456 ST. JOHN. I,   
   
 ay him; and without him was not any thing made that   
 4 literally, through.   
   
 God.” (hk) We find a much nearer ap- ning” is not said of an act done in the   
 proximation to the Alexandrine method of beginning (as in Gen. i. 1), but of a state   
 speech in the Epistle to the Hebrews, existing in the beginning, and therefore   
 written evidently by some disciple inti- without beginning itself. was, not   
 mately acquainted with the Alexandrine equivalent to “is” (see “I am,” ch. viii.   
 gnosis (see the opening verses, and espe- 58 al.), as Euthymius and others have   
 cially “upholding all things by the word of supposed ; but Origen has given the trne   
 His power”). But even there we have reason for the indefinite being used,—   
 not the “Logos” idendified personally “¥t would have been more strict, in   
 with the Lord Jesus,Christ, or indeed speaking of God the Word, to say is; but   
 personally spoken sof at all,—however seeing that he is speaking with reference   
 near some passages may seem to approach to the distinction of Incarnation, which   
 to this usage (ch’iv. 13; xi.3). (i) The took place at a certain time, the Evan-   
 Alexandrine gnosis was where the Gospel gelist uses was instead of is.” The exist-   
 of John~vas probably written. Apollos ence of an enduring and unlimited state   
 (Acts xviii. 24) came thither from by Theo- of being, implied in “was,” is contrasted   
 d v4 to have studied and formed his phi- with ‘was made,” or “became” (the   
 Yosophic system in Egypt, before coming word is the same) in verses 3 and 14.   
 ‘to Ephesus. (7) These notices will serve and the Werd was with God]   
 to account for the term “Logos” being ‘With is here used in the sense of “chez,”   
 already found by St. John framed to his abiding with. Basil remarks that St.   
 use; and the anti-Gnostic tendency of his John says “with God, not in God, that.   
 writings will furnish an additional reason he may set before us the distinctness of   
 why he should reseue such important Person: . . . that he may give no open-   
 truths as the pre-existence and attributes ing for the confusion of person.” Both   
 of the divine “Word” from the perver- the inner substantial union, and the dis-   
 sions which false philosophy had begun to tinct personality of the “ Word ” are here   
 make of them. (4) In all that has been asserted. ‘The former is distinctly re-   
 said in this note, no insinuation has been peated in the next words. and the   
 conveyed that either the Apostle Paul, or Word was God] This is the trne form of   
 the Writer to the Hebrews, or John, the sentence; not ‘God was the Word.   
 adopted in any degree their TEACHING This is absolutely required by the usage of   
 from the existing philosophies. Their the Greek language: see in my Gr. Test.   
 teaching (which is totally distinct from But the sense to be conveyed here is as   
 any of those philosophies, as will be weighty a consideration as the form of   
 shewn in this commentary) is that of the the sentence. Had St. John intended to   
 Holy Spirit;—and the existing philoso- say, ‘ God was the Word,’ —what meaning   
 phics, with all their and inadequacies, could his assertion possibly have con-   
 must be regarded, in so far as they by veyed? None other than a contradic-   
 their terms or ideas subserved the work tion to his last assertion, by which he had   
 which the Spirit had to do by the Apostles distinguished God from the Word. And   
 and teachers of Christianity, as so many not only would this be the case, but the   
 providential preparations of the minds of assertion would be inconsistent with the ~   
 men to receive the fuller effulgence of whele historical idea of the Word, making:   
 the Truth as it is in Jesus, which shines this term to signify merely an attribute   
 forth in these Scriptures. of God, just as when it is said, “ God is   
 In the beginning] Equivalent to love.” Not to mention the unprecedented   
 “before the world was,” ch. xvii. 5. The inversion of subject and predicate which   
 expression is indefinite, must be inter- this would occasion; “the Word” having   
 preted relatively to the matter spoken of. been the subject before, and again resumed   
 ‘Thus in Acts xi. it is “the beginning of as the subject afterwards. The ren-   
 the Gospel:” and by the same principle of dering of the words being then as above,   
 interpretation, here it is the beginning their meaning is the next question. God   
 of all things, on account of “all things (see the grammatical reasons in my Gr,   
 were made by him” ver. 3. These Test.) must be taken as implying God in   
 words, if they do not assert, at least substance and essence,—not ‘the Father,’   
 imply, the eternal pre-existence of the in Person. It docs not mean “   
 divine Word. For “was in the begin- nor is it be rendered “a God ”—but, as   
 in “became flesh,” “flesh” expresses that   
 state into which the Divine Word entered