thought which does not truly belong to the Jewish world, but is absolutely at home in the Greek world. The next step, therefore, in our argument will be a study of the influence of the Greek *logos* idea on the Church's later understanding, not of the person of the *logos*, but of the Scriptures and of the liturgical use of the Scriptures down through the ages. From the standpoint of Hebrew thought the Scriptural *logos* would be understood as God's spoken word, addressed to each concrete individual ; From the standpoint of Greek philosophy the Scriptural *logos* is no longer a *verbum* but a divine *ratio*, no longer concrete words or revelations spoken in an historical context, but *revelation* in an absolute sense.[1]

KEVIN CONDON, C.M.

All Hallows College,
Dublin

(*to be continued*)

PAULINISM AND JOHANNISM : RAPPROCHEMENT

The case to be proposed is that there has in past years been too strong a tendency to find a cleavage between the two most coherent theologians among the New Testament writers, St Paul and St John, and that the time has come to look for common ground. It will not be sufficient

---

[1] This observation is not without bearing on the question of the nature of inspiration. If the Hebrew notion of the ' word of God ' is that of a dynamic kerygma which calls for action, and the Greek idea of *logos* is more akin to our idea of revelation in an absolute sense, our understanding of the truth of inspiration will differ accordingly. In the Hebrew notion the prophet himself, as a spokesman of God, actively intervenes as mediator of a ' word ' which calls for *response*. In the Greek notion, the prophet is a *passive* instrument in the hands of the deity, who through him reveals a ' truth '. In the former, inspiration bears a pragmatic aspect, in the latter a speculative one. Both of these aspects can be seen reflected in texts of the N.T.: the Hebrew one in 2 Tim. 3 : 16 : ' Every inspired scripture is *profitable* for teaching, for reproof, for correction and for training in justice '; the Greek one in 2 Pet. 1:19–21 : the ' prophetic word ' shines ' like a lamp in a darksome place '; ' no prophecy ever came by the impulse of men, but men *moved* (*feromenoi*) *by the Holy Spirit spoke from God* '. The Greek hermeneutic is also apparent in the manner in which texts are cited for their truth-content in Hebr. 1–2. (The bearing of this distinction on problems of inspiration and inerrancy is well brought out by Pierre Benoit in his chapter on inspiration in *Guide to the Bible* (Robert-Tricot), 2nd ed., 1960, pp. 9–52).

From this distinction there also arise two different ways of viewing revelation. If the Hebrew *verbum* is a concrete word (or event) spoken in history, then the emphasis will be on the history of God's saving interventions, or his plan of fulfilment : whence ' salvation-history ' (=*Heilsgeschichte*). But if one understands the Greek word *logos* according to the dominant Greek philosophy of *logos*, then the accent will be not on the history of revelation but on the absolute reality disclosed by the revelation.

to find shared characteristics so general as to be of only general significance. It will be more significant if we discover similar drifts of doctrine and similar tools of exposition.

But first, what are the general grounds for raising this matter at all ? In the remoter past, critics were almost unanimous in pointing to contrasts between the two writers, especially in the course of examining the question of the hellenisation of Christianity. Writing over thirty years ago, Albert Schweitzer said of an attempt by Adolf Deissmann to assimilate the teaching of St Paul and St John on the union of the Christian with Christ :

> 'What lapses scholarship is capable of is shown by Adolf Deissmann, who, as though Baur and Holtzmann had never lived, commits himself to the statement, "The most imposing monument of a genuine and thorough understanding of the Pauline mysticism is furnished by the Gospel and Epistles of John." One might as well say that Beethoven was the best interpreter of Bach ! ' He continues : ' To all this confusion the recognition that the Johannine mysticism is a Hellenisation of the Pauline puts an end. By it the resemblances and differences are alike explained.' (*The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, 2nd ed., 1953, p. 372.)

The reader of Schweitzer must judge whether his verdict on Deissmann is not a little abrupt and the weight that he gives to the resemblances between St Paul and St John altogether insufficient : they are, after all, the only two New Testament writers to develop the concept of the Christian's life ' in Christ ' together with the images that accompany it.

Anders Nygren in his *Agape and Eros* was concerned with a quite different question—that of the doctrine of justification *sola fide*. But again he sees a profound gulf between the two writers. It is not merely a question of two approaches to a single truth, but ultimately the difference between heresy and orthodoxy, with St John as the hesitant pioneer of the whole misguided tradition of the ascent of the soul to God. Martin Werner (*The Formation of Christian Dogma*, p. 63) uses typically strong language. The theology of the Fourth Gospel, he writes, ' is really a transformation of Paulinism in a Gnostic sense,' and he thereby endorses the assessment made of it by Heracleon and Valentinus. Bultmann also pushes St John out to the verges of the Gnostic world, and he sees no linear relationship between him and St Paul. Thus, St John ' does not presuppose Paul as a link between himself and the earliest Church '. Though ' in regard to the current religious atmosphere (they) have certain things in common, John stands in an atmosphere of theological thinking different from that of Paul '. (See *Theology of the New Testament*, vol. II, pp. 6–11.)

In all four cases St John comes off worse. Not only is he firmly the product of the Hellenistic world, but to say that is to label him as

the perverter of an earlier and better understanding of the faith, the first of a long line who have yoked the Gospel to alien companions, whether Greek philosophy or the sacramentalism of the mysteries.

Without deciding upon the merits of these assessments of St John, let us ask whether there are grounds for looking at the relationship between him and St Paul in a new light. The great shift of perspective which affects the question is the fresh appreciation of the nature of first century Judaism and so of Jewish Christianity, especially in relation to Gnosticism.[1] Many phenomena formerly considered hellenistic or rather(vaguely) oriental find a place within Judaism, and Gnosticism itself appears plausibly as a series of luxuriant growths from Jewish apocalyptic speculation, to which it remains closely related. The effect is for St Paul and St John to find themselves ensconced much more convincingly in the Jewish world. It is clearly more of a reversal of former trends to demonstrate the Jewishness of St John than that of St Paul, though of course it has been attempted before. Nevertheless it has recently been much accentuated, even to an astonishing degree.[2]

Of St Paul's Jewishness and even strictly rabbinic connections recent work should leave us in no doubt, at least as far as the main *corpus* is concerned. Certain features of Colossians, 1 Corinthians and Ephesians sidle over from the Hellenistic to the Jewish christian camp, and we are less ready to cry ' Greek ' at every scent of a redemption myth.

This has been by way of establishing a general case for seeking common ground between our two writers, and Jewish ground at that. Granted such signs of common foundation, how far do the two structures resemble one another ? They wrote such different works, the one a Gospel, formed and relatively polished, the other a series of sometimes scrambling letters. In comparing them people have not always made enough allowance for this wide difference of genre.

There is also considerable difference of expression. Fair comparison needs to bear both these things in mind. This essay will look for similarities under two heads : their teaching on creation and on the work of Christ.

St John's Gospel could be reasonably expounded as a treatise on the mission of Jesus in terms of the eternal creative work of God. It places

---

[1] cf. the work of J. Danielou, s.j., and R. M. Grant.

[2] See W. F. Albright : ' Recent Discoveries in Palestine and the Gospel of St John ' in *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology* (ed. Davies and Daube, 1956) ; J. A. T. Robinson : *Twelve New Testament Studies*, VII & VIII ; W. C. van Unnik : ' The Purpose of the Fourth Gospel ', in *The Gospels Reconsidered* : 1960 ; C. H. Dodd : *Historical Tradition in `the Fourth Gospel*, 1963 ; A. Guilding : *The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship*, 1960.

his life, death and resurrection against a backcloth which is not merely that of his own time, nor that of the history of Israel, but of eternity itself. The Prologue firmly establishes this perspective, with its modelling of itself on the first chapter of Genesis.

At the turn of the eras, Jewish speculation ranged with particular zeal over two great themes : the structure of the universe and the plan of history. In both matters, Gen. 1 was a source of information. Among the extravagant patterns woven on this modest base, Jn. 1:1–14 stands as the essence of sobriety. Nevertheless it is in the context of this speculation that it ought to be placed, and the sobering agent was surely the sheer factuality of the Lord's life as a man in the world. St John is not required to speculate about the future : he is writing primarily about past and present.

From the raw material of Gen. 1, St John has extracted four chief elements : the utterance of God by which He created ; the light which was the first created object ; the life which characterised the various creatures on the earth ; and Adam, the image of God. But instead of leaving these as separate items of creation, he has assimilated them all to one another ; and instead of leaving them as distinct from God, he has drawn them into the divine sphere. The *logos* is *theos* ; life is in the *logos* ; light is identified with life ; and the *logos* becomes human.

The Gospel as a whole stands under the shadow of its prologue, and it is therefore a Gospel about God's creative activity carried out through the agency of the Word who is Jesus. Thus in Jn. 5:17 we learn that God's creative activity overpowers the sabbath. Up to the end of chapter 11, 'life' is one of the chief words, and the object of Jesus' mission is defined and demonstrated as the bringing of life. In 14:6 as in 11:25, Jesus *is* 'life'. In the supper discourses, where the setting is the Christian community, 'love' replaces 'life' as the dominant category. The Christians have already passed over from death into life (5:24), and 'life' is characterised by obedience to the new commandment of love. Yet the permanent existence of the state of affairs embodied in the supper discourses, where the Church is set in union with her Lord, awaits the cross and resurrection. So in chapter 20, the creation motif reappears : perhaps it embraces Jesus and Mary Magdalene as a new Adam and Eve (Jesus is taken for a gardener), perhaps merely the effusion of the Spirit for the forgiving of sins, which takes up the Spirit's chaos-banishing role in Gen. 1:3. Even on the basis of what we have examined so far, it is evident that St John does not think in terms of creation and redemption as separate chapters in the activity of God, but of one single creative process which pushes onward whether its way is impeded by human sin or not.

As in Gen. 1–3, so in the Gospel, the role of Adam is central. Jesus

is the Adam of the new creative act, but he cannot be only that. In the Old Testament, the perspective is narrowed as Genesis proceeds, from humanity as a whole to Israel the chosen people. In the Gospel, it broadens out again, and Jesus plays the parts of Messiah to the new Israel and Adam to the new human race. In 20:31, John claims to be convincing us only of the former, but he says that the fruit of believing the Messiahship of Jesus is, not membership of the new Israel, but ' life '—the gift associated with the adamic role. This is not the only place where the two roles are brought together. In 19:5 and 14, there are Pilate's two presentations of Jesus with the words ' Behold the man ' and ' Behold your king ', in which the Roman governor unwittingly identifies his prisoner in his dual role. In 1:51 we have the saying about Jacob's ladder : ' Truly, truly I say to you, you will see heaven opened and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man.' The reference is to the story of Jacob at Bethel, and as Jacob is the father of Israel we should have expected the typology to be completed by the attribution on some messianic, purely Israelite title to Jesus. But no such title is employed ; instead we have ' Son of Man ', best taken as adamic in meaning.[1] In other words, if we think of Old Testament theology as operating with two concentric circles of humanity, Israel and the whole human race, and tending to err in the direction of keeping them apart, St John operates with the same circles but tends to assimilate the one to the other. It is another instance of that tendency to unify images which we observed in the Prologue's use of Gen. 1.

As we turn to St Paul and so to a collection of *ad hoc* writings, we must be content to pick up our evidence here and there. In St Paul too God's work in Christ is described in the language of creation : see 2 Cor. 5:17 and Gal. 6:15. The separateness of Israel is no longer significant and the human race is regarded as one in the new Christ-given order. The adamic role of Christ is explicit in Rom. 5 and 1 Cor. 15:21-8—with the special interest in this second passage that St Paul leaves clear traces of his mental processes. First we have the contrast between Adam and Christ, then an exposition of the Lord's ultimate dominion in terms of Ps. 8. He refrains from quoting v. 4, with its man/son of man parallelism, but concludes with a reference to the ' Son ', which must surely in the context be short for ' Son of Man '. The suggestion came from Ps. 8, which is in St Paul's mind, and was presumably understood in an adamic sense. Again, just as in Jn. 20 Christ the new Adam breathes out the Holy Spirit upon his disciples, so in Rom. 8:9 we have : ' If any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he

---

[1] cf. Dodd, op. cit., p. 361f. Jn. 12:34 could be cited as evidence that Son of Man is for this evangelist a messianic rather than adamic title, but Dodd's comment on 17:2 shows how the one readily expands into the other.

is none of his.' Other passages go further and identify Christ with the life-giving Spirit. Thus on the one hand we have 1 Cor. 15:45 and on the other hand Jn. 14:17f., where both the Paraclete and Christ himself will perform the same rôle of dwelling in the believer.

In Phil. 2:6–11 we probably have evidence that the adamic view of Christ is pre-pauline. By contrast with Adam (cf. Gen. 3:22) Christ did not snatch at equality with God, but nevertheless (or rather because of this) God highly exalted him and gave him a name above every name —one which merits the worship of all creation. That is, he receives from God the equality which he, unlike Adam, did not try to grasp for himself.[1]

St John showed himself similarly aware of this need, and also dealt with the ideas of equality and subordination. 10:30 : I and my Father are one ; 14:28 : The Father is greater than I ; 5:18 : He said that God was his own Father, making himself equal to God. This last phrase represents the Jews' way of stating the matter, in effect accusing Jesus of the sin of Adam, and it thus has the same quality of irony as Caiaphas' statement that it was expedient for one man to die for the nation (11:51). The reader already knows the right way of regarding Jesus' equality with God from the Prologue (1:1). The equality which Jesus has is given, not ' snatched at ' : he did not *make himself* equal with God.

It is worth noting the difference between St Paul and St John on the main concept of Phil. 2:6–11. In this passage, and generally, St Paul thinks of the humiliation (' form of a servant ') and exaltation of Christ as successive stages whereas in St John, though there is an analogous conception expressed by ' descend '–' ascend ', there is also the more dominant idea of both phases existing simultaneously in the Lord's life on earth ; e.g. in 13:16 he is ' servant ' and yet, as in ch. 17, one with God ; and the Cross is his exaltation. St Paul does have this notion of simultaneity, but applies it to the life of the apostle : 2 Cor. 4:16f.

Not only is Jesus the second Adam, he is also the agent of creation :

---

[1] It might be argued that a parallel between Gen. 3:22 and this passage, such as F. C. Synge (Torch Bible Commentary : *Philippians*) for example advocated, will not stand : in Phil. 2 Christ is not refraining from snatching what has never been his for he was originally ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ, whereas Adam was aspiring after something he had never had. It is necessary to suppose a contrast not only between grasping and not grasping, but also between Adam who was the *image* of God and Christ who is in the *form* of God. As εἰκών is used quite happily elsewhere to describe Christ's status (e.g. 2 Cor. 4:4) we have to assume that the unusual use of μορφή is either because St Paul was quoting or because it was best to use a word which would express the notion of ' form of a servant ' better, later in the argument ; or else because in making such a close parallel between Adam and Christ, he wanted to point the distinction between the two in the matter of their relation to Godhead, a matter requiring some delicacy of statement : hence μορφή not εἰκών.

in St Paul as in St John. In the unchallenged Pauline writings, 1 Cor. 8:6 is the clearest example of this : ' yet to us there is one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we unto him ; and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and we through him.' Compare Jn. 1:3, where again the preposition ' through ' appears. Col. 1:15–18 makes the same point more elaborately, and adds the adamic term ' image ' thus uniting language appropriate to the pre-existent and incarnate states—as does St John, especially in the Prologue. Nowhere does St Paul directly identify Jesus with the creative *logos* of God, but in 1 Cor. 1:24 he receives the parallel title ' wisdom of God ', cf. Wis. of Sol. 9:1 (' who madest all things by thy word ; and by thy wisdom thou formedst man '). Perhaps the expression ' life-giving spirit ' in 1 Cor. 15:45 ought to reappear in this context—looking back to such passages as Ps. 33:6 where ' word ' and ' spirit ' are in parallel. If this is correct, Christ as incarnate is again assimilated to Christ as pre-existent : as man he has the role of the eternal life-giving Spirit of God.

The imagery of 2 Cor. 4:4–6 is not entirely free from obscurity despite the fact that it is all about light. In the perishing, says St Paul, ' the god of this world has blinded the minds of the unbelieving, that the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God, should not dawn upon them. For we preach not ourselves but Christ Jesus as Lord, and ourselves as your servants for Jesus' sake. Seeing it is God, that said, Light shall shine out of darkness, who shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.' The reference to the face of Christ, in which we are to see the light of the knowledge of God's glory, looks like an allusion to the Transfiguration : cf. 1 Cor. 15:51f., where, according to Joachim Jeremias, the transformation which awaits those alive at the parousia of Christ is derived from the same story. The theme was therefore in St Paul's mind. Bearing in mind the reference to God's word in Gen. 1:3 the sense seems to be an interpretation of Christ's adamic role (note ' image ' again in v. 4) in terms of God's creative, eternal work of which light is both the primary product and a symbol. And as a symbol, it covers the knowledge of God's glory and the gospel of Christ's glory—both, presumably, as works of God. That is, Christ sets forth both God's eternal nature and his constant activity. This once more is very much like, though less lucid than, the linking of categories which we have found in St John.

So in both writers, Christ has three interlocking parts to play in relation to the activity of God the Creator. First, as the agent in creation, with a variety of the relevant Old Testament images being used to state the point ; second, as himself the first man of a new humanity within creation as a whole ; third, as the one in whom are

concentrated the prime energies of creation, light and life, perhaps with transfiguration and resurrection as the typical incidents representing the two categories. This third point is more obvious in St John ; but in St Paul we have seen signs of it in 2 Cor. 4:4–6. Col. 3:4 also applies. Just as in the Prologue to St John light and life are closely associated (1:4), so here 'glory', a 'light' word, is associated with the new life or resurrection state : and in St John too the believer will share the glory of Christ, e.g. 17:22 : 'And the glory which thou has given me I have given them.'

It is evident that if St John's Gospel is rightly expounded as a presentation of Christ's work in terms of the doctrine of creation, and if St Paul's teaching has many signs of a similar drift, nevertheless each writer also speaks of the act of Christ in its own right, detached from the backcloth (labelled 'creation' or 'eternity') against which it often appears.

St John's way of demonstrating the atonement is at first sight strange, especially to those who come to it full of transactional images derived from St Paul. St John's purpose is to show Christ extending to the believer that relationship which he himself already has with the Father. His method is to state, mainly in the first eleven chapters of the Gospel, some aspect of the relationship of Father and Son ; then in the supper discourses (i.e. within the sphere of faith) to extend that relationship to the believer, using the same language. For example, compare 8:18 and 15:26f. (using the idea of 'witness') ; 10:30 and 17:11 (unity) ; 10:36 and 17:19 (sanctification) ; 5:36 and 14:12 (the works) ; 1:18 and 13:23 (the bosom). The believer is enabled to become like Christ in being, working, witnessing. He shares his role and is drawn into union with God.

St Paul's teaching again uses a variety of images to describe the work of Christ and its effect : the liberation of slaves, the acquittal of those accused, the making up of a quarrel, the triumphal procession of a general. None of these is exactly paralleled in St John's Gospel— though the ἱλαστήριον of Rom. 3:25 does reappear as ἱλασμός in 1 Jn. 2:2, and the idea of freedom as a result of Christ's act occurs in Jn. 8:32–36. It would generally be said that in these main Pauline images, God or Jesus is seen as performing a definite act (acquitting, expiating, reconciling, etc.), and in some of them (the sacrifice and the redemption of the slave, for example) that act appears as a transaction carried out once for all. It is a piece of business done and finished. In St John, by contrast, (apart from 1:29) it is a question of a state of existence, a relationship, being extended, thrown open and continuing. Time sharpens distinctions and the two approaches have become separated

in Christian tradition. But it would be a mistake to see St Paul as thinking only in the first of the two ways.

Two of his images in particular are very close to St John. First, that of sonship. Except in the expression 'sons of light' (12:36, cf. I Thess. 5:5), the Fourth Gospel never calls Christians 'sons' in relation to God, whereas in Rom. 8:14ff., and Gal. 4:6f., St Paul makes important use of the idea. But St Paul also uses 'children' as an equivalent of 'sons'—in the Romans passage (8:16) and in Philippians 2:15 : and St John uses the same word in 1:12 and 11:52. It also appears in I John 3:1, 2 and 10 and 5:2. And whereas St Paul contrasts slaves and sons (Gal. 4:7 and Rom. 8:15), St John contrasts slaves and friends (15:14f.).

In 2 Cor. 3, the veil of the old covenant is permanently removed and the Christian is to gaze upon the unveiled face of Christ, with its full glory, and is gradually to increase in glory himself. Similarly in St John (17:22) we have : 'And the glory which thou hast given me, I have given to them', cf. v. 24 and 1:14. In both cases it is a matter of describing the permanent relationship with Christ in terms of contemplation, which produces discernible and gradual transformation into his likeness. Outsiders will see and be moved : so, in 2 Cor. 4:1 the possession of this glory is seen as a 'ministry'; and in Jn. 17:23 the purpose of unity in glory is 'that the world may know that thou didst send me'.

In these two images the emphasis is less on the initial act than on the continuing and developing relationship; and its essence is that the believer comes to share that which Christ already has from the Father.

As we examine further this relationship which results from the work of Christ, we find that St Paul and St John share the chief idea used to express it : that of mutual indwelling, mostly expressed by the phrase 'in Christ' but also by 'Christ in you or in us' (Jn. 14:23, Rom. 8:10 and Col. 1:27). To demonstrate that ultimately the thought of both these writers is not fixed in a crudely spatial mythology it is important to note this reciprocity of statement. Nevertheless the 'in Christ' form dominates its opposite, and its existence demands an explanation. It is not easy to find a satisfactory account of its origin in St Paul's mind (supposing it to be original to him) and it would be tedious to list those that have been given—ranging from the view that it is a native Christian conception springing from the nature of the Christian experience of union with Christ to attempts to derive it from Hellenistic or Rabbinic sources or Old Testament notions of corporate personality.

But the concept of existence-in-Christ is Johannine as well as Pauline, and we ought to use this fact in seeking a solution. Also it is

only Johannine and Pauline : it is not such a general and inescapable way of stating the Christian's relationship with Christ, that the fact of its being shared by these two alone is without significance. How then do they come to share it ? St John might possibly depend upon Pauline teaching, but even so his use of the idea could illuminate its source and meaning, for St John is a more systematic writer than St Paul and could help us over the difficulty of the latter's *ad hoc* writing.

In St John, the idea of one person having existence in another is a further example of the procedure which we examined as his way of stating the fact of atonement by and through Christ : the Father-Son relationship is extended to the believer. The first fully clear example is 10:38 : ' that you may know and understand that the Father is in me, and I in the Father '. The same formula appears (in reverse order) in 14:10 and 11, but we only wait nine verses to find this : ' In that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and *ye in me and I in you.*' In the ' figure ' of the Vine in chapter 15 it occurs four times (vv. 2, 4, 5 and 7) normally with the verb ' remain ', then finally in 17:23 and 26. In St John, as distinct from St Paul, the ' Christ in you ' direction is as prominent as its opposite. As with the other examples of this relation-ship-extending language, this one conforms to the pattern of confining the application to the believer, to the supper discourses. Further, not only is the general setting both ecclesial and eucharistic but, even within that, the ' in Christ ' language is concentrated in chapter 15, in the specially eucharistic image of the vine. It could be argued that the symbol of the branches of the vine is the background of the language of mutual indwelling : in other words that the Church's life and nature are set forth most typically and recognisably in the eucharistic assembly, and reflection on this has produced the parable of the vine (out of its Old Testament source) ; and this imagery has in turn been short-handed into the ' in me ' formula.

When we turn to St Paul, the Body is of course the chief image parallel to that of the Vine. That image itself is obscure in origin, and it is no original suggestion that it stems from its implicit use in the last supper narrative. The key verse for the development of this idea is 1 Cor. 10:16, with the translation : 'because there is one loaf, we though many are one body.' This follows the words : ' the bread which we break, is it not a sharing of the body of Christ ? ' It is only in this verse that the image of the body of Christ, first used in 1 Cor. 6, begins to take on a fully corporate sense, and it is reworked in new variations in chs. 11, 12 and 15. Among all these different though connected applications of the same image, here in ch. 10 we seem to be nearest to an explanation. The loaf on the table is broken up and radiates out into the mouths of the faithful. It is called ' body of Christ ' by Christ

himself (and the next chapter recalls the fact), so they also are 'body of Christ'. If this is so, then St John has acted according to Pauline precedent in using corporate language equivalent to this in the eucharistic context of ch. 15. And St Paul's other question in 1 Cor. 10:16 ('The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a sharing of the blood of Christ?') provides a bridge thrown out towards St John.

It seemed possible to suggest in the case of St John that the 'in me' formula is a shorthand version of the idea written out in full in the parable of the Vine. It may be that in St Paul the 'in Christ' formula is a shorthand version of the idea written out in full in the language about the bread and the body of Christ. There is of course ample evidence in the New Testament that either body/loaf or blood/cup alone could serve as an allusion to the Eucharist as a whole. In the narratives of the supper and in 1 Cor. 10:16 they appear together ; but we have body/loaf alone in the Feeding stories ; in Lk. 24:35 ; Jn. 21:13 ; Acts 20:7 ; in the discourse in John 6 (except vv. 53–6) ; perhaps in Jn 12:24 ; and in 1 Cor. 5:7. Blood/cup alone appears in Mk. 10:38 ; Jn. 19:34 (seeing in both passages a reference to the two rites of Baptism and Eucharist) ; Jn. 15 ; and 1 Jn. 5:6.

In this matter of the life of the believer in Christ, there is one other noteworthy point of contact between the two writers. It is the idea of Christ as the successor of the temple or tabernacle of Judaism. Its uses are varied : sometimes Christ is the cornerstone of the Temple, sometimes the Temple itself, sometimes the presence within the Temple or the High Priest at the altar, sometimes the one who supersedes the rites which took place in the Temple. The Epistle to the Hebrews explores the seam exhaustively. And—even without necessarily accepting Professor Guilding's whole thesis (*The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship*)—it would be hard to deny its importance for St John, from the 'he tented among us' of 1:14 onwards. In 2:21 ('He spoke of the temple of his body') we have a formal link between this image and that of the body, and in St Paul also the two have a like sense : e.g. 1 Cor. 3:16 ; 2 Cor. 6:13–16 (with its threefold antithesis, and the association of Christ—believer—temple of God, and then 'we are a temple of the living God ; even as God said, I will dwell in them and walk in them'—which is very close to Jn. 1:14).

This essay began by noticing how many scholars are nowadays disposed to find a common background for St Paul and St John in first-century Judaism, itself often seen as more syncretistic than hitherto. It is proving less possible to divide the two writers by the technique of attributing a markedly greater degree of hellenisation to the one than to the other.

We have examined a few aspects of the teaching of the two writers on creation and the work of Christ. Close similarities of concept and argument appeared and at no point has it proved necessary to depart far from a Jewish framework of thought. Dr Dodd holds in his second volume on St John (with J. A. T. Robinson, van Unnik and others) that the tradition lying behind the Fourth Gospel is palestinian and primitive. It seems that it is not possible to use this criterion to distinguish between the tradition used and the theology which forms it into its final shape.

J. L. HOULDEN

Oxford

JUDAH AND TAMAR (Gen. 38)

All will agree that the story of Judah and Tamar is one of the narratives in the Old Testament that cause surprise and even scandal to the average Christian reader of the Bible. True, he will not fail to take cognizance of the artistic excellence of the story, so remarkable for its striking interplay of the various human passions, which gives to the whole account an ever-fresh actuality ; he will also appreciate it for the element of human interest that comes to full play in it. But despite all this he will also quite naturally ask : What is the place of this story in the Bible which is the record of the history of salvation ? Does it possess what one might term its *eigentlichen Zeugnischarakter*,[1] its specific character as a witness to God and the realisation of His salvific designs for mankind ? If it does, what is it ? Before these questions can be satisfactorily answered, we have to study the whole story closely and moreover must also trace its genesis.

As every reader will admit without hesitation, the story as it stands now is an insertion into the Joseph-cycle, and the reason for it is undoubtedly the redactor's intention to preserve a tradition concerning the ancestor of the royal tribe of Judah, and his wife Tamar, the great ancestress of king David (cf. Ruth 4:12, 18–22).[2] The account begins

[1] cf. G. von Rad : *Das erste Buch Mose* [5] (Das AT Deutsch 2/4), Göttingen, 1958, p. 30.
[2] cf. G. von Rad : op. cit., p. 312. We may here note in passing that the Joseph-cycle presupposes that Judah was all the time living with his brothers, and there is question of his separation from them. These conflicting details only bear witness on the one hand to the complexity of the traditions embodied in Gen. 37–50 and on the other, to the absence of all preoccupations in the redactors to eliminate all differences and thus harmonize the various traditions they had at their disposal.