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**Introduction**

Some people interested in ecclesiastical and theological matters believe that the risk posed to Orthodoxy because of its participation in inter-Christian and inter-religious dialogues lies either in the dogmatic minimalism and relativism or in the confessional and religious syncretism. This is why the solution they proposed to avoid the above risk is to deny the participation of Orthodoxy in those dialogues. However, such a proposal is totally unacceptable from an orthodox point of view, not only because it denies the nature and salvific mission of Orthodoxy in the world, but also because it does not coincide with the orthodox patristic practice and tradition.

The theological example offered by the philosopher and martyr Justin on the basis of the concept of the “spermatic word”, as well as the eclectic attitude of St. Basil the Great and other Fathers of the Church towards Greek philosophy, who essentially continue the practical dimension of Justin's theology of the “spermatic word”, offer a fully satisfactory solution to the above problem. But let us first examine the concept of the “spermatic word” in Justin's theology, in order to understand then its importance for inter-Christian and inter-religious dialogues.

1. **The concept of the “spermatic word” in the theology of Justin the philosopher and martyr**

It is well-known that Justin received the concept of the “spermatic word” from the vocabulary of Stoic philosophy[[1]](#footnote-1). However, the context in which this concept was used in his theology has nothing to do with stoicism.

In stoic philosophy the “spermatic word” is conceived either as the universal divine word, which is inherently a fire spirit within matter, constituting the intra-cosmic logical principle and power of the world that creates, penetrates and lawfully retains all individual beings[[2]](#footnote-2), or as the individual reason, which is inherent in all individual beings which as parts of the world enclose a corresponding part of the universal word in themselves[[3]](#footnote-3). In this sense, all spermatic words inherent in individual beings are embodied in the universal divine word and are fragmentary manifestations of it[[4]](#footnote-4). Particularly in man, the spermatic word, which as part of the universal word penetrates and retains his body, is not in the Stoic perception no other than his own soul[[5]](#footnote-5). Thus, the man essentially represents the entire world, constituting a microcosm, since all the world is understood as a body that is animated and retained by the universal world. In this regard, the meaning of the Stoic spermatic word, especially at a purely anthropological level, is, as we admittedly perceive, inextricably linked to a particular pantheism that marks in general the entire Stoic philosophy.

On the contrary, according to Justin, the “spermatic word” has nothing to do with the universal word or pantheism of the Stoic philosophy; it rather refers to the Word of God, who is being spoken of in the preamble of John’s Gospel[[6]](#footnote-6). Thus, the “spermatic word” is for him the inherent power of the Word of God that exists in and acts upon every man without exception, illuminating his consciousness and his intellect and guiding him to the partial discovery of truth[[7]](#footnote-7). Here, in other words, the basis upon which Justin develops his teaching of the spermatic word is not stoic, but totally biblical, related to the Johannine teaching of the Word. He merely uses Stoic terminology to highlight the Johannine concept, according to which the illuminating energy of the Word in the world is not exclusively limited to Christians, but extends to all people, since the Word according to John is "the true light ... which enlightens every man coming into the world " (*John* 1, 9) and not only Christians[[8]](#footnote-8).

In order to render this position more comprehensive, we must bear in mind that Justin's dependence on the Gospel of John, despite the fact that he refers only indirectly to it once[[9]](#footnote-9), as argued by a large number of researchers, is very narrow[[10]](#footnote-10). There is such an intense effect of John’s Gospel on Justin’s thought that A. Thoma, as early as the middle of the nineteenth century, leads to the conclusion that Justin “knows and uses almost every chapter of the Gospel of the Word, and in fact in its fullness”[[11]](#footnote-11). Along the same lines G. Volkmar emphasizes that Justin's theology about the pre-existing Son and Word of God is basically the same as that of the fourth Gospel, which is the only one that responds so much to the way of his thinking[[12]](#footnote-12). As also noted by the ever memorable Professor A. Theodorou, when referring specifically to the relationship between the teaching of John and the theology of Justin, “From the times of the holy John the Evangelist, Justin was the eldest ecclesiastical writer, who first developed and dealt with the theology of the Word in more detailed way. However, speaking of God the Word, he does not appear introducing a new teaching, but he speaks of a faith already known in the Christian circles of his time. Justin derives his teaching about God the Word directly from the Holy Scripture and ecclesiastical tradition”[[13]](#footnote-13). In an article on the same topic Theodorou notes the following: “The meaning of the Word and his role was already provided to him (i.e. to Justin) by the preamble of the fourth Gospel. If he used philosophical perceptions to make this teaching more understandable to his readers, this does not in any way mean, according to Goodenough's proper observation[[14]](#footnote-14), that these perceptions constituted the soul of this teaching, being merely the outer wrapping of his faith”[[15]](#footnote-15).

Therefore, if the Logos theology of Justin derives, according to the experts, from the Logos teaching of John, which is mainly developed in the preamble of his Gospel, we may argue that it is not possible for Justin’s teaching of the “spermatic divine word”, inextricably tied to His Logos theology[[16]](#footnote-16), to have any other source of origin than the preamble of *John’s Gospel*. Besides, we must bear in mind that Justin, in spite of the philosophical, i.e. Stoic, terminology he uses, is a biblical theologian *par excellence*, as becomes evident especially in his *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew[[17]](#footnote-17)*. This is precisely why His Beatitude the Archbishop of Albania Anastasios Giannoulatos argues that when Justin speaks of the “spermatic word”, although he uses the philosophical terminology of his time, he followes the path that the evangelist John had already opened in the preamble of his Gospel referring to the Word[[18]](#footnote-18). And it should be noted in this regard that there is no more suitable passage in the preamble of *John’s Gospel*, which Justin might use as the basis and starting point for the development of his teaching about the “spermatic word”, than the passage of *John* 1, 9 (“He was the true light that enlightens every man coming into the world”), which highlights, in a straightforward way, the illuminating presence and effect of the Word to all human beings without exception. Regardless of whether the phrase “coming into the world” is referring to "true light" or to "every man", it is important that in both cases the Word as the “true light”, as thus stated, “enlightens every man”. From this point of view, as the above-mentioned Archbishop of Albania very aptly remarks, the above cited passage of St. John establishes “the Christological foundation for a proper understanding of the highest religious inspirations of humanity”[[19]](#footnote-19).

Therefore, based on these facts, Justin supports the view that all truths adopted by the pre-Christian humanity are essentially products of the illuminating energy and presence of the spermatic divine Word who indiscriminately acts to all people, since of course he is not obscured by their passions and desires[[20]](#footnote-20). As he states, “For whatever either lawgivers or philosophers uttered well, they elaborated by finding and contemplating some part of the Word”[[21]](#footnote-21). Thus, not only the truths of the Old Testament, but also the truths of Greek antiquity are closely related to the revelatory presence and effect of the Word. But while in the time of the Old Testament the Word acted in a revelatory way and directly to the Patriarchs and the Prophets as the fleshless Word[[22]](#footnote-22), in Greek antiquity he acted indirectly as the spermatic word through the various philosophers, poets and writers. For this reason all truths formulated by the Greek philosophers, poets and writers, because they are precisely due to the effect of the spermatic divine word, can ultimately be regarded as Christian truths[[23]](#footnote-23). As Justin very characteristically points out, that is “not because the teachings of Plato are different from those of Christ, but because they are not in all respects similar, as neither are those of the others, Stoics, and poets, and historians. For each man spoke well in proportion to the share he had of the spermatic divine word, seeing what was related to it”[[24]](#footnote-24). That is why he concludes without hesitation: “Whatever things were rightly said among all men, are the property of us Christians”[[25]](#footnote-25). This position is not arbitrary nor is it the result of a latent theological syncretism, but it is a consistent conclusion of Justin’s theology for the function and effect of the spermatic word to all human beings without exception. Since all philosophers and writers of pre-Christian humanity, according to his above statement, have been able to see and conceive certain truths, albeit vaguely, through the existing spermatic divine word within them or, as he *verbatim* says, “through the sowing of the implanted word that was in them”*[[26]](#footnote-26)*, these truths may be not considered foreign to the Christian faith, in which there is the complete revelation of the truth on the part of the incarnated Word.

In this sense, he argues that all those who lived in the pre-Christian antiquity according to the commands of the Word, i.e. not only the men of the Old Testament who accepted the revelation of the fleshless Word, but also the Greek philosophers guided by the spermatic divine word, can be considered as Christians, even if they were considered by their contemporaries to be atheists. As he characteristically says, “those who lived reasonably (according to the word) are Christians, even though they have been thought atheists, as, among the Greeks, Socrates and Heraclitus, and men like them, and among the barbarians, Abraham, and Ananias, and Azarias, and Misael, and Elias, and many others whose actions and names we now decline to recount, because we know it would be tedious”[[27]](#footnote-27).

However, the fullness of the revelation of divine truths exists according to Justin only in Christianity, which in itself is the only “safe and profitable” philosophy[[28]](#footnote-28). This is because the teaching of the Word is preserved in its fullness and authenticity only in Christianity, since the Word did not act in history merely as a spermatic word, leading people only to the partial discovery of the truth, but He was fully revealed as incarnated Word in the face of Jesus Christ, leading His faithful in the fullness and authenticity of the truth He revealed. Moreover, as Justin states, the “spermatic word” in relation to the fullness of God's Word is only “seed ... and imitation” of the divine Word given to people by grace and in proportion of their strength, so that they can in this way participate in a faint and imitative way in the revealed truth of the incarnated Word of God in Christ[[29]](#footnote-29). That is why the teaching of Christian faith is for him far superior in relation to the teaching of Greek philosophy and intellect[[30]](#footnote-30). But this does not mean that Greek philosophy and thought should be discarded, just because it does not have the fullness of Christian revelation. On this point Justin is absolutely clear.

Besides, it is undisputed that Justin's positive assessment of Greek philosophy and Hellenism in general, based on the theology of the “spermatic word”, though original and unique in its formulation, is of enormous significance for the creative evolution and course of the functional relationship between Christianity and Hellenism in history. And this despite the fact that there were quite contradictory and exclusive trends coming both from his contemporaneous Tatian in the East and from his a little posterior Tertullian in the West, trying, each one from his own perspective and in his own way, to torpedo any relationship between Christianity and Hellenism. As it is known, although Tatian recognizes the importance of Justin's personality, calling him "most admirable" («θαυμασιώτατος»)[[31]](#footnote-31), he differentiates himself from him, accusing all ancient Greek philosophers and poets and rejecting the value of Greek philosophy and intellect[[32]](#footnote-32). The same is also sought on the side of Tertullian in the West, arguing that there is neither a common point between Athens and Jerusalem, nor an agreement between the Platonic Academy and the Church[[33]](#footnote-33), considering moreover all philosophers - even Plato - as the patriarchs of heresies[[34]](#footnote-34). However, despite these extreme and exclusive positions, the above positive assessment of Hellenism by Justin, based on his theology of the “spermatic word”, was not only the beginning of the rapprochement between Christianity and Hellenism, undertaken in the next century by the Alexandrian theologians Clement and Origen, but also the starting point for the combination of Christianity and Hellenism, something that was achieved by the Cappadocian Fathers. Particularly, the eclectic attitude and practice towards the Greek philosophy recommended by St. Basil the Great in his address *To young men on the right use of Greek literature*[[35]](#footnote-35), if it does not presuppose Justin's theology of the “spermatic word”, is in full harmony with it. Besides in his work *The Longer Monastic Rules* he seems to be well-aware of the notion of the “spermatic word”, making good and appropriate use of it, in order to build on it his view of the “unversed” character of love to God that characterizes the human nature[[36]](#footnote-36).

Apart from that, however, what is of particular interest for us is that this theology of the “spermatic word”, as understood, gives Justin the ability not only to avoid confessional or religious exclusivity but also to have a fruitful and creative dialogue both with Judaism and Hellenism, considering them as places of partial revelation of Christian truths. He does not, however, hurts or scorns those with whom he is in dialogue, nor loses his Christian identity by sliding into theological syncretism.

Let us now review the significance of Justin’s theology for the inter-Christian and inter-religious dialogues carried out by Orthodoxy in our times.

**b. The significance of Justin’s theology of the “spermatic word”  
for the inter-Christian and inter-religious dialogues**

It is a fact that Justin's theology of the “spermatic word”, despite its obvious universal and anti-exclusive significance, has not been systematically exploited yet by the Orthodox in either inter-Christian or inter-religious dialogues. Particularly with regard to inter-religious dialogues, the systematic development of a theology which could serve as a basis for the positive attitude of Orthodoxy towards other religions has not been achieved, although such a theology may render interreligious dialogue constructive and facilitate the work of orthodox mission[[37]](#footnote-37). On the contrary, we are often witnesses to the absence of such a theology. As a result extreme and exclusive trends emerge, similar to those of Tatian and Tertullian, creating a misunderstanding of the interreligious dialogues as well as insurmountable difficulties in achieving the objectives of the Orthodox mission. Therefore, Justin’s theology of the “spermatic word” is, in my view, the most proper theology of the patristic tradition to serve as the theological background and the most appropriate model for Orthodoxy to adopt in carrying out inter-Christian and especially inter-religious dialogues in our time. In other words, we deeply believe that the application of the above Justin’s theology to the inter-Christian and inter-religious dialogues decisively helps, from an Orthodox point of view, to overcome both the confessional or religious exclusivity (Exclusivism) and the confessional or religious inclusivity (Inclusivism), while at the same time it saves and brings out the salvific completeness and authenticity of God's revealed Word in Christ within the Church.

Let us now proceed to a more detailed discussion of how modern Orthodoxy could exploit the above-mentioned aspects of Justin's theology of the “spermatic word” in the inter-Christian and inter-religious dialogues.

First of all, it must be noted that all particular aspects of Justin's theology of the “spermatic word” mentioned above, although referring exclusively to the philosophers and poets of Greek antiquity, because of the challenges of his time to which he was obliged to answer, they certainly cannot be applied only to the ancient Greek world, but also to all non-Christian people of every age. This is because, according to him, the illuminating presence and energy of the “spermatic divine word” is neither locally nor temporally limited, but spreads indiscriminately and over time in the whole of mankind.

In this sense, both his position, referring to the evaluation of the truths of Hellenism (according to which “whatever things were rightly said among all men, are the property of us Christians”), and his position related to the evaluation of people who lived before Christ (according to which “those who lived reasonably, i.e. according to the word, are Christians, even though they have been thought atheists”) – both understood within the frame of the function and effect of the “spermatic divine word” in the consciousness of the people who are outside the Church in every place and in every age – do not permit the religious depreciation of those who were born and continue to live as heterodox or heathen as well as of the Confession or religion they profess. Just as the Word acted as a sperm within Hellenism, which led ancient Greek philosophers and poets to partial discovery of the truth, it can also act in any other human society or cultural community that professes a particular confession or religion. Of course, the difference between a Christian Confession and any other religion is enormous in this regard, because each Christian Confession accepts, even if in its own different way, the teaching of Christ, whereas this is not the case with any other religion. However, the “spermatic divine word” does not cease to act and “enlighten”, according to John the Evangelist, “every man coming into the world” either he is faithful to a Christian Confession or to any other religion.

From this point of view, the function of the “spermatic word” outside the Orthodox Church is the connecting link of various Confessions and religions with itself. The Orthodox Church, possessing the fullness of the revealed divine truth in the person of Christ, can only feel a kind of spiritual affinity with all Confessions or religions that even have some seeds of the Christian truth, due to the effect of the “spermatic divine word” among their believers.

Thus, on the basis of these facts, nothing of “whatever… rightly said”, i.e. of the truths found in various confessions and religions, is contrary to Christianity and Orthodoxy in particular; since all these truths are fruits of effect of the spermatic divine word that “enlightens every man coming into the world”. On the contrary, they can be regarded as Christian and Orthodox in exactly the same way that Justin regarded as Christian whatever is right in Hellenism, formulating the above original and fundamental position: “whatever things were rightly said among all men, are the property of us Christians”. Besides, the mere formulation of this position, despite the fact that it was dictated by its attempt to evaluate Greek philosophy and poetry from a Christian point of view, goes beyond the narrow boundaries of Hellenism and acquires an ecumenical and universal significance.

However, in order to avoid misunderstandings, a clarification is needed: What are these things that are “rightly said”, and moreover “among all men”, so that they can be considered as Christian and Orthodox? The answer to this question presupposes, I think, a very good knowledge of the Orthodox Christian teaching as well as an acute theological and spiritual criterion, in order to enable the Orthodox theologian who participates in inter-Christian or in inter-religious dialogues to distinguish which of the multitude of elements that make up the self-identity of a Christian Confession or religion are “rightly said” and constitute a partial truth that responds to the fullness of the truth in the Church and which are not. In other words, the criterion of whether something is “rightly said” or not is none other than the very content of the Orthodox Faith. For this reason everything that is considered to be a partial truth of another Christian Confession or religion should agree with the Orthodox Faith. This partial truth, however, whatever it is, should not be considered foreign and disposable because it happens to be an element of a heterodox Confession or of another religion, but it should be considered to be Christian and Orthodox precisely because it is the product of the same Word who acts as incarnated Word fully in the Church and only as a spermatic word outside of it.

How important and necessary this attitude is to the inter-Christian and inter-religious dialogues, and to the mission in general, is shown by the similar way in which Apostle Paul behaved in Athens several years before Justin. As it is known, in his speech in Areopagus he adopted und understood biblically the stoic perceptions of the poets Aratus and Pseudo-Epimenides in order to promote the Christian teaching about the omnipresence of God and his relationship with the human race[[38]](#footnote-38). Yet this attitude is much more important and imperative when it is not simply dictated by a missionary tactic or ethics of dialogue, but by a theology, such as Justin's theology of the “spermatic word” in this case.

At this point, it should be noted that the fact that this attitude, dictated by the theology of the “spermatic word”, leads to the rejection of confessional or religious exclusivity (Exclusivism), does not necessarily imply that a comprehensive perception of Christianity or Orthodoxy (Inclusivism) should be adopted. Of course, some Christian or Orthodox truths as fruits of effect of the spermatic word can also be found in other confessions or religions. But that does not mean that the significance and value of Christianity or Orthodoxy is relativized. This is because, according to Justin, the above truths acquire their true meaning and salvific perspective only within the Church, where the fullness and authenticity of the revealed divine truth lies. Besides, as already said, the criterion of whether some of the elements that make up the content of the various religions or confessions are “rightly said” or not is none other than the revealed divine truth that is kept within the Church. Only under these conditions, both the perception of a confessional or religious exclusivity and the perception of a confessional or religious comprehensiveness will be abandoned, without jeopardizing the Orthodox Christian identity of those who participate in the inter-Christian and inter-religious dialogues carrying out by Orthodoxy in our time.

**Conclusion**

It is understood that the theology of the “spermatic word” that was the basis for the dialogue between the philosopher and martyr Justin and Hellenism is the most suitable theological background for the inter-Christian and especially inter-religious dialogues carried out by the Orthodox Church in our time. It is a theology which, among other things, also dictates the right missionary practice of Orthodoxy all over the world, similar to that applied by Apostle Paul in Athens.

We strongly believe that modern Orthodoxy, if it applies the theology of the “spermatic word” and follows the example of Justin in its interfaith relations and missionary practice, will avoid the religious scornfulness of both the people with whom it is in dialogue and the different confession or religion these people profess, without at the same time endangering dogmatic or religious syncretism. Besides, this theology fully responds to the very nature of Orthodoxy, since its history and tradition clearly indicate that respect for people of different religious beliefs is deeply rooted in its consciousness and long-standing practice.
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