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PREFACE

After 12 years I have come to the end of this study of ἔξοδος ἑμι in the Fourth Gospel. For it was over 12 years ago, as a freshman student, that my attention was first called to the phrase in the Gospel, and since that time I have never forgotten it. I have constantly searched for material on the subject, but the bibliography indicates the meagerness of the material which I found helpful. Perhaps the idea was too speculative for the majority of our writers.

The search has been both laborious and rewarding. I feel I know the Evangelist as I have known no other writer; I feel I not only know his words, but perhaps, to some extent, understand his motives and his feelings. I have an appreciation for him I would never have had otherwise.

The Christ of the Fourth Gospel is beyond adequate description. As I have tried to teach and preach Him, I have come to a deeper realization of his pre-eminence. To the Evangelist I owe a tremendous debt for his conception and understanding of Jesus.

My life in the ministry has been one of constant blessings--my debts to others continue to pile up! To the members of my committee I owe so much because of their fine Christian spirit of helpfulness all through my graduate work. I owe an even greater debt to Dr. J. Estill Jones and Dr. T. C.
Smith for their helpfulness and guidance on this thesis. Without their assistance and encouragement, I would have given up long ago.

I am indebted to two churches that had a part in the accomplishment of my graduate work, and especially to the Ranchvale Baptist Church of Clovis, New Mexico. These have been friends who have sacrificed and "stuck closer than a brother."

I am also indebted to the personnel of the Library of Eastern New Mexico University, and to Miss Peggy Tozer, Public Services Librarian, who have aided me so much through the interlibrary loan service. Without their help, this thesis could not have been completed.

And then to LaWanna, Jimmy, Judy, and Sara Nell, I bow my head in deep gratitude for all the sacrifices they have made through these years. I would gladly have given up my graduate work several times, but they would not permit it. I still marvel at their sacrifices!

And to Him who has made "me able to meet all things," I publicly and unashamedly acknowledge my debt. By his grace only, 

H. E. Bergstrom

Portales, New Mexico

August, 1955
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INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this thesis is to examine the \textit{\v{e}j\^w \v{e}m} sayings in the Fourth Gospel to see if they are claims of deity. For this reason a careful study has been made of other ancient religious writings in search of a stressed "I am" style in the language of their gods. When these claims were in the Greek language, the problem was not too difficult, but when we dealt with translations, the ground was not so firm. It was necessary to study the Septuagint rather carefully in tracing the phrase in Jewish thought.

Many problems in connection with the Fourth Gospel, and its background, have no attempted solution in this study. A comparison of the translators of the Septuagint; a treatment of Deutero-Isaiah on the basis of the use of \textit{\v{e}j\^w \v{e}m}; the effect of Philo, the Wisdom Literature, and mysticism upon the author: all these knotty and interesting problems are left for others to solve.

The terminus \textit{a quo} for this thesis is the self-revelation of God, or gods, through their names, especially through Yahweh, which is related to the verb "to be." The terminus \textit{ad quem} is the Apocalypse where the sacred phrase is found in claims of deity. It is true, however, that later writings have been cited when it was felt they would increase our understanding of the subject.

Not only has an historical study been made, but also
an exegetical one. Especially in the Fourth Gospel has there been an attempt to gain additional evidence by an historical and exegetical study of both ἐγώ είμι and all words used in close proximity with the phrase. Most of the translations are from the American Standard Version of the Bible, but when it was felt that a more literal translation was helpful, the writer has felt free to use his own.

The first chapter deals with the relationship of ἐγώ είμι to the self-revelation of God. The chapter presents a very brief survey of the self-revelation of God, and how his names are media of expressing his nature. This chapter concludes with an attempt to define the meaning of Yahweh in the historical period, and how it was perhaps connected with the verb "to be."

The second chapter attempts to trace the ἐγώ είμι expression, or its equivalent in other lands and religions. It presents examples from Greek inscriptions, the Aztec hymns, the sacred writings of India, Persia, and Babylonia to substantiate the claim that it is the language of deity.

In the third chapter the results of a careful study of the Septuagint are presented and interpreted. The first part of the chapter deals with the use of ἐγώ and the rest deals with the use of ὢν είμι. The results are presented in a series of tables, and an attempt is made to interpret
the results in the Pentateuch and Prophets, particularly.

The fourth chapter deals with the heart of the thesis: the use of \textit{ἐγὼ εἰμί} in the Fourth Gospel. The problems of authenticity, and the relation of \textit{ἐγὼ εἰμί} to the title of "Son of man" are briefly discussed in the first part of the chapter. The \textit{ἐγὼ εἰμί} sayings are then grouped and discussed individually. The writer attempts to prove that the \textit{ἐγὼ εἰμί} sayings make divine claims presenting a continuity and a climax.

The final chapter deals with \textit{ἐγὼ εἰμί} elsewhere in the New Testament. The discussion is brief, and the usage is grouped as far as possible. Stress is placed only upon those examples when the use of \textit{ἐγὼ εἰμί} seems to be analogous to its use in the Fourth Gospel.

The conclusion sums up the evidence, and presents what the writer feels to be the use of \textit{ἐγὼ εἰμί} in the Fourth Gospel.

An appendix is added as an attempt to disprove the thesis of Eduard Schweizer and others, who claim that the Fourth Gospel, and especially the \textit{ἐγὼ εἰμί} sayings, are to be interpreted in the light of the Mandaean scriptures. This appendix concludes by showing the close relationship existing between Mandaeism and Gnosticism, thus excluding the former as an important factor in the understanding of the \textit{ἐγὼ εἰμί} sayings in the Fourth Gospel.
CHAPTER I

THE RELATIONSHIP OF ELO EIMI

TO

THE SELF-REVELATION OF GOD
CHAPTER I

THE RELATIONSHIP OF ΕΙΔΩ ΕΙΜΙ

TO

THE SELF-REVELATION OF GOD

It would be impossible to study the significant phrase ΕΙΔΩ ΕΙΜΙ without a very brief review of revelation, and how this revelation is inter-woven in the name which God himself acquires.

I. BRIEF STATEMENT ON THE REVELATION OF GOD

The Old Testament presents to us a God who makes himself known. Man is incapable of knowing God except as he reveals his true nature to man. The idea of man knowing God through his own efforts is foreign to the Old Testament. It is God who speaks; it is man who listens. It is God who appears; it is man who beholds. This revelation takes several forms: to the prophets, he revealed himself in the inspiration of their minds, in visions, in dreams, or in spiritual intuitions; to Moses, he appeared face to face. Although the method of revelation was different, the reality was the same. The prophet was just as positive that God had revealed himself to him through his mind as the patriarch who was visited by an angelic visitor.
We are not to assume that any one method of revelation was complete or full. God's revelation of himself is inadequate because of man's limitation. Moses only saw a part of God, the patriarchs saw only a human form, in the tabernacle his presence was manifested in the smoke that hung over the Ark, and in Eden he was revealed in the cherubim.

II. A NAME AS A MEANS OF SELF-REVELATION

Another method of revelation is by means of a name; as God reveals himself he acquires a name.

Men call that which they know by name. . . . The Hebrews never used a name as a sign whereby one person could be distinguished from another. It always remained descriptive. . . . The name bore the same relation to the significance of the thing or person as a word does to a thought. It was always the expression of it. Hence, when a man acquired a new significance, when he began to play a new role, or entered into a new relation, or was in some sense a new man, he received a new name. Therefore Abram became Abraham; Jacob, Israel; . . . So even to God men have a name. Thus he calls Moses and Cyrus by name. That is, He conceives to Himself what their significance is, what meaning they have in His redemptive providence; and He recognizes this, and enters into relation with them as men having this meaning. And the same is true of God's own names. Such a name expresses that which is known to men of the nature of God. When a new or higher side of the Being of God is revealed to men, there arises a new name of God. Any name of God expresses some revelation of His Being or character. When the word Name is used absolutely as God's name, it describes His nature as revealed, as finding outward expression. So when the Psalmist in Psalm VIII exclaims, 'How excellent is Thy name in all the earth!' he means how glorious is God's revelation of Himself, or God
as revealed on the earth,—that is, among the family of men, whom He has so dignified as to put them over the work of His hands, with all things under their feet. . . . So Israel is warned to give heed to the Angel of the Lord that leads them, for His name is in him (Exodus 23:21), the sense is that the significance of God is present there; what God is, His majesty and authority, is there embodied. So His name is holy and reverend; He, as being what He is known to be, is reverendus.¹

When God speaks and says "for his name's sake," when he swears by his name, when he will not cast off Israel, the idea is that because of what he has made known of himself to Israel he must act accordingly and consistently. Although "for his name's sake" is comparatively late in the Old Testament, such as in Second Isaiah, Ezekiel, and the later Psalms, the thought is in such New Testament expressions as "in his name," "by his name," "on his name," and "for his name."

Inasmuch as God has revealed himself to man in several ways, he has several names. His names are limited to his revelation and that is why he says in Exodus 6:3, "And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, as God Almighty (El Shaddai); but by my name Jehovah (Yahweh) I was not known to them."

III. A STUDY OF THE PARTICULAR NAMES OF GOD

Some of these names which God acquired express the general notion of deity, as 'El, 'Elohim; others are descriptive titles applied to deity, as 'El Shaddai, 'El 'Elyon; but in Exodus, Yahweh is the personal name of the God of Israel.

1. 'El

The name 'El (אֵל) is the most widely distributed of all names for deity, being used in Babylonian, Aramaean, Phoenician, Hebrew, and Arabic, particularly southern Arabic. It thus belonged to the primitive Semitic speech before it became modified into dialects, though conceivably one or more of the dialects may have retained in use the root with which it was connected.2 Its origin was prehistoric and its meaning obscure. It could be derived from the Hebrew root לֶחֶץ "to be strong" in which case it would be the participle meaning "the strong." This is the conclusion of Gesenius and others.3

---


It could possibly be derived from the Arabic root 'ul, meaning "to be in front," "to govern," and therefore have the sense of "leader." This meaning would be more in harmony with the Semitic names for God such as baal, adon, "lord," melek, "king," etc. Other suggestions for origin are less plausible but should be noted. It has been suggested that it came from a supposed root with the sense of power or might. This idea would be too abstract for the ancient mind. Some have assumed it was derived from a root supposed to be related to the preposition so as to designate God as a goal to which man is drawn. This would be too conjectural. We must admit that we do not know its origin.

'El is quite often connected with an epithet such as "the living God," "the eternal God," and "God Most High." It is also found alone for "god" or "God," and in a few cases it is found in the plural for "gods." It retained its place all through the language as well as in other dialects in the

---

5 Davidson, op. cit., p. 39.
6 Brown, Driver, and Briggs, op. cit., p. 42.
formation of proper names.  

2. 'Elohim

'Elohim is a plural form of the singular אֱלֹהִים. The singular is found in late prose and in poetry such as in Psalm 18:29, 32 and Deuteronomy 32:15, 17. Some try to explain this plural form as being the plural of 'El. This is not plausible as 'El has its own plural form 'elim. Its plural form 'Elohim has caused much conjecture. It is not likely that it is a remnant of polytheism. Oehler suggested the plural could mean the fulness of mights or powers contained in God. This idea assumes the singular means "might" which cannot be proved, and is too abstract for the Hebrew mind. W. R. Smith suggested that the plural began because of community gods. This, too, is doubtful as each locality had only one deity.

It is suggested by Cohen that we can reconstruct tentatively the history of the names of God in the religion

7Hastings, op. cit., p. 199.

8Loc. cit.

9Oehler, op. cit., p. 129.

of Israel.

Apparently there were at first many names; each tribe, for instance, may have had its own name for the deity that it worshipped in common with the rest of the nation. Among such early names may have been not merely Elyon, Shaddai and the like, but such tribal names as Asher . . . Gad, Dan, Menasseh, and Joseph (the name Joseph-el, "Joseph is God," occurs in Egyptian records). In course of time, as the tribes united into a nation, all other names were superceded by the Tetragrammaton, Yahweh; this process seems to have been completed by the 9th century B.C.E., after which time almost every royal name is compounded with Yahweh.

It seems the best explanation for the plural is that it is a plural of eminence. This is not inconsistent with Hebrew thought and we find similar usage elsewhere. The plural appears in Ethiopic 'amlak (from singular malek), and in the Amarna letters the plural ilani, "God" is used in addressing the Egyptian king. The Egyptian does not say rab for "master" but arbab. In Hebrew, Baal which means "Lord," "owner," or "ruler" is used in the plural although its sense is singular. Isaiah 1:3 says, "the ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib" (אָּלַהֶנְיָיו). In use 'Elohim, although plural, was regularly constructed with a

---


12Hastings, op. cit., p. 199.

13Davidson, op. cit., p. 41.
singular verb or adjective with some few exceptions in E.\textsuperscript{14}

3. 'El Elyon and 'El Shaddai

Both 'El Elyon and 'El Shaddai are descriptive titles applied to deity. 'Elyon was an epithet meaning "Most High" and Shaddai is also probably an epithet qualifying 'El. 'El Shaddai is old, appearing in Genesis 17:1 and Genesis 49:25. In the Septuagint the name is translated \textit{\textit{iκνος}} twice in Ruth, three times in Job, and once in Ezekiel, and translated "mighty" or "almighty" (\textit{\textit{iχυρος}}, \textit{παντοκράτωρ}) in Job. This suggests that the translators recognized \textit{\textit{Shaddai}} as derived from \textit{\textit{7 ψ}}, "the sufficient." If derived from \textit{\textit{7 7 ψ}} it would mean "destroyer" and not "the Almighty." There is little from context or Hebrew thought to recommend this latter derivation.

Albright believes the \textit{\textit{Shaddai}} means "mountain" or "to be high." It would thus be connected with the Assyrian shadu. In the same work he speaks of \textit{\textit{Shaddai}} as the storm-god.\textsuperscript{15} Albright seems to be following Delitzsch at this point. The most that can be said of it is that \textit{\textit{Shaddai}} may be an epithet with the idea of "Almighty," as 'Elyon is an epithet of 'El with

\textsuperscript{14}Loc. cit.

\textsuperscript{15}William T. Albright, From the Stone Age to Christianity, (Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1940), pp. 175ff.
the idea of "Most High." Therefore Abraham's faith responded to the thought of "God the Omnipotent," the one who was able to protect him at all times and in all places. 16

4. Yahweh

The name that was above every name, the name that was the greatest self-revelation of God was Yahweh, the personal name of the God of Israel. It was perhaps an ancient name as seen in Genesis 4:26 although at the exodus it received a special significance. Its origin is still clothed in obscurity although much has been written on the subject. A few things may be said about it with some certainty.

It seems that the name Yahweh was peculiar to the Israelites and was not known by the other Semites. When it does appear in the proper names of other tribes, it seems to be borrowed. 17

The name must have been known from prehistoric times for the following two reasons: Moses' mother had a name compounded with it; the people of Israel were to recognize the name when Moses came before them, suggesting that the name was not new to the people.

16 Davidson, op. cit., p. 40.
17 Ibid., p. 45
In the Pentateuch the word is brought into connection with the verb "to be." This is not to say that it can be proven that this is its origin. But this is significant, for it suggests that although the origin of the word is lost, *Yahweh* certainly was connected with the verb "to be" in the historic period. And this sense, not its primary sense, is what is important.

This designation of God is to be understood as distinctly a personal name, going back to pre-historic times, but made the vehicle, or the channel, of special revelation, until it acquired a sacred character and significance, incommunicable otherwise. The expression in Exodus 3:14 is descriptive of the nature of God as then making himself known. He was the one true God, self-existent and self-sufficient, the cause and ground of all being, faithful to his promise, and constant in all his relations with his people. The true meaning and content of the name became evident in the course of history, as successive acts and manifestations showed Israel what kind of a Supreme Being it was whom they were bidden alone to worship. *Yahweh* remained the name of the covenant God of Israel, where the term "covenant" indicates a special relation between God and his people, and a relationship of which the whole national history is a running commentary.
The distinctive feature of the Old Testament teaching of God is the emphasis laid on the moral character of Yahweh. He is unique not in power only but in wisdom, righteousness, goodness, and truth. The prophets from Amos onward defined more clearly, and enforced more strenuously the true nature of Yahweh. They emphasized two main truths concerning God: (1) they taught the unity and supremacy of Yahweh in relation to the whole world as well as to Israel; and (2) they proclaimed and pressed home the doctrine of his holiness in its full meaning and implications, as this had never been done before.

Jesus had no new God to announce. He began with, and proceeded to build upon the revelation of the one living and true God. He is personal, spiritual, transcendent, yet draws very near to men in revelation and communion, unique in holiness, goodness, and the loftiest moral attributes. With this doctrine Jesus began; how far he traveled beyond it remains to be seen.

Although Jesus is quoted by the Synoptic Gospels as calling God "Father," this designation is used in the Fourth Gospel more than in the other three Gospels combined. All four Evangelists are careful to indicate that the word always came from Jesus' lips and not from the apostles. In the one passage in John18 that ranks Jesus and his disciples as all

18 John 20:17
sons, Jesus deliberately marks a distinction saying, "My Father and your Father, and my God and your God."

Although it is not the purpose of this thesis to discuss the problem of the authorship of the Pentateuch, the names for God have been used for the determination of the different strands of the narrative. Thus they point out that according to the Jahvist source, (J), the Tetragrammaton was not confined to the Israelites, but known to mankind as early as the second generation after Adam (Genesis 4:25). In contrast to this the Elohist code, (E), relates that Moses had to ask the ancestral deity for his true name and in reply was given the Tetragrammaton (Exodus 3:15). The Priestly Code (P) declares that this revelation came to Moses after he returned to Egypt and that God was known as El Shaddi to the patriarchs (Exodus 6:2-3); accordingly it uses El Shaddai in Genesis. Finally, according to the Kenite Document, (K), it was not apparent until the Israelites reached Mount Sinai that the Tetragrammaton was revealed to Moses (Exodus 34:5-6).

In some of the poetry of the Old Testament and as a part of personal names are found the related forms Yah and Yahu. Yah is found in the following passages: Exodus 15:2 and 17:16; II Kings 1:3; Psalm 68:10, 104:35, 105:45, 106:1, etc. Yahu is found in the following passages: I Kings 17:1, 16,18,22,24, etc. For many years it was believed that Yahweh
came from one of these shorter forms, but now the drift is
toward the view that Yah and Yahu are derived from Yahweh. 19

When it is admitted that Yahweh is the older form, the
field is limited in the origin of the word. Three possibili-
ties are usually suggested:

(1) Although hwh is connected with the verb "to be" in
later Jewish thought, this was not its primary meaning. "To
be" was a derived meaning as its primary meaning meant "to
fall" or "to blow." Therefore God would be "the falling one"
or causatively "the one who causes (wind) to blow." The storm
and nature attributes of God in the Old Testament are brought
in to support this view. One great difficulty presents itself:
how can anyone know that Yahweh originated from hwh when the
latter possessed this primitive meaning? Those who hold to
this view do so largely because "to be" seems too abstract to
them. 20

(2) The next possible view is that Yahweh is the
causative form of the Hebrew hyh or hwh. Albright holds to
this view and says it is the only one that makes sense. For
those who claim this meaning is too abstract he quotes from

19 J. Coert Rylaarsdam, "Origin of Israel's Name for
God," The Interpreter's Bible, (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury

20 Loc. cit.
Egyptian, Babylonian, and Accadian texts. Not only does he claim **Yahweh** to be causative, but also claims it to be an abbreviation of a longer name or litanic formula. He cites the following illustrations:

In Sumerian Babylonia the name **Shagan** (later **Shakkan**), belonging to the god of animal husbandry, is an abbreviation of **Ama-shagan-gub**, 'He who Assists Bearing Mothers'; **Dumuzi** (later Tammuz) stands for **Dumu-zid-abzu**; **Asari** (a name of Marduk) represents the fuller **Asari-lu-dug**; **Gish** stands for **Gisbilgamesh** (later **Gilgamesh**), etc. Similar abbreviated formulae are common as divine names in later Accadian and Egyptian religion: cf. Accadian **Asushu-namer**, **User-amatsu**, and Egyptian **Iusas**, etc. It is, indeed, probable that many Egyptian names of Gods are just as abbreviated as the names of kings and commoners are known to be in all early periods; e.g., the name **Osiris** is probably an abbreviation of the fuller **Osiris-onnophris**. A most remarkable illustration comes from the Canaanite religion of the 15th century B.C., where the standing appellation of the storm-god, Baal, usually given as **Al'iyan**, appears in its full form as 'I prevail ('al'iyu) over the champions whom I meet in the land of battle.' The abbreviated name accordingly means simply 'I will surely prevail.' The enigmatic formula in Exodus 3:14, which in biblical Hebrew means 'I am what I am,' if transposed into the form in the third person required by the causative **Yahweh**, can only become **Yahweh asher yihweh** (later **yihyeh**), 'He Causes to be what Comes into Existence.' Later this formula was modified, presumably because the old causative was no longer used in later Hebrew. In the dialect of Moses the formula may even have been **Yahweh ze-Yihweh**, employing the ze which appears as a relative preposition in Canaanite and poetic Hebrew as well as in the appellation of **Yahweh** in Judges 5:5, **Ze-Sinai**, 'the One of Sinai' (as first pointed out by H. Grimme, in accordance with widespread West-Semitic usage). If the restored formula were isolated one would be justified despite the evidence in suspecting its correctness, but we have it again and again in Egyptian texts of the second
millennium B.C.: '(a god) who causes to be (or who creates) what comes into existence' (e.g., repeatedly in the great hymn to Amun from the 15th century B.C.). Even if this view should prove to be wrong, there is ample evidence in the Bible that the Israelites had always regarded Yahweh as Creator of All.21

(3) The third possible interpretation makes in Exodus 3:14 the basis of interpreting Yahweh. The meaning would not be causative in this case. Yahweh is made to mean "being," "he who is," or "he who will be." It is an imperfect form and is a reference to God's essential being.

This is the simplest explanation to the problem. The previous two theories have so much conjecture as to the relationship with other languages, the time of the origin of Yahweh, the causative meaning, etc. As already pointed out,22 Yahweh was connected with the verb "to be" in the historic period, and that is important for this study.

This places a great deal of emphasis on Exodus 3:14, but not an over-emphasis. From the writer's viewpoint 'ehyeh (נָּוָּא) and Yahweh (יָהָה) were the same. God is 'ehyeh, "I am" or "I will be" when he speaks of himself, and Yahweh, "he is" or "he will be" when spoken by others.

22Supra, p. 10f.
Nothing could be more assuring to an individual than to know that his god was pre-existent, existent, and post-existent. The other ancient people had claimed this for their gods as they placed upon their lips great "I am" statements as to their origin, character, and importance. It was reserved for the Hebrew people to have a God who revealed himself to his people as the great "I am" and they called him by a similar name as they spoke of him. Both words had the same meaning and depended in form only because of the speaker: when God spoke, he was the great 'ehyeh; when man spoke of God, he was the great Yahweh.

IV. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN YAHWEH AND בָּרָא בָּיָם

The Hebrew basis for "I am" will be discussed briefly in the third chapter, but it must be pointed out here that בָּרָא בָּיָם is translated several times in Deutero-Isaiah as "I am" (בָּרָא בָּיָם). Isaiah 48:12 is translated "I am he; I am the first, I also am the last" (בְּנֵא אַלּוֹ שָׁם). The Septuagint translators seem to have taken בָּרָא בָּיָם as the equivalent to a divine name as they render it בָּרָא בָּיָם. In Isaiah 43:25 they render בָּרָא בָּיָם by בָּרָא בָּיָם בָּרָא בָּיָם, "I am 'I AM.'" They appear to have understood בָּרָא בָּיָם in the same sense, for in Isaiah 45:18 they render בָּרָא בָּיָם by בָּרָא בָּיָם. In Isaiah 45:19 they seem to have rendered בָּרָא בָּיָם twice, once by בָּרָא בָּיָם
and once by ἐγώ εἰμι ἐγώ εἰμι, "I am 'I AM' the Lord." This is most interesting as this thesis is based upon the Greek text of the Old Testament.

There is a definite relationship between the claims of Yahweh and the use of ἐγώ εἰμι in the Septuagint. The translators had a theological motive in using ἐγώ εἰμι as they did. There seems to be no question but that they connected ἐγώ εἰμι and Yahweh theologically, as the preceding verse indicates (Isaiah 45:19). Both were means of the self-revelation of God.

There were perhaps two other reasons why the translators used ἐγώ εἰμι so frequently in the language of God: when the people ceased pronouncing the sacred Tetragrammaton, it was natural that they looked for another title to express the same idea: ἐγώ εἰμι was a ready vehicle and just made to order. Also, other religious groups had a phrase that they were using to make grand the claims of their gods, as well as to pronounce curses upon their enemies: ἐγώ εἰμι. This is the argument of the next chapter, but it needs to be pointed out now that if other gods could make the claim of ἐγώ εἰμι, surely the Yahweh of Israel could. He, above all others, had

---

the right to make the claim, for he only was pre-existent, existent, and post-existent.

Therefore if Yahweh were connected in the mind of the people with the verb "to be"; if Yahweh ceased to be pronounced; and if pagan gods used ἐγένομεν as a means of self-revelation, it is logical to suppose that a divine emphasis would be given to the phrase in the translation of the Septuagint, and in the words of their great Messiah in the New Testament. It remains to be seen just how far this idea was incorporated in their scriptures. This is the problem for succeeding chapters.
CHAPTER II
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CHAPTER II

THE USE OF £ρω £ΙΜΙ IN NON-BIBLICAL LITERATURE

If £ρω £ΙΜΙ has any special meaning in the New Testament and especially in John's gospel, its origin should be found in other writings. The next chapter is reserved for the use of £ρω £ΙΜΙ in the Septuagint, and this chapter for its use in non-biblical literature.

I. THE USE OF £ρω £ΙΜΙ IN GREEK CLASSICAL LITERATURE

The search in classical literature does not supply many discoveries. There are very few examples and not one real parallel. The best example is in Homer's Odyssey where the lover of Tyro makes himself known to her by saying:

αὐτὴν ἔγω τοι εἰμι Ποσειδάων ἐνοσίκθων, Ἡμερίθρως ἐνεχθήμενον ἡμῖν ἡμῖν ἡμῖν, ἡμῖν ἡμῖν ἡμῖν

"I am Poseidon" (Neptune). This passage is certainly not weighty. The £ΙΜΙ is separated from the £ρω; it was a common introduction; and the £ρω could have been inserted for rhythmical reasons. In one of the so-called "Homeric Hymns" is found, εἰμι δὲ Δημήτρι τιμάοχος ;

"I am honorable Demeter." This would have been a wonderful

---

1Homer, Οδησσί, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1889), p. 185

opportunity to have used ἔγω but it seems to have been purposely omitted.

In the Greek tragedies, the actors had to introduce themselves to the audience, but it is noticeable that they did not use this significant combination as would be expected. The work of Euripides has been thoroughly examined by Schweizer and the nearest he found to the phrase was: ὁ γὰρ δὴ πολλὰ μοιχὸσας ἔγω/Μενέλαος εἰμι kai στρατεύματ' Ἀχαιῶν, "I am Menelaus the great fighter and soldier of the Achaeans."

Again it is evident that Euripides was apparently separating ἔγω and εἰμι for some specific reason. He would not begin a sentence with ἔγω εἰμι.

Plautus used the ἔγω with εἰμι but not an ἔγω εἰμi.

Homer used a stressed ἔγω, but the third person ἔστι was also stressed in the classical period.

Norden goes so far as to conclude that the formula ἔγω εἰμι was not only strange to ancient Greek, but they even intentionally avoided it.4

It was believed that this ἔγω εἰμι was a fixed saying

---


of the Semites, but Schweizer has well proven that this "I Am" emphasis had its analogies in other religions which were non-Semitic.\(^5\) Especially in the ancient writings of India is this formula found. These examples are most convincing because the Sanskrit is akin to the Greek, and the personal pronoun is superfluous in connection with the verb.

II. THE USE OF "I AM" IN THE RELIGIONS OF INDIA

As in the New Testament, there were several expressions for stressed speeches in the ancient religions of India. The use of "aham asmi" in the Upanishads and in the Bhagavad Gita would be equivalent to ḫ Invocation; the "aham . . . asmi" in the Rig Veda would be equivalent to ḫ Invocation; the inverted "asmi aham" is found in the Upanishads; the "aham abhavam" in the Rig Veda would be equivalent to ḫ Invocation. They also had the stressed "I" in various constructions but not equivalent to the ḫ Invocation expression.

1. Examples from the Rig Veda

The following passage found in Rig Veda 4:26.1-3 shows the stressed "I" where the god is speaking of himself

\(^5\)Schweizer, op. cit., p. 15 ff.

\(^6\)Loc. cit.
or calling attention to his deeds. In the three verses "aham" is used eight times. The translation is Schweizer's.7

I was Manu and I Surya, I am Kaksivat, the Rsi, powerful of speech. I force the Kutsa, the son of Arjuna; I am the Kavi Usanas, look at me! I gave the world to the Aryan, I the rain to the mortal. I guided the loudly roaring waters; the gods obeyed to my wishes. I destroyed, drunk with soma, ninety-nine castles of the Sambara at once; to make the hundred complete, I killed the occupant when assisting the Divodasa Atithigva.

The following passage is from the Rig Veda 4:42. 2-4 and shows how the "asmi" was separated from the "aham" by the name of the god:

I, Varuna, am the King; the dignity of an Asura was first destined to me. The gods follow the advice of Varuna; I rule over the people of the most perfect physique. I, Varuna, am Indra. I know these two wide, deep, well founded spaces in all their greatness, and all creatures like Tvastr: I have created these two worlds and maintain them. I told the running waters to spring, I maintain the sky at the seat of the law.8

In the Rig Veda 10:48. 1-9 is not only the stressed "I" but also the "I Am" ("aham asmi"). One verse will suffice:

I am the lord of properties from the very beginning, and I obtain the treasures of everyone.9

In the Rig Veda 10:49. 1ff. is certainly a stressed "I Am" style. Schweizer says of it:

7Ibid., p. 16. 8Ibid., pp. 16f. 9Ibid., p. 17.
... is an I-hymn of the India, which contains twenty "aham" and four oblique cases in ten verses. In all ten verses (and moreover in seven half-verses,) "aham" (respectively an oblique case once) is the first word. In verse six the predicate is a relative sentence, in verse eight a verbal adjective which nearly corresponds to the participle (saptaha equals "the killer of seven"). Concerning the contents, the introducing "I Am" is followed by the threat and the promise with the indirect appeal to the listeners; the deeds of the god, with which he proves his identity; and finally a short doxology.10

2. **Examples from the Bhagavad Gita**

In the later writings of India the "I Am" style becomes much more frequent. In late additions to the Bhagavad Gita which were quite speculative, the "I am" is repeated in one passage six times in five verses; in another passage, ten times in four verses; and in still another passage, forty-two times in twenty-three verses.11

A lengthy example from the Bhagavad Gita is 10:19ff which says in part:

I am the beginning, the middle, and also the end of all beings; I am Visnu among the Adityas, the brilliant sun among the stars; I am Marici among the Maruts, the moon among the stars. Among the Vedas I am the Samaveda. ... I am the game of dice among the deceptive things; I am the brightness of the bright; I am the victory, I am the determination, I am the goodness of the good ... 12

---

10 Loc. cit. 11 Ibid. pp. 17f.

In verses 19-42 "I am" is used 63 times.

In late writings one can find such expressions as: "I am Brahma- I am God- I am the one whom I love, and he whom I love, is I."13

III. THE USE OF "I AM" IN THE ANCIENT WRITINGS OF IRAN

In the ancient writings of Iran is found a similar emphasis upon their god when he speaks. The stressed "I am" is also found in connection with those who have close relationships with the gods. Schweizer quotes the well known introduction of the virgin who comes to meet the dead:

"I am, oh man of good thoughts, words, and deeds, your good religion, your personal confession."14

IV. THE USE OF "I AM" IN SUFISM

A similar expression is found in the writings of Islam, especially in Sufism which is a system of Mohammedan mysticism developed, especially in Persia, into an elaborate symbolism much used by the poets. The following quotation will suffice:

I am the board, I am the slate-pencil. I am Abraham, Moses, Jesus, I am Gabriel, Michael, Israfil. He who comes into the true being, is absorbed by God, is God.15

In the Babylonian writings is found the following:

"I am Nebo, the Lord of the slate-pencil, praise me."\(^{16}\) "I am the shepherd, the command has been given to me as a gift."\(^{17}\) "I am Hammurabi, the shepherd, called upon by Enlil."\(^{18}\)

V. THE USE OF \(\text{ἐγώ εἰμι} \)
IN THE GREEK MYSTERY RELIGIONS

The Greek mystery religions were well acquainted with the \(\text{ἐγώ εἰμι} \) form as a claim to deity. In *Acta Thomae* a string of sentences beginning with \(\text{ἐγώ εἰμι} \) is put into the mouth of the dragon.\(^{19}\)

It was Deissmann who discovered many inscriptions with \(\text{ἐγώ εἰμι} \) as a claim to deity. In a pre-Christian Isis inscription which was graven about 200 A.D. at Nysa the following is found:\(^{20}\)

\[\text{Ἐγὼ Ίσις εἰμι ὅ βασιλεῖσα πατὴρ Χρήσων ἢ παίδωθεν εἰς ὑπὸ ξυμοῦ καὶ ὅσα ἔγω ἐγκαλοῦντα, οὐδεὶς οὗτα δύναται λύσαι. ἔγω}\]

\(^{16}\)Ibid., p. 31.
\(^{17}\)Ibid., p. 34. \(^{18}\)Loc. cit.
I am Isis, the queen of every land, taught by Hermes, and whatsoever things I have ordained, no one is able to destroy them. I am the eldest daughter of Cronos, the youngest god. I am wife and sister of King Osiris. I am the first that devised fruit for men. I am mother of Horus the King. I am she that riseth in the dog-star.

An inscription found at Ios is just as plain in showing that ἔμι ἔμι was a part of the liturgical texts of the Isis cult.21

I am the eldest daughter of Cronos. I am wife and sister of King Osiris. I am she that riseth in the star of the Dog god. I am she that is called goddess by women.

In the following lines ἔμι was used again and again but not with ἔμι.

21Ibid., pp. 139-140.
A 4th century magical papyrus has been discovered which has ἐγὼ εἰμί several times. This headless demon says:

'Ἔγὼ εἰμί ὁ ἀκεφαλὸς δαίμων, ἐν τοῖς ποτὶν ἐγὼ τὰν ὀργὴν ἵσχυρός, τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἀθάνατον. Ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ὁ ἀκριβῶς ὁ πεισμένοις ἀκριβῶς μαται ὁμίσεως ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ. Ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ὁ ἀκριβῶς ἀρωματω στὰ ἄρατα τὰς καὶ ἄρωμα τὰς. Ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ὁ ἀκριβῶς ὁ ἀρωματώς ἐπιπείπτων ἐπὶ τὰν ἄνθρωπον ὀρεί ς. Ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ὁ ἀρωματώς. Ἐγὼ ἐγὼ ἄρα τὰ στόμα καὶ ἀστάτου δι' ἀκαλ. Ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ὁ ἄδειαν καὶ ἀποδεικνύων. Ἐγὼ εἰμὶ καὶ ἀρζός τοῦ αἰῶνος.'

I am the headless daemon, having eyes in my feet, the strong one, the deathless fire. I am the truth, who hateth that evil deeds are in the world. I am he that lighteneth (here follow certain magic words) and thundereth. I am he whose sweat is a shower falling upon the earth to make it fruitful. I am he whose mouth burneth altogether. I am he that begetteth and begetteth again. I am the grace of the aeon.

A similar example is found in the pagan magical text of 300 A.D. In line 2999 it says:

Ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ἐρμής ἐμπνεύσω μου το ὁμιλω σε σοῦ ἄνθρω πος δαίμων καὶ ἐν καλῷ π....

---


23 Deissmann, op. cit., p. 255.
I am Hermes. I seize thee in fellowship with good Tyche and good Daemon and in good hour. . . .

Plutarch gives the following Isis inscription:24

I am everything that has come to pass and which also will come to pass. No one shall reveal my--of death.

The Εγώ Είμι is also found in the Mithraic liturgy as it is evident from the following inscription:25

For I am the son. . . .
I am a daggar . . . .
I am a star of deception to you.

In the Egyptian Book of the Dead is found the following: "I am Anubis . . . I am the steer . . . I am Osiris . . . I am Horus . . . ." There then follows many rows of "I Am."26

In the Leyden Papyri W VII 33 and 39 are found the following two statements:27

25 Loc. cit. 26 Schweizer, op. cit., p. 29.
27 Ibid., p. 30.
Because I am, speak the name
Because I am, speak the name

In the London Papyri XLVI, 236ff. is found the following: 28

I am Thouth, the searcher and creator of drugs and scribes.

Other examples of this use of \( \varepsilon \gamma \omega \ \varepsilon \iota \mu \iota \ \theta \omicron \omicron \omicron \theta \omicron \) may be found in the London Magical Papyrus No. XLVI 472 and 108ff.; CXXII 37 and 50; in the Leyden Papyrus V. VII 23ff., V. VII 17ff., W XVII 15ff., W. VI 20, and V. II 21ff.

VI. THE USE OF "I AM" IN THE AZTEC WRITINGS

In the sacred writings which come down from the Aztecs of Old Mexico there is found the "I am" emphasis. They are usually called the Old Mexican hymns. The following excerpts will be sufficient to prove this connection.

I, Cinteotl, was born in Paradise, I come from the place of the flowers. I am the only flower, the new, the glorious one. 29


This was a hymn sung at a fast and certainly has the stressed "I am" sayings.

I go forth, I go forth about to destroy. I Yoatsin; my soul is in the Cerulean water; I am seen in the golden water; I shall appear unto mortals; I shall strengthen them for the words of war.30

This was the hymn of the high priest Xipetotec with a definite stress on the "I."

I come forth from Chizomoztoc, only to you, my friends, only to you, honoured ones—
I come forth from Tzivacticlan, only to you my friends, only to you honoured ones.
I sought, I sought, in all directions I sought with my pack.
I sought, I sought, in all directions I sought with my traveling net.
I took them in hand, I took them in hand; --yes, I took them in hand; yes, I took them in hand.

In the ballground I sang well and strong, like to the quetzal bird, I answered back to the god.31

This was the hymn which they sang every eight years when they fasted on bread and water.

The following was what they called the War Song of the Huitznahuac:

What hol my work is in the hall of arms, I listen to no mortal, nor can any put me to shame. I know none such, I am the Terror, I know none other. I am where war is, my work is said to be in the hall of arms, let no one curse my children.32

---

30 Ibid., p. 57. 31 Ibid., p. 53. 32 Ibid., p. 19
This final hymn was of Tlaloc:

I, the god, have returned again, I have turned again to the place of abundance of blood-sacrifices; there when the day grows old, I am beheld as a god.\textsuperscript{33}

VII. THE ABSENCE OF \textit{ἐστι ἐμί} IN THE ANTI-NICENE FATHERS

There is not an emphasis upon \textit{ἐστι ἐμί} in later writings, such as in the Anti-Nicene Fathers. The tone of some of the statements sound Johannine, but the construction is not identical. Irenaeus in his work \textit{Against Heresies} quotes the Gnostics in book I, chapter xxv and paragraph five as saying:

\begin{quote}
\begin{verbatim}
\textit{ἐγώ ἐμί ἐγὼ ἐμί ἐγὼ ἐμί
ναῦς ἐγὼ ἐμί ἐγὼ ἐμί

I am a son from the Father— the Father who had a pre-existence, and a son in Him who is pre-existent.

I am a vessel more precious than the female who formed you.
\end{verbatim}
\end{quote}

In the same work is found this statement which sounds

so much like the Fourth Gospel:

\[ \varepsilon \nu \omega \ \varepsilon \iota \mu \iota \, \kappa \iota \ \gamma \iota \nu \nu \acute{\sigma} \acute{\kappa} \omega \ \omicron \theta \acute{\epsilon} \nu \varepsilon \iota \mu \iota . \]

"I know myself, and I know whence I am."\(^{35}\)

Although these sound like the Fourth Gospel, they do not have the \( \varepsilon \nu \omega \ \varepsilon \iota \mu \iota \) of the Fourth Gospel. These were the nearest parallels found.\(^{36}\) There was a reluctance on the part of the writers to use the sacred phrase.

**VIII. THE USE OF \( \varepsilon \rho \alpha \ \varepsilon \iota \mu \iota \) IN THE MANDAEAN SCRIPTURES**

The stressed \( \varepsilon \nu \omega \ \varepsilon \iota \mu \iota \) is found in the Mandaean scriptures, but as the Mandaeans will be treated in the appendix as to the source of their teaching, the treatment of them will be brief here. Inasmuch as they have copied the \( \varepsilon \nu \omega \ \varepsilon \iota \mu \iota \) from John, as well as using certain descriptive terms found in John, they must have recognized them as claims of deity. In John, Book 44, verse 27, it is recorded: "I am

\[^{35}\text{Loc. cit.}\]

\[^{36}\text{In addition to Irenæus, the writings of four other Church Fathers were checked for the use of } \varepsilon \nu \omega \ \varepsilon \iota \mu \iota . \text{ Migne's Vol. XI, pp. 47-278 was checked for Origen's use of } \varepsilon \nu \omega \ \varepsilon \iota \mu \iota ; \text{ Vol. XIX, pp. 85-162 was checked for Eusebius' use; Vol. IX, pp. 1-102 was checked for the use of } \varepsilon \nu \omega \ \varepsilon \iota \mu \iota \text{ by Clement of Alexandria; and Vol. XLI, pp. 174-274 for the use of } \varepsilon \nu \omega \ \varepsilon \iota \mu \iota \text{ by Epiphanius. Not one example of } \varepsilon \nu \omega \ \varepsilon \iota \mu \iota \text{ was found except when the Fathers quoted either from the Old Testament in the declarations of God, or from the Gospels. They used } \varepsilon \nu \omega \ \varepsilon \iota \mu \iota \text{ quite frequently, and } \varepsilon \iota \mu \iota \text{ a few times, but never } \varepsilon \nu \omega \ \varepsilon \iota \mu \iota .\]"
a shepherd who loves his sheep. I watch my sheep and lambs."

In John, Book 58 verses 17ff. the following claims are made:

I am ( ἐγὼ εἰμί ) the ambassador of the light whom the Great has sent into this world.
I am ( ἐγὼ εἰμί ) the true ambassador with whom there is no lie.

In John 3:17ff. another ἐγὼ εἰμί expression is found:

I am ( ἐγὼ εἰμί ) the perfume of the Uthros,
I who went and dwelt in every faithful heart.
I brightened and enlightened beyond any measure the heart in which I dwelled.37

These examples should be sufficient to show that the Mandaeans recognized the ἐγὼ εἰμί as a claim to deity and put the words into the mouths of their gods.

It seems that there is only one conclusion that can be reached concerning the use of ἐγὼ εἰμί in non-biblical writings. The Greek expression ἐγὼ εἰμί or its equivalent was used in India, Babylonia, Mexico, and Egypt in the speeches of the gods. There is no doubt that it was a claim to deity. It was also found in the inscriptions, for it was used in magical formulas of the ancients. It was not found in classical Greek literature for perhaps one of two reasons: It had

37 Schweizer, op. cit. pp. 64ff.
not developed this early in history, or because no one has found any real revelation of the god.\footnote{Ibid., p. 20}

Although this "I am" saying may become corrupt and be used by those who are not gods, in the beginning it seems to have been used solely by gods. It was used as an epiphany or theophany.
CHAPTER III

THE USE OF ΕΠΟ ΕΙΜΙ IN THE SEPTUAGINT
CHAPTER III
THE USE OF ΕΤΩ ΕΙΜΙ IN THE SEPTUAGINT

The study of the use of ετω ειμι in the Septuagint is both tedious and rewarding. The first problem is the Hebrew which has led to the translation of ετω ειμι.

I. THE HEBREW BASIS FOR ΕΤΩ ΕΙΜΙ

The translators seemed to have been inconsistent as they translated 'I ἦν' as ετω ειμι and 'σοι' as ετω ειμι. Their practice led to some strange constructions: there are several cases of ετω ειμι used with a finite verb. In Judges 11:27 Jephthah says: ἐτω ειμι οὐχ ἡμερῶν δεῖ. In Judges 11:35 Jephthah says: ἐτω ειμι οὖν. In II Kings 11:5 (or II Samuel in the English Bible), Bathsheba is quoted as saying: ἐτω ειμι ἐν γυοτρί ἐκ. Some other such examples are: II Kings 12:7; II Kings 24:12; II Kings 24:17; Isaiah 28:28; Job 33:31, and several other examples in the Books of the Kings.

No doubt this strange construction of ετω ειμι with a finite verb is without parallel outside of the Septuagint and its presence must be explained on the basis of the Hebrew original.

Schleusner attempted to explain this strange construc-
tion by saying it was due to an ellipsis of the relative.\(^1\)

This explanation has something to offer in a passage as II Kings 12:7 where \(\varepsilon\gamma\omega\ \varepsilon\iota\nu\iota\ \alpha\omicron\pi\iota\varsigma\) balances \(\varepsilon\gamma\omega\ \varepsilon\iota\nu\iota\ \varepsilon\omicron\pi\omicron\sigma\omicron\mu\iota\nu\); but as Thackeray maintains, the true text in the first clause is no doubt that witnessed by the Old Latin and a group of cursives, \(\varepsilon\gamma\omega\ \varepsilon\iota\nu\iota\ \varepsilon\chi\rho\iota\omega\). Moreover, this explanation would not account for the phrase in passages where no emphasis is laid on the agent, or where as in Judges 11:37 \(\varepsilon\gamma\omega\ \varepsilon\iota\nu\iota\) follows the other verb.\(^2\)

It cannot be claimed that this strange construction was an exception to all rules because it had reference to the Divine Name of Exodus 3:13. This strange construction was used as often in connection with men and women as with God.

I have nowhere seen stated what I think no doubt is the true explanation. It is to be found in the usual ellipsis in Hebrew of the verb 'to be' and in the varying forms of the Hebrew pronoun. The pronoun of the first person took the two forms \(\alpha\omicron\kappa\iota\kappa\iota\) and \(\alpha\iota\iota\). Later writers show a growing preference for \(\alpha\iota\iota\), and the longer form practically disappeared: Aramaic had no equivalent for it. At the time when the later translators did their


work, anoki was a strange word and would excite attention. The use of the one form or the other in the earlier Hebrew books is often indiscriminate: the longer form is, however, regularly employed with a predicate.

"I am" is expressed by anoki, not by ani, except in the phrase "I am the Lord," where ani is usual. This distinction between the two forms was observed by the translators, and the practice seems to have grown up of rendering the long form by ἐγώ εἰμι, the shorter by εἰμί. When the demand arose for rigid exactness of translation, and every jot and tittle in the original required to be indicated in the version, the equation of ἐγώ εἰμι equals anoki became an invariable rule, even where anoki obviously did not mean "I am." The Greek phrase was merely a mechanical device for indicating to the Hebrew-speaking reader the form which the pronoun took in the original. In all the passage quoted above, where ἐγώ εἰμι appears with another verb, anoki stands in the M.T., with the exception of the last two in IV Kings (10:9, 22:20) and Jer. 45 (38) 26, the passage where two readings are attributed to Aquila. As regards the two passages in IV Kings the translators probably found anoki in their text: but by Origen's time it had been replaced by ani in 22:20, as the εἰμι was obelized in the Hexapla.

Schweizer is not in full accord with this explanation. He maintains that ἐγώ was such a worn-out word that the later translators had no way of really showing an emphasized "I." They finally hit upon the impossible idea of using ἐγώ εἰμι with a verb in the indicative.  

3Ibid., pp. 272f.  
As already indicated, this study must be based on the Greek text of the Old Testament. It is the use of \( \varepsilon\rho\omega \) and \( \varepsilon\rho\omega \ \varepsilon\iota\mu\iota \) that will be noted and studied, for this thesis is not designed to defend or prove the translation; it is designed to prove on the basis of the Septuagint that there was a claim of deity in the phrase \( \varepsilon\rho\omega \ \varepsilon\iota\mu\iota \).

The examples cited are intended to be exhaustive as based on the Septuagint published by Samuel Bagster and Sons Limited. There is the obvious possibility of an oversight in the examples cited, but not an intentional omission.

II. THE USE OF \( \varepsilon\tau\omicron \omicron \) IN THE SEPTUAGINT

The first study is based on the use of \( \varepsilon\rho\omega \) in the Septuagint as there does appear to be a direct relationship between the use of \( \varepsilon\rho\omega \) and \( \varepsilon\rho\omega \ \varepsilon\iota\mu\iota \). It was found that \( \varepsilon\rho\omega \) was used without \( \varepsilon\iota\mu\iota \) in 952 instances. This is a surprisingly large number of examples. The examples were found in all the books with the exception of Obadiah, but with some striking differences. The following table shows the number of times \( \varepsilon\rho\omega \) was used in the various books and whether it was in the speech of God or of someone else.

\[ \text{Table} \]

---

\[ ^5 \text{Supra, p. 17f.} \]
### TABLE I

NUMBER OF TIMES ΘΕΩ IS USED IN LXX
AND THE IDENTITY OF THE SPEAKER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Speech of God</th>
<th>Speech of Man, Angel, or Messenger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Genesis</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Exodus</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leviticus</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Numbers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Deuteronomy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Joshua</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Judges</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ruth</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I Kings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. II Kings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. III Kings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. IV Kings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I Chronicles</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. II Chronicles</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Ezra</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Nehemiah</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Esther</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Job</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Psalms</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Proverbs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE I (continued)

NUMBER OF TIMES ἘΠΘ IS USED IN LXX
AND THE IDENTITY OF THE SPEAKER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Speech of God</th>
<th>Speech of Man, Angel, or Messenger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. Ecclesiastes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. The Song</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Isaiah</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Jeremiah</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Lamentations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Ezekiel</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Daniel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Hosea</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Joel</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Amos</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Jonah</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Micah</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Nahum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Habakkuk</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Zephaniah</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Haggai</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Zachariah</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Malachi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals       509          443

Grand total ........ 952
There are some noticeable differences, some as we would expect, but others more pronounced than we would expect.

1. The Use of ἐγώ in the Pentateuch, Historical, and Poetical Books

In the Pentateuch, Exodus has ἐγώ used in most cases in the speech of God with the ratio of 5:1, and in Leviticus all cases of ἐγώ were in the words of God. Of course, the very nature of this book demands that the use of ἐγώ be restricted to the speeches of God, for most of the book consists of the commandments of God. Moses is quoted in some brief passages, e.g., 8:31-35 and 10:1-20. It is recognizable that the first personal pronoun is scarce in these few passages and yet ἐγώ could have been used in two cases, 8:31 and 10:18, but was not. On the other hand ἐγώ could have been omitted in these 35 instances, but was not. The problem when and why the translators used ἐγώ and ἐγώ εἰμι has already been briefly discussed.

There is a definite emphasis in the speeches of God in the book of Exodus. The writer could have used a stressed

---

6 This statement is made on the basis of the Revised and American Standard Versions.

7 Supra, p. 38f.
"I" for the speeches of others but refrained from doing so in most cases. Exodus 2:22 presented a good opportunity for using ἔγγον ἐγὼ but the ἔγγον is absent. The same is true for 4:10 and 22:28. The absence of ἔγγον is seen in such places as 2:27; 3:3; 4:1, etc. In Exodus where the speeches of God are frequent, there is a noticeable relationship between ἔγγον and the claims of God.

This cannot be maintained about the other three books of the Pentateuch. The table makes obvious that there was no reluctance in using ἔγγον for the speeches of man, or special desire to use it in speeches of God.

The same conclusion must be reached in the historical and poetical books. It is in the study of the prophets that a difference is recognized.

2. The Use of ἔγγον in the Prophets

The study of the book of Isaiah was quite rewarding: the chart reveals that ἔγγον was used 77 times in the book itself. The chart does not reveal this additional truth: ἔγγον was used only six times in the first 39 chapters in the speeches of God, and 60 times in the balance of the book. Not only is this enlightening, but whereas ἔγγον was used in the speeches of men eight times in the first 39 chapters, it was only used three times in the speeches of men in the bal-
ance of the book. This makes it plain that the author of
the last part of the book was certainly writing with a dif­
ferent style and was emphasizing the speeches of God with

The book of Jeremiah also showed an emphasized "I" in
the speeches of God with a ratio of almost 7:1, and with 98
such examples in the speeches of God. The natural suggestion
is that the prophet used language which led the translators
to emphasize the "I" in the speeches of God. There was a
pronounced relationship between the use of \( \text{יְהוָה} \) and the words
of Yahweh.

It was in Ezekiel that the most pronounced examples of
\( \text{יְהוָה} \) were found. With 139 examples of \( \text{יְהוָה} \) used in the
speeches of God, only two were found in the speeches of men.
There can surely be no argument about the stressed "I" in the
speeches of God in Ezekiel. In the first chapter where much
was written in the first person, and dealt with the prophet
himself, only one \( \text{יְהוָה} \) was found and that in 1:1.

In the minor prophets the results were about the same.
The examples were fewer in each book, of course, but the com-
combined effect was quite like the major prophets.

In Hosea all 18 examples of \( \text{יְהוָה} \) were in the speeches
of God; in Amos 11 out of 12; in Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk,
Zephaniah, Haggai, Joel, and Malachi all the examples of
were in the speeches of God. The number, of course, was small in each, but the combined number was 19. In Zechariah the ratio was 8:1 with 16 examples of גֵּאוֹפ in the speeches of God and two in the speeches of men.

The following conclusions may be drawn: the use of גֵּאוֹפ was dependent on the Hebrew and the translators' interpretation of the Hebrew. In the Hebrew original, it may be concluded that the emphasized "I" was used rather indiscriminately in practically all the books except the prophetic books. The only exceptions, if any, would be Exodus and Leviticus, but because of the contents of these books, one cannot be dogmatic.

The use of גֵּאוֹפ in the prophets was not only increased in number but was largely restricted to the speeches of God.

Beginning with the 40th chapter of Isaiah, there was a pronounced emphasis upon the use of "I" in the declarations of God. From the 40th chapter of Isaiah to the end of Malachi, גֵּאוֹפ was used 361 times in God's sayings and used only 60 times in the sayings of men. One-half of these sayings of men were found in the book of Daniel where one would expect to find several because it was written largely in the first person, and, of course, was apocalyptic literature where the first personal pronoun was highly emphasized.
III. THE USE OF ΕΓΩ ΕΙΜΙ IN THE SEPTUAGINT

The use of ΕΓΩ ΕΙΜΙ in the Septuagint followed somewhat the same pattern as the use of ΕΓΩ with some differences, especially in the book of Jeremiah.

1. The use of ΕΓΩ ΕΙΜΙ in the Pentateuch

There was a definite emphasis upon the use of ΕΓΩ ΕΙΜΙ in Exodus and Leviticus as there was a prominent usage of ΕΓΩ in the same two books. ΕΓΩ ΕΙΜΙ was used nine times in the book of Exodus, and eight of these times in the declarations of God. Six times the same declaration was made:
ΕΓΩ ΕΙΜΙ ΚΥΡΙΟΣ. (See TABLE IV, Illustration 1, p. 60).
In 3:6, ΕΓΩ ΕΙΜΙ Ο ΘΕΟΣ, and in 3:14 the well-known:
ΕΓΩ ΕΙΜΙ Ο ΘΕΟΣ. There was a definite emphasis upon ΕΓΩ ΕΙΜΙ as God made his great claims and demands.

In Leviticus ΕΓΩ ΕΙΜΙ was used 22 times, all in the declaration of God, and all stated almost exactly alike:
ΕΓΩ ΕΙΜΙ ΚΥΡΙΟΣ. (See TABLE IV, Illustration 1, p. 60).
Most of the time it was stated quite augustly: ΕΓΩ ΕΙΜΙ ΚΥΡΙΟΣ Ο ΘΕΟΣ ΙΣΧΥΕΙ. As God gave the various commands, he strengthened his claims and emphasized his right in making such demands by repeating the well known phrase 22 times:
ΕΓΩ ΕΙΜΙ ΚΥΡΙΟΣ.
Genesis had 13 examples of the use of ēḡū ʾeṯi and seven of these were found in quotations of men. This suggests that there was no particular sacred use of ēḡū ʾeṯi in the book of Genesis.

There were no examples of ēḡū ʾeṯi in Numbers, and only three examples in Deuteronomy; Deuteronomy 32:39 was perhaps the basis for the use of ēḡū ʾeṯi without a predicate in the Fourth Gospel: "īṣētē ʾṣētē ʾōti ēḡū ʾeṯi."

Perhaps because of the reluctance of the people to speak the sacred name Yahweh, this method was used in identifying Him. The other two uses were identical to Leviticus. (See TABLE IV, Illustration 1, p. 60).

2. The Use of ēḡū ʾeṯi in the Historical and Poetical Books, with the Exception of Job

In the historical and poetical books, with the exception of the book of Job, ēḡū ʾeṯi was used more in the speeches of men than of God. (See TABLE III, p. 55) This indicates that the translators saw no sacred use of ēḡū ʾeṯi.

The following tables indicate the examples of ēḡū ʾeṯi and the speakers.
TABLE II
EXAMPLES OF ἔστη ἦμα! USED IN THE LXX
AND THE IDENTITY OF THE SPEAKER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>God</th>
<th>Man, Angel, or Messenger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Genesis 26:24</td>
<td>2. Genesis 27:32 (Jacob)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Genesis 31:13</td>
<td>5. Genesis 31:41 (Jacob)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Exodus 8:22</td>
<td>10. Judges 5:3 (Deborah)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Leviticus 11:45</td>
<td>16. Judges 16:17 (Sampson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Leviticus 19:12</td>
<td>18. Ruth 2:10 (Ruth)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE II (continued)

EXAMPLES OF 

AND THE IDENTITY OF THE SPEAKER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Man, Angel, or Messenger</th>
<th>God</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. Ruth 3:12 (Boaz)</td>
<td>Leviticus 19:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I Kings 1:15 (Hannah)</td>
<td>Leviticus 19:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I Kings 4:16 (messenger)</td>
<td>Leviticus 19:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I Kings 9:19 (Samuel)</td>
<td>Leviticus 19:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I Kings 17:8 (Philistine)</td>
<td>Leviticus 19:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I Kings 17:42 (Philistine)</td>
<td>Leviticus 19:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I Kings 22:22 (David)</td>
<td>Leviticus 19:34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I Kings 30:13 (Egyptian)</td>
<td>Leviticus 19:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. II Kings 1:8 (Amelekite)</td>
<td>Leviticus 19:37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. II Kings 1:13 (Amelekite)</td>
<td>Leviticus 20:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. II Kings 3:8 (Abner)</td>
<td>Leviticus 24:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. II Kings 3:39 (David)</td>
<td>Leviticus 25:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. II Kings 11:5 (Bathsheba)</td>
<td>Leviticus 26:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. II Kings 13:28 (Absalom)</td>
<td>Leviticus 26:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. II Kings 14:6 (harlot)</td>
<td>Leviticus 26:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. II Kings 15:26 (David)</td>
<td>Deuteronomy 5:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. II Kings 15:28 (David)</td>
<td>Deuteronomy 5:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>Man, Angel, or Messenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Judges 6:8</td>
<td>40. II Kings 19:35 (Berzelli)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. II Kings 12:7 (twice)</td>
<td>41. II Kings 20:17 (Joab)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. II Kings 24:12</td>
<td>42. II Kings 20:19 (woman)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Psalm 45:1</td>
<td>43. II Kings 24:17 (David)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Isaiah 41:4</td>
<td>44. III Kings 2:2 (David)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Isaiah 41:10</td>
<td>45. III Kings 3:7 (Solomon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Isaiah 43:10</td>
<td>46. III Kings 13:18 (false prophet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Isaiah 43:25</td>
<td>47. III Kings 19:4 (Elijah)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Isaiah 45:18</td>
<td>49. IV Kings 4:13 (Shunammite)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Isaiah 45:19</td>
<td>50. IV Kings 10:9 (Jehu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Isaiah 45:22</td>
<td>51. IV Kings 22:20 (Prophetess)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Isaiah 46:4 (twice)</td>
<td>52. I Chronicles 21:17 (David)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Isaiah 46:9</td>
<td>53. Job 30:9 (Job)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Isaiah 48:12 (twice)</td>
<td>54. Job 33:31 (Elihu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Isaiah 48:17</td>
<td>55. Psalm 34:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Isaiah 51:12</td>
<td>56. Psalm 118:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Isaiah 52:6</td>
<td>57. Psalm 118:63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE II (continued)
EXAMPLES OF \( \text{ETO} \ \text{EIMI} \) USED IN THE LXX
AND THE IDENTITY OF THE SPEAKER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>God</th>
<th>Man, Angel, or Messenger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah 1:8</td>
<td>Psalm 118:94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah 3:12</td>
<td>Psalm 118:141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah 9:24</td>
<td>Song 1:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah 23:23</td>
<td>Song 1:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah 24:7</td>
<td>Isaiah 6:8 (Isaiah)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah 26:28</td>
<td>Isaiah 28:28 (Isaiah for God)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel 7:9</td>
<td>Isaiah 47:8 (Chaldeans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel 28:22</td>
<td>Isaiah 47:10 (Chaldeans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel 28:23</td>
<td>Isaiah 56:3 (Eunuch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel 28:24</td>
<td>Jeremiah 1:6 (Jeremiah)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel 28:26</td>
<td>Jeremiah 1:7 (God quotes Jeremiah)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel 29:6</td>
<td>Zephaniah 3:1 (city of Nineveh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel 29:9</td>
<td>Zechariah 13:5 (Zechariah)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel 29:16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel 29:21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel 30:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel 30:19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel 30:25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel 30:26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE II (continued)

EXAMPLES OF ἐγώ εἰμι USED IN THE LXX AND THE IDENTITY OF THE SPEAKER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 32:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 33:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 34:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 34:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 34:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 35:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 35:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 35:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 36:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 36:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 37:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 37:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 37:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 38:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 39:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 39:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 39:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 39:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.</td>
<td>Hosea 5:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.</td>
<td>Joel 2:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.</td>
<td>Haggai 1:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.</td>
<td>Haggai 2:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.</td>
<td>Malachi 1:14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE III

NUMBER OF TIMES ἘΤΩ ΕΙΜΙ IS USED IN THE LXX
AND THE IDENTITY OF THE SPEAKER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>God</th>
<th>Man</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leviticus</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Chronicles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Prophets</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. The Use of תִּכָּלֵל in the Book of Job

And yet a word must be said about Job as it seems to be in a class by itself in the study of תִּכָּלֵל. It seems the translator of Job put תִּכָּלֵל before all possible verbs but he intentionally avoided it in front of תִּכָּלֵל. There were only two examples of תִּכָּלֵל (30:9 and 33:31), out of 16 uses of תִּכָּלֵל. All of these examples of תִּכָּלֵל were in the language of men. They are: 7:8, 12, 20, and 21; 9:29, 10:15, 11:4, 13:2, 23:8, 32:6 and 18, 33:9 (twice) and 12, 34:4, and 35:2. In addition תִּכָּלֵל was found in 1:7 and 2:2 in the statements of the adversary. In many places in the book of Job תִּכָּלֵל appears but not the תִּכָּלֵל.

There must be some reason for the absence of תִּכָּלֵל with תִּכָּלֵל when there seems to be an emphasis upon the use of תִּכָּלֵל in the book of Job. TABLE I, p. 42, shows that תִּכָּלֵל was used 33 times in the book, and only twice was it used with תִּכָּלֵל. Since the book largely deals with the conversation of men, the opportunity of using תִּכָּלֵל was limited, for the most part to men, but the translator did not wish to use this combination and place the phrase on the lips of men. It certainly seems that he was purposely avoiding the use of תִּכָּלֵל with תִּכָּלֵל for perhaps sacred reasons. He felt it was a phrase which should be reserved for God and did not wish to cheapen it by placing it on the lips of men.
4. The Use of εἴπω εἰλή in the Prophets

The use of εἴπω εἰλή in the prophetic books was most rewarding, as was true of εἴπω without the εἰλή. In Isaiah there was not an example of εἴπω εἰλή in a statement of God before the 41st chapter, but beginning with the 41st chapter there were 15 examples. On the other hand, there were two examples of εἴπω εἰλή in the speeches of men before the 41st chapter and three thereafter (47:8, 10; 56:3); but even two of these were divine claims. In the first two examples, 47:8 and 10, Isaiah quoted the Chaldeans as using εἴπω εἰλή which certainly was an epiphany. As the writer used εἴπω εἰλή for God, he said the Chaldaeans were to be destroyed because they were claiming this prerogative for themselves. Isaiah 56:3 was the only exception in the latter part of this book. God was the speaker but he was quoting the eunuch and the writer used εἴπω εἰλή.

It appears that the writer was using εἴπω εἰλή in God's declarations for a purpose. This purpose was to give a sacred tone and to establish this sacredness through the use of εἴπω εἰλή. In the next chapter it will be pointed out several times how the Fourth Evangelist uses these expressions from Deutero-Isaiah to claim the deity of Christ. These εἴπω εἰλή sayings must have been recognized as divine claims, or else the Fourth Evangelist would not have so used them.
The search was not so rewarding in Jeremiah. Whereas there were 113 examples of יָּעִּיש, there were only eight examples of יָּעִּישִׁיָּהוּ. One of these examples was 1:6, and in it Jeremiah was the speaker and identified and described himself with יָּעִּישִׁיָּהוּ. The use of יָּעִּישִׁיָּהוּ as a means of identification of oneself, or describing oneself was a rather common one. The following examples from the Septuagint are examples of this same usage: Ruth 2:10 and 3:9; Genesis 45:3 and 4; etc. Examples in the New Testament would include Luke 1:19; John 9:9; Acts 22:3; etc. It was an emphatic way of identifying oneself or presenting something about oneself such as "young," "old," "grieved," etc.

In the following verse, God quoted Jeremiah and retained the יָּעִּישִׁיָּהוּ. The other examples were in the speeches of God. In 1:8 God used the יָּעִּישִׁיָּהוּ, it seems, in contrast to Jeremiah's declaration about himself. Yahweh as the great יָּעִּישִׁיָּהוּ was to be with Jeremiah and all things were possible to him. (Note the use of Yahweh in the same verse as a supplement to יָּעִּישִׁיָּהוּ.) The other examples were all in the first part of the book and can be noted from TABLE II, pp.50f.

It would have to be concluded that the examples of יָּעִּישִׁיָּהוּ in Jeremiah are not enough in number to form a strong case, and although the translators do use יָּעִּישִׁיָּהוּ in Jeremiah's speech, it seems to be reserved for the speeches of
God, for the most part. Even in the example of Jeremiah's speech where the $\text{אֲנֶה} \text{ אֵל}$ is used, God then is quoted as using $\text{אֲנֶה} \text{ אֵל}$, seemingly, as a rebuke to Jeremiah for his declaration.

A study of Ezekiel was most rewarding of all. There were 31 examples of $\text{אֲנֶה} \text{ אֵל}$ and all were in the speeches of God. The speeches were very solemn and identified God as saying, "I am the Lord." This was the only use of $\text{אֲנֶה} \text{ אֵל}$ in Ezekiel. $\text{אֲנֶה} \text{ אֵל}$ was too sacred a term to be used by men.

The following tables show the uses of $\text{אֲנֶה} \text{ אֵל}$ in the Septuagint in the speeches of God. It does not show the use of $\text{אֲנֶה} \text{ אֵל}$ in the speeches of men. The $\text{אֲנֶה} \text{ אֵל}$ as it is used in the speeches of men has no set pattern--the uses are too various to classify.

The one use which is significant in the speeches of men is found in Isaiah 47:8, 47:10 (twice), and Zephaniah 3:1. The phrase was used by man as a claim to deity. There would have been no such claims and constructions if the phrase were not recognized as a claim to deity.

Also included in the tables are the uses of $\text{אֵל} \text{ אֲנֶה}$ and $\text{אֲנֶה} \ldots \text{אֵל}$ when separated. They are found in TABLES V and VI and cannot be considered important for this study.
TABLE IV

THE USE OF "ΚΥΡΙΟΣ" IN THE DECLARATIONS OF GOD

Illustration 1

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Exodus 7:5</td>
<td>20. Leviticus 19:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Exodus 14:4</td>
<td>22. Leviticus 20:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Leviticus 11:43</td>
<td>26. Leviticus 26:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Leviticus 11:45</td>
<td>27. Leviticus 26:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Leviticus 19:16</td>
<td>31. Isaiah 45:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Leviticus 19:18</td>
<td>32. Isaiah 45:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Leviticus 19:30</td>
<td>35. Ezekiel 7:9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE IV (continued)

THE USE OF E\(\text{\small \text{\textbullet}}\)\(\text{\small \text{\textbullet}}\) IN THE DECLARATIONS OF GOD

Illustration 1 (continued)

\(\text{\small \text{\textbullet}}\)\(\text{\small \text{\textbullet}}\)\(\text{\small \text{\textbullet}}\)\(\text{\small \text{\textbullet}}\)\(\text{\small \text{\textbullet}}\)\(\text{\small \text{\textbullet}}\)\(\text{\small \text{\textbullet}}\)\(\text{\small \text{\textbullet}}\)\(\text{\small \text{\textbullet}}\)\(\text{\small \text{\textbullet}}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 28:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 29:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 29:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 29:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 29:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 30:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 30:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 30:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 30:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 32:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 33:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 34:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 34:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 34:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 35:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 35:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 35:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 36:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 36:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 37:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 37:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 37:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 38:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 39:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 39:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 39:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>Ezekiel 39:28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE IV (continued)

THE USE OF ἐστι ΕΙΜΙ
IN THE DECLARATIONS OF GOD

Illustration 2

ἐστι ΕΙΜΙ, ἐστι ΕΙΜΙ

1. Isaiah 43:25 (followed by articular participle)
2. Isaiah 45:19 (followed by κύριος ο ἡλιον)
3. Isaiah 51:12 (followed by articular participle)
TABLE IV (continued)
THE USE OF ἐγώ εἰμι
IN THE DECLARATIONS OF GOD

Illustration 3
ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ θεὸς

1. Genesis 17:1
2. Genesis 26:24
3. Genesis 28:13
4. Genesis 31:13
5. Genesis 46:3
6. Exodus 3:6
7. Psalm 45:10
8. Isaiah 41:10
9. Isaiah 45:22
10. Isaiah 46:9
11. Isaiah 48:17
TABLE IV (continued)

THE USE OF ΕΤΩ ΕΙΜΙ
IN THE DECLARATIONS OF GOD

Illustration 4

ἐγώ εἰμι with Prepositions

ἐγώ εἰμι μετὰ τοῦ

1. Genesis 28:15
2. Jeremiah 1:8
3. Jeremiah 26:28

ἐγώ εἰμι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα

1. Isaiah 48:12

ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ θόρυβος ἐγώ εἰμι

1. Joel 2:27

ἐγώ εἰμι μεθ' ὦμῶν

1. Haggai 1:13
2. Haggai 2:6
TABLE IV (continued)

THE USE OF מִקְדָּשׁ מִי
IN THE DECLARATIONS OF GOD

Illustration 5

מִקְדָּשׁ מִי followed by participle

1. Exodus 3:14
2. II Kings 12:7
3. Jeremiah 23:23
TABLE IV (continued)

THE USE OF $\ell\tau\alpha\ e\iota\beta\iota\մ$ IN THE DECLARATIONS OF GOD

Illustration 6

$\ell\tau\alpha\ e\iota\beta\iota\մ$ followed by finite verb

1. II Kings 12:7
2. II Kings 24:12
TABLE IV (continued)

THE USE OF £70, C1M1
IN THE DECLARATIONS OF GOD

Illustration 7

£70, C1M1 without a predicate

1. Deuteronomy 32:39
2. Isaiah 41:4
3. Isaiah 43:10
4. Isaiah 46:4 (twice)
TABLE IV (continued)

THE USE OF ΕΙΜΙ IN THE DECLARATIONS OF GOD

Illustration 8

Followed by Various Other Parts of Speech

| 1. Judges 6:8 |
| ____________ |
| 'Εμω ΕΙΜΙ followed by a relative pronoun |

| 1. Isaiah 48:12 |
| ____________ |
| 2. Jeremiah 3:12 |
| ____________ |
| 'Εμω ΕΙΜΙ followed by an adjective |

| 1. Isaiah 52:6 |
| ____________ |
| 1. Hosea 5:14 |
| ____________ |
| 'Εμω ΕΙΜΙ followed by a personal pronoun |

| 1. Hosea 5:14 |
| ____________ |
| 'Εμω ΕΙΜΙ followed by a comparative |

<p>| 1. Malachi 1:14 |
| ____________ |
| 'Εμω ΕΙΜΙ followed by a predicate nominative |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scripture Reference</th>
<th>Character(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Genesis 18:27</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Genesis 34:30</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Exodus 6:12</td>
<td>Moses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Exodus 6:30</td>
<td>Moses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Exodus 15:26</td>
<td>God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Exodus 20:5</td>
<td>God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Leviticus 20:26</td>
<td>God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Joshua 17:14</td>
<td>Joseph's sons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Job 13:18</td>
<td>Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Psalm 21:6</td>
<td>David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Psalm 80:10</td>
<td>God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Isaiah 61:8</td>
<td>God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Hosea 1:9</td>
<td>God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scripture Reference</td>
<td>Character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Genesis 4:9</td>
<td>Cain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Genesis 50:19</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Exodus 3:11</td>
<td>Moses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Leviticus 11:44</td>
<td>God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Leviticus 11:45</td>
<td>God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>II Kings 3:28</td>
<td>David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>II Kings 7:18</td>
<td>David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I Chronicles 17:16</td>
<td>David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I Chronicles 29:14</td>
<td>David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Psalm 24:16</td>
<td>David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Psalm 49:7</td>
<td>God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Psalm 68:29</td>
<td>David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Psalm 85:1</td>
<td>David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Psalm 87:15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Psalm 108:22</td>
<td>David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Psalm 118:125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Psalm 140:10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Jonah 1:9</td>
<td>Jonah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Zechariah 13:5</td>
<td>Zechariah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Malachi 1:6</td>
<td>God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ezekiel 28:2</td>
<td>Prince of Tyrus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Ezekiel 28:9</td>
<td>Prince of Tyrus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The use of ἐγώ εἰμι in the minor prophets is not important. Only seven examples in all were found with five in the speeches of God and two in the speeches of men. They would not have been noticed except for the fact that it is emphasized in some of the other books.

Some conclusions are evident in the use of ἐγώ εἰμι in the Septuagint, especially in the prophetic books.

In the study of the Septuagint it was noticeable that the use of ἐγώ εἰμι depended on the writer himself. Some of the writers felt no sacred use of ἐγώ εἰμι and used it without discrimination, e.g., Genesis. Others refrained from using it in the speeches of man, such as found in the book of Job, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, and Ezekiel.

As one reads Deutero-Isaiah and Ezekiel, he is impressed with the lofty speeches and great claims of God. These become more profound in the study of the Septuagint as these claims are frequently augmented by, or closed out with the significant ἐγώ εἰμι. These writers recognized the phrase as a means of claiming deity and used it freely.

On the other hand, there were those who evidently saw no sacredness in the phrase and used it carelessly. To these it was merely a way of emphasizing one's identity, claims, or qualifications, regardless of whoever the speaker might be.
Inasmuch as the phrase was connected with Κόσμος so many times, (65), it must have had sacred connotations. Even when it stood by itself, e.g., Deuteronomy 32:39, Isaiah 41:4, etc. (see Table IV, Illustration 7, p. 67), it must have signified the essence and deity of God. If it meant the essence of God when separated, it would conceivably be used in later writings with such expressions as light, life, resurrection, etc., to present a two-fold claim: claiming all the prerogatives of Yahweh and all that the similitude would suggest in Old Testament usage. This is the argument of the next chapter,
CHAPTER IV

THE USE OF ΕΙΔΟΣ ΕΙΜΙ IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL
CHAPTER IV

THE USE OF ΕΥΩ ΕΙΜΙ IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

It has been recognized through the years that the Fourth Gospel is a unique Gospel. One does not read far until he realizes that he is in a different atmosphere than felt in the Synoptic Gospels. The Jesus of the Fourth Gospel is the same and yet different, the miracles are greater, the teachings are loftier, etc. One of the main differences always felt by the reader is the difference in the style of the writer, which not only affects the tone of the narrative but also the discourses.

I. TWO PROBLEMS IN CONNECTION WITH THE ΕΥΩ ΕΙΜΙ SAYINGS

The several differences in the Gospel have been responsible for a great deal of literature on the Fourth Gospel, much of which deals with the problem of authorship, date, historical accuracy, etc. Although it is not the design of this thesis to deal with these problems, there are two problems which seem to demand attention: the problem of authenticity, and the relationship of the ΕΥΩ ΕΙΜΙ sayings to the title "Son of Man."

1. The Problem of Authenticity

The first problem in connection with the ΕΥΩ ΕΙΜΙ
sayings in the Fourth Gospel is the problem of authenticity. The source of the ἐπίσημοι ἔρμοι sayings, as well as the entire Gospel, has been discussed through the years. Some certainly have a basis for believing that the author of the Gospel, who will be called the Evangelist, cast the words of Jesus into a particular form in the Gospel.\(^1\) It must also be pointed out that the other writers were guilty of interpreting and rearranging the words of Jesus. Matthew's arrangement of his work into five divisions was certainly not accidental, but conformed to the Pentateuch; Matthew's Sermon on the Mount was the result of editing and compiling; some of the differences in the Synoptic accounts can be explained through the writer's individual interpretation, as a comparison of Matthew 24:5 and Luke 21:8 will indicate. The author of the Fourth Gospel should be given the same privilege of interpreting Jesus as granted to the Synoptic writers. The authenticity of the words does not depend upon proving them as the actual utterances of Christ.

As Westcott says, the meaning and effect of a long discourse may be more truly conveyed by an entirely different style and language. We are therefore dealing with the spirit

of the words of Jesus whether we are dealing with the actual words or not. The Evangelist has given us the meaning of the teachings as he is in absolute sympathy with the thoughts of Jesus. He has them recorded in a form which is truest to the idea presented.\(^2\)

The Evangelist certainly had a purpose in mind in writing his Gospel. For that reason his strong pre-possession causes him to see all the events from one point of view. Unconsciously to himself he alters the perspective, and reads his own meaning into words and incidents. He disregards circumstances which seem to him immaterial. The import of the fact is more important to him than the fact itself. Sayings are ascribed to Him which may not have been literally spoken, but which express His essential thought, as the Evangelist conceived it.\(^3\)

The Evangelist spiritualizes as he interprets history and the life of Christ. Scott states it so well when he says:

\[\text{He so records the several events as to give them the double import of facts and symbols. The history}\]


becomes so to speak, transparent, so that through it all we can discern the spiritual work of Jesus as well as the outward events of His life. The feeding of the five thousand is like a parable of the giving of the bread of life. The healing of the blind man is no isolated miracle, but the type of the true light breaking in on the darkened world. That no doubt may remain of the deeper import of those actions of Jesus, they are followed in every case by a discourse in which they are plainly interpreted. Even in His lifetime Christ appears as we know Him now, the dispenser of spiritual gifts, whose activity is inward and invisible.4

The problem of the source of the εἰσεύσθη εἰς sayings would be no different from the problem of the source of the other sayings of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel. Strachan maintains that the Fourth Evangelist conceived of himself as a prophet with the same spirit of communion between him and the exalted Jesus as the Old Testament prophet experienced with God. Although the Evangelist knew the recorded words of Jesus, the Jesus who speaks is not the historic Jesus, but the risen and ascended Lord. The Evangelist was therefore conscious of the presence in his heart of the Spirit promised by Jesus who would lead the disciples in all truth, and will not speak from himself (16:12,13). Jeremiah 42:2-7 shows how the prophet was presented with a problem, and how he prayed about it until he felt he was declaring God's message.

4Ibid., p. 299.
The Evangelist, as the prophet, considered the words of Jesus and prayed about them until he felt he was really uttering the mind of Christ in these discourses.⁵

It is then a short step to his conclusion to the authenticity of the sayings of Jesus as he sums up by saying:

If we allow that the prophetic consciousness is a strong element in the personality of the Fourth Evangelist, would he in attributing this 'I AM' style to Jesus, be taking an unwarrantable liberty with that lofty self-consciousness which speaks in Matt. 11:27ff., or in Mark 14:62? Is he not interpreting actual words of Jesus? Even if the words 'I am the bread of life' never actually 'ruffled the air of Palestine' in that particular form, Jesus did take bread and break it and gave to his disciples saying 'This is my body'; in other words 'This is myself.' The benefits of what he is about to do in laying down his life are to be appropriated by them. The teaching of the parable of the Lost Sheep is summarized in the claim, 'I am the Good Shepherd.' As we hear Jesus say in Matthew 11:27 'Neither does any know the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to receive him,' do we not hear as an overtone, 'I am the Way'; i.e. the way to God? It is impossible, however, to be dogmatic regarding the verbal authenticity of these 'I AM' utterances in the Gospel. That they are in the prophetic style does not decide whether Jesus also actually spoke in this form, or whether the Evangelist speaks thus in His name, as the Old Testament prophet spoke in the name of God. Both suppositions are probably true.⁶


⁶Ibid., pp. 19-20.
The Evangelist is thus a theologian in the original sense of the word. What God has done in revelation and redemption was according to his nature. If God loved the world, it is because he is love. If he has enlightened the world, it is because he is light. In revealing himself to men in Christ, he has expressed his own thoughts, feelings, and will. The greatest revelation is not an announcement about God but "consists rather in the coming to men of One who, in his own person and character, is a transcript of the divine nature."7

What better way could the Evangelist have used in revealing God and the self-consciousness of the deity of Christ than he did in the ἐγώ εἶμι sayings? It seems these sayings present the fact of the deity of Christ and his own self-consciousness of this fact better than any other vehicle, or means at the disposal of the writer. He used them purposely, and one does well to interpret them as the Evangelist used them to interpret Christ.

2. The Problem of the Relationship of ἐγώ εἶμι to "Son of Man."

The second problem in connection with the ἐγώ εἶμι

sayings in the Fourth Gospel is the relationship between the
description "Son of Man" and ἐγώ εἰμি. Can the ἐγώ εἰμι
sayings be equated with the title "Son of Man" in either the
Fourth Gospel or in the Synoptic Gospels?

One might naturally draw this inference as the expression
"Son of Man" is found only nine times in the Fourth Gos-
pel and 71 times in the Synoptic Gospels. The only time the
title is found outside the Gospels is Acts 7:56. It was not
a title given to him by others, but was a self-designation
used by Jesus. Some have claimed that Jesus did not bear
witness to himself in the Synoptic Gospels, but in a rather
recent work Karl Ludwig Schmidt claims that Jesus did bear
witness to himself in the Synoptic Gospels. One way of bear-
ing witness to himself was by the use of the title "Son of
Man," speaking of himself in the third person. 8 It seems
necessary to examine the possibility of the relationship be-
tween the ἐγώ εἰμι sayings and the "Son of Man" at this point.

It should be remembered that the "Son of Man" desig-
nation was not used in the Old Testament as another name for
the Messiah. The expression "son of man" as found in Psalms 8:4
and 144:3 can only be rightly interpreted as designating man

8W. F. Howard, Christianity According to St. John,
in general. The same is true of Job 25:6 and 38:8. Ezekiel is called "son of man" time and again and surely has no Messianic connotations. The only Old Testament passage that can be cited as having Messianic suggestion is Daniel 7:13: "I saw in the night visions, and, behold, there came with the clouds of heaven one like unto a son of man, and he came even to the ancient of days, and they brought him near before him."

This, no doubt, is the basis for the passages which we have in Enoch which identify the "Son of Man" as the Messiah. Such passages are XLVI. 1-5; XLVIII. 2; and LXIX. 26-29. It is also found in IV Ezra 7:28ff.; 13:37ff.; and 14:9. Accepting the late date for Daniel (c. 167 B.C.), it appears that the "Son of Man" concept is a late one and cannot be equated with קָצִיר in antiquity or in meaning.

Bernard makes no distinction in the use of "Son of Man" in the Fourth Gospel and in the Synoptic Gospels. He defines the title in the following manner:

It was not a recognized term for Messiah, and was not interpreted as such; rather was it always enigmatic to those who heard it applied by Jesus to Himself. For Him it connoted all that "Messiah" meant, and more, for it did not narrow His mission to men of one race only. It represented Him as the future Judge of all men, and as their present Deliverer, whose Kingdom must be established through suffering, and whose gift of life was only to become available through His death.9

9Bernard, op. cit., p. cxxxiii
Scott sees a closer connection between the "Son of Man" and Messiah than between the ἐγώ εἶμι sayings and the "Son of Man." His position is that Jesus used the title "Son of Man" to impress the disciples with the spiritual nature of his work so that when he designated himself as Messiah they would not go back to a mere national conception of his ministry. ¹⁰

It appears that the connection between the "Son of Man" and Messiah was slight, and the connection between "Son of Man" and ἐγώ εἶμι was even more remote.

Another important factor to be considered is the relationship between these two titles and the Eschatological Discourses. A study of the "Son of Man" in the Synoptic Gospels reveals that it was used largely in connection with eschatological teachings. In just the opposite way, the ἐγώ εἶμι sayings are not found in the eschatological teachings. The Evangelist was not purposely using ἐγώ εἶμι in the Fourth Gospel to conform with the "Son of Man" in the Synoptics.

There is one other reason why it appears impossible to equate ἐγώ εἶμι with the "Son of Man." When Jesus speaks of himself as the "Son of Man" in the Fourth Gospel it appears

¹⁰Scott, op. cit., pp. 178ff.
obvious that the people were ignorant of any divine significance. This would be in contrast to the ἐφ' οὖν sayings as this thesis shall attempt to prove that the people recognized the latter as a claim to deity. In John 9:35 Jesus asks the blind man, "Dost thou believe on the Son of Man?" The answer of the man shows his complete ignorance of the title as he answers, "Who is he that I should believe on him?" In John 12:34 the crowd did not equate the "Son of Man" with Jesus. It seems plain enough to us that Jesus was referring to himself, but it was not evident to them, for it was not a title known to them.

Jesus' use of "Son of Man" in the Fourth Gospel can perhaps be best understood by a close study of his initial meeting with Nathanael. Jesus is quoted as saying in John 1:51, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, ye shall see the heaven opened and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man." This immediately reminds us of Genesis with a substitution of Son of Man for Jacob. As Strachan says:

Frequently in the Old Testament 'Jacob' is a name not for the individual but the nation, composed of his descendents (Psalm 14:7; Isaiah 14:1). The 'kingdom' or sovereignty of God is conferred upon the nation, symbolized by 'one like unto a son of man' in the Daniel vision. The promise to Nathanael is that the disciples will see the Kingdom of God, typified by the ascent and descent of
the angels of God upon Jesus, revealed in the human life of the Son of Man. The Son of Man is no longer the nation, but Jesus Christ himself. All the promises and purposes of God once believed to be fulfilled through His chosen instrument, the nation Israel, are now realized in the person and mission of Jesus Himself. 11

There is a much closer connection between "Son of God" in the Fourth Gospel and the ἐγὼ εἰμί sayings. As one studies the Gospel, he is immediately impressed with the number of times "Son," "Son of God," "only begotten Son," "His son," and such titles are found. The combination "only begotten Son" carries with it the idea of personal pre-existence and clearly implies a unique relation of Jesus to God. It denotes a permanent relation: others become sons of God; he is the Son of God, and as such was sent into the world. The appearance of Jesus is in this sense a real theophany, a self-manifestation of God, under the conditions of space and time.

In concluding, it can be said on the basis of the preceding discussion that the Evangelist was neither equating ἐγὼ εἰμί with the Synoptic "Son of Man," nor making ἐγὼ εἰμί and "Son of Man" synonymous in his own Gospel.

II. THE OCCASION AND MEANING OF THE ἘΓΩ ΕΙΜΙ SAYINGS

It is now time to study the frequency of the use of

personal pronouns, and especially the different uses of ἐγώ ἐγώ in the Fourth Gospel.

1. The Use of Personal Pronouns in the Fourth Gospel

There is a noticeable frequency of the personal pronouns ἐγώ, ἡμεῖς, σοῦ, and ἦμεῖς in the Fourth Gospel, but more especially the use of ἐγώ. ἐγώ is found 134 times in John compared to 29 occurrences in Matthew, 17 in Mark, and 23 in Luke. As Bernard concludes:

... The use of ἐγώ adds dignity and impressiveness to the sentence, just as it does in the hymn on Wisdom in Ecclesiasticus 24, where Wisdom makes her majestic claims: ἐγώ ἀπὸ στοιχείων ἁγίων, "I came out from the mouth of the Most High" (v. 3); ἐγώ ἐν υψίσταις μακρυγνωσίσκην, I tabernacled in the heavens" (v. 4); ἐγώ ὁς τερεμίν θασσέτειν κλάσων μου, "As the terebinth I stretched out my branches" (v. 16); ἐγώ ὁς κοπεῖς βλαστήσωμήν, "As the vine I put forth grace" (v. 17).12

The Evangelist uses ἐγώ in stressing the claims and personality of Jesus Christ.

ἐγώ ἐγώ is used 24 times in the Fourth Gospel,

ἐγώ ἐγώ is found six times, and ἐγὼ... ἐγώ is found four times. Since this thesis is not concerned with the latter two constructions, but with the first, the references of ἐγώ ἐγώ and ἐγὼ... ἐγώ will not be cited.

12Bernard, op. cit., p. cxvii. (English translation supplied.)
2. An Arrangement of the ἦν ἐίμι sayings

(1) ἦν ἐίμι in the speech of man

9:9 ἐκεῖνος ἔλεγεν ὅτι ἦν ἐίμι

(2) ἦν ἐίμι followed by a participle:

4:26 ἦν ἐίμι, ὁ καλῶν σοι
8:18 ἦν ἐίμι ὁ μαρτυρῶν

(3) ἦν ἐίμι with the Similitudes:

6:35 ἦν ἐίμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς γυνῆς
6:48 ἦν ἐίμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς γυνῆς
6:41 ἦν ἐίμι ὁ ἄρτος ὁ καταβάς
6:51 ἦν ἐίμι ὁ ἄρτος ὁ γίνη
8:12 ἦν ἐίμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου
10:7 ἦν ἐίμι ἡ θύρα
10:9 ἦν ἐίμι ἡ θύρα
10:11 ἦν ἐίμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς
10:14 ἦν ἐίμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς
11:25 ἦν ἐίμι καὶ οἰκοσκόπος καὶ γυνὴ
14:6 ἦν ἐίμι καὶ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀληθεία καὶ ἡ ἀληθεία καὶ ....
15:1 ἦν ἐίμι καὶ ἀμπελος καὶ ἀληθεία
15:5 ἦν ἐίμι καὶ ἀμπελος

(4) ἦν ἐίμι without a predicate:

6:20 ἦν ἐίμι, μὴ ροπῇ εἰς θεό
8:24 ἐὰν γὰρ μὴ πιστεύσῃτε ὅτι ἦν ἐίμι
8:23 τότε σὺντωσοῦντες ὅτι ἦν ἐίμι
There is only one example of ἐγώ εἰμι in the speech of man (9:9)

There are two examples of ἐγώ εἰμι followed by a participle: John 4:26 and 8:18. There is a question whether
or not they should be interpreted alike.

\[\text{εἰμί, ὁ λαλῶν θεός} \ (4:26)\]

A passage that is somewhat akin to John 9:9 is John 4:26. Jesus had been conversing with the woman at the well, and she says, "I know that the Messiah cometh, the one called Christ; whenever that one comes, he will declare all things to us." Jesus then says, "ἐγώ εἰμι, ὁ λαλῶν θεός," "I that speak unto thee am he." He identifies himself as the one who was speaking to her and uses the emphatic ἐγώ εἰμι so there could be no doubt in her mind as to the identity of the Messiah. The people of Samaria were looking for a Messiah on the basis of Deuteronomy 18:15. This was the basis for her question and the reason Jesus gives the affirmative answer so emphatically. There would be no necessity to interpret this as a style of deity. Bernard suggests the possibility of equating this ἐγώ εἰμι with Isaiah 52:6, where the phrase ἐγώ εἰμι πάυεις ὁ λαλῶν is placed in the mouth of Yahweh.13 Were it not for the context, it would make a strong case, but in view of what has been said above, it does not seem the most natural.

\[\text{ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ μετατρέπων} \ldots (8:18)\]

The other example of ἐγώ εἰμι with a participle is

---

13 Bernard, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 151
8:18: ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ ἐμαυτοῦ καὶ μαρτύρει περὶ ἐμοῦ ὁ πείμων με πατὴρ.

"I am that beareth witness of myself, and the Father who sent me beareth witness of me." "He" can best be omitted. Jesus here speaks in the accent of deity. His crucifixion at their hands will, after the resurrection, show that he has the right to speak as only God can speak.

Again it is the context that makes the difference. There are five Εγώ εἰμι sayings in this one chapter and must all be translated in the light of the others in the immediate context. The Evangelist has cast all of these sayings into a divine mould, and one must be careful not to break the unity presented. For that reason, this saying should be treated differently from the previous one.

Some would refer the Εγώ εἰμι back to the Εγώ εἰμι τῶν ἀνω εἰμί, "I am from above," and make the latter Εγώ εἰμι say, "I am from above," too.14 As Bernard indicates, this would certainly be very elliptical. It is doing injustice to the Evangelist's mystical interpretation of Jesus' claim, and is an attempt to make parallel that which is not; Εγώ εἰμι is not the same as when Εγώ and εἰμι are separated. It makes more sense to accept it as a claim to

deity and compare with Isaiah 43:10, where God makes the
great affirmation, ἵνα πιστεύσητε... ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι ,
"That ye may know and believe me, and understand that I am
(he)." Jesus is then saying that the divine announcement has
been given, and the people are responsible for their sin.15

(3) ἐγώ εἰμι in the Similitudes

The use of ἐγώ εἰμι in the similitudes has been an
interesting study through the ages. The Fourth Evangelist
uses seven similitudes in Jesus' description of himself in
his discourses. He speaks of himself as the Bread of Life
(6:35), the Light of the World (8:12), the Door (10:7), the
Good Shepherd (10:11), the Resurrection and the Life (11:25),
the Way, the Truth, and the Life (14:6), and the True Vine
(15:1). These similitudes are interesting within themselves,
but the ἐγώ εἰμι used in connection with each of them makes
them even more interesting.

a. ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἁρτος τῆς Ἰσωμᾶς

The first of the similitudes has perhaps caused the
most discussion of all the ἐγώ εἰμι sayings. It is found in
the above form in 6:35 and 48; ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἁρτος
ὁ καταβὰς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ "I am the
bread coming down from heaven," in 6:41; and ἐγώ εἰμι
ὁ ἁρτος ὁ Ἰσώμ , "I am the living bread," in

15 Ibid., p. 301.
6:51. These four will be treated together.

The first problem in connection with this similitude is the relationship of the Fourth Gospel to the writings of Philo. This is not to imply that some have not tried to affiliate the Fourth Gospel with Greek philosophy, the mystery religions, and the Hermetic writings. Many have tried to show these connections, but there has been presented a much better case for a relationship between the Fourth Evangelist and Philo in connection with the "Bread of Life" discourse. The Evangelist was surely acquainted with Philo's system, but this does not mean he agreed with Philo. It is highly probable that the Evangelist was well acquainted with Philo's attempt to syncretize the Greek Logos with the New Testament Christ, but the Evangelist's conception of the Logos was quite different from Philo's. There are many striking coincidences of thought, but the differences are so fundamental that anything but a slight and indirect contact is improbable. 16

The second, and more difficult problem, is the relationship of ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῆς γεννᾶς to the Lord's Supper or the Eucharist.

There seems to be a reference to the Lord's Supper in

16Howard, *op. cit.*, p. 29.
this saying, and some say it has sacramental teachings. The Fourth Gospel does not have the institution of the Lord's Supper, and surely it was not due to the ignorance of the author of the Gospel. The institution is given in the Synoptic Gospels and in I Corinthians 11. The author could not have been ignorant of these accounts. The Fourth Gospel has the upper room where Jesus instituted the Lord's Supper according to the Synoptic account. In John 13:24-30 Judas partakes of the Passover Feast, accepts the sop, and goes out into the night to betray Jesus to the Jewish rulers. In the sixth chapter, after the teaching of Jesus being the "bread of life," the Fourth Evangelist says, "Jesus answered them, Have I not chosen you the twelve, and one of you is a devil? For he was speaking concerning Judas the son of Simon Iscariot, for this one was about to betray him, one of the twelve" (John 6:70-71). In other words, the teaching of the "bread of life" was so connected in the mind of the writer with the Lord's Supper that he brought in the betrayal in anticipation in 6:71. If the teaching on the "bread of life" were not connected with the Lord's Supper, why would the Evangelist have brought in the betrayal at this point?

Even the word "Eucharist," that is used by many as a term designating the Lord's Supper, fits this sixth chapter.
The word Eucharist, meaning "give thanks," is found twice in this chapter: 6:11 and 23. Paul speaks of "the cup of blessing which we bless" in I Corinthians 10:16. He was certainly referring to the Lord's Supper.

Another strong point in connecting the "bread of life" with the Lord's Supper is found in the walking on the water, which immediately follows. It may be that the Evangelist desired to teach that the nature of the body of Jesus was not bound down to earthly and material conditions. It was of a kind that could serve as spiritual food and heavenly bread.\(^\text{17}\)

As pointed out above, many try to give the Fourth Gospel a strongly sacramental teaching. The passage under consideration is used in the defense of their position. The entire tone of the book must be remembered in interpreting any one passage. Before answering the argument as to the reference to the Eucharist and its saving efficacy here, it is necessary to look at the other sacrament in the Fourth Gospel.

The Fourth Evangelist does not narrate the baptism of Jesus by John; he lays no stress on the historic antecedents of baptism; he gives no command to baptize; and he belittles the ministry of John the Baptist rather than exalting it.

Some think that it was beneath the dignity of Jesus to be baptized by anyone.\textsuperscript{18} A more probable reason for this subordination of John the Baptist to his successor was in order to combat a sect at Ephesus that looked to John as its founder and his baptism as final. The Evangelist purposely refutes this baptism and belittles their founder.\textsuperscript{19}

It is apparent that the Evangelist places no emphasis upon baptism unless it is mentioned in some passages which must have a symbolical interpretation such as John 3:1-6, 13:1-11, and 19:34-37.

Should one go overboard on the sacramental teaching of the "bread of life," he might also go overboard on the "water of life." There is an obvious relationship between the two. If the sixth chapter refers only to the Eucharist, then the fourth chapter refers only to baptism. Yet in the fourth chapter the water is not used outwardly but inwardly; it is to quench the thirst, not to purify. By arguing in reverse, it could be said that inasmuch as the fourth chapter has a spiritual and not a ritualistic teaching, the sixth chapter


and the phrase ἐγώ εἰμί ὁ άρτος τῆς γεν. must likewise be interpreted spiritually.

The Evangelist does not say, "this is my body," but used the word "flesh"; he makes no mention of the memorial as a rite as Paul does in I Corinthians; the disciples do not distribute the elements in the Fourth Gospel; the Gospel does not say that Jesus "broke"; "give thanks," (ἐυχαριστεῖτε), is used elsewhere in the Gospel without sacramental meaning (e.g., 11:41); "looking up to heaven," a very ancient feature in the sacramental ritual, is omitted, but occurs in the great "high priestly" prayer (17:1); in his account of the upper room he places more emphasis on the washing of the apostles' feet than on anything else; he seems anxious to sever the Lord's Supper from any antecedent such as the Passover; he gives strictly a spiritual import to the ordinance.

Jesus seemed to foresee the possibility of making the ritual of the Eucharist effective or efficacious and therefore supplied an antidote in his teaching on the "bread of life." He said in verse 63, "It is the spirit that giveth life; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I have spoken to you are spirit and are life."

Scott states it so well as he says:

The omission of the Lord's Supper and the substitution of the feet washing are both significant, and cannot well be explained except in one
way. With his profound insight into the spiritual meaning of Christianity, John saw a danger in the increasing reverence attached to the outward rite of the Supper. The natural craving for something visible and material in religion had seized on the simple ordinance bequeathed by Jesus, and invested it with a superstitious value. More particularly among those Greek Churches for which the Evangelist wrote, the ideas that had grown up around the heathen mysteries were gradually transferring themselves to the Christian Sacrament, with the result that the Gospel message was half emptied of its meaning. The marked omission of the one incident which to many must have appeared the most important in the whole narrative, must have been intentional. John wished in the most decisive manner to subordinate the outward rite to what was spiritual and essential.

Macgregor disagrees at this point maintaining that although the Eucharistic discussion would have been impossible in Jesus' own day before the sacrament was even instituted, it becomes intelligible when related to a later Jewish attack upon Christian sacramental teaching.

Those who believe that the discourses of Jesus are more or less authentic records feel that a ritualistic interpretation of our passage would be an anachronism. On the other hand, there are those who feel that the Evangelist was presenting a "spiritual" religion, "in which faith brings the believer into a saving fellowship with Jesus Christ, so that

---

20Scott, op. cit., pp. 122f.
any material medium is superfluous, if not contradictory, to
the main teaching of the gospel."\textsuperscript{22}

The words of Stevens are a fitting conclusion to the
sacramental consideration of the "bread of life."

The prevailing interpretation among Protest­
ants refers the words to the propitiatory death of
Christ. This was the opinion of Augustine and the
Reformers, and is presented in the commentaries of
Lange, Godet, and Meyer. It is favored by the fol­
lowing considerations: (a) the term I will give
(δώσω, verse 51) points to a future saving act;
(b) the expression to drink his blood, necessarily
refers to his death; (c) passages like 1:29, 3:14,
and I John 4:10 confirm this explanation.\textsuperscript{23}

Stevens then proceeds to attack the validity of these
three arguments,\textsuperscript{24} but it is necessary to leave him at this
point and attempt to give other possible truths in relation
to the "bread of life."

The "bread of life" of which Jesus speaks is the bread
which gives life. In verse 33 Jesus says, "For the bread of
God is that which comes down from heaven and gives life to
the world." In verse 51 he goes further in saying, "I am the
living bread coming down from heaven." Therefore his life
gives life and really only life can beget life. There is the

\textsuperscript{22}Howard, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 144.

\textsuperscript{23}Stevens, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 160f.

\textsuperscript{24}Ibid., pp. 161ff.
same double sense in the "water of life" (Rev. 21:6 and 22:1), the "light of life" (John 8:12), the "tree of life" (Genesis 3:22; Rev. 2:7, etc.), and the "word of life" (I John 1:1).  

Jesus' use of this similitude and the emphatic use of \( \text{ἐκώμε} \) seems to be connected with Ecclesiasticus 24:19f. where Wisdom says:

Come unto me, ye that are desirous of me, and be filled with my produce. For my memorial is sweeter than honey, and mine inheritance than the honeycomb. For they that eat me shall yet be thirsty.

According to this passage one never is satisfied in the study of the Torah; the more he learns, the more he wants to know. But as Jesus speaks of himself as being the "bread of life," he claims that he will satisfy man's deepest needs and man will never hunger. If Jesus uses the expression as an echo of Divine Wisdom and contrasts his saying with it, it indicates his own divine self-consciousness. In that sense it could be connected with Matthew 5:6 where Jesus says: "Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled."

It would be comparable to the teaching as found in the 15th chapter of John which will be discussed later. It is by living with Christ and partaking of him that one becomes a branch of the true vine. Our life on earth shall be part of

\[ \text{25Bernard, op. cit., p. 198} \]
the life of Christ and shall complete the works which he did in the world, in subordinating his human will to the divine will.\textsuperscript{26}

It is His life, and cannot reproduce itself in his followers until they are inwardly identified with him, possessed of the self-same will and spirit that dwelt in Christ. The fundamental thought of the Gospel is that to share in the life of Christ we must become one with him, for "apart from him we can do nothing."\textsuperscript{27} This teaches a mystical union of the believers and Christ. This is a descriptive phrase of the living appropriation of Christ to the heart. "Flesh and blood" stand as symbols of his very self. To partake of these is spiritually to appropriate Christ by an intimate life-union with him.

As Calvin said, one is more prone to seek something in Christ, other than Christ himself.\textsuperscript{28}

The appropriation of Christ, in the fullest sense of the word, includes the acceptance of the benefits of his sacrificial work. This sacrificial work is symbolized in partaking of the Lord's Supper. To partake of Christ spiritually

\textsuperscript{26}Gardner, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 205.

\textsuperscript{27}Scott, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 293.

is to live eternally just as the Israelites sustained their physical lives by partaking of the manna.

God gave his Son to save the world and by the same token Christ gives himself to save the world. He identifies himself with the Wisdom of God and with God himself as he says: "I am the bread of life."

b. ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου (8:12)

"I am the light of the world" was declared by Jesus on the last day of the Feast of Tabernacles, according to the Fourth Evangelist (8:12). The Pharisees thought they were the light of the world although they would have hardly said it in plain words.29 Jesus' statement was shocking to them because of its claims. Matthew introduced the Galilean ministry by saying, "The people who sat in darkness saw a great light." He seems to have anticipated this great statement which Jesus made of himself (Matthew 4:16).

The Fourth Evangelist is noted for comprehending all the forces of goodness under some general idea, like light or truth, while all the forms of evil are summed up as darkness or falsehood.30 He seems to have chosen the term because of its very largeness and vagueness. Light is the immemorial


30Stevens, op. cit., p. 11.
symbol of all that is divine and holy; it suggests gladness, security, quickening, and illumination.\textsuperscript{31} It may be said, then, that light to the Fourth Evangelist was the symbol of goodness, love, and spiritual life, while darkness was the synonym of evil, hate, and moral death.\textsuperscript{32}

\(\phi\omega\) in the prologue is synonymous with the personal \(\lambda\sigma\gamma\oslash\) and perhaps to the Evangelist the two could never be completely separated. Other passages in the Fourth Gospel dealing with Jesus as the light of the world are: 3:11-21, 12:35, 36, and 46. In these verses Jesus is quoted as calling himself "light" without \(\epsilon\gamma\omega\ \epsilon\iota\mu\iota\). In I John 1:5-7 God is called "light." If the Epistle had the same author as the Gospel, the author ascribed prerogatives to Jesus which were reserved for God. The Evangelist’s use of light in this way was a claim to deity.

The Hebrews thought of God as not only giving them light through the Torah (e.g., Proverbs 6:23), but also being their light. Psalm 27:1 says: "The Lord \underline{is} my Light;" Isaiah 60:19 says: "The Lord shall be thy everlasting Light." The later Rabbis applied the thought to the Messiah: "Light

\textsuperscript{31}Scott, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 254.

\textsuperscript{32}Stevens, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 128.
Deutero-Isaiah claimed that He would be a Light to the Gentiles (Isaiah 42:6 and 49:6). The Evangelist goes beyond them all as he says for Jesus "the light of the world." 34

This is a definite attempt on the part of the Evangelist to identify Jesus with the God of the Old Testament.

Light in Hebrew thought is also regarded as a synonym for 'salvation,' with its accompaniments of joy and healing (cf. Enoch XCVI. 3). There exists a targum or interpretative translation of Isaiah 60:1 which reads 'Arise, shine clearly, Jerusalem, for the time of thy salvation is come.' The term 'light of the Messiah' is also found, and denotes the 'light' with which the Messiah will lighten the righteous when he comes. This 'light of Messiah' is also interpreted as the original light at Creation, which, it is said, God ultimately withdrew, in order to keep it for the righteous. The words of II Corinthians 4:6 are both an illustration of, and a sharp contrast with such a conception. 35

Light then connoted salvation, and when Jesus is quoted as saying, εγώ είμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ ἱστόμου he was claiming a divine prerogative, for Yahweh had always been thought of as the author and finisher of the Israelite salvation. With the εγώ είμι the claim is even greater as he is the great "I AM" of the Old Testament.

35 Strachan, op. cit., p. 206.
He is the "true light," the absolute revelation. His message might be capable of ever new and larger interpretation, but it would always be the same message, revealed through him once for all. . . . Jesus is contrasted with the 'men sent from God' who went before him, - with John the Baptist and Moses, the supreme types of the prophetic order. They were only reflections of the light which in Him was directly manifest.

The Fourth Evangelist uses the similitude with the εἶμι to add evidence to his claim: Jesus was God, therefore a theophany.

εἶμι ἐγώ (10:7)

This third similitude, "I am the door," is stated twice: John 10:7 and 9.

The statement has no exact Old Testament parallel and the nearest one to it is Psalm 118:20:

This is the gate of the Lord;
The righteous shall enter into it.

The Sahidic text supports a variant reading which Moffatt adopts here. Instead of ἦ Θύρα, the Sahidic has ὁ ποιμέν, "the shepherd." In a Gospel that stresses symbols and numbers, it is not likely that the Evangelist would have six similitudes instead of seven!

"I am the door" has practically the same meaning as

the saying which shall be discussed later, "I am the way."
"Jesus is He through whom the believer is introduced into
the upper heavenly world, where the Father dwells."37 Under-
lying it also is the general conception of 1:51 where the Son
of Man is the ladder between heaven and earth.38 Just as the
ladder formed a bridge between heaven and earth in Jacob's
dream, in the same way Jesus forms the entrance into the
heavenly abode.

There is some question whether Jesus had the shepherds
or the sheep in mind in verse 7. There is no question but
that he had the sheep in mind in verse 9. It makes little
difference whether Jesus had the sheep or shepherd in mind in
verse 7 for the fact remains: no one will enter the spirit-
ual fold except by means of Christ.

John 10:8 sounds harsh, and because it does Πρὸ έμὸν
is omitted in ∼ and in many versions. Westcott and Hort
also omit the two words explaining them as a gloss. The bet-
ter explanation is that they were omitted by some because of
the harshness, but were in the earliest manuscript. Some per-
haps interpreted Jesus as saying that the prophets (who were
before him) were thieves. Robertson thought he was referring

and Environment, (London: Student Christian Movement Press,
38Loc. cit.
to the Pharisees. The contrast is not between those who prepared for his coming and Jesus, but between those who falsely claimed to be heaven-sent deliverers and the true Messiah himself.

The methods, e.g., of Judas of Galilee, who instigated the people to revolt against Roman taxation about the year A.D. 6, were violent, and led to murder and robbery. According to Acts 5:36, Theudas was an early impostor of the same type, although Josephus seems to put him later, if indeed he is describing the same person. And, apart from Judas and Theudas, we have the testimony of Josephus that at the beginning of the first century Judea was the scene of innumerable risings and disorders, which were caused, in part at any rate, by current misinterpretations of the Messianic idea, associated by the Zealots with militant activities. It is true that we have no knowledge of any Jew before Barcochba (A.D. 135) who claimed explicitly to be the Messiah. But there were many pretenders to the office of leadership of the nation, and to such the words of Jesus, "thieves and robbers," were fitly applied. And the present tense ἐστίν confirms the view that His allusion was to leaders of revolt who belonged to the first century, some of whom were probably living at the time.

It would be similar to the teaching of Luke 13:1-9, where Jesus was warning the Jewish nation of their impending destruction, on the basis of the two events cited. The

---

39 Robertson, op. cit., p. 87.


41 Loc. cit.
Zealots were causing the people untold misery as they were promoting their own Messianic program. The parable presents the fact that they were living on borrowed time; unless they conformed to the program of the true Deliverer, Jesus, they would perish. They did not accept Jesus, or conform to his program, and consequently they were largely destroyed in 70 A.D.

This, then, is another theophany. The Yahweh of the Old Testament, who spoke through the prophets and warned Israel of her coming captivity and destruction, is speaking again. There was only one route left for them in the Old Testament: the way of repentance and returning to God. There is only one door in the New Testament: repentance and returning to God. God is very near to them and the way is open before them, the way of the great "I AM." Therefore Jesus repeats it so that none might misunderstand, "I am the Door."

This saying is also found twice in the Fourth Gospel: 10:11 and 14. It is translated, "I am the good shepherd."

The conception of the Good Shepherd was deeply rooted in the Old Testament. Many expressions were used in connection with the shepherd idea. Israel was called the flock of God (Isaiah 40:11; Jeremiah 23:1-4; Psalms 74:1 and 95:7). Sometimes the flock was in the hands of unfaithful shepherds (Jeremiah 23:1-4; 2:8 R.V.M.; Zechariah 11:3-9; and Ezekiel 34).
Salvation will come to the flock by David, the true shepherd of Israel (Ez. 34:23 and 37:24), or by a descendent of him (Jer. 23:5f.). Surely as Jesus said, "I am the good shepherd," the people thought of the shepherd passages, especially found in Ezekiel.

Jesus manifested a shepherd spirit in his compassion for Israel (Matt. 14:14); he thought of Israel as lost sheep, not having a shepherd (Matt. 9:36); in his Messianic self-consciousness, he thought of himself as the beaten shepherd (Mark 14:27); one of his most tender sayings is recorded in Luke 12:32 as he called the disciples "little flock"; he described his own ministry, in one of his best-known parables, as like a shepherd looking for a sheep; he is called the "Shepherd and Bishop of your souls" in I Peter 2:25.

One of the most striking passages in Jewish literature about the shepherd is found in the Psalms of Solomon 17:40f., where the Messiah is spoken of as "mighty in deed and strong in the fear of God, who guards the flock of the Lord in truth and righteousness. He suffers it not that any of them stray on the pasture ground. He leads them all by straight paths."42

This similitude is closely related to the previous one.

As Westcott has pointed out, Christ is the door in relation to the fold, and the shepherd in relation to the flock.\textsuperscript{43}

The position, dignity, and responsibility of bishops have been derived from this passage. Strachan maintains that:

The immediate reference is to the ecclesiastical authorities who have excommunicated the man born blind, or elsewhere appear as men who are more concerned with the preservation of orthodox tradition than with those under their charge who need healing.\textsuperscript{44}

It seems the main teaching is missed completely if the passage is construed to give emphasis to the bishops of the churches. Jesus and believers in general are rather incidental as Scott interprets the passage:

The drift of this parable first becomes clear to us when we realize that Jesus is speaking not so much of the sheep as of the under-shepherds,—the guardians whom he has appointed for his people. 'I am the door of the sheep.' i.e., the door through which alone they can be approached. 'He that entereth in by the door is the shepherd. And the sheep hear his voice: and he calleth his own sheep by name, and leadeth them out.' 'I am the door: by Me, if any man enter in, he shall go in and out, and find pasture,' i.e., for the sheep entrusted to him. . . . Further on, with a variation of the image, He describes Himself as the 'true shepherd,' the pattern shepherd whom His subordinates must strive to imitate.\textsuperscript{45}

It must not be forgotten that these εἰς εἰς sayings


\textsuperscript{44}Strachan, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 224.

\textsuperscript{45}Scott, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 135-136
were used by the Fourth Evangelist to magnify Christ and to present him as God in the flesh. To put that fact subordinate in the Fourth Gospel is to do injustice to the design of the author. It was not the under-shepherds whom the writer was interested in—it was The Shepherd.

God had been known through the ages as the one who provided for Israel, guided her through all her history, protected her from her enemies, and would save her for eternity. God only had been thought of as capable of doing all these things. Now Jesus claimed all these things for himself in his figure of speech: he combined all that could be included in the "shepherd" idea with the divine ἐγώ εἰμι and said to the people who were needing guidance, protection, provision, and salvation: "I am the good shepherd."

ἐγώ εἰμι ἐκ ναστασις καὶ ἐς ψω(11:25)

His great statement, "I am the resurrection and the life," is found in John 11:25. The problem of the death of Lazarus is largely an unsolved one. Did Lazarus really die, or did the Evangelist fabricate the incident? If it is a genuine account, why did not the Synoptic writers mention it? The view of Renan, that something like a pious fraud was arranged between Jesus and his friends at Bethany, is most repulsive to all Christians. 46 Perhaps the facts of the case

will never be known, but the suggestion of Gardner is quite logical:

... The story is probably a transposition into a higher key of something which really happened, but which probably did not take the great place in the imagination of the people of Jerusalem which the Evangelist supposes. 47

The account has too many details to have been a mere fabrication. The several intimate sayings and emotions are too genuine in tone to be easily discredited. The Synoptic writers did not attach too much importance to it, and consequently omitted the event. The Fourth Evangelist not only saw its importance in connection with the crucifixion of Christ, but also in connection with a great teaching on the resurrection.

Life in the Old Testament passed from a physical to a religious conception. Originally life was thought of, no doubt, as just physical, but developed into the idea of fellowship with God through obedience to his will and possession of his spirit. But even this kind of life was thought of as being restricted to time and space. In Isaiah 38, is found the song of gratitude by Hezekiah for his extended life, and in verse 19 Hezekiah says, "The living, the living, he shall praise thee. . . ." This is in contrast to the inhabitants of Sheol

47 Loc. cit.
who cannot praise God (v. 18). As the idea of future life was later brought into the purview of Jewish thought, it was life in as real and complete a sense as in the present earthly life. All the faculties and energies of man would find a place of service, and would only be purified and heightened through fellowship with God. 48

The idea of Paul was not as advanced as the Evangelist in his conception of eternal life. His was the primitive Christian view, thinking of life as the supreme blessing of the future. He knew he had the sure promise of it, and could in some measure anticipate it by living even now "in the spirit," but the actual possession of it was reserved for him in the world to come. 49

The Evangelist frequently used the word "eternal" with "life" to give more prominence to the thought. As Scott indicates, it is quite likely that Jesus never used the word "eternal" in connection with life, for the word "life" to Jesus would have included all that "eternal" suggested and even more. 50

When Jesus is quoted as saying, "I am the resurrection and the life," he maintains that life in its full reality is

50 Scott, op. cit., pp. 238ff.
communicated here and now. The Evangelist, as stated above, added the word "eternal" several times to show qualities, not future. Indeed, the primary aim of the Evangelist was to affirm the claim of the believer in Christ to an actual and present possession of that life which had previously been associated with another state of existence. Christ had become flesh in order that in this world of time, with the limitations of earthly conditions, believers might become partakers of eternal life.\(^{51}\)

Since eternal life begins now, death does not command the position in the Fourth Gospel that it does in the Old Testament and in Paul. To the Fourth Evangelist, death was but the natural close to an earthly life. It marked the moment when the true life was set free, but death did not alter in any essential way the quality and nature of that life. The real change, to the Fourth Evangelist, took place in connection with the new birth. The fearful death to the Fourth Evangelist was not an act, but a condition of exclusion from the higher life. The natural man, who had not participated in the change effected by the new birth, was in a state of "death."\(^{52}\)


\(^{52}\)Scott, op. cit., p. 248
Jesus is dealing with Martha's preconceived ideas of the general resurrection and trying to get her to look at the present as well. Martha is cherishing a belief in a resurrection at the end of time. Jesus does not exactly negate the idea, but he does say that resurrection and life begin even now, the believer triumphing over death in him because he receives both resurrection and life directly from the Saviour. The contrast is, therefore, not between a physical and spiritual resurrection, but between a far-off resurrection day and the present power of resurrection which resides in Himself. This Jesus clearly teaches as he says, "I am the resurrection and the life."53

Jesus wants Martha to take her mind off of the "last day" and to fasten her attention upon himself, as the one who has abolished death for all believers, and has ushered in eternal life. The life to which he refers does not abrogate the physical resurrection, but includes it. She is now taught that "he that believeth on me, though he die (i.e., actually physical death) yet shall he live" (as Martha believes); and also (what she does not yet understand) "whosoever liveth (i.e., is still alive) and believeth on me shall never die."54 Belief in Jesus is now equal to the possession

54Strachan, op. cit., p. 235.
of eternal life. Strachan continues by saying:

He brings even the living believer into an eternal and indestructible relationship with the Father. To our minds it is somewhat perplexing and incongruous that Jesus and Martha should enter, at this stage in the story, upon a discussion of immortality, but this is the Evangelist’s way. . . . Lazarus is not only a man dead and in his grave about to be raised miraculously to life, but a symbol of those that are dead, i.e., oblivious and ignorant of the heavenly world, who are awakened to faith and to life through the historical coming of Jesus the Son of Man. . . . 55

The resurrection is not the commencement of the new life, but the manifestation of it. The true resurrection takes place in this present world, when a man accepts Christ as Saviour and immediately "passes from death unto life." The change is an invisible, inward one, but is just as real and vital. All would see the miracle of Lazarus being raised in his grave clothes and leaving the tomb where he had been for four days. But this was only a symbol of the real miracle which had already happened to Lazarus, and which is repeated in every Christian experience. "He that liveth and believeth in me shall never die." 56

The life imparted by Jesus was independent of physical

55 Ibid., pp. 235f.

56 Scott, op. cit., p. 251. (The reader will note that I have considered Scott's treatment of this saying very helpful.)
life or death. Those who believed on him had risen already; their death was only apparent as they, in reality, were to carry into the world beyond the same life as started here on earth.

Lazarus had never died. Through faith in Christ he had possessed himself of the true life, and still continued in it, in spite of his apparent death. But the fact of his continuance in life is made manifest by his return at the call of Jesus to a bodily existence. The real miracle had been effected in him during his lifetime, in the act of his believing in Jesus; but his resurrection in the flesh gives a visible evidence and confirmation to the miracle. 57

Therefore Jesus was himself the essence of God, and the life that dwelt in him was different in quality from that of men. The purpose of his coming was to transfuse into man's earthly life the higher life which belonged originally to God alone. 58

Scott's summation of the resurrected life is one of the best:

The Christian life is the resurrected life. . . . It is like a new birth, a transition from death to life. However we may judge of John's own peculiar doctrine of the new life, we cannot but recognize that he has supplied us with the one conception of the work of Christ which can never lose its value and fruitfulness. The eternal need of man is for life, more abundant life. The word may carry with it widely different meanings to different men, in various periods of the world's history, but in itself is the one compre-

57 Ibid., p. 250. 58 Ibid., p. 364f.
hensive word which sums up all the thousand wants and longings of our human nature. And in Christ Jesus as this evangelist has taught us, we have Life - the supreme possession in which all desire is satisfied. 59

Jesus is, then, according to the Evangelist, God in the flesh. He alone is able to impart that divine life to human life because he is both. That new life is not futuristic in the sense that it will be granted at the great resurrection day, but is a present reality as Jesus is a present reality. He is the great "I AM" of yesterday, today, and forever. Therefore as he can impart that which had been reserved for Yahweh up until that time, he speaks as the Yahweh of the old dispensation as he says: "I am the resurrection and the life."

14:6

"I am the way, and the truth, and the life" is found in John 14:6 and was the answer to Thomas' question, "We know not whither thou goest; how know we the way?" It is necessary to study the meaning of "way," "truth," and "life" separately and then in their combined effect.

(a) 14:6

The word "way" was used with great frequency in the Old Testament. When it was used of God, it had reference to

59 Ibid., pp. 373f.
his creative activity, moral administration, and above all, his commandments. The word "way" had many synonyms as easily seen from a study of the 119th Psalm. Such synonyms were "law," "testimonies," "precepts," "statutes," "commandments," and "judgments." There was yet another meaning of the word "way" in the Old Testament to be borne in mind. The purpose of God, foretold by the prophets and fulfilled in Christ, was described as the "way of the Lord" by the Synoptic Gospels (Mark 1:2f.; Matthew 3:3; Luke 3:4). These Gospels used the word "way" in this sense because of its use in Isaiah 40:3 and Malachi 3:1.

The Evangelist brought together two distinct ideas in his picture of Jesus: He was the fulfillment of the law, and was also the fulfillment of prophecy. He was the new Torah from heaven to make God's will known to men. He was the true prophet who not only spoke for God but who could also say: "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." The transfiguration was foreseen in the Prologue. The synoptic account said that Moses and Elijah (who represented Law and Prophecy), met with Jesus. According to the Evangelist, Moses and Elijah met in Christ as the μέγας, which was both the Torah and the spoken Word of God. Jesus, then, was representative of both the written and the spoken Word of God. 

---

In Hellenistic religion there was a widespread conception of what was called the "journey of the soul." The souls of men were originally in heaven, and when they made their abode in human bodies they lost their divine qualities. To reach heaven again, they must make a long trip through the spheres of the planets, being purified that they might enter the Kingdom of Light. There was also the belief that some divine leader would help them along the way. This Gnostic conception might have been in the Evangelist's mind as he speaks of Jesus being the "way" to the Father. He would be presenting the true way in contrast to the erroneous one.\(^6\)

This saying became the basis for the earliest designation by which the Christians were known by their opponents. When Paul went to Damascus to arrest the believers who were there, they were described by Luke as members of the "Way" (Acts 9:2). Paul was forced to leave Ephesus when Demetrius and others started "no small stir concerning the Way" (Acts 19:23). Previous to this, Paul was forced to leave the synagogue in Ephesus because "some were hardened and disobedient, speaking evil of the Way before the multitude" (Acts 19:9). In Paul's defense before Felix he said, "After the Way which they call a sect, so serve I the God of our Fathers" (Acts 24:14).

After Paul's defense, Felix postponed his decision because, as Luke says, "having more exact knowledge concerning the Way" (Acts 24:22). This word certainly became a title for the Christians because of their lives in the communities.

Jesus was speaking of the way to the Father. To Jesus, heaven and earth were near together, and that which separated them was not death, but sin. Jesus was therefore not talking about death, but sin. As he removed the penalty of sin, he made it possible for believers to go to the Father.

Jesus did not point out the way, he did not claim to be a guide along the way, but he claimed to be The Way. The ethical demands which were the result of this relationship were not the result of legalism, but the result of a new fellowship.

Many had sought and found God in the generations before Christ, but the road was rough, crooked, and sparsely traveled. In Christ, man had the final revelation, the perfect example in conduct, and The Way to the Father.

(b) ἶ ἀλήθεια... ἔστιν

The "way," "truth," and "life" form an ascending series: Christ is the way that leads to truth, and therefore to life.

62 Stevens, op. cit., p. 14
"Truth" is associated with "way" several times in the Psalter. "Teach me thy ways, O Lord: I will walk in thy truth (Psalm 86:11); "I have walked in thy truth (26:3); and "All the paths of the Lord are loving-kindness and truth unto such as keep his covenant and testimonies" (25:10). These passages are clear in presenting this connection between "truth" and "way."

Scott thinks that the Evangelist was affected by Platonic philosophy, and if so the "truth" of anything is the spiritual reality of which it is a symbol. This would imply that over against the world of visible things there is a world of supersensible realities, which have now for the first time been revealed in Christ.63 God is therefore "the only true" (John 15:3), and all other things have truth in them in direct ratio as they reflect his thought and purpose.

The mission of Christ who came forth from God was to declare "the truth" in his own person. "Through him it becomes possible for men, in the midst of earthly change and illusion, to lay hold on the eternal reality."64 The Evangelist was not just thinking of truth as the use of the intellectual faculties. In Asia generally, and more especially among the Jews, when truth was spoken of or a true person commended, it

63 Scott, op. cit., p. 253. 64 Ibid., p. 254.
seldom bore the restricted scientific sense. "Truth in man is sincerity and transparency of soul, loyalty in word and action." In *Iliad* Homer said: "He is to me as hateful as the gates of death, who utters one thing with his lips and hides another in his heart."66

When the Evangelist spoke of truth, then, he was not referring to facts of the physical world, which are a matter of observation. He was not even referring to intellectual illumination, which sees the permanent in the temporary and the reality lying behind the mere phenomenon. It was not wholly independent of intellect, but was not primarily intellectual. It cannot be construed as a reasoned system of belief.67 Truth was used predominantly in an ethical and spiritual sense in the Gospel.

The higher kind of truth found by the Evangelist in the teaching of Jesus was often designated by him as "words" or "sayings" (λόγοι or ῥήματα). An examination of the following passages reveals some of the Evangelist's ideas of "truth." In John 6:63 Jesus says his words are "spirit and life." In 15:7 Christ's words abiding in the believer assure

65 Gardener, *op. cit.*, pp. 259f.
him of answered prayer. In 8:51 Jesus is quoted as saying the retention of his word gives eternal life. John 8:32 is very familiar: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." "Words" and "works" are equated in certain passages such as John 15:22-24, 18:37, and 14:10. He calls the Holy Spirit the "spirit of truth" (16:13).

It is clear from these passages that "truth" is not thought of as any verbal teaching, but as the faith which unites the disciples to the Master, and makes the two one mystical body. In 17:3 Jesus says, "And this is life eternal, that they should know thee the only true God, and him who thou didst send, Jesus Christ." Faith and knowledge are both presented as absolutely essential. To "know" in this passage is clearly not to "be aware of," or be "convinced of" the existence of God and Christ, but to have communion with them through the spirit. It is the "truth" of the Psalms, but adapted to new conditions and becomes almost a technical word in the new religion.68

It is to be remembered that to know God is to be in harmony and sympathy with his will and program. The Evangelist does not intend to separate mind and heart, will and emotion. After all, the truth of this religion makes its

---

68 Ibid., pp. 268f.
appeal to the entire man. Therefore, to know God as the Evangelist uses the word "know" is to obey, trust, and love God. Truth is not passive, but active; it is not just something known, it is something done (III John 3, 8; I John 1:6).

The truth dwells in the individual (John 8:44 and I John 2:4); the Holy Spirit guides in all truth (John 16:13); the believer belongs to it, and draws from it the strength and inspiration of his life (John 18:37 and I John 3:19).

It is a life that is abundant, a life which embraces the fullest activity and best development of the entire man. All powers and gifts should contribute to its enrichment. It should draw its supplies from the deepest sources, - abiding fellowship with God, and ethical likeness to him. Neither a barren intellectualism nor a dreamy and unpractical mysticism in religion could ever develop along the lines of teaching which John has marked out. All such excesses would be excluded by the very comprehensiveness and depth of his idea. 69

This "truth" presupposes a likeness between its subject and object. Man can only know the truth of God as he becomes like him. The First Epistle of John unmistakably teaches that there is a direct connection between a true knowledge of God and moral likeness to him. One cannot have the truth of God and live and hate like the world.

When Jesus said, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free," he was speaking of being freed

from the bondage of sin and death. The first century Chris-
tians did not think of the restraint of Christianity, but of
its freedom. The Evangelist quotes Jesus as saying, "He that
committeth sin is a slave of sin." Paul speaks of the "glori-
ous liberty of the children of God" (Rom. 8:21). This truth
is contrary to what is practiced by so many people, both
Christian and members of other religions. The "truth" would
unshackle all from superstition, sin, and fear of death,
temptations, and insecurity.

Christ has disclosed God to men in his real character
so that they may truly know him; and they know God by being
in him as they are in Christ. Union with Christ involves
union with God, and this true God to whom believers are
united through Christ becomes eternal life. "In the knowl-
edge and fellowship of God we realize the true life."70

If truth is the great liberator, it is also the great
condemner: "He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my say-
ings, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I spake, the
same shall judge him in the last day." (John 12:48.) Like
other great blessings, it carries its own punishment and re-
wards. When anyone is exposed to "truth" in Jesus Christ, he
is responsible for his decision in respect to him.

70 Ibid., p. 322
Truth can be summed up by saying with Howard: "It is not a correct conception of God to be apprehended by the intellect so much as a revelation of reality to be received in a personal relationship." There can then be no discord between knowing and doing. Further, the Truth is God's gift to men, and as God's presence in man, it unites man with God. In so far as men are of the truth, they are of God. 

(c) \( \text{'έλιος οίκος... η φωτ'} \)

The Fourth Gospel begins and ends with the great thought of life. In 1:4 is found the familiar verse: "In him was life; and the life was the light of men." The Gospel originally closed with these words found in 20:31: "... and that believing ye may have life in his name." Jesus as the Son of God possessed in himself divine life and was capable of imparting it to all who believed on him. "The problem of Christianity, as it presents itself to the evangelist, is to account for the reappearance in the believer of the life that was manifested in Christ." 

It is to be remembered that life in the Old Testament was primarily the physical, earthly life, the sum of energies

---

71 Howard, op. cit., p. 185f. 72 Ibid., p. 183.

which made up a man's actual existence. The soul separated from the body did not cease to be, but it forfeited its portion in the true life. Therefore the highest good was simply "length of days," the continuance of life until natural death. But in the development of the idea the mere physical existence was distinguished from the essential life, which was associated with joy, prosperity, peace, wisdom, and righteousness. Man "lived" as he participated in those activities which were most distinctive of his spiritual nature. For that reason, God was really the "living one." Since God alone possessed life in its highest sense, fellowship with him was the one condition by which men would obtain this life. A study of Deuteronomy 3:3 makes evident that communication with God is really what makes "life," and not just physical existence. Communion with God and life became synonymous in Hebrew thought.74

It was left to the Evangelist to define the Christian life as the new life. He saw that this life demanded a complete inward change, a regeneration of the entire nature of man. The Synoptic Gospels presented this truth but not with the clarity and insistence that the Fourth Gospel does. The actual impartation of the actual life of God is the core of
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the Gospel. Christ is the Mediator of this life and this is the Fourth Gospel. Whether one studies the similitude of the vine or of the bread; whether one studies the miracle of turning the water into wine or the feeding of the five thousand; whether one studies the first chapter or the last chapter, the truth is evident: Christ is life and is mediator of life.

The Evangelist recognizes that life can only be imparted by a Person. To attain life a man does not conform to truth or accept a creed; it is belief in a Person, Jesus. The new life in the individual is not the reason for salvation, but the result of regeneration. As one has fellowship with this Life, he is transformed by it. If a person receives Christ in his heart, the believer not only lives but Christ lives again (compare Gal. 2:20). As Scott says:

And He, who thus shared from all eternity in the absolute, self-existent life of God, came down into this lower world and identified Himself with our race. The gift that seemed to be forever beyond man's reach was now directly accessible to him. Through Christ he entered into fellowship with God and received into himself the divine life.75

It is apparent from the study of the words "way," "truth," and "life" that we are dealing with titles connected with deity. Although it is true that the Fourth Evangelist was surely acquainted with Greek philosophy and Gnostic teachings, his main basis for his choice of terms was a Jewish one. He
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took terms from the Old Testament, and especially those connected in some way with Yahweh, poured additional meaning into them, and ascribed them to Christ. As God had been thought of as the only way of true revelation and conduct; as God was only truth in every sense of the word; as God was the only "living one" and able to impart or reclaim life, so Jesus now was The Way, The Truth, and The Life. He is identified with God in his attributes, conduct, and claims.

With these exalted claims for the Christ of his Gospel, the Evangelist again brings them into juxtaposition with Εὑρίς ὁ λόγος. In this way he has accentuated the claim to deity. He is not only the great "I Am" but is also the way, truth, and life. That is why the Evangelist places on the lips of Jesus the words that have not yet been completely fathomed:

Εὑρίς εἶμι ζ ὁ δόξα καὶ η ἀλήθεια καὶ η Γλυκὴ.

A fitting close are these lines from Thomas a Kempis:

Follow thou me. I am the Way the Truth and the Life. Without the Way there is no going; without the Truth there is no knowing; Without the Life there is no living. I am the Way which thou must follow; the Truth which thou must believe: the Life which thou must hope for.

I am the inviolable Way; the infallible Truth: the never ending Life. I am the straightest Way; the sovereign Truth: Life true Life blessed Life uncreated. If thou remain in My way thou shalt know the Truth; and the Truth shall make thee free: and thou shalt lay hold on eternal Life.

This last similitude, "I am the true vine," is found in 15:1, and in 15:5 it is stated: ἐγώ εἰμι καὶ ἀμπελός καὶ ἄνθισις (15:1).

In the Psalms and prophets, the nation Israel was spoken of as God's "vine" or "vineyard," as an examination of the following passages will show: Isaiah 5:1-7; Jeremiah 2:21; Ezekiel 15:1-6 and 19:10-14; Psalm 80:8-16. In these passages there was the same relationship between Israel and God as exists between that which is planted and the planter. This relationship was not nearly so close as the relationship which is cited in the passage under study.

The Fourth Evangelist was constantly reminding his readers of the person of Christ, the ultimate force in Christianity. Gnosticism had already begun making inroads into the Christian community with the threat of severing the founder of Christianity from the movement itself. The Gnostics believed that one could get the true revelation without Christ to impart it. His earthly life was reduced to a mere appearance by many of the Gnostics, which doctrine was called Docet-icism. The author of the Fourth Gospel realized that a religion severed from Christ would be emptied of all content and power, for it was Christ who was the life and light of men. The greatness of Christ was not in his words or works, but in his
personality. The Evangelist could not explain the transformation wrought in the early members of the group apart from the impact and life of the person Jesus. If Christianity was to survive and see other miracles performed in individuals, it would be through the person Jesus, not his doctrine. There must be the same vital relation between Jesus and his believers as had existed between Jesus and his apostles in the first century.

"This is the sovereign thought of the Fourth Gospel," says Scott,

and in spite of the alien speculation with which it is entangled, it is everywhere pressed upon us with a matchless power and grandeur. The life was in Christ Himself; we must grow one with Him by a direct and personal fellowship before it can live again in us. 77

The apostles had lived with Jesus in the flesh long enough that they could think with him, and became lost to self as they became identified with Christ. "No longer do I call you servants"; Jesus is quoted as saying in John 15:15, "For the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth: but I have called you friends; for all things that I heard from my father I have made known unto you." This relationship between Christ and the apostles was so intimate that there was no thought of class consciousness. There was the idea of
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sharing, communion, and fellowship. Nothing was being withheld from the apostles by their Master. As the Fourth Evangelist spoke of the coming of the Comforter, he had the same thought in mind. This one who was to be brought-in-alongside would share with them, guide them, and constantly remind them of their relationship and obligation to Christ. The Holy Spirit would not be an outward friend, but an inward presence.

The Evangelist had become so identified with his Saviour that he had lost his own separate identity; his life was merged in Christ's through the Holy Spirit who had become in him "a well springing up into eternal life."78

Paul, in that familiar verse already cited, says, "I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I that live but Christ liveth in me: and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself up for me" (Gal. 2:20). This is the teaching of the vine but not so realistic and inviting. One might get the impression from Paul that he was one among millions. The Idea from the Fourth Gospel is that all believers have this same relationship.

It is the Evangelist who quotes Jesus saying to Thomas: "Because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are
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they that have not seen, and yet have believed" (20:29).

This is the thought of the vine but presented in a different way: believers of all ages can become identified with Christ in the same way that the apostles did. All believers have the same immediate access to this source of life. They are to be assured that Christ whom they are to know only in an inward experience is the same Christ whom the apostles knew outwardly. This unseen presence is to be the same as the Jesus of history. Just as the apostles were about to enter into a larger fellowship, and yet a continuation of the one started on earth, all believers were to have this real and personal fellowship with Christ through the Holy Spirit. These later ones may come to know Christ better and be more closely identified with him than the apostles, but it will only become a fact as they begin with the historical Jesus and contemplate him. Jesus' earthly life was a visible guarantee of what he is forever, and one must return to the historical Christ or his religious experience may degenerate into mystical imagination. Both the inward experience and the historical Jesus are necessary as they explain and complete one another. The Evangelist, instead of disregarding the earthly life, takes it as a sound basis for his exposition of the larger ministry of Christ. The Jesus of history is the stock, and one must know him if he knows the Jesus of
his personal experience. 79

A more thought-provoking allegory than the one used by the Evangelist would be difficult to find. It lends itself to so many interesting sidelights. It immediately reminds the reader that there is no distinction between believers: this distinction could have been easily made by the Evangelist, or Christ, but none was made; believers are all attached to the stock and have the same relation to the stock, or Christ. The branches are the vine: if the branches are cut off, the stock does not die, but puts out more branches; this shows that no branch is indispensable. The higher type of life which resides in Christ cannot be imparted to men except by a process of direct transmission: although this union is in its nature inexplicable, it is just as real as the union between God the Father and God the Son (John 17:22f).

The First Epistle of John has the same teaching: "Hereby we know that we abide in him and he in us, because he hath given us of his spirit" (I John 4:13). "Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not: whosoever sinneth hath not seen him, neither knoweth him" (I John 3:6). Other passages, such as I John 2:6, 10, 24, and 28 teach the same truth.

In the same Epistle the teaching is plain that if one abides in Christ he also abides in God, and has fellowship
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with Him (I John 1:3, 3:24, and 4:12). These verses present
the same truth as John 14:20. If the believer abides in
Christ, and Christ abides in God, it stands to reason that
the believer abides in God.

The similitude, then, can be summed up by remembering
that the higher type of life which resides in Christ cannot
be imparted to men except by a process of direct transmission.
In some real, although mysterious, way the believer is united
with Christ as the branch is attached to the vine. The life
of the believer is, in a real sense, the extended life of Christ.
The Evangelist sometimes thought of Christ as residing in the
believer, as a fountain of living water (4:14); in the allegory
of the vine, he thought of the believer being in Christ. The
problem was this: how do you explain the coming of the godly,
higher nature into the human, lower nature? Fellowship with
Christ in the purely moral and religious sense would never be
sufficient to gain eternal life; mere teaching, preserved
verbatim, would never give power to life. The Evangelist
realized that somehow Jesus imparted a part of himself so
that the disciples had a similar attitude toward God, toward
sin, the Father's will, obedience, and life itself.80 The
best way to explain it was through an allegory, thought the
Evangelist. One may never know all that the Evangelist had
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in mind, but he can know this much from his discourse: as God had imparted life to mankind through the generations, so Jesus, as God in the flesh, could and would impart life to all believers. As branches must be directly connected to the stock to live, so must believers have a vital, mystical relationship with Christ to live. As God had made his message known through the prophets, so Jesus has his message made known through the Holy Spirit.

The very qualities that God possessed, the very activities that had been reserved for God, and the very unique relationship that God had had with man, the Evangelist claimed for Jesus. And for the seventh time he augmented the divine claim with the language reserved, for the most part, for deity. Jesus is quoted as saying: ἐγώ εἶμι ἐὰν πέλοις ἐὰν νησὶν.

With this saying the Evangelist concluded his use of ἐγώ εἶμι in the similitudes. In each of the similitudes, the Evangelist identified Jesus with Old Testament ideas that had been reserved for God, and with the symbols, he had used the significant phrase ἐγώ εἶμι.

ἐγώ εἶμι was the claim of deity, for only deity could perform the miracles that had been wrought in the first believers; only deity could speak in the way Jesus had spoken; only belief in Jesus as deity would work the miracle necessary
to change the world from darkness to light.

(4) ἐγώ εἰμι without a predicate

The use of ἐγώ εἰμι without a predicate has been mentioned in connection with the man born blind in John 9:9. There are eight other uses of ἐγώ εἰμι without a predicate in the Fourth Gospel and these eight sayings are all in the words of Jesus. (See page 86f.)

a. ἐγώ εἰμι, καὶ φοβεῖσθε (6:20).

The first instance of ἐγώ εἰμι without a predicate is found in 6:20 as Jesus comes to the disciples during the storm and says: ἐγώ εἰμι, καὶ φοβεῖσθε, "I Am, be not afraid." Some would translate it simply as "It is I, be not afraid." This would be somewhat of a natural explanation as both Matthew and Mark say that the disciples thought they saw a phantasm. Jesus would then be saying, "I am not a ghost; I am a person, Jesus, whom you know." But Abbott maintains that there is no proof that these words could mean this. He would translate it as, "I am the Christ," or "the Deliverer." This he does on the basis of a comparison between

---
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Matthew and Mark in the eschatological discourse. Matthew interprets the "I am" of Mark 13:6 as meaning "I am the Christ" (Matt. 24:5). A comparison of these two passages will be made in the next chapter.84 As Abbott also points out, the logical way of saying "I am he" would be \(\text{ἐγώ ἐμ} \) \(\text{αῖρὸς} \) and this is exactly the way Luke states it in 24:39.85

Bernard also translates the passage as "It is I, be not afraid."86 He admits that John could have a mystical meaning but that the mystical style would be foreign to Mark, and therefore the passage in John should be translated according to its use in Mark. It may be that Mark is more mystical than it has been supposed, and Mark 13:6 may be just the verse to prove it. At this point suffice it to say that one should not deny the \(\text{ἐγώ ἐμ} \) in John 6:20 as a claim to deity just because it is found in the Synoptic Gospels in the same context.

It appears that the Evangelist wished to convey the divine implications with this statement. The disciples were afraid for their lives and only God could help them in the
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storm; their own efforts were useless. Jesus came and said: "I AM" thus "I am God; I can help you for I am greater than the storm that is raging; I AM, the Deliverer of old; the Yahweh of the Red Sea and the Jordan River." The second reason why this translation is preferable is because of the phantasm. Jesus was not saying "It is I" (and not a ghost), but I AM, (therefore I can walk on the water). It was the apparent walking on the water that frightened them, and not the appearance of Christ. By explaining the walking on the water, he quieted their fears. This he did by claiming to be the Yahweh of Deuteronomy 32:39 and Isaiah 43:10, and for that reason had no difficulty in walking on the water.

 Jesús is here quoted as saying, "... for except ye believe that I Am, ye shall die in your sins." These words sound a great deal like Isaiah 43:10: "... that ye may know, and believe, and understand that I AM; before me there was no other God, and after me there shall be none."

Abbott interprets the saying as "I (am) HE." He claims that Jesus could not have meant "I am the eternal God" for the following reasons:

(1) Christ's hearers (until they heard the words 'before Abraham') did not take I AM in that sense. Else they would have stoned Jesus at once. (2) The words are put by the Synoptists
into the mouth of any false Messiah that might say, in effect, 'I am the Deliverer.' (3) John always represents the Son as claiming to reveal the Father, but never as claiming to be the one God.87

His argument is not too difficult to answer. (1) One cannot press the sequence of events in the Fourth Gospel as Abbott does. Just because it is in the verse 59 before the attempted stoning took place, does not necessarily indicate that a great deal of time elapsed between verse 24 and verse 58. Jesus could have made the two statements close together and the Evangelist separated them for his own reasons. The writer was not interested in sequence of events as he was in the result of Jesus' teaching. The result is clearly evident in verse 59. (2) The words put into the mouth of the false Christ may mean more than "deliverer," but God in the flesh. This was the claim in Zephaniah 3:1 and is the most logical explanation of Mark 13:6. (3) His third argument could be an error as it appears that the Evangelist wanted to convey the idea that Jesus was God, and used language that would leave the impression that he was describing a theophany.

Abbott develops the idea of this ἐγώ εἰμί, (and others like it, e.g., 8:28 and 58; 13:19) as presenting the unity of God.88 This would be more than "I am the Divine Deliverer"

and less than "I am the eternal God." It seems more logical
to suppose that the Evangelist wanted to present the suprem­
acy of Christ and His claims and adopted the language of God
himself to do so.

The speech of Jesus was intended, then, to impress
upon all who heard or read the necessity of believing that
Christ was God in the flesh, or else die in their sins. To
the Evangelist, nothing short of this would suffice or present
the true picture of Christ. A person who was less could never
have accomplished what Jesus did in the lives of the believ­
ers. This was the Evangelist's Jesus of contemplation. He
perhaps was responsible for putting these particular words on
the lips of Jesus, but he was not responsible for this unique
Saviour. He had transformed too many people, his teaching
was too grand, and his life too different to be anything less
than God. For that reason, three times the Evangelist used
this ἐγώ εἰμι without the predicate to present this identical
truth: John 8:24-28; and 13:19.

The Evangelist not only used the divine phrase in these
verses, he also brought in prophecy. This latter verse is
stated: ... ἵνα πιστεύσητε ὅταν γένηται ὥστε ἐγώ εἰμι...
"... that, when it comes to pass, you may believe that I
Am." In 8:28 the Evangelist quoted Jesus as saying, ὅταν
ὑμῶν ὑπόστατε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, τοῖς
"When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I Am." This latter saying was not only one of prophecy but also connected the recognition of the import the ΕΙΩΕΙΩ sayings with the crucifixion. Perhaps the Evangelist had reference to the unnatural physical phenomena which accompanied the crucifixion, and caused the centurion to cry out: "Truly this man was Son of God." Or perhaps he had reference to the effect of the crucifixion upon the people on the Day of Pentecost. "Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly, that God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified. Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and the rest of the apostles, 'Brethren, what shall we do?'" (Acts 2:36,37.) The full import of their deed was now evident as they realized that it was the ΕΙΩΕΙΩ as well as Messiah, whom they had crucified. Or was the Evangelist thinking of the saying on the cross, "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do"? This forgiveness was reserved for God, and Jesus would be blaspheming if he were not God in the flesh. Although one may never know just how the Evangelist connected the crucifixion as a proof of the deity of Christ, the fact remains that he did and used ΕΙΩΕΙΩ to anticipate it.

One of the prerogatives of Yahweh was to foretell future
events, as passages like Ezekiel 24:24 make evident: "... when this cometh, then shall ye know that I am the Lord God."

In this passage under discussion Jesus not only claimed the prerogative of foretelling future events, but also implied in the larger context that he could have prevented it (13:27).

On two other occasions in the Fourth Gospel Jesus claimed the prerogative of prophecy: 16:4 and 14:29. "But these things have I spoken unto you, that when their hour is come, ye may remember them, how that I told you." "And now I have told you before it came to pass, that when it is come to pass, ye may believe."

Jesus therefore not only claimed the ability to foretell future events, and affect them, but the Evangelist used the divine phrase to substantiate His claim.

"Jesus said unto them, "Verily, verily I say unto you, Before Abraham was born, I Am" (John 8:58).

Some see in this passage only the timelessness and pre-existence of Christ. And surely there is a basis for this conclusion based on the Old Testament as well as on other
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writings. The contrast between the verbs ἔγνωσθαι and εἶναι is made evident in Psalm 90:2: Πρὸ τοῦ ὀργ ἔγνωσθαι... ἀπὸ τοῦ γῆς ἔως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὑπ' είναι. "Before the mountains came into being... from age to age THOU ART." Bernard also quotes from Plutarch where the time­less existence of God is contrasted with ἔγνωσθαι. 90 In 1:18 the Evangelist says: ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἐν αἰῶναῖς ὁ ἐν καλύπτει τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐξαιρετικὸς. The participle is used in the absolute sense indicating timeless existence. In Exodus 3:14 God identifies himself to Moses as ὦ ἐστιν ὁ ὅμοιος.

The ὡ ἐστιν in 8:58 would mean more than timelessness. There is a direct connection between Exodus 3:14, John 1:18, and 8:58. It would imply changelessness or uniqueness more than anything else. 91 The Evangelist was therefore ascribing divinity to Jesus as he used this expression which went back to Isaiah 46:4. As God had revealed himself in several ways in the Old Testament, including his sacred name Yahweh, he manifested himself through his Son, the ὡ ἐστιν of the New Testament.

Strachan has an interesting interpretation of this
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passage, but it seems too strained:

The saying states explicitly what is implicit in the words, 'Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden' (Matt. 11:27f.). These words are an echo of words that are put in the mouth of Wisdom (Ecclesiasticus 51:23-27). Thus Jesus implicitly claims to speak in the name of the eternal Wisdom of God, to speak as the Logos. The weary and the heavy laden are those to whom the legal and scribal interpretations of the Torah were oppressive. The Johannine words are a claim to know God's eternal purpose and to act as His representative. . . . Here 'I am' is to be interpreted in the light of Deut. 32:39; Isaiah 41:4; 43:10; 48:12. The claim in these passages is that God shares His Divine place as Mediator between God and man (1:51) with no other, not even Abraham. 92

It seems more consistent to accept the former interpretation than the latter. The listeners interpreted his sayings as a claim to deity and lost all patience with Jesus at this point. In the following verse (v. 59) they were ready to stone him, as the penalty for blasphemy. In 10:33 they admitted they were ready to stone him because he made himself God. They did not claim that he was making himself like unto, or equal with, but he made himself God. How did he make himself God? By claiming that he was the great I AM. The Evangelist had claimed a unique relationship for Jesus as the Logos in the first verse of his gospel, but here the Evangelist has Jesus claiming for himself the uniqueness and changelessness

of the Yahweh of Abraham.

\[ \text{d. Λέγει αὐτοῖς ἐγώ είμι... ἐστιν εἰπεν αὐτοῖς ἐγώ είμι, ἀπελθαν εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω καὶ ἐπέσαν Ἰακώβι} \]

"He says to them: I AM ... as therefore he said to them, I Am, they went backward, and fell to the ground" (John 18:5f.).

It is fitting that the Evangelist should close the \( ἐγώ είμι \) sayings with this scene in the garden. It not only climaxes the claims of his Jesus but shows the effect of his claim upon the soldiers.

We are conscious that the Evangelist's description of the arrest varies at this point from the Synoptic account. The Evangelist so interprets the incident and its effect, and we must grant him that privilege.

Some explanations of this arrest are not in keeping with the Gospel or with the divine claims of Christ. It could not have been just his majestic appearance;\(^3\) neither can it be satisfactorily explained as "an exaggeration into the supernatural sphere of a natural feeling of respect and compunction


which the officers may have felt in the presence of Jesus, but which, according to the Evangelist, they soon changed for one of hatred and spite;\textsuperscript{94} nor can it be translated as "they were floored." This figurative translation Bernard gives as expressing discomfiture only. He compares it to Psalm 27:2, Isaiah 8:15, and Jeremiah 46:6 where "stumbled and fell" means no more than that the enemies were "overthrown." He therefore renders the phrase in colloquial English as "they were floored."\textsuperscript{95}

It is not likely that one can explain the amazement of the officers by the ease with which they found and arrested Jesus.

It must be admitted that the scribes who were responsible for manuscript B placed no divine emphasis upon \textit{ἐγὼ ἐμ} in the garden. This manuscript has \textit{ἐγὼ ἐμ} \textit{Ἰππος}. \textit{Ἐγὼ ἐμ} would be nothing more than saying, "I am Jesus of Nazareth for whom you are searching." This is neither consistent with the Evangelist, nor with that which followed.

There is no satisfactory explanation for the action of the soldiers apart from \textit{ἐγὼ ἐμ} as a claim to deity. As


it has been pointed out in the second chapter of this thesis, the expression \( \text{ἐγώ ἐμ} \) was used by many to claim deity and to pronounce curses upon enemies. As the Evangelist records the incident, the soldiers were looking for Jesus of Nazareth. When Jesus claimed that he was very God, they were struck with fear, amazement, and awe. The soldiers had heard of the saying, no doubt, but had never before met a man who claimed to be the great "I Am." They thought they were in search of a man; they were met by a man who claimed to be God!

In 18:8, Jesus is quoted as saying the same thing in answer to their search for Jesus of Nazareth: \( \text{,None ὁ Ἐμ} \). If he were merely wanting to reveal his identity as Jesus of Nazareth, he would have answered as \( \text{he} \) has it. The Evangelist would have his readers know that they were arresting no common man when Jesus was arrested: they arrested God.

The Evangelist had been working toward this point all through his Gospel. His use of \( \text{ἐγώ ἐμ} \) was somewhat akin to his use of "hour." Other verses in the Gospel become more meaningful if this thought is kept in mind: he quoted Jesus as saying that his mission was to make known the name of God (17:6 and 26). This Jesus did through the use of \( \text{ἐγώ ἐμ} \), a sacred phrase which immediately reminded the listeners of the \text{Yahweh} of the Old Testament. The Evangelist quoted Philip
as saying, "Lord, show us the Father and it sufficeth us."

Philip correctly perceived that a revelation of God was the greatest desire of anyone. Philip was requesting a theophany such as was given to Moses in Exodus 24:9-11 and 33:18. But Philip had failed to see that his prayer had already been answered, and God was present with them. Therefore this saying in the garden was used to convince Philip, and the other disciples, that Jesus was God in the flesh.

There have been several attempts to "water down" this saying in the garden, as already indicated. Dodd admitted that he was tempted to adopt the poorly attested reading, έν ἔλθεν... ἔπεσεν. This would make it refer to Judas. Many commentators have been unable to understand why the soldiers fell. Their mistake has been in their failure to understand the ἐγώ εἰμι sayings.

The Evangelist wanted the readers to know that Jesus was God, and even the Roman soldiers recognized this fact. The garden scene, then, was the climax to the claims and recognition of Jesus. If Roman soldiers recognized him as deity, surely everyone else should.

With 18:8 is concluded the examination of the ἐγώ εἰμι sayings.

---

96 Supra, pp. 145f.

sayings in the Fourth Gospel. It was pointed out that only one ἐγώ εἶμι saying was found in the speech of man, showing a reluctance on the part of the Evangelist to use this sacred expression except from the lips of Jesus. In 22 of the remaining 23 examples this thesis has tried to show that they were claims of deity. The one exception was 4:26 and even this one had a great deal to suggest that it, too, was a divine claim. With the participle, in The Similitudes, and without a predicate, the same result was noted: the Evangelist used the divine phrase in connection with the life of Jesus to present him as the Yahweh of the New Covenant.

It was suggested that the Evangelist's Jesus was the one of contemplation. After years of study the writer has given this teaching in his own words, and the shape and color which it had assumed through long reflection upon its contents and meaning. He had not only studied Jesus, but had studied the change that had been wrought in the lives of the believers. He could not understand that change apart from the personality of God perfecting it. And although the Jesus of history is the same Jesus today, the Jesus of today cannot be known apart from the Jesus of history. These two must never be separated.

These ἐγώ εἶμι sayings were well arranged and worked toward a climax. The apostles recognized the claim as Jesus
was walking upon the water; the Jews tried to stone him for blasphemy when he argued with them, claimed divine prerogatives, and called himself the great \( \equiv \neq \equiv \); but the Evangelist closed by showing that even the Roman soldiers recognized Jesus for what he was, God in the flesh, when Jesus told them that he was the great \( \equiv \neq \equiv \).

It is now necessary to look at some other examples in the New Testament which present this same truth.
CHAPTER V

EXAMPLES OF ΕΤΟ ΕΙΜΙ ELSEWHERE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT
CHAPTER V

EXAMPLES OF ΕΙΣ ΕΙΜΙ ELSEWHERE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

It appears necessary to look briefly at the use of ΕΙΣ ΕΙΜΙ elsewhere in the New Testament, and see if it has the claim of deity in the other books, and by other New Testament writers. If it developed through the centuries to have such a significance,¹ one would expect to find it all through the New Testament.

I. ΕΙΣ ΕΙΜΙ IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

ΕΙΣ ΕΙΜΙ is found 12 times in the Synoptic Gospels in connection with the seven events:

The announcement of Gabriel (Luke 1:19).
The walking on the water (Matt. 14:27 and Mark 6:50).
The coming of the false messiahs (Matt. 24:5; Mark 13:6; and Luke 21:8).
The question concerning the betrayal (Matt. 26:22, 25).
The statement during the trial (Mark 14:62 and Luke 22:70).

These seven examples can best be understood by classifying them and briefly interpreting the sayings within the classification.

1. ΕΙΣ ΕΙΜΙ in Sayings of Men

There are two examples of ΕΙΣ ΕΙΜΙ used in the Synoptic

¹Supra, pp. 20ff.
Gospels in the speeches of men. The first is found in Luke 1:19 when Gabriel identifies himself by saying: ἔγω εἶμι ἡμᾶς... This usage has already been discussed in connection with John 9:9.\(^2\) It was an emphatic way of self-identification and is found quite frequently in the Septuagint in this way. (e.g., Gen. 45:3: ἔγω εἶμι Ἰσαὰκ).

The second example of ἔγω εἶμι in the sayings of men is found twice: Matthew 26:22, 25. In verse 22, the disciples ask Jesus, μήτι ἔγω εἶμι, Κυρίε; in verse 25, Judas asks the same question. It is the use of ἔγω εἶμι in a question of identification. It is a device that is used to make the question more exact. The negative particle is used both times to indicate that all were sure they would not be guilty of this treachery.

2. ἔγω εἶμι in the Speeches of Christ.

There are five examples in the Synoptic Gospels of ἔγω εἶμι in the sayings of Jesus:

(1) The Phantasm Speaks

The first example is in connection with the walking on the water, and is found in Matthew 14:27 and Mark 6:50.

Bernard, among others, discredits the sacred use of ἔγω εἶμι in John 6:20 on the basis of this Synoptic account.

\(^2\)Supra, p.87.
A better explanation is that the ἐγὼ εἰμί is used here as a claim of deity, and the reader is referred to the study of John 6:20 for the evidence. ³

(2) The quotation of Exodus 3:6

The second use is found in Matthew 22:32, which is a quotation of Exodus 3:6: ἐγὼ εἰμί Ο Ἕλεόσαννα Ἀμάμ...

There is no question but that the account in Exodus is a claim of deity and Jesus merely quotes from the account.

(3) The coming of the false messiahs

The next use of ἐγὼ εἰμί has been used by many to discredit the sacred use of ἐγὼ εἰμί. It is found in Matthew 24:5; Mark 13:6; and Luke 21:8. The great difference is this: Mark quotes Jesus as saying: "Many shall come in my name saying, 'I am,' and shall deceive many." Luke quotes Jesus as saying: "Many shall come in my name saying 'I am,' and 'the time is at hand.'" But Matthew interprets Jesus as saying: "Many shall come in my name saying, 'I am the Messiah,' and shall deceive many."

Did Matthew correct Mark at this point? Did he correctly interpret the meaning of ἐγὼ εἰμί? Or did he do an injustice to Jesus' use of ἐγὼ εἰμί? Morgan⁴, Barnes⁵, and

---

³Supra, pp. 136 ff.


Broadus\(^6\) say that Matthew gives the true meaning of \(\epsilon\gamma\omega\epsilon\imath\iota\iota\iota\) as he adds \(\delta\ \chi\alpha\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\omicron\sigma\). William Manson has gone a long way in solving the problem as he maintains that Matthew misunderstood the significance of \(\epsilon\gamma\omega\epsilon\imath\iota\iota\iota\), instead of understood it.\(^7\)

According to Manson the \(\epsilon\gamma\omega\epsilon\imath\iota\iota\iota\) is that of the Messianic Presence, and means, "the Christ is come, the Parousia has arrived!" The \(\epsilon\gamma\omega\epsilon\imath\iota\iota\iota\) would, then, suggest the supernatural manifestation of God in Christ. He shows the similarity existing between II Thessalonians, the second chapter, and Mark 13. The Pauline expression "the Day of the Lord" and the \(\epsilon\gamma\omega\epsilon\imath\iota\iota\iota\) would be identical.

This seems to be the most logical conclusion. It is not a prophecy about the coming of impostors and pretenders, such as Theudas and Judas the Galilean. These men did not come "in the name" of Christ. They were not Christian false Messiahs. A Christian could not say that he himself was the Messiah--the two thoughts would be self-contradictory. Therefore these who make the false statement do not make claims


for themselves, but they claim that Jesus has returned, the

The people were eagerly awaiting the Parousia. It was their great thought of encouragement in the midst of adverse conditions. They were susceptible to going overboard at the slightest indication that Christ had returned, therefore the warning. But instead of Mark putting the idea in the third person, he used the phrase that had been connected with the self-manifestation of God. He used the ἐγώ εἰμί. Many would come and say, "Christ is come," the ἐγώ εἰμί is here, God is manifested in the flesh again before our eyes!"

(4) The statement during the trial

The use of ἐγώ εἰμί during the trial is another use in a claim of deity. It is found in Mark 14:62 and Luke 22:70. As Mark has it, the question was asked Jesus if he were the Messiah, to which he answered by saying, "I Am" (ἐγώ εἰμί); and you shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of Power, and coming with the clouds of heaven" (Mark 14:62). As Luke records it, the question was asked Jesus if he were the Son of God. To this question Jesus answered, οὐκ εἶπα λέγειν οτι ἐγώ εἰμι, "Ye say that I am." It is evident that Jesus' accusers interpreted this ἐγώ εἰμί in a divine sense because they immediately accuse him of blasphemy. Jesus is quoted here as saying more than just "I am he," for we look
at that use next. One would expect ἐγώ εἰμι αὐτός, but Jesus doesn't say that here. He is saying, "I am not just the Messiah: I am not just the Son of God; I am the unmentionable Sacred Name, the Tetragrammaton, the great I AM."

(5) The resurrection appearance

The last passage is Luke 24:39 and was mentioned in the preceding paragraph. Jesus was trying to convince the disciples that he was the same Jesus and says: "See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself." The Greek has it: . . . . ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι αὐτός. It is the reflexive use of αὐτός. There would be no claim of deity in this passage.

It appears that ἐγώ εἰμι as used in the Synoptic Gospels has just a small carry-over from its use in the Septuagint and in Greek writings. As Jesus walks upon the water he is quoted as using ἐγώ εἰμι, and it seems in its divine sense; as he foretells the coming of the false messiahs he is quoted as saying they would call themselves ἐγώ εἰμι, again in a divine sense; when he is interrogated, he speaks of himself as the ἐγώ εἰμι. The other examples in the Gospels have no special meaning. This naturally suggests what has been noted before: ἐγώ εἰμι originally had the meaning of deity, but it degenerated in meaning until some saw no special sense in it; others used it sometimes for God, but also used it at times in the speeches of men; and still others reserved it for God.
almost altogether. The Fourth Evangelist comes in this latter category.

II. THE USE OF ἐγώ εἰμι IN THE BOOK OF ACTS

ἐγώ εἰμι is found seven times in the book of Acts: 9:5, 10:21, 18:9, 22:3 and 8, 26:15 and 29. Three of these, 9:5, 22:8, and 26:15 are in Paul’s conversion experience. Manson interprets the phrase in its Messianic sense in these three examples. But it seems that Luke used it, with one exception, as a means of identification: Jesus identifies himself to Saul as ἐγώ εἰμι Ἰησοῦς ὦ σὺ δίκαιος. In 22:9 ὁ Ἰωάννης is added to Ἰησοῦς. It is doubtful that a great deal of emphasis can be placed on this use in the book of Acts. In 10:21 Peter identifies himself by saying, Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ πρεσβύτερός σου. One immediately sees the similarity between this passage and the previous three. In 22:3 Paul begins his defense by saying, Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ πρεσβύτερος τούτων. In 26:29 he says, "I would to God, that whether with little or with much, not thou only, but also all that hear me this day, might become such as I am (γενέσθαι τοῖς ὅποιοι καὶ ἐγώ εἰμι), except these bonds."

In 18:9 Paul is encouraged by God as He says to Paul

8Ibid., p. 144.
in a vision: διότι εἶμι εἰμὶ κέτοις... This certainly reminds one of the use in the Septuagint as God used such language to impress the people with his personality.9

Luke could have been somewhat affected by the emphasis placed upon the use of εἰμὶ εἰμὶ as a claim to deity, for he seemed to use it rather sparingly. Only twice in his account of the defenses of Paul did he quote Paul as using it in reference to himself, but he used both εἰμὶ and εἰμὶ separately in them. He seemed to prefer not to use it. But as stated above, it is not likely that Luke intended to stress the εἰμὶ εἰμὶ sayings as divine when he did use them.

III. THE USE OF ΕΤΩ ΕΙΜΙ IN THE APOCALYPSE

The use of εἰμὶ εἰμὶ in the Apocalypse is quite prominent and akin to its use in the Fourth Gospel. There certainly is a strong similarity in the use of εἰμὶ εἰμὶ in the two books.

There are four examples of εἰμὶ εἰμὶ in the Apocalypse, three in the words of Jesus: Revelation 1:17, 2:23, and 22:16. These are certainly claims of deity and have an Old Testament background. The other example (1:8) has God as the speaker and heightens the use of εἰμὶ εἰμὶ elsewhere.

In Revelation 1:8 God is quoted as saying, εἰμὶ εἰμὶ τὸ

9Supra, p. 64
In Revelation 22:13 the \textit{ἐξῆ} is omitted when the same claim is made for Jesus. In Revelation 1:17 Jesus is quoted as saying, \textit{ἐγώ ἐμή ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ἐστὶν ἔστιν.}

There are several passages in the Septuagint which have similar claims for \textit{Yahweh}: \textit{ἐγὼ θεὸς πρῶτος καὶ εἰς τὰ ἐπερχόμενα...} “I \textit{Yahweh}, the first, and with the last I Am.” (Isaiah 41:4); \textit{ἐγὼ ἐμή πρῶτος καὶ ἐγὼ ἐμὴ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα}, “I am first and I am forever” (Isaiah 48:12); \textit{ἐγὼ πρῶτος καὶ ἐγὼ μετὰ τῶν, I am first, and I am hereafter” (Isaiah 44:6). There isn’t much question but that the author of the Apocalypse placed \textit{ἐγὼ ἐμή} in 1:17 on the lips of Jesus to emphasize his claim of the deity of Christ. He made the same claim for Christ that he did for God in 1:8.

In Revelation 2:23 the writer quotes Jesus as saying, \textit{ἐγὼ ἐμή ὁ ἐραυνῶν νεφροὺς καὶ καρδίας, “... and all the churches shall know that I am he that searches the reins and hearts.”} This, no doubt, has its Old Testament background in Jeremiah 11:20 and 17:10. In both of these verses \textit{Yahweh} is the one who tries the hearts of men. The writer of the Apocalypse ascribes this power now to Jesus and connects it with an \textit{ἐγὼ ἐμή} saying.

This verse is also connected with such verses as Exodus 7:5, when God says, \textit{γνῶσται πάσαι οἱ Αἰγυπτιοί ὅτι}
"All the Egyptians shall know that I am the Lord," and with Psalm 7:9: ἐστιν κύριός καὶ νεφέως ὁ Θεός, "O God that searcheth the hearts and reins." Yahweh, in this verse, is known for his omniscience and judgment. He even made himself known to the Egyptians. The author of the Apocalypse ascribes these same prerogatives to Jesus. Heathen Rome, and all who resist Christ, shall know him who sees all, and therefore knows all.

The other ἐγώ εἰμι saying is 22:16: ἐγώ εἰμι καὶ ρίζα καὶ τὸ γένος Δαβίδ, . . . . "I am the root and the offspring of David." Although no Old Testament passage has this saying, there are many passages in the Old Testament that suggest this idea, e.g., Isaiah 11:1 and 10; 53:2; 60:3. The writer here ascribes these words to Jesus to present him as deity. The ἐγώ εἰμι is definitely used to promote Jesus as the Yahweh of the Old Testament.

There seems to be an attempt to make identical Jesus, Messiah, and Yahweh: "the root and the offspring of David" would immediately suggest the Messiah; the ἐγώ εἰμι would remind them of Yahweh; "the Alpha and the Omega" of 22:13, which is ascribed to Christ, would naturally be related to 1:8, where God is identified with this expression. This is clearly an attempt on the part of the writer to identify Christ with God.
The writer of the Apocalypse is surely akin to the Fourth Evangelist in his use of ἐγώ εἰμι. He purposely uses it as a means of equating Christ with God.

The ἐγώ εἰμι sayings, then, are found in other places in the New Testament to present Jesus as Yahweh manifested. They are probably the result of the interpretation of the writers' conception of Jesus, but the fact remains they are intended to convey the idea that Jesus was God in the flesh.

This idea is not altogether inconsistent with the New Testament as a few passages can be found elsewhere that seem to indicate the same truth. These passages are controversial, but it does appear they teach this truth. Such passages are: I Timothy 1:1, where God is called Saviour; in Hebrews 1:8, where it is said of the Son, "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever"; in Romans 9:5, Paul says, "... of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh, who is over all, God blessed forever."

It is not in the scope of this thesis to develop this idea, or defend the various interpretations of them. It is left for others to discuss such passages.
CONCLUSION
CONCLUSION

The phrase which was found so frequently in the Septuagint in the claims of Yahweh became a ready vehicle to accomplish the design of the Evangelist: to present Jesus as God. This he did through this epiphany or theophany. The following conclusions can be drawn.

The phrase was a phrase that was reserved for ancient deities in its beginning. The god who had this phrase placed upon his lips used it to magnify his position, and to pronounce curses upon his enemies. It seems to have been absent from those writings that made no divine claims.

People of other languages copied the idea and translated it into their own vernacular to exalt their own gods. It degenerated when it was used in a magical way to pronounce charms and curses. Its use cannot be limited to any one group of people--its use was widespread.

The Evangelist used the phrase, for the most part, in its original sense as a claim to deity. In many cases he not only used the phrase, but other Old Testament words with it, to make the claims of Jesus more divine. He may have been responsible for putting the words on the lips of Jesus, and showed the effect of this idea upon the people. These statements were shocking to the people because of the divine implications. These listeners were acquainted with the
solemnity of these claims of Yahweh in the Septuagint, and 
resented the use of ἔρως εἰλικρίνη by Jesus. It was blasphemy to 

The use of ἔρως εἰλικρίνη by the Evangelist was one of deep 
contemplation. After thinking of the life of Jesus and his 
effect upon all believers, he came to this conclusion: Jesus 
was God. No one else could have accomplished what He did 
in men. This same Jesus was capable of transforming all others, 
if the historical Jesus was not lost in the Jesus of experi-
ence. He wished to make inseparable the Jesus of history 
and the Jesus of experience. Jesus was therefore presented 
as deity through the use of ἔρως εἰλικρίνη.

ἔρως εἰλικρίνη was in a state of degeneration during the 
First Century A.D., and for that reason the other writers 
did not usually use it in any special sense. Mark and the 
writer of the Apocalypse did, but the other writers did not 
stress its divine claims.

After the close of the first century, it seemingly 
lost all significance except for the Mandaean scriptures where 
it was revived for a purpose: to make divine claims for their 
own scriptures. But for the most part it was dropped from 
the religious vocabulary because of its misuse.

The use of ἔρως εἰλικρίνη therefore must not be studied in 
the light of its use at a later time, as Eduard Schweizer
did in connection with the Mandaean scriptures, but must be studied in its usage in earlier times. The Evangelist used it as it had been used through many centuries, and especially in the Septuagint: to equate Jesus with **Yahweh** in the Old Testament.

There is no question but that **εἰμὶ ὁ θεός** is one of the keys to unlock some of the mysteries of the Fourth Gospel. Not only will one understand the Gospel better, but he will also have a deeper conception of Jesus. There was nothing ordinary about the Jesus of the Fourth Gospel: his miracles were greater, his teachings were more profound, and his claims were greater. One of his greatest claims was his claim of identity with **Yahweh** of the Old Testament. This he did through the use of **ἐγώ εἰμι**.

**Ἐγώ εἰμι** had become identified with **Yahweh** in the mind of the people as they read from the Septuagint. Especially as they read from Deutero-Isaiah and Ezekiel did **Ἐγώ εἰμι** become indelibly associated with the self-manifestation of God through his new name.

The Evangelist realized this, and used the phrase as a self-manifestation of God in connection with Jesus. God had disclosed himself through a name in the Old Testament, and in the New Testament he had disclosed himself through his Son. The Evangelist brought the two ideas together as
Jesus the Son spoke the phrase reserved for God. In this sense, Jesus was a double manifestation: a manifestation of God through his presence and through his name.

The Fourth Gospel also shows the effect of this declaration by Jesus. It angered some until they were ready to kill him; it disgusted some until they no longer walked with him; it impressed some until they knew that Jesus was the Son of God; it frightened some to the extent that they fell flat on the ground. But the fact that the phrase did not affect all alike did not imply that it was an enigma; it implied that all did not wish to accept the divine claims of Jesus. This was also true of God's manifestations in the Old Testament.

It must be admitted from the study of εἰμί εἰμί in the Fourth Gospel that Jesus was deity, he knew he was deity, he revealed his deity, and the Evangelist understood his claim. He was, to the Evangelist, the great "I AM."
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APPENDIX

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

AND

THE MANDAEAN SCRIPTURES

In recent times the \( \text{\textit{\textexclam}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textexclam}} \) sayings of John have been discussed in connection with the Mandaean religion. Especially has Eduard Schweizer\(^1\) developed this idea and his theory must either be accepted or disproved. There are many similarities between John's gospel and the Mandaean scriptures including the \( \text{\textit{\textexclam}} \) \( \text{\textit{\textexclam}} \) sayings. It seems imperative to discuss this possibility. It seems that Burkitt was right when he said that the Mandaean theory was advanced because scholars were not satisfied with the interpretation of John.\(^2\)

The Mandaeans are the only surviving Gnostic sect.\(^3\) They are located in present Iraq or in the lower valley between the Tigris and Euphrates rivers. Because of the frequent ablutions in their religion, it is necessary they be near a flowing river.

They are called "Subbis" or "baptizers." Their sacred book is called "Ginza" or "The

\(^1\)Eduard Schweizer, \textit{EGO EIMI}, (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1939).


\(^3\)Ibid., p. 100.
Treasure." They also have the "Book of John" and a sort of hymn-book called Qolasta. The Ginza is divided into two parts, that concerned with the Living and that concerned with the Dead. These two books are always bound together, so that each begins the book, but from opposite ends, meeting in the middle; the one part is upside down to the other. . . . The two parts are known respectively as the Right and the Left Ginza.

The Roman Catholic missionaries first met these Mandaeans in the 17th century and erroneously named them 'Christians of St. John.' Although this theory is abandoned today, it survives in altered form, and there are still those who regard the Mandaeans as the survivors of a Palestinian sect. 4

Schweizer believes that the gospel of John and Mandaeism have a common source. At one point he says:

Not only in this last case but throughout the first part of our book we have constantly had to refer to the Mandaean scriptures. In fact, it appears that there we do not only find an explanation for the termius of our metaphorical language but also for the terms in St. John in general, and that this relationship can be traced even in the smallest stylistic peculiarities: the tendency of St. John to use the words at the end of one sentence to start the next one by just reversing them, (e.g., John 18:36, 3:32) is a typical characteristic of the Mandaean literature and cannot be explained differently. 5

I. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANDAEISM AND JUDAISM

If the Fourth Gospel and the Mandaean religion have a common source would it not stand to reason that the Mandaean

4 Ibid., p. 100f.  5 Schweizer, op. cit., pp. 44f.
scriptures would show an affinity for Judaism? It surely would, and Schweizer is confident that the affinity is evi­
dent. 6 But Pallis is in direct disagreement with Schweizer at this point and has developed a strong case showing that there is no important connection between Judaism and the Man­
daean scriptures. 7 He says:

The cosmology, world-process, the baptism, the doctrines of the journey after death, and of the inhabitation of the planets by demons, all these things pointed toward an influence from the Persian religion or Gnosticism. On the other hand, no single point showed affinity with Judaism. 8

He goes so far as to say that Judaism and Mandaeism do not agree at any important point. 9

In a careful study of the writings, it is noticeable that the so-called Judaistic influence is found in the late tractates. These tractates also show knowledge of the New Testament, so the logical supposition is that the Old Testament tales were introduced through Christianity. 10

It is noticeable that the Mandaeans made no distinc­tion between the Jews and the Christians. This is easily understood if we accept the fact that the holy book of the

6Ibid., p. 62.
8Ibid., p. 115. 9Ibid., p. 116. 10Ibid., p. 117.
Christians was the Old Testament. In the later writings, the Mandaeans discovered that the Jews and Christians were two different (creeds), and even mentioned such things as Pilate, Nazareth, the formulae of the Christian Trinity, and of baptism.

One of the most obvious proofs that the Mandaeans' knowledge of Christianity came indirectly is the confused rendering of some of the narratives. They confused Abraham with Moses and say Abraham was on Mount Sinai. They confused Jacob's ladder with the ascension of Christ. They also confused the dome of the priests with the temple in Jerusalem.

Burkitt proves that the knowledge of the Old Testament that the Mandaeans had did not come from a Jewish source but from the Peshitta, the Syriac version of the Bible current in the Mesopotamian churches. He says:

It is true that Eshu Mshiha (Jesus Christ) is a false prophet, who is also Nbu, i.e., Nebo-Hermes, the planet Mercury. His mother is Ruha d' Kudsha (the Holy Spirit), an evil demon who is also Dlibat, the planet Venus. A little investigation makes it quite clear that Mandaean hostility to Eshu Mshiha is hostility to the fully developed post-Nicene Church. In several places 'Christ' is actually called 'the Byzantine' (Rumaya), and further we are told that the disciples of this Christ become 'Christians' (Kristiani), and turn into monks and nuns who have no

---

11 Ibid., p. 141. 12 Ibid., p. 142.
children and who keep fasts and never wear white clothes like the Mandaeans. In a word it is not the Christ of the Gospels, but the Christ of a fully developed ecclesiastical organization and policy to which Mandaeism is so hostile.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 107f.}

We can readily see why the Mandaeans would be violently opposed to celibacy, as they were not only permitted to marry, but were commanded to do so.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 112f.}

On the basis of the previous considerations we may infer, then, that on no important point has there been any direct connection between Mandaeism and Judaism.

If the Fourth Gospel and Mandaeism do not have a common source, the source must be found elsewhere. It will be necessary to study three sources which are found in the Mandaean scriptures and not found in John's Gospel.

II. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANDAEISM AND BABYLONIAN RELIGIONS

In a study of the Babylonian religion is found the basis for some of the Mandaean teachings. This is, of course, not surprising if it is admitted that the Mandaeans developed in the Mesopotamia region and not in the Mediterranean region.

Certain similarities are noticed and certainly some Mandaean conceptions were derived from late Babylonian religious
customs, especially from the Istar cult.\textsuperscript{17} The Mandaeans became acquainted with the Babylonian study of the planets and many texts bear evidence that they become acquainted with the popular form of it, viz., astrology, and not with astronomy.\textsuperscript{18}

The use of the numbers 3, 5, and 12 in Mandaeism seems to have a Babylonian origin, but the ideas with which they were connected prove unmistakably that the Mandaeans did not take over these ideas directly from Babylon; Gnosticism was the intermediate link.\textsuperscript{19}

The Mandaean names of the planets were taken from the late Babylonian forms and not from the ancient ones. This is obvious after making the following observations.

1. The spelling in the Mandaean writings makes it obvious that words were used without being understood.

2. Nirigal became Nirig because al was pronounced el and then discarded because el was only affixed to the names of the friendly deities.

3. Bil especially points to a late period, for in the late Babylonian period Marduk's name is Belu.\textsuperscript{20}

The Babylonian influence can be seen in the Mandaean

\textsuperscript{17}Pallis, op. cit., p. 17. \textsuperscript{18}Ibid., pp. 19f. \textsuperscript{19}Ibid., pp. 32f. \textsuperscript{20}Ibid., pp. 33-37.
conception of the abode of the god in the North. Although this concept is present in Islam, it has analogies to the Babylonian concept.21

The relationship between the Babylonians and Mandaeans in primeval revelation and baptism is small indeed.

Pallis has the following to say about the relationship of the Mandaeans and Babylonians in connection with baptism:

The only resemblances are the facts that the Babylonians as well as the Mandaean religion were acquainted with the use of water to remove evil spirits and the pronouncing of certain names of deities to give the water more power. These points of resemblance, however, prove nothing, for practically all people know the power of water: the Greeks among whom especially the ablutions of the Orphics in fresh water are worth noting, the Persians, the Hebrews, the Elkesaites, and the other Semites. In short this phenomenon occurs so frequently in the different religions that the comparison with Babylonia has no value at all.22

III. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANDAEISM AND PERSIAN RELIGION

The relationship between the Persian religion and Mandaeism is much more striking.

In the Mandaean writings, the planets were regarded as evil beings, and this conception was originally derived from Persia.23

---

21 Ibid., pp. 37-40. 22 Ibid., p. 46. 23 Ibid., p. 51.
In the Mandaean account of the war between the beings of Light and darkness depends in all details on the Persian account, and this fact is especially corroborated by the Mandaean conception of the planets as evil powers. On the other hand the names of the beings of darkness have come from an entirely different source; Ruha and Ur are proofs of the antagonism between Mandaeism and Christianity, while their children, 'the seven,' are derived from the Persian religion. 24

The Mandaean conception of the world as a conflict, the world's destruction by fire, and the total victory over all that is evil are concepts which are absolutely identical with the Persian conception of the course of the world. 25

Schweizer tries to make a strong case in the use of "light" in attempting to prove a common source for both John and the Mandaean scriptures. 26

The thing he has overlooked is that the "light" idea in Mandaeism is from the Persian religion. Again quoting Pallis:

The very name 'King of Light' suggests Zervan who, as we saw, was connected with 'the light' raoca in Parsism. Here it is useless to mention ἄσ and its contrast οίνα in the gospel of St. John as parallel, for ἄσ was introduced from Gnosticism; the word 'light' is only used of the supreme deity in the Persian Zervan doctrine and the Gnostic systems dependent thereon, mentioned above. Consequently there is every reason to

ascribe the Mandaean use of the term 'King of Light' to the same source, especially as we have just seen proofs that the Mandaeans knew and adhered to the Zervan doctrine.27

In the Mandaean literature in the account of creation, it is related how everything created was created from "fire and water." This doctrine which teaches that fire and water are the fundamental elements from which everything else was created is found in Ulemia Islam. It is not to be argued, then, that this Mandaean teaching has its origin in this Persian concept.28

There are other corresponding teachings in these two religions.

Lamentations for the dead were prohibited in the Mandaean writings, and death was to be accompanied by feasting and merriment. To break this command would cancel all the good deeds of the deceased. In the Persian text Sad Dar lamentations over the dead were prohibited.29 In all fairness to the Mandaeans, it must be remembered that this inhibition became strong not because of the Persian influence, but because of the Gnostic teaching that the body was evil, thus death became a means of deliverance.

The Persian religion placed a great emphasis upon good

27 Pallis, op. cit., pp. 72f.
28 Ibid., p. 74. 29 Ibid., p. 75.
works as a means of salvation, and the Mandaeans seemed to have derived a late teaching concerning the value of good deeds from the Persians.\textsuperscript{30}

The influence of Persian theology is certainly seen in the late Mandaean teaching concerning the final judgment. The general ancient belief was that the soul was judged immediately after death. But this was not true in the Persian religion as it taught there was a final great day of judgment. This gave rise to the compromise doctrine of the intermediate state as seen in the book of Enoch and in the Apocalypse. The early Mandaean conception of judgment was that it was immediately after death. But this doctrine seems to have been modified, too, in time, as a result of Persian theology.\textsuperscript{31}

And yet one must not overlook the fact that the late Mandaean writings were also affected by Christianity. It can be said that the doctrines of a judgment on the last day, of the intermediate state, and of purgatory as taught in the late Mandaean scriptures, reached the Mandaeans indirectly, through the channel of Christianity, from the Persian religion.\textsuperscript{32}

Schweizer sees a common ancient source for "water of life" in both John and Mandaism.\textsuperscript{33} A better source for this

\textsuperscript{30}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 77-85. \textsuperscript{31}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 89.

\textsuperscript{32}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 92. \textsuperscript{33}Schweizer, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 63.
"living water" in Mandaeism is the Persian religion. In the Persian religion there is the conception of the celestial ocean and in Mandaeism it is seen as "the waters of Life." 34

There is one striking difference between the Mandaean and Persian systems. In Persian theology, as well as in Judaism, is found the teaching of the resurrection of the body and ἀπὸ καρδιῶν where the righteous shall live eternally, enjoying all the material comforts. This is not true in Mandaeism as the body is looked upon with contempt. Whereas the Persians believed that man's supreme bliss consisted in avoiding the separation of the soul from the body, the Mandaeans felt that death was the deliverance of the soul from the body. This difference is readily recognized as the result of Gnosticism upon Mandaeism. 35

IV. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANDAEISM AND Gnosticism

There is one other source of Mandaeism which must be looked at in some detail, although it has already been mentioned several times. This source is Gnosticism. The relationship between Gnosticism and Mandaeism is too striking to be accidental.

34Pallis, op. cit., p. 86
35Ibid., pp. 68f.
The cosmological dualism is common to nearly all Gnostic systems and it greatly affects all their other doctrines. The anthropological dualism has already been noted somewhat in connection with the Persian religion. There is no doubt that the cosmological dualism of Gnosticism is due to the Persian belief, and there is no way of knowing whether this dualism came to Mandaeism directly from Parsism or indirectly through Gnosticism.\textsuperscript{36} We are on sure grounds when we notice again and again in the Mandaean scriptures the anthropological dualism. This diametrical contrast between soul and body, and the dogma that the soul is only \textit{σπυρ Θεος} from the Realm of Light, which has been inclosed in the \textit{σύμα} is pure Gnosticism.\textsuperscript{37}

Although one cannot claim Gnosticism as the source of the Mandaean repeated baptisms, it surely has no affinity with John. John seems to minimize the importance of baptism unless the sacramental interpretation of John 3:4-6, 13:1-10, and 19:34 is accepted.\textsuperscript{38} It seems that the emphasis placed upon baptism in Mandaeism is quite inconsistent with John. According to Epiphanius, the Marcionites permitted a second and third baptism.\textsuperscript{39} This could be the basis for the baptisms

\textsuperscript{36}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 156. \hspace{1cm} \textsuperscript{37}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 151.

\textsuperscript{38}\textit{Supra}, p. 94. \hspace{1cm} \textsuperscript{39}\textit{Burkitt}, op. cit., p. 113.
Central in the Mandaean religion is the doctrine of the enlightened soul after its separation from the body. It makes its way through the "custodies" (Mattartas), i.e., guarded frontiers, which only those provided with the seal acquired in baptism can pass. Above each other tower the seven Mattartas and in front of each stands a demon trying to capture the soul, that he may never reach the lost land, but must remain there forever, tortured and yearning. These demiurgic beings are unlike in name and in function from anything known elsewhere. These may be of Mesopotamian origin. Burkitt says:

No one has yet suggested a really satisfactory derivation for 'Abatur' and 'Ptahil,' who occupy somewhat the same place in the Mandaean system (or rather systems) as Jaldabaoth does in some Western Gnostic systems.40

Those who are successful in their fight against the evil powers become identified with the deity and feel the thrill of being made one with the universe. Their souls being redeemed are carried to the Realm of Light. This Mandaean teaching is like true Gnosticism in the complete reunion with their divine source.41

In later Mandaeism the soul is clad in raiments of Light before the ascent, and the Mattartas are not mentioned.

40Ibid., p. 115. 41Pallis, op. cit., p. 176
These Mattartas have been replaced because of the influence of Christianity, which taught that the wicked go to hell. Therefore the good ascend unimpeded to the Realm of Light, clad in garments of splendour. 42

Pallis traces three strata in the study of Mandaeism:
The ancient stratum has the myth of the fall of Primal Man.
The second stratum replaces the ancient proper nouns by abstract or compounds.
The third stratum contains an affinity between Mandaeism and other Gnostic sects. Especially was Satornilia Gnosis helpful in paving the way for the influence of Christianity. The Mandaeans rejected Christianity very strongly at first, but later assimilated much of Christianity into their doctrine because of the close relation of Mandaeism to Islam. Yet this gradual approach to Christianity through the Satornilia Gnosis did not proceed smoothly. After much strife, Mandaeism resulted in a combination of Mythology, Gnosticism, Islam, and Christianity.

The problem of origin is well summarized by Burkitt:

We have now in the Scholion of Theodore bar Konai, an account of the Mandaeans by an ancient Mesopotamian writer, writing in the year 792. He

42 Ibid., p. 177. 43 Ibid., pp. 204, 205.
tells us that their founder was a certain Ado, a mendicant, who came from Adiabene, i.e., from the district just north of Monsul. He further tells us that his teaching was derived from the Marcionites, the Manichaeans, and from the "Kanteans." These latter are only known from Theodore himself. . . . There is no reason for rejecting the evidence of Theodore bar Konai. He was writing about a century after the Ginza had been compiled for the Ginza (G.R. 387) expects the end of Arab dominion after 71 years, i.e., a little after 700 A.D. But of course the matter does not end here. It is important to consider how much his evidence comes to.

There is a great deal in the Mandaean literature that recalls Marcionite and Manichaean teaching, especially as set forth in the polemics of S. Ephraim against these religions. Who were the "Kanteans" or "Knathaye"? Our authority, Theodore, gives a clearly fantastic account of them, asserting that they were Babylonian descendants of Philistine priests of Dagon. I think we may judge from this that they were not recognizably a Christian or Jewish sect, and this corresponds with the fact that there is in the Mandaean mythology a large element which is neither Biblical nor Christian, e.g., that connected with Ptahil and Abatur. We may therefore paraphrase Theodore's account of the Mandaenians by saying that this religion is a mixture of Christian and non-Christian elements being mostly derived from Marcionite and Manichaean sources. 43

The Mandaenians, then, rejected the Christ of the Catholic Church, born of a woman and crucified, but they accepted the stranger who appeared in Jerusalem in the days of Pilate, who healed the sick and taught the true and life-giving doctrine, and who ascended in due course when his work was done to his own place in the world of Light. This Personage is called the Stranger, but he is no stranger to the modern student of Christian antiquity. It is clearly the Manichaeen Jesus, a personage adopted

43Burkitt, op. cit., pp. 102f.
by Mani from Jesus of Marcion. 44

Burkitt maintains that Anush-uthra is the Marcionite Jesus. (Anush-uthra divided means: "uthra" is interpreted "wealth" or "treasure" or "good spirit" to the Mandaeans; Anush equals Enosh of the Old Testament which equals "man." Thus both words mean "Saint Homo" or "Son of man." At least Burkitt thinks there may be this comparison.) 45

But as for what may be called more particularly the "Gnostic" part of the Mandaean theology, the doctrine that the human soul is imprisoned in an alien, non-redeemable body, from which it escapes at death but even then cannot win its way to its true home outside the spheres which encompass this world, save only if it has assimilated the true knowledge during this life, this also can be traced to the Euphrates Valley in ancient Christian circles, for it is the doctrine of Bardaisan. Bardaisan was a philosopher, a man of culture and science, as such things were understood in his days, with some astronomical knowledge of his own. So far as his ideas have been transmitted to us, he does not speak of monstrous genii with fantastic forms and names, but of Fate and Free-will, of the Planets, of the Heavenly Powers on the right or the left. What may be called the fairy-tale element is absent. But his mythology does speak of souls hindered at the crossing, and kept in seven Limbos (Ma'One) which correspond in function at least to the Mandaean celestial prisons (Mattartas). Moreover Madd'a, the Syriac word from which Manda is actually derived, was the name Bardaisan used for the Divine Reason or Gnosis that dwells in man. 46

In any case, what we know of Bardaisan's cosmogony is enough to show analogies with the substructure underlying the fantastic and complicated fairy-

tales. The important thing is, that Bardaisan belongs to the region of the Euphrates Valley. We need not go to the sects described by Irenaeus and Hippolytus and Epiphanius for analogies to Mandaeism. The Mandaeans lived in Babylonia. Their sacred writings were compiled some 70 years after the coming of Islam, i.e., not before 700 A.D. Their founder, that is to say the founder of Mandaeism in its present form, according to the only tradition we have, was a wandering ascetic from Adiabene, whose doctrines were partly borrowed from those of the Marcionites and the Manichees, both known to have been influential in Mesopotamia generally. It requires very strong detailed evidence to make it probable that any parts of the system which do not seem to come from the Marcionites or Manichees were derived directly from a Mediterranean source. The Biblical knowledge of the Mandaeans can all be traced to a study of the Peshitta, the Bible of the official Christians of Babylonia, including their unsympathetic portrait of Jesus Christ. The Mandean Anush-uthra, on the other hand, is not a mere pale reflection of the Church's Jesus Christ, but the Marcionite (and Manichaean) Jesus. All that is said of Anush-uthra, including the figure of Miriai, a queer reminiscence of Mary Magdalene, is ultimately derived from the Lucan Gospel as curtailed and arranged by Marcion.

In other words, Mandaeism may be interesting in itself, but it is useless to go to it as a key to unlock the mysteries of early Christian development. 47

There seems to be no reason to go overboard in the study of the Mandaean texts in an attempt to understand the Fourth Gospel and the meaning of the ἐζὼ ἐζοเลิศ sayings. Certainly these texts will throw some light on our sayings. But so will the Egyptian and other texts. To say that the Evangelist got his idea from the Mandaeans, or that they have

47Ibid., pp. 118f.
a common source, is not valid in the light of all that has been said. Mandaeism is, for the most part, Gnostic. The Evangelist was certainly an opponent of Gnosticism and the two would be poles apart.

But some have claimed the Evangelist was a champion of Gnosticism, and to these a brief answer must be given. It is true that the Evangelist speaks of "knowing" God, that he has a certain intellectualism in his conception of faith that he speaks of light and darkness, children of God, and of the devil, and those of the spirit and of the flesh. But on the other hand, he refutes too many Gnostic principles to be called a Gnostic. He certainly has no contempt for the Old Testament, he completely denies "Docetism," and has no place for some intermediate spiritual beings. It is only logical to suppose that the Evangelist's ideas that are akin to Gnosticism were current beliefs of his day and were to be identified with Gnosticism at a later date.

48John 8:19; 6:69; 17:3.
50John 1:5. 51John 1:13. 52John 8:44.