

Is John's Λόγος Christology a Polemical Response to Philo of Alexandria's Logos Philosophy? (Part 2)

Robert Peltier and Dan Lioy

Abstract

This journal article is the second in a two-part series that examines the Prologue to the Gospel of John (1:1–18) as a Christological statement for the purpose of repudiating Philo of Alexandria's philosophical logos. In Part Two, we exegete Philo of Alexandria's writings for the purpose of determining his logos philosophy, which is then compared and contrasted with John's Christological Logos. Philo's logos is shown to be a metaphysical construct built upon the syncretization of the philosophical Greek logos with an allegorical interpretation of the Pentateuch. John's Christological Logos theology is shown to have no commonality with the Philonic logos. Further, the Logos described in the Prologue cannot be viewed, as some scholars have suggested, as merely the next logical step in the development of Philo's mythological logos writings. Thus, John's description of the Christological Logos may be viewed as a carefully constructed polemical statement opposing the Philonic logos.

Keywords

Christology, Gospel of John, Hellenism, Logos, Philo of Alexandria, Philosophy, Prologue, Exegesis

About the Authors¹

Robert Peltier
Mr Peltier received his *Bachelor of Theology from Northpoint Bible College* (formerly Zion Bible College), M.A. Old Testament from Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, and an M.A. Biblical Languages from Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary.

Dan Lioy
PhD, North-West University
The Senior Research Manager at the South African Theological Seminary, Dan has a particular research interest in intertextuality, Biblical ethics and spiritual care in professional settings.

¹ The views expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the beliefs of the South African Theological Seminary.

1. Introduction

In Part One of this article, an exegesis of the Prologue to the Gospel of John (1:1–18) was used to prepare ten important statements about John's Logos Christology. In Part Two, we will explore Philo of Alexandria's use of a logos motif within Hellenistic Judaistic thought. A comparison of these two belief systems will reveal whether John's description of the *Logos* is merely an extension of the Greek logos or if the Prologue is a polemical statement against Philo's philosophical logos.

1.1 Did John's Logos Evolve from Greek Thought?

A portion of scholarly literature views the *Logos*, in a philosophical sense, as the next logical step in its development from the paganism of eclectic Jewish Hellenism that ultimately found its way into the fourth Gospel (Thyssen 2006:133). More specifically, Thyssen views Philo's mystical philosophy as merely an evolutionary step in what was to become John's Christological view of the *Logos*. Danielou (2014:169) views the Prologue of John's gospel as originating with the Philo of Alexandria's Judeo-Hellenistic view of the Word of God presented in abbreviated form. Perhaps a more extreme view is that John's *Logos* and the Philonic logos were birthed from quasi- or incipient-Gnostic Jewish thought (Goodenough 1945:145), although the external evidence for this view is scant. Another interesting hypothesis is that the Gospel of John was of Alexandrian origin thereby strongly linking John's *Logos* with Philo's mystical logos (Gunther 1979:582). Other scholars take Gunther's view one step further when describing John's writing as virtually embracing Philo's understanding of Hellenistic Judaism (Schnackenburg 1968:125). In sum, the scholarly view of the impact of Hellenism on the writing of John's Prologue is a spectrum, ranging from a strong literary dependence, to a general influence, and merely implicit influences that arise from living within a Hellenistic Judaism culture (Gunther 1979:584).

1.2 The Origin of the Greek Logos

At the time of John's writing, the term *Logos* was infused with abundant philosophical meaning that had evolved over centuries. The philosophical or mystical logos did not originate with Philo but reflected Platonic beginnings, perhaps as early as the late 6th century BCE with Ephesian philosopher Heraclitus (Nash 2003:70). This philosophy was subsequently more fully developed by Plato and later adopted by the Stoics, who added further details.

Although there is a dearth of surviving writings by Heraclitus on the topic of the logos, the logos does seem to play a fundamental role in his philosophy. Heraclitus writes about the importance of living in accordance with the logos, which he describes as the unity of all things or the wisdom that directs all things. There is a cause behind every effect seen in nature and the logos is responsible.

Plato's view of the logos seems to advance Heraclitus in many ways. The Platonic logos is described as the rational intelligence that unifies all creation. But how does the logos interact with creation? Apparently, not all of humanity is equally imbued with wisdom, and the degree of wisdom acquired is for each person self-determined. In Plato's *Republic*, for example, Plato explores the difference between a common person who seeks beautiful things and the philosopher who desires to know beauty itself. In other words, a common person recognizes that there is greater than human wisdom that was the proximate cause of creation. The philosopher wants to personally know and attain that wisdom. Plato also views this cognitive disparity as the difference between opinion and knowledge of absolute truth (Book V, 476d–480a). Philo's identification with philosophers of all stripe explains the conclusions he reached in his exegesis. Inclusiveness was required in order to gain acceptance of his view of the preeminence of the Pentateuch above all other philosophies, particularly Greek philosophy.

The logos played an important role in Hellenistic philosophical thought in the first century. Kleinknecht (1964:77) describes the logos as representing the 'Greek understanding of the world' and the nature of all creation. In Greek philosophy and largely reflected in Platonic thought, the logos refers to the rational, underlying intelligence of the universe. The logos is the creative and governing mind of God that is in control of the universe or the 'rational power set in man' (Kleinknecht (1964:82). However, the logos was divine but not a god. Greek philosophers developed this understanding through observation of the world around them. Philo, on the other hand, appears to inherit his view of logos largely from the Stoics, the first to systemize logos thought as the primary source of reality (Beasley-Murray 2002:liv), the cosmic or divine reason that is found throughout all creation, and the rationale for 'the ordering of physical reality' (Runia 2001:142). In ancient thought, every phenomenon had an underlying cause or agent.

For example, Plato speaks of the divine craftsman with respect to the creation of the world's soul (reminiscent of Proverbs 8). The Stoics believed the universe was a living reality much like a living creature and logically a superior being is in control of reality.

The Stoic's quest for the single, underlying principle or elementary particles of the universe are much like modern physicists searching for the elusive Grand Unified Theory of the universe. Philo's writings record his attempt to advance his philosophical understanding of the *logos* rationalized through ancient Jewish beliefs as reflected in the Mosaic Law (which Philo reveals as the *logos*). Philo's primary means for rationalizing Platonic thought with the Pentateuch was by defining the forms and function of the *logos*.

1.3 John's Purpose for Using the Term 'Logos'

There are scholars who theorize that John selected the *logos* literary motif because the Greek *logos*, reflected by Philo, was a widely-known and accepted philosophical concept in the Roman world (Bernard 1948:xciv, Dodd:1968:54–55). The term *logos* plays a fundamental role in Hellenistic, particularly Philonic, thought although its usage is profoundly different from John (Dodd 1968:73). For the Greeks, the *logos* was a conceptual cosmic principle, a cosmic soul, that helped the early Greek philosophers solve metaphysical and epistemological difficulties (Boice 1999:35). John's *Logos* was immanent and eternal, existent before creation and the agent of creation (Dodd 1968:263). Redefining the *logos* well-known by the first-century Roman world was an excellent means to encapsulate a description of the divine origin and purpose of the God-man Jesus Christ (Du Toit 1968:11). The *logos* motif is a common word familiar to those acquainted with Greek philosophy and Johannine Christology, such as the early Christian apologist Justin Martyr's defence of the *Logos* (Rokeah 2001:22). John's use of the Greek *logos* motif was a 'stroke of genius' because of its Platonic roots and therefore held 'currency' for his readers (Boice 1986:300). Recognizing this, John leveraged the word's wide semantic range in the first century for Hellenist and Hebrew cultures to his advantage (Parker 1988:31).

2. Philo of Alexandria

In this section, a short biography of Philo of Alexandria is presented so that the Alexandrian version of Hellenistic Judaism may be appreciated before his writings are investigated, particularly his hermeneutical approach to scripture interpretation.

This section also examines Philo's eclectic beliefs about the nature and character of the Greek *logos* through the lens of a thoroughly Hellenized Jew.

2.1 A Short Biography of Philo of Alexandria

Philo of Alexandria was an enigmatic first-century Jewish intellectual whose work is generally characterized as a rationalization of diaspora Judaism within the dominant Hellenistic culture that existed in Alexandria, Egypt in the first century. Philo lived and wrote at a pivotal time in history as a contemporary of Jesus (although separated geographically) and as the Gospel was taking root in Palestine and other parts of the Roman Empire. His writings are the exemplar when the Hellenist view of the Jewish Bible, particularly the Pentateuch, is desired. The Septuagint, the Bible of the Seventy, and the Wisdom of Solomon (part of the Alexandrian Bible tradition) are additional examples of Alexandrian Jewish thought. A survey of recent Philonic scholarship reveals the disparate views of Philo as a mystic removed from the world, politician and envoy to Caesar, and as 'philosopher preacher' (Danielou (2014:xv)). Philo was a man of his time, wrestling with the tension of a transcendent creator, self-sufficient, and abstract ruler of the created order with an immanent God who reveals himself and draws humanity close. Philo attempts to unite these disparate views of God in his conception of the divine *logos* (Lewy 2004:11), although from within his Hellenistic Greek milieu. Regardless of which view is taken of Philo the man, there is no doubt that Philo was an important first-century figure standing at the crossroads of Jewish faith intersecting Greek culture.

Philo's works are best read in the context of a people seeking to live within the Greek culture while retaining their traditional religious beliefs. He was a contemporary of the rise of Synagogue Judaism coupled with Hellenistic 'biblical embellishment' that reflect this era (Sandmel 1979:131). In other words, Philo's work interprets Alexandrian Judaism in light of Hellenism in contrast with the writers of the New Testament who interpreted the Old Testament in light of Palestinian Judaism. Philo's works record his struggle to construct this framework thus making his writings emblematic of Alexandrian Jewish thought during the first century. Philo was a spokesman for like-minded members of the Jewish diaspora who wished to spread to the world a new religion best described as Jewish religious thought syncretized with Hellenistic philosophy (Beasley-Murray 2002:lv).

Little is known about the life of Philo, and what is known is widely published. In sum, Philo was born into a wealthy family that allowed him time to pursue his philosophical interests.

He was stirred from his contemplative life and authorial interests with his election as head of a delegation that travelled to Rome to plead for the plight of Alexandrian Jews before emperor Gaius Caligula (39–40 CE) in response to the pogrom Prefect Flaccus instituted in 38 CE (*Spec. Leg.* 3:1–6, also see *Flacc.* and *Leg.*).² Alexander, Philo's brother, was a wealthy customs agent for Rome who once loaned money to Herod Agrippa I. Marcus Julius Alexander, the younger of Alexander's two sons, married Bernice, the daughter of Herod Agrippa I (Acts 25:13, 23; 26:30). Philo's other nephew was Tiberius Julius Alexander who rejected his Jewish heritage and entered the Roman civil service. Tiberius would later become procurator of the province of Judea (46–48 CE) and prefect of Egypt (66–70 CE), during which time he brutally put down a Jewish rebellion in Alexandria. Tiberius was politically astute, supporting Vespasian in his quest for power. Tiberius Julius Alexander's reward was the position of second in command of the Roman army during the siege of Jerusalem in 70 CE. Philo of Alexandria, unlike the remainder of his dysfunctional family, continued to embrace and serve as an apologist for his Jewish beliefs, but from a thoroughly Hellenized point of view.

² The complete titles of each of these standard abbreviated references are included as Appendix 1

2.2 Philo's Interpretive Construct

Philo may be commended for his desire to interpret scripture yet his interpretive framework (generally, allegory) and his hermeneutic presupposition (Neoplatonic thought syncretized with the Pentateuch's statements about God and his actions) are unique in the first century. Philo leans heavily on an allegorical hermeneutic of Jewish Scripture popular with first-century writers. When his allegorical interpretation of Jewish Scripture contradicts Greek thought, Philo usually allows his Greek presuppositions to trump Jewish dogma.

An examination of his writings yields several important observations. First, Philo employs an allegorical hermeneutic to interpret Scripture in light of his Hellenistic culture (Danielou 2014:90). Philo's exegetical method applied to the Old Testament mirrors the philosophical approach of the early Greek philosophers, particularly Plato. An allegorical hermeneutic is used to search for messages hidden within the text that must first be uncovered, and then a spiritual meaning is applied to arrive at the final interpretation and application.

For Philo, virtually all animate and inanimate objects have a unique spiritual meaning that the reader must discern in order to achieve spiritual enlightenment.

Yet, Philo abandons allegory and leans strongly to a literal interpretation when Hebrew symbolic rituals are being interpreted, such as circumcision or the Sabbath (*Mig.* 89–93, *Spec. Leg.* 1.1–11). Philo’s allegorical hermeneutic permeates his writings, particularly when he describes the nature and work of the logos.

Philo’s writings defy a narrow classification, but can be generally separated into three groups; writings on the Pentateuch, philosophical treatises, and historical-apologetic writings. Each of these writings reveals different perspectives of Philo’s logos. Philo’s view of the transcendence of God, particularly with personified divine wisdom (Job 28:12; Prov 8, 9) and the role of the ‘utterance’ of God in creation, are common themes. Another important theme is Philo’s explanation or description of how a transcendent God is able to have a relationship with humanity. Philo’s system of beliefs reflects the Platonic view of a separation between imperfect humanity and the perfect God, thus an immanent yet eternal, divine intermediary is required. The logos, the highest of the intermediary creations of God, often called the ‘first-born’ (*Agr.* 51; *Conf.* 146), and his allegorizing of the Hebrew Bible are perhaps the two most prominent themes found in his writings. Philo’s allegorical interpretive approach does have its limits. When Greek philosophy and Old Testament writings contradict, Philo inevitably chooses the former while always strongly supporting the Jewish One True God. The most important intersection of thought between the Prologue and Philo is his understanding of the logos (Beasley-Murray (2002:iiv), the subject of this work.

2.3 Finding Logos in Philo’s Writings

Searching Philo’s writings for clues to his views of the logos was performed in a two-step process. First, a morphological search of Borgen (2005) using the noun *λόγος* including cognates quickly identified each occurrence of this word within Philo’s original Greek writings. The search results were manually filtered for specific instances in which *λόγος* or cognates were found that describe attributes of God related to Philo’s philosophical logos.

Those instances were then cross-referenced to the English translation of Yonge (2006) to determine context. Next, further semantic searches were conducted on Yonge's (2006) English translation of Philo's writings using search terms suggested by the Liddell and Scott (1995) lexicon and others gleaned from a close examination of Philo's writings for important statements about the logos that do not include the word logos.

This two-step search approach does not guarantee every reference or allusion to Philo's philosophical logos was identified, but the results of the searches are extensive and certainly satisfactory for identifying important characteristics of Philo's philosophical logos.

3. Similarities and Differences: John's Logos Christology compared to Philo of Alexandria's Logos Philosophy

In this section, we compare and contrast the results of the investigation into Philo of Alexandria's philosophical logos with the outcomes of the exegetical study conducted in Part One that characterized the apostle John's Christological *Logos*. The standard for this comparison is the ten-point description of John's Christological *Logos* developed in Part One, summarized by the section heading, followed by Philo's description of what he describes as like or dissimilar characteristics. A conclusion is reached with each of the ten points of comparison with respect to Philo's philosophical logos.

3.1 The *Logos* is Preexistent and Eternal

Philo of Alexandria describes the logos as having a close relationship with God (positioned above the Mercy Seat and between the Cherubim in heaven) although contextually the reference describes physical proximity rather than being due to relationship or composition (essence). The Philonic logos does not enjoy the intimate relationship shared by the members of the Godhead. For Philo, the logos is looking onto the throne of God as one would attend an event honouring others. Philo's logos is watching and observing, not contributing to God's actions in the throne room. Philo's logos is a heavenly observer, not a participant.

Philo describes God as the supreme being who stamped his wisdom onto the logos, making the logos second in the heavenly line of authority (*Op.* 24). Philo defines wisdom in his writings as 'the knowledge of all divine and human things, and of the respective cause of them' (*Congr.* 79).

Since the wisdom of the logos is a copy of God's wisdom and the logos is a created being, according to Philo, we are obliged to conclude that the logos occupies this exalted position not by divine right but by the sovereign selection of God. The logos, according to Philo, occupies an exalted position in relation to God but does not have the same familial position, relational, or share the divine nature as God as does the *Logos*.

Philo often depicts the logos as having divine characteristics, such as 'firstborn', 'archetype of God', or 'chief deputy'. On the surface, each of these titles appears to describe divine characteristics. However, on closer observation, we find that Philo is describing functions of the logos, not divine characteristics. For example, Philo's 'firstborn' description in context describes the logos as an 'imitator' or 'image' of the Father in a Greek dualistic sense. Instead, from Philo's view, this and like terminology explicitly describe the logos as God's first creation imbued with certain divine attributes by God, 'For that [logos] must be God to us imperfect beings, but the first mentioned, or true God, is so only to wise and perfect men' (*Leg. All.* 3.207). In other words, the work of the created logos, from the view of humanity, appears to be the divine in action although those actions are based on God's creative power hidden from humanity.

Philo's logos has many other forms and purposes, such as an angel of the Lord that appeared in order to reveal God's will to particular people (*Som.* 1.228–239; *Cher.* 1–3). God remains transcendent yet the immanent logos appears visibly to humanity, presenting certain characteristics of God that Philo describes as divine characteristics.

The 'image of God' (*Leg. All.* 1.43) is particularly crucial to Philo's Greek dualistic logos philosophy, such as the logos is God's messenger and supplier (not originator) of wisdom to humanity. Philo's dualistic philosophy requires the separation of divine God from immanent humanity, thus the created logos is the intermediary. The 'image of God' motif is used by Philo to justify a divine logos because it is described as an exact copy of the wisdom of God. The 'image of God' from which the logos is formed is not an exact duplication but rather the image is limited to the 'wisdom' of God that is shared. The logos is viewed as the 'stamp' of wisdom that is then imprinted onto humanity via the logos thereby maintaining God's distance from humanity. Philo also calls the logos the 'high priest' and the 'chief of angels' (*Conf.* 146), further functional descriptions rather than a description of divine characteristics.

Philo does call the logos the ‘paraclete’ that bestows God’s blessings on humanity (*Mos.* 2:134) and as God’s ‘reason’, which are, again, are functional descriptions of how wisdom and virtue flow from a transcendent God, through the logos, to immanent humanity. These, and many other descriptive terms are used synonymously and contextually wherever in scripture Philo found reference to transcendent God directly interacting with immanent humanity (e.g. angels in the Old Testament, Moses speaking to the burning bush, the angel with the flaming sword guarding the Tree of Life [Gen 3:24], etc.). In each of those episodes, Philo substitutes a contextually appropriate appearance of the logos as the revealer of God found in scripture, but not God.

Philo’s view of God is not of prime importance within the scope of this work although a short discussion is appropriate in light of Genesis 1. Philo certainly views God as One God, transcendent and uncreated, although he does embrace Greek dualistic thought with respect to God’s functions displayed in scripture, especially when it relates to God’s relationship with his created. Philo recognized the seeming two ‘faces’ of God described in scripture (love and judgment) and he puts a name to these two functions. First, the Beneficent Power is closely related to the creative and judgmental characteristics of God. Second, the Creative Power reflects God as truth and his love for humanity. Philo views the logos as the intermediary between these two ‘faces’ of God and humanity thus providing humanity a glimpse of God through the work of the logos.

Humanity exists as an image of God to the degree or amount of wisdom provided to humanity by the logos. In fact, each person receives a small yet specific portion of the wisdom of the logos, and it is through that act we each have some likeness of God.

Humanity is an image of the logos, which is an image of God—thus we possess a copy of a copy of God’s wisdom. The philonic logos stands between humanity and transcendent God.

It is through this clever act of interpretation that Philo is able to reconcile his monotheistic beliefs with Greek dualism. In contrast, John describes an immanent, divine, and eternal *Logos*, who humbly and voluntarily became human as the supreme act of love.

3.2 The Logos (Jesus Christ) is Divine

The fully divine Jesus Christ exists as a separate person within the Godhead in an intimate and perfect relationship with the Father. The eternal *Logos* exhibits the same divine nature and attributes of God.

The *Logos* is uncreated because he shares the same divine, eternal nature as uncreated God. Implicit in this description of the *Logos* is recognition that he shares God's holiness and separateness. God must also be separate and distinct, holy in all his ways (Lev 11:44) and never mistaken for the profane (Lev 10:9–11). Thus, these same attributes of holiness must apply equally to the *Logos*. The *Logos* also displays other incommunicable attributes or perfections that are implicit in God. For example, the three 'omnis' describe important incommunicable divine traits. First, the divine *Logos* is omnipresent. The totality of God is present everywhere in creation. The *Logos* is present in heaven with God at creation, but is also present in equal measure on earth or anywhere in the universe.

When the Bible speaks of God in heaven it is picturing God as being in control of all things and being exalted by all the heavenly hosts, not as God limited to a single physical space. Second, God is omniscient. *Logos* has perfect knowledge of himself and all other things, from eternity past to eternity future. Finally, God is omnipotent. God is all-powerful and may do whatever he wishes to do with his created. Philo does not ascribe these characteristics to his logos, likely because it would violate his monotheistic sensibilities.

Philo consistently interprets scripture using Hellenistic presuppositions, such as there can be no direct relationship between humankind's rational soul and the transcendent God (*Quaest in Gn* 2.62), and therefore a mediator is required. The role of the mediator found in scripture is, in the mind of Philo, the logos. As stated in the previous section, Philo's logos is a created being that does not share all the divine, eternal attributes of an uncreated God and none of the 'omnis'. The incommunicable traits found in the *Logos* are not present in Philo's conception of the logos. The logos is described as creator, but with a caveat: all the power found in the logos was imbued by creative power by God.

If the logos was God's first act of creation prior to the creation of the universe and humanity then by definition the logos was not present at time of creation, that is, it is God's creation. The co-eternal *Logos* was personally responsible for the creation of all things and his own creative power is not derived from that of God but is a feature of his eternal divine essence. This is an essential difference between Philo's philosophical logos and John's Christological *Logos*.

Philo also credits the logos with the role of binding together the polar Beneficent and Creative powers of God.

Regardless of Philo's view of which of these two 'sides' of God have precedence in power, the fact remains that Philo states that Creative power is the older of the two. Philo describes a bifurcated God that is no longer uncreated or eternal in his quest to syncretize basic Hebrew theology with Greek dualistic beliefs. Equally confusing is Philo's attempt to equate the created logos to Creative power in *Quaest in Ex.* 2.62. In essence, Philo describes the created logos as superior to God as Beneficent power. This logical inconsistency is not addressed by Philo. Philo also describes the logos as having the mind of God. Certainly, John's Christological *Logos* has the mind of God but for different reasons. The eternal uncreated *Logos* and eternal uncreated God share the same essence, exist in a perfect relationship, and therefore, have the same mind.

What one knows, the other knows. What one desires, the other desires. Philo's created logos does not share any of these divine characteristics.

3.3 The *Logos* is the Creator of All Things

Every single thing that has ever been created was created by the *Logos*, including physical life and all non-physical objects, including the basic elements from which all creation originates. The *Logos* created all things *ex nihilo* (out of nothing) and therefore humanity creates from the things God has provided. The *Logos* is what holds together and sustains creation. *Logos* is sovereign over all of creation with no limitations, from the smallest detail, which means that he does what he wants, when he wants, and to whom he wishes (Ps 93:1)—also perfect. The corollary to this observation is, if *Logos* commands something to be done, then it will be done immediately and perfectly (Ps 33:6–9).

Philo describes the logos as preexistent but only because his creation preceded the creation of the heavens, the earth, and humanity. For Philo, the creation of the logos appears to be primarily one of timing, not eternity. This is a necessary conclusion because Philo states that the logos is a created image of God that was used as a template for the creation of all things (*Leg. All.* 1.43).

Philo also calls the logos the 'soul of the world' (*Aet.* 84), among other titles, although, to the Greek mind, the soul is the life-force that animates life and leaves the body at death for life eternal. The soul takes up residence on the moon according to Plutarch (c. 40–120 CE) while Greek philosophers have suggested many other destinations.

Philo sheds some light on his view of the soul more clearly in *Leg. All.* 91 where we learn that the immortal part of the soul is given to humanity from the Father through the logos, a view clearly informed by Greek dualism. The Prologue does not directly address a theology of the soul although John clearly states that the *Logos* was the creator of all things and thus whatever the *Logos* created was by his hand without the need for an intermediary being, particularly the eternal soul that inhabits every person.

Philo views important functions of the logos as the creation of the universe, which includes the perfect man (*Som.* 8), and holding together the physical world including the soul within the physical bodies of humanity. The apostle Paul describes Jesus Christ as holding ‘all things’ together (Col 1:17), although there are significant differences between the two views to be explored.

First, Philo states that the acts of creation were performed by God using the logos as his ‘instrument’ (*De Cherubin* 127). In contrast, the *Logos* was the proximate cause of creation, not through an intermediary. The divine *Logos* is quite capable of creation *ex nihilo*, including humanity with an eternal soul. Philo, on the other hand, describes the creative work of the logos based on the prior presence of the ‘four elements’ (earth, air, water, and fire). In other words, the creative acts of the logos are derived works from God having been provided the four elements as the building blocks of creation. In the Stoic mind, the act of holding together creation is described by Philo as ‘bringing disorder and irregularity into order and regularity’ (*Som.* 1.241), thus creative acts by the logos appear to be more ‘housekeeping’ than original works of creation. Also, Philo describes the immanent logos as the only means for humanity to understand the created world. It is through the wisdom of the created logos that formed and controls the universe. The logos is created by transcendent God as the means to interact with the immanent universe. Hence, the philosophical creative and sustaining acts attributed to the logos are derived works and inconsistent with John’s statement that the *Logos* is creator and sustainer of all creation *ex nihilo*.

Philo also describes his philosophical logos as the conduit to humanity that produces rational thought, intellect, and free will (*Quod Deus.* 47) thereby bringing order to humanity. In Philo’s view, God breathed the logos into Adam to give life to humanity (*Leg. All.* 1.37) and then stepped back allowing the logos to interact with humanity in the many forms discussed earlier. Some may liken these tasks as remarkably similar to God’s creation and sustaining of humanity through Adam.

However, the apostle John affirms that creation is the sovereign territory of uncreated, eternal God. The *Logos* created and then breathed life into humanity. The *Logos* is life-giver and sustainer, the author of humanity's soul, eternal, and therefore there is no need for the *Logos* to take on different names, forms, or functions. Philo is using finite descriptions of forms and function to describe the infinite, an impossible task. The unbegotten eternal *Logos* subsumes all functions of the philonic logos.

Philo describes the logos placing a portion of the 'stamped' and 'copied' soul within each person. Philo describes the 'soul [a]s divided into seven divisions; there being five senses, and besides them the vocal organ, and after that the generative power' (*De Opificio Mundi* 217), obviously derived from Greek Platonic thought.

However, it is not surprising that Philo would be comfortable with this definition as the word 'soul' is never used in the Old Testament as a reference to the immortal soul but rather as a life principle, to a particular living being (e.g. Gen 1:20–21, 24), or to the creation of humanity (Gen 2:7) when God breathed life into dust. For John, the *Logos* created each person as a unique individual who must personally answer to God for their actions (v. 1:12) so John implicitly sees each person as possessing a God-given unique and complete soul, not an identically 'stamped' portion of soul given by the logos to every person.

The *Logos* implicitly incorporated free will and intellect into his creation and Philo agrees with that assessment. However, that motif is consistent with Scripture and their agreement on this point is not surprising. However, for Philo, intellect is one's ability to exercise the wisdom 'stamped' onto humanity by the logos, which is an image of God's wisdom. Philo and John do agree that God did the creative work, however, the *Logos* stands front and centre as the creator. Philo's logos, as second to God as his 'Shadow,' executed God's plan, although from the viewpoint of humanity the work was completed by the divine logos. For John, the creative work of the *Logos* is made apparent in all of creation and is independent of humanity's view of the *Logos*.

3.4 Jesus Christ is the Source of Humanity's Spiritual Enlightenment

Philo's interpretive construct of the logos is guided by his Greek philosophical hermeneutic. For Philo, philosophy is 'the desire to see things accurately', particularly God and his logos. The mind of humanity is finite and cannot conceive of the mind of an infinite God, so Philo's philosophical journey is doomed from inception.

It seems that humanity's innate need to pursue God is a possible point of agreement between John and Philo, although this point is debatable given the depraved sin nature of humanity. There are wide differences between Philo and John in their understanding of how God reveals himself to humanity. For Philo, God may only reveal himself through an intermediary, that is, the wisdom of God, the *logos*. Philo describes the spiritual enlightenment brought by *logos* in the form of a simile, 'of light to light,' to describe how the *logos* reveals God. However, Philo also believes that philosophers have an inside track to enlightenment compared to the remainder of humanity.

Philosophers alone seek to comprehend God, while all others are limited to an understanding of God based on his actions, that is, the actions of the *logos*. The apostle John writes of the *Logos* coming to bring spiritual enlightenment to all of humanity, not to a privileged few based on personal effort. Philo believes that humanity desires wisdom except that it rejects the wisdom of God (*Post.* 136). The apostle John writes that the *Logos* came incarnate but was rejected by his own people. Rejection is a common theme, although Philo's view of humanity's rejection of wisdom is a rejection of the opportunities to come to a greater understanding of God. The apostle John describes rejection in terms of humanity rejecting the spiritual enlightenment that results in a personal relationship with God in terms of becoming a child of God and enjoying eternal life with the *Logos*, an incomprehensible concept to Philo. Philo sought philosophical enlightenment rather than spiritual enlightenment and eternal relationship.

Philo also describes the *logos*, a creation of God, as fundamentally a messenger between transcendent God and immanent humanity. After the creation of the *logos*, God retreated from his created and remained distant. The *logos* became a vague image for humanity, alternately playing the role of an angel, prophet, or even *Yahweh*. The roles of the *logos* are read into scripture and Philo, often using an allegorical hermeneutic to justify his Greek dualistic presuppositions, identifies the work of the *logos*. The apostle John views the work of the person of the *Logos* by his actions, such as creation, salvation, rejection, and incarnation.

There are no disguises or interpretive legerdemain at play. The *Logos* goes about his work in perfect submission and relationship with the Father. The philonic *logos* is commissioned by the Father to perform works.

The *Logos*, as will be described in an upcoming section, directly touches humanity through his incarnation. The *logos* interacts with humanity in various disguises.

The *Logos* singular is worthy of the glory of humanity. In fact, the logos steals the glory due God when humanity is fooled into believing that the logos is God. God never countenances stealing of his glory in scripture and he warns readers that punishment follows. The *Logos* reveals God to humanity. God earnestly desires to be revealed to humanity and he did so through the incarnation, crucifixion, resurrection, and glorification of the *Logos*. The infinite God revealed himself to the finite. The role of the created logos, whether intended or not, was to conceal the uncreated God from humanity. Philo assumes that a transcendent God does not desire to directly interact with his created and never considers the possibility.

The work of the *Logos* is the transcendent God reaching down, in love, to touch humanity. For Philo, immanent humanity will not reach out to touch God, only the logos.

3.5 John the Baptizer called for repentance, heralded the coming of the Messiah

Philo's view of repentance is, as we should expect, closely aligned with the call of John the Baptizer. Philo often calls for his readers to turn away from sinful action and redirect one's life in conformance with the Law (cf. *Leg. All.* 2.78; 3.105–106). Philo describes the logos as God's messenger, but does not cite a comparable forerunner of the logos.

There are approximately 100 instances in his writings where Philo calls for one to repent of sin. One entire section is dedicated to repentance (*Virt.* 175–186) in which Philo defines repentance in a very philosophical manner, 'crossing over from ignorance to a knowledge of those things to be ignorant of which is shameful; from folly to wisdom, from intemperance to temperance, from injustice to righteousness, from cowardice to confident courage' (*Virt.* 175–186). Each of these characteristics clearly has Greek wisdom overtones, and they are only a shadow of the covenantal law requirements of repentance. John the Baptizer came to testify about the true Light of the world and preached repentance in light of judgment (Luke 3:17). Philo's repentance has the purpose of accessing God's wisdom in order to acquire divine knowledge and a vision of God (*Quod. Deus.* 143), to become like God, and to rise above the material world (*Fug.* 63), in order to contemplate the divine logos (*Som.* 1,71; 2.249).

The differences between Philo and John related to repentance are clear: Philo wishes to grow in wisdom and knowledge about God (static condition) in order to become like God, while John the Baptizer encouraged people to make a radical change in their life (Matt 3:11) and return to their covenantal relationship with God (although as an individual, not in response to a collective call to repentance) in order to avoid eternal condemnation of their sin. John says repentance requires a response (active condition) to the Light of the world in order to experience life change. For Philo, humanity is passive and through the work of the logos some amount of wisdom is ‘stamped’ into the human soul (*Leg. All.* 2.31–32). Philosophically, Philo and his colleagues gain the wisdom necessary to see and possibly to know God through personal achievement. For John, true repentance begets a right relationship with God and explicitly avoids eternal punishment.

3.6 A Majority of Fallen Humanity Reject Spiritual Enlightenment

Wisdom, in an Old Testament sense, is a form of knowledge that allows humanity to have a deep understanding of something or understand the practical significance of something (Ps 104:24; 136:5). Scripture also describes wisdom as putting knowledge to work in a practical sense (Prov 2:2–5) or to increase in wisdom in order to understand the person of God more fully. For Philo, wisdom leads to a deeper philosophical understanding of transcendent God and the universe.

Philo views the logos as the source of light for humanity although the product of that light was that portion of wisdom embedded in the soul of each person. Philo presents the logos as more than one form of light but rather as one of many forms of light. For example, the Israelites fed on manna provided by the ‘most ancient logos of God’ (*Det.* 118). In addition, wisdom is provided to humanity by a ‘stream’ that injects God’s people with ‘manna’ by which God’s people are nourished by the logos (*Leg. All.* 3.175–176). Philo resorts to an allegorical interpretation to identify the provider of the manna (the logos) and the content of the manna (wisdom). Philo is speaking in terms of God’s covenant people, but it is best to view this statement as collective (all humanity).

Philo also relates that not all will benefit equally with this infusion of wisdom from the logos. Wisdom is proportioned based on, in the view of Philo, the more perfect the person. The more perfect the person, the more wisdom is received. Perfection, however, is viewed as the possession of various virtues. Philo dedicates an entire writing (*On the Virtues*) to defining the virtues.

Generally, the virtuous few are those who have overcome the indignities of human life by diligently pursuing virtue over seemingly a long time and thus collecting a disproportionate share of wisdom. Greater wisdom allows one to have greater knowledge of the *logos* (which is only visible to humanity) and thus come closer to transcendent God. For Philo, anyone can pursue wisdom although it is relatively few Greek philosophers with a sufficient stockpile of virtue who have success with their pursuit.

The apostle John states the unique *Logos*, the One and only Son of God, brought the promise of spiritual renewal first to his own people and then to the world. Every person that hears of the person and work of the *Logos* has an opportunity to embrace the Truth. The message is universal and the grace and truth of the *Logos* is easily comprehended by the world, 'so that all might believe through Him' (John 1:7b), not a select few philosophers.

3.7 A Minority of Fallen Humanity Embrace Spiritual Enlightenment to Become Children of God

Most of the Jews who heard Jesus speak rejected Messiah Jesus, but a few individuals, not limited to Jewish descent or nationality, did accept Jesus' salvific message and were adopted into the Kingdom of God and became children of God. To be a child of God is to live in his presence and enjoy all of the familial benefits of that relationship. Philo's philosophical *logos* is given the responsibility of the spiritual welfare of humanity by nourishing their souls with God's wisdom and pastoring the flock as the Royal Shepherd (*Mut.* 113–116). The *logos* appeared to Moses on Mount Sinai as the giver of the Mosaic Law to the Israelite nation (*Mos.* 95, 253). Philo's *logos* is also said to be the source of virtue (*Som.* 118–119) and rational thought for humanity (*Det.* 86–90). The *logos* has many other functions, such as prophet (*Deus.* 182), healer of the soul (*Mos.* 2.134), the source of judgment and forgiveness for humanity (*Quaest in Gen.* 3.27, 28, 51) and represents personified wisdom (specifically as presented in Prov 8:22). The philonic *logos* as a healer of the soul in context means the *logos* delivers God's blessings to humanity in the form of wisdom. Philo writes that Moses calls this wisdom the 'sight of God' or the 'vision of God.' Philo views the wisdom of Moses written in the Pentateuch as the predecessor and foundation of all Greek philosophies.

A common theme found in Philo's philosophical writings is the value of philosophy to humanity. A small portion of humanity will pursue a virtuous life in order to increase in wisdom (provided by the *logos*, *Sacr.* 9; *Som.* 1.182) as mentioned earlier.

The gift of reason was received from God (*Op.* 77) and those who use reason to pursue wisdom will receive the greatest knowledge of God. Philosophy, according to Philo, is what allows humanity to 'live in conformity with nature' (*Prob.* 160), which is Philo's way of saying how humanity may live a moral and virtuous life. Philo defines the four virtues as wisdom, self-control, courage, and justice (*Leg. All.* 1.63–64).

Philo views the logos as providing humanity with a path to gain wisdom through personal effort in order to become enlightened with knowledge of God. The philosopher represents those who pursue this enlightenment through their personal efforts to live a virtuous life. Philo's philosophical logos may allow a minority to become enlightened about God and the universe, but John's Christological *Logos* allows all of humanity to become children of God, although only a minority will accept the offer.

The minority of respondents is a point of similarity between Philo and John, although the object of our faith and the means by which faith is pursued are remarkably different.

3.8 Salvation is Not the Product of Human Work

The apostle John rejected the Jewish view of their special relationship with God that ensured their communal righteousness based on keeping the Mosaic Law. Works righteousness, nor being born into a particular people or ethnic group, does not produce a relationship with God. It is only through faith in the completed work of Christ on the cross that results in salvation and eternity in the presence of God. Works righteousness does not replace salvific faith.

As touched on in the previous section, Philo's logos is the image of God's wisdom that was used to imprint each person with wisdom. The logos, as the Word or Thought of God, connects the thoughts and wisdom of God to humanity. As part of creation, individuals remain with an imperfect understanding of the logos. Our understanding of the logos may only be perfected through perseverance in understanding wisdom and limited only by the reasoning capability given to each person. For Philo, in general, it was the philosopher who was granted the necessary quantity of the gift of reason to allow him to pursue wisdom and thus a greater experiential understanding of God and the universe. There is a marked difference between John's view of salvation through the completed work of Christ and Philo's philosophical pursuit of works righteousness.

3.9 Jesus Christ Arrived Incarnate in the World

The *Logos* incarnate, Jesus as 100% flesh and blood and 100% divine, has no parallel in Philo's philosophical writings or in history for that matter. For Philo, transcendent God does not initiate contact with finite humanity much less take on the humble form of his created and walk on earth with immanent humanity. Philo does speak of the Beneficent Power that performs legislative, chastising, and correcting functions, but those functions are carried out by the *logos* by directive action of Beneficent God. Philo writes that the *logos* is the source of destruction on earth as well as the source of forgiveness to humanity. The *logos* is also described as guiding God's judgment of the universe and will judge humanity at some time in the future. Philo believes in the immortality of the soul although only a portion of the soul is immortal and, again, it is the *logos* that provides it to humanity.

In sum, Philo certainly recognizes the presence of evil in the world and the eternality of the soul, but does not attempt to define a means to reconcile humanity's sin with God's righteousness. The limit for humanity is a deeper knowledge and understanding of God and the universe. Philo's metaphysical concept of the *logos* placed as the mediator between God and humanity is perhaps the only similarity with the anthropomorphic *Logos* described by the apostle John. The *Logos* reaches down to humanity. The philonic *logos* encourages a segment of humanity to reach up to the *logos* in its futile attempt to understand God.

There are further, very significant differences between Philo's philosophical *logos* and the apostle John's Christological *Logos* that should be considered at this time. First, the incarnation of the *Logos* certainly demonstrates God's love for humanity and his desire to be in an eternal, loving relationship with his created. For Philo, the Creative Power is peaceable and gentle, but personal interaction with humanity is impossible. God, regardless of Philo's functional descriptions, never reaches out to humanity because the infinite cannot penetrate the finite (the same apologetic response used today by many agnostics). The *logos* is the mediator of all things to humanity. Philo describes the *logos* as a created being (*Leg. All.* 2.86) that is eternal (a logical inconsistency, *Deus.* 47, *Cher.* 1.27–28) that is humanity's source of virtue (*Som.* 118–119), humanity's paraclete (*Mos.* 2.134, 135), interpreter of God's will (*Leg. All.* 2.207), and sustainer of humanity with wisdom (*Leg. All.* 2.175–176). The *logos* also appears in various forms, such as personified wisdom (Prov 8), High Priest, chief deputy, and even as the image of God (*Leg. All.* 1.43). And, as motioned earlier, the *logos* appears as the messenger of God to humanity.

This is the limit to which the logos, the messenger of God, appears to humanity in many forms. However, the logos never appears in a form that calls humanity into a direct relationship with God.

None of the many forms in which the philonic logos appears describes the humanity and divinity of the logos, a mark of the *Logos*. The logos does the will of God in creation, for example, but the relationship is one-sided—the logos responds to an order with the immediate action of creation and interacts with humanity when commanded, but never communicates back to God. The logos was a messenger, but never returns a message. In the first century the words of an emissary from a distant king are the words of the king himself. Thus, the logos speaks with the authority of God. However, this is a description of merely a functional relationship between God and the logos, not a relationship based on the two moving together in perfect synchronism and for the same purpose, as is the case of God and the *Logos*.

Philo's logos never addresses humanity's sin that separates God from humanity because God is transcendent and the separation was forever permanent. Reconciliation of humanity with God is not possible because there was never a relationship to begin with. In contrast, John's *Logos* walked among humanity for the sole purpose of reconciling sinful humanity with a righteous God. The *Logos* was not a messenger from God because he is God and therefore possessed within himself the power of reconciliation. The incarnate *Logos* walked on earth to facilitate his ministry of reconciliation, as well as present to humanity an intimate picture of God's perfect grace, mercy, and love.

For Philo, the purpose of the logos was to bring rational thought to humanity (*Op.* 146; *Praem.* 163; *Det.* 86–90), which in turn motivates humanity's free will and intellect (*Quod Deus.* 47) and allows one to comprehend one's environment and spiritual things (*Quis Het.* 234–236; *Det.* 90). Humanity may have free will and the ability to grasp spiritual things through the work of the logos but this philosophical stance does not consider the basic sinful nature of humanity who, left to their own devices, would not seek deliverance from God, free will or not. Thus God reached down to humanity by sending *Logos* as the means for humanity to be reconciled to God. None of the many forms or functions of the logos replicate this act. Nor does Philo describe the actions of the logos as voluntary actions on behalf of humanity. Instead, the relationship between God and the logos should be viewed as hierarchal—God commands and the created logos obeys as his intermediary. Humanity's only relationship with uncreated God is once removed through the created logos.

Jesus Christ said, 'He who has seen Me has seen the Father' (John 14:9); this represents John's view of the divinity of the *Logos*. God has reached down to humanity through the uncreated *Logos* and it is through the *Logos* humanity may view God. Philo views the relationship as unidirectional. The apostle John does not view the need of an intermediary for God's salvific message. God sent the incarnate *Logos* to humanity for the purpose of lifting up humanity into eternal familial relationship. The nature of Philo's God is secretive, 'For he has not revealed his nature to anyone' (*All. Leg.* 3.206) and only the *logos* reveals transcendent God. God created the *logos* and the *logos* then proceeded to carry out the plans of God with respect to humanity. It is only through the *logos* as an intermediary that humanity may have any interaction with God. In fact, the *logos*, what Philo also calls the perfect man, creates humanity based on the image of God 'stamped' on the *logos*. John's *Logos* arrives among humanity incarnate, God in flesh.

3.10 Jesus Christ is our source of grace and truth

If one can earn salvation, then one does not need grace. It is only through the reason and wisdom provided by Philo's *logos* that one may become knowledgeable about God and the universe. God's grace does not play a role, because the *logos* does not require an understanding of and repentance from one's sin. Instead, one must only strive to lead a virtuous life. In much the same way, the standard of truth stated hundreds of times throughout scripture as 'Thus says the Lord' is based on the unchanging character of God. John the Baptizer preached a message of repentance, that is, turning away from sin and back to conformance with the Law in preparation for the coming of the divine *Logos* and his message of forgiveness and eternal life.

Grace and truth are attributes that reflect the fullness of God and thus the *Logos*. Philo's *logos* is the messenger that brought a limited set of God's characteristics to humanity. John's *Logos* is God living among humanity. The grace and truth of the *Logos* bring glory to God by sharing those attributes with humanity. For Philo, the *logos* is the revelator and we may only see God through the created *logos*, an image of an image (*Praem.* 43–44; *Leg. All.* 1.37–38). The *Logos* is God thus seeing the *Logos* is to see God, an unthinkable proposition to Philo. We see God through spiritual eyes when we believe in his name and become a child of God. This new familial relationship allows us to see and abide with our Father. It is only through the *Logos* that we may properly comprehend the Father.

As a side note, John speaks of grace and truth as the essence of the *Logos*. Philo views grace and truth within the framework of four Greek virtues (temperance, prudence, courage, and justice, although Plato replaced prudence with wisdom in some writings) that define good moral behaviour. The pursuit of these virtues was supremely important to Philo's Stoic mind. Plato argued that the four virtues are mutually exclusive as one may act with great courage but with injustice. Bad behaviour or poor choices stem from a lack of wisdom possessed by the individual. The Greeks viewed the four virtues as evidence of a moral existence, yet the virtues are based solely on wilful personal acts. They are volitional acts for the purpose of a person being viewed as exceptional within Greek society. However, the presence of the four virtues in any amount does not reflect the heart of the individual, reminiscent of Jesus' condemnation of the Pharisees as whitewashed tombs (Matt 23:27). In contrast, grace and truth are divine attributes that describe the essence of the *Logos*.

For the child of God, grace and truth are to be emulated, but cannot be replicated because these are immutable attributes of God.

Philo describes one further action of the *logos*: the *logos* dwells in the soul of persons whose 'life is an object of honour' (*Post.* 122). Philo suggests that the invisible God does have an earthly presence in the invisible soul (*Cher.* 101). Philo sees the presence of an image of the invisible God present in each person by virtue of the 'image of an image' motif discussed earlier. Each person is born with this image as part of one's soul. This is where and how God grants the gifts of peace, 'the highest of blessings' (*Mos.* 1.304) and 'joy' (*Som.* 1.71). Once again, the gifts of peace and joy are experienced only by the virtuous and thus represent works righteousness. Philo's words sound remarkably similar to the peace and joy that comes from being a child of God. However, as is often the case with Philo, like terms often have different definitions.

Philo understood the Stoic ideal of *apatheia* (source of the English word apathy), that is, the desire to be free from all emotions or passions. These are not emotions or passions in the modern sense of the terms. The Stoics classified emotions as either healthy or unhealthy (generally presented as pairs of opposite emotions) and that our reactions to either must remain under strict control by the individual. Healthy emotions include joy, peace and so on. The unhealthy emotions are part of opposite pairs, such as pain or suffering, fear, lust, and pleasure, and so on. Stoicism was an ethical approach to life,

the way to live a virtuous life or attainment of moral excellence, therefore, it was the practice of the virtues that created happiness.

One who lives a virtuous life controls one's emotional responses to uncertain events of life, even those that are highly desirable, such as peace and joy. Thus, the *Logos* was the source of the virtues and the desirable emotions of joy and peace. The apostle John implicitly moves the frame of reference for a follower of *Logos* from dealing with the daily vagaries of life to an eternal perspective. The peace and joy that comes from the *Logos* is the result of becoming a child of God and is based on the finished work of the *Logos* on the cross, not through human efforts, for the reward of eternity in the presence of God.

4. Summary and Conclusions

A detailed exegetical analysis of the Prologue produced ten essential statements about the origins, person, and work of John's Christological *Logos*, and was compared to Philo's description of his mythological *logos* using the set of ten criteria developed in Part One.

1. The *Logos* is preexistent and eternal. Philo's *logos* was a created entity possessing a necessary portion of uncreated God's divinity for performing the tasks given to him. Philo uses descriptive terms reminiscent of those used to describe the person and work of the predicted Messiah found in the Old Testament. The *logos* was not present at the creation, therefore the *logos* is not the Word.

2. The *Logos* (Jesus Christ) is divine. Philo views God as transcendent and thus requires a mediator with humanity. The *logos* does not share all the divine or eternal characteristics of the *Logos*. The power of the *logos* is bestowed by God and is not part of his nature. The *Logos* and God are both uncreated and share the same essence and exist in perfect relationship. Therefore, the *logos* is not divine.

3. The *Logos* is the creator of all things. Every single thing that has ever been created was created by the *Logos ex nihilo*. The *Logos* holds together all creation and is sovereign over creation. For Philo, the *logos* was created by God to perform particular tasks using a variety of contextual identities. The *logos* created all things from the 'four elements' that were provided (earth, air, water, and fire). The *logos* does not create *ex nihilo* therefore the *logos* is not the *Logos*.

4. Jesus Christ is the source of humanity's spiritual enlightenment. The *Logos*, as part of the act of creation, placed a divine light within humanity (wisdom), our intellect, and an internal moral compass sufficient to discern the existence of God and the *Logos* as the source of eternal salvation. For Philo, the mind of humanity is finite and cannot conceive of an infinite God thus the need for the unique and privileged role of the philosopher who seeks to better understand God is required. The major point of disagreement is centred on the incarnation of the *Logos* who seeks the salvation of humanity in the form of an eternal, personal relationship with God. These concepts were completely foreign to Philo and do not describe the work of his description of his mystical logos in any way.

5. John the Baptizer called for repentance, heralded the coming of the Messiah. In context, John's call for repentance distinctly reflected the Old Testament action of spiritual cleaning and personal recommitment to the Law of Moses, clearly consistent with Philo's beliefs.

John describes the *Logos* as calling for a radical change in a person's life so that individuals may come into an eternal personal relationship with God. For Philo, the logos enables persons to gain the wisdom necessary to know God better by means of virtuous actions (works righteousness). The *Logos* offers salvation through repentance and faith, unlike the logos that looks for personal virtuous works.

6. A majority of fallen humanity reject spiritual enlightenment. John describes the *Logos* as the source of humanity's spiritual enlightenment although many will reject the *Logos* as true Light and will intentionally continue to embrace the darkness. Spiritual enlightenment, in context, is a personal knowledge and belief in God. Philo also describes spiritual enlightenment as the possession of the various 'virtues' individually earned, for the purpose of attaining a greater understanding of the logos, not God. The ultimate goal is that one becomes closer to transcendent God, rather than personally 'knowing' God, as John teaches.

7. A minority of fallen humanity embrace spiritual enlightenment to become children of God. John states that the majority of Jews rejected the *Logos* as Messiah, yet those who do embrace the *Logos* become children of God and receive all the benefits of that familial relationship for eternity. Philo describes his logos as having the responsibility for the spiritual welfare of humanity.

The logos appeared many times in scripture as personified wisdom, thus delivering to humanity blessings in the form of increased wisdom. Pursuing wisdom for the purpose of personal enlightenment conflicts with John's description of the Logos pursuing humanity for eternal salvation.

8. Salvation is not the product of human work. John states that salvation comes as a free gift from the *Logos*. Philo writes that our understanding of the logos is perfected by personal perseverance with acquiring wisdom and our success is limited only by our capacity for reason. Humanity may pursue knowledge of transcendent God only through increasing knowledge of the logos. Eternal salvation for eternity is a free gift from the *Logos*.

9. Jesus Christ arrived incarnate in the world. The incarnate *Logos* as 100% divine and 100% human has no parallel in Philo's writings. There is also no parallel with an immanent God reaching down to humanity with the purpose of developing an eternal relationship. Philo does describe the logos as guiding God's judgment of the universe, including humanity.

Reconciliation is not a function of Philo's logos and, for Philo, it is impossible for God to directly interact with humanity. The *Logos* came in incarnate form into the world with a message of salvation. The logos was commanded to be a messenger to humanity in a functional relationship with God. Philo never speaks about the logos and humanity's sin nor the need for God's grace, mercy, and love.

10. Jesus Christ is our source of grace and truth. John uses the terms grace and truth in the Prologue as essential elements of our understanding of salvation and the work and person of the *Logos*. To know the *Logos* is to know God. God is grace and truth and therefore cares about the eternal destiny of individuals. For Philo, the logos functionally is the revelator of God and has a presence in our invisible soul. But since the logos is 'an image of an image' of God, we see God imperfectly and dimly. The logos is all that humanity may 'see' of transcendent God. Peace and joy come only from virtuous actions (works righteousness), not as the free gift of God's grace.

This work concludes that there are no intersections of thought between John's description of the Christological *Logos* and Philo's logos philosophy. Therefore, John's Prologue is an *explicit* 'rejection' of Philo's logos philosophy, whether or not the apostle John was aware of the writings of Philo of Alexandria. John's Prologue is also an *implicit* apologetic, or better,

a polemic against Philo's logos philosophy insofar as John's knowledge of Philo's writings can be determined through circumstantial evidence, although specific motives are impossible to determine without direct knowledge of John's state of mind at the time of writing the Prologue.

These conclusions have many implications. For example, the view held by many scholars that Philo's mystical philosophy was an evolutionary step into what was to become John's Christological view of the *Logos* or that John's *Logos* is Philo's logos in abbreviated form must both be rejected because neither conclusion is supported by the evidence presented. If there are no similarities of thought then there can be no evolution of thought.

John's Prologue to the fourth Gospel was written for multiple purposes. John wrote a persuasive evangelical tract with the purpose of attracting Greek-speaking Jews and Gentiles with the purpose of persuading readers to accept John's apologetic description of the incarnate *Logos* as God in flesh. In doing so, John *explicitly* rejects the Philonic logos as the detailed comparison of John's Christological *Logos* and Philo's philosophical logos demonstrates.

John chose the word 'logos' because it is a term recognizable to Gentiles and Jews, living within a Hellenistic culture, as a literary device to attract the largest possible audience as a means to present his gospel message so that all his readers '... may believe Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God, and by believing you may have life in His name' (John 20:31).

Appendix 1. The Works of Philo of Alexandria

Abr De Abrahamo On Abraham

Aet. De Aeternitate Mundi On the Eternity of the World

Agr De Agricultura On Husbandry

Cher. De Cherubim On the Cherubim

Conf. De Confusione Linguarum On the Confusion of Tongues

Congr. De Congressu Eruditionisgratia On the Preliminary Studies

Decal. De Decalogo On the Decalogue

Det. Quod Deterius Potiori insidiari solet The Worse attacks the Better

Ebr. De Ebrietate On Drunkenness

Flacc. In Flaccum Flaccus

Fug. De Fuga et Inventione On Flight and Finding

Gig. De Gigantibus On the Giants

Hyp. Hypothetica/Apologia pro Iudaeis Apology for the Jews

Jos. De Josepho On Joseph

Leg. De Legatione ad Gaium On the Embassy to Gaius

Leg. All. Legum Allegoriarum Allegorical Interpretation

Mig. De Migratione Abrahami On the Migration of Abraham

Mos. De Vita Mosis On the Life of Moses

Mut. De Mutatione Nominum On the Change of Names

Op. De Opificio Mundi On the Creation

Plant. De Plantatione On Noah's Work as a Planter

Post. De Posteritate Caini On the Posterity and Exile of Cain

Praem. De Praemiis et Poenis On Rewards and Punishments

Prov. De Providentia On Providence

Quaest in Gn. Questiones et Solutiones in Genesin Questions and Answers on Genesis

Quaest in Ex Questiones et Solutiones in Exodum Questions and Answers on Exodus

Quis Her. Quis rerum divinarum Heres sit Who is the Heir

Quod Deus. Quod Deus sit Immutabilis On the Unchangeableness of God

Quod Omn. Prob. Quod omnis Probus Libersit Every Good Man is Free

Sac. De Sacri Nciis Abelis et Caini On the Sacrifices of Abel and Cain

Sob. De Sobrietate On Sobriety

Som. De Somniis On Dreams

Spec. Leg. De Specialibus Legibus On the Special Laws

Virt. De Virtute On the Virtues

Vit. Cont. De Vita Contemplativa On the Contemplative Life

Reference List

Beasley-Murray GR 2002. *John* (2nd ed.). *Word Biblical Commentary* 36. Nashville: Thomas Nelson.

- Borgen P, Fuglseth K, and Skarsten R 2005. *The Works of Philo: Greek Text with Morphology*. Bellingham: Logos Bible Software, 2005.
- Danielou J 2014. *Philo of Alexandria Translated by James Colbert*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers.
- Dodd CH 1968. *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Du Toit AB 1968. The Incarnate Word—A Study of John 1:14. *Neotestamentica* 2:9–21.
- Goodenough ER 1945. John A Primitive Gospel. *JBL* 64(19):145–182.
- Gunther JJ 1979. The Alexandrian Gospel and Letters of John. *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 41(1):581–603.
- Kleinknecht H 1964. The Logos in the Greek and Hellenistic World. In G Kittel, GW Bromiley, and G Friedrich (eds). *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (vol. 4), 77–91. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Liddell HG, Scott R et. al. 1996. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Logos Bible Software.
- Lewy H 2004. *Selected Writings: Philo of Alexandria*. Mineola: Dover Publications, Inc.
- Nash RH 1982. *The Word of God and the Mind of Man: The Crisis of Revealed Truth*. Contemporary Theology. Grand Rapids: Zondervan
- Parker J 1988. The Incarnational Christology of John. *Criswell Theological Review* 3.1. Criswell College.
- Rokeah D 2001. *Justin Martyr and the Jews*. Boston: Brill
- Runia K 2001. *The Present-Day Christological Debate*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers.
- Sandmel S 1979. *Philo of Alexandria: An Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Schnackenburg R 1968. In K Smyth (ed), *The Gospel According to St. John. Volume One: Introduction and Commentary on Chapters 1–4*. Montreal: Palm.
- Thyssen HP 2006. Philosophical Christology in the New Testament. *Numen* 53(2):133–176.
- Yonge CD with Philo of Alexandria 2006. *The Works of Philo: Complete and Unabridged*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers Marketing.