at the Boundaries of the Community

The early sub-apostolic period saw increasing boundary demarcation between rival Christian

communities and between Christian and Jewish communities. The notion of Satan—

adversary of Christ's true flock—provided a conceptual framework for unambiguously

unmasking "intimate enemies," to use Elaine Pagels's term.[83] Consequently, concerns about

Satan infiltrating or undermining the church through his ecclesiastical agents become more

pronounced in early second-century literature.[84]

Ignatius describes false teaching as a "plant of the devil" (*Eph.* 10.3, text in Ehrman,

Apostolic Fathers, 1:230) and warns against being "smeared with the stinking filth of the

---

[81] *Demonic Desires: 'Yetzer Hara' and the Problem of Evil in Late Antiquity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011), 53-57. Nevertheless, Hermas does not necessarily reject belief in external demons, as Rosen-Zvi possibly implies and Burke asserts ("Satan and Demons," 149). The two angels are to be identified with the spirits of God and the devil respectively (see n41), and Hermas clearly portrays the devil "mythologically. . .as an external agent of evil" (Boyd, *Satan and Māra*, 61). Hermas's remarkable equation of demons with specific vices (e.g., "Slander is evil; it is a restless demon," *Mand.* 2.3; text in Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2:238) is not necessarily demythologization but more likely a synthesis between mythology and ethics. For a balanced treatment of Hermas's demonology, see Osiek, *Hermas*, 31-34, 123-26. Hermas clearly accepts the externality of angels, since he converses with one (e.g., *Vis.* 5.7; *Mand.* 12.6.1).

[82] Oscar J. F. Seitz argued that James, Hermas, *1 Clement, 2 Clement,* and *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* all rely on a common, unknown scriptural source ("Relationship of the Shepherd of Hermas to the Epistle of James," *JBL* 63 [1944]: 131-40). Dale C. Allison, Jr. has conclusively identified this source with the *Book of Eldad and Modad* mentioned in Herm. *Vis.* 2.3.4 ("Eldad and Modad," *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 21 [2011]: 99-131). Thus the "strikingly close" parallel between Jas 4.7 and Herm. *Mand.* 12.5.2-4 on resisting the devil, causing him to flee (Allison, "Eldad and Modad," 118), suggests that this Satanological image is drawn from *Eldad and Modad.*

[83] Elaine Pagels, "The Social History of Satan, Part Three: John of Patmos and Ignatius of Antioch: Contrasting Visions of 'God's People'," *HTR* 99 (2006): 487-505.

[84] Such ideas occur in (mostly later) NT texts, but with little elaboration (Acts 5.3-4; 13.10; 2 Cor 11.13-15; 1 Tim 3.6-7; 5.15; 1 John 3.10; perhaps Rev 2.24).

teaching of the prince of this age" (*Eph.* 17.1, text in Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1:236). The devil can infiltrate the church whenever people disregard the ecclesiastical authorities (*Trall.* 7.1-8.1; *Smyrn.* 9.1). Polycarp similarly identifies those who fail to confess certain traditional doctrines as of diabolical origin (*Ep.* 7.1).

Other writers see Satan's influence in the church more in charismatic than ecclesiastical terms. The notion that true and false prophets are influenced by different spirits, perhaps rooted in 1 Kgs 22.19-24,[85] is probably assumed in *Did.* 11.7-12.[86] Hermas explicitly asserts that a false prophet speaks some truth because "the devil fills him with his own spirit, in case he might be able to break any of the righteous" (*Mand.* 11.3; text in Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2:284), while Justin writes of false prophets "filled with the deceitful and unclean spirit" (*Dial.* 7.3; cf. 82.3).[87] That the author of *Ascension of Isaiah* 1-5 understands false prophecy as satanically inspired is apparent from Beliar's association with the false prophet Bechira (*Asc. Isa.* 5.2-15). He also implicates the spirit of error (probably Beliar's spirit) in a withdrawal of the holy spirit and consequent dearth of true prophets (*Asc. Isa.* 3.27-28).

Given the fluid boundaries between Jews and Christians at this early stage of the "parting(s) of the ways," anti-Jewish polemic also falls under the rubric of boundary circumscription. The use of Satanology in anti-Jewish polemic (possibly already present in John 8.44, Rev 2.9 and 3.9) intensifies in the early second century. For Ignatius, closing one's ears to those who offer Judaism without Christ is tantamount to fleeing "the conspiracies and

---

[85] See Esther J. Hamori, "The Spirit of Falsehood," *CBQ* 72 (2010): 15-30.

[86] Ehrman uniformly translates ἐν πνεύματι "in the Spirit" in *Did.* 11.7-12, apparently assuming that the Holy Spirit is meant throughout (*Apostolic Fathers,* 1:435-36). More likely, ἐν πνεύματι denotes spirit possession without specifying which spirit (André de Halleux, "Ministers in the Didache," in *The Didache in Modern Research,* ed. Jonathan A. Draper [Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 37; Leiden: Brill, 1996], 309). Paul denies the possibility of one saying "Jesus is accursed" ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ; hence the need for διακρίσεις πνευμάτων (1 Cor 12.3, 10). Similarly, the *Didache* probably presupposes that a prophet who says "Give me money" is not speaking ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ but in an evil spirit (de Halleux, "Ministers," 309; Draper, *Commentary on the Didache,* 244-45; cf. ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ, Mark 1.23; 5.2).

[87] Text in Bobichon, *Dialogue avec Tryphon*, 1:204.

treacheries of the prince of this age" (*Philad.* 6.1-2; text in Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1:288). The author of the *Epistle of Barnabas* wishes to prevent "the evil one" "smuggling in error among us" (2.10; text in Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2:16); the error in question is the Jewish notion that the Lord needs sacrifices (2.4). Similarly, the Jews had wrongly taken the law of circumcision literally because "an evil angel instructed them" (9.4; text in Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2:44)—perhaps an alternative aetiology of the oral Torah! While this angel is probably not Satan, his role is "steht sachlich parallel zu" Satan's.[88] In Jesus' rejoinder in *Apoc. Pet.* 16.8 (quoted above) to Peter's question about building three tabernacles, Bauckham detects a critique of Jewish aspirations to rebuild the Jerusalem temple during the Bar Kochba revolt.[89] Perhaps surprisingly, Justin's *Dialogue* never implicates Satan in Jewish unbelief, though in *1 Apol.* 63.10 he says Jesus' sufferings were inflicted by "demons. . .through the senseless Jews."[90]

Satan's Political Hegemony in This World

The image of Satan as ἄρχων is pervasive in early Christian literature.[91] Satan exercises considerable worldly power during this age through his manipulation of earthly political forces, which he uses to persecute Christians.[92] The depiction of Satan as persecutor of the

---

[88] Prostmeier, *Barnabasbrief*, 359-61. Other writers ascribes legislative activity to Satan more directly (*Herm. Mand.* 12.4.6; *Sim.* 1.3-6; Ptol. *Ep.* 7.5).

[89] Richard Bauckham, "The *Apocalypse of Peter*: A Jewish Christian Apocalypse from the Time of Bar Kokhba," in *The Fate of the Dead: Studies on the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (NovTSup 93; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 190-94. See, however, criticism by Eibert Tigchelaar, "Is the Liar Bar Kokhba? Considering the Date and Provenance of the Greek (Ethiopic) Apocalypse of Peter," in *The Apocalypse of Peter,* ed. Jan N. Bremmer and István Czachesz (Studies on Early Christian Apocrypha [hereafter, SECA] 7; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 73-74.

[90] Text in Minns and Parvis, *Apologies*, 246. Justin's *Dialogue* asserts that the devil counterfeited Christian truth in Greco-Roman mythology (*Dial.* 69.1; 70.5; 78.6). This is a major theme in the *Apologies*, with the devil exchanged for demons.

[91] On its background see n20. This title is used for Satan in Matt 12.24-29; Mark 3.22-27; Luke 11.15-21; John 12.31; 14.30; 16.11; Eph 2.2; *Barn.* 4.13; 18.2; *M. Polyc.* 19.2; *Asc. Isa.* 1.3; 4.4; (probably also 4.2; 10.12; 10.29); *T. Sim.* 2.7; *T. Jud.* 19.4; Athenagoras, *Leg.* 24.24; 24.27; 25.4; 25.25. For similar titles and concepts see Luke 4.5; Acts 26.18; 2 Cor 4.4; 1 John 5.19; *Asc. Isa.* 9.14; *Herm. Sim.* 1.3-6; Just. *1 Apol.* 28.1.

[92] On Satan's relatedness to eschatological antichrist figures, see n28. Ἄρχων-language for Satan is not always clearly political (Ign. *Eph.* 16.2-17.1; *Barn.* 4.13; 18.2).

church probably developed from the belief that he orchestrated Jesus' crucifixion.[93] This relationship is apparent in the parallel between *Asc. Isa.* 9.14 and *Apoc. Pet.* 14.4 (Rainer fragment). The former implicates "the god of that world" in Jesus' crucifixion "by the hand of his son," probably depicting Pilate as Satan's son.[94] In the latter, Jesus "foretells" Peter's death "at the hands of the son of the one who is in Hades," probably depicting *Nero* as Satan's son. For the author of *Ascension of Isaiah* 1-5, Beliar's persecution of the righteous through Manasseh (2.4-5; 5.14-16) foreshadowed his persecution of the church through Nero (4.2-3).[95] Satan's hand is perceived behind Roman torture of Christians in Ignatius (*Rom.* 5.3; cf. *Magn.* 1.2) and the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* (2.4[3.1]). Surprisingly, however, in these texts, "the Devil is anti-martyrdom"![96] He aims not to kill Christians, but to coerce them to deny Christ (*M. Polyc.* 2.4); not to destroy Ignatius's body, but to corrupt his mind (*Rom.* 7.1). The devil reacts angrily, not jubilantly, to Polycarp's exemplary martyrdom (*M. Polyc.* 17.1), which is a victory over him (19.2; cf. Herm. *Sim.* 8.3.6). Justin depicts the devil's attitude toward martyrdom differently: he and his host use Roman officials to kill Christians as punishment for their piety (*Dial.* 131.2; cf. 39.6). The Jews, too, are regarded as Satan's agents both in the crucifixion (*Asc. Isa.* 11.19) and persecution of Christians (*M. Polyc.* 17.1-2;[97] Justin, *Dial.* 131.2).[98]

Satan in a Cosmic Dualistic System

---

[93] In likely first-century writings, Satan's involvement in Jesus' death appears in Luke (22.3, 22.53), John (13.2, 13.27), *Ascension of Isaiah* (9.14; 11.19) and possibly 1 Cor 2.8. Satan's role in persecuting Christians appears in 1 Pet 5.8, Rev 2.10, 12.17 and perhaps 1 Thess 2.18.

[94] Translation follows Norelli's translation of 9.14 E (*Textus*, 100; see n64). Despite some textual problems, "his son" is probably the instrument rather than the object of the attack (Norelli, *Commentarius*, 462-64). Norelli identifies "his son" as Herod, but Pilate is more likely in light of 11.19, where Satan (here designated "the stranger") instigates the children of Israel to hand Jesus over to "the ruler."

[95] Knight believes that expected or actual maltreatment of Christians by Romans was the occasion for the *Ascension of Isaiah*'s composition (*Disciples*, 16-17).

[96] Middleton, "Overcoming the Devil," 370.

[97] The text of 17.2 is problematic; various theories of interpolation have been proposed (see Boudewijn Dehandschutter, "The Martyrium Polycarpi: A Century of Research," in *ANRW* II.27.1 [1993]: 497).

[98] See Judith Lieu, "Accusations of Jewish Persecution in Early Christian Sources," in *Neither Jew nor Greek? Constructing Early Christianity* (London: T&T Clark, 2002), 135-51.

Numerous Christian texts place Satan within a dualistic system (ethical, eschatological and/or cosmological). Such schemes typically exhibit tension concerning Satan's amount of power. Whereas the *Didache* eliminates angelology from its Two Ways material (1.1), *Barnabas* enhances it: Satan leads the angels placed over the way of darkness (18.1-2).[99] Satan's present rule contrasts with God's eternal lordship (18.2); nevertheless, Satan currently has *the* ἐξουσία (2.1).[100] Hermas exhorts his readers to fear God but not the devil, since "he is impotent, just like the sinews of a corpse" and the angel of repentance shatters all his power (*Mand.* 12.6.2-4, text in Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2:302; cf. 7.2-3; 11.17; 12.4.6-7). Nevertheless, the devil has enough power to overcome the weak and empty (*Mand.* 4.3.4; 12.5.1-4), and his works *are* to be feared (*Mand.* 7.3).

The *Ascension of Isaiah*'s Satanology is unique in its cosmological precision.[101] Satan is the highest evil being in the cosmos, dwelling in the firmament (*Asc. Isa.* 7.9; 10.29; 11.23).[102] However, this is a vast distance below God in the seventh heaven, and Satan cannot

---

[99] Read alongside the "Two Ways" material in 1QS and the Didachist's source (as reconstructed by van de Sandt and Flusser, *Didache*, 128), it appears *Barnabas* has "satanized" the anonymous angel of darkness/iniquity. Van de Sandt and Flusser express uncertainty over whether the Didache's omission of the "two angels" "occurred by accident in the course of transmission" or was "the result of a deliberate attempt to ethicize the tradition" (*Didache*, 63). Most scholars regard it as a deliberate demythologizing move (e.g., Draper, *Commentary on the Didache*, 19; John S. Kloppenborg, "The Transformation of Moral Exhortation in Didache 1-5," in *The Didache in Context: Essays on its Text, History, and Transmission*, ed. Clayton N. Jefford [NovTSup 77; Leiden: Brill, 1995], 92-97). Differently, Jenks suggests that the omission of evil figures from the Didache's Two Ways material *highlights* the appearance of the world-deceiver in the apocalyptic ending (*Antichrist Myth*, 308-10). Milavec regards the *Didache*'s reluctance to mention supernatural evil as a pastoral strategy for training novice Christians to abandon their previous polytheistic thinking (*Didache*, 65). This would coincide with Ignatius's construal of angelology as esoteric (*Trall.* 5.1-2; cf. *Diog.* 2.10, which seems to deliberately avoid mentioning demons in an apologetic context).

[100] The attribution of ἐξουσία to Satan is found also in Luke 4.6; 22.53; Acts 26.18; Eph 2.2; Col 1.13; Rev 13.2; Herm. *Sim.* 1.3.

[101] R. Bauckham argues that the *Ascension of Isaiah*'s cosmology depends and elaborates on Pauline and deutero-Pauline ideas, especially (concerning Satanology) 1 Cor 2.6-8 and Eph 2.2 ("How the Author of the *Ascension of Isaiah* Created its Cosmological Version of the Story of Jesus," in *The Ascension of Isaiah,* ed. Jan N. Bremmer, Thomas R. Karmann and Tobias Nicklas [SECA 11; Leuven: Peeters, 2016], 23-44; cf. Knight, *Disciples,* 190-91).

[102] *Ascension of Isaiah* does not indicate whether Satan had previously lost access to heaven (cf. Rev 12.7-9; Luke 10.18), but throughout early Christian literature the traditional Jewish Satanological role of celestial accuser is absent or explicitly countermanded (Rev 12.10-11; Luke 22.31-32). Ignatius implicitly locates Satan in heaven (*Eph.* 13.1-2; *Trall.* 4.2-5.2), though he is less cosmologically precise than *Ascension of Isaiah*. Ignatius associates Satan with a visible/invisible dichotomy (*Rom.* 5.3; *Trall.* 4.2-5.2; cf. *Smyrn.* 6.1; Col 1.16) that appears to distinguish between two kinds of heavenly beings, with "visible" denoting astral powers (see Schoedel, *Ignatius*, 91-92, 145, 156).

even maintain order within his domain (7.9). In the earlier vision (composed later), Beliar—

explicitly an angel[103]—descends from the firmament as the eschatological antichrist (4.2-13).

However, this is an almost comically short journey compared to the Beloved's descent from

the seventh heaven, and ends with Beliar being dragged into Gehenna (4.14). Whereas in

Ascension of Isaiah a being distinct from Satan rules the underworld (the "angel/prince of

death"/"angel who is in Sheol", 9.16; 10.8; 10.14; 11.19),[104] the *Apocalypse of Peter* is the

earliest Christian text to demote Satan to the underworld, as "the one who is in Hades" (14.4,

Rainer fragment).[105] This apocalypse, however, never mentions Satan in its detailed tour of

the punishments of hell.

Satan in the Abstract

Two texts in particular—the *Odes of Solomon* and *Gospel of Truth*—describe ultimate evil

more in terms of personified abstractions like "Error" and "Corruption" than a personal

adversary.[106] By defining the plight of humanity negatively, in terms of ignorance and

desolation rather than a sentient enemy, such writings heighten the importance of *gnōsis* and

an accompanying realized eschatology.[107] Aune notes that *Ode* 38 reflects a "de-

---

[103] Surprisingly, besides *Asc. Isa.* 2.4 and 4.2 no Christian text through the mid-second century explicitly calls Satan an angel (cp. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 5.24.3; Theophilus of Antioch, *ad Autol.* 2.28). However, this ontological identification is often implicit (Matt 25.41; 2 Cor 11.14; 12.7; Jude 9; Rev 12.7-9; *Barn.* 18.1; Justin, *Dial.* 79.1-4).

[104] This figure's relationship to Satan is unspecified, but he is clearly evil: the Beloved will spoil him (9.16 E) or take him captive (9.16 SL[2]). Laurato Roig Lanzillotta's otherwise excellent analysis of *Ascension of Isaiah*'s cosmology ("The Cosmology of the *Ascension of Isaiah*: Analysis and Re-Assessment of the Text's Cosmological Framework," in Bremmer, Karmann, and Nicklas, *Ascension of Isaiah*, 259-88) unfortunately overlooks the cosmos's subterranean "stories" (Sheol, Perdition [10.8 E] and Gehenna [4.14]).

[105] Some earlier texts identify Satan as the destroyer, however (1 Cor 5.5; 10.10; Heb 2.14; 11.28; see Farrar and Williams, "Diabolical Data," 54-56).

[106] On personal and impersonal views of evil in Justin Martyr and the *Gospel of Truth* respectively, see Cullen I. K. Story, *The Nature of Truth in "The Gospel of Truth" and in the Writings of Justin Martyr: A Study of the Pattern of Orthodoxy in the Middle of the Second Christian Century* (NovTSup 25; Leiden: Brill, 1970), 141-45.

[107] Both writings seem to depict the devil as already defeated. Concerning the seven-headed dragon/serpent of *Ode* 22, Lattke locates the beast's destruction by the speaking "I" "in the mythological past," so that "here—in contrast to the New Testament—there is no longer any power hostile to God" (*Odes of Solomon,* 316). Similarly, Jacques-É. Ménard asserts that, unlike the entire NT, *GTr.* 33.19-21 regards the devil's defeat "comme déjà accomplie" (*L'Évangile de Verité* [NHS 2; Leiden: Brill, 1972], 157). However, several NT texts place the devil's destruction or defeat in the past (Heb 2.14; John 12.31; 1 John 2.13-14, 3.8; Rev 12.10-11) yet depict him as still active (1 John 3.8; 5.19; Rev 12.13-13.4). The *Gospel of Truth* preserves this eschatological paradox: although the readers have "already destroyed" the devil, the warning "Do not become a (dwelling)

apocalypticizing" tendency: the seer experiences a heavenly journey in which "Truth functions as an apocalyptic *angelus interpres*."[108] "Corruption" and "Error" may therefore function in the *Odes* as partially de-apocalypticized versions of Satan,[109] as Error (ⲡⲗⲁⲛⲏ) does in the *Gospel of Truth* (18.21-24; 26.19-27). Nevertheless, it would be hazardous to call this demythologization, since Corruption and Error in these texts are mythical concepts.[110]

From influencing an individual believer's heart to tyrannizing the world, no task within the portfolio of evil is too small or big for Satan in early Christian literature: he is the intimate and ultimate adversary. The notion of a transcendent enemy bore considerable theological freight in addressing the problem of evil—freight that might otherwise arrive at the feet of the Creator, as Marcion argued it should (Tertullian, *Marc.* 2.10.1).[111]

APPLIED SATANOLOGY: THE USE OF THE CONCEPT IN THE CHURCH

Satanological Liturgical Forms

Several references to Satan in our literature likely reflect liturgical forms. *Did.* 8.2 is obviously liturgical and, like the parallel in Matt 6.9-13, should arguably be understood as an apotropaic prayer seeking deliverance from satanic power (cf. *Odes Sol.* 14.5).[112] The tripartite formula in Polycarp's *Ep.* 7.1 likely cites a liturgical anathema designed to exclude

---

place for the devil" (trans. Attridge and MacRae, "Gospel of Truth," 1:105) presupposes his ongoing activity. The same may hold in *Ode* 14.5, where the speaker looks *forward* to salvation from (the) evil (one).

[108] D. E. Aune, "The *Odes of Solomon* and Early Christian Prophecy," *NTS* 28 (1982): 441.

[109] Cf. ܛܥܝܘܬܐ in 18.10; 31.2 (besides *Odes* 33 and 38).

[110] On the mythical background to "Error" in the *Gospel of Truth*, see Robert Haardt, "Zur Struktur des Plane-Mythos im *Evangelium Veritatis* des Codex Jung," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 58 (1962): 24-38; Attridge and MacRae, "Gospel of Truth," 77-78. On dualistic mythology in the *Odes of Solomon,* see Lattke, *Odes of Solomon,* 310-15, 450-51, 511-25.

[111] Tertullian attributed Marcion's heresy to his "unhealthy interest in the problem of evil" (*Marc.* 1.2.2; text and translation in Ernest Evans, ed. and trans., *Tertullian: Adversus Marcionem*, 2 vols. [Oxford: Clarendon, 1972], 1:6-7).

[112] On the Matthaean Lord's Prayer as apotropaic, see Benjamin Wold, "Apotropaic Prayer and the Matthean Lord's Prayer," in Dochhorn, Rudnig-Zelt and Wold, *Das Böse*, 101-112. *Ode* 14 contains "poetic variations on themes of the Lord's Prayer" (Lattke, *Odes of Solomon*, 197).

heretics from the community.[113] The *Ascension of Isaiah* mentions those who "because of the faith will have cursed Beliar and his kings" (4.16)[114] and records an actual curse formula pronounced on Malkira by Isaiah (5.9). This probably reflects a liturgical practice, well-attested at Qumran, of cursing Belial/Malkira (1QM 13.4; 4Q286 7 ii; 4Q280 2.2; cf. 1QS 2.4-10). Finally, Norelli observes that *Ascension of Isaiah*'s reference to Satan's "pomp" (πομπή, 2.7)[115] may reflect a baptismal rite of renunciation of Satan and his pomp, otherwise attested only from the third century.[116] This suggestion finds support not only in the linguistic parallel between *Asc. Isa.* 2.2, 7 ("[Manasseh] served Satan, his angels and his powers"; "the service of Satan and his pomp")[117] and later renunciation formulae, but also in the author's uncharacteristic use of the traditional Christian designation "Satan" here rather than his own preferred term "Beliar" (or "Sammael").[118]

Satanological Hermeneutics

In depicting King Manasseh as Beliar's and/or Sammael's servant (e.g., 1.8-9; 2.1-4; 5.1), *Ascension of Isaiah* inserts a Satan figure into rewritten biblical narrative, a technique first attested in the *Book of Jubilees* (e.g., 17.15-16; 48.2-3; 48.9; 49.2). An equally imaginative

---

[113] Such a liturgical anathema (suggested by Gokey, *Terminology*, 177) must be located within Johannine churches, since Polyc. *Ep.* 7.1 likely depends on 1 John 4.2-3 and 3.8 (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* [VCSup 62; Leiden: Brill, 2002], 88-91; Jan Dochhorn, "Kain, der Sohn des Teufels: Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu 1 Joh 3,12," in Dochhorn, Rudnig-Zelt and Wold, *Das Böse*, 169-88). For a comparable proto-rabbinic tripartite formula see *m. Sanh.* 10.1.

[114] Translation based on that of Norelli, *Textus*, 68.

[115] The Greek MS recommences after some missing text with [κ]αὶ τὴν πομπὴ[ν αὐ]τοῦ (Norelli, *Textus*, 137).

[116] Norelli, *Commentarius*, 121-23. For a hypothesis on the Jewish origin of "Satan's pomp," see M. E. Boismard, "'I Renounce Satan, his Pomps and his Works'," in *Baptism in the New Testament: A Symposium*, trans. David Askey (London: Chapman, 1964), 107-112. Second-century evidence for pre-baptismal exorcism—which is, however, distinct from the renunciation rite—includes the statements in *Barn.* 16.7-8 and Valentinus's *Frg.* 2 (Clement, *Strom.* 2.114.3-6; text in Markschies, *Valentinus Gnosticus?*, 54) about the heart being an abode of demons until receiving the remission of sins (*Barnabas*) or being visited by the Father (Valentinus). For discussion of third-century references to the renunciation rite (Tertullian, *An.* 35.3; *Cor.* 3.2; *Spect.* 4.1-3; Origen, *Hom. in Num.* 12.4; [Ps.-]Hippolytus, *Trad. Ap.* 21.9), see J. H. Waszink, "*Pompa Diaboli*," *VC* 1 (1947): 13-41; Georg Kretschmar, *Die Geschichte des Taufgottesdienstes in der alten Kirche* (Kassel-Wilhelmshöhe: Stauda, 1966), 96-101.

[117] Translations based on those of Norelli, *Textus*, 48, 50.

[118] Apart from 2.2 and 2.7, the author of chs. 1-5 uses "Satan" only in the epilogues to the two parts of the work (5.16; 11.41-43).

hermeneutic is employed by Justin. His *Dialogue* is the earliest extant Christian text to

explicitly cite the two LXX texts that undoubtedly gave Satan his Greek name ὁ διάβολος:

Job's prologue and Zech 3.1-2 (*Dial.* 79.4; 103.5; 115-116). However, Justin finds Satan in

numerous other biblical passages—most importantly, Gen 3 (e.g., *Dial.* 45.4, 70.5, 79.4, 88.4,

94.2, 100.4-5, 102.3, 103.5, 112.2, 124.3) but also Gen 6.1-4 (*Dial.* 45.4; cf. 100.6), Ex 7-8

and 1 Kgs 18 (*Dial.* 69.1), Num 21.8-9 (*Dial.* 91.4; 94.1), Isa 27.1 (*Dial.* 91.4; 112.2) and Ps

21(22).14 (*Dial.* 103.5). For Justin, Scripture foretold Satan's downfall in veiled language

(Irenaeus, *Haer.* 5.26.2). Justin's hermeneutic gives him a greater interest in primeval

Satanology than any prior writer. He also draws Satanological ideas from earlier Christian

writings: written gospels, Revelation[119] and possibly the *Controversy of Jason and*

Papiscus.[120]

Satanology in Theological Debates

The ideas of three mid-second century Christian thinkers—Justin, Ptolemy and Marcion—

provide insight into the role Satanology played in wider theological debates. Justin's

Dialogue with Trypho is a heavily stylized account of a debate between the author and a

proto-rabbinic Jew. Its main topic is Christology, but at one point Satanology, or at least

angelology, comes to the fore. Trypho (79.1) reacts angrily to Justin's "blasphemous" idea of

---

[119] Justin cites dominical sayings corresponding to Matt 25.41 and Luke 10.19 in *Dial.* 76.5-6, and explicitly refers to the "apostles' memoirs" in connection with the devil's temptation of Jesus (*Dial.* 103.6; cf. 125.4). Justin refers to Christian writings regarding Satanological names (Serpent, Satan, Devil; *1 Apol.* 28.1). He probably has Rev 12.9 and 20.2 in view here: these texts mention all three designations, and Justin mentions this book in *Dial.* 81.4.

[120] Oskar Skarsaune argues that Justin depended on this Jewish-Christian text for his proposed etymology of Σατανᾶς in *Dial.* 103.5 (*The Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition; Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile* [NovTSup 56; Leiden: Brill, 1987], 234-42). Justin probably did not concoct it himself, for although *nas* as a transliteration of נחש may presuppose Samaritan pronunciation, comporting well with his Samaritan background (L. W. Barnard, *Justin Martyr: His Life and Thought* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967], 108n6; see *1 Apol.* 1.1; *Dial.* 120.6), Justin appears to have botched the explanation. His source probably rightly stated that *sata* (=שטה) means "apostate" in Hebrew, but Justin erroneously says that *satan* means "apostate" in Hebrew (*pace* Bobichon [*Dialogue avec Tryphon,* 2:835], who emends σατὰν τῇ to σατᾶ ἐν τῇ). The oddity of a Hebrew etymology reached via a Greek transliteration does not preclude a Jewish source: R. P. C. Hanson argues that nearly all of Origen's etymologies of Hebrew names are taken from Jewish *Onomastica* despite often beginning from Greek transliterations ("Interpretations of Hebrew Names in Origen," *VC* 10 [1956]: 103-123).

apostate angels (cf. 76.3-5; *Gen. Rab.* 26.5). In reply, Justin implies that Trypho had previously cited Zechariah's and Job's testimony concerning Satan (79.4). Regrettably, the passage where Trypho discussed these texts is lost—probably in the lacuna between 74.3 and 74.4.[121] Given that Justin interprets Trypho's previous comments as a concession, it seems Trypho did affirm Satan's existence. By combining this affirmation with Trypho's denial of an angelic apostasy and taking later rabbinic Satanology into account,[122] we can posit that Trypho regarded Satan as a celestial being (angel?) but not an apostate. Whatever one makes of Trypho's historicity, Justin displays an impressive knowledge of post-biblical Judaism,[123] so he probably correctly characterized this difference between proto-rabbinic and early Christian Satanology.

Contrasting with his over 40 appearances in Justin's *Dialogue*, Satan is mentioned in just one passage between Justin's *Apologies* (*1 Apol.* 28.1).[124] While demons feature prominently in the argument of both *Apologies*, their leader does not. The likeliest explanation for this "conspicuous absence" is that Justin tailors his *Apologies* to a Greco-Roman audience familiar with demons but not Satan.[125]

---

[121] So Bobichon, *Dialogue avec Tryphon*, 1:63-64. Miroslav Marcovich believes this lacuna was "huge" (*Iustini Martyris: Apologiae Pro Christianis. Iustini Martyris; Dialogus cum Tryphone* [Patristische Texte und Studien 38; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005], 5).

[122] In rabbinic literature, Satan is a seducer and accuser but not an apostate (see Gottfried Reeg, "The devil in rabbinic literature," in Fröhlich and Koskenniemi, *Evil and the Devil,* 71-83).

[123] So Daniel Boyarin, "Justin Martyr Invents Judaism," *CH* 70 [2001]: 452; Allert, *Revelation, Truth, Canon, and Interpretation*, 57. See n3 on Horner's reconstruction of an earlier "Trypho Text."

[124] Minns and Parvis regard *1 Apol.* 28 as "out of place in its present position" but still "a genuine fragment of Justin" (*Apologies*, 159n1). This passage obviously introduces Satan to a Greco-Roman audience: "For among us the leader of the evil demons is called Serpent and Satan and Devil, as indeed you may learn by searching our writings."

[125] James C. Pope, *The Power of Demons: Demonology in Justin Martyr's Apologetic* (Master's dissertation, Carleton University, 1993), 87-88. Erkki Koskenniemi investigates possible parallels to Satanology in first-century Greco-Roman culture, and concludes that "a concept similar to Satan was alien to traditional Greek thought" ("'For We are Unaware of His Schemes': Satan and Cosmological Dualism in the Gentile Mission," in Dochhorn, Rudnig-Zelt and Wold, *Das Böse*, 120). Satanology is notably absent from some other early Christian apologetic works directed at Gentiles, such as the *Apology of Aristides* and the apologetic portion of *Diognetus* (chs. 1-10; but cf. 12.3-8). Tertullian's *Apology,* like Justin's (as received), makes one passing reference to Satan (22.2). Athenagoras (*Leg.* 24-25) and Theophilus of Antioch (*ad Autol.* 2.28-29) weave Satanology into their apologetics more substantially.

Ptolemy's *Letter to Flora*, preserved by Epiphanius (*Pan.* 33.3.1-7.10), affords a first-hand glimpse of the early Valentinian school's theology. Ptolemy presupposes God's and the devil's existence, even offering an ontological description of the latter,[126] but is primarily concerned with demonstrating the existence of a third principle, an intermediate Demiurge, to whom he ascribes the Law of Moses. Ptolemy mentions and dismisses two other contemporary identifications of the legislator, namely God the Father and the devil (*Ep.* 3.2-6). The latter position is usually identified with Marcionism. Some scholars hold that Ptolemy's and Marcion's theologies were close,[127] and that (for that reason?) Ptolemy has misrepresented Marcion as identifying the creator as the devil.[128] This claim would indeed have been misrepresentative, since Marcion apparently regarded Satan only as *angelus creatoris* (Tertullian, *Marc.* 5.16.6, text in Evans, *Adversus Marcionem*, 2:612; cf. 5.12.7-8); but Ptolemy never makes this claim.[129] Ptolemy only construes his opponents' creator as a "god of corruption" (φθοροποιοῦ θεοῦ, *Ep.* 3.6; text in Quispel, *Ptolémée*, 48), which need not be the devil (notwithstanding that the devil, for Ptolemy, is characterized by φθορά). The fundamental theological difference between the two teachers was that Ptolemy's Demiurge was nearer the Father,[130] whereas Marcion's was nearer the devil. According to Tertullian, Marcion applied several canonical passages about Satan to the creator.[131] Marcion's gospel

---

[126] The adversary's "nature" (φύσις) is "bad and evil, characterized by injustice" (κακός τε καὶ πονηρὸς ἐν ἀδικίᾳ χαρακτηριαζόμενος), his "substance" (οὐσία) is "corruption and darkness" (φθορά τε καὶ σκότος) and he is "material and divided into many parts" (ὑλικὸς γὰρ οὗτος καὶ πολυσχιδής) (Ptol. *Ep.* 7.7; text in Quispel, *Ptolémée*, 66).

[127] So Winrich A. Löhr, "La doctrine de Dieu dans La Lettre à Flora de Ptolémée," *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 75 (1995): 188; Dunderberg, "The School of Valentinus," in *A Companion to Second-Century Christian 'Heretics',* ed. Antti Marjanen and Petri Luomanen (VCSup 76; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 78-79.

[128] Löhr, "La doctrine de Dieu," 188; cf. Quispel, *Ptolémée, 72.*

[129] For other arguments against misrepresentation see Moll, *Arch-Heretic Marcion,* 48-49.

[130] For Ptolemy, the Demiurge is neither good like God nor evil like the devil but "just" (*Ep.* 7.5). Moreover, Ptolemy seems to identify the Savior as a "demiurgic agent" (Einar Thomassen, *The Spiritual Seed: The Church of the 'Valentinians'* [NHS 60; Leiden: Brill, 2006], 122-24) or even as the Demiurge himself (Markschies, "Ptolemaeus Gnosticus," 240-43).

[131] These are Luke 11.21-22 (*Marc.* 4.26.12; 5.6.7), 2 Cor 4.4 (*Marc.* 5.11.9-11), 2 Cor 11.14 (*Marc.* 5.12.7) and Eph 6.11-12 (*Marc.* 5.18.12-13). Tertullian would add Luke 12.39 (*Marc.* 4.29.7), where he (mis)interprets the thief as Satan.

seems also to have omitted some important Satanological material.[132] Together these features suggest that Marcion's Demiurge partially supplanted his devil. As Russell infers, "If Satan has a superior in evil, then that superior is really the Devil. . .[thus] the evil creator god is Marcion's true Devil."[133]

CONCLUSION

Satanology is part of the supporting cast of theological motifs in early second-century Christianity just as in first-century Christianity. *Teufelsglaube* influenced the way Christians viewed their own inner selves, their perceived religious and political enemies, the cosmos and the anticipated (and/or realized) eschaton. It impacted their liturgical practices, their hermeneutical strategies and their theological debates. One must not overstate the importance of Satanology in early Christianity, but the disparity between ancient and contemporary Christian worldviews makes the opposite risk far greater. May this modest overview inspire further research into the early church's distinctively personal characterization of the ever-present problem of evil.

Thomas J. Farrar

Lecturer in Statistics

Cape Peninsula University of Technology

---

[132] Tertullian implies in *Marc.* 5.6.7 that Marcion's gospel lacked the wilderness temptation story (Luke 4.1-13) and the words Εἰσῆλθεν δὲ σατανᾶς εἰς in Luke 22.3 (Dieter T. Roth, *Towards a New Reconstruction of the Text of Marcion's Gospel: History of Research, Sources, Methodology, and the Testimony of Tertullian* [Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Edinburgh, 2009], 74, 245). While the former omission probably relates to Jesus' use of Torah rather than Satanology, the latter may reflect Marcion's intention to implicate the creator, rather than Satan, in Judas's betrayal. The only Satanological texts that were probably in Marcion's gospel correspond to Luke 11.15-20 (*Marc.* 4.26.11-12), 13.16 (Epiphanius, *Pan.* 42.11.6[39]) and 10.18-19 (*Marc.* 2.10.3; 4.24.9-12; cf. Roth, *Marcion's Gospel*, 262, whose reconstruction omits the Satanological material in 10.18 and 10.19b).

[133] Russell, *Satan*, 57-58. Tertullian calls the devil "the author of evils of sin and guilt" (*Marc.* 2.14.2, trans. Evans, *Adversus Marcionem*, 1:127; cf. 2.28.1). Marcion seems to have regarded the creator as the author of evil (Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.27.2; 3.12.12), but this may concern specific instances of evil rather than its origin (*Haer.* 4.28-30), since Marcion apparently regarded evil as uncreated (*Marc.* 1.15.5).