Hellenistic globalisation and the metanarrative of the logos

Abstract

Although characterized by the interaction between contemporary societies and cultures, globalization is a multivalenced phenomenon that can be identified at any point in history where these interactions result in a confluence of once disparate ideas, beliefs, and ways of life. This article will address that form of globalization that took place as a result of the conquests of Alexander the Great, termed ‘Hellenistic’ globalization herein. Rather than seeking out its exterior or material expressions, it will focus on the development of the metanarrative of the Logos within this Hellenistic framework, which, it will be argued, was conducive towards a unified perception of reality with existential significance. That this perception remains in stark contrast to contemporary globalization – which is void of strikingly existential interpretive methods such as the metanarrative – will be especially highlighted with reference to the appropriation of the concept of the Logos within the early Christian discourse.

Introduction

Contemporary globalization has ironically led to the devaluation of positive and holistic interpretive criteria, the consequences of which can be described as a general existential dilemma, exemplified by a growing 'external' narcissism nourished by a collective, 'internal' void. In response to this crisis,
this article will attempt to rehabilitate the metanarrative of the Logos that emerged in light of the Hellenistic ‘globalization’ initiated by Alexander the Great and was later adopted by the early Church. It will begin by addressing the aforementioned ‘devaluation’ before giving an account of the Hellenistic context of Alexandria within which the Jewish scriptures were translated and the metanarrative of the Logos emerged. Next, it will turn to the great thinker Philo, who not only extrapolated the concept of the Logos from the scriptures but expounded an intricate cosmology with the Logos at its centre. This will lead to an analysis of the unique valence given to the concept of the Logos in the Gospel according to St John, where this ancient cosmological principle was identified with a historical (and indeed, metahistorical) person, Jesus Christ, the Son of God. Finally, this article will demonstrate that the role of the incarnate Logos in the incipient Christian world-view, as reflected by the *Epistle to Diognetus* and in the writings of St Justin Martyr, can help to provide meaning and purpose – both on theoretical and personal levels – to our globalized, secular world.

**A barren utopia**

Economist Philippe Legrain (2003: 4) has defined globalization as ‘shorthand for how our lives are becoming increasingly intertwined with those of distant people and places around the world – economically, politically, and culturally’. In this sense it is not a novel phenomenon, irrespective of the specific means of communication currently at our disposal; what is new about globalization is this controversial term that expresses the scale to which this process takes place today, that is globally. Facilitating domestic and international relations through open markets and free trade; accelerating the methods and modes of communication and hence the exchange of information, globalization has been interpreted as promoting a trans-national/cultural reciprocity leading to integrity or ‘oneness’. Yet globalization in many ways seems to fall short of these Utopian promises. To this effect, its failure on a personal level has been described by historical theorist Keith Jenkins (2007: 74), who in his brief summary of the emergence of the postmodern mind, affirmed:

*In the open market [...] people too can take on the garb of objects, finding their value in external relationships. Similarly, private and public moralities*
are affected; ethics becomes personalised and narcissistic, a relative and free-wheeling affair of taste and style: 'You can be anything you like man!' 

In our globalized world, the tendency to become preoccupied with ascribing value to external objects is so great, that along with the prioritization of consumer choice there has also emerged an analogous prioritization – if not exaltation – of the consumer per se. This poses a dilemma for globalization’s promotion of ‘oneness’ insofar as this ‘exaltation of the consumer’ has encouraged the spread of a narcissistic attitude that is in fact antithetical to the effectuation of unity on a global scale. In any case, Jenkins framed this discussion of the financial impetus for globalization within the broader context of the dissolution of ideas in recent history, and, more specifically, the devaluation of positive interpretive frameworks in epistemological and methodological discourses, historical or otherwise (Jenkins 2007: 71-72). Concerning the latter, Jenkins, like Jean-François Lyotard (1979: xxiv) before him, spoke of the postmodern epoch as defined by ‘incredulity towards metanarratives’, those ‘great structuring (metaphysical) stories’ (Jenkins 2007: 71-72) that seek to give order, meaning and purpose to what we know and what we experience. In this capacity, metanarratives are replete with experiential import and can be used across a range of interpretive disciplines. Nevertheless, beginning with the ‘death of God’ – or the theological metanarrative – heralded by the brilliant yet equally tragic Friedrich Nietzsche in the nineteenth century (1882: 90), in the postmodern world the death of secular surrogates – idealist, Marxist, liberalist, et cetera – has also occurred (Jenkins 2007: 72), in the absence of which human beings have become more disposed to idolising external objects of experience. Moreover, the death of metanarratives has resulted in an internal vacuum, the consequences of which can be seen in our society’s desperation to achieve exterior/superficial forms of perfection at any cost.

This shallow ideological framework, which is scarce in positive interpretive criteria such as the metanarrative, can be viewed as precipitating the dissolution of cultural, ideological, and personal integrity on particular levels. At the beginning of this article I stated that globalization is not a new phenomenon. I would like to propose that what distinguishes today’s globalization from the incremental advances in inter-national/cultural relations in the past is that ancient, medieval, and early modern societies
alike, employed (and were hence conditioned by) holistic metanarratives that promoted universal integrity and were existentially significant. One such metanarrative emerged as an outcome of that period of Hellenistic 'globalization' facilitated by Alexander the Great, the locus of which was the city that still bears his name.

Hellenistic globalization and Philo of Alexandria

In the first century BC, one of the main philosophical expressions of the Hellenic mind was Middle Platonism; a movement characterized by its practitioners' endeavours to eclectically synthesize the ideas of Plato, the Peripatetics, and the Stoics into various homogeneous worldviews (Dillon 1977: 94). This eclecticism was a manifestation of the integration of culture, religion and philosophy that had taken place on a broad scale since Alexander's conquests (fourth century BC) which disseminated Hellenism throughout the Middle East and Central Asia, resulting in an amalgamation of Greek thought with local traditions and customs, and the establishment of the Greek language as the koine or lingua franca. Indeed, the philosophy that developed in this period conventionally comes under the umbrella title of Hellenistic philosophy. The core of this Hellenistic 'globalization' was Alexandria, which quickly became one of the most important centres of trade in the ancient world. As such, it accommodated a melting pot of ideas, some of which were endearing to the Jewish diaspora that was itself quite extensive and had been established in Egypt as early as the Babylonian exile in the sixth century BC (Aitken 2000: 81). Some of the more educated members of the Alexandrian Jewish community, attracted as they were by Greek thought, felt compelled to present their faith to this thoroughly Hellenised society, and the greatest example of this endeavour was the translation of the Torah, the first five books of the Hebrew scriptures attributed to Moses, into koine or common Greek (Marcos 1998: 18). This translation came to be known as the Septuagint, meaning seventy in Latin, because of a legend concerning its origins surrounding King Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285–246 BC) which is preserved in the pseudepigraphical Letter of Aristeas. In this letter, the king was said to have commissioned seventy-two Jewish scholars from Jerusalem to translate the scriptures. Completing their task in its entirety in precisely seventy-two days, they were lavishly rewarded by the king, who deposited the
work in the great library of Alexandria (Dines 2004: 28). The legend, which is extant in various versions, was undoubtedly an attempt at apologetics; it endeavoured to establish the compatibility between Hellenism and Judaism (Marcos 1998: 43).

The historical details concerning this translation process remain a matter of scholarly debate. Nevertheless, the translation of the Hebrew scriptures made them accessible to those who could read Greek. The translators moreover used Hellenistic concepts that may have influenced the development of the deuterocanonical texts that were incorporated into the Septuagint as it was being compiled. One such example is the term Logos, which was first given ontological veracity by the pre-Socratic philosopher Heraclitus in the sixth/fifth centuries BC (Copleston 2006: 43). Since then, the term has more or less signified a universal or all-encompassing rational force that gives order, meaning and purpose to everything that exists, thereby performing the function of an ontological metanarrative. In the apocryphal Wisdom of Solomon the Logos is depicted as joined together with Sophia, the Greek term for wisdom, as God’s agents in the creation of the universe (Winslow 1998: 688): ‘O God of my fathers and Lord of mercy, who has made all things by his Logos and by thy Sophia has formed man...’ (Wis 9:1-2). The use of these concepts meant that the scriptures were now open to various philosophical interpretations, and Philo of Alexandria (20 BC-50 AD), a Jew versed in both the Greek language and Hellenistic philosophy attempted such an interpretation in an endeavour similar to that of the writer of the Letter of Aristeas. Using allegory, he tried to reconcile the scriptures, to which he was committed, with his Middle Platonic presuppositions. Nowhere is this more evident than in his synthesis of their respective world-views, wherein the Logos – the penultimate organizational, and hence metanarrational force in the Greek vocabulary – played a pivotal role.

Though paradoxically transcendent on account of his inherent unknowability, for Philo God is nevertheless immanent due to the fact that he reveals himself, a revelation which is manifested in the creation of heaven and earth. Philo posited a dualistic cosmology consistent with the Middle Platonic tradition; for him, matter was dissociated from the spiritual realm. Reflecting the Platonic cosmogenesis, he affirmed that the material world is based on an ideal, spiritual pattern or world of the forms that he located, not within God
himself – who as we mentioned was for him completely transcendent – but in God’s image or spoken expression that he identified with the Logos. Created before the organization of the material world, the Logos, as God’s ‘true Word and Firstborn Son [τὸν ὁρθὸν αὐτοῦ λόγον καὶ πρωτόγονον υἱόν]’ (Philo, On Husbandry 12, at 134-35) was in fact, like the Platonic Demiurge, responsible for the organization of matter. Harry Austryn Wolfson suggested that in Philo we can conceptually distinguish between two invariably linked stages in the generation of the Logos; first, it existed from eternity in the mind of God and it was then created, becoming a ‘real incorporeal being and used by God as an instrument, or rather a plan, in the creation of the world’ (Wolfson 1976: 177). The Logos, in what we will arbitrarily call the second stage of its existence, contains within itself the divine ideas or forms upon which all of the particular things in the material universe are modelled and organized. This means that it contains within itself the world of the forms and is hence analogous with the Stoic concept of a universal Logos containing within itself the seminal principles (λόγοι σπερματικοί) that guide the development of all the particular things in the universe (a concept which Philo employed). This, however, must be elucidated. The Logos is indeed akin to God insofar as it is his first born. But Wolfson also distinguished a third stage in the existence of the Logos in Philo’s thought, when it was implanted within the world and as an immanent Logos ‘acts as the instrument of divine providence within it’ (Wolfson 1976: 177). Thus, whilst forever transcending the material world as God’s image, the Logos is simultaneously immanent in the matter that it organizes. Articulated cosmologically, the Logos in Philo also functions on a personal level insofar as the human soul is endowed with its own logos spermatikos orientating it towards good in spite of the body’s disposition towards passions or aberrant, irrational behaviour (Philo, Allegorical Interpretation of Genesis III 51, at 403). For Philo, the human being, endowed with the logos spermatikos, is called to union with the universal Logos via ascetical exercises and contemplation of the scriptures that ease the path of the soul towards divine inspiration (Philo, Who is the Heir of Divine Things 14, at 316-17).

We can see that this period of Hellenistic ‘globalization’ resulting in the cross-cultural synthesis between the Greek mind and Hebraic tradition provided fertile ground for the articulation of a world-view that transcended
cultural boundaries; a world-view with the Logos at its centre. The Logos, as an interpretive prism akin to the metanarrative, not only endeavoured to give order, meaning and purpose to the immediate cultural or historical circumstances, but to the entire cosmos and all that it contained. But perhaps the most profoundly existential formulation of the concept of the Logos did not emerge until the end of the first century AD, with the advent of the Christian Church. For it was during Philo's lifetime that Jesus Christ preached his Gospel of salvation in Judaea and the surrounding countryside, proclaiming that he was, in fulfilment of the Old Testament scriptures, the Son of God.

**Christianity's metanarrative of the Logos**

The Christ experience, which set the precedent for the exposition of the metanarrative of the 'incarnate' Logos, was interpreted in various ways, which are extant – at least from the immediate context – in the form of epistolary correspondences and Gospel narratives. We will concern ourselves exclusively with the Gospel traditionally attributed to St John. Written in *koine* Greek – that form of the language that emerged from Alexander's Hellenistic 'globalization' – the prologue to the Gospel reads as follows:

_In the beginning was the Word [Logos], and the Word was towards God, and the Word was God [Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν καὶ θεός ἦν ὁ λόγος]. He was in the beginning towards God. All things came into being through him, and without him not one thing came into being. What has come into being in him was life, and the life was the light of all people. The light shines in the darkness, and the darkness did not overcome it. [...] And the Word became flesh and lived among us, and we have seen his glory, the glory as of a Father's only Son, full of grace and truth (Jn 1: 1-5, 14-15)._

The Johannine concept of the Logos was revolutionary. For the author of the Gospel, the Logos or Son of God the Father became incarnate as the person of Jesus Christ, who from the outset was considered as both divine and human, although the relationship between his two natures would take centuries to articulate. Pre-existing his assumption of the human flesh in Christ, the Logos, insofar as he is also described as God, is personalised both before and after his incarnation. In other words, the pre-existent Logos is paradoxically identical to the transcendent God whilst simultaneously having
his own existence, for he is described both as God and ‘in the beginning towards God’,\textsuperscript{10} where ‘towards’ implies a personal relationship. Moreover, in a manner consistent with the Middle Platonic and Philonic traditions, the Logos is described in a cosmic sense as having brought all things into being. But in St John’s Gospel there is no further elaboration; the Logos, as the agent of creation, is simply identified with God on the one hand, and with Christ on the other. Indeed, the role and function of the Logos – both in his pre-incarnate and incarnate modes of being – would only begin to emerge as the Church developed its own unique world-view, which along with its Hebraic antecedents, continued to appropriate and transfigure the conceptual apparatus of Hellenistic philosophy from the perspective of the Christ experience. I would like to take a look at two examples of the role of the Logos in this incipient Christian world-view. The first is from an anonymous apology entitled the \textit{Epistle to Diognetus} – variously dated to the late second/early third centuries AD – which illustrates its significance on a cosmic scale. Containing a lengthy exposition on the character of Christian life, the seventh chapter of the \textit{Epistle} (Epistle to Diognetus 7, at 144–45) reads:

\begin{quote}
But the truly all-powerful God himself, creator of all and invisible, set up and established in their hearts the truth and the holy word [Logos] from heaven, which cannot be comprehended by humans [\textit{\'\'Αλλὰ\ άντις άληθώς ο παντοκράτωρ καὶ παντοκτιστής καὶ άδρατος θεός, αύτος άπ’ ούρανών τήν Ἀλήθειαν καὶ τόν Δόγον τόν άγνον καὶ άπερινότητον άνθρώπου ενίδρυσε καὶ έγκατεστήριξε ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν}. To do so, he did not, as one might suppose, send them one of his servants or an angel or a ruler or any of those who administer earthly activities or who are entrusted with heavenly affairs, but he sent the craftsman and maker of all things himself, by whom he created the heavens, by whom he enclosed the sea within its own boundaries, whose mysteries all the elements of creation guard faithfully, from whom the sun was appointed to guard the courses that it runs during the day, whom the moon obeys when he commands it to shine at night, whom the stars obey by following the course of the moon, by whom all things are set in order and arranged and put into subjection, the heavens and the things in the heavens, the earth and the things in the earth, the sea and the things in the sea, fire, air, the abyss, creatures in between – this is the one he sent to them.
\end{quote}

Beyond global considerations and cultural boundaries, the Logos of
God is here depicted as the Demiurge of the entire universe, establishing the boundaries for all of its delicately interwoven aspects. But there is also a very immanent and hence personal dimension to the Logos, who is described as established in the hearts of human beings – ἐγκατεστήμενος ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν. Indeed, this personal dimension is perhaps articulated in a more nuanced way by St Justin Martyr (d. 165 AD), a Palestinian convert versed in Hellenistic philosophy and apologist of the persecuted Church in the Roman Empire. Trying to explain how Jesus Christ is God, yet distinct from God the Father, he did so in terms of the transcendence of the ineffable Father and the immanence of the first-begotten Son and Logos who remains present in the creation that he has brought into being, but who, as an intermediary agent, is hierarchically subordinated to the Father. Responding in his First Apology to the common objection that since Christ came so late in time the Christian faith must be a novelty, the saint attempted to establish the historical priority of Christianity, maintaining that whatever wisdom is reflected in the Greek philosophers has been derived from their contact with the Hebrew scriptures.

... everything that both philosophers and poets have said concerning the immortality of the soul, or punishments after death, or contemplation of heavenly things, or doctrines like these, they have received such hints from the prophets as have enabled them to understand and expound these things. And hence there seem to be seeds of truth among all people [ὅτεν παρὰ πάσιν σπέρματα ἅληθέως δοξαὶ εἰναὶ]; but they are proved not to have understood them accurately when they contradict each other. (St Justin Martyr, The First Apology 44, at 53–54. PG6 396AB)

Despite the inherent difficulties with demonstrating the familiarity of the philosophers with the works of the prophets, what we can discern here is that, much like Philo, St Justin attempted to reconcile Greek philosophy with the Hebrew scriptures. But instead of establishing some sort of superficial compatibility between the two, the saint used the Stoic/Philonic concept of the logoi spermatikoi in order to demonstrate that all people are capable of participating in the Logos insofar as these same logoi are communicated through the Hebrew scriptures. John Behr (2001: 108) restricted St Justin’s use of the logoi spermatikoi to the scriptures themselves, but it is clear from the saint’s Second Apology that, for him, human beings were – much like in Philo – constituted by the particular rational seeds of the universal Logos.
who guides and arranges the cosmos. Indeed, Eric Osbourne (2008: 97–99) interpreted St Justin as putting forward three ‘elements’ in the human person’s constitution; body, soul, and *logos* (*spermatikos*), which is tantamount to reason. In St Justin there is therefore a threefold relationship between the Logos who governs the universe, the *logoi* through which the former has constituted all the particular facets of the universe (especially in the ‘rational faculty’ of human beings), and the *logoi* transmitted in the scriptures. But although he seems to imply that all who lived before the incarnation of Christ – despite their endowment with the *logoi* – were dependent on the prophets and unable to grasp the truth completely, St Justin’s overall disposition towards the ancient philosophers could not have been more positive.

But lest some, reasoning absurdly, with a view to refuting what we teach, should maintain that we say that Christ was born a hundred and fifty years ago under Cyrenius, and somewhat later, under Pontius Pilatus, taught what we say He taught, and should object as though all people who were born before Him were not accountable – let us anticipate and solve the difficulty. We have been taught that Christ is the First-born of God, and we have suggested above that He is the logos of whom every race of men and women were partakers [τὸν Χριστὸν πρωτότοκον τοῦ θεοῦ εἶναι ἐδιδάχθημεν καὶ προεμπήσαμεν λόγον δόντα, οὗ πάν γένος ἀνθρώπων μετέσχε]. And they who lived with the logos are Christians, even though they have been thought atheists; as, among the Greeks, Socrates and Heraclitus, and people like them ... (St Justin Martyr, The First Apology 46, at 55. PG6 397C).

Giving examples principally from amongst the Greeks, St Justin was here asserting that all those who have lived according to reason before the incarnation of the Son and Logos nevertheless participated in this same Logos through whom all things were created. This means that they were able to live and think, albeit unconsciously, as Christians before Christ, and points to the fact that the metanarrative of the incarnate Logos encompasses all those persons who actively strive towards reason, to be understood in this context as analogous with virtue.

**Conclusion**

Whilst preaching cultural/national integrity, globalization – often a narcissistic phenomenon – has paradoxically accompanied and exacerbated
the death of holistic interpretive frameworks or metanarratives, which, despite their rejection by postmodernism, do in fact attempt to produce such integration. On a personal level, this has resulted in an internal vacuum that manifests itself in an obsessive preoccupation with exterior objects and forms. The metanarrative of the Logos, arising from the Hellenistic globalization of the ancient world, transcends cultural boundaries by teaching us that there is a rational meaning, order, and purpose to the entire universe. This concept of the Logos, which had existed, in a Greek context, since the pre-Socratics, was reconciled to the Hebraic world-view with Philo of Alexandria, who advocated both its universal and personal dimensions (i.e. through the Logos and the logoi spermatikoi, respectively). Although, for the sake of brevity, we have not explored the extent of Philo’s influence on early Christian thinkers, what is significant for this article is that this process of Hellenistic globalization paved the way for the appropriation of this term by the Christian Church. Beginning with the Gospel according to St John that identified the Logos both as God and as the distinct person of Jesus Christ, with the Epistle to Diognetus we have seen a nuanced interpretation of his role in both the creation of the universe and human beings, within whose hearts he has established himself. When read in tandem with St Justin Martyr’s teaching, namely that all persons are endowed with the logoi spermatikoi that allow them to participate in the universal Logos, the profound existential message of this Christian metanarrative becomes strikingly evident. I have stressed that the death of metanarratives in our globalized world has resulted in an internal vacuum. In teaching that all persons are endowed with the Logos (or logoi), which has been established in their hearts and minds, both the Epistle and St Justin are filling this vacuum with their implication that all people are endowed with the potential to recover their natural propensity to be Christ-like. Moreover, St Justin’s suggestion that those who lived by the Logos before his incarnation are in fact Christians opens up remarkable potential for dialogues in ecumenism, pluralism and transdisciplinarity. These are avenues that all Christian denominations should consider when addressing the secularization of our globalized world, the pervasiveness of which can be attributed to our increasing neglect of the one through whom all things have been established, and who has established himself ‘in our hearts’ (Epistle to Diognetus 7, at 144–45); the incarnate Logos of God, Jesus Christ.
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Notes

1 I have recently published an article that both elicits and constructs a theological metanarrative from the writings of the fourth century Cappadocian father of the Church, St Gregory the Theologian. It begins with an assessment of the dissolution of metanarratives and the analogous rise of skepticism/nihilism in contemporary historiography. Cf. 'The Meaning of History: Insights from St Gregory the Theologian's Existential Metanarrative' *Colloquium* 43:1 (2011): 17-38. A shorter version of this article, focusing exclusively on St Gregory's metanarrative, has also been published in *Phronema* 26:2 (2011): 63-79.

2 In focusing on the Hellenistic context, I do not mean to imply that a concept resembling that of the Logos did not already exist in the Egyptian or Semitic cultures that predated the advent of Hellenism (or the Hellenisation of the former represented by Alexandria). The ancient Egyptians, for instance, believed in *ma'at*, which was there from the beginning of existence as an all-embracing principle of order. The Mesopotamian equivalent was a belief in the *mes*; principles of order distributed at the beginning of time by the highest god to his children [somehow corresponding to the later Greek view of the *logoi*] (Cohn 1993: 9-10, 35). The contribution of the Greeks, whilst extremely significant, must not be overstated at the expense, or neglect, of these pre-existing cultures that unfortunately cannot be addressed in this article.

3 I selected the *Epistle to Diognetus* and the works of St Justin Martyr because the views on the Logos expressed therein are generally representative of the early Church's disposition. Word restraints prevented me from consulting the works of other apologetic figures, such as, for instance, St Irenaeus of Lyons (d. 202 AD), whose views on the Pauline concept of the *ἀνακεφαλαίωσις* or recapitulation of all things in Christ (Eph 1:10) has further implications for globalization, summarized in the belief that 'human existence finds its exemplar in the humanity of the incarnate Christ in whom the human race is unified.' (Clark 1998: 588). These implications,
unfortunately cannot be addressed here.

4 Legrain admitted that ‘Globalisation is blurring the borders between nation states.’ But he went on to affirm that this process ‘is neither uniform nor universal. Talk of a “borderless world” or the “end of the nation state”, the titles of two books by Kenichi Ohmae, a Japanese management guru, is nonsense.’ (Legrain 2003: 7-8).

5 Michel Foucault affirmed that before the nineteenth century (and thereby including ancient, medieval, and early modern societies), history was conceived ‘as a vast historical stream, uniform in each of its points, drawing with it in one and the same current, in one and the same fall or ascension, or cycle, all men, and with them things and animals, every living or inert being, even the most unmoved aspects of the earth.’ (Foucault 2008: 401).


7 In formulating his two-stage cosmogony, Philo compared God to an architect, who before building a city (i.e. the material world), sketches out in his mind the ideal patterns (akin to the Platonic forms). Subsequently, the architect keeps ‘his eye upon this pattern’ whilst ‘making the visible and intangible objects correspond in each case to the incorporeal ideas’ (Philo, On the Creation 4, at 16-17). Continuing the analogy of the architect, Philo went on to locate these ‘incorporeal ideas’ in the Logos: ‘As then, the city which was fashioned beforehand within the mind of the architect held no place in the outer world, but had been engraved in the soul of the artificer by a seal; even so the universe that consisted of ideas would have no other location than the Divine Reason, which was the Author of this ordered frame [οὐδὲ ἐκ τῶν ἱδεῶν κόσμως ἄλλων ἄν ἐχω ὀόπον ἢ τὸν θεοῦ λόγον τὸν ταύτα τα διακοσμήσαντα].’ (Philo, On the Creation 4, at 16-17).

8 Cf. note 7.

9 Philo described these logoi spermatikoi when, in illustrating the outcome of the human being’s propensity towards irrational behaviour, he remarked the following: ‘then it is that the soul experiences the breaking up of the right principle [logos], the principle that is the seed whence all noble things are begotten [διαπίπτει γάρ τόσο ἡ ψυχή καὶ ὁ σπερματικός καὶ γενετικός τῶν καλῶν λόγων φύσεως].’ Philo, Allegorical Interpretation of Genesis III 51, at 402-03.

10 The unity of the Father and the Son is expressed in many instances throughout this Gospel, such as in John 5:19 where Jesus says: ‘Very truly, I tell you, the Son can do nothing on his own, but only what he sees the Father doing; for whatever the Father does, the Son does likewise,’ and again in John 17:21 when he prays ‘that they may all be one, as you Father are in me and I in you.’

11 John Behr criticized St Justin for adhering to the common philosophical presupposition of his day, namely that the Father is wholly transcendent and is therefore disclosed through an intermediary, the Word or Logos (Behr2001: 103-04). Accusing the saint of ontological subordinationism, he focused his criticism on Chapters 60 and 127 of the Dialogue with Trypho, in which St Justin argued that it was not the Father who appeared to the Patriarchs of the Old Testament, but the Son. But Behr overlooked the fact that, in his use of typological hermeneutics, the saint not only implicitly refuted the common objection that Christ only came recently in time (cf. note 12), but he also displayed his concern to mount a Christian apology for Jewish audiences by arguing that Christ is the source of both covenants, the Old and the New. Moreover, St Justin’s use of Middle Platonic terminology is clearly an attempt at apologetic when read in light of his statements concerning the unity of will between the Father and the Son; statements which obviate any ontological subordinationism. The following passage from the Dialogue aptly demonstrates both the saint’s apologetic intentions and the fact that any subordinationism found in his writings should be considered hierarchical (i.e. with reference to position), as opposed to ontological (i.e. with reference to being). ‘Thus, neither Abraham, nor Isaac, nor Jacob, nor any other man saw the Father and Ineffable Lord of all creatures and of Christ Himself, but (they saw) Him who, according to God’s will, is God the Son, and His Angel because He served the Father’s will [...καὶ Θεόν ὑπ’ Τινὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἄγγελον ἐκ τοῦ ἐπιτεθῶν τῇ γνώσῃ αὐτοῦ]; Him who, by his
12 On pages 106-107 of the first volume of his *Formation of Christian Theology*, John Behr outlined St Justin’s views on the *logos spermatikos* as implanted in people by the Son and Logos, Jesus Christ. Behr then contradicted both his own assertion and the saint’s by claiming that ‘if human beings posses a “seed of the Word,” it is not as a natural property implanted in them. It is rather, as [Edwards] specifies, through encountering the words expressing the *Logos spermatikos*, Christ, that some have received these seeds.’ (Behr 2001: 108–09). However, one need only read Chapter 8 of St Justin’s *Second Apology*, where he made it plain that human beings are implanted (ἐ επικουρότητα του λόγου) with the ‘seed of the logos (σπέρμα τοῦ λόγου)’ whilst also hinting at a distinction between those who live by ‘part of the logos’ – i.e. those who came before Christ – and those who, coming after, live according to the ‘whole logos, who is Christ.’ (St Justin Martyr, *The Second Apology* 8, at 79. PG6 457A). I am grateful to Chris Baghos for notifying me of this discrepancy in Behr’s work.

13 St Justin made the relationship between the universal Logos and the logoi spermatikoi especially clear in chapter 8 of his Second Apology: ‘And those of the Stoic school, since they were honourable at least in their ethical teaching, as were also the poets in some particulars, on account of a seed of the logos (διὰ τοῦ ἐμφύτου παιντέ ψυχής ἀνθρώπων σπέρμα τοῦ λόγου) implanted in every race of men and women, were, we know, hated and put to death, as for instance Heraclitus mentioned before […] And it is not astonishing that the demons are proved to cause those to be much worse hated who lived not by a part of the logos, the Sower, but by the knowledge and contemplation of the whole logos, who is Christ.’ (St Justin Martyr, *The Second Apology* 8, at 79. PG6 457A).

14 In fact, Osbourne distinguished two anthropologies in the St Justin’s thought. In the first – which is to be found in the *Dialogue with Trypho* – the saint described the human being as body, soul, and spirit, but in the *Second Apology* he replaces spirit (ἔστιν εἰς τοὺς σπερματικοὺς) with *logos spermatikos*. Cf. Osbourne2008: 97–99.

15 That living according to the Logos is tantamount to living according to virtue is made clear by St Justin when he juxtaposed the righteous pagans who lived by the logos and the unrighteous who, incited by the demons, would persecute them (i.e. their righteous counterparts). Cf. St Justin Martyr, *The First Apology* 46, at 55. PG6 397C and St Justin Martyr, *The Second Apology* 8, at 79. PG6 457A.