
A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

perceived how the men beside Him were sunk in grief, and to cheer them He said, 'If ye loved me ye would rejoice.' Why? 'Because I go to the Father.' And again, later in the same talk, 'A little while, and ye shall see me, because—I go to the Father.'

Finally, sonship gives a new and deeper sense to prayer. That, you will note, is a point the Apostle particularly touches upon. 'The Spirit of sonship,' he writes, 'whereby we cry, Abba, Father.' He means that we cry thus to God in emergencies of stress and pain. 'Abba, Father'—we seem to have heard these words before. Are they not an echo of something familiar? Sonship was there, but also pain and struggle: struggle and pain was there, yet the Spirit of sonship reigned over all, and Christ went on with fearless eyes to the Cross awaiting Him. So, too, it may be with us.

Are we not mysteriously unwilling, in spite of all that we know of Christ, to believe that God is love, and that He is our Father? Do we not cling strangely to our fears? There was a time when men surmised that if the great Nile were tracked up to its fountain-head, its origin might prove to be some tiny spring, some scanty nameless rivulet. But when explorers pierced the secret, it was to find that the river sprang from a vast inland sea, sweeping with unbroken horizon round the whole compass of the sky. And we, too, are ready with our fears lest the river of life and salvation that streams past our doors, and into which we have dipped our vessels, if followed back to its farthest source, might rise in some grudging and uncertain store. But in truth the Father's mercy is like that great inland sea in the continent's heart, from which the river breaks full and brimming at its birth. It is from everlasting to everlasting.[1]

[1] H. R. Mackintosh, in *United Free Church Sermons*, 132.

The Johannine Doctrine of the Logos.

By the Reverend Archibald B. D. Alexander, D.D., Langbank.

II.

The problems which have been discussed in the previous article, viz. the meaning and contents of the Prologue of St. John's Gospel, and the sources of the Logos idea, and terminology, are not matters of merely scholarly interest; they closely affect the validity and value of the Johannine representation of the Person of Christ. We now turn to the main problem suggested by our previous paper—the purpose of the writer in prefacing his Gospel with a brief statement of the relevant ideas for which the doctrine of the Logos stood. This department of our theme really resolves itself into a discussion of the relation of the Prologue to the rest of the book. Have they practically the same aim? Or are they entirely foreign to one another? Is the Logos section simply a bit of philosophical speculation imposed upon the Gospel, but without any integral association with it? Or, may it be regarded as the key and quintessence of the entire treatise which the succeeding chapters seek to elucidate and elaborate? Much has been written in recent years upon this aspect of the question and various views have found expression. Without entering, however, upon the minuter shades of opinion that have been offered, the attempted solutions of the problem fall generally into three main theories, of which the names of Wendt, Weizsäcker, and Harnack may be taken as representative.

I.

1. In his well-known and justly commended work, entitled *Die Lehre Jesu*, Wendt contends for the unity of the Gospel, but he does so on the peculiar ground (which no other writer, so far as I am aware, has taken) that there is no special reference to the Logos-doctrine in the Prologue at all. 'It is a matter of regret,' he says, 'that we are accustomed to leave the term *Logos* in the Prologue untranslated. On the one hand, by the employment of a foreign word we are deprived of the immediate impression which the term would naturally make upon those who read it for the first

time; and, on the other hand, by retaining the expression, "Logos" or "Word," with a capital, we create the idea that the term stands for a proper name and signifies the definite, pre-existent personality of Jesus. This notion, however, is an unjustifiable assumption' (vol. i. p. 307). As a matter of fact, Wendt maintains, Logos signifies merely 'expression' or 'utterance' (*Verkündigung* or *Ausspruch*); and all that is stated in the Prologue is that the undeclared thought of God *was* in the beginning. It is the Divine mind that is eternal. No doctrine of the Logos, such as Philo conceived, is suggested. It would never have occurred to an apostle, or to one of the apostolic circle, brought up in Jewish tradition and steeped in Hebrew Scripture, to accommodate his teaching to Hellenic philosophy. It is true that the 'Word of God' frequently occurs in the body of the Gospel; but it is the 'Word' as the message from God to man in the O.T. sense that is clearly signified. It is the 'Word' which the Divine Father revealed to Jesus; the Word which Jesus communicated to His disciples, and they again declared to the world (8^{55} 14^{24} 17^{6} 17^{17}). These references, Wendt contends, leave us in no doubt that the Logos cannot be interpreted as a personal being, but simply as an abstract impersonal deliverance or message of God. To understand the term in the Prologue in one sense, and in the later chapters in another, only creates confusion.

With the exception of a vague footnote in an article by Harnack in the *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, no scholar, so far as I know, refers to the theory of Wendt. I do not think it will bear investigation. It is well known that the word *Logos*, whatever it might originally mean, had come to have a specific and scientific significance. It stood for a particular conception. It had entered into the vocabulary of the cultured. All this must have been known to the author of the Fourth Gospel, and he must have used the word with a clear understanding that it had a history of its own and a very definite value for his readers. If he had wished only to express by it the impersonal revelation or message of God, surely he would have been at greater pains to avoid even the appearance of giving a personal reference to his opening sentences.

2. At the opposite pole from Wendt, Karl Weizsäcker, the successor of Baur and a prominent upholder of the doctrines of the 'Tübingen School,' may be taken as the representative of the view that the Fourth Gospel is a unity; that the Prologue and body of the work are all of a piece; and that neither can be rightly understood without recourse to the Hellenic Logos-doctrine. In his principal work, *Das Apostolische Zeitalter der christl. Kirche*, published in 1886 (the same year as that in which Wendt's *Die Lehre Jesu* appeared), Weizsäcker says: 'The whole narrative itself, quite as much as the words of Jesus, undisguisedly reveals that the Logos-doctrine is its origin. This philosophy is not simply spread as a mantle over the history and faith, but determines the ideas completely. Light and Life in the consciousness of the believer as the communication of Jesus, are nothing else than that which the Logos Himself gives to the world' (p. 536 f.).

According to these statements the Logos is viewed not merely as the source of the character and contents of the Gospel, but as the determining factor from beginning to end, as the key, indeed, of the entire treatise. The Jesus of the Gospel has the same value as the Logos of the Prologue, and though the philosophical form is departed from in the historical narrative, still the basis and leading conception of the book are supplied by the Prologue; and throughout the story there is an implicit, if not expressed tendency to see in the earthly life of Jesus the controlling presence of the Logos. A glory more than human shines forth in all the acts and sayings of the Master, and reveals Him as the Only-Begotten of the Father.

3. Professor Harnack of Berlin may be chosen as the most powerful spokesman on behalf of those who dissent from the verdict of Weizsäcker. With his usual lucidity of language as well as his wonderful learning and insight, both in the *Dogmengesch.* and specially in two articles in the *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* (1892–3), Harnack maintains that the significance of the Logos-doctrine for the Fourth Gospel has been grossly exaggerated. The idea, he admits, was undoubtedly borrowed from Hellenic sources (by the Apostle John or some other of Jewish birth, but Greek sympathies) and incorporated to attract Greek readers. But so far from the Prologue dominating the general aim of the work, it is entirely left behind when the author enters upon his theme, and no further mention of it is made. It is idle to describe, as some do, the Prologue as the quintessence of the Gospel, or to regard the Logos as the key to its interpretation. The language, style, and aim of the two parts are wholly different. The purpose of the Gospel is clearly set forth in

the last verse of chapter 20: 'That ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name.' To awaken and establish the life-giving belief that Jesus is the Messiah is the one object of the writer. From the moment he enters on the story of Jesus' life every chapter reveals this single aim. The whole of Christ's farewell discourses and the intercessory prayer disclose not the slightest Hellenic influence. 'I must confess,' says Harnack, 'I cannot detect anywhere the faintest echo of the Logos-idea.'

On the other hand, if we examine the Prologue, we find that it is entirely different in content and spirit. There is nothing in the first five verses which an Alexandrian Jew might not have written. It is not a narrative; it is a philosophical statement. It is bald and cold, lacking life and movement. But the remarkable thing is that at v.[18] the author introduces a subtle change and substitutes for the invisible and inaccessible Logos the visible and accessible Son of God. The Logos of philosophy is displaced by the Christ of faith. A writer, Harnack contends, who can thus substitute 'the Only-Begotten of the Father' for an abstract idea, and can affirm that the Logos 'has become flesh,' has left the Philonic doctrine far behind. It is impossible to call the Johannine Logos a 'Hülfs-Vorstellung'; nor can we affirm that the Prologue, in any way, contributes *data* to the Johannine view of the world. Had it been the purpose of the Logos-doctrine to make the gospel history clearer and more real, or to give a fuller insight into the consciousness of Jesus, there would not surely have been wanting references to it throughout the narrative and especially in the discourses of Christ. But these are totally absent, and the Logos, in the sense of the Prologue, is never again referred to. Harnack concludes his elaborate study of the problem in a verdict which, while distinguished by his accustomed force and incisiveness of style, is not lacking in those traits of self-confidence and finality sometimes discernible in the savant's utterances. 'The Prologue is not the key to the understanding of the Gospel. It is simply a general introduction which paves the way for Hellenic readers. It annexes a well-known and important idea, breaks it up and remodels it, substituting for it the Incarnate Christ, the Only-Begotten of the Father, thereby combating prevailing false Christologies. From the moment Jesus is unveiled the Logos-idea falls into the background. The author henceforth pursues the narrative of Jesus in order to establish the belief that He is the Messiah, the Son of God. The important element in this belief is that Christ is *of*, and *from* God. But the author is far removed from any conception of Him which involves cosmological relations.'

II.

It strikes the present writer that in charging Weizsäcker and others with greatly exaggerating the place and import of the Logos-idea in relation to the Fourth Gospel, Harnack lays himself open to the criticism of unduly minimizing, if not practically denying, the value and validity of the Prologue and the significance of the conception it presents for the author of the treatise.

It seems hardly possible to conceive that a writer like John could have set in the foreground of his Evangel a preface which had no integral connexion with, and no direct influence upon, the rest of his work; that he simply left it for what it was worth and then proceeded to deal with an entirely new theme. Even if we admit that the word 'Logos' does not again occur in quite the same sense in which it is used at the outset, we are not ready to allow that there are no after-references to the idea for which it stands (see, *e.g.*, 16[15. 16. 23. 25. 27. 28]). But, apart from direct reference, the result to which the author attained in the last verse of the Prologue is constantly present as a formative factor throughout. It underlies the whole conception of the Christ. It explains the kind of man He was. It throws light on His relation to His Father and contains the secret of His power over Nature and His authority towards man. All through the earthly life of Jesus the presence of the Logos seems to be felt as of a glory from above, pervading and transfiguring His humanity. Along with the human sympathy of word and deed, which no one can miss, there is also an aloofness of mind and gesture, as of one who belongs to a higher world; and the twofold note of independence and self-surrender to a higher will, so wonderfully fused in this Gospel, is a feature of the Christly consciousness which irresistibly suggests that the author's conception of Christ as outlined in the Prologue has never been lost sight of in the succeeding chapters.

Of all the Gospels surely this is the most sublime, the product not merely of a profoundly spiritual genius, but of a mystic and a poet whose work

marks the highest point reached by the early followers of Jesus in interpreting the Person of their Master. Never before nor since has there existed a writer who sought in such a manner to present his history *sub specie æternitatis*. The author moves and breathes in a super-earthly element, and he lifts those who hearken unto him with strong yet gentle wings into the radiance of the Eternal. And yet it is not so much into a new and unearthly sphere of being that he seeks to raise his readers, as to bring them to a Person who, while embodying and manifesting the Light, the Truth, and Life of the Divine, is no ethereal being but a living actuality upon the earth.

It is probably true, as Harnack himself admits, that the immediate object of the Prologue was to introduce the Gospel to Greek readers. It marks the first great step in what has been deplored by some, and by Harnack among others, as 'the Hellenizing of the primitive Faith,' a process which many regard as inevitable if the religion of Jesus was 'to hold its own in the arena of rational controversy.' The present writer is disposed to agree with those who recognize the incalculable debt which Christian theology owes to Greek thought. Not only did it provide the external environment amid which Christianity was enabled to advance to the conquest of civilized mankind, but it greatly enlarged and enriched the Christian conception of the world by creating also 'the inward conditions whereby its ideas could be interpreted and brought into that systematic form which was necessary to procure their permanent influence upon the human mind.' The root-message of the author is that through the Logos-Christ, incarnated in Jesus of Nazareth, the real nature of God has been manifested in an actual human life. After the Prologue the word 'Logos' disappears and is replaced by 'Son.' But undoubtedly the thought of Jesus as the incarnate Logos is in the mind of the author throughout; and many passages cannot be understood on any other assumption. Indeed, it might be argued that the conclusion of the Prologue itself, to which the writer so skilfully leads on, by a succession of statements growing in concreteness and clearness, is none other than that the Son of God is identical with the Logos with which he started.

There are two ways in which a speaker may introduce his subject to an audience. The one method is by agreement and accommodation; the other is by contrast and paradox. Does it not seem as if the author of the Gospel combines both methods? Many of those for whom he wrote were familiar with the Logos-idea. It was the staple of their thought. Hellenic speculation about God and His manner of revelation was in the air. Philonism was exerting its influence upon the cultured classes of the Apostle's age. Now, just as St. Paul, in addressing the thoughtful citizens of Athens, said, 'The God whom ye ignorantly worship declare I unto you'; so the Apostle John might be conceived as saying, 'The Logos which ye erroneously accept as the explanation of Divine revelation, I interpret to you. The Logos is no secondary impersonal agency mediating between God and the world. He is the Logos of God, sharing from the beginning the Divine mind—the Word of God who has become flesh—the eternal Son of God incarnated in man.' In other words, he meets them on their own ground and seeks to show that, even starting from their own position, the Logos is the Christ.

But the object of the writer was not to propound a new philosophy; it was rather to win men to Christ, whose life on the plane of history he now proceeds to unfold. In the pursuit of this design it is not necessary that he should be constantly harking back to first principles. But, none the less, in almost every chapter, in every incident, in every discourse and act of gracious ministry, the author seems conscious that he is portraying the life of one who has the closest relations with eternity, of one whose existence did not begin when He entered the world, nor cease when He departed from it.

Supposing the Prologue had not been written and the author had simply begun with the nineteenth verse, would not the subsequent narrative have been poorer and less convincing; lacking something—who could say what?—a gleam, a vision, a spirit—which we now feel to be the very secret and pulse of the whole? Should we not have expected that somewhere, either at the beginning or the conclusion of his treatise, the Evangelist would have sought to state, with some definiteness, his view of the place and value of the Jesus of history in the eternal scheme of being?

Notwithstanding the authority and repute of Harnack, justly acclaimed to be the prince of historical and Biblical interpretation, to whose scholarship and experience one would not rashly put oneself in opposition, I am disposed to maintain that the Prologue is an integral part of the Johannine Gospel; and that it was designed by its author to

afford the setting and give the keynote of the entire work. To affirm, with some recent writers, that the idea of the Logos 'is a bit of alien philosophical speculation imposed upon, and disturbing, the history,' seems to me to be singularly inept and not in consonance with the trend and spirit of the book. To me, without the Prologue the narrative would lack not only its natural introduction but its guiding 'motif' and determining factor. It would be like a temple without a porch, a mansion without a tenant. The Logos-doctrine, whencesoever derived, lifts the whole Gospel into ampler regions and starts its history upon a higher level. If Christ be, as it is the object of this evangel to declare Him to be, the central truth of the world, the very fountain-head of Divine life, light and love for humanity, then He must not only bear a unique relation to the Eternal Being, but have necessary and far-reaching cosmic implications. In what more fitting terms could these relations be expressed than in just those of the Prologue? Nor is there anything derogatory in the thought of an inspired writer making use for his purpose of a term that was already current in pagan literature and at the same time transforming and transfiguring it by making it the vehicle of a nobler and more splendid conception. God claims the whole universe as His own; and all the forces of Nature and the lives and endeavours of men, in all ages, are the servants of His purpose; so too, all history and thought, all philosophy and wisdom of ancient times,

> Hellas, the nurse of man complete as man,
> Judea pregnant with the living God,

are preparative and contributory to Him who came in the fullness of the time to be, on the arena of human history, the express image of God and the brightness of His glory, the life of man and the light of the world.

In the Fourth Gospel the human ministry of Jesus is represented as the climax of a revelation which has been in progress from the beginning, the manifestation to the human eye of an age-long conflict between light and darkness. The brief ministry is thus lifted out of its Jewish environment and regarded as the decisive act of an eternal drama. We seem to find ourselves, as we read this Gospel, in two worlds, but they are not placed in opposition as 'natural' and 'supernatural.' They are one. The higher, without obliterating the lower, has taken it up into itself and transfigured its earthly aims and aspirations with new spiritual meanings. The earthly kingdom with its material accessories, shadowed forth in the earlier dreams of seers and thinkers, has given place to the idea of an eternal life which is defined as the knowledge of God and of the Christ whom He has sent.

III.

The Logos embodies one of those creative ideas which has marked successive epochs in the evolution of thought, and it has not lost its significance for our time. The problems for which it stands return with every age, and each new philosophy must face the questions which it involves.

It will be impossible in the remaining space at our disposal to show how the Logos-idea became the fruitful source of much speculation in Gnostic circles and among the ante-Nicene Fathers; and how, under the guiding influence of this conception, the thinkers of the Alexandrian school—especially Clement, Origen, and Athanasius—gradually wrought into shape the Nicene Creed as the expression of the Church's faith. Nor can more than a passing reference be made to the place which the ideas centring in the Logos hold in moulding the Idealistic Philosophy of the nineteenth century. In the school of thought inaugurated by Kant, of which, on its spiritual side, Hegel was the most illustrious representative, the 'Logos' or 'Word' was the ruling conception and pulse of all Being. The evolution of Divine Thought in the universe is depicted as the self-utterance and coming to consciousness of God Himself. The world, which comes to its fullest development in the human spirit, is the utterance of the Mind of God, the Word becoming flesh. Whether or not Hegel accepted the historical Jesus as the actual Christ of God in the Johannine sense, is difficult to determine; but for him the Incarnation was the central and vital point of his system of theology, the conception in which the Divine and human met, God and the world became one. And without doubt modern thought is greatly indebted to the school of Hegel, and especially to his British successors, for the development of the ideas inherent in the Logos-Conception of Immanence, Evolution, and Personality,[1] which have come to mean so much in our attempts to formulate a Christian view of God and the world.

There can be, however, no finality of thought or expression, in regard to the great things of God, who

[1] See the Gifford Lectures of Caird, Sir H. Jones, and Pringle-Pattison.

is ever more uttering His Mind and Will through the Spirit of Truth. Each successive generation must create its own terms and restate its faith in its own current language. No belief is worth having that has not glimpses of infinity, visions of truths not yet realized, of ideals still unattained. The problem of to-day is still the problem of the Christ; and the two main branches of that problem are the old questions, of His relation to the Father, and the union of the Divine and human elements in His nature. These are just the questions with which the Fourth Gospel is concerned, and the purpose and *raison d'être* of the whole book from beginning to end is to emphasize the truth with which it starts—'The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us.' We may say with Ritschl, that 'Christ has for us the value of God.' It is better to say, with our Lord Himself, 'I and the Father are one'; since the key to this value is His filial consciousness in relation to God, His oneness with the Father in character, purpose, and love; never so fully manifested, as in His human sufferings and sacrifices, which were not the emptying of Himself of all Divine attributes, but rather the consummation of his Divine being, the fullest expression of God Himself.

These, and many other interesting points, cannot be elaborated here. Our conclusion is, that the Prologue (which embodies the Christian interpretation of the Logos), so far from being no longer a *Hülfsmittel* but rather a hindrance to the modern acceptance of the Gospel—must be regarded as a vital part of the whole book, containing the clue to its meaning and purpose; the very essence and controlling motive of the writer's message—which is, as the Evangelist himself definitely states, 'that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name.'

Recent Foreign Theology.

German Theology.

It is now nearly three years since Professor Otto Eissfeldt published his 'Hexateuch-Synopse,' in which he gave a distinct impulse to Hexateuchal criticism by advancing and defending the theory that, apart from D, there are not three, but four sources in the Hexateuch, viz. L, J, E, and P—L being the oldest and the most secular in spirit, but a genuine source, as continuous as the others. The theory, warmly welcomed by some scholars, was bitterly opposed by others as a *reductio ad absurdum* of the critical tendency to disintegrate the traditional text. Nothing daunted, however, Dr. Eissfeldt has pursued his investigation through the Book of Judges, and in his recently published study [1] he has submitted that book to a remorselessly searching analysis, which confirms the conclusion to which his examination of the Hexateuch had led him, viz. that there are in it three pre-Deuteronomic sources, not two.

It has long been widely admitted that J and E are present, probably throughout, in Judges: it is obvious enough even to an uncritical eye that behind the story of Gideon must lie at least two sources. In some of the other sources which presented more the appearance of a unity, there were always felt to be refractory elements which it was the habit to dispose of glibly as glosses or to set down to the count of the redactor. It is the merit of Dr. Eissfeldt to have seen that these so-called 'glosses' belong to a hitherto unrecognized source, the frank recognition of which reduces the numerous unevennesses of the narratives to the vanishing point. This discovery, besides giving us an extra source, helps us to dispense with the frequent appeals to editorial interpolations, at which it was so easy and so natural to scoff. It is impossible here even to pretend to deal with the multitudinous detail which Eissfeldt skilfully marshals to prove his point, but the broad results may be summarized. L, J, and E are all represented in the stories of Gideon, Abimelech, and Jephthah; L and J in the stories of Ehud and Samson and chs. 17–21;

[1] *Die Quellen des Richterbuches* in synoptischer Anordnung ins Deutsche übersetzt, samt einer in Einleitung und Noten gegebenen Begründung, von Otto Eissfeldt, Professor an der Universität Halle (Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, Leipzig; geh. Gm. 9, geb. 10.50).