

NOTE TO USERS

This reproduction is the best copy available.

UMI[®]

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

May 22 1930

I hereby recommend that the thesis prepared under my
supervision by Julian Price Love
entitled The Johannine Philosophy of Life

be accepted as fulfilling this part of the requirements for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Approved by:

Guy A. Tawney

UMI Number: DP16726

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print; colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI Microform DP16726
Copyright 2009 by ProQuest LLC
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

THE JOHANNINE PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE

INTRODUCTION: pp.1-21.

1. The Type of Philosophy found in the Johannine Writings: 1-4
2. The Method of Approach in these writings: 5.
 - In the Gospel: 6-12.
 - In the Epistles: 12-16.
3. The Writer's Background: 16-18.
4. The Unity of Thought in the Johannine Writings: 18-21.

I. The Philosophy of Life as a UNITY: pp.21-27.

1. Metaphysical dualism denied: 21-23.
2. Ethical dualism recognized: 23-25.
3. The unifying life-passions: 25-27.

II. The Philosophy of Life as a WAY - The Logos Concept: pp.27-67.

1. The nature of the Logos Concept: 27, 28.
2. History of the Use of the Concept: 28-45.
 - In Buddhism and Taoism: 28, 29.
 - In Greek Thought: 29-33.
 - In Jewish Thought: 33-36.
 - In Philo: 36-40.
 - Early Christian Use: 40-45.
3. Use in the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel:
 - a Philosophy of Personality: 45-54.
4. Use of the Prologue concepts in the rest of the Gospel: 54-67.

III. The Philosophy of Life as LIGHT: pp.67-83.

1. The self-revealing of God: 67-73.
2. The moral Significance: 73-75.
3. The Personality of Jesus as Light: 75-77.
4. Relation of Light to Judgment-Concepts: 77-83.

IV. The Philosophy of Life as WILL: pp.83-91.

1. Will as harmonization: 83-88.
2. Will in relation to Prayer: 88-91.

V. The Philosophy of a Life of Will as revealed in RIGHTEOUSNESS: pp.91-105.

1. The moral Imperative: 91-94.
2. The nature of Sin: 94-98.
3. The nature and relations of Righteousness: 98-105.

VI. The Philosophy of a Life of will revealed as LOVE: 105-138.

1. Love grounded in God: 105-117.
 As his essential Nature: 105-107.
 As the gift of Himself: 107-109.
 As a moral Passion: 109-111.
 As revealed in Death: the death of Christ: 111-117.
2. Love imperative as the human Relationship: 117-124.
 As imitation of God's Love: 117-120.
 As revealed in a Brotherhood: 121-124.
3. Love to God: 124-132.
 As a family Relationship: 124-128.
 As the ultimate Test of Life: 128-132.
4. Use of terms for 'Love': 132-135.
5. The boldness of Love: 135-138.

VII. The Philosophy of Life as a Will revealed in BELIEF: pp. 138-151.

1. The sense of Reality: 138-141.
2. Truth personalized in Jesus: 141-143.
3. Belief in Jesus as the son of God: 143-148.
4. The effects of the will to believe:
 Fellowship as Sons: 148-151.

VIII. The Philosophy of Life as KNOWLEDGE: pp. 151-170.

1. The Doctrine of Knowledge as Intuition: 151-156.
2. The Holy Spirit as the Personalization of this Knowledge: 156-164.
3. Fellowship with God as a Growth in this Spiritual Knowledge: 164-170.

IX. The Meaning of ETERNAL LIFE: pp. 170-180.

1. The Loftiest and most Universal Expression of Life: 170-173.
2. Contrast of Death and Resurrection as Ethical Terms: 173-177.
3. "Eternal Life" as the essential Quality of all true Living: 177-180.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(The chief Sources are marked with an Asterisk, thus: *)

I. Theology and Philosophy in General.

* Beyschlag: "Biblical Theology of the New Testament", 2 Vol.

* Stevens: "Theology of the Johannine Writings".

"Theology of the New Testament".

Sheldon: "New Testament Theology".

Adeney: "New Testament Theology".

* Weiss: "Biblical Theology of the New Testament".

Zahn: "Introduction to the New Testament".

* Macintosh: "The Originality of the Christian Message".

* Gloag: "Introduction to the Johannine Writings".

Denny: "Jesus and the Gospels."

More: "The Christ of the New Testament."

Garvie: "Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus".

Salmond: "Introduction to the New Testament."

Harnack: "What is Christianity?"

"History of Dogma."

* Hyde: "The Five Great Philosophies of Life".

* Drummond: "Via, Veritas, Vita".

Soper: "The Religions of Mankind."

Streeter: "Reality".

Salmond: "The Christian Doctrine of Immortality."

Additional contributors of the following works are:

Catholic. Ignatius. Epistles, etc. etc. etc.

Greek. Justin. Martyr. Dialogue, etc. etc.

Patristic. Irenaeus. Against Heresies, etc. etc.

II. Backgrounds of Christian Thought.

* Drummond; "Philo Judaeus."

Dorner: "Doctrine of the Person of Christ."

More: "Christ the Word."

Aall: "Geschichte der Logos Idee."

Legge: "Texts of Taoism."

Douglass: "Taoism and Confucianism."

Uberweg: "History of Philosophy", Vol.1.

Angus: "The Mystery Religions and Christianity".

* "The Environment of Early Christianity."

"Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World."

* Case: "The Evolution of Early Christianity."

"Experiende with the Supernatural in Early Christianity,"

III. Works on the Johannine Writings.

* Dodds, in the Greek Expositor, Vols. 1 and 5: Gospel and Epistles.

* Bernard, in the International Critical Commentary, 2 Vols.
on the Gospel of John.

* Sanday: "The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel."

Smith, David: "Commentary on the Gospels", Vol.3.

M'Clymont: in The Century Bible, Vol.4.

* Garvie: "The Beloved Disciple."

Coffin: "Portraits of Jesus in the New Testament".

----- "Addresses on St. John", an Anthology.

* Law: "The Tests of Life", a study of the First Epistle of John.

Individual commentaries of the following consulted in part:

Calvin, Lucke, Haupt, Wendt, Westcott, Ebrard,

Godet, Meyer, Alexander, Brooke.

Articles in Encyclopedia Britannica and Bible Encyclopedias.

THE JOHANNINE PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE

By a "philosophy of life" is not meant a system of thought. It is frankly admitted that such a thing does not exist in the Johannine writings. Systematic elaboration of thought is indeed foreign to the New Testament point of view, and of no part of the New Testament is this truer than of the sections known as Johannine. But to say that a philosophy of life is not systematized is different from saying that it is non-descript. Order and poise, clarity and depth, all exist in marked degree in the writings under consideration, and they contribute to a definite idea of the meaning of life. To say that these writings present a philosophy of life is to say that by philosophy we mean serious thinking about life. Such thinking does not necessarily work out formulas. It often defies exact classification. Above all it is never mechanical. It is as much guided by emotion as by reasoning, but it is no more emotion run riot than it is reasoning reduced to rules. It is sober reflection on the meaning of life in its many-sidedness. It is purposive thinking toward some end that grows in vividness as the thought develops.

Such a philosophy may not only be unsystematic; it will often appear disproportionate and repetitious. In its attempt to view life as a whole it will weave many thoughts together, at times taking them apart again for separate examination. It must sometimes seem even to jump around from one

idea to another. There will be back eddies in the stream of the thought; yet if it is a true philosophy, progress will be clearly discernible. Such a philosophy of life is the kind to be found in the Johannine writings of the New Testament. In this sense only can Sanday be right in his statement, "The author of the Fourth Gospel was a thinker, but not a professed philosopher." (1) He deals with a few large and important thoughts. He turns them round and round to view them from all angles and relationships. He goes forward rapidly at times from one to another, and then returns to gather up some other threads. Thus he may be dealing with ethical considerations and pause to relate them to the problem of knowledge. He may be considering at length the volitional aspect of life, and at once seek to determine its effect on ethical standards. He often dwells on the relations of the cognitive and the emotional, and is especially fond of showing his favorite theme of intuition in its bearings on the expression of love. All the Johannine writings present a very limited vocabulary, a using and reusing of a few outstanding words, and a definite limitation and reiteration of thought. Yet the ideas broached are far-reaching, the thought never content to stay on the surface; and in the willingness to come to grips with realities these writings are among the most profound of literature.

(1) Sanday: "The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel",
p. 188.

From the above it is obvious that certain much mooted questions which our sources have raised do not come within the province of this investigation. The writings with which we propose to deal all carry the popular designation of one author, the gospel and the three epistles of John. In the consideration of their philosophy of life it is not necessary to inquire whether or not this John is the beloved apostle of Jesus or the half mythological "John the Presbyter" or some other John. The philosophy of life is the same regardless of authorship. It is not even necessary to establish the almost universally acknowledged belief that the gospel and the epistles are by the same author, whoever he may be. That their philosophy of life will appear on investigation to be one is the essential for the purpose here. We may likewise put aside as irrelevant that much deeper question about the gospel as to how much of it and what parts present the actual thought of Jesus as heard by a witness, and how much is the result of years of reflection on what he has meant to the world. All the gospels are meant to be much more than history; they are an interpretation of history. The Gospel of John is scarcely more unique than the Gospel of Matthew in its reflective arrangement of the thought of Jesus. The Johannine writings contain no biography in the strict sense of the word. The gospel does not purport to present a life of Christ, nor do the epistles undertake a record of the church. But they do clearly indicate that the life of Jesus

has passed through the life of the writer in a full and free fashion, transforming its motives and powers, and leaving a distinctive view of reality.

Still less does the object of this presentation include the question of the relation to these writings of the Apocalypse that goes by the name of John. It is not included in this discussion. But by its omission is intended no dogmatic avowal that its philosophy of life cannot be reconciled with that herein set forth, either in authorship or ideas. Indeed it is not hard to set up a series of arguments to show that the life philosophy of the great Apocalypse of the New Testament is supplementary to rather than contradictory of, the philosophy of these writings. But that the two philosophies are different is at once apparent. Here we have a developmental philosophy of life; there a catastrophic. Here the powers of life are so ordered as to produce results much as a tree produces fruit; there no dominant power may be found except as the outcome of struggle.

We are dealing, then, with a single stream of philosophic thought, regardless of these formal considerations. We are dealing with it as presented in two of the most remarkable documents of antiquity, the "Gospel of John" and the "First Epistle of John", which we shall hereafter refer to, for convenience, as "G" and "I", designating the two smaller documents of the Second and Third Epistles as "II" and "III".

(1) 1911-12.

(2) 1911-12.

The method of approach in the Johannine writings has been often said to be metaphysical rationalization. Popularly they are supposed to have little relation with the life circumstances either of Jesus, around whom the gospel centers, or the church at large, to which the epistles are addressed. Such a conception is, however, inadequate. While it is true that the incidents of the earthly life of Jesus are relatively unimportant in the Fourth Gospel as compared with the Synoptics, yet they have their purpose. They are not merely the basis of conflict and argumentation. They serve to connect the thinker with the flesh and blood Jesus around whom his thought revolves. Thus the very purpose of the gospel, as stated at its close, involves this close relation: "These are written that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name." (1). The very having of life, the meaning of the life which the writer hopes his readers may have, lies in an experience which he relates to Jesus. The same fact is evident in the First Epistle: "That which was from the beginning, that which we have heard, that which we have seen with our eyes, that which we beheld, and our hands handled, concerning the Word of life --- that declare we unto you." (2) However much the writer may have reflected upon the meaning of life in relation to all the Jewish and Greek background of his age, he is still consciously reflecting on a first

(1) G:20:31.

(2) I:1:1-3.

hand and very real experience with one who has given meaning to that life.

This will become more apparent through a brief examination of the contents and method of the gospel and the epistles. Principal Garvie has analyzed the entire gospel into a purpose to display testimony, judgment, and glory with relation to Jesus and the life that is in him. (1) The gospel presents the testimony of those who purport to be eye witnesses of what Jesus said and did and of what he meant to men. It presents the results of that testimony in the form of judgments upon the character of men, a condemnatory judgment upon those who reject the testimony, and a commendatory judgment upon those who accept it. It presents the glory of the life of Jesus as consisting in his ability so to reveal God as to establish the good results of adequate testimony to all who have the willingness to believe what they see. This is indeed a very definite philosophy of life; but it is one that is built on the effect of a personality, not on abstract ideas.

The entire course of the gospel bears this out. In the first chapter John the Baptist appears as the great witness for the character of the Stranger. The effect of his life on the lives of five men who become his first disciples follows as the theme of the passage. (2) The second chapter presents Jesus as refusing to tarnish the glory of his life

(1) Garvie: "The Beloved Disciple", p.65.

(2) G:1:35-51.

by a showy revelation of himself which his mother desires (1), but calling on all within the temple area to witness to his interpretation of the purity of worship (2). A cavil with the Jews follows, out of which the clandestine visit of one of the Sanhedrin, Nicodemus by name, calls forth the witness to the meaning of a spiritual birth (3), and to the relationship of Jesus to God as a son sent of his Father (4). A casual noonday at a Samaritan well results in an interview with an outstanding, albeit a notorious woman, and a lengthy testimony ensues on the spiritual springs of life and worship. (5) A visit to Jerusalem during the crowded days of one of the feasts leads to a healing of a chronic invalid known as a hopeless frequenter of the Bethesda pool (6); but as the work was done on a Sabbath day, it led to the question of the righteousness of the one who did it. When he replied that he was simply doing his Father's work and went on to indicate that he meant God by his Father, charges of blasphemy arose (7). These in turn led to one of the most fully developed accounts in the gospel of the testimony of witnesses, the nature of judgment, and the glory of the life which Jesus bespoke (8). The interest in teaching and feeding a large throng is given as the setting for a series of sayings about the "Bread of Life" (9), sayings which result in an

(1) G:2:1-11. (2) G:2:13-22. (3) G:3:1-12. (4) G:3:13-21.

(5) G:4:1-38. (6) G:5:1-9. (7) G:5:16-18. (8) G:5:19-47.

(9) G:6:22-40. (10) G:6:41-51. (11) G:6:52-58. (12) G:6:59-71.

interpretation of the life of Jesus as "come down from heaven" in a manner comparable to the manna of old (1). A new feast scene in Jerusalem presents Jesus as a question to the minds of the people, and the life that he says is in him as a hard thing for them to understand; and again the power of witness is invoked (2). The closing scene of the feast opens with the startling declaration, "I am the light of the world" (3), and closes with the still more amazing, "Before Abraham was I am" (4), the passage that intervenes being a description of the life which Jesus claims to have illumined with his light and the resultant clear meaning of sonship as the great relation of life. The healing of a neglected blind man, outstanding because he was born blind, (5) furnishes the key for a new interpretation of life in terms of a shepherding of the needy (6), and leads again to a fresh emphasis on the Sonship of Jesus to God as being the ground of the interpretation of life in such terms (7). The great scene at Bethany of the raising of Lazarus gives occasion for the stress of life as the reality in antithesis to death, and as being such a reality only because life itself is inherent in the person of Jesus (8), testimony and glory being woven together here. The "triumphal entry" into Jerusalem, pictured as a glory by the Synoptists, has in the Fourth Gospel, in addition to its glorification of Jesus, a

(1) G:6:41-59. (2) G:7:14-36. (3) G:8:12. (4) G:8:59.

(5) G:9. (6) G:10:1-18. (7) G:10:22-39. (8) G:11:25,26.

rather ugly turn in the motive assigned to the people. They are said to have burst into their acclaim because they looked upon the event as a "sign" of what was coming, (1) a comment characteristic of this gospel in interpreting the popular lack of understanding of the meaning of Jesus' life. In bold relief is set the brilliant understanding of the meaning of life in terms of sacrifice on the part of Mary (2), and the glory which Jesus himself is pictured as claiming as a result of the understanding of the Greeks (3). Another daring contrast is the scene immediately following in which the disciples evidence the grossest sensuality and lack of appreciation of any spiritual meaning in life (4), a scene which leads smoothly away from the crowd to the vivid picture of the quiet upper room where Jesus sought by question and answer to reveal himself to them, and in revealing himself to reveal the true meaning of life (5). The "high priestly prayer" is pregnant with suggestion of the relation of the three thoughts which Garvie finds to be uppermost throughout the book (6), while the stories of the crucifixion and the resurrection add certain suggestions of their own to Jesus' interpretation of life (7). Especially does the beautiful epilogue to the gospel, chapter twenty-one, bring the whole of the author's philosophy to a point in Jesus' urgency that

- (1) G:12:18. (2) G:12:1-8 (3)G:12:20-28. (4)G:13:1-30.
 (5) G:13:31-16:33. (6) See, for example, G:17:1,2,5,8,24.
 (7) See, for example, G:18:11,21,36,37; 19:30; 20:17,27,29.

his rock apostle shall love even as he does." (1)

Thus it will be seen that the gospel of John takes simple stories of every day incidents and around them builds the structure of a life philosophy that is intended to meet the exigencies which just such incidents illustrate. It is beside the point to inquire here whether or not these incidents are historical. For the purpose of illustrating the need of a life determinant they are intended to be representative of many common needs. "No writing, perhaps", says Wescott, --- "combines greater simplicity with more profound depths." (2) Yet the simplicity of the story incidents is not the most striking fact. It is these "profound depths" of thought that hang upon them. President Coffin can even say, in speaking of the question and answer scene in the upper room, "Judas, not Iscariot, for example, is merely a label for a question - a question which had arisen in the minds of those with whom Jesus had talked, and, without spending a moment describing this Judas, he uses him to bring his readers perplexity straight to Jesus." (3) Hence the particular incidents, even though thoroughly historical, are but typical, and the mystical motive is apparent in all.

Such considerations tend to undermine the popular conception that the gospel is a series of lengthy discourses. The words of comment on the various incidents of life, whether reported words of Jesus or of the evangelist, are not really

(1) G:21:15. (2) Wescott, "Introduction to the Study of the Gospels", p.255.

(3) Coffin, "The Portraits of Jesus Christ in the N.T.", pp. 93, 94.

discourses. They are rather strings of aphorisms. The events are the occasion of discussion, and during the course of the discussion the life principles emerge. Most of these life principles are briefly stated and in terms of common concepts. The method of antithesis is frequently employed, as: light and darkness, will and judgment, law and grace, truth and blindness, life and death. Some of these pairs of opposites are at once evident, as life and death; others do not at first seem to be opposites, as truth and blindness of vision; but the very presentation of truth as clarity of vision on the part of the man who is true is part of the presentation of John's philosophy of life.

But it would be unfair to leave this view of the method of approach in the Fourth Gospel without noting what will be developed later, that the entire attitude toward life which it unfolds is grounded in the personality of Jesus. "I am" is his common declaration, not merely in stating some phase of his character, but in stating a ground for some effect on life. Thus, "I am the living bread come down out of heaven" (1) is the ground for a relationship in life that renders it continually nourished. "I am the vine" (2) is the ground of a constant fruitfulness in men's lives. "I am the way" (3) is the ground of men's being able to live ordered and planned, instead of meandering, lives. It is even represented, not only that Jesus reveals God to men, but that it is God's own purpose, as the Father of Jesus, to reveal Jesus to men that

(1) G:6:51. (2) G:15:5. (3) G:14:6.

they may be able to live. Thus the Father "draweth men to the Son", and he "teacheth all men before they know the Son"(1) that in coming to the Son they may have life. This intensely personal presentation of the essence of life lays the emphasis again on the fact that the philosophy of the Fourth Gospel is in no sense abstract. It is the presentation of a personal experience with a person. This fact so dominates the tone of the gospel that it led such a critic as Origen to declare after a lengthy perusal of questions of authorship, "So then we make bold to say that the firstfruits of the gospels is that according to John, the meaning whereof none can apprehend who has not leaned upon the breast of Jesus"(2). The vividly spiritual quality of the writing has been seen by students of all times as its chief characteristic, affecting its entire view of life, and justifies the remark of a most capable modern scholar that, "The intensity of the effect makes up for its want of extension." (3) The method of approach to the problem of life in the First Epistle is readily seen to be similar to the above. Life interpreted as fellowship with a person is indeed very spiritual; it may also become quite vague. The reasoning of the epistle shows just how vague it had become. Whatever

(1) G:6:44, 45.

(2) Origen, "Comm. in Joan.", 1,6.

(3) Sanday, "The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel", p.206:

date or author one may accept, the epistle is an address to a relatively large section of the Christian church in which the Docetists, the "seemists", had a strong hold. These men could not see how the Logos of the 'prologue' to the Fourth Gospel could be related to the Jesus who met actual needs of life. Surely they only seemed to be related. The Logos was the reality; but the tabernacling of the Logos in human flesh was only an illusion. Jesus was not the Son of God really; he came in the flesh; he was not the Logos incarnate. God's Son did not really have the human nature he appeared to have. Consequently many of the distinctions which Christians made were unreal. Sin only seemed to be. The fleshly nature of man was only an appearance; whatever was done by man in and through it was unreal; and so ethical distinctions rapidly disappeared. If one lived in the highplain of spirituality above the flesh, what the flesh actually did mattered not. Hence there were no real problems in life and one did not need to become concerned about humanity and all its woes.

Against such a devitalizing of the life of the spirit this epistle is written. There are few documents in religious literature more polemic. Only a brief passage ever separates the sayings that are controversial, and frequently these sayings become the vital part of the message (1). "The truth becomes here a searchlight, flashed into a background of darkness." (2)

The First Epistle almost defies analysis. Its thoughts are so interwoven and so often repeated from a slightly differ-

(1) See especially, I:2:18;; 4:1-6.

(2) Law: "The Tests of Life", p.25.

ent angle that it is impossible to say one section of thought ends at a given place and another begins. The common systems of the church fathers give little evidence of insight into the depth of the thought. One of the most successful attempts at analysis appears in the work by Theodor Haring (1), the main lines of whose divisions as given in the translation by Brooke (2) are as follows:

- A. 1:5-2:27. First presentation of the two theses of the epistle: Ethical and Christological.
 - I. 1:5-2:17. The ethical theses: Walking in the light is the true sign of fellowship with God.
 - II. 2:18-27. The Christological thesis: Faith in Jesus as the Christ is the test of fellowship with God.
- B. 2:28-4:6. Second presentation of the two theses separately but with special emphasis on their connection.
 - I. 2:28-3:24. The ethical thesis. Doing of righteousness (the same in essence as love of the brethren) is the test of being born of God.
 - II. 4:1-6. The Christological thesis. The spirit which is of God confesses Jesus Christ come in the flesh.
- C. 4:7-5:12. Third presentation of the theses. Their inseparableness.
 - I. Love is based on faith in the revelation of love.
 - II. Faith is the base of love.

Perhaps a still clearer outline, remarkably similar to the above for one who had never seen the earlier work when he prepared it, is that of Law (3) who finds three cycles of repeated thoughts:

- A. 1:5-2:28. Life as fellowship with God tested by righteousness, love, and belief.
- B. 2:29-4:6. Life as divine sonship tested by righteousness, love, and belief.
- C. 4:7-5:21. Closer correlation of righteousness, love, and belief as the way of walking in the light.

- (1) "Gedankengang und Grundgedanke des ersten Johannesbriefs."
- (2) "The Epistles of S. John," pp. xxxiv-xxxvi.
- (3) "The Tests of Life", in toto.

Thus it will be seen that men of different time and language and working independantly have found in the epistle the same polemic presentation of its thesis: "God is light"(1). He has made himself really light in his presentation in the life of Jesus. This was a real, not a seeming, presentation. To believe in its reality is essential to real life, that life of fellowship with God which establishes family likeness. To have such a belief is to do real righteousness, to live with a right attitude always instead of living in sin; for sin and righteousness are both real possibilities of the spiritual life, and so are to be carefully distinguished. To live a life of such a righteousness is to be mindful of human need, as Jesus was mindful; it is to love. Thus love and righteousness and belief are inseparably bound up in the real life experience which the writer is striving to lay before his readers.

While the writer is thus presenting his philosophy of life as reality in answer to the philosophy of unreality, he nevertheless has polemics in mind, not as an end in itself, but as a means to an end. He means, not so much to overthrow the philosophy of someone else, as to establish the actual readers he has in mind in what he feels is the truth. He is tenderly solicitous of them, calling them "little children"(2), and introducing many notes of personal regard which bespeak his writing as a true letter rather than a treatise. His round of thought is circumscribed, yet his vision within his narrow field is kaleidoscopic, and his thought always as profound as it is simple; so that the reader instantly sympathizes with

(1) I:1:5. (2) I:2:18; 3:7; 5:21.

this German characterization of him: "His whole spiritual work is a contemplative sinking of himself in a small circle of great truths, which unveil ever new sides to him, disclose ever new depths in them, present the same object in ever new lights." (1)

The little leaves which are known as the Second Epistle of John and the Third Epistle of John bear close resemblance to the gospel and the First Epistle in what we have sought to establish as the method of approach to a philosophy of life. They, like the longer writings, rise out of specific situations, develop their thought in terms of personal relationships, and have the same characteristic ideas of reality as consisting in a spiritual life of righteousness, love, and belief. Thus II is addressed to the "elect lady" or the "lady Electa" or the "elect Cyria" (the Greek *ἐκλεκτῇ Κυρίᾳ* being capable of any one of these renderings) concerning the relation of truth and love (2), where truth appears as a content of belief. In like manner III is addressed to one Gaius "whom I love in the truth" (3), and deals with the Christian righteousness of receiving traveling preachers into one's home, condemning in unsparing terms those whose lack of hospitality and graciousness prevents their showing this evidence of love to the apostles of truth.

The writer of all of these documents has a peculiarly mixed background. His attitude toward the Jewish heritage of the Christian church is many sided. He speaks of many of the Jews of Jesus' audiences as enemies of the truth, yet almost in the same breath considers the honor of the name of a true Israelite (4). Moses and the prophets are the word of God and

(1) Weiss, "Biblical Theology of the New Testament", Vol. II, p. 317.

(2) II:3. (3) III:1. (4) See esp., G:1:47; 4:23; 20:16, 17.

as such are to abide (1). He quotes the Old Testament profusely and even makes frequent use of Hebraisms of speech. He sets side by side the distinctively New Testament concepts of faith and grace and the Old Testament concepts of commandments and works, seeming to find in them no conflict as earlier Christians had found. He even speaks of love as a commandment(2). The writings are decidedly Christocentric, as are most of the writings of the New Testament, but it is the center of the person of Christ, the sense of a living fellowship with him that is dominant in much the same way that living fellowship with God is represented by the Old Testament as the life of the patriarchs. There is little emphasis in these writings upon that legal work of Christ which makes the Pauline section of the New Testament so antithetical to the Old.

On the other hand there is decided evidence in the Johannine writings of the Greek background in the midst of which the author was living. At the time he wrote, Christianity had practically admitted its failure among the Jews. Like its great apostle it had turned to the Gentiles. And with this turning had grown the necessity for putting the gospel of life in terms of Greek thought and Greek culture. Hence the many references in the Johannine literature, not only to terms of thought made current through the popularizing of Greek philosophy by the eclectic schools of Alexandria and elsewhere, but also the evident attempt to translate Jewish methods of thinking into solutions of problems of life in Greek communities.

(1) G:10:35. (2) G:15:12; II:6.

The close relation of the Fourth Gospel and the Epistles in this combination of Jewish and Greek background, as well as their close relation in method of approach, prepares the reader for the unity of theme that appears. The very fact that a message about a life lived on Jewish soil and working amid Jewish life problems could be translated into terms of Greek thought, gave the gospel an ecumenical aspect. Just how that translation was wrought we shall see later; suffice it to say here that the gospel evidences it not only in the use of terms that are Greek in their origin, but also in the presentation of the entire problem of life, even as Jesus worked it out with Jews, in Hellenistic methods of thought. In the Epistles, somewhat in reverse fashion, we have the Greek environment and problems of life translated back into terms of Old Testament phraseology and mode of thought. This reciprocal relationship heightens the unity of theme.

This unity is to be seen at every turn when the writings are compared. They all are of experimental character, dealing with the subjective as resolving all objective situations. The gospel and first epistle both claim a basis in eye witness of the earthly events of the life and ministry of Jesus. Their prologues parallel each other in stating this claim. Yet they both emphasize their purpose to unfold a definite type of message, and they follow the same main courses in that message. If the gospel sets forth a definite creed, so does the first epistle. This latter is no document of "creedless sweetness"

as it has sometimes been called. The content of belief as a necessary part of life is quite as much in evidence as it is in the gospel, and it is the same general content as in the gospel. Its philanthropic love is very definitely the outgrowth of this belief. The union of the two is made the basis of abiding in God(1). God as Spirit, as light, as love are dominant ideas in both. The necessity of cleansing from sin, the positiveness of the righteous life, the potency of the will, the necessity of revelation to life, the interdependence of creed and conduct, the lifting of love beyond the realm of sentiment, - all of these are vital to the whole scheme of life in both writings. Holtzmann(2) and Brooke (3) have elaborated to great length the similarity of words and ideas. Without any such elaboration the unity of them in the main lines of thought may become apparent. Thus both gospel and epistle speak of Jesus as God's Son come in the flesh (4); they both represent life as dependent on him (5); they both dwell again and again on life as an abiding in God through fellowship with Jesus (6); they both present God's love as a self-giving through the sending of his Son (7); they both insist upon the impossibility of love in the moral sense except as dependant upon this self-giving love of God (8); they both connect belief in the reality of Jesus with this oneness with God (9); and they both lay their greatest stress on a continual play on the word 'witness'(10);

- (1) I:4:15,16. (2) In "Jahrbuch für Prot. Theologie" 1882p.128.
 (3) "The Epistles of S. John", pp.1-vii.
 (4) Cf. G:1:14 and I:4:2. (5) Cf. G:1:4;6:33 and I:5:11.
 (6) Cf. G:3:6; and I:2:24. (7) Cf. G:3:16 and I:3:16; 4:9.
 (8) Cf. G:13:34 and I:3:23. (9) Cf. G:1:12,13 and I:5:1.
 (10) Cf. G:5:36,37 and I:5:1-6.

The relation of the two great works to each other in their common use of the life which the author believes to be realized only in fellowship with Jesus is suggestively summarized by the epistle in a sentence which points definitely to the gospel account of the life of Jesus: "He that saith he abideth in him ought himself also to walk even as he walked." (1) The very prologue to the epistle has been often worked out as the correlate of all parts of the gospel (2). Thus "That which was from the beginning" is parallel to "In the beginning was the Word". "That which we have heard" is the summary of all that the witness in the gospel heard of the teaching of Jesus. "That which we have seen with our eyes, that which we have gazed upon" suggests the series of mighty works of goodwill. "And our hands have handled" points to the basis of reality again in the actual humanity of the Word. Even the emphasis upon the Holy Spirit, used in G:5 as chief witness, and in G:14 and again in 16 as the abiding presence of Christ and the worker in men's hearts, receives supreme recognition in the epistle where it is bluntly declared that "the spirit is the truth". (3).

Thus the gospel and the great epistle are related in theme, and the same emphasis on truth and love is to be seen in the minor epistles. In II the writer cautions against setting oneself up as capable of independent speculation about truth. In III he cautions against setting oneself up as capable on independent ambition in the church. Both of these are cautions against lovelessness. The epistles constantly suggest

(1) I:3:6. (2) See, for example, Alexander, Op.cit., pp25,26.
(3) I:5:7.

setting of his attributes over against each other, as in so much theological work. There is no grace against holiness. Each of the so-called attributes of God appears in broad, general relations, so that any one of them may be used in connection with any activity to which God is represented as being a party. Thus, while it is usual to think of God's love or his free grace as being the prompter of his forgiveness to men, John can think of God's righteousness, so often represented as needing to be appeased, as being the means of his forgiveness: "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins"(1).

Neither is there any dualism of matter and spirit, The thinking world of the days of these writings was greatly affected by the whole movement of Gnosticism. It used to be commonly supposed that Gnosticism did not appear until the middle of the second century. Now it is generally admitted that incipient Gnosticism was present in philosophical thought before the time of Christ. That "many-headed monster of thinking", as it has been described, was founded on the assumption that matter is evil. The dualism of spirit and matter led on the one hand to asceticism in the attempt to get rid of the dominance of matter, and on the other hand to sensual indulgence as not being able to affect spirit since it was of different essence than matter. Both results of gnostic thinking are viewed with alarm in the Johannine writings. The author feels that all such dualism is false. There is nothing inherently evil in flesh. Even the divine Logos can become flesh (2).

(1). I:1:9. (2). G:1:14.

The quickening of the spirit which Jesus says is his giving of life to men is immediately connected with the quickening of the body in resurrection: "The hour cometh, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live. --Marvel not at this, for the hour cometh, in which all that are in the tombs shall hear his voice, and shall come forth." (1) Man is not viewed in our sources as spirit and body, but as one man. The only dualism that occurs is ethical, and that is not the finding of two natures within man, as Paul does (2), but the choice of the whole of the man's will between the ethical end of righteousness and the unethical end of unrighteousness.

It has been urged against this view of the Johannine writings that they have a great deal to say about the spiritual source of unrighteousness in Satan, and that this presents a metaphysical dualism which destroys the true unity that John elsewhere builds up. But our sources never refer to a diabolical power except to set off an ethical relationship. Satan is described as entering in to Judas Iscariot with the result that he sells his Lord (3). Judas himself is in turn called a devil (4), with evident reference to the deed he was about to do. In the most pointed passage in the gospel where the devil is referred to, Jesus is discussing with his hecklers their own moral character in return for the accusations they have been hurling at him. "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father it is your will to do. He was a

(1) G:5:25, 28, 29. (2) Romans 7:7-25.

(3) G:13:27. (4) G:6:70.

murderer from the beginning, and stood not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh his own: for he is a liar and the father thereof"(1). Here, while the devil is set down as being inherently of a lying nature, the entire reference is to the sin of Jesus' accusers, their willing falsifying of the case. As Stevens says, "The sonship to Satan is here set in contrast to the sonship to God which the Jews claimed for themselves. In both instances an ethical kinship is referred to"(2). In the same vein, the author discussing the nature of sin in the first epistle declares, "He that doeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. ---In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil"(3). The ethical relationship is again the only point of dualism that is suggested. The very term used, *Σαβώτορ*, suggests 'calumniator' or a kindred ethical connotation. The only other passages in our sources in which an evil spirit world is referred to at all have to do with the accusation that Jesus has a demon, *δαίμων*, and so is crazy.(4) The answer that Jesus makes to such accusations is significant: "I have not a demon; but I honor my Father, and ye dishonor me"(5). That is to say, the filial relationship of honor as set over against a cheap trumping up of dishonor is my quiet proof that I have no source of power in the evil spirits. To an age that so greatly feared the demon power of the air as real antitheses to divinity, Jesus' answer is that true honor delivers from all

(1) G:8:44. (2) Stevens, "The Theology of the New Testament" p.194.
 (3) I:3:8-10. (4) G:7:20; 8:48,49,52; 10:20,21.
 (5) G:8:49.

such. If an honorable ethical relationship can deliver from a certain power, then that power must have been an ethical antithesis. And the very note of deliverance, strongly insisted upon in these writings, is evidence of ethical import.

But even stronger in its presentation of the unity of life is the frequent occurrence in these writings of the thought of some one great passion ruling life so as to guide it in one certain direction. We have seen how that is represented in the case of those who are children of the devil because they seek constantly to do evil deeds. It is even bolder in its relief in the case of those who are given up to a dominant good passion. Joy is such a passion. Jesus is represented as praying that his joy may remain in his followers so that their joy may be made full(1). Even their sorrow is to become joy (2). No man will be able to take their joy from them(3), a significant statement in the face of impending persecution. The high-priestly prayer includes the petition that Jesus' own joy (his leading characteristic according to John) may be "fulfilled" (that is, filled full of meaning) in his followers(4), a possibility which he quite evidently contemplates as the normal expectancy of their living the life he has in mind. Again, love is such a passion. Jesus makes love the test of Simon Peter's restoration to the fulness of life(5). He prays for nothing more than that his love shall abide in the hearts of his followers(6). And in two of the most enraptured visions of his first epistle, the author declares, "He that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God"(7) - an absolute unity of life; and,

(1) G:15:11. (2) G:16:20. (3) G:16:22. (4) G:17:13.

(5) G:21:15. (6) G:15:10; 17:26 (7) I:4:16.

"Perfect love casteth out fear"(1)- a deliverance of life from the one thing that mars most lives and so a unifying of it in a single purpose. One is reminded of Epicurus' dream that a man should come to see the pleasure he had in mind as being "not a gratification of isolated desires but peace and pleasure for his whole being"(2).

The very unity of the Christian brotherhood, so often dwelt upon in these writings, is the outgrowth of this emphasis upon the unity of life. For if men have their own lives unified within themselves they can live in unity one with another, and any failure in social solidarity is fundamentally a failure in a unified life of the spirit. So Jesus, at the same time that he is praying the utterances quoted above for the peace and unity of his disciples' spirits, prays that they may at one with each other in the same sense that he and his Father have unity of life (3). And he adds that he prays not for the world, as though he and John, comforting the churches cannot expect this of it. Concerning the many who had left their fellowship, reminds them somewhat plaintively that "They were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would have continued with us"(4), seemingly a ridiculous reasoning in a circle until this connection is seen.

The very interrelatedness of righteousness, love, and belief, as we found them in the analysis of the First Epistle, testify to the oneness, both of the inner life of the individual and of the group. John has been criticized as narrow for speaking so often of love as related to "the brethren". But he sees

(1) I:4:18 (2) Angus, "The Environment of Early Christianity",
 (3) G:17:21. (4) I:2:19. p.188.

clearly that the unity of relationship he has in mind by love necessitates a brotherhood, a oneness of spirit.

A second, and still more definite conception of life in the Johannine writings is that life is a way, a definite order, the following of a well articulated plan. The words of Jesus, "I am the Way"(1) are but the summary of the whole life philosophy of these writings. They express the conviction that the way of life is not an abstract concept, but inherent in a person.

Now there is nothing particularly unique in the general thought of life being according to an orderly law. Making that law to be such as it is in our sources, however, especially unfolding it in relation to a life, brings us face to face with some of the most fundamental concepts of the Johannine thought, concepts that have influenced the world's thinking profoundly.

Life as a "way" is developed by the use of the 'Logos' notion. By this we do not mean to restrict ourselves to the use of the term 'Logos'. Such a restriction would soon dispose of the subject, for the term itself occurs but seldom in the Johannine writings. But the idea runs all through them. The Logos concept of life is a concept of development in accord with orderly procedure rather than lawless change. It is evolutionary, not revolutionary. It is a concept of growth, but that growth is cosmic, not chaotic. Such a concept dominates the thinking of the gospel and the First Epistle from start to finish. Indeed, as we shall try to show later, the

(1) G:14:6.

very thought of the Logos, as John handles the term, not only influences, but controls, the entire thought of the gospel. The so called 'prologue', often set off from the gospel as though it were a kind of appended treatise, really states the thesis and the modus operandi of the whole thought. But even before we set ourselves to establish this fact, the very analysis of the plan of the gospel given above (1) impresses us with its strong and consistent emphasis upon life as an order plan, the Logos idea.

Some kind of Logos concept of life has been manifest in most philosophies; a philosophy of chaos is a thankless effort. The very term is common in expressing this concept, though many true Logos concepts of life are to be found where the term is sparingly or never used. The notion is, indeed, well-nigh inevitable unless one is to surrender to the doctrine of chance. Either one must be a Hindu and admit as he does at times, that this world is without design and is meaningless, or else he must admit design, which is to admit purpose, which is to admit plan.

The history of the relation of philosophic thought to the Logos concept of life has been often investigated; and though the results have varied in detail, they have generally been the same in main outline. Whatever the exact meaning intended in words and phrases now too ancient to fix, their general bearing upon the development of life is clear. Thus, even the old Buddhist conception of "law" was in the main a Logos concept, though fatalistic in much of its import

(1) pp. 6-9

and thus difficult to relate to any idea of human responsibility. The "Tao" of Lao-Tse and other writers of the sixth century B.C., while it may never be shown conclusively to mean 'way', is a clear Logos concept. The "Tao" is a principle of nature pervading all creation. It is universal. One may run into it "on the right hand or on the left", as Lao-Tse was wont to say. It cannot be seen or heard, and it is not attainable. Nevertheless the whole universe is dependent on it. The very life of man, the same as anything else in the universe, is unthinkable without it. One cannot pick out, even at random, a paragraph from the writings of ancient Taoism, without recognizing how strong was the hold of this idea:

"He who understands the conditions of Life does not strive after what is of no use to life; and he who understands the conditions of Destiny does not strive after what is beyond the reach of knowledge.--When life comes, it cannot be declined; when it goes, it cannot be detained." (1)

Greek thought furnishes many examples of more or less highly developed Logos doctrines of life. Heraclitus, who challenged the orthodoxy of his day on the fixed state of things, was nevertheless most careful to maintain that the constancy of the change he taught was in accordance with fixed law. It was simply the law that was fixed, not the things in the universe; but the fixing of this law was by no means incidental. Indeed it was Heraclitus who used and developed to great extent this very term of 'logos' to denote the unchanging principle by which all change was wrought.

(1) "The Tests of Taoism" as published by Mueller, Book XIX, Part II, Section XII.

He dignified the Logos as an abstraction of his thought.

He taught that it was surrounded by all the elements of the world, earth, air, fire, and water, as by a garment. Heraclitus needed such a Logos principle. He was considered to be dark, obscure in his reasoning. The Logos became for him the means of clarifying his thought. He did not, indeed, conceive of the Logos as one of the principles of an Infinite Mind; he rather tended to make the Logos itself his god. But whether an attribute or an existence, it was controlling law, according to which all things happen. Among the Stoics and Epicureans Logos concepts of life were common. Epicureanism is often unfairly represented as a philosophy of riot and disorder. But far from it. Whether one accepts its philosophy of life's end or not is one question. But to try to evade the fact of a definitely ordered concept with an end in view is quite another. To say that "the end of all our actions is to be free from pain" is to set a very definite goal to life, and in accord with that goal all the flux that Heraclitus saw must correspond. The Stoics used the term Logos in a highly developed sense, and their whole thought of life was quite in accord with its representation. To them the Logos was an operative principle, an attribute of a great impersonal Reason, the creative Will. To them the concept was unalterably bound up with teleological ideas. Thus in the famous hymn of Cleanthes, the Stoic conception appears addressing the orthodox Zeus in the

terms of a glowing tribute to the reign of law:

"Thee, all this universe, as it rolls
circling around the earth, obeys, wheresoever
thou dost guide, and gladly owns thy sway.
In thy invincible hand thou holdest as a
minister the two-edged, fiery, everlasting
thunderbolt, under whose stroke all nature
shudders. No work upon earth is wrought
apart from thee, O Lord, nor through the
divine ethereal sphere, nor upon the sea." (1)

In commenting upon this hymn Case says, "In place of the gods and demons who, according to the popular superstition, played freakishly with the affairs of men, the Stoic substituted a sober and well behaved divine power called the Logos, or divine reason, which was said to pervade all matter and indeed to constitute the primal material out of which the entire universe was composed." (2) To apply such thought as this to the common beliefs of the people, as the hymn of Cleanthes does, is simply to take the current thought of its own day and try to breathe into it the desired conceptions.

Plato seldom used the term Logos, yet his is the greatest of all Greek philosophies of life which may be termed Logos philosophies in a cosmic sense. His words, *ἰδέα, σοφία*, and *νοῦς* are counterparts of the Heraclitan and Stoic *λόγος*. They all denote value concepts. He feels it is not enough to predicate painlessness with the Epicureans. It is not enough to gain pleasure; we must know what we gain it for. Such a concept is contradicting one Logos notion with another; but instead of being a contradiction of the Logos concept of life as such, it is a carrying of this concept farther. For

(1) Case, "Experience with the Supernatural in Early Christian Times", p.14.

(2) Ibid, p.14.

Plato one might arrange a series of equations, Idea equals Wisdom equals Purpose equals Logos.

In similar fashion, Aristotle's idea of "proportion" is a Logos idea. When the emphasis is not what one does but why, a very definite concept of a controlling force in life is laid down. Life becomes still less a thing of chance and much more a product of carefully operating principles.

So also Plutarch, writing at the very time that the Fourth Gospel was interpreting Jesus to the Greeks in terms of a new development of the Logos concept, speaks of the Isis religion of Egypt as a "principle of nature", thought of by the common people under various names, but "converted by the Logos (that is, Osiris,) into all appearances and forms"(1). It had been, according to Plutarch, a function of Osiris to bring the world into being according to what he here styles a Logos, or a rational, plan.

It is indeed often the subject of debate whether the predominate idea of the Logos of life in Greek thought was reason or utterance, "ration or oratio". The one is thought of as subject, the other as object; and the debate loses much of its point when we recall that the distinction between subject and object is a modern, not a Greek mannerism of thought. There is really no thought without expression in some form. Even the Greek concept of the Logos was representing not merely an abstract Reason, which moderns term 'subjective', but rather a relation. That relation was, even to the Stoics, fundamental to the idea of ruling principle in life. It was

(1) Plutarch, "Pompey", pp. 39, 53, 61.

"the uttered thought of God". (1) And so, after all, perhaps the term "word" is as good as any English designation. But Jewish as well as oriental and Greek thought evidences this dependence upon creative and controlling principle in life. The very term *λογος* is used again and again in the Septuagint to render the thought of Psalms and Prophets when dealing with the "Word of the Lord" in a half personified sense. Thus, "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made" (2). "He sendeth out his word and healeth them" (3). "His word runneth very swiftly" (4). "The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand forever" (5). "For as the rain cometh down and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, and giveth seed to the sower and bread to the eater; so shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: It shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I send it." (6) And in the book of the "Wisdom of Solomon", to be found among the Old Testament Apocrypha, the term also is of frequent occurrence, Thus: "O God of the Fathers, and Lord who keepest thy mercy, who madest all things by thy word" (7). "For of a truth it was neither herb nor mollifying plaster that cured them, but thy word, O Lord, which healeth all things" (8). "Thine all-powerful word leaped from heaven out of the royal throne, ---

(1) Drummond, "Via, Veritas, Vita", p. 301. (2) Ps. 33:6.
 (3) Ps. 107:20. (4) Ps. 147:15. (5) Isa. 40:8. (6) Isa. 55:10, 11.
 (7) Wisd. 9:1. (8) Wisd. 16:12.

and while it touched the heaven it trode upon the earth." (1).

It will be seen how strongly these quotations suggest, not merely a general Logos conception of life, but even personal activities of some agent more or less distinct from the Lord who is being served. Of course all the references cited are high poetry. Their concepts would fall by no means under the head of literal. But their thought seems to increase in its personalizing tendency, until Wisdom can declare that God's word "leaped from heaven", and that while still being able to touch the heaven it trode upon the earth", where we are faintly reminded of the words of Jesus that he is at the same time the Son of Man come down out of heaven and yet is in heaven. (2) The Memra of the Targums contain similar usages.

The Word of the Lord is said to come to the prophets in a very special way. Especially is Jeremiah filled with emphasis upon this vivid coming to him of God's utterance. (3) Isaiah even says that he "saw" the word (4), and we are reminded of the reverent avowal of the Fourth Gospel in reference to the Christ: "These things said Isaiah, because he saw his Glory; and he spake of him." (5)

But not only in the use of the term 'Logos' itself is the Jewish concept to be seen; it appears in other cognate terms which carry the same idea of life. The frequent appearance of the "angel of the Lord" is usually connected with some thought of guidance in life or assurance of God's pres-

(1) Wisd. 18:15, 16. (2) G. 3:13. (3) See, for instance, Jer. 1:4, 11:2:1.
(4) Isa. 2:1. (5) G. 12:41.

ence. Such an appearance was that to Moses in the burning bush (1), where the angel's visit is proclaimed a theophany of the very "I am" with whom the Fourth Gospel so mystically identifies the incarnate Logos. The angel of the Lord is even more frequently represented in the other capacity of a guide of life as in the beautiful words to the Israelites in the wilderness: "Behold I send an angel before thee, to keep thee by the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. Take ye heed of him and hearken to his voice; provoke him not, for he will not pardon your transgression; for my Name is in him" (2). This mixture of the idea of kindness in the guidance of the angel and of awfulness at his presence finds full fruition in the appearance of the angel to Manoah and his wife by the name of 'wonderful' (3). All such manifestations have their evident relation to the thought of incarnation, and form a background for the growing concept of life as plan and guidance.

The term "Wisdom" is another which, in the writings of the Old Testament, is closely associated with a Logos idea of life. Here, as a rule, there is high apostrophe, and often Wisdom is introduced in the first person, speaking. Thus: "The Lord created me in the beginning of his ways, before his works of old" (4). "When he prepared the heavens, I was there" (5). "Whoso findeth me findeth life" (6). And the most impassioned passage of the wisdom section of proverbs interrelates all the ideas of creation, guidance, and provi-

(1) Ex. 3:6. (2) Ex. 23:20, 21. (3) Judges 13:22. (4) Prov. 7:22.
 (5) Prov. 7:27. (6) Prov. 7:35.

dence through the means of personification: "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. ---When he established the heavens, I was there: when he set a circle upon the face of the deep, ---there I was by him as a Master-workman: and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him: rejoicing in his habitable earth: and my delight was with the sons of men."(1). With such a passage as a background it is small wonder that Paul should have called Jesus God's wisdom (2), or that Jesus himself should have so personified the term as to say, "Wisdom is justified of all her children".(3)

From these instances it will be seen that the whole Logos concept of life, as it is found in the writings of the Old Testament, whether in the use of the equivalents for 'Logos' or cognate terms, was employed to do two things at once: it was useful to keep the sense of the nearness of God at the same time that the apparently childish notion of his visible presence was done away. Adam had actually talked with God in the cool of the day. Abraham had held converse with the Almighty. So had Moses and the other patriarchs. But even in the cases of Abraham and of Moses this intervening character of the "angel" tended to distance God that he might not lose any of his dignity in contact with men, while still enabling men to learn his will and rest assured of his abiding plan for their lives.

It was inevitable that with such oriental and Greek and Hebrew notions of life, meeting in the Logos concept, some

(1) Prov.8:22-31. (2) I Cor.1:24. (3) Luke 7:35.

minds should set to work to weave the whole into one connected philosophy of life. Hence Philo and the other eclectics. Philo sets about definitely to harmonize Hebraism and Hellenism in all of their particulars. He believes in one spirit of revelation running through them both, through all their teachers and in all their concepts. He moves from the commonest thought of angel guidance in the Old Testament to the deepest thought of the Ideas in Plato and undertakes to show that they are alike manifestations of God among men. So sure is he in particular that Plato is inspired by the same Jehovah who inspired the prophets that it has become a common saying, "Either Plato philonizes, or Philo platonizes."

Philo's 'Logos' was the central unifying figure of his system of allegory. By the side of the Eternal there was a second god, the divine Word. This Word was the agent or intermediary in creation. Philo calls it the *λόγος*. This Word is declared to be the Light, and is often presented as God's interpreter. He is called the eldest Son, *πρεσβύτατος υἱός*. Other designations that are especially suggestive are *ἀίδιος*, everlasting; *εἰκών*, image; *ἀρχήτυπος*, archetype. Yet in spite of these highly personified characterizations, rising at times to actual consideration of personality, Philo takes pains to declare that the Logos is "not a separate person" from God.⁽¹⁾ The reason for this is not far to seek. Philo remained a good Jew. He was a monotheist through and through. And he never taught in any sense a doctrine of incarnation. Now, to make the Logos separate from God, while at the same time non-incarnate,

(1) See Philo, "De Somn.", I.39.

would be, of course to give up monotheism. Since there is no incarnation of the Logos, he could never be identified with the Messiah of the prophets, and Philo is consistent in denying such identification. The only way in which Philo may be said to weaken the monotheistic God of the Hebrew prophets is in this: that he lays far more stress on the metaphysical concepts of God than they and far less on the ethical. This he does, of course, in order to interpret Hebrew theology to his own age in terms of Greek forms of thought, and he succeeds by this method in presenting a Logos conception of life which sums up all the world-building forces of deity, all the angel ministrants and the miracle workings and the Platonic Ideas in one great presentation. His very monotheistic insistence enables him to steer clear of an individual hypostatizing of the Logos. He says, for instance, "Nothing Divine communicates itself by means of separation; it only extends itself." (1) So far, then, as the Logos is God, it is only self-extended God; God reaching down in an unseparated fashion, not giving up himself, careful to maintain his identity, and striving to get at the human race. Yet it is hard for Philo to keep God from giving himself up to humanity as a separate person subordinate to deity, and Überweg characterizes the attempt with no uncertain words:

"Philo wavers between the attributive and substantive conception of it (the Logos); the latter, according to which the Logos is hypostatized to a person, is already developed in his doctrine to too firm a consistency for us to suppose that the personification was for Philo's own consciousness a mere poetic fiction; --- and yet not to a consistency of so absolute a

(1) Quoted by Dorner, "Doctrine of the Person of Christ", p.23.

character that Philo could be interpreted as teaching as a positive doctrine, the existence beside God of a second person, in no way reducible to a mere attribute or function of the first person. Yet so far as Philo personifies, whether it be poetically or doctrinally, he owns to a certain subordinationism. The Logos is for him, as it were, a chariot-driver, whom the other divine forces (*Surauis*) must obey; but God, as the Master of the chariot, prescribes to the Logos the course which is to be maintained." (1)

Drummond concludes his lengthy examination of important passages from Philo thus:

"From first to last the Logos is the Thought of God, dwelling subjectively in the infinite Mind, planted out and made objective in the universe. The cosmos is a tissue of rational force --- The reason of man is this same rational force entering into consciousness, and held by each in proportion to the truth and variety of his thoughts; and to follow it is the law of righteous living. Each form which we can differentiate as a distinct species, each rule of conduct which we can treat as an injunction of Reason, is itself a Logos --- Thus, wherever we turn, these Words, which are really Works, of God confront us, and lift our minds to that uniting and cosmic Thought --- of whose perfections it is the shadow, and whose splendors, too dazzling for all but the purified intuitions of the highest souls, it at once suggests and veils." (2)

That Philo was one of these "highest souls" in the inner experiences of the Logos guiding, we may judge from his own words: "By a divine possession I was filled with enthusiasm." (3)

Thus from east and west, from Greek and Jew, from most conservative dogmatist to most liberal eclectic, the thought of life as under a definite plan and order, guided by a divine power, - in short, the philosophy of a way of life presents itself, now through quite impersonal representations

(1) Überweg, "A History of Philosophy", p.231.

(2) Drummond, "Philo Judaeus", Vol.II, p.273.

(3) Philo, "De Cherubim", 9.

and again through almost personal agents, now through the use of one term and now through another, but always giving what we have herein defined as a Logos conception of life.

It is not surprising that the early Christians varied in the use they made of these ideas that were ready to their hand. It is especially not to be wondered at that many of the earliest feared them as expressive of pagan or otherwise foreign thought. The passion of early Christianity was ethical, and in their Greek environment they found much which they felt was hostile to such an emphasis. When men are surrounded by what they feel intensely to be moral evil, they are slow in picking out the good. This unfriendly attitude persisted for some time among certain minds of the early Christians. Tertullian can declare contemptuously as late as 220, "What has the Christian to do with the philosopher?"

It is still less surprising that the earliest Christians hesitated to take up Greek forms of thought when there sprang up in their own body groups of men who made use of such thought and yet built upon it strange and even wierd systems and crude and even base ethics. The Gnostics made themselves offensive to the humble-minded from among whom many early Christians were drawn; for in their insistence on a mystic knowledge as the essential for admission into the presence of God, they boasted of their own attainments in this line. Gnosticism was eclectic in the worst sense. It was as much influenced by astrology as by Plato. It delved no deeper into speculative rationalism than into magic. It strove to blend Greek,

Egyptian, Persian, and Hindu thought, and became vaguely pantheistic at the same time that it was rigorously dualistic. It taught that the *idea* are delegates of the creative mind, and that the Logos comes at the end of them. The Ideas here become substantive, and the Platonism of these Ideas becomes just what Aristotle understood Platonism to be - an objectification of deity, off yonder, out of touch with reality, a deity or an idea, in which mundane beings could participate only by imitation, and this only by a long series of intermediary steps. This was Aristotle's conception of Plato run to see. It was the Idea taken off into a world by itself and then got at only by an elaborate arrangement of steps. It did not present any attractive opening to Christian thought to use the Logos conception of life. Indeed it had reduced the Logos concept of life to a dull metaphysic. The Gnostics had, indeed, something to say about the incarnation of the Logos, the last of the series of the emanations by which God deigns to reach men; but this incarnation was, as More says, "not an isolated event in human history, but rather a single act of cosmic drama, wherein the spheres of the eternity and integrity of God are mysteriously involved." (1) Yet Philo claimed to be a Jewish Gnostic, and Clement of Alexandria declared himself openly a Christian Gnostic and called the Christian faith "the true gnosis".

But for the days of the Hohenine writings, Gnosticism in Clement's developed form had no place. The peculiar form of Gnosticism, only incipient though it was, that was abroad

(1) More, "Christ the Word", p.66.

in the church of the time, was known as Doceticism. According to the docetists, the Logos only seemed to be incarnate in the human Jesus. His was not a Logos birth nor death. He did, indeed, live a Logos life during the few months of a well-guided ministry, but that Logos which came upon him at his baptism forsook him at his death, and he died because he could not help himself, caught as a prey to his beliefs.

Such a mixture of Logos and non-Logos, did not of course appeal to the average Christian thinker; and when to this doctrine of "seeming" the Gnostic added the equally divisive ethical teaching that sin only seemed to be, the Christian's moral stamina was aroused. The very author of our First Epistle reviews such notions with scathing condemnation and describes them as the "spirit of error." (1)

In the face of all this it is really remarkable that so many of the early Christians, and some of them at such an early date, should have been able to take the very concepts and terminology of the pagan world, and of the worse than pagan Gnostics within their own church, and use them as tools with which to combat the error that was so abhorrent to them and to forge the weapons of truth they held so dear. Nearly a century before Tertullian's slighting remark, Justin could utter his words of high rhetoric as well as high thinking:

"Our doctrines, then, appear to be greater than all human teaching; because Christ, who appeared for our sakes, became the whole rational being, both body, and reason, and soul. For whatever either lawgivers or philosophers uttered well, they elaborated by finding and contemplating some part of the Word. ---And

(1) I:4:6.

Socrates, who was more zealous in this direction than all of them, was accused of the very same crimes as ourselves. ---But these things our Christ did through his power. For no one trusted in Socrates so as to die for this doctrine, but in Christ, who was partially known even by Socrates, for he was and is the Word who is in every man." (1)

Elsewhere Justin refers to Christ as the fulfiller of Greek thought, and to the Logos as order, beauty, and celestial reason.

The background we have traced renders it both impossible and unnecessary to inquire concerning the literary dependence of the Johannine writings and the rest of the New Testament upon Philo or any other leading thinker. The air was full of the thoughts and forms of speech that are current in the writings of both Paul and John. "People talked about the Logos then as they would talk about evolution today"(2). If the Fourth Gospel and the epistles were written by John, son of Zebedee, fisherman of Galilee, it is perhaps not inviting to think of him becoming a documentary student of the Philonic writings. But such a thought is not at all necessary. The ideas which Philo made still more popular than they had been were part of the general thinking of his age. They were his to ignore, or to combat, or to use, as he saw fit. He saw fit to use them to clothe in them the deep thought he had, while he fought unconditionally the misuse of them by gnostics and others. Indeed the very passion of the early Christians for the spread of the gospel became a reason for their use of the terms of thought of their day. It was easy for the Greeks, to whom their chief mission was

(1) Justin, Second Apology, X.

(2) Coffin, "The Portraits of Jesus Christ in the N.T.", p.86.

now directed, to understand what they were talking about if it was put in their forms of speech. Scores of such forms are to be found in the New Testament somewhat as shrines at which the sacrifices of Christian thought may be offered; and the Logos idea becomes a kind of altar to Paul's unknown God. The early Christians were sensitive both to the religious forces and to the needs of their environment, and they were therefore quick to use, in spite of some of their natural fears, the terms of thought of their own day as means through which the truth might be effectively proclaimed.

Such, then, was the outlook for the writer of the Fourth Gospel, when he took hold of the term 'Logos' and from it developed the completest and the deepest, albeit the simplest stated, Logos concept of life the world had yet known in its philosophy. The term does indeed appear elsewhere in the New Testament, in some writings of probably an earlier date than these under consideration. This is part of John's general background, and evidence that other Christian writers were making similar use of the thought of their environment. Thus in the Epistle to the Hebrews, so replete with Hellenistic imagery of thought as with Hebraistic ritual, the author refers to the Logos in a rather definitely personified fashion: "For the word of God is living, and active, and sharper than any two-edged sword, and piercing even to the dividing of soul and spirit, of both joints and marrow, and quick to discern the thoughts and intents of the heart"(1). Here of course the "word" is a personification of the gospel, yet its active and

(1) Heb. 4:12.

discriminating powers have become vividly personal. Similarly, with an occasional slight modification of terminology, as in that interesting apocalyptic address to the early church, the Second Epistle of Peter, "There were heavens from of old, and an earth compacted out of water and amidst water, by the word of God"(1). Here of course the Old Testament thought of creative activity is uppermost. But clearest of all in the New Testament outside our sources, is the passages in the greatest of the apocalypses: "And I saw the heaven opened; and behold, a white horse, and he that sat thereon called Faithful and True; and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. And his eyes are a flame of fire, and upon his head are many diadems; and he hath a name written which no one knoweth but he himself.

And he is arrayed in a garment sprinkled with blood: and his name is called The Word of God."(2) Here personality shines forth bright and clear in the one who is the hero of the book and in whom the author's hope for all the world is centered. He is God's Word, fully armed, the Reason and Utterance of God in relation to men completely revealed.

But when we come to the "prologue" to the Fourth Gospel, it is at once clear that we are dealing not only with a general Logos concept of life, the common background of nearly all the world's serious thought, not only with an attempt to consider creation and providence on God's side and life processes on man's side as flowing from the same fountain of principles of the universe, not only with personification of the chief of these principles into a formal Logos, not only

(1) II Pet. 3:5.

(2) Rev. 19:11-13.

with an occasional clear recognition of personality as the determinant of life, but with a distinct advance in definiteness and consistency of ideas and in simplicity of their statement which renders the Logos concept of John unique.

The writer indeed made use of his background, but he used it rather than being used by it. He did not hastily jot down some thoughts on the connection between the gospel he was proclaiming and the current thought of his day, but he came to his task after years of mature brooding over the whole meaning of life in terms of a certain well-defined and very precious experience which was life itself to him.

The cardinal point in this experience for our author was the incarnation. Yet an incarnation, in and of itself, would not have been to him sufficient to account for the source of a philosophy of man's life. Incarnations there were in Greek and oriental thought, numbers of them; but they were not of the sort to which he had come to give his allegiance. For the author of the Fourth Gospel the incarnation rests back, not on a general Logos concept, but on the particular ideas of eternity and divine fellowship with which he ever associates the Logos thought.

Hence the author begins his presentation with the words, *ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν*, where the *ἦν* denotes eternity of existence, not in the sense of extension of time but in the sense of timelessness.(1) He is at pains to contrast this verb with that used of the creation and of the birth of John the Baptist, *ἐγένετο*. In the one case it is the imperfect tense of con-

(1) Stevens, "The Johannine Theology", p.89.

tinuance, in the other the aorist of accomplished fact. In the one case it is the verb *εἶναι*, to be in an existential sense, in the other it is the verb *γίνομαι*, to come into being, to come to pass. (1) The starting point, then for the Fourth Gospel's treatment of the Logos is the thought of eternity rather than of incarnation. Yet it is significant that the author does not dwell upon this thought of eternity, as though it was important to have a history of the being of the Logos. There is only one thought in connection with what we might term pre-incarnation that interests the author, and that is a thought of fellowship within the divine nature. "The Logos was turned toward God", *πρὸς τὸν θεόν* (2). The *πρὸς* is far more colorful than *μετά* would have been. It denotes, not merely existence alongside of, but intimate fellowship with. Indeed it does not so much suggest at all separateness of existence, and the author is quick to add, "God was the Logos". The metaphysical query, so often urged, as to whether the writer is trying to express two distinct eternal personalities, hardly strikes at the right point. Stevens summarizes the thought of such writers as Lücke, Godet, and Wescott, by saying,

"John here uses *ὁ θεός* to denote specifically the Father - the central seat and fountain of divinity - and *θεός* to denote the category of divine nature or essence in which the Son, equally with the Father partakes. He thus affirms a distinction of persons, but an identity of essence, between the Logos and the Father." (3)

But Beyschlag reminds us of the "undogmatic, unscholastic, and popular mode of expression of the evangelist" (4) and

(1) G:1:1,3,6. (2) G:1:1. (3) Op.cit.,p91.
(4) "New Testament Theology", Vol.II,p.425.

points out that the distinction of persons is part of the poetic use of imagination playing over a great thought. Rather would we say that the thought of eternity is not meant in the passage to be contrasted with time, since then it would contradict all the thought of eternity presented in the rest of the gospel (see discussion, pp. 170-180); and in like manner, the thought of the Logos as personal is not presented in contrast to the thought of God as personal. The author has simply availed himself of the Logos concept to express the eternal quality of life of the Jesus whom he knew in personal experience, and to express the fact that life like his life, character like his, being like his, is divine. He is not thinking of reality in any substantive sense. His divinity and eternity of the Logos is simply the highest possible tribute he can pay to that Life in which, for him, all life is contained and inheres. For John can never think of the Logos in a pre-temporal or heavenly state, separate from the life of Jesus. For this reason the Logos idea is personal. For this reason what we know as the "incarnation" is for him the greatest expression of life's reality.

Similarly, the idea of creation is treated in the prologue. Creative power and agency are affirmed of the Logos (1). But the Logos as a pre-temporal abstraction creating worlds is no more thought of separate from the life of Jesus than the Logos as an eternal person separate from God. It is the fact that for the author of the Fourth Gospel metaphysical speculation may hardly be said to exist. He sees all things in

(1) G:1:3,10.

(2) Gervase, "The Fourth Gospel," p. 70.

(3) Gervase, "The Fourth Gospel," p. 71.

the light of what the life of Jesus means to him as a personal vitalizing power. No one could be to men what he felt Jesus was to him and to others whom he knew without being everything. Eternity of life, divinity of person, creativity of action in the bringing of worlds into being, all these are but attempts to express what for John was the great reality: the forming of eternal quality, divine sonship, in his own life, the creation within him of a new world order. All this was brought about by his fellowship with the one whom his gospel worships. How to express this was his problem. The best way is to avail himself of the Logos concept, so often used to denote the relationship of God to the world, so often used in connection with thoughts of creation and formation of worlds; and to fill the concept full of the meaning that life had come to have to him through his experience with the historical Jesus. Garvie has given the thoughtful expression to this in his words,

"It is not a bold and vain speculation with no contact with historical reality with which we are concerned in John's doctrine of the Eternal Word; it is a sober and serious interpretation of a real experience that the Fourth Evangelist offers to us. It was because Jesus had been to him the Light, the Life, the Love of God Himself, that he described Him as the Eternal Word." (1)

And elsewhere in his writings this same scholar has put it, "What led the evangelist to go beyond Philo was the fact of Christ." (2)

This vital relationship explains the rapid and general

(1) Garvie, "Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus", p.70.

(2) Garvie, "The Beloved Disciple", p.8.

acceptance accorded the Fourth Gospel in an age that was becoming indifferent to so-called "similar ideas" in the established religious cults. The divine parentage of heroes and the notion of pre-existent souls may, on the surface bear close resemblance to the idea of the eternity and pre-existence of John's Logos; but they have in them none of the passion of a vital experience with which the thoughts of the Fourth Gospel are associated. Pre-existence and divine parentage had become a mere debating ground for literalists and agnostics. The poet of a life uses them to enable him to fill his own thought full of meaning.

The very manner in which John expresses the idea of the incarnation of the Logos dispels all feeling that he might have had in mind a duality of existence. The Logos is not said to become an intermediary between human and divine life in some intangible sense. He becomes a mediator in a very genuine flesh and blood sense. "The Word became flesh and dwelt among us" (1). Here the word 'dwelt' is the suggestive $\varepsilon^{\circ}\sigma\kappa\eta\nu\omega\sigma\epsilon\iota$, 'tented', actually lived with men in their dwelling places. There is no shadowy docetism in these words, but an insistence on a real human being. Neither is there any suggestion of a leaving behind of some quality participated in in a former existence. The very utterance of God, his very self, became real in human life in the experience to which John refers. All else points to it, all else leads up to it. This alone is real. It is not said that the Logos "took flesh", which might have led to the Docetic notion of divided existence, but that he "became flesh",

(1) G:1:14.

expressive of the complete and only existence of the Logos in human form. As Weiss puts it, "A Logos extra carnem is never assumed alongside the Logos in carne." (1)

This leads to the realization that not the fact, genuine in experience as the author conceives it, but the purpose for the fact, is the important thing here. The incarnation of the Logos is daringly conceived as the very incarnation of God, that men may see God and understand what it means for deity to be completely expressive to humanity. The eternal idea became in Jesus an object of sense perception. "The personal element in the Johannine conception belongs not to the idea of the Logos but to the historical Christ; the originality of the evangelist consists in uniting the Christ of history with the idea of the Logos." (2) This very personal element is the vital part which the Logos plays among men. He is incarnate, be it observed, not merely in the world at large, but in a person. And the essential thing to the writer is that in the sense in which he thinks of the Logos he becomes re-incarnate in each person who comes under the influence of the complete God-revealing of Jesus, and who lives therefore the Logos kind of life. The doctrine of the new birth, so often dwelt upon by the evangelist, (3) becomes another expression of the purpose of the Logos incarnation. All the relations of the Logos that are treated in the prologue are personal relations. It is people among whom he becomes incarnate. It is people who receive or reject him. It is

- (1) Weiss, "Biblical Theology of the N.T.", Vol. II, p. 345.
- (2) Sanday, "The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel", p. 193.
- (3) See, for example, G:3:3; 15:3, 4.

people whose lives are judged or redeemed by their own attitude toward him. Beyschlag senses exactly the thought of John when he says, "The eternal life of humanity begotten in the person of Jesus has virtually become the property of humanity in a human personality, which has become its organ." (1)

The purpose of the Logos in man, then, briefly put, was that man might have life. This connection of the Logos with life is new in the history of the usage of the term. Philo had called the Logos 'light' but never 'life'. But John connects the two: "In him was life; and the life was the light of men." (2) Philo had used the same manna figure from the Old Testament to which Jesus refers on the occasion of the discussion that followed the feeding of the multitude; but John introduces a distinctly new thought when he represents Jesus as saying, "I am the bread of life." (3) To connect life-giving properties with the person of the incarnate Logos is to lay greater stress on redemption than on the commoner thought of creation, or rather to lay stress upon the new creation of life as more vital than the old creation of worlds. It is to subordinate speculative reasoning to religious revelation. And this is ever the point of view of our sources.

Such, then, is the peculiar use that John makes, not only of the general background of a Logos, an orderly concept of life, but of the particular background of the personified Logos or Idea or Wisdom of God. He uses all of these current ideas and pours into them the full meaning of personality.

(1) Beyschlag, "New Testament Theology", Vol. II, p. 443.
 (2) G:1:4. (3) G:6:48.

His presentation becomes, therefore, the flower and fruit of Logos teaching. The Jews and Greeks alike were only partial in their ways of relating God to human life; hence John's use of the Logos. What had been anamnesis in Plato, the recollection of the ideas, becomes in John fully realized in human life, not in any vague and mystic sense, but in a real and vital sense. Philo had, indeed, represented a divine faculty, an activity, an ideal world, and sometimes even a sensible world, as expressing the meaning of the Logos. Frequently he went so far as to personify such representations. But John's consistent personalization is different, because it is always related to the adequate purpose of the transformation of life. In John the Logos is immediately related to the Hebrew Messiah (1), a connection which never appears in Philo with all his Jewish background. All the purposiveness which the prophets of Judaism attributed to Messiah John predicates of the Logos. The Logos as an eternal divine life is just as individual as the Messiah came to be considered and as the Jesus of history was to his associates.

To Plato's age-old question, "Do phenomena participate in Ideas?", the Logos as he appears in the writings of John becomes the positive answer. In Jesus' statement, "I am the truth," (2) Plato's hard problem becomes for John resolved.

As More expresses it,

"When the searchers of that age read that the Word became flesh, it seemed to them as if, by a sudden burst of light from on high, all the difficulties and obscurities of Plato's effort to explain the immanence of Ideas in

(1) G:1:17, 18. (2) G:14:9.

(1) More, "Christ the Word", p. 35.

(2) Eucken, "The Christian Philosophy," Vol. II, p. 135.

terrestrial phenomena were lifted, while to the realm of pure Ideas came life and hospitality by the presence of a God visible there to the eye of faith." (1)

But seeing what the Logos doctrine of the Fourth Gospel is, the question remains, is it made use of in the gospel outside the prologue? To maintain, as this thesis has maintained, that the Logos doctrine is not used by John merely as a metaphysical concept but that it is related vitally to his whole philosophy of life, is almost to assume that the idea is used throughout the work. If it is not so used, then this fact of itself would tend to undermine the view of the term here set forth.

Many scholars have been unable to see any connection between the Logos idea and the main themes of the gospel. To them the prologue is a separate entity, scarcely a real introduction, but rather a commendatory epistle in itself, seeking to rouse the attention of the Greek world to the message which the gospel contains. So Beyschlag, speaking of the Logos concept in this gospel, says,

"We see how little speculative this writer is; he borrows a single speculative idea, but --- he does so only as a help for his Christology; he takes it as a rudimentary basis of his theology and cosmology, but he does not carry it out. His simple biblical and religious thinking comes out even without this idea, which remains half foreign to him." (2)

Of course, as we have attempted to show, the treatment of John's Logos as a 'speculative idea' is inconsistent even with its use in the prologue; and one cannot but wonder how an idea could be borrowed as "a help for his Christology"

(1) More, "Christ the Word", p.29.

(2) Beyschlag, "New Testament Theology," Vol.II, p.434.

when he never makes use of it in the development of that Christology through a series of treatments equal in length to forty prologues. Beyschlag really contradicts himself when he says, "The Logos is the most expressive name which he can give to Jesus, and he offers it as the key to the understanding of his narrative about Jesus." (1) Likewise Garvie says, "Dr. Scott affirms while Harnack denies that the identification of Jesus with the Logos dominates the whole of the Fourth Gospel. The writer's own study has led him to agree entirely with Harnack." (2) Yet he also says on the same page, "That the Christology of the evangelist himself was influenced by the Logos philosophy cannot be denied." Such an admission is tantamount to a recognition of a fuller meaning to the prologue's use of the term Logos than Garvie has expressed in his comments upon it. As a matter of fact, not only the concept of what the Logos is as set forth in this paper, but, as a result, the whole question of the unity of the thought of the Fourth Gospel, depends on the question of the use of the Logos in the rest of the book. It is Garvie's impression that the Logos idea does not dominate the thought of the book which leads him to try to divide the book between the testimony of the "witness" and the meditation of the philosopher. (3) But it is the admission noted above that leads him to find unity in its thought none the less, the unity we quoted from him of testimony, judgment, and glory.

Sanday says cautiously, "If there is any truth in the

(1) Op. cit., p. 421. (2) Garvie, "The Beloved Disciple", p. 5.

(3) Ibid., pp. 14-29: 38-60.

contention that the doctrine of the Prologue governs the rest of the Gospel, it must not be directly as a doctrine of the Logos, but rather indirectly through those two great constituent conceptions of Life and Light which together make up, and are embraced under, the doctrine of the Logos"(1) But what could be clearer than that the conceptions of Life and Light are the very meaning of the Logos to John?" In him was life; and the life was the light of men."(2) Sanday himself quoted instance after instance from the gospel to show that the ideas of life and light dominate its whole thought (3), and when comparing the Logos doctrine of John with that of Paul and Hebrews he speaks of "the order of thought by which the author of the Fourth Gospel arrived at his doctrine of the Logos" thus: "It is the copping-stone of the whole edifice, not the foundation stone. It is a comprehensive synthesis which unites under one head a number of scattered ideas. From this point of view it would be more probably that the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel was a true preface, written after the rest of the work to sum up and bind together in one mighty paragraph the ideas that are really leading ideas, though scattered up and down the gospel."(4) Now whether a "Foundation stone" or a "copping-stone", this admission that the Logos concept is a summary of all the leading ideas of the gospel is exactly the point we are making. The Logos concept is vital to the whole thought.

This is the thought of the two great writers on this

(1) Sanday, "The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel", p.194.

(2) G:1:4. (3) Sanday, Op.cit., pp.201,202. (4) Ibid., pp.211,212.

subject whose works have not found their way into English.

Says Loisy, (1) "Les observations précédentes et tout ce qu'on a remarqué touchant le caractère

du quatrième Evangile prouvent suffisamment que la theologie de l'incarnation est la clef du livre tout entier, et qu'elle le domine depuis la première ligne jusqu'à la dernière." (1)

And Aall, in his comprehensive history of the whole subject of the Logos, concludes his section on the Johannine concept and use with a paragraph in which the following is outstanding:

"Erst er aber hat das ganze Christbild der Geschichte auf diesen begrifflichen Hintergrund gestellt und somit dem Thema sein neues litterargeschichtliches Perspektiv gegeben." (2)

But what scheme may be devised to show in concrete form this use of the Logos idea of life in the Johannine sense throughout the Johannine gospel? Those who claim that such a use exists and is fundamental have seldom been at the pains to work it out in any but a very general way. Even the attempt of Gloag, suggestive as it is, is quite inadequate. (3) The term 'Logos' itself is not of frequent occurrence in the Fourth Gospel, and in the connections in which it does occur it often connotes only indirect reference to the great Personality who, for John, was the Logos. Thus Jesus says, "He that heareth my word, and believeth him that sent me, hath eternal life". (4) More pointedly Jesus says to his enemies, "And ye have not his word abiding in you; for whom he sent,

(1) Loisy, "La Quatrieme Evangile", p.98.

(2) Aall, "Geschichte der Logosidee", Vol.II, p.148.

(3) See Gloag, "Introduction to the Johannine Writings", p.243.

(4) G:5:24.

him ye believe not."(1) He declares in prayer to God, "Thy word is truth."(2) Yet it is not so much the use of the term *λόγος* in these and other passages that is important as it is the Logos concept of life as related to the personality of Christ. The following is submitted as evidence of the dominance of this thought through the gospel.

The idea of the timelessness of the personal Logos, so marked in the prologue, is carried out throughout the gospel. Jesus prays for himself, "And now, Father, glorify thou me with the glory which I had with thee before the world was."(3) He says to his disciples, "I came out from the Father, and am come into the world: again, I leave the world, and go to the Father."(4) But more significant still is the concept that Jesus is both on the earth and in heaven at the same time, a concept of frequent occurrence.. Thus Jesus is pictured as declaring to the learned Nicodemus, "No one hath ascended up into heaven, but he that descended out of heaven, even the Son of Man who is in heaven"(5), a statement without meaning except in the light of the timeless thought of the Logos. He prays for his disciples, "Father, I desire that they also whom thou hast given me be with me where I am"(6), and he says in the same connection, "Thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world." The very constant use of the half-mystic saying "I am", often without a predicate, serves to emphasize this idea of timelessness.

(1) G:5:38. (2) G:17:17. (3) G:17:5. (4) G:16:28.
(5) G:3:13. (6) G:17:24.

Close akin to this thought of timelessness, represented in the prologue by the term $\tilde{\eta}\nu$, is the idea of oneness of the God nature, represented there by the fellowship phrase $\pi\rho\acute{o}s\ \tau\acute{o}\nu\ \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\nu$. This phrase also finds amplification in the gospel. Thus Jesus assures the wondering Philip that his very life among the disciples has been a manifestation of God: "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." (1) He tells the Jews, "If ye knew me, ye would know my Father also." (2) He boldly declares, "I and the Father are one" (3). He gives his reason for breaking the Sabbath law, "My Father worketh until now, and I work." (4) He comforts the sorrowing heart of Magdalene, "I ascend unto my Father and your Father, unto my God and your God" (5), thus dwelling upon one of the favorite Logos thoughts of the Fourth Gospel that the oneness of himself and his Father must be reproduced in his followers, a thought which he expands at length in the allegory of the vine and the branches. (6) He makes belief in him as God's Son the test of escape from judgment (7), and of the obtaining of eternal life (8), declaring that the Father has given all things into the hands of the Son. (9) Nothing could be more evident that these sayings in their setting are not intended for dogmatic statements but for gracious portrayals of the realization of life in the world through the indwelling of a life supremely and completely God-like. The very thought of grace as over against law, which forms the conclusion of the prologue, reappears in the thought of the cross as the crown of the

(1) G:14:9. (2) G:8:19. (3) G:10:30. (4) G:5:17. (5) G:20:17.
 (6) G:15:1-8. (7) G:3:18 (8) G:3:36. (9) G:3:35.

whole plan of life instead of the shame it was thought to be.(1)

Another closely related thought is the idea of frequent occurrence that Jesus has been "sent" to earth for a definite purpose. "Whom he sent, him ye believe not", he declares to those who reject testimony.(2) "I am come down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me."(3) And the doing of this will is vitally tied up with any real concept of life on the part of those with whom he comes in contact: "As the living Father sent me, and I live because of the Father; so he that eateth me, he also shall live because of me."(4) Here all ends of the thought are tied together; for the unity of the nature of God is made the basis for the oneness of life which is revealed to men, and the experience of that life is made as vital and as real as the partaking of food. The same vital purpose of life is applied by Jesus to his teaching: "My teaching is not mine, but his that sent me,"(5) and to his work of ministry, "We must work the works of him that sent me while it is day"(6), with which should be compared the meditative remark of some of his observers, "If this man were not from God, he could do nothing."(7) He feels constraint of a definite mission that is related to life, for he says, "I spake not from myself; but the Father that sent me, he hath given me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak."(8) And in urging the reception of his message by his disciples he pleads: "The word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's who sent me."(9) But most signifi-

(1) G:12:32. (2) G:5:38. (3) G:6:38. (4) G:6:57. (5) G:7:16.
(6) G:9:4 (7) G:9:33. (8) G:12:49. (9) G:14:24.

cant of all perhaps is his saying, in which he defines eternal life: "This is life eternal, that they should know thee the only true God, and him whom thou didst send, Jesus Christ." (1) Perhaps in all the above references to himself as "sent" Jesus is being represented as putting himself forth as a kind of new tabernacle, descended, like the pattern of the tabernacle of Moses, from the presence of God. This in itself was a Logos concept of life, though not, of course, personal as in the present instance. But, at all events, whether this ancient illustration is in the background or not, the presentation of God's plan for life as the only plan that men can follow, and the making of it possible for men to follow that plan, is given as the purpose for the sending of the Logos into the world. This purpose is dwelt upon throughout the gospel as an ordered way of life, a Logos idea. Jesus is always represented as biding his time. "Mine hour is not yet come" (2) is a favorite saying. He is everywhere conscious that he has been born for a definite purpose. "Therefore doth the Father love me because I lay down my life, that I may take it again. No one taketh it away from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." (3) "The cup which the Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?" (4) "To this end have I been born, and to this end am I come into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth." (5) Not only his work in general, but every utterance bears out this plan: "The words

(1) G:17:3 (2) G:2:4; Cf. 7:3-8. (3) G:10:17, 18. (4) G:18:11.

(5) G:18:37. (

that I have spoken unto you are spirit, and are life."(1). And Jesus is represented as realizing this same plan in every act of the common round of his ministry. Most significant are the words which the writer uses to represent the thought of Jesus in performing the simple service of washing the feet of his disciples in the absence of a slave: "Jesus, knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he came forth from God, and goeth unto God, riseth from supper, and layeth aside his garments; and he took a towel, and girded himself."(2) This is the Logos concept of life in rare and beautiful form.

But it is in the representation of the Logos as life and light(3) that the prologue finds its greatest and most frequent use in the gospel as a whole. The new birth that is necessary for men is a life from above(4). The Son of God is to be uplift on the cross that men may have life (5). Wherever the words of God's Son are heeded, there life will spring up like a fountain of water. (6) His very likeness to his father is said to consist chiefly in the giving of life. (7) He is the bread of life, its true nourishment. (8) He is the resurrection and the life. (9) His way is revealed both as the truth and as the life(10), a saying whose significance disappears in most of our English versions; for where they render, "I am the way, and the truth, and the life", the Greek *καί, καί*, seems rather to point to the common meaning 'both, and', and

(1) G:6:63. (2) G:13:3,4. (3) G:1:4. (4) G:3:3,6,7. (5) G:3:15,16;
12:32

(6) G:4:14; 7:38. (7) G:5:21,26. (8) G:6:35.

(9) G:11:25,26. (10) G:14:9.

to signify that he is the way for men, and that as that way he is both truth and life. He declares himself to be the Light of the world.(1) As such he calls upon men in his final public appeal to "walk in the light"(2), even as he had declared early in his ministry that the very essence of judgment is to hate the light.(3)

To all of this concept of life John bids men give heed as to witnesses testifying to the truth. He represents Jesus as dealing prominently with the subject of his witnesses. This is a thorough reusing of a leading thought of the prologue, for there the witness of John the Baptist is constantly alternated with the character and the life of the Logos as a sort of secondary theme. So also Jesus speaks of himself not as speaking in a hit-and-miss fashion, but as bearing witness only to what he has seen.(4) It is for this reason also that his works are said to be the witness of the Father to him.(5) The "Spirit of truth" is also listed as a witness.(6) But chiefly here is the emphasis laid on the testimony of the "word" in the law and the prophets. Jesus says that the Jews were constantly seeking the truth in these, "and these are they which testify of me."(7) To the Jews the "word was locked up in ancient documents and legal traditions"(8). Jesus brought to light the fact that the true word was contained in the richness of his own personality. Such is the gospel's presentation of the case.

Reference has been made to the use by Jesus of the

(1) G:8:12;9:5. (2) G:12:35,36. (3) G:3:20. (4) G:3:32.
 (5) G:5:36. (6) G:15:26. (7) G:5:39.
 (8) Drummond, "Via, Veritas, Vita," p.315.

suggestive "I am". Of course such a statement, occurring in ordinary surroundings, would give rise to no thought of special meaning. But in the peculiar usage which it receives in the Fourth Gospel it quite evidently denotes characteristics that are purely qualitative and therefore timeless, even if it does not have direct reference to the divine name of Exodus which was revealed to Moses. Sometimes the words occur with a predicate, always with one that is significant:

- "I am the bread of life." (1)
- "I am the light of the world." (2)
- "I am the door of the sheep." (3)
- "I am the good shepherd." (4)
- "I am the resurrection and the life." (5)
- "I am the true vine." (6)
- "I am the way." (7)

One could scarcely conceive of a list of predicates that set forth more decisive personality. The whole intimacy and purpose of life is in them. But there are other passages where the expression occurs without a predicate, and where it is all the more worthy of attention. To the woman at Jacob's well Jesus declared in answer to her longing for Messiah, "I am, the one speaking to you." - *ἐγώ εἰμι, ὁ λαλῶν σοι* (8).

In the discourse on the light of the world, he declares, "If ye will not believe that I am - *ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι*, ye shall die in your sins." (9) To take this as a requirement to believe in his existence is to render it void of sense. And immediately after, as if to clarify, he adds, "When ye shall lift up the son of Man, then ye shall know that I am" - again, *ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι*. (10). And as if to make assurance doubly sure, the discourse closes

(1) G:6:35. (2) G:8:12. (3) G:10:7. (4) G:10:11. (5) G:11:25.
(6) G:15:1. (7) G:14:6. (8) G:4:26. (9) G:8:24. (10) G:8:28.

after a brilliant debate with the classic expression, *πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι, ἐγὼ εἰμι* "before Abraham was, I am." (1)

Jesus is represented as telling his disciples that he has forewarned them in order that, when things have come to pass as he said they would, "ye may believe that I am" - *ἵνα πιστεύετε ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι* - (2). And possibly most significant of all, John represents the remarkable effect of the scene at the arrest of Jesus, the soldiers going back and falling to the ground on their faces as due to the effect made on the Jews who had led them out by Jesus' dramatic revealing of himself from his hiding place with the words, *ἐγὼ εἰμι*. (3)

Such an array of usage cannot but impress one with the fact that John intends to present the life of Jesus as linked with all that is divine in life; as belonging not to a few years spent in a human form, but as belonging to the ages.

Wescott sums it up by saying, "The phrase marks a timeless existence. In this connection 'I was' would have expressed simple priority. Thus there is in the phrase the contrast between the created and the uncreated, and the temporal and eternal." (4)

The use of the Logos concept of life in the Johannine epistles will appear more readily as the main themes treated there are developed. Suffice it to say here that in the First Epistle the whole subject is related much more closely even than in the gospel to controversy. The epistle speaks quite pointedly of the Logos of life (5), and of the purpose of its

(1) G:8:58. (2) G:13:19. (3) G:18:5.
(4) Wescott, "Gospel of St. John", p.140. (5) I:1:1.

writing being to strengthen the faith of those in whom the Logos of God already abides.(1) The issue of life is in the triumphant conflict with evil, according to the epistle. It is a conflict with evil in belief and in morals and in love. Such a conflict as an issue of the Logos way of living, had indeed been presupposed by the gospel: "Now shall the prince of this world be cast out"(2); "He that believeth on him shall not be judged"(3); "For judgment came I into the world, that they that see not may see."(4) In the epistle this happy issue to the conflict of life is the cardinal thought. Such an issue is made possible by abiding in the Word which has been preached to them.

Thus is the Logos doctrine of life basic in the Johannine philosophy. It breathes into one of the most common thoughts of all philosophy its passion for personality. It takes of the contribution of Greek logician and Jewish religionist, oriental mystic and Egyptian eclectic, but instead of having its own thought moulded by these, it freely uses these thoughts as the tool of its unique ideas. It represents all of life as inherent in one great life, which is the very life of God seen in human form. It represents that life as completing all the Logos ever stood for, - therefore as being the Logos incarnate. It uses this as a concept of life in all of its phases, not because the personality of the Logos in Jesus can pass over into an abstract idea, but because it can become reincarnate in lives that are one with itself. To live such a Logos life is to experience all that may be

(1) I:2:13;14. (2) G:12:31. (3) G:3:18. (4) G:9:39.

called living. It is evident that the Johannine philosophy of Life expresses itself through various figures of speech, each one of which is the symbol of a concept. These figures are not to be carefully distinguished from each other as though they were scientific terms, but they overlap with the ease which always belongs to poetic figures each expressive of the whole of life from its own point of view. Thus light and way and love and righteousness do not represent four different parts of a whole entity called Life, but each represents all of life looked at from a certain standpoint. Thus the Logos concept is always in control. Each expression of life is but another view of harmony with the personality of the Logos in Jesus. One of the most common of these figures that is used is light. Its common occurrence is not a mere evidence of repetition, for its use is cardinal to the thought both of gospel and epistles. Thus Jesus declares that his whole life purpose is that men "may be children of the light" (1), and the First Epistle states as its thesis, "This is the message which we have heard from him and announce unto you, that God is light." (2). It is possible to take light as a figure for either of two thoughts: revelation or purity. Commentators and theologians have expended much erudition in comparing the various usages of the term in the New Testament and elsewhere in an effort to decide which of the two is intended. The Johannine writings seem to use the term in both senses; indeed it is rather hard to think the one without the other.

(1) G:12:36 (2) I:1:5.

Light annihilates darkness and makes the path clear, the essence of revelation. But in making the path clear it enables the eye instantly to select between the objects to be embraced and those to be avoided, the essence of purity. Thus, whether looked at from the one or the other point of view, light always suggests an ethical content. That suggestion is not, however, merely one of holiness in a negative sense; it is one of positive goodness and revealed truth. That both of these senses of the term are blended in the Johannine writings it becomes our object to show.

But in examining the treatment of light it becomes at once apparent that the purpose of Light in revealing God and displaying his ethical character in a positive way is closely interwoven with the thought of leading men to follow in a definite way, the way of light, which is a way of purity just because it is a way that is revealed. "God is light" is vital to the thought of these writings; but no more vital than the injunction, "Walk in the light." Here, then, we have a two-fold purpose exhibiting the two-fold usage of the term. There is the purpose of showing the nature of God. It is a nature of light, both in the sense of being self-revelatory and in the sense of being pure. Here there is also the purpose of illuminating a path of life for men. That path is a path of light, both in the sense that it is revealed instead of being discovered, and in the sense that it is the path of pure living. The one purpose rests back upon the other. To show men the path of light God must show himself to be light.

This is profoundly essential. Philo taught that God is invisible. He has no contact with earth save through acts of power. Even Philo's Logos does not unveil God. John taught that God is made visible to men as perfect goodness, a loving Father, in Christ: "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." (1) It is this seeing that enables men to "walk in the light."

For John the revelatory sense of light finds its entire meaning, as everything else does for him, in the person of Christ. He cannot think in impersonal abstractions. The experience of such a one as Jesus has made God real to him, has revealed God to him, not as another being (he had seen that before), but as exactly what Jesus was. God - all there is or ever can be of him - actually was to be seen in Jesus. God's Logos became flesh.

The writer emphasizes this by dwelling on the thought that only Christ could reveal God, because only he was acquainted with his real nature and character. "The Father knoweth me, and I know the Father." (2) "No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." (3) The revelation which Jesus thus gives of God is exact; it does not leave anything wanting: "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father" (4) is his answer to the fretful query of Philip, "Show us the Father."

The writer takes great pains to make clear why it is that Jesus can give such a perfect revelation of God. It is because of his first-hand acquaintance. Not only is he the only one who knows God, but his is a direct and original

(1) G:14:9. (2) G:10:15. (3) G:1:18. (4) G:14:9.

knowledge. "We speak that which we know, and bear witness to that which we have seen"(1). "As the Father taught me, I speak these things".(2) And again Jesus refers his very words to a direct revelation of sight: "I speak the things which I have seen with my Father"(3). And his complaint of his enemies is that they seek to kill him, "a man that told you the truth which I heard from God"(4). Thus revealing God and revealing God's truth become one and the same thing. They are united in the life of Christ, according to John, because of this first hand relationship. Thus Beyschlag, discussing the meaning of the passage, "The only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he has revealed him"(5), says, "Since the object is to show how Christ could reveal to us the invisible God, the meaning must be: "He who (always essentially) resting on the heart of the heavenly Father, is the confidant of God the Father, just as the favorite disciple resting on the Master's bosom is the confidant of Jesus."(6)

In this confidential, first-hand relationship, God is said to have given all things into the hand of Jesus and thus made complete revelation of himself possible: "The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand."(7) "The Father loveth the Son, and showeth him all the things that himself doeth."(8) Of especially moment here is his word of power to the disciples at the time they are feeling their own powerlessness the most: "All things whatsoever the Father hath are mine."(9)

(1) G:3:11. (2) G:8:28. (3) G:8:38 (4) G:8:40 (5) G:1:18.
 (6) Beyschlag, "New Testament Theology", Vol.II, p.420.
 (7) G:3:35. (8) G:5:20. (9) G:16:15.

The purpose of such an unveiling of God before men is expressed most frequently in the Johannine writings as a making known of the truth. "The law was given through Moses; grace and truth came through Jesus Christ"(1). Jesus answers Pilate's close questioning at the judgment seat as to his life purpose, "To this end have I been born, and to this end am I come into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth."(2) But John is careful to make it plain that this is not to say that men knew nothing of the truth of God before the birth of Jesus. The Logos which was in Jesus, completely revealing to men the truth of God in such a way that they could see it, was always in the world, not indeed in a personal form, but in the sense of a general revelation to the conscience of men. Thus the description of the essential of the Logos in the prologue, before the idea of the incarnate life of Christ is introduced, rises to the thought; "There was the true light, even the light which lighteth every man, coming into the world."(3) The translators, by means of the punctuation just noted, have attempted to evade the thought here by suggesting that the phrase 'coming into the world' goes back to 'the light' rather than to the immediate context, 'every man'. Professor Nestle has done the same in his Greek text, but Wescott and Hort have let the words stand without punctuation, thus permitting the natural sense of the Greek, *Ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν, ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον.*

(1) G:1:17. (2) G:18:37. (3) G:1:9.

Either is, of course, grammatically possible; but it would be very unlike the colloquial Greek of John to carry a participial back of a word to which it stands in immediate connection and join it with a word in another phrase. No such harsh treatment of the text is needed. What John evidently intends is to teach the illumination of every man who ever was born with the Logos light of God. Indeed he elsewhere indicates that men must see and know something of God before they ever come to the full revelation in Christ: "No man can come to me, except the Father that sent me draw him. --- It is written in the prophets, "And they shall all be taught of God."(1) And John also indicates that one must know God by this common revelation of the Logos in such a way as to live up to his knowledge before he will ever seek the full revelation: "He that doeth the truth cometh to the light, that his works may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God."(2)

On the other hand, John is also careful to distinguish between this partial and general illumination of every man and the full and complete illumination which men receive from Christ. There would have been no need for an incarnation of the Logos if the light that every man received were enough for the greatest glory of life, so that the writer can declare, "The whole world lieth in the evil one"(3). His point is that one attains to perfect knowledge of God only in the fellowship that he has with the personal Logos, Jesus. God completely reveals himself in Jesus because thus can men best understand him; he is plainest in this way, and it is the purpose of light to be plain and to make plain. As Beyschlag sums it up,

(1) G:8:44, 45. (2) G:3:21. (3) I:5:19

"Whatever the pre-christian man may have heard or received of light through the Logos, he does not thereby attain to 'seeing God', that is, to the pure and perfect knowledge of God as eternal love; and yet this knowledge of the Father is the immediate precondition of having eternal life. The result of this is that 'no man comes to the Father but by the Son', who alone has seen the Father, and in whom alone one can see the Father as Father. Even Moses and the prophets 'have not seen the Father'; in their lofty hours of revelation they did not see God as the only-begotten Son sees him always." (1) The Logos of God has life in himself, but he must be personal, incarnate in man, to make that life available to man. Or, more accurately, according to the representation of the prologue, Jesus was such an one, and the only one, in whom the very essence and source of the Logos life could be said to abide. To come into vital relation with him, then, is to live by having the Logos life of God made entirely real. ὁ λόγος τῆς ζωῆς is equivalent to 'the Word that gives life', or 'the Word that has life in himself.'

But there is a deeper reason why the man who has only the general Logos revelation of God and not the life relation with the incarnate Christ cannot attain to true sight of God. That reason is moral. The power of sin, the veil of guilt, hangs between the eternal light of the Logos and all of mankind. It is only self-deception, as John frequently pictures it, especially in the First Epistle (2), that can keep a man from

(1) Beyschlag, Op.cit., Vol.II, p.441.

(2) See, for Example, I:1:8.

realizing this difference. Hence the purpose of the revelation of God comes to be, not that this revelation shall be an end in itself, but that it shall become a means for the transformation of men. The intimacy of relationship between God and men, which the writer counts the essence of life, is impossible without such a transformation. He calls it receiving the incarnate Logos(1), a new birth (2), being begotten of God(3) a loving of God's only begotten.(4) Such a transformation is made possible by the revelation of God in a Person, so that men can say as they have not been able to say otherwise, "Of his fulness have we all received, and grace upon grace."(5)

Walking in the light becomes, then, the test of having experienced this transformation of life from sin to goodness; for if Life and Light are synonymous terms, then the holiness, which is a symbolism of light, must become the characteristic of life. This thought is dwelt upon in the First Epistle, turned round and round, and viewed from all angles. A searching test of the reality of life it becomes. Are men's lives light or are they dark?, is the problem before the church according to the writer. In relation to the controversies of his own day, how are the claims of the various leaders to be resolved? How are their boasts of being enlightened and of being able to enlighten others to be met? By just one test: is their light productive of a genuine love and righteousness? If not, then their light is only pretense: "He that saith he is in the light and hateth his brother, is in

(1) G:1:12. (3) I:3:9 (5) G:1:16 (reading the margin.)
 (2) G:3:3-5 (4) I:5:1.

the darkness even until now." (1) The whole test of being true or being self-deceived of being free from condemnation or being accused even by one's own hear, is made to be this reality of the life of righteousness and love. (2) Self-deception, according to John, is complete darkness. And everyone naturally deceives himself unless illumined by this very personal light. Hence it is that Jesus can turn the tables on the thought of God's drawing men to him, and declare with equal validity, "No one cometh unto the Father, but by me" (3) and he gives thanks to God in prayer for the illumination of those who have known him in a sense that the rest of men are not illumined, at the same time resting his faith in this difference of illumination upon the revelation in himself of the ethical quality of the righteousness of God: "O righteous Father, the world knew thee not, but I knew thee; and these knew that thou didst send me; and I have made known unto them thy name, and will make it known." (4)

The finest development in the Johannine writings of this idea of Jesus as God's light in the combined sense of revealing God and showing men a path of life is to be found against the background of one of the ancient Jewish feasts. Here (5) Jesus is pictured as having waited for the psychological moment to make a great revelation. It is the "feast of the tabernacles" (6) which lasted for seven days (7). During this great week the Jews abandoned their homes and dwelt in tents, to commemorate the time when their fathers

(1) I:2:9. (2) I:3:10-24. (3) G:14:6. (4) G:7:37-52; 8:12
 (5) G:7:37; 8:12.
 (6) G:7:2. (7) Lev.23:34; Neh.8:18.

had dwelt in tents in the wilderness. The feast was rich in symbol. As many as possible dwelt in and around Jerusalem, and used the temple area for much of the daily symbolism. Thus every night, according to the Talmud, the Court of the Women was brilliantly illuminated to remind the devotees that the path in the wilderness was illuminated by the presence of God. The "pillar of fire", which may have been a basket of fire hung from the end of a pole, had been to their Fathers the symbol of God's light leading them on and on. They did not know where they were going with any exactness. They simply followed the light. The feast was not a sorrowful time but a gladsome time, filled with festivity and dancing, for the worshippers were filled with delight in celebrating the fact of God's guidance. Their fathers never could have found their way through the desert without this light from the presence of God. Especially was the last day of the feast one of great joy and illumination, commemorating the arrival at the promised land. It was in the midst of this gala occasion, fraught with the deepest of emotion, that Jesus stood forth in the temple area before them all "on the last day, the great day of the feast"(1), revealing God in his teaching, and culminating with the words daringly suited to the occasion, "I am the light of the world"(2). Here is the direct representation that in the personality of Jesus all

(1) G:7:37. (2) G:8:12.

the revealing of God's light is contained. He is the very light itself. And here is also the representation that in that light of Jesus there is the marking out of a path of life, for he goes on to say: "He that followeth me shall not walk in the darkness, but shall have the light of life." (1) This can only mean in such a setting that to follow Christ is actually to be able to see the path of life and walk in it, as the Israelites, following the "pillar of fire" which was God's light, saw (though less fully) the path by which they should go. As Dodds sums up the representation of this passage, "Those who believe in Christ have not a chart but a guide; not a map in which they can pick out their own route, but a light going on before, which they must implicitly follow." (2) This is the Johannine philosophy of light as both the revelation of the life of God and of a path of life for men who would be pure.

But such a revelation is a judgment. Almost all of the frequent references to judgment in the Johannine writings are in connection with the giving of light. Judgment for John was not an arbitrary imposition of character from without, but a revelation of character within by the power of light. Judgment consisted in the attitude of men toward light: "This is the judgment, that the light is come into the world, and men loved the darkness rather than the light; for their works were evil." (3) The primary effect of light in the mind of John seems to have been to secure its own rejection:

(1) G:8:12. (2) Dodds, In "Greek Expositor", Vol. I, p. 773

(3) G:3:19.

"And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness apprehended it not"(1), where the most probable meaning of the word κατέλαβεν is "to lay hold of" in the sense of the English 'apprehend'. Yet the light of God is absolute: "In him is no darkness at all"(2); and so to claim fellowship with God at the same time that one walks in darkness is adjudged a lie: "If we say that we have fellowship with him and walk in the darkness, we lie, and do not the truth."(3) Deceivers and false teachers are judged by this standard.(4)

There are in the gospel at least two rather fully developed incidents which illustrate this conception of judgment as an attitude toward light. One is connected with the visit of the Greeks at the time of Jesus' last public appearance. (5) "We would see Jesus"(6) is their simple request, but it draws from his lips a lengthy comment on what it means to see him; how he must be lifted up from the earth so that all men can see him; how the principle of life through death must be made apparent to all. The words grow in ecstasy until they reveal Jesus' conception of the greatest glory of life in self-sacrifice. Then occurs the saying, "Now is the judgment of this world"(7). After a discussion with the people as to the meaning of the philosophy of death that has been presented, Jesus carries on the treatment of judgment, relating it to the idea of light:

(1) G:1:5. (2) I:1:5. (3) I:1:6. (4) I:4:2,3; II:7.
 (5) G:12:20-50. (6) G:12:31. (7) G:12:31.

"Yet a little while is the light among you. Walk while ye have the light, that darkness overtake you not: and he that walketh in darkness knoweth not whither he goeth. While ye have the light, believe on the light, that ye may become sons of light." (1)

John then records the fact that Jesus withdrew himself from the people and hid himself, and to show how unimpressed with the light they were, he quotes the words of the prophet,

"He hath blinded their eyes,
and he hardened their heart;
Lest they should see with their eyes,
and perceive with their heart,
And should turn,
And I should heal them." (2)

Jesus appears on the scene for a moment more to reiterate his last appeal:

"I am come a light into the world,
that whosoever believeth on me may
not abide in the darkness. --- He
that rejecteth me, and receiveth not
my sayings, hath one that judgeth him:
the word that I spake, the same shall
judge him in the last day." (3)

This judgment implies both the possibility of good and the possibility of evil; it is not predetermined. To those who believe on the light it saves from darkness; to those who reject the light, it is condemnation. The attitude taken toward light is the basis of the judgment.

The other developed illustration of this relation of judgment and light is to be found in the story of the healing of the man born blind, with the parley that follows over the incident itself and the denunciation of the pharisaical attitude which results. (4) Because the story of

(1) G:12:35, 36. (2) G:12:40, quoting Isa.6:10.
(3) G:12:46, 48. (4) G:9:1-10:21.

gracious ministry is in connection with one who is physically blind it offers many chances for symbolism and for suggestions concerning the meaning of spiritual blindness. These opportunities are used to the utmost. The story is naively told so that it becomes an account of the gradual revelation of Jesus to the man. The disciples are represented as being interested only in the speculative question of the source of the man's blindness and the blame that might be attached to him or his parents. Jesus insists that the situation is rather to be viewed as necessitating the bringing of light. "We must work the works of him that sent me, while it is day: the night cometh, when no man can work. When I am in the world I am the light of the world."(1) The healing is then related, followed by a questioning as to whether or not the man who presents himself as healed is actually the man who had been born blind. They drag the man about, before the gaping crowd, before the Pharisees, before his home to get his parents assurance it is he, and before the Pharisees again. Everyone seems to be afraid to believe what he sees or to say what he thinks. The man himself is an interesting study. He sticks doggedly to the story of what he knows. He refuses to amplify his statements with guesses. When asked to pronounce upon Jesus the arbitrary judgment that he is a sinner, because he had done the work on the Sabbath day(2) the man replies, "Whether he is a sinner, I know not: One thing I know, that whereas I was blind, now I see".(3) And

(1) G:9:4,5. (2) G:9:14. (3) G:9:25.

yet this very ability to keep to the truth is represented as being the ground for the man's steady increase in understanding of who Jesus is. When he is first asked, he replies that the one who healed him is "The man that is called Jesus"(1), but he does not even know where he is (2). When the division arises as to which is the greater, the sin of working on the Sabbath or the good of helping a man, the man is asked for his opinion of one who would do such work in such a way, and he replies, "He is a prophet."(3) When they reviled the man for not being willing to give the glory to God and curse the upstart stranger, he twitts them with the peculiar situation that they claim to be religious leaders and yet know not the source of this man's power. (4) Indeed he quotes good synagogue doctrine to them on the subject, "We know that God heareth not sinners: but if any man be a worshipper of God, and do his will, him he heareth. ---If this man were not from God, he could do nothing."(5) When the man is put out of the synagogue for his growing boldness, Jesus finds him and tells him he is the son of God. "And he said, Lord, I believe. And he worshipped him."(6)

This tremendous development of belief from "The man that is called Jesus" to the worship of this same Jesus as the Son of God would readily be termed a rationalization of an experience. John presents it as a response to light. He represents Jesus as following the man's worship immediately with the words, "For judgment came I into this world, that

(1) G:9:11. (2) G:9:12. (3) G:9:17. (4) G:9:30. (5) G:9:31,33.

(6) G:9:38.

they that see not may see; and that they that see may become blind." (1) The Pharisees who were with him saw that he was talking about spiritual blindness, and asked him if he meant to account them as blind. His enigmatical reply is, "If ye were blind, ye would have no sin: but now ye say, We see: your sin remaineth." (2) Then follows the much admired sayings about the Good Shepherd, set in a stinging retort that is usually missed; for the representation is that the men who should have taken an interest in the blind man and did not are "hirelings, whose own the sheep are not" (3), while Jesus who has brought light to him is the Good Shepherd. The judgment is not only seen in the contrasted attitudes toward light, but also in the willingness to be the bearers of light.

Light is thus vitally connected with character. At the trial of Jesus, the high priest is pictured inquiring diligently into the character and methods of Jesus. The only reply John deems it necessary to report Jesus as making is, "I have spoken openly to the world; I ever taught in synagogues, and in the temple, where all the Jews came together; and in secret spake I nothing." (4) It is this open honesty of character that makes fellowship possible: "If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship on with another." (5) This is the only basis for agreement among men. Light is utter truth. (6)

This presentation of light as revealed completely in the person of Jesus - God's light, self-revealing of a holy God, pathfinding for men, - is represented by John

(1) G:9:39 (2) G:9:41. (3) G:10:12. (4) G:18:19. (5) I:1:7.

(6) Cf. II:2,4; III:3,4.

whole?", for the *Θέλεις* here quite evidently is emphatic and is stronger than "Do you desire to be?"(1) The commanding personality revealed in Jesus' own strength of will leads the sick man to obey his orders in spite of his doubts. (2) When his enemies question the validity of his work, Jesus at once points to the harmony of that work with what they have been accustomed to think of as God's way of doing.(3) It is then that he strikes into his incisive presentation of his witness. He passes by the testimony of John the Baptist to whom they had all gone out (4), and declares that the kind of work which he himself is doing shall be its own testimony to what he is: "The very works that I do bear witness of me."(5) He cites the scriptures of the law and the prophets in which they all believed as evidence that just the kind of work he is doing ought to be done by the giver of life: "Ye search the scriptures, because ye think that in them ye have eternal life; and these are they which bear witness of me."(6) He twitts them with the accusation that if a man came simply boasting of what he could do without any evidence that he was doing it, they would put more credence in that man than they have put in him.(7) And so he places the final reason for their absurd rejection on the stubbornness of their own wills: "Ye will not come to me, that ye may have life."(8) Jesus recognizes that with all the Logos of God, the Light of God made vivid in complete personality, men may still refuse to live.

But over against this stubborn, hard will that refuses

(1) G:5:6. (2) G:5:9. (3) G:5:17,19-22,26,27. (4) G:5:33-36.
(5) G:5:36. (6) G:5:39. (7) G:5:43. (8) G:5:40.

the evidence before it, the true will is not just another of the same kind. It is not equal dogmatism in accepting life. Such iron determination toward life had been tried to the fullest by the Stoics. Many of them had nobly striven to be indifferent toward all untoward circumstances, toward all doubts and misgivings. From Epictetus, the slave, to Aurelius, the emperor, they had demonstrated what fortitude of will could do to mould life. They had bent to the shape of their thoughts about life all its vicissitudes. They could sing with Henley of today,

"I am the master of my fate,
I am the captain of my soul."(1)

They could complacently say with Kant his famous dictum: "Act as if the maxim of thy nature were to become by thy will a universal law of nature." They could view trouble as well as comfort without excitement, for did not that which seemed evil to one work good to the whole? They could view moral evil as consisting in the fact alone, not in the degree or consequences of the act; for they had so set their wills to observe 'universal law' that they realized clearly 'to steal a pin violates universal law as well as to steal a million'. They would have joined the Epistle of James in its recognition of the nature of this law, "Whoso shall keep the whole law and yet stumble in one point, he is become guilty of all."(2) Whether or not they were happy or comfortable, they could will to do their duty.

There is something grand in this attitude, yet its

(1) Henley:

(2) James 2:10.

grandeur is cold. And that very coldness is dangerous to the conception of the will as we find it in our sources. More has well characterized the final barrenness of this kind of will:

"The categorical imperative, which severs the moral sense from the desire of happiness and declares that we must do our duty with no thought of consequences to ourselves, is the emptiest of metaphysics, meaningless at the best, fraught with a cargo of hypocrisies at the worst."(1)

The Christian thought of the will as receptive of God's light, which is dwelt on by John is rather the thought of the will which feels itself in perfect harmony with the will of God. Some of the Stoics, indeed, came to put just such a feeling into will. One of the outstanding thoughts of Seneca was: "I do not obey God; I consent with him." It is this consent which characterizes the will that forms so prominent a part in the Johannine philosophy of life. Not that it is easy, or arrived at without a struggle, as consent might seem to imply.

The meaning of this will, a free consent arrived at through the struggle to be willing, is clearly illustrated in the gospel by the author's examination of the will of Jesus himself. The struggle part seldom appears in the narrative. It is carried on behind the scenes; indeed much of it is accomplished when the narrative opens. Hence the common presentation of the will of Christ is one in perfect harmony with the will of God and so making for fulness of life. Thus he can declare that the will of God is the very food that he subsists on, for when the disciples counsel their weary Master to eat, he replies,

(1) More, "The Christ of the N.T.", p.119.

"My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to accomplish his work."(1) This will of God has been not grudgingly admitted by Jesus; he seeks for it always: "I seek not mine own will, but the will of him that sent me."(2) So great is this harmony that Jesus can even substitute will for petition in his prayer to his Father: "Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me be with me where I am."(3)

Yet this oneness of will is nowhere represented as something mechanical, a fact implied from the nature of Christ and therefore inimitable by men. It is indeed perfection, but it is a perfection arrived at through the surrender of self, and is intended as a philosophy of the way in which all human wills may come into harmony with the divine. Especially in relation to Jesus' impending death is this representation emphatic. When Jesus hears of the death of his friend Lazarus, he invites his disciples to accompany him from their Perea retreat to the village of Bethany, Lazarus' home. The disciples realize that this means to go back into the hotbed of opposition, and Thomas says resignedly, "Let us also go, that we may die with him."(4) The boldness of Jesus stands out here. Yet when that return has led to just the result which the disciples anticipated, Jesus is represented as battling with himself in the fact of the awfulness of the death that hangs over him: "Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour? But for this cause came I unto this hour. Father,

(1) G:4:34. (2) G:5:30. (3) G:17:24. (4) G:11:16.

glorify thy name."(1) Here the doubt, the struggle, the victory, the beautiful harmony, are all encompassed in a brief statement which seems a sort of counterpart to the Synoptic picture of Gethsemane. The victory that is achieved, and the glory of settled purpose, find their ultimate expression in those fine words which John has recorded of the scene on the cross: "He said, It is finished: and he bowed his head, and gave up his spirit."(2) This, as Dodds says, "was not the gasp of a worn-out life, but the deliberate utterance of a clear consciousness that his work was finished, ---that all had now been done that could be done to make God known to men, and to identify him with men."(3) This same relation of his will to die to purpose for men is recognized by Principal Garvie when he says of Christ that "he anticipates death voluntarily endured as the necessary condition of his universal spiritual effectiveness among men."(4)

But the direct bearing of this harmony of will as seen in Christ on the lives of men comes out most clearly in the Johannine treatment of prayer. Now, curiously enough, the common words for 'to pray', *δεῖσθαι* and *προσεύχεσθαι* used almost everywhere else in the New Testament, together with their cognate nouns for 'prayer', *δέησις* and *προσευχή* never occur in any of the Johannine writings. John does not consider prayer as colorless meditation, as we might expect him to. But the verbs he uses are *αἰτεῖν* and *ἐρωτᾶν*, both of them laying stress on asking, petitioning.(5) And stranger still, the verb

(1) G:12:27,28. (2) G:19:30. (3) In Greek Expositor, Vol.I, p.839.

(4) Garvie, "The Beloved Disciple", pp.195,196.

(5) See Trench, "N.T.Synonyms", Sect.40.

that is used of the prayers of the disciples is always *αἰτεῖν*. With the rest of the New Testament, John never uses *ἐρωτᾷν* of the praying of men. Yet he makes frequent use of the latter word in describing the prayers of Jesus (1), and in a single usage in the First Epistle actually forbids prayer in this sense of *ἐρωτᾷν* to men for those who have "sinned a sin unto death." (2) There is evidently intent in the constant choice between these synonyms. They seem to express, on the part of the disciples, a recognition by John that their petitioning has not attained that high quality of harmony of will with God's which is to be found in the petitioning of Christ. Dr. Abbott expresses the two thus:

"The main distinction appears to be this: *αἰτεῖν* is, in general, to ask for something which one desires to receive, something to be given, rarely for something to be done; it is therefore used when the object sought, rather than the person of whom it is sought, is prominent in the mind of the writer. --- *ἐρωτᾷν*, on the other hand, is to request or beseech a person to do something, rarely to give something; it refers more directly to the person of whom the favor is sought, and is therefore naturally used in exhortation and entreaty." (3)

And Stevens, comparing the usages in gospel and epistle, says,

"*Αἰτεῖν* is the more specific and more urgent word; it suggests the idea of petition for some definite gift; *ἐρωτᾷν* is more general, and is the higher and finer word, suggestion, as it does, the reference of the matter in hand to God's wisdom with the confidence of perfect trust." (4)

(1) G:14:16; 16:26; 17:9,15,20. (2) I:5:16.

(3) Abbott, "Critical Essays", p.127.

(4) Stevens, "The Johannine Theology", p.297.

The two words are nicely contrasted in the words of Jesus to his disciples in the upper room: "In that day ye shall ask ($\alpha\lambda\tau\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$) in my name: and I say not unto you, that I will pray the Father ($\epsilon\rho\omega\tau\tilde{\alpha}\nu$) for you; for the Father himself loveth you." (1)

The very prominence of the name of Christ in the prayer life of the disciples indicates how anxious he is for them to come into this harmony of will with God which he treasures as an abiding possession. The fact that with the giving of the Spirit they are no longer to ask things of him but are to ask direct of God, bears out this expectation that he is looking forward to a time when they will be harmonious enough with God to make these direct askings. (2) Yet prayer on their part, though limited to this request for receiving, is not thereby rendered inglorious; for to John, the whole of life as illumined by God's light, depends upon the willingness for receptivity. So it is that he can dwell upon the certainty of answer to prayer that is prayed in Jesus' name or to God in the power of the Spirit; "If ye shall ask anything in my name, that will I do." (3) "I chose you --- that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my name, he may give it you." (4) The solemn certainty of this is driven home by Jesus: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, If ye shall ask anything of the Father, he will give it you in my name." (5) Yet the asking in the name of Christ or by the right of the spirit is but another way of saying that it is to be in harmony with the will of God: "This

(1) G:16:26;27. (2) G:16:23, a. (3) G:14:14.
 (4) G:15:16. (5) G:16:23, b.

is the boldness which we have toward him, that, if we ask anything according to his will, he heareth us." (1) Such a harmony is possible to men, and John represents Jesus in believing in it so heartily that he can say to his disciples on the eve of his departure from them, "If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you." (2) This is the height where prayer becomes not so much an asking as a way of living, because the life has willed to live the will of God.

But if the Johannine philosophy of life is a philosophy of unity and order, a Logos concept of life, and if it depends upon illumination from God and must freely will to open itself to that illumination, in what avenues is the effect of such a life displayed? The answer in both the gospel and the epistles is the three tests of life which we found outlined in the First Epistle: righteousness, love, and belief. The Will that has received the Light becomes operative as a Will to do right, as a will to love, and as a will to believe, so that William James' famous phrase is close to the representations of these writings. Once more let it be noted, however, that this will, so expressed, is not a cold determination, but an ardent volition into which the whole self enters.

And first of all it is a will to righteousness. The conception of righteousness in the Johannine writings is not legalistic in any sense. There is no idea of the piecemeal piling up of deed upon deed. There is especially no idea

(1) I:5:14. (2) G:15:7.

of the pride of humanity in what it is able to accomplish. The very nature of the will as we have studied it in John makes us expectant of the thought, which is often presented, that all human righteousness inheres in God. "If ye know that he is righteous, ye know that every one also that doeth righteousness is begotten of him." (1) "Whosoever is begotten of God doeth no sin, because his (i.e. God's) seed abideth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is begotten of God. In this the children of God are manifest." (2) Leaving for later consideration the question of what is meant here by the inability to sin, we have presented in these two references the conception that righteousness of a positive sort and the freedom from sin are alike derived from the nature of God. Placing the whole thought of human righteousness on this high plane obligates John to consider both righteousness and sin from the most serious standpoint. There is no "more rigorous and tremendous imperative of righteousness, or rigorous intolerance of sin" (3) than such a presentation. Likeness to God becomes the very ground for a sharp antithesis between righteousness and sin. The distinction is absolute: "All unrighteousness is sin" (4). Guilt becomes a direct opposition to God himself. The whole ethic of life is thus tied up with an appreciation of God. Not only can man become most righteous by realizing that his righteousness is rooted and grounded in God; this realization is the one thing that makes righteousness possible at all.

(1) I:2:29. (2) I:3:9,10. (3) Law, "The Tests of Life", p.69.
 (4) I:5:17.

(5) I:5:18.

It is this realization that makes one still believe in the possibility of righteousness when sin looks to have a strangle hold. It would appear that this is the concept More has in mind when he defines religion as "the union of other-worldliness and morality", and proceeds to show the vital relation between the two thus:

"Morality without otherworldliness loses its large emotional and imaginative values, and, being deprived of its proper support, sinks at last into a desperate struggle with pessimism, or yields to the easy logic of the Epicurean. Genuine religion demands an even balance of the two, or, more strictly speaking, is such a balance." (1)

The attitude which More calls "the easy logic of the Epicurean" is nowhere to be found in the Johannine writings. Righteousness has become an imperative: "He that saith he abideth in him ought himself also to walk even as he walked." (2) One cannot be rooted and grounded in God through the Light that Jesus has brought without living the life of righteousness. Such a statement would appear to be trite, yet it means that the Johannine philosophy of a righteous life not only excludes the evidently selfish and flagrantly immoral, but it also puts aside as wanting in sufficiency that jaunty, easy-going attitude of many of the most pleasing and not-immoral philosophers. Obviously the hedonism of Omar Khayyam is excluded:

"Come fill the Cup, and in the fire of Spring
Your Winter-garment of repentance fling;
The bird of time has but a little way
To flutter, and the Bird is on the Wing."

(1) More, "The Christ of the N.T.", p.22.

(2) I:2:6.

Heaven but the vision of fulfilled Desire,
And Hell the Shadow of a Soul on Fire."(1)

But also Stevenson's,

"The world is so full of a number of things
I'm sure we should all be as happy as kings,"(2)

which was his philosophy for adults as well as for children, falls short. Not that it is wrong; it simply does not reach down to the depths of living. Likewise his moral dictum, "If your morals make you dreary, depend upon it they are wrong" does not state an untruth; indeed it contains a great truth; but for our author, it would come far short of the realization of a morality based upon the righteousness of God. John was too close to the incipient gnosticism of his day with its doctrine that "moral law does not exist for the elect", and its implication that some, even within the pale of Christianity, namely, those who know, are the elect, and are therefore exempt, on the one hand from the contaminating influence of sin, and on the other from the imperative to do right. To miss the seriousness of this moral imperative is, for our author, sin.

Sin is variously described in the Johannine writings. It is lawlessness, *ἀνομία*: "Every one that doeth sin doeth also lawlessness; and sin is lawlessness."(3) That is to say, to act in such a way as to be out of control, out of an ordered path in life, out of a Logos concept of life, is to be sinful. It is that which is freakish, unregulated, run wild. Sin is also pictured as slavery: "Every one that committeth

(1) Fitzgerald's translation. (2) "Child's Garden of Verses".

(3) I:3:4.

sin is the bond servant of sin." (1) Occurring as this does in the discussion of the nature of sonship and of freedom, it carries with it the implication that the habitue of sin loses his freedom of character and of will. Indeed Jesus warns at least one man of this very danger, the man whom he healed at Bethesda's pool: "Sin no more, lest a worse thing befall thee." (2) Sin is also pictured as a false love: "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes and the vainglory of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world. And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof." (3) Law analyzes the Hebrew parallelism of this passage into a three-fold emphasis (4): the lust of the flesh referring to animal passion, the lust of the eyes to intellectual imagination, and the vainglory of life to "pride of possessions and success"; against which three-fold picture of sin is the Father who abides while it is passing away. But more fundamentally than the representation of sin in such figures is John's insistence that it is a cosmic fact. The passage just quoted, "Love not the world" shows that the writer is thinking of the world, *Kócos*, as a sphere of moral evil. Thinking of it as such, sin is universal: "Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world!" (5) "He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but

(1) G:8:34. (2) G:5:14. (3) I:2:15-17. (4) Law, "The Tests of Life" p. 152.
 (5) G:1:29. (6) G:3:16-18. (7) G:3:19-21. (8) G:3:22-24. (9) G:3:25-27. (10) G:3:28-30. (11) G:3:31-34. (12) G:3:35-36. (13) G:3:37-38. (14) G:3:39-40. (15) G:3:41-42. (16) G:3:43-44. (17) G:3:45-46. (18) G:3:47-48. (19) G:3:49-50. (20) G:3:51-52. (21) G:3:53-54. (22) G:3:55-56. (23) G:3:57-58. (24) G:3:59-60. (25) G:3:61-62. (26) G:3:63-64. (27) G:3:65-66. (28) G:3:67-68. (29) G:3:69-70. (30) G:3:71-72. (31) G:3:73-74. (32) G:3:75-76. (33) G:3:77-78. (34) G:3:79-80. (35) G:3:81-82. (36) G:3:83-84. (37) G:3:85-86. (38) G:3:87-88. (39) G:3:89-90. (40) G:3:91-92. (41) G:3:93-94. (42) G:3:95-96. (43) G:3:97-98. (44) G:3:99-100. (45) G:3:101-102. (46) G:3:103-104. (47) G:3:105-106. (48) G:3:107-108. (49) G:3:109-110. (50) G:3:111-112. (51) G:3:113-114. (52) G:3:115-116. (53) G:3:117-118. (54) G:3:119-120. (55) G:3:121-122. (56) G:3:123-124. (57) G:3:125-126. (58) G:3:127-128. (59) G:3:129-130. (60) G:3:131-132. (61) G:3:133-134. (62) G:3:135-136. (63) G:3:137-138. (64) G:3:139-140. (65) G:3:141-142. (66) G:3:143-144. (67) G:3:145-146. (68) G:3:147-148. (69) G:3:149-150. (70) G:3:151-152. (71) G:3:153-154. (72) G:3:155-156. (73) G:3:157-158. (74) G:3:159-160. (75) G:3:161-162. (76) G:3:163-164. (77) G:3:165-166. (78) G:3:167-168. (79) G:3:169-170. (80) G:3:171-172. (81) G:3:173-174. (82) G:3:175-176. (83) G:3:177-178. (84) G:3:179-180. (85) G:3:181-182. (86) G:3:183-184. (87) G:3:185-186. (88) G:3:187-188. (89) G:3:189-190. (90) G:3:191-192. (91) G:3:193-194. (92) G:3:195-196. (93) G:3:197-198. (94) G:3:199-200. (95) G:3:201-202. (96) G:3:203-204. (97) G:3:205-206. (98) G:3:207-208. (99) G:3:209-210. (100) G:3:211-212. (101) G:3:213-214. (102) G:3:215-216. (103) G:3:217-218. (104) G:3:219-220. (105) G:3:221-222. (106) G:3:223-224. (107) G:3:225-226. (108) G:3:227-228. (109) G:3:229-230. (110) G:3:231-232. (111) G:3:233-234. (112) G:3:235-236. (113) G:3:237-238. (114) G:3:239-240. (115) G:3:241-242. (116) G:3:243-244. (117) G:3:245-246. (118) G:3:247-248. (119) G:3:249-250. (120) G:3:251-252. (121) G:3:253-254. (122) G:3:255-256. (123) G:3:257-258. (124) G:3:259-260. (125) G:3:261-262. (126) G:3:263-264. (127) G:3:265-266. (128) G:3:267-268. (129) G:3:269-270. (130) G:3:271-272. (131) G:3:273-274. (132) G:3:275-276. (133) G:3:277-278. (134) G:3:279-280. (135) G:3:281-282. (136) G:3:283-284. (137) G:3:285-286. (138) G:3:287-288. (139) G:3:289-290. (140) G:3:291-292. (141) G:3:293-294. (142) G:3:295-296. (143) G:3:297-298. (144) G:3:299-300. (145) G:3:301-302. (146) G:3:303-304. (147) G:3:305-306. (148) G:3:307-308. (149) G:3:309-310. (150) G:3:311-312. (151) G:3:313-314. (152) G:3:315-316. (153) G:3:317-318. (154) G:3:319-320. (155) G:3:321-322. (156) G:3:323-324. (157) G:3:325-326. (158) G:3:327-328. (159) G:3:329-330. (160) G:3:331-332. (161) G:3:333-334. (162) G:3:335-336. (163) G:3:337-338. (164) G:3:339-340. (165) G:3:341-342. (166) G:3:343-344. (167) G:3:345-346. (168) G:3:347-348. (169) G:3:349-350. (170) G:3:351-352. (171) G:3:353-354. (172) G:3:355-356. (173) G:3:357-358. (174) G:3:359-360. (175) G:3:361-362. (176) G:3:363-364. (177) G:3:365-366. (178) G:3:367-368. (179) G:3:369-370. (180) G:3:371-372. (181) G:3:373-374. (182) G:3:375-376. (183) G:3:377-378. (184) G:3:379-380. (185) G:3:381-382. (186) G:3:383-384. (187) G:3:385-386. (188) G:3:387-388. (189) G:3:389-390. (190) G:3:391-392. (191) G:3:393-394. (192) G:3:395-396. (193) G:3:397-398. (194) G:3:399-400. (195) G:3:401-402. (196) G:3:403-404. (197) G:3:405-406. (198) G:3:407-408. (199) G:3:409-410. (200) G:3:411-412. (201) G:3:413-414. (202) G:3:415-416. (203) G:3:417-418. (204) G:3:419-420. (205) G:3:421-422. (206) G:3:423-424. (207) G:3:425-426. (208) G:3:427-428. (209) G:3:429-430. (210) G:3:431-432. (211) G:3:433-434. (212) G:3:435-436. (213) G:3:437-438. (214) G:3:439-440. (215) G:3:441-442. (216) G:3:443-444. (217) G:3:445-446. (218) G:3:447-448. (219) G:3:449-450. (220) G:3:451-452. (221) G:3:453-454. (222) G:3:455-456. (223) G:3:457-458. (224) G:3:459-460. (225) G:3:461-462. (226) G:3:463-464. (227) G:3:465-466. (228) G:3:467-468. (229) G:3:469-470. (230) G:3:471-472. (231) G:3:473-474. (232) G:3:475-476. (233) G:3:477-478. (234) G:3:479-480. (235) G:3:481-482. (236) G:3:483-484. (237) G:3:485-486. (238) G:3:487-488. (239) G:3:489-490. (240) G:3:491-492. (241) G:3:493-494. (242) G:3:495-496. (243) G:3:497-498. (244) G:3:499-500. (245) G:3:501-502. (246) G:3:503-504. (247) G:3:505-506. (248) G:3:507-508. (249) G:3:509-510. (250) G:3:511-512. (251) G:3:513-514. (252) G:3:515-516. (253) G:3:517-518. (254) G:3:519-520. (255) G:3:521-522. (256) G:3:523-524. (257) G:3:525-526. (258) G:3:527-528. (259) G:3:529-530. (260) G:3:531-532. (261) G:3:533-534. (262) G:3:535-536. (263) G:3:537-538. (264) G:3:539-540. (265) G:3:541-542. (266) G:3:543-544. (267) G:3:545-546. (268) G:3:547-548. (269) G:3:549-550. (270) G:3:551-552. (271) G:3:553-554. (272) G:3:555-556. (273) G:3:557-558. (274) G:3:559-560. (275) G:3:561-562. (276) G:3:563-564. (277) G:3:565-566. (278) G:3:567-568. (279) G:3:569-570. (280) G:3:571-572. (281) G:3:573-574. (282) G:3:575-576. (283) G:3:577-578. (284) G:3:579-580. (285) G:3:581-582. (286) G:3:583-584. (287) G:3:585-586. (288) G:3:587-588. (289) G:3:589-590. (290) G:3:591-592. (291) G:3:593-594. (292) G:3:595-596. (293) G:3:597-598. (294) G:3:599-600. (295) G:3:601-602. (296) G:3:603-604. (297) G:3:605-606. (298) G:3:607-608. (299) G:3:609-610. (300) G:3:611-612. (301) G:3:613-614. (302) G:3:615-616. (303) G:3:617-618. (304) G:3:619-620. (305) G:3:621-622. (306) G:3:623-624. (307) G:3:625-626. (308) G:3:627-628. (309) G:3:629-630. (310) G:3:631-632. (311) G:3:633-634. (312) G:3:635-636. (313) G:3:637-638. (314) G:3:639-640. (315) G:3:641-642. (316) G:3:643-644. (317) G:3:645-646. (318) G:3:647-648. (319) G:3:649-650. (320) G:3:651-652. (321) G:3:653-654. (322) G:3:655-656. (323) G:3:657-658. (324) G:3:659-660. (325) G:3:661-662. (326) G:3:663-664. (327) G:3:665-666. (328) G:3:667-668. (329) G:3:669-670. (330) G:3:671-672. (331) G:3:673-674. (332) G:3:675-676. (333) G:3:677-678. (334) G:3:679-680. (335) G:3:681-682. (336) G:3:683-684. (337) G:3:685-686. (338) G:3:687-688. (339) G:3:689-690. (340) G:3:691-692. (341) G:3:693-694. (342) G:3:695-696. (343) G:3:697-698. (344) G:3:699-700. (345) G:3:701-702. (346) G:3:703-704. (347) G:3:705-706. (348) G:3:707-708. (349) G:3:709-710. (350) G:3:711-712. (351) G:3:713-714. (352) G:3:715-716. (353) G:3:717-718. (354) G:3:719-720. (355) G:3:721-722. (356) G:3:723-724. (357) G:3:725-726. (358) G:3:727-728. (359) G:3:729-730. (360) G:3:731-732. (361) G:3:733-734. (362) G:3:735-736. (363) G:3:737-738. (364) G:3:739-740. (365) G:3:741-742. (366) G:3:743-744. (367) G:3:745-746. (368) G:3:747-748. (369) G:3:749-750. (370) G:3:751-752. (371) G:3:753-754. (372) G:3:755-756. (373) G:3:757-758. (374) G:3:759-760. (375) G:3:761-762. (376) G:3:763-764. (377) G:3:765-766. (378) G:3:767-768. (379) G:3:769-770. (380) G:3:771-772. (381) G:3:773-774. (382) G:3:775-776. (383) G:3:777-778. (384) G:3:779-780. (385) G:3:781-782. (386) G:3:783-784. (387) G:3:785-786. (388) G:3:787-788. (389) G:3:789-790. (390) G:3:791-792. (391) G:3:793-794. (392) G:3:795-796. (393) G:3:797-798. (394) G:3:799-800. (395) G:3:801-802. (396) G:3:803-804. (397) G:3:805-806. (398) G:3:807-808. (399) G:3:809-810. (400) G:3:811-812. (401) G:3:813-814. (402) G:3:815-816. (403) G:3:817-818. (404) G:3:819-820. (405) G:3:821-822. (406) G:3:823-824. (407) G:3:825-826. (408) G:3:827-828. (409) G:3:829-830. (410) G:3:831-832. (411) G:3:833-834. (412) G:3:835-836. (413) G:3:837-838. (414) G:3:839-840. (415) G:3:841-842. (416) G:3:843-844. (417) G:3:845-846. (418) G:3:847-848. (419) G:3:849-850. (420) G:3:851-852. (421) G:3:853-854. (422) G:3:855-856. (423) G:3:857-858. (424) G:3:859-860. (425) G:3:861-862. (426) G:3:863-864. (427) G:3:865-866. (428) G:3:867-868. (429) G:3:869-870. (430) G:3:871-872. (431) G:3:873-874. (432) G:3:875-876. (433) G:3:877-878. (434) G:3:879-880. (435) G:3:881-882. (436) G:3:883-884. (437) G:3:885-886. (438) G:3:887-888. (439) G:3:889-890. (440) G:3:891-892. (441) G:3:893-894. (442) G:3:895-896. (443) G:3:897-898. (444) G:3:899-900. (445) G:3:901-902. (446) G:3:903-904. (447) G:3:905-906. (448) G:3:907-908. (449) G:3:909-910. (450) G:3:911-912. (451) G:3:913-914. (452) G:3:915-916. (453) G:3:917-918. (454) G:3:919-920. (455) G:3:921-922. (456) G:3:923-924. (457) G:3:925-926. (458) G:3:927-928. (459) G:3:929-930. (460) G:3:931-932. (461) G:3:933-934. (462) G:3:935-936. (463) G:3:937-938. (464) G:3:939-940. (465) G:3:941-942. (466) G:3:943-944. (467) G:3:945-946. (468) G:3:947-948. (469) G:3:949-950. (470) G:3:951-952. (471) G:3:953-954. (472) G:3:955-956. (473) G:3:957-958. (474) G:3:959-960. (475) G:3:961-962. (476) G:3:963-964. (477) G:3:965-966. (478) G:3:967-968. (479) G:3:969-970. (480) G:3:971-972. (481) G:3:973-974. (482) G:3:975-976. (483) G:3:977-978. (484) G:3:979-980. (485) G:3:981-982. (486) G:3:983-984. (487) G:3:985-986. (488) G:3:987-988. (489) G:3:989-990. (490) G:3:991-992. (491) G:3:993-994. (492) G:3:995-996. (493) G:3:997-998. (494) G:3:999-1000. (495) G:3:1001-1002. (496) G:3:1003-1004. (497) G:3:1005-1006. (498) G:3:1007-1008. (499) G:3:1009-1010. (500) G:3:1011-1012. (501) G:3:1013-1014. (502) G:3:1015-1016. (503) G:3:1017-1018. (504) G:3:1019-1020. (505) G:3:1021-1022. (506) G:3:1023-1024. (507) G:3:1025-1026. (508) G:3:1027-1028. (509) G:3:1029-1030. (510) G:3:1031-1032. (511) G:3:1033-1034. (512) G:3:1035-1036. (513) G:3:1037-1038. (514) G:3:1039-1040. (515) G:3:1041-1042. (516) G:3:1043-1044. (517) G:3:1045-1046. (518) G:3:1047-1048. (519) G:3:1049-1050. (520) G:3:1051-1052. (521) G:3:1053-1054. (522) G:3:1055-1056. (523) G:3:1057-1058. (524) G:3:1059-1060. (525) G:3:1061-1062. (526) G:3:1063-1064. (527) G:3:1065-1066. (528) G:3:1067-1068. (529) G:3:1069-1070. (530) G:3:1071-1072. (531) G:3:1073-1074. (532) G:3:1075-1076. (533) G:3:1077-1078. (534) G:3:1079-1080. (535) G:3:1081-1082. (536) G:3:1083-1084. (537) G:3:1085-1086. (538) G:3:1087-1088. (539) G:3:1089-1090. (540) G:3:1091-1092. (541) G:3:1093-1094. (542) G:3:1095-1096. (543) G:3:1097-1098. (544) G:3:1099-1100. (545) G:3:1101-1102. (546) G:3:1103-1104. (547) G:3:1105-1106. (548) G:3:1107-1108. (549) G:3:1109-1110. (550) G:3:1111-1112. (551) G:3:1113-1114. (552) G:3:1115-1116. (553) G:3:1117-1118. (554) G:3:1119-1120. (555) G:3:1121-1122. (556) G:3:1123-1124. (557) G:3:1125-1126. (558) G:3:1127-1128. (559) G:3:1129-1130. (560) G:3:1131-1132. (561) G:3:1133-1134. (562) G:3:1135-1136. (563) G:3:1137-1138. (564) G:3:1139-1140. (565) G:3:1141-1142. (566) G:3:1143-1144. (567) G:3:1145-1146. (568) G:3:1147-1148. (569) G:3:1149-1150. (570) G:3:1151-1152. (571) G:3:1153-1154. (572) G:3:1155-1156. (573) G:3:1157-1158. (574) G:3:1159-1160. (575) G:3:1161-1162. (576) G:3:1163-1164. (577) G:3:1165-1166. (578) G:3:1167-1168. (579) G:3:1169-1170. (580) G:3:1171-1172. (581) G:3:1173-1174. (582) G:3:1175-1176. (583) G:3:1177-1178. (584) G:3:1179-1180. (585) G:3:1181-1182. (586) G:3:1183-1184. (587) G:3:1185-1186. (588) G:3:1187-1188. (589) G:3:1189-1190. (590) G:3:1191-1192. (591) G:3:1193-1194. (592) G:3:1195-1196. (593) G:3:1197-1198. (594) G:3:1199-1200. (595) G:3:1201-1202. (596) G:3:1203-1204. (597) G:3:1205-1206. (598) G:3:1207-1208. (599) G:3:1209-1210. (600) G:3:1211-1212. (601) G:3:1213-1214. (602) G:3:1215-1216. (603) G:3:1217-1218. (604) G:3:1219-1220. (605) G:3:1221-1222. (606) G:3:1223-1224. (607) G:3:1225-1226. (608) G:3:1227-1228. (609) G:3:1229-1230. (610) G:3:1231-1232. (611) G:3:1233-1234. (612) G:3:1235-1236. (613) G:3:1237-1238. (614) G:3:1239-1240. (615) G:3:1241-1242. (616) G:3:1243-1244. (617) G:3:1245-1246. (618) G:3:1247-1248. (619) G:3:1249-1250. (620) G:3:1251-1252. (621) G:3:1253-1254. (622) G:3:1255-1256. (623) G:3:1257-1258. (624) G:3:1259-1260. (625) G:3:1261-1262. (626) G:3:1263-1264. (627) G:3:1265-1266. (628) G:3:1267-1268. (629) G:3:1269-1270. (630) G:3:1271-1272. (631) G:3:1273-1274. (632) G:3:1275-1276. (633) G:3:1277-1278. (634) G:3:1279-1280. (635) G:3:1281-1282. (636) G:3:1283-1284. (637) G:3:1285-1286. (638) G:3:1287-1288. (639) G:3:1289-1290. (640) G:3:1291-1292. (641) G:3:1293-1294. (642) G:3:1295-1296. (643) G:3:1297-1298. (644) G:3:1299-1300. (645) G:3:1301-1302. (646) G:3:1303-1304. (647) G:3:1305-1306. (648) G:3:1307-1308. (649) G:3:1309-1310. (650) G:3:1311-1312. (651) G:3:1313-1314. (652) G:3:1315-1316. (653) G:3:1317-1318. (654) G:3:1319-1320. (655) G:3:1321-1322. (656) G:3:1323-1324. (657) G:3:1325-1326. (658) G:3:1327-1328. (659) G:3:1329-1330. (660) G:3:1331-1332. (661) G:3:1333-1334. (662) G:3:1335-1336. (663) G:3:1337-1338. (664) G:3:1339-1340. (665) G:3:1341-1342. (666) G:3:1343-1344. (667) G:3:1345-1346. (668) G:3:1347-1348. (669) G:3:1349-1350. (670) G:3:1351-1352. (671) G:3:1353-1354. (672) G:3:1355-1356. (673) G:3:1357-1358. (674) G:3:1359-1360. (675) G:3:1361-1362. (676) G:3:1363-1364. (677) G:3:1365-1366. (678) G:3:1367-1368. (679) G:3:1369-1370. (680) G:3:1371-1372. (681) G:3:1373-1374. (682) G:3:1375-1376. (683) G:3:1377-1378. (684) G:3:1379-1380. (685) G:3:1381-1382. (686) G:3:1383-1384. (687) G:3:1385-1386. (688) G:3:1387-1388. (689) G:3:1389-1390. (690) G:3:1391-1392. (691) G:3:1393-1394. (692) G:3:1

also for the sins of the whole world."(1) John does indeed make use of the term *κόσμος* in the sense of a "created order" and also in the sense of humanity in general; but this ethical sense is most characteristic of his usage.(2)

This cosmic fact of sin leads the author to lay great stress upon its intensity and devilishness. We have already seen that all the uses of the term "devil" in the Johannine writings are related to these ethical subjects, and that whatever dualism there is between the devil and God is therefore presented always as an ethical, never as a metaphysical, dualism. But the presentation is extreme within this ethical sphere. John takes the devil as a fact quite as he takes sin as a fact. Sin is no more grounded in human nature than is righteousness. Sin is an evil spirit, just as righteousness is the presence of God's Spirit. It is probably for this reason that John insists so on the adjective 'holy' in the term 'Holy Spirit', as an ethical contrast to the unholy spirit, whom he terms the devil, or Satan. Thus, "He that doeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning"(3) is but the echo in the epistle of the words of Jesus in the gospel, "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father it is your will to do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and standeth not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father thereof."(4) Thus under the moral principle 'like father, like son', Jesus thinks of those whose acts are selfish and thoughtless as

(1) I:2:2. (2) So. Stephens, "The Theology of the N.T.", p.187.

(3) I:3:8 (4) G:8:44.

children of the devil, just as truly as he thinks of others as children of God. With the background of such a conception, it is not strange that the writer should take the dread Christian term 'antichrist', and breathe into it a moral meaning, so as to make the antichrist not any one specific individual, but the tendency to sin as manifest in many individual leaders of evil: "As ye have heard that antichrist cometh, even now there are many antichrists." (1) "Every spirit that confesseth not Jesus is not of God: and this is the spirit of the antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it cometh; and now it is in the world already." (2) "Many deceivers are gone forth into the world, even they that confess not that Jesus Christ cometh in the flesh. This is the deceiver and the antichrist." (3) It is because of this cosmic spirit that John can so bluntly declare, "The whole world lieth in the evil one." (4)

But just because this entire emphasis on the contrast between the children of God and the children of the devil is so entirely ethical, therefore the Johannine writings contain no dualism of flesh and spirit as such. There is indeed the representation that flesh (*σάρξ*) may become the tool of sin: "The lust of the flesh --- is of the world." (5) There is the recognition that flesh cannot produce anything higher than itself: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." (6) Yet there is never any allusion to the desirability of mortifying the flesh, as though it were inherently evil, as the Gnostics affirmed. And so, while the writer is strongly insistent

(1) I:2:18. (2) I:4:3. (3) II:7. (4) I:5:19. (5) I:2:16.
(6) G:3:6.

against all forms of mere indulgence which one branch of the Gnostics practised on the ground that they were spiritual and the flesh did not matter, he was just as insistent against the mutilation of the flesh, practised by another branch of the Gnostics in the attempt to rid themselves of its evil. Jesus can even use the figure of eating his own flesh as a symbol of men's abiding in him. And in his intercessory prayer he is very careful to say of these same men: "I pray not that thou shouldst take them from the world, but that thou shouldst keep them from the evil one." (1) Here both the antinomianism of the one class of Gnostics and the worldlessness of the other are set aside in a true balance.

Our sources are not content, however, to present the reality and the hideousness of sin as opposition to God. The transformation from sin to righteousness is amply treated, both as a possibility and as a necessity for those who would live. "Marvel not that I said unto thee, ye must be born anew." (2). The transformation is considered entirely on the basis of the powerful person of Christ: "If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our sins." (3) "If the Son make you free, ye shall be free indeed." (4) There is no deliverance from sin possible otherwise: "Except ye believe that I am (he) ye shall die in your sins." (5) Once more we find ourselves face to face with the fact that for John all of the meaning of life is contained in personality, and in the personality completely God's, Jesus Christ.

(1) G:17:15. (2) G:3:7. (3) I:2:1,2. (4) G:8:36. (5) G:8:24.

The reason everywhere given in these writings for this place assigned to the personality of Jesus is his sinlessness. The connection is obvious. One who himself knew no sin is presented as the only one with a personality of righteousness strong enough to free men from sin. That sinlessness of Jesus becomes a passion of this author. He presents Jesus as making the challenge himself, "Which of you convicteth me of sin?"(1) He calls him "Jesus Christ the righteous."(2) And he reverently writes, when speaking of the utmost depths of evil: "He was manifested to take away sins; and in him is no sin."(3) In one of the most beautiful passages in the gospel Jesus is presented as keeping himself from sin for the very purpose of being able to help and redeem men: "For their sakes I sanctify myself, that they themselves also may be sanctified in the truth."(4)

John nowhere attempts a rationalization of how the sinless personality of Jesus affects men in such a way as to deliver them from sin. He has none of the symbols of atonement and legal reconciliation which are prominent in the writings of Paul. Even his statement that God loved us and "sent his Son to be a propitiation for our sins" carries with it no examination into the process. The emphasis in John is always on facts, not on rationalizations of facts. Especially here is he interested, not so much in how the things takes place, as in the actual falling off of sin, its actual passing away

(1) G:8:46. (2) I:2:1. (3) I:3:5. (4) kG:17:19.

(1) 1:17. (2) 1:18.

He is interested in the reality of the results. Perhaps this is the real reason that the only descriptive word he does use is this word propitiation, for the term *ἱλασμός* properly denotes a 'covering', and the writer is reveling in the fact that in Christ sin actually gets covered up and is put out of sight. As Beyschlag expresses John's thought:

"Now what can 'cover' the sin of the world in God's eyes? Only a personality and a deed which contains the power of actually delivering the world from its sin. For the sin which allows itself to be broken and disappear, and only such, God can forgive and consider as no longer existent. ---That he only forgives where at the same time he can purify; that is, where sin is really in the process of vanishing, is expressly said in I John I:9." (1)

The passage referred to lays down confession as a condition, for the author does not wish his readers to imagine that the transformation comes without any sense of the reality of sin on their part. With the Docetists in mind he never gets far away from the insistence on a sense of reality. So also the actuality of the change is insisted upon. "The blood of Jesus his Son cleanses us from all sin." (2) He "takes away sin." (3) In both of these passages the connection of deliverance from sin and the death of Christ is suggested, the comparison being implied in the latter to the scape-goat of the old dispensation carrying off the symbol of sin into the wilderness. It is the life of this complete personality, given to the full, given unto death, that makes the transformation possible; but the meaning of the death of Christ is discussed by John much

(1) Beyschlag, "N.T. Theology", Vol. II, pp. 448, 449.
 (2) I:1:7. (3) I:3:5.

more in relation to the subject of love than to the subject of righteousness.

The actual results of the transformed life are expressed first of all in terms of a deep sense of the "commandments" of Christ and of ready willingness to obey them.

"He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father."(1)

"If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love."(2)

These words of Jesus in the gospel are made the basis in the epistles of an elaborate working out of the idea of a righteous life in terms of the keeping of commandments: "He that saith I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar."(3) "He that keepeth his commandments abideth in him, and he in him."(4)

The subjects of righteousness and love are so interrelated in the writings of John, that it is difficult to treat one without the other. The commandment is always presented as a very practical manifestation of love toward those who are in need, and so a transformed life becomes a living example of the fact that to love is to walk in the - way of God. But it is the walking in God's way that is the point of the transformation itself, a fact which the little Second Epistle dwells on: "I rejoice greatly that I have found certain of thy children walking in the truth, even as we received commandment of the Father. --- This is love, that we should walk after his commandments. This is the commandment, even as ye heard from the beginning, that ye should walk in it."(5)

(1) G:14:21. (2) G:15:10. (3) I:2:4. (4) I:3:24. (5) II:4-6.

The transformed life of righteousness is presented as a glory. It is a life that will be free from shame in the end: "And now, my little children, abide in him; that, if he shall be manifested, we may have boldness, and not be ashamed before him at his presence." (1) It is a life which is convinced, not only of the fact that the reality of sin lies in rejection of the personal Christ, but that the reality of righteousness lies in a confidence in his power:

"And he (the Holy Spirit), when he is come, will convict the world in respect of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, because they believe not on me; of righteousness because I go to the Father, and ye behold me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world hath been judged." (2)

In this remarkable passage it is represented that the feeling of the reality of sin is a spiritual matter, and that all sin, of whatever kind, resolves itself into a lack of belief in the one who is God's complete revelation of light. But it does not leave men there, for there would be no glory, only helplessness, in a conviction of sin with nothing else. It goes on to present the conviction of righteousness as a spiritual matter also. To the man, realizing the reality of sin, and hopelessly wondering if anything can enable him to be right, it presents the conviction of the power of this same revelation of the light of God, pictured as returning to his Father, the seat of power, and thus making it possible for a man to have the full power of his righteousness. Nor does it stop even with that. For men may be convinced that

(1) I:2:28 (reading the margin). (2) G:16:8-11.

both sin and righteousness are possible, nay, that they are real, but may feel that they are ever in a close struggle without any issue. Hence the presentation of judgment as a spiritual conviction too. There is an issue; "the prince of this world hath been judged," the perfect tense denoting a result already accomplished and affecting the present. This is the glory of the transformed life - its reality, its power, its certainty.

The First Epistle presents this same thought in terms of the victory of faith: "For whatsoever is begotten of God overcometh the world: and this is the victory that hath overcome the world, even our faith." (1) If the epistle stopped at that point, anyone would be impressed with the consistency of its presentation of a glorious triumph for the righteous life. But it goes on to present that life in absolute terms in what is often said to be the hardest saying in the epistle, a saying that has caused more controversy, and be it admitted, more evasion, than anything else in the Johannine writings. The saying is variously presented: "Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not." (2). "Whosoever is begotten of God doeth no sin, because his (God's) seed abideth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is begotten of God." (3) "We know that whosoever is begotten of God sinneth not." (4) Is this a flat contradiction of the statement, "If we say that we have no sin we deceive ourselves?" (5) Is it merely a strong statement of the urgency of righteousness in the face of gnostic antinomianism? Is it

(1) I:5:4. (2) I:3:6. (3) I:3:9. (4) I:5:18. (5) I:1:8.

the use of the term 'sin', *ἁμαρτία*, in a different sense from its use in the apparently contradictory thought? Is it a doctrine of human perfectionism? All these explanations have been advanced. "All Christians commit sinful acts, but they do not possess a sinful character", says Stevens(1); but surely this is verbal gymnastics. While the same word, *ἁμαρτία*, might conceivably be used in two such different senses, yet to use it thus in the same writing with no explanation, would be to court misunderstanding. It is to be noted that these sayings about the absoluteness of the sinless life all occur in connection with some assertion concerning sonship to God. Now sonship, according to John, is the result of abiding in a Father; and he literally means to say that the life which abides in God is a life of freedom from, and power over, sin. He does not aver that any one life is always free from sin, inasmuch as he nowhere asserts the perfection of the sonship relation. But whenever there is this relation, sin has no power. Thus he keeps the same meaning for *ἁμαρτία* all the time. It is, in fact, both an act and a state. But both as act and as state it needs confession and forsaking, which is the emphasis of the injunction against self-deception; while both as act and as state it is rendered impotent by an abiding relation of sonship. Thus against the Docetic notion that sin did not much matter John places the solemn fact of its presence, resulting always in broken morality and loss of fellowship with Christ. And then he presents the glorious triumph that wherever fellowship with Christ is maintained

(1) Stevens, "The Johannine Theology", p.137.

there is a life free from sin and actually practising righteousness. Beyschlag presents essentially this view when he says of this passage, in asking how to reconcile it with the fact of sin:

"Not by ingenious distinctions between different sorts of sinning, between having sin and doing sin, as if the *ἁμαρτία* referred to were not committed, but by the distinction of an ideal and empiric view. Ideally it is true that whosoever is born of God cannot sin; the life from God and in God absolutely excludes the life in sin. And it is in the highest degree necessary to tell believers that, in order that they may never rest in their imperfection, satisfied with being pardoned sinners instead of pardoned saints. But what is true in idea only gradually becomes true in reality; and so John, who loves antitheses, can, without any contradiction, represent the ideal truth and men's failures in realizing it, in order to spur on his readers to work out that which they are in principle."(1)

Secondly, the illumined Will is a will to love. John is everywhere recognized as the apostle of love, and rightly. Yet the grossest injustice has been done his writings by imagining that they present love as a sentiment, pale and sickly, weak and passive. Never was there a doctrine of love with more of the active, virile, powerful elements stressed than this. Far from being a mere sentiment, love in our sources is a force, second to none.

The most fundamental presentation of this truth is that love is the very nature of God, and that human love, therefore, like human righteousness, is rooted and grounded in God: "God is love; and he that abideth in love abideth in God, and God abideth in him."(2) "Love is of God; and everyone that loveth is begotten of God, and knoweth God."(3)

(1) Beyschlag, "N.T. Theology, II, p. 463. (2) I:4:16. (3) I:4:7.

"We love, because he first loved us." (1) These are the foundational statements of the meaning of love, as essentially rooted and grounded in God and his love. Such a presentation is profound, and prepares the way for the wonderful treatment that love receives in these writings; for, "To separate the love of man from the love of God is simply to betray religion with a kiss." (2)

But more than this: When John avers that "God is love", he is not simply stating love as a principle in God from which the human quality that goes by the same name may be derived. He is stating that love is all of God, the whole being of God, the very nature of God. This author does not divide the divine nature into component and contrasting parts any more than he does human nature. There is no struggle in God between the principle of righteousness, with which we have just dealt, and the principle of love. There is no dualism of necessity and desire. All God's righteousness is contained within his love, just as all his love is contained within his righteousness, and to see this is essential that men may not confuse and cause strife between the two in themselves. It is astonishing how often theologians and other interpreters of these writings have missed this point, and have represented the love of God as not really essential to his nature. Thus Dr. Patton, whose spirit has done so much to mould the thought of Princeton, says, "God is bound to be just; he is not bound to be generous. The measure of God's

(1) I:4:19. (2) More, "The Christ of the N.T." p.116.

benevolence is a matter of option."(1) Dr. Shedd declares, "Whatever God may be or may not be, he must be just. It is not optional with him to exercise this attribute or not to exercise it, as it is in the instance of that class of attributes which are antithetic to it."(2) And Dr. Strong, the Shedd of these later years in this school of theology, states bluntly: "Love is an attribute which --- God may exercise or not exercise, as he will.")3) To set off thus, righteousness from love, and exalt the former at the expense of the latter, is to present a God totally different from the God of the Johannine writings; and to go so far as to think of love as an optional quality is to deny entirely the significance of the simply avowal: God is love. The inner union of love and righteousness in God is the same as that in men, as John represents it in his injunction, "Hereby know we that we love the children of God, when we love God and do his commandments. For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments."(4) It is simply the case that "righteousness is love in the imperative mood."(5)

The truth of this union is quickly seen when one reverts to the conception, so often presented in the Johannine writings, that the love of God is self-revealing and self-seeking. Love is not an inward, gnawing, desire, that is self-contained. It is outgoing, it is self-communicating. "The very fact that God desires his righteousness to become the life of men is proof that his nature is a nature of re-

(1) In the "Princeton Review", Jan. 1878. (2) "Theological Essays" p. 285
 (3) "Philosophy and Religion", p. 196. (4) I:5:2,3.
 (5) Law, "The Tests of Life", p. 87.

vealed love. The whole Christian philosophy of life, according to John, is dependent on this thought. The very possibility of men's knowing God is dependent upon his having a nature of love that is self-imparting. John nowhere represents men as climbing up to God. "Herein was the love of God manifested in us, that God sent his only begotten Son into the world that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." (1) The very Advocate for men, whom the Father sends because of his great love for men, is called "Jesus Christ the righteous" (2), and the power to do right and to keep the commands of God is always represented as being through the power of love.

This thought of God as giving himself out in love is the distinguishing mark of the originality of John's conception of God; and it becomes the basis of his insistence on a meaning of human love that is higher and finer, because more clearly articulated, than that found elsewhere. The idea of men desiring and seeking God is often to be found in the history of thought; but it is so often mixed with fear. Men are far more frequently represented as cringing before an exacting deity than as loving a heavenly Father. Again God is frequently presented as a Creator and upholder of the universe, and as interested in certain men or certain races in particular. Plato conceives of the love of God as the

(1) I:4:9,10. (2) I:3:1.

very ground of his creative activity. Seneca represents this interest of God in certain men; "Between good men and the gods there is a friendship founded on virtue." (1) The Love of the Stoic God is not so much an active will as it is a mere principle of being. This is about as far as one can go in the ancient world with the thought of the relation between the love of God and helpful activity for men. Rohde, after a careful examination of the subject, has been led to say, "The deity is benevolent toward men and the human race. But here we touch the limits of Greek reflection - the idea of a being whose inmost being is Love, Love to man not merely to chosen persons, never dawned on the Greek mind." (2)

But this contrast is much more clearly seen if one considers love as a moral passion. Love on the part of God, in Seneca's sense of friendship with good men, can be found in much noble thinking. Where men are good, God is good to them. It is even true to say that to many thinkers where men were not good, but were striving to be good, where they were earnestly desiring to find God, God condescended to be of help. But a God who seeks, a God who takes the first step, a God who loves men, not when they are fit for celestial friendship, but when they are unlovely, this is the distinctively Christian thought of God which lies at the basis of John's philosophy: "We love, because he first loved us." (3) For God to care for men so that he would go forth in search of those whose sinfulness contradicts his righteousness is for God to love

(1) Seneca, "De Providentia", 1. (2) "Kleine Schriften", p. 327.
(3) 1:4:19.

in a way that fuses his very righteousness with his love and presents him as seeking to make men righteous like himself because it is his nature to love them. There are suggestions of all this in the mystery religions, especially in the Isis cult, where the patience and pity of the goddess are likened to a mother's pity for her children's feeble efforts. But that there can be any moral power in God which he will readily use to empower those feeble efforts of men is not present until the presentation of the God of the New Testament whom John crowns as being the essence of outreaching love. As Mackintosh puts it,

"That God is holy love and nothing else; that love is not an accident but the essence of his nature; that this infinite love flows out upon its objects irrespectively of their moral attainment or individual privilege, with the aim of establishing an all-inclusive, fellowship of free conscious persons bound up in a spiritual kingdom through mutual care - this, quite certainly, had not been credible to the pagan mind till Jesus came." (1)

This is the representation of John. Love in God means that because God is so righteous he desires men to be righteous, and he expends himself to make them so. The very demanding justice of God, which the theologians quoted above so much insist on, is the ground for his endeavor to redeem men from lives of injustice: "A just God, and therefore a Savior." (2)

This concept makes clear the distinction between benevolence and love. Benevolence is the giving of things; love is the giving of self. The God of providence may be

(1) MacIntosh, "The Originality of the Christian Message", pp. 41, 42.

(2) Ibid, p. 40.

benevolent; the God of saviorhood must be loving. If God's love means anything more than complacent observance, if it means a care for what men as men are and do, then its very nature necessitates the outgoing of God's own self in the seeking and saving of men. This is the logic on which John depends in presenting the love of God as a redeeming love. It is not simply that God loved, and was good enough to go so far with that love as to give himself to men. It is that because God loves, he must give himself to men.

This giving of himself to men as a savior is presented by John, as we should expect, in terms of the life and ministry and death of Jesus Christ. He who is the real personal Logos, he whose personality illuminates the divine for men and makes it completely Light, he whose surrendered Will found oneness with God as a Father, he it is in whom the love of God as a self-giving activity is completely seen. It is for this reason that John's favorite designation of God is "Father", and his favorite designation of Jesus is "Son of God". He represents the entire life of Jesus as given life, unthinking of self in every way, and therefore completely representing in visible human form, the life-love of God. The entire gospel story of the ministry of Christ represents him as under a constraint to make real to men this self-giving love of God by working works that will represent God in this light to men: "We must work the works of him that sent me, while it is day: the night cometh, when no man can work."⁽¹⁾ That work was a ministry to learned Rabbi and to despised Samaritan alike;

⁽¹⁾ G:9:4.

sometimes in the same setting of the gospel it is presented to the beloved Jewish intimate and to the most casual Gentile stranger(1); for John insists that while Jesus came to redeem men from the power of sin, it was "not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world"(2). And his best known saying is, "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son."(3)

This last citation brings us to the fact that John represents this self-giving love of God in Christ, not merely as giving up to a certain point, but as giving to the limit, the giving up of life itself. Death is not the limit to which love may go if called upon; it is the absolute essential of the proof of love. And so, as the bearer of God's love to men, as the complete impersonizing of love, Jesus is always presented in the gospel as under the constraint of death. Thus in this passage, "God so loved the world", the word rendered 'so' in our English versions does not mean 'so much' but 'in such a manner', 'thus'. *αὕτως* can never mean 'so much'. And of course for the setting of any thought which begins with 'thus' one must go back. The preceding sentences give the idea in unmistakable terms: "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth may in him have eternal life."(4) Then follows the statement, "For God so loved the world". That is to say, God loved the world when he gave Christ in

(1) As in G:12:1-8; 20-25. (2) I:2:2. (3) G:3:16. (4) G:3:15.

the same way that he loved it when he sought to save the suffering Israelites in the desert. And the act of Moses in lifting up the snake on the pole that all might turn to it and see and be healed, becomes in this figurative presentation, the symbol of Jesus' being lifted up from the earth. It is only by death at any time that God can reveal his love to the world.

This same idea of the necessity of death is to be seen in the allegory of the Good Shepherd.(1) Here the good shepherd after being pictured as providing for the sheep and knowing them by name and protecting them from their foes, is represented as dying for them: "The good shepherd layeth down his life for the sheep."(2) It is to be noted that the word for good here is not *ἀγαθός*, of moral good character, but *καλός*, of exceptional quality. John's picture is not so much that the morality of the shepherd depends on his loving his sheep to the extent of placing his life at their disposal. Perhaps he rather takes that for granted. But it is the mark of the shepherd which exceeds other shepherds, much as we speak of some mark of a teacher as exceeding others by saying that he is "a good teacher". It is purposely comparative, and the comparison is all in favor of the love that is unto death.

The urgency of this thought is seen again in the scene arising out of the visit of the Greeks: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die

(1) G:10:1-18. (2) G:10:11.

it abideth by itself alone; but if it die it beareth much fruit. He that loveth his life loseth it; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal."(1)
 Here the purpose of death is conceived of as being to make life possible. The fruitage that his death is to have in the lives of men is its justification. So that Jesus can go on to say, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth (reminiscent of the wilderness scene once more), will draw all men unto myself", a saying on which the writer comments, "This he said, signifying by what manner of death he should die."(2)
 There is in the Johannine writings very little rationalization of the way in which the death of Christ is related to the saving of men. The term 'propitiation' does occur several times in the epistle as we have seen, and indeed the whole thought of atoning grace is more prominent there than it is in the gospel, but the idea of laying down life is viewed by John, not so much as the endurance of punishment due to men, as the complete service of love. The common phrase which is used both in the gospel and the epistle for the death of Christ is *τιθεῖναι τὴν ψυχὴν*, 'to lay down the life'. Thus in connection with the Good Shepherd allegory it is used four times: "The good shepherd layeth down his life for the sheep." "Even as the Father knoweth me and I know the Father; and I lay down my life for the sheep." "Therefore doth the Father love me, because I lay down my life that I may take it again. No one taketh it away from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have

(1) G:12:24, 25. (2) G:12:32, 33.

(3) G:12:32.

(4) G:12:32.

(5) G:12:32.

power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." (1)

Again, in the scene between Jesus and the disciples in the upper room, after Jesus has plead with his disciples to obey his one commandment of love, He tells them that he must go from them. (2) Peter instantly replies, "Why cannot I follow thee even now? I will lay down my life for thee." (3) Jesus replies that he does not know the meaning of laying down his life, as evidenced by the fact that he is even then on the point of denying that he ever knew him. (4) Hence in this as well as in the Good Shepherd instances the thought of the laying down of life occurs in relation to the thought of love. In the allegory of the vine and the branches the two are very definitely joined: "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." (5) And the first epistle almost repeats the thought: "Hereby know we love, because he laid down his life for us." (6) From these examples it is evident that the author has in mind, in his references to the death of Christ as a laying down of his life, not any bearing of punishment, but a service of love. He simply does not approach the subject from the legalist's point of view at all. He does not think in terms of a debt to be paid. He thinks of the spiritual quality of love unto death.

The same is true in reference to the use of other terms and thoughts in the Johannine writings that bear relation to the death of Christ. They all are closely associated with the loving ministry as a background. True it is that the thought

(1) G:10:11, 15, 17, 18. (2) G:13:34-36. (3) G:13:37.
 (4) G:13:38. (5) G:15:13. (6) I:3:16.

of the Old Testament plays a large role. The sacrificial system of the Old Testament is often before the mind of the writer, especially in the gospel. Jesus is called the "Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world." (1) It is said that "he was manifested to take away sins" (2), and in both these cases the passover lamb of the Jewish feast is doubtless in the writer's mind as a symbol. Indeed, the symbolism of this feast is so meaningful to John that he identifies the date of the death of Christ with the slaying of the paschal Lamb, a thing which the Synoptists do not suggest, and says that on the cross his legs were not broken "that the scripture might be fulfilled, A bone of him shall not be broken." (3) The blood of Christ is frequently mentioned, though not on a great variety of occasions. Several times in the discussion on the Bread of Life that follows the feeding of the multitude, drinking his blood is the essential of life (4), though here it is paralleled by eating his flesh, and both of course are figurative for utter participation in him. The First Epistle is more specific about the death in terms of the shedding of blood. "The blood of Jesus his son cleanses us from all sin." (5) Of somewhat curious interest is the dwelling of the epistle on the fact that the blood of Christ was as real a part of his life as the baptism. "This is he that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ; not with the water only, but with the water and with the blood." (6) Of course the blood stands here for the death, just as the water stands for the baptism; and the author, with

(1) G:1:29; of. verse 36. (2) I:3:5. (3) G:19:36. (4) G:6:53-56.

(5) I:1:7. (6) I:5:6.

his polemical purpose in mind, is urging the fact that the death of Christ, fulfilling the purpose of his ministry, is just as real as the public announcement at the baptism which initiated it. The point in all of these passages is, that the death of Christ is very definitely related to the taking away of sin; but that purpose is conceived also very definitely as the culmination of his ministry of loving service, and there is no rationalization along the lines of forensic thought. Even the term, *ἱλασμός*, 'propitiation', so often used in the Pauline section of the New Testament as a symbol of Paul's struggle to express the meaning of Jesus' death in terms of legal satisfaction, is used by John as the greatest manifestation of love; indeed it is definitely said to be the essence of the expression of love: "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." (1)

This love of God, then, is manifest uniquely in the fact that it is not merely gracious toward one who seeks it, but actually does the seeking; in that it loves, not the attractive, but the unattractive; and in that it loves to the uttermost of the giving up of life. But it is not treated as a beautiful recognition of what love is in God. It is treated as an impetus to human love. Because God's love is seeking for men, because it loves the unattractive, and because it loves unto death, therefore men must love in seeking those who need them, in seeking even those who do not appeal, and in laying down their lives. There is no choice; the divine love is the imperative for the human. Thus love is the great *ἐντολή*, the commandment, of the new dispensation. Jesus is represented as laying it

(1) I:4:10.

down. In connection with the washing of the disciples' feet, a service of loving ministry, he takes occasion to point the moral: "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another"; and he immediately relates it to the example of his own love as the motive: "even as I have loved you, that ye also love one another." (1) And he repeats the thought when speaking of his disciples' abiding in him because of the spirit he has shown: "This is my commandment, that ye love one another, even as I have loved you." (2) The epistles ring the changes upon this thought of love as a commandment, resting on the nature of the love of God: "A new commandment I write unto you, which thing is true in him and in you; because the darkness is passing away, and the true light already shineth. ---He that loveth his brother abideth in the light." (3) Here the significant expression is, "which thing is true in him and in you"; that is to say, love in man must be the same thing that it is in God. Again, connecting the thought directly with the gospel passages, "This is the commandment, that we should believe in the name of his Son Jesus Christ, and love one another, even as he gave us commandment", where the 'he' of the last clause evidently refers to Christ. (4) The commandment is represented as being old, even though it is constantly new in spirit: "Not as though I wrote to thee a new commandment, but that which we had from the beginning, that we love one another." (5)

It is even represented that we prove love to God by love to men, and love to God cannot exist without this very

(1) G:13:34. (2) G:15:12 (3) I:2:8,10. (4) I:3:23 (5) II:5.

godlike love to men. "If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar; for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, cannot love God whom he hath not seen.

And this commandment have we from him, that he who loveth God, love his brother also."(1) But this love must be genuine, and it must be practical. It is no more a soft sentiment than is the love of God for men. Seldom has the ethic of love been more clearly revealed than in the simple, yet searching words of this writer, who is sure that love is substantial: "Whoso hath the world's goods, and beholdeth his brother in need, and shutteth up his compassion from him, how doth the love of God abide in him? My little children, let us not love in word, neither with the tongue; but in deed and truth."(2)

Indeed this love of man for man must go to the same limits as the love of God if it would prove itself to be godlike. That is to say, it must be self-giving in the same sense that the love of God is self-giving. It must be an act, not a mere sentiment: "Hereby know we love, because he laid down his life for us: and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren."(3) Just after the writer has said that the love of God is actually to be seen in his sending his Son to be the propitiation for our sins, he strikingly adds: "Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another."(4) Thus those philosophers of our own day who aver that thinking is an act, find a substantiation for their views in this philosophy of nineteen

(1) I:4:20,21. (2) I:3:17,18. (3) I:3:16. (4) I:4:11.

centuries ago which insists that sitting down and meditating about what a beautiful thing love is, is not to love; but that only the act life of helpful ministry in the spirit of self-sacrifice is the life of love. Indeed, such a love is made by our author to be the test of having life at all: "We know that we have passed out of death into life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not abideth in death." (1) And if to abide in God be admitted to be the essence of life, as John makes it to be, then this also is tied up with the imperative of love: "If we love one another, God abideth in us." (2) And again, "God is love, and he that abideth in love abideth in God, and God abideth in him." (3)

All of this is of course in sharp antagonism to the gnostic spirit and teaching which the writer was seeking to refute. Unbrotherly aloofness was its attitude. Because ethical distinctions were unreal, therefore the material should not bother. Hence human need was of no particular concern. To see one's brother in distress and to "shut up one's compassion from him" was to do the perfectly natural thing. The Johannine doctrine of love, as a result, is quite as polemical as any other of the concepts of these writings. It is not pious meditation on a finespun theory of the nature of being, but it is at once a tremendous invective against the lovelessness of much of the philosophy of the day, and a vital presentation of the true significance in activity of this, the deepest of all the emotions.

(1) I:3:14. (2) I:4:12. (3) I:4:16.

But it has been objected that the Johannine love is narrow. Both in the gospel and in the epistles it is limited apparently to "the brethren". At least almost all of its outreaches and its functions are described in the love of brother for brother; and even though John includes in the term 'brother' some who may not be of like mind in all particulars, yet, it is said, he does not give a real test of love by his restriction of his thought. Still, as we have seen, this representation is not entirely correct; for it forgets that the love of God, which is the standard everywhere set for human imitation, is presented all through the writings as seeking the unattractive. "God so loved the world" is one of John's cardinal thoughts, and this is all-inclusive.

There are, too, several considerations to be borne in mind in examining the Johannine illustrations of love in its bearing on relations of "brothers" and the idea of a Christian brotherhood. For one thing such a limitation of the thought permits of great intensification. To show that universal love is in his mind, and so to escape the charge of clannishness, and yet at the same time to develop his thought of the practical outreaches of love in terms of its activity among those who are supposed to understand it, is to make the thought of love burn with passion and glow with the keenest ardor. Again, to speak of love as needing to be shown to "the brethren", and to dwell thus in an intense manner upon its display to them, is certainly to put the particular case he had in mind fairly.

But even so, the love of God is the basis of all.

John 1:9-13

We must remember that the writer was dealing with manifestations of lovelessness, not in the world at large where they might have occasioned little wonder, but among the Christian brotherhood where they were shameful. Here at least ought love be found in complete display. If love is to be put down as one of the tests of life (and we must keep in mind that the writer is always testing the reality of life), then surely love can be looked for in a brotherhood group. If it cannot be found here, then the case for life is well-nigh hopeless. If those who love a common Lord, and such a Lord as is the personal Logos of God, cannot love each other, there is no use to inquire what it would mean for them to love the world. The lengthy part of the discussion has to do with practical outgoings of love to one another that the writer may display under the most favorable circumstances possible the fulness of its meaning.

It is for this reason that the author holds up to such scathing denunciation all attitudes of hate and neglect: "He that saith he is in the light and hateth his brother, is in the darkness even until now. ---He that hateth his brother is in the darkness, and walketh in the darkness, and knoweth not whither he goeth, because the darkness hath blinded his eyes." (1) Here the terrible force of Hebrew parallelism makes itself felt in saying four times over essentially the same thought. The Christian man who hates his brother, whom he ought by all means to find it in his heart to love, is in darkness, he walks in darkness, he does not know where he is going, the darkness has blinded his eyes. Again the

(1) 1:2:9,11.

murder of Abel by his brother Cain suggests to the writer the full force of hate where love should be expected, and he uses the illustration with point: "This is the message which we heard from the beginning, that we should love one another: not as Cain was of the evil one and slew his brother. And wherefore slew he him? Because his works were evil, and his brother's righteous. ---He that loveth not abideth in death. Whoso hateth his brother is a murderer: and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him." (1) Hate consists, really in treating people as means, not as ends, because of the jealousy toward their better doings, as the comparison of Cain and his brother suggests. Love consists in treating each person as an end in himself. This makes possible a family likeness, a relationship without which true love cannot be developed.

Yet love, according to John, includes even a certain direction of hate. Jesus is represented as teaching his followers, "He that loveth his life loseth it; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal." (2) Evidently, for Jesus, a man could love the wrong thing. To hate life is predicated as necessary, and the word used is *ψυχῇ*. The result of hating such life is to receive the gift of life eternal, and this time the word for life is *ζωή*. The former of these is the ordinary word for 'life' as it is used in the New Testament, while the latter is the word always used, especially in this phrase 'life eternal', in contrast to death. In other words, to hate the ordinary life in such a way as

(1) I:3:11,12,14,15. (2) G:12:25.

not to cherish it selfishly and seek to keep it for one's self - to be willingly to do what love does, and give it up - is to find that type of life which cannot die. This is the Johannine antithesis of love and hate in relation to life and death. Similarly in the First Epistle, the misdirection of love is warned against, "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. --- And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth forever." (1) Here the thought is strikingly parallel to that of the gospel, for the proper direction of love is the gaining of the life that cannot die, and that thus abides forever. These thoughts strengthen our representation that John is intensifying love within a family group in order to show what may be its full measure in the best circumstances.

This family likeness and relationship becomes clearer as John proceeds to treat of the love for God. For while a large part of the emphasis in both gospel and epistles, especially in the epistles, is on the love of God to men as evidencing the kind of love that men should show to each other, yet the love of men for God is by no means neglected. And this latter direction of love becomes the crowning mark of Christian brotherhood and the chief evidence of likemindedness. John seems never to have ceased wondering at the very possibility of men who love coming into a relationship of love with God which establishes them as his true children, a relationship

(1) I:2:15,17.

in which others cannot share: "Beloved what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called children of God; and such we are. For this cause the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not. Beloved, now are we children of God, and it is not yet made manifest what we shall be. We know that, if he shall be manifested, we shall be like him; for we shall see him even as he is."(1) Love like God's is the very essence of the spiritual life, so that simply to love, in and of itself, is to be of the family of God, and is to know God as a Son knows a Father: "Beloved, let us love one another: for love is of God; and everyone that loveth is begotten of God, and knoweth God. He that loveth not knoweth not God; for God is love."(2) Only to the loving heart is the knowledge of God possible, for only by being God-like can we know God. And since the true nature of God is always revealed, according to John, as a Father, he can be known therefore only by a Son, one who possesses his family trait of love.

It is for this reason that the gospel speaks oftenest of God as loving Jesus, because he is in so supreme and unique a fashion, God's Son. It is for this reason also that both gospel and epistles represent the love of God as being more for those who have come into relationship with him through Jesus than for the world at large, because there is to a greater degree this relation of sonship established. Well over a hundred times is God presented in our sources as the Father; it is indeed the most frequent single characterization of him. Jesus so often uses the thought that he finally

(1) I:3:1,2. (2) I:4:7,8.

brings the disciples to the high pitch of enthusiasm where they say, "Show us the Father, and it sufficeth us." (1) The same insistence on a family manifestation of the love of God is seen in a very beautiful way in the use of the term John employs to denote the relationship that men may attain as God's sons. While he makes frequent use of the word *υἱός* especially to denote Jesus' sonship to God, he never uses it to denote men's sonship to God. He always uses *τέκνον* instead. Now *υἱός* emphasizes the dignity and right of sonship, but *τέκνον* emphasizes the tender and endearing relations of a child. *υἱός* suggests the full-grown, *τέκνον* the one on the way to maturity. This peculiarity of usage is to be noted, not only in the passages quoted above from the First Epistle where men's sonship to God is marveled at, but also in the gospel, and in the prologue at that: "But as many as received him (the Logos), to them gave he the right to become children of God, even to them that believe on his name." (2) Wescott describes this usage in words that merit quotation:

"The idea of *τέκνον*, as it is presented by St. John, includes the two notions of the presence of the divine principle and the action of human growth. The child is made to share in his Father's nature, and he uses in progressive advance the powers which he has received. It is therefore easily intelligible why St. John never uses the title *υἱός*, the name of definite dignity and privilege, to describe the relation of Christians to God. He regards their position not as the result of an 'adoption' (*υἱοθεσία*), but as the result of a new life which advances from the vital germ to full maturity." (3)

(1) G:14:8. (2) G:1:12

(3) Wescott, "The Epistles of St. John", add. note, pp. 123, 124.

It is this child-like nature into which one is "born anew"(1), and it is this same child-likeness that distinguishes him as a child of God from a son of the devil: "In this the children of God are manifested, and the children of the devil: whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother."(2) And the thought of the family life of love is completely rounded out in the saying, "Whosoever loveth him that begat loveth him also that is begotten of him. Hereby we know that we love the children of God, when we love God and do his commandments."(3) To love God is to love his Son Jesus, the one who has the full dignity and worth of a Son (*υἱός*). To love God is to have the certainty that we can love his children (*τέκνα*), who are of his family, the counterpart of the thought that we must love men whom we can see before we have any right to say that we love God whom we have not seen; for here the thought is that to love is to see and know God.

Love to God, then, is presented in the First Epistle as a test of walking in the light (4) and of sonship(5): This means family relationship in the deep and tender way that we have seen. These two sections beautifully develop the thought that we have summarized by taking apart their constituent elements and looking at them closely. Another of the connected passages on love treats of its genesis in God, (6) and still another of its synthesis with belief (7), this last being left for fuller development in the treatment of the subject of belief. Thus the love sections of the First Epistle may be said to be

(1) G:3:3. (2) I:3:10. (3) I:5:1,2. (4) I:2:7-17.
 (5) I:3:10, b-24, a. (6) I:4:7-12. (7) I:4:13-16.

a deep development of the philosophy of life in terms of intimate relations that can be expressed only in the closest and dearest figures of speech that have ever clustered around the family group.

But the gospel as well as the Epistles treats love to God in this intimate fashion. Here, however, it is love to Christ as the revealer of God that is insisted upon; and Jesus is represented as claiming for himself the singular devotion of his followers because he is able to bring them into this family relationship which is expressed in the epistle by love to God. There are two main portions of the gospel in which this fellowship of love is developed: first in the scene between Jesus and his disciples in the upper room on the night preceding the crucifixion, (1) and second in the scene by the lakeside which forms the epilogue to the gospel. (2)

In the first of these the note of the family circle is very marked. The scene begins with the significant remark, "Jesus knowing that his hour was come that he should depart out of this world unto the Father, having loved his own that were in the world, he loved them unto the end." (3) Here Jesus' consciousness of his oneness with God as his Father, and his consciousness of his oneness with his disciples through love, are blended. There is no understanding of the gospel's representation of the nature of love without this centralness of Jesus as Son, and this resultant revelation on his part of God as Father. The scene proceeds to lay bare the startling

(1) G:chs.13,14,15. (2) G:ch.21. (3) G:13:1.

revelation of the meaning of love in practical service that is known as the "washing of the disciples' feet", a scene in which the utmost of humility and graciousness are set over against the pride and bigotry on the part of the men in the performance of a menial and unpleasant task. This is the prelude to the supper scene, in which "the disciple whom Jesus loved" (1) plays so prominent a part in bringing to light the family conception of their life, and in which Jesus not only encourages his disciples to forget their petty jealousy and love one another, but to love with the same ardor with which he has loved them: "Even as I have loved you, that ye also love one another." (2)

But this is only the beginning of the revelation of what it means for men to come into the peculiar relation with the divine by means of love. A discussion of what Jesus is and has been striving to reveal of God leads to a question and answer parley about God as Father, and then the significant statement in which the Johannine philosophy of love, as directed through the Sonship of the personal Logos to God as Father, is fully contained: "He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself unto him." (3) And again, a little later, "If a man love me, he will keep my word: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." (4) The purpose of this thesis does not include an investigation

(1) G:13:23. (2) G:13:34. (3) G:14:21. (4) G:14:23.

of the exact presentation of the person of Jesus in its nature and essence. Scholars may differ over just what is meant to be literal and what figurative in the presentation. But it would be only the most arbitrary who failed to find in these words a clear delineation of the central place of Jesus in the mind of the writer as the revealer and establisher of love. To love such a one as Jesus has shown himself by his loving ministry, is to love God as a Father; for love is seen in the perfection of a loving personality. And for one so to love is to have God abide within him as a Father. But as though this thought might still be intangible, the writer presents Jesus, the flesh and blood Jesus whom they can see, as saying that for God to abide in human hearts by love is nothing different from him himself abiding in their hearts by love. Hence the "We" of the latter part of the assertion. Jesus as the personal revealer of the love of God to men unites himself with God through dwelling in the heart by love; thus that indwelling becomes tangible and understandable. Jesus can assure them that "Even as the Father hath loved me, I also have loved you." And the exhortation that he draws from this is, "Abide ye in my love"(1). God's love to Jesus as the perfect Son is everywhere in the gospel represented as unique; yet so great is Jesus's power of revelation that he can love men with the same unique devotion.

The other passage, contained in the remarkable epilogue to the gospel, centers around the relations of Jesus and Simon Peter. The scene is highly dramatic and the characters vividly

(1) G:15:9.

drawn. Peter has been disloyal. None realizes it better than he. He has denied his lord after vowing to be true to him even though all others should fail him. In the presence of scorn and threat he has denied that vow with an oath. Once since, for a moment, he has seen this same lord and master(1). He is back at the Lake of Galilee, where he and Jesus have so often toiled and talked together. There are six others with him. Fretful and uncertain, these expert fishermen, returning to their customary labor, have none of their customary success; they toil all night and take nothing. Jesus has told them he will meet them in Galilee, and they are anxious about when he will come. In the early dusk of the morning he appears, not as the reviler, but as the humble minister once more, preparing a breakfast for the weary men. He calls to them in their boat. It is the intuitive John who recognizes first who he is, but it is the responsive Peter who leaps into the water and swims or wades ashore. After the meal in which all seem to have joined in silence, the thing which was bound to come occurs. Jesus takes Peter off up the shore a little ways and talks to him. Peter seems to have partly welcomed, partly dreaded, the necessary interview. But it is not what might have been expected. The words of Jesus are clear and concise. They leave no loophole. But they are not a bid for further pledges of doing this or that. They are not rebukes for failure. They are put in the form of one simple test: "Simon, son of John, lovest thou me?"(2) This test, spoken solemnly three times, is the one means Jesus uses to recall Peter to the meaning of the

(1) See Lk.24:34 and I Cor.15:5. (2) G:21:15,16,17.

relationship he had lost and to which Jesus characteristically seeks to restore him. It is for this reason that the picture is so homely, so impressionistic. It is for this reason that Jesus is represented as doing once more a common, menial task. It is for this reason that Jesus at once assigns to Peter definite obligation: "Feed my lambs. Tend my sheep." (1) Through these actions and words of Jesus the writer is once more expressing his philosophy of love: that love is a family relationship of inner depth and sweetness, and that it is expressive in activity that is needed, regardless of the kind; that this relationship is bound up with, and this activity is best expressed by the personality of Jesus.

It has often been remarked that John uses two different words for the verb 'to love'; *ἀγαπᾶν*, which is usually employed of high and reasoned affection and is always employed in love to God, and *φιλεῖν*, which properly means 'to be a friend', 'to care for in an emotional way'. That the two words are synonyms is evident; that John means to contrast them is quite probable. In this scene at the lake with Peter, the two words are used by the writer in an interchange which is greatly heightened in its effect if contrast is intended. Thus, Jesus asks Peter the first time if he loves him, and he used the high word, *ἀγαπᾶς*. Peter replies with the lower word of ordinary friendly affection, *φιλεῖς*. Again Jesus repeats his question, using the high word of reasoned and thoughtful love, and once more Peter, not trying to measure up to it, replies with the lower word.

But the third time John puts into the mouth of Jesus Peter's

(1) G:21:15, 16.

own word, as though he would say: "Well, Peter, are you sure you love me even in this very human way?" (1) To say that Jesus and Peter probably discoursed in Aramaic and that therefore the point to this play on words would have been lost, is to beg the question. It is the Greek text that is before the reader. It is John's interpretation of the scene that we have, and he used the Greek as the vehicle of that interpretation. That he meant the contrast to appear seems evident from the words with which he continues: "Peter was grieved because he said unto him the third time, *φιλεῖς*." (2) Not that Peter objected to the repetition of the question, but that it hurt him to have Jesus come down to his own word. The characteristic uses of the two terms in the gospel accord with this interpretation. Thus both are used in all kinds of relationships and are interchangeable; but wherever *φιλεῖν* is used, the emphasis seems to be on natural inclination, an involuntary, intense passion, the Latin 'amare', which was the disposition of Peter. Wherever *ἀγαπᾶν* is used, the less ardent, more sustained, reasoned and voluntary admiration or esteem seems to be intended, — the Latin 'diligere'. Thus the love of Christ for his disciples is oftenest expressed by the lofty *ἀγαπᾶν* (3); yet his affection for the nameless disciple whom he is said to have loved with especial tenderness is at least once expressed by the homlier *φιλεῖν*. (4) The love for his good friend Lazarus, another of his intimates, is expressed by this same *φιλεῖν* (5), yet in the same scene, where the sisters, Martha

(1) G:21:15,16. (2) G:21:17. (3) See for example, G:13:23; 19:26; 21:7,20.

(4) G:20:2. (5) G:11:3,36.

and Mary are included in the expression of Jesus' love, the more restrained *ἀγαπᾷ* is used. (1)

But more significant than the usages of these two verbs is the constant use in the Johannine writings, as in the rest of the New Testament, of the lofty noun for love, *ἀγάπη*. This term never occurs in classical Greek, nor in any Greek of a later period prior to the New Testament, with the exception of a single instance in Philo. It may be said, then, to be the distinctively Christian noun for the expression of that high and holy relationship existing between God and man, between men and their brethren, between men and God. It is used in all the passages we have quoted both from the gospel and the epistles where the noun occurs at all. When God is declared to be love (2), it is this lofty term. When men are said to abide in God when they abide in love (3), it is the same. To comprehend and follow the self-sacrificing spirit is to perceive love in this high sense (4). Love becomes then an understanding by which one enters into the very life purpose of another. Thus Mary who came to Jesus and anointed his feet beforehand for his burial (5) is represented as understanding his mission of the giving up of himself in a way that no others understood, and the fellowship of her love is stressed. In the intimate scene in the upper room, John pictures the fellowship of love as being discussed by Jesus as soon as Judas the loveless has gone out, and he adds of Judas' retirement, apparently with intentional poetic suggestion, "And it was night." (6) Thus is Jesus "embalmed in the love of his intimates." (7)

(1) G:11:5. (2) I:4:8. (3) I:4:16. (4) I:3:16. (5) G:12:1-8.

(6) G:13:30. (7) Dodds, "The Greek Expositor", Vol. I, p. 805.

and the real meaning of love comes to be "that outreaching power of the imagination by which we grasp and make real to ourselves the being of others." (1) The reciprocal relations of a love that follows God by obeying the revelation of God is beautifully expressed in the chiasmic figure of the gospel; "If a man love me, he will keep my word: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with Him." (2) And the whole thought of the allegory of the vine and the branches is one of the intimate relations of love.

One other noteworthy fact of the Johannine representation is that love is both bold and enthusiastic. "We have boldness toward God" (3) is the saying of the loving heart. This boldness is represented as asking God for what is desired. (4) The reason for this bold attitude, that would otherwise be affrontery, is that "Perfect love casteth out fear." (5) In this is the Johannine doctrine the answer to all the superstition of the ages that leaves men's hearts cringing before a mysterious, unknown Power. The God of the Johannine writings has so revealed himself as a God of love that he has created love within man, and this love is so ardent in its fellowship with God that fear can have no room left. When fear goes, the mainstay of paganism has been thrown down. Indeed so very daring does the writer become in the thought that this love has cast all fear to the winds and made men one with God, that he can write: "Herein is love made perfect with us, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment;

(1) More, "The Christ of the N.T.", p.123. (2) G:14:23.

(3) I:3:21 (4) I:5:14. (5) I:4:18.

because as he is, even so are we in this world. "(1) This is not the agonizing self-consciousness of assurance that saints and mystics have so often sought with tears, but it is the peace of a life made one with God.

Such a concept of love binds together elements that never ought to be separated. It does not attempt to build up on the one hand a theoretic love of God for the world in general; nor does it attempt on the other hand a philosophy of love in terms of human values that has no relation to the love of God. The doctrine of positivism, made popular today in the philosophy of humanism, however admirable may be the ethic of its sense of the worth of humanity as such, stands in the light of this philosophy inadequate and misleading as is any ethic when severed from its origins. The very notion of value lying in humanity is a notion of a love greater than the love of humanity; and according to the thought of these writings, to love mankind in general, and more especially, individual men in particular, and to keep up the enthusiasm of unselfishly doing for them what they need, regardless of their attractiveness, requires the deep and abiding well-spring of love to God that is union with God. Otherwise, humanism soon must lose its enthusiasm. As has been well said, "To Positivism, with the enthusiasm of humanity as its sole religion, succeeds neo-paganism with the enthusiasm of self as the one true faith and royal law." (2)

Such is the Johannine presentation of love. The writer

(1) I:4:17. (2) Law, "The Tests of Life", p.105

believes that love is the very nature of God, the all essential of God, and that it is not to be distinguished from, nor set over against, his justice or any other 'attribute'. This love of God is self-revealing, willing to be known, seeking companionship among men. It is not content with a benevolent giving of good things; it is the expenditure of God himself, the yielding of the very essence of his life for men. This conception of the love of God can, for John, be expressed only in the life and ministry of Jesus Christ, perfectly at one with God, yet incarnate so that men may see and know the meaning of love revealed in a life like their own. And since self-giving love is never fully revealed in a life until that life is completely given, so Christ must die for men as the full token of love. Such love prompts men's love as the great imperative. It makes their love toward one another to become, not merely a beautiful sentiment, but a practical helpfulness of spirit which, like God's, gives to the full expenditure of life. John does not consider the subject of love unrequited. For him it is best studied in groups of the like-minded, for it is the nature of love to create and maintain a brotherhood. Hate is therefore the cardinal sin, as love is the sum of virtue. As a good philosopher of life has expressed it:

"To take the duties and trials, the practical problems and personal relationships of life up into the atmosphere of love, so that what we do and how we treat other people becomes the resultant, not of the outward situation and our natural appetites and passions, but of the outward situation and love within our

hearts, this is what it means to live in the Christian spirit." (1)

This is a complete fulfillment of the Platonic ideal of striving to subordinate the trivial to that of greater value; it is the Christian expression that all has become valuable. Especially is this notion of love to be seen in men's love to God made possible by the example and work of Christ. It was his life purpose to take away the evil from the hearts of men that they might be able to appreciate the love of God. He was supremely devoted to this one purpose. His words to Pilate at his trial, "To this end have I been born, and to this end am I come into the world" (2), are the fulfillment of Aristotle's ideal of devotion to a worthy end. This worthy end is expressed by our writer as the bringing of men into the intimacy of family relationship with God, teaching them the meaning of love, and inspiring their deepest affection. This is Christian love, the supreme test of life, the most important phase of the Johannine philosophy.

Thirdly, the illumined Will is a will to believe. Now curiously enough the term faith, *πίστις*, occurs nowhere in the gospel and but once in the epistle: "This is the victory that hath overcome the world, even our faith." (3) When we remember that this is one of the leading spiritual terms in the Pauline section of the New Testament, we are at first concerned that it seems to have so little part in this highly spiritual philosophy. But for Paul faith did not connote a

(1) Hyde, "The Five Great Philosophies of Life", Chp. 5.

(2) G:18:37. (3) I:5:4.

content of belief; it represented an abandonment of the self to trust in God. This concept is paralleled in the Johannine philosophy by love. It is love that is the expression for John of a passionate abandonment, a turning over of one's whole self to God. He scarcely needs the idea of faith in its common New Testament usages, and makes no use of it.

But the cognate verb, *πιστεύειν*, 'to believe', is of frequent occurrence in these writings, and it does denote a content of belief, more or less specific. Once more the reason for this is to be found in the polemical object both of gospel and epistles, and especially of the first epistle. The presence in the church of those who taught a certain definite system of belief, calculated, in John's mind, to undermine the thinking and living of Christians, was sufficient to rouse him to the task of developing belief in a wholly different direction. Docetism was taking the particular turn of a denial of the reality of certain truths which to the writer were the very basis of reality. We have seen how to him the very possibility of righteousness and love rested back on the righteousness and love of God, and how these were to be known only in the actual human life of Jesus which was God's full Logos. But the Docetists said that the Logos had no real existence in Jesus; that the human experiences which had come to mean so much to Christians as enabling them to visualize and understand God, were unreal. In contending for their actuality by his insistence on belief, the writer's thesis becomes a treatise on the nature of reality.

Reality becomes for the Johannine philosophy a belief

in the possibility of knowing God, not first through some strange or mystic meditation, but through spiritual acquaintance with, and purposeful imitation of, the character and life of Jesus. To believe that Jesus was really the Messiah, God's Logos come to life in human form, is to have the only proper sense of reality. To deny this is to exhibit here and now the antichrist, which the apocalyptists were looking for in some future manifestation of terrible form. This is an ingenious use of a common thought of the day, and a definite identification of the Christian idea of antichrist, not with any one individual, but with a spirit or tendency to wrong belief:

"Beloved, believe not every spirit, but prove the spirits, whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world. Hereby know ye the spirit of God: every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit that confesseth not Jesus is not of God: and this is the spirit of the antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it cometh; and now it is in the world already." (1)

And again,

"Who is the liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? This is the anti-christ, even he that denieth the Father and the Son." (2)

And yet again in the little Second Epistle,

"For many deceivers are gone forth into the world, even they that confess not that Jesus Christ cometh in the flesh. This is the deceiver and the antichrist." (3)

This Second Epistle is especially strong in its urgency upon the test of belief. The writer is solicitous for the "children of the elect lady" to whom he is writing. He is afraid that,

(1) I:4:1-3. (2) I:2:22. (3) II:7.

not being grounded in the meaning and implication of the truth, they will be led astray by the wiles of the false teachers ere they have become aware. For this reason he desires the "lady" to draw a sharp line in the matter of fellowship:

"He that abideth in the teaching, the same hath both the Father and the Son. If anyone cometh unto you, and bringeth not this teaching, receive him not into your house, and give him no greeting: for he that giveth him greeting partaketh in his evil works."(1)

It is evident from these citations that the author of the epistles fears more strongly the corruption of Christian teaching within the church than he does the influence of paganism without. It is these considerations that give rise to the very general use in the epistles of the term ἀλήθεια, truth. "By this we know the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error"(2), he says, in speaking of the response to the gospel the Christian church is preaching. He is very sure that the Spirit who is guiding this preaching is the Spirit of truth (3) because God himself has given to loving hearts calm assurance that they are of the truth(4). He himself dares to love the people to whom he writes only because this love is "in the truth"(5). He is greatly relieved and very happy to find "certain of the children" of the "elect lady" "walking in truth" (6), and also his friend Gaius and his companions(7) And his strongest plea for the development of Christian hospitality to those who are traveling about to preach the gospel, is, "That we may be fellow-workers for the truth."(8) All this is indicative of a state of mind disturbed by contentions among the people to whom the writer is ministering,

(1) II:9-11. (2) I:4:6. (3) I:5:6. (4) I:3:19. (5) II:1,2;III:1.
(6) II:4. (7) III:3,4. (8) III:8.

fearful lest the people whom he loves shall fall for seeming truth which is error because they are untrained, and fearful especially lest their morals and their sense of Christian fellowship alike shall suffer the curse of shallowness in broadening out to meet this indefinite and unreal philosophy. For this reason John's belief is concrete.

This definiteness is the reality of Jesus as the complete revelation of God. "Jesus is the Christ" seems to have been the simple summary of the writer's creed both in gospel and epistles: "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is begotten of God"(1) "These are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God."(2) It is presented in the gospel as well as in the epistles as definitely "the truth", the thought usually occurring in the gospel in connection with the presentation of witness for the Christ. Thus, Jesus declares that John the Baptist "bore witness unto the truth"(3), a truth which the prologue had declared, in connection with the birth of John, to be a greater revelation than the law that had come through Moses (4). In his argument with the Pharisees in the great scent of the eight chapter, Jesus declares that they are slaves to the blind error of their way that they need the truth he has come to reveal that they may be at liberty: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free"(5); and he somewhat plaintively upbraids them for desiring to kill him, "a man that hath told you the truth."(6) He declares that it is for the very reason that he is telling the truth that they refuse to believe him because

(1) I:5:1. (2) G:20:31. (3) G:5:33. (4) G:1:17.
(5) G:8:32 (6) G:8:40.

lying is inherent with them, it is the very warp and woof of their character.(1) When his disciples are asking for witness of what he may be to them he discloses himself as the way, and then defines that way as truth and life(2), or, as we should say, creed and conduct, both of which he presents as inherent in his own personality. He presents the promise of the gift of the Holy Spirit as the chief of all witnesses to the truth, for this shall be the abiding spiritual presence in their lives that shall guide them into all truth,(3), the Spirit that comes direct from him and therefore represents his truth.(4) Thus to friend and foe alike Jesus is represented as presenting the same passion for truth as contained in a definite thought of himself as the epistles present in contending for him. The gospel is fair in presenting, not only the growth of faith on the part of those who believe the witness, but also the growth of unbelief on the part of those who reject; but it is unsparing in its thought of these latter as coming not to the truth because their deeds are evil. The climax is to be seen in Pilate, whose rejection of Jesus after an attempt to befriend him, is with the slighting remark about his chief contention: "What is truth?"(5)

This definite content of belief about Jesus which the Johannine writings style 'the truth' has only a few connotations. The chief of these is the thought of Jesus as God's Son. While the thought of the sonship of Jesus to God is perhaps not really more prominent in the Fourth Gospel than in the Synoptics, it is more significant. The Synoptics lead

(1) G:8:44-46. (2) G:14:6. (3) G:16:13. (4) G:15:26. (5) G:18:38.

up through a series of remarkable narratives to the thought; the Fourth Gospel leads down from it as its starting place. The Synoptics deduce the sonship, as it were, out of the proofs that are at hand; the Fourth Gospel reasons from sonship to all that it means for the world. This is clearly seen in the chief passages in which the idea of sonship is discussed at length.

The first of these follows the interview with Nicodemus.(1). Here the gift of God's Son is the proof on his love. This love is to be set over against judgment, says the writer: "God sent not his Son into the world to judge the world; but that the world should be saved through him." (2) The one who "doeth truth" comes to this light, believes that God loves instead of condemns, and so is saved.(3)

The second passage has to do with Jesus' array of his witnesses and presents Jesus, not so much in Messianic dignity, as in close relation and fellowship with God as his Father.(4) Here the chief thing to be believed is that the work of Jesus is not bad, but that it is the work of God. He sees his Father doing certain works, and because it is in him as a Son to reveal his Father, therefore he does these same works also: "The works which the Father hath given me to accomplish, the very works that I do bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me." (5)

The third passage is in connection with the discussion of Jesus as the bread of life. (6) Here the particular point is that Jesus is the one who has been sent of his Father in a

(1) G:3:16-21. (2) G:3:17. (3) G:3:21. (4) G:5:17-23, 36, 37.
(5) G:5:36. (6) G:6:27-48.

way similar to that in which the manna was sent from heaven of old. The people are working hard for bread as men always work for bread. If they will do the best kind of work, however, they will do the work of God. And what is this? "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent." (1) God, as Jesus' Father, seeks to draw men to this belief in him and so to give them eternal life: "Every one that hath heard from the Father, and hath learned, cometh unto me. --- Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth hath eternal life." (2)

The fourth passage is in connection with the discussion of the true nature of sonship. (3) We have already handled it in dealing with the subject of righteousness, for the ethical element looms largest of all here. Jesus insists that the true test of his Sonship to the Father is the fact that he has the character of the Father, while the real proof that the calumniators are not even sons of Abraham is the fact that they are not like Abraham in their belief and action: "I speak the things which I have seen with my Father; and ye also do the things which ye heard from your father." (4) "If God were your Father, ye would love me: for I came forth and am come from God; for neither have I come of myself, but he sent me." (5)

But the chief passage is that which follows the allegory of the Good Shepherd. (6) Here again Jesus alludes to the works of the Father which he is doing, especially the work of preserving the souls of men as the shepherd is careful to

(1) G:6:29. (2) G:6:45,47. (3) G:8:31-59. (4) G:8:38.
(5) G:8:42 (6) G:10:22-38.

preserve the lives of his sheep. Then follows the dialogue which is extremely significant as denoting what it was that was set before people as the thing they should believe:

"Many good works have I showed you from the Father; for which of these works do ye stone me? The Jews answered him, For a good work we stone thee not, but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God. Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods? If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came (and the scripture cannot be broken), say ye of him whom the Father sanctified and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God? If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do them, though ye believe not me, believe the works: that ye may know and understand that the Father is in me, and I in the Father." (1)

From this passage it is evident that no bare metaphysic is being presented as the necessary point of belief. Jesus frankly admits their insistence that he is a man. He insists just as determinedly that he is the Son of God, but when they urge that this is blasphemy, his refutation is two-fold: first that even certain illumined ones in the Old Testament were called sons of God; and second, that his works are like the works of God. It is evident here then what Sonship to God meant to Jesus. The ethical note was uppermost as we have seen it to be in all the Johannine writings. The test of his being God's Son was his likeness to God. This was its meaning for him. The only question involved was whether or not his works were really like the works God is constantly doing. If they are not, do not believe him; if they are, believe him. There is plenty of ground here for trinitarian

(1) G:10:32-38. (2) 1:1-14. (3) 1:18-24. (4) 1:25-27. (5) 1:28-34. (6) 1:35-51. (7) 3:1-15. (8) 3:16-21. (9) 3:22-36. (10) 4:1-42. (11) 4:43-54. (12) 5:1-47. (13) 6:1-71. (14) 7:1-53. (15) 8:1-59. (16) 9:1-34. (17) 9:35-104. (18) 10:1-45. (19) 10:46-51. (20) 11:1-54. (21) 11:55-120. (22) 12:1-11. (23) 12:12-50. (24) 13:1-20. (25) 13:21-33. (26) 13:34-38. (27) 13:39-48. (28) 13:49-76. (29) 14:1-31. (30) 14:32-49. (31) 15:1-20. (32) 15:21-26. (33) 15:27-47. (34) 16:1-33. (35) 16:34-36. (36) 16:37-40. (37) 16:41-46. (38) 16:47-50. (39) 16:51-58. (40) 17:1-19. (41) 17:20-26. (42) 17:27-36. (43) 17:37-40. (44) 17:41-43. (45) 17:44-46. (46) 17:47-50. (47) 18:1-11. (48) 18:12-27. (49) 18:28-35. (50) 18:36-40. (51) 18:41-43. (52) 18:44-46. (53) 18:47-50. (54) 19:1-15. (55) 19:16-22. (56) 19:23-27. (57) 19:28-30. (58) 19:31-37. (59) 19:38-42. (60) 19:43-45. (61) 19:46-48. (62) 19:49-51. (63) 20:1-11. (64) 20:12-17. (65) 20:18-29. (66) 20:30-31. (67) 20:32-39. (68) 20:40-46. (69) 20:47-51. (70) 21:1-14. (71) 21:15-17. (72) 21:18-23. (73) 21:24-27. (74) 21:28-31. (75) 21:32-33. (76) 21:34-36. (77) 21:37-40. (78) 21:41-46. (79) 21:47-51. (80) 22:1-6. (81) 22:7-15. (82) 22:16-18. (83) 22:19-21. (84) 22:22-23. (85) 22:24-26. (86) 22:27-30. (87) 22:31-34. (88) 22:35-38. (89) 22:39-46. (90) 22:47-51. (91) 23:1-9. (92) 23:10-17. (93) 23:18-25. (94) 23:26-29. (95) 23:30-35. (96) 23:36-39. (97) 23:40-43. (98) 23:44-46. (99) 23:47-51. (100) 24:1-14. (101) 24:15-17. (102) 24:18-21. (103) 24:22-25. (104) 24:26-28. (105) 24:29-31. (106) 24:32-34. (107) 24:35-38. (108) 24:39-41. (109) 24:42-44. (110) 24:45-48. (111) 24:49-51. (112) 25:1-13. (113) 25:14-19. (114) 25:20-23. (115) 25:24-27. (116) 25:28-31. (117) 25:32-35. (118) 25:36-39. (119) 25:40-43. (120) 25:44-46. (121) 25:47-51. (122) 26:1-11. (123) 26:12-15. (124) 26:16-19. (125) 26:20-23. (126) 26:24-27. (127) 26:28-31. (128) 26:32-35. (129) 26:36-39. (130) 26:40-43. (131) 26:44-46. (132) 26:47-51. (133) 27:1-6. (134) 27:7-10. (135) 27:11-14. (136) 27:15-18. (137) 27:19-22. (138) 27:23-26. (139) 27:27-30. (140) 27:31-34. (141) 27:35-38. (142) 27:39-42. (143) 27:43-46. (144) 27:47-51. (145) 28:1-11. (146) 28:12-15. (147) 28:16-19. (148) 28:20-23. (149) 28:24-27. (150) 28:28-31. (151) 28:32-35. (152) 28:36-39. (153) 28:40-43. (154) 28:44-46. (155) 28:47-51. (156) 29:1-11. (157) 29:12-15. (158) 29:16-19. (159) 29:20-23. (160) 29:24-27. (161) 29:28-31. (162) 29:32-35. (163) 29:36-39. (164) 29:40-43. (165) 29:44-46. (166) 29:47-51. (167) 30:1-11. (168) 30:12-15. (169) 30:16-19. (170) 30:20-23. (171) 30:24-27. (172) 30:28-31. (173) 30:32-35. (174) 30:36-39. (175) 30:40-43. (176) 30:44-46. (177) 30:47-51. (178) 31:1-11. (179) 31:12-15. (180) 31:16-19. (181) 31:20-23. (182) 31:24-27. (183) 31:28-31. (184) 31:32-35. (185) 31:36-39. (186) 31:40-43. (187) 31:44-46. (188) 31:47-51. (189) 32:1-11. (190) 32:12-15. (191) 32:16-19. (192) 32:20-23. (193) 32:24-27. (194) 32:28-31. (195) 32:32-35. (196) 32:36-39. (197) 32:40-43. (198) 32:44-46. (199) 32:47-51. (200) 33:1-11. (201) 33:12-15. (202) 33:16-19. (203) 33:20-23. (204) 33:24-27. (205) 33:28-31. (206) 33:32-35. (207) 33:36-39. (208) 33:40-43. (209) 33:44-46. (210) 33:47-51. (211) 34:1-11. (212) 34:12-15. (213) 34:16-19. (214) 34:20-23. (215) 34:24-27. (216) 34:28-31. (217) 34:32-35. (218) 34:36-39. (219) 34:40-43. (220) 34:44-46. (221) 34:47-51. (222) 35:1-11. (223) 35:12-15. (224) 35:16-19. (225) 35:20-23. (226) 35:24-27. (227) 35:28-31. (228) 35:32-35. (229) 35:36-39. (230) 35:40-43. (231) 35:44-46. (232) 35:47-51. (233) 36:1-11. (234) 36:12-15. (235) 36:16-19. (236) 36:20-23. (237) 36:24-27. (238) 36:28-31. (239) 36:32-35. (240) 36:36-39. (241) 36:40-43. (242) 36:44-46. (243) 36:47-51. (244) 37:1-11. (245) 37:12-15. (246) 37:16-19. (247) 37:20-23. (248) 37:24-27. (249) 37:28-31. (250) 37:32-35. (251) 37:36-39. (252) 37:40-43. (253) 37:44-46. (254) 37:47-51. (255) 38:1-11. (256) 38:12-15. (257) 38:16-19. (258) 38:20-23. (259) 38:24-27. (260) 38:28-31. (261) 38:32-35. (262) 38:36-39. (263) 38:40-43. (264) 38:44-46. (265) 38:47-51. (266) 39:1-11. (267) 39:12-15. (268) 39:16-19. (269) 39:20-23. (270) 39:24-27. (271) 39:28-31. (272) 39:32-35. (273) 39:36-39. (274) 39:40-43. (275) 39:44-46. (276) 39:47-51. (277) 40:1-11. (278) 40:12-15. (279) 40:16-19. (280) 40:20-23. (281) 40:24-27. (282) 40:28-31. (283) 40:32-35. (284) 40:36-39. (285) 40:40-43. (286) 40:44-46. (287) 40:47-51. (288) 41:1-11. (289) 41:12-15. (290) 41:16-19. (291) 41:20-23. (292) 41:24-27. (293) 41:28-31. (294) 41:32-35. (295) 41:36-39. (296) 41:40-43. (297) 41:44-46. (298) 41:47-51. (299) 42:1-11. (300) 42:12-15. (301) 42:16-19. (302) 42:20-23. (303) 42:24-27. (304) 42:28-31. (305) 42:32-35. (306) 42:36-39. (307) 42:40-43. (308) 42:44-46. (309) 42:47-51. (310) 43:1-11. (311) 43:12-15. (312) 43:16-19. (313) 43:20-23. (314) 43:24-27. (315) 43:28-31. (316) 43:32-35. (317) 43:36-39. (318) 43:40-43. (319) 43:44-46. (320) 43:47-51. (321) 44:1-11. (322) 44:12-15. (323) 44:16-19. (324) 44:20-23. (325) 44:24-27. (326) 44:28-31. (327) 44:32-35. (328) 44:36-39. (329) 44:40-43. (330) 44:44-46. (331) 44:47-51. (332) 45:1-11. (333) 45:12-15. (334) 45:16-19. (335) 45:20-23. (336) 45:24-27. (337) 45:28-31. (338) 45:32-35. (339) 45:36-39. (340) 45:40-43. (341) 45:44-46. (342) 45:47-51. (343) 46:1-11. (344) 46:12-15. (345) 46:16-19. (346) 46:20-23. (347) 46:24-27. (348) 46:28-31. (349) 46:32-35. (350) 46:36-39. (351) 46:40-43. (352) 46:44-46. (353) 46:47-51. (354) 47:1-11. (355) 47:12-15. (356) 47:16-19. (357) 47:20-23. (358) 47:24-27. (359) 47:28-31. (360) 47:32-35. (361) 47:36-39. (362) 47:40-43. (363) 47:44-46. (364) 47:47-51. (365) 48:1-11. (366) 48:12-15. (367) 48:16-19. (368) 48:20-23. (369) 48:24-27. (370) 48:28-31. (371) 48:32-35. (372) 48:36-39. (373) 48:40-43. (374) 48:44-46. (375) 48:47-51. (376) 49:1-11. (377) 49:12-15. (378) 49:16-19. (379) 49:20-23. (380) 49:24-27. (381) 49:28-31. (382) 49:32-35. (383) 49:36-39. (384) 49:40-43. (385) 49:44-46. (386) 49:47-51. (387) 50:1-11. (388) 50:12-15. (389) 50:16-19. (390) 50:20-23. (391) 50:24-27. (392) 50:28-31. (393) 50:32-35. (394) 50:36-39. (395) 50:40-43. (396) 50:44-46. (397) 50:47-51. (398) 51:1-11. (399) 51:12-15. (400) 51:16-19. (401) 51:20-23. (402) 51:24-27. (403) 51:28-31. (404) 51:32-35. (405) 51:36-39. (406) 51:40-43. (407) 51:44-46. (408) 51:47-51. (409) 52:1-11. (410) 52:12-15. (411) 52:16-19. (412) 52:20-23. (413) 52:24-27. (414) 52:28-31. (415) 52:32-35. (416) 52:36-39. (417) 52:40-43. (418) 52:44-46. (419) 52:47-51. (420) 53:1-11. (421) 53:12-15. (422) 53:16-19. (423) 53:20-23. (424) 53:24-27. (425) 53:28-31. (426) 53:32-35. (427) 53:36-39. (428) 53:40-43. (429) 53:44-46. (430) 53:47-51. (431) 54:1-11. (432) 54:12-15. (433) 54:16-19. (434) 54:20-23. (435) 54:24-27. (436) 54:28-31. (437) 54:32-35. (438) 54:36-39. (439) 54:40-43. (440) 54:44-46. (441) 54:47-51. (442) 55:1-11. (443) 55:12-15. (444) 55:16-19. (445) 55:20-23. (446) 55:24-27. (447) 55:28-31. (448) 55:32-35. (449) 55:36-39. (450) 55:40-43. (451) 55:44-46. (452) 55:47-51. (453) 56:1-11. (454) 56:12-15. (455) 56:16-19. (456) 56:20-23. (457) 56:24-27. (458) 56:28-31. (459) 56:32-35. (460) 56:36-39. (461) 56:40-43. (462) 56:44-46. (463) 56:47-51. (464) 57:1-11. (465) 57:12-15. (466) 57:16-19. (467) 57:20-23. (468) 57:24-27. (469) 57:28-31. (470) 57:32-35. (471) 57:36-39. (472) 57:40-43. (473) 57:44-46. (474) 57:47-51. (475) 58:1-11. (476) 58:12-15. (477) 58:16-19. (478) 58:20-23. (479) 58:24-27. (480) 58:28-31. (481) 58:32-35. (482) 58:36-39. (483) 58:40-43. (484) 58:44-46. (485) 58:47-51. (486) 59:1-11. (487) 59:12-15. (488) 59:16-19. (489) 59:20-23. (490) 59:24-27. (491) 59:28-31. (492) 59:32-35. (493) 59:36-39. (494) 59:40-43. (495) 59:44-46. (496) 59:47-51. (497) 60:1-11. (498) 60:12-15. (499) 60:16-19. (500) 60:20-23. (501) 60:24-27. (502) 60:28-31. (503) 60:32-35. (504) 60:36-39. (505) 60:40-43. (506) 60:44-46. (507) 60:47-51. (508) 61:1-11. (509) 61:12-15. (510) 61:16-19. (511) 61:20-23. (512) 61:24-27. (513) 61:28-31. (514) 61:32-35. (515) 61:36-39. (516) 61:40-43. (517) 61:44-46. (518) 61:47-51. (519) 62:1-11. (520) 62:12-15. (521) 62:16-19. (522) 62:20-23. (523) 62:24-27. (524) 62:28-31. (525) 62:32-35. (526) 62:36-39. (527) 62:40-43. (528) 62:44-46. (529) 62:47-51. (530) 63:1-11. (531) 63:12-15. (532) 63:16-19. (533) 63:20-23. (534) 63:24-27. (535) 63:28-31. (536) 63:32-35. (537) 63:36-39. (538) 63:40-43. (539) 63:44-46. (540) 63:47-51. (541) 64:1-11. (542) 64:12-15. (543) 64:16-19. (544) 64:20-23. (545) 64:24-27. (546) 64:28-31. (547) 64:32-35. (548) 64:36-39. (549) 64:40-43. (550) 64:44-46. (551) 64:47-51. (552) 65:1-11. (553) 65:12-15. (554) 65:16-19. (555) 65:20-23. (556) 65:24-27. (557) 65:28-31. (558) 65:32-35. (559) 65:36-39. (560) 65:40-43. (561) 65:44-46. (562) 65:47-51. (563) 66:1-11. (564) 66:12-15. (565) 66:16-19. (566) 66:20-23. (567) 66:24-27. (568) 66:28-31. (569) 66:32-35. (570) 66:36-39. (571) 66:40-43. (572) 66:44-46. (573) 66:47-51. (574) 67:1-11. (575) 67:12-15. (576) 67:16-19. (577) 67:20-23. (578) 67:24-27. (579) 67:28-31. (580) 67:32-35. (581) 67:36-39. (582) 67:40-43. (583) 67:44-46. (584) 67:47-51. (585) 68:1-11. (586) 68:12-15. (587) 68:16-19. (588) 68:20-23. (589) 68:24-27. (590) 68:28-31. (591) 68:32-35. (592) 68:36-39. (593) 68:40-43. (594) 68:44-46. (595) 68:47-51. (596) 69:1-11. (597) 69:12-15. (598) 69:16-19. (599) 69:20-23. (600) 69:24-27. (601) 69:28-31. (602) 69:32-35. (603) 69:36-39. (604) 69:40-43. (605) 69:44-46. (606) 69:47-51. (607) 70:1-11. (608) 70:12-15. (609) 70:16-19. (610) 70:20-23. (611) 70:24-27. (612) 70:28-31. (613) 70:32-35. (614) 70:36-39. (615) 70:40-43. (616) 70:44-46. (617) 70:47-51. (618) 71:1-11. (619) 71:12-15. (620) 71:16-19. (621) 71:20-23. (622) 71:24-27. (623) 71:28-31. (624) 71:32-35. (625) 71:36-39. (626) 71:40-43. (627) 71:44-46. (628) 71:47-51. (629) 72:1-11. (630) 72:12-15. (631) 72:16-19. (632) 72:20-23. (633) 72:24-27. (634) 72:28-31. (635) 72:32-35. (636) 72:36-39. (637) 72:40-43. (638) 72:44-46. (639) 72:47-51. (640) 73:1-11. (641) 73:12-15. (642) 73:16-19. (643) 73:20-23. (644) 73:24-27. (645) 73:28-31. (646) 73:32-35. (647) 73:36-39. (648) 73:40-43. (649) 73:44-46. (650) 73:47-51. (651) 74:1-11. (652) 74:12-15. (653) 74:16-19. (654) 74:20-23. (655) 74:24-27. (656) 74:28-31. (657) 74:32-35. (658) 74:36-39. (659) 74:40-43. (660) 74:44-46. (661) 74:47-51. (662) 75:1-11. (663) 75:12-15. (664) 75:16-19. (665) 75:20-23. (666) 75:24-27. (667) 75:28-31. (668) 75:32-35. (669) 75:36-39. (670) 75:40-43. (671) 75:44-46. (672) 75:47-51. (673) 76:1-11. (674) 76:12-15. (675) 76:16-19. (676) 76:20-23. (677) 76:24-27. (678) 76:28-31. (679) 76:32-35. (680) 76:36-39. (681) 76:40-43. (682) 76:44-46. (683) 76:47-51. (684) 77:1-11. (685) 77:12-15. (686) 77:16-19. (687) 77:20-23. (688) 77:24-27. (689) 77:28-31. (690) 77:32-35. (691) 77:36-39. (692) 77:40-43. (693) 77:44-46. (694) 77:47-51. (695) 78:1-11. (696) 78:12-15. (697) 78:16-19. (698) 78:20-23. (699) 78:24-27. (700) 78:28-31. (701) 78:32-35. (702) 78:36-39. (703) 78:40-43. (704) 78:44-46. (705) 78:47-51. (706) 79:1-11. (707) 79:12-15. (708) 79:16-19. (709) 79:20-23. (710) 79:24-27. (711) 79:28-31. (712) 79:32-35. (713) 79:36-39. (714) 79:40-43. (715) 79:44-46. (716) 79:47-51. (717) 80:1-11. (718) 80:12-15. (719) 80:16-19. (720) 80:20-23. (721) 80:24-27. (722) 80:28-31. (723) 80:32-35. (724) 80:36-39. (725) 80:40-43. (726) 80:44-46. (727) 80:47-51. (728) 81:1-11. (729) 81:12-15. (730) 81:16-19. (731) 81:20-23. (732) 81:24-27. (733) 81:28-31. (734) 81:32-35. (735) 81:36-39. (736) 81:40-43. (737) 81:44-46. (738) 81:47-51. (739) 82:1-11. (740) 82:12-15. (741) 82:16-19. (742) 82:20-23. (743) 82:24-27. (744) 82:28-31. (745) 82:32-35. (746) 82:36-39. (747) 82:40-43. (748) 82:44-46. (749) 82:47-51. (750) 83:1-11. (751) 83:12-15. (752) 83:16-19. (753) 83:20-23. (754) 83:24-27. (755) 83:28-31. (756) 83:32-35. (757) 83:36-39. (758) 83:40-43. (759) 83:44-46. (760) 83:47-51. (761) 84:1-11. (762) 84:12-15. (763) 84:16-19. (764) 84:20-23. (765) 84:24-27. (766) 84:28-31. (767) 84:32-35. (768) 84:36-39. (769) 84:40-43. (770) 84:44-46. (771) 84:47-51. (772) 85:1-11. (773) 85:12-15. (774) 85:16-19. (775) 85:20-23. (776) 85:24-27. (777) 85:28-31. (778) 85:32-35. (779) 85:36-39. (780) 85:40-43. (781) 85:44-46. (782) 85:47-51. (783) 86:1-11. (784) 86:12-15. (785) 86:16-19. (786) 86:20-23. (787) 86:24-27. (788) 86:28-31. (789) 86:32-35. (790) 86:36-39. (791) 86:40-43. (792) 86:44-46. (793) 86:47-51. (794) 87:1-11. (795) 87:12-15. (796) 87:16-19. (797) 87:20-23. (798) 87:24-27. (799) 87:28-31. (800) 87:32-35. (801) 87:36-39. (802

thought, as a three-fold expression of the unity of God; but there is absolutely no standing ground for that extreme representation of trinitarian formulas that is practically a repetition of pagan triads, a worship of more than one God. Indeed the ethical note is uppermost in all contrasts of Jesus sonship to God with men's lack of it. Jesus' enemies are declared not to be God's sons because they are sinners.(1) Jesus' challenge is, "Which of you convicteth me of sin?"(2) The epistle expresses this conviction just as positively: "In him is no sin."(3) He is the only-begotten Son in this as well as in all respects, *μονογενής*. And everywhere the unique fact is represented to be, not that God should have a Son peculiarly like himself, but that the man Jesus should be able to be that Son and at the same time share all the experiences of human nature.

Closely allied with this highly ethical presentation is the thought of the fellowship of Jesus with his Father. The meaning of sonship is presented in terms of oneness of purpose and will. Jesus is everywhere shown to be dependent on the will of his Father, seeking to follow it in all particulars. The men whom he wins as his own disciples are said to be given him of his Father (4). The works he does are his Father's works.(5) The teaching which he proclaims is what he has heard from his Father. (6) He does nothing of his own impulse, as though he were a being separate from his Father.(7) He does not express judgments of his own, as separate from his Father's judgments.(8) He does not seek

(1) G:8:41. (2) G:8:46. (3) I:3:5. (4) G:6:37,39; 17:6.
 (5) G:10:25. (6) G:8:28. (7) G:5:43. (8) G:5:30.

his own honor, but ever the honor of his Father.(1) He can use unique expressions in speaking of his relations to his Father, for that relation is altogether incomparable: "I know him and keep his word."(2) "I abide in his love"(3) "I do always what is pleasing to him."(4) "All mine are thine, and thine are mine."(5) And most complete of all, "I and the Father are one."(6) The little Second Epistle has caught the spirit of this exactly in its opening benediction: "Grace, mercy, and peace from God the Father, and from Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father, in truth and love."(7)

This is the presentation in epistles and in the gospel of what John calls the 'truth' that men should believe. It is especially a truth about Jesus Christ, as revealing God to men, as having shown in fleshly existence what it means to be perfectly God's Son, what it means to be in complete and loving harmony with God as a Father.

But what is the object of such a belief? What does it accomplish in life? What changes in character attend it? Jesus says pointedly to his followers in their darkest hour: "Believe in God, believe also in me"(8) -- for surely both occurrences of the verb *πιστεύετε* are imperative here. He even uses the *πιστεύετε εἰς*, 'believe into God', 'believe into me', an expression of transforming power, and deep inner experience. And that is exactly his point. He means to suggest that this same fellowship which he has with his Father comes to those who believe that he is really in his Father, that is, to those who believe in the reality of such a fellowship at all. It is

(1) G:7:18; 8:50. (2) G:8:55. (3) G:15:10. (4) G:8:29.

(5) G:17:10. (6) G:10:30 (7) II:3. (8) G:14:1.

this which the First Epistle calls an understanding: "We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ." (1) Thus belief is not only one of the tests of fellowship; it is a test of sonship also. And this is in line with what we have found to be the point of view of the First Epistle, the presentation of righteousness, love, and belief, as tests both of fellowship and of sonship. Indeed the gospel presents this belief as an essential of becoming sons of God: "To as many as received him, to them gave he the right to become children of God, even to them that believe on his name: who were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." (2) Thus men may become partakers of that family relation and fellowship. It is God's will that they shall. It is Christ's purpose to make it possible by making it real.

This connection in the prologue of becoming children with being born of the will of God, finds its counterpart in the Nicodemus story. There a man must be "born anew" before he can "see the kingdom". (3) In the epistle a similar thought is expressed in the words: "Whosoever is begotten of God doeth no sin, because his (God's) seed abideth in him" (4), and again: "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is begotten of God" (5), this new birth in each case symbolizing the change of heart and life that comes with belief - a change that introduces men into this family of fellowship. Belief becomes, then, not so much the ground of approval as it does the condition of

(1) I:5:20. (2) G:1:13. (3) G:3:3. (4) I:3:9. (5) I:5:1.

attainment to this desired state. As Weiss puts it, "To those who accept him by faith Christ has given not sonship itself, but the power to become sons of God; the last and highest realization of this ideal, a realization for the present fathomless, lies only in the future consummation." (1)

But this belief does not necessarily come all at once. Conviction grows with experience. In the early days of his ministry Nathaniel the clear-sighted came to Jesus, and though not even knowing him by sight, was led by Jesus' own understanding of him to exclaim, "Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel." (2) Jesus commended his intellectual candor, though Nathaniel's confession was necessarily somewhat impersonal. More striking is the trembling admission of Martha in the presence of death and of Jesus' challenge of her faith: "I have believed that thou art the Christ, the Son of God, even he that cometh into the world." (3) But most complete is the word of "doubting Thomas" after a full experience has convinced him of the personal reality of Jesus to him: "My Lord and my God!" (4) Yet still more striking is Jesus' comment upon this occasion, noting the nature of the very finest type of belief; "Because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed." (5) True belief at its highest is spiritual unity of heart and mind.

Thus to believe is to live. Its opposite is death. "Except ye believe that I am he, ye shall die in your sins." (6) But, "He that believeth on me, though he die, yet shall he live;

(1) Weiss, "Biblical Theology of the N.T.", II, 376. (2) G:1:49.
(3) G:11:27. (4) G:20:28. (5) G:20:29. (6) G:8:24.

and whosoever liveth and believeth on me shall never die."(1)
 "He that believeth hath eternal life."(2) It is the obedient life, for while "He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life", at the same time, "he that obeyeth not the Son shall not see life."(3) As love is not sentiment but activity, so belief is not mere consent, but sincere union in purpose and action with God.

Close akin to this conception of belief as the third of the tests of walking in the light is John's idea of knowledge. The term 'knowledge' itself, *γινώσκis*, never occurs in our sources, perhaps from the reaction against the false 'gnosis' of the Gnostics. But the two verbs meaning 'to know' occur in their various forms upwards of one hundred and fifty times. So prominent indeed is their use that many writers consider the gospel and epistles of John treatises upon life as a process of knowing.

The occurrences of the two verbs, 'to know', are almost evenly divided in number. That the two words are synonyms is apparent; yet that they are often used with full cognizance of their widely different shades of meaning is equally evident. *γινώσκω* is the word of knowledge that has come to one in his contact with the world, or, if it is knowledge of God that is in question, through his contact with God. Thayer defines it as "a knowledge grounded in personal experience."(4) *οἶδα*, on the other hand comes from that great root family *εἶδω* whose significance always lies in some form of perception. The aorist infinitive indeed, *ἰδεῖν*, means 'to see', while the infinitive of the second perfect, *εἰδέσθαι*, which is the only other of its kind in the New Testament, means 'to know'. This kind

(1) G:11:25,26. (2) G:6:47. (3) G:3:36.

(4) Thayer, "Greek-English Lexicon of the N.T.", p.118.

of knowledge, then, is bound up with the thought of mental sight. To quote Thayer again: "*εἰδέναι*, lit. 'to have seen with the mind's eye', signifies a clear and purely mental perception, in contrast both to conjecture and to knowledge derived from others." (1) Each word often occurs in the Johannine writings where the other might have been used, either as an exact synonym, or if the other phase of the thought of 'knowing' had been in mind; but there are cases where their choice seems to be quite discriminating. Thus in the experiences of life the gospel commonly records a knowing, *γινώσκειν*. Nathaniel, surprised at Jesus' discriminating remark about him at first sight, says, "Whence knowest thou me?" (2) That is, he wondered where Jesus had met him before. Jesus, at his first visit to Jerusalem, was not taken by surprise at the perfidy of men, for by experience with them he "knew what was in man." (3) Here, of course, the *εἰδέναι* could have been employed quite as well of Jesus; but the writer is thinking of Jesus' acquaintance with men through the contacts he has had. Jesus is surprised that Nicodemus, a Master in Israel, does not "know these things" (4); these commonplace spiritual ideas of which he is speaking should have been a part of the Rabbi's training. "I know you, that ye have not the love of God", says Jesus to his enemies on the occasion of their rejection of his witnesses. (5) Jesus as the Good Shepherd has taken care to become intimately acquainted with his sheep: "I know mine own, and mine own know me." (6) On the other hand, these

(1) Thayer, op. cit., p. 118. (2) G:1:48 (3) G:2:25. (4) G:3:10.
 (5) G:5:42. (6) G:10:14

same sheep are said to "know his voice", where *εἰσέραι* is used, indicating graciously that they immediately perceive his voice, and in the same sense they are said not to know the voice of strangers.(1) This same Nicodemus, who has failed in empirical knowledge at some crucial points, knows intuitively, when he sets eye on the masterful work of Jesus that he is "a teacher come from God"(2) Jesus declares this knowledge of immediate perception upon many occasions. Thus he says to Nicodemus, "We speak that which we know, and bear witness of that which we have seen"(3), apparently referring to this immediate sight of intuition. He says to the Samaritan woman, "If thou knewest the gift of God" (4), if you could really see through this gift of life that is being offered you, you would be different; and he goes on to tell her, "Ye worship that which ye know not: we worship that which we know."(5)

Sometimes the discrimination between the words rises to heights of real importance and gives suggestive insight into the workings of the writer's mind. Thus he presents Jesus as saying, "If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it is of God, or whether I speak of myself"(6), where obviously there is no place for immediate perception, and the *γινώσκειν* is used of becoming acquainted with the teaching through the doing of the will. But to the disciples in the upper room, Jesus can say, "Whither I go ye know the way."(7) He can say to the motley crowd, "When ye have lifted up the Son of Man, then ye shall know that I am he"(8), using

(1) G:10:4,5. (2) G:3:2. (3) G:3:11. (4) G:4:10. (5) G:4:22.
(6) G:7:17. (7) G:14:4. (8) G:8:28.

the *γινώσκειν* of becoming acquainted with the fact: - they still may not perceive its meaning, for they will still be opposed to him in spirit. Even the disciples he can address in rebuke, telling them, "If ye had know me, ye would have known my Father also"(1): acquaintanceship with me would have brought acquaintanceship with the Father. Yet with deep divining of their unperceiving hearts, he can say to his craftiest opponents, "If ye knew me, ye would know my Father also,"(2) using *εἰδέναι*. And especially when it comes to the purpose of Jesus in the world, while he can express it as being that men "might know thee the only true God, and him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ"(3), using the term of acquaintance through experience, yet when it comes to an expression of his own consciousness of that purpose the *εἰδέναι* of thorough perception is used: "Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands"(4) "Jesus knowing that all things were now accomplished."(5)

The epistles manifest at times the same significant usage. The test of finding out true and false spirits is expressed by *γινώσκειν*: "Hereby know ye the spirit of God"(6). Likewise the test of love: "He that loveth not knoweth not God; for God is love."(7) Not only does the writer love the 'elect lady', "but also all they that know the truth"(8), that is, those who have learned what the truth is, the truth being this content of belief, as we have seen. But some of the greatest Christian assertions of knowledge are significantly

(1) G:14:7. (2) G:8:19. (3) G:17:3. (4) G:13:3. (5) G:19:28.
(6) I:4:2. (7) I:4:8. (8) II:1.

expressed by the *εἰδέναι* of immediate perception: "We know that we have passed out of death into life, because we love the brethren."(1) "These things have I written unto you, that ye may know that ye have eternal life, even unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God."(2) The First Epistle indeed closes in a burst of the certainty of this knowledge: "We know that we are of God"(3). "We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding"(4); and the purpose of this last is that a process of empirical knowledge may be set up in them, "That we may know him that he is true", using the *γινώσκειν*.

Thus in the same verse the two words are contrasted, seeming to fix the Johannine "Theory of knowledge", so far as we may use such a term of so unsophisticated a writing. The knowledge that is a divining, a seeing through, an immediate perception, an intuitive reality, is the disclosure of the highest values in life; it is the ground and guide for all worthwhile knowledge that comes to men through the avenues of experience. John does not indeed decry this experiential knowledge. It requires the right use of the will quite as much as intuition: "If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching"(5), where a growth in the experience of knowledge is contemplated. This experiential knowledge leads to freedom: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."(6) It is linked with belief: "We have known (the

(1) I:3:14. (2) I:5:13. (3) I:5:19. (4) I:5:20. (5) G:7:17.
(6) G:8:32.

perfect tense has been missed in the English) and have believed the love which God hath in us."(1) But all of these rest back on that deeper form of knowledge which the writer expresses the clearest when he says, using *ἐἴδεται*, "Ye have an unction from the holy one, and ye know all things."(2) As Angus has expressed it, summing up the New Testament epistemology: "It frankly recognized that there is more in man than can be satisfied by conceptual knowledge; that there are aspects of truth and reality irreducible to formal logic; that there are other avenues to the higher knowledge than sense perception or ratiocinative deductions."(3) And Streeter, recognizing this method in the New Testament, declares,

"If a committee of students of Comparative Religion had set to work to compile a system, carefully selecting the best elements in each of the great religions, they might have reached something very like Christianity. But that was not the way it came. It was flashed upon the world as a Vision; and its synthetic unity is not that of a well-drawn committee report, but that of a work of art; and, like a mediaeval cathedral, it is the objectivation of corporate, as well as of individual, intuition."(4)

But how is this intuitional knowledge mediated? How is this 'Vision' flashed on the world? John's answer is the Holy Spirit. The Johannine doctrine of the Holy Spirit becomes his philosophy of knowledge, and is a clear and thoroughgoing explanation of what he means by knowing. The passage quoted above, "Ye have an unction from the holy one, and ye know all things"(5) displays the term *χρῖσμα*, 'anointing'.

(1) I:4:16. (2) I:2:20

(3) Angus, "The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World," p.32.

(4) Streeter, "Reality", p.48 (5) I:2:20.

It is the anointing from on high that makes it possible for Christians to know with deep and real insight.

The doctrine of the Holy Spirit has an altogether unique place in the writings of John. It is not used, as so often in the Pauline writings, to express unusual gifts or powers of activity, but it is closer akin to the Pauline use of the inner guide. Its common place with John, however, especially in the gospel, is as substitute for the eschatology of the Synoptic Gospels. The term *παρουσία*, 'presence', rendered 'coming' in the English versions, and applied to the Apocalyptic "second coming" of Christ, is quite common in all other parts of the New Testament. It never occurs in the Gospel of John, and only once in the Epistles: (1) While there are several references to the 'last hour' and a future world in the epistle (2), yet these are of an ethical and highly spiritual nature. In the gospel the teaching of the Holy Spirit absorbs almost entirely the interest that might otherwise be diverted to an apocalyptic return of Christ. Most significant is the fact that the long discourses occurring in each of the Synoptists, giving an account of Jesus' comment on the impending destruction of Jerusalem and the "end of the age", are entirely wanting in the Fourth Gospel, and that in their place chronologically is the scene in the upper room where the fellowship of Jesus with his own in an abiding presence and the sending of the Holy Spirit are the chief subjects of conversation. The destruction of

(1) 1:2:28. (2) 1:2 :18; 3:2.

Jerusalem had already taken place when these documents were written. The "end of the age" as far as the age of Jewish domination was concerned had come. The problem now was a Gentile, not a Jewish, problem. The problem was not an end but a new beginning. The dread was not impending catastrophe but the inability to know how to go on. The teaching that needed special emphasis - and it is essentially an epistemological teaching - was the abiding presence of the spiritual Christ, enabling men to know - to see through the significance of life.

The Spirit in the Johannine writings is generally designated by the term, ἅγιος, 'holy'. Evil, according to John, is spiritual, not material in its nature. There is, in an ethical sense, an 'unholy spirit'; and since John's polemics are so largely ethical, he emphasizes the hold nature of that Spirit who lives and abides in men. He often speaks of the Spirit also as τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, 'the Spirit of truth'.(1) Here he has in mind the conflict with error in belief which is prominent both in the gospel and the epistles. The Spirit is to lead men into a knowing of the truth, being himself of the nature of the truth. But most often the Spirit is referred to as ὁ παράκλητος, 'the Paraclete'. This is a beautiful term, but its rendition has been the subject of much debate. In the gospel the occurrence of the term is everywhere rendered "Comforter", but in the First Epistle the same term is rendered, "Advocate." (2) This difference exists in practically all the

(1) G:14:17; 15:26; 16:3; I:4:6; 5:7. (2) I:2:1.

English versions, from Wicliff's to the American Revision. It is hard to account for, but may have grown out of the fact that in the reference cited from the First Epistle it is Christ who is referred to as 'Paraclete', and from the first in Christian Theology there has been a tendency to distinguish sharply the Holy Spirit from Christ. The term means literally 'one called alongside', and perhaps the English word 'helper' would be simpler and better than either 'comforter' or 'advocate'. The spirit is said to effect men's lives positively, not negatively, as 'comforter' might suggest, and is of help in many more ways than the somewhat legal 'advocate' would suggest. One modern scholar has offered the beautiful and effective rendering, "The easily-summoned One."

The question of the sharp distinction of the Holy Spirit from Christ, just referred to, would not concern us in determining the Johannine philosophy of life, if it were a mere theological dogma. But it has important bearings on the problem of the personality of Jesus, which, for John, is the ever vital concern. It is unquestionably true that in the gospel, especially in the upper room discourse of chapters fourteen to sixteen, Jesus refers to the Spirit, not alone in personal terms, as we would expect, but also in terms distinct from his presence with the disciples at the time. Jesus calls the Spirit "another Paraclete"(1), evidently referring to his presence there as the first. He says the Father will send the Holy Spirit in his name (2); and when he reverses the

(1) G:14:6. (2) G:14:26.

thought by saying that he will send him from the Father, he adds: "He shall bear witness of me." (1) The Spirit shall take of the things that are his, he says, and shall show them to the disciples. (2), where he says emphatically, "He shall glorify." And even more significant is the statement, "It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Paraclete will not come unto you; but if I go, I will send him unto you." (3) The distinct personality of the Spirit is further emphasized by the fact that, although the word for Spirit in Greek is neuter, τὸ πνεῦμα, wherever immediate grammatical context does not prevent, the writer uses the masculine pronoun when the antecedent is τὸ πνεῦμα. (4) But are not these very usages sufficient to indicate what Jesus has in mind? By the very saying that he is sending him in his own name and from his Father, he is indicating that the Spirit is his "alter ego". By insisting that he shall bear witness of himself and shall glorify himself, he is insisting that the same glory which he has displayed, only in another form will yet be with his disciples. And particularly does he mean to say in the passage where he refers to his own departure, that it is better for him to leave them in a limited physical sense that he may be with them in an unlimited spiritual sense, the constant presence in their lives. The words taken literally sound like a different reality. But John is no literalist, whatever he is. The Spirit indeed is personal, just because Christ as the divine Logos is personal. "I will send him" is

(1) G:15:26 (2) G:16:14. (3) G:16:7. (4) G:16:7,8,13,14.

another way of saying, "Lo, I am with you alway"(1). It is affirming that all the personal fulness and meaning of the Son of God will abide in the hearts of those who believe and love and follow.

When we turn to other passages, Jesus says as definitely as in the Synoptic report: "I will not leave you desolate: I come to you"(2), where the coming is not to be referred to some distant and apocalyptic event, but is stated as an encouragement for the immediate future in facing misunderstanding and persecution. He also says, "Yet a little while, and the world beholdeth me no more; but ye behold me."(3) Here the reference is evidently to a continued sight of some kind. Again he says, "A little while, and ye behold me no more; and again a little while, and ye shall see me."(4) Here his speedy return to their darkened hearts in the dawning of a new spiritual understanding, fits the case exactly. In harmony with this is the significant statement earlier in the gospel, "The Spirit was not yet given, because Jesus was not yet glorified."(5) That is to say, Jesus could not be spiritually present in all men's hearts so long as the physical presence was the mediating view. Of chief import in this connection is the saying of the writer, "He breathed on them, and saith to them, Receive ye the Holy Spirit"(6), a saying placed after the resurrection. With this interpretation agrees the injunction of the Christ to his disciples, often repeated in thought, "Abide in me,

(1) Matt. 28:20. (2) G:14:18. (3) G:14:19. (4) G:16:16.
(5) G:7:39. (6) G:20:22.

and I in you."(1) With this also agrees the representation of the First Epistle, which we quoted, of the Christ as the Paraclete of men. (2) With this agrees that fine representation of the epistle: "As for you, the anointing which ye received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any one teach you; but as his anointing teacheth you concerning all things, and is true and is no lie, and even as it taught you, ye abide in him."(3)

The Johannine teaching of the Holy Spirit, then, is the spiritual heightening of the personality of Jesus, the making eternal in the hearts of men what he is and means to men as Word, Light, Way, Righteousness, Love, Life. The Spirit is another in a sense that Spirit is different from fleshly manifestation. But the Spirit is the same in the sense that it is the same Jesus Christ who is presented as the center of men's thinking and living. What Jesus did for men as a man in the flesh was to make God clear to humanity; but the very understanding of that clear revelation was, paradoxically enough, dimmed by its being limited to time and place relations. John is saying that this same revelation is ever present with us; the thing that Jesus was and did at a point in history has become forever and continually the Reality of God to men by his glorified abiding in thier hearts in a spiritual relation. As Moberly says, with philosophical fulness as well as theological accuracy:

(1) G:15:4. (2) I:2:1. (3) I:2:27.

(1) G:15:4.

"Christ in you, or the Spirit of Christ in you; these are not different realities; but the one is the method of the other. It is in the Person of Christ that the Eternal God is revealed in manhood to man. It is in the Person of His Spirit that the Incarnate Christ is Personally present within the spirit of each several man. The Holy Ghost is mainly revealed to us as the Spirit of the Incarnate." (1)

But how does the spiritual presence of the Eternal Christ abiding in men become their means of knowledge? What is represented as transpiring? To the world at large the Spiritual Presence is presented as bringing a conviction of certainty:

"And he, when he is come, will convict the world in respect of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, because they believe not on me; of righteousness, because I go to the Father, and ye behold me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world hath been judged." (2)

This 'conviction', or 'making certain', is a spiritual affair. Men are not convinced that they are sinful by an outward process. It is a spiritual perception. Especially would they never see that the very essence of all sin consists in not believing in Christ as the full revealer of God, which is the same idea elsewhere presented as rejecting light. This realization is a spiritual intuition. Making the possibility of righteousness a conviction is also spiritual. "Because I go to the Father" is the symbol of power; that such a character as Jesus' is possessed of eternal power is a spiritual insight. And when it comes to the most daring of the three

(1) Moberly, "Atonement and Personality", p.194.
(2) G:16:8-10.

thoughts, that judgment has already taken place, that in the life and death and resurrection of Jesus, the issue has been cast, this above all is a matter for the Spirit to make clear to the world. "Spiritual things are spiritually discerned."(1)

But to those who are "not of the world", but are disciples already of the way of life that is in Jesus, the Spirit has clear functions. He witnesses to Christ. "There are three who bear witness, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and the three agree in one."(2) Here the testimony of the Spirit is placed alongside of that of the beginning of the public ministry of Jesus at the baptism and its close at the cross, as a demonstration of certainty. Similarly the gospel sets the witness of the Spirit side by side with the witness of those who have seen Jesus in the flesh: "He shall bear witness of me: and ye also shall bear witness, because he have been with me from the beginning."(3) This witnessing is further presented as a teaching or instructing in all the things that have already been heard: "He shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said to you."(4)

Now there is no purpose in mere reiteration. That which is said again is said to be made clear. The function of the Spiritual Presence, then, is to give clear insight, to revive the powers of memory. But more especially: "When he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak from himself; but what things soever he shall hear, these shall he speak: and he shall declare

(1) This common saying, it is well to note, is adapted from

(1) I Cor. 2:14.

(2) I:5:7. (3) G:15:26,27. (4) G:14:26.

unto you the things that are to come." (1) This remarkable saying is the far-flung challenge to all complacent static-mindedness and all reaction. It is the assertion that progress in thought is a spiritual quality, that there is in Jesus that spirit of the forward look which leads men on and on. Because this Spirit is of the very nature of truth, he guides into all truth. There is truth yet undiscovered, There is always cause for new adventure into truth; and that man has lost the Spirit of Christ who fails to go in his thinking and life beyond the Christ of the flesh. This is the goal of the spiritual life according to John: it is to go on and on in knowing the truth, a knowledge gained primarily by that spiritual intuition of which those who have the Christ-life are the real exponents. It is the realization that the spiritual interpretation of life is the interpretation of that Jesus "Whose life on earth is only one incident in the eternal self-revelation of God" (2). It is the consciousness of the unity of all life, whereby men know that future events will only manifest what in part already exists - the truest of all eschatology.

But let us examine a little closer into this progressive life of the Spirit into which men may come. It is not what all men have thought it to be. Hegel felt that Christianity was the synthesis of all religions because it was spiritual, 'geistig'. Yet by his 'geistig' Hegel mean 'rational', and that is not what John means. Some have thought of it as a changeless experience; others as a form of certainty that can

(1) G:16:13. (2) More, "The Christ of the N.T.", p.211.

be expressed once and for all in a correct creed; still others in a method of conduct that is adaptable to all circumstances; and still others as a special privilege - the error of the Gnostics of John's own day. All of these confuse the rational and the statically certain with the whole problem of knowing. Fundamentally for John, the spiritual 'Gnosis' is a fellowship, in which life is changed from disorder to order, from lawlessness to willingness, from darkness to illumination, from wilfull evil to righteousness, from lovelessness to unselfish affection, from hazy doubt to positive belief, by God's Light - the light that was seen in incarnate fashion in Jesus - dwelling within and guiding men. This is the same sort of spiritual notion that Plato had when he said "Knowledge is virtue". But to make knowledge a spiritual fellowship is to personalize it.

The representations of this fellowship in the Johannine writings are full of a tender beauty. The term employed is *κοινωνία*, 'commonness'. The archetype of this fellowship is always represented to be that of Jesus and his Father; for whatever may be said, as we have maintained, about the ethical emphasis put upon the Sonship of Jesus to God in our sources, it remains true that he is still Son in an unique sense. He is the Son; his very nature is to reveal Sonship. Men become sons; they must gain the fellowship of sonship by learning to know the family and becoming like God. One can scarcely turn a leaf in these writings without finding himself in these representations. Jesus is in his Father

and his Father is in him. And this relation in his case is perfect: "I and my Father are one." (1) Yet he desires this same relationship to be with his disciples. The entire round of this thought is perhaps best expressed in the saying in the upper room, when, in speaking of the coming of the Spirit, he says, "In that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you." (2) Here knowledge is the spiritual consciousness that God and Jesus and men constitute one fellowship.

Many of the numerous passages that are used to describe this fellowship have been examined in this paper. The fine delineation of love in connection with the talk about Jesus' going away (3) is directly connected with it. The allegory of the vine and the branches is given to make vivid the whole thought of the abiding fellowship. The intercessory prayer is most intense in those parts where Jesus is pictured as beseeching His Father that the fellowship which they have and know so well may be real to men: "I in them and thou in me, that they may be perfected into one; that the world may know that thou didst send me." (4) And again, "That the love wherewith thou lovedst me may be in them, and I in them." (5). Love and unity are in this fellowship. Nothing is more characteristic of the Johannine writings than the expression of the prologue to the First Epistle: "Our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ." (6) The whole purpose of the Third Epistle is to show the unchristian attitude of a lack of fellowship with those who are in Christ.

(1) G:10:30. (2) G:14:20. (3) G:14:21-24. (4) G:17:23.

(5) G:17:26. (6) I:1:3.

But lest it should be supposed that the morbid experience of some of the mystics is the thought here, be it said that while the fellowship of intuitional knowledge in John is a philosophy of identification, it is not a vague absorption. Individuality is maintained and plays a distinct part. The most careful students of the Johannine writings have always realized this distinction. Thus even Gloag, who emphasizes the mystical and goes as far as he can in his setting for the inner life, checks himself in interpreting the Johannine representation:

"By mysticism in religion we mean the inner life, or that religion which is founded on the feelings rather than on the reason, which is intuitive rather than logical, idealistic rather than realistic, the product of contemplation rather than of speculation, and can thus be understood only by a sympathetic mind; it relates to the soul's union with God; it refers to God's relation to us rather than to our relation to God. And yet this mysticism of John must not be perverted, as if there were anything fanciful or morbid about it."(1).

And on the other hand Weiss, inclined to be non-mystical, says a true thing of this subject in John:

"That is the Johannine mysticism, which does not consist in a soaring in indefinite and confused views and feelings, but in an effort to get at the one central point of the spiritual life, in which everything which is to have real value is traced back to the deepest foundation of the being in the personal life itself."(2)

And again Weiss says,

"The perception of intuition and contemplation is very suggestive; it comprehends and determines the whole man, because the object thereby is not in general apprehended in the

(1) Gloag, "Introduction to the Johannine Writings", p.240.

(2) Weiss, "Biblical Theology of the N.T.", Vol. II, p.320.

divided territory of intellectual life, but in the centre of the spiritual life. On this standpoint there can be no contrast between the theoretical and the practical, between knowing and doing, between faith and life."(1)

Nothing could be truer to the Johannine point of view than this last statement of Weiss; for while John is not merely presenting a concrete life of Christ lived in the flesh at a certain point of time but is presenting a present inner experience of the Christ, while he "is not looking back, but looking in"(2), yet that inward look is for the purpose of making real everything in the daily walk. We have already seen how his threefold union of the Father and the Son and the disciples in a mystic fellowship is immediately followed by the statement that the only one who loves Christ is the one who keeps his commandments.(3) But perhaps the finest presentation of the union of the mystical experience with practical living is to be found in the fact that the First Epistle, in connection with each of the three tests of life we have noted, righteousness, love, and belief, ties them up with this inner abiding life: "He that keepeth his commandments abideth in him, and he in him."(4) "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God abideth in him, and he in God."(5) "He that abideth in love abideth in God, and God abideth in him."(6) Here is the greatest of all thoughts of the spiritual life as the institutional knowledge of fellowship, that it is demonstrated, not in secret morbidness, but in social intercourse. This

(1) Weiss, Op.cit., p.319. (2) Coffin, "The Portraits of Jesus
(3) G:14:20,21. Christ in the N.T.", p.85.
(4) I:3:24. (5) I:4:15. (6) I:4:16.

This has been the faith of all true souls from the 'Apology' of the accused Socrates to the present.

But the grand climax of the Johannine philosophy of life is the fact that this spiritual fellowship has a great name, a name which has enriched thought and ennobled personality by its unique presentation. That name is "Eternal Life", $\zeta\omega\eta\ \alpha\iota\omega\nu\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$. The term $\zeta\omega\eta$ is employed in a high sense throughout the writings of John. It denotes that sum of all these spiritual characteristics that go to make up the genuine fellowship of God and man. As such, it has no contrast with $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$, which is used of the life in the sense of an inner experience, 'the soul', as it is usually rendered. But it is in distinct contrast with $\beta\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$. This latter term also means 'life' but in the sense of means of existence. Originally in the Greek language it was the higher word, being applied to the life of man, while $\zeta\omega\eta$ was applied to the life of animals, and a few traces of its higher use may be found in the New Testament, especially in the Epistle to the Hebrews and the writings of Peter. But the common New Testament usage, and the absolutely uniform Johannine usage is to exalt $\zeta\omega\eta$ to the highest point possible as the very quality of life, and degrade $\beta\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ as manner of subsistence. Thus John speaks of the vain-glory of life as $\beta\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ (1), and he calls "this world's goods" which one should supply to his brother if he loves him, $\beta\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ (2). But wherever the term $\zeta\omega\eta$ occurs it is related to that which has no vain-glory in it and which enables one to 'live' in a higher sense than "this world's goods."

(1) I:2:16. (2) I:3:17.

The term *ζωή*, always in this glorified sense, occurs nearly forty times in the gospel and about a dozen times in the epistles. In approximately half the occurrences (both in gospel and epistles) the qualifying adjective *αἰώνιος* is to be found. 'Eternal life' is thus John's favorite designation for the highest spiritual experience. It often occurs in contrast to *θάνατος*, 'death'. Thus, "God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life." (1) "I give them eternal life; and they shall never perish." (2) "He that heareth my word --- hath eternal life, and cometh not into judgment, but hath passed out of death into life." (3)

Eternal life is thus the highest expression of this fellowship that we have found is the goal of the Johannine thought. It is this inner, mystic experience, this indwelling of God, this abiding in God, that John exhausts the round of vocabulary and illustration to express. Thus we are driven back once more upon the realization that life, for this writer, is personal relationship, in which the all-pervading power of the world's greatest Personality expresses the very essence of the life of God within men. Thus John quotes Jesus as saying, "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life." (4) And in his comment on the scene with Nicodemus, he reaches the conclusion, "He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life" (5); while in his epistle he says, "He that hath the Son hath the life; he that hath not the

(1) G:3:16. (2) G:10:28. (3) G:5:24. (4) G:6:54 (5) G:3:36.

life"(1); and again, "We are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life." (2) Thus John looks upon the personality of Jesus as the life-giving power of the world. Through him the very life of God is released for men, the life-professes of men become vitalized, and that divine reality which it is life to know, becomes, not an awful thing, driving men to fearful flight, but a magnet drawing them, a wooing graciousness winning their fellowship. The works of Jesus are life-giving(3); his very words are life and spirit (4). The writer can define Jesus in the terms we have quoted above, as the "true God and eternal life", because he is the very Logos life of God, God's own Word, spoken so that men may hear, uttered in a complete life. "In him was life." (5) It is for this reason that John can divine the whole life purpose of Jesus as life-giving, not a niggardly existence that shall pass for life, but life to the full: "I came that they may have life, and may have it abundantly." (6) He expresses the very purpose of God in Jesus as being "that to all whom thou hast given him, he should give eternal life." (7) It is for this reason also that, with all his sense of the fellowship of the like-minded, John can represent the mission of Jesus as universal: "God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son--" (8). "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold: them also must I bring, and they shall hear my voice; and they shall become one flock, one shepherd." (9) To the Samaritan woman

(1) I:5:12. (2) I:5:20. (3) G:5:20,21. (4) G:5:24; 6:63.
 (5) G:1:4. (6) G:10:10. (7) G:17:2. (8) G:3:16. (9) G:10:16.

debating whether worship is to be localized to Samaria or Jerusalem, Jesus can say, "The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for such doth the Father seek to be his worshippers"(1) - a clarion call to the recognition of universality in worship toward him who has sought all men. When speaking of Jesus' death "for the nation", John adds, "not for the nation only, but that he might also gather together into one the children of God that are scattered abroad"(2), a clause reminiscent of the saying of the prologue concerning the eternal Logos, that he lights "every man coming into the world."(3)

The contrast of this life with death is a favorite theme of the writer, especially when speaking of resurrection. In fact the term *ἀνάστασις*, 'resurrection', never occurs in our sources except in connection with *ζωή*, 'life'. Death, then, becomes the unresurrected life, the life that is not transformed. Death is an ethical term as a rule, denoting the absence of the principles of life we have noted. Thus, not to believe on the light of life is to be judged, that is, to be condemned to death: "He that believeth not hath been judged already, because he hath not believed on the name of the only-begotten Son of God. And this is the judgment, that light is come into the world, and men loved the darkness rather than the light; for their works were evil,"(4) "Except ye believe that I am he, ye shall die in your sins."(5) In

(1) G:4:23. (2) G:11:52. (3) G:1:9. (4) G:3:18,19.
(5) G:8:24.

the allegory of the vine and the branches, "If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and they gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned." (1)

Resurrection has, similarly, this high ethical, or spiritual, tone. Jesus is said to make morally dead people alive here and now, a work which is God's work: "As the Father raiseth the dead and giveth them life, even so the Son also giveth life to whom he will." (2) Eternal life is a resurrection out of moral death which, for the one who has experienced this fellowship, has already taken place: "He that heareth my word, and believeth him that sent me, hath eternal life, and cometh not into judgment, but hath passed out of death into life." (3) He does indeed speak of resurrection in the future, apocalyptic sense, but only as a further manifestation of this great moral resurrection which has transpired: "Marvel not at this; for the hour cometh, in which all that are in the tombs shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of judgment," (4) where the use of the term 'resurrection' in connection with a condemnatory judgment is evidently a play on the word. The very resurrection of Christ himself, though it is pictured in the gospel as a physical phenomenon, is clearly represented as an accommodation, in its physical form, to the minds of the disciples. The very appearances of Christ in the flesh after the resurrection are used to

(1) G:15:6. (2) G:5:21. (3) G:5:24. (4) G:5:28,29.

dispel the doubt and grief of his followers by once more permitting them to see in human form the meaning of life to the full, but their very need for such a physical manifestation is rebuked in the words to Thomas, "Reach hither thy hand, and put it into my side; and be not faithless but believing.--- Because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed."(1) And immediately the gospel writer connects this physical appearance of the resurrected Jesus with the numerous "signs" which he was always doing to help out human frailty (2), thus indicating what the entire gospel strives to show that Jesus himself is the great miracle. Similarly, at the lake-shore, in the epilogue, the physical appearance to the disciples, so complete as to include the taking of physical food together is once more an opportunity to draw them to the higher spiritual plane, and Jesus uses it as the test of Peter's love to make sure that he has "passed from death into life."

But the greatest of all passages in the Johannine writings that makes clear this contrast of life and death is to be found in the scene of the raising of Lazarus. There Jesus, after drawing from Martha the common Pharisaical confession that she does not believe her brother is dead forever, that he "shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day"(3), shows his dissatisfaction with this conception of the resurrection. And summoning all his powers of personality to describe life as inherent in him, he says, "I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth on me, though he die, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth

(1) G:20:27,29. (2) G:20:30. (3) G:11:24.

on me shall never die."(1) Here Jesus has passed from the physical phenomenon before them in the 'death' of Lazarus, and has lifted the hearts of the sorrowing sisters into a higher plane of thought. He has averred that this life of fellowship in God which his life has made real, is the true and eternal life. Even though a man has died morally, by faith in this abiding fellowship he may live: "He that believeth on me, though he die, yet shall he live"; and that if one abides in this fellowship he shall never die in the real sense of the word. Physical dissolution is not death. Absence from the principles of spiritual life is death; and that death, as that life, is a present occurrence. His subsequent raising of Lazarus from the tomb is used, as one of his 'signs', to symbolize this true and final type of resurrection from the reality of death to the reality of life.

It is because he uses the terms in this sense, that John can represent Jesus as using death as the means to life, and using the cross, not as his shame, but as his triumph. He has become the "propitiation for our sins"(2) by taking on him the sin of the world and dying the real moral death for men which is separation from these principles of life, that is, separation from God. His physical death is but the symbol of this higher truth of death. Yet in his perfectly ethical character, in his inner nature as being life in himself, is the power to triumph over death even in this real and virile form; so that he can say, "Therefore doth the Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I may take

(1) G:11:25, 26. (2) I:2:2; 4:10.

it again. No one taketh it away from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." (1) Nothing could be plainer than that Jesus is here pictured, not as driven to a cruel necessity by the failure of his life-plan and purpose, but as voluntarily giving up life, this life in all the fulness of meaning which to him is his union with his father, that he might "taste of death for every man" (2). And because it is such as he who wills to do this, therefore the triumph over the reality of death because he himself is the reality of life. This is the reason that John presents him as able to say, "I am the resurrection and the life." (3) In the same way he represents everyone who has this life in him as coming to the realization of this principle that life is through death for everyone who has life and so is able to live through death: "He that loveth his life loseth it; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal" (4), where he changes the word for life, beginning with the *ψυχή* that seems dear to men and passing to the *ζωή αἰώνιος* that is represented as the dearest of all. So Jesus, in the same passage, represents his own life as carrying out this principle by dying that may bear much fruit (5) or, in another figure, may "draw all the world unto himself" (6) which is his glorious hour. (7) Death is thus no ultimate; life in the highest sense is the reality.

(1) G:10:17,18. (2) Heb.2:9 (The entire chapter is similar in thought to the Johannine representations).

(3) G:11:25. (4) G:12:25. (5) G:12:24. (6) G:12:32.

(7) G:12:23

From this it is evident that the use of the term 'eternal life' in the Johannine writings is qualitative, not quantitative. This life is not merely a precursor to another; it is life in the same sense that any other may be. Eternal life begins here and now with the ethical transformation of a man. In discussing this present righteousness John can say, "This is the promise which he promised us, even the life eternal." (1) As Salmond has put it, "The 'eternal' is a qualitative term, not a quantitative; used not in order to add to the 'life' the idea of perpetuity, but to express more fully the quality which belongs to the 'life' itself." (2) Eternal life is not an idea of a continuance beyond time; it is a timeless concept. It is the energizing power which is the positive side of the negative idea of deliverance from sin. It is represented in our sources as developmental, which of course inheres in the very idea of life. He says to the woman at Jacob's well, coming a weary distance to draw water and woefully conscious of the static effect of time and place relations, "The water that I give him shall become in him a well of water springing up unto eternal life." (3) He tells the multitude that wants another feeding, "Work not for the food which perisheth, but for the food which abideth unto eternal life." (4) He encourages the disciples to go on toiling in his work, "He that reapeth receiveth wages, and gathereth fruit unto life eternal." (5) And in the First Epistle, which in its entirety is an interpretation of life, not as a temporal

(1) I:2:25. (2) Salmond, "Christian Doctrine of Immortality" p.391.
 (3) G:4:14. (4) G:6:27. (5) G:4:36.

(6) I:1:1. (7) I:1:1.

phenomenon, but as a moral quality, John applies this expectancy of growth to the common Christian thought of a non-temporal future, and yet relates it to this same fine experience that characterizes the present life: "Beloved, now are we the children of God, and it is not yet made manifest what we shall be. We know that, if he shall be manifested, we shall be like him; for we shall see him even as he is." (1) In this connection, it is significant that in the great text of love and eternal life in John's writings (2) the author represents "might not perish" by the aorist subjunctive of the single act of purpose, but "might have eternal life" by the present subjunctive of the continued and growing purpose. Streeter is right when he says, "The Infinite Life is nothing if not creative; hence only when our life is functioning in a way that is actively creative can it in any sense mirror the Infinite." (3) The whole Johannine doctrine of eternal life as an ethical, timeless reality, renders meaningless Mr. H. G. Wells' oft-quoted statement, "Whether we live forever or die tomorrow does not effect righteousness." (4) Law has expressed complete insight into this philosophy of life when he says, "For John there is only one life - the Eternal; and there is but one world - the ideal, which is also the only real (*ἀληθινός*)" (5).

This eternal life is ever spiritual. The Holy Spirit is definitely said to mediate it. In one of the most

(1) 1:3:2. (2) G:3:16. (3) Streeter, "Reality", p.173.

(4) Wells, in "God the Invisible King."

(5) Law, "Tests of Life", p.316.

familiar passages in the gospel, the life that inheres in Jesus is compared in its powerful sweep and its incomprehensible movements to the operations of the Spirit. The translation has been spoiled by introducing the term "wind" for *πνεῦμα*, as an illustration. Keeping the meaning of *πνεῦμα* the same throughout the passage, (for it all has reference to the Spirit), the translation will read: "The Spirit breatheth where he will, and thou hearest his voice, but knowest not whence he cometh, nor whither he goeth: so is everyone that is born of the Spirit." (1) And as if to complement this idea of the Spirit in the likeness of eternal life, by reference once more to knowledge, Jesus says in his great prayer, "This is life eternal, to know thee the only true God, and him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ." (2)

This, then, is the Johannine philosophy of life: not an organized system, but a living reality none the less; not a presentation of life as hopelessly divided, but as a unit; not a philosophy of meaningless change, but of growth in terms of the principle of life called the Logos; not the thought of life as groping its own way out of darkness and forming concepts of thought by mediation on experience, but as being illumined by God's light; not a life of forced acquiescence but of willing harmony, a harmony represented through the beauty of the thought of prayer; not a Will that is blind but moving through right living, through love that is self-giving through belief that unites with God; a

(1) G:3:8. (2) G:17:3.

fellowship of "eternal life", all of which has as its center the incarnate perfect life of Christ; so that John's whole philosophy of life may be summed up in his avowed purpose: "that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye may have life in his name." (1)

(1) G:20:31.