NOTES AND STUDIES

GENESIS I—III AND ST JOHN'S GOSPEL.

IN his introduction to the 'Johannine Vocabulary' Dr Edwin Abbott points out the real difficulty of Johannine exegesis: 'A mere glance at the R.V. marginal notes on the Gospels will shew the reader that, in the synoptists, the notes mostly suggest alternative readings, but in the Fourth Gospel they suggest alternative renderings. The former imply corruption in editors or scribes, the latter imply obscurity in the author ...' The Fourth Gospel contains many words and phrases which bear two or even three meanings, and each different meaning carries with it further allusion and suggestion. Those commentators who are concerned with the problem of historicity often fail to note the suggestive character of the Gospel; whilst others, who feel the ambiguity of meaning, take refuge in a bald and crude symbolism, which confines the author's meaning within too narrow limits, and ultimately destroys his ambiguity. The notes which follow endeavour to fix the origin of a series of suggestions in the Gospel; but it is not intended to limit the meaning of the passages discussed, or to exaggerate such suggestions so as to turn allusion into symbolism.

The quotations from the Fathers in the Corderius catena on John xix 31 ff, and the passage in Ephraem's commentary on the Diatessaron (Moesinger 260) shew that, in the interpretation of the Johannine account of the Crucifixion, traditional exegesis apparently naturally compared and contrasted Adam and Christ. This raises certain considerations. Are the Fathers imposing such an interpretation upon the text, or are they drawing out a meaning suggested in the text itself? And further, are there other passages in the Gospel which presuppose a similar parallel? The problem may be approached by a study of John xix 26, 27.

The Beloved Disciple and Mary the mother of Jesus are standing by the cross, *παρὰ τῷ σταυρῷ*; and Jesus, seeing them there, unites them as mother and son. Mary is called *ἡ Μήτηρ* absolutely and *Γύναι*. *Ἰησοῦς οὖν, ἰδὼν τὴν μήτερα καὶ τὸν μαθητὴν παρεστῶτα ὃν ἠγάπα, λέγει τῇ μητρί, Γύναι, ἰδού, ὁ υἱός σου.* That they do not immediately go away is shewn clearly in *v.* 35, in which the mysterious eyewitness, who is the authority for the Gospel, and who is variously described as *ὁ ἄλλος μαθητής*, and *ὁ μαθητὴς ὃν ἠγάπα ὁ Ἰησοῦς*, sees the Blood and the Water coming from the pierced side, and presumably falling on those who

stand below, that is upon the Mother and the Son. This is the scene St John is describing. For our purpose verses 30 and 34 are important. Καὶ κλίνας τὴν κεφαλὴν παρέδωκε τὸ πνεῦμα, with its parallels, ἀφῆκε τὸ πνεῦμα (Mt.), ἐξέπνευσε (Mk.), πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου (Lk.). St Mark suggests that there is a mystery connected with ἐξέπνευσεν, by noting that the centurion was compelled to faith when he saw that He thus 'breathed out'. St Matthew also describes suggestively that 'He let go the spirit', not 'His spirit'. St Luke reports a saying which explains the death as the handing over of His spirit—to the Father. St John says that having inclined His head, He handed over the Spirit; and from the chapters which precede, it is suggested that the Spirit is handed over to the Mother and the Son, whilst the second meaning of κλίνας τὴν κεφαλήν, of reclining in sleep, suggests the peace of the return to the Father, which is also foretold in the preceding chapters. In the description of the death St John therefore suggests that while Jesus returns to the peace of the Father, the Spirit is left with the believers, which is what we have been led to expect from chapters xiii–xvii. The Spirit of Life is thus handed over to the Mother and the Son, and they are re-created or reborn with a new life, which is eternal, ζωὴ αἰώνιος; and the Spirit, freed by the sacrifice of the only-begotten Son, is the means of re-creation, as in Gen. i 2 the Spirit of God is the means of the original creation. Mary, the Mother, is, however, not re-created merely as an individual; the title 'mother' implies children, and it is through her that the life is passed on. Her new son already stands by her side.

The title, Γυνή, is thus significant, standing as it does immediately following ἡ μήτηρ. Its meaning in Jn. xvi 21 is clear, where St John describes the pain and joy of the woman who bears a man. The change of παιδίον to ἄνθρωπος and ἡ ὥρα suggests that it is to the birth of believers the passage refers in point of fact. ἡ γυνὴ ὅταν τίκτῃ λύπην ἔχει, ὅτι ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα αὐτῆς· ὅταν δὲ γεννήσῃ τὸ παιδίον, οὐκέτι μνημονεύει τῆς θλίψεως, διὰ τὴν χαρὰν ὅτι ἐγεννήθη ἄνθρωπος εἰς τὸν κόσμον. In any case, whatever suggestions there may be, ἡ γυνή is the woman as mother, and this use of γυνή can be exactly paralleled in Gen. ii 23. αὕτη κληθήσεται Γυνή (Theod. Ζωογόνος) and in Gen. iii 20 καὶ ἐκάλεσεν Ἀδὰμ τὸ ὄνομα τῆς γυναικὸς Ζωή, ὅτι αὕτη μήτηρ πάντων τῶν ζώντων. If this be the true significance of γυνή as applied to Mary, its use in Jn. ii 4 τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, γύναι; οὔπω ἥκει ἡ ὥρα μου becomes clear. Because Mary is the mother of Jesus, she will become the mother of those who believe in Him. This second motherhood of Mary is anticipated, whose hour will come when the sacrifice on the cross has been offered. 'Woman' is a far better translation than 'Lady'. When, therefore, the Fathers say that Mary is the new Eve, they have caught the meaning of the

passage far better than modern commentators; for, while Eve was the mother of a sinful people who ceased to have real contact with God, Mary is the mother of believers, who, redeemed from sin, are reborn and abide (*μένειν*) with God. In this Christian motherhood of Mary the other great women of St John's Gospel to some extent share. The woman of Samaria brings the Samaritans to Jesus, that is to Life; Mary Magdalene first sees the living Lord in the garden and tells the disciples. This idea of motherhood explains the group of women, who in St John's account of the Crucifixion stand *παρὰ τῷ σταυρῷ*, and not as in Mk. xv 40 *ἀπὸ μακρόθεν*. The 'sister of his mother' is further defined as the [mother] of Cleopas, a disciple, Lk. xxiv 18, or if it be translated the 'wife of Cleopas' (Alphaeus), she would be the mother of James, Mt. x 3. They are all mothers; Mary Magdalene finding her true motherhood springing from the sacrifice of the Lamb. They are the mothers of the new Israel, among whom Mary, the mother of Jesus, is supreme.

The same allusion is found in the twelfth chapter of the Revelation, where the Γυνή–Μήτηρ is also referred to. There the woman is first the mother of the child, who is caught up to God and to His throne, xii 5, and then also the mother of the Christians, who are called 'the remnant of her seed, who keep the commands of God and have the testimony of Jesus' (a phrase which incidentally is Johannine). Both the mother and her seed fly to the desert, where they are persecuted by the great dragon, the old serpent, called in *v.* 15 simply 'the serpent'. The Mother of the Messiah is also the mother of the believers, and is persecuted by the serpent, but in contrast to Eve protects her seed from the serpent's power. The suggestion is that the mother of the Lord and of those who believe in Him is the new Eve, still persecuted by the serpent; but, where Eve failed by handing her seed over to death, the new Eve is victorious by bearing children who possess eternal life.

Justin Martyr in the Dialogue 100, commenting on Lk. i 35, draws the same parallel between Eve and Mary, . . . *καὶ διὰ τῆς παρθένου ἄνθρωπον γεγονέναι, ἵνα δι' ἧς ὁδοῦ ἡ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄφεως παρακοὴ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔλαβε, διὰ ταύτης τῆς ὁδοῦ καὶ κατάλυσιν λαβῃ. Παρθένος γὰρ οὖσα Εὔα καὶ ἄφθορος, τὸν λόγον τὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄφεως συλλαβοῦσα παρακοὴν καὶ θάνατον ἔτεκε· πίστιν δὲ καὶ χαρὰν λαβοῦσα Μαρία ἡ παρθένος, εὐαγγελιζομένου αὐτῇ Γαβριὴλ ἀγγέλου ὅτι πνεῦμα Κυρίου ἐπ' αὐτὴν ἐπελεύσεται καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει αὐτήν* . . . There is no reason to suppose that such a comparison was first drawn in the second half of the second century, and we may even suggest further that the mother of Jesus was historically of far more importance within the community of original believers than modern critics have allowed.

Returning to the Gospel, xix 31 ff, the mother and the son remain

with the other women by the cross whilst the soldier pierces the side, from which is poured out Water and Blood. The earlier chapters of the Gospel prepare us for the interpretation of the death on the cross as the sacrifice of the true Lamb of God, by which those who believe receive both purification and life. Modern commentators have pointed out that St John describes the Crucifixion so as to draw attention to the truth that Jesus is the real Paschal Lamb; but they have not seen that the Lamb presupposes a people to receive the benefit of the sacrifice, and that the group at the foot of the cross are in fact the new and true Israel. Thus the original believers stand beneath the cross to receive the new birth very literally 'from above' through the Spirit breathed upon them, and through the Water and the Blood poured out upon them. Very striking passages in the Gospel anticipate and interpret this incident, *ἐάν τις διψᾷ, ἐρχέσθω πρός με καὶ πινέτω. ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ, καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή, ποταμοὶ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ ῥεύσουσιν ὕδατος ζῶντος*, vii 37, 38. The ambiguity of *ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ*—it may be subject to *ἐρχέσθω* and *πινέτω*, or explanatory of *αὐτοῦ*—is caused by the double nature of Christian experience; the new life comes from Jesus, but is passed on to the world through the faithful. *Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, ἐὰν μή τις γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν, οὐ δύναται ἰδεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ*, iii 3. In iii 5 *ἄνωθεν* is explained as *ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος*, and the whole passage both illustrates and is illustrated by the account of the Crucifixion, where Jesus is lifted up in death and those below receive both Spirit and Water. The connexion between the Blood of Jesus and eternal life is definitely stated, *ὁ τρώγων μου τὴν σάρκα καὶ πίνων μου τὸ αἷμα ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον*, vi 54, whilst the famous passage in the first Epistle 1 Jn. v 8 provides the basis for the true interpretation of the incident in the Crucifixion with which we are dealing. In the Epistle St John brings together the Spirit and the Water and the Blood which bear witness to the conquest of the world by Jesus, and to the new birth of the Christians as nothing less than birth from God.

The idea of re-creation and new birth therefore underlies St John's account of the death on the cross, and Mary herself, as the mother of the faithful, shares in this rebirth. If this be accepted we can hardly dismiss as fantastic the allusion implied in the account of the reclining of the head of Jesus in sleep, followed immediately by the rebirth of Mary from his side. The account suggests Gen. ii 21–22 *καὶ ἐπέβαλεν ὁ θεὸς ἔκστασιν ἐπὶ τὸν Ἀδάμ, καὶ ὕπνωσεν· καὶ ἔλαβεν μίαν τῶν πλευρῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀνεπλήρωσεν σάρκα ἀντ' αὐτῆς. καὶ ᾠκοδόμησεν Κύριος ὁ θεὸς τὴν πλευράν, ἣν ἔλαβεν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀδάμ, εἰς γυναῖκα*, and Tertullian's comment *De anima* 43 represents real insight, 'For as Adam was a figure of Christ, Adam's sleep shadowed out the death of Christ, who was to sleep a mortal slumber, that from the wound inflicted on His

side, might, in like manner (as Eve was formed), be typified the church the true mother of the living.'

The study of Jn. xix 31 ff has shewn the idea of re-creation to be fundamental to St John, and has further presented some evidence that in his narrative he alludes to the opening chapters of the book of Genesis. If other passages in the Gospel can be interpreted in the same way, the argument will be strengthened.

Some modern commentators have noticed that in the account of the Crucifixion St John alone uses the words *κῆπος*, *κηπουρός*. In the parable of the mustard seed St Luke uses the word once, Lk. xiii 19, but otherwise the word is not used in the N.T. The Johannine passages are: *ταῦτα εἰπὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐξῆλθε σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ πέραν τοῦ χειμάρρου τῶν Κέδρων, ὅπου ἦν κῆπος, εἰς ὃν εἰσῆλθεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ*, xviii 1, cf. xviii 26; *ἦν δὲ ἐν τῷ τόπῳ ὅπου ἐσταυρώθη κῆπος, καὶ ἐν τῷ κήπῳ μνημεῖον καινόν, ἐν ᾧ οὐδέπω οὐδεὶς ἐτέθη*, xix 41; *λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Γύναι, τί κλαίεις; τίνα ζητεῖς; ἐκείνη, δοκοῦσα ὅτι ὁ κηπουρός ἐστι, λέγει αὐτῷ, Κύριε . . .*, xx 15. For St John, therefore, the Betrayal and the Resurrection take place in a garden, and the site of the Crucifixion is closely connected with a garden. In the O.T. the word *κῆπος* is used as a synonym for *παράδεισος*, *ἐποίησά μοι κήπους καὶ παραδείσους*, Eccles. ii 5; in Ecclus. xxiv 23–34 Wisdom waters her garden, and creates the true garden of Eden, which the first man did not perfectly know, *ὡς ὑδραγωγὸς ἐξῆλθον εἰς παράδεισον· εἶπα Ποτιῶ μου τὸν κῆπον*. In the LXX the 'Garden of the Lord', גַּן־יְהוָה, is translated by *παράδεισος* in Gen. ii and iii, but the version of Aquila has *κῆπος* in Gen. ii 8, iii 2, and in Isa. xli 3, 'For the Lord hath comforted Zion; he hath comforted all her waste places, he hath made her wilderness like Eden, and her desert places like the garden of the Lord; joy and gladness shall be found therein, thanksgiving and the voice of melody.' Cf. also Ezek. xxxi 8, 9 where the Garden of the Lord is Eden. The version of Theodotion also has *κῆπος* in Gen. iii 2, Isa. li 3, Ezek. xxviii 13, xxxi 8. We may therefore conclude that the Garden of the Lord, the true Eden, could be in Greek either *ὁ παράδεισος τοῦ κυρίου* or *ὁ κῆπος τοῦ κυρίου*, but that in the translation made in the first half of the second century A. D. *ὁ κῆπος τοῦ κυρίου* is preferred.

Κηπουρός is used neither in the O.T. nor in the N.T. except in Jn. xx 15. Mary thinks that Jesus is the gardener. The real question is, is she right or wrong? There are passages in St John's Gospel where a statement is made which at first sight is obviously mistaken, but which proves on further consideration to be as a matter of fact true, because the speaker makes use of words which have a double meaning. The woman of Samaria says, *πόθεν οὖν ἔχεις τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ζῶν; μὴ σὺ μείζων εἶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἰακώβ . . .*; iv 12. Jesus will not give her 'running

water' as opposed to well-water, which she wishes; but he will give her 'living water', which she really requires; and as a matter of fact he is greater than Jacob. The true interpretation depends on an understanding of the double meaning of *τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ζῶν*. Caiaphas says *συμφέρει ὑμῖν, ἵνα εἷς ἄνθρωπος ἀποθάνῃ ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ, καὶ μὴ ὅλον τὸ ἔθνος ἀπόληται* xi 50; as he means it, what he says is totally false; and yet what he says is true, if the words *ἀποθάνῃ, ἔθνος, ἀπόληται* be rightly understood. St Peter says *ὑπάγω ἁλιεύειν* xxi 2. He was wrong if he meant that he was going back to Galilee to return to his old occupation; but, as the miracle which follows shews, he is as a matter of fact to go away into the world to catch men. In its true meaning *ὑπάγω* picks up xv 16, *ἐγὼ ἐξελεξάμην ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἔθηκα ὑμᾶς, ἵνα ὑμεῖς ὑπάγητε καὶ καρπὸν φέρητε . . .*, and *ἁλιεύειν* has the same double meaning as is implied in Lk. v 1–11. When therefore Mary thinks that the risen Lord is the gardener, we cannot be content merely to say that she was mistaken. The key to the interpretation of the incident is to be found in the further meaning suggested by *κῆπος, κηπουρός*. By emphasizing that the great deeds by which Christian redemption was effected took place in a garden, St John suggests that the events which caused the original fall are here reversed, and once again the Garden of Eden is open to men. Mary's words are then true, the risen Lord is *ὁ Κηπουρός*, for He is the Lord of the Garden, and once more He walks in His garden in the cool of the day, the early morning, xx 1, and converses not with the fallen but with the redeemed. The importance of the Betrayal in a garden is also now clear; Satan, the prince of this world, in Judas (xiii 2–27) again attempts to betray the Man; but, where the serpent succeeded, Judas failed, since the death which Judas-Satan caused was not a punishment for sin, but the means of new creation by which Eden was reopened. 'The Prince of this world cometh, but he hath nothing in me': cf. xviii 3. Incidentally this series of suggestions explains the *ἔξω* in xii 31. The Prince of this world is cast 'out' not 'down' (syr sin, it, chrys, read *κάτω* in recollection of Lk. x 18).

The use of *ἐμφυσᾶν* in xx 22 is important for our purpose; *καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἐνεφύσησε καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Λάβετε πνεῦμα ἅγιον.* The word *ἐμφυσᾶν* occurs in the N.T. only in this passage, but it is used in the LXX twelve times, where it describes the method by which creation or re-creation or healing or destruction is effected. *ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοὴν ζωῆς*, Gen. ii 7, Wisd. xv 11; *ἐμφύσησον εἰς τοὺς νεκροὺς τούτους*, Ez. xxxvii 9, cf. Tob. xi 11; *ἐνεφύσησεν τῷ παιδαρίῳ τρίς*, 1 Kings xvii 21; *ἐν πυρὶ ὀργῆς μου ἐμφυσήσω ἐπὶ σέ*, Ez. xxi 31, cf. xxii 20–21, Job iv 21, Na. ii 1, Ecclus. xliii 4. It would appear that Jn. xx 22 re-echoes Gen. ii 7, as do all the other O.T. passages. When, therefore, the Lord breathes upon His disciples, they are through this action

reborn to the new life, and given new powers, and, because they are reborn from God Himself, they share both in His creative and in His destructive power; they too have power to re-create men by loosing them from sin, and to destroy them by retaining their sins. This explains naturally the words which follow immediately, *ἄν τινων ἀφῆτε τὰς ἁμαρτίας, ἀφίονται αὐτοῖς· ἄν τινων κρατῆτε, κεκράτηνται* xx 23. The verbal parallel with Gen. ii 7 ceases to be fanciful and unnatural, if once we are clear that St John is describing Christianity as the new creation by God Himself, and the Christians as the new race. The phrase *γεγεννημένοι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ—ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος* is either stated or implied throughout the Gospel, as it is in the first Epistle, iii 3–8, xvi 21, 1 Jn. ii 29, iii 9, iv 7, v 1, 4, 18. This underlying idea explains the importance which St John attaches to the fact that the blind man in the ninth chapter was blind 'from his birth'. Jesus does not merely heal him. He re-creates him. And the meaning of the miracle was truly seen by those who ordered this chapter to be read on the third Sunday in Lent, when the catechumens were being finally prepared for baptism (Ambr. *de sacr.* iii 2). Since Jesus is Himself born from God as the Eternal Word, those who share in His life are also born from God, and whether in i 13 we read *ὃς . . . ἐγενήθη* or *οἳ . . . ἐγεννήθησαν*, both senses are Johannine, and the problem can be understood better by the theologian than by the textual critic. If St John wrote *ὅς* he implied *οἵ*, and *vice versa*.

If re-creation by God is St John's primary explanation of Christian experience, the Prologue ceases to present real difficulty. Dr Rendel Harris in his 'Origin of the Prologue to St John's Gospel' has brought back the study of i 1–14 from Hellenistic Philosophy to the Old Testament Wisdom Literature, and for this we cannot be too grateful. But he has not explained the use of the word *Λόγος*. If his argument were finally adequate, the Gospel should have opened with the words *Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ἡ Σοφία*. If, however, we take the opening chapters of Genesis rather than the Wisdom Literature as the starting-point, and then use the Wisdom Literature where it also is alluding to the Book of Genesis, the theological as well as the linguistic difficulties of the Prologue can be explained. *Ἐν ἀρχῇ, ὁ θεός, ἐγένετο, σκοτία, κόσμος, φῶς, ζωή*, all suggest the first chapter of Genesis. In his Johannine Grammar 2134 Dr E. Abbott explains the use of the Hebraic narrative *καὶ*: 'In the opening of the Gospel John follows the style of the opening of Genesis, not in affectation, but with a symbolism natural to him, sympathetically describing what was "in the beginning" of Spiritual Being, as Genesis describes what was in the beginning of material creation. But after the Resurrection, when the apostles are receiving their morning meal before going forth to convert the whole world, Greeks as well as Jews, "all

things are become new", and the old-world Hebraic style is thrown aside.' St John's natural and instinctive sympathy with the first chapter of Genesis, to which Dr Abbott has drawn attention, supports an interpretation of the Gospel which insists on the importance to St John of Christianity as the new creation, and the return to the presence of God, which had been lost by the sin of Adam and Eve.

The relation of the Prologue to the opening of Genesis is, however, not primarily one of grammar or of vocabulary. The parallel lies rather in the underlying conception of creation as effected by the Word of God: speech being thought of as effective and creative rather than as descriptive. 'And God said, Let there be light; and there was light.' This attitude to the Word of God is preserved by the prophets. When God has spoken creation or destruction follows inevitably. The dramatic situation, for instance, of the Book of Amos, is not due primarily to any historical causes, but to the fact that God has spoken and destruction is imminent. The prophet is able to announce the coming destruction and to warn the people, because he has heard the Word of God uttered. This is the line of thought which lies behind the Prologue. Since Christianity is the new creation, such a creative act can only be explained by the claim that Jesus was the incarnate Word of God. For the same reason throughout the Gospel the words of Jesus are effective both in creation and in destruction, and thus both *ζωή* and *κρίσις* follow inevitably. This may be illustrated most clearly in the account of the raising of Lazarus: *καὶ ταῦτα εἰπών, φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἐκραύγασε, Λάζαρε δεῦρο ἔξω* xi 43. These words actually caused the recreation of the decayed body of Lazarus. St John draws attention to this by noting that Jesus cried 'with a loud voice', and by his description of the miracle in xii 17 *ἐμαρτύρει οὖν ὁ ὄχλος ὁ ὢν μετ' αὐτοῦ ὅτε τὸν Λάζαρον ἐφώνησεν ἐκ τοῦ μνημείου καὶ ἤγειρεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν.* All who hear the word of Jesus have eternal life vi 68, are clean xv 3, have joy xvii 13, because the words of Jesus are creative words.

The conception of *κρίσις* in the Gospel belongs to the same line of thought. He who does not hear or believe the creative word comes under *κρίσις. ὁ ἀθετῶν ἐμὲ καὶ μὴ λαμβάνων τὰ ῥήματά μου ἔχει τὸν κρίνοντα αὐτόν· ὁ λόγος ὃν ἐλάλησα, ἐκεῖνος κρινεῖ αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ* xii 48. But destructive judgement takes a secondary place in the Gospel, because St John is concerned primarily with Christianity as creative rather than destructive. 'For God sent not the Son into the world to judge the world, but that the world through Him might be saved.'

To sum up. What originally appeared a somewhat fantastic interpretation of a single incident in the account of the Crucifixion has led to an interpretation of other passages, and has thrown considerable

light on the great underlying claims of the Gospel. The theory, with which we started, has been found to explain much which has often appeared inexplicable, and since this is the only means by which a theory can be tested, the fact that it does explain what commentators do not explain inspires confidence that the theory at least contains truth. St John is dealing with the experience of Christianity, and he asserts that it is nothing less than a new creation. He explains this experience by saying that the author of the original creation and the author of Christianity are the same—namely God Himself. But since Christian tradition claimed Jesus of Nazareth as the founder of the religion, St John harmonizes Christian experience and Christian tradition by interpreting the life of Jesus as the life of the incarnate Word of God, by whom the universe was originally created. Thus the Life of Jesus is rewritten in St John's Gospel from this point of view, and the passages, which we have examined, shew that the account of the Creation and of the Fall in Genesis has influenced his account of the life and death of Jesus.

E. C. HOSKYNS.