

St John's Gospel and the Logos.

By A. N. Jannaris, St. Andrews, Scotland.

New Testament readers are familiar with the great variety of titles and epithets by which Jesus Christ is designed. In the vast majority of cases, these descriptive terms are so appropriate and self-evident as to require no explanation. Thus the titles *Christ* (Anointed), *Head*, *Shepherd*, *Deliverer*, *Saviour*, *Mediator*, *King*, *Lord*, *High Priest*, *Bishop*, *Rabbi*, *Master*, *Righteous*, *Holy One*, *Son of God*, *Son of David*, etc. etc. — are perfectly clear in themselves. In other cases again, such as *Life*, *Light*, *Bread of Life*, *Son of Man*, etc., the metaphoric designation finds its explanation in the Jewish and generally Oriental mode of thought which delights in picturesque metaphors. But while all these names and numerous others offer no difficulty to Biblical readers, one title has never been satisfactorily explained. I mean the Johannine term *Logos* or *Word* in the sense of the *Incarnate Son*, the origin and real meaning of which is still a dark mystery. It is true that an immense amount of learned literature, alike in books and dissertations, has been written on the subject; that alike the Hellenic, Jewish, Philonic, pre-apostolic and post-apostolic phases of the problem have been the subject of special investigations; yet the fact that every year, aye almost every month, adds to this line of literature¹ is a sufficient proof that the Logos doctrine is still a standing puzzle to the Christian world. As a matter of fact, all the theological, philosophical, metaphysical and, if you like, mystic theories and interpretations hitherto advanced have failed to give real satisfaction and still less to carry con-

¹ Within the last two years the subject has been treated most extensively by W. Baldensperger, *Der Prolog des vierten Evangeliums* (Freiburg 1898), by Anathon Aal, *Geschichte der Logoslehre* (Leipzig, 1899—1900 two vols.), and by H. H. Wendt, *Das Johannesevangelium* (Freiburg 1900).

viction. This being so, the appearance of the present paper would seem to be redundant and so require an apology. The best apology I can offer is to explain the circumstances under which the article has arisen. Some years hence, while working out the material for an *Historical Greek Grammar*, I was struck by the great frequency in New Testament Greek of what I should call editorial misreadings and misrenderings. As soon as the publication of my said work¹ had afforded me leisure, I resumed my studies in Biblical Greek and soon recognised that, as it appears in our printed editions, alike Received and critical, the New Testament is perhaps the worst edited of all ancient texts. I therefore set about to read and translate into English the current text, as, to the best of my belief and judgment, the sacred authors would themselves have read and interpreted it to our own age. I began with St John's Gospel and Epistles and I now, after four years' continuous studies, venture to offer a specimen of the results of my labours.

As expected, my object here is not the ambitious task of investigating or even reviewing the Logos doctrine in its wide and long post-Apostolic history, nor shall I embark on philosophical and theological speculation. My research will be confined within the New Testament or rather to the Johannine writings, and the method I shall adopt is that of a purely philological, that is grammatical and historical study. Under these limited and definite conditions I purpose to examine the following three questions.

I.

Can the Greek term λόγος possibly be taken in an hypostatic or anthropomorphic sense and so justify the meaning of the Incarnate Son or Christ?

The answer to this question is a simple and emphatic *No!* — As every classical student knows, and as every Greek lexicon will confirm, the term λόγος always expresses the 'abstract' notion or result of the verb λέγω: *dico: I speak, say, declare, state, tell*, — used either in an objective *i. e. declarative* sense (like φάσκω, φράζω), as λέγω ὅτι ὑπακούει 'I say (state, declare) that he obeys'; or in a subjective *i. e. jussive* sense (similar to, but milder than, κελεύω, προοράσκω), as: λέγω σοι ὑπακούειν I tell (bid, command) thee to obey'. It is these two fundamental notions that underlie the verb λέγω through all classical and subsequent litera-

¹ An *Historical Greek Grammar* chiefly of the Attic dialect, as written and spoken, from classical antiquity down to present times (pp. xxiii. 737), London, 1897.

ture including modern Greek. In accordance with these leading meanings of λέγω, its abstract noun λόγος is either —

1. a *declarative* λόγος, *i. e.* τὸ λέγειν or εἰπεῖν, τὰ λεγόμενα (λόγος προφορικός): *oratio, dictum, effatum: Spruch: speech, utterance deliverance; word; message, statement, declaration; narrative, report; teaching or doctrine, precept; saying or proverb, maxim, etc. etc.* — a usage very common through all periods of the Greek language down to present times.

2. a *jussive* (or *injunctive*) λόγος, *i. e.* τὸ λέγειν or εἰπεῖν, τὰ κελευόμενα: a *bidding, injunction, order or command(ment); deliverance, decree, oracle* — a usage equally common alike in classical and post-Christian Greek.

Now inasmuch as an utterance, or a word uttered, reflects the abstract image of a conception in the mind, the term λόγος came to be identified with the *mental faculty as manifested in speech* (λόγος ἐνδιάθετος). Accordingly we have now a developed or —

3. a *speculative* λόγος, *i. e.* *ratio: intelligence, reason*, a more or less philosophic term used both in Greece proper and in the East, by writers of all ante-Christian and post-Christian schools, alike secular and religious. But it should be distinctly noted that in this usage λόγος (like its derivative λογικός) is never found in the Gospels, evidently because the Evangelists, in particular St John, never professed nor expounded any philosophic system; they appealed to simple minds in a simple, direct, and unsophisticated language.

4. Another *foreign* (levantine) usage of the term λόγος occurs in the New Testament¹ as a translation of the Aramaic word *memra* (word), when this term accompanies a noun or possessive pronoun and forms a periphrasis of the noun or pronoun itself. Thus the 'word of God' or 'His word' in the Targums of Onkelos very often stands simply for 'The name or, person of God', 'God Himself'. This usage, by the way, can be traced through Byzantine Greek down to modern speech where it survives in the polite phrase: τοῦ λόγου σου (τοῦ, τῶν) 'your (his, their) Honour'.

Now however manifold and extensive the function of the Greek term λόγος may have been, it is evident that none of these usages can possibly apply to the Johannine Logos. We may therefore pass over to the second question.

¹ Compare John 4, 41, 8, 31, 17, 17. 1 John 1, 1; 10, 2, 14. Rev. 12, 11, 19, 13. Luke 4, 32. Acts 13, 48. 14, 3, 20, 32. 1 Cor 1, 18. 2 Cor 6, 7. Hebr 4, 2; 12, 7, 28. Col 3, 16 ὁ λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ. 1 Thess 1, 8 ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου; so also 4, 5; then ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ (for ὁ θεός) often in Paul.

II.

When and where in the post-Christian literature, but outside the New Testament writers and Philo (whom we shall consider later on), does the term λόγος appear unmistakably as the personal or anthropomorphic Logos, as the Incarnate Son of God?

The reply is that a critical examination of the extant literature establishes the fact that λόγος in the above sense never occurs before the middle of the second century of our era. It is true that Ignatius, who lived in the first half of that century (90—150), is usually quoted in support of an earlier date, but, even if we count the Epistle to the Magnesians among Ignatius's genuine writings, the one solitary passage adduced therefrom (ad Magn. 8, 2) affords no clear evidence. It runs thus: εἰς θεός ἐστιν ὁ φανερώσας ἑαυτὸν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ ὃς ἐστιν αὐτοῦ λόγος ἀπὸ τῆς προελθῶν· ὃς κατὰ πάντα εὐηρέτησε τῷ πέμψαντι αὐτόν, *i. e.* "There is one God who manifested Himself through Jesus Christ His Son who is His Word (= Message, or Son?) proceeding from silence; he in every way satisfied his sender". Here then λόγος αὐτοῦ, "His word" is identical with the expression λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, "message or messenger of God", already referred to (*supra* p. 16).

As a matter of fact,—our earliest unmistakable authority for the use of λόγος in the anthropomorphic or Christological sense, as the *Incarnate Son* of God, is Justin the Martyr who wrote between 150 and 165. In his apologetic and controversial writings, Justin founds his arguments on the *Memoirs of the Apostles* (ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων), as he usually calls the Gospels, and it is here that we first meet with the Logos as the Incarnate Son. Apol. I, 5 (= p. 56A) τοῦ λόγου μορφωθέντος καὶ ἀνθρώπου γενομένου καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κληθέντος, *i. e.* "the Logos having assumed form and become man and having been called Jesus Christ". Again Apol. I, 22 (p. 67E) γεγεννηθῆσαι αὐτόν ἐκ θεοῦ λέγομεν λόγον θεοῦ, *i. e.* "him being born of God, we call him Logos of God." Then again I, 32 (p. 74B) υἱὸς (τοῦ θεοῦ) ὁ λόγος ἐστίν· ὃς τίνα τρόπον αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος γέγονεν ἐν τοῖς ἔξῃς ἐροῦμεν, *i. e.* "the Logos is His Son; how he (or it) assumed flesh and became man, we shall say in what follows". 63 (p. 95D) ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ, *i. e.* "the Logos of God is His Son". Fragm. I (p. 588C) υἱὸς ὁ λόγος ἦλθεν εἰς ἡμᾶς σὰρκα φορέσας, *i. e.* "the Son Logos came to us having put on flesh"; — and so on through many other passages, *E. g.* Apol. I, 5 (56A); 10 (58D); 12 (59E); 21 (66E); 23 (68C); 33 (75 C); 46 (83 C);

13/2. 1901.

63 (95 C); 64 (97 B); 66 (98 A); II, 6 (44 D); 8 (46 C); 10 (48 E); Dial. c. Tryph. 61 (284 C).

Our next authority is Athenagoras who in his *πρεσβεία περί Χριστιανῶν*, addressed to Marcus Aurelius between 176 and 180, possibly alludes to the Incarnate Logos in two passages: c. 10 (p. 11, 2 ed. Schwartz): ἄλλ' ἔστιν ὁ υἱὸς θεοῦ λόγος τοῦ πατρὸς, *i. e.* "but the Son of God is the Logos¹ of the Father"; and ib. (p. 11, 16) νοῦς καὶ λόγος τοῦ πατρὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, *i. e.* "the Father's mind (or intellect) and Logos¹ is the Son of God."

However, towards the last quarter of the second century the doctrine of the Incarnate Logos seems to have gained a fairly wide currency among Christians, seeing that Celsus (about 180) charges them with sophistically claiming that the Son of God was the Logos itself: Χριστιανοῖς ἐγκαλεῖ ὡς σοφιστομένοις ἐν τῷ λέγειν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ εἶναι αὐτόλογον (Origen II, 31 = I, 178 Koetschau).

From this time onwards when the Christian faith had joined hands with philosophy and become theology, the term λόγος, so convenient and adaptable to theosophic speculation, acquired a novel meaning and function and became the basis of logosophic Incarnation. But it must be remembered that, outside speculative theology and christology, the term λόγος never in the history of the Greek language, whether written or spoken, came to denote a *concrete* person or deity. Needless to add that these remarks apply also to the Hebrew or Aramaic *memra*.

If then neither in Greek nor in Hebrew with Aramaic the term *logos* (*memra*) cannot possibly admit of the current theological or logosophic interpretation; if such a meaning is alien to both ante-Christian and primitive Christian minds, having developed long after Apostolic times; then the whole problem is reduced to the definite question which we have now to answer.

III

By using the terms: "In the beginning was the Word (ὁ λόγος) and the Word was with God", then, "and the Word became flesh" — did the author actually mean the Incarnate Son, the Second Person of the Trinity?

Before discussing this crucial side of the problem, some points require a preliminary notice. In the first place the expression *The Word* (ὁ λόγος),

¹ Here λόγος can mean either the message or the Son.
Zeitschrift f. d. neutest. Wiss. Jahrg. II. 1901.

introduced with such startling suddenness, in the opening of the exordium, is very striking. The presence of the article (δ λόγος, *The Word*) without any contextual preparation, and without any subsequent explanation or definition, clearly indicates that the author had in his mind something *well-known*. Another equally striking and significant point is that no sooner is our attention and keen interest invited to the exalted Logos in the prologue, than the term is dropped never to be mentioned again by the author. It is true that theologians sometimes appeal to Rev. 19, 13 and to 1 John 1, 1. But it is now universally admitted by Biblical scholars, of the orthodox and negative school alike, that Rev. 19, 13 is irrelevant:

"And I saw the heaven opened and behold a white horse, and he that sat upon him was called faithful and true, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. His eyes were as a flame of fire and on his head were many crowns, and he had a name, written that no man knew but himself. And he was clothed with a vesture dipt in blood, and his name is called *the Word of God*."

Here the triumphant conqueror's mystic name, *the Word of God* (δ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ), if it means anything definite, can be best translated by the terms *message* (= messenger) or *person of God*.

Equally inconclusive is the passage quoted from St John's First Epistle 1, 1:

"That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, concerning *the word of life*" —

seeing that in the expression: *concerning the word of life* (περὶ τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς), the *word of life* either means the *Life itself* or again refers to '*the message* (or *person*) of God'. Hence Westcott very properly observes that 'if the expression "Word of life" admitted a christological interpretation, such an interpretation 'could not fail to present itself to later readers in whose speculation 'the Word' occupied a far larger place than it occupies in St John, and to become popular.'

Another passage sometimes referred to is 1 John 5, 7, where the term *word* (λόγος) occurs absolutely and does unmistakably mean the Incarnate Son. However, the whole of this verse is spurious, being absent from all MSS antedating the fifteenth century.

In this way we are reduced to the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel, where the Incarnate Logos is alleged to occur four times, thrice in the exordium and once in verse 14. In dealing with these passages which

form the basis of the Johannine doctrine, it will be convenient to consider first verse 14. After announcing the Logos (1—3), the author speaks of the light and darkness (4—5), then introduces the account about St John the Baptist and his witness to the Light (6—9), then speaks of the unwilling reception accorded to the Light by His own people (10—11), then refers to the authority or power (ἐξουσία) granted to those who received Him as well as to believers in His name who were born not in a carnal manner but of God (12—13). After all these accounts which occupy half a printed page, he proceeds:

"and the Word (καὶ ὁ λόγος) became (or was made) flesh and dwelt among us."

Now two points are striking in this sentence. First the introductory or continuative 'and the word': how can it refer back to the opening sentence of the exordium from which it is so widely separated and disconnected? This is surely forced and unnatural, while the alternative of connecting it with *what immediately precedes* is most regular and natural. Then, Is the term λόγος here necessarily identical in meaning with the very distant λόγος of the opening sentence? One may object of course that its association here with such an expression as 'dwelt (or tabernacled) among us' (ἐκκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν), points to some *personal being* having pitched his tent among us. Such an objection, however, is invalidated by two considerations. First the expression ἐν ἡμῖν does not necessarily mean 'among us': the preposition ἐν rather stands in its ordinary sense *in*, so that ἐν ἡμῖν means 'he dwelt *in* us', i. e. in each of us individually and collectively. Then I very much doubt whether, by using the word ἐκκήνωσεν here, the author had in his mind the rather military term κληνῶ from κληνή, 'a tent', so that by ἐκκήνωσεν he should have meant: (the Logos) 'pitched his tent, camped or encamped.' I rather believe that the author thought of the more spiritual word τὸ κληνός which is fairly common in post-classical and Christian Greek in the sense of 'body'; so that ὁ λόγος ἐκκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν means 'and the λόγος lodged in our bodies', 'was *embodied* in us'.

As to the subject of the clause, the λόγος, let us consider the context. The author tells us that those who received the Light (*i. e.* Christ), to them he granted authority or power (ἐξουσία) to become children of God, after which he remarks: "and *the* logos (*i. e.* and *the said* logos, and *that* logos) became flesh." Grammatically considered, then, the logos here cannot refer to the very first line of the prologue, already lost sight of, but to the immediately preceding statement, to the

'authority' or 'power' just spoken of: 'and the said word of authority' and 'the empowering word', 'the mandate' — became flesh and lodged in us: an interpretation which becomes the more natural and intelligible, as the terms 'authority, (command[ment]) or mandate, and word (ἐξουσία ἐντολή, λόγος)', are used synonymously in the New Testament. Thus John 10, 18 "I have *power* (ἐξουσία) to lay it (*i. e.* my life) down, and I have power (ἐξουσία) to take it again: this *commandment* (ἐντολή) have I received of my father." Compare also 10, 35 "if he called them gods unto whom the *word* (ὁ λόγος, commandment) of God came". 8, 55 „but I know him (*i. e.* God) and keep His saying (λόγος, commandment). Likewise: 8, 51; 52; 55. 14, 23; 24. 17, 6; 14. 1 John 2, 4f. Rom. 9, 28. 13, 9 "and if there be any other *commandment* (ἐντολή), it is briefly comprehended in this *saying* (λόγος, mandate): Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." So further Matthew 15, 6. Mark 7, 13. Gal 5, 14. 1. Thess 4, 15. 2 Peter 3, 5 and 7. Compare also Deut 10, 4 οἱ δέκα λόγοι, 'the ten commandments'.

And now at length we come to the first line of the prologue, the exalted sentence with which the Gospel opens and which forms the *locus classicus* for the Logos doctrine: "In the beginning was *the Word* (ὁ λόγος) and the Word (ὁ λόγος) was with God, and the Word (ὁ λόγος) was God; the same was in the beginning with God."

Before entering upon the discussion of this weighty Logos itself, we must emancipate ourselves from the current printed text and transfer our minds back to the original manuscriptal reading of the text, which shews no marks of notation or punctuation. There we read: ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος οὗτος ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἐν, *i. e.* "in the beginning was the Logos and the Logos was unto God and was a God; this Logos was in the beginning unto God all things were made through *it* and without *it* nothing was made." Now what can this Logos, — *the* Logos — be with which the writer supposes his readers to be already familiar? It can only be the well-known logos, the familiar λόγος, 'der *Spruch*', the dictum or deliverance with which the book of Genesis opens: God *said* (εἶπεν ὁ θεός), the *utterance* (λόγος) or *Spruch* by which God created the world, by the repetition (nine times!) of which utterance all things came into being (ἐγένετο) one after another and without which not a thing came into being. The term λόγος refers then to that well known utterance or *Spruch* with which the creation of the world began; that well known oracular utterance

which God made unto (πρὸς) Himself and which having been instrumental (δι' αὐτοῦ) in the creation, is naturally represented as a creative power, a creator, that is a *god*, — god and creator being two synonymous terms. In beginning the life of Christ, St John very naturally and fittingly thinks of the beginning of the world, and so opens or prefaces his narrative with the account of the Creation in Genesis.

"God said, Let there be light; and there was light. And God saw that the light was good; and God divided the light from the darkness. And God called the light day, and the darkness he called night."

Conceiving Christ as the 'true *Light*', then, John very naturally connects Him with the account in Genesis where the *light* marks the first divine step. And just as Genesis represents *light* as the beginning of the cosmic world, so too John represents the *Light* (*i. e.* Christ; cp. ὁ φῶς, the man, the hero) as the beginning of the spiritual and redeemed world.

The above interpretation of the exordium to St John's Gospel not only explains the sentences contained therein; it also accounts for the coincidence — the unmistakable coincidence — regarding the use of the term *logos* both in St John and Philo. For without necessarily copying imitating or even knowing each other, both writers refer to the same well known work of God recorded in the well known opening lines of Genesis. And the coincidence is only such as could be expected from two different writers who referred to the same event, but who had two different objects in view: St John, being concerned with the life of the Light (= Christ), merely alludes to the story of the Creation as recorded in Genesis; whereas Philo dealing especially and entirely with the subject of Genesis itself, discourses, comments, and speculates upon it. Accordingly while St John is contented with a mere allusion to that event by the summary remark 'In the beginning (*i. e.* first of all) was the utterance (ὁ λόγος) of God', *Im Anfang war der Spruch*, Philo discourses and speculates upon that utterance or *logos* in the interest of the Jewish faith, and thus represents that divine *logos* or *Spruch* now as 'the oldest of things created (ὁ πρεσβύτερος τῶν γένεσιν εἰληφόντων, II, 269, 20, Cohn-Wendland; so also I, 151, 29); now as 'the oldest son of the father of all beings' (πρεσβύτατος υἱὸς τοῦ τῶν ὄντων πατρός, 241, 18); now as 'His first-born, the oldest messenger' (ὁ πρωτόγονος αὐτοῦ, τῶν ἀγγέλων πρεσβύτατος, II, 257, 2; so too II, 106, 2), as 'His first-born divine *logos* (ἐν μὲν ὄδε ὁ κόσμος ἐν ψ καὶ ἀρχιερεὺς ὁ πρωτόγονος αὐτοῦ θεῖος λόγος, III, 251, 13; so also 133, 20), as 'the second god, which is His *logos*'

(δεύτερος θεός δε ἐστὶν ἐκείνου λόγος II, 625 Mangey) etc. At other times again the Logos is spoken of as 'the instrument by which God created the world' (εὐρήσεις αἴτιον μὲν αὐτοῦ [τοῦ κόσμου] τὸν θεὸν ὑφ' οὗ γέγονεν . . . ὄργανον δὲ λόγον θεοῦ δι' οὗ κατεσκευάσθη, I, 200, 8; so further I, 134, 18; then II, 225 Mangey, — all of which are perfectly intelligible and true. Insofar, then, both St John's literal and direct mention of the divine utterance or logos, the cosmogonic *fiat* or *Spruch*, and Philo's speculative and allegoric interpretation of that divine utterance or logos refer to the same common source; hence both versions not only agree with the cosmogonic account in Genesis; they also naturally coincide between themselves.

The question now which naturally suggests itself is, How is it that the term λόγος, used as it was by St John in its ordinary and simple meaning of *Spruch*, *utterance* or *speech*, etc., assumed the logosophic or hypostatic and anthropomorphic sense, and so gave rise to the theological logos doctrine? As explained above, this side of the problem lies outside the scope of the present paper. However, I may suggest here that the early post-Apostolic Christians must have often been taunted by pagan wits with espousing a doctrine devoid of all philosophy — so fashionable then — devoid of all rational foundation or λόγος. What would be more natural than that, in self-defence, some ingenious Christians, argumentatively or sophistically (as Celsus puts it, supra p. 17) had recourse to the λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ (supra p. 15), especially to that sententious and weighty λόγος which opens our Gospel, and so replied that it was precisely that philosophical and exalted λόγος which formed the basis, of the Christian faith? It is evidently to this new but mistaken interpretation of the λόγος (as Logos-Son) that many an intelligent and fair minded Christian individually raised objections — those well meaning Christians whom subsequently Epiphanius wished to have called by the rather catching than fair name of ἀλογοὶ (Logos-less, sense-less): Haeres. 51, 3 (I 892 A Migne): ἐπεὶ οὖν τὸν λόγον οὐ δέχονται, τὸν παρὰ Ἰωάννου κέκηρυγμένον, Ἄλογοι κληθῆσονται. Be that as it may the above well-meaning but mistaken interpretation of λόγος as Logos-Son, this logosophic doctrine, appears first in the writings of Justin the Martyr (died about 165 A. D.), a professional philosopher of Greek origin, who became Christian at Ephesus in the time of Hadrian. Justin had been brought up in the midst of Hellenic culture and was in close touch both with Jewish doctors and pagan philosophers. In order to meet the objections as well the needs of critical and philosophizing men, he

endeavours to interpret Christianity in a rational and philosophic spirit (λογικῶς). With this object in view, he avails himself of the convenient term λόγος, a term which, owing to its manifold and elastic meaning, was admirably fitted for higher speculations. Now besides the frequent phrase λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, no passage could better serve his purpose than the solemn and awe-inspiring words with which the Fourth Gospel opens: ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος· καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ θεὸς ἦν — then καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο; — words to which he so often appeals, as already explained above (p. 16).

Justin's method of dealing with the term λόγος is well illustrated by the following passage in *Apol. I*, 46 (p. 83 c): τὸν Χριστὸν πρωτότοκον τοῦ θεοῦ εἶναι ἐδιδάχθημεν καὶ προεμνήσαμεν, λόγον (Logos-reason) ὄντα οὐ πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων μετέεχε. καὶ οἱ μετὰ λόγου (Logos-wisdom-reason) βίωσαντες Χριστιανοὶ εἰσι, κἄν ἕθει ἐνομοίωσαν· οἶον ἐν Ἑλλήσι μὲν Σωκράτης καὶ Ἡράκλειτος καὶ οἱ ὅμοιοι αὐτοῖς, ἐν βαρβάροις δὲ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἀνανίας καὶ Ἀζαρίας καὶ Μισαὴλ καὶ Ἡλίας καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοί . . . ὥστε καὶ οἱ προγενόμενοι ἄνευ λόγου (Logos-wisdom-reason) βίωσαντες, ἀχρηστοὶ καὶ ἐχθροὶ τῷ Χριστῷ ἦσαν καὶ φονεῖς τῶν μετὰ λόγου (Logos-wisdom-reason) βιούντων· οἱ δὲ μετὰ λόγου βίωσαντες καὶ βιούντες Χριστιανοὶ καὶ ἀφοβοὶ καὶ ἀτάραχοι ὑπάρχουσι. δι' ἣν δὲ αἰτίαν διὰ δυνάμειος τοῦ λόγου (Logos-wisdom?) κατὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς πάντων καὶ δεσπότου θεοῦ βουλὴν διὰ παρθένου ἀνθρώπος ἀπεκυήθη καὶ Ἰησοῦς ἐπωνομάσθη, καὶ σταυρωθεὶς ἀποθανῶν ἀνέστη καὶ ἀνελήλυθεν εἰς οὐρανόν, ἐκ τῶν διὰ τοσοῦτων εἰρημένων ὁ νουενχῆς καταλαβεῖν δυνήσεται. ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἀναγκαίου ὄντος ταῦν τοῦ περι ἀποδείξεως τούτου λόγου (Logos-argument-proof), ἐπὶ τὰς ἐπιγεύσας ἀποδείξεις πρὸς τὸ παρὸν χωρήσωμεν.

Justin's successors were Theophilus, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Hippolytos, Tertullian, and Origen, all Christian apologists, learned men who were guided by, and worked in, the interests of the Christian faith and church. Being all well versed in Greek philosophy and culture, they took up the eminently acceptable and adaptable term λόγος and developed out of it the logosophic doctrine already initiated, and this doctrine has ever since pervaded Christian theology. The gradual evolution of this Christology is well described by Harnack in his recent *History of Dogma*,¹ when he says: —

"The Christian doctrine of the Son of God could be most easily rendered acceptable to cultured heathens by means of the Logos doctrine . . . The conception of the Logos was capable of the most manifold contents and its dexterous treatment could be already supported by the most instructive precedents. This conception could be adapted to every change and accentuation of the religious interest, every deepening of speculation, as well as to all the needs of the cultus, nay even to new results of Biblical exegesis. It revealed itself gradually to

¹ A. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, iii. p. 6 f. (English translation.)

be an available quantity of the most accommodating kind, capable of being at once determined by any new factor received into the theological ferment. It even admitted contents which stood in the most abrupt contradiction to the processes of thought out of which the conception itself had sprung, *i. e.* contents which almost completely concealed the cosmological genesis of the conception. But it was long before this point was reached. And as long as it was not, as long as the Logos was still employed as the formula under which was comprehended either the original idea of the world, or the rational law of the world, many did not entirely cease to mistrust the fitness of the conception to establish the divinity of Christ."

To sum up, it is true that Christ is designated in the Bible by a great variety of titles, some of which even denote *abstract* ideas, such as *Life, Light, Gift of God*, nay even *Word of God* (*i. e.* Message, Gospel), but I hold that He is never designated by the term *Logos a Word* absolutely. The alleged occurrence of the Logos or Word as the Incarnate Son in the opening verses of the Fourth Gospel is irrelevant; there the term logos simply refers to God's well-known utterance or *Spruch*, recorded in the opening verses of Genesis. Assuming then the extant text of our Prologue to represent the original form, and discarding only the current punctuation which has little authority and less value, I believe that the writer's meaning is represented by the following reading and translation.

Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος. καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ θεὸς ἦν. ὁ λόγος ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν θεόν. πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν. ὃ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων. καὶ τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν.

Ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ θεοῦ· ὄνομα αὐτῷ Ἰωάννης. οὗτος ἦλθεν εἰς μαρτυρίαν (ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ φωτός), ἵνα πάντες πιστεύσωσιν δι' αὐτοῦ. οὐκ ἦν ἐκεῖνος τὸ φῶς, ἀλλ' ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ φωτός ὁ ἦν.** τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν,

"In the beginning was the utterance. Now the utterance was *made* unto God, and was a god. This *utterance* was in the beginning *made* unto God. 3 All things came into being through it and without it not a thing came into being. That which is come into being, 4 therein was life and the life was the light of mankind. 5 And the light is shining in the darkness and the darkness hath not overtaken it.

6 There appeared a man sent from God: his name was John. 7 The same came for declaration (to declare *things* concerning the Light), so that all may become believers through him. 8 He was not the Light, but was (came) to declare *things* concerning the Light.

* This is one of the numerous instances of mispunctuation and consequent misinterpretation in the New Testament, especially in St John.

** Another instance of the editorial misreadings found in St John.

δ φωτίζει πάντα άνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ¹⁰ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἦν, καὶ ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ ὁ κόσμος αὐτὸν οὐκ ἔγνω. ¹¹ εἰς τὰ ἴδια ἦλθε καὶ οἱ ἴδιοι αὐτὸν οὐ παρέλαβον. ¹² ὅσοι δὲ ἔλαβον αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα Θεοῦ γενέσθαι τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ· ¹³ οἱ οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος σαρκὸς οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρὸς ἀλλ' ἐκ Θεοῦ ἐγενήθησαν. ¹⁴ καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ.

9 The true Light that illuminateth every man coming into the world ¹⁰ was in the world, and the world came into being through him, and yet the world recognised him not. ¹¹ He came into his own home and his own people received him not. ¹² But as many as received him, to them gave he authority to become God's children for those which believe in his name; ¹³ which were born not through bloodshed nor through the will of the flesh nor through the will of man, but from God. ¹⁴ And the mandate became flesh and lodged in us, and so we beheld his (the Light's) glory."

The doctrine, therefore, of the so called Johannine Logos is foreign to the New Testament writers including St John; it is a theological product which originated and developed in the apologetic speculation of post-Apostolic Christianity.

These are the views I have been compelled to adopt after five years' earnest study and reflection. I own to have reluctantly espoused them, since they seemed to destroy one of my old cherished beliefs; but in the struggle which arose between that old belief and the truth of facts, the latter had to prevail. This result, however, affords one comfort and compensation to my mind, and that is the following reflection: In Christian theology the doctrine of Logos has been one of the chief sources of long and bitter controversy, and modern negative criticism, based thereon, has led many an attack upon the author of the Fourth Gospel: Is he really guilty of the charge?