

Durham E-Theses

The foundations of the doctrine of the logos in the prologue to the fourth Gospel

Kenneth Harper

How to cite:

Harper, Kenneth (1946) The foundations of the doctrine of the logos in the prologue to the fourth Gospel. Masters thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/9659/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

Kenneth Harper,
Hatfield College.

THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE LOGOS IN THE
PROLOGUE TO THE FOURTH GOSPEL,
being a thesis towards the degree of Master of Letters.

VOLUME TWO.

30th. September 1946.

ANOTHER APPROACH.

Πᾶσα διδασκαλία καὶ πᾶσα μάθησις διανοητικὴ ἐκ προῦ παρχούσης
γίνεται γνῶσεως.

- Aristotle, Anal. post. 1,1.

"Ideas which can be explained adequately from Christianity, or from

Judaism whence Christianity sprang, must not be traced back to other religions."

- Carl Clemen, in the Journal of
Theological Studies (1908)

In approaching the question of the origin of the Logos-doctrine in the Johannine Gospel, two principles have to be kept in front of us:-

- (a) that the term is introduced as being already familiar to the reader; that is to say, the term was significant;
- (b) that it must have been culled from a source with which the nature of this Gospel suggests that the reader is likely to have been familiar.

In brief, the purpose of the foregoing discussion has been to present, in broad outline, an account of the various sources to which scholars have looked for the origin of the Logos-term in the Johannine Prologue. Other sources have been brought forward, but, since these have not commanded any great attention, they have not been discussed in the main body of the work, but are to be dealt with, more summarily, in an appended excursus. In the discussion the aim has been to present the various theories in such a way as to indicate their respective strength and attraction; but, in each case an attempt has been made to demonstrate any real weaknesses. On the whole the conclusion is that all the theories discussed have failed to satisfy the two principles enunciated above. This is not to say that none of these sources has contributed to the Logos-term of the Prologue. But the suggestion is that

some, or all, may have contributed, not in any way directly, but only in so far as they aided the development of a distinctively Christian technical vocabulary. It is this, or some such factor which provides the link between such sources and the Prologue, and which also explains why they have not satisfied the two principles just indicated. And it is also possible that a mistake has been made in regarding this Johannine Logos-term as isolated and almost unique in the New Testament.

The present writer first began to consider this possibility as the result of reading the Greek New Testament during long spells of duty in an air raid wardens' post during the early days of the German attack on Britain. Some months later, the late Sir Edwyn Hoskyn's books on the Fourth Gospel appeared, in which he also suggested that it has been misleading to consider the Logos-term of the Johannine Prologue in isolation to the use of the word elsewhere in the New Testament.

It is proposed now to initiate a discussion of the use of the term Logos in the New Testament.

There are several methods by which the use of the term Logos in the New Testament could be considered. We could begin with St. Matthew's Gospel and work systematically through the books until we reach the Revelation. While it would only be confusing to treat each book in chronological order, it would also obscure the presentation to begin at one end and finish at the other. For instance, it is obviously desirable to deal at the same time with the Gospel and the First Epistle of St. John. The following sequence will be used, and is the result of experiment and the advice of others:-

1 and 11 Thessalonians

1 and 11 Corinthians

Galatians

Philippians

Romans

Colossians

Ephesians

Gospels according to Mark,

Luke,

Matthew,

Acts of the Apostles

Revelation

Epistle of James

1 Epistle of Peter

"To the Hebrews"

The Pastorals

11 Epistle of Peter

Gospel according to John

1 Epistle of John

It will be readily appreciated that this arrangement is an attempt at classification into 1. St. Paul's Epistles ; 2. Synoptic Gospels and Acts, 3. Other New Testament Writings, 4. Johannine Writings. In some classes attention has clearly been given to chronology; in others, this has been set aside.

It is not necessary to give arguments for the dating of the books, but some comment seems to be called for in justification of the arrangement.

It appears to the present writer that Galatians, in consideration of its subject-matter, belongs to the preliminary stage of Paul's development of his ideas about "law" and "works", culminating in Romans. Hence it is placed after the 11 Corinthian Epistle, and is regarded as belonging to the "Ephesian" epistles. The placing of Philippians is made on the assumption that it, too, belongs to the "Ephesian" Epistles.

The Synoptic Gospels, Acts and the Revelation are treated successively, not because it is imagined that they succeeded each other to the exclusion of any other part of the New Testament; they are here considered together as being the non-epistolary New Testament Writings. Of the Synoptists, the Gospel according to Matthew is probably a little later than that according to Luke, in consideration of its affinities with the Didache and with the Ignatian Epistles.

The examination of the Epistle of James for the present topic has convinced the present writer that, at any rate in its present form, it requires to be dated sometime later than is indicated in most modern New Testament chronologies. F. C. Burkitt once advanced a theory of an original "James" in Aramaic which was translated into Greek (and that not slavishly) in the second century. Canon W. L. Knox has recently read a paper at Cambridge on the subject of the Epistle of James; this, at the time of writing, is not yet available in published form. In this paper Canon Knox distinguished two strata in the Epistle of James:-

(a) A primitive document of the sayings of Jesus of Nazareth. If allowance is made for some slight expansions, it is quite possible that James of Jerusalem was the author of this:

(b) A later interspersing with a commentary on these sayings, this

being done in the normal Rabbinic fashion, so that the text and commentary present a unity. The present writer had concluded that the concept of regeneration through the Logos argued towards a later date than is usually assigned to this Epistle. This conclusion seems also to be required by the more general critical approach to the document.

Reference has already been made to J. N. Sander's recent book on "The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church". In this little work he argues that the first Johannine Epistle is prior to the Fourth Gospel. But, while the argument is attractive, Brooke's position (I.C.C.) still seems warranted, that the Epistle presupposes that the Gospel (at least without the Prologue) was already available. Dr. W. F. Howard accepts this position, for he calls the first Epistle of John the "earliest commentary" on the Fourth Gospel. ("Christianity According to St. John", p. 20)

With these preliminary remarks, we now turn to the New Testament itself.

11. THESSALONIANS

3¹

Τὸ λοιπὸν προσεύχεσθε, ἀδελφοί, περὶ ἡμῶν, ἵνα ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου τρέχῃ καὶ δοξάζεται καθὼς καὶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἵνα ῥυσθῶμεν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀτόπων καὶ πονηρῶν ἀνθρώπων, οὐ γὰρ πάντων ἡ πίστις. Πιστὸς

The phrase *ἕως ὑμᾶς* immediately establishes a close connection of thought and meaning between this verse and 1 Thess. 1⁸. The borrowing of imagery from the racing contests again suggests very strongly the sense of striving to carry "tidings". Once again we have the picture of activity devoted to the spreading of story about the Lord Jesus as news. (see also Col. 4³.)

3¹⁴

εἰ δέ τις οὐχ ὑπακούει τῷ λόγῳ ἡμῶν διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς, τοῦτον σημειώσατε, μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι αὐτῷ, ἵνα ἐν-

The qualifying *ἡμῶν* and the fact that the Logos is *διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς* (bearing in mind the hortatory nature of the epistle) gives the Logos here the force almost of "the injunction".

1. THESSALONIANS

Logos is used without the article in 1⁵, denoting "speech", as opposed to deed, or power (*δύναμις*);

in 2⁵ (*ὦ λόγῳ κολακείας*) signifying "talking" - "flattering speech".

We must, however, look a little more closely at 2¹³.

¹³ Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ θεῷ ἀδελφίως, ὅτι παραλαβόντες λόγον ἀκοῆς παρ' ἡμῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐδέξασθε οὐ λόγον ἀνθρώπων ἀλλὰ (καθὼς ἀληθῶς ἐστίν) λόγον θεοῦ, ὃς καὶ ἐνεργεῖται ἐν ὑμῖν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν. ὑμεῖς γὰρ μιμηταὶ ἐγενήθητε, ἀδελφοί, τῶν ἐκ-

The rendering in English of this passage has manifest difficulties. Soutar's edition of the Greek New Testament (here used) places *καθὼς ἀληθῶς ἐστίν* in brackets. But Scott, in his commentary, renders thus "but as it really is, the word of God", i.e. not the written word, but the word

of God of which the word written or spoken is the vehicle" - the word which is "living and effective." (Hebr. 4¹² cp. John 15⁷).

The Revised Version gives, "when ye received from us the word of the message, (R. V. m. "the word of hearing"), even the Word of God." The Latin reads, "quoniam cum accepissetis a nobis verbum auditus Dei". Abbott (I.C.C.) is inclined to regard the genitive as subjective - "the word delivered by Christ" Logos here, would connote the Gospel ~~the~~ Gospel as delivered by Christ." Lightfoot, however, took this phrase as signifying the presence of Christ in the heart, a conclusion also suggested by the verb of the relative clause (ἐνεργείται). In view the affinity of language with 1⁸ (εξήμενοι τὸν λόγον and ἐδέξατο οὐ λόγον of 2¹⁵). Abbott's explanation seems to be more acceptable. But it is quite possible that more is being made of the verse than need be, and Logos here may signify no more than the brief message which Paul had been able to give to the Thessalonians before the disturbance and the despatching of Paul and Silas to Berea (Acts 17¹⁰); in 4¹⁵ (ἐν λόγῳ Κυρίου), where apparently Κύριος is used of Christ Jesus. The reference may be to some saying of Christ's, though not recorded in any of our existing Gospels; or to an inward appreciation of the spirit of our Lord's teaching. Machon is, however, definite on the point; λόγος here connotes a saying delivered during our Lord's ministry and does not signify a revelation.

11. THESSALONIANS

Logos is used without the article in 2² (μῆτε διὰ λόγου) and in 2¹⁵ (εἴτε διὰ λόγου), where it signifies the spoken word as distinct from δι' ἐπιστολῆς, as a vehicle of teaching;

in 2¹⁷ (λόγῳ), where the contrast is with ἔργον.

1 CORINTHIANS.

1¹⁸

Ὁ λόγος γὰρ ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῖς μὲν ἀπολλυμένοις
μωρία ἐστίν, τοῖς δὲ σώζομένοις ἡμῖν δύναμις θεοῦ ἐστίν.

One commentator has rendered ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ as "the argument about the place of the Cross." But many will sense that this could scarcely be δύναμις θεοῦ. It is at least all that is intended by the verb of the previous verse (εὐαγγελίῳ). In verse 23 it is χριστὸς ἐσταυρωμένος who is μωρία and θεοῦ δύναμις. Turning to Romans 1¹⁶, we have, "I am not ashamed of the Gospel; for it is δύναμις θεοῦ εἰς σωτηρίαν παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι." Although no direct object το πιστεύω is supplied by St. Paul, the object may readily be inferred.

Thus we have a close association of the Logos with the Power of God and Christ Jesus. Nor should we close our minds against the possibility that the dictum of the Jews preserved in Luke 4³⁶ was known to St. Paul and was in his mind as he was "writing":-- τίς ὁ λόγος οὗτος; ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ καὶ δυνάμει ἐπιτάσσει τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις πνεύμασι καὶ ἐξέρχονται.

24-5

καὶ ἐν τρόπῳ πολλῇ ἐγενόμην πρὸς ὑμᾶς) καὶ ὁ λόγος μου 4
καὶ τὸ κήρυγμά μου οὐκ ἐν πιθοῖς σοφίας λόγοις ἀλλ' ἐν
ἀποδείξει πνεύματος καὶ δυνάμεως, ἵνα ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν μὴ ᾖ 5
ἐν σοφίᾳ ἀνθρώπων ἀλλ' ἐν δυνάμει θεοῦ. | Σοφίαν 6

At a first glance, the sense of this passage appears to be satisfied if "my Logos" is rendered as "my argument." But Robertson and Plummer rightly observed that to regard the Logos as "private conversation" and the Kerygma as "public preaching" is not satisfactory. "Nor", they continued, "is the one the delivery of the message and the other the substance of it" (I.C.C. p. 32.) Still less could this be accepted since Dr. Dodd's book on the "Apostolic Preaching and its Developments." Robertson and

Plummer concluded that "ὁ λόγος" looks back to 11^B, and means the Gospel which the Apostle preached, while κήρυγμα is the act of proclamation, viewed not as a process (κήρυξις), but as a whole....." The Logos is at least the Evangel; at the most, whatever connection and associations had, at this point in the Epistle, begun to cling to δύναμις θεοῦ.

419

πρὸς ὑμᾶς, εἴαν ὁ κύριος θελήσῃ καὶ γνώσομαι οὐ τὸν
 20 λόγον τῶν πεφυσιωμένων ἀλλὰ τὴν δύναμιν, ἣ γὰρ ἐν

Here the Logos and the Power of the πεφυσιωμένοι are clearly meant to connect in contrast in the reader's mind with that Logos of the Cross and that Power of God of which St. Paul had already written.

1436

36 ναὶ καὶ λαλεῖν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ * Ἡ ἀφ' ὑμῶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ
 37 ἐξῆλθεν, ἢ εἰς ὑμᾶς μόνους κατήνησεν; ΠΕΪ

For the purposes of meditation this verse can be taken as speaking of our Lord's going out from Jerusalem to Calvary, or of his leading out of his disciples after his Resurrection and immediately before his Ascension. But in view of the rest of the chapter it is scarcely likely that St. Paul wrote the words with either of these in mind. Possibly the verse is best understood as being heavily sarcastic, and as having been intended to remind his readers that Corinth is not the mother Church. In this case we should see a reference to the Apostolic mission of carrying the Gospel from Jerusalem "to the uttermost parts of the earth", and, perhaps, to the going out of the Logos from such centres as Thessalonica. (See 1 Thess. 1^B) The Logos of God here, then, signifies the Gospel, preached by the apostles. (This verse is given by Archbishop Bernard as an instance of ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ used in this particular sense - "Pastoral Epistles" in Cambridge Greek Testament, p. 74.)

15⁵⁴ ὁ λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος is here used to introduce that specific quotation from the Old Testament which follows (Is. 25⁸, Hos. 13¹⁴).

11 CORINTHIANS

1¹⁸

τὸ Ναί βαι καὶ τὸ Οὐ οὐ; πιστὸς δὲ ὁ θεὸς ὅτι ἰσ
ὁ λόγος ἡμῶν ὁ πρὸς ὑμᾶς οὐκ ἔστιν Ναί καὶ Οὐ λόγος

The Logos here is St. Paul's preaching, which, he claims, is not double-tongued. But the context of the Logos is defined as "the Son of God, Jesus Christ" who "was not yea and nay, but in him is yea." (19).

2¹⁷

17 καὶ πρὸς ταῦτα τίς ἰκανός; οὐ γὰρ ἐσμεν ὡς οἱ πολλοὶ
καπηλεύοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, ἰδὲν ὡς ἐξ εἰλικρινίας,

4²

ἄλλὰ ἀπειπάμεθα τὰ κρυπτά τῆς αἰσχύνης, μὴ περιπα-
τοῦντες ἐν πανουργίᾳ μηδὲ δολοῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ
θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ τῇ φανερώσει τῆς ἀληθείας συνιστάμενοι

The Logos of God has already been defined by St. Paul's declaration of his purpose at Troas, it was εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ (2¹²). In 1 Thessalonians 2³⁻⁵ that which is "not of error" is also ἡ παράκλησις. The genitive signifies that the Logos is supplied by God, rather than that the Logos is about God. Only in this sense can we rightly say that the Logos of God is the Apostolic message, the content of which is Christ Jesus.

5¹⁸⁻¹⁹

18 γέγονεν καινά; τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ καταλλά-
ξαντος ἡμᾶς ἑαυτῷ διὰ Χριστοῦ καὶ δόντος ἡμῖν τὴν
19 διακονίαν τῆς καταλλαγῆς, ὡς ὅτι θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ
κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἑαυτῷ, μὴ λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ
παραπτώματα αὐτῶν, καὶ θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν τὸν λόγον τῆς

It will be seen that the earlier words have to do with God's reconciliation of the world "into himself" "in Christ." Taken by itself, then, the Logos appears to be the Gospel which proclaims this fact. (cp. Acts 15²⁶, Eph 1¹³ Col. 1⁵) But attention should be given to Romans 5¹¹, "we also rejoice in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received the reconciliation". Thus is emphasized again the connection between the Logos

and the Person and work of Christ Jesus. Nor should Harnack's advice be forgotten: "in determining the meaning of λόγος in Paul one must always keep in mind 1 Cor. 2¹⁷, "I am determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ and him crucified." ("Constitution and Law of the Church"

p. 341.)
10¹⁰⁻¹¹

10 λῶν· ὅτι Αἱ ἐπιστολαὶ μὲν, φησὶν, βαρεῖαι καὶ ἰσχυραί,
ἡ δὲ παρουσία τοῦ σώματος ἀσθενής· καὶ ὁ λόγος ἐξουθε-
11 νημένος. τοῦτο λογίζεσθω ὁ τοιοῦτος, ὅτι οἱοί ἐσμεν τῷ
λόγῳ δι' ἐπιστολῶν ἀπόντες, τοιοῦτοι καὶ παρόντες τῷ
12 ἔργῳ. (Οὐ γὰρ τολμῶμεν ἐγκρίναι ἢ συγκρίναι ἑαυτούς

In the first verse the Logos is evidently the Apostle's verbal delivery of the message, as distinct from the written exhortation. In the following verse there is great emphasis on "the antithesis between λόγῳ and ἔργῳ so frequent in Thucydides." (Plummer, I.C.C. p. 284) This use of Logos is also found, e.g. Col. 3¹⁷, Rom. 15¹⁸

1 CORINTHIANS

Logos occurs without the article in 1⁵, where Robertson and Plummer suggest that ἐν παντὶ λόγῳ signifies "the gift of speech"; in 1¹⁷ ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου where the sense is "argument based on disreputable sophistry."

Robertson and Plummer again have a suggestion - "the mere gift of the rhetorical". Certainly, St. Paul is rejecting rhetorical professionalism. These considerations in turn fix the meaning of Logos in 2¹;

in 4²⁰, where, as in the previous verse, Logos is contrasted with Power (οὐ γὰρ ἐν λόγῳ, ... ἐν ἔργῳ); probably we could best render by "talk" and "action".

In 12^{8ff} we have a very interesting use of Logos; "to one is given through the Spirit Logos of wisdom; and to another Logos of knowledge, according to the same Spirit: (9) to another faith, in the same Spirit; to another gifts of healing in the same Spirit; (10) and to another workings of miracles; and to another prophecy; etc." It has been suggested that λόγος, σοφίας

connotes "wise talk" and that $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma \gamma\nu\omega\sigma\acute{\iota}\omega\varsigma$ means "knowledgeable speech." But why not "wisdom" and "knowledge"? for "faith", "prophecy", etc. are mentioned as absolute, as is indicated by the use, in the Greek, of the nominative ($\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$; $\pi\pi\omicron\phi\epsilon\tau\epsilon\iota\alpha$). But it has to be remembered that the Apostle had already said scathing things about "Wisdom" (1 Cor. 24) and "knowledge" (81) as such, indicating their powerlessness. Perhaps he wished to be specific that it is not such knowledge nor wisdom which he now means. Logos of wisdom and Logos of knowledge, by this point in the epistle, should, as we have seen, have carried with them the notion of power, and also - bearing in mind 15 - of enrichment and activity, "in everything ye were enriched in (Jesus Christ), in all Logos ($\epsilon\nu \tau\alpha\nu\tau\eta \lambda\omicron\gamma\omega$), and in all knowledge ($\pi\alpha\sigma\eta \gamma\nu\omega\sigma\iota$)" (But. cp. 116-7)

In 149, since $\gamma\lambda\omega\sigma\sigma\alpha$ means "the organ of speech" (as normally in the New Testament), and $\epsilon\upsilon\delta\eta\mu\omicron\varsigma$ means "well-marked," Logos is best rendered as "talk;"

in 152, where St. Paul stressed "with what Logos" ($\tau\iota\upsilon \lambda\omicron\gamma\omega$, and not ω "Logos with which") he had "evangelized" the Corinthians. The substance was, then, the Evangel; so that Logos must refer to the form or method. Moffatt is near the mark with "statement".

11 CORINTHIANS

In the sixth chapter the Apostle stresses the leading characteristics of the commendation whereby he and his companions "commended themselves as ministers of God," among which he listed $\epsilon\nu \lambda\omicron\gamma\omega \alpha\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha\varsigma$ (6) The genitive may be (1) of apposition, "a Logos which is truth"; (2) of possession, "Logos belonging to truth; or (3) of object, favoured by Robertson and Plummer, who suggest as a translation "the declaring of truth." This sense certainly fits neatly into the catalogue. Logos, once more, connotes speech, as it

also does in 8⁷.

GALATIANS 6⁶

6 Κοινωνεῖται δὲ ὁ κατηχούμενος τὸν λόγον τῷ κατηχούντι
7 ἐν πάσιν ἀγαθοῖς. Ἥμῃ πλανᾶσθε, θεὸς οὐ

Here the Logos may possibly be the subject of catechetical instruction - the Faith. But it is possibly best understood as the Apostolic message, as such being comparable with the sense of the Logos in 1 Thes. 1⁶.

Logos occurs without the article in 5¹² (ὁ γὰρ ^{πῶς} λόγος ἐν ἐνὶ λόγῳ πεπλήρωται) where it has the obvious meaning of a dictum, in this instance the subsequent quotation of Lev. 19¹⁸, although, as Burton pointed out, even in this sense, the emphasis is on "the inward content" (I.C.C. p. 296)

PHILIPPIANS

1¹²⁻¹⁸ (12)

νας τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἐν κυρίῳ πεποιθότας τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου
Γινώσκειν δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι τὰ κατ' ἐμέ ¹² οὐ θεοῦ λα-
μᾶλλον εἰς προκοπὴν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐλήλυθεν, ὥστε ¹³ αἱ ἔριν, τινὲς
τοὺς δεσμούς μου φανεροὺς ἐν Χριστῷ γενέσθαι ἐν ὄλῳ ¹⁴ οἱ μὲν ἐξ
τῷ πραιτωρίῳ καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς πᾶσιν, καὶ τοὺς πλείο- ¹⁵ λείου κείμεναι,
¹⁶ οὐχ ἀγνώσ-
¹⁸ οἰόμενοι θλίψιν ἐγείρειν τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου. τί γάρ; πλήν
ὅτι παντὶ τρόπῳ, εἴτε προφάσει εἴτε ἀληθείᾳ, Χριστὸς
καταγγέλλεται, καὶ ἐν τούτῳ χαίρω· ἀλλὰ καὶ χαρήσομαι

Here once more, the Logos of God bears the immediate meaning of the Apostolic message. This is suggested by the allusion in verse 12 to "the progress of the Gospel". But much more important to our present discussion is the fact that "speaking the Logos of God" is immediately succeeded by references to "preaching" and "proclaiming" Christ. True, St. Paul probably meant no more than a reference to the Apostolic message when he used the expression the Logos of God. But in this type of passage we can see how the early Christians could well have come to understand by the phrase not only the Gospel about Jesus Christ but "the Gospel that is Jesus."

(A.M. Ramsay; "The Resurrection of Christ" p. 10.)

Logos is found without the article in 2¹⁶ (λόγον ἰωῆς ἐπέχοντες), where it seems to have the force of "message," and is perhaps to be compared with the "tip" of the trainer, since the context in which it is set is that of comparing the fidelity of the Christian spiritual athlete with that of the determined contestant at the games. In this connection, the English authorized and Revised Versions are somewhat misleading, rendering the phrase as "holding forth the word of life; this should be "holding fast Logos of Life", and is to be compared with the injunction of "an angel of the Lord" to the Apostles, newly freed from prison, "to stand and speak in the temple πάντα τὰ βήματα τῆς ἰωῆς ἑστίης".

As used in 4¹⁵⁻¹⁷, Logos has the force of "account" ("reckoning"), "score". (Milligan and Moulton); εἰς λόγων "on the matter or on account of"; εἰς λόγων ὑμῶν "to your account." ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα, οἵτινες εἰσι Ἰσραηλιταί. ὧν ἡ νόθεσις καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ αἱ

ROMANS

95-6

Ἰεραγγελίου, ἡ ἐπαγγελία, καὶ ὁ ὧν ἐπὶ τῆς καρδίας μου ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, ὅτι Οὐχ οἶον πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ, ἀλλ' Ἐν Ἰσραὴλ κληθήσεται σοὶ σπέρμα.

The Revised Version has ,....."Christ as concerning the flesh, who is over all, God blessed for ever". Since the ancient Greek manuscripts are devoid of punctuation marks, it will be appreciated that other renderings are possible:-

- 1....."Christ as concerning the flesh. He who is God over all be (is) blessed for ever"
- 2....."Christ as concerning the flesh. He who is over all is God, blessed for ever"

3....."Christ as concerning the flesh, who is over all. God be (is) blessed for ever." (R.V. Marg. readings.)

Nor do we get any help from other passages in the New Testament, for, in each case, the correct rendering cannot be made with certainty. If we excise θεός, then there is no doubt that St. Paul predicates "language appropriate to the mention of God" with Christ. (Bp. Kirk, "Romans", p. 104, Clarendon Bible.) But for such there is no justification from the point of manuscript authority. For the purposes of our argument, it would be a gain if the punctuation of the Revised Version could be established. For then, even in spite of the $\mu\upsilon\lambda\upsilon$, it would be very difficult to regard the Logos of God as referring to no more than the Apostolic message; in fact, in such a setting it could scarcely have that force. Sanday and Headlam (I.C.C. p. 240) agree that the use of the phrase here is unusual, and that it does not mean "the Gospel." In a context alluding so much to the Israelites, it might, of course refer to the Old Testament writings (and verse nine gives support to this supposition,]. But it is set in a context in which St. Paul is speaking primarily of Christ; so that, whatever he intended by the phrase as he employed it, in the case of those who had access to the epistle it could easily acquire associations with the mission and Person of Jesus Christ. The effect of accepting the renderings in the Revisers' margin, is to regard the second half of verse five as a little doxology. It might seem, then, that verse six marks the opening of a fresh topic. In this case it is more likely that ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ refers to the Jewish Scriptures, and points forward to "this Logos" of verse nine.

9⁹ ἐπαγγελίας γὰρ ὁ λόγος οὗτος....

"This Logos" is here a quotation from Genesis 1⁸.

[It is then, true, that the Logos here is used in the formal sense of "utterance" (i.e. the quotation from the Old Testament). But the whole discussion of the problem of Judaism (9¹ - 11³⁶) centres around the quotations from Isaiah 8¹⁴ and 28¹⁶ (9¹² and 10¹¹). St. Paul clearly regarded these as Messianic. Thus, although the Logos has this formal sense, it is referred to the Messiah.]

13⁹, καὶ εἴ τις ἑτέρα ἐντολή ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ ἀνακεφαλαιοῦνται ἐν τῷ....

The Logos is, again, a quotation; this time from Leviticus.

Logos is found without the article in 9²³, in a shortened quotation from the LXX of Isaiah 10²²⁻²³. It is not easy to see what St. Paul means by speaking of the Lord as executing "A Logos upon the earth."

Σαδδαι and Ηοσαϊαμ render λόγος as "reckoning";

in 4¹², where it denotes "statement", i.e. account, or report;

in 15¹³, where, again, we have the phrase λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ .

COLOSSIANS

1³⁻⁵

3 Εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ θεῷ πατρὶ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ
4 [Χριστοῦ] πάντοτε ἑπεὶ ὑμῶν προσευχόμενοι, ἀκούσαντες
τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην [ἣν
5 ἔχετε] εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα τὴν ἀποκει-
μένην ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ἣν προηκούσατε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ
6 τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ παρόντος εἰς ὑμᾶς, καθὼς

Abbott (I.C.C.) regarded the genitive τῆς ἀληθείας as qualifying the Logos and thought that "this compound notion is explained by εὐαγγελίου." So Bede Frost is right in referring the entire phrase to "the whole of the Gospel". (Commentary on Ephesians and Colossians, p. 55.), to wit,

"the substance of the Apost^{le}

125-26

τῇ σαρκί μου ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ὃ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐκ-
 κλησία, ἧς ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ διάκονος κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν ²⁵
 πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθείσάν μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς πληρῶσαι τὸν
 λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ ²⁶
 23 ὅ ἐστιν Χριστοῦ, ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν, - νῦν δὲ ἐφανερώθη
 καταγγέλλομεν τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ, οἷς ἠθέλησεν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι τί τὸ ²⁷

As it stands, the sense of this passage is adequately supplied by the Logos of God signifies the Gospel which the Apostle preached. In this case the guiding idea is that of executing the full demand of that Gospel itself, the preaching of it to the Gentiles. But if we accept the manuscript evidence (as Bontar did) which makes μυστήριον the antecedent of the relative in verse 27 (ὃ), we have indication of a richer connotation for the Logos. Moreover, in 2³, while the readings vary, there is at any rate the possibility that the "mystery" is defined as "Christ" - εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ rejecting the excision of Χριστοῦ or the addition καὶ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. In this case we should have a nexus of the Logos, of God, the "mystery", and the Christ. Nor does it seem that this conclusion will be greatly affected if we accept the opinion that τὸ θεὸν Χριστῶν is "probably a primitive error for τὸ ἐν Χριστῶν." (see Westcott and Hort's edition of the New Testament in Greek, p. 337.)

It is also relevant to notice that the preceding passage (15-20) deals with the relation of Christ to God (15-17) and to the Church (18-20) and that some commentators have regarded the ^{γεννητῆρ} as alluding to the pro-Incarnate life of the Logos, and the latter as referring to the Incarnate Logos. But the use of the present tense (ἐστίν) however, makes it much more likely that the Apostle is speaking throughout of the ascended Christ. Even so, whatever St. Paul meant when he wrote, and possibly because ἡρωτότοκος had come to be recognized as a Messianic title, by the second and third centuries, orthodox theologians were turning to this passage for guidance

and material in developing their teaching about Christ the Logos.

5 13-16

ἐάν τις πρὸς τινα ἔχη μομφήν· καθὼς καὶ ὁ κύριος
 14 εὐχαρίστω ὑμῖν οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐπὶ πᾶσι δὲ τοῦτοις
 15 τὴν ἀγάπην, ἧ ἔστιν σύνδεσμος τῆς τελειότητος. καὶ ἡ
 εἰρήνη τοῦ χριστοῦ βραβεύτω ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν,
 εἰς ἣν καὶ ἐκλήθητε ἐν [ἐν] σώματι· καὶ εὐχαρίστοι
 16 γίνεσθε. ὁ λόγος τοῦ χριστοῦ ἐνοικεῖτω ἐν ὑμῖν
 πλουσίως ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ διδάσκοντες καὶ νοουθετοῦντες
 ἑαυτοὺς ψαλμοῖς, ὕμνοις, ᾠδαῖς πνευματικαῖς ἐν ᾧ χάριτι,
 17 ᾄδοντες ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν τῷ θεῷ· καὶ πᾶν ὅτι

A glance at any critical edition of the Greek New Testament shows how great are the textual variants in this passage. For κυρίως in verse 13 some MSS. read χριστός; for χριστοῦ in verse 16, some ancient MSS. read κυρίου and others, θεοῦ. The truth of the matter would appear to be in his use of the title κυρίως St. Paul moved readily backwards and forwards between κυρίως = Yahweh of the Old Testament, and as serving as a title for Jesus Christ. (That this is so can be judged from his first Epistle to the Thessalonians.) The tone of the whole passage is ethical rather than metaphysical, perhaps accounting for any lack of precision in terms.

As it stands, the Logos of Christ (or of the Lord) probably refers to the Gospel about Christ. At any rate, that is how Dr. Anderson Scott has understood it. Some, however, have regarded the passage as treating of the Logos spoken by Christ Jesus, either by his Gospel, or (less likely) through the operation of the individual consciences. But Principal G.C. Martin once put forward the suggestion that the phrase ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ should be detached from the first part of verse 16, to serve as the first phrase of the latter part. In this case we should have the independent little injunction ὁ λόγος τοῦ χριστοῦ ἐνοικεῖτω ἐν ὑμῖν πλουσίως. It does not require much imagination to see how such a phrase could gain currency. The genitive τοῦ χριστοῦ would come to be regarded as subjective. ("The Logos delivered by Christ", cp. 1 Thess. 2¹³)

From this, the expression would eventually come to mean for the worshipping Christian communities "The Logos who is Christ". This evolution would be easier, too, if the phrase had been current in the other form in which it is given, as we have seen, in other readings of the verse (κυριου).

Perhaps some such process was at work and lies behind John 15.

42-3

Τῇ προσευχῇ προσκαρτερεῖτε, γρηγοροῦντες ἐν αὐτῇ 2
ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ, προσευχόμενοι ἅμα καὶ περὶ ἡμῶν, ἵνα 3
ὁ θεὸς ἀνοίξῃ ἡμῖν θύραν τοῦ λόγου, λαλῆσαι τὸ μυστή-
ριον τοῦ χριστοῦ, δι' ὃ καὶ δέδεμαι, ἵνα φανερώσω αὐτὸ 4

Although the Logos has the immediate meaning of the Apostolic Gospel, we notice that the Logos has to do with speaking "the mystery", this time "of Christ". The idea of the opening door seems to have been St. Paul's way of referring to opportunities for preaching his Gospel (cp. 1 Cor. 16⁹ and 11 Cor. 2¹²)

4⁶ ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν πάντοτε ἐν χάριτι, ὡς ἔστι ἱρτυμένος.

The Revised Version renders ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν as "your speech". Perhaps better would be "your message", in which case we should have an apostolic instruction on the delivering of the Apostolic message. On the other hand, we may have no more than advice on conduct in public, although this is unlikely if ἱρτυμένος was meant by St. Paul, to send the minds of his readers to any reports circulating among them about the Lord's reference to the need of having salt in themselves.

It may be added that if the force of, 3¹⁶, developed in any way comparable with that which we have conjectured, then this present verse would, in turn, acquire a much deeper meaning.

In 2²³ Logos connotes "reputation" or "account"; and in 3¹⁷, we have the phrase, ἐν λόγῳ ἢ ἐν ἔργῳ.

EPHESIANS

1¹³

ἔπαινον δόξης αὐτοῦ τοὺς προηλπικότας ἐν τῷ χριστῷ·
ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀκούσατες τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας, τὸ
εὐαγγέλιον τῆς σωτηρίας ὑμῶν, ἐν ᾧ καὶ πιστεύσατες

See on Colossians 1⁵. Abbott (I.C.O.) renders "The Word whose context is truth, i.e. the Gospel". Armitage Robinson explained the passage as "the teaching which told you the truth of things." When we remember that in this same epistle St. Paul spoke of "truth" as being "in Jesus", we can see how a reference to "the Logos who told men the truth of things" could - by virtue of reading over and over again, and use in liturgy - have acquired a much richer meaning than teaching or Gospel - in fact a "personal" meaning.

Logos in 4²⁰ denotes "speech" and corresponds to ῥῆμα in Matt. 12³⁶. 20¹⁹ Logos is rendered in the Revised Version by utterance; this was accepted by Abbott. But Martin notes that ὄνομα is used by St. Paul "only in a circumstance of great seriousness and importance". Thus Logos is more than "a synonym for speech".

ὁ λόγος in 1 Thes. 4¹⁶ means the words of the Actual Epistle; in 1 Cor. 14¹⁹ five sensible words (λόγοι) are contrasted with ten thousand unedifying ecstatic utterances. ὁ λόγος is also used in Romans 9⁴, being a quotation from Psalm 51⁴, the Davidic authorship of which St. Paul accepted; thus he understood the λόγοι to be God's judgment on David after his sinful conduct with Bathsheba. (Dunbar and Headlam however, refer the λόγοι to the λόγοι previously mentioned). In Ephesians 5⁶ λόγοι denotes "chatter".

We turn now to consider the use of Logos in our Synoptic Gospels.

Mark 1⁴⁵ = Luke 5¹⁵⁻¹⁶

Mark 1⁴⁵ ἃ προσέταξεν Μωυσῆς εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς. ὁ δὲ ἐξελθὼν ⁴⁵

ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν πολλὰ καὶ διαφημίξειν τὸν λόγον, ὥστε
μηκέτι αὐτὸν δύνασθαι φανερώς εἰς πόλιν εἰσελθεῖν, ἀλλὰ

Luke 5¹⁵ εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς. διήρχετο δὲ μάλλον ὁ λόγος περὶ
αὐτοῦ, καὶ συνήρχοντο ὄχλοι πολλοὶ ἀκούειν καὶ θεραπεύε-

The Revised Version has "the matter" (IT.) and "the report." (LK.)

In an article in the Journal of Theological Studies (XL, 160, Oct. 1939.

p. 389) G. D. Kilpatrick points out that the usual translation of Logos in

Mk. 1⁴⁵ is "the story". To this he offers two objections; first, that

this will involve a sudden change of subject from the Lord Jesus to the

newly healed man; second, that, as he has tried to show, this conotation

of the Logos would be unique in Mark's twenty three uses of the term.

Normally, he contends, Logos in Mark denotes "the message" of the Lord

Jesus or the Church. If we retain this meaning in 1⁴⁵, then Jesus will

be the subject both of λόγος in verse 42, and of ἡρῆξατο in verse 45.

"If we translate λόγον as "message," how do we understand the verse? It

is clear that it must be severed from the story of the leprous man so that

we are not told whether the injunction to silence was kept or not. Positively

the sentence proves to be a summarizing verse between two stories such as

we have in 1¹⁴, 1³⁸, 6⁵⁶.

In the Expository Times of February 1940 (p. 252) T. Nicklen criti-

cized this interpretation; but in the J.T.S. of January - April 1941

(XIII, 165-166) Kilpatrick insisted afresh on the validity of his argument.

We may note, however, that in recognizing that in the Lucan parallel passage

(5¹⁵) ὁ λόγος is used in the sense of "story", he insists that had it not

been for this use of ὁ λόγος, we should never have attached this meaning

13 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς Οὐκ οἴδατε τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην,
 14 καὶ πῶς πάσας τὰς παραβολὰς γνώσεσθε; Ὁ σπείρων τὸν
 15 λόγον σπείρει. οὗτοι δὲ εἰσὶν οἱ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ὅπου
 σπείρεται ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν εὐθὺς ἔρχεται ὁ
 Σατανᾶς καὶ αἶρει τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐσπαρμένον εἰς αὐτούς.

πρόσκαιροὶ εἰσιν, εἴτα γενομένης θλίψεως ἢ διωγμοῦ διὰ
 τὸν λόγον εὐθὺς σκανδαλίζονται. καὶ ἄλλοι εἰσιν οἱ εἰς 18
 τὰς ἀκάθους σπειρόμενοι· οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ τὸν λόγον ἀκού-
 σαντες, καὶ αἱ μέριμναι τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ ἡ ἀπάτη τοῦ πλού- 19
 του καὶ αἱ περὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐπιθυμῖαι εἰσπορευόμεναι συνπι-
 γουσι τὸν λόγον, καὶ ἄκαρπος γίνεται. καὶ ἐκεῖνοι εἰσιν 20
 οἱ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν σπαρέντες, οἵτινες ἀκούουσιν τὸν
 λόγον καὶ παραδέχονται καὶ καρποφοροῦσιν ἔν τριάκοντα
 καὶ [έν] ἑξήκοντα καὶ [έν] ἑκατόν. Καὶ ἔλεγεν 21

αὕτη; ἢ ἢ ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, “Ἰμῶν δέδοται γνῶναι 10
 τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ· τοῖς δὲ
 λοιποῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς, ἵνα βλέποντες μὴ βλέ-
 πωσι καὶ ἀκούοντες μὴ συνιώσιν. ἢ Ἔστι δὲ 11
 αὕτη ἡ παραβολή· ὁ σπόρος ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ
 Θεοῦ· οἱ δὲ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν εἰσιν οἱ ἀκούοντες, 12
 εἴτα ἔρχεται ὁ διάβολος καὶ αἶρει τὸν λόγον ἀπὸ
 τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, ἵνα μὴ πιστεύσαντες σωθῶσιν.
 οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς πέτρας, οἱ ὅταν ἀκούσωσι μετὰ 13
 χαρᾶς δέχονται τὸν λόγον, καὶ οὗτοι ῥίζαν οὐκ

ἔχουσι, οἱ πρὸς καιρὸν πιστεύουσι καὶ ἐν καιρῷ
 14 πειρασμοῦ ἀφίστανται. ἢ τὸ δὲ εἰς τὰς ἀκάθους
 πεσόν, οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀκούσαντες, καὶ ὑπὸ με-
 ριμῶν καὶ πλούτου καὶ ἡδονῶν τοῦ βίου πορευ-
 15 ὄμενοι συμπνίγονται καὶ οὐ τελεσφοροῦσι. τὸ
 δὲ ἐν τῇ καλῇ γῇ, οὗτοί εἰσιν οἵτινες ἐν καρδίᾳ
 καλῇ καὶ ἀγαθῇ ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον κατέχουσι,
 καὶ καρποφοροῦσιν ἐν ὑπομονῇ.

Matthew.

19 οὐδὲ ἀκούσατε τὴν παραβολὴν τοῦ σπείραντος. Παντὸς
 ἀκούοντος τὸν λόγον τῆς βασιλείας καὶ μὴ συνιέντος, ἔρχε-
 ται ὁ πονηρὸς καὶ ἀρπάζει τὸ ἐσπαρμένον ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ
 20 αὐτοῦ· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν σπαρεῖς. ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὰ
 πετρώδη σπαρεῖς, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων καὶ εὐθὺς
 21 μετὰ χαρᾶς λαμβάνων αὐτόν· οὐκ ἔχει δὲ ῥίζαν ἐν ἑαυτῷ
 ἀλλὰ πρόσκαιρός ἐστιν, γενομένης δὲ θλίψεως ἢ διωγμοῦ
 22 διὰ τὸν λόγον εὐθὺς σκανδαλίζεται. ὁ δὲ εἰς τὰς ἀκάθους
 σπαρεῖς, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων καὶ ἡ μέριμνα
 τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ ἡ ἀπάτη τοῦ πλούτου συνπιγεί τὸν λόγον,
 23 καὶ ἄκαρπος γίνεται. ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν καλὴν γῆν σπαρεῖς,
 οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων καὶ συνιεί, ὅς δὲ καρπο-
 φορεῖ καὶ ποιεῖ ὁ μὲν ἑκατόν ὁ δὲ ἑξήκοντα ὁ δὲ τριάκοντα. ἢ

to its use in the Markian version.

The importance of these considerations for our present discussion is manifest. If Kilpatrick's argument is accepted, then in Mark 1⁴⁵ we have a reference of the Logos which Christ Jesus spoke.

Mark 2² = Luke 5¹⁷

Mark 2² ²σθη ὅτι ἐν οἴκῳ ἐστίν·) καὶ συνέχθησαν πολλοὶ ὥστε
μηκέτι χωρεῖν μηδὲ τὰ πρὸς τὴν θύραν, καὶ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς
³τὸν λόγον·) καὶ ἔρχονται φέροντες πρὸς αὐτὸν παραλυτικόν.

The late Dr. C. H. Turner, in his article on St. Marks Gospel in Gore's Commentary, made a remark which is well worth quoting in full; for it indicates the very *raison d'être* of this present discussion "to preach the word", 'the ministry of the word' are phrases so ingrained in Christian language that it is difficult to realize that at first it was a special and technical usage word, so to say, as much as 'the way' or 'the Brethren'." The whole question of course is, "What was the full content of the Logos used as a Christian technical term?" That is our present problem.

In the present verse it is clearly the message which our Lord spoke. But it is also relevant to notice that the next verse indicates that the uttering of the Logos is the occasion for works of healing and forgiveness. The Lord Jesus speaks (ἐλάλει) the Logos, and he speaks (λέγει) to the sick of the palsy (5). There is, then, a clear association of power and the Logos. (cp. Matt. 8⁸, and 1 Cor. 2⁴⁻⁵.) ✓ Mark 4^{13ff} † Luke 8^{11ff} = Matt. 13^{18ff} (being the exposition of the Parable of the Sower)

The three expositions open with varying emphasis. Mark and Luke begin with simple statements, the former that "the sower soweth the Logos," and the

latter with the specific assertion that "the seed is the Logos of God." But the Logos is used absolutely in the subsequent verses of the exposition. Matthew is slightly more discursive, but the identification is clear; "the Logos of the Kingdom" is obviously, "that which hath been sown in the heart." Again, the Logos is used absolutely in the rest of the passage.

It is manifest that our argument would be well supported if Plummer is right in supposing that the Logos of God in the Lukan Version means not so much "the word which tells of God," as "the word which comes from God." (I.C.C.) Were this so, then we should have an indication of a New Testament connection between the Old Testament concept of the Word of Yahweh and the Logos which "was ἀπὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ", in the Johannine Prologue. But since the expression "the Logos of God" corresponds to "the Logos of the Kingdom" in Matthew, it is probable that "the word which comes from God" does more than justice to the Lukan phrase.

It strikes the reader of these expositions immediately that there is some confusion of interpretation. It is "the Logos" which is sown (Mark 4¹⁴); And it is various types of people who receive the Logos by hearing. (Mr. 4¹⁵ = Lk 8¹² = Mt. 13⁹) But, before long it is those types of people who are spoken of as being sown, the type being identified by the capacity to hear the Logos. (Mark 4¹⁸ = Mt. 13²²). This identification of the hearers and the Logos culminates in the assertion the crop consists of various classes of people. (Mark 4²⁰ = Lk 8¹⁵ = Mt. 13²³) Professor C. H. Dodd (in "The Parables of the Kingdom") argues from this confusion of exposition that an element of interpretation was being used even by those who purported

to record the Lord Jesus' own interpretation. He also notes that this Synoptic exposition includes several words found nowhere else in these three Gospels, but which are demonstrably Pauline. All this suggests that the exposition of the Parable of the Sower was "not a part of the primitive tradition of the words of Jesus, but a piece of apostolic teaching" (p. 14) being "a striking example of the way in which the early Church reinterpreted sayings and parables of Jesus to suit its changing needs." (p. 131) It is a fact that this synoptic interpretation bears marks of an apostolic background; there is reference to "tribulation" and "persecution" (cp. 1 Thess. 1⁶ "having received the Logos in much affliction.")

We have, then, to make allowance for an element of interpretation in the Synoptic exegesis of the Parable of the Sower which has effects to be seen in the fact that the identification of the seed is not consistent. At least in the instance of Mark and Luke it could be said that the emphasis moves from the conception, in the first verse of the passage, of the Logos-seed which is sown, to the picture of the varied acceptances of the Logos. The teaching of the closing verse in all three versions reminds the reader forcibly of the Lord Jesus' teaching about the relationship between himself and at least two types of hearers, given by the Fourth Evangelist in the Vine-Branches-Fruit narrative. (Chap. 15) Here the cleansing agency is "The Logos" (Verse 3.) How close in the thought of the apostolic Church was the connection between that which was accomplished $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\sigma\alpha\iota$ and that which was effected $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\sigma\alpha\iota$ can be seen by comparing the "I am the vine" passage with 11 Cor. 5¹⁷⁻¹⁹.

It is true that the circumstances of "tribulation" and "persecution" may have forced certain elements into the Synoptic interpretation of the Parable of the Sower; but the suggestion is worthy of serious consideration that the confusion about the role of the Logos reflects a period in the development of apostolic thought when the idea of the Logos spoken by Christ was giving place to the concept of the Logos who is Christ. If we consider Mark 4¹⁷ it is easy to see how this development was possible ^{ΕΙΤΑ} γενομένης θλίψεως ἢ διωγμοῦ διὰ τὸν λόγον εὐθὺς σκανδαλίζονται.
 With this compare Matt. 11⁶. καὶ μακαριὸς ἐστὶν ὁς ἐὰν μὴ σκανδαλισθῇ ἐν ἐμοί... 26³¹ πάντες ὑμεῖς σκανδαλισθήσεσθε ἐν ἐμοί.....
 Mark 4²⁵ = Matt. 13³⁴ (cp. 26³³)

Mark 4³³ οὐρανοῦ κατακκηνόειν. | Καὶ τοιαύταις παρα- 33
 βολαῖς πολλαῖς ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον, καθὼς ἠδύνατο
 ἀκούειν | χωρὶς δὲ παραβολῆς οὐκ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς, κατ' ἰδίαν 34

Here the Logos is the teaching of Christ; the context and comparison with the Lukian and Matthew's Gospel suggests that it was teaching about the Kingdom of God (Heaven).

Mark 5³⁶ = Luke 8⁵⁰
 36 ἀπέθανεν· τί ἐτι σκύλλεις τὸν διδάσκαλον; ἢ ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς
 παρακούσας τὸν λόγον λαλοῦμενον λέγει τῷ ἀρχισυναγώ-
 37 γῳ Μὴ φοβοῦ, μόνον πίστευε. | καὶ οὐκ ἀφήκεν οὐδέν.

The Logos is here the report of the death of Jairus's daughter.
 Mark 7¹³ = Matt. 15⁶
 Mark 7¹³ θανάτῳ τελεγτάτῳ· ὑμεῖς δὲ λέγετε! Ἐὰν εἴπῃ ἄνθρω- 11
 πος τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ μητρὶ Κορβάν, ὃ ἐστὶν Δῶρον, ὃ ἐὰν
 ἐξ ἐμοῦ ὠφελήθῃς, οὐκέτι ἀφίετε αὐτὸν οὐδὲν ποιῆσαι τῷ 12
 πατρὶ ἢ τῇ μητρὶ, ἀκυροῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ παρα- 13
 δόσει ὑμῶν ἢ παρεδώκατε· καὶ παρόμοια τοιαῦτα πολλὰ
 ποιεῖτε. | Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος πάλιν τὸν ὄχλον ἔλεγεν 14
 Matthew 15⁶ ὠφελήθῃς, οὐ μὴ τιμήσει τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ·| καὶ ἠκυρώ- 6
 σατε τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν. | ὑπο- 7
 (Some ancient MSS have ὠμὸν instead of ἀφέν)

Some have thought that the phrase ἐν τῇ παράδοσιν suggests that the "Logos of God" means not so much "the utterance" as "the authority of God."

But, on the whole, the context indicates that "the Logos of God" alludes to the Decalogue (and the fifth commandment in particular).

Mark 7²⁹ = Matthew 15²⁸.
29 ἀπὸ τῶν ψυχῶν τῶν παιδίων. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ Διὰ τοῦ-
τον τὸν λόγον ὑπάγε, ἐξελήλυθεν ἐκ τῆς θυγατρὸς σου τὸ
30 δαιμόνιον. | καὶ ἀπελθούσα εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτῆς εὗρεν τὸ

"This Logos" is the Syrophenician woman's reply about the little dogs eating the crumbs from the childrens' table.

Mark 8³¹⁻³². = 31 αὐτοῖς. | Καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς ὅτι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀνα-
32 στήναι· καὶ παρρησίᾳ τὸν λόγον ἐλάλει. | καὶ προσλαβό- = Lk. 9²² = Mt. 16²¹.

The Logos is here the prediction of our Lord about his own capture, death and resurrection; in fact the substance of the first apostolic preaching. The late Sir Edwyn Hoskyns rightly recognized the importance of this verse. "In the Synoptic Gospels and in the Acts of the Apostles the WORD, with or without an explanatory genitive, is a synonym for the GOSPEL. It denotes the teaching of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, given publicly to the crowds by means of parables and miracles and privately to the disciples.....it denotes also the substance of the missionary teaching of the apostles and others concerning Jesus the Messiah..... Mark 8³² is an important passage. Here Jesus, for the first time in St. Mark's Gospel, is said to have referred openly to his death and resurrection. The Evangelist checks his narrative at this point and adds the significant comment: HE SPAKE THE WORD OPENLY. That is to say, the final context of the Gospel or Word is defined in the death and resurrection of Jesus." ("The Fourth Gospel," pp 159 - 160.)

Mark 9⁵⁻¹⁰ = Luke 9⁵⁸⁻⁵⁶ = Matthew 17⁴⁻⁹.

Mark 9¹⁰ συναλαούτες τῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος λέγει τῷ Ἰησοῦ Ῥαββεί, καλὸν ἐστὶν ἡμᾶς ὧδε εἶναι, καὶ ποιήσωμεν τρεῖς σκηνάς, σοὶ μίαν καὶ Μωυσεὶ μίαν καὶ Ἠλείᾳ μίαν. οὐ γὰρ ἴδει τί ἀποκριθῆ, ἔκφοβοι γὰρ ἐγένοντο. καὶ ἐγένετο νεφέλη ἐπισκιάουσα αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἐγένετο φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ

in verse 36, may refer to the saying so recently addressed to the demoniac (verse 34); or it may involve the general discourse of our Lord during the incident, culminating in the command which healed the demoniac.

But it is to be noticed that whereas according to St. Luke it is our Lord's Logos which "was ἐν ἑξουσίᾳ" St. Mark tells us that it was our Lord who "taught ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ ἑχων." (1²² cp Matt. 7²⁸) So, then, we have a glimpse at a stage in the development of the tradition of the Church when little distinction was drawn between the Logos being ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ and the Christ teaching as one having ἐξουσία. How close we are approaching to the view-point which was behind the Fourth Gospel is to be realized when we recall that, in the Lukan and Markan accounts, the narrative goes on to record the healing of Peter's wife's mother (Luke 4³⁸⁻³⁹ = Mark 1²⁹⁻³¹) Especially in the Lukan version we have in the whole passage 4^{31b-41} the idea of the Christ by utterance recreating and making whole. Similarly, in Matthew's account of the "Cananitish woman" (15²¹⁻²⁸) it is the withholding by the Lord Jesus of his utterance which impedes the health of the woman's daughter. (ὁ δὲ οὐκ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῇ λόγον.) Similarly, according to St. Luke, the centurian believed that it was enough for the Lord Jesus to "speak a Logos" for the servant to be healed (Luke 7⁷) - although here it is possible that he was looking for some specific saying, such as "Take up thy bed and walk." But the talk of "authority" in the next verse must also be given some place in determining the force of Logos in verse 7. (cp. Mt. 8⁸⁻¹⁰)

Luke 5¹⁻¹¹ = Mark 1¹⁶⁻²⁰ (although Mark is apparently drawing upon a different version).

Luke 5¹

Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ τὸν ὄχλον ἐπικεῖσθαι αὐτῷ καὶ ἀκούειν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ἐστῶς παρὰ τὴν λίμνην Γεννησαρέτ, καὶ εἶδεν πλοῖα δύο ἐστῶτα παρὰ

The phrase ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ is a favourite one of St. Luke, being used four times in his Gospel and twelve times in the Acts of the Apostles. (Luke 5¹; 8¹¹; 8²¹, 11²⁸; Acts 4³¹; 6²; 6⁷; 8¹⁴; 11¹; 12²⁴; 13⁵; 13⁷; 12⁴⁴; 13⁴⁶; 17¹³; 18¹¹;) Once again we have a choice as to what was intended by the genitive τοῦ θεοῦ ; it could mean "the Logos about God." But as for instance Adeney, others have understood the phrase to mean "the Logos which God speaks." Most likely, however, the truth is that St. Luke (or, maybe, the author of his source) used the phrase to denote Christ Jesus' teaching about God; then, in time, the same phrase came to mean all that was understood by τὸ εὐαγγέλιον; and so on, until the phrase carried the notion of the Logos as going out from God. Today - with no offence to grammar - the modern reader can find the antecedent of αὐτῶς in the Logos of the previous clause. The sentence also, would be a valid statement for the modern reader if τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ be replaced by a simple αὐτῶν. At what point this became possible, is not easy to say. Probably much earlier than we have hitherto suspected. Would the author of the Johannine Prologue have introduced the Logos-term unless he did so in the full realization that he was using a term which had already acquired a certain significance in the Christian vocabulary? To have delved into stoic philosophy, or the byeways of Jewish Wisdom literature for a term which was already taking its place in Christian

technical language would have been to invite misunderstanding.

Luke 8²¹ = Mark 3³³⁻³⁵ = Matthew 12⁴⁹⁻⁵⁰
 ἐστήκασιν ἔξω ἰδεῖν θέλοντές σε. ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς
 Luke 8²¹ πρὸς αὐτοὺς Μήτηρ μου καὶ ἀδελφοί μου οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ
 τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ ἀκούοντες καὶ ποιῶντες.

As it stands, and bearing in mind that the other Synoptists say that those who "do the will of God" (Mark 3³⁵ cp. Matt. 12⁵⁰) are Christ's "brother, and sister, and mother," it seems that the Logos of God means our Lord's declaration of the purpose of God. But this has to be balanced with such teaching as that of John 15¹⁴⁻¹⁶ ("Ye are my friends if ye do the things which I (ἐγὼ) command you") The Logos of God is the divine purpose manifest in Jesus Christ.

Luke 22^{60b-62} = Mark 14⁷² = Matthew 26^{74b-75}.

Luke 22³¹. καὶ ὑπεμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τοῦ λόγου τοῦ κυρίου, ὡς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὅτι.....

Both Schwarz and Westcott and Hort accept the reading τοῦ ῥήματος ; both Mark and Matthew have τῷ ῥήματι . Ἰσχύος λόγου is correct, it is used in the sense of "utterance," namely that recorded in the following verse.

Matthew 15¹⁰⁻²³ = Mark 7¹⁴⁻²³
 Matthew 15¹² θηταὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ Οἶδας ὅτι οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον ἐσκandalίσθησαν; ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν Πᾶσα ἰσχύς

The immediate sense of the Logos is the dictum of verses 10⁶⁻¹¹. But see notes on Mark 4¹⁷. Considering the point made there, and noting such verses as Mark 14²⁷, we can recognize yet another instance of the employment of the term Logos in a formal sense, but in such a context that its use (and especially in liturgy) would lead the early hearers of the Gospel to attach to it much more than that formal sense.

So far, for the purpose of convenience, we have dealt with the use of the Logos-term in Mark and in matter common either to all three Synoptic writers, or Mark and one of the other two. We must now look at the use of this term in passages peculiar to Luke or Matthew.

Luke 1² ΕΠΕΙΔΗΠΕΡ ΠΟΛΛΟΙ ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι· ἀνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς καθέξῃς σοι γράψαι, κράτιστε Θεό- διήγησεν περὶ τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων, φιλε, ἵνα ἐπιγνῶς περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων τὴν ἀσφάλειαν· καθὼς παρέδοσαν ἡμῖν οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέ- ται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου, ἔδοξε καὶ μοι παρηκολουθηκότι, λειαν.

This is a grammatically difficult description of the early apostolic preachers as "those who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the Logos." Admonney was content to compare the usage here with that in Acts 13²⁵, and to regard the Logos as a technical term for "the subject matter of Christian teaching". Plummer rendered the term as "the doctrine".

The point which strikes the reader of the New Testament is that here, as in the Johannine prologue ἀρχὴ and λόγος are closely associated in the preface to what purports to be a narrative of the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. In St. Mark's Gospel there is a juxtaposition of ἀρχὴ and εὐαγγέλιον . Hoskyns is again well worth quoting: "St. Luke clearly means by the word more than the teaching of Jesus..... Nor, in St. Mark's preface, can the GOSPEL OF JESUS CHRIST mean merely the Gospel which Jesus proclaimed, since in the course of the Gospel Jesus as the Messiah becomes more and more the subject of his own teaching."

He goes on, "since therefore, no Evangelist could divorce the Gospel or word of God from Jesus himself, both the Gospel and the word of God are drawn into the orbit of his person" (cp. cit. p. 160)

When we take into consideration the fact that Origen (and, after him, Athanasius) regard the Logos in 1² as the personal Logos, Jesus Christ,

we can see that the use of the Logos term in the Lukan Prologue stands well on the road from the use of the Logos-term for the utterance of Christ to its use in the Johannine Prologue for the Christ.

Luke 12⁹ μετὰ σοῦ. ἡ δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ διεταράχθη καὶ διελογίζετο 29
ποταπὸς εἶη ὁ ἀσπασμὸς οὗτος. καὶ εἶπεν ὁ ἄγγελος 30

The Logos here is the angelic message just delivered (επτὸ ῥήμα in verse 38).

Luke 7¹⁷ 17 ὅτι Ἐπεσκέψατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξήλθεν ὁ λόγος οὗτος ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ πάσῃ τῇ περιχώρῳ.

The Logos here is the saying just mentioned - "that God had visited his people by sending a mighty Prophet." (Plummer)

Luke 10³⁹ οἰκίαν. καὶ τῆδε ἦν ἀδελφὴ καλουμένη Μαριάμ, [ἡ] καὶ 39
παρακαθεσθεῖσα πρὸς τοὺς πόδας τοῦ κυρίου ἤκουεν τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ. ἢ δὲ Μάρθα περιεσπάτο περὶ πολλὴν διακονίαν 40

The Logos on this occasion is the teaching which the Lord Jesus gave at this particular time.

Luke 11²⁹ ἐκείνου χεῖρα τῶν πρώτων. Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ 27
λέγει αὐτὸν ταῦτα ἐπάρασά τις φωνὴν γυνὴ ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου εἶπεν αὐτῷ Μακαρία ἡ κοιλία ἢ βαστάσασά σε καὶ μαστοὶ οὓς ἐθήλασας· αὐτὸς δὲ εἶπεν Μενούν μακάριοι 28 οἱ ἀκούοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ φυλάσσοντες.

In the account in Acts of Stephen's apology φυλάσσειν is used of keeping, or guarding, the precepts of Torah. This predisposes us to say that here in conjunction with the phrase "the Logos of God," the meaning is "Blessed are they that hear my teaching and keep the precepts thereof."

Thus once again we have a passage in which the phrase "the Logos of God" is moving to connote much more than the teaching of Christ - in fact, the

Person of Christ. διασκορπίζων τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ, καὶ φωνήσας αὐτὸν 2
εἶπεν αὐτῷ Τί τοῦτο ἀκούω περὶ σοῦ; ἀπόδος τὸν λόγον 3
τῆς οἰκονομίας σου, οὐ γὰρ δύνη ἐτι οἰκονομεῖν. βέβαιον 3
ἔστι ἐν ἑαυτῷ ὁ οἰκονόμος Τί ποιήσω ὅτι ὁ κύριός μου

Logos is used in the classical sense of "report" or "(necessary) account."

Matthew 5²⁷ 27 τριχὰ λευκὴν ποιῆσαι ἢ μέλαιναν. ἔστω δὲ ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν ναι ναι, οὐ οὐ· τὸ δὲ περισσὸν τούτων ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ.

The Logos bears the immediate meaning of "speech" or "talking." But, keeping in mind 11 Cor. 117-19 (see notes), it will be realized that the early Christians would have come to understand by the Logos, as used in this and similar contexts, something beyond its original import.

Matthew 19¹¹ ἡ θρόνου μετὰ τῆς γυναίκος, οὐ συμφέρεи γαμήσαι· ὁ δὲ εἰ-
πεν αὐτοῖς· Οὐ πάντες χωροῦσι τὸν λόγον, ἀλλ' οἷς δέδοται!

This Logos is the teaching of the Lord Jesus on marriage. (verses 8-10) But if those MSS which omit the demonstrative τοῦτο should, by any chance, preserve the original words of our Lord, or even the form in which the saying was generally recounted among the early Christians, then in this verse we have just the type of phrase in which, by use and association, the Logos-term would acquire a meaning approaching that which it has in the Johannine Prologue.

Matthew 28¹⁵ δάχθησαν· Καὶ διεφημίσθη ὁ λόγος οὗτος παρὰ Ἰουδαίους
μέχρι τῆς σήμερον [ἡμέρας]. Ἰ Οἱ δὲ ἕνδεκα ιβ

This Logos is defined as the statement that his disciples had stolen the Lord's body out of the tomb.

For the sake of convenience and brevity the other uses of Logos (and its plural) in the Synoptic Gospels may be summarized:-

- A. 1. "matter" or "topic", Mk. 11²⁹ (=Lk. 20²³ = Mt. 21²⁴).
- 2. "talk(ing)", Mk. 12¹³ (=Lk. 20²⁰ = Mt. 21¹⁵) Mt. 22⁴⁶
- 3. "reckoning", Mt. 18²³, 25¹⁹
- 4. "statement", Lk. 12¹⁰ (=Mt. 12³²)
Mt. 12³⁶ (thought by W. O. Allen
to be in a quotation.
L.C.C. p. 138)
- 5. in conjunction with ῥῆγμα Lk. 24¹⁹
- 6. to render קִרְיָא קַדְשָׁא ("something unchaste") Mt. 5³²

B.

B. (in the plural) l. of our Lord's teaching,

Mk. 8³⁸ (=Lk. 9²⁶), Mk. 13³¹, (=Lk. 21³³ = Mt. 24³⁵)

Lk. 4²²; 6⁴⁷; 24⁴⁴; Mt. 7²⁴⁻²⁶⁻²⁸ (where Lk. has $\rho\acute{\nu}\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$)

2. of specific teaching, Mk. 10²⁴; Lk. 9²⁸; 9⁴⁴
Mt. 10¹; 26¹;
3. of the message of the twelve Mt. 10¹⁴.
4. of the facts of the Faith, Lk. 1⁴.
5. of the message of Isaiah, Lk. 5⁴
6. of a specific angelic prophecy, Lk. 12⁰
7. of talk (or conversation), not our Lord's, Luke 24¹⁷ Mt. 12³⁷.

Since the book of the Acts of the Apostles is the story of the Apostles' work in spreading the Gospel "both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth" (Acts 1⁸) there is small wonder that the Logos-term is so frequently found - signifying, as it so often does, the Gospel. In this connection it is interesting to remark that H. U. Gaebury, in his note on "Names for Christians and Christianity in Acts," includes $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ as being used "in the sense of Christianity." (Theodos - Jackson and K. Lake, "Beginnings of Christianity." Vol. IV p. 391) As a matter of fact Logos, in various forms, is used nearly seventy times in Acts. It would require extending the present enquiry to impossible length to examine individually and in detail each incidence of the Logos-term in the Acts of the Apostles. It will, moreover, be appreciated that the nature of the book itself is a clear indication of the sense in which $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ is likely to be used in most of the instances. Thus, only those passages of particular interest in the present discussion will be treated separately, while the others are included in the following summary.

A. The Gospel viewed as the burden of the Apostolic preaching:-

1. the full expression (which is so characteristic of Acts 4¹⁹) ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ or Κυρίως is found in :-

4³¹; 8¹⁴; 8²⁵; 11¹; 13⁷ (where it almost amounts to "the Faith")
15⁴⁴; 13⁴⁶; 15⁴⁸; 15⁴⁹; (According to 15⁴⁶ acceptance or rejection of the Logos of God is intrinsically bound up with ἡ οὐκ ἐπίσταται σωτήριον, while of 13⁴⁹; it might be remarked that it is difficult to understand how, if there was a diffusion of such contexts, the early Christian readers of the Johannine Prologue would be likely to refer the Logos of John 1¹; to Genesis 1 15³⁵; 15³⁶; 16³²; 17¹³; 18¹¹; 19¹⁰;

2. without the qualifying genitive are:-

4²⁹; 8³¹; (R.V. has "matter", but in view of 8¹⁴, it is probably better to regard the Logos as the Gospel) 10⁴⁴ (as distinct from the Petrine pronouncement ὅτι πάντα - in the first part of the verse) 14²⁵; 16³; 17¹¹ (evidently in contrast with ἡ γραφή)

(b) A particular pronouncement:- 6⁵ (of the twelve) 7²⁹ (quotation Exod. 2¹⁵) 20⁵⁶ (St. Paul's statement to the Ephesians that they would not see him again) Probably the use is similar in 2⁴¹; (Peter's

Sermon) 4⁴ (message of Peter and John about the Resurrection) 20⁷

(Paul's sermon at Troas) 22²² (Paul's remark about being sent to the Gentiles;)

(c) Matter or subject:- 10²⁹; 13¹⁵; 15⁶; (where some MSS in fact have ὅτι πάντα) 16¹⁵; 19³⁸⁻⁴⁰; 20² (almost teaching);

(d) Book:- (apparently St. Luke's Gospel) 11

(e) Report:- 11²²

(f) Account (value):- 20²⁴

λόγος is also used in these two phrases: ὁ ἡγούμενος τῶν λόγων (14¹²; Moffat renders "chief spokesman") and διὰ λόγου (13²⁷⁻²⁸ "orally").

The plural is used of, or alluding to pronouncements in 2²²; 2⁴⁰; 5⁵; 5²⁴; 15¹⁵; (O.T. quotations) 15²⁴ (of the Judaizers) 16³⁶ (of the Philippian magistrates) 20³⁵ (of Christ); and in the sense of "talking" in 7²².

The following instances of the use of the Logos-term in Acts are of particular interest:-

(a) 8⁴; 13⁵; 11¹⁹;

8⁴;

4 Οἱ μὲν οὖν διασπαρέντες διήλθον εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὸν
5 λόγον. Φίλιππος δὲ κατελθὼν εἰς τὴν πόλιν τῆς Σαμα-
6 ρίας ἐκήρυσσεν αὐτοῖς τὸν χριστόν. ἠπροσεῖχον δὲ οἱ ὄχλοι

It is quite true that this verse, which introduces the account of Philip's visit to Samaria, could mean no more than that he preached the Gospel. But attention should be given to three other instances of the use of the verb εὐαγγελίζομαι in Acts, where the direct object is Jesus Christ: (5⁴²; 9³⁵; 11¹⁹;) Canon Ramsey describes the expression "to Gospel Jesus" as "this striking phrase" (Resurrection of Christ p. 12). If, as the evidence suggests, there was current in early Christian communities, two expressions "to Gospel Jesus" and "to Gospel the Logos;" then we may legitimately suppose that there would be a close association between Jesus and the Logos in the minds of those early Christians. It would be to such a use of Logos that a subsequent Christian writer would more naturally turn; it would be such a use of Logos which was the more likely to be associated with his employment of the term, in the minds of those who read his Prologue.

Perhaps the same processes are at work behind Ephesians 2¹⁴; and 2¹⁷ αὐτὸς γὰρ ἡ Χριστὸς ἵεστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ὑμῶν ... Acts 10-36.

ἐλθῶν εὐαγγελίσασθε εἰρήνην ...

Now should the point be ignored that, while verse 4 tells us that the Apostles, when "scattered abroad" went about "gospolling the Logos", the next verse tells us that Philip "preached Christ" (εὐκέρυσσεν τὸν Χριστὸν) to the Samaritans.

(A few ancient MSS have εὐαγγελίσασθε τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ.)

15⁵ (Barnabas - Paul)

4 Ἄυτοὶ μὲν οὖν ἐπεμφθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος
κατήλθον εἰς Σελευκίαν, ἐκεῖθεν τε ἀπέπλευσαν εἰς Κύπρον,
5 καὶ γενόμενοι ἐν Σαλαμῖνι κατήγγελλον τὸν λόγον τοῦ θε-
οῦ ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων· εἶχον δὲ καὶ Ἰωάν-
6 νην ὑπηρέτην. (Διελθόντες δὲ ὄλην τὴν νῆσον.

Although this is not the only instance in Acts of καταγγέλλω with λογος

other instances (o.g. 15³⁶) have been included in the summary for the sake of brevity and convenience. But attention is drawn to the fact that this verb is also used in Acts in close association with the name Jesus (o.g. 17³⁰ Ἰησοῦς ὃν ἐγὼ καταγγέλλω ὑμῖν.) St. Paul also used the verb in this way in his letters (o.g. Phil. 1¹⁷⁻¹⁸ Χριστῶς καταγγέλλεται)

Again 11¹⁰; is not the only instance in the Acts of the Apostles in which λαλέω has the Logos as a direct object (o.g. 5⁰¹; 3²⁵; 13⁵; etc.) But this verse is particularly interesting because it precedes one of the "gospolling Jesus" verses.

1. Οἱ μὲν οὖν διασπαρέντες ἀπὸ τῆς θλίψεως τῆς γενομένης ἐπὶ Στεφάνῳ διήλθον ἕως Φοινίκης καὶ Κύπρου καὶ Ἀντιοχείας, μηδεὶ λαλοῦντες τὸν λόγον εἰ μὴ μόνον Ἰουδαίοις. Ἦσαν δὲ τινες ἐξ αὐτῶν ἄνδρες Κύπριοι καὶ ...

The conclusion would appear to be that in the Acts of the Apostles the process is at work by which the Lord Jesus Christ and the Logos of God were identified.

αὶ χῆραι αὐτῶν· προσκαλεσάμενοι δὲ οἱ δώδεκα τὸ πλῆ-
 θος τῶν μαθητῶν εἶπαν· Οὐκ ἀρεστόν ἐστὶν ἡμῶς καταλεί-
 ψαντας τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ διακονεῖν τραπέζαις· ἐπισκέ-
 ψασθε δέ, ἀδελφοί, ἄνδρας ἐξ ὑμῶν μαρτυρουμένους ἐπιτὰ
 πλήρει πνεύματος καὶ σοφίας, οὓς καταστήσομεν ἐπὶ τῆς
 χρείας ταύτης· ἡμεῖς δὲ τῇ προσευχῇ καὶ τῇ διακονίᾳ τοῦ
 λόγου προσκαρτερήσομεν. καὶ ἤρεσεν ὁ λόγος ἐνώπιον

Set, as they are, in the narrative dealing with the appointment of the
 "seven men full of good report," in which the chief topic is the distinc-
 tively apostolic work, the Logos bears the natural sense of the apostolic
 Message. But attention is drawn to the close proximity of this passage
 to εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τῶν Χριστῶν. It is in just such passages as this that the
 Logos-term was likely to have acquired the significance which it has in the
 Johannine Prologue. Von Harnack remarked of the use in 3rd that it may have
 meaning that the word of God is the master of the Apostles, "and he traces"
 "an undoubted step towards the Johannine Logos that attained by John in his
 own Prologue, where λόγος of verse 3 yields to λόγοι in verse 4, though
 Harnack doubted if this was intentional and thought that τῶ λόγῳ could have
 been used. ("Constitution and Law of the Church" p. 337, n2.)

1036-38 τὸν καὶ ἐργαζόμενος δικαιοσύνην δεκτὴς αὐτῆ ἐστίν· τὸν 36
 λόγον ἀπέστειλεν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ εὐαγγελιζόμενος ἀρχόμενος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα ὁ ἐκῆρυ-
 εἰρήνην διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· οὗτός ἐστιν πάντων κύριος. 38 ξεν Ἰωάννης, Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέθ, ὡς ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν
 ὑμεῖς οἴδατε τὸ γινόμενον ῥῆμα καθ' ὅλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας, 37

Many ancient MSS omit ὁ, but ἰδὸν be the correct reading, then we could
 read with the Revised Version:-

"The Logos which (God) sent unto the children of Israel, preaching
 good tidings of peace by Jesus Christ (he is Lord of all) - that saying ye
 yourselves know, which was published throughout all Judaea, beginning from
 Galilee, after the baptism which John preached; **BEING** Jesus of Nazareth,-
 how that God anointed him with the Holy Ghost and with power...."

If the ὁ be rejected (and the MSS evidence is good, though not

conclusive) then we could follow the R.V. margin:-

"(God) sent the Logos unto the children" etc.

In either case, and before discussing this passage any further, we note that in this context the Logos stands in close relationship to Jesus of Nazareth. The insertion of EVEN before Jesus of Nazareth in verse 38 shows that the translators wished to emphasise that the Logos and Jesus of Nazareth are in apposition to one another; in the Greek both are in the accusative case. Nor should the presence of *ἐν τῷ ἱσραὴλ* be ignored; nor the fact that it is nominative, agreeing with the subject of *ἰσραὴλ* - God.

The general meaning of the passage is clear, but there are certain obscurities due to the overloading of the sentence, perhaps by a redactor, including in the text phrases which were originally marginal comments. Westcott and Hort, in their edition of the Greek New Testament, sought greater clarity by the use of different punctuation. In the main text they rejected *ὁ* and the result may be rendered:-

"(God) sent the Logos to the sons of Israel, "gospelling" peace by Jesus Christ; he is Lord of all. You know the saying which was spread throughout all Judaea..... (namely) Jesus of Nazareth" etc..... Their marginal reading runs:-

"The Logos which (God) sent to the sons of Israel "gospelling" peace by Jesus Christ (he is Lord of all), you know; the saying was spread abroad" etc.

Possibly the truth of the matter is that we are here dealing with the mishandling of an Aramaic original. The Greek is strained, and there is an

absence of the normal connecting participles. Perhaps the original read something like this:-

"The Logos which the Lord of all sent to the sons of Israel, "gospelling" peace through Jesus Christ; the story which was enacted (an Hebraism) throughout all Judaea, beginning from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached, you know - the one about Jesus of Nazareth and how God anointed him" etc. (For this use of ἡμεῖς to render 727 cp. Mk. 2:15 R.F. Jackson and K. Lake render "ye know the event which happened.")

The above matter was prepared before the publication of Mgr. R.A. Knox's new translation of the New Testament. It is interesting to notice that his rendering of the passage is very similar to that just given, and conveys the same notion of the mission and work of the Logos as the subject of the story.

1386

26 ἄξιός τὸ ὑπόδημα τῶν ποδῶν λύσαι. Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, υἱοὶ γένους Ἀβραὰμ καὶ οἱ ἐν ὑμῖν φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν, ἡμῖν
27 ὁ ΛΟΓΟΣ τῆς σωτηρίας ταύτης ἔξαπεστάλη. Ἰοὶ γὰρ κατοί-

This is a quotation from St. Paul's speech at Pisidian Antioch in answer to the invitation to give ^{ἐπιμνησθε} ~~ἐπιμνησθε~~ _{εως} ~~εως~~ the people - the Jews and φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν. Doubtless, if St. Paul is reported accurately, he used the phrase "the Logos of God" knowing that it would be associated in the minds of this particular audience with the Sacred Scriptures of the Hebrews, (cp. Mk. 7:13), and perhaps with such as Ps. 107:20 ^{ἀπέστειλε τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ.} But the main burden of the speech is contained in the exposition of the office and ministry of Jesus in relation to these Scriptures. For it seems clear that verses 27 - 31 refer to the fate of Jesus Christ at the hands of them "that dwell in Jerusalem." Yet, while ^{ἐπιμνησθε} ~~ἐπιμνησθε~~ _{εως} of verse 23 could be the antecedent of the ^{εως} ~~εως~~ _{εως} of verse 27, the renewed vocatives of verse 26

make it much more likely that we should find the antecedent of $\tau\omega\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$ in the Logos of God. Thus we have the Logos of God spoken of in relation to the events of the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Then, almost as if to clear up our doubts, the matter is clinched by the introduction of the reference to the raising up of Jesus in verse 33. Dr. Howard is right; St. Paul "was speaking of the Gospel, but as a word spoken by God and sent forth by God in a personal life." ("Christianity According to St. John". p. 63.)

Interesting, too, are the reference to "the Logos of his Grace", 14³,

20³².

$\tau\omega\nu$ ἐθνῶν κατὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν. ἱκανὸν μὲν οὖν χρόνον
διέτριψαν παρησιαζόμενοι ἐπὶ τῷ κυρίῳ τῷ μαρτυροῦντι
τῷ λόγῳ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, δίδόντι σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα
ἵ γίνεσθαι διὰ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν. ἔσχισθη δὲ τὸ πλῆθος

14³

It is irrelevant to the present discussion to decide whether verse 3 is displaced and should follow verse 1

20³²

δακρύων νοουθετῶν ἕνα ἕκαστον. | καὶ τὰ νῦν παρατίθεμαι 3²
ὑμᾶς τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ τῷ λόγῳ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ τῷ δυναμένῳ
οἰκοδομῆσαι καὶ δοῦναι τὴν κληρονομίαν ἐν τοῖς ἡγια-
σμένοις πᾶσιν. | ἀργυρίου ἢ χρυσοῦ ἢ ἱματισμοῦ οὐδενός 33

The first is a reference to the message of Barnabas and Paul and the second is what is presented as a verbatim report of St. Paul's farewell speech to the Ephesians at Miletus. Our attention, in view of the present enquiry, was bound to be arrested by any association between the Logos and $\chi\alpha\rho\iota\varsigma$.

In 14³ Moffatt is probably right in regarding $\kappa\omicron\varsigma\upsilon\iota\varsigma$ as Christ ($\kappa\alpha\iota$ denotes "reliance upon"). Taken by itself, it might not merit special attention; but in view of the recurrence of the phrase in 20³², it ought to be noted. Precisely what is meant by its use in 14³ is not easy to see. It may be a reference to the works accompanying and following the preaching.

of the Logos (cp. Acts 11¹⁹⁻²⁴) or it may denote that the Apostles had been speaking of the life of the Lord Jesus in such a way as to draw out the picture of the grace of God which was upon him (cp. Luke, 2⁴⁰) or, more likely, it may signify that St. Paul had been speaking of his own convictions about the grace of Christ which he had himself received. (cp. Romans 12³, 1 Cor. 15¹⁰, 2 Cor. 12⁹.) [✓] In 20³², we are faced with a conflict of MSS evidence τῷ θεῷ καὶ τῷ λόγῳ is well attested.

But there is good support for τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ τῷ λόγῳ (which has the support of C. Vaticanus, a 12th and 13th cent. MSS of Oxford and Upsala, the Stockholm (Gigas) copy of the Old Lat. V. and the Sahadic V.) In the latter case κυρίως will refer back to the Lord Jesus in verse 24, in which event it might be thought that "the Logos of his grace" might correspond to "the Gospel of the Grace of God." It may strike us as strange that Paul should commend men to a person and a Gospel; but we have to remember that it was part of his thought to associate Logos with "building up" and "grace" (cp. Eph. 4²⁹ "Let no corrupt Logos proceed out of your mouth, but such as is good for the building up πρὸς οἰκοδομῆν) of what is needed, that it may give grace (ἵνα δὲ χάριν) to the hearer." cp. Col. 4⁶) Surely we may suppose, too, that the story would be current about the Lord Jesus saying "Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build (οἰκοδομήσω) my Church." (Mt. 16¹⁸).

In other words, we have evidence of the circulation of ideas about the Logos "building up," and also of Christ "building up." (cp. also Lk. 4²², ἐδάμψον ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος, τοῖς ἐκπορευομένοις ἐκ τοῦ στόματος.)

If however, the reading θεῷ be accepted, then the Logos "is mentioned alongside of God" (Cadbury, in "Beginnings of Christianity" IV p. 391.) In

this case, there is an identification implied not merely of the Logos and the Apostolic Preaching, but also, in some measure, of the Logos and the Lord Jesus. (see Cadbury op. cit. p.232) Even Cadbury, who regarded this verse as coming most close of all the instances to an hypostatization, but still refused to allow that this had happened, has to concede that here the term is "a concrete thing." And Rackham drew attention to the fact that *δυνάμει* refers to the Logos.

St. Peter, according to Acts, opened his speech at the Council of Jerusalem with these words:-

ἀναστάς Πέτρος εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ὑμεῖς ἐπίστασθε ὅτι ἀφ' ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων ἐν ὑμῖν ἐξελέξατο ὁ θεὸς διὰ τοῦ στόματός μου ἀκούσαι τὰ ῥήθη τὸν λόγον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου καὶ πιστεῦσαι, καὶ ὁ καρδιογνώστης θεὸς

(15⁷)

It is possible that the genitive *εὐαγγελίου* is definitive, in which case the Logos of the Gospel is best rendered as "the message about the Gospel." But it is worth while noticing in passing that in St. Mark's Gospel, when our Lord first speaks openly of his death and resurrection, the Evangelist comments, "he spake the Logos openly." (8³²) Many have argued that St. Mark's Gospel represents the preaching of Peter. If this is so, and if Acts 15⁷ preserves faithfully the words of St. Peter, we should be very wary of dismissing "the Logos of the Gospel." As no more than the "message of the Gospel." Exactly, what, however, we can otherwise give us the force of the expression, is not easy to see, unless we are to regard the Logos as the subject matter of the Evangel. 185.

5 τε Ἰουδαίους καὶ Ἕλληνας. Ὡς δὲ κατήλθον τῷ λόγῳ ὁ Παῦλος, διαμαρτυρούμενος τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις εἶναι ἀπὸ τῆς Μακεδονίας ὁ τε Σίλας καὶ ὁ Τιμόθεος, συνείχετο τὸν χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν. Ἄντιπασσομένων δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ βλα-

According to Sontar, *δυνάμει* in the context means "I am pressed." The verse could mean no more than that on coming down from Macedonia, Paul was overcome with a sense of the urgency of preaching the Gospel in Achaia.

But two considerations should be noticed. First, in similar circumstances it is the "Spirit" (8²⁹, the case of Philip of the Ethiopian Church) or the "Spirit of Jesus" (16⁷, the forbidding to go to Bithynia) to whom is attributed the prompting to evangelize. Secondly, when St. Paul uses the verb in his own letters, it is "the love of Christ which constraineth", (606/11 Cor, 5¹⁴) Moreover, in the context 18⁵ is quite clear that the Logos is not a synonym for Christ's teaching; at the very least it is the setting forth of the fact "Jesus was the Christ."

By way of drawing to a close this examination of the use of the Logos-term in the Acts of the Apostles, we may consider the fact that, of the six verses which summarize the divisions of the book, three contain the term, (6⁷; 12²⁴; 19²⁰; cp. 9⁵¹; 16⁵; 28³¹) and the language is almost identical.

6⁷; 12²⁴; 19²⁰. *Καὶ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἤξανε, καὶ ἐπληθύνετο ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν μαθητῶν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ σφόδρα, πολὺς τε ὄχλος τῶν ἱερέων ὑπήκουον τῇ πίστει.*
 12 *καὶ γενόμενος σκληρόβρωτος ἐξέψυξεν.* *Ὁ δὲ κυρίου ὁ λόγος ἤξανε καὶ ἴσχυεν.*
λόγος τοῦ κυρίου ἤξανε καὶ ἐπληθύνετο. 19 20

It is hard to see how the verb *ἴσχυεν* can be applied to the Logos (of God) or how these three summaries can have any real significance, if the meaning of the term is to be limited to those generally allowed by translators and commentators. We could, like Osbury, regard the Logos as synonymous with Christianity. But it seems reasonable and within the evidence to suggest that these summaries belong to the final redaction of the book and to the time when the usage of the worshipping Christian Church was lifting the term "the Logos (of God)" forward from its earlier restricted sense towards the position which it occupies in the Johannine Prologue.

The use of the Logos-term in the Revelation of St. John the Divine has on the whole received adequate attention from most commentators. This makes the neglect of, or the superficial consideration of the term in the other New Testament writing all the more difficult to understand.

There are five passages which may conveniently be considered together:-

- 11-2; ¹ ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΙΣ ΙΗΣΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ, ἣν ἔδωκεν ² αὐτοῦ τῷ δούλῳ αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννῃ, ὃς ἐμαρτύρησεν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅσα εἶδεν. | μακάριος ὁ ἀναγινώσκων καὶ οἱ ἀκούοντες τοὺς
- 19; Ἐγὼ Ἰωάννης, ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὑμῶν καὶ συνκοινωνὸς ἐν ⁹ τῇ θλίψει καὶ βασιλείᾳ καὶ ὑπομονῇ ἐν Ἰησοῦ, ἐγενόμην ἐν τῇ νήσῳ τῇ καλουμένῃ Πάτμῳ διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ. | ἐγενόμην ¹⁰ ἔνθα καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν θηρίων τῆς γῆς. | Καὶ ⁹ ὅτε ἤνοιξεν τὴν πέμπτην σφραγίδα, εἶδον ὑπὸκάτω τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν ἐσφαγμένων διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ διὰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἣν εἶχον. | καὶ ¹⁰ ἔβαλεν ὁ δράκων ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ | καὶ ἄργισθη ¹⁷ ὁ δράκων ἐπὶ τῇ γυναίκῃ, καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ποιῆσαι πόλεμον μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτῆς, τῶν τηρούντων
- 1217; τὰς ἐντολάς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐχόντων τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ. | καὶ ἐστάθη ἐπὶ τὴν ἄμμον τῆς θαλάσσης. |
- 204; Ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς | καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν πεπελεκισμένων διὰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ καὶ διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ | καὶ οἵτινες

In connection with the first instance (1²) we have to decide whether genitive Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ of the first verse is subjective or objective. Dr. Hort declared that "Jesus Christ" is the subject of the Apocalypse. But this leaves the αὐτῷ of the clause ἣν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς εἶναι somewhat "in the air." This difficulty is solved if, as the grammar allows, we regard "Jesus Christ" as the giver of the Revelation. Turning next, to verse 2, and, with R. H. Charles, regarding the genitive Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ as subjective, we could render the verse, "(John) bore witness of the Logos given by God and of the testimony borne by Jesus Christ". The Revisers, by the insertion of EVEN, rightly indicate that the Logos and the witness are the objects of the vision; and the Logos is already defined by the previous verse as the "revelation". For our immediate purpose, we need

say no more than that, from the outset, the Logos term is used in the Apocalypse with a much wider reference than the Evangel or Apostolic Message. But, when we come to the next instance, we find that H.B. Swete has suggested that, while he regarded the Logos of God in the second verse as the Apocalypse itself, yet in verse 9 the same phrase connotes "the preaching of the Gospel." Thus, the verse could mean either that John was in Patmos for the sake of carrying the Gospel thither, or that he was there - in exile? - as the result of his Evangelistic work. It must be admitted that we should not expect to find such a change of meaning in a phrase of almost identical wording recurring within the space of a few verses - unless we can be persuaded that the first three verses are a later addition. This would predispose us to regard the Logos as again connoting the apocalypse itself. But whether denoting this or "The preaching of the Gospel", the clause does not mean FOR THE SAKE OF - at least not if Charles is right in insisting that $\delta\iota\alpha$ cannot carry this meaning. Certainly the use in 6⁹ supports the view that we could render $\delta\iota\alpha$ as "because of". In the case of 6⁹ the closing words $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma\ \chi\omicron\upsilon\beta\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ are missing, but there need be no hesitation in supplying them in order to elucidate the meaning of the phrase. Certainly the Logos-term here bears most naturally the connotation of Gospel. In this case is it too fanciful to suppose that the use of the term in 1⁹ is poised between that in 1² (the Revelation) and in 6⁹ (the Gospel)?

Although Charles did not argue ~~that~~ in this way, his conclusion with regard to 1⁹ is just such a deduction as this suggestion indicates, namely that in 1⁹ the Logos-term refers to the Christian revelation AS A WHOLE.

The example of 12⁷ is worth noting for two reasons. In the first place, there is the recurrence of the phrase "the testimony of Jesus". Most commentators understand by the expression: "bearing of witness to Jesus" (Swete), compared with "the testimony borne by Jesus Christ" in 12. While it will not make much material difference to the present enquiry, it can be said that the sentence is still lucid if we retain the rendering "borne by Jesus". As "the commandments" are given by God, so "the testimony" is borne by Jesus. If the testimony was to Jesus, then we should have looked for wording similar to that of 6⁹ as we find in 12¹¹. The second reason for noting this verse (12¹⁷) is that it is found in the narrative of the woman and the man-child. Many are the interpretations of the vision, and the attempts to identify the figures. Some years ago Dr. G. H. Dix put forward a well argued case for identifying the woman with Divine Sophia and the man-child with the Logos.

(J.T.S. XXVI, No. 101) To summarize and discuss all the evidence brought forward and the conclusions brought forward would take us too far afield from our present task. It is sufficient to say that his finding was that in the Apocalypse we have the revival of one strand of tradition, namely the expectation of a Messiah, already identified as the Logos of God. Thus, in the Apocalypse we have a series of passages - at present under examination - which speak of the Logos of God, and related to the Vision of the woman and the man-child, who is the Logos.

The remaining verse (20⁴) does not call for further comment.

verse 12c and verse 13b. We are told, in the former, that he that sat on the white horse "hath a name written, which no one knoweth ($\delta^{\prime} \omicron \upsilon \beta \epsilon \alpha \iota$ $\omicron \dot{\iota} \delta \epsilon \nu$) but he himself". But in 13b we learn that "his name is called the Logos of God." R. H. Charles proposed to solve the conflict by excising 12c (l.c.c.), Bousset decided that 13b was an interpolation. (Die Offenbarung Johannis^{cs}.) For neither is there any textual evidence. It will be recognized that both Charles and Bousset proposed very radical solutions.

Even some of the most conservative of commentators have allowed that here, in the First Johannine Epistle and in the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel we have the common use of "a transcendental name of Christ."

(C. A. Scott) It is generally conceded, too, that in the Apocalypse we find the earliest use of the Logos-term as a personal name. Thus we shall have to see if either of the alleged interpolations must necessarily be regarded as such. M. E. Tobac, in the Revue d' Histoire Ecclésiastique (LIV, 2, Apr. 1929) has an article in which he discusses Bousset's proposed excision. Tobac, however, seems ignorant of Charles' proposal in this matter. But, since both were trying to solve the same problem, Tobac's criticisms are equally relevant. The main points may be outlined:-

1. The symmetry of verse 11 to 13 demand the retention of 13b. Any excision will destroy this.
2. $\omicron \dot{\iota} \delta \alpha$ in the Johannine vocabulary signifies "to penetrate." Of course, as an R. C., Tobac accepts an identity of authorship for all the New Testament Johannine writings. However, that this is the connotation of $\omicron \dot{\iota} \delta \alpha$ is confirmed by Abbott in his exhaustive work on the vocabulary of the New Testament. This being so, the clause (13b) does not mean that the

name is not to be divulged, but that it is not to be penetrated, that is, fully understood, except by the bearer thereof. Bousset was mistaken in regarding the verb as meaning "not to be deciphered."

3. The Logos of God does not, as it were, constitute the unknown name, which may be regarded as the name OF the Logos of God. "Il n'en résulte pas encore que ce nom soit celui de Verbe de Dieu."

(It is interesting to note that, as a Roman Catholic M. Tobac regards his argument as illuminating the belief of his Church as to the authorship of the Apocalypse. "Le verset 13b serait parfaitement authentique et fournirait «undes signes le plus lumineux de l'origine Johannique de l'Apocalypse»" (p.227) He has, however, to admit that while in the Johannine Prologue and the Apocalypse the Logos is a title of Christ, "dans l'Évangile, le Christ est appelé Logos dans sa préexistence à cause de son rôle dans la défaite des ennemis de Dieu et des croyants." (p. 230)

What the secret name is, can, of course, only be a matter of speculation. It might be^a name given to the victor (3¹²) or that given to the conquering Christ (2¹⁷) and known only to him who receives it. This seems to be an assumption of any argument in which this passage is used to help identify the Christ and the man on the white horse.

Since reference has just been made to the question of identifying the man on the white horse, it may be said that the identification with the Christ is indicated by the fact that-putting aside "the unknown name" - the Logos of God is the only new name of the Person. (See 1⁸; 5⁷; 5¹⁴;

cp.19⁵; 22⁶)

Having noted the lines of argument for identifying the Christ and the Logos of God in the Apocalypse, and for the authenticity of 13b, we can now claim the conclusion of most New Testament scholars, that in Revelation 19¹³ the title Logos is given to our Lord.

Before quitting our consideration of the Apocalypse, reference may be made to the fact that all commentators note the similarities of 19, 11-16 and Wisdom 18, particularly verse 14 to 16. This is interesting, for it means that the Logos used in a sense which is generally admitted to approach that of the Fourth Gospel, is found in a work falling within the tradition of Jewish apocalyptic writing. (And yet the Logos doctrine is wanting in other early Christian writings with a Jewish bias, such as the First Epistle of Clement and the Shepherd of Hermas.) The argument in the section on the Jewish Wisdom Literature was not designed to prove the complete independence of the Prologue and this literature, so much as to indicate the inadequacy of such a source. If there was a debt to the sacred writings of the Hebrews - especially the Wisdom Literature - it is more likely to have been mediated through such channels as have survived to be represented in canon of the New Testament by the Apocalypse. That such mediation would involve modification is apparent when we remember the place of the Apocalypse in the eschatological writings, and the fact pointed out by Canon Knox, that the apocryphal Wisdom Books "are non-eschatological in character" ("Expositor" 8th Series, No. 67.)

In Epistle of James there is a passage so well-known that its importance tends to be overlooked.

ἀγαπητοί. | πᾶσα δόσις ἀγαθὴ καὶ πᾶν δῶρημα τέλειον
ἀνωθεν ἔστιν, καταβαίνον ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν φώτων,
παρ' ᾧ οὐκ ἔστι παραλλαγὴ ἢ τροπῆς ἀποσκίασμα. βου- 18
ληθεῖς ἀπεκήρυσεν ἡμᾶς λόγῳ ἀληθείας, εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς
ἀπαρχὴν τινα τῶν αὐτοῦ κτισμάτων.

-53-

117-24

Ἰστε, ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοί. ἔστω δὲ πῦς ἄνθρωπος 19
ταχύς εἰς τὸ ἀκοῦσαι, βραδύς εἰς τὸ λαλήσαι, βραδύς
εἰς ὀργήν, ὀργὴ γὰρ ἀνδρὸς δικαιοσύνην θεοῦ οὐκ ἐργά- 20
ζεται. διὸ ἀποθέμενοι πᾶσαν ῥυπαρίαν καὶ περισσεΐαν 21
κακίας ἐν πραύτητι δέξασθε τὸν ἔμφυτον λόγον τὸν δυνά-
μενον σώσαι τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν. Γίνεσθε δὲ ποιηταὶ λόγου 22
καὶ μὴ ἀκροαταὶ μόνον παραλογιζόμενοι ἑαυτοῦς. ὅτι εἰ 23
τις ἀκροατὴς λόγου ἔστιν καὶ οὐ ποιητὴς, οὗτος ἔοικεν
ἀνδρὶ κατανοοῦντι τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ ἐν
ἐσόπτρῳ, κατενόησεν γὰρ ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀπέληλυθεν καὶ 24
εὐθέως ἐπελάθετο ὁποῖός ἦν. Ἰὸ δὲ παρακύψας εἰς νόμον 25

We have already mentioned some reasons for giving to the Epistle of James a later place in the New Testament Chronology than most modern writers have given it. Liddon's advice, given so long ago, is still worth hearing; "St. James' Epistle is so far from belonging to the teaching of the earliest apostolic age, that it presupposes nothing less than a very widespread and indirect effect of the distinctive teaching of St. Paul." ("Our Lord's Divinity" p. 282.) As a conclusion, this still holds good, though nowadays we should not make so much of the "faith-works" theme as the nexus between the Epistle of James and the Pauline Epistles. It is recognized nowadays that this was a standard topic of discussion and exegesis in the Rabbinic schools.

Liddon understood by both *λόγος ἀληθείας* and by *λόγος ἐμφυτος* "Christian doctrine;" "Christian doctrine is the absolute truth;" "Christian doctrine is also the engrafted word." (op. cit. 288). But he has to go on, this *λόγος* is clearly not the mere texture of the language in which the faith is taught. It is not the bare thought of the believer moulded into conformity with the ideas suggested by the language. It is the very substance and core of the doctrine; it is he in whom the doctrine centres;

it is the Person of Jesus Christ himselfIs not St. James here in fundamental agreement not merely with St. Paul, but with St. John? St. James' doctrine of the Engrafted Word is a compendium of the first, third and sixth chapters of St. John's Gospel " (op. cit. 289) R. L. Ottley, while he denied that the Logos-term is here used in a personal sense had to admit that "it implies that the message of God to man is embodied in the life and work of the Incarnate; Christ is himself a word from God". ("The Incarnation" p. 90) It would seem fair to wonder with what meaning a man is using words when he says in the same sentence"; λογος in this text has not, indeed a personal sense" and that "Christ is himself a word from God." Nor does his next statement make this any clearer; "the word of God is in him, as a creative and operative power." The only explanation seems to be a determination to maintain the unique use of the Logos term in the Johannine writings.

Incidentally, it is in this Epistle that we have a glimpse at the influences at work in the developments of the Logos-term in the vocabulary of the worshipping Christian communities. For Hort is almost certainly right in taking 1¹⁸ as a reference to the creation of man, though it is difficult to see how he equals the Logos of truth and the Creator resolve to create. It is much more likely that James is viewing God's creative work in the perspective of its regeneration through the operation of Christ Jesus; that is, seeing the creature as the "new creature". It would be in such teaching that the concepts of the Old Testament would

be able to take their part in the development and expression of the Christian doctrine of Christ as the Logos of God.

Used in 3^d Logos (ὁ λόγος) clearly denotes "speech".

In the First Epistle of Peter, we note this passage:-

122, 22

22	εἶναι εἰς θεόν.	Τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν ἡγικότες	ΛΙΘΟΝ ζῶντα, ὑπὸ 4
	ἐν τῇ ὑπακοῇ τῆς ἀληθείας εἰς φιλαδελφίαν ἀνυπόκριτον	παρὰ δὲ θεῷ ἐκλε-	
23	ἐκ καρδίας ἀλλήλους ἀγαπήσατε ἐκτενῶς, ἀναγεγεννημέ-	ωότες οἰκοδομήσθε 5	
	νοι οὐκ ἐκ σποράς φθαρτῆς ἀλλὰ ἀφθάρτου, διὰ λόγου, ἀνεύγκαι πνευ-		
24	ζῶντος θεοῦ καὶ μένοντος· διότι	τὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ·	
	πᾶσα σὰρξ ὡς χόρτος,		6
	καὶ πᾶσα δόξα αὐτῆς ὡς ἄνθος χόρτου·	ἐκτὸν ἀκρογωνι-	
	ἐξηράνθη ὁ χόρτος,	αἶον ἔντιμον,	
	καὶ τὸ ἄνθος ἐξέπεσεν·	καταίχνηθῃ.	
25	τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα Κυρίου μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.	πιστοῦσιν δὲ λίθος 7	
1	τοῦτο δὲ ἐστὶν τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν εἰς ὑμᾶς.	Ἄτες οὗτος ἐγε-	
	ποθέμενοι οὖν πᾶσαν κακίαν καὶ πάντα δόλον καὶ ὑπό-	θεος προσκόμμα- 8	
2	κρισιν καὶ φθόνους καὶ πάσας καταλαλίαις, ὡς ἀργιέν-	ροσκόπτουσιν τῷ	

One, ἵνα βρέφη τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα ἐπιποθήσατε, ἵνα ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ μὴ ἀυξηθῆτε εἰς σωτηρίαν, εἰ ἐγεγάσθε ὅτι χρηστὸς

Word of God, living and abiding for ever, is the Author of the souls new birth; and Christ Jesus our Lord does not only bring us this Logos from heaven; he is this Logos" (op. cit. pp. 298-299). It will be noticed that - wittingly or unwittingly - Liddon side-tracked one of the difficulties of this passage by rendering the Greek participles (ζῶντος and μένοντος) by English participles, thus avoiding the use of relative pronouns, and, in consequence, the need of attaching ζῶντος to either λόγος or Θεοῦ. Hort assigned ζῶντος to Θεοῦ, but most commentators have taken the other view. For our own discussion, it makes no material difference which is accepted. The only point is that clearly the attaching of the participle ὁ λόγος will be to heighten its significance and to underline its possible affinities with verse 4 of the Johannine Prologue.

But weight must be given to the possibility that λόγος of verse 23 is τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν of 23b, which, in view of its affinities with Matthew 24⁵⁵

most likely connotes the apostolic presentation of the teaching of Jesus of Nazareth. If, of course, the participles belong to λόγος it is unlikely that λόγος & ῥῆμα are to be identified.

[Since these notes were prepared Dean Selwyn's commentary on the First Epistle of Peter has come to hand. Very interesting, therefore, is this remark on the passage which we have been considering: "We have not yet reached the explicit identification of the Word (of God) with Christ which we find in Rev. 19.....and in the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel..... but New testament thought is already on the way there." (p. 151) Dr. Selwyn also says that this is why Peter prefers λόγος τῷ ῥήματι, although ῥῆμα is in his quotation from Isaiah. (p. 152)]

[This seems a good opportunity to summarize the use of ῥῆμα in the New Testament. It is used to render some of the sense of the Hebrew

1. a spoken word of any kind, e.g. Mt. 12³⁶ ῥῆμα ἔρχόν;
2. a matter, e.g. Lk. 1³⁷ οὐκ ἔδυνατήσῃ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ πᾶν ῥῆμα (nothing shall be too hard for God); Lk. 2¹⁵ τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο τὸ γεγούσ;
3. in a solemn sense, such as "the word of God" to a prophet, e.g. Lk. 3² ἐγένετο ῥῆμα θεοῦ ἐπὶ Ἰωάννῃ
4. especially of the Christian teaching, e.g. Heb. 3⁵. So J. Armitage Robinson in his commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians (pp. 206-207); he regards 1 Peter 1²⁵ as an instance of the fourth usage.]]

In verse 8 of Peter 2 we read:-

οἱ προσκώπτουσιν τῷ λόγῳ ἀπειθεῦντες εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐτέθησαν.

εἰς ὃ is generally taken to refer to the stumbling. The first part of the verse could mean, "They stumble, being disobedient to the Logos." In

view of 3¹ this is the more likely sense of the words than, "They stumble at the Logos".

3¹ reads,

1 ψυχῶν ὑμῶν. Ὁμοίως γυναῖκες ὑποτασσόμεναι τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσι, ἵνα ἢ εἴ τις ἀπειθοῦσιν τῷ λόγῳ διὰ τῆς τῶν γυναικῶν ἀναστροφῆς ἀνευ λόγου κερδηθῆσονται.
2 ἐποπτεύσαντες τὴν ἐν φόβῳ ἀγνῆν ἀναστροφήν ὑμῶν.

The quotation in 2⁸ from Isaiah 8¹⁴ is also used in the Epistle of

Paul to the Romans 9^{33b}, which runs,

ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιών λίθον προσκομματος καὶ πέτρην σκανδαλίου, καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ καταίσχυνθήσεται.

Here the quotation from Isaiah is inserted in the middle of a quo-

tation from Isaiah 28¹⁶. In the Hebrew original the reference is to Yahveh, but the reference in Psalm 118²² to "the stone" rejected of the builders had acquired a Messianic resonance. It is, also, quite possible that "the Stone" became a Messianic title in Jewry. Naturally, other passages in which "the Stone" was mentioned would acquire a Messianic reference. In the First Epistle of Peter, Isaiah 8¹⁴, and 28¹⁶ are quoted separately (2^{8a} and 2⁶), and are connected by the quotation of Psalm 118²² (2⁷). It is possible the author of the First Petrine Epistle knew the Epistle to the Romans; but it is much more likely that both writers were using a common Testimony Book, consisting of quotations from the Old Testament, and drawn up for use in controversy with the Jews.

So, then, the allusion to those who are "scandalized at the Logos" is conjoined to Messianic quotations from the Old Testament, drawn, according to modern opinion, from a Book of Testimonies drawn up by Christians to aid the argument that Jesus of Nazareth is the promised Messiah of

Israel. The force of τῷ λόγῳ ἀπειθοῦσιν fixed the meaning of ἀπειθοῦσιν τῷ λόγῳ

3¹ while ἀνευ λόγῳ means "without talking" (that is, by "silent example") and,

may even constitute a bit of play upon words.

The use of λόγος in 3¹⁵ and 4⁵ to denote "reason" or "account" is classical.

Before going forward to examine the Epistle to the Hebrews, there are several points worth mentioning. Each of these is worthy of further discussion; but the present investigation is not the place, and brief reference must suffice.

Dr. Inge was typical of the times when he said in his Bampton lectures (1899), "The Epistle to the Hebrews cannot be the work of St. Paul". ("Christian Mysticism," p. 72.) We can accept Origen's oft quoted remark that "God alone knows who wrote the Epistle." But, making all allowances, and without suggesting a Pauline authorship, the tendency of recent years has been to admit that the figure of the Apostle lurks somewhere in the background experience of the Auctor ad Hebraeos. The Epistle stands somewhere between the Apostle Paul and the Fourth Evangelist, (See Rawlinson, "New Testament Doctrine of Christ," p. 176)

There are certain similarities of ideas and expressions in the Epistle to the Hebrews and Works of Philo, such as the equation of the Logos with Melchizedek and the high-priest. But those can best be explained as a borrowing by both from current Rabbinic exegesis of the Old Testament, and by supposing that both were influenced by Alexandrine Jewish thought.

Lastly, it can be accepted that the Jewish Wisdom literature and thought played their part in the development of the ideas of the Auctor ad Hebraeos.

Two most important passages in the Epistle to the Hebrews are 4² and 4¹²

ΕΙΣΕΛΘΕΙΝ ΔΙ' ΑΠΙΣΤΙΑΝ. | φοβηθῶμεν οὐ μὴ ποτε κατα-
λειπομένης ἐπαγγελίας εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν καταπαύσιν
αὐτοῦ δοκῇ τις ἐξ ὑμῶν ὑστερηκέαι· καὶ γὰρ ἔσμεν
εὐηγγελισμένοι καθάπερ καὶ οὗτοι, ἀλλ' οὐκ ᾤφελθον
ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς ἐκείνου, ἢ ἢ «συνκερασμένον» τῇ
πίστει τοῖς ἀκούσασιν. | Εἰσερχόμεθα γὰρ εἰς [τὴν] 3

12 θείας. | Ζῶν γὰρ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐνεργῆς καὶ
τομώτερος ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν μάχαιραν δίστομον καὶ δικνού-
μενος ἄχρι μερισμοῦ ψυχῆς καὶ πνεύματος, ἀρμών τε καὶ
μυελῶν, καὶ κριτικὸς ἐνθυμήσεων καὶ ἐννοιῶν καρδίας.

The English Revised Version of 4² follows the bulk of the MSS and renders the verse, "The word of hearing did not profit them, because they were not united by faith with them that heard. (δυσκεκρασμένος) The R. V. margin follows the reading of ~~2~~, the Old Latin and Peshitta versions, given above. But in spite of the weight of MSS evidence, the sense is more consistent if the reading ~~δυσκεκρασμένος~~ be retained, otherwise Caleb and Joshua are "those who heard", in disagreement with 3¹⁶, where πάντες is unqualified. Warborough, in the Clarendon Bible, brings out the meaning with:- "The word of hearing did not benefit, not having been mixed with faith in them that heard it." This is reminiscent of the teaching of the parable of the Sower, insisting on the two factors, the seed and the ground (the recipient). Thus, while the sense of "the Logos of hearing" must be fixed by its present context, allowance must be made for a change of emphasis or modification of meaning in view of possible associations such as with the parable of the Sower.

Even to read some of the standard commentators on 4¹², is to realize the confusion of thought about the Logos of God in the New Testament. Peake (Century Bible) said, "This word is not the Son, the personal Logos of the Prologue to the Gospel of John; for this would have no relevance in this context." Warborough (Clarendon Bible) writes that we have "A

personification of the Word of God." Moffatt (I.O.C.) notes that "here the writer poetically personifies the revelation of God for a moment.... The revelation, however, is broader than Scripture: it includes the revelation of God's purpose in Jesus." "For some reason, not readily apparent, Moffatt withdraws himself, and is content to say, "Here it denotes the Christian Gospel." L. P. Jacks is right; "men are slow to realize the results of their own thinking."

Milligan and Moulton here speak of "the somewhat extended use of ^{Logos} of". And it is refreshing to turn to Westcott, who said that the five epithets move "step by step from that which is most general to that which is most personal" (p. 101). But "by the Word of God we must understand the word which he speaks through his messengers or immediately in the heart of each man." This does, at any rate, illustrate the proximity of thought between the Johannine Prologue and the Epistle to the Hebrews, which should lead us to suspect something in common in the use of terms. And Westcott had to admit that "the passage shows how naturally the transition was made from the revelation of God to him who was at once the Revelation and Revealer."

The passage in "Hebrews" was commonly understood by patristic writers to refer to the personal Logos. (See Bright's edition of Athenagoras contra Gentes II §§ 35, 72, pp. 105, 142.) How neatly the passage falls into the line of the development of thought about the Logos can be seen by a glance at the Revisers' critical apparatus. "Completely

It is also true that Origen regarded Jesus Christ as completely "identified with the Word." (cp. R.H. Strachan, "The Historic Jesus in the New Testament," p. 117)

~~as "The Attributes of Jesus in the New Testament" p. 117).~~

Peake was wide of the mark, then, in judging the personal Logos irrelevant to the context, and in declaring that its inappropriateness is to be seen in the substitution of terms.

The affinities of the passage with Wisdom 18^{15ff} are manifest, and it is quite possible that through such passages the writer of the Johannine Prologue stood in contact with the Jewish Wisdom Literature. But, curiously enough, while the Epistle to the Hebrews has some passages in which Christ might have been presented as the Wisdom of God, the term "Wisdom" is missing in the Epistle.

In view of all that has just been said, it is not easy to accept the Revisers' rendering of the following verse:
πάντα ἐὰν γυμνὰ καὶ τετραχνηλασμένα τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ, πρὸς ὃν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος

"All things are naked and laid open before the eyes of him with whom we have to do." Literally, this should run, "towards whom there is for us the Logos." But, the translators have rendered the passage very freely, and have understood ὁ λόγος to mean the "matter" or "the subject". Perhaps ὁ λόγος is used in the classical sense of "the account," (Zaglung, Rechnung, vide Theol. Worth. Z. N. T. p. 73) The use of κτίσις earlier, suggests this. Perhaps it is sufficient to render the phrase as "to whom we have to give our account." This use of λόγος is also made in 13¹⁷.

In εἰ ἀρχὴ ὁ λόγος are brought together,
διὸ ἀφέντες τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ χριστοῦ λόγον.
"Wherefore let us leave the Logos of the ARCH OF Christ." But there can be no doubt that λόγος here denotes "the topic," or "the subject," of Christ's ARCH.

In 2²⁰ δι' ἡμετέρων ἀληθεῖς λόγος means "the law," ὁ λόγος having been prepared to ὁ νόμος as maintaining the emphasis upon the divine *ἀλλείν*. But in 13⁷ the Logos of God carries still the simple meaning of the apostolic message. In view of its affinity with the literary device πολλὸς ὁ λόγος ("there is much to say") πολλὸς ἡμῶν ὁ λόγος in 5¹¹ is best regarded as "the theme." In 13²² we meet the phrase "the Logos of Exhortation," where the use is comparable with that in Acts 13¹⁵, and the force is patently "the message of the Epistle." In 7²⁸ the Logos is "the text", or the actual words of the oracle, namely Psalm 110⁴, and the emphasis is on ὁρκωμοσία while in 12¹⁹ the term denotes "matter," in this instance another commandment.

Finally we look at 5¹³ γάλακτος, οὐ στερεάς τροφῆς. ἅπας γὰρ ὁ μετέχων ἵ3
γάλακτος ἄπειρος λόγου δικαιοσύνης, νήπιος γὰρ ἐστίν. ἅ

Westcott noted that the absence of the article is significant, although his suggestion is not very helpful, "that the main conception lies in the character and not in the concrete realization of the "word". The conjunction of λόγος ἔδικοσύνη probably connotes an ethical category, and the phrase maybe rendered "right judgement", or "discrimination."

In the brief compass of the Pastoral Epistles we find not only an interesting range of uses of the Logos-term, but also a number of instances in which there has been the widest divergence of opinion as to interpretation.

1 Tim. 4⁴-5

4 τὴν ἀλήθειαν. ὅτι πᾶν κτίσμα θεοῦ καλόν, καὶ οὐδὲν ἀπό-
5 βλητόν μετὰ εὐχαριστίας λαμβανόμενον, ἀγιάζεται γὰρ
6 διὰ λόγου θεοῦ καὶ ἐντεύξεως. Ταῦτα ὑποτιθέ-

By using the definite article in translating $\delta\iota\alpha\ \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\upsilon$ it is possible that the English Versions convey a biased notion of the force of the expression.

Logos could refer to some dominical ordinance, either preserved in the written Gospels (e.g. Mark 7), or circulated in an oral tradition (cp. Titus 1¹⁵ and Romans 14¹⁴⁻²⁰). But Archbishop Bernard (in the Cambridge Greek Testament) opined that a Logos of God would connote an Old Testament saying embodied in a "grace before meat", perhaps a verse from a psalm. To illustrate further the division of opinion, however, we may note that the late Dr. W. Locke (I. C. C.) compared the use here with that in Justin Martyr's Apology (1. 66), $\delta\iota\alpha\ \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\upsilon\ \sigma\alpha\rho\kappa\omicron\pi\omicron\iota\eta\ \theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \iota\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, and agreed that the phrase may be used in the Johannine sense. But since he also held the view that the Johannine technical usage is "foreign to our writer", he was not prepared to press this point. Moffatt rendered the clause, "it is consecrated by the prayer said over it".

The phrase ἐν λόγῳ is also found in the Pastoral Epistles but, in conjunction with ἐν ἔργῳ . In 1 Tim. 4¹² the force has to be decided by reference to the use of the phrase in 5¹⁷ where it is accompanied by καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ . Thus the phrase refers not to mere speaking, but to talk concerned with the presentation of teaching. In Titus 2⁸ we have a reference to λόγος ὑγιῆς but, in view of the use of ὑγιῆς in 1 6³ and 11 1¹³, we should probably understand here a reference to some known λόγιόν of Christ's sayings. In 11 2⁹ we learn that "the Logos of God is not bound." This may be an allusion to the freedom offered in the Gospel forcibly underlined by the physical captivity of the writer. It is, however, possible that the Logos of God is used with reference to the written message of the prisoner, the freedom of which is compared with the writer's captivity.

11 2¹⁵

¹⁵ των. σπουδάσον σεαυτὸν δοκιμὸν παραστήσαι τῷ θεῷ,
 ἐργάτην ἀνεπαίσχυντον, ὀρθοτομοῦντα τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀλη-
¹⁶θείας. τὰς δὲ βεβήλους κενοφρονίας περιύστασο· ἐπι-

ὀρθοτομοῦντα is best rendered as "giving right direction to the Logos of truth". In view of Col. 1⁵ and Ephesians 1¹³, there can be little doubt that the Logos of truth is the Gospel, and the whole phrase means "applying the Gospel boldly to situations." The verb ὀρθοτομέω is found in the LXX of Proverbs 3⁶, where ὀρθοτομή renders תָּיַיֵּר, תָּיַיֵּר means, "to make smooth

by clearing away obstacles". The use of Logos here and in 2⁹ fixes the meaning of the absolute use of it in the injunction (4²) κήρυξον τὸν λόγον (cp. 1 Thes. 1⁶, Gal. 6⁶ and Col. 4³)

In Titus 2⁵ allusion is made to the defence of "the Logos of God" from blasphemy. This can scarcely be the injunctions regarding womanly behaviour. It is at least the Gospel which is in danger of being blasphemed. Perhaps the phrase answers to that of 1 Tim 6³ λόγοι, οἱ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ. (cp. 11 1¹³.)

In 11 Tim. 2¹⁷ mention is made of the Logos of "irrefene babblings", that is the talk disseminated by the like of Hymenaeus and Philetus.

Titus 1-3
ΠΑΥΛΟΣ δούλος θεοῦ, ἀπόστολος δι' Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἰ
κατὰ πίστιν ἐκλεκτῶν θεοῦ καὶ ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας τῆς
κατ' εὐσέβειαν ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ζωῆς αἰωνίου, ἣν ἐπηγγείλατο
ὁ ἀψευδὴς θεὸς πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων ἐφάνερωσεν δὲ κατ-
ροῖς ἰδίοις, τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ ἐν κηρύγματι ὃ ἐπιστεύθη
ἐγὼ κατ' ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ, Πίτρω γνησίῳ 4

Bernard believed that ἐν κηρύγματι is definitive, and as such, rules out the possibility that the Logos here mentioned in the Incarnate Logos. But at least one Commentator has noted that "here the writer trembles on the verge of the Logos doctrine of John", and that "it would not be inappropriate to translate it "the Incarnate Logos". (Horton) Of course, what really matters is, as we have pointed out before, not so much what the writers of the New Testament actually meant by their words, but rather the sense in which those words would come to be

understood as used in the worship of the Church. The Logos is, clearly, the subject of κηρύγμα; and it is that which would govern the sense in which the term would be understood. If the case could be proved that the Logos of the "Faithful Sayings" is personal, then the argument that the Logos of Titus 1³ refers to the Incarnate Logos is very strong.

In this connection it is worth noting that E. Walder in his article in the Journal of Theological Studies on "The Logos of the Pastoral Epistles", (Vol. XXIV, No. 25), refers to Titus 1²⁻³, ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ... τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ, ἐν κηρύγματι ὃ ἐπιστεύθη ἐγώ, which he rendered "Eternal Life..... even his Logos, by the proclamation with which I was entrusted." He claimed that here Logos "seems to require a personal sense.....It is parallel to 'eternal life,' just as the Logos of the Gospel corresponds to the Eternal Life of the Epistle of St. John". (p. 311)

Walder's argument begins with an attempt to show that there are strong traces of Johannine ideas in these Pastoral Epistles. He notes the use of ἐπιγινώσκειν ("to know the truth"), and that the sequence φανερόν .. ἐπιφανεία.... φωτισίῃ, used with reference to the Incarnation "have a most marked Johannine colouring." (p. 310) He notes that εὐαγγελίον (11. Tim 1⁹⁻¹⁰), while a perfectly good Pauline word, carries with it in the Pastoral Epistles a Johannine

connotation.

δεῖ γὰρ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἀνεγκλήτων εἶναι.....
ἀντεχόμενον τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδασχῆν (Tit. 1⁷⁻⁹)
πιστοῦ λόγου.

In connection with this passage we have to be prepared to reckon with obscurity resulting from subsequent ecclesiastical controversy. Those who, like Archbishop Bernard, distinguish between the force of *πρεσβύτερος* and *ἐπίσκοπος* point to this passage as enunciating the episcopal duty of guarding the deposit of Faith. On the other hand, those who like Horton, Conybeare and Howson, identify these two, would say that the Logos here is the "proclamation of the truth which Paul had taught". Walter Lock (I.C.C.) thought that "the phrase suggests a stereotyped outline of doctrine either^{oral} or written, such as is quoted in 1 Cor. 15^{3ff}". Moffatt proposed the radical solution of regarding verses 7-9 as a gloss "added, rather awkwardly, to the original text". Interesting, then, are Walder's comments on the passage.

Where *ἀντεχόμενος* occurs elsewhere in the New Testament, it is used with a personal object (Matt. 6²⁴, Lk. 16¹³ 1 Thess. 5¹⁴). Therefore he proposes to regard the Logos of the present passage as personal and to render thus:- "cleaving to the Logos who is faithful according to the teaching, in order that he may be empowered both to exert in doctrine which is sound, and to convict gainsayers",

The passage thus appears parallel to 11 Tim. 4¹⁷.

¹⁷ ἔγκατέλειπον— μὴ αὐτοῖς λογισθεῖν— ἃ ὁ δὲ κύριός μοι
παρίστη καὶ ἐνεδυνάμωσέν με, ἵνα δι' ἐμοῦ τὸ κήρυγμα
πληροφορηθῇ καὶ ἀκούσωσιν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, καὶ ἐρύσθην
¹⁸ ἐκ στόματος λέοντος. ῥύσεται με ὁ κύριος ἀπὸ παντός

"But the Lord stood by me and empowered me in order that the Gospel published through me might be fully believed,"

Walder also believed that his case would be strengthened by attaching a personal significance to the "catch phrase" of the Pastoral Epistles πιστὸς ὁ λόγος . With this he compared πιστὸς ὁ θεός (1 Cor. 1⁹, 10¹³ 11 Cor. 1¹⁸); πιστὸς ὁ καλῶν ἑμαῖς (1 Thess. 5²⁴); and πιστὸς δεῖ ἐστίν ὁ κύριος (11 Thess. 3³), where the use is clearly personal. In 1 Tim. 1¹⁵ we read

¹⁵ πιστὸς ὁ λόγος καὶ πάσης ἀποδοχῆς ἄξιός ἐστι Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ἦλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἁμαρτωλοὺς σῶσαι ἵνα

Horton, while noting that the expression "Jesus came into the world" is Johannine, thought that the Logos refers to things commonly said among Christians. Turner regarded it as a marginal note by a later copyist. But most commentators follow Bernard and H. B. Swete (J. T. S. XVIII. 6ε) in regarding the phrase as a preamble to a subsequent saying, possibly from a collection of Testimonia, the link being supplied by ὅτι . But Walder points out that to give an impersonal sense to the Logos entails a break in the line of argument; whereas this is avoided if the Logos is personal ".....faith and love which is in Christ

Jesus. Faithful is the Logos and worthy of all acceptation because Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners".

"The only impersonal interpretation of πιστὸς ὁ λόγος that has ever been advanced is that it introduces a liturgical refrain. That it plainly does not do in all the passages. Surely πιστὸς ὁ λόγος is itself the refrain, parallel to the precisely similar ἄγιός τῷ ἄρνιον (Apoc. 5¹²), for τὸ ἄρνιον of the Apocalypse is the equivalent of ὁ λόγος in the Gospel" (p. 213). He also appeals to the use of the expression "came into the world" in the Johannine Gospel, where it "is used exclusively by John of the Logos. (Jn. 1⁹, 12⁴⁶ 16²⁸, 18³⁷.)"

He considers next 3¹.

*γεν. λ σωθήσεται δὲ διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας, ἐὰν μείνωσιν ἐν 15
πίστει καὶ ἀγάπῃ καὶ ἀγιασμῷ μετὰ σωφροσύνης. πιστὸς ὁ
λόγος. Εἰ τις ἐπισκοπῆς ὀρέγεται, καλοῦ ἔρ-
γου ἐπιθυμεῖ. Ἰδεῖ οὖν τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἀνεπίλημpton εἶναι, 2*

He accepts the reading πιστὸς as against ἄθετος πινος in the Bezan MS, the Old Latin, Ambrosiaster and the western codices known to Jerome. He also accepts Chrysostom's punctuation, by which πιστὸς ὁ λόγος is attached to the previous verse. He renders the passage thus:- "She shall be saved through child bearing, if they abide in faith and love and sanctification with sobriety, for 'the Logos is faithful' and will reward the faith and love which is in Christ Jesus". He notes that μένων ἐν is "distinctly Johannine".

In 1 Tim. 4⁹ we meet again πιστὸς ὁ λόγος in company

with καὶ πίστις ἀποδοχῆς ἀξίος, and Walder interprets the passage by saying that the ἐπαγγελία ἰωῆς is assured because the Logos is faithful. He has already noted (p. 312) that outside the New Testament πίστις ἀποδοχῆς ἀξίος carries a personal significance. Thus, Philo ("Praem. et Poem; 11 140, 2), "All things are open to accusation (ὀπίσθιοι); he alone is worthy of acceptance (ἀποδοχῆς ἀξίος)". Bernard ("Pastoral Epistles", p. 32) notes that an inscription was found at Ephesus, "Titus Aelius Friscus.....πιστῆς τῆς καὶ ἀποδοχῆς ἀξίου"

There are two points to be noted in connection with the expression πιστὸς ὁ λόγος as it occurs in 11 Tim. 2⁸⁻¹⁴. First that ὅτι is missing; and, secondly, that it is followed by γὰρ Swete (J. T. S. XVIII, 69) maintained that the Logos is a saying introduced by this phrase in spite of the omission of ὅτι, and he accounted for the γὰρ by attributing it the original source of the quotation. Walder establishes the personal nature of the Logos by pointing out that the phrase "he abides faithful (ἐκείνος πιστὸς μένει) for he cannot deny himself" (verse 10), harks back to "faithful is the Logos".

In Titus 3⁴⁻⁸, the phrase once more occurs, and Walder says, "Not only does the context require the personal Logos who is faithful and will not belie the hope of those who have put their faith in God; but the Laver of regeneration

(λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας) and the renewing of the Holy Ghost (ἀνακαινέσεως Πνεύματος Ἁγίου) are obviously the writer's interpretation of John's 'born of water and of the Spirit'".

Such, in outline, is Walder's interesting approach to the "faithful sayings". Lock, in his volume of the International Critical Commentary, notes the article in question, but dismisses its findings airily. But the weakness of his criticism appears to be that he did not seriously consider Walder's idea that πιστὸς ὁ λόγος is itself a "liturgical refrain". To this there will follow two corollaries; firstly, that in the repeated introduction of a catch phrase the appositeness must sometimes be somewhat strained and the phrase itself appear a little awkward; secondly, that we must not forget what is meant by a "liturgical phrase". It means that the phrase was being used in a liturgical setting, in which it would acquire deeper and newer shades of meaning.

The λόγοι of 1 4⁶ probably refers to doctrinal statements which Timothy had been authorized to make, and in 11, 4¹⁵ may denote the apostolic preaching, or, conceivably, it might allude to the arguments put forward in the trial at home.

In the second Epistle of Peter the plural λόγοι is used of "talk" (2³) and the Logos is used with the adjective προφητικός of the Old Testament (1¹⁹).

The following passage is, however, full of interest:-

Χῆς κτίσεως.) λανθάνει γὰρ αὐτοῖς τοῦτο θέλοντας ὅτι 5
οὐρανοὶ ἦσαν ἔκπαλαι καὶ γῆ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος
"συνεστῶσα" τῷ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγῳ, δι' ὧν ὁ τότε κόσμος 6
ὑδατι κατακλυσθεὶς ἀπώλετο· οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ 7
γῆ τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσὶν πυρὶ τηρού-
μενοι εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως καὶ ἀπωλείας τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἀν-
θρώπων. | * Ἐν δὲ τούτῳ μὴ λανθανέτω ὑμᾶς, 8

5-7
(3)

Here we have a deliberate effort to connect the concept of creation by the Logos of God with the early verses of Genesis. In the Epistle we have allusions to specific acts of creation, and a statement that these were done by the Logos of God. But in Genesis we have only the mention of these specific acts, with no mention of the Logos; whereas in the Johannine Prologue there is no reference to the several creative acts, but only to the Logos who made all things.

This consideration should be given attention, since it suggests the possibility that this Epistle is later than the Fourth Gospel. But, even if this thought is not to be entertained, the passage does show that there was an attempt on the part of some early Christian thinkers to bring into the ambit of their speculation the relation between creation and the work of the Logos, a thought which,

as we learn in verse seven, was pursued to the extent of identifying the work of creation and destruction with the Logos.

We pass on now to review the use of the Logos-term in the Fourth Gospel itself. The varying usages can be grouped under several categories.

1. There is, first, the normal use of the term to denote
 - a. a quotation from the Old Testament, 12³⁸ (Isaiah 53^{1,2}); 15²⁵ (Psalm 35 or 6a)
 - b. a proverbial saying 4³⁷.
 - c. a statement by someone, 4³⁹ (by the woman of Samaria);
 - d. the Old Testament Scriptures, 5³⁸ (In view of the context, there can be no doubt that Hoskyns~~s~~ was right in seeing here a reference to the Old Testament.)

The Plural is used of our Lord's statements (7⁴⁰, 10¹⁹ 14²³) and of the statements of the Jews (19¹³) 19⁸ (by the Jews); 21²³ ("that disciple should not die").

2. In two instances the term denotes the apostolic message

† 15²⁰ *κόσμου, διὰ τοῦτο μισεῖ ὑμᾶς ὁ κόσμος. μνημονεύετε τοῦ λόγου οὗ ἐγὼ εἶπον ὑμῖν Οὐκ ἔστιν δοῦλος μείζων τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ· εἰ ἐμὲ ἐδίωξαν, καὶ ὑμᾶς διώξουσιν· εἰ τὸν λόγον μου ἐτήρησαν, καὶ τὸν ὑμέτερον τηρήσουσιν. ἀλλὰ*

π 17²⁰ *20 ἀληθείᾳ. Οὐ περὶ τούτων δὲ ἐρωτῶ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῶν πιστευόντων διὰ τοῦ λόγου αὐτῶν εἰς 21 ἐμὲ, ἵνα πάντες ἐν ᾧσιν, καθὼς σύ, πατήρ, ἐν ἐμοὶ κἀγώ*

"Since the words of Jesus and his sacrifice are of universal validity through the preaching of the disciples, the Lord extends his prayer to embrace the whole body of the faithful" (Hoskyns's "The Fourth Gospel", p. 599).

3. The term is often used to denote a specific saying of our Lord. 2²² (the Lord's words in verse 19); 4⁴¹ (his message to the Samaritans); 4⁵⁰ (the statement to the nobleman that his son should live. Here again we meet the thought already noted in connection with Synoptists, (cp. Lk. 7¹⁻¹⁰, Mt. 8⁵⁻¹³) of the giving and withholding of the Logos as vital to recovery. One commentator gives the opinion that here the Evangelist is exalting faith "fondée sur la parole non sur des miracles"); 6⁶⁰ (the saying about the Bread of Life); 7³⁶ (defined in the second part of the verse); 14²⁴ (where it may correspond to the $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\iota$ of verse 24a, or, more likely to the $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\omicron\lambda\alpha\acute{\iota}$ of verse 21); 15²⁰ (defined by the second half of the verse. So Hoskyn's; but Bernard (11 492) finds the definition in 13¹⁶); 18⁹. (defined by the second half of the verse.); 18³² (the Lord's statement as to the manner of his death, 12³²⁻³³)

In 17⁶ & 14 ($\tau\omicron\nu\acute{\nu}\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\nu\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$) the Logos is the revelation of the will of the Father given through his Son. "Jesus himself speaks of the readers of a certain Psalm as those to whom the Word of God came, and of his own message (rather than himself) as the word of the Father which he had communicated to his disciples". (J.R. Harris, Expositor, 8th series No. 68 p. 149) Rendel Harris inferred from this that the Logos of the Fourth Gospel connotes no more than the message of Christ. Commenting again on the

passage, he finds the sense of λόγος here fixed by ῥήματα of verse 8 (Article in Bulletin of John Rylands library, January 1922). But, surely, the remarkable thing is that ῥήματα is abandoned in verse 14 in favour of λόγος. So, too, in his "Origins of the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel" (p. 20) he appeals to the works of Justin Martyr, claiming that the word Logos is used "not for Christ, but for the scripture". But the reading of Justin Martyr shows that in many contexts he uses frequently Logos to denote the Person of Christ. For this is the whole point of his celebrated argument for "Christians before Christ". He is the Logos of whom the entire human race partakes (Apol. 1 46, 2); and it is because they have, although reckoned atheists, lived with the Logos (μετὰ λόγου) that Socrates, Heraclitus, Abraham, Elijah, and the rest are to be called Christians. He says specifically that "Christ is the Incarnation of the Logos in its entirety". The purpose of the prophecies of the scriptures is to prove that "Jesus is Christ, the Son of God, his messenger being from former ages, the Logos". (Apol. 1, 63, 96)

This point has been noted at some length, since, if Harris's criticism is accepted, it will militate against the claim that within the New Testament itself we have to be prepared to find reflections of that process (and progress) whereby the Christian worshippers moved from the thought of the Logos as given by Christ to that of the

Logos who is Christ.

In 12⁴⁸ we read that he who rejects Christ and his $\rho\acute{\eta}\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ "hath one that judgeth him: the Logos" which Christ Jesus spoke "shall judge him in the last day". Again the Logos replaces $\rho\acute{\eta}\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$. This is no place to try to discuss the sayings of Christ about his judgment upon men. It is sufficient to say that he recognized that his presence involved judgment. Here he speaks of his Logos as exercising that critical office upon men.

In 15³ the work of Christ in "cleansing" is attributed to the Logos spoken by him, and his work of sanctification is said to be in the truth, which is declared to be God's Logos (17⁷). The disciples are clean $\delta\iota\alpha\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\nu$. Had the genitive been used, then the implication would be that the Logos was the instrument of cleansing. The force of the accusative is to express the notion that the Logos abiding in the disciples is the reason for their purity; this point is emphasised in the exposition which follows. Thus we have an attribution to the Logos spoken by Christ of that cleansing function proper to himself, and expressed in the washing of the disciples' feet.

In the case of 17¹⁷ - $\delta\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma\ \sigma\ \sigma\omicron\varsigma\ \mu\eta\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\alpha\ \epsilon\acute{\sigma}\tau\iota\nu$ - we have an echo of Psalm 119⁴², where the word of God is his Torah. But in 1¹⁷ we are told that the Torah was given by Moses; but that "grace and truth came by Jesus

Christ". We shall have something more to say later on about the relationship which would develop in the minds of his followers between Jesus Christ and the Law. For the present we need only notice that the Fourth Evangelist said that "truth came by Jesus Christ", and that he records that the Lord Jesus declared that God's Logos "is truth", and, of course, that he is himself "the truth". (14⁶)

To keep Christ's or God's, Logos is a characteristic phrase of the Fourth Evangelist (8^{51,52,55}, 14^{23,24,15²⁰}, etc.). τὸν λόγον τηρεῖν is not the equivalent of "to keep the commandments" of Christ; in 1 John 2³⁻⁵ we have, "In this we know that we know him (Jesus Christ the righteous) εὖ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ τηρῶμεν ὅς δ' αὖ τηρῆ αὐτοῦ τὸν λόγον , truly the love of God hath been made perfect in him". (cp. also 15¹⁰ in the Gospel). It is with this in mind that we notice the Lord's claim that if "a man keep his Logos he shall never see death" (8⁵¹ cp. 8⁵²). Just exactly what he meant by "keeping his Logos" is not easy to see; but it is not to be restricted to "keeping his commandments." Nor is it apparent as to what he meant by saying that he himself "keeps God's word" (verse 55) But Westcott is surely close to the mark when he comments, "The relation of the Son to the Father is attested by the same active devotion as the relation of the believer to Christ". ("The Gospel According to St. John p. 139)

In other words, this dual relationship of Christ to the Father, and of the world to Christ, finds expression in terms of relationship to God's Logos and Christ's Logos. Bengel suggested "doctrina" as a rendering of $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ in verses 51 and 52; but such a translation will not do in 55. We can, it seems, come no nearer than rendering by the loose term "revelation", in the one case, known to Christ in virtue of his relationship to the Godhead, and made known, in the other instance, to men in virtue of the presence of Christ among them, and of the teaching which he gave them.

Thus we come very close to the Prologue, with its statement that "the Logos was with God and was God", but that "he came to his own and dwelt among us."

We have already noted the presence in the Gospel of the idea of Christ's Logos exercising the office of judge, and of Christ's own recognition of his critical function (cp. 9³⁹).

We have just noticed the saying in which he declared that the man "shall not see death" who keeps Christ's Logos. It is interesting to notice that in 5²² the Lord Jesus acknowledges his own office of judging, and then goes on to co-ordinate the avoidance of both judgement and death, since both are dependant upon "hearing his Logos, and believing him that sent him." (5²⁴) The doing of this, moreover, is to "have eternal life". The statement, moreover, follows

closely upon a discourse in which the Lord has been expounding the thought of himself as the giver of life. And, once more, we come within a stone's throw of the Prologue with its claim that in the Logos was life.

In 8^{31ff} we encounter a most interesting passage.

τον. *Ελεγεν ουν ο Ιησους προς τους πεπι- 31
θευκοτας αυτω Ιουδαιους 'Εαν υμεις μεινητε εν τω λο-
γω τω εμω, αληθως μαθηται μου εστε, και γνωσσετε 32
την αληθειαν, και η αληθεια ελευθερωσει υμας.' (απεκρι- 33

In the earlier part of this passage two points are noteworthy:-

1. the similarity of the thought of abiding in Christ's Logos, and of abiding in Christ himself (15^{1ff} the Vine and the Branches discourse, especially verse 7 *εαν μεινητε εν εμοι* , and cp. also 1 John 2⁸, in which the thought is of the Logos of God abiding in men and 2¹⁴ speaking of the in-biding of that which has been heard *απ' αρχης* and the consequent abiding *εν τω υιω και εν τω πατρι* .)

2. the phrase in 11 John 2⁹; "whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the teaching of Christ (*και μη μενων εν τη διδαχη του Χριστου*) hath not God". Here we should ~~not~~ expect *λογος* , but find, instead, *διδαχη* . It is true that the word is also to be found in the Gospel (7^{16,17} and 18¹⁹), but in view of the verb *μενειν* , we should have

expected λόγος ~~ε~~ to have been used in the Epistle. It is, of course, possible to attach too much importance to this use of ~~οἱ δὲ~~ in one instance. But in view of the fact that Archbishop Bernard drew attention to the similarity of thought in 8³¹ of the Gospel and this verse of the Epistle, it is, perhaps, not out of place to notice the change of terminology.

The use of the Logos-term in verse 37 has an immediate reference to the impact of Jesus of Nazareth upon contemporary Jewry. But in the eyes of the readers of the Gospel it would have a consequent application to the impact of Christ upon the world. In other words the term is used in one of those contexts in which it would become more and more difficult to distinguish precisely between Christ Jesus and his message or teaching. Thus Hoskyn's* comments on the use of the term a little later (in 8⁴³), "The failure of the Jews to perceive the meaning of Jesus' spoken word (SPEECH) can be explained only by their inability to hear the Word of God which is made manifest in the teaching (WORD) of Jesus". (p. 393)

We noticed, above, Rendel Harris's reference to our Lord's speaking of the readers of a certain Psalm as those to whom the Logos of ^{God} came." (Psalm 82⁶) Actually, it is much more likely that our Lord's thought was rather of the coming of the revelation of God's will through his

word granted to the great prophets of Israel. But it is also quite obvious that the Lord Jesus meant to bring into close relation the thought of the coming of the Logos of God and his own being "sanctified and sent into the world". (verse 36) With such ideas stored up in his own mind, it would be strange if he did not draw upon them in writing his Prologue. Once more Hoskyn's is well worth quoting. "The Evangelist has so phrased the contrast that the readers of the Gospel recognize the distinction between "those unto whom the word of God came" and the Son of God sanctified and sent into the world, a delicate reference to the Prologue". (p. 486) And Augustine himself maintained that a contrast is implied between "those to whom the word of God is addressed" (by whom he understands the prophets of old), and the same word of God, Christ the Logos.

[[The present writer has a page from a note book in which, a good number of years ago, he wrote side by side John, 1⁵⁻¹⁸ and 12⁴⁴⁻⁵⁰ and commented on the similarity of "architecture":-

- A. the thought of Light, in relation to which men stand
- B. the concept of the Logos among men.
- C. the mention of the Father.]]

We turn to the opening words of the First Epistle of John:-

Ο ΗΝ ΑΠ' ΑΡΧΗΣ, ὁ ἀκηκόαμεν, ὁ ἐωράκαμεν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν, ὁ ἐθεασάμεθα καὶ αἱ χεῖρες ἡμῶν ἐψηλάφησαν, περὶ τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς, — καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἐφανερώθη, καὶ ἐωράκαμεν καὶ μαρτυροῦμεν καὶ ἀπαγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν τὴν ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον ἣτις ἦν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα καὶ ἐφανερώθη ἡμῖν, — ἰδὲ ἐωράκαμεν καὶ ἀκηκόαμεν ἀπαγγ-

Most commentators are content to class the Logos here and in Revelation 19, as personal; but by no means all; and Tobac discussing the possibility of a distinction between "La Vie, c'est le Christ" and "La Parole de la Vie". (op. cit. p. 233) (A. E. Brooke (I.C.C.) thought that the use was not personal, and Westcott, in translating the phrase ὁ λόγος τῆς ζωῆς as the "message or revelation of life" appears to be unwilling to allow that this is a personal use of the term. But most commentators (e. g. Huther, Weiss, etc.,) regard the reference as being to the Logos who is Christ. Law, in his exposition of the First Johannine Epistle ("Tests of Life", pp. 44ff cp. p. 370), decided that the Logos in 1,1 has the same meaning as in the Prologue to the Gospel. So, also Haupt; "It is certainly inadmissible to translate the words as meaning the annunciation or message concerning life; for St. John's aim is not to speak ABOUT the preaching of the Apostles, but to announce that preaching itself". ("The First Epistle of John" p. 3)

Looking at this conflict of opinion in review, the case for the impersonal use in 1¹ depends on

two main arguments: 1) the use four times of the neuter ὁ ; 11) the fact that the term is not used absolutely. But against these can be set the fact that all the verbs in the early verses of the Epistle suggest a reference to the historical life of Christ. Attention, too, can be drawn to the fact that in the Revelation (19¹³) the use is not absolute. Plummer's point is worth noting, that περί is normally used of testimony concerning a person (Cambridge Greek Testament.) He also puts forward the idea that the genitive τῆς ἰωάννου is descriptive, and that λόγος and ἰωάννου may be considered as being in apposition. Since there is a good case for seeing in ἰωάννου, as used in verse 2, a personal name, we have, thus, a strong suggestion that the Logos is also such a personal name. But against all this must be reckoned the fact that περί has the genitive and not the simple accusative.

The following seems to the present writer a fair conclusion.

A. If we accept the usual position that the Epistle is "the earliest commentary" on the Fourth Gospel (F.W. Howard, "Christianity According to St. John" p. 20), then it is natural to suppose that the Logos of the Epistle is that of the Prologue of the Gospel, and personal.

B. If, on the other hand, we agree with J.N. Sanders, who, as we have already noted, claims that "the author of the Gospel knew the Epistles", (op. cit. p. 86) we

shall also agree with him in saying that in the First Epistle the Logos "is only on the way to personification" (p. 9), and that "Λόγος would only be translated 'Word' (with the capital) by one who already held that the Gospel and Epistles were by the same author."

We should, thus, think of the Apocalypists' "Logos of God" and the Epistle - writer's Logos of Life" as the final stages in the development of the New Testament concept of the Logos before it emerges in the Johannine Prologue. Nor, should Swete's comment be forgotten: "The relative use of the term would naturally precede the absolute". (Revelation p. 252) .

As used in 1 John 2,⁷, the Logos may refer to some of Christ's teaching already known ("old commandment") as distinct from that which is not known, and is shortly to be divulged ("New commandment"). In 1¹⁰ the reference is most likely to Christ's teaching or even to his teaching about sin, while 3¹⁸ it is clearly "word of mouth", being without the article and in company with γλῶσση contrasting with ἔφη καὶ ἀλάσεια .

All that has been written so far on the subject of the Logos in the New Testament has been said with the full consciousness that it is not enough only to examine the use of the term. But it is also apparent that certain limits have to be set to the present enquiry. During the consideration of the Pauline Epistles and the Acts of the Apostles there was a strong temptation to examine in detail the relationship between Pauline and Johannine thought. Again, the Epistle to the Hebrews invites the reader to go much farther and investigate the affinities of thought and expression with the Johannine Prologue, and the implications of the stress in both that Epistle and the Fourth Gospel upon the historical events of our Lord's life.

The present enquiry is conducted with the assumption that both in the Epistle to the Hebrews and in the Johannine writings we have a genuine and natural development of the Pauline teachings. (For this affinity struck Wernle, in the "Beginnings of Christianity", 11, so strongly that he argued that John was a disciple of Paul who finally secured the ascendancy of his master's teaching within the Church.) It is also apparent that, even if St. Paul does not use the term, all the elements of a Logos-doctrine are present in his Epistles (W.R. Inge, "Personal Idealism and Mysticism", p. 47), and that the Logos-Christology looms larger for him than for the Fourth Evangelist. This is obvious even at a cursory glance at the apostle's expositions of Christ's

three fold relationship 1) to the Godhead, cp. 11 Cor. 4⁴, Col. 1¹⁵, etc., Liddon maintained that the term εἰκῶν is here used as the equivalent of λόγος . ("Our Lord's Divinity", p. 320)

2) to the world, cp. πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, διὰ εἰς πρὸ πάντων συνέστηκεν . Col. 1^{15ff}, 1 Cor. 8⁶, Phil. 2⁶, Eph. 1¹⁰, Col. 3², etc.

3) to the human soul, Gal. 4¹⁹, 1 Cor. 15⁴⁵, etc.

It will be noticed that twice in the above notes reference is made to the great Christological passage of the Epistle to the Colossians. No one can go far in a study of the Johannine Prologue without encountering references to this passage. (e.g. W. Prynian-Adams", The Prologue of the Gospel seems to be a veritable echo of Colossians 1.15-20". C. Q. Review CCLXXVII. p. 18). Without going very far into the matter, a few words may be said on this topic.

John and Paul (this without prejudice to any question of authorship) had the same problem. To the Gentile world, in which the Christian Gospel was having an ever-widening diffusion, the title Christ carried little significance, and the expansion of the Church led to a demand that categories be sought to express intelligibly to the world the Church's convictions about the Person of Jesus of Nazareth. John chose Logos. Some have said

that he did this because the term was intelligible to those whom he approached through its contacts with current theological, or philosophical expression, or through its associations with Alexandrian and especially Philonic, religious writings. The idea which is being put forward in the present discussion is, of course, that John used the term because it had become familiar through the diffusion of the type of Christian literature which has survived in the New Testament, and was already, through the use of such literature in Christian worship, well on the way to becoming a technical term in Christian circles. In St. Paul's famous Christological passage (1^{15ff}), although we can see "how precisely St. Paul is in accord with St. John" (Frost, commentary, p. 62), the Logos-term is missing, and εἰκὼν was, for this occasion, St. Paul's choice. Burney has effectively shown (J.T.S. XXVII. p. 160ff) that in this passage we are offered a normal piece of rabbinical exegesis on the opening word of Genesis. In the passage, too, Paul transfers to Christ functions ascribed to Sophia in the Hebrew Wisdom Literature. The mystery has often been discussed as to why, where we should expect to find it, Paul eschews the use of the Logos-term. It has been suggested that he did so because it was liable to be misunderstood, on account of its use in Gnostic and kindred circles. To the question, Why, then, does St. John use the term? it has been answered

that perhaps he sensed no need for reserve in using it, and, even that he chose it deliberately so as to constitute an act of aggression against what he considered to be the erroneous^{use} of the term.

Canon Knox, however, finds the explanation in "the gradual diffusion of language in the synagogue of Dispersion", and suggests that by the time of John, as it had not been when Paul wrote, "Philo's term.....has become a common place of the Synagogues". (St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles p. 144¹²).

But this suggestion should be considered; that St. Paul did not use the term because it had not, at the time that he wrote, emerged fully as a Christological title, whereas when St. John wrote, that process of development virtually forced the use of the term upon him. Although the source of the following quotation has been lost, it is still worth recording:- "The Logos identification with the person of Jesus Christ must have been known before, and the Evangelist seems now to be giving only a more deliberate and definite expression to this identification." (? Bernard).

Another point to which we said that we should have to return is that of Christ in relation to the Law, and of the possible effect of early Christian thought on this subject upon the development of a Logos Christology.

We have already seen thatm attractive as the theory is that the concept of Christ as the Logos springs from the

Hebrew Wisdom Literature, there is a distance between the two which has to be bridged. This, we have already hinted, is accomplished in the distinctive contribution of that literature represented by the New Testament.

In the New Testament, Christ Jesus is called by St. Paul "the Wisdom of God." (1. Cor. 1²⁴) . Unless this statement was quite haphazard and unpremeditated, then there must lie behind it some process of thought. Any attempt to reconstruct this can only be provisional and, to some degree, suppositions. But let us make the attempt.

In the Synoptic Gospels we are given the view of Jesus of Nazareth as the one who outbid the authority of Torah. (Mt. 5⁴³, Lk. 6²⁷) He would, therefore, stand before those who accepted his displacement (or fulfillment) of the old Law, as the new Torah. The identification of the old Torah with the Wisdom of God (in the Sapiential Literature) would naturally lead the followers of Christ to identify him, as the embodiment of the New Torah, with the Wisdom of God.

We have already seen that Rendel Harris propounded the idea of a proto-Prologue in which Christ is spoken of as the Sophia of God. But, in point of fact, so far as the Johannine Prologue is concerned the Sophia-Christ identification is superfluous. (Gerhardus Vos in the Princeton

Theological Review XI, challenged the whole idea of such an identification and Sir Edwyn Hoskyn's commented that if Harris's argument "were finally adequate the Gospel would have opened with the words ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ἡ Σοφία.) For the Christ - (New) Torah association opened up, in the literature of rabbinic Judaism, a tremendous source of just such expressions, predicates and descriptions as we find in the Johannine Prologue. This can be seen at a glance by examining the material from rabbinic exegesis collected in the Strack-Billerbeck Kommentar (zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch):-

Torah existed 2,000 years before the world.

Torah lay on God's lap as he sat on his throne of glory.

As oil is the life of the world, so are the words of Torah life for the world;

As oil is the light of the world, so are the words of Torah light for the world.

Torah is Yahweh's only begotten daughter, wedded to his people Israel.

By his first (Torah) God created heaven and earth. (11 pp. 353)

In connection with the supposition that Christians came to think of Christ as the Wisdom of God by regarding him as the new Torah, there is one possible weakness which ought to be mentioned; this is the possibility that the Wisdom - Torah identification is not authentic. Indeed Bousset dismissed the equivalence (in Eccles. c. 24²³)

as the work of an Alexandrian glossator. But even if this Torah-Wisdom-Christ hypothesis is a legitimate reconstruction of the development of Christian thought - as seems to be vouched for by the fact in the early "Testimonia" of apostolic times the Wisdom passages of the Hebrew Scriptures are applied to our Lord - the point which still has to be explained is the choice of Logos and the rejection of Sophia as a title of Christ in the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel. The contention to which the whole of the present argument leads is that the use of Logos was forced upon the writer of the Johannine Prologue by the development of the term in the technical vocabulary of the Christian Church, a process which has left its marks upon the New Testament itself.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

The whole attempt to account for the Logos-term and conception in the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel has moved in circles. We have seen something of the enthusiasm of Professor James Adam for seeking the origins of the expression and its significance in the bye-ways of Greek philosophical and religious thinking. This was in 1905. Writing in 1908 Carl Clemen pleaded "the definite necessity for a broader basis of interpretation". But he found the literature of the Old Testament and later Judaism inadequate for that purpose. At that time scholars were ransacking the writings of Philo of Alexandria for parallels to the Johannine Prologue; but even at that date Clemen declared his dissatisfaction with that approach. But in 1915 the late A. E. Garvie could still write: "The dependence of the Prologue on Philo is so evident as not to need discussion". (Expositor, 8th series No. 56, p. 164). Reaching its high-water mark in the works of Reitzenstein and Loisy, there have been the various attempts (noted briefly in an excursus) to discern the roots of the Johannine Prologue in the Hermetic literature, the various mystery religions, Mandaeism, Gnosticisim, (so-called) and so forth. In all this the student cannot help thinking of Plato's search for the definition of justice, and he begins to wonder if the solution has not been lying at his feet all the time. And so there has come, in these later years, the

renewed attempt to find the sources of the Johannine Logos-doctrine and title in the sacred literature of Israel. The movement is in the right direction; for, as Canon Pythian-Adams puts it, "there is, in fact, in the Fourth Gospel not a trace of "Alexandrian" or "Protognostic" teaching. It is Biblical through and through". (C. Q. Review CCLXXVII Oct. - Dec. 1944. p. 19) But the student is bound to be aware that despite the development of Old Testament and rabbinic studies during the last half century, he is invited to a source which has been explored before and found deficient.

But there is a hint of a further field of investigation. We continue to quote Dr. Pythian-Adams' article: the Fourth Gospel "reproduces in its own language all the essential doctrines of Paul."

This suggests that, if the teaching of the Fourth Gospel, no matter how distinctive, is an integral part of that of the New Testament - and this is more and more recognized - then there is every reason to suspect that its characteristic terminology will be derived from that biblical source - remembering that the Bible has always been the Bible of the worshipping Church.

The principle which is seen to govern even what to us seem perverse and outlandish attempts to account for the Logos of the Fourth Gospel is that the Author is using a term which he could introduce without explanation, as, mani-

festly, significant to those to whom his work is addressed.

Moreover, we have to reckon with the fact that by the time of Polycarp the title of Logos of God clung to Christ and was accepted as normal. In fact, by the time of the Epistle to Diognetus (i.e. by 135 A. D.), a work had been written employing neither the name Jesus, nor the title Christ but using only the title Logos.

We have, therefore, re-examined the use of the Logos term in the New Testament. It is not proposed to tabulate all the uses found therein, but only to summarize some of the more relevant and interesting instances:-

- 1. Logos is still used in the New Testament to denote the utterance of God: e.g. Mk. 7¹³ (=Mt. 15⁶), Acts 7²⁹, ~~II~~ Peter 3⁵, John 5³⁸.
- 2. It is also used of that which Christ Jesus spoke, sometimes of a pronouncement, but sometimes of his message in a broader sense: e.g. Col. 3¹⁶ (?) Mk. 1⁴⁵ (=Lk. 5¹⁵) 2², 4³³, 8³², 10²², (=Mt. 19²²) 14³⁹, Lk. 8²¹, 11²⁸, Mt. 15¹², Jn. 2², 4⁴¹, 8³¹, 12³², 14⁶, 15³.

Special attention is directed to Lk. 4³²⁻³⁷, 5¹, Jn. 17^{6&14}, 5²²; in these instances we see cases where it is not enough to limit the meaning of the Logos-term to Christ's message.

3. Indeed there is a little group of instances where the Logos is at least the Christian revelation as an whole, and just such uses as would influence one writing the Johannine

Prologue and drawing upon a profound store of Christian experience; e.g. Rev. 12, 9, 69, Hebrews 4¹² (which Athanasius regarded as a personal use of the term), Jn. 8^{51ff} (if the term is not merely a summary for εἰς τὸ λαλῆναι) 8³⁷ (for Augustine appears to have understood by the Logos here, Christ the Logos).

4. The Logos term is regularly used to connote the Gospel especially viewed as the Apostle's message; e.g. 1 Thes. 1⁸, 11 Thes. 3¹, Gal. 6⁶, Col 1⁵, numerous verses in Acts, Heb. 4², 11 Tim. 2¹⁵, Jn. 15²⁰, 17²⁰, and especially Eph. 1¹³, where, again, we can see subsequent use in a liturgical setting could readily lead to a change of emphasis. Harnack himself drew attention to the use of Logos in the Acts, and said, "It was through the Acts of the Apostles.....that the expression 'the word of God' was naturalized in the Church". ("The Constitution and Law of the Church", p. 335)

5. Following closely on these is another group of uses where, although in each case (though sometimes with a great impoverishment of sense) no more than the Apostolic message may be meant, it is now suggested that we have the idea of Christ the Logos as preached, and even, in some cases, the thought of Christ the Logos Incarnate. Special attention is drawn to those passages underlined. 1 Thes 1⁶, 1 Cor. 11⁸, 2⁴⁻⁵, 14³⁶ 11 Cor. 11⁸, 2¹⁷, 4², 5¹⁹ (although this could mean the Christian revelation as an whole), Phil. 1¹⁴

Rom. 9⁶ (?) Col. 1²⁵ (in the second and third centuries the passage was used in developing the presentation of Christ as the Logos), 3¹⁶, Mark 4^{13ff} (=Lk. 8^{16ff} =Mt. 13^{19ff}, ex-
position of the parable of the sower) (16²⁰), Acts 6² & 4,
10³⁶, 13²⁶, 14³, 20³², Tit. 1³.

Particular attention is drawn to James 1^{17ff}, 1 Peter 1²³,
2⁸ and 3¹. In these cases there is good reason to think
that the writers had in mind the Incarnate Logos of God.

It has also been argued that the "Faithful Sayings" of the
Pastoral Epistles constitute a personal use of the term.

6. It has not been thought necessary to dwell at great
length on the uses in 1 John 1¹ and the Apocalypse 19¹³, in
view of the general acceptance that the reference here is
to the Logos Personal and Incarnate. But very important
is the use in Lk. 1², also standing in the Prologue to a
Gospel. Apart from 1²⁹ (a specific saying of the Arch-
angel) and 5¹⁵ (followed by the definitive $\kappa\epsilon\pi\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \delta\epsilon\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$)
1² is the only absolute use of $\delta\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ in the Lukan Gospel,
and was regarded by Origen as personal.

It will be seen that we suggest that we have:-

- a) a number of instances in the New Testament of the use of Logos in which, by use in teaching and worship, the term was bound to become a title for Christ Jesus;
- b) signs within the New Testament of this process of development, and of the pressure thereof, upon the New Testament writers: "the Auctor ad Hebræos.....seems, in the

resounding exordium of his discourse, to challenge his readers to hail their Lord as $\acute{\omicron} \text{ } \acute{\lambda}\acute{\omicron}\gamma\omicron\varsigma \text{ } \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ " (W.F. Howard; "Christianity according to St. John" p. 42.) Nor is the Logos term likely to be unique in this connection. A glance at the use of $\acute{\omicron} \delta\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ for example, reveals that, while used in a normal literary sense, it also developed into a technical Christian term.

That the development of the Logos term may not have been altogether haphazard, nor its introduction fortuitous, seems to be indicated by the fact that in α , $\acute{\omicron} \text{ } \acute{\lambda}\acute{\omicron}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ (as a technical term) is missing. It is, then, possible that the exigencies of the early presentation of the Gospel demanded the introduction of some kind of primitive technical language, and that the Logos-term came to be introduced into the Christian tradition and literature in this way.

It is, also, impossible to estimate the effect upon the meaning which would result from the attaching to the Logos-term of certain definitive words and phrases. If the early Christians knew that the Lord had called himself "the way, the truth, the Life," this was bound to affect the significance which they attached to such expressions as $\acute{\omicron} \text{ } \acute{\lambda}\acute{\omicron}\gamma\omicron\varsigma \text{ } \eta\varsigma \text{ } \acute{\lambda}\eta\gamma\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha\varsigma$ (Col. 1⁵, Eph. 1¹³. 1¹ Tim. 2¹⁵). Nor, in view of the fact that in some contexts the Logos connotes the Evangel, should we forget the effect upon the meaning of the term from the identification of the $\epsilon\upsilon\acute{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\omicron\upsilon$ and Jesus Christ involved in such instances as 1 Cor. 929,

Eph. 3¹, 4¹, 11 Tim. 1⁸. Attention has already been drawn to the point emphasized by Canon Ramsay, in his book "The Resurrection of Christ" - the importance of the phrase in Acts "to Gospel Christ (Jesus)" .

In view of this attempt to demonstrate the possibility that, in the composition of his Prologue, and for its leading term, the Logos, the Fourth Evangelist was drawing upon a technical vocabulary developed by the Christian Church in its teaching and worship (We have even gone so far as to suggest that this development forced the term upon him,), and in consideration of the argument that we can mark this process in the New Testament itself, it is gratifying to find a recognition of this in a book published when the present investigation was already in its final stages. In his Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Peter, Dean Selwyn, although there is no reason to think that he would allow all that has been said in this study, admits of the use of the Logos-term in that Epistle that "New Testament thought is already on the way" to the Fourth Gospel. (p. 151)

But everyone who attempts such an investigation as that which now closes must bear in mind Professor Dodd's admonition:-

"The thought of the Gospel is indeed so original and creative that a search for its "sources" or even for the "influences" by which it may have been

affected, may easily lead us astray. We may be sure that its principal sources were inward, and that whatever influences may have been present have been masterfully controlled by a powerful and independent mind."

†

Excursus on some of the other sources whence the foundations of the Logos in the Johannine Prologue have been sought.

In the study of the subject of the present work the student inevitably meets certain other attempts to account for the Johannine Prologue and its Logos-term which fall outside the classifications Scriptural, Hellenistic, Sapiential, Philonic. These have failed to commend themselves to scholars. This is so, on the whole, for two reasons; firstly, the inherent improbability of the suggestions put forward, and, secondly, the lack of accurate information about the proposed sources themselves.

It is proposed to mention some of the suggestions which have been advanced. No great details will be given either as to the arguments of those who have advanced them, nor as to why they have not been generally accepted. Nor is there any pretence at a complete survey.

In the case of "Gnosticism", during the earlier part of this century Bousset and Reitzenstein persuaded us to regard this not as the bastard of Christianity and Greek philosophy but as the result of the impact of Greek and Oriental thought, and, consequently, as possibly older than Christianity, and, thus, at least likely to have influenced the Fourth Evangelist. More recently, however, the closer investigation of literary sources reveals that the earlier Christian writers never reckoned with Gnosticism at all, but only with Gnostics and Gnosis. The late Professor Burkitt's

"Church and Gnosis" sees the position again under review. He accepted the fact that we can no longer speak of a broad category called "Gnosticism", but thought that "several systems are best understood when considered as Christian systems," (p. 9) These he attributed to the effect of the non-realization of the Parousia. Whereas orthodox Christians were content to refer the eschatological prophecies to the remoter future, others began a pseudo-philosophical attempt to interpret these eschatological passages. It is here that he found the beginnings of "several systems" which, a century ago, would have been classed together as Gnosticism.

In 1925, R. Bultmann had an article in Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft (Vol. 120 pts. 1/2 pp. 100 - 146) entitled, Die Bedeutung der neuerschlossenen mandaeschen und manichaischen für das Verständnis des Johannesevangeliums. In this he takes up the thesis of an essay which he had contributed to a series of papers in honour of Gunkel's sixtieth birthday (1923), on the religious background of the Johannine Prologue, and in which he had argued that this is indebted "nicht auf philosophischer Spekulation, sondern auf orientalischer Mythologie." In the later article he also argued that the Johannine Prologue is a Mandaean document, adapted for Christian use by the addition of a few verbal additions and the introduction of verses 6-8, 15 and, possibly, 17.

The parallels between the sacred Mandaean writings (Ginza, Book of John, Qolasta - the Liturgy Book) are obvious and have been listed by Bauer (in Lietzmann's Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, 2nd edition, Tübingen, 1925.) and later by E. Percy ("Unter-suchung über den Ursprung der Johannes-schen Theologie.") So, also, Norden, "Agnostos Theos". p. 181ff.

The Mandaeans continue to exist by the banks of the River Tigris, and call themselves the Christians of St. John. An eighth century orthodox Christian account of the Mandaeans (by Theodore bar Konai) attributes their foundation to Ada, a "wanderer" of Adiabene, and says that the Mandaean doctrines are derived from the Marcionites and Manichees and the "Kanteans", thus making these doctrines post-Christian.

A good deal of the confusion about the Mandaeans arose from the fact that in a book published in 1555, mention is made of "imperfect Christians" at Basra, and in which it is also said that St. John the Evangelist preached there. This is repeated in a publication of 1665. Accordingly, as early as 1784 comparisons were drawn between Mandaism and the Fourth Gospel. Clearly the initial mistake was made in 1555 by confusing John the Evangelist with John the Baptist. Since 1697 (when a certain d'Herbelot issued his Bibliothèque Orientale) there has been a steady opinion

Mandaeism is not a pre-Christian, Gnostic-Chaldean growth, but a western and post-Christian development, with contacts with later Judaism (although this last was rejected by Pallas in his "Mandaean Studies").

Still, the parallels between the Mandaean texts and the Fourth Gospel are there. We have seen that Bultmann has tried to turn back the clock and account for these by postulating the dependence of the Johannine Gospel on the Mandaean sources. As we should expect, such a reversal of opinion, together with the proposal to strip the Prologue of all that makes it specifically Christian, has not been accepted.

The obvious alternative is to suppose that the Mandaean writings draw upon the Johannine Gospel. Since the establishment of this case cannot assist our thesis, we can only afford to note it briefly. Gressmann (in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* XL) also examined the Mandaean literature and declared that there is little evidence of a pre-Christian Mandaism. Dr. Burkitt, in the work already mentioned and in an article ("The Mandaeans") in the *Journal of Theological Studies* (XXIX No. 115 April, 1928), has argued that the concepts of Mandaism are derived from the Peshitta (Syriac) Version of the Christian Scriptures. He gives his opinion that the Mandaeans are "properly to be looked on as Christians, though heretical Christians. They are, in fact, dissenters."

v

("Church and Gnosis," p. 114) He concludes that "Mandaicism may be interesting in itself, but it is useless to go to it as a key to unlock the mysteries of early Christian development." (J. T. S. XXIX p. 255)

The third alternative is that the Mandaean writings and the Fourth Gospel were dependent, as regards their parallelisms, upon a common source. This is the opinion of Ernest Percy, (op. cit) and was also reached by Dr. Vincent Taylor. ("The Madaeans and the Fourth Gospel", in the Hebbert Journal, XXVIII, No. 3. April 1930.) who concluded that these parallelisms have no "significance at all" (p. 532) "The Johannine sayings are not directly dependent on the Mandaean sayings and the latter are not directly dependent on the Fourth Gospel... ..The relationship between the Johannine sayings and those of Mandaism lies in the fact that both the Evangelist and the Mandaean authors have independently drawn upon the same stock of common forms, symbols, and figures, and, to some extent, of ideas as well." (p. 544)

Taylor's conclusion is supported by the consideration that parallels also exist between the mandaeen sources and Philo, the Odes of Solomon and the Hermetic Writings.

In the introduction to his two volumes on the Fourth Gospel in the International Critical Commentary, Bernard included among the factors which influenced the writer of

the Prologue, the Hermetic writings; and Granger, writing in the Journal of Theological Studies for April 1904 (V. No. 19) declared that the key to the Fourth Gospel "is to be found in the Gnostic ideas which underlie the Poimandres." (p. 411). Certainly the Hermetic literature of itself constitutes one of the most interesting features of any investigation into the Johannine writings.

The Corpus Hermeticum consists of eighteen tractates, although the late W. Scott, by dividing XI and XII, listed nineteen in his four volume edition. The writings represent a type of literature which results from an amalgam of Platonism and Stoicism. (Plato's "Timaeus" and the works of Posidonius are clearly among the sources from which the Hermetic writers drew ideas.) The Hermetic Corpus represents an attempt to offer this teaching, not as the result of philosophical enquiry, but as a matter of supernatural revelation, derived from antiquity. The writings purport to be Greek versions of ancient Egyptian books, consisting of the communication from Hermes to Tat, (= Thoth, or Asclepius, or Ammon.) Bevan ("Later Greek Religion" p. 176) thought that Egypt contributed no more than the names. Moret ("Mystères Égyptiens" pp. 105ff) discerned in the Corpus some elements of Egyptian mystical piety. Scott ("Hermetica" Vol. 1 P.11) considered the Egyptian contribution to be the religious fervour of the writings.

Although it seems that Clement of Alexandria knew that the Hermetic writings were not of great antiquity, it was not until 1614 that Isaac Casaubon had the temerity to suggest a date later than Moses! Richard Hooker, for instance, accepted the sequence Homer, Mercurius Trismegistus (i.e. the Hermetic writings) Ananagoras, Plato and the Stoics. Reitzenstein, in his preliminary work, "zwei religions-geschichtliche Fragen" (1901) and his "Poimandres" 1904) initiated the modern study of the Hermetic Literature. ("Poimandres" is the title of the tractate standing first in the Corpus). Most of the conclusions which he reached have, subsequently, been rejected or contradicted. He thought that at least in the case of an hypothetical Hermetic literature, deriving from the Pantheology of Memphis, there lay popular religion. Scott (op. cit.) and, earlier, Cumont, ("Les Religions Orientales" p. 340.) both deny that this literature represents any considerable religious following. Reitzenstein dated the entire collection as in the time of Diocletian, and considered that "Poimandres" was available before the writing of the Shepherd of Hermas. He claimed that the Hermetic writings have influenced the New Testament.

In 1918, Windisch (writing in Theologisch Tijdschrift) declared that the entire Hermetic Corpus is post-New Testament, and Kroll ("Die Lehren des Hermes Trismegistus", pp. 386ff) could find no trace of Christian influences.

But Canon Knox persisted that the literature may have been known before the destruction of the Temple. Kerbs ("Der Logos als Heiland") contradicted Droll in discerning Christian sources as influences in Poimandres;" in contrast also to Reitzenstein, he denied the possibility of anything approaching Hermetic Literature in the Ptolemaic period! Bevan (op. cit.) thought that what others had considered to be traces of Christian influence were no more than reflections of the LXX, and pointed out that even the doctrine of rebirth in (Tract XIII) is not indisputably Christian. Scott's work has forwarded the tendency to see less and less point of contact between the Hermetic and New Testament Literature. He judged the Greek to be late, and, almost certainly, the original language. He infers from I § 13 that the Hermetic writers found Christianity beneath contempt, and unnoticeable as a serious factor in their religious prospect. As early as 1914, the late Prof. J. M. Creed declared for Christian influences in tractates I, VII, XIII, but rejected Reitzenstein's discerning of a Hermetic source behind the Shepherd of Hermas. (J. T. S. XV. No. 60) Twenty years later commenting on C. H. Dodd's "Bible and the Greeks", he wrote: "I am still disposed to think that Christian Baptism may have been in the mind of the author of No. IV, on "Baptism in a Crater"..... But even so Christian influence if present at all, is a quite subordinate feature." (J.T.S.

XXXVI No. 143, July 1935).

C. H. Dodd finds no trace of Christian influence anywhere in the Corpus, with the possible exception of a Pauline touch in No. Xl11; but this is more likely to have been due to contact with the Greek commentators, like Chrysostom. What might be thought to be traces of Christian influence, are, in Dodd's opinion, no more than borrowings from later Judaism, that is from that circle of Hellenistic Jewish ideas which was available to the writers of the New Testament. He concludes that parallels between Poimandres and the New Testament "are explicable as the result of minds working under the same general influences," ("Eible and the Greeks" p. 247.) a conclusion expressed in identical words by E. Carpenter ("Johannine Writings" p. 312) (Particularly interesting is the wide range of meanings attaching to in the Corpus:-

teaching of The Hermetica	XVI § 2
doctrine	Xl11 § 1
speech	X11 (1)12
discourse	X § 1a
reason	VI § 16
faculty of reason	1 § 11b
utterance of	1 § 5a
a person distinct from God	1 § 6

though Scott suspects some meddling by a Christian interpolator.)

When, in 1912 J. Rendel Harris published the second edition of his translation and notes on the "Odes and Psalms of Solomon", he wrote: "We may be sure that the Christian Church of today has been enriched by the discovery of a literary monument of the highest value". (p. 89) There is no need to comment of the vanity of this statement. Like the case of the Didache, the discovery of these poems was hailed as the clue to all mysteries. But none today gives any serious attention to the Odes as throwing any light on the influences at work on the Fourth Evangelist. Round about 1915 Dom Conahly and others conducted an interesting, but academic discussion on the topic of the original language of the Odes. With this, all interest in them seems to have ended. All we can do is to give a summary of the principal literature available on the subject.

In 1910, Harnack ("Texte und Untersuchungen") put out an edition of the Odes, claiming that they are of Jewish origin, 50 B.C. - 67 A.D., and subjected to Christian redaction c. 100 A.D. In the same year Zahn (Neue Kirch. Zeitsc). Said that the writer of the Odes knew the Pauline Epistles, and the Johannine and Mathew's Gospels. He dated the Odes 120 - 180 A.D., but thought there were traces of pre-Christian origins. Spitta, also in 1910 (Zeits. f. d. Neuen-Test. Wiss.) working on the same material, concluded that Paul knew the Odes, which, in turn, were interpolated by one knowing the Fourth Gospel. Bernard, in the

J.T.S. for 1910, considered the Odes to be specifically Christian, containing quotations from the Fourth Gospel and constituting a series of baptismal hymns. He reiterated these opinions in his "Texts and Studies" Vol. Vlll (1912), and was supported by H. B. Swete, in J.T.S. XVlll. Wellhausen, in 1910 (Gott. Gel. Anz) declared for the dependence of the Odes upon the Fourth Gospel.

In 1911, as we have noted, Harris issued the second edition of his annotated translation of the Odes. In the first edition he had assigned the Odes to a Jewish source and allowed no Christian redaction. But in the second edition he conceded that the references to the Virgin Birth and the Descent into Hades are the work of a Christian interpolator. Battifol (Rev. Bibl. Internat.) in the same year, put forward the suggestion that the Odes belong to the gnostic-docetic type of teaching. Connolly, in the J. T. S. for 1912 declared that the Odes are Christian works, and, in 1920, assigned them to Alexandria at the end of the second century Vos. (Princeton Theol. Rev. 1913), on the ground that in the Odes there is "a theological definiteness and suggestiveness", thought that the Odes must be post-Johannine. In 1913, E. P. Scott (Amer. J. of Theol.) suggested that the Odes are the work of a Jewish poet, redressed in a "Christian garb."

Since then no interest has been shown in the Odes, and the general conclusion would appear to be that their

Messianism is, at any rate, Pharaonic, and that they are too late to have influenced the New Testament.

In his "Religion des Juifs," Bousset professed to find the original of the Hebrew hypostatization of Sophia in the hypostatical beings of Persian religion (Amesha Spentas), and thought that in the "Good Thought" (Vohu-Mano), counsellor of Mazda (also represented as the son of Mazda) there was a remote resemblance to the later Logos-idea. To establish this, however, would require an earlier dating of the relevant Persian literature (Gaza) and of its diffusion than can be demonstrated.

Attempts have also been made to associate the personified Word of God in the Babylonian and Assyrian religions with the Sophia of Hebrew Sapiential Literature and the Logos-idea of the New Testament. But these efforts ignore the fact that in such religions no distinction was made between the being and function of deity, thus emptying the idea of an utterance of deity of the significance which we attach to it. But, so far as the present study is concerned, it is enough to note that Clemens (American Jour. of Theol. XII) who was determined to give full place to foreign influences upon the Fourth Gospel, decided that Babylonian influences are confined to the Gospel exclusive of the Prologue. (Call of Disciples, Woman of Samaria) He also sets aside any question of Buddhist influence, since there is no proof of contact between Christianity and Indian thought at a

sufficiently early date.

In the second chapter of Alexandre Cumont's "Mystères Egyptiens" (pp. 105ff) there is a readable account of the idea of the Word in Egyptian religious thought, although his purpose is to find parallels between Egyptian texts on the one hand, and Hebraic and Hermetic writings on the other. The main impression left on reading his evidence is that the Egyptian ideas about the Word or Voice (verbe) had to do chiefly with the work of creation, a matter of little interest in Johannine thought. There is, however, good evidence for the diffusion of the concepts of ancient Egyptian religion. (Plato: Phaedra, 274c; Cicero: de Natura Deorum, III 22, 56.) But while there is evidence that the Egyptians regarded God (Thot) as creating "aus sprechen", there is no evidence that they held a doctrine of the Word as a distinct person. In fact Egyptian religion was pantheistic; the production of another God is only the production of self - "from every God's body, or mouth, he produces his own being". (An inscription of the 8th century B.C.) "Egypt," remarked Cumont, "never professed any but a chaotic aggregate of disparate doctrines." ("Oriental Religions of Roman Paganism," p. 198)

(All that has been said above is not a criticism of Canon Knox's explanation of the development of the concept of Sophia in Alexandria as a "counter blast"

* IV

to Isis. Canon Knox has continued to press this idea which he put forward in 1937 in the J. T. S. (XXXVIII No. 151).]

As regards the possible influence of the contemporary mystery religions, the late Dr. N. P. Williams (in his contribution to "Essays Catholic and Critical") provides an excellent review of that tendency during the first quarter of the century, under such leaders as Bousset and Loisy, to find the origin of all Christian ideas in the mystery religions, and also (pp. 392ff) subjects the tendency to a penetrating scrutiny, successfully re-establishing the case for the inherent genius and originality of the New Testament. (His thesis has the subsequent support of Dr. A. D. Nock.) After all, the literature of the mystery religions is so extensive and voluminous that it would be surprising if it did not afford some instances of passages and ideas similar to those of the Fourth Gospel. But, as W. H. Rigg says, all that is indicated is "that the evangelist had Greek readers, especially those attracted by the mystery religions." (Ch. Q. Rev. CXX (239) "The Purpose of the Fourth Gospel". p. 16).

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

The following bibliography does not purport to contain all the books or articles mentioned in the text; nor are all commentaries listed, but only those containing notes or articles of special importance.

- Adam, J. Religious Teachers of Greece.
- Alford, Dean Greek New Testament.
- Angus, S. Mystery Religions & Christianity.
- Arnim, A. von Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta (4 vols.).
- Arnold, V. Roman Stoicism.
- Bacon, B. Jesus, the Son of God.
- Baillie, J. And the Life Everlasting.
- Bernard, Abp. St. John's Gospel (I.C.C. 2 vols.).
Texts & Studies, VIII.
Pastoral Epistles.
- Bert, G. Evangelium des Johannes.
- Bethune-Baker, J. Introduction to Early History of Christian Doctrine.
- Bevan, E. Stoics & Sceptics.
Later Greek Religion.
Hellenism & Christianity.
- Beyschlag, W. New Testament Theology (2 vols.).
- Bigg, C. Christian Platonists of Alexandria.

- Blakency, E.H. Hymn of Cleanthes.
- Bréhier, E. Idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon.
- Bousset, W. Religion des Judéens (2nd. ed.).
Kurios Christos.
- Bulgakov, S. Wisdom of God.
- Bultmann, R. Jesus & the Word.
- Burch, V. Structure & Message of St. John's Gospel.
Jesus Christ & his Revelation.
- Burkitt, F.C. Church & Gnosis.
Judaism & the Beginning of Christianity.
- Burnoy, C.F. Apocryphic Origin of the Fourth Gospel.
- Caird, E. Evolution of Theology.
- Carpenter, E. Johannine writings.
- Cave, S. Doctrine of the Person of Christ.
- Charles, R.H. Apocrypha & Pseudepigrapha (2 vols.).
Revelation of St. John (2 vols.).
Enoch.
- Charnwood, Lord According to St. John.
- Clarke, W.N. Christian Doctrine of God.
- Clemen, C. Primitive Christianity & its non-Jewish Sources.
- Cumont, F. Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism.
- Dalman, H. Words of Jesus

- Danby, H. Midrash Translated.
- Davidson, A.B. Theology of the Old Testament.
- Davidson, W.L. Stoic Creed.
- d'Aviella, F.G. Evolution du Dogme Catholique (1.).
- Dodd, C.H. Meaning of Paul.
- Parables of the Kingdom.
- Apostolic Preaching and its Developments.
- Bible & the Greeks.
- Epistle to the Romans.
- Johannine Epistles.
- Drummond, H. Character and Authership of the Fourth Gospel.
- Drummond, J. Philo Judaeus (2 vols.).
- Eck, H.V.S. Incarnation.
- Evans, E. Epistles to the Corinthians.
- Fairweather, W. Jesus & the Greeks.
- Farnell, L.R. Higher Aspects of Greek Religion.
- Findlay, G.C. Fellowship in the Life Eternal.
- Gardner, P. Ephesian Gospel.
- Garvie, A.E. Romans.
- Gilbert, G.H. Greek Thought in the New Testament.
- Goodrick, G. Book of Wisdom.
- Gore, C. Belief in Christ.
- Incarnation of the Son of God.
- Grenotod, W. Person of Christ.
- Halliday, W.R. Pagan Background of Early Christianity.

- Harnack, A. What is Christianity?
Constitution & Law of the Church.
History of Dogma (1-VII).
Texte und Unter-suchungen (Odes of Sol-
omon.)
- Harris, J.R. Odes & Psalms of Solomon.
Origin of the Prologue to St. John's
Gospel.
Origin of the Doctrine of the Trinity.
- Hatch, E. Influences of Greek Ideas & Usages
upon the Christian Church.
- Haupt, E. First Epistle of St. John.
- Herford, R.T. Christianity in the Talmud.
- Hicks, R.D. Stoic & Epicurean.
- Hodgson, L. Doctrine of the Trinity.
And Was Made Man.
- Holland, H.S. Philosophy of Faith.
- Hoskyns, E.C. Fourth Gospel (2 vols.).
Riddle of the New Testament (with Davey).
- Howard, W.F. Christianity According to St. John.
Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism & In-
terpretation.
- Inge, W.R. Christian Mysticism.
Platonic Tradition in English Religious
Thought.
Theology of Fourth Gospel (Camb. Bibl. Es.

- Jackson & Lako Beginnings of Christianity (1 & 11).
- Jewett, B. St. Paul's Epistles.
- Kennedy, H.A.A. Philo's Contribution to Religion.
- Korbs, E. Logos des Heiland im ersten Jahrhundert.
- Kittel, G. (ed.) Wörterbuch zum neuen Testament.
- Knox, W.L. Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity.
- St. Paul & the Church of the Gentiles.
- St. Paul & the Church of Jerusalem.
- Kroll, J. Lehren des Hermes-Trimegistus.
- Ingrange, R.P. Évangile selon S. Jean.
- Law, R. Tests of Life.
- Le Breton, J. Origines du Dogme de la Trinité.
- Levison, M. Jewish Background of Christianity.
- Liddon, H.P. Our Lord's Divinity.
- Lotzmann, (ed.) Handbuch zum neuen Testament.
- Lightfoot, J.B. Philippians.
- St. Clement of Rome.
- Epistles of Ignatius.
- Little, V.A.S. Christology of the Apologists.
- Loisy, A. Mystères païens et le Mystère chrétien.
- Quatrième Évangile.
- Loofs, F. What is the Truth about Jesus Christ?
- Machon, J.G. Origin of St. Paul's Religion.
- Hanson, W. Incarnate Glory.

- Maspero, G. Histoire ancienne des Peuples de l'Orient.
Maspero, G. ~~Maspero~~
Matthews, W.R. God in Christian Thought & Experience.
Maurice, F.D. Commentary (early chapters only).
Mead, G.R.S. Thrice Greatest Hermes.
Moffatt, J. Theology of the Gospels.
Epistle to the Hebrews.
General Epistles.
Montefiore, C. Judaism & St. Paul.
Moore, C. Religious Thought of the Greeks.
Moore, G. F. Judaism (3 vols.).
More, P.E. Christ the Word.
Moret, A. Mystères Égyptiens.
Rituel en Égypte.
Mozley, J.K. Incarnation.
Christian Theology.
Murray, G. Five Stages of Greek Religion.
Murray, J.C.F. Jesus According to St. John.
MacDonald, A.J. Interpreter Spirit & Human Life.
MacGregor, G.H.C. Gospel according to St. John.
" & Purdy Jew & Greek.
Mackinnon, J. From Christ to Constantine.
Mackintosh, H.R. Person of Christ.
Narborough, F.D.V. Epistle to the Hebrews.
Nock, A.D. Conversion.
Nolloth, C.F. Fourth Evangelist.

- Worden, Agnostos Theos.
- Oosterley, W.O.E. Jewish Background of Early Christianity.
Jews & Judaism during the Greek Period.
Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha.
Ecclesiasticus.
Book of Proverbs.
Judaism & Christianity, vol.1 (editor).
- " & Box Worship of the Synagogue.
- Ogerrau, F. Systeme philosophique des Stoiciens.
- Ottley, R.L. Incarnation.
- Pallis, S.A. Essay on Mandaean Bibliography.
Mandaean Studies.
- Pearson, A.C. Fragments from Zeno & Cleanthes.
- Percy, E. Untersuchung über den Ursprung der Joh-
annesevangelischen Theologie.
- Pfoiderer, O. Primitive Christianity, vol. LV.
- Phythian-Adams, J. People & the Presence.
- Prentice, G.L. God in Patristic Thought.
- Pullan, J.L. Early Christian Doctrine.
- Quick, O.C. Doctrines of the Creed.
- Rackham, R.B. Acts of the Apostles.
- Raven, C.E. Jesus & the Gospel of Love.
What Think ye of Christ?
- Rawlinson, A.E.J. New Testament Doctrine of Christ,
Essays on the Trinity & the Incarnation. (ed.

- Redlich, E.B. Introduction to the Fourth Gospel.
- Reitzenstein, J. Zwei religionsgeschichtliche Fragen.
Poimandros.
- Relton, H.H. Study in Christology.
- Robinson, J.A. Commentary on Ephesians.
- Robinson, W. Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit.
- Sanday, W. Christology & Personality.
Criticisms of the Fourth Gospel.
- " & Headlam Epistle to the Romans (2 vols.).
- Sanders, J.N. Fourth Gospel in the Early Church.
- Schechter, S. Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology.
- Schürer, J. Jewish People in the Time of Christ (11,3.)
- Scott, C.A. Footnotes to St. Paul.
- Scott, E.F. Fourth Gospel.
Gospel and its Tributaries.
- Scott, W. Hermetica (4 vols.).
- Selwyn, E.G. First Epistle of Peter.
Oracles of the New Testament.
- Sharp, D.S. Epictetus and the New Testament.
- Stevens, G.B. Theology of the New Testament.
- Stock, St. J. Stoicism.
- Strachan, H.H. Historic Jesus & the New Testament.
Fourth Gospel.
Commentary on 11 Corinthians.

- Strack-Billerbeck Kommentar zum neuen Testament.
- Stroeter, B.H. Four Gospels.
- Swete, H.B. Patristic Studies.
Apocalypse of St. John.
- Taylor, A.E. Plato.
Timaeus.
- Temple, W. Plato & Christianity.
Christus Veritas.
Readings in St. John's Gospel (2 vols.).
- Thackeray, H.St.J. Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary
Jewish Thought.
- Thornton, L.S. Incarnate Lord.
- Tixeront, J. Histoire des Dogmes dans l'Antiquité, 1.
- Watkins, H.W. Modern Criticism & the Fourth Gospel.
- Wendt, H.H. Gospel according to St. John.
- Westcott, B.F. Commentary on St. John's Gospel.
Epistle to the Hebrews.
- Williams, N.P. Origins of the Sacraments, in Essays,
Catholic & Critical (ed. Selwyn.).
- Zeller, E. Philosophie der Griechen.
Outlines of Greek Philosophy (trans.
L.R. Palmer.).

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY.

- VIII(1) McFadyen, J.E. Hellenism & Hebraism.
IX(1) Sayce, A.H. Babylonian Accounts of the Creation
IX(2) Casman, A.S. Philo's Doctrine of the Divine
Father & Virgin Mother.
XII(4) Clemen, C. Does the Fourth Gospel Depend
upon Pagan Traditions?
XV(3-4) Wakefield, B.B. Two Natures in Recent Christo-
logical Speculation.
XVIII(2) Strachan, R.H. Idea of Preexistence in the
Fourth Gospel.
XX(3) Scott, E.F. Hellenistic Mysticism of the
Fourth Gospel.

BULLETIN OF JOHN RYLAND'S LIBRARY.

- 1922 Harris, J.R. Origin of the Prologue to St.
John's Gospel.
1935 Dodd, C.H. Background of the Fourth Gospel.
1937 " John I & the Fourth Gospel.

GEORGE QUARTERLY REVIEW.

- CXX Rigg, W.E. Purpose of the Fourth Gospel.
CCXXVII Adams, W.J.F. Logos Doctrine of the Fourth Gospel.

EXPOSITOR. VIth series.

- 24 Hitchcock, F.R.M. Baptist & the Fourth Gospel.

- 33 Fairbairn, A.M. Governing Ideas of the Fourth Gospel.
Vlith. series.
- 46/50 Strachan, R.H. Christ of the Fourth Gospel.
- 46 Clemen, C. Dependence of Early Christianity on
Judaism.
- 47 " " upon non- Jewish Religion.
- 70 Kennedy, H.A.A. Hellenistic Atmosphere of the Epistle
of James.
Vllith. series.
- 3 Bacon, B.W. Odes of the Lord's Rest.
- 47 Sharp, D.G. Resemblances between the Discourses of
Epictetus & the New Testament.
- 56/7 Garvie, A.E. Prologue & the Evangelists Theological
Reflexions.
- 67 Bok, G.H. Jewish Environment of Early Christianity.
- 68/72 Harris, J.R. Origins of the Prologue to St. John.
- 83 " Christ the First-born.
- 97/8 Marmonstein, A. Jews & Judaism in Early Christian Apologies¹
- 98/01 Kennedy, H.A.A. Philo & the Old Testament.

EXPOSITORY TIMES.

- XXXI Michael, J.H. Notes on the Johannine Prologue.
- XXXII McGillivray, D. Prologue to the Fourth Gospel - Christus
Creator.
- XXXIII Cryer, C. Prologue to the Fourth Gospel.

HIBBERT JOURNAL.

- XXVII(1) Bacon, B.W. History & Dogma in John.
XXVII(3) Taylor, V. Mandaeans & the Fourth Gospel.

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

- 1922 Moore, G.F. Intermediaries in Jewish Theology.
1938 Postiglione, A. Hermetica.

JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW. (N.S.)

- XLI(47) Schochter, S. Some Rabbinic Parallels to the New Testament.
XVII(65ff) Hart, J.H.A. Philo of Alexandria.
XXIII(2) Box, G.H. Idea of Intermediaries in Jewish Theology.
XXIX(1) Middleton, R. Logos & Shekinah in the Fourth Gospel.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

- V(65) Howard, W.F. Fourth Gospel & Mandaean Gnosticism.

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

- XI Vos, G. Range of the Logos-title.

THEOLOGICAL STUDIES (JOURNAL of).

- I(1) Turnor, C.H. Pleroma in St. John 1¹⁴.
IV(12) Locke, W. Partition Theory of St. John's Gospel.
V(19) Grangor, F. Poimandros of Hermes Trismegistus.
XI(41) Hart, J.H.A. Philo & Catholic Judaism of the 1st. Century.
XII(45) Bernard, J.H. Odes of Solomon.
XIV(60) Creed, J.M. Hermetic Writings.
XVIII(69) Swete, H.B. " Faithful Sayings."

- XXI(82) Hoskyn's, E.C. Genesis 1-111 & St. John's Gospel.
XXIII(90) Aytoun, R.A. Servant of the Lord in the Pargues.
XXIV(94) Burkitt, F.C. Monra, Shekinah & Motatron.
(95) Waldor, E. Logos of the Pastorials.
XXVI(101) Dix, G.H. Heavenly Wisdom & Divine Logos in Jewish Apocalyptic.
(102) Creed, J.M. Heavenly Man.
XXVII(106) Burney, C.F. Christ as the APXH of Creation.
XXIX(115) Burkitt, F.C. Mandaeans.
XXXVI(141) Casey, R.P. Study of Gnosticism.
XXXVIII(151) Knox, W.L. Divine Wisdom.
XL(160)- 45
Kilpatrick, G.D. Mark 1 & the Meaning of Logos.
XLI(165-6)

THEOLOGISCHE QUARTALSCHRIFT.

- LXXXV(4) Bolser, A. Prolog des Johannesevangeliums.
XCI(3-4) " Johannesevangelium und seine neueste Beurteilung.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR WISSENSCHAFTLICHE THEOLOGIE.

- XLV(8) Klopper, A. Zur Christologie der Pastorbriefe.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR NEUTESTAMENTLICHE WISSENSCHAFT.

- II(2) Soltan, W. Zum Problem des Johannesevangeliums.
VIII(4) Schütz, R. Zum ersten Teil des Johannesevangeliums.

- XIII(3) Bonhôte, A. Epiktet und das neue Testament.
XIV(1-2) Bultmann, K. Botschaft der neuerschlossenen Mandt-
schen und kanaanitischen für Verstand-
is des Johannesevangeliums.

XXVI(1-2) Pichtner, J. Sapientia Salom.

REVUE BIBLIQUE.

- V(4) Lagrange, P.R. Paternité de Dieu.
IX(1-2) " Philosophie religieuse d'Épictète ou
le christianisme.
IX(1) Calmos, Th. Étude sur le Prologue du IV^{me}. Évangile.
XII(2) Lagrange. L'Age de Jahvé.
XXII(2) " Le Logos d'Israélite.
(2) " Vers le Logos de S. Jean.
(3) " Le Logos de Philon.
XXIV(3) " L'Hellénisme.
XXVI(3)- " Gnose mandéenne et la tradition évangé-
XXXVII(1) ique.
XL(3) Festugière, A. Sagesse et Christianisme.
XLIII(3) Allo, E-B. Sagesse et Proverbia dans la première
Épître aux Corinthiens.
XLIII(3)- Robert, A. Attachés littéraires bibliques de Prov, 1-
XLIV(3-4)
XLVII(1) Inschoot, P. van Sagesse et Esprit dans l'Ancien Testament.

REVUE D' HISTOIRE ECCLESIASTIQUE.

- II(1) Hoonacker, A. Prologue du IVme. Évangélique.
XXII(2) Tobac, E. Notes sur le IVme. Évangile.
XXV(2) " Notion du Christ-Logos dans la Littérature
johannique.

REVUE D'HISTOIRE ET DE LITTÉRATURE RELIGIEUSES.

- V(6),
VI(2, 3-4), Mencl, C. Religions et Peuples classiques avant le
VII(2) Christianisme.
VI(2-3) Loisy, A. Mythes babyloniens et les premiers chap-
itres de la Genèse.
XI(1-2) Dids, A. Évolution de la Théologie dans les phil-
osophes grecs.
XI(4) Dupuis, A. Trinité et la théologie des hypostases
dans les trois premiers siècles.