figure of prostitution. In contrast, then, all those who belong to the lamb ought to be called virgins : they have not given themselves up to the prostitution of idolatry. This does not eliminate all allusion to virginity in its proper sense, however. As with martyrdom, virginity is the most excellent representation of the Christian life. Just as one cannot be saved without sharing in the dignity of martyrdom, so one is equally incapable of salvation without participating in virginity. Virginity is a heavenly perfection, an anticipation, for those called to it, of what will be the objective of all in the Kingdom of heaven.' [1]

R. DEVINE

## *THE HOLY EUCHARIST IN ST JOHN—II*

The brief summary of St John's doctrine on the Holy Eucharist [2] could only be presented on the basis of a number of preceding conclusions. Consequently it is now necessary to state and justify them in order to test the soundness of that summary. Briefly they may be reduced to two : first that the whole of the discourse which follows the narration of the feeding and the walking on the sea is a discourse on the Eucharist ; and second, that this discourse is written for the instruction of the Christians who frequently celebrate the Eucharist at the time the Fourth Gospel was finally completed. It was on account of these conclusions that the Johannine doctrine of the Eucharist was stated to be concerned with the benefit accruing to the individual Christian when he partakes of the Eucharist, and with the need for belief precisely in regard to this sacrament.

But many would not agree with this doctrinal synthesis, precisely because they would reject the foregoing conclusions. Perhaps there are some who would wish to accept the doctrinal synthesis whilst still repudiating the conclusions reached by the preceding exegetical and literary study of the text. This latter course seems impossible ; the attitude of the former has much to commend it, for in point of fact there have always been those who have denied any reference whatsoever to the Eucharist in Jn. 6. This may be surprising, since the weight of ecclesiastical tradition has always considered Chapter 6 to be concerned with the Eucharist, and has usually referred to it more

[1] ibid.

[2] *Scripture* 1963, pp. 97–103

precisely as the promise of the Eucharist. And yet, a more careful and more thoughtful reading of the text could easily make us much less certain of this. Among the fathers, Clement of Alexandria, Origen and Eusebius of Caesarea saw no reference to the Eucharist in Jn. 6; Augustine, to say the least, was somewhat uncertain. In the sixteenth century Cajetan, Luther and Calvin adopted the same view.[1] At the present time it is a common position, held by many outstanding scholars, to consider that only vv. 51c–8 refer to the Eucharist. Moreover a few would consider that these verses are a later addition made after the gospel was written, in order to include a eucharistic reference in a discourse from which it had been wholly absent. For my part, not only have I rejected, along with most commentators, this last opinion, but I have maintained that the whole of the discourse, and not simply vv. 51c–8, is eucharistic in its reference.

Without any doubt the reasons for the contrary opinion are strong. Thus, there is first of all no explicit mention of the Eucharist, namely the celebration of the Lord's Supper, nor of the breaking of bread; nor is there any explicit reference to the Last Supper itself. Why then should vv. 26–51, first of all, be considered eucharistic? The statement 'I am the bread of life' has no necessary reference to the Eucharist, simply because 'bread' is mentioned. The statement immediately calls to mind other descriptions in this gospel, of what Jesus is when it is a question of the salvation of men: 'I am the light of the world' (8:12); 'I am the door of the sheep' (10:7); 'I am the good shepherd' (10:11); 'I am the resurrection and the life' (11:25); 'I am the way, the truth and the life' (14:6); 'I am the genuine vine' (15:1). These are so many metaphorical expressions and symbolical descriptions of what Jesus is for us. Similarly then, 'I am the bread of life' would be a metaphorical description, without any reference to real bread, but descriptive of Jesus as our spiritual food, attained by our believing in him, and thereby giving us eternal life. This understanding of the phrase seems to be borne out by the text: 'I am the bread of life; he who comes to me shall not hunger, and he who believes in me shall never thirst' (6:35). And it is supported by the fact that already in the sapiential books the image of eating bread had been used as a description of receiving heavenly wisdom, such as, according to John, Christ is the very incarnation (cf. 1:14). Wisdom says, for instance: 'Those who eat me will hunger for more, and those who drink me will thirst for more' (Sir. 24:21). Or again: 'Come, eat of my bread and drink of the wine I have mixed' (Prov. 9:5). The first part of John's discourse, at least (viz. vv. 26–51b),

[1] cf. A. Wikenhauser, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (Regensburger N.T.) (1957), p. 134

would therefore be concerned simply with presenting Jesus to us as the object of our faith, and through faith, as the source of life : to believe in Jesus is to eat of the true, heavenly bread of life. It is the common opinion that only after this does John refer to the Eucharist, in vv. 51c–8, for now he speaks, not of Jesus the bread of life, but of the bread which Jesus will give which is his flesh. The mention of bread, given for the life of the world, and of flesh and blood, are said to be obvious references to the Eucharist, the sacrament of Christ's sacrificial death.

But we ought not to lose sight of the fact that this last remark is true only when we recall the words of institution : 'This is my body given for you' (Lk. 22:19 longer text), and 'This is my blood of the covenant poured out for many' (Mk. 14:24). If we were to read Jn. 6:51c–8 without reference to the words of institution, and let us here recall that John has no account of the institution, then vv. 51c–8 have no more explicit reference to the Eucharist than have the preceding verses. If Jesus is the bread of life in the metaphorical sense explained above, then to eat the bread of life is metaphorically to eat Jesus, namely, if we carry the metaphor to the extreme limit, to eat his flesh and drink his blood. Bernard, for instance, whilst admitting that the *language* is sacramental, could write : 'This does not mean that a non-sacramental explanation might not be placed by a Christian reader upon the mystical phraseology of the passage. No-one would deny that there may be ways of "eating the flesh and drinking the blood" of Christ in a spiritual manner which do not involve sacramental feeding.'[1] The point I am trying to make is this : vv. 51c–8 are eucharistic, precisely because they echo the words of institution, given to us by the other three gospels, and rightly we suppose that John intends them to do so. This is a correct supposition ; but if, wrongly, we refused to allow it, John's words would not then become meaningless : they are susceptible of a metaphorical interpretation. Now I consider it to be altogether more consistent, to make the supposition that John had the same intention whilst composing the whole of this discourse, and therefore that he had in mind the eucharistic banquet from the very beginning, namely from the very moment he narrated the feeding of the 5,000. Therefore the whole of the discourse and not just its closing verses are eucharistic in reference. It is wrong to divide vv. 51c–8 from what goes before, and speak of them as introducing a fresh thought. To argue to this, from the contrast between 'My Father gives you the true bread from heaven' (6:32) and 'The bread which I shall give' (6:51), as though there were two breads : Jesus the object of faith, and the eucharistic bread : the

[1] J. H. Bernard, *The Gospel according to St John* (I.C.C.) (1928), p. clxix

former sent by God, and the latter given by Jesus, seems to be over-literal. The eucharistic bread might well be considered as given in two stages, if we wish, as John does, to compare it, first with the Manna : it is given by the Father and from heaven, in so far as He has sent His son to earth : without the incarnation there is no Eucharist ; but at a later stage it is given by Jesus, in that he gives himself, saying, ' This is my body ; this is my blood.' It is not to be ignored that the discourse concludes in terms which provided its beginning : ' This is the bread which came down from heaven, not such as the fathers ate and died ; he who eats this bread will live for ever ' (6:58).

The discourse as we now find it in the gospel is one whole, and the whole of it is eucharistic, not because of the words in themselves (even those of vv. 51c–8), but because John is writing fully conscious that the only bread of which the church thinks, as soon as bread is mentioned in connection with Jesus, is that bread which Jesus took, and pronouncing the blessing broke. The living water offered to the Samaritan woman, the door of the sheep, the light of the world and so on, have no sacramental significance, because in fact there were no such sacraments within the life of the community. On the other hand, the water of which a man must be born again certainly has (Jn. 3:5). But why ? Not because of any supposedly sacramental language, but because we rightly accept that John and those for whom he writes are conscious of the sacrament of Baptism, whereby they are reborn to life in the kingdom. What John insists upon is that Baptism is a birth of the Spirit, made possible only by the descent from heaven of the Son of Man, and demanding faith in him. So, too, in Chapter 6 the feeding of the 5,000 is narrated because it is the accepted ' sign ' of the Holy Eucharist, the living bread sent from heaven by God in the person of His son, but only accessible through faith. John is not speaking of two things : first that act of believing in Jesus which might metaphorically be called eating the bread of life ; and second, that eating of the flesh and drinking of the blood of Christ which is called the Eucharist. He is speaking of the eating of the bread of life which is Jesus, flesh and blood, an eating which must be an act of faith, if he who eats this bread will live for ever.

The second conclusion on which the synthesis of John's eucharistic doctrine is based has already begun to appear. The discourse as we find it in Chapter 6 was composed from the standpoint of the post-resurrection community, with its frequent celebration of the Eucharist. That obviously implies that this discourse as it now stands, and according to the intention of the author who has given it to us, has been put into a literary setting which is unhistorical, for it is said to be addressed

to the people who had followed Jesus from the other side of the lake (6:24–5) ; the Jews interrupt the discourse at various points, and at the end of it we read : ' This he said in the synagogue, as he taught at Capernaum ' (6:59). Clearly this conclusion is of considerable importance, and doubtless it is one that may easily be misunderstood. But it is also clear that it makes all the difference to our understanding of the discourse, for the interpretation of the text would of necessity have been very different if, instead of supposing that the discourse has in mind the Christian contemporaries of John toward the end of the first century, it had been taken for granted that it was addressed to the Jews of Capernaum about the year A.D. 30.

But perhaps the importance of this may be overshadowed by the fear that this foregoing conclusion impugns the historical reliability of the whole of St John's gospel. To give a full answer to this second and more general problem is obviously beyond the scope of this article, for the question concerns the relation of the whole of John's gospel to the history of Jesus. It is however significant to see how much more cautious commentators are becoming in this respect. Until recently many interpreters of John dismissed his historical reliability very quickly, and considered his gospel to be the free speculation of a theologian who felt little responsibility towards the historical teaching of Jesus. This attitude has changed, because it is becoming increasingly apparent that below the superficial dissimilarity between John and the synoptics, there is considerable identity of material ; it has also changed because the synoptics can no longer be regarded as the yardstick with which to measure the historical reliability of John. Let us therefore accept that the historical reliability of John's material is not to be called in question too easily. But it still remains true that John adapts and rearranges and develops that material with the greatest freedom. Barrett puts it well : ' John probes into the meaning of the synoptic narratives, and expresses it in other terms. It follows on the one hand that the differences between John and the synoptic gospels must not be exaggerated. John does not so much import foreign matter into the gospel, as bring out what was already inadequately expressed in the earlier tradition. On the other hand, the consequences of this process for the question of the historicity of the fourth gospel must be understood and faced. It is of supreme importance to John that there was a Jesus of Nazareth who lived and died in Palestine ; but to give an accurate outline of the outstanding events of the career of this person was no part of his purpose. The critical and scientific writing of history was no common art in the ancient world, and it was certainly not a primary interest with John. He sought to draw out, using in part the form and style of narrative, the true

meaning of the life and death of one whom he believed to be the Son of God. It is for this interpretation, not for accurate historical data, that we must look in the fourth gospel.' And further : 'He (John) did not hesitate to repress, revise, rewrite or rearrange. On the other hand there is no sufficient evidence for the view that John freely created narrative material for allegorical purposes. His narratives are for the most part simple, and the details generally remain unallegorised. This means that the chronicler can sometimes (though less frequently than is often thought) pick out from John simple and sound historical material ; yet it may be doubted whether John would approve of the proceeding, for he wrote his gospel as a whole, combining discourse material with narrative, in order to bring out with the utmost clarity a single presentation, an interpreted history, of Jesus. Neither of these factors, history and interpretation, should be overlooked ; nor, for a full understanding of what John intended, should they be separated.'[1]

The clear inference is that there must be sound reasons for questioning the historicity of even the lesser details. What grounds are there then for the conclusion at which we arrived concerning Chapter 6 ? The answer in brief is that a study of the discourse reveals that it has a looser connection with the preceding historical narratives than appears at first sight ; and that the discourse itself is composite, and therefore has a history of its own. In other words we do not find in Chapter 6 a stenographic-like record of Jesus' instruction in the synagogue at Capernaum, but a highly theological presentation of the doctrine of the Eucharist.

First of all the discourse, and we must continually make clear that we are at present speaking of the discourse as it now exists in Chapter 6, does not have close historical connections with the situation described in the opening narrative. The immediate link between the two, in vv. 22–4, is confused and gives the impression of a hurried attempt to provide some sort of connection. But more important, the discourse begins : 'You seek me, not because you saw signs, but because you ate of the loaves and were filled' (6:26). But we have just read at the end of the feeding narrative : 'The men therefore, having seen what sign he had done, were saying that this was truly the prophet coming into the world' (6:14). And they were for making him king. Why are they now credited with no higher ambition than to fill their bellies ? Is not the reason simply that John intends the feeding to be a sign to his readers, not that Jesus is the prophet coming into the world, nor that he is the king, but that he is the bread of life ? Moreover, is not

[1] C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to St John* (1960), pp. 44 ; 117. cf. J. A. T. Robinson, 'The Relation of the Prologue to the Gospel of St John,' *New Testament Studies* (1963), pp. 128–9

the expression ' Labour not for the food that perishes ' a rather strange way of referring to their search for Jesus ? It reminds us rather of the synoptic saying : ' Do not seek what you are to eat and what you are to drink, nor be of anxious mind. For all the nations of the world seek these things ; and your Father knows that you need them. Instead, seek his kingdom, and these things shall be yours as well ' (Lk. 12:29–31).

Perhaps a more obvious connection between narrative and discourse would seem to be ' Our fathers ate the Manna in the wilderness ' (6:31). The last words perhaps remind us that the feeding had taken place in a deserted place. But this information is in fact absent from John. It is supplied by the synoptics. No connection therefore with the Johannine narrative is to be found through the words ' in the wilderness.' But it could be insisted that there is a clear similarity between the Manna in the wilderness and the feeding of the 5,000. Certainly there is a logical or, may we say, a homiletical connection ; but surely the raising of the subject of the Manna does not depend very closely on the narrative of the feeding. What I mean is this : the subject could just as easily have been brought up without the foregoing narrative, as an example of a ' work,' i.e. a sign, done by Moses and as a challenge to Jesus : Can he equal it ? In fact, if we suppose a close connection with the feeding narrative, then it seems foolish to choose this example of the Manna, since Jesus has on this hypothesis done something at least similar in feeding the 5,000. In order to make sense of this remark about the Manna on the supposition that there is an immediate historical connection between narrative and discourse, we would be forced to make the contrast between Manna : bread from heaven, and earthly bread though miraculously multiplied : the former a greater sign than the latter ; so that although Jesus has worked a sign (6:14), it is not as great as the Manna sign. Yet the discourse does not take up this contrast : there is no reference to the lesser sign worked the previous day. Rather, Jesus says it was not Moses who gave the bread from heaven but ' my Father, (and my Father) gives you the genuine bread from heaven. . . . I am the bread of life. . . .' This first reference to the Manna therefore does not seem to have any close connection with the narrative. The second (6:49) and third (6:58) are simply linked with the first (6:31). Note that there is no other reference of any kind to the narrative, not even in order to strengthen the faith of the disciples.

We now turn to the most important reason for thinking that the discourse does not strictly belong to the narrow historical setting of the synagogue at Capernaum. Chapter 6:26–58 is a composite text, namely John in giving us this gospel in its final form has written this

discourse by weaving together what Jesus said on at least two different occasions. This will seem a very strange procedure to those unfamiliar with the way in which the material now forming all four gospels was first handed down by word of mouth, and only later formed into the literary works. But even a casual reading of Chapter 6:26–58 cannot fail to create the impression of a certain confusion, a certain obscurity, a certain amount of strange repetition. This composite character has been noted in other parts of John's gospel,[1] so that some would speak of a first and second edition. Whether there actually existed a first edition before our present gospel is a moot point. But the composite character of the eucharistic discourse is so important that we must attempt to make it clear by suggesting a possible determination of its two component parts, which we will call A and B :

| A | B |
|---|---|
| (vv. 26, 30–5, 37–9, 41–4, 48–50, 58–9) | (vv. 27–9, 36, 40, 45–7, 51–7) |
| 26 Truly, truly I say to you, you seek me not because you saw signs, but because you ate your fill of the loaves. | 27 Do not labour for the food which perishes, but for the food which endures to eternal life, which the Son of Man will give to you ; for on him has God the Father set His seal. |
| 30 So they said to him : Then what sign do you do, that we may see and believe you ? What work do you perform ? | 28 Then they said to him : What must we do to be doing the work of God ? |
| | 29 Jesus answered them, This is the work of God, that you believe in him whom He has sent. 36 But I said to you that you have seen me and yet do not believe. |
| 31 Our fathers ate the manna in the wilderness ; as it is written : He gave them bread from heaven to eat. | |
| 32 Jesus then said to them, Truly, truly I say to you, It was not Moses who gave you the bread from heaven ; my Father gives you the true bread from heaven. | |
| 33 For the bread of God is that which comes down from heaven, and gives life to the world. 34 They said to him : Lord, give us this bread always. | |

[1] M.-E. Boismard, 'L'évolution du thème eschatologique dans les traditions johanniques,' *Revue biblique* (1961), pp. 507–24 ; 'Les traditions johanniques concernant le Baptiste,' *Revue biblique* (1963), pp. 5–42

35 Jesus said to them : I am the bread of life ; he who comes to me shall not hunger, and he who believes in me shall never thirst. 37 All that the Father gives me will come to me ; and him who comes to me I will not cast out. 38 For I have come down from heaven, not to do my own will, but the will of Him Who sent me ;
39 and this is the will of Him Who sent me, that I should lose nothing of all that He has given me, but raise it up at the last day.

40 For this is the will of my Father that everyone who sees the son and believes in him should have eternal life ; and I will raise him up at the last day.
45 It is written in the prophets, And they shall all be taught of God. Everyone who has heard and learned from the Father, comes to me.
46 Not that anyone has seen the Father, except him who is from God ;
he has seen the Father.
47 Truly, truly I say to you, he who believes has eternal life.
51 I am the living bread which came down from heaven ; if anyone eats of this bread he will live for ever. And the bread which I shall give for the life of the world, is my flesh.

41β The Jews then murmured at him because he said, I am the bread which came down from heaven. 42 They said,
Is not this Jesus the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know ?
How does he now say,
I have come down from heaven ?
43 Jesus answered them :
Do not murmur among yourselves.
44 No one can come to me unless the Father who sent me draws him ;

and I will raise him up at the last day.

52 The Jews then disputed among themselves, saying,
How can this man

give us his flesh to eat ?
53 So Jesus said to them :

Truly, truly I say to you,
Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, you have no life in you ;
54 he who eats my flesh and drinks my blood has eternal life ;
and I will raise him up at the last day.
55 For my flesh is food indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. 56 He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood abides in me and I in him. 57 As the living Father sent me, and I live because of the Father, so he who eats me will live because of me.

| A | B |
|---|---|
| 48 I am the bread of life. | 58 This is the bread which came down from heaven ; |
| 49 Your fathers ate the manna in the wilderness and they died. | not such as the fathers ate and died ; |
| 50 This is the bread which comes down from heaven, that a man may eat of it and not die. | he who eats this bread will live for ever. |

If we compare A and B we find first of all that they are closely parallel and they are both concerned with the need for believing in Christ. They both present Christ as the one who has come down from heaven, sent by the Father to save men from death. Both insist on the close union existing between the Father and Christ, and they both emphasise that no-one can come to Christ unless he is drawn or instructed by the Father. But there are also certain differences. In A, Christ is the true bread that comes from heaven, the bread of God and the bread of life. There is a greater emphasis on the need to *come* to Christ, and only at the end is there a mention of eating this bread. In B, Christ is the living bread (not the bread of life), which came down from heaven ; immediately the need to eat this bread is stated, and the bread is the flesh of Christ. Although both A and B twice have the refrain ' And I will raise him up at the last day,' only B uses the expression ' eternal life.'

It is also of interest to compare the two discourses A and B with the composite discourse at the last supper (Jn. 13–17). Just as both A and B insist on the need to believe in Christ, so too at the last supper Christ emphasises this (cf. 14:1, 24 with 6:29, 38). But the supper discourse is closer to B than to A. In 14:8–10 we read of Philip's request : ' Lord, show us the Father.' Our Lord then complains that although he has been with them so long they still do not know him, for they do not realise that in seeing him they see the Father also : ' I am in the Father, and the Father in me.' Now in B (6:36, 40, 45–6) we have the same doctrine in similar terms : Christ complains that although they have seen him they yet do not believe. He asserts an intimate relationship between himself and the Father, so that everyone who has learned from the Father comes to Christ, even though they have not seen the Father. Moreover in 15:4–7 Christ speaks of the need to abide in him, a need which according to 6:56 is achieved by eating his flesh and drinking his blood. Lastly, in 17:2–3 Christ speaks of giving eternal life, and defines it as the knowledge of the Father and himself ; in B, Christ promises eternal life to him who believes and eats his flesh and drinks his blood.

The one discourse therefore which we find in Chapter 6 is John's composition, but in no sense his own free, creative teaching on the Eucharist. Essentially the words are Christ's, and the teaching is Christ's, preserved by the tradition. But John, as untrammelled by any artificial and rigorist idea of historical veracity as all his successors engaged in teaching the gospel truths, feels free to adapt these words to one particular purpose. It is difficult to discover their original historical settings. Perhaps one is the occasion of the feeding of the multitude. Mark tells us that on the occasion of the feeding of the 5,000 : 'He began to teach them many things' (6:34). Moreover after Mark has described the feeding of the 4,000[1] he tells us that the Pharisees sought from Christ a sign from heaven (8:11), and that 'He left them, and getting into the boat again he departed to the other side. Now they had forgotten to bring bread ; and they had only one loaf with them in the boat. And he cautioned them, saying : "Take heed, beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod." And they discussed it with one another, saying : "We have no bread"' (Mk. 8:13–16). Then Jesus complains of their lack of understanding (cf. also Mk. 6:52). How are we to explain this extremely enigmatic passage ? Is it not reasonable to suppose that Jesus had been preaching just previously on the theme : I am the true bread ? That moreover he had preached on this theme at Passover time, as a commentary on the unleavened bread to be used at the Passover ? That the only bread the disciples had taken with them in the boat was that true bread, that bread from heaven, Christ the unleavened bread (cf. 1 Cor. 5:7) ? That in failing to understand Christ's teaching the disciples were continuing to eat the leavened, the corrupted bread of the Pharisees ? Matthew explicitly interprets Jesus' warning as concerned with the teaching of the Pharisees (Mt. 16:12). Is it not reasonable, lastly, to suppose that Jesus' proclamation of himself as the bread of life, the true wisdom, took place at Passover time[2] in the synagogue at Capernaum (cf. Jn. 6:4, 59) ? These suggestions are admittedly conjectural. But the second historical setting is much less so. It is almost certainly the Last Supper, and perhaps we may suggest the reason for the surprising omission by John of the institution of the Eucharist on this occasion. John regards the celebration of the Eucharist in his own community as the Christian celebration of the Passover.[3] But in his

[1] It is possible that this is a doublet, namely an alternative tradition to the feeding of the 5,000 narrative.

[2] Bertil Gärtner, *John 6 and the Jewish Passover* (Lund 1959), propounds the interesting thesis that Jn. 6 is modelled on the Passover instructions given in the synagogue either for the feast itself or on the four preceding Sabbaths. cf. also Edward J. Kilmartin, 'The Formation of the Bread of Life Discourse (Jn. 6),' *Scripture* 1960, pp. 75–8.

[3] 'Investigation has shown that the primitive church celebrated the Passover according to the Jewish liturgy.' Gärtner, op. cit., p. 30.

view Jesus' Last Supper was not a celebration of the Passover,[1] and therefore from the Christian, theological point of view as distinct from the historical, the eucharistic references in Christ's last discourse are better placed within the discourse given at the time of Passover (cf. Jn. 6:4).

The determining of the original historical contexts of Jesus' teaching is bound to be conjectural, but this has not been our real task. We have undertaken to interpret the text of Jn. 6 as it now stands; to determine what its author intended to convey, and not what the words meant at the time they were first uttered. But we must emphasise strongly that this does not mean that John makes use of Christ's words to signify something different and altogether new. As we have tried to show, John has composed this discourse in this way, to teach us that Christ is the bread of life pre-eminently when, as the climax to hearing his heavenly wisdom, we believe in him and eat of the bread of the Eucharist, so that we are united with the source of life by faith and by sacrament together.

T. WORDEN

*Upholland*

## *REVELATION IN THE BIBLE*[2]

### III IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

The Hebrew word which the LXX translated with fair consistency by *apokalyptō*, 'reveal,' is *galah*. But its usage is much looser than that of *apokalyptō* in the New Testament. Thanks doubtless to the vogue of apocalyptic literature, Daniel, Enoch, Jubilees, etc., in the last two centuries B.C., *apokalyptō* as used in the New Testament is a strongly religious word; rather like the English 'revelation,' which can of course be used in profane or secular contexts, but whose proper field is generally felt to be the religious. Certainly *apokalyptō*, when used in the active voice in the New Testament, always has God, Father, Son, Christ, or Holy Ghost for its subject; and in the passive its subject is usually though not invariably something religious.

The case is quite different in the Old Testament. There *galah* is a neutral word, equally at home in a secular or sacred context. Like the English 'disclose' or 'uncover' it can be applied to sacred or profane objects, and have human or divine subjects indifferently. A thing

[1] cf. Jn. 18:28

[2] cf. *Scripture* 1963, pp. 1–6; 103–9