


INTERNET ARCHIVE

Digitized for Microsoft Corporation
by the Internet Archive in 2007.

From University of California Libraries.

May be used for non-commercial, personal, research,
or educational purposes, or any fair use.

May not be indexed in a commercial service.



THE FOURTH GOSPEL IN
RESEARCH AND DEBATE

THE FOURTH GOSPEL IN RESEARCH AND DEBATE

A SERIES OF ESSAYS ON PROBLEMS CON-
CERNING THE ORIGIN AND VALUE OF
THE ANONYMOUS WRITINGS ATTRIB-
UTED TO THE APOSTLE JOHN

BY

BENJAMIN WISNER BACON, D.D., LL.D.

Buckingham Professor of New Testament Criticism and Exegesis in Yale University
Author of "An Introduction to New Testament Literature," "The Story
of St. Paul," "Beginnings of Gospel Story," etc.



NEW YORK

MOFFAT, YARD AND COMPANY

1910

BS2615
B2

COPYRIGHT, 1910, BY
MOFFAT, YARD AND COMPANY
NEW YORK
All Rights Reserved
PUBLISHED, FEBRUARY, 1910

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
LIBRARY

TO THE MEMORY
OF
MY GRANDFATHER
LEONARD BACON
A STATESMAN
OF
THE KINGDOM OF GOD

PREFACE

The present volume has grown out of certain articles contributed by the author from time to time during the last ten years to technical and semi-technical journals on the vexed problem of the origin of the Fourth Gospel. It owes its semi-popular, semi-technical character to this fact.

The controversial element implied in its title is also a reflection of the conditions of the time equally manifest in the articles which preceded it. A group of four appeared in the *Hibbert Journal* in the issues of April, 1903 (I, 3), January, 1904 (II, 2), January, 1905 (III, 2) and October, 1907 (VI, 1). In these the effort of the writer was to bring before the intelligent lay public the merits of the great critical debate, the cause of the opponents of the traditional authorship being frankly espoused. At intervals before and during this period contributions were made also to *The Expositor* (1907), the *Journal of Biblical Literature* (1894, 1908), and the *American Journal of Theology* (1900) in the interest of research pure and simple into questions involved in the problem. The volume begun as nothing more than a reproduction of these two groups of articles, somewhat revised and supplemented, naturally reflects, even in its present greatly developed and altered form, the two aspects of current discussion which called forth the material of its substratum.

Knowledge of the fact just stated may be of service to the reader, but the fact itself needs no apology. Whether fortunately or unfortunately—and the effects are not all unfavorable—biblical criticism is forced to build with one hand on shield and spear, the other on the trowel. Before

its results are tested on their merits it is required to justify its own existence. The assailant of the traditional authorship of the Fourth Gospel has no real success unless he can obtain a hearing from men profoundly interested in the cause of revealed religion, above all in the religion which has Jesus Christ as both teacher and Lord. The first step of those who resist his conclusions is to assure the public to which he appeals that his motives are inimical to its dearest and most sacred ideals. How, then, can criticism obtain a hearing without the weapons of controversy?

On the other hand, what examples not only of consecrated scholarship, but of dignified and noble Christian courtesy, are evoked in such names as Lightfoot, Sanday, James Drummond! Only the conviction that his cause is just can lead a comparative novice into the lists against such as these. If one venture, it can only be in the full realization of relatively imperfect scholarship, less extensive learning, less accurate knowledge on many important facts. And yet in such a field as this, where new facts are grains of gold hidden under mountains of thrice sifted waste, the more vital requisite is the perspective of great and well-known things in their true proportion and relation, rather than extent or minuteness in the knowledge of particulars. New perspectives may be given to a younger generation, and when seen they demand to be made known. Such is the reason for this book. Errors will doubtless reveal their presence in it. Its tone toward older and greater authorities of opposing view may be criticized as showing too little of that respect professed by the author, and professed not in insincerity, nor as conventionally due, but out of deep and well-founded conviction. We hope the criticism will not seem justified. Many things might have been better said, some perhaps might have been better left unsaid. And yet withal the faith remains that our book will be of service. May the reader gain from it new insights into

the beginnings of our faith. May the Church of Christ be stimulated by it to a larger and freer apprehension of his Spirit.

BENJ. W. BACON.

NEW HAVEN, Oct. 26, 1909.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	iii
INTRODUCTION: THE ISSUES INVOLVED	I

PART I

THE EXTERNAL EVIDENCE

CHAPTER	I. THE MODERN FORM OF THE QUESTION	17
CHAPTER	II. ECHOES AND INFLUENCES	43
CHAPTER	III. PAPIAS, EUSEBIUS, AND THE ARGUMENT FROM SILENCE	73
CHAPTER	IV. THE TRADITION AS TO THE ELDERS AND ITS TRANSFORMATIONS	101
CHAPTER	V. JOHN IN ASIA AND THE MARTYR APOSTLES	127

PART II

THE DIRECT INTERNAL EVIDENCE

CHAPTER	VI. THE JOHN OF REVELATION	157
CHAPTER	VII. EPISTLES AND APPENDIX—THEIR RELATION TO ONE ANOTHER AND TO THE GOSPEL	184
CHAPTER	VIII. THE APPENDIX A PRODUCT OF REVISION AT ROME	210

		PAGE
CHAPTER	IX. THE BATTLE FOR RECOGNITION OF ASIAN TRADITION AT ROME	226
CHAPTER	X. IRENAEUS THE MEDIATOR AND THE FOURFOLD GOSPEL . . .	247

PART III

THE INDIRECT INTERNAL EVIDENCE

CHAPTER	XI. THE EVANGELIST'S TASK . . .	273
CHAPTER	XII. THE DISCIPLE WHOM JESUS LOVED, AND HIS RELATION TO THE AUTHOR	301
CHAPTER	XIII. JOHANNINE PRAGMATISM . . .	332
CHAPTER	XIV. JOHANNINE TREATMENT OF SYN- OPTIC MATERIAL	356
CHAPTER	XV. JOHANNINE TOPOGRAPHY AND CHRONOLOGY	385
CHAPTER	XVI. JOHANNINE QUARTODECIMANISM .	412

PART IV

LATEST PHASES OF DEBATE AND RESEARCH

CHAPTER	XVII. THE "DEFENSE" OF THE GOSPEL	443
CHAPTER	XVIII. THE ANALYTICAL SCHOOL OF CRITICISM	472
CHAPTER	XIX. DISLOCATIONS OF MATERIAL AND TATIAN'S ORDER	497
CHAPTER	XX. CONCLUSION	528
INDEX	539

THE FOURTH GOSPEL

INTRODUCTION

THE ISSUES INVOLVED

The greatest English scholar of his generation, acknowledged leader of the self-styled "defenders" of the Fourth Gospel, in beginning his discussion of the problem made the following statement of his conviction regarding the issues involved:

"The genuineness of St. John's Gospel is the center of the position of those who uphold the historical truth of the record of our Lord Jesus Christ given us in the New Testament. Hence the attacks of the opponents of revealed religion are concentrated upon it. So long however as it holds its ground, these assaults must inevitably prove ineffective. The assailants are of two kinds: (1) those who deny the miraculous element in Christianity—Rationalists, (2) those who deny the distinctive character of Christian doctrine—Unitarians. The Gospel confronts both. It relates the most stupendous miracle in the history of our Lord (short of the Incarnation and the Resurrection), the raising of Lazarus. Again, it enunciates in the most express terms the Divinity, the Deity, of our Lord. And yet at the same time it professes to have been written by the one man, of all others, who had the greatest opportunities of knowing the truth. The testimony of St. Paul might conceivably be set aside, as of one who was not an eye-witness. But here we have, not an *ἔκτρομα*,¹ not a personal disciple merely, not one of the twelve only, but *the one* of the twelve—the Apostle who leaned on his Master's bosom, who stood by his Master's cross, who entered his Master's empty grave. If therefore the

¹ I Cor. 15:8.

claim of this Gospel to be the work of John the son of Zebedee be true, if in other words the Fourth Gospel be genuine, the most formidable, not to say an insuperable, obstacle stands in the way of both classes of antagonists. Hence the persistence and the ingenuity of the attacks; and hence also the necessity of a thoroughness in the defence.”¹

It is possible that Bishop Lightfoot, were he living to-day, might modify somewhat the terms by which he characterizes his opponents. Those who antagonize—not “the claim of this Gospel to be the work of John the son of Zebedee”; for, Bishop Lightfoot to the contrary notwithstanding, the Gospel does *not* “profess to have been written” by him—but the theory traceable to about 170 A. D. imputing its authorship to “the beloved disciple,” are still accustomed to being described as rationalists and Unitarians, and by no means anticipate that the “defenders of the Gospel” will altogether refrain from the imputation of evil motives of which the example has been so conspicuously set. In this no immediate change is to be expected. But inasmuch as on the one side a considerable and increasing number of scholars of Bishop Lightfoot’s own evangelical type of belief are to-day joining the ranks of his opponents on the Johannine question, while on the other one of the most eminent and conspicuous defenders of the “genuineness” is both a Unitarian and a denier of that “most stupendous miracle . . . the raising of Lazarus,” it is possible his phraseology might be altered.

Whether the epithets, and the imputations of motive be fair and reasonable or not, as applied to scholars of to-day, all such will thoroughly agree with Bishop Lightfoot as to the vital character of the issues involved. We see many an eminent scholar whose views on this moot point of historical and

¹ Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays*, Macmillan, 1893, p. 47.

literary criticism are diametrically opposed to Bishop Lightfoot's, who is an ardent supporter both of "revealed religion" and of "the divinity of our Lord." But such scholars have no disposition to deny, they vehemently affirm, that their interpretation of those much debated terms "revelation," "divinity of Christ," varies widely from that which would be forced upon the Church by some advocates of the Johannine authorship. It does indeed make a tremendous difference whether the particular doctrine of "the Divinity, the Deity of our Lord" which this admittedly late writer presents as reflecting Jesus' teaching as to Sonship is, or is not, to be enforced as the main feature of his message, conveyed on the authority of "the one man, of all others, who had the greatest opportunities of knowing the truth." On this question we are driven unavoidably to the alternative: Either Synoptics, or John. Either the former are right in their complete silence regarding preëxistence and incarnation, and their subordination of the doctrine of Jesus' person, in presenting his work and teaching as concerned with the kingdom of God, with repentance and a filial disposition and life, as the requirement made by the common Father for that inheritance; or else John is right in making Jesus' work and message supremely a manifestation of his own glory as the incarnate Logos, effecting an atonement for the world which has otherwise no access to God. Both views cannot be true, and to a very large extent it is the science of literary and historical criticism which must decide between them. We agree, then, with Bishop Lightfoot that the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel is the question of questions in all the domain of biblical science. The criticism which has effected a transformation in our conception of Hebrew religious history by making the so-called Priestly Document the latest and historically speaking least reliable source of the Pentateuch, instead of the earliest and most fundamental, will accomplish

a still more revolutionary change in our conception of New Testament beginnings, if its deductions are accepted regarding the Fourth Gospel.

Since the period of the Greek fathers and the Ecumenical councils all approaches toward a historical view of the origins of Christianity have been dominated by that metaphysical conception of the person of Christ which begins with Paul and culminates in the Confession of Nicæa. The Hellenistic conception of incarnation visibly enters the domain of Jewish messianism in the Epistles of Paul; in that which we may designate the Johannine Canon, a group of Epistles, Gospel and Apocalypse appearing at Ephesus, the most important centre of the Pauline mission field, at the very close of the first century, this conception has become a full fledged Logos doctrine. In this group of writings Jesus is formally and distinctly identified with the Logos principle of Heraclitus, the Ephesian philosopher of about 500 B. C. There cannot be in the whole domain of biblical science a question more absolutely vital and fundamental than this: Is the conception of the life of Jesus as an incarnation of the divine Logos a development of Pauline speculation about Christ; or is it Jesus' own teaching regarding himself? The question depends in large measure upon the ulterior one: Is the Fourth Gospel, which presents this view—and presents it in complete contrast to the earlier three, known as Synoptic—is the Fourth Gospel our sole surviving record from the hand of one of the twelve—one of the most intimate of these companions of Jesus in Galilee? Or is this Gospel not only late, but altogether secondary and dependent; serviceable for the light thrown upon the development of Pauline into patristic Christology, but of little or no service to supplement historically the Synoptic picture of the teaching and career of Jesus?

Paul, like his great contemporary Philo, the interpreter of

Judaism in terms of Greek philosophy, rests largely upon the Alexandrian book of Hellenistic stoicism, the Wisdom of Solomon (*ca.* 30 B. C.). In this book the redemptive as well as the creative principle in the divine nature is the element of "wisdom." This "effulgence" of the divine glory, which was in the beginning the "artificer" of creation, which "fills all things," interpenetrates all things, and "holds all things together," enters also "into holy souls and makes men to be prophets and friends of God." Philo, the Erasmus of the Jewish church in the period of its great crisis, interpreted this "wisdom" doctrine on its scholastic and intellectual side. He naturally makes a shorter course in his identification of it with the creative and revelative principle of Heraclitus, as subsequently developed in current stoic cosmology. For Philo, the step would be easy from the divine "wisdom," his "second God," which is not another, but only God manifest and operative in the world, to the Logos of the Ionic school of cosmological speculation. Paul, the Luther of the age of the Hellenization of Judaism, has not yet taken this step. With him there are other elements in the divine "wisdom" which are not covered by the more coldly intellectual Greek term. The "wisdom of God" is to Paul preëminently that redeeming agency which goes out "to seek and to save that which was lost." This is characteristic of the Palestinian "wisdom" doctrine, as against the Hellenistic. We see it for example in what the Epistle of James says of the gift of "wisdom" (Jas. 1:5, 17, -8, 21; 3:13-18; 4:5, 6).

Paul is not at heart a Greek, however deeply affected by stoic dualism. Fundamentally he is a Pharisean messianist. Cosmological speculation with him is secondary. Ethics and eschatology are primary. He is interested in questions of conduct, he is schooled in the extravagant dreams of apocalypse. Nay, he is an apocalypticist himself, rapt

away in ecstasy to the third heaven. When Paul became a Christian, Jesus became to him the solution of his ethical and his eschatological ideal in one. Ethically Christ became to Paul "the end of the law unto righteousness" by a teaching and life which put ethics upon a wholly new plane. Eschatologically he became the Lord from heaven, Heir of the Creation, predestined Head of a redeemed universe of conscious beings, by the fact that he had been "manifested as the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead." Messianism, and especially apocalyptic messianism with its copious importations from Persian and pre-Persian mythology, had almost no effect on Philo. It was the breath of life to Paul. No wonder, therefore, that Paul is in no haste to identify that redemptive agency of God which he found incarnate in Jesus, and that apocalyptic Second Adam whom he had seen in the person of the risen Christ, with the cosmological principle of Heraclitus "the obscure."

And yet the cosmological ideas half unveiled in Paul's letters to Corinth and Rome, founded as they unmistakably are upon the Hebraized stoicism of the Wisdom of Solomon, have as their unavoidable issue just such an identification of this phase of the divine "wisdom" as Philo makes. As has been well said, "All of the Logos doctrine but the name is already present in the Pauline Epistles."

But it is not the Logos doctrine of Philo to which Paul's thought is leading up. Even in the Johannine literature, wherein the name Logos itself is naturalized, thenceforth to be used in the Greek fathers of the second century interchangeably with the Jewish term Wisdom, it only appears upon the threshold and does not invade the sanctuary. The prologue of the Fourth Gospel makes the formal identification, presenting the evangelist's cosmology; but it is not introduced into the utterances of Jesus himself. Indeed it is one of the main objects of this writer to fill the term with

that ethical and sociological, if not eschatological, import which it could never have obtained by the short cut of Philo's scholasticism.

The roots of the Johannine Logos doctrine are only to a slight and subordinate degree in Philo. They run back by way of Hebrews and more especially by way of the great Pauline Epistles of the second period, Colossians and Ephesians, through purely Christian soil to the common ancestor, the Wisdom of Solomon. We have said, "All of the Logos doctrine but the name is already present in the Pauline Epistles." We might say with almost equal truth, The whole Christology of "John"—a vastly greater matter than the mere cosmological concept of the Logos—is a straightforward development of the incarnation doctrine of Paul.

Hebrew speculative thought, once it had reached the stage of the Wisdom of Solomon, was sure to issue in some sort of Logos doctrine. Even the Synagogue developed its hypostases of a Memra and a Metatron. In Alexandria the step could be taken easily, logically, through a Philo. In Palestine and the Christian world it had to undergo a period of postponement and of immeasurable enrichment by all that is implied in the story of Jesus and of Paul.

Philosophers of the period of Justin Martyr and Irenæus confessed that there was no practical difference between their own mode of thinking and that of Christian theologians save on the one point of the *incarnation* of the Logos. The doctrine of the Fourth Gospel would be acceptable to them if they might be permitted to cancel the one clause "the Logos became flesh." Gnostics and Docetics would go further still, asking only to substitute "dwelt in" for "became." But one must have failed to grasp even the elements of Johannine thought not to realize that this verse is absolutely central to the system. Incarnation is its keynote. The Johannine Christ comes not by water only, like the æon

Christ of Cerinthus, who at the baptism made the man Jesus a "receptaculum" for his presence until the passion. It is one that comes by water and by blood. Its Jesus was not divine from the baptism only, nor from the birth only, but from all eternity and to all eternity. The fourth evangelist is determined to hold that very man whose voice the Church had heard, whose form it had seen, and their hands had handled, in eternal, inseparable union with that very Word and Wisdom of God, "who being in the form of God had not counted it (like the first Adam) a prize to be grasped by robbery to be equal with God, but had humbled himself and taken on him the form of a servant, and become obedient unto death, even the death of the cross;" having also for this very self-humiliation been highly exalted by God, and given "the name, which is above every name, that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, and that every tongue of men and of angels should confess that he is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

The Logos doctrine of Paul is also a creation doctrine. "We believe in one God the Father of whom are all things, and in one Lord Jesus Christ through whom are all things." It is also a wisdom doctrine, as postulating a mind substance which forms the common term between the human reason, the intelligible cosmos, and the Absolute.

" " Things which eye saw not.

And ear heard not.

And which entered not into the heart of man.'

(Even the things which God hath prepared for them that love him); he hath revealed them unto us by the Spirit; for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God."

As a man's spirit gives him consciousness of his purposes and intentions, so we in having the mind of Christ are made participant in the consciousness of the Creator. Such is Paul's conception of the *λόγος ἐνδιάθετος*. But beyond and

above these merely philosophical aspects, Paul's Logos doctrine is an avatar of the redemptive energy of the divine nature. The legalistic and apocalyptic thought of Pharisaism give it substance. The life of Jesus on earth as proclaimer and exponent of the gospel of sonship by faith, Paul's vision of him as the risen Lord of glory—these give it definite form. Such is Paul's doctrine of the *λόγος προφορικός*. Is it a matter of righteousness and the law and the knowledge and fulfilment of the divine will?—"Say not in thine heart, Who shall ascend into heaven (that is, to bring Christ down); or, Who shall descend into the abyss (that is, to bring Christ up again from the dead). The word is nigh thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart (that is, the word of faith which we preach)." Is it a matter of the coming kingdom, the new heaven and new earth of religious aspiration? Then the scripture is applicable.

" 'When he ascended on high
He led captivity captive
And gave gifts unto men.'

For this 'He ascended,' what is it but that he also descended into the lower parts of the earth. He that descended is the same also that ascended far above all the heavens that he might fill all things."

How is it possible in face of the genius, the ardor, the enthusiastic conviction of a Paul, that anything should survive to us of that simpler Christology which roots itself in the Galilean tradition of Jesus' own life and teaching? Not a fragment remains of the reputed Aramaic compilation by the Apostle Matthew of the Sayings of the Lord. If we can restore them it is only in Greek translation, as elements taken from the substance of later Greek gospels. The narrative of Jesus' life which tradition tells us comes ultimately from the lips of Peter, and which at all events has practically taken the place of all other tradition from times as remote as

the origin of our first and third Gospels,—even this narrative of Mark also comes to us as a Greek product, from the Pauline church of Rome, framed in the interest of Pauline doctrine, saturated with Pauline phrases and ideas. And yet the older, simpler Christology *has* survived. Neither the teachings as restored from the non-Markan material common to Matthew and Luke, nor the Markan narrative, nor our canonical first or third evangelist has introduced anywhere one trace of the Pauline doctrine of the preëxistence of Christ or of incarnation. Both the fundamental Synoptic sources, Matthæan sayings and Markan narrative as well, exhibit a consistent historical situation true to conditions as we know them at the time. We see legalism dominant in the Synagogue, the masses religiously destitute, disinherited from the now transcendentalized messianic hope. Jesus comes forward taking up simply and loyally the prophetic and humanitarian reform of John the Baptist. He becomes the champion of the publicans and sinners, offers an “easy yoke” of simple God-likeness, and an assurance that the relation of fatherhood and sonship is open to all. It is the Father’s good pleasure to give the kingdom even to the little flock now gathered around him. Sayings, incidents, parables are all consistent with this Galilean environment, this ethico-religious impulse. Jesus speaks to “babes” in the wisdom that is revealed to “babes,” like a plain man to plain men, albeit with the power of a prophet and of more than a prophet. Even his miracles are not as in the Fourth Gospel “manifestations of the glory” of the incarnate Logos. “He went about doing good, healing all that were oppressed of the Devil.” Like the “sons of the Pharisees” he exorcised. Like his disciples, and even some that followed not with them, he “did mighty works,” mainly of healing, “because God was with him.” There was collision with the scribes and synagogue authorities—Jesus was driven out of Galilee. He went to Jerusalem and challenged

the priestly hierocracy itself in the stronghold of their power, demanding in the name of "the people" that the temple be no longer a den of robbers but a house of prayer, and referring those who called for his authority to the example of the Baptist. Priestly conspirators seized him, delivered him to the Roman governor as aspiring to be the Christ, and secured his crucifixion on this ground. His followers, scattered at first, soon rallied to Jerusalem, convinced by appearances to Peter and others that God had raised him from the dead and exalted him to heaven, whence he would indeed soon appear as the Christ, the Son of man, the Redeemer of Israel.

Such is the Synoptic story of Jesus. Its keynote is not incarnation but apotheosis. Jesus is the Servant whom God according to promise had "raised up from among his brethren" "to bless them in turning away every one of them from his iniquities." Him "the heavens must now receive until the time of the restoration of all things." Meantime repentance and forgiveness in his name must be preached to Israel and "to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." All the factors, all the essential elements of this story fall within the known historical environment. The ideas in debate are those current in Judaism as it then was. John the Baptist, the Pharisees, the scribes, the publicans and sinners, the mutual relations of these and their conflicting hopes and ideals, are all intelligible. The whole drama is a drama of real life. It demands the divine factor behind it just as all life does, just as the life of our own time does; because without this not even the simplest thing is intelligible. But for all the essential factors of the story divine intervention is not required in any other sense. We say "essential factors" for it can scarcely be required that we regard this tradition as miraculously exempted from the tendencies to exaggeration and legendary accretion to which all others are exposed.

The representation of the Fourth Gospel inverts all this. Divine intention and operation are not interpreted by historical fact, but historical fact by divine intention and operation. What an incarnation of deity must say and do in order to make clear the redemptive plan, this is what is said and done. The selection of seven "signs" is avowedly made for the purpose of producing faith in this sense. The Synoptic sayings give way to dialogues on Christological doctrine, the parables to seven allegorical "I am's." There is neither order nor connection, nor do events entail their consequences. John the Baptist already proclaims Jesus as "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world;" Jesus' earliest disciples regard him as "the Son of God, the King of Israel;" the very opening of his ministry introduces the culminating act of resistance to priestly control in the temple.

The contrast in point of view between the Synoptic and Johannine conception is not a matter of dispute to-day among intelligent people. The facts above stated are verifiable. The general contrast is admitted. We have even from the most unexpected quarters admissions of the unhistorical character of this representation, its allegorical, mystical and metaphysical nature. It is admitted that the dialogues, which maintain throughout, for all speakers, the same style, and that style the marked and characteristic style of the Epistles of John, are the evangelist's own composition. It is even conceded by at least one prominent advocate of Johannine authorship that the incidents themselves may be—and that in some of the most vital cases—fictitious. Yet if these concessions seem to be made in one quarter they are immediately repudiated, or withdrawn, in another. Such an attitude is untenable. There must be consistency one way or the other. The life of Jesus was either divine only in so far as it realized all the divinity of which humanity is capable; or else it was not human save in so far as deity

can take upon itself "the form of a servant," while still retaining the attributes and consciousness of deity. Which of these two modes of conceiving the life of Jesus contains a real gospel for a world of lost and disinherited sons of God, is a question for the Church to determine. Hitherto, it has placed all its emphasis upon the metaphysical. Which of them represents the real Jesus, is for historical criticism to determine; and the heart of the problem is the Gospel attributed to John, with its reversal of the Synoptic conception. Both conceptions cannot represent the apostolic story. Harmonization overreaches itself when it attempts to bridge this chasm. Manifestly an apostolic eye-witness and intimate of Jesus who should so abuse his unique position as to offer speculative fiction and allegory instead of the rich store of personal recollections of the Master he was competent to give, would be worse than no witness at all. His high claims to present "the truth," regarded as the reality of tangible experience, would be mockery.

No; the issue is far deeper than a mere matter of words and names, and it calls aloud for decision. If the Fourth Gospel is that which tradition maintains, then the whole history of our religion, the whole conception of its Founder is radically involved. We cannot reasonably treat Synoptic story as of equal value with this subsequent, completely different, representation, by one immeasurably better qualified to set forth the truth. If, on the other hand, it is within the competence of historical and literary criticism to determine from what sources, in what period, with what authority, this Johannine representation has been produced, then our lives of Christ and our interpretations of Christianity must be written, or rewritten, accordingly.

Such lives of Christ, such interpretations of Christianity, and of the Fourth Gospel itself, are fortunately not wanting. But as long as the issue hangs undecided, Christian teaching

as a whole will follow the beaten track of tradition. It will even be treated as heresy and disloyalty to Christ to question the authorship long imputed to these writings. Such considerations will not greatly weigh with those accustomed to believe that the scientifically trustworthy is apt to prove also the practically edifying to faith. If in addition the Ephesian Canon is found to be the exponent of Christian life and faith in just that obscure period which marks the transition from Paul to the post-apostolic age, genuine and true because reflecting the very heart's faith of a great church in a great age, there will be compensations for the loss of a supposedly apostolic record. Its author, like Paul, will have known no "Christ after the flesh"; but deeply and truly the eternal Christ after the Spirit. The faith will not be vain in which he has written to the end that by believing we also "might have life in his name."

PART I
THE EXTERNAL EVIDENCE

PART I

THE EXTERNAL EVIDENCE

CHAPTER I

THE MODERN FORM OF THE QUESTION

A singular difference of opinion seems to exist, even among the strongest upholders of the Johannine Authorship of the Fourth Gospel, as to the relative value of what is called the "External Evidence," that is, the traces of its influence, direct or indirect, which the book has left upon subsequent writers. Principal Drummond, the most recent, and one of the most distinguished defenders of the traditional view, after a review of the contents in which he feels compelled to "attribute a lower historical value to the Fourth Gospel than to the Synoptics," so that "it is to be accepted more in the spirit than in the letter," is yet so impressed with the evidences of its early reception in the Church that he

"cannot but think that the external evidence of Johannine authorship possesses great weight, and, if it stood alone, would entitle the traditional view to our acceptance."

His ultimate conclusion is

"The external evidence . . . is all on one side, and for my part I cannot easily repel its force. A considerable mass of the internal evidence is in harmony with the external. A number of the difficulties (in the internal evidence) . . . melt away on nearer examination, and those which remain are not sufficient to weigh down the balance." ¹

¹ Drummond, *Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, Scribner, 1904, pp. 64, 351, 514.

Over against this clear admission of the decisive influence of the external evidence in the formation of Principal Drummond's opinion let us set that of Professor Sanday, who welcomes the appearance of this volume from his distinguished Oxford colleague with extraordinary enthusiasm.¹ So long ago as 1872, Sanday had written

"The subject of the external evidence has been pretty well fought out. The opposing parties are probably as near to an agreement as they ever will be. It will hardly be an unfair statement of the case for those who reject the Johannean authorship of the Gospel, to say, that the external evidence is compatible with that supposition. And on the other hand, we may equally say for those who accept the Johannean authorship, that the external evidence would not be sufficient alone to prove it."²

Since that early utterance three great English treatises have been devoted, exclusively or mainly, to this aspect of the problem. Ezra Abbott in 1880 redeemed American scholarship from the reproach of sterility by his famous essay *The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel: External Evidences*.³ This was in reality a supplement to Lightfoot's brilliant *Essays* in reply to the author of *Supernatural Religion*, and became a classic for all subsequent "defenders."⁴ The work of Principal Drummond already referred to, which appeared in 1904, was but a development and enlargement of work in which he had already engaged as an ally of San-

¹ *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, Scribner, 1905, p. 32.

² *Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel considered in reference to the contents of the Gospel itself*, Macmillan, 1872, p. 3.

³ *Unitarian Review* for February, March, June, 1880; reprinted by Scribner, *The Fourth Gospel*, etc.; *Essays by Ezra Abbott, Andrew Peabody, and Bishop Lightfoot*, 1891.

⁴ We should mention particularly Lightfoot's own discussion, "External Evidence for the Authenticity and Genuineness of St. John's Gospel," reprinted from lecture notes in the volume of his *Biblical Essays*, Macmillan, 1893.

day so early as 1875.¹ Finally, but a few weeks before Principal Drummond's book, there had also appeared the most thorough and judicial of all recent arguments for the Johanne Authorship from the external evidence from the pen of Professor V. H. Stanton of Cambridge.² But not even these three consecutive great and able treatises seem to have materially altered Professor Sanday's original conviction. In his recent work entitled *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*³ the treatment of "the External Evidence" is still relegated to less than a dozen pages in the last of the eight lectures. Dr. Drummond seems to him "to overstate a little—but only a little—the external evidence for the Gospel,"⁴ and we are left to infer that he abides by the conviction in which he had concurred some fourteen years before⁵ with his great antagonist Schürer, that the decisive arguments must fall within the field of the internal evidence.

If we ask how this singular difference in valuation of the external evidence arises, the answer is not far to seek. For Lightfoot and Ezra Abbott the great antagonist had been the author of *Supernatural Religion* together with the now obsolete school of Baur, who for reasons connected with his own theory of the early history of the Church placed the origin of the Fourth Gospel at the extremely late date of

¹ Three articles on Justin Martyr and the Fourth Gospel originally printed in the *Theological Review* for October, 1875, and April and July, 1877, are reproduced in Chapter II of the volume above referred to, including pp. 84 to 162. Chapter X on "Basilides" appeared first in the *Journal of Bibl. Lit.* for 1892. It had been prepared at a considerably earlier date.

² *The Gospels as Historical Documents; Part I. The Early Use of the Gospels*, Cambridge University Press, 1903.

³ Scribner, 1905, pp. 238-248.

⁴ P. 36.

⁵ See the article by Emil Schürer in the *Contemporary Review*, September, 1891, with Sanday's reply, *ibid.*, October, 1891. This reply was more fully elaborated by Sanday in a series of articles in the *Expositor* for 1891 and 1892.

170 A. D., denying even its *existence* prior to the times of Justin Martyr (150-160) and Tatian (160-180). The battle of critics began, therefore, as a question of dating, and the great victories of Drummond, Lightfoot, and Abbott were won by the use of the external evidence to disprove this untenably late date. Principal Drummond does not need to be told that Baur's theory of the origin of the Johannine writings is as obsolete as the Ptolemaic geography. And yet, as we shall see, his own treatment of the external evidence is but nominally adapted to modern conditions and to the new alignment of the opposing critical forces. He himself describes the change of critical opinion as follows:

"The appearance of the first volume of Keim's *Geschichte Jesu*, in 1867, may be taken as marking the beginning of a new period. In this work Keim proved himself one of the most strenuous assailants of the genuineness of the Gospel, but at the same time he made a very long retreat from the positions of Baur. He conceded that the Gospel was used by Justin Martyr, and brought back its date to the days of Trajan, 100-117 A. D.¹ He thought it probable that the author was a Jew and not a Gentile, and dismissed as without weight some of the arguments which had been considered adverse to this view. Thus the opponents were brought much nearer to one another, and those who were not under Tübingen influence began to feel the force of the arguments which were pressed against the apostolic authorship; and many who still defended the genuineness conceded that the author's point of view and purpose in his composition were not primarily historical. Thus, in Germany at least, the general result of the controversy has been to extend the area of doubt respecting the authorship, or, if not the authorship, the historical accuracy of the Gospel, and on the other hand to bring the opponents of its genuineness much nearer to the traditional view."

It is hard for an old soldier to forsake ground won in

¹ Principal Drummond omits to state that Keim subsequently relapsed to the date 130 A. D.

battle, even when it has lost strategic importance. In point of fact the Modern Form of the Johannine Question scarcely concerns itself with the question of date. It is a question not of date, but of authorship and historicity. Therefore the kind of external evidence once relied upon to prove the *existence* of the Gospel in the times of Polycarp, Ignatius, Papias, Justin, and Tatian, is almost totally irrelevant. To-day nobody denies the kind of existence this evidence is alone competent to prove; while on the other hand, evidence competent to prove acceptance of this Gospel as authoritative and apostolic, or even as sharing in the respect accorded to the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and (somewhat later) Luke, is wanting until the period of Tatian and Theophilus of Antioch (170-180 A. D.).¹ To critics of the present generation such as Edwin Abbott, Schmiedel, and Wellhausen, it is perfectly apparent that Baur mistook the period of *dissemination* for that of *origin*. To-day Strauss' dictum comparing the Fourth Gospel in its indivisible oneness to the holy coat "woven without seam" is no longer an axiom. Half a century of literary criticism has laid bare to us somewhat more of the formative period of our gospel writings. We are obliged to admit, nowadays, whether conservatives or radicals, that mere acquaintance with ideas or phraseology which more or less resemble the Johannine is not equivalent to acquaintance with our canonical Gospel of John, inclusive of its appendix and its latest editorial supplements. The conservative Oxford committee who report on traces of Johannine influence in the Epistles of Ignatius,² confess

"our ignorance how far some of the Logia (sayings) of Christ

¹ On the revolution effected about 170-180 A. D. in the acceptance of the Fourth Gospel, see Keim, *Jesus of Nazara* (Engl. transl.), Vol. I, pp. 197-199.

² *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, by a Committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1905, p. 83.

recorded by John may have been current in Asia Minor before the publication of the Gospel. If they formed part of the Apostle's oral teaching, they must have been familiar to his disciples, and may have been collected and written down long before our Gospel was composed."

Professor Sanday too is apparently less confident to-day than in 1872 of "a date not very far from 80-90 A. D.,"¹ for the Gospel as a finished whole. He prefers to speak of the Ignatian letters as proving the existence "well before the end of the first century, of a compact body of teaching like that which we find in the Fourth Gospel." The external evidence to his mind proves the "existence" of "the substance of the Fourth Gospel" "before the end of the first century," and this he considers "a considerable step towards the belief that the Gospel existed in writing."²

If many leaders of the conservative school appear to-day so much more cautious in their inferences from the external evidence, the reason becomes fully apparent when we notice what inferences are drawn from it by their opponents.

The most thorough and scholarly treatment of the external evidence accessible to the English reader, from the point of view of those who repudiate the traditional authorship, is that of the veteran scholar Edwin A. Abbott of London, in §§ 83 to 107 of the article "Gospels" in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*.³ Abbott discusses seriatim all the alleged traces of influence of the Johannine writings upon Clement of Rome (ca. 96 A. D.), the *Didaché* (?80-110), Barnabas (132), Simon Magus (?90-100), Ignatius (110-117), Polycarp (110-117), Papias (Harnack: 145-160, Abbott: 120-130), *Epistle to Diognetus* (Lightfoot: former

¹ *Authorship*, p. 12. For the difficulty in the way of so early a dating, see Stanton, *Gospels*, etc., pp. 18, 238.

² *Criticism*, p. 245.

³ *Macmillan*, 1901, Vol. II, columns 1825 to 1839.

part 117-147; latter part 180-210), Hermas (114-156), Basilides (117-138), Marcion (125-135), and Valentinus (141-156), and compares these with the use made at first of Matthew, or Matthew and Mark, later of Luke. He reaches the following conclusion:

“Up to the middle of the second century, though there are traces of Johannine thought and tradition, and immature approximations to the Johannine Logos-doctrine, yet in some writers (*e. g.*, Barnabas and Simon) we find rather what Jn. develops, or what Jn. attacks, than anything that imitates Jn., and in others (*e. g.*, Polycarp, Ignatius and Papias) mere war-cries of the time, or phrases of a Logos-doctrine still in flux, or apocalyptic traditions of which Jn. gives a more spiritual and perhaps a truer version. There is nothing to prove, or even suggest, that ‘Jn. was recognized as a gospel.’”

The relatively voluminous¹ treatises of Justin Martyr (153-160 A. D.) form a class by themselves for all students of the external evidence. The surprising non-appearance of the Fourth Gospel among his recognized authorities, at least in a degree approximating his “more than one hundred”² employments of the Synoptists, is one of the admitted difficulties of the supporters of tradition. Drummond, for example, after accumulating all possible traces of the use of John, meets the question “Why has Justin not quoted the Fourth Gospel at least as often as the other three?” with certain analogies whose validity we must test hereafter. Abbott, on the other hand, meets the alleged traces of the Fourth Gospel in Justin by an analysis even more thorough than Drummond’s, resulting in the following summary:

¹ The two *Apologies* and the *Dialogue with Trypho* occupy together about six times the space of the eight Epistles of Polycarp and Ignatius combined.

² So Schmiedel, article “John, son of Zebedee,” *Encycl. Bibl.*, Vol. II, column 2546, § 44. Drummond, *Character and Authorship*, p. 100, counts “somewhere about 170 citations from or references to the Gospels.” Among these he probably includes what he regards as “three apparent quotations” from John. See below.

“ It appears, then, that (1) when Justin seems to be alluding to Jn., he is really alluding to the Old Testament, or Barnabas, or some Christian tradition different from Jn., and often earlier than Jn.; (2) when Justin teaches what is practically the doctrine of the Fourth Gospel, he supports it, not by what can easily be found in the Fourth, but by what can hardly, with any show of reason, be found in the Three; (3) as regards Logos-doctrine, his views are alien from Jn. These three distinct lines of evidence converge to the conclusion that Justin either did not know Jn., or, as is more probable, knew it, but regarded it with suspicion, partly because it contradicted Luke his favorite Gospel, partly because it was beginning to be freely used by his enemies the Valentinians. (4) It may also be fairly added that literary evidence may have weighed with him. *He seldom or never quotes* (as many early Christian writers do) *from apocryphal works*. The title he gives to the Gospels (‘Memoirs of the Apostles’) shows the value he set on what seemed to him the very words of Christ noted down by the apostles. Accepting the Apocalypse as the work of (*Trypho* 81) the Apostle John he may naturally have rejected the claim of the Gospel to proceed from the same author. This may account for a good many otherwise strange phenomena in Justin’s writings. He could not help accepting much of the Johannine doctrine, but he expressed it, as far as possible, in non-Johannine language; and, where he could, he went back to earlier tradition for it, such as he found, for example, in the Epistle of Barnabas.”

As between the inferences drawn by “defenders” and by opponents of the Johannine Authorship only a careful study of the literature itself can enable us to judge. What we are now attempting to make clear is the common ground of agreement, the fact that in our day the debate concerns not date, but authorship; because the most radical opponent can easily afford to grant the utmost claims the conservative scholar is able to make from the external evidence as respects the mere “existence well before the end of the first century of a compact body of teaching like that which we find in the

Fourth Gospel." An early example of this coincidence of radical and conservative in the mere matter of dating was furnished by Keim, as already shown. In our day Zahn, "the prince of conservative scholars," is still arguing for the date 80-90 A. D., for the work in its present form,¹ while Wellhausen on purely internal grounds is arguing for substantially the same date, with the difference that for him, it only marks the beginnings of a literary process which culminated, through a series of supplementations and reconstructions, not earlier than 135 A. D.,² in our canonical Fourth Gospel. What Wellhausen thinks of the Johannine Authorship appears from his statement that Schwartz has "proved" the death of John the son of Zebedee along with James his brother in Jerusalem in 44 A. D.³

Schmiedel, in Professor Sanday's view, "understates the (external) evidence for the Fourth Gospel" prior to the year 180;⁴ but he esteems him a competent and sincere scholar, albeit "cold and severe," a "lawyer who pursues his adversary from point to point with relentless acumen."⁵ Professor Sanday is "not so sure as he (Schmiedel) is that there is no allusion to the Gospel in Barnabas or Hermas, where it is found (*e. g.*) by Keim, or in the Elders of Papias, where it is found (*e. g.*) by Harnack."⁶ But at least Schmiedel cannot be ruled out of court as unqualified to pronounce an opinion on the external evidence, and to understand what

¹ *Einleitung*, Bd. II, § 69.

² *Evangelium Johannis*, 1908. Jn. 5:43 contains in Wellhausen's view (pp. 27, 126), a reference to Bar Kochba (132-135 A. D.). The Appendix (Chapter 21) is not considered in the effort at dating, p. 126.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 119. See below, Chapter V.

⁴ *Criticism*, p. 240.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 241. Schmiedel's reasons for disagreeing with Harnack on this point are given in § 45 of his article "John, son of Zebedee," above referred to. On this point, as well as the "allusions" in Barnabas and Hermas, our own judgment is given in Chapter II.

questions are, and what are not, now regarded as within its capacity, we must hear also the opinion of Schmiedel.

After emphasizing the "distinction between testimonies expressly favorable to the apostolic authorship, and those which only vouch for the existence of the Fourth Gospel, without conveying any judgment as to its authorship" Schmiedel protests against the heaping up of alleged testimonies of the latter class as if they belonged to the former, as follows:

"Most of the early Christian writings which were held (by apologists of the last generation) to bear testimony to the Fourth Gospel—and of these precisely the oldest and therefore most important—in reality do not justify the claim based upon them.

(a) They show manifold agreements with Jn., but these consist only of single, more or less characteristic words or formulas, or other coincidences which might equally well have passed into currency by the channel of oral tradition. The great number of such agreements does in very deed prove that the Johannine formulas and catch-words were very widely diffused, and that the Johannine ideas had been, so to speak, for decennia in the air. We should run great danger of allowing ourselves to be misled, however, if, merely because it so happens that such phrases and turns of expression first became known and familiar to ourselves through the Fourth Gospel, we were at once to conclude that the writers in question can have taken them from that source alone. The true state of the case may very easily be quite the opposite; the words and phrases circulated orally; as they circulated they received an ever more pregnant, pointed, memorable form, and the writer of the Fourth Gospel, not as the first but as the last in the series of transmitters, set them down in a form and in a connection which excelled that of the others, and thus his work came to appear as if it were the source of the others."¹

Examination of all these resemblances, and estimate of their bulk and importance as compared with the use made by the same early writers of the other gospels, and as com-

¹ *Encycl. Bibl.*, Vol. II, s. v. "John, son of Zebedee," § 45.

pared with what on the traditional theory of authorship we might have reason to expect, leads Schmiedel to the following conclusion:

“If we were dealing with a book attributed to an undistinguished man, such as, for example, the Epistle of Jude, it could not be held to be very surprising that proofs of acquaintance with it do not emerge until some considerable time after its production. The case is very different, however, with a gospel written by an eye-witness. Papias noticed defects in the Gospel of Mark; the third evangelist noticed them in the writings of all his predecessors (*cf.* GOSPELS, §§ 65, 153). The writing of an eye-witness would immediately on its publication have been received with the keenest interest, however violently it may have conflicted with the gospels hitherto known. It would at least by these contradictions have attracted attention and necessarily have given occasion to such remarks as that ‘the gospels seem to contradict one another’ of Claudius Apollinaris (*στασιάζειν δοκεῖ τὰ εὐαγγέλια*) (§§ 42 and 54*b*). No mention of the Fourth Gospel which we can recognize as such carries us back further than to 140 A. D. As late as 152 (*Acad.*, 1st Feb., 1896, p. 98), Justin, who nevertheless lays so great stress upon the ‘Memorabilia of the Apostles,’ regards Jn.—if indeed he knows it at all—with distrust and appropriates from it but a very few sayings. Therefore, notwithstanding the fact that conservative theology still cherishes the belief that the external evidence supplies the best possible guarantee for the genuineness of the Fourth Gospel, we find ourselves compelled not only to recognize the justice of the remark of Reuss that ‘the incredible trouble which has been taken to collect external evidences only serves to show that there really are none of the sort which were really wanted,’ but also to set it up even as a fundamental principle of criticism that the production of the Fourth Gospel must be assigned to the shortest possible date before the time at which traces of acquaintance with it begin to appear. Distinct declarations as to its genuineness begin certainly not earlier than about 170 A. D. (§ 42).”¹

¹ *Ibid.*, § 49.

From the foregoing extracts summarizing the conclusions of representative scholars on both sides it will be apparent that the road to agreement does not lie along the line of heaping up more or less fanciful resemblances to Johannine thought or phraseology, from the period before the Gospel attains to its wide dissemination and authoritative standing about 170 A. D. Neither does it lie along the line of adding to the already abundant testimonies from the period of the half century of conflict following Tatian (170 A. D.), during which its ardent advocates were triumphantly overpowering the weak opposition offered at first to its claims at Rome. The accumulation of alleged resemblances in writers of the former period has been carried already to a point where in many cases they certainly appear to opposing critics, and may well seem to the impartial observer, to be merely fanciful; in other cases they will be held to prove no more than is matter of common consent. The many and widespread assertions of the Johannine Authorship of this Gospel, coupled with an employment of it with a frequency and regard equal to, or even beyond the other three, which begin to appear about 180 A. D., coincidentally with the beginnings of the debate at Rome, will prove indeed—if proof were needed—how acceptable to the Christianity of the time was the type of doctrine of the Ephesian Church, but can throw but little light on the actual origin of the Gospel.

Whether, then, we attribute the Gospel directly, or indirectly to John, or to some wholly different writer, what we seek to-day from the external evidence is not so much the Gospel's "date" in the old sense of the word; for on this the evidence we have is incapable of shedding more than a very limited amount of light. To-day we inquire for its "formative period"; and the "formative period" of the Fourth Gospel has already been determined as closely as the data available, or likely to become available, admit. It is approxi-

mately the close of the first century and opening decades of the second.¹ Proconsular Asia² with the great headquarters of the Pauline mission field, Ephesus, as its metropolis, was the region in which the group of writings attributed to the Apostle John first came into circulation, in supplementation of the Epistles of Paul, and probably the Gospels of Matthew and Mark and the so-called First Epistle of Peter. In the threefold form of Gospel, Epistles, and Prophecy, or Apocalypse, these writings served the purpose of a canon of New Testament scripture to "the churches of Asia." The ancient tradition³ which assigns the origin of the "Johannine" writings to this region and this approximate date is therefore in substance correct.⁴

Since, then, the modern form of the Johannine question is but slightly, if at all, a question of date or provenance, it is a primary condition of clear thinking as regards the external evidence that we distinguish between (1) evidences which bear on "the existence of a body of teaching like that which we find in the Fourth Gospel," evidences which for the period anterior to 181 A. D. consist of mere resemblances to its doctrine or phraseology, and (2) evidences which bear upon the question of authorship; these latter being either confined to the period of dissemination beginning with Tatian and Theophilus (170-180), or consisting of inferences

¹ Harnack considers (*Chronologie*, p. 680) "that the Gospel was not written later than *circa* 110 A. D. is an assured historical fact." Moffat (*Historical New Testament*, p. 495) fixes on 95-115, "nearer the latter year, in all probability, than the former."

² The designation "Asia" usually applies, in reference to this period, to the Roman province of Asia, the district immediately surrounding Ephesus.

³ Clement of Alexandria (*Hypotyposes*, on authority of "the early Presbyters," quoted by Eusebius, *H. E.* VI. xiv. 7) as to the Gospel; Irenaeus (*Haer.* V, xxx, 3) as to Revelation.

⁴ On this date and provenance as matter of common consent see, *e. g.*, Stanton, *Gospels as Historical Documents*, 1903, p. 19, and Schmiedel, *Encycl. Bibl.*, s. v. "John, son of Zebedee," §§ 52, 53.

to be drawn from the *mode* and *measure* of unacknowledged employment in the earlier time.

It is also vitally important to define our terminology and to use it consistently with the recognized practice of criticism, not classifying as "quotations" mere resemblances of thought or language, more or less remote, which may or may not be due to acquaintance with the Fourth Gospel. For mere resemblances of this kind we propose to employ the term "echo," or "influence," reserving the term "quotation" for instances where appeal is directly made to a definite writing so described as to be recognizable, and attributed to a particular author mentioned by name, or otherwise defined as the authority to whom appeal is made. The number and importance of "echoes" and "influences" will vary of course with the keenness of the critic's hearing, which in the present case has been stimulated to the utmost by the conviction that "the genuineness of St. John's Gospel is the centre of the position of those who uphold the historical truth of the record of our Lord Jesus Christ given us in the New Testament."¹ The German critic who has been accused of "hearing the grass grow" has abundant opportunity in this field to retaliate upon his English opponent.² Unfortunately for the latter the accumulation of these echoes and influences, so long as they remain manifestly inferior in mode and measure of employment not only to what, as Schmiedel points out, we should have a right to expect on the theory of Johanneine authorship, but conspicuously inferior to the employments of Synoptic tradition, creates a new and serious embarrassment; and the more the witnesses are multiplied the worse the embarrassment becomes. We refer of course to

¹ Lightfoot, as quoted above, p. 1.

² A *reductio ad absurdum* of this type seems to be afforded in the recent work *The Four Gospels in early Church History*, by Thos. Nicol, D. D., 1908. See the review by W. Bauer in *Th. Lit.*, 1909, 7.

the objection already noticed in the case of Justin Martyr, and which is commonly spoken of as if it were a phenomenon of his writings alone, viz., the singular neglect of a Gospel which of all other writings would naturally be the first resort for Christians in the conditions supposed. The argument is wont to be confined to Justin, because with Justin we reach an age when by common consent the Fourth Gospel must have been already current, and an author, relatively voluminous, who in at least one instance gives highly probable evidence of acquaintance with it. But there is no reason save the more doubtful character of the alleged echoes and influences in earlier writers, and the more limited compass of the material, why these should not be included in the argument. Professor Stanton, who alone of the "defenders" makes serious attempts to grapple with the objection from the neglect of John in the earliest period, considers that "the absence of any mention of the Apostle John is very strange only in the Epistles of Ignatius."¹ Others might prefer to say "in Polycarp," considering how all the Johanne tradition is made to hang on the alleged relation between John and Polycarp.² Still others might find the neglect of Papias harder to account for,³ seeing that Papias explicitly acknowledges the defective and secondary character of Synoptic tradition. In reality the phenomena are the same in all the writers of the early period, and the more the number is increased by the addition of remote and dubious echoes and influences from still other writers, the more serious becomes the problem. Echoes and influences there may well be. If in mode and measure they corresponded to

¹ *Gospels as Historical Documents*, p. 236. On the silence of Justin's predecessors, and Stanton's explanation see Chapter II.

² On Polycarp's alleged use of the Fourth Gospel as compared with Paul and the Synoptics see below, Chapter II.

³ So, *e. g.*, Keim, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 197.

the influential position a writing such as our Fourth Gospel, acknowledged as the work of the last surviving apostle, would necessarily hold, they might conceivably make good the absence of direct quotation or appeal. But even the echoes, instead of becoming clearer and more unmistakable as we approach their supposed origin, "tremble away into silence" and leave us bewildered. Starting with Justin, whose one resemblance in employing Johannine phraseology to combine the deutero-Pauline doctrine of the "bath of regeneration" with the teaching of Jesus,¹ makes us practically certain that he was really acquainted with the Fourth Gospel, we pass backward through Valentinus, Papias, Basilides, Polycarp, Ignatius, Hermas, to Barnabas, the *Didaché* and Clement of Rome. In Papias as in Justin we have true "quotation" of *Revelation*, and probable use of First John, with a much disputed possibility, or probability, of employment of the Fourth Gospel.² As to Basilides (133 A. D.) and Valentinus (150-160 A. D.) Sanday himself can go no further than to say, "There remains in my own mind a slight degree of probability that they used the Gospel."³ In Polycarp there is found one "battle-cry" from First John. In Ignatius a very few much disputed echoes and a diffused

¹ After describing the rite of baptism in the name of the Trinity Justin adds (*Apol.* I, lxi), "For Christ also said, Unless ye be born again, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. But that it is impossible for those who are once born to enter into the wombs of those who brought them forth is evident to all." The phrase (*ἀναγέννησις*) by which he refers to the doctrine is that of Tit. 3:5 and I Pt. 1:3, 23. As to his relation to Jn. 3:3-5 Drummond (p. 87) justly says, "It cannot be denied that this passage immediately reminds one of Jn. 3:3-5, and all critics, as far as I know, acknowledge that there is some relation which is more than accidental between the two passages. As little can it be denied that it is not quoted verbally from the Fourth Gospel, but has variations both in language and meaning."

² On this see Chapter II.

³ *Criticism*, p. 247. On the evidence from these two Gnostic writers see Chapter II.

and equally disputed influence of the Gospel. In Hermas Stanton thinks he can detect traces, and Sanday is "not so sure" as Schmiedel that there are none.¹ As to Barnabas his feeling is the same, although even the famous Oxford committee, who have certainly not erred in the direction of radicalism, "must regard Barnabas as unacquainted with the Fourth Gospel."² He finds also in the eucharistic prayer of the *Didaché* a resemblance in the phrase, "Remember, Lord, thy Church to deliver it from all evil and to perfect it in thy love" to I Jn. 4: 17, 18; Jn. 17: 23, which again, in spite of the silence of the Oxford Society's Committee, he thinks "cannot be wholly accidental."³ None of these really responsible "defenders" consents to follow the rash echo-chasers who wander up and down the disappointing pages of Clement of Rome.⁴

Now in answer to these phenomena of steady decrease

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 241. On Stanton's supposed traces in Hermas see Chapter II.

² *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, Report of the Committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology, 1905, p. 23.

³ *Criticism*, p. 246. The committee report three passages (*Did.* ix, 2, 3 and x, 3) which "seem reminiscent of Johannine ideas and terminology." They decline, however, to class these among even probable employments. The phrase quoted by Sanday, if its pedigree must be traced, is more nearly related to Eph. 3:14; 5:32 than to the Johannine passages.

⁴ Stanton (*Gospels*, etc.) is conscious of the serious objection to a date so early as 80-90 A. D. (Zahn, Sanday) which emerges from the silence of Clement of Rome, who, as he says (p. 18), "gives no clear sign that he knew this Gospel." Stanton would account for this by a date "not earlier than the last decade of the first century" (p. 238). The only resemblance noticed by him in Clement is referred to in a footnote on p. 18. "The thought" of Clem. xlii, 1 seems to him to "correspond closely" to Jn. 20:21. No resemblances are adduced in the *Apology* of Aristides nor in the so-called *Second Epistle of Clement*. These with Clement of Rome cover a space somewhat greater than the Gospel of Matthew. Stanton (p. 152, note) agrees with Harnack in dating the *Epistle to Diognetus*, cc, i-x, ca. 200 A. D., and cc, xi-xii still later. Lightfoot's claim of an echo of Jn. in this epistle, which Edw. Abbott endorses (see above, p. 22) may therefore be disregarded.

in the employment and recognition of the Fourth Gospel by those who might reasonably be supposed to know it, as we approach the date and region where its currency and authority should be at a maximum, it is not enough to utter general disparagements of "the argument from silence"; because the external evidence, from the moment we pass into the debated period, back of the time of express and undisputed quotations, becomes of necessity an "argument from silence." To quarrel with that is to quarrel with the external evidence for being external; and it is by challenge of the "defenders" that we have entered this field. If it were a mere idiosyncrasy of Justin Martyr it might perhaps be enough to say with Sanday: "The whole chapter of accidents is open before us," and to commend it as "sounder method to fall back with Dr. Drummond simply upon our ignorance."¹ But we are dealing with a whole group of writers, many of whom could not have been ignorant of the supposed work of John and all of whom had the strongest motives for referring to it. It does not seriously affect this argument to demand an estimate of "the total bulk of the literature on which the argument is based."² With the authors named there might very properly be included some of the later books of the New Testament;³ yet even without these, the "thin octavo volume" of which Professor Sanday speaks⁴ which should include all second century Christian writers down to the period of real quotations, would bulk considerably larger than the New Testament itself, and is at all events sufficient to exhibit a contrast in mode and measure of employment to

¹ Sanday, *Criticism*, p. 247.

² *Ibid.*, p. 47.

³ Even Stanton, who admits the validity of this inclusion, passes over unmentioned the important epistle of First Peter (90-110 A. D.?), *Gospels*, etc., p. 165.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

which not even the most unwilling eye can be blind, between the Synoptic Gospels and the Fourth.

To what extent, then, has Principal Drummond accommodated himself in his momentous inferences from the external evidence to the Modern Form of the Question? His most jubilant and indeed extravagant commender—for in the matter of commendation even Sanday can be extravagant—admits that Drummond's book gives the appearance of being "written round" certain articles contributed by the author to the debates of twenty or thirty years ago, and that there is a certain inadequacy about an argument in this field which does not so much as recognize the existence of Schmiedel and Jülicher, two of the leading critics on the opposing side.¹ We may add that Drummond's discussion of the citations of Justin with which we are now concerned is equally silent as to Bousset whose treatment of this subject² would probably interest the modern reader more than those of Hilgenfeld³ and Thoma,⁴ and gives only nominal attention even to Edwin Abbott.

But Sanday is specially filled with admiration for the "freedom" of this author "from all dogmatic prepossessions," his "judicial habit of weighing all that is to be said on both sides," his "impartiality."⁵ And this is not greatly hindered even by a recognition that

"On the whole question of the external evidence, Dr. Drum-

¹ Sanday in *Hibbert Journal*, Vol. II (1903-04), pp. 616 ff.

² Abbott in *Enc. Bibl.*, s. v. "Gospels." Bousset in *Evangelienkritik Justins des Märtyrers*, 1891. A note on p. 86, referring to Abbott's articles in the *Modern Review* for July and October, 1882, and another on p. 130, referring to *Encycl. Bibl.* ii, 1836, are found. For an adequate bibliography of the subject see Preuschen, *Antilegomena*, 1901, p. 93.

³ *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Evangelien Justins*, 1850.

⁴ *Justins' literarisches Verhältniss zu Paulus u. zum Johannesevangelium*, in *Ltz. für wiss. Theol.*, 1875.

⁵ *Criticism*, pp. 33-36.

mond's view might almost be called optimistic. He endorses affirmatively almost every item of evidence that has ever been alleged." ¹

For ourselves we yield not even to Sanday himself in admiration of Principal Drummond's scholarship, and we are sure of his sincerity of conviction; but we cannot admit that an author, however learned and sincere, who has merely "written round" the brief he presented as an advocate some thirty years ago, recasting it into the form of a judicial verdict, can be considered to occupy a position of superior impartiality. In applying again his old-time arguments against modern writers whom he seems to regard as occupying substantially the same position as his quondam antagonists, Principal Drummond is doubtless free from the embarrassments which beset scholars of less liberal ecclesiastical communions. But few temptations to a biased judgment are found in practice to be more effective with the scholar than consistency with his own opinion once published, and in this respect none could be more thoroughly committed in advance. We recognize indeed a studied reserve in the phraseology wherein Principal Drummond so summarizes his present conclusions as not to seem to make unreasonable demands. It may account for the praise accorded by Professor Sanday to his "impartiality" and "judicial habit." But this pertains rather to the form. That which affects the substance is the "optimism" which "endorses affirmatively almost every item of evidence which has ever been alleged," and disregards the most recent and ablest presentations of the opposing case.

As the matter is vital, and Principal Drummond's book is expressly put forward as an example of judicial impartiality, at once refuting and putting to shame the superficial and

¹ See "Drummond on the Fourth Gospel," *Hibbert Journal*, Vol. II (1903-04), p. 615.

biased judgments of the opposing school, it becomes imperative that the dissent we have just expressed from Professor Sanday's lavish praise be supported by direct citation of fact. We may use for this purpose the very passage of Drummond's book which Professor Sanday twice adduces as "perhaps the most important and the most far-reaching of all the corrections of current practice."¹ It represents the nearest approach the book affords to direct treatment of the modern form of the question.

"But why, then, it may be asked, has Justin not quoted the Fourth Gospel at least as often as the other three? I cannot tell, any more than I can tell why he has never named the supposed authors of his Memoirs, or has mentioned only one of the parables, or made no reference to the Apostle Paul, or nowhere quoted the apocalypse, though he believed it to be an apostolic and prophetic work. His silence may be due to pure accident, or the book may have seemed less adapted to his apologetic purposes; but considering how many things there are about which he is silent, we cannot admit that the *argumentum a silentio* possesses in this case any validity."²

Passing over the objection that it is not the silence of Justin alone, but of all his predecessors as well, which is in question, we confine ourselves to two points of the above comparison.³ The reader is clearly intended to infer that Justin's neglect to appeal to the Gospel of John is paralleled by a failure (1) to "name the supposed authors of the Memoirs" and (2) to "quote from the Apocalypse." From this the conclusion would naturally be that Justin, in strange

¹ *Criticism*, p. 33. Cf. *Hibbert Journal*, Vol. II, p. 614.

² Sanday, *Criticism*, etc., p. 33, quoting Drummond, *Character*, etc., pp. 157 f.

³ On the absence of "reference to" the Apostle Paul see below, p. 93. The careful reader will note that the *use of* the Pauline Epistles, of which there are a number of instances in Justin, is not excluded by the term "reference." Without very careful handling Principal Drummond's argument will break.

contrast to his age, cared little for apostolic authority, at least in relation to those he was addressing, and in particular might wholly neglect to avail himself of that of the Apostle John, even when it lay at his command. What now are the real facts? (1) In Justin's time, or even earlier, it was known that none of the Synoptic Gospels in their current form could be directly ascribed to apostolic authors. "Mark" and "Luke" were not names to conjure with; "Matthew's" could be applied only indirectly to the current Greek Gospel. In later times church fathers torment the ancient tradition in various ways to evade, or at least to minimize, the unwelcome admission.¹ Instead of being indifferent to the apostolic authority of his *Memoirs*, Justin adopts just that form of description, "Memoirs of the apostles," "Memoirs called gospels, which were written by apostles and their companions" which enables him to make the maximum claim of apostolic authority, without directly doing violence to the tradition. These Memoirs he uses as authoritative, quoting and employing them, according to Drummond's own count, some 170 times.² Is the mode and measure of his employment of these, then, really parallel to his treatment of the Fourth Gospel, which he has never referred to, and from which even Drummond can find but three "apparent quotations"?

(2) But we are more particularly to infer from a comparison of Justin's treatment of the Apocalypse with his treatment of the Fourth Gospel, that he did not care to invoke the authority of the Apostle John even in defense of that doctrine of the Logos and the divinity of Christ, which Drummond finds tintured throughout with "influences" indicative of its Johannine origin. Let us see how this second analogy holds.

¹ See, e. g., the quotation below, p. 84, from Tertullian, *adv. Marcionem*.

² See above p. 23, note.

First of all we are repeatedly informed that Justin "has nowhere quoted the Apocalypse." Here, as in the other cases, the whole argument depends upon the exact choice of terms. Drummond does not deny, he rather takes pains to assert, that Justin *employs* Rev. 20-21. He does not deny that Justin *appeals to it by name* as "a revelation." He admits that he *refers to it as authoritative* and *names its author*. It is the "prophecy" of "one of ourselves, John, an apostle of Christ."¹ But all this *in the case of Revelation* is not sufficient to meet the high requirements of the term "quotation." That term Principal Drummond reserves for three correspondences with the Fourth Gospel, one of which as an admitted "echo" we have already discussed.² It is the reference to baptism as typifying "regeneration," for Christ also said, "Unless ye be regenerated (*ἀναγεννηθῆτε*) ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." There is here no mention of John, no appeal to his authority, no reference to so much as the existence of a writing. Some even remain doubtful whether in the passage Justin was influenced at all by this Gospel.³ Such, however, is the first of Drummond's three "quotations"; for we must remember that they are expressly distinguished as such from the mere alleged resemblances.

The second "quotation" is not even a probable echo. It is only a possible influence. In his *Dialogue* (ch. lxxxviii) Justin refers to the Baptist's testimony to Christ, using the Synoptic form, but with the peculiarity of employing the first person:

"Even he himself cried, I am not the Christ, but a voice crying; for there shall come he who is stronger than I, whose sandals I am not worthy to take off."

¹ *Dial.* lxxxi. See Drummond's elaboration of the two supposed analogies of neglect on p. 159.

² Above, p. 32.

³ So Bousset, whose work, however, is not referred to by Drummond.

This might be due to unconscious reminiscence of Jn. 1:20, 23; but, as Edwin Abbott had already pointed out in the very article referred to by Drummond a few pages before,¹ it may equally well be due to the influence of Acts 13:25:

“And as John was fulfilling his course he said, What suppose ye that I am? I am not he, but there cometh one after me, the shoes of whose feet I am not worthy to unloose.”

Nevertheless to Drummond this is still a “quotation” of the Fourth Gospel, by the author who “has nowhere *quoted* the Apocalypse.”

The third “quotation” is the furthest of all from deserving the name. Several pages² are occupied with an elaborate effort to insert a Johannine foundation under Justin’s language. In his *First Apology* Justin maintains that there was a fulfilment of Is. 58:2, “they now ask of me judgment” in the fact that *the Jews* “in mockery set him (Jesus) upon the judgment seat and said, Judge us.” Such an incident is related nowhere in any of our four Gospels. But in a fragment found in 1892 of the *Ev. Petri*, which in the same manner as Luke transfers the story of the mockery of Jesus to the account of “the Jews,” it is related that “they arrayed him in purple, and set him on a throne of judgment, saying, Judge justly, O King of Israel.” Drummond, however, will not admit that Justin can be referring to this, although it presents both points of correspondence with the Isaianic passage, viz., that it is “the Jews” who are guilty of the mockery, and that the nature of it was that they “asked of him judgment.” Drummond still clings to the contention he had supported long before the discovery of *Ev. Petri*, that Justin’s language can only be accounted for as a misunderstanding of the statement of Jn. 19:13 that “*Pilate*

¹ The argument for the “quotation” occurs on p. 149, the reference to *Encycl. Bibl.* ii, 1836, on p. 130.

² Pp. 150-152.

led Jesus forth and *sat down* on the judgment seat." He gives instances to prove that the word "sat down" (*ἐκάθισεν*) *could* be used transitively. Whence Justin derived the statement that the Jews said "Judge us" he does not explain. As regards this alleged "quotation" of the Fourth Gospel we will simply refer to another "defender" whose scholarship is warmly and justly praised by Professor Sanday, but who, as Sanday seems to think, does not rise quite to Drummond's level of judicial impartiality and lofty superiority to dogmatic prepossession. Stanton's "defense," appearing but a few weeks before Drummond's, had given the following verdict on the alleged "quotation":

"It has in the past been thought by some ¹ that Justin had come to imagine it through a misunderstanding or misremembering of Jn. 19:13. But any appearance of probability which this explanation may once have had has now been destroyed through our finding it again in 'Peter.' " ²

Whether we follow or reject the acute, and to the present writer convincing, argument of Stanton that the true derivation of the "fulfilment," both in *Ev. Petri* and in Justin, is the *Acts of Pilate*, the judgment of Stanton on the fate of Drummond's argument is manifestly true. A comparison of Drummond's use of the word "quotation" as applied to Justin's use of the Gospel and Revelation respectively will enable the reader to form his own judgment. With it we conclude our examination of the pattern paragraph.

It is indeed important that we distinguish mere "echoes" and "influences" such as make no reference to a recognizable document, and mention no author; from "quotations," which describe some recognizable written source, and appeal to the author by name as authority. In the former case

¹ A footnote reads, "First, it would seem, by Drummond, *Theol. Rev.* for 1877, p. 238."

² *Gospels as Historical Documents*, p. 99.

it is equally important that we exercise the keenest, most impartial, most critical judgment as to the *mode* and *measure* of employment of the source. Such impartial verdicts, however, are *not* illustrated in the statement that Justin "has nowhere quoted the Apocalypse," but has three apparent "quotations" from the Fourth Gospel. They are not attained by the mere "writing round" of arguments originally framed against the Tübingen School and the author of *Supernatural Religion*. They are not likely to be found in one who "endorses affirmatively almost every item of evidence which has ever been alleged." The real greatness and splendor of scholarship of the venerable Principal of Manchester College, his critical insight, his judicial poise, have been proved on many an occasion; proofs of them remain in many parts of his really great and scholarly defense of the Johannine Authorship of the Fourth Gospel; but these qualities, or at least *all* of these qualities, are not conspicuous in his treatment of the external evidence and the argument from silence as these are presented in the Modern Form of the Question.

CHAPTER II

ECHOES AND INFLUENCES

We have seen in our consideration of the most highly lauded of recent presentations of the external evidence in favor of the Johannine authorship that a judgment on the question in its modern form requires first of all a separation of evidence which only bears upon the existence at an early period of "a compact body of teaching like that which we find in the Fourth Gospel," which at best can be no more than "a considerable step towards the belief that the Gospel existed in writing," from evidence bearing on the question of authorship. In the nature of the case evidence bearing on the authorship must be found mainly within the compass of the Gospel itself. External evidence, however, will have something to say on this point also. If on the one hand, the employments of the Gospel in the region and period of its origin are such in mode and measure as the claims made in its behalf would lead us to expect, this may to an extent make good the admitted lack of explicit appeal to "John" as an evangelic authority. If, per contra, there is a noteworthy silence where employment was most to be expected, and that not in one church father, but in a considerable group; if in addition this silence extends not only to the Gospel, but to the very presence of John in Asia, and to the whole body of tradition regarding the connection of the Apostle John with the anonymous writings attributed to him; if the earliest traces of this tradition are found in the period marked by strenuous advocacy on the one side of "the fourfold gospel" and equally strenuous denial, on the other side of "that

aspect which is presented by John's Gospel," it being principally adduced by an ardent champion of the "fourfold gospel," who at the same time is anything but an accurate scholar—then the bearing of the external evidence can certainly not be considered altogether favorable to these claims. The mere fact that it is an argument from silence, subject to the weakness of all negative evidence, is merely a warning to rely on internal evidence for its appropriate function, and upon the external for that which is appropriate to it. Silence is all that can be expected in the case.

Our summary of the alleged "quotations" from John in 90-155 A. D., will already have justified in some measure the remark of Reuss that "the incredible pains taken to collect external evidences only serve to show that there really are none of the sort which were really wanted." It is better, however, that we adduce on this matter of alleged "echoes" and "influences" of the "Johannine" writings, more impartial judgments than that of Drummond, before proceeding to the question what may be inferred from early statements and early silences regarding the alleged activity of the Apostle John, in literature or otherwise, during the period in question.

Sanday, as we have seen,¹ is "not so sure" as Schmiedel that there is "no allusion to the Fourth Gospel in Barnabas or Hermas, where it is found (*e. g.*) by Keim, or in the Elders of Papias, where it is found (*e. g.*) by Harnack." As regards Papias an "allusion" or two to the Fourth Gospel, or to some of its traditions would certainly be anything but surprising. So meagre a use—just sufficient to make it certain that besides the First Epistle he also, like his contemporary Justin, *knew* the Fourth Gospel, and *appealed* to Revelation—if confirmed, will only increase the marvel of his silence when dealing in his Preface with the relative reliability of

¹ Above, p. 33.

apostolic sources of authority for evangelic tradition. This question of traditions regarding John in Asia must be treated by itself, Papias' witness being by far the most important factor.¹ But we must not neglect possible echoes and employments of the debated writings, for if these attain a sufficient volume to indicate high regard for the Fourth Gospel, the phenomenon of silence regarding its author may be in a measure counteracted. Let us, then, hear the testimony of other impartial witnesses regarding Barnabas and Hermas, and investigate the nature of Papias' possible employment of the Gospel.

It is true that the erratic and brilliant Keim, as if he would accentuate the paradox of his early dating, writes as follows regarding the *influence* of this Gospel upon Barnabas:

“However clearly it may be shown that the Epistle of Barnabas gives no narrative, not a single word out of this Gospel,² is not acquainted with the idea of the Logos, makes an independent use of the watchword of the water and the blood, or of the types of Christ in the Old Testament, or, above all, of the serpent that was lifted up for believers in the wilderness;³ yet the inner sphere of thought of this Epistle corresponds with the Gospel in so many ways, both in general features and details, that scientific criticism is compelled to infer a connection.”

Connection there is, and influence there is in the “inner sphere of thought.” But with what?—It would have done more credit to the common sense of Keim to remember that the influences which he traces in these vague generalities

¹ See Chapter IV.

² As against twelve from the Synoptics in Chapters i–xii alone, without counting the copious use of Matthew in the “other knowledge and teaching” (the *Two Ways*) incorporated in Chapters xviii–xxi.

³ Justin, who borrows this type from Barnabas along with much more from the same context (*Dial.* xc–xcvii) remains notably unaffected by “John’s” use of the same. See Abbott, *s. v.* “Gospels,” *Enycl. Bibl.* II, § 102.

are quite as easily derived from the Pauline system by way of the Alexandrianism of Hebrews, an epistle of which Barnabas makes undeniable use, as by way of the Fourth Gospel with whose Logos-doctrine, as Keim himself admits, Barnabas is "not acquainted."¹ As against Professor Sanday's uncertainty as to whether he may venture to claim the alleged evidences in Barnabas we may set the judgment of his own Oxford Committee already quoted,² confirmed by that of Professor Stanton,³ that it "contains no distinct traces of the two other Synoptics (besides Matthew) or of St. John."

Keim's attempt to find a literary relation between the exhortations of Hermas to "keep the commandments of Jesus" and the neo-legalism of I John⁴ shows equal inattention to the distinction between commonplaces of the period, and distinctive features. Neo-legalism is just as common among church writers of this period as antinomianism among heretics. Now Hermas has direct literary connection with the Epistle of James, in which neo-legalism reaches its climax; whereas if he coincides at any point of his long and tedious allegories with a phrase or idea of John, it is so utterly different in form, context, and application, as to make acquaintance with the Fourth Gospel altogether improbable. Again we may set against Professor Sanday's uncertainty the careful and judicial verdict of the Oxford Committee,⁵ who place all four of the alleged resemblances in the category of lowest probability (class *d*). The following is their judgment of that one of the four which reaches the highest de-

¹ It is one of the defects of Keim's view that it attributes an undue measure of "Alexandrianism" to the Fourth Gospel. Paulinism was not confined to Ephesus for its development.

² Above, p. 33.

³ *Gospels as Historical Documents*, p. 33.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 195.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 123.

gree of plausibility [the gate (πύλη) of the tower, *Similitudes* IX, xii. 1, interpreted as "the Son of God," recalling "I am the door (θύρα) of the sheep" in Jn. 10:7]:

"The figure of a gate admitting to the tower which represents the Church is a natural one, and need not be borrowed.¹ Nevertheless the passage has a Johannine coloring; but whether this is sufficient to prove a literary connection may be reasonably questioned. Such sentiments must have spread among Christians apart from direct literary influence."²

Stanton³ finds other resemblances in Hermas in addition to the above supposed trace of Jn. 14:6, quoting *Mand.* iii, 1, as follows:

"Love truth and let nothing but truth proceed out of thy mouth, that the Spirit, which God made to dwell in this flesh, may be found true in the sight of all men, and thus shall the Lord who dwelleth in thee be *glorified* (δοξασθήσεται), for the Lord is *true* (ἀληθινός) in every word, and with him there is no falsehood."

Stanton rests his case on the words he has here italicized; for, as he properly notes, the phrase "the Spirit which God made to dwell in this flesh" is not Johannine, but from Jas. 4:5. But these very italicized words are used in a sense contrary to the Johannine, since the glorification here sought is a glorification, *i. e.*, praising, of God by men, as in I Pt. 4:11; Mt. 5:16; not as in Jn. 17:10 the raising of Jesus to his heavenly state. Similarly the word ἀληθινός is applied in

¹ The allegory is the common N. T. one of the Church as "a building of God." That the building (in this case a tower) should have a gate [πύλη] is certainly not surprising; nor, in view of Mt. 7:13, 14, need it be surprising that a Roman Christian of 140 A. D. should thus allegorize "the Son of God."

² The spread of this particular sentiment: Christ the gate (πύλη), apart at least from the literary influence of the Fourth Gospel, is proved by its occurrence twice in Hegesippus (*ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* II, xxiii, 8, 12) in the form τῆς ἡ θύρα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ and once in *Clem. Hom.* iii, 52 f. Ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ πύλη τῆς ζωῆς. Mt. 7:13, 14, seems to be the common starting point so far as Christian literature is concerned.

³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 43, 46 f.

Hermas to truth speaking, and not, as in Jn. 7:28; I Jn. 5:20; 2:27, to action and being.¹ The expressions, "the witness which he witnessed" and "the law which he received from his Father" in *Sim.* v. have equally little of the Johannine character. "The law" which the Son received has precisely the character of the neo-legalism of Matthew and James² in *contrast* with the Johannine. In Jn. 15:12 we have still the Pauline sense of "the law of Christ"; the new commandment is love. In the very same context of Hermas (*Sim.* v. 5) it is defined to be "the commandments (*ἐντολαί*) which he (God) gave to his people through his Son," and the special application, apropos of which the whole allegory is given, is the law of *fasting*, together with the merit or reward to be gained by doing more than the written requirement. The "witness" witnessed by God to the Servant, as we shall see, is a phrase from Hebrews, not from the Fourth Gospel. No distinctive character whatever can be claimed for the remaining two phrases from *Sim.* ix, "The seal is the water (of baptism). . . . To them, therefore, was this seal preached, and they used it, in order that they might enter into the kingdom of God."³ Indeed, Stanton himself seems to rest very little weight upon these alleged resemblances, which are similarly treated by the committee. That which he alone deems worthy of separate consideration is the phrase concerning the Servant [explained by Hermas himself to be the (angelic?) being who assumed flesh, and because of his earthly service was thereafter exalted to partnership with "the preëxistent Spirit which created the whole creation"].

¹ The Johannine passages compared are those adduced by Stanton.

² Cf. Mt. 28:20; Jas. 1:25; 2:8.

³ Baptism (of the spirit) is referred to as the "seal" in Eph. 1:13, and often thereafter. In the phrase from Hermas we are supposed to be reminded of Jn. 3:5. But what other phrase than "enter into the kingdom of God" could Hermas be expected to use? Cf. Mk. 9:47; 10:23-25, etc. Baptism is the token of admission in Mt. 28:19; Mk. 16:16 and universally.

In the parable, which is simply an adaptation of the Synoptic parable of the Vineyard,¹ the friends (angels) rejoice at "the witness which the Master (God) witnessed to him." This Stanton² designates "a characteristic Johannine thought and expression," comparing Jn. 5:32. And yet but a page or two further on he notes with interest the "signs of knowledge (in Hermas) of the Epistle to the Hebrews," which "taken with that of Clement of Rome, shows that it must have been early held in high esteem in the Church of Rome." Had the thought and expression been called characteristic of Hebrews, or even of Clement of Rome in an adoptive sense, the remark would have been just; for it is by this phrase "God bearing witness to him" that Hebrews constantly [7:8; 10:15; 11:2, 4 (twice), 5, 39] refers to the favorable verdict of Scripture, and Clement of Rome follows suit (xvii, 1, 2; xviii, 1; xix, 1, etc.). "Witness" is indeed a favorite term of the Johannine writings; but the sense in which it is applied to Christ in Jn. 5:37 is that of Old Testament *prediction*, not of favorable *verdict*.

Of the four resemblances adduced from Hermas by the Oxford Committee three are identical with the first of those already considered from Stanton. The fourth is a reference in *Vis.* II, ii, 8, to those who by "denying their Lord are rejected from their life." This is compared with Jn. 11:25, or 14:6 "I am the life." But the committee themselves say:

"The only connexion is in the word ζωή ('life'), and it is by no means certain that it refers to Christ in Hermas; in any case the verse in Colossians (Col. 3:4) is sufficient to show that the expression need not be borrowed from John. The sentiment of the passage is closer to the Synoptics."

Stanton's disregard of this bit of "evidence" is certainly justified.

¹ Mt. 21:33 ff. = Mk. 12:1 ff. = Lk. 20:9 ff.

² The committee do not refer to this resemblance.

It has not been our object in thus considering at length the alleged traces of John in Barnabas and Hermas, at the possible cost of wearying the reader, merely to justify the statement that "the incredible pains taken to collect 'evidences' of this kind only serve to show that there are none of the sort which were really wanted." We must indeed anticipate such a result, at least for the Shepherd of Hermas, if nothing more than the above can be evoked from a work of its character and dimensions.¹ But we have no mere polemic interest in view. Indeed, so far as date is concerned, Hermas might perfectly well have known the Gospel, or at least its "body of teaching." Our real interest is to show that outside of "Asia" even the meager influences attributed to this "body of teaching" are not really present.² In regard to Clement of Rome (95-125 A. D.) and the homily known as *Second Clement* (140 A. D.?) which Stanton thinks of Corinthian origin, the claim is not seriously advanced. Nor does it seem to be in the case of the *Apology of Aristides* (Athens, 125-126 A. D.?) from which Professor Stanton adduces only the general reference to the doctrine of the Incarnation of the Son of God as supported by both oral and written gospel.³ Sanday's very dubious appeal to the *Didaché*, or rather to the liturgy incorporated in the *Didaché*, whose derivation is wholly unknown, we have already considered.⁴ Until recently much was made of alleged employments in the fragment of the *Ev. Petri*, found at Akhmim in 1892. On this we need only cite the able and impartial judgment of Stanton,⁵ after the most careful discussion yet given to the

¹ *The Shepherd* is somewhat longer than the four longest Pauline Epistles.

² Cf. Harnack, *Chronologie*, p. 680, note 3.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 51. Professor Stanton does not seem to claim a reference to the Fourth Gospel, nor does such appear to be present.

⁴ Chapter I, p. 33. On the *Epistle to Diognetus* see *ibid.*

⁵ *Gospels*, etc., p. 121.

question of the use of the Canonical Gospels in *Ev. Petri*, and of the latter by Justin:

“The dependence of ‘Peter’ upon St. John more particularly has been rendered very doubtful. We have seen strong reason for thinking that various points in ‘Peter,’ which were supposed to have been derived from the latter, were in reality taken from the Pilate-document (the *Acts of Pilate* cited by Justin).

“It is, however, to be added that the question of the relation of ‘Peter’ to our Gospels has lost the greater part of its interest. Since Justin does not refer to the work, the earliest trace of its existence is Serapion’s notice of it at the end of the century. It may have been composed *circ.* A. D. 170-80.”

What, then, becomes of acquaintance with the Fourth Gospel outside of “Asia” in 100 to 150 A. D.? The only writings which might still present an exception to the rule of silence are those of the Gnostic heresiarchs to which Principal Drummond has devoted some of the most important and learned chapters of his book. These we must consider; for Professor Sanday, after sympathetic perusal of Drummond’s ardent advocacy of Johannine quotations in Basilides and Valentinus¹ is led to the confession: “There remains in my own mind a slight degree of probability that they used the Gospel.”² On this measure of success in converting a devout believer Principal Drummond should be congratulated. Others will not go so far.

As regards Valentinus, who was at first a disciple of Marcion, and flourished in Rome “between A. D. 138 and 160”³ it would hardly affect the case were Drummond really able to make good his contention that not the later members of the school alone, Theodotus in Antioch, Ptolemæus and Heracleon, contemporaries of Irenæus (186-196 A. D.) in

¹ *Character and Authorship*, Chapters VIII and X.

² *Criticism*, p. 247.

³ Drummond, p. 266.

Rome, but Valentinus himself is also referred to as using the Fourth Gospel.¹ The policy of Valentinus in the use of evangelic writings, like that of Apelles his "fellow-disciple of Marcion and fellow-deserter," as Tertullian calls him, made radical departure from that of Marcion, who had violently opposed the gospels employed by the orthodox, and introduced one of his own formed by mutilation of Luke. Valentinus and Apelles relied on interpretation, avoiding mutilation, and winning converts from the Church on the basis of its own canon.² Valentinus himself, the founder of the new school, can hardly have departed from Marcionism much earlier than 150-160 A. D., so that his taking up the Fourth Gospel—if a fact—belongs simply among the phenomena of rapid dissemination after 160 A. D. which we have later to consider.

As regards Basilides the case is different. This heresiarch is said to have flourished in the reign of Hadrian (117-138 A. D.) and seems to have established a school in Alexandria, subsequently led by his son and disciple Isidore. Harnack dates this event about 133 A. D. We may perhaps infer from Basilides' use of Aramaic names³ that he came originally, like Cerdo, the Gnostic teacher of Marcion, from Antioch,

¹ Stanton, *Gospels*, etc., pp. 64-69, will not even go so far as Sanday in thinking that "Drummond has made good his position." He agrees with Zahn about the "suspiciously modern stamp" affecting Hippolytus' extracts, giving "color to the supposition that he has a treatise by Isidore before him" and feels that the same doubt applies to the alleged references of Valentinus.

² Tertullian contrasts Valentinus who "used the whole instrument (canon)" with Marcion the mutilator. "Marcion," he says, "used the knife, Valentinus the pen. Yet Valentinus took away more by his subtle addition of false meanings than Marcion with his open violence." *De Præser. Her.*, p. 38.

³ Agrippa Castor, an early opponent of Basilides, said that he "named as prophets to himself Barcabbas and Barcoph, appointing also some other non-existent persons," and that he "assigned to them barbarous appellations to astonish those who stand in awe of such things." Eusebius, *H. E.* IV, vii.

the home of heresy in Ignatius' day (110-117). He is classed by Eusebius with Saturninus the Antiochian as a pupil of Menander the successor of Simon Magus. Hippolytus in his *Refutation of all Heresies* (220 A. D.) treats the school as a whole, and frequently employs the formula $\phi\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}$ of individual teachings which are thus in some sense attributed to the master, but he affords no proof that he knew the Alexandrian heresiarch of a century before his time otherwise than through the writings of others. Irenæus, who also deals with the school, though not without occasional references in the singular¹ displays his usual unscholarly method and seems to be borrowing his information largely from the *Syntagma* of Justin Martyr. It is possible to infer with Drummond that his source "may have contained statements which were avowedly quoted from Basilides." We may say the same of Hippolytus, with the difference that Hippolytus was a scholar, Irenæus an unscholarly plagiarist and polemic. In either case we get very little help. Clement of Alexandria, however, displays direct knowledge of the founder of the Alexandrian heresy in the heresiarch's own work; for he quotes at length from the twenty-third book of Basilides' *Exegetica*,² and in some instances expressly distinguishes between the teaching of the founder, and of the later disciples. In the absence of such discrimination on the part of Hippolytus it becomes impossible to separate the two instances in which he quotes from his unnamed authority references to the Fourth Gospel with employment of the formula $\phi\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}$,³ from the many which are taken from Isidore. Even the

¹ His habitual plurals are interrupted by two instances of *ait.* As Drummond shows (p. 321) Irenæus is positively incorrect in more than one instance in substituting the later teachings of the school for the earlier.

² In the *Stromata*, iv, 81-88.

³ Drummond himself has shown (p. 297) that the same Hippolytus uses this formula $\phi\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}$, to quote the general doctrine of the Naassene heretics without reference to any individual.

much desired proof that Hippolytus really means Basilides as subject of the verb "he says" would decide nothing until we were sure he had the means, as well as the intention, of making the discrimination. The case becomes the more hopeless when we observe that, as Drummond himself admits, in at least one instance, and probably more, Hippolytus has wrongly ascribed to the earlier Basilideans "an incongruous feature derived from his knowledge of the later and degenerate school."¹

But we must go further. As Windisch² has shown, in opposition to Zahn,³ the two authorities who actually do quote for us from Basilides' own work, Clement of Alexandria and the *Acta Archelai et Manetis*, make it highly probable that Basilides' gospel was *not* our fourth, but a more or less variant form of *Luke*. The fragment quoted by the *Acta* from the thirteenth book of Basilides' *Exegetica* is an interpretation of the parable of the rich man and Lazarus (Lk. 16:19-25), while those cited by Clement from the twenty-third book are concerned with the martyrdom of Jesus (Lk. 22-23), treated from the special point of view of Luke, that "the Lord suffered according to the will of the Father"⁴ (*cf.* Lk. 23:40 f.; 24:25-27, 44-46). Indeed it is almost incredible that Basilides, if he really knew and ac-

¹ P. 322.

² Art. "Das Evangelium des Basilides" in *Zts. f. ntl. Wiss*, VII, 3 (1906), pp. 236-246.

³ *Gesch. d. ntl. Kanons*, I, 2, 1889, pp. 763-784.

⁴ These words are quoted by Clement as the subject of this twenty-third chapter (as we should call it) of Basilides' Commentary. They remind us strongly of I Pt. 3:17. The whole discussion, in fact, in all three writers, Luke, I Peter (*cf.* especially 2:20-24; 3:14-18; 4:1, 12-19, etc.) and Basilides, bespeaks the period of persecution in 90-117. *Cf.* Rev. 2:13, 14, 20 (95 A. D.) with the statement of Agrippa Castor that Basilides "taught also that the eating of meat offered to idols and the unguarded renunciation of the faith in times of persecution were matters of indifference." Eusebius, *H. E.* IV, vii, 7.

cepted the Fourth Gospel, should have laid himself open to the charge of "making the devil divine, because he regarded the sufferings of martyrdom as a punishment (though an honorable one) for sin committed in a previous life."¹ We have indeed a relation here between the doctrine of the sinlessness of Jesus and the theory that suffering may be accounted for on purely monistic principles through metempsychosis, which can hardly be without literary connection with the Fourth Gospel, where the same two peculiar ideas are brought into a similar relation, though with opposite intent.² Only, if a connection exists, *it is certainly to Basilides and not to the Fourth Gospel that priority must be assigned.* For the attitude of Basilides is well defined by Drummond:³

"The reality of Christ's humanity and Passion is assumed, even though it drives Basilides to a conclusion which he is reluctant to admit. He thinks that all suffering is a punishment for sin, either actual or potential, in the person suffering; and when pressed with the case of 'such a one' (ὁ δεῖνα, rightly understood by Clement to refer to Christ) that he sinned, since he suffered; he would answer, he did not sin but was like the suffering infant. But, if urged, he would say, that man, whosoever you may name, is man, and God is just."⁴

Basilides, who would not admit that the sufferings of the martyrs were inflicted on them as the Church held, by the

¹ Drummond, p. 324.

² Jn. 9:1; 10:21.

³ P. 312. Principal Drummond is engaged in the context in proving the untrustworthiness of Irenæus, who attributes to Basilides the Docetism of Cerinthus, and even puts in his mouth a representation of the passion drawn from the *Acts of John* by Leucius Charinus.

⁴ Basilides took the position of Heb. 2:9-18 as regards the suffering of Jesus being incidental to his humanity; only since he did not supplement it with the doctrine of the disciplinary intention of suffering, borrowed by Heb. 12:3-11 from the O. T. (*cf.* Wisd. of Sol. 11:9-26; II Macc. 6:12-16) his monistic doctrine of divine sovereignty and penal significance of all suffering forced him to the assumption in Jesus' case of prenatal guilt.

malignant power of Satan, because he held to one sole Supreme Power, found but one loophole of escape from the inference that Jesus' sufferings were then a proof of sinfulness. This was the precarious theory of prenatal guilt, by which he also explained the suffering of new-born infants. Hence Clement denounces him for having dared to call the Lord a sinful man (*ἄνθρωπον ἁμαρτητικόν*), and promises in due time to take up Basilides' doctrine of the devil and of metempsychosis.¹

How, then, is it possible to imagine that Basilides knew and admitted as authoritative the Fourth Gospel, in which this whole ground, including the suffering of infants on account of parental guilt, is so completely covered, and with such complete vindication of the sinlessness of Jesus? We have in fact not only the incident of the man born blind, beginning, "Rabbi, who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind" and ending with the controversy with the scribes whether Jesus was "a sinner," or no; we have reiterated efforts throughout the whole Johannine story of the Passion, to show that Jesus went voluntarily to his martyrdom, and that neither Satan nor Pilate had any power at all over him save as "given from above."²

With Basilides grouped where Origen has placed him, among the innumerables hæreses quæ evangelium secundum Lucam recipiunt,³ vanishes the last trace of early use

¹ *Stromata*, iv, 12.

² See Jn. 6:70, 71; 10:11, 17, 18, 39; 11:8, 9, 51, 52; 13:1, 18, 19, 26-31; 14:30; 17:1, 5 ff.; 18:4-6; 19:11, etc.

³ Quoted by Windisch, *op. cit.*, pp. 240-242. The real reason for this, in Marcion's case as well as the rest, will have been not so much the later date and greater availability of Luke as against Matthew and Mark, nor even its supposed connection with Paul, though this may have had weight with Marcion. Luke, by ancient tradition (Euseb., *H. E.* III, iv, 7), as well as by strong internal evidence, is the gospel of Antioch. But Antioch, as we have seen, was the original seat of the heresiarchs, Menander, Cerdo, Saturninus, and probably Basilides as well.

of the Fourth Gospel in the larger world of Christendom. It is a result of something more than controversial interest to observe that outside the little group of Asiatics, Ignatius, Polycarp, Papias, Justin, even the faint echoes and influences to-day rather hesitatingly advanced as possibly showing acquaintance with the "instrumentum Johanneum,"¹ prove on closer scrutiny to be altogether illusory. As regards the four, on the other hand, we have positive knowledge of acquaintance with the Johannine Epistles in the case of Polycarp and Papias, and not only quotation from the Apocalypse, but explicit defense of its apostolic authority by Papias and Justin.¹ Only Ignatius, the visitor from Syria, gives no decisive evidence of acquaintance with any of the five Johannine writings, but only of influence from this "type of teaching," while all the group, if they make use at all of the Gospel, use it so sparingly, and so completely without acknowledgment, that we are compelled to recognize a striking difference between their treatment of it and of Synoptic material.

In scrutinizing for ourselves this ultimate problem of the evidence from actual (not illusory) echoes and influences it will be convenient, since we have already sufficiently discussed those of Justin, to pass backward chronologically and Asia-ward geographically, asking first of Papias (Hierapolis, 145-160 A. D.)² then of Ignatius (Antioch-Asia-Rome, 110-117 A. D.), then of Polycarp (Smyrna, 110-117 A. D.) the mode and measure of their employment of the Fourth Gospel as compared with Synoptic tradition.

Sanday, we note, has greater confidence in the evidences

¹ We borrow this convenient term from Tertullian to designate the corpus of five writings, Gospel, Epistles, and Revelation or "Prophecy" attributed to the Apostle John.

² Lightfoot (*Bibl. Essays*, p. 64), "not before 130 to 140." The date 145-160 A. D. is Harnack's. For the reasons see below, p. 120.

of Papias' employment of the Fourth Gospel than in other alleged echoes, and in this judgment we willingly concur. The fact that "in the preface" to his *Ἐξηγήσεις* Papias referred to commandments derived "from the truth itself" ¹ will not indeed bear much weight; nor is it indicative of anything more than the undisputed provenance of the Fourth Gospel, that "Andrew, Philip, Thomas" appear in Papias' list of the Apostles, of whom only the Fourth Gospel makes individual mention. That such traditions were in circulation in "Asia," particularly regarding Philip, was known independently.² There is, however, good reason to suppose that Papias knew at least the Johannine Epistles,³ if not the Gospel; and it is certain that he knew and accepted the Apocalypse as *ἀξιοπιστός* ("trustworthy"). But Papias is said to afford evidence of "influence" from the Fourth Gospel itself, if we may take as from him that which Irenæus reports ⁴ as from "the Elders," an expression under which he reproduces traditions borrowed from Papias.⁵ In support of their doctrine of a lower, middle, and upper place of reward in the Kingdom, "the Elders" ⁶ quoted, he says, as a "saying of the Lord," "In the region (*ἐν τοῖς*) of my Father there are many mansions." It is true that the same

¹ Adduced by Lightfoot (*Bibl. Essays*, p. 68) in comparison with Jn. 5:33; 8:32; 14:6. A closer parallel (especially if the reading *παραγινόμενοις* be followed) is III Jn. 12.

² Zahn's attempt (in his essay on Papias, *Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.*, 1866) to "explain Papias' remark as to Mark's want of orderly arrangement, as based on a comparison with John, instead of with Matthew" cannot be dismissed with Keim (*op. cit.*, p. 191, note 1) as "truly laughable," since it has seemed worthy of attention even to H. J. Holtzmann. It hardly requires refutation, however.

³ Eusebius' testimony that he used I Peter and I John is undisputed.

⁴ *Haer.* V, xxxvi, 1, 2.

⁵ On the strong grounds for believing this an extract from Papias, see Lightfoot, *Bibl. Essays*, p. 67.

⁶ On the real location of this group of authoritative "Elders" see Chapter IV.

“Elders” quote other fragments of apocalyptic writings as “sayings of the Lord” which are certainly unauthentic,¹ and that this particular saying is also found in the pre-Christian apocalypse of *Slav. Enoch* (lxi, 2), in a form perhaps as near to “the Elders’” citation as Jn. 14:2.² Moreover, a mere “watchword” such as this could readily appear independently in the sayings of “the Elders” and the Fourth Gospel. Indeed it is clear that “*the Elders*” quote only oral tradition, and not even then in just the form of the Fourth Gospel. As regards *their* authority it must be conceded to Abbott³ that the form of reference shows that they are “not quoting and misinterpreting John, but quoting and interpreting in accordance with (oral) tradition a Logion (illustrating the Synoptic Parable of the Sower) of which Jn. gives a different version.” Papias, however, in quoting “the Elders” may possibly have been influenced by Jn. 14:2. This, then, is the measure of Papias’ use of the Johannine writings. He certainly used Revelation and attributed it to the Apostle John. The Epistles he probably echoed. It is barely possible that he was remotely influenced by the Fourth Gospel. With the evidence from Papias we must group the earlier witness of Ignatius and Polycarp (110–117 A. D.) presenting as a verdict whose impartiality none will question the report of the Oxford Committee:

“Ignatius’ use of the Fourth Gospel is highly probable, but falls some way short of certainty. The objections to accepting it are mainly (1) our ignorance how far some of the Logia (sayings) of Christ recorded by John may have been current in Asia Minor

¹ In the interest of the same chiliastic doctrine of the Kingdom they quoted as a saying of the Lord the Jewish midrash on Gen. 27:28, found in *Apoc. of Baruch*. xxix, 5.

² Rendered by R. H. Charles, “In the world to come . . . there are many mansions prepared for men, good for the good, evil for the evil, many without number.”

³ *Encycl. Bibl.* II, s. v. “Gospels,” § 94.

before the publication of the Gospel. . . . (2) The paucity of phrases which recall the language of the Gospel, and the absence of direct appeals to it; phenomena which are certainly remarkable when we consider the close resemblance between the theology of Ignatius and that of the Fourth Gospel. It is difficult, for example, to think of any reason why Ignatius did not quote Jn. 20 in *Smyrn.* iii, 2 (the passage where he quotes the *Ev. Hebr.* (?) to prove that 'Jesus was in the flesh even after his resurrection')."¹

As regards the Epistle of Polycarp the Committee find only two possible echoes. In *Ep. Polyc.* v, 2 we have: "even as he promised us to raise us from the dead"; and in xii, 3: "that your fruit may be manifest among all." Of the former clause they say: "The reference seems certainly to be to a Johannine (?) tradition, though it need not necessarily be to our Fourth Gospel."² Of the latter: ". . . the only point of contact with John is in the word *fructus*, and this might be accounted for, *e. g.*, by Gal. 5:22,³ if so natural an expression requires any assignable source."⁴

What inferences then may be drawn from the mode and

¹ Compare this result with Ignatius' twenty-two echoes, references, or quotations from the Synoptic writings, and sixty-one from the Pauline Epistles. Of I Corinthians, for example, the committee say: "Ignatius must have known this Epistle almost by heart." In addressing the Ephesians Ignatius calls them "fellow-adepts in the mysteries with Paul" reminding them how frequently Paul "boasts of them in his letters." He never mentions John whether in addressing the Ephesians, Polycarp, or others. He does, however, show the influence of "a body of teaching like that which we find in the Fourth Gospel." On this see below, p. 64.

² The context is dealing with Mt. 19:27-20:28, and connects with it the "faithful saying" II Tim. 2:12 (*cf.* I Jn. 2:25). It is difficult to see any distinctive remainder to justify the claim of "Johannine" influence.

³ We may add, by Rom. 6:22, "your fruit" in combination with I Tim. 4:15, as suggested by Abbott, *Encycl. Bibl.* Vol. II, col. 1831.

⁴ Stanton (*op. cit.*, p. 19) comes to a similar conclusion regarding Ignatius and Polycarp. Admitting that "here we may certainly expect to find indications of its use," he adds, "and such do not seem to me to be altogether wanting, although they are not so full and clear as might have been expected."

measure of employment of the Fourth Gospel in 100-150 A. D. by those who seem really acquainted with the Johannine writings?

We have found it a very singular fact that Justin, the advocate of the Ephesian Logos doctrine and of a chiliasm which he supports by the authority of Revelation, should make no acknowledged use, and next to no indirect use, of the Fourth Gospel. It is at least equally singular that Papias, who made similar use of Revelation and showed acquaintance with First John, should seem to neglect entirely the Fourth Gospel, when treating of the apostolic sources of evangelic tradition, and afford no sure proof even of acquaintance with it. Some consider more surprising still the silence of Ignatius, who writes seven letters to the very persons but recently bereaved (according to the "defenders") of the presence and leadership of the last and greatest of the Apostles, a peerless champion of the doctrine Ignatius himself defends against the same opponents. But Ignatius refers only to Paul, and never to John. Perhaps the most unaccountable of all these surprising instances of neglect is reached when we read the actual letter of the man whom the tradition holds up as its one sure link of connection with the Apostle John, Polycarp; for it was Polycarp's supreme distinction to have been an eye-and ear-witness, yes, an intimate disciple, of the intimate disciple of the Lord. Polycarp never mentions John, though repeatedly he commends to his readers the writings and authority of Paul; and the extent of influence of the Fourth Gospel discovered by the Oxford Committee in his Epistle is "the word fructus"—really connected more closely with Rom. 6:22.

Stanton alone among advocates of the traditional view seems to appreciate the cumulative force of this array of silent witnesses, and endeavors to deal with it, discussing first in his chapter on "The Apostolic Fathers and the Fourth Gospel" (pp. 18-21) "the question . . . whether in

these writings there are indications of the influence of the Fourth Gospel.”¹ We may quote his summary regarding the earlier writers:

“The case as regards the evidence of acquaintance with the *Gospel according to John* supplied by the Epistles of Ignatius and Polycarp stands thus. Taken by itself it is inconclusive. In the former writer it is somewhat indeterminate; his Johannine expressions² might possibly have been derived from the phraseology of a school. In Polycarp on the other hand the evidence is partly indeterminate, partly indirect. Neither can fairly be reckoned a witness adverse to the existence at this time of the Fourth Gospel or the recognition of its Johannine authorship, and this is in itself important. On the contrary, the phenomena that we have noted point to acquaintance with it, but we cannot feel confident that they may not be due to some other cause, so long at least as we confine our attention to the Sub-apostolic Age. The decision between alternative explanations must come, if it is to come at all, from the position which the Gospel holds and the strength of the tradition in its favor, which we shall observe later.”

Let us distinguish in this summary that which bears on the *existence* of the Fourth Gospel, a point not in dispute, from that which bears on the *apostolic authorship*, a proposition which becomes harder to defend in proportion as the other point is established. Professor Stanton adduces just one single resemblance, which to his mind suggests knowl-

¹ P. 21, note.

² The two resemblances which Stanton thinks alone worthy of consideration in Ignatius are quoted on the preceding page (p. 19). They are *ad Rom.* vii, “My lust hath been crucified, and there is no fire of material longing in me, but only water living and speaking in me, saying, Come to the Father” (*cf.* Jn. 4:10; 17:6; 14:6); and *ad Philad.* vii, “For even though certain persons desired to deceive me after the flesh, yet the spirit is not deceived, being from God; for it knoweth whence it cometh and whither it goeth” (*cf.* Jn. 3:8).

edge of the Fourth Gospel in the Epistle of Polycarp:¹ "He that raised him from the dead will raise us also; if we do his will and walk in his commandments, and love the things which he loved." This from *ad Philad.* ii, he compares with Jn. 7:17 (but see also Mt. 12:50); and 14:15 (but see also Mt. 19:17). The passage as a whole is a very plain echo of Rom. 8:11, "If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you, he that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall quicken also your mortal bodies." Its Johannean (?) tinge consists only in a substitution of the characteristic (Matthæan) neo-legalism of the period for the Pauline "If the Spirit dwelleth in you"; and even in support of this Professor Stanton cites principally from the Epistles rather than from the Gospel. All his other "evidences" adduced from Polycarp, including two passages supposed to resemble the one just quoted, are *from the Epistles*, and are manifestly irrelevant in a chapter in which "the question considered is simply whether in the language of these writings (Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp) there are indications of the influence of the Fourth Gospel."

Why, then, are we put off with these irrelevancies, when we ask for evidences of the influence of the *Gospel*, insisting that they should be apparent in two writers like Ignatius and Polycarp, who

"wrote after sufficient time had unquestionably elapsed for them to have become acquainted with the work, if it was by the Apostle John, . . . the former of them writing from, and in most of his Epistles addressing the Churches of, a region where . . . St. John lived and exercised great influence during the closing years of his life, while Polycarp had been one of his hearers"?² Is it not manifestly because "there really are no evidences of the kind that are really wanted"?

¹ Neglect of "the single word fructus" is an evidence of his good sense.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 19.

We entirely agree with Professor Stanton that neither Ignatius nor Polycarp "can fairly be reckoned a witness adverse to the *existence*¹ at this time of the Fourth Gospel." We go further. We point to the careful comparison by Von der Goltz of the Logos-doctrine of Paul, Ignatius, "John," and Justin,² and indorse his result that both Ignatius and "John" stand as middle links between Paul and Justin, testifying to the existence of what Sanday designates "a compact body of teaching like that which we find in the Fourth Gospel." We indorse (for substance) his conclusion on the question immediately before us as to the relation of the two contemporary middle links, that it cannot be accounted for by the use by either of the work of the other. We will not dispute the inference that "Ignatius must have come under the prolonged influence of a community itself influenced by Johannean thought."³ *Inasmuch as this is conceded on both sides to be so*, is the *employment* of the Fourth Gospel (we defer the question of appeal by name to its author) by Ignatius and Polycarp in mode and measure what we should expect on the traditional theory? To this question, the only one really in debate, Professor Stanton gives a somewhat hesitating answer: "Neither (Ignatius nor Polycarp) can fairly be reckoned a witness adverse to . . . the recognition of its Johannine authorship." But even this deprecation of the negative inferences which naturally suggest themselves, is left utterly unsupported. Instead of giving reasons, Stanton reverts to "signs of its use" which he admits to be "less distinct" (*sic!*) than of our first Gospel, and refers the reader to other indications of "the position

¹ Italics ours.

² *Ignatius von Antiochien als Christ und Theologe*, by Freiherr von der Goltz (*Texte u. Unters.* Bd. xii).

³ P. 139. The context is quoted by Sanday, *Criticism*, etc., p. 242. In using the word "Johannean" Von der Goltz of course has no thought of connecting this type of teaching with the son of Zebedee.

which the (Fourth) Gospel holds and the strength of the tradition in its favor, which we shall observe later."

The promised later consideration is given on pages 235-238, after separate discussion of the neglect of Justin on pages 81-91, and of the absence of traces of the tradition regarding the Apostle on pages 164-171. Papias is considered only under the latter head. As we have already considered at some length Drummond's explanation of Justin's neglect, we may deal briefly with Stanton's, which adds but little. The two *Apologies* and the *Dialogue with Trypho* are indeed systematically reviewed with this question in mind; but the conclusion is only that: "The scope of Justin's argument (in the *Apologies*) and his method of conducting it furnish a satisfactory explanation . . . for the measure of vagueness which there is in the indications of his use of the Synoptics," and the same considerations may account, Professor Stanton thinks, for the "somewhat greater obscurity" resting upon Justin's attitude to the Fourth Gospel.¹

We have found a more adequate explanation for Justin's "vagueness" in defining the nature of Synoptic authority in the vagueness of the tradition regarding their apostolic authorship. The Fourth Gospel should have supplied just the definiteness required. Besides, Justin *does* cite copiously from the Synoptists and appeals (as well as he can) to their apostolic authority. Why not cite to an at least equal extent from "John"? Even when dwelling upon "the great doctrine of the relation of the Son to the Father" Justin employs only Mt. 11:27 = Lk. 10:22, and, correctly enough, employs it to prove the Jews' ignorance of the personal Logos.²

"He might have quoted a great deal more to the same effect, especially from the Fourth Gospel," says Professor Stanton, "but it does not fall within his plan to do so. . . . The argu-

¹ *Gospels*, etc., p. 84.

² *Apol.*, I, lxiii.

ment of Christ's witness to himself would not have been convincing to those for whom Justin wrote."

Justin, it would seem, understood his age far better than the fourth evangelist, who changes the Synoptic report of the teaching of Jesus to this very form of self-witness. And yet the fourth evangelist *was successful*.

In the *Dialogue with Trypho* similar considerations are held to explain the neglect. "The mere name of John, apostle though he was, would not carry weight with Jewish hearers and readers." (Was the *Dialogue* really written to convert the Jews?) If Justin does appeal to John's authority as author (better "*seer*") of the Apocalypse, that is an exception which leaves the rule intact. "In the view of Jews and heathen a vision, even though made to a Christian, would partake of the character of inspiration." Moreover, "Justin and the Christians of his age might, even while regarding the Fourth Gospel as Apostolic, be more familiar with the others." Finally:

"If—as is admitted by most critics at the present day—the evidence shows at least that he (Justin) used this Gospel, he can hardly have taken it for anything else than what it professes to be (through anonymous guarantors in the Appendix!), a faithful record of the testimony of a personal and singularly close follower of Christ regarding the words and deeds of Christ."¹

Can these considerations, after what we have seen to be the real situation, even if admitted at their full value, be really regarded as furnishing a "satisfactory" explanation? Could Justin really so treat what would be to him "a faithful record of the testimony of a personal and singularly close

¹ See for all the extracts *Gospels*, etc., pp. 81-91, on "Justin's attitude to the Gospel according to John." The question of "The Apostolic Fathers (Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp) and the Fourth Gospel" is discussed on pp. 18-21; but no explanation is offered of a neglect at least as conspicuous as Justin's.

follower of Christ"? And if the explanations be satisfactory in the case of Justin, will they remain so when to his neglect is added that of Papias, of Ignatius, of Polycarp? Who then were the loyal and discerning disciples who showed such superior judgment in publishing the Gospel as the "true witness" of "the disciple whom Jesus loved," when men like Polycarp and Papias were neglectful?—Or may it perhaps be within the limits of possibility that the Fourth Gospel known to these men and to Justin was not yet furnished with that high imprimatur, which once accepted could not fail to procure for the work it accompanied a commanding preëminence among the Gospels? Professor Stanton infers from the appended chapter (Jn. 21) "that the *Gospel according to St. John* was first given to the Church after his death by companions and disciples."¹ To what period, then, is it more reasonable to assign this attachment and publication? To the period when no one accords to the Gospel a treatment corresponding to this claim? Or to that of the formation of the "fourfold gospel," when on the one side are ranged its ardent advocates, on the other the strenuous deniers of Johannine authorship?

We cannot believe that Professor Stanton himself is satisfied with his attempts at explanation. In fact after a discussion of the silence of the Sub-apostolic Age regarding the person of John,² which we must consider in connection with the tradition of the Apostle's supposed residence in Asia, he returns again to the question: "How the silence of the Sub-apostolic Age (as to the Johannine writings) may possibly be explained."³ At this point, then, we expect to be favored with that evidence, which if not indeed sufficient to bear the whole weight of the argument, as Drummond considers,

¹ *Gospels, etc.*, p. 19.

² Pp. 164-168.

³ Pp. 235-238.

is at least sufficient "to render it highly probable that the correspondences with its thought and language in the very early writings . . . should be put to the account of its use."¹ Considering the importance of the issue we feel justified in making a considerable extract:

"In estimating the significance of the early silence we must remember how scanty the remains of the period are. Moreover, the absence of any mention of the Apostle John is very strange only in the Epistles of Ignatius,² and there we are forced to recognize that any inferences from it may be precarious, when we notice how limited and special is the use made even of the name of St. Paul. . . .

"Nevertheless, it appears to me difficult to avoid inferring from the absence of allusions to the Apostle John in writings of the beginning of the second century, that there was a difference—which it is a matter of great interest to notice—between his reputation and influence then and at the close of the century. At this later time (*i. e.*, 180–200 A. D.) men were fast learning, if they had not already learned, to give him a place, as we do to-day, among the greatest Masters of the Christian Faith, distinct from, but not inferior to, that of Peter and Paul.

"This position is accorded him mainly as the evangelist of the Fourth Gospel. . . . Unquestionably peculiar reverence must have been felt for the Apostle John if he lingered on among men as the last surviving Apostle. Yet his real influence may have been confined within a narrow circle of disciples who had the mental power and the spirituality to understand his teaching in some degree.³ To the majority of Christians during his lifetime, and for the first generation or two after his death, his title to honor may have not seemed essentially different from that of

¹ Stanton, p. 21.

² On this point see Chapter IV. We should have included also the First Epistle of Peter, but Stanton passes this over without mention.

³ Is Professor Stanton really thinking of the Galilean fisherman, or of the "theologian" of the Fourth Gospel, when he indulges in such conjectures as this?

Andrew or Philip. Whether he was in the strict sense the author of the Gospel ascribed to him, or it was composed after his death by the aid of records of what he had said, or which actually proceeded from his own pen, here was a legacy of which the value could only be appreciated with time."

Instead of supporting the robust claims of apostolic authorship with which Professor Stanton set out, the external evidence when finally reviewed seems to be rapidly carrying him toward the position of his opponents. The final paragraph, which we have not space to quote, digresses to certain phenomena of the internal evidence which might explain the early belief as to its authorship if "a disciple (of John), whose own intellectual characteristics and training may have determined in greater or less degree the form of the composition, . . . set himself to record therein what he had learned from the venerable Apostle." It will be interesting to observe, when Professor Stanton's discussion of the internal evidence appears in the promised second volume, whether this theory of indirect apostolic authorship is definitely adopted. We are confining our own attention for the present to the external evidence, and are interested to observe that even Professor Stanton's diligent search reveals *nothing whatever* in support of his earlier statement that the silence of Ignatius and Polycarp could not fairly be reckoned as witness adverse to the existence at this time of the Fourth Gospel *or the recognition of its Johannine authorship*. The Johannine "body of teaching" *was* in existence, *teste* Ignatius. The Johannine Epistles *were* in existence, *teste* Polycarp and Papias. The Revelation *was* treated as of apostolic Johannine authority, *teste* Papias and Justin. The Fourth Gospel *may* have been known in some form. It was not appealed to, nor even used like the Synoptics.

We have left to the last a single item of the external evidence, partly because it has a bearing upon this question of

the period to which we should assign the attachment of the Johannine epilogue, partly because neglected by most "defenders." It is that to which Professor Sanday seems to accord the position of chief importance, as the present writer had previously done in the second of the articles to which Professor Sanday replies.¹ The echo found in Mk. 16:9 is, as we then stated, "perhaps the earliest" of all known employments of the Fourth Gospel. The point of difference between ourselves and Professor Sanday lies in his statement made "with confidence" that

"Its date is earlier than the year 140—whether we argue from the chronology of Aristion, its presumable author, or from its presence in the archetype of almost all extant MSS., or from the traces of it in writers so early as Justin and Irenæus."²

In reality there is no reason whatever for connecting the editorial appendix to Mark with Aristion, whether the (probably heathen) writer of Pella, or any other. As we have elsewhere shown,³ the supposed evidence to this authorship, discovered by Conybeare in his Armenian MS. of the Gospels from Edschmiadzin, is a mere worthless conjecture of the Armenian scribe John, in the year 989 A. D., resting on a comparison of the Armenian version of Eusebius⁴ with a misunderstood passage from Moses of Chorene, the father of

¹ See below, p. 213.

² *Criticism*, p. 241.

³ Hastings, *Dict. of Christ and the Gospels*, s. v. "Aristion (Aristo)."

⁴ This version has the spelling "Aristo" and the designation "presbyter" applied not to John only but to "Aristo" also, like the gloss inserted by the scribe before Mk. 16:9. The translator of Eusebius seems to have identified the "Aristion" of *H. E.* III, xxxix, 4 with the historian "Aristo" quoted in IV, xvi, 3. The latter was probably a heathen writer, since neither Eusebius nor Jerome includes him among the Christian authors they undertake to enumerate, and may be the same as Aristo, "the cultured rhetorician" of Gerasa known to Stephen of Byzantium. He is not at all likely to have been the author of the *Dialogue of Jason and Papiscus* as stated by Maximus Confessor (600 A. D.).

Armenian history. On the other hand, Celsus, the opponent of Christianity in 176-180 A. D., already uses Mk. 16:9, though not, in our judgment, the Fourth Gospel. Both were also used by Tatian (172 A. D.), and Sanday may even possibly be right in claiming acquaintance with the Markan appendix on the part of Justin. He properly disregards the flimsy claim that Hermas shows acquaintance with it in using the phrase "apostles and teachers who preached unto the whole world;"¹ but seems to consider Justin's expression, "His apostles went forth and preached everywhere"² a real echo of Mk. 16:20, though the expression surely has nothing distinctive about it. Let us date the Markan Appendix then *ca.* 150 A. D. The one thing certain is that it represents a period when the older gospels of Matthew and Mark were being adapted to circulate side by side with the more recent third (and fourth?). Now Harnack has lent the full weight of his great authority³ to the brilliant attempt of Rohrbach,⁴ to show that Asia was the scene of that process of redaction whence issued our fourfold gospel. We shall not here advocate the claims of Rome as against Asia. Certainly Asia contributed its full share. But it is hard to reconcile so early a date as 120-140 with the silence of Papias regarding the two newer gospels, and the fact that the use of them, first of Luke, then of John also, is otherwise traceable only with Marcion, Justin, Tatian, and Theophilus in 140-180 A. D. The real course of events would seem to us to be the use first of a twofold gospel by Papias in Asia, then of a threefold by Justin at Rome, ultimately, after prolonged

¹ *Sim.* IX, xxv, 1, 2. Disregarded also by the Oxford Committee. Cf. Clem. R. *ad Cor.* xlii. 3, 4.

² *Ap.* I, xlv, *Οἱ ἀπόστολοι αὐτοῦ ἐξελθόντες πανταχοῦ ἐκήρυξαν.* Cf. Mk. 16:20, *ἐκεῖνοι δὲ ἐξελθόντες ἐκήρυξαν πανταχοῦ.*

³ *Chronologie*, 1897, pp. 696-700.

⁴ *Der Schluss des Markusevangeliums, der Vier-Evangelien-Kanon und die kleinasiatischen Presbyter*, Berlin, 1894.

struggles against the admission of the *Instrumentum Johanneum* at Rome, the general adoption of the fourfold gospel of our canon. We shall have occasion hereafter to ask just what sort of Fourth Gospel it is to which Mk. 16:9-20 bears witness. For the present we note only that the summary appended to Mark finds its true date and significance in connection with this transition, effected by the Church about 150 A. D., from a twofold to a threefold, and ultimately a fourfold gospel. We note also that the epilogue is based almost exclusively upon Luke;¹ that its aim is harmonistic; and that the Johannine influence is confined absolutely to the single trait that the appearance of Jesus in Jerusalem to Mary Magdalen *and the other Mary* of Mt. 28:9, 10, has become an appearance to Mary Magdalen alone. While the contrary relation of a dependence by the author of Jn. 20:1-18 on this adapted form of the Lukan tradition is not excluded, it is reasonable to suppose that this slight change is really due to the Johannine narrative. If so, we have in this harmonistic adaptation of the Lukan story of the resurrection, attached in most manuscripts to the mutilated Mark, our first sure employment. It coincides in its bearing with all the evidence derivable from the period of echoes and influences. 1. Before 150 A. D. the Fourth Gospel is unknown outside of proconsular Asia. 2. In Asia itself it is not treated by those most likely to have known it as a writing of this character by the Apostle John would surely be treated. 3. Its wider diffusion begins shortly after 160 A. D. from the entourage of Justin, the Ephesian convert and promulgator of the Logos doctrine, at Rome. 4. This wider diffusion and employment as apostolic authority is met at once, as we shall see, with vehement resistance and denial of the authenticity of all the Johannine writings by eminent representatives of the Roman church.

¹ According to Abbott, Justin's favorite gospel.

CHAPTER III

PAPIAS, EUSEBIUS, AND THE ARGUMENT FROM SILENCE ¹

In his famous debate with Schürer on the Johannine problem,² Professor Sanday expressed "surprise to see Dr. Schürer repeat an argument which has been so often exploded as that about Papias." The explosions would seem to have first occurred in Lightfoot's able essays against the author of *Supernatural Religion*, entitled "The Silence of Eusebius" and "Papias of Hierapolis."³ In point of fact Schürer, who had fixed as the very *latest* date to which modern critics were assigning the Fourth Gospel ⁴ 130 A. D., and who therefore could have had no possible motive for rejecting indications of its employment by Papias in 145-160, was far from "repeating the argument" of the author of *Supernatural Religion*. As we have seen, that author followed the lead of Baur and the extreme school of Tübingen critics in denying the *existence* of the Fourth Gospel prior to 160 A. D. It may help us, however, to understand why "defenders" should be still engaged in writing round thirty-year old

¹ Under the title: "Recent Aspects of the Johannine Problem: I. External Evidence," this chapter appeared originally as first of a series of four in the *Hibbert Journal*, I, 3 (Jan., 1903), II, 2 (Jan., 1904), III, 2 (Jan., 1905), VI, 1 (Oct., 1907). It is here reproduced with slight abbreviation and correction.

² In the *Contemporary Review*, September and October, 1891. Professor Sanday's reply was supplemented later by a series of six articles in the *Expositor*, 1891-1892.

³ Republished under the title *Essays on Supernatural Religion* (2d ed., 1893), Chapters II and V.

⁴ Pfleiderer, however, adopts 135-140 A. D. in his *Urchristenthum*, 1887, p. 778.

discussions of the external evidences, if we note that even Professor Sanday understands Schürer to be "repeating the argument" of Baur. In reality the silences of Eusebius and Papias are still eloquent, though interpreted far differently by modern critics than by the author of *Supernatural Religion*. They have to do with the traditions of the Apostle John as an author. Since we have already discussed the evidence from the mode and measure of early employment of the Gospel, we may now reasonably consider the significance of early silences on this further point.

We must not imagine any disposition on the part of Dr. Sanday or his associates on the conservative side to discredit the argument from silence,¹ nor to advance the claim, as some have done, on the alleged authority of Lightfoot, that, "The silence of Eusebius and his authorities is favorable to the apostolic authorship, as well as their utterances." That would come near to eliminating external evidence altogether. If silence and utterance alike "give consent," then the external evidence can prove anything; which is about equivalent to saying it can prove nothing. Unless the verdict of the external evidence is *always* to be in the affirmative, it *must* be based on silence. We do not expect pre-Shaksperian writers to declare, "The Shaksperian plays do not yet exist." We expect those of Shakspeare's own time and environment and the period immediately following, if dealing with the drama, and profoundly interested to maintain the credit of the author of the plays, to show directly or indirectly that they know and value them. If they are not only silent as to the authorship, but do not even show any considerable knowledge of the plays, it leads us to approach the internal evidence for the date and authorship with a degree of scepticism proportioned to the amount of reason we had for expecting utterances. Even when we meet

¹ See, however, Professor Sanday's reply to this: *Criticism*, etc., p. 35.

expressions and phrases in Marlowe and the pre-Shakspearian dramatists which remind us of features of plot or character in Hamlet or Macbeth we are cautious in our inferences, because we know that Shakspeare did not build his plays *de novo*, but recast existent plays, borrowed plots and characters, and even incorporated whole scenes. Those who make large claims in behalf of very dubious "Johannine echoes" as implying acquaintance with our present Fourth Gospel are more disposed to admit this principle in theory than in practice. They should also admit that the emergence, *ca.* 100 A. D., of a work, which, if regarded as apostolic would possess for Papias and Justin superlative importance, would be marked by no mere ripple on the stream of Christian tradition and doctrine. What we have a right to expect from the argument *e silentio* will be apparent from a single illustration, purposely taken from the very center of our field of inquiry.

A Latin *argumentum*¹ prefixed to a Vatican ninth-century MS. of the Vulgate alleges that "one Papias by name, of Hierapolis, has related in his exoteric (a blunder for exegetic), that is, in his last (*extremis*) five books," that "the Gospel of John was published and given out to the churches by John while he yet remained in the body." It goes on to declare that Papias himself "wrote down the Gospel at the dictation of John." Passing by the absurd anachronism which follows, about an encounter of John with Marcion, let us see what the argument *e silentio* has to say regarding this alleged utterance of Papias, by one who did not even know correctly the title of his book. Lightfoot² has indeed committed even his great authority, though hesitatingly, to

¹ On this *argumentum*, and its derivation and connection, see the interesting Appendix ii, in Burkitt's "Two Lectures on the Gospels," Macmillan, 1901.

² *Essays on Super. Rel.*, p. 214.

the following as "the most probable explanation of the whole passage." "We may suppose that Papias, having reported some saying of St. John on the authority of the Elders, went on somewhat as follows: 'And this accords with what we find in his own Gospel, which he gave to the churches when he was still in the body (ἔτι ἐν τῷ σώματι καθεστῶτος). . . .' If St. John's authorship of the Gospel had been mentioned in this incidental way, *Eusebius would not have repeated it, unless he departed from his usual practice.*" Lightfoot even comes to the defense of the statement regarding the dictation of the Gospel. "Papias may have quoted the Gospel delivered by John to the churches, which *they* wrote down (ἀπέγραφον) from his lips; and some later writer, mistaking the ambiguous ἀπέγραφον, interpreted it 'I wrote down,' thus making Papias himself the amanuensis. . . . *Eusebius would be more likely than not to omit such a statement if it was made thus casually.*" Reserving our judgment of the two very large assumptions here required to be made regarding (1) Papias' mentioning a matter of such paramount importance only "thus casually," (2) this conception of "the silence of Eusebius," what shall we say of *the silence of Irenæus*, passionate advocate of the Johannine authorship against those who were denying that aspect (*speciem*) of the fourfold gospel? Irenæus was well acquainted with Papias through his single quite modest little work, and knew as well as did Eusebius that he must look in it, if anywhere, for the evidence which would utterly silence his opponents. Here Lightfoot is clearly minimizing the value of the argument from silence. Is it really possible to make such suppositions regarding either Eusebius or Irenæus? We will consider the two in order of date.

Almost certainly Irenæus was not otherwise acquainted with Papias than through his book; for in quoting from it he declares, "These things Papias, who was a hearer of John

and a companion of Polycarp, an ancient worthy, witnesseth in writing in the fourth of his books; for there are five books composed by him." Eusebius corrects the error of Irenæus in representing Papias to have been, like Polycarp, a hearer of the Apostle, and shows, by citing the preface¹ of Papias himself, that this author, in the "traditions of the Elder John" (*τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου Ἰωάννου παραδόσεις*) which he transmits, is not referring to the Apostle as his authority, but to a contemporary of his own, a John whom he distinguishes from the Apostle in words at once so clear and so familiar that to cite them again is almost superfluous.² Of this error of Irenæus in confounding the John of Papias' *paradoses* with the John whom he believed to have been associated with his revered master Polycarp,³ an error but partially corrected

¹ Jerome (*De Vir. Illust.*, p. 18) also informs us that the passage in question was in the *preface* of Papias' work.

² Since, however, so great a scholar as Zahn can still make it appear to himself compatible with honest exegesis to say that Papias does not distinguish the two, but means one and the same person, we subjoin the passage itself, with Eusebius' comment, in the translation of Lightfoot: "And again, on any occasion when a person came in my way who had been a follower of the Elders, I would inquire about the discourses of the Elders—what was said by Andrew, or by Peter, or by Philip, or by Thomas or James, or by John or Matthew, or any other of the Lord's disciples, and what Aristion and the Elder John [the disciples of the Lord] say. For I did not think that I could get so much profit from the contents of books as from the utterances of a living and abiding voice." "Here," adds Eusebius, "it is worth while to observe that he twice enumerates the name of John. The first he mentions in connection with Peter and James and Matthew and the rest of the Apostles, evidently meaning the Evangelist, but the other John he mentions after an interval, and classes with others outside the number of the Apostles, placing Aristion before him, and he distinctly calls him an Elder," etc. We have also inclosed in [] a clause wanting in some authorities, and both textually and intrinsically doubtful. See *Encycl. Bibl.* s. v. "Gospels," col. 1815, and my article in *Journ. Bibl. Lit.*, 1897. See also below, p. 112.

³ On the correctness of Irenæus' recollection of Polycarp's references to John as the Apostle, see Gwatkin "Irenæus on the Fourth Gospel," in *Contemp. Rev.*, 1897, i, and Fisher (*op. cit.*, pp. 254 ff.) against Réville (*Le Quatrième Evangile*, 1901), Harnack (*Chronologie*, 1897), and M'Giffert (*Apost. Age*, 1897). See also below, p. 254 f.

by Eusebius,¹ and the fruitful source of ages of misunderstanding, we shall have more to say hereafter. Suffice it that Irenæus, knowing him to be a (later) contemporary and near neighbor of Polycarp, assumed (were prefaces then read as carelessly as now?) that his *παραδόσεις Ἰωάννου* were of John the Apostle in Ephesus. He pronounces him accordingly *Ἰωάννου ἀκουστής*, and the phrase thereafter constantly reappears in later references to Papias. In our *argumentum* it becomes, *e. g.*, *discipulus Johannis carus*. But Irenæus literally "compasses heaven and earth" to find an argument against those who denied the apostolic authorship. Because there are four winds, four elements, four zones of the earth, four pillars of heaven, four cherubim sustaining the throne of God, the folly is manifest of "those wretched men who wish to set aside that aspect presented by John's Gospel." Is his silence under these circumstances compatible with the existence in Papias of a direct statement, however casual, that "John while yet in the body published and gave out the Gospel to the churches," Papias himself or "the churches" (!) having written the Gospel at

¹ Eusebius tolerates so much of the misunderstanding of Irenæus as accords with his own pet theory of a second John at Ephesus, on whom might be fathered Revelation; for this is his individual improvement upon the theory of Dionysius of Alexandria, who was at a loss to fix upon another John for the (then) obnoxious book. But while Eusebius eagerly seizes on the confusion as proof that Papias was indeed an *ἀκουστής Ἰωάννου*, though not the John imagined by Irenæus, he is too candid a scholar not to admit that there was no evidence of it in Papias' text; for after repeating Irenæus' phrase as applicable to the Presbyter, he qualifies the statement by adding, "At all events (*γούνη*) he mentions them (Aristion and the Elder John) frequently by name, and besides records their traditions in his writings." In point of fact the passage quoted clearly implies that neither one of the two Johns was accessible to Papias. The Apostle had long since been dead (*ἔπεν*); the Presbyter, though living, was accessible to Papias only through report of travelers who "came his way." On the true habitat and date of this much-debated John, see Scholten, and Schlatter, *Die Kirche Jerusalems, vom Jahre 70 bis 130*, Gütersloh, 1898.

the Apostle's dictation? Careless Irenæus doubtless was in mistaking Papias' authority for one much higher, but his carelessness did not go to this extent, nor tend in this direction.

How, then, has the course of recent research and discovery altered the nature of Lightfoot's argument on "Papias of Hierapolis," and "The silence of Eusebius"?

Lightfoot was far more accurate than his opponent, more accurate than many who borrow his arguments, when he pointed out the fundamental distinction made by Eusebius between "disputed" (*ἀντιλεγόμενα*) or "spurious" (*νόθα*) New Testament writings, and the "acknowledged" (*ὁμολογούμενα*); the four gospels belonging, of course, among the latter. He also pointed out the *two* passages in which Eusebius defines his *twofold* purpose. This is (1) "to indicate what church writers of various periods have made use of any of the disputed (*ἀντιλεγόμενων*) books." These *employments* (unacknowledged) are carefully identified and trustworthy; they are termed by Lightfoot "testimonies," and their presence or absence is the basis of Eusebius' argument for or against the *ἀντιλεγόμενα*. Of course they are not extended to the *ὁμολογούμενα*, though I Peter and I John, perhaps as standing on the border-line, are covered. In the second place, Eusebius undertook to tell from these same early writers (2) "what has been *said by them concerning* (a) the canonical and acknowledged Scriptures, and (b) anything that they have *said concerning* those which do not belong to this class."¹ He makes still clearer what he means in this second undertaking by reiterating it at the point where he is about to give "the statements of Irenæus in regard to the divine Scriptures," as follows:

"Since in the beginning of this work we promised to give, when

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.*, III, iii.

needful, the words of the ancient presbyters and writers of the Church, in which they have declared those *traditions which came down to them concerning* the canonical books, and since Irenæus was one of them, we will now give his words, and, first, what he says of the sacred Gospels."

Thereupon follows Irenæus' account of Matthew and Mark, which, although borrowed from Papias, and already once given by Eusebius from Papias directly, is now repeated, and his account of Luke and John. This latter is simply:

"And Luke, the attendant of Paul, recorded in a book the gospel which Paul had declared. Afterwards John, the disciple of the Lord, who also reclined on his bosom, published his Gospel while staying at Ephesus in Asia."¹

Here was a definite and very important fact regarding the intention of Eusebius, and so bearing directly upon the question of his "silence," which ought never to have been disregarded; and yet it was by no means fully appreciated even by Lightfoot, who himself brought out the phenomena. Eusebius had anticipated modern criticism in its distinction between *employments*, whose only bearing could be upon the existence and currency, or acceptance, of a writing; and "*statements relating to*" the books received as canonical in his own time, particularly "the sacred Gospels." It was a definite and important part of his great historical enterprise, made practicable by his access to the library collected by his predecessors at Cæsarea, to demonstrate the apostolic derivation and authority of the four received gospels, from statements regarding their origin found in "ancient presbyters and writers of the Church."

Had Lightfoot been able to foresee the light which the closing decade of the nineteenth century would throw upon the debates of the second and third regarding the trust-

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.*, V, viii, M'Giffert's trans.

worthiness and authority of the gospel narrative, he would hardly have defined it as the "main object" of Eusebius in regard to the four gospels merely to "preserve any anecdotes which he may have found illustrating the circumstances under which they were written."¹ He would have realized that the pre-Eusebian age was almost as familiar as we with the higher criticism in *both* its forms, *historical* as well as literary. He would thus have appreciated that the "statements concerning" the gospels in both Irenæus and Eusebius are only links in a long chain of prologues, or *argumenta*, by which writers of *both orthodox and heretical* circles endeavored to establish the apostolicity of their traditions of the Lord's life and teaching. Of these we have had one example in the *argumentum* already cited; for, so far from being a late invention of the scribe himself, it bears not only internal evidence of translation from an early Greek original,² but Wordsworth and White, by the discovery of another version of the same in a MS. which betrays relations with the Old Latin version, have furnished evidence which, in the judgment of Burkitt, must carry its origin back much beyond the time of Jerome.³ The famous Muratorian Fragment, which Professor Sanday now brings down as late as 200 A. D., stands forth in its true light as one more link in this chain, its denial of any discrepancy between the Fourth Gospel and the rest being aimed, as Zahn has seen, at the same Alogi antagonized by Irenæus and Epiphanius. On the heretical side stands another succession, into which P. Corssen has opened the way by his *Monarchianische Prologe*.⁴ Here is a heretical account of the origin of the Fourth Gospel leading back directly to the Gnostic legends of Leu-

¹ *Essays on Supern. Rel.*, p. 46.

² So Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, p. 213.

³ Burkitt, *Two Lectures on the Gospels*, 1901, p. 90.

⁴ *Texte u. Unters.*, xv, 1.

cius Charinus and his *Acts of John*. It is true that the new fragment of these *Acts* published by M. R. James in the *Cambridge Texts and Studies* (1897), and the complete edition by Bonnet,¹ show Corsssen to have perhaps inverted the relation of Leucius to the Gospel. The dependence may be on his side, if either.² On the other hand, it is these Gnostic legends which furnish a possible key to "Johannine" phraseology; not only the term Logos, but the designation of John as "the disciple whom Jesus loved." But we are now concerned merely with the interest displayed among both orthodox and heretics in the second century (the Monarchian prologues are earlier than Tertullian) to connect our Gospel with the Apostle. If we proceed in the reverse direction a similar feeling of the need for authenticating the records displays itself increasingly as rivals multiply. The first two gospels have no prologue, but the third is introduced under the patronage of Theophilus, and with assurances of the author's better qualification for his task than certain rivals. The Revelation of John has both a prologue vouching for the writer, with a blessing on the

¹ *Acta Apost. Apocrypha*, ii, 1, Lipsiae, 1898.

² The clause specially relied on by Professor James, *νόσσομαι λόγους*, when read in the context, is in much closer relation to the interpolated reading of Mt. 24:49 (BCLUT min. vss. Chrys.), which also makes the lance thrust part of the soldiers' abuse *before* the death of Christ (*cf.* Clem. v, 1311), than to John. There is therefore at least the possibility of derivation in all three cases from a common source. Hilgenfeld, in a masterly discussion entitled *Der gnostische und der Kanonische Johannes* (*Z. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1900), at least succeeds in showing that the alleged evidences for Leucius' acquaintance with the Fourth Gospel are inconclusive. Certainly the Gnostic writer relies on Synoptic tradition for his facts, his perverted and fanciful elaboration standing for the Docetic application of the Pauline Christology to this tradition, as the Fourth Gospel stands for the anti-Docetic. It *must* be admitted that the Johannine writings presuppose a Docetism of the Leucian type, though probably an older form. It *cannot* be said that the Leucian writings necessarily presuppose the Johannine, least of all as apostolic.

devout reader, and an epilogue pronouncing a curse on spurious matter. The same purpose of authentication of the record is subserved by the appendix to the Fourth Gospel, whether with Lightfoot¹ we limit the later hand to verses 24-25, or with Zahn and the great majority of critics consider the whole chapter a later attachment. But the question of the Appendix and its relation on the one side to the Gospel, on the other to the tradition as transmitted through church fathers and *argumenta*, is one which must be treated by itself, falling as it does on the border-land between external and internal evidence. Here we have but two things to note: (1) Eusebius' second principal object in reporting the evidence derivable from the earlier writers on questions relating to the canon was by no means a mere antiquarian interest, still less an idle curiosity. He had the example of two centuries of effort to *authenticate the gospel record*, and both he and his predecessors give evidence of having searched their authorities with almost the diligence of a modern critic for anything that might tend to prove its close connection with the apostles. To imagine, therefore, that Eusebius would remit the search in such a work as *Papias*, still more to suggest that "Eusebius would be more likely than not to omit" a statement of Papias, such as Lightfoot assumes, is to betray a conception of the external evidence and what it signifies impossible to impute in our day to a scholar of Lightfoot's eminence.²

¹ *Biblical Essays*, essay on John 21.

² Lightfoot's reply, when his opponent in a subsequent edition presented the argument from the silence of Eusebius in a form more like the modern, was singularly weak. He replied (*ibid.*, p. 182), "If Papias had merely said of the fourth Evangelist that 'John the disciple of the Lord wished by the publication of the Gospel to root out that error which had been disseminated among men by Cerinthus, and long before by those who are called Nicolaitans,' or language to that effect, it would be no surprise to me if Eusebius did not reproduce it; because Irenæus uses these very words of the Fourth Gospel (*Her.*, III xi, 1) and Eusebius does not allude to the fact." As if it

This, then, is the outcome of a full generation of research on the point in question. There have been no stage dénouements. No single startling discovery has been made, proving or disproving whole theories at a stroke. We have simply come to realize by gradual increase of knowledge that criticism did not originate with our age, and to appreciate better, on a wider historical background, the salient facts already in our possession. In particular we can evaluate more justly the argument from silence.

Modern discovery forces us to look upon the silence of *both* Irenæus and Eusebius as highly significant. Irenæus was fighting with every available weapon, but chiefly the weapon of apostolic tradition in Asia, against "those wretched men who wish to set aside that aspect (of the fourfold tradition) which is presented by John's Gospel." Eusebius was engaged in vindicating from ancient writers the strength of the claim which Tertullian had formulated:

"That the Evangelic Instrument (the fourfold gospel) has apostles for its authors, on whom this charge of publishing the gospel was imposed by the Lord himself; that if it includes the writing of apostolic men (Mark, Luke) also, still they were not alone, but wrote with the help of Apostles, and after the teaching of Apostles." ¹

Both Irenæus and Eusebius had the little five-chaptered treatise of Papias open before them and would eagerly search every nook and corner of the work for any statement directly connecting the Gospel with the Apostle, in fact *anything of the kind* reported by the *argumenta*. Others will have done the same; for the *Exegeses* of Papias remained in circulation for centuries. Evidence of acquaintance with the were all one to Eusebius whether he found this in *Irenæus*, an anti-Gnostic writer of 180-190 in Gaul, or in Papias, the fountainhead of tradition on the origin of the gospels, the friend of Polycarp in Asia, and the alleged "hearer of John!"

¹ *Adv. Marc.* iv, 2.

Gospel in some form may very well have been found. There is not the slightest reason for doubting the statement of Eusebius that he found evidence of acquaintance with I John and I Peter. Neither he nor others can have found any statement regarding the Johannine Authorship.

It is less easy to account for Eusebius' failure to explicitly acknowledge the use made by Papias of Revelation. For Eusebius is not lightly to be accused of a *suppressio veri*. Yet the testimony of two commentators on Revelation of 450-500 A. D., Andreas of Cæsarea and Arethas, the former quoting a considerable passage, as he says, "word for word," is conclusive on this point. Some even infer from the expression τὸ ἀξιόπιστον ("the trustworthiness"; Lightfoot, "genuineness"), employed by Andreas, that Papias, like his contemporary Justin, was not content with *using* Revelation, but signified his belief in its more or less direct relation to the Apostle.¹ Here the silence of Eusebius is explicable—to the discredit of his impartiality. But the silence of Irenæus and Eusebius, to say nothing of Tertullian, Hippolytus and others deeply interested in the controversy, makes it practically certain that the data of the *argumenta* and all their tribe are not derived, and could not be derived, from Papias.

The instance of the *argumentum* can to-day be cited only as an illustration, because those who deny the inference as to the silence of Papias no longer claim with Lightfoot that Papias said anything so explicit, but only *something of this*

¹ The silence of Eusebius on this point must be subject to the discount that he was almost as strongly prejudiced *against* the apostolic authorship of Revelation as he was *in favor* of that of the Gospel. Hilgenfeld (*Einl.*, p. 61) goes too far in claiming that τὰς ἀποστολικὰς διηγήσεις (*H. E.* III, 39, 12) refers specifically to Revelation (*cf.* § 11); but Rev. 20:3 is probably included in Eusebius' thought. We cannot argue from this, however, that he felt that further acknowledgment was needless; nor even that he might not disregard a direct statement of Papias. Still the very loose expressions of Andreas must be judged in the light of Eusebius' silence.

kind. That he actually paid no attention whatever to the Fourth Gospel is an admission which they probably feel would be fatal to their argument. His mention and use of it must be taken to be just "casual" enough to make the silence of both Irenæus and Eusebius seem reasonable, though both rest on him for their accounts of the first and second gospels, and at the same time not *so* doubtful or *so* casual as to indicate either ignorance or lack of the respect which could not fail to attach to so lofty an authority.

Whence, then, do the statements emanate which attribute the Fourth Gospel to the son of Zebedee?

It is a fact of very direct bearing upon the question, and of no small interest, that a comparative study of these statements, whether in the Fathers or in the *argumenta*, gives with a high degree of probability their real derivation. Long since it was conjectured (by Zahn) that the legendary account given by the *Muratorian Fragment* might be derived from the Leucian *Acts of John*, a product of Gnostic romancing and allegory of 160-170 A. D. It was almost surely a source, perhaps *the* source, as Corssen, James, and Bonnet have shown, of the *heretical* representations. Orthodox tradition, however, as embodied in the two forms of the *argumentum* above cited, in the *Muratorianum*, and in the statements of Irenæus and Clement of Alexandria, seems to come from a less tainted source. It is probably connected indirectly with the Gnostic legend through an orthodox recast known by the name of Prochorus; but it rests fundamentally and ultimately on the Appendix to the Gospel (Jn. 21).¹ In proof of this it is only needful to place their expressions side by side. The *argumentum* begins, "The Gospel of John was published and given forth to the churches by John while yet in the body."² This is to answer, of

¹ See Jülicher, *Einleitung* (ed. 1902), p. 320.

² For the longer form, regarded by Burkitt as the earlier, and as repre-

course, the objection that it had appeared as a posthumous work; for who ever thought of declaring the work of a given author to have been published "while he was still alive," except in answer to such an opinion? But the opinion is clearly suggested by the Appendix, Jn. 21:23; and the answer just as clearly rests upon the following verse, probably taken in comparison with the related passage in 19:35,¹ where the present "he knoweth" (*οἶδεν*) takes the place of the "we know" (*οἶδαμεν*) of 21:24. In other words, the question of the relation of the Gospel to the Apostle, as a posthumous production or otherwise, was raised and debated 175-200 A. D. just as it is to-day, and on both sides appeal was taken to the Appendix just as to-day. Similarly, the *Muratorianum* also makes the same appeal as to-day to I Jn. 1:1-4 in proof of the *direct* Johannine Authorship.² The only other information which the tradition is able to impart is something held in common by the informant of Clement,³ by Irenæus, the *Muratorianum*, the prologues and *argumenta*, and all later reporters, viz., that the Gospel was written at the close of the Apostle's life in response to the request of his "disciples" (*γνώριμοι*, Clem.), "fellow-apostles and bishops" (*condiscipuli et episcopi*, *Mur.*), "bishops of Asia" (*Prologus Toletanus* and Jerome), and that these became jointly responsible with him in various ways (*Muratorianum*, "recognoscentibus omnibus") for the contents. What have we here but variant interpretations of Jn. 21:20-25, and sending the source of Jerome's extract, *De Viris Ill.* ix, see Burkitt, *op. cit.*, and Wordsworth and White, pp. 490, 491. This form has: "Hoc igitur Evangelium post Apocalypsin scriptum manifestum et datum est ecclesiis in Asia," etc. It should be compared with Corsen's Monarchian prologues.

¹ Jülicher, *loc. cit.*, suggests 1:14.

² *Non solum visorem, sed et auditorem, sed et scriptorem . . . [se] profitetur.* Cf. Jn. 21:24. We shall have occasion hereafter to discuss the argument of Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, pp. 186-190, on the First Epistle as "a commendatory postscript to the Gospel."

³ Clem. Alex. *ap. Eus., H. E.* VI, xiv.

attempts to identify those who in 21:24 vouch for the Gospel, with or without comparison with Papias? Irenæus identified them with the "Elders" of Papias, whom he locates in Asia, as is manifest from the passages quoted by Eusebius from his second and third books.¹ The *Muratorianum* heightens the inspired authority of the writing by making its supplementary authors the apostles (hence in Jerusalem?), and by appending a legend of revelation after fasting.² All forms, so far as they are not manifestly modified by heretical or orthodox legendary traits and by the passage of Papias (Irenæus), have complete explanation as simple inferences from the same passages relied upon by modern defenders. Jn. 21:19-25 was the great proof-text then as now. It not only furnishes a perfectly *adequate* explanation for all that the second century could advance in the way of tradition on the authorship; its very phraseology (verse 20, "the *disciple*—*μαθητής*—whom Jesus loved, which also leaned back on his breast at the supper," verse 23, "that disciple *should not die*," verse 24, "the disciple which *testifieth*—*μαρτυρῶν*—these things," "we know that his *witness* is true") echoes and reëchoes along the whole chain of transmission.

We think it must now be apparent that a failure to distinguish between (1) mere evidence for the *existence* of something identifiable as "Johannine" tradition and doctrine,

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.* III, xxiii.

² "John, one of the *disciples*, when his fellow-disciples and bishops urged him, said, Fast with me three days, and whatever is revealed to each one, let us relate it to one another. The same night it was revealed to Andrew, one of the *Apostles*, that John should write all in his own name, the rest indorse." There are here elements of affinity with the heretical *argumenta* and the orthodox. The dictante Johanne *recte* of the *Argumentum* of Thomasius seems also to be connected with the Monarchian declaration that John dictated the entire Gospel not "at a sitting" but "*standing erect*." See also the *Prologus Quattuor Evangeliorum* from Jerome's *Commentary on Matthew* (Preuschen's *Analecta*), where the legend is attributed to an *ecclesiastica historia*.

and (2) evidence connecting the Fourth Gospel in its present form with the son of Zebedee, denotes inability to appreciate the modern attitude toward the external evidence in general.

To be abreast of the times in the matter of external evidence to the Johannine writings, one must draw a line at about 170 A. D., and passing backward beyond it, must pursue his inquiry along two divergent lines: (1) What difference is there in the *use* made of material of the Johannine type as we recede? (2) What becomes of the tradition of John as an author?

The continued accumulation of "Johannine" echoes must be expected. Every new find will be greeted with as much delight in one camp as the other; but it adds practically nothing on the question *now* in debate. To-day the argument from silence is an argument from the silence of Eusebius, the silence of Irenæus, the silence of Justin Martyr, the silence of Polycarp and Ignatius, and, as we now venture to add, the silence of Papias. Where there seems to be a disposition to pass over this too easily, as if all these champions of the Church had been indifferent to the great problem of *authenticating the records* which agitated *both* Church and heretical sects from Papias down, it seems to argue a certain unprogressiveness, a failure to appreciate the changed aspect of the problem since the theory of Baur and Volkmar and the author of *Supernatural Religion* was "exploded."

So also with the argument from utterance. To-day we are not concerned with "testimonies" later than Justin; nor with earlier ones, except with relation to a quite altered problem. Testimonies to the existence of the type of evangelic tradition or teaching known as "Johannine" are superfluous unless earlier than Justin. Those which are of Justin's age or earlier never connect this type with John. Testimonies to the Johannine Authorship to be of value must be independent of the Appendix.

It must, then, be admitted that a sharp line of demarcation is to be drawn at the point where Theophilus of Antioch for the first time distinctly declares this Gospel to be the work of "John, one of the vessels of the Spirit," and almost simultaneously Tatian introduces it to a parity with the Synoptics, and Irenæus and Hippolytus and the Muratorian fragment vigorously defend it against the Alogi. These appear to have been orthodox opponents of Montanism, conservative in opposition to its excesses, ultraconservative (in the view of Irenæus and his school) in resisting the doctrine of a fourfold gospel. In denying the apostolicity of the Johannine writings they did not deny their antiquity, but alleged, perhaps because of the favor the Gospel had begun to enjoy in Gnostic circles, that it was the work of Cerinthus, the arch-gnostic of Asia.¹ The basis of their argument was its discrepancy with the Synoptics.² But the weak resistance of the Alogi was speedily overcome. As Professor Sanday has put it:

"Direct and express ascription to the Apostle begins with Theophilus of Antioch (*ca.* 181 A. D.). . . . From that time it is of course rapidly taken up in a number of the most diverse quarters; it has, perhaps, already had an elaborate commentary

¹ This allegation has been held up by modern critics as evidence that the Alogi ("senseless") deserved the epithet coined by Epiphanius, whose own house, however, is a genuine crystal palace. In point of fact the evidence is quite the other way. Doubtless they were unpardonably influenced by dogmatic prejudice, but their line of proof was well chosen and consistently carried out; and, while the selection of Cerinthus as forger was doubtless a mere dictate of hatred, recent discovery has now afforded us the proof that the school of Cerinthus *did* engage in the copious manufacture of spurious gospels and Acts of the Apostles, in particular in the production, still in the second century, not only of the *Acts of John* above referred to, but of a *Gnostic Gospel of John* as well.

² Cf. the *Muratorianum*, Et ideo licet varia singulis evangeliorum libris principia doceantur, nihil tamen differt credentium fidei. See also Jerome's version of the *Prologus Toletanus* at the end. Quae res et *διαφορίας* quae videtur Johannis esse cum ceteris tollit.

written upon it by the Gnostic Heracleon; ¹ it has been used by the heathen philosopher Celsus (*ca.* 178); and it has been included in the *Diatessaron* of Tatian [we may now add 'and the Sinaitic Syriac version of about the same date']. We have abundant proof that from the last quarter of the second century the Fourth Gospel is firmly rooted in every branch of the Christian Church, with that one exception [of the Alogi]."

This is not put too strongly, nor is it inadvertently that Professor Sanday writes that from the time of direct ascription to the Apostle "*of course*" it was "*rapidly taken up.*" But we have now to pass behind the epoch of rapid dissemination, and put our double question, asking first, however, since the answer is relatively easy, What becomes of the tradition of John as an author? Unless we greatly mistake the evidence, all that connects him with the Fourth Gospel runs rapidly out in mere legend, either born of Gnostic fancy, or educed from the "Johannine" writings themselves. The *Acts of John* (160-170 A. D.) identify "the disciple whom Jesus loved" with the son of Zebedee, explaining the phrase by John's alleged *celibacy*. Valentinian Gnostics, as less bound by tradition, may well have taken up the Fourth Gospel sooner than the orthodox, though for Basilides and Marcion Luke was "the" gospel. Corssen even thinks he finds traces of opposition to it in Gnostic circles, anticipating that of the Alogi. On the orthodox side it is hard to see how the situation differs from what we might expect it to be if not one of the church writers, from Clement of Rome to Justin Martyr, had ever heard of John as an author, except in so far as he is recognized as the *seer* of Revelation. The solitary gleam of light that we can obtain from their *utterance* is the fact that in his list of the apostles, Papias *groups* John with Matthew. Lightfoot regarded this as evidence that Papias considered him as in some sense an evangelist.

¹ Disciple of Valentinus. Harnack dates his career in 145-180 A. D.

We have only to realize what was the main object of Papias' Expositions of the (principally Matthæan) *logia*, and what writing principally determined his chiliastic views, to see that this explanation is not required. In fact another is more probable. Papias' "expositions" were directed against those whom Lightfoot rightly identifies as the *ἐξηγήται κακοὶ τῶν καλῶς εἰρημένων*. He may even have had the recently published *Exegetica* of Basilides in mind. In the language of his friend and colleague Polycarp, they "perverted the *logia* of the Lord . . . denying that there is either resurrection or judgment." Papias answered them by applying *Revelation* in support of his interpretations of Matthew and Mark. In particular he adduced Rev. 12:9, probably in explanation of Mt. 12:25-29. We may also infer with great probability that it is to Papias that Irenæus refers as the interpreter of Rev. 13:18 (*Her. V, xxx, 1*). Irenæus certainly took from Papias his doctrine of a physical Paradise, which Papias based on Mt. 13:8, 23, interpreted through certain "unwritten traditions," but also, apparently, through Rev. 20:3. To seek a further reason for Papias' grouping of Matthew and John is surely superfluous. Matthew was his authority for the sayings of the Lord, John—the *John of Revelation*—for "the resurrection and judgment." For the rest, the silence regarding John as an author is simply more marked the nearer we draw to the time and place of origin of the Gospel.

(2) But as already noted we must also ask, What of the employments of Johannine evangelic material in the years immediately preceding the vehement advocacy of Irenæus? Why is there so sudden and enormous a falling off in the amount, so little importance attached to the minimum that appears, so distant a resemblance to our text? Why does the Fourth Gospel sink at once from the first to the very lowest rank as an authority? Why does Justin Martyr,

eager as he is in advocacy of a *Logos*-doctrine difficult to distinguish from the Johannine, never appeal to its authority, though in advocacy of his millenarian doctrine he is glad to quote Rev. 20:3, and to make the most of the tradition that "the revelation was made to a certain man with us whose name was John, *one of the apostles of Christ*"? ¹ Why do his quotations from the Synoptic Gospels, which he regards as "memoirs written by Apostles and their followers" ² [*i. e.*, Matthew, Peter, Paul (?), Mark, and Luke], run up into the hundreds and extend over whole paragraphs; while a few lines will contain all that shows even a plausible connection with the Fourth Gospel, even the single brief passage generally made the chief reliance, ³ showing so close affinity with I Pt. 1:3, 23, Mt. 18:3, and *Clem. Hom.* xi, 26, and departing so widely from the Johannine form as to lead Bousset and Edwin Abbott to the conclusion that the *logion* at least is taken from an extracanonical source? ⁴

Answers of a certain sort have been found for these questions. "The Gospel had not yet obtained currency." "Justin had no copy with him." "He was prejudiced against it by Gnostic use." "Its esoteric character made it unsuitable for general use." ⁵ Our own ignorance has been appealed to,

¹ *Dialogue with Trypho*, lxxxi.

² *Dial.* ciii. ἀ φημι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκείνοις παρακολουθησάντων συντετάχθαι. The quotation here introduced is the interpolation in Luke 22:43-44. In cvi, where the naming of the sons of Zebedee Boanerges is referred to, the gospel which alone contains the incident is spoken of as "his (*i. e.*, Peter's) memoirs." The phrase "apostles and their followers," which Westcott would make to include John, cannot fairly be required to include more than the two apostles Matthew and Peter.

³ Jn. 3: 3, 5, in Justin's *Apology*, I, lxi.

⁴ See *Encycl. Bibl.*, s. v. "Gospels," col. 1833 f.

⁵ Professor Sanday, in the *Expositor*, 1891, even esteemed it altogether the *best* reply that can be made, a reply "sufficient to invalidate Dr. Abbott's whole position," to say that "By precisely the same mode of reasoning it might be proved that Justin recognized none, or only one, of St. Paul's Epistles, at a time when his opponent, the heretic Marcion, certainly recog-

and justly. But can it be said that these are *satisfactory* answers? Is there not a startling contrast still to be accounted for between Justin and the generation after in their treatment of this Gospel as compared, say, with Matthew? And as regards its claims of apostolicity and those of Revelation? Was Justin ignorant of Jn. 21:24, or did he refuse it credence?

And the phenomena which meet us so startlingly in Justin simply increase in cogency as we come nearer to the very spot and date whence the Gospel has always been held to emanate. Just *because* Papias and Polycarp betray casually an acquaintance with I John, it is the more surprising that they indicate not a trace of acquaintance with the Apostle as an author,¹ just *because* Ignatius is concerned to refute the same Cerinthian type of Docetism antagonized in the First Epistle, and (according to both tradition and internal evidence) in the Gospel, just *because* he has recourse to a *Logos*-doctrine which is far cruder than the Johannine, and yet resembles it, and *because* his very language has here and there a "Johannine" tinge, and *because* he is writing from the very scene of the Apostle's latest days, it is the more extraordinary that he should pass by the story of the dispelling of Thomas' doubts, Jn. 20:27, and the scene of post-resurrection eating with the eleven, Jn. 21:9-14, and resort to an apocryphal gospel of unknown origin to prove to the Smyrnæans the reality of the resurrection body against the Docetæ.²

nized ten of them." But what sort of authority would Paul's Epistles have been for Justin in his endeavor to give the heathen a correct idea of the life and teaching of Jesus? And of what use would they have been in persuading a *Jew* that Jesus was the Messiah and taught a *Logos*-doctrine similar to Justin's own?

¹ The exception above noted, that Papias, like Justin, vouched for the genuineness of *Revelation*, should be remembered.

² Ignatius, *Ad Smyrn.* iii, 2. See Lightfoot, *Apost. Fathers*, as to the derivation of the quotation.

That Hermas,¹ and the *Διδαχή*, and Barnabas, and the Smyrnæans, and Clement of Rome are silent, both as to the Apostle and anything written by him, is scarcely to the point, since nothing was perhaps to be expected. But if any are disposed to find "Johannine" echoes in the eucharistic prayers of *Διδαχή*, or elsewhere in these early writings, it simply increases the difficulty of accounting for the two unaccountable things, (1) the general non-employment of the Gospel, (2) the apparent universal ignorance of its claims to apostolic authorship.

As the outcome of the changed aspect given to the external evidence by modern phases of the Johannine problem, it appears thus, finally, that Lightfoot was indeed right in declaring both the silence and the utterance of the earliest writers to be eloquent. Only, now that both our knowledge of utterances and our understanding of silences has increased, there is very much to turn the inferences once drawn in almost the opposite direction. Eighteen years ago Drs. Schürer and Sanday were already agreed on the conclusiveness of the external evidence regarding the early existence of the Gospel. They were divided in opinion as to whether the balance of this evidence inclined in favor of the Johannine authorship. To-day the agreed point is much more emphatically determined than before; the question is now, What *kind* of

¹ The proof of the use of the "sacred quaternion" of the Gospels by Hermas, expected by Professor Sanday in 1891 (*Expositor*, iv, 4, p. 419), has resolved itself into the simple fact that the four supports of the seat on which Ecclesia sits, which *Irenæus* adopts as an allegorical type of the four gospels, are found in Hermas (*Vis.* iii, 13). Only, the application made by Hermas is *not* that of *Irenæus*, III, xi, 8, but simply: "Whereas thou sawest her seated on a couch, the position is a firm one; for the couch has four feet and standeth firmly; for the world too is upheld by means of four elements." Dr. C. Taylor developed the promised "proof" in 1892, under the title *The Witness of Hermas to the Four Gospels*, which Harnack very unceremoniously dismisses as "mere *inepta*." Stanton, *Gospels.*, etc., p. 47, note 3, is more gentle in finding it "impossible to adopt his view."

existence had the Fourth Gospel in the first half of the second century? Did it circulate in its present form, and accompanied by its present "letter of commendation" in the so-called Appendix? Did it circulate, as Lightfoot supposed, with both this and I John besides attached to it as a "commendatory letter"? Or does a use barely sufficient to prove its early existence, even when helped out from Gnostic sources, and by echoes so remote as to suggest something quite unlike our form of the text, accompanied by a silence on the question of authorship, more marked the further we recede from the stalwart claims of Irenæus and the *argumenta* toward the actual time and place of origin,—do these complementary lines of evidence to-day tend to show that the notion of direct apostolic authorship is a later development?

Against these debated questions we may well propound in briefest form what we regard as the real facts concerning evangelic tradition in the Sub-apostolic Age, and the authority attached to it in the various provinces of the ecclesiastical world; for as Harnack has admirably set forth,¹ the circulation of a *fourfold* gospel is not only a phenomenon of late appearance, for which battle is still being vigorously waged by Irenæus and the author of the *Muratorianum*; it is in itself a complete anomaly, whose explanation may be expected to shed a flood of light upon the obscurities of the tradition. The only normal and intelligible beginning—and of this primitive condition many traces survive—is one in which the Church embodies its whole "evangelic instrument" in a single gospel—as indeed it repeatedly attempted to do, and the founders of heretical churches almost invariably did. A remote period is dimly discernible when the orthodox Church also had but one gospel. It was written in Aramaic and hence confined in circulation to Palestine. It

¹ *Chronologie*, p. 681.

was said to have been a compilation by the Apostle Matthew of the Sayings of the Lord. But at the earliest period to which we can trace the story, this primitive gospel had assumed several variant Greek forms. As the Church expanded this growth was inevitable. In Palestine, however, "the" gospel continued for centuries to be the Gospel according to Matthew, however varied the forms assumed. Of these forms (Papias' "translations") one was our own Greek Matthew, which may have been composed in Cæsarea, or perhaps Alexandria; others, written in Aramaic, circulated in Palestine. The Greek Matthew, however, is known and accepted everywhere in the earliest times; only, as every modern student knows, canonical Matthew is already a product of fusion. It combines the ancient Matthæan Sayings (Q) with the Roman gospel founded on Petrine narrative, attributed to Paul's companion Mark. And the combination itself displays a Palestinian or South Syrian origin, as indeed we find these two sources (the Sayings and Mark) recognized by the (Palestinian) "Elders" of Papias. Matthew and Mark, the Palestinian and the Roman gospels, are the only ones of which we have traces everywhere in the earliest time. They alone circulate without "letters of commendation" in the form of preface or appendix. Indeed, outside of its native Rome even Mark is not treated with a respect approaching that paid to Matthew. "The" gospel for the *Didaché* is Matthew. Quotations, whether in Asia, Syria, Egypt, or even Rome, are almost invariably from Matthew. Mark is seldom used, and an apologetic tone is assumed in speaking of its limitations.

Later there appears in Antioch ¹ a new combination of the

¹ Ancient tradition (Eusebius, *H. E.* III, iv, 7), early employment (Marion, Basilides), and internal characteristics (settlement of the issue between Jews and Gentiles in the Church on a Petrine basis at the instance of Antioch) combine to prove Luke-Acts an Antiochian product.

Matthæan Sayings with Mark, developed with great literary skill and with the aid of ancient missionary records into a complete history of the founding of the Church. This third gospel and book of Acts is put forth under distinguished patronage.¹ It is carried to Rome and to Alexandria. In Asia it strongly influences the author of our Fourth Gospel. By Marcion and Basilides it is adopted as "the" gospel. It is placed at least on equal terms with Matthew and Mark by Justin, and even a new conclusion is framed to the latter gospel adapting its resurrection narrative to the Lukan form. The *Gospel of Peter* effects a harmonizing combination of the three. Only in Asia is there little trace, outside the Fourth Gospel itself, of any disposition to take up the Antiochian gospel. Papias, if he knew it, would seem to have classed it with the "books" which to him were of less value than "the living and abiding voice." He perhaps included the Fourth Gospel in the same category. Asia, as we know, had given a welcome to the South Syrian embodiment of Matthæan tradition on the one hand, and to the Roman embodiment of Petrine tradition on the other. In this headquarters of the Pauline Greek mission field both tendencies were thoroughly felt, intense loyalty to the independent mysticism of Paul, and at the same time a disposition to revert to "the word handed down from the beginning" (in Palestine) against heretical, ultra-Pauline perverters of the oracles of the Lord and deniers of the resurrection and judgment. From its whole history Asia could not be satisfied with any modern product not fundamentally akin to its own lofty Paulinism. Its own evangelic tradition remained long unformulated, as we might expect would be the case from Paul's comparative indifference to the mere story of the earthly Jesus. When at last formulated it displayed that lofty eclecticism and disdain of the mere conventionalized

¹ Lk. 1:3; Acts 1:1, κράτιστε Θεόφιλε.

Synoptic form which only a Pauline mysticism could produce. For long it is the name of Paul, and only of Paul, by which the Asiatic type of evangelic tradition, distinguished especially by the Logos-doctrine, is supported. After the middle of the second century, at Rome, we find the name of "John" attached to it, which previously is associated only with the book of Revelation, an Asiatic recast, as its preliminary letters to the seven Churches of Asia attest, of a Palestinian Apocalypse. The first attempt to secure for the Gospel and Epistles the same apostolic authority vigorously—and it would seem successfully—asserted for the Apocalypse, is made (in a very cautious and almost ambiguous manner) in an Appendix, attached, it would seem, at Rome. The whole object of this Appendix is to adjust the claims of the Gospel to those of a regnant Petrine tradition. The office of chief under-shepherd of the flock of Christ is here conceded to Peter, together with the crown of martyrdom. Only for "the disciple whom Jesus loved" there is reserved the special and unique function belonging to the "abiding witness"; not indeed that once accepted in the Church "that that disciple should not die"; but in the new and vital sense that his "witness" shall remain as the "true" interpretation of the faith, the essential "mind of Christ." With this epilogue of commendation to a world-wide circle our Fourth Gospel is "given forth to the churches."

If Rome be not the place where the harmonizing Appendix was framed, certainly Rome is the scene of the great controversy which now breaks out, as it would seem in consequence of it. The question which now for half a century agitates the Christian world with respect to the standard of evangelic tradition is that of a single, double, threefold, or fourfold gospel. Rome is the inevitable battle-field. Tatian seeks to solve the problem by a reduction of the four to one composite gospel; and his solution is accepted in Syria, his na-

tive place. Theophilus of Antioch follows a similar plan. Gaius of Rome rejects the Asiatic gospel on account of its "discord with the other three." Cerinthians and Docetists adopt Mark alone, Basilides Luke alone, Marcion a mutilated form of Luke. But the method of the Catholic Church has always been inclusive, and in the matter of the canon, more especially the gospel canon, inclusion and combination had been the method established from the very start. The long established double standard had already become threefold. The only logical step was now to make it fourfold. Against Proclus and his few Phrygian Montanists a great scholar and ecclesiastic like Gaius might for a time make head. But the weight of all Asia and the increasing spirit of catholicity was against him. It was impossible to cut off the whole province of Asia by excluding its form of gospel teaching. Irenæus, proud to take up the cause of Polycarp and Polycarp's associates, as he esteemed it, swung his heavy battle-ax against the "wretched men" who think that in the nature of the case there can be less than four gospels. In particular he denounced those who dared to question "that aspect which is presented by John's Gospel." Hippolytus overwhelmed them with his learning and logic, and elaborated a chronology to remove the discrepancies between the Synoptics and John developed during the Paschal controversies. Such in outline is the course of history as we read it, in place of that *fides semper eadem*, that unbroken transmission of a *fourfold* "evangelic instrument having for its authors Apostles, on whom this charge was imposed by the Lord himself," which Catholic theory presents.

CHAPTER IV

THE TRADITION AS TO THE ELDERS AND ITS TRANSFORMATIONS ¹

All discussion of the origin and history of the tradition of John in Asia, and as author of the Gospel, must necessarily begin with Papias. The famous fragment of his work which contains practically all we know of the beginnings of gospel composition, and forms our strongest link of connection with the apostles, is quoted by Eusebius in an endeavor to correct what has been designated from its principal promulgator the "Irenæan tradition" of apostles in Asia. Eusebius did not criticize this in its whole extent, but simply in so far as it rested on the statements of Papias.² Shortly before³ the period of Irenæus' work (written *ca.* 186 A. D.) the Roman presbyter Gaius in debate with the Montanist Proclus, had repudiated the latter's authorities, the Johannine writings, as unauthentic.⁴ Irenæus (followed later by his disciple Hippolytus, whose *Heads against Gaius* are still extant in

¹ Reprinted by permission of the editors from the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XXVII, i (July, 1908).

² The section begins: "Irenæus makes mention of these (the five books of *Exegesis*) as the only works written by him (Papias)." It proceeds to cite and criticize his description of Papias' relation to the apostles and to Polycarp, as below, p. 117.

³ Eusebius dates Gaius under Zephyrinus (*H. E.* II, xxv, 6), probably too late.

⁴ The *Dialogue* aimed to "curb the rashness and boldness of his opponents in setting forth new Scriptures." It maintained the authority of "Peter and Paul" (attributing thirteen letters to the latter) against that of the writings attributed to "a great apostle" at Ephesus (*H. E.* II, xxv, 7; VI, xx, 3; III, xxviii, 2). Polycrates (*H. E.* III, xxxi, 3) inverts the argument.

abstract¹) became their stalwart champion, especially defending the Fourth Gospel. For this task his early residence in Asia and direct eye and ear knowledge of Polycarp, a survivor of the apostolic age, gave him an advantage of which he makes the utmost. He depends, however, for all his specific citations of apostolic tradition upon a written source, now generally admitted to have been the work of Papias, entitled *Κυριακῶν λογίων ἐξηγήσεις*.² In the passage wherein his principal quotation is made he designates the worthy bishop of Hierapolis as "a man of the earliest period, a hearer of John and companion of Polycarp."³ Eusebius one hundred and forty years later, having the work of Papias before him, and examining it carefully for the specific purpose of determining this particular point, had no difficulty in showing by citation of the passages bearing upon the question that Irenæus had misinterpreted them, attributing to Papias a much closer connection with the apostolic fountainhead of tradition than could be justly claimed.

On the other hand, if Irenæus was misled by his zeal to establish the unbroken continuity in proconsular Asia of that apostolic tradition whereof he counted himself a providential representative, Eusebius in his turn cannot be altogether acquitted of similar partiality. He also had read the *Dialogue of Proclus and Gaius*, and on all but one point was as ardently opposed as Irenæus himself to its anti-Johannine criticism. The Roman followers of Gaius, one of whose favorite arguments was to point to the disagreement of the Fourth Gospel with the other three, were to Eusebius as obnoxious as to Hippolytus and to the author of the *Murato-*

¹ See J. R. Harris, *Hermas in Arcadia and Other Essays*, 1896.

² Lightfoot (*Bibl. Essays*, pp. 64, 66, 68) varies from the reading 'Ἐξήγησις to 'Ἐξηγήσεις. His apparent preference for the plural is based on the nature of the work (p. 68, note 2). The present writer was guilty of oversight, as Drummond notes (*Authorship*, p. 195), in neglecting the variant.

³ ἀρχαῖος ἀνὴρ, Ἰωάννου ἀκουστής, Πολυκάρπου δὲ ἐταῖρος.

rianum. He regarded them as "senseless" Alogi, to quote the punning epithet of Epiphanius,¹ men who for the sake of ridding themselves of the excesses of the "Phrygian heresy" had "emptied out the baby with the bath" by rejecting the whole Phrygo-Asiatic canon—Gospel, Epistles,² and Apocalypse of John together. On one point of their contention, however, Eusebius was disposed to yield, though the arguments which had convinced him were not, or at least not directly, those of Gaius. Eusebius had been profoundly influenced by the reasoning of another great *malleus hereticorum*, Dionysius of Alexandria, whose opponents the Chiliasts based their millenarian doctrines, not like the Phrygian champions of the prophetic Spirit on the Johannine canon as a whole, but simply on the Apocalypse. Dionysius cut the ground from under their feet by denying its apostolicity, though he maintained as cordially as ever the authenticity of the Gospel and at least of the first of the Epistles. Henceforth Revelation, the writing which alone of the five made direct claim to Johannine authorship, with direct and explicit attestation by both Papias and Justin Martyr, became the "disputed," and the other four, or at least the Gospel and First Epistle, the "undisputed" Johannine writings. Eusebius quotes at length the argument of Dionysius against the Apocalypse, wherein the Alexandrian scholar displays the skill in literary criticism one might anticipate in a pupil of Origen, showing how completely Revelation differs in style and standpoint from the Gospel and Epistles.

¹ Epiphanius in this portion of his *Refutation of All Heresies* merely reflects Hippolytus, the disciple of Irenæus, whose *Heads against Gaius* give us the substance of his refutation of the presbyter.

² The rejection of the *Epistles* seems to be only the inference of Epiphanius, but it was doubtless correct. The work of Hippolytus in the list of his writings on the back of the statue in the Lateran Museum is called only a *Defense of the Gospel and Apocalypse of John*. The Epistles were perhaps not involved in the dispute.

Eusebius himself was anything but favorably disposed toward the Chiliasts. He even attributes the crude eschatology he found represented by Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and other members of the Ephesian school, to the influence of Papias, whom for this very unfair reason he contemptuously sets down as "a very narrow-minded man."¹ We are not surprised, therefore, to find him not only quoting the theory of Dionysius with approval, but in his famous list of "admitted," "disputed," and "spurious" books making special exception of Revelation, which *if* by the Apostle must of course be admitted as canonical; but otherwise cannot even be classed with the "disputed" books (*ἀντιλεγόμενα*) which included II and III John, but must take its place with the "spurious" (*νόθα*).² To impute partiality to Eusebius without convincing evidence would be a hazardous proceeding; but on this particular matter of the Apocalypse of John the evidence is convincing, for, Blass to the contrary notwithstanding, Papias certainly did make repeated and copious use of this book, besides attesting its "credibility" (*ἀξιόπιστον*). We have the full and explicit testimony of Andreas of Cæsarea, supported by Anastasius of Sinai, and Victorinus, to say nothing of Eusebius' own statements regarding the infection of millenarianism which spread from Papias through Justin to Irenæus. Over and above all we have Irenæus' testimonies concerning the currency of Revelation among "the persons who had seen John with their

¹ σφόδρα μικρὸν τὸν νοῦν.

² Stanton (*Gospels as Hist. Documents*, p. 240), who thinks that if the *Dialogue against Proclus* had rejected the Fourth Gospel, "Eusebius could not have ignored so serious a departure," fails to perceive that Eusebius introduces his answer to Gaius in III, xxiii, xxiv. Very shortly before (ch. xviii) he speaks his mind on the origin of "the so-called Apocalypse of John." That he should lend weight to the objections "that the Gospels are at variance with one another" by naming as their author the "very learned ecclesiastic" Gaius was not to be expected.

eyes.”¹ To deny weight to all this is to discredit oneself, not the testimony. Yet Eusebius, who had promised to give his readers the evidence he found in early writers of their use of books whose canonicity was in dispute, maintains complete silence regarding Papias’ use of Revelation, while he mentions his “testimonies” taken from I Peter and I John. Silence under such conditions—silence so marked as to lead not only Blass but even Hilgenfeld actually to deny Papias’ acquaintance with Revelation *in toto*—cannot be called impartial.

Clearly Zahn is right in maintaining that no scientific judgment can be passed upon Eusebius’ correction of Irenæus’ inferences from Papias, which does not give due consideration to his strong bias in favor of Dionysius’ theory of Revelation as the work of “another John in Asia.” In fact, he makes direct reference to Dionysius’ suggestion in citing the passage (τῶν δύο . . . εἰρηκότων).

Now the weak point of Dionysius’ theory had been his inability to point to any “other John in Asia” than the Apostle, for he does not himself rely upon the alleged “two μνῆματα in Ephesus each bearing the name of John,” but prefers to identify the John of Revelation with John Mark of Acts. It is here that Eusebius comes in with his great discovery. He has found, he thinks, the desired evidence in the Papias fragment. Papias does indeed refer to another John besides the Apostle, for, as Eusebius says, “he mentions him after an interval, and places him among others outside the number of the Apostles, placing Aristion before him, and distinctly calls him an Elder.” On this Elder John of Papias Eusebius therefore eagerly seizes, as evidence “that it was the second (the Elder), if one will not admit that it was the first (the Apostle), who saw the Revelation, which is ascribed by name to John.” He has the candor to admit,

¹ Iren. V, xxx, 1.

however, that Papias did not really state that he had been "himself a hearer of Aristion and the Elder John," but only "mentioned them frequently by name and gave their traditions in his writings." We see, then, that while Eusebius is anxious to correct Irenæus *in so far as the correction would militate against Revelation*, he is as anxious as any other orthodox father not to undermine the support of the rest of the Johannine canon by weakening those links of tradition which Irenæus had boasted of as connecting himself with the Apostle, for it is certainly Papias that Irenæus has in mind when he alleges that some of the Asiatic Elders "saw not only John (as Polycarp had) but other Apostles also, and heard these things (the tradition of Jesus' age) from them, and testify to the statement."¹ The present "testify" (*testantur*) shows that he is quoting a written authority, which can be no other than Papias.

It is important to observe this distinction in Eusebius' prejudices in weighing Zahn's endeavor to discredit his statements. He was, we must admit, quite perceptibly anxious to deprive Revelation of its claim to apostolicity. *As regards all other elements of the Irenæan tradition he was doubly zealous to support it.* His eagerness to find "another John in Asia" does indeed require a discount on this feature of his testimony. In fact, the concessive *γούν* ("at all events he [Papias] mentions them frequently by name, and gives their traditions in his writings") is nothing less than an admission that his imputation of a personal relation between Papias and this "Elder John" had no support in the text. As we shall see, an eye not prejudiced like that of Irenæus, and that of Eusebius in no less degree, to support the apostolic succession of Asia would have drawn quite other inferences. Dionysius, for example, can hardly have been ignorant of this Elder John. So renowned a scholar can

¹ *Her.* II, xxii, 5; Eusebius, *H. E.* III, xxiii, 3.

scarcely be supposed to have left unnoticed the famous work of Papias in his controversy with the Chiliasts. But Dionysius found nothing in Papias to connect "the Elder John" with Asia. In this "discovery," therefore, Eusebius could claim complete originality. Contrariwise as respects all other points of the Irenæan tradition. From these Eusebius had cogent reason for subtracting as little as possible, for in his own earlier work¹ he had committed himself to all the exaggerations of Irenæus, ranking Papias in the generation along with Polycarp, and even calling him in Irenæus' own words "a hearer of John the Apostle." Thus the stronger Zahn's case becomes against the impartiality of Eusebius, the stronger grows the probability that Papias knew of no John in Asia at all, save what he read in Rev. 1:4-9.

Effort has been made by Zahn,² and especially by Gutjahr,³ to turn to account the new evidence afforded by the Syriac version of Eusebius in the interest of this same heightening of the rank of Papias and vindication of Irenæus' pretensions on his behalf. We shall endeavor to show on the contrary that the peculiarities of this extremely ancient translation furnish evidence only on the opposite side. They are striking enough and eminently consistent, for all tend to the very object the Protestant champion of reactionary views and his Roman Catholic ally have so much at heart. The one great drawback is that they prove altogether too much, evidencing not so much what *Eusebius* wished to say, as what the *translator*, whom we may designate S, desired to make him say; for S's loyalty to his author was not equal to his loyalty to current orthodoxy. In short, he takes sides against his own text for a still more

¹ *Chronicon* for Olymp. 220, ed. A. Schoene (1866), II, p. 162.

² *Forschungen*, VI, i. *Apostel und Apostelschüler in der Provinz Asien*, 1900.

³ *Glaubwürdigkeit des Irenäischen Zeugnisses*, 1904.

stringent interpretation of the long-established Irenæan tradition. Not unnaturally he makes the same kind of nonsense we find in Biblical versions such as the LXX and Targums, whose authors felt it necessary to be more orthodox than the Scriptural writers they professed to translate. As manifesting this *Tendenz* even the blunders and arbitrary changes of S have value. The tenacity of the Irenæan tradition, in the teeth of positive disproof will teach us two things: (1) A juster valuation of Eusebius' opposition to it. We shall realize both how impossible it is that Eusebius should have made resistance on a point so vital to the Church, even retracting his own earlier statements, without a careful and systematic review of the admitted sole source of information on the subject;¹ and also how impossible that having made it, his representations should have gone uncontradicted if Papias' treatise, in general circulation as it was for centuries after, had really been misrepresented.

(2) We shall also better realize from it how much more serious was the temptation to Eusebius to understate his correction than to overstate it. As we have seen, his *Chronology*, a substructure of his *History*, had embodied at full face-value Irenæus' erroneous placing of Papias, a vital link in that succession of "Apostles and disciples of Apostles in Asia" so indispensable to all defenders of the Ephesian canon. We must therefore by no means minimize, but rather take at their *maximum* value, Eusebius' admissions that in the authority on which so much of his case rested there was no claim of direct relation even to the Elder John. Eusebius had made thorough search of the work of Papias,—

¹ It was essential to Eusebius' argument to show that Irenæus had no ulterior source of information, but based his statements on the passages adduced. Hence *ὡς μόνων γραφέντων*. Irenæus' exclusive dependence on the written work for his knowledge of Papias is proved (against Gutjahr) not merely by his gross misdating of the man, but by his description of the source of his information *ἐστὶ γὰρ κτλ.*

the only source of evidence known either to Irenæus or himself,—and is obliged to admit that even the lower ranking which he tries to give its author finds no support in the book. The Papias passages themselves,—the most favorable Eusebius was able to find,—interpreted in their own context, place their author, as we shall see, not at the second, but at the *third* remove from apostolic authority. Papias was not a hearer even of the “disciples of the Apostles” *γνώριμοι τῶν ἀποστόλων*. Why then does Eusebius halt half-way in his correction of the error of Irenæus? Our study of his interest in current questions of canonicity leaves the motive transparent. To admit that Papias had not even been a hearer of the *second* John would conflict with *both* of Eusebius’ cherished ideas. He would then be sacrificing both the authenticity of the Gospel *and* the unauthenticity of the Apocalypse as well. Such an interpretation would have been almost as obnoxious to him as to Zahn and Gutjahr. And yet this *third*-hand relation of Papias to the apostles is what naturally follows from Eusebius’ admissions. It is in fact, as we shall see, the only interpretation which can give a consistent meaning to the citation, or enable us to understand *πρεσβύτερος* in the sense always attached to it in the period in question. But let us turn now to **S**.

The Syriac version of Eusebius’ *History*, edited in France by Bedjan in 1897, and by Wright and McLean in 1898 in England, is of extreme antiquity. It is known in a Petersburg manuscript of 462 A. D., a London manuscript of the sixth century, and from a subsidiary Armenian version (collated by Merx in Wright and McLean’s edition) made before 441 A. D.; so that there is some ground even for the claim of those who think the translator may have been a contemporary of Eusebius himself. For our purpose it is sufficient to place in one column the accepted Greek text, with collation of the MS. variants, the more or less arbitrary

Latin renderings of Rufinus and Jerome, and the excerpts of Nicephorus, while we set in a parallel column an English rendering of Nestle's translation of the Syriac carefully compared with the original.¹ Italics are used to call attention to the variations of the Syriac from the Greek text, [] for its omissions.

THE PAPIAS FRAGMENT

GREEK EUSEBIUS

SYRIAC VERSION

Οὐκ ὀκνήσω δέ σοι καὶ ὅσα ποτὲ παρὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καλῶς ἔμαθον καὶ καλῶς ἐμνημόνευσα συγκατατάξαι ^a ταῖς ἐρμη-
 5 νέαις διαβεβαιούμενος ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀλήθειαν. οὐ γὰρ τοῖς τὰ πολλὰ λέγουσιν ἔχαιρον ὥσπερ οἱ πολλοὶ, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τάληθῆ διδάσκουσιν, οὐδὲ τοῖς
 10 ἀλλοτρίας ἐντολὰς μνημονεύουσιν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τὰς παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου τῇ πίστει δεδομένας ^b καὶ ἀπ' αὐτῆς παραγινομένοις ^c τῆς ἀληθείας. Εἰ δέ πον καὶ
 15 παρηκολουθηκώς τις τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ^d ἔλθοι, τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀνέκρινον ^e λόγους, τί Ἀνδρέας ἢ τί Πέτρος εἶπεν ἢ τί Φίλιππος ἢ τί Θωμᾶς ἢ

I do not scruple to adduce for thee in these interpretations of mine that also which I well learned []^a from the Elders and well remember. And I attest on behalf of these *men*^b the truth. For I did not take delight in those who have much to say, as many do, but in those who teach the truth; neither in those who recall commandments of strangers, but in those who transmit what was given by our Lord to the faith, and is derived and comes from the Truth (itself). *Neither*^c *did I* when any one came along who had been a fol-

¹ By the kindness of Professor C. C. Torrey.

^a Var. συντάξαι Ruf. exponere cum interpretationibus suis.

^b Ruf. qui domini mandata memorabant.

^c Var. παραγινομένας.

^d Ruf. apostolos.

^e Ruf. expiscabar. Jer. considerabam.

^a Syr. om. ποτε.

^b Syr. masc.

^c Gressmann (*Th. Ltz.*, 1901, p. 644) (*Contrariwise*) *not even when.*

20 Ἰάκωβος^f ἢ τί Ἰωάννης ἢ
 Ματθαῖος ἢ τις ἕτερος τῶν τοῦ
 κυρίου μαθητῶν, ἃ τε Ἄρισ-
 τίων καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάν-
 νης οἱ τοῦ κυρίου μαθηταὶ
 25 λέγουσιν.^g οὐ γὰρ τὰ ἐκ τῶν
 βιβλίων τοσοῦτόν με ὠφελεῖν
 ὑπελάμβανον ὅσον τὰ παρὰ
 ζώσης φωνῆς καὶ μενούσης.^h

lower of the Elders, *compare* the words of the Elders: what Andrew said, or what Peter said, or what Philip, or what Thomas, or what James, or what John, or Matthew, or any other of the disciples of our Lord. Nor what Aristo^d or John the Elder^e [].^f For I did not think that I could so profit from *their*^g books, as from the living and abiding utterance.

The sense given by S to the Papias fragment is clear enough. He makes Papias distinguish three classes of teaching: (1) "the commandments of the Lord," "the Truth itself," which when reported by the actual ear-witnesses could be described as a "living and abiding utterance." These are the object of Papias' quest. (2) The second class includes "words of the Elders," oral or written. By "the Elders" S understands "the disciples of our Lord" mentioned by name, *and* "Aristo [*sic*] and John the Elder," the designation of the last two by the same title as the apostles being omitted. To "books" S attaches the possessive "*their* books," showing that he is thinking of the Gospels. From the sayings and writings of "the Elders" (*i. e.*, apostles)¹ Papias could profit, but not "*so* profit as from the

^f Nic. (III, 20) ἢ τί Σίμων Ἰάκωβος.

^g Ruf. ceterique discipuli dicebant. Jer. discipuli domini loquebantur. Nic. (II, 46) om.

^h Jer. add. in suis auctoribus.

^d Arm. Aristos.

^e Arm. *the elders*; simple addition of the plural points in Syr.

^f Syr. om. οἱ τοῦ κυρίου μαθηταὶ λέγουσιν.

^g Syr. add. *their*.

¹ Jerome at this point is even less scrupulous than S. To make it perfectly clear that "the Elders" are really the men of the first generation, he

living and abiding voice." (3) The third class of teaching includes the wonder-tales or "commandments of strangers" current in Papias' vicinity, but which were useless or worse.

To obtain this sense the Greek text has suffered; partly by S's intentional reconstruction, partly by accident. The extraordinary rendering, "Neither did I . . . compare the words of the Elders," which excites the wonderment of Zahn and Gutjahr, may be due to simple accident. $\epsilon\iota\Delta\epsilon$ has been misread $\omicron\Upsilon\Delta\epsilon$, probably from illegibility of the first two letters. The rest of the changes are systematic, including the omissions.

Although in vol. xvii of the *Journal of Bibl. Lit.* (1898) I had already published previous to the appearance of the Syriac a conjectural emendation of the clause designating Aristion and John the Elder as "disciples of the Lord," pointing out that several references in Irenæus suggest $\omicron\iota\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\ \overline{\text{MA}}\theta\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ instead of $\omicron\iota\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \overline{\text{KY}}\ \text{MA}\theta\eta\tau\alpha\iota$,¹ and that transcriptional and internal evidence alike support the former reading, I cannot agree with Mommsen, who welcomed S's omission here, as representing the true reading.² On the contrary, Corssen³ rightly insists that *some* designation of these unknown men is indispensable to the context. Manifestly it should not be a designation identical with that just employed for the apostles themselves, but one which marks the distinction imperfectly implied in the contrast of tenses

adds in the last clause "in the person of their authors," *i. e.*, the apostolic authors of the Gospels (*viva vox usque hodie in suis auctoribus personans*).

¹ Edwin A. Abbott in adopting the conjecture (*Encycl. Bibl. s. v.* "Gospels," col. 1815, n. 3) improves upon it by using the supra-linear line in the word $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\upsilon$. He also cites an instance of the same corruption in Jud. 4:24. LXX, $\tau\omega\upsilon\ \nu\iota\omega\upsilon$ B, but A $\kappa\upsilon$ (*i. e.* $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon$) $\nu\iota\omega\upsilon$.

² Abbott had previously taken this view (*l. c.*) on the basis of Arm. "The words 'the disciples of the Lord' can hardly have followed 'Ariston, etc.,' in the text used by Eusebius. . . . This . . . is confirmed by (1) their absence from the Arman version," etc.

³ *Zts. f. ntl. Wiss.* iii (1902), p. 244.

(εἶπε, λέγουσι), and more adequately in the case of the second individual, who might otherwise be confused with the Apostle, by the epithet "the Elder." The distinction should be that of the second generation, as in Lk. 1:2; Heb. 2:3. The original *in Papias* was, as I have maintained and still maintain, οἱ τούτων μαθηταί, *i. e.*, "the Elders the disciples of the Apostles," so frequently referred to in Acts, Hegesippus, and authorities dependent on Papias.¹ But the corruption is earlier than Eusebius, probably earlier even than Irenæus. In Eusebius' text the phrase had already been assimilated to that of the line preceding, else Eusebius would not have been obliged to rely on grammatical arguments (διαστείλας τὸν λόγον . . . προτάξας αὐτῷ τὸν Ἀριστίονα) to prove his point. Indeed, the corruption may well be largely responsible for the blundering of Irenæus himself. But S in omitting the clause is *not* following a better text of Eusebius, much less is he consulting a text of Papias. He is probably not even sensitive to the "chronological difficulty" which Lightfoot himself admitted to be occasioned by the clause.² On the contrary, he makes two other changes in harmony with the Irenæan anachronism: he omits ποτέ and obliterates the difference of tense (εἶπε, λέγουσι), the only remaining trace of the chronological distinction. No, S's omission (followed by Arm.) is doubtless occasioned by the manifest incongruity, which produces the same result in one of the two excerpts of Nicephorus Callistus,³ not to speak of other changes by Rufinus and others⁴ at the same point. "Aristo" [*sic*] and "John the Elder" could not be regarded as "disciples of the Lord" *in*

¹ *E. g.*, Irenæus, *Her.* V, v, 1 and xxxvi, 2, "The Elders, the disciples of the Apostles." Euseb. παρὰ τῶν ἐκείνοις (the apostles) γνωρίμων.

² *Supern. Rel.*, p. 150, n.

³ II, 46. The excerpt III, 20 retains it.

⁴ Rufinus omits τοῦ κυρίου. Four Greek MSS. omit *ol.*

the same sense as the designation had just been applied to Andrew, Peter, Philip, Thomas, James, John, and Matthew. Changes were felt to be imperative. Arm., which simply adds plural points to the Syriac "the Elder," makes a shrewd guess at the real meaning; but the simplest remedy was to drop the unintelligible clause as a repetition. S understood very well that Andrew, Peter, Philip, and the rest were designated μαθηταί (not ἀπόστολοι), because the matter concerned was the transmission of teachings (μαθήματα). He knew the first "disciples" included no such names as "Aristion and John the Elder." The clause was patently erroneous; therefore he dropped it along with the ποτέ and the λέγουσι. In the extract he does but one further violence to his text; he changes the spelling of the name "Aristio" to "Aristo." The form Aristo then becomes current in Armenian texts, being adopted in the Edschmiazin Codex of Conybeare from Moses of Chorene. This is a comparatively harmless, though mistaken identification of the unknown "Aristion" with "Aristo" of Pella, a heathen writer¹ quoted by Eusebius a few pages farther on. Moses of Chorene adds to the quotation, while Maximus Confessor, on the basis of a (misunderstood?) passage of Clement, declares Aristion to have been the author of the *Dialogue of Jason and Papiscus*.² Gutjahr is probably mistaken in supposing S to have read συνέκρινον for ἀνέκρινον in the clause, "Neither did I *compare* the words of the Elders."

¹ Perhaps the same as Aristo of Gerasa (30 miles from Pella) referred to as an ἀστυεὶς ῥήτωρ by Stephen of Byzantium.

² As I have shown elsewhere (Hastings, *Dict. of Christ and Gospels*, s. v. "Aristion"), Conybeare's apparent discovery of the authorship of Mk. 16: 9-20 turns out to be a mare's nest. Moses of Chorene was understood by the Armenian scribe to have declared that Hadrian made Aristo of Pella the secretary of "Mark" when he appointed him (Marcus) bishop of Jerusalem. Hence he attributes the Appendix which he introduces for the first time into Armenian codices to "the Elder Aristo," the *secretary of Mark*.

S renders *ἀνέκρινον* in the same way elsewhere, employing the same word (*p^eham*) for “verify by comparison (with the Gospels).” He inserts an *αὐτῶν*, as we have seen, after *βιβλίων* in l. 23, and renders *αὐτῶν* in l. 5 as a masculine—pardonable liberties. The rest of his variants have significance only as supporting the preferred reading *παραγυνομένας* in l. 12.

The net result of S’s work on the Papias fragment is then as follows: Papias appears, as in Irenæus, as the immediate ear-witness of more than seven of the apostles, besides two individuals, one of whom is called “the Elder”; but the words of Elders, even Apostle-Elders, are of quite subordinate value to him. He is not seeking *their* words, but words of the Lord, to which they can bear witness. Needless to say this is not the sense of the Greek. Here the all-important word is the term *πρεσβύτερος*, four times repeated in the paragraph. *Their* words are just what Papias is after. The “commandments delivered by the Lord to the faith” have been already considered with their interpretations. But the interpretations are disputed. As Polycarp had declared at a much earlier date, “the oracles of the Lord” were being perverted by the Antinomians to their own lusts. The heretics denied also “the resurrection and judgment.” The books of “John” (the Apostle and revelator) and of “Matthew,”¹ representing as they did the apostolic teaching on the two points of doctrinal contention required to be supplemented by “turning to the tradition handed down from the beginning.” It is exactly this which Papias undertakes to do. He may even have had the twenty-four books of Basilides’ *Exegetica* in mind in adopting his own title. But

¹ As already shown, Papias knows John the Apostle as (reputed) author of Revelation. He “used testimonies” from I Jn., and therefore may have known the Fourth Gospel. That he considered John its author is improbable. His “Matthew” is certainly ours.

we shall best get the sense of Papias' response to Polycarp's appeal by reproducing the paragraph from his preface in simple outline. The process is easy, for in spite of adverse criticism the style of the fragment is admirably clear and logical; its structure is perfectly in accord with the best principles of Greek rhetoric. Simply drop the subordinate clauses, and sense and logic force themselves free of the false presuppositions introduced by the Irenæan misdating.

Συγκατατάξω ὅσα ἔμαθον παρὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν διαβεβαιούμαι ἀλήθειαν·

οὐ γάρ . . . ἀλλὰ τοῖς τάληθῆ . . .

οὐδὲ . . . ἀλλὰ τοῖς τὰς . . . τῆς ἀληθείας.

εἰ δέ που παρηκολουθηκώς τις τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ἔλθοι τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀνέκρινον λόγους· . . .

οὐ γὰρ τὰ ἐκ τῶν βιβλίων . . .

ὅσον τὰ παρὰ ζώσης φωνῆς.

Everything here concerns the traditions of "the Elders" which Papias thinks not unworthy to be subjoined to his interpretations of the Lord's oracles. Hence the emphatic position and reiteration of the word "Elders." He bespeaks for their words higher consideration than such traditions are wont to receive because of the care he had taken in collecting them. This method he then describes in two negative clauses and one affirmative: "I did not . . . , nor did I . . . , but when a follower of the Elders came along I inquired for the words of the Elders." Finally, he justifies his going beyond the instruction of his own teachers by the superiority of oral tradition thus sifted to books.

Whom Papias meant by "the Elders" we have yet to inquire. All that is apparent thus far is that it is not, as S supposes, words of the Lord of which he is here speaking, but "words of the Elders," and that he gives no indication of meaning anything different by the term "Elders" in one part of the passage from what he means in another. True,

Eusebius, and Irenæus before him, took "Elders" in l. 15 to equal "disciples of the Lord." Jerome actually adds three words to the text (l. 26) to force this meaning upon it. But the evidence that Abbott justly demands¹ that the word was ever so used has yet to be supplied. Even if Irenæus and Eusebius were not misled by the corruption of *τούτων* to *τού κυρίου*, we have seen that Irenæus was blinded by his own prejudice on this point, and Eusebius was similarly precluded from more than a partial correction. The real distinction which Papias makes is between teachings from "books" and "words of the Elders" who reported the "*living and abiding voice*" of apostles. The latter he got from chance comers who had been their (the Elders') followers, in particular followers of Aristion and the Elder John. The former he had obtained like others about him from those who had "taught the truth."

But since we are now dealing only with S and his evidences of *Tendenz*, let us leave temporarily his distortion of Papias, and see what he makes of the argument of Eusebius which incloses the extract. Here, too, we find the same bias in favor of Eusebius' opponent. The introductory sentence runs thus:

CONTEXT OF EUSEBIUS

Αὐτός γε μὴν ὁ Παππίας
κατὰ τὸ προοίμιον τῶν αὐτοῦ
λόγων ἀκροατὴν μὲν καὶ αὐ-
τότην οὐδαμῶς ἑαυτὸν γενέσ-
5 θαι τῶν ἱερῶν ἀποστόλων
ἐμφαίνει, παρεληφέναι δὲ τὰ
τῆς πίστεως παρὰ τῶν ἐκείνοις
γνωρίμων διδάσκει, δι' ὧν
φησιν λέξεων.

But he, Papias, *does not show at the beginning* of his words that he had heard from the holy Apostles, or had seen them. But that he had received *words* of the faith from men that had known the Apostles he teaches in these words, saying:

¹ *Encycl. Bibl.*, s. v. "Gospels," § 71.

Here follows the extract as above; thereafter:

*Ενθα καὶ ἐπιστῆσαι ἄξιον
 δὶς καταριθμοῦντι αὐτῷ τὸ
 Ἰωάννου ὄνομα, ὧν τὸν μὲν
 πρότερον Πέτρῳ καὶ Ἰακώβῳ
 5 καὶ Μαθαίῳ καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς
 ἀποστόλοις συγκαταλέγει, σα-
 φῶς δηλῶν τὸν εὐαγγελιστὴν,
 τὸν δ' ἕτερον Ἰωάννην, δια-
 στείλας τὸν λόγον, ἑτέροις παρὰ
 10 τὸν τῶν ἀποστόλων ἀριθμὸν
 κατατάσσει, προτάξας αὐτοῦ
 τὸν Ἀριστίωνα, σαφῶς τε
 αὐτὸν πρεσβύτερον ὀνομάζει·
 ὡς καὶ διὰ τούτων ἀποδείκνυσθαι
 15 τὴν ἱστορίαν ἀληθῆ τῶν δύο
 κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν ὁμωνυμῶν
 κεχρησθαι εἰρηκότων, δύο τε
 ἐν Ἐφέσῳ γενέσθαι μνήματα
 καὶ ἑκάτερον Ἰωάννου ἔτι νῦν
 20 λέγεσθαι· οἷς καὶ ἀναγκαῖον
 προσέχειν τὸν νοῦν, εἰκὸς γὰρ
 τὸν δεύτερον, εἰ μὴ τις ἐθέλοι
 τὸν πρῶτον, τὴν ἐπ' ὀνόματος
 φερομένην Ἰωάννου ἀποκάλυ-
 25 ψιν ἑωρακέαν· καὶ ὁ νῦν δὲ
 ἡμῖν δηλούμενος Παππίας τοὺς
 μὲν τῶν ἀποστόλων λόγους
 παρὰ τῶν αὐτοῖς παρηκολου-
 θηκότων ὁμολογεῖ παρεληφθέ-
 30 ναι, Ἀριστίωνος δὲ καὶ τοῦ
 πρεσβυτέρου Ἰωάννου αὐτή-
 κοον ἑαυτὸν φησι γενέσθαι.^a

But here it is requisite for us to understand that he twice enumerates the name of John; the first, he reckons him together with Peter and James and Matthew and the rest of the Apostles, simply pointing to the Evangelist,^a but the other John, him he distinguishes by the word, and joins him in a different way to the number of the Apostles, and places Aristo (*sic*) before him; and him he distinctly calls "Elder," so that we show from this regarding the story that it is true, of those who said that there were two in Asia who had the same name, and their graves are in Ephesus, and both to this day are called John; since it behooves us to reflect in our mind. For the Revelation which is called John's, if one do not admit that it is from John the Evangelist, it is probable that it was manifested to this other man. But he, this Papias, of whom we have now given account, testifies that he received the words of the Apostles from

^a Ruf. om. δε, and αὐτηκοον . . . γενεσθαι.

^a Lond. Syr.: the evangelists.

ὀνομαστὶ γοῦν^b πολλάκις αὐ-
τῶν μνημονεύσας ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῦ
35 συγγράμμασιν τίθησιν αὐτῶν
παραδόσεις.

those who were their follow-
ers, and^b from Aristo (*sic*) and
from the Elder John. *For he*
said that he had listened to
them and he often mentions
them by name, and in his
books he records the tradition
he received from them.

Now that we have supplied the key to these systematic mistranslations further comment is needless. We only sub-join one further passage as additional proof that the motive is, as stated, to restore to Papias as much as possible of his authority as an ἀρχαῖος ἀνὴρ αὐτήκοος τῶν ἀποστόλων, in spite of Eusebius. It is the famous passage cited by Eusebius in which Irenæus quotes Papias by name.

Ταῦτα δὲ καὶ Παππίας ὁ Ἰωάν-
νου ἀκουστῆς . . . ἐγγράφως ἐπι-
μαρτυρεῖ κτλ.

This Papias also *said*, who
heard (it) from John . . .
and in writing he testifies . . .

To Gutjahr this translation is a God-send, for it makes him a present of the most serious obstacle to his theory, the admitted impossibility of grammatically rendering the passage as if it read καὶ ἐγγράφως, instead of καὶ Παππίας. When S translates, not only does Papias become a direct hearer of John, but Irenæus becomes a direct hearer of Papias, and the strength of the traditional succession is doubled. Hallelujah!

It should be by now sufficiently apparent that Irenæus, Eusebius, S, and Jerome all have the same bent as regards the interpretation of Papias. Eusebius is far more of a scholar, and confesses that the vital point of his contention for "another John in Asia" known to Papias is not sup-

^b Ruf. unde et.

^b Petersb. Syr., Arm. om.

ported by the text; but on the question of Papias' chronological rank in the succession of apostolic tradition he has the same propensity and the same prejudice as the rest. Instead of dating his work in 145-160 A. D. as does Harnack, on the basis of the recently recovered de Boor fragment,¹ which shows Papias dependent on the *Apology* of Quadratus, instead of recognizing in him a contemporary of Justin Martyr, Eusebius is still under the glamour of the description he had adopted from Irenæus in his *Chronology*. Papias was an ἀρχαῖος ἀνὴρ, a contemporary if not strictly an αὐτήκοος of apostles, so that those to whom he referred as "the Elders" must be synchronous, if not identical, with "the disciples of the Lord." How much of this idea was due to the textual corruption by which those whom Eusebius assumed to have been Papias' immediate informants were also designated "the disciples of the Lord," we need not pause to estimate. The misconception is certainly present, and a truly dispassionate exegesis of the fragment requires that we take account of the fact. The final step in our inquiry, accordingly, must be an analysis of the extract, approached without either of the Eusebian prepossessions as to (a) the closeness of Papias to the apostles, or (b) his relation to "the Elder John," which, if immediate, would imply that this John also was "in Asia."

We note that Papias "subjoins" Words of the Elders to his "interpretations" in spite of some reason for hesitation

¹ Πάπιας ὁ εἰρημένος ἱστορήσεν ὡς παραλαβὼν ἀπὸ τῶν θυγατέρων Φιλίππου, ὅτι Βαρσαβᾶς ὁ καὶ Ἰουστὸς δοκιμαζόμενος ὑπὸ τῶν ἀπίστων, ἰὼν ἐχθρῆς πῶν ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀπαθῆς διεφυλάχθη. ἱστορεῖ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα θαύματα καὶ μάλιστα τὸ κατὰ τὴν μητέρα Μαναῖμου τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστᾶσαν. περὶ τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάντων ὅτι ἕως Ἀδριανοῦ ἔζων. Papias seems to have taken Quadratus' statement that *some* of those who had experienced the miraculous power of Jesus in *healing and* raising from the dead "lived even to *our day*" as referring to the day of Hadrian, to whom Quadratus was addressing the *Apology*. At all events, his reference to "the times of Hadrian" implies a date after the close of Hadrian's reign.

(οὐκ ὀκνήσω). They, too, have value as interpreting the "commandments given by the Lord to the faith," although they would not be so esteemed, if the reader did not know how carefully and discriminatingly they had been gathered. For (1) Papias can testify in his own behalf that he had given heed to the twofold warning of Polycarp¹ against τὴν ματαιότητα τῶν πολλῶν, as well as τὰς ψευδοδιδασκαλίας. Both these classes of false teaching were already current in Papias' youth, but he had kept himself to those who taught the orthodox faith. But (2) he had not confined himself to what these teachers, excellent as they were, could give him, but had sought testimonies of the apostles themselves. For Papias had also followed the advice of Polycarp in "turning to the tradition handed down from the beginning." But how? Not, of course, by applying directly to the apostles themselves, as Irenæus and his satellites, ancient and modern, assume. Such a sense for the term "words of the Elders" makes the whole passage ridiculous. Who indeed would "hesitate to subjoin" to his own "interpretations of the Lord's words" the words of apostles—and apologize for the addition! But the "words of the Elders" are here contrasted not merely with the ματαιολογία τῶν πολλῶν and the ἀλλοτρίαι ἐντολαί of the Gnostics, but primarily with τὰ ἐκ τῶν βιβλίων, which his own teachers in Asia had given him, but which "did not profit so much." What, then, does Papias mean by "Words of the Elders"? And whence does he get them? If one could depend upon the emendation ΟΙ ΤΟΥΤῶ ΜΑΘΗΤΑΙ for the second ΟΙ ΤΟΥ ΚΥ ΜΑΘΗΤΑΙ, all would be plain; for we should then understand that "the Elders" in Papias mean "the disciples of the Apostles" (οἱ ἐκείνων γνώριμοι), as they are indeed called in several dependent passages.² More particularly he would mean the group in the original mother church and home of the apostles, to

¹ *Ad. Phil.* vii.; cf. Papias, ll. 6-10.

² See note 1, p. 113.

which the author of Luke-Acts and Hegesippus look back as the self-evident authorities in interpreting the Lord's commandments. "Aristion" would be an otherwise unknown member of this Palestinian group, "John the Elder," probably identical with the Jerusalem Elder of that name,¹ whose death is placed by Epiphanius in 117 A. D.²

But the emendation is not yet admitted. We must depend on the context.

"The Elder John" is distinguished from the Apostle not merely by the debatable clause and title, but by the tense of the verb. When Papias was making his inquiries the apostles were dead. Many of "the Elders their disciples" were also dead, but Aristion and the Elder John were still alive. For some reason (distance seems to be that implied in *εἰ τις ἔλθοι*) Papias could not interrogate these Elders himself, but followers of theirs who came his way reported to him the teaching they were then still giving. The same chance-comers, or others like them, also reported the sayings of other deceased Elders they themselves had heard. *Such* traditions were to Papias strictly equivalent to teachings of the disciples of the Lord, "Andrew . . . Matthew," as giving the true sense of the Lord's commandments. They could be called "living and abiding," because reported by at least two surviving ear-witnesses. Papias not unreasonably thought them worthy of altogether different consideration from the *ματαιότης* and *ἄλλοτρίαι ἐντολαί* injuriously prevalent in Asia. They even seemed to him of more advantage than the "books" his own local Elders interpreted, for Papias seems to have known no strictly apostolic gospels for the determination of the real intent of "the oracles of the Lord." What their real value was we have several examples to inform us—the tradition of the woman taken

¹ Euseb. *H. E.* IV, v, 3.

² *Haer.* lxvi, 20.

in adultery,¹ of Jesus' senior age,² of the miraculous fertility of the soil in the messianic age,³ of the three degrees in heaven,⁴ etc.

The interpretation here given to the fragment rests primarily upon the principle that it is unjustifiable to give a fundamentally different sense to the most salient word of the paragraph (*πρεσβύτερος*) in four adjacent clauses, or to draw an arbitrary line between the series of imperfects in which the author describes his preparation for his task (*ἔμαθον, ἔχαιρον, ἀνέκρινον, ὑπελάμβανον*).

It is true that in ll. 6-13 Papias refers to his teachers (*διδάσκουσι*), who need not necessarily be identical with the "followers of the Elders" (*παρηκολουθηκώς τις τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις*), but to whom we have still less reason to apply the title "the Elders" in l. 2. It is true that he contrasts their simplicity and orthodoxy with the qualities which attracted the crowd. But this is not for the sake of giving the reader confidence in these unknown men, but in the judgment of Papias himself, whose tastes were unlike the multitude's (*ἔχαιρον*). But why, if Papias' teachers taught him "the truth," "commandments given by the Lord to the faith," does he resort to others? Every reader asks himself the question, and none of those whose hearts are set on the assumption that his teachers were themselves "the Elders" (or even the apostles!) gives any heed to the answer Papias himself sets down with all explicitness. He questioned travelers who "came his way" *because* only thus could he get "the living and abiding voice" of apostles, the same which to his mind guaranteed the inerrancy (*οὐδὲν ἡμαρτε*) of Mark. From chance-comers who had been followers of "the Elders" (the same referred to in l. 2) he inquired what (by the Elders' testimony) the apostles had said, and what

¹ Euseb. *H. E.* III, xxxix, 16.

² *Ibid.*, V, xxxiii, 3.

³ *Iren. Her.* II, xxii, 5.

⁴ *Ibid.*, V, xxxvi, 1, 2.

the surviving Elders were saying. He thought he could learn more from these well-authenticated "living" words of the Elders than from his own home teachers, because the latter, excellent as they were, could only give him the contents of books (*τὰ ἐκ τῶν βιβλίων*).

Who, then, were "the Elders" whose words the chance-comers reported? We have two means of judging. (1) Eusebius tells us that the authorities largely relied on by Papias for this kind of material were the Aristion and John mentioned, the latter of whom is "distinctly called an Elder" to distinguish him from the apostle of the same name. In the same generation were the daughters of Philip, whose traditions probably also came to Papias at second hand. But these were themselves in Hierapolis, and were not Elders. He does not mean these, nor does he mean Polycarp, whom, if he were not among the teachers who "taught the truth," we should expect to find named. He means a group or class in which neither Polycarp nor the daughters of Philip would naturally be thought of by the reader, but which did include "Aristion and the Elder John." (2) Irenæus preserves for us a number of the traditions in question, which have indeed a strongly Jewish-Christian and chiliastic character, but are quite too legendary and artificial to be really derived from apostles. Their character is that of Jewish midrash, particularly that based on the fanciful interpretation of Gen. 27:28 in the *Apocalypse of Baruch*,¹ and the equally fanciful combination of Mt. 13:8 with Mt. 20:28 (*β* text) to support the doctrine of three degrees in the future abode of the righteous—Heaven, Paradise, and "the City" (*i. e.*, Jerusalem).

Both indications concur to prove that "the Elders" in this case were no more apostles than were Papias' own teachers.

¹ *A p. Bar.* xxix, 5. See Rendel Harris in *Expositor*, 1895, pp. 448-449, and R. H. Charles, *A poc. of Baruch*, p. 55, note.

The advantage of their words was not their proximity to the apostles in time, but in place. Their words were brought (ἐάν τις ἔλθοι) from the seat of the "living and abiding voice." Had the chance-comers themselves then actually heard apostles? This is distinctly negated by the contrast of tense (τί εἶπεν Ἀνδρέας . . . τί λέγουσιν Ἀριστίων καὶ Ἰωάννης). They could tell what the Elders *were* saying, and what the apostles *had* said. Like the Gospels which are and always have been valued both for their authors' own representations, and still more for the "oracles of the Lord" which they embody, were the "words of the Elders" which Papias "subjoined to his own expositions." These words concerned themselves with "what Andrew or what Peter had said, or what Philip, or what Thomas, or James, or what John, or Matthew (for Papias was concerned to defend the Apocalypse and the first Gospel), or any other of the Lord's disciples"; and in so far as in at least two cases the testimonies were "living and abiding" their rank was equivalent to that of the Gospel of Mark.

It is true that Papias includes both elements of this oral gospel of the chance-comers—(a) reports of apostles' sayings, and (b) teachings of their own immediate followers—under the single phrase "words of the Elders" (ἀνέκρινον τοὺς λόγους τῶν πρεσβυτέρων), which led those of later times, ignorant of the date of his writing, to the violence of making πρεσβυτέρων in ll. 14-15 mean apostles, while in the adjacent occurrences it was admitted to mean "disciples of these." But if the corruption of text in l. 22 had not occurred, this misunderstanding would have been impossible. I have tried to show that even with it the remaining traces of the chronological distinction enable all who will separate the fragment from the prejudiced ideas of its later reporters to obtain the true sense. It was just because the best teachers in Asia could *not* report save from books (ἐκ τῶν βιβλίων)

“what Andrew, or Peter, or Philip, or Thomas, or James, or John, or Matthew, or any other of the Lord’s disciples had said” that Papias was obliged in his pursuit of “the living and abiding voice” to question “those who came his way.” Polycarp, it would seem, like the other teachers of Asia who “taught the truth,” could give it only “from books.” This we should naturally infer from his epistle. Irenæus cherished among the dearest recollections of that boyhood time when “what boys learn growing with the mind becomes joined to it,” how Polycarp in public discourse had related “his intercourse with John and with others who had seen the Lord, and their words as he remembered them, and what he heard from them concerning the Lord, and concerning his miracles and his teaching.” Whether Polycarp’s acquaintance with those who “had seen the Lord” was really, as Irenæus maintains, with the Apostle John, or only with the Elders, we have still to inquire.

CHAPTER V

JOHN IN ASIA, AND THE MARTYR APOSTLES ¹

Before proceeding to the history of the tradition regarding John the Apostle as author of the writings emanating from Asia in that second stage which is marked by the great controversies in Rome as to the number of authoritative gospels, we have one further question to consider from the earlier period and more limited stage of Asia. The Irenæan tradition of "apostles and elders" in Asia, was, as we have seen, grossly exaggerated in the interest of the effort to establish a fourfold "evangelic instrument" from "apostles." Polycarp was its chief reliance, next to the misinterpreted if not corrupt passage from Papias. Was it then so greatly exaggerated as to introduce the whole sojourn of John the Apostle in Asia without real basis in fact?

Two principal grounds are advanced for this seemingly radical skepticism towards Irenæus. We have (1) evidence from reported statements of Papias and from other sources tending to show that the Apostle John died a martyr at the hands of the Jews, and therefore probably in Palestine, quite too early for the intercourse with Polycarp alleged by Irenæus. (2) We have also an extraordinary coincidence of silence in all authorities earlier than Irenæus concerning any such sojourn of John in Asia, many of these authorities, including Polycarp himself, having the strongest motives for advancing appeals to this supreme apostolic authority if they could. This second, or negative, line of evidence falls prop-

¹ In part reprinted by permission from the *Expositor*. Ser. VII, iv (1907).

erly to be considered under Part II, since it is connected with the Roman debate of 160-220 A. D. originated, as we have endeavored to show, by the claims of the Appendix to the Fourth Gospel. The former, or positive (1) has been very drastically presented by E. Schwartz,¹ whose conclusions in their entirety, including even the date 44 A. D. for the martyrdom of James and John, are regarded by so eminent a scholar as Wellhausen as "demonstrated." Bousset and others have argued independently for the martyrdom on the basis of the Synoptic "prophecy" Mk. 10:35-40 = Mt. 20:20-23, but without committing themselves to the date 44 A. D., when, as reported in Acts 12:2, "Herod the king (Agrippa I) killed James the brother of John with the sword." We may leave to Bousset, Schwartz, and Wellhausen their debate with Harnack and others regarding the value of the two reports of the statement in Papias, and devote our attention primarily to the side-lights which may perhaps be gained by closer inspection of the Synoptic representation, as well as from a glance at Hegesippus' very confused account of the martyrdom in Jerusalem *ca.* 62 A. D. of the better known James, "the brother of the Lord."

The gospel writers know of but three among the twelve who suffered martyrdom, and even tradition, which busied itself in developing the later career of each apostle, long hesitated to award the martyr's crown to any save Peter and James and John. The last-named held a curiously vacillating position of both martyr and surviving "witness (*μάρτυς*) of Messiah." He drank the cup of Jesus (according to legend a cup of poison) and was baptized with his baptism of death (according to legend immersion in boiling oil), but emerged from the ordeal unharmed, to continue untouched of corruption in a sleep that only resembled death until the coming of the Lord. The legend is due to the

¹ *Tod der Söhne Zebedaei*, Berlin, 1904.

harmonistic interweaving in later fancy of two antithetic prophecies of Jesus, one to the disciples at the Declaration of Messiah's Fate, "Some that stand by shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom";¹ the other to James and John, as they ask the preëminent places in the messianic kingdom, "Ye shall indeed drink of my cup, but to sit at my right and left hand is reserved for them that are worthy." Peter is the third, who had offered to go with Jesus to prison and death; but broke down in the attempt.

Regarding the actual fate of these apostolic volunteers to martyrdom only one is reported in positive, distinct terms by any New Testament writer. In Acts 12:1f. Luke informs us of the decapitation of James by Agrippa I early in the year 44 A. D. As to Peter's fate, while the tradition is early, and apparently trustworthy, that he perished at Rome by crucifixion in the Neronian persecution of 64 A. D., the only New Testament references to it are in the veiled language of symbolism. The Appendix to the Fourth Gospel, balancing the respective claims of the apostle to whom leadership over the flock of Christ is committed, and the "other disciple" whose task it is to "witness" until the Lord come, shows already the traces of the harmonization of the two antithetic prophecies already referred to, in application to John. Peter, who had been told when first he volunteered

¹ Mt. 16:28 = Mk. 9:1 = Lk. 9:27. As an actual promise of Jesus the passage is not only supported by this strong array but by the kindred saying Mt. 24:34 = Mk. 13:30 = Lk. 21:32, and by the conviction of the whole primitive Church, attested by Paul in numerous well-known passages, that the second advent was to come "quickly," while some of them "were alive and remained." The unique phrase "taste of death" is an indication that Jesus has in mind the expected "witnesses of Messiah," Moses (or Enoch) and Elias, who in Jewish Apocalypse (II Esdr. 6:26) attend the coming of Messiah as "the men that were taken up, that have not *tasted death* from their birth." The meaning seems to be repeated in the Lukan assurance (Acts 1:8), "*Ye are my witnesses.*"

to lay down his life for Jesus, "Thou canst not follow me now, but thou shalt follow afterwards" (Jn. 13:36),¹ is told now, "When thou wast young thou girdedst thyself, and walkedst whither thou wouldest; but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt *stretch forth thy hands*, and another shall gird thee,² and carry thee whither thou wouldest not." The author adds that Jesus "spake this signifying by what manner of death Peter should glorify God," and then significantly adds that "when Jesus had spoken this he saith unto him, Follow me."

This account leaves little doubt in the mind of the reader accustomed to the symbolism of the Fourth Gospel, that an allusion is intended to the time, and even the manner, in which Peter's too self-confident offer, "Lord, why cannot I follow thee even now? I will lay down my life for thee" was to find at last its worthy fulfilment.

But while the symbolic veil is less transparent, there is one other gospel fragment which seems to the present writer scarcely less certainly concerned with the same over-confident offer of Peter to "follow," redeemed, after a first humiliating failure, by an ultimately victorious faith. It forms an appendix in Mt. 14:28-32 to the Markan story of Jesus' Walking on the Sea. This narrative itself is suggestive of symbolism, from its connection with the Feeding of the Multitude, wherein the fourth evangelist rightly finds a type of the Agapé with its memorializing (in the appended eucharist)

¹ The relation of this passage to that of the Appendix is one of several proofs that the process of final editing which sent forth this Gospel to the churches was not limited to the mere attachment of a postscript, but laid hold also of the substance. See below, Ch. XVIII, and my *Introd. to N. T.*, 1900, p. 274.

² In the Orient old men are girded by standing up, stretching out the hands and revolving the body, thus winding around the waist the long sash or girdle, whereof one end is held by an attendant. Young men gird themselves.

of the Lord's death (Jn. 6:52-58). Jesus by his death had been separated from the disciples, leaving them to battle alone against the elements of the world, yet left them not alone, but triumphing over all the waves and billows of death which had gone over him, came to them, cheered them and piloted their craft to its desired haven. For those to whom triumph over the sea-monster was a favorite symbol for Jesus' victory over the power of death and the underworld,¹ and his rebuke of the storm which threatened the boat-load of disciples on Gennesaret one of the proofs of his messianic power, such a combination in the symbolism of sacramental teaching is not difficult to conceive.²

Whether or not this be the case with Mk. 6:45-52, which the evangelist declares to have been a sign misunderstood at the time by the disciples because "their heart was hardened," Matthew's addition to the story is highly suggestive of symbolic intent. When Peter saw Jesus treading the billows under foot he entreated:

"Lord, if it be thou, bid me come unto thee upon the waters. . . . But when he saw the wind he was afraid; and beginning to sink, he cried out, saying, Lord, save me. And immediately Jesus stretched forth his hand and took hold of him, and saith unto him, O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt?"

We have little difficulty in recognizing in the legend of Domine, quo vadis? a variation on this same theme of Peter's denial and recovery. It is certainly conceivable that this representation of Peter's ultimately successful attempt to share in Jesus' triumph over the powers of the under-world should have been promoted by a fate which redeemed his promise to "follow unto prison and death," though the primary reference is to his "turning again."

¹ Cf. Mt. 12:40, and *Jona*, H. Schmidt, 1907.

² For an instance of the kind very fully elaborated see the *Epistle of Clement to James* (prefixed to the *Clementine Homilies*), xiv.

To the practically certain allusion in Jn. 13:36-38; 21:18 f. we may, therefore, join Mt. 14:28-32 as a possible second allusion within the limits of the gospels, though only in their latest elements, to the martyrdom of Peter. It remains to be seen whether further traces may not be discoverable of other apostolic martyrdoms.

An increasing number of critics, beginning with the independent conclusions of Bousset and Wellhausen, are convinced that the "prophecy" to the two sons of Zebedee, "Ye shall indeed drink of my cup," could not have obtained its place in Mk. 10:39 = Mt. 20:23, and then maintained it unaltered until the stereotyping of the tradition, unless the prophecy had actually met fulfilment. These critics are therefore disposed to accept as genuine and historical the fragment of Papias recently published by de Boor¹ in which this writer of about 150 A. D. declares that "John and James his brother were killed by the Jews," to which an interpolator of the Codex Coislinianus adds, "thus fulfilling the prophecy of Jesus concerning them." Zahn² vainly endeavors to show why it is impossible that Papias—who undoubtedly regarded the Apostle John as "in some sense responsible for the Apocalypse"³—can really have indorsed this tradition. No reason exists why Papias may not have referred this somewhat indefinite literary activity of the apostle—or, for that matter the authorship of the whole "Johannine" canon—to a period antecedent to this martyrdom. The *Muratorianum*, if it does not actually rest upon Papias, is at least as open as Papias to all these objections of incompatibility with the later tradition of John's survival to the times of Trajan. And the *Muratorianum* represents John's authorship of Revelation as antecedent to the Pauline

¹ *Texte u. Untersuchungen*, V, 2, p. 170.

² *Forschungen*, VI, pp. 147 ff.

³ Fragments x and xi in *The Apostolic Fathers*, Lightfoot-Harmer, 1891.

Epistles! As for the argument that later readers of Papias could not then have accepted the tradition of the aged survivor of the apostolic band, it is enough to observe that the two writers who actually do quote the statement of Papias are able to reconcile it with the accepted belief, and that those who could not (such as Eusebius) have simply ignored it, doubtless classing it with the *μυθικώτερα* which Eusebius claims to find in his pages.

Until some valid reason is advanced, therefore, why this doubly attested statement of the martyrdom of James and John may not have stood on the pages of Papias, writing *ca.* 150, it must be accepted as the simple historical fact, in perfect harmony with the "prophecy" it was adduced to confirm.¹ What must be explained is its displacement by the subsequently dominant tradition of the survival of John, the earliest attestation of this tradition being found again in the Appendix to the Fourth Gospel (Jn. 21:23).

But it is not the whole truth to say that a tradition identifying the surviving "witness of Messiah" of Mk. 9:1 with John the son of Zebedee is attested by the apologetic of John 21:23. The author does indeed undertake to vindicate for "the disciple whom Jesus loved" a "white martyrdom" in contrast to the "red martyrdom" of Peter. He goes further. He undertakes a vindication of this form of the tradition *against the objection* that the witness had died—or at least might be expected to die. Not merely that the word of Jesus had been conditionally spoken, but also that the disciple's "witness" does in fact continue in the same way as the witness of Moses and the prophets appealed to in 5:39. "This is the disciple that beareth witness to these things (ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ τούτων) and wrote these things."

¹ We have, in addition to the twice reported statement of Papias, the dates appointed in ancient martyrologies which fix for Stephen December 26, for *James and John* December 27.

The paragraph, therefore, should be closed after verse 24, not after verse 23. This is part of the truth concerning this author's dealing with the tradition of the *μαρτυρία* of John. The other part, unfortunately ignored in current discussions of the Appendix, is that it also deals (in the lightest touch of symbolism to be sure, but no less surely) with the other form of the tradition: *John a sharer of Jesus' cup of martyrdom*. The author does not lightly use the term "follow" in this connection. All possible literary art is used in verse 19 to indicate its pregnancy of meaning. If, therefore, he tells us immediately after (verse 20) that "Peter, turning about, seeth the disciple whom Jesus loved following," and then that Peter asked the question when he saw John "following," *what then John's fate would be* (κύριε, οὗτος δὲ τίς);¹ the ambiguity of the answer which Jesus returns is deliberately designed to cover both forms of the tradition. The writer intends to meet the contention of both parties. Some had thought John's *μαρτυρία* was to be a "following" in the same sense in which Peter finally "followed" Jesus. Others had thought it was to be that of the survivor of "those that stood by" when Jesus declared that that generation should not pass till the judgment came, a tarrying "without tasting of death" until the Lord came, in the sense of "the witnesses of Messiah" of II Esdras 6:26.² A "tarrying" or a "following" witness—which had Jesus predicted for John?

¹ The rendering "What shall this man do?" does not convey the sense. The meaning is, By what manner of "witness" shall *this* man (emphatic οὗτος) glorify God?

² "Whosoever remaineth . . . shall see my salvation and the end of my world. And they shall behold the men that have been taken up (Moses—according to other authorities Enoch—and Elijah), who have not tasted death from their birth."

On the current apocalyptic conception of the "witnesses of Messiah," the "sons of oil" that "stand in the presence of the Lord of the whole earth" as his "remembrancers" of the need of Zion, see Bousset, *Legend of Antichrist*, the chapter on this subject, and Rev. 11:3-13.

The Evangelist's answer to this question is: It cannot be known whether Jesus predicted one fate or the other for John. One thing is important. As Peter was given the function of administrative care (as moderns might say, the ruling eldership) John was given that of interpretation of the truth (the teaching eldership). Whatever the form of his visible *μαρτυρία*, whether by life or by death, his enduring "witness" to the Lord is that he "is a witness of these things and wrote these things." The pertinence of the Appendix as a commendation of the evangelic writing which it accompanies resides, accordingly, in this paragraph Jn. 21:15-24¹ treated as a whole. The writer takes account of *both* forms of the earlier tradition of the *μαρτυρία* of John, and substitutes for them his own, along with the book whose "truth" he guarantees.

It is doubtful if the New Testament contains other allusions to the *μαρτυρία* of James and John, yet before we confront the problem why the tradition interpreting it in John's case in the sense of the tarrying witness (Mk. 9:1) should have ultimately superseded that which interpreted it in the sense of the following witness (Mk. 10:39), we must take into account two more possible traces. The former may be dismissed briefly, since its value is wholly dependent on our judgment regarding the difficult question of the composite structure of Revelation.

(1) In substantially its present form the Apocalypse of John is a product of "the end of the reign of Domitian," as even Irenæus was already aware. It seems to have included the portions which claim Johannine authorship at least from before 155 A. D., when Justin already quotes it as the work of this apostle. Whether the imputation to John is older than the introductions and epilogues which

¹ Verse 25 is not found in \aleph^* , and should be canceled as a later addition. Tischendorf's text rejects it.

seem to have been added "in the end of the reign of Domitian" would be difficult to say. For, as practically all recent critics admit, an older element borrowed from Jewish apocalypse has been incorporated at least in the section dealing with the two "witnesses of Messiah" in 11:1-13. That these "witnesses" were originally Moses and Elias is quite apparent from the description of their miraculous endowments in verse 6.¹ Their prophecy follows upon the voice of the seven thunders (Rev. 10) which the seer is forbidden to write and commanded to "seal up." In a measure it takes the place of these thunders, the witnesses themselves having both of them the Elijan weapon of fire from heaven, so that "if any man shall desire to hurt them fire proceedeth out of their mouth and devoureth their enemies." Nevertheless, "when they shall have finished their testimony" the beast from the abyss puts them to death. This, too, as we learn from Mk. 9:13, is a genuine element of the old apocalyptic legend of Elias. A vivid trait is the fact that their dead bodies are suffered to lie exposed "in the street of the great city." Finally, after the symbolic period of the half of seven days,

"The breath of life from God entered into them, and they stood upon their feet, and great fear fell upon them which beheld them. And they heard a great voice from heaven saying unto them, Come up hither. And they went up into heaven in the cloud," after the likeness of the ascension of Jesus.

The occidental reader would probably have some difficulty in guessing that "the great city" in whose streets the bodies of the two witnesses lie unburied is Jerusalem (!), were it not for the friendly editorial hand which inserts the

¹ "These have the power to shut the heaven that it rain not during the days of their prophecy (Elias); and they have power over the waters to turn them into blood, and to smite the earth with every plague, as often as they shall desire (Moses)."

explanation "that which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where their Lord also was crucified." But whom does the incorporator of this bit of apocalypse mean by "the two witnesses"? For it is somewhat difficult to imagine him, as a Christian, thinking of Moses' and Elias' return otherwise than in some Christian embodiment, as John the Baptist in the Synoptic writers is treated as a reincarnation of Elias. Especially difficult is it when their martyrdom is brought into express relation with that of Jesus as "their Lord" (!), and their resurrection and ascension are depicted in obvious relation to that of Jesus.

If the question were asked of Justin Martyr, we could answer it at once. The "witness of Messiah," who comes again in the guise of Elias to effect the "great repentance" before the great and terrible day of the Lord (*cj.* Rev. 11:13) is John the Baptist redivivus:

"Shall we not suppose that the word of God has proclaimed that Elijah shall be the precursor of the great and terrible Day, that is, of his (Jesus') second advent? 'Certainly,' he (Trypho the Jew) answered. 'Well, then, our Lord in his teaching,' I continued, 'proclaimed that this very thing would take place,' saying that Elijah would also come. And we know that this shall take place when our Lord Jesus Christ shall come in glory from heaven; whose first manifestation the Spirit of God, which was in Elijah, preceded as herald in the person of John, a prophet among your nation."¹

But the apocalypticist has not yet reduced the "two witnesses" to one; and he gives no indication that he has in mind the Baptist. On the contrary, he seems to be thinking of two martyrs of Jesus, whose fate provokes the bitterest resentment in his mind against "the great city which spiritually is called Sodom, and Egypt, where their Lord too was crucified." For the stereotyped apocalyptic feature of

¹ See the instructive context in *Dial.*, xlix.

the "great repentance" almost disappears from view in his elaboration of the vengeance inflicted on the guilty city through the earthquake, wherein a tenth part of the city is destroyed and seven thousand persons are killed (verse 13; *cf.* the earthquake of Mt. 27:51-53). Where hot indignation flames out as here there must be something more than scholastic borrowing of dead material.

The pages of the Synoptic Gospels, which reflect the popular apocalyptic conceptions of the coming of Elias as witness of Messiah, as martyr, as raised from the dead, and perhaps (in Christian form) as avenger of Messiah's wrongs, are those to which we must look for light on the question what personalities, if any, the incorporator of Rev. 11:1-13 has in mind. In Matthew and Mark, John the Baptist appears as Elias, who anoints the Messiah and makes him known to himself and the people.¹ The idea that his martyrdom was in fulfilment of (apocryphal) prophecy is admitted,² and we have traces of its companion elements,³ the miracles which are supposed to "work in him" *because* he is risen from the dead (Mk. 6:14), and his coming again before the end (15:35 f.). But the last two conceptions are only alluded to, not admitted by, the evangelist. The Baptist's function is complete, in Mark's idea, at his death. On the other hand, Moses and Elias are certainly introduced

¹ For the Jewish tradition on this point see Justin Martyr, *Dial.*, viii and xlix.

² Mk. 9:13. The only other trace of this in pre-Christian legend is in the Slavonic *Book of Biblical Antiquities* attributed to Philo, where Elias redivivus in the person of Phineas is put to death by the tyrant.

³ The apocalyptic developments of the doctrine of the "witnesses" are fond of introducing the trait of the duel of wonders in which the true witness(es) withstand and outdo the wonders of the false prophet(s) in the presence of the tyrant; as Moses and Aaron withstood Jannes and Jambres in the presence of Pharaoh. The great repentance ensues upon the final victory of the witnesses in raising the dead. *Cf.* Bousset, *Legend of Antichrist* and the Clementine duel of Peter (and Paul) against Simon Magus.

as witnesses of Messiah in the remarkable scene of the Transfiguration; only their function is obscure. It is not clear whether their appearance in "the vision" witnessed by the three disciples is prophetic of the glory that is to be by-and-by, or whether it is an uncovering to their minds of the present hidden reality. Perhaps both.¹

In Luke the crudity of the Markan apocalyptic ideas is much modified. The Baptist was from his birth a forerunner "in the spirit and power of Elijah" (1:17, 76-79; 7:27), but the direct identification with Elias (Mt. 11:14), the statement that "scripture" had been fulfilled in his martyrdom, and the cry from the cross, are omitted. The allusions to popular expectations of the resurrection of Elias and his mighty works are also almost completely suppressed. "Moses and Elias" still appear in the Transfiguration to predict the crucifixion (9:31; cf. 24:25-27); but instead of coming again from the dead to effect the great repentance, Israel is forewarned in a special appendix to the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus (16:26-31) that if they do not accept the *written* witness of Moses and the prophets the return from the dead would be useless.

How radically the Fourth Gospel treats the identification of the Baptist with Elias, his witness and his mighty works (Jn. 1:19-28; 10:41) need here only be mentioned. To this evangelist as well as to Luke it is only in their writings that Moses and Elias are the witnesses of Messiah (Jn. 5:33-47).²

But in the deep-lying material incorporated by both Mark and Luke there are certain suggestions which cannot well be overlooked when the question is put, Whom, if any one,

¹ For the Markan conception in general see the passages commented on in my *Beginnings of Gospel Story*, Yale University Press, 1909.

² The Baptist, however, was "the lamp" (ὁ λύχνος, John 5:35; cf. αἱ δὲ δόξα λυχνῶν, Rev. 11:4) granted as a concession to human weakness.

had the apocalypticist in mind when he incorporated the paragraph on the martyred "witnesses"?

Aside from the prophecy to the sons of Zebedee, "Ye shall indeed drink my cup," significantly omitted by Luke (!), the Synoptic Gospels contain but two references to the brothers James and John taken by themselves. The first is Mk. 3:17, where we learn that they bore *together* the Aramaic surname Boanerges. What the real meaning of the epithet may have been is obscure; even the meaning Mark attached to it is almost equally obscure, for while the words "sons of thunder" by which he renders the surname are plain enough, no feature of the life or character of the brothers is given to show in what sense the epithet was meant.

The only other New Testament passage where the pair are mentioned by themselves is Lk. 9:51-56; and here the textual variants, even if unauthentic, are of sufficient interpretative value to be worthy of incorporation (in []) with the text:

"And it came to pass when the days were well-nigh come that he should be received up, he steadfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem, and sent messengers before his face; and they went and entered into a village of the Samaritans to make ready for him. And they did not receive him because his face was (set as) going to Jerusalem. And when his disciples *James and John* saw (this), they said, Lord, wilt thou that we bid fire to come down from heaven and consume them [as Elijah did]? But he turned and rebuked them [and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. [For the Son of man came not to destroy men's lives but to save them]].¹ And they went to another village."

To the evangelist at least the spirit rebuked is not so much that of the historical Elijah, which it would not have occurred to any of our gospel writers to question; but (unless

¹ The clause in double [] is found in still fewer authorities than that which precedes it.

we greatly err) he sees rebuked in it the vindictive spirit of Rev. 11:1-13, a spirit which rejoices in the fire proceeding out of the mouth of the two witnesses and devouring their enemies "as Elijah did" (II Kings 1:12), a spirit only too glad that "if any man desireth to hurt them, in this manner must he be killed." But if the narrative have really this aim in view, we have here a clue to the long-vexed problem of the epithet "Sons of Thunder." It was applied to James and John not so much for what they had done, as for what *they were expected to do*. Revelation 11:1-13, with its lurid substitute for the unuttered "voice of the seven thunders," is a cry from the tortured spirit of the Church, driven out in 64-67 A. D. from "the city which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt," after its chief "pillars" James the Just (and may we now conjecturally add, John the son of Zebedee?) had been stoned and beaten to death in its streets, "where their Lord too was crucified." Under the ancient apocalyptic figure the vision depicts the work of vengeance which is to be wrought by the *μάρτυρες* of Messiah in the day when he comes to judgment against the guilty city. As in Justin John the Baptist-Elias renews his work of preparing the way of the Lord at the second advent, so here the Sons of Thunder come before him to judgment, with fire to destroy their enemies.¹ A great earthquake destroys a tenth part of the bloodstained city, and seven thousand perish of those that had made merry over the dead bodies of the prophets.²

But in our Gospels another spirit has displaced the vindictive spirit of the earlier parts of Revelation. The cry from the cross is no longer an appeal to Elias to come and

¹ Early Christian legend attributes *metastasis* (ascension to heaven) to both James (the Lord's brother) and John.

² Cf. the cry of the souls of the martyrs from under the altar, Rev. 6:9 f., "How long, O Master, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood?" and its answer.

take him down, but a wail over the departing presence of God. The last remnant of the spirit of Rev. 11:1-13, if the title "Sons of Thunder" be really such, remains a meaningless survival in Mark. Thereafter it disappears. And in its place comes in the Lukan story of the rebuke to James and John, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of."¹

(2) One more trace seems to us to be distinguishable in the Synoptic Gospels of the period when James and John, together with Peter, Rome's "following" witness ("carried away whither he would not") were the three martyr-apostles. Like the two sons of Zebedee, the trio, "Peter and James and John" are mentioned in but three fundamental passages by our second evangelist, from whose pages the group has generally been transferred intact to those of Matthew and Luke.² Mark represents Jesus in these three instances as admitting only "Peter and James and John" to a peculiarly intimate relationship with himself. Not even Andrew, who forms one of the group of four at the calling of the first followers (Mk. 1:16-20) and the prediction of the doom of Jerusalem (Mk. 13:3), is here admitted.

It is conceivable that the phenomenon might have its explanation in the subsequent importance to the Jerusalem church of "James and Cephas and John, those who were regarded as pillars" (Gal. 2:9), anachronistically referred

¹ If the *argumentum e silentio* is not to be excluded, we should take also into account the strange phenomenon that the fourth evangelist, who treats Synoptic eschatology so radically, in particular the doctrine of the coming of Elias, has stricken from his pages all mention whatever of either of the sons of Zebedee! In their place comes in the new and mysterious figure of "the disciple whom Jesus loved." On this see Ch. XII.

² Matthew disregards the selection of the three in the story of the raising of Jairus' daughter. Luke, after introducing the group in the Markan form at the beginning of the Transfiguration story, refers to them in the addition which he makes (Lk. 9:32) only as "Peter and they that were with him" (cf. 13:45). Hence the trio appears to be of primary significance to Mark only.

to the earlier time. To the present writer this explanation would seem more probable than the current one of some special predilection of Jesus for just these three. But one difficulty—perhaps not insuperable¹—is the fact that the James who became the “pillar” is not the same as the intimate of the Gospel of Mark. A more serious objection to this theory is that it leaves unexplained the special nature of the three occasions in which only the trio are admitted. It cannot be mere accident that all are connected with the same supremely important theme: “Christ and the power of his resurrection.” The three occasions are the Raising of Jairus’ Daughter, the Transfiguration, and the Agony in Gethsemane. It may fairly be assumed that to our evangelist, as to the writer of Jn. 21:18 f., Peter was one who had “followed” Jesus in almost literal repetition of his sufferings. Mark 10:39 shows that he looked upon James and John as destined to fulfil, if not as having already fulfilled, the prophecy of the Lord that they should “drink his cup.” From this point of view it will no longer seem strange that in a gospel wherein Jesus’ pedagogic relation to the twelve is more prominent than in any other,² Peter and James and John should be made the confidants of his wrestling with “him that had the power of death.”

The facts we have presented are collected as indications that the New Testament itself contains confirmation of the strange new testimony that:

“Papias relates in his second book of the Oracles of the Lord, that John was slain by the Jews, fulfilling manifestly, together with his brother, the prediction of Christ concerning them, and their own confession and undertaking in the matter.”³

¹ Confusion between “James the Just” and James the son of Zebedee is frequent in post-apostolic literature.

² Cf. Mark iii, 14.

³ The MS. Coisl. 305 (tenth or eleventh century) of Georgius Hamartolus,

Their cogency will doubtless be variously judged, and must depend largely on the value attached to the alleged witness of Papias. Corroboration of this has been found in ancient martyrologies which celebrate the martyrdom of "James and John" the sons of Zebedee on the day following that of Stephen, which itself follows the anniversary of the incarnation. Not improbably there is connection between the martyrologies and the Synoptic passage, and perhaps Papias as well. They at least serve to show how "the prediction of Christ concerning" James and John was understood at an early date. But they cannot compel us to understand Mk. 10:39 in the sense of a *simultaneous* martyrdom of the two brethren. That conception might quite as easily be based on the confusion so frequent in early Christian writers between James the brother of John, and James the brother of the Lord. Galatians 2:9 gives strong evidence that John the brother of James was still a "pillar" of the Jerusalem church at least fourteen years after Paul's conversion; for against Schwartz's attempt to explain it as referring to John Mark stands the unmistakable evidence of the Lukan representations of John (without James) as a faint satellite of Peter¹ in the beginnings of the Jerusalem church, and the relative obscurity of Mark. On the other hand, we have some reason apart from the application made in Rev. 11:8 of the legend of the two martyred witnesses, to think that Jerusalem, the bloody city, murderess of the prophets, "where also their Lord was crucified," became indeed in the period just before its destruction the scene of at least a double martyrdom, one of the confessors being James the brother of the Lord. The well known passage

published by Muralt, (Petersburg, 1895, p. xvii, f.). Cf. the fragment from Cod. Baroccianus 142 in the Bodleian library quoted above (p. 143) from de Boor *T. u. U.* v. 2, p. 170.

¹ Lk. 22:8; Acts 3:1, 3, 11; 4:13, 19.

of Josephus, *Ant.* XX, ix, 1, gives positive evidence to this effect:

“As therefore Ananus (the high priest appointed by Agrippa II *ca.* 62 A. D., a son of the New Testament Annas), was of such a disposition (harsh towards insubordination like the Sadducees), he thought he had now a good opportunity as Festus was now dead, and Albinus was still on the road. So he assembled the Sanhedrin of judges, and brought before them the brother of Jesus who was called Christ, whose name was James, *and some others*, and having accused them as breakers of the law he delivered them over to be stoned.”

Hegesippus, the Palestinian father whose five-chaptered book of *Memoirs* written at Rome *ca.* 170 A. D., is Eusebius' main reliance for the history of the Jerusalem church after the departure of Paul to Rome, has a very confused and inconsistent account of the martyrdom, transferring to it traits from Luke's account of the martyrdom of Stephen, as Luke himself would seem to have introduced into that of Stephen the trait of trial before the Sanhedrin on charges of speaking against the temple and the law.¹ According to Hegesippus James' life was a sacrifice to the fanaticism of some of the heretical sects among the Jews, whose description corresponds exactly with that of Polycarp's adversaries. Like those who “denied resurrection and judgment” they “did not believe either in a resurrection or in one's coming to give every man according to his works.”

James, as Hegesippus proceeds to relate, was placed by the rulers on the “pinnacle” of the temple at Passover, with the expectation that he would repudiate this apocalyptic type of Christology. When on the contrary

“he answered with a loud voice, ‘Why do ye ask me concerning Jesus the Son of man? He himself sitteth in heaven at the right

¹ See Bacon: “Stephen's Speech” in *Contributions of the Semitic and Biblical Faculty*, “Yale Bicentennial Publications,” 1901.

hand of the great Power, and is about to come on the clouds of heaven' . . . they went up and threw down the just man."

The story is properly at an end here; for not only is a fall from "the pinnacle of the temple" something self-evidently fatal in Mt. 4:5-7=Lk. 4:9-12, but immediately before the statement "they threw down the just man" the narrator introduces (in Jewish fashion) a scripture fulfilment from Is. 3:10:

"And they fulfilled the scripture written in Isaiah, 'Let us take away the just man, because he is troublesome to us: *therefore they shall eat the fruit of their doings.*'"

The italicized words are intended to connect the fate of Jerusalem with the murder of James, and should therefore be followed at no great remove by those at the extreme end of the paragraph "And immediately Vespasian besieged them." Instead of this we have a *second* martyrdom of the same man attached without a break:

"And they said to one another, 'Let us stone James the Just.' So they began to stone him, *for he was not killed by the fall*; but he turned and knelt down and said 'I entreat thee, Lord God our Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.' . . . And one of them who was a fuller, took the club with which he beat out clothes and struck the just man on the head. And thus he suffered martyrdom."

This is an entirely separate account of the martyrdom, with its own adaptation of the beautiful trait from the martyrdom of Stephen,¹ in contrast to the vindictive spirit of the narrative first given. The clause italicized, which aims to explain how the *two* martyrdoms could be perpetrated on the same victim, is almost ludicrously inept. The proposal to "stone James the Just" manifestly does not presuppose that he is already lying mangled at the foot of "the pinnacle of

¹ Acts 7: 60.

the temple"; nor can the martyr from that situation very well "turn, and kneel down" and offer his Christ-like prayer.¹ On the contrary, that which must really follow the words "and they went up and threw down the just man" in the former account, is the clause at the end of the second citation, "and thus he suffered martyrdom" with the statement which now follows the latter:

"And they buried him on the spot by the temple, and his monument still remains by the temple"

for in the second narrative no particular spot is mentioned.

The self-evident duplication may be due to either one of two sorts of combination: (1) Hegesippus may have interwoven two diverse accounts of the death of James; or (2) he may have combined the accounts of two different martyrdoms. We are not without some internal indications that the latter is the case besides the statement of Josephus that James was not the only victim. There are even hints that James' principal companion in martyrdom was no other than John the son of Zebedee, his fellow "pillar" in the Church and the only survivor there of the group described by Paul.

The earlier portion of Eusebius' extract from Hegesippus when reëxamined in the light of the later portion displays the same characteristics of duplication. *Two* surnames are said to have been given to James. He was called "the Just" to distinguish him from others of the name of James. But he was also surnamed "Oblis," which Hegesippus interprets "Bulwark of the People," because of his constant intercession for them in the temple. If so, then the former surname was not required. Moreover, the words added to this translation "and righteousness" clearly do not apply to it, but would seem to belong to a rendering of the other sur-

¹ Later writers (Epiphanius, Jerome) therefore interject here either a miraculous preservation from injury by the fall, or an equally miraculous disregard of the broken bones.

name. Furthermore, we are given a long description of the intercessor, Oblias, which is clearly of a piece with the description of the *second* martyrdom whose victim kneels down to pray for the forgiveness of the people. It runs as follows:

“He was holy from his mother’s womb; and he drank no wine nor strong drink, nor did he eat flesh. No razor came upon his head; he did not anoint himself with oil nor did he use the bath. He alone was permitted to enter the holy place; for he wore not woolen but linen garments.¹ And he was in the habit of entering alone into the temple, and was frequently found upon his knees begging forgiveness for the people, so that his knees became hard like those of a camel, in consequence of his constantly bending them in his worship of God, and asking forgiveness for the people.”

Later writers go still further in developing the portrait of this high-priestly intercessor. Epiphanius, who used Hege-sippus, states in two passages that James was both of high-priestly descent and wore the *πέταλον* upon his head.² In the context of the second³ he connects James’ wearing of the linen garment with Mk. 14:51, and makes this costume to have been distinctive of him *and* the two sons of Zebedee, John being identified with the youth of Mk. 14:51. Epiphanius adds further in the same context (in spite of I Cor. 9: 5) that James maintained perpetual virginity.

But all these are traits which elsewhere we find attached to the Apostle John! In Jn. 18: 15 “the beloved disciple” identified in 21: 24 with the son of Zebedee is an intimate of the high-priest’s family. In the tradition of Asia cited by Polycrates of Ephesus *ca.* 190 A. D. he had worn the *πέταλον*. The ascetic mode of life and the linen clothing are both traits derived from New Testament characters of the name

¹ The garb necessary for the priests and allowed to them only. Josephus attributes the disasters of the war to the presumption of the Levites in venturing to assume the linen vestments.

² *Haer.* xxix, 4 and lxxviii, 14.

³ lxxviii, 13.

of *John*, though in the one case it is the Baptist, in the other probably John Mark who is originally meant. In the Gnostic *Acts of John* (170 A. D.) the perpetual virginity of John is the ground of the title "the beloved disciple." James, on the other hand, was certainly not of priestly descent and had no access to the holy place in the temple. He would seem from I Cor. 9:5 to have been married. In view of all these phenomena it is not unreasonable to conjecture that the duplications of Hegesippus' narrative are due not to a combination of two accounts of the martyrdom of James, but to consolidation of the double martyrdom of James and *John*.

The *Memoirs* of Hegesippus furnish still further evidence that no survivor remained after 70 A. D. of the original twelve, at least not one who had stood next to James as a "pillar" at Paul's visit in 48-50 A. D.

"After James the Just had suffered martyrdom, as the Lord had also on the same account, Symeon, the son of the Lord's uncle, Clopas, was appointed the next bishop (of Jerusalem). All proposed him as second bishop because he was a cousin of the Lord."¹

According to a previous statement of Eusebius,² "the apostles and disciples of the Lord that were still living came together from all directions" on this occasion. But the outbreak of heresy is attributed by Hegesippus to a certain Jew, Thebuthis, who at this time had expected to become the successor of James, and on account of his disappointment led off the heretical sects.³ No great reliance can be placed upon the confused chronology of Hegesippus; but we

¹ Hegesippus, *ap.* Eusebius, *H. E.* IV, xxii, 4.

² *H. E.* III, xi, 1.

³ Another inconsistency. If heresy has its origin in the chagrin of Thebuthis in *ca.* 70 the Church cannot have remained, as claimed, virgin pure from heresy until the death of the last of the witnesses "in the times of Trajan."

can at least say that Thebuthis could hardly have cherished the alleged aspirations while John the Apostle and "pillar" was still alive. Certainly Hegesippus implies that the only surviving relatives of the Lord were the two grandsons of Jude when these were brought before Domitian shortly after his accession. He plainly states that this marked the end of persecution on the score of Davidic pretensions. We cannot but infer that the martyrdom of the successor of James, Symeon the Lord's cousin, on the same charge, a martyrdom which Hegesippus dates under Trajan, at the age of 120 years (!), has undergone displacement.¹ But the question of the inconsistencies of Hegesippus, though too wide for present consideration, is certainly wide enough to leave room for a martyrdom of John as well as James the Just in the troublous times antecedent to the Christians' withdrawal from the spiritual Sodom and Egypt.²

The question remains, How could the Church pitch upon the very same individual who at an earlier time had been widely held in reverence as fulfilling the prophecy "Ye shall drink my cup" to be the subject of the almost contradictory prophecy, "Some of them that stand by shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom"?

Some bearing on this question must certainly be conceded to the coincidence that one of the Elders³ of the Jerusalem church, who survived, according to Epiphanius, until the

¹ The motive would be again the prophecy of the surviving witness. Symeon represents the generation that should not pass away. His age (120 years) is the Old Testament limit of human life (Gen. 6:3; Deut. 34:7). Traditions of the survival of "witnesses" "until the times of Trajan" in the Jerusalem church parallel the later traditions of Ephesus.

² The reference in this expression of Rev. 11:8 is to Lot's withdrawal and Israel's exodus. Cf. Lk. 17:28-32.

³ In the Jerusalem church the links of the succession (*διαδοχή*) on which the second century laid such stress were reckoned as "Apostles and Elders" (Acts 11:30; 15:6, etc.), "the elders, the disciples of the Apostles" (Papias *ap. Iren. Haer. V, v, 1* and *passim*); not "bishops" as in the Greek churches.

year 117 A. D., bore this same name John. This Elder John (of Jerusalem), whom Papias still carefully distinguishes by the title from the apostle of the same name, is certainly confounded with him by Irenæus in his quotations from Papias, and very probably also in his boyhood recollections of Polycarp's references to anecdotes of "John" about the Lord "concerning his miracles and his teaching." Since it is to Irenæus and his contemporaries and fellow-defenders of the Johannine authorship of the Ephesian canon that we owe the tradition of John the Apostle as the long-surviving witness, this fact has certainly an important bearing. But by itself alone it cannot explain the well-nigh complete eclipse of the earlier tradition by the later. A more important factor is the interaction of the two conflicting "prophecies" of Jesus, facilitated by the ambiguity not of the mere Greek word *μάρτυς* but of the deeper-lying Semitic tradition of the "witnesses of Messiah," wherein both the martyrdom and the witness-bearing are original elements. Its Protean forms admit of adaptation to every contingency. Are there some still surviving of those who "stood by" when Jesus uttered his memorable assurance of vindication within the lifetime of the perverse generation which rejected him? These may be the fulfilling counterparts of those apocalyptic "witnesses of Messiah" who were not to "taste of death" until they had seen and heralded the Lord's Christ.¹ Have two shared the Baptist's fate, and the rest departed before the coming of the Lord? Then these two may be expected to return with him at his second advent, devouring their enemies with fire from heaven "as Elijah did." For this is precisely the rôle assigned by the Church of Justin's day to

Under Hadrian this church still claimed as its leaders "the disciples of the disciples of the Apostles" (Epiph. *de mens.* xv).

¹ The story of Simeon, Lk. 2:25 ff., as well as that of Zacharias, Lk. 1:17, seems to have points of contact with the legend of the Forerunner.

its John the Baptist-Elias. The martyrdom also is a mark of the "witnesses." Surely in the long interval which intervened between the martyrdom of the two sons of Zebedee there must have been some who began to ask whether the *μαρτυρία* of John might not be the tarrying 'witness.'

Time is one great corrector of apocalypse. The spirit of Jesus was another. Rapidly after the seventies the course of events demonstrated the inadmissibility of both apocalyptic forms of the Christianized doctrine of "the witnesses of Messiah," the "tarrying" and the "following" *μαρτυρία*. The Pauline doctrine that the outpouring of the Spirit is the pledge of the *parousia* came to its predestined right. The very apocalypse which makes the martyr-apostle its mouthpiece—if indeed in the earlier Palestinian form of the book it be John and no other who is the seer that receives his revelation of "the things which must come to pass" in an anticipatory ascension in spirit to heaven¹—even Revelation no longer holds to a literal fulfilment of the prophecy. Paulinism enters even here: "The *μαρτυρία* of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy."² With this interpretation it matters little whether the apostle-prophet "tarries" or "follows," the "witness" is given. Twenty years later the churches of Asia are passing through a new crisis. Persecution without is allied to heresy within. The prophet-witness of Jesus is invoked again. From Patmos, whither he is brought "for the word of God and the testimony of Jesus," he is made to deliver his message again in new and broader form to meet the double enemy on a wider field. This is not "forgery." Even if the pseudonymity be deliberate, this is simply the method of apocalypse, which has not one true representative among its multitude of productions that is not pseudony-

¹ With Rev. 11:12 cf. 4:1. Ascension to heaven is another point in which James the Lord's brother is decked with the plumage of John by later writers.

² Rev. 19:10.

mous. Its strict parallel is found in the use of the authority of Peter against the same heretics in II Peter. The Appendix to the Fourth Gospel furnishes the key to the history of the conflicting traditions of John the "following" and the "tarrying" witness, superseded as they could not fail to be by the Pauline-Johannine doctrine that the true prophet-witness of Messiah, refuting the false prophecy of Antichrist-gnosis, abiding with the Church until the coming of the Lord, is the "witness of the Spirit." But how inevitable it was that an age which took literally the symbolism of the prophet-apostle in Patmos, addressing "the churches of Asia," should cling to one form of the earlier "prophecy" of Jesus, and gradually build up for itself, first in Palestine, afterward, in Irenæus' time, in Asia, the legend of the "tarrying Witness."

Our study of external evidences has shown a complete contrast between the periods before and after the middle of the second century. Before it no trace whatever of the Johannine writings save in Asia, and there mere echoes and influences, attesting indeed the existence of a body of teaching similar to what we find in the Fourth Gospel, but far from what we should expect on the traditional theory of authorship.

As regards the standards of evangelic tradition Asia rests its Christology on the name of Paul. John is not mentioned. Its evangelic tradition rests on Matthew, with subordinate use of Mark. John is mentioned only as the seer of the Apocalypse, and this only after 140 A. D. There is no local apostolic authority. The apostles and elders to whom appeal is made for the historic sense of Jesus' teaching are, as in Acts, the sacred college in Jerusalem.

As respects the person and work of John specifically there is nothing whatever to suggest his presence in Asia save the

acceptance of Revelation by Papias and Justin. The sojourn "in Patmos" required by Rev. 1:9 is fixed by the *Muratorianum* at a date antecedent to the Pauline Epistles (!). Whether Papias and Justin conceived the apostolic visit as having really occurred at that time, we cannot tell. It is quite possible that in regarding the revelation as a whole as *ἀξιοπιστός*, they had no intention of indorsing the entire editorial framework in 1:1-3:22 and 22:8-21. We have definite testimony from two sources that Papias reported the death of John by martyrdom at the hands of "the Jews," which corresponds with the prediction of Mk. 10:39 and some other traces in early Palestinian tradition. Such is the sum total of external evidence on the Johannine problem for the first half of the second century.

The facts are neither abundant nor clear, but so far as available all point in one direction. The later Irenæan tradition of apostles and elders in Asia, on which were largely based the claims of the champions of the fourfold gospel in 180-220 A. D., in the light of these facts can only be a pseudo-tradition, whose origin must be studied in connection with the dissemination of the fourfold gospel.

PART II
THE DIRECT INTERNAL EVIDENCE

PART II

THE DIRECT INTERNAL EVIDENCE

CHAPTER VI

THE JOHN OF REVELATION

The external evidence as we have followed it shows a marked transition about 160 A. D. Previously there is just enough to show the existence in Asia after 110-117 A. D. of "a body of teaching like that which we find in the Fourth Gospel," with traces of the "Johannine" Epistles. Neither seem to be known outside of proconsular Asia until about 152 A. D., and the employment of the Epistles and Gospel in mode and measure falls far short of what we should expect of an apostolic autograph. Paul, not John, is the apostolic authority whose doctrine and writings are appealed to, and who lives in the remembrance of the churches. Only at the very close of the period is there the beginning of a change. It is now a full generation after Polycarp had uttered his anathema upon those who were misinterpreting the sayings of the Lord to their own lusts, and denying the (physical) resurrection and (apocalyptic) judgment, and had exhorted his readers to meet "the empty talk of the many and their false teachings" by turning "unto the word handed down unto us from the beginning." At this time (145-150 A. D.) we begin to find a sense of the importance of duly authenticated records. Papias now undertakes to establish on the one hand the evangelic tradition on a firm historical basis by "Interpretations" authenticated by transmission from "the

apostles and elders." On the other hand he maintains the "trustworthiness" of the book of Revelation with the implied appeal to the authority of "John."

It is not necessary to assume that Papias' "Interpretations," based on the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, for which he claimed the largest measure of apostolic authority compatible with their known derivation, were intended as a direct answer to the *Exegetica* of Basilides, based on the more recent Gospel of Luke; but, in view of the close connection between Polycarp's exhortation and Papias' definition of his object and method, we must at least admit that the abuses aimed at were the same. Considering too what Eusebius tells us of the infection of chiliasm which was traceable from Papias "through so many of the church fathers after him, as for example Irenæus," we may safely say that Justin Martyr and Papias, contemporaries in their writings and allies against the same deniers of the resurrection and judgment, were also at one in their appeal to and dependence on Revelation as "trustworthy" because "a revelation granted to one of ourselves, a man named John, an apostle of the Lord."

Thus at the very close of the period under discussion the Asiatic Christians are seen to have, besides the generally current Pauline Epistles and Gospels of Matthew and Mark, one authoritative, inspired, apostolic, book of their own. It is introduced by seven letters to their own churches which the *Muratorianum* later takes to have served as model for the seven church letters of Paul. Naturally the real relation is the other way, though the *sevenfold* canon of Pauline letters may be of later development. "The commandments of God and the faith of Jesus" the keeping of which distinguishes "the saints" in this book (Rev. 14:12) are embodied, the former in the Old Testament, the latter in "the everlasting gospel," which of course is unwritten. Its own princi-

pal content is a revelation or "prophecy" of "the things which must shortly come to pass," said to have been granted to John the Apostle when in the island of Patmos "for the word of God and the testimony of Jesus." Ephesus thus seems to have taken the lead in the formation of a New Testament canon. But its canon consisted of only one book, a book of "prophecy." The gospel it presents was unwritten. The epistles which introduce it have canonical standing only as a framework for the "prophecy."

We cannot safely say that the indorsement of Revelation given about 150 A. D. by Papias and Justin was intended to cover more than the doctrine then actually in dispute, *i. e.*, "the resurrection and the judgment." Hegesippus also, as we have seen, reckons the denial of these among the early heresies which took their rise from Judaism.¹ The wording of the indorsement is such (τὸ ἀξιόπιστον, "testified in a revelation granted to him") as not to commit the church fathers to a definite statement as to John's residence in Asia, or as to his personal authorship. Papias and Justin may be merely indorsing the attribution of the contained "revelation" to the Apostle John, without specifically vouching for the *mise en scène* of the prefixed letters to the churches, in which the seer is represented as sojourning in Patmos. They may on the other hand have thought of this sojourn as actual, but referred it, as it is referred in the *Muratorianum*, to the period before the coming of Paul to Ephesus.² The reported statement of Papias that "John was killed by the Jews," makes it probable that if he accepted the representation of John's sojourn in Patmos, he regarded it as only a temporary in-

¹ Even in Acts the Sadducees, *i. e.*, the priestly nobility, are treated as if they were a doctrinal party. Cf. Acts 4:2 and 23:6-8.

² Cf. Acts 19:1-7. It is possible that the existence of a body of disciples of "John" in Ephesus before the coming of Paul may have played some part in the development of the tradition.

terruption of the Apostle's regular residence in Jerusalem. At all events we have in the indorsement by both Papias and Justin of the book of Revelation as their authority against the opponents of chiliasm in about 150 A. D. our first trace of the tradition of John as an author, and indeed the first trace of his alleged residence in Asia.

Since the assertion is clearly and emphatically made in Rev. 22:8, "I John am he that heard and saw these things," although appended after the formal and solemn conclusion, 22:6-7,¹ and since the prefixed letters to the churches of Asia are similarly written in the name of "John," although no trace of the Johannine personality appears in the substance of the Apocalypse (4:1-22:7), we are called upon to treat the prologue and epilogue of Revelation (chaps. 1-4, and 22:8-21) as conveying "direct internal evidence" on the question of Johannine authorship. It must of course be tested in its own connection, and if found untrustworthy, dependent assertions of later date will add nothing to its weight.

Besides the explicit, not to say obtrusive, claims of Rev. 1-3 and 22:8-21 on behalf of the apocalypse which they commend to "the churches of Asia," we have at least one other testimony, which directly affects the Fourth Gospel, but presents a singular contrast to that of Revelation in the veiled and ambiguous mode of its reference to the Apostle, that of the Appendix. Lightfoot even considered that the First Epistle of John had been also written to accompany the Gospel, for the purpose of commending it to the various classes of readers addressed in I Jn. 2:12-14; and it is certain

¹ Rev. 22:8-9, it should be noted, simply takes up and repeats Rev. 19:10, *adding to it* this identification of the "prophet," who speaks in 19:10 without making any pretense of the kind. In the following verses (10-21) the angel of prophecy whom the "prophet" has now been *twice* forbidden to worship, suddenly becomes "Jesus" and "the Alpha and Omega" of the "epistles" to the churches, certainly a worthy object of worship.

that the *Muratorianum* already appeals to I Jn. 1:1-3 as referring to the Gospel. There would then be examples in these three instances of editorial compositions aiming to perform for literary products the function of the "epistles of commendation" delivered to oral preachers. However this may be—and we shall have occasion later to revert to the claim—there can be no doubt that the Appendix, Jn. 21, is composed with the object of commending the Gospel it accompanies to the Christian world, and intends to suggest the identity of "the disciple whom Jesus loved which also leaned back on his breast at the supper, and said, Lord, who is he that betrayeth thee?" with the evangelist. In a more enigmatic and veiled way it seems also to identify this "disciple whom Jesus loved" with John the son of Zebedee. This representation is combined, as we have seen, by the *Muratorianum* with I Jn. 1:1-3 to form its proof of the Johannine authorship, and since these passages can be shown to underlie all the earliest patristic claims, they may also be reasonably classified as "direct internal evidence." In due time we shall have to scrutinize the Appendix and its relation to the Gospel which it accompanies, asking what grounds there may be for accepting or rejecting its statement "This is the disciple which beareth witness of these things and wrote these things." If the words are really written by John's "fellow-disciples (apostles) and bishops," as it has been the habit of churchmen since the *Muratorianum* to assume, they will undoubtedly carry very great weight. If, on the other hand, the Appendix does not appear to be known before 160 A. D., and seems not to speak at first hand, but to partake of the character of other epilogues, subscriptions, argumenta, and appendices of this period, in basing its statements on inferences drawn from the writings themselves which they indorse,¹ it

¹ This is notoriously the case with the "subscriptions" to the Pauline Fourth Gospel—11

will carry no more weight than the correctness or incorrectness of its exegesis warrants. Thus the direct internal evidence may be found to resolve itself simply into a subordinate element of the indirect—one example more of how in the age of the canon-makers evidences were sought in the long-accepted writings of the Church, which should prove them of really apostolic derivation as against the “new scriptures” which were beginning to be poured out from Gnostic and other sources. But this study of epilogues to the Gospel, actual or only possible, must be taken up later. First of all we must consider the earlier traceable and more explicit testimony of Revelation, and its connection with the later-appearing tradition of John in Asia.

Professor Stanton in his excellent treatise already discussed has to some extent commingled under the single heading “The Silence of the Sub-apostolic Age”¹ the two related questions: (1) Why “there should be no allusion to the Apostle John, if he was, or had been, a prominent figure in the Church in the province of Asia” in this period; (2) why, if the Gospel and Epistles circulating in that province were really attributed to the Apostle, there should be no allusion to the fact by those who use them and are influenced by them, and no corresponding employment. We confine ourselves to the former question, deeming what has been already said sufficient on the mode and measure of employment of the books in question.

The writings first enumerated as showing a surprising silence as to the presence of John in Ephesus are (1) the Epistle to the Ephesians—held by some to have been composed in the last two decades of the first century—(2) the

Epistles. *Cf. Muratorianum*: “The letters of Paul themselves make known to those who would know, both what they are, and from what place, on what occasion they were sent.”

¹ Pp. 164-166.

Pastoral Epistles (90-100 A. D.?) and (3) the Address to the Elders at Miletus in Acts 20 (85-95 A. D.). Since the Epistles to Timothy and the Address at Miletus specially concern themselves with the inroads of heresy at Ephesus, the latter placing in Paul's mouth a prediction of the fate of the flock "after his departure," because of the "grievous wolves" and the teachers of "perverse things" destined to arise among themselves, it would be natural to expect some reference, even if a veiled one, to so notable a reinforcement as the coming of John. Those, however, who find it possible to date the book of Acts so early as in the years immediately after the overthrow of Jerusalem, an event generally admitted to be reflected in Luke's "former treatise," may plead that John's coming to Ephesus was enough later to account for the silence.¹

Professor Stanton next passes (4) "to the Epistle of Clement of Rome." But what of I Peter? Some even of the most stalwart champions of the authenticity of this epistle feel compelled by its reflection of the period of governmental persecution "for the Name" to date it at least as late as Domitian (81-95 A. D.); and an increasing number of critical scholars regard it as pseudonymous, and reflecting the same persecutions referred to in Pliny's letter to Trajan (112 A. D.) which affected the regions addressed in I Pet. 1:1. Whatever its authorship, the immense preponderance of modern scholarship makes it later than the date at which the Johannine residence in Asia is supposed to have begun, and the writer himself in addressing "the elect . . . in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, *Asia*, and Bithynia" in the name of "Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ" shows how much weight the name "John, an apostle of Jesus Christ" would have carried here at this

¹ It should be remembered, however, that if in the early seventies John was still in Jerusalem the representations of Hegesippus as to events succeeding the death of James become much more difficult to account for.

time. Absolute silence in I Peter under these circumstances is not a *quantité négligeable*.¹

Neither should the Synoptists be forgotten, whose writings cover approximately the period from 75 to 95 A. D. Mark, it is true, is of Roman origin, and Matthew of south-Syrian, and for its narrative dependent on Mark. But Lk.—Acts is Antiochian on the authority of ancient tradition and internal evidence as well. The Markan idea of the Apostle John, his character, residence, and fate we have already considered.² It is distinctly unfavorable to the Irenæan tradition, and is followed by canonical Matthew. However, Luke quite significantly omits Mark's prediction of the martyrdom of James and John, giving per contra a rebuke of the vindictive spirit they had manifested.³ He also makes a further step toward the assignment of an individual rôle to John. Once in the Gospel⁴ and seven times in Acts⁵ John appears, a faint satellite just emerging into separate visibility from the rays of Peter's glory. But there is still no suggestion whatever of a Johannine residence in Asia, although, as we have seen, Luke follows with prophetic interest the struggle of the Ephesian church after Paul's "departure" against the "grievous wolves" from without and the teachers of "perverse things" from among their own selves. On the contrary, Luke is a stalwart champion of Jerusalem as the seat of apostolic authority and orthodox tradition. Even Antioch, and its great Apostle Paul have, in Luke's view, no other recourse for the settlement of the one great dispute which he

¹ "Defenders" explain the absence of reference to Paul by the death of that apostle. But John is supposed to be alive and resident in the region addressed.

² Chapter V. The Martyr Apostles.

³ Lk. 9:51-56, attached after the Markan story of the rebuke of John for his intolerance.

⁴ Lk. 22: 8.

⁵ Acts 3:1, 3, 4, 11, 13; 4:13, 19; 8:14.

admits to have threatened in some degree the harmony of apostolic times, save to "go up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about this matter."¹ From "Peter and John" as apostolic delegates from Jerusalem emanates, according to Luke, the endowment of the Spirit in earlier days;² from "James and the elders" the *ex cathedra* determination of questions of faith and practice in the later.³ The Antiochian synoptist is certainly a contemporary of the period of the supposed Ephesian residence. He interests himself both in Ephesus and in John. He may even be thought to evince a certain opposition to the idea of the martyr fate of John. But Luke certainly does not bring John and *Ephesus* together. He knows of disciples of "John" in Ephesus; but this John is neither the Apostle nor the mysterious Elder, but John the Baptist. For Luke the seat of apostolic authority is the college of "apostles and elders" at *Jerusalem*, presided over by "James the Lord's brother." It is still so in Papias (rightly interpreted) and in Hegesippus. This enhanced importance attached by Luke not to Ephesus but to Jerusalem is significant. We beg leave, therefore, to add to the list of silent witnesses as (5), (6), and (7), I Peter, Mark (with Matthew), and Luke.

We may probably attribute to about this period (90-100 A. D.) the epistles of James and Jude, of which only the latter concerns itself specifically with the outbreak of heresy, though both reflect the same type of conservatism as Hegesippus, for whom the Jerusalem church is the bulwark of true orthodoxy by virtue of its unbroken succession of apostles, elders, witnesses, and kindred of the Lord. The authenticity of the superscriptions "James, a servant of God, and of the Lord Jesus Christ, unto the twelve tribes which are of the Dispersion,"⁴ and "Jude, a servant of Jesus Christ and

¹ Acts 15: 2.

² Acts 8:14.

³ Acts 21:18.

⁴ Jas. 1:1.

brother of James, to them that are called," etc., is much disputed. But whether the two epistles—rightly designated catholic, or ecumenical, as the superscriptions prove—were actually written by James and Jude the brethren of Jesus, or, as is far more probable, are pseudonymous, is not vital to our present contention. The two epistles appeared not far from this time, and owed their acceptance in the churches east and west to the fact that Jerusalem with its apostles, elders, and kindred of the Lord, in particular James, and Jude the brother of James, claimed, and obtained in greater or less degree, the kind of general censorship of faith and practice which we have seen reflected in Luke, Papias, and Hegesippus. While, then, these two writers could not be expected to refer to John, the employment of these names in writings meant to be ecumenical confirms our thesis that Jerusalem, not Ephesus, still remained the recognized seat of apostolic tradition.

Since the testimony of Revelation is the matter itself under discussion we need not give to this book its place in our chronological list, though the brevity and vagueness of its references to John in Patmos, and the very terms in which he is described, "Your brother and partaker with you in *the tribulation and kingdom and patience (ὑπομονή)* which are in Jesus"¹ are far more suggestive of the Markan than of the Irenæan tradition.

With this side-glance at I Peter, the Synoptists, James, Jude, and Revelation we may consent to "pass to the Epistle of Clement of Rome" with Professor Stanton.

The relations of the church in Corinth to the church in Ephesus were of necessity, whether geographically, or from the history of their founding, intimate from the beginning. In 95 A. D. Clement, officially representing the church in Rome, writes to the Corinthians an epistle half as long again

¹ Rev. 1: 9; cf. II Tim. 2:11, 12.

as Romans, to expostulate with them for having deposed bishops and other officers who had been "appointed by the apostles, or afterward by other men of repute."¹ What sort of attitude towards the twelve apostles was characteristic of this period might be inferred from the book of Acts, or from Revelation with its twelve foundations of the New Jerusalem inscribed with their names. But let us take Clement's own words:

"The Apostles received the gospel for us from the Lord Jesus Christ; Jesus Christ was sent forth from God. So then Christ is from God, and the Apostles are from Christ. Both therefore came from God in the appointed order. Having therefore received a charge, and having been fully assured through the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ and confirmed in the word of God with full assurance of the Holy Ghost, they went forth with the glad tidings that the kingdom of God should come. So preaching everywhere in country and town,² they appointed their first-fruits, when they had proved them by the Spirit, to be bishops and deacons unto them that should believe. . . . And our Apostles knew through our Lord Jesus Christ that there would be strife over the name of the bishop's office. For this cause therefore, having received complete foreknowledge, they appointed the aforesaid persons."³

To explain why the church in Rome with Clement as their agent, should have taken upon themselves this intervention in the affairs of Corinth at the very time when Ephesus, so much nearer, so much more closely related to them than Rome, was presided over by no less a character than the Apostle John himself, and why Clement should not so much as mention John, though explicitly referring to Peter and

¹ *Ad. Cor.* xlv.

² With this general statement of the mission of the twelve compare that of Justin, above referred to, p. 70 f., made the basis by Sanday of a claim that Justin uses Mk. 16: 20.

³ *Ad. Cor.* xlii, xlv.

Paul—nay, should speak of “the apostles” in general as if their witness could only be known through their successors—is something of a problem. Even if it stood alone we could hardly deem it adequately solved by Professor Stanton’s explanation, which we cite in full:

“It is not unreasonable to suppose that, while the tradition as to the long life and later labors of St. John was substantially true, there may yet have been some exaggeration in the representation that he lived ‘till the times of Trajan,’ that is, till two or three years later than the date at which Clement was writing; and even if he had died only a few years before, there would have been no special reason for Clement’s referring to him.”¹

That is all.

While the silence of Clement is to us by no means a slight difficulty, that of the Epistles of Ignatius seems to Professor Stanton to be “far more serious.” We may take his own statement of the case together with his explanation:

“In writing to the Ephesians he (Ignatius) expresses the desire that he ‘may be found in the company of those Christians of Ephesus who were ever of one mind with the Apostles in the power of Jesus Christ.’ St. Paul and St. John may be more particularly in his mind. But as in writing to the Romans he names Peter and Paul, why does he not here name both Paul, the founder of the Church of Ephesus, and also that venerable Apostle who, according to the belief which we have under consideration, had lived and taught there more recently, and for a longer period? In the immediate sequel he mentions Paul only. There was indeed a special reason for referring to Paul, because Ignatius saw in that Apostle’s stay at Ephesus on his way to martyrdom a parallel with his own case. Nevertheless the notice of St. Paul might naturally have suggested one of St. John. We should have expected that appeals would have been made to the teaching of both these Apostles in order to confirm those warnings against errors concerning the Person of Christ, and those exhortations to

¹ P. 165.

unity, of which Ignatius' *Epistle to the Ephesians* and others of his Epistles are full. The fact, however, that he does not use St. John's authority for this purpose cannot be pressed, for he does not use even St. Paul's name in this way. But at least some personal reference to St. John would have been natural in writing to the Church at Ephesus. So too he might have been expected to recall to Polycarp (in the *Epistle to Polycarp*) the close ties which bound him to the Apostle John, and to remind the Smyrnæans (in *ad Smyrnaeos*) of the authority which their bishop derived from this connexion. That Polycarp himself in his short *Epistle to the Philippians* should not speak of St. John, in spite of the personal reasons he might have for doing so, is not so surprising because the Church which he was addressing had not come under St. John's influence."¹

At this point Professor Stanton breaks off his consideration of "the silence of the Sub-Apostolic Age," admitting that "It does not seem satisfactory to regard this early silence respecting the Apostle John as merely accidental," but promising later to "consider whether it can be more or less reasonably explained consistently with the supposition that the common tradition is true." This later consideration appears on pp. 236-238, after a discussion of the evidence from Papias and Justin. We shall again be compelled to cite at considerable length in order to do full justice to Professor Stanton's loyal attempt to grapple with the difficulty:

"It appears to me difficult to avoid inferring from the absence of allusion to the Apostle John in writings of the beginning of the second century, that there was a difference—which it is a matter of great interest to notice—between his reputation and influence then and at the close of the century. At this later time men were fast learning, if they had not already learned, to give him a place, as we do to-day, among the greatest masters of the Christian Faith, distinct from, but not inferior to, that of Peter and of Paul.

"This position is accorded him mainly as the evangelist of the

¹ *Gospels, etc.*, pp. 165-166.

Fourth Gospel. Now it will be suggested that the change in the estimate formed of him of which I have spoken can be explained, if we allow that he spent his later years in Asia, and suppose that from this circumstance the Gospel which was produced in that region was mistakenly attributed to him, though not before the middle of the century. Thenceforth it will be said his celebrity rapidly grew. It should be remarked, however, that the different parts of the tradition are closely connected, that they form one whole in the mind of the Church of the latter part of the second century, and are attested by the same witnesses, who, if they are trustworthy in regard to one point, ought to be so as to others. And I believe that we may view the early silence about the Apostle John in a manner which harmonizes more fully with other facts.

“There is much which tends to show that the persons of the Evangelists, and the importance of the function which they discharged, were for a time commonly lost sight of, because the minds of Christians were absorbed with the main contents and the outline of that Gospel which had been at first orally delivered. There is no sufficient ground for assuming an exception in the case of the Fourth Gospel and its author.”¹

With the statement about the unity of the Irenæan tradition in the latter part of the second century we need not now concern ourselves, since we are dealing with the period of its beginnings, when but a single factor is traceable, *i. e.*, Rev. 1:9. We will also pass by the very precarious rule that traditions true in one point may be trusted in others. We concern ourselves only with Professor Stanton's explanation of the early silence about the Apostle John by the lack of interest in the persons of the evangelists. In this there is both truth and significance. But the significance is precisely contrary to Professor Stanton's main contention.

Everything depends on (1) the duration of that time when

¹ *Gospels*, etc., p. 237. From this point Professor Stanton diverges toward a middle position, cautiously suggesting the possibility of an indirect relation of the Gospel to John. The substance of this sequel has already been cited. See above, p. 69.

the importance of the gospel writers and their work was "commonly lost sight of," and (2) the beginnings of that later appreciation of the importance of authenticated apostolic tradition, which we find reflected in various forms of editorial supplementation. It is unquestionably true that in the time when our first and second canonical gospels were composed the need of authentication was not felt. The authors merely give written form to "that gospel which had at first been orally delivered," and are content for themselves to remain nameless. The same is measurably true of the Fourth Gospel—*apart from the Epistles and Appendix*—though the fourth evangelist does not altogether refrain from a commendatory address to the reader (20:30 f.). The change is more marked in the third gospel, whose author seeks authentication of his tradition in a preface placing the work under the patronage of "Theophilus," and asserting its dependence on "eye-witnesses and ministers of the word." In the time of Papias the authentication of the anonymous Matthew and Mark had already become a matter of concern, and apparently of no little difficulty, to judge from the effort evinced to combine claims of inerrancy for each with the utmost tenable degree of apostolicity.¹ Eusebius informs us—on what authority he does not say—that "the age immediately succeeding that of the apostles" was distinguished by many attempts to deliver the gospel in writing to the churches throughout the world.²

¹ Papias is concerned to show by means of the tradition derived from "the Elder" that the discrepancy in "order" between Matthew and Mark is immaterial, since the preaching of Peter was reproduced by Mark "without any mistake." Conversely "the Lord's oracles," which must be mainly drawn from Matthew because Mark "had no design of giving a connected account of them," are not open to objection on the score of disagreement, since the difference which exists can be accounted for by variation in "translation." Thus Peter's and Matthew's authority, he contends, is justly appealed to for doings and sayings respectively in spite of cavil.

² *H. E.* III, xxxvii.

We have seen that Basilides and Marcion indirectly witness to the same, and the preface of Luke and Appendix of the Fourth Gospel bear similar witness.¹ The multiplication of gospels drove the Church unavoidably to the task of discrimination, in which the standard uniformly applied against the innovations of Gnostics and other heretics was always, and necessarily, *the apostolic tradition*. Whether it be Luke, or Clement, or Jude, or Polycarp, or Ignatius, or Papias, or Hegesippus, the churchman always falls back upon "the faith once delivered to the saints," the integrity and unbroken continuity of the apostolic tradition. Eusebius simply treads in the footsteps of Hegesippus in his great endeavor to "record the true tradition of apostolic doctrine."²

Now it is manifestly true that in the early years of the second century there had been, *in the past*, a neglect to authenticate the evangelic tradition of Matthew and Mark. The "vain talk of the many and the false teachings" complained of by Polycarp were giving the Church most painful reason to regret that ignorance of which Professor Stanton speaks. It is also true that evangelic tradition *of the Sub-Apostolic age* such as Papias refers to as contained in "books," from which one could "be profited" indeed, but not so much as from "the living and abiding voice" heard at the seat of apostolic tradition, might also continue for some time to obtain a local currency without special imprimatur. "A body of teaching like that which we find in the Fourth Gospel" might have in this anonymous way a limited circulation in the province of Asia. But it is nothing short of a complete misconception of the attitude of the times toward apostolicity, and toward genuinely authenticated evangelic tradition, to imagine for one moment that an Ignatius, a Polycarp, nay, actually, a Papias, could "lose

¹ Lk. 1:1; Jn. 21: 25.

² Spoken of Hegesippus, *H. E.* IV, viii, 2; *cf.* I, i, 1.

sight of the importance of the work" of the fourth evangelist, supposing him to have been in reality the last survivor of the apostles.

No better corrective could be devised for this totally false estimate of the value of apostolicity in the times in question, than a true appreciation of the history of Revelation, the first writing to claim the dignity of Johannine authorship, and the effort manifested in its own prologue and epilogue, as well as attested outside, to give it "canonical" standing.¹ We may well turn, therefore, to this first example of the Direct Internal Evidence.

Fortunately there is no longer much doubt about the date of Revelation in its present form. Whatever may be said of the distinctly Palestinian elements incorporated in the main substance of the Apocalypse, modern criticism no longer disputes the plain statement of ancient tradition (Irenæus) attributing the work to "the end of the reign of Domitian." The internal evidence of the letters to the seven churches of Asia, including the development of church life and doctrine, the growth and subdivision of heresy, more particularly the conditions of persecution and martyrdom, are conclusive for a date not earlier than 90-95 A. D. As Dr. Moffat justly says:

"A statement like that made by Mr. J. B. Strong,² that 'the majority of modern critics are of opinion that the book was written in the time of Nero' becomes true only if the word 'not' be read between 'was' and 'written.' The former popularity of this date was probably due in some degree to Renan's presentment, in what forms the most brilliant volume of his series upon early Christianity, *L'antichrist* (espec. chaps. xv-xvii). Besides, the lapse of years which intervenes between the Neronic period of the Apoca-

¹ See the article "Der Apokalyptiker Johannes als Begründer des neutestamentlichen Kanons," by H. Windisch in *Zts. f. ntl. Wiss.* x, 2, June, 1909.

² Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, Vol. II, p. 690.

lypse and the much later date of the Fourth Gospel, obviously helped to remove some of the difficulties felt by those who were anxious to accept both as works of the same author.”¹

Harnack is fully justified in making the date 93-96 A. D. for Revelation a point of departure for his great work on the Chronology of primitive Christian literature. He has unfortunately allowed his loyalty to genuine ancient tradition to be overborne by the persuasions of an ingenious pupil.² For the tradition that the Apostle John was its author is still more ancient, and even Harnack cannot lend antiquity to Eusebius' notion of an *Elder* John in Asia. The statements of Papias and Justin regarding the authorship are doubtless based on those of Revelation itself; but at all events they show how purely modern are the attempts, originating, as we have seen, with Eusebius' prejudice against the chiliasm of the book, to find “some other John at Ephesus” on whom it might be fathered.

Rev. 1-3 and 22:8-21 present the most conspicuous examples in the New Testament of commendatory prologues and epilogues composed for the purpose of equipping a book with apostolic authority. They testify thus at once to the felt need, and to the still available opportunity afforded by the name of John. For in this respect also ancient tradition, which unanimously dates the Apocalypse before the Gospel, is confirmed. This was the first writing to claim the name of John. It is not an already existent Gospel of John which the seer of Rev. 14:6 sees in the hands of the flying angel. The “commandments of God and the testimony of Jesus” are

¹ *Historical New Testament*, p. 459.

² Harnack has indorsed the theory of his pupil Vischer that Revelation is a mere Christianized translation of a pure Jewish apocalypse. This theory permits him to subscribe to “the critical heresy” of attributing Revelation and the Gospel and Epistles to the same author. “John the Elder” could be author of the latter and *translator* of Revelation. The theory of Vischer has not been accepted in this form.

for him in their New Testament elements an *unwritten* gospel. The present message of Jesus is sent not by reference to a written Gospel, but in seven Epistles (already a fixed institution of church edification).¹ It concerns itself with maintenance of the true tradition of the faith against forms of heresy, and includes directions on the moot points of "fornication and meats offered to idols." In addition to this special message for the times there is the main substance of the book; but this concerns the future. The chief danger for the readers is from those who "deny the (bodily) resurrection and (apocalyptic) judgment." "Prophecy" is therefore the required antidote; only it must needs have authority, and for this the method had been stereotyped since the Book of Daniel was written. The author of Rev. 1-3, 22:8-21 therefore commends the accompanying "prophecy" to the churches of Asia.² The author, he declares, was "John." He does not call him an "apostle," because it is not John's authority as an "apostle" (*i. e.*, traveling evangelist) that is wanted. For like reasons later writers such as Papias and Irenæus when appealing to John's testimony to the life or teaching of the Lord refer to him as John the "disciple" (*μαθητής*) not the "apostle" of the Lord. A more immediate cause, however, for our author's epithet for John is the influence of the work he edits; for the seer constantly classifies himself with "the Lord's servants *the prophets*" (10:7-

¹ The fact noted by the *Muratorianum* that Paul also had "addressed seven churches not otherwise than by name" may be mere coincidence, though it is certain that the letters of Paul were in circulation at this time, and the idea of the glorified Lord employing this means of communicating with the churches certainly is suggested by them.

² The procedure of the pseudonymous writer of II Peter, a writing of about the same period, is curiously analogous. This author reverses the process. He incorporates a current rebuke of antinomian laxity (Jude = II Pet. ch. 2) and himself supplies (chs. 1 and 3) the refutation of those who "deny the resurrection and judgment." "John" was the next name of authority after "Peter."

11; 11:18; 16:6; 19:10; *cf.* 22:8, 9). Nevertheless, the tone of authority assumed in the prologue and epilogue, the simple "John to the seven churches of Asia," the utter non-existence of any other John who could be thought of as thus addressing the seven churches of Asia, should be conclusive as to who is here meant.¹ It does not follow that the writer of the prologue and epilogue in 95 A. D. was not aware of the martyr death of the Apostle some thirty years before. Rather he could not have ventured the attribution if the Apostle had not been dead. As suggested above, his characterization of him as "your brother, and partaker with you in the *tribulation and kingdom* and endurance of Jesus" recall the terms of Mk. 10:36-40. Whether he had other grounds for attributing the "prophecy" to John besides its Palestinian origin and apostolic doctrine we cannot say.² He holds, at all events, that the "prophecy" of 4:1-22:7 "concerning the things which must shortly come to pass" had been given to John the Apostle. Papias and Justin follow suit. In reality the "prophecy" speaks of "the twelve apostles of the Lamb" quite too objectively to have been written by one of them, and there are further objections, as we shall see, to its Johannean authorship. But it enunciated the true apostolic doctrine, and almost certainly had been brought from the seat

¹ If to some the omission of the title "apostle" still seems an obstacle, no difference whatever will result in our main contention. It will only follow that the writer of the prologue and epilogue had one John in mind—probably John the Elder of *Jerusalem*—and his readers another. There can be no disputing the fact that for five generations the John *understood* was the "apostle of the Lord" (Justin) "a great apostle" (Gaius). Dionysius of Alexandria originates the notion of "some other John at Ephesus" to be author of Revelation, about 255 A. D.

² Of the four disciples who are given a similar revelation in Mk. 13:3 James could not come into consideration, and Peter's name had been already employed (see above on I Peter). John's name was more prominent than Andrew's and had besides the special aroma of martyrdom, as suggested in the text, to fit it for such employment.

of apostolic tradition in Palestine. The only way to secure consideration for it in the Sub-apostolic Age was to place an apostolic name behind the anonymous authoritative "I" of the "prophecy." The approved method of the time was to supply a prologue and epilogue continuing the first person singular of the anonymous Palestinian "prophet," and clearly declaring him to have been "John."

If John the Apostle had indeed been one of the martyred "witnesses" obscurely adverted to in Rev. 11:7-12, and was known to have been "killed by the Jews" thirty years before in Jerusalem, this only fitted him the better to be the "prophet" of the embodied "revelation." No Christian reader of Asia in 95 A. D. could possibly take exception to the representation that such a prophet, having been brought to Patmos "for the word of God and the testimony of Jesus" and "being in the Spirit on the Lord's day," should have been supernaturally equipped with all the local knowledge necessary for his messages to the seven churches of Asia. In fact the letters are not his at all, but dictated epistles of Jesus. What readers in Asia in 95 A. D. would understand from the representation is shown by what the *Muratorianum* actually understands: The Apostle John, *before* the coming of Paul to Asia, had set the example "in the Apocalypse" of writing a canon of seven Epistles to the Churches. As the same apostle is considered by the same writer to have subsequently (?) written his Gospel from the midst of the original apostolic group,¹ the stay in Patmos is probably regarded as transient.

In modern phraseology the sense of the commendatory framework of Revelation might be represented, then, as follows: "The speaker in the enclosed 'prophecy' is John, one of the company of prophets and martyrs to whom the promise

¹ Cohortantibus condiscipulis . . . revelatum Andreae ex apostolis ut recognoscentibus cunctis Johannis describeret.

is fulfilled 'if we suffer with him we shall also reign with him,' one who has shared the 'endurance' which is in Jesus. He received his vision of the approaching end when for reasons connected with his calling he was temporarily in the island of Patmos. It was preceded by seven letters dictated by the glorified Lord, who spoke in vision to the prophet, addressing in addition a special message to each of the seven churches of Asia." This commendatory prologue is put in the first person simply because such is the invariable custom of all the apocalyptic writers,¹ and because, seeing the writer of the main body of the work spoke in the first person, and prologues and epilogues in this period of literary history were not divided from the substance of the work, it was necessary to continue the first person in order to secure uniformity.

But some still ask, Why may it not be in reality the same John (Elder or Apostle) who actually does compose—for deliberate composition is certainly the nature of the work—both "prophecy" and prefixed "epistles"?

We are not directly concerned with the history of Revelation, and cannot, therefore, review at length the investigations of ancient and modern criticism into its composition and authorship. It may, however, be set down as an axiom of criticism, established already by Dionysius of Alexandria against Nepos the chiliast (250 A. D.) that the author of Revelation is a totally different individual from the author of the "Johannine" Gospel and Epistles. These, as being now in debate, we may designate the X literature. Those, therefore, who maintain the Johannine authorship of the X literature must abandon the claim for Revelation.² A second proposi-

¹ The *Muratorianum* shows doubt as to whether the *Shepherd* of Hermas is to be classed "among the prophets or among the apostles," *i. e.*, as epistle or apocalypse. If the latter, it is perhaps an exception to the otherwise invariable rule of pseudonymity among writers of apocalypse.

² On Harnack as a seeming exception see note above, p. 174.

tion almost equally axiomatic concerns the composite character of the work. Of this its most eminent commentator speaks as follows:

“It seems to be settled that the Apocalypse can no longer be regarded as a literary unity. Against such a view criticism finds irresistible considerations.”¹

Even more obvious than the indications of literary patchwork in the “prophecy” itself is the separate, but by no means independent, origin of the prologue with its “epistles” to the churches of Asia (chs. 1-3) and the epilogue (22:8-21). These are written to commend, indeed in a true sense of the word to canonize, the “prophecy” among those churches.² The “epistles” borrow the imagery of the “prophecy” for their promises to the faithful. But there is absolutely no converse relation, as there would surely be if the “prophecy” had actually been received as represented. The instant we cross the threshold of the “prophecy” at 4:1, Asia with its seven churches, its troubles from heretical teachers, its Balaamites and Nicolaitans, its greater or less degree of faithfulness to the teaching of Jesus, is absolutely lost from view. The whole interest is focused upon Jerusalem and “Babylon” in their mortal duel for the dominion of the world. The “seven churches” have disappeared as if non-existent; what remains is a “tale of two cities.” The author’s horizon is limited, with all the narrow absorption of the typical Jewish apocalypticist, to Palestine and its agonizing struggle with Rome.

This main substance of the book is nevertheless represented in the framework as following immediately *after* the vision of the epistles to the seven churches of Asia, and in fact forming one whole with it as part of the experience in Patmos. Such certainly could not have been

¹ W. Bousset, s. v. “Apocalypse,” *Enc. Bibl.* I, § 32.

² Note the curse (22:18-19) pronounced on interference with the contents.

the representation if the "prophecy" had been previously experienced by the writer of the epistles in Palestine or elsewhere. The author who takes this alien material and adapts it thus to circulation on foreign soil can only be employing the transparent devices of apocalyptic fiction exemplified in scores of similar "prophecies." The Ephesian editor is concerned with the interests of the province of Asia. He is certainly not the same as the seer whose personality he assumes in incorporating his "prophecy"; for the interests of the seer are those of Judæa exclusively. It is not merely that his language and mode of thought are Palestinian. The Hebrew gematria (13:18), the angelology and demonology (12:7) might characterize a Jew even after long residence on foreign soil. But the whole geographical standpoint of the "prophet" is exclusively Palestinian, without the slightest thought of the province of Asia. "Euphrates" is the barrier against invasion (9:14; 16:12), "Armageddon," *i. e.*, Megiddo, is the great battle-field, Mount Zion is the place of Messiah's appearing, the Valley of Hinnom is the scene of the vintage of blood (14:20), Jerusalem is "the" city (11:13; 14:20), "the holy city" (11:2), "the beloved city" (20:9), and even "the great (!) city" (11:8; 16:19). "The wilderness" (12:6, 14) is assumed to require no more explanation than "the city." No other can be meant than the wilderness of Judæa. The Gentile world is to this writer "the rest of mankind . . . which worship devils and idols" (9:20). Gentile Christians are "the rest of the seed" of the Daughter of Zion (12:17). Messiah is "the man-child who is to rule all the Gentiles with a rod of iron" (12:5; 19:15). The salvation of the world is the hegemony of Jerusalem, standing mistress of the nations on the mountains of Judah (21:24-26), while to the twelve thousand redeemed from each of the twelve tribes are gathered an innumerable company of *adopted* Israelites out of every kingdom and tongue and people (7:4-10).

The editor has frequent occasion to interpret for non-Palestinian readers (4:5; 5:6; 9:11; 11:4, 8; 12:9), and to adapt the material for later times (17:10-11) and for a wider circle (7:9-17; 15:3; 17:6, 14, etc.). On one occasion (19:13) he introduces his own distinctive "Asian" Christology, contrary to the intention of his "prophet," declaring the name known to none but the Messiah himself to be "the Logos of God." Verse 16 defines it to be "King of kings and Lord of lords." In general the Christology of the editor is more developed and metaphysical than the messianism of the seer (*cf.* 1:18; 19:13^b, 22:13, 16, with 1:8; 5:5; 12:5; 19:11-21, except 13^b). Were it not for the mitigation introduced by some of the later passages we should ourselves find it hard to reconcile the narrow vindictiveness of the "prophet" against Rome and the heathen world with "the meekness and lowliness of Christ."

For all these reasons, and many more which cannot be here enumerated, it is impossible to admit the Ephesian editor's identification of the Palestinian "prophet" with the Apostle John, and of himself with both. The seer is not an apostle, nor an immediate disciple of Jesus, and does not claim to be. He looks back upon "the twelve apostles of the Lamb" (21:14) as great names of the past. They and the martyrs have borne their testimony and gone to their reward (12:11). Two great martyrs in particular stand out, to his mind, among those whose blood cries aloud for vengeance (6:10, 11). Their bodies had lain unburied in the streets of Jerusalem (11:8), and we have seen some reason to think that one of these was himself John the son of Zebedee. The Ephesian editor who places this Palestinian apocalypse in the mouth of "John" in the island of Patmos, *after* a vision exclusively concerned with the seven churches of Asia, may or may not have known of "some other John" in Palestine. All his readers at least, for more than a century,

took him to mean the Apostle John. He certainly was not himself that Apostle. The representation that John "saw and heard these things" in Patmos is therefore a literary fiction, comparatively harmless in 95 A. D., momentous for later times, when the battle of chiliasts and anti-chiliasts was waged, first in Asia, later in Alexandria, over the authority of this book, and men began to argue about the personality of the author and his relations to "the churches of Asia." At first men like Papias and Justin only insisted that the book was ἀξιοπιστός, and that the revelation had been "granted to one of ourselves, a man named John, an apostle of the Lord," leaving the question more or less open of the alleged visit to Patmos. The tradition of a residence of John in Ephesus, traveling as a kind of patriarch among the seven churches of Asia, grew up later, and upon the basis of Rev. 1-4, in combination with II Jn. 12; III Jn. 12, 13.

"It was at this time (the close of Domitian's persecution) that the Apostle John returned from his banishment in the island and took up his abode at Ephesus, according to an ancient Christian tradition."¹

The tradition was indeed already "ancient" to Eusebius (325 A. D.), but it belongs to the days of prologues, epilogues, argumenta, and subscriptions, when men studied the contents of their canonized writings for proofs of apostolic authorship, and to learn "from what place, on what occasion they were written."² For all the period from Paul's own departure from Asia down to that in which Papias and Justin are found defending Revelation against those who "deny the resurrection and judgment," the testimony of every writer is adverse to the Irenæan representation; whether by silence where

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.* III, xx, 11. The "ancient Christian tradition" is perhaps that of Prochorus based on the Leucian *Acts of John* which represent John as going to Asia from Patmos. Cf. Tertullian, *Praescr.* xxxvi.

² *Muratorianum* on the letters of Paul.

silence is unaccountable on the assumptions of the tradition; by direct statement like that of Papias concerning the murder of John by the Jews; or by indirect reference, as in Mark and in the Lukan and later references to Jerusalem as seat of the true apostolic tradition. Even the author of the prologue and epilogue of Revelation himself, by his very conception of "John" as prophet and martyr, "partaker of the tribulation and kingdom and endurance which are in Jesus," brought to Patmos and made the mouthpiece of "epistles" from the glorified Lord to the Asian churches, confirms the Markan rather than the Irenæan tradition.

Other influences contributed, as we shall see, particularly in the rapidly developing field of the epilogues and arguments, to the growth of the legend of John in Asia. Polycarp, who in his own epistle looks back not to John, but to Paul as the source of apostolic teaching, became instrumental, through the part he was called upon to play in another great interecclesiastical controversy, toward the further development of the legend; but its true starting-point, as contemporary references show, is in the literary fiction by which the Ephesian editor of the Palestinian book of "prophecy" sought to give it currency and canonicity among the churches of Asia.

CHAPTER VII

EPISTLES AND APPENDIX—THEIR RELATION TO ONE ANOTHER AND TO THE GOSPEL

The second factor of the Direct Internal Evidence of the Fourth Gospel is that of editorial attachments to the Gospel itself, intended to commend it to the public and to enhance its authority. Lightfoot held that I John "was in all likelihood written at the same time with and attached to the Gospel."¹ If so, it has been displaced by another epilogue, whose ascription of the Gospel to John, while still veiled, approaches more nearly to the standard of the canon-makers of Rome in 150-175 A. D. Here, then, are two stages in the development of the tradition as to the apostolic authorship. First John surveys the Gospel and commends its witness as "true" against "the false prophets which are gone out into the world," much as the "epistles to the churches" had commended Revelation to the same circle. The message it contained concerning the incarnate Logos, the Word of life; not a mere emanation, but "seen and handled"; not coming "by water only, but by water and by blood"; its law of love, a practical commandment of ethical application, not a mere *gnosis* of emancipation, are the true gospel of Jesus, as against the denials of docetists and antinomians. First John thus takes the same polemic view of the bearing of the Gospel as Irenæus and the later fathers, except that it does not specifically mention Cerinthus. As Lightfoot well says:

"The close association (in the Muratorian Canon) of the two

¹ *Bibl. Essays*, p. 63. He further develops this view on p. 198.

Johannine writings (John and I John) warrants the inference that the author of the Canon treated the First Epistle as an epilogue to the Gospel. And this in fact is its true character. The Epistle was intended to be circulated with the Gospel. This accounts for its abrupt commencement, which is to be explained as a reference to the Gospel which in one sense preceded it. This accounts likewise for the allusion to the water and the blood (I John 5:6 f.) as the witnesses to the reality of Christ's human nature, the counterpart of the statement in the Gospel narrative (19:35)."¹

Lightfoot might have added that the *Muratorianum* probably made the same "association" between the Gospel of Mark and I Peter, which in the name of that apostle assures the persecuted churches of Asia Minor that "this is the true grace of God;" and that the so-called Epistle to the Hebrews follows with the same "abrupt commencement" upon the instrumentum Paulinum. The idea, however, of treating these writings as epistles of commendation intended to accompany the Gospel of Mark and the Epistles of Paul respectively had not suggested itself to Lightfoot, although the omission of all reference to them in the *Muratorianum*, unless I Peter was mentioned in connection with Mark, suggests that they may have been so considered.² The Codex Bezae before its mutilation placed, as is well known, III Jn.,

¹ *Bibl. Essays*, p. 198.

² Support for it may also be found in Papias' reference to a statement of his own (not the Elder's) concerning Mark's relation to Peter. "For he (Mark) was not a follower of the Lord, but afterwards, as I said, of Peter." Harnack (*Zts. f. ntl. W.* III, 1902, pp. 159-163) properly refuses to admit Zahn's contention for a Papias extract in Eusebius, *H. E.* II, xv. The infinitives, τοῦ δὲ Μάρκου μνημονεύειν τὸν Πέτρον . . . σημαίνειν τέ are dependent grammatically on τοσοῦτον ἐπέλαμψεν . . . ὡς κτλ. But Eusebius would not thus glide into the form of indirect discourse if he were not consciously reproducing the traditional argument. It is therefore not unreasonable to accept, as conjecture only, Zahn's suggestion that the "testimony from I Peter" found by Eusebius in Papias was really I Pt. 5:13, and that the subsequent development of the tradition connecting the Gospel of Mark with Peter rests upon this basis.

and therefore probably all three Johannine epistles, immediately before Acts, an indication that the association continued, in the case of these epistles at least, for a long period.¹

What, then, is the internal relation of the Johannine Epistles to the Gospel? Who are they who write this commendation of the message, alternating between "we" and "I"?—Like the group Ephesians—Colossians—Philemon current in this same region we have (1) a general epistle (I Jn.), (2) a special church epistle (II John), and (3) a personal epistle (III Jn.). The individuality of the writer comes out most strongly, as we might expect, in the last. He is an elder in an orthodox church, probably that of Ephesus. He is doubtless well known to "Gaius," whose good offices he bespeaks for the bringing of his message before the church (III Jn. 9). Gaius, then, is his Mæcenas, fulfilling the office Theophilus fulfils for Luke. Certain messengers are the bearers of his writings, and Gaius is to promote the work of these. Curiously "the Elder" gives himself no name, either because it was needless, or because his real name would have detracted from the authority of the writings he would put in circulation rather than add to it. For while he seems to occupy a position of some authority in the church, it is by no means undisputed. "Diotrephes who loveth to have the pre-eminence among them" will not receive the writer nor his messengers or message. And Diotrephes is a bishop of some standing, for he "casts out of the church" those who take the Elder's part. One of those who seems to have suffered for this reason is "Demetrius." Demetrius has the witness of all. The author and his friends bear witness, and Gaius

¹ The present order of D is Matthew, John, Luke, Mark, Acts. But as Nestle shows (*Einf. i. d. Gr. NT.*, p. 56) this is not original. The fragment of III Jn. which in the Latin column remains attached to the beginning of Acts shows that the four gospels had originally the usual order, John being followed by I—III Jn.

“knows that their witness is true.” Such is the conclusion of the epilogue which consists of the three epistles, manifestly of the same Asian provenance as the Gospel. When we come to examine the present epilogue, we shall see that its conclusion (Jn. 21:24) repeats this phraseology and gives it a special application. In short, the Appendix follows the model of its predecessor, making the personality a shade more concrete. But we must return to the Epistles.

Second John addresses a local church in the name of a sister church (II Jn. 13). The main object is to warn against “the deceiver and the antichrist.” This is “they that confess not that Jesus Christ cometh in the flesh,” in fact the same docetists opposed by Ignatius. Forgetfulness of the fact that Christ has also a *law*, the new commandment of love, is the other occasion of warning. As in III Jn. the writer’s personality is allowed to appear to this extent, that he hopes for the further privilege of a personal presentation of his message.

First John is absolutely general. Those addressed are “children,” “young men,” and “fathers” everywhere. The message is as before a warning against “those who would lead you astray” (2:26), and the essence of the false teaching is again neglect of the moral law of love in practical application, and denial of the human, historic Jesus, a “Christ come in the flesh.” The author’s personality still appears to the extent of employing the first person singular in the phrase “I write” (or “have written”); but in speaking of the evangelic tradition whose historical trustworthiness he aims to uphold it is always merged in that of his fellow-witnesses in the Church. The form is always “we have seen and heard” “our witness,” never “I have seen.” In fact 5:9-12 expressly defines the witness borne to the Son of God to be the inward witness of the Spirit of adoption, which is necessarily common to all believers in all ages.

It may be possible by indirect inferences with which we are not here concerned, to draw certain conclusions as to the personality of this author. The office of "Elder" which he fills implies maturity of years, as well as his use of the Pauline expression "my little children" (*cf.* Gal. 4: 19). The type of language and the use of the term "Gentiles" (III Jn. 7) for "heathen" suggest that like nearly all church teachers of this period he was a Jew. But so far as direct claim to be the Apostle John is concerned it is conspicuous only by its absence. The writer makes the utmost that he can of the evangelic tradition of the Church, asserting its historicity and trustworthiness against those who "deny that Jesus is the Christ" (2: 18-23). His test of the true teaching against the antichrist of false prophecy that is gone out into the world is that "every spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God" (4: 2). For this reason he leaves no device of rhetoric unemployed to heighten the authority and authenticity of the witness of the incarnation. But just this fact is fatal to the idea that he is the last survivor of the apostolic college, the special eye-witness and intimate of Jesus. How is it credible that the Apostle John instead of simply saying, "I, John, am he that heard and saw these things" should seek to bolster his own authority against opponents like Diotrefes and his adherents, by appeal to such unknown names as "Gaius" and "Demetrius"? Why should he conceal his own direct first-hand knowledge by merging his personal testimony in the general witness borne by the Spirit in the Church and all its teachers? Why should he call himself "the Elder" and not "an apostle of Jesus Christ," unless because he *was* simply an elder and not an apostle?

It is indeed quite possible that Lightfoot was mistaken in his very confident assertion that "the Epistle was intended to be circulated with the Gospel," though our own judgment confirms the opinion, and joins with the first the second and

third Epistles, whose history is inseparable from that of the first until the time when distinctions began to be made between "the Elder" and "the Apostle."¹ But even if we disconnect Gospel and Epistles the result is the same. The writer is generally admitted to be the same as the author of the Gospel. If he was the Apostle John, he had the strongest possible motives for making it known. No rational motive has ever been propounded why he should hinder his primary objects by thus veiling his identity. If, on the other hand, he could not pretend to higher authority than that of a simple presbyter, but rested with a truly Pauline conviction on that inward witness of the Spirit which unites all generations of the Church in a common consciousness that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, and was eager to give widest currency to a great "spiritual Gospel" whose key-note is the Incarnation, then such expressions as those of the Johannine Epistles are precisely what we should expect. They approach as near to the claim of real apostolic authority as candor will allow. Their mystical merging of the author's personality in that of the Church as the abiding witness of the Christ manifest in the flesh makes the utmost, on the other hand, of its advantage over its opponents in the matter of historic continuity.

Professor Sanday misconceives the present writer's position in classifying him with those who differentiate between the author of the Gospel and the author of I Jn.² There are indeed elements of the Gospel in the form in which we

¹ In the fourth century and later we find II Jn. and III Jn. counted among the *ἀντιλεγόμενα* while I Jn. is one of the *ὁμολογούμενα*, although all three are certainly by the same author. The reason is that I Jn. had by this time become so inseparable from the Gospel as to share its claim to apostolicity, whereas II Jn. and III Jn. professed to be written by "the Elder." The phenomenon, therefore, has no significance save to show that Elder and Apostle were by no means equivalent terms, as some interpreters of Papias seem to think.

² *Criticism*, etc., p. 57.

have received it which are later than the Epistles, and which the author of the Epistles could not have subscribed to. Such is certainly the Appendix with its identification of "the disciple whom Jesus loved" with the writer of the Gospel, and suggested identification of both with the son of Zebedee. The author of A (if we may so designate the epilogue consisting of the three Epistles) has no idea of the sort. Such are a number of passages inserted in the body of the Gospel, and generally tending to accommodate its teaching to Synoptic conceptions, which show a relation to the Appendix, and prove that its author was by no means content to leave the writing as he found it with the mere addition of an epilogue of his own. The discussion of these internal evidences must be deferred to a later time.¹ For the present we observe that on general grounds of style and doctrinal standpoint, as well as by primeval tradition, Lightfoot's judgment of the intimate relation of Gospel and Epistles is justified. The substance of the Gospel was compiled by the author of the Epistles. There is, however, this important difference, that in the Gospel, unlike the Epistles, he aims to reproduce a body of evangelic tradition not peculiar to himself, though saturated with his own personality. On the other hand, there is not a word to even remotely suggest the name of "John." All that pertains to this is intimately connected with the Appendix, but shows no relation whatever to the substance of the Gospel. We must allow that the author of the Epistles, if he really was seeking to commend the Gospel, has indeed gone as far as real candor would allow in the suggestion of immediacy of the record; but of pseudonymity there is not the faintest trace. So far from obtruding an assumed personality the writer of A goes to the other extreme in merging his own in the common consciousness of the Church. The common object of authenticating the tradition is pursued by quite a

¹ See below, Chapter XVIII, and *cf.* my *Introd. to N. T.*, p. 274.

different method in the present epilogue of the Gospel known as the Appendix; but even here the case still falls far short of pseudonymity.

It is conceded by all scholars that "The Gospel was originally intended to end with the twentieth chapter."¹ Even those who with Lightfoot and Zahn contend for identity of authorship on both sides, admit that "the twenty-first chapter is an after-thought."² But with what object was it appended? The object is made somewhat clearer when the textual corruption is removed of the added verse 25. Tischendorf rightly rejected this addition, absent from \aleph^* , whose real service to the scholar is only to illustrate the morbid disposition of editors and scribes toward a species of appendicitis. Internal evidence abundantly confirms Tischendorf's textual judgment, for not only is the verse a mere exaggerated imitation of 20:30 in a style much inferior to the context, but this context is itself only obscured by the addition.³

Omitting the spurious verse 25, chapter 21 ends, as already noted, with an echo of the conclusion of the Epilogue of the three Epistles, "we know that his witness is true." The words are certainly connected also, as often observed, with the scholium of 19:35,⁴ "He that hath seen hath borne witness,

¹ Lightfoot, *Bibl. Essays*, p. 194.

² Lightfoot, *ibid.*; cf. Zahn, *Einkl.* II, § 66.

³ Lightfoot with characteristic conservatism writes thus of verse 25: "The last verse is evidently a scholium. Tischendorf declares that in the Sinaitic manuscript (\aleph) it is written in a different hand from the rest of the Gospel, by the *διορθωτής* of the whole. . . . However, as it occurs in all the other copies, and these come from very various sources, we may safely infer that, if an addition, it was written by St. John himself, or by one of his immediate disciples."

⁴ Cf. Lightfoot, *ibid.*, p. 197. "Through the main part of the narrative we find these parenthetical additions. . . . At length (19:35; 20:31) there is a direct appeal to these disciples, for whom the whole has been written."

and his witness is true; and he knoweth that he saith true that ye also may believe," which itself rests on 20:31. The effort to authenticate the record is again apparent. But what strange obscurity! Who ever heard of a writer employing such ambiguities to make the simple statement, "I myself saw this"? And who can testify to the content of another's consciousness ("he knoweth," etc.) unless that other has himself first given expression to it? Sanday is inclined to follow the extraordinary exegesis offered by Zahn that

"ἐκεῖνος (in 19:35) points to Christ. It would be just a formula of strong asseveration, like God knoweth."¹

But this ignores the author's manifest desire to establish the fact upon historical testimony, and particularly the "near parallel in III Jn. 12" and the equally close relation with 20:31. The key will be found in the phenomenon described of the issuing of water and blood from Jesus' side, and the emphasis laid upon this particular fact in the A epilogue (I Jn. 5:6 ff.) in connection with these literary relations. The author of the "parenthetic addition" (19:35) is no other than he of the Appendix who has his eye not only upon III Jn. 12, as already noted, but also upon I Jn. 5:6 ff., and Jn. 20:31 as well. Only, instead of being content, as his predecessor of I Jn. 5:6-11 had been, with the inner witness of the Spirit corroborating the historical tradition, this editor, whom we may designate R, aims to make the corroboration individual and concrete. He means by his ἐκεῖνος his own predecessor, who with reference to this same currently reported phenomenon had testified: "This is he that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ; not with the water only, but with the water and the blood," and thereafter (III Jn. 12) "we also bear witness, and thou knowest that our witness is true." Jn. 19:35 is a paraphrase by the author of 21:24 of

¹ *Criticism*, p. 78.

these passages of A, together with I Jn. 5:7, "It is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is the truth." Viewing his predecessor A as not only the evangelist, but as identical with "the disciple whom Jesus loved," if not the son of Zebedee in person (21:24), R takes the witnessing "Spirit" to be that of A's authorship. "He (*ἐκεῖνος*) knoweth that he saith true" is, then, in the view of R, an equivalent for the expression of the evangelist's consciousness regarding the same phenomenon in I Jn. 5:7, "It is the Spirit that beareth witness." He therefore puts it in the present tense (*ἐκεῖνος οἶδεν*)¹ and conjoins with it the phrase from the end of the Gospel proper (20:31) "that ye may believe."

R, the author of Jn. 21:24, looks back, then, both to the Epistles and the Gospel, identifying their author, the nameless "Elder," with the figure designated in certain passages of the Gospel "the disciple whom Jesus loved." What was really meant by this expression is a question to be met in connection with the internal evidence. Here we need only note that outside the Appendix there is nothing whatever to suggest the name of "John."

But verse 24, we are told by the "defenders" is not by the same hand as the rest of the Appendix. In this case it is the conservatives who resort to the dissecting knife, and the critics who maintain the integrity.

For Jn. 21:1-24 is certainly a literary unit. Amputate verse 24 and its whole *raison d'être* disappears. *Μαρτυρία*—"testimony," "confession," or "white and red martyrdom," to use a phrase felicitously chosen to express the double sense of the Greek, is, as we have seen already,² the subject of the whole paragraph, verses 15-24, and is illustrated in the respective fates of Peter and "the disciple whom Jesus loved." The

¹ *Written* testimony is referred to in the present tense. *Littera scripta manet*.

² Above, Chapter V.

latter is identified with the Apostle John, not explicitly, but by a process of elimination subtly suggested to the reader, who thus assumes the responsibility R seems loth himself to undertake.¹

In symbolic language and description the risen Lord is presented in the act of imparting *two* commissions, corresponding to the two senses of the word *μαρτύς*, and the two types of *μαρτυρία* illustrated in the history of the Church. Since the time when Paul had found himself "in a strait betwixt two" to "depart and be with Christ, which is very far better," or "to abide, which is more needful for your sakes" the Church had clung to two promises, that of a share in the Lord's glory for those who suffered with him (II Tim. 2:12), and that of an "abiding witness" to "be alive and remain till the Coming of the Lord" (Mk. 9:1). We have seen² that first "red," then "white," then both types of "martyrdom" together were attributed in church tradition to the Apostle John. Here the functions are distributed. For the first time save the obscure reference of Clement of Rome³ we have distinct allusion to the martyrdom of Peter. Joining on to the primitive Synoptic tradition of Peter's turning again and

¹ This characteristic attitude of R toward current tradition has been observed by Lightfoot with his habitual acumen, and interpreted with his habitual apologetic tendency, in the Appendix B to his *Essays on the Johannine problem*, entitled, "On the Conversational Character of the Gospel" (*Bibl. Essays*, p. 197). The instances adduced by Lightfoot from 1:41; 2:11; 4:54; 18:13; 19:34; 21:14, and 21:23 are of immense "evidential value," as Lightfoot declares. They are also to be connected in our interpretation of their significance, as he further notes, with 19:35 and I Jn. 5:6 ff. But the inferences to be drawn are very different from those drawn by Lightfoot. These phenomena are in reality the specific and characteristic marks of a redaction which aims to accommodate "Johannine" to current tradition.

² Chapter V.

³ *Ad. Cor. v.* "There was Peter, who by reason of wicked jealousy endured not one or two, but many toils, and thus having borne his testimony (*μαρτυρήσας*) went to his appointed place of glory."

stablishing his brethren, thus retrieving the humiliating failure of his offer to go with the Lord to prison and to death,¹ our author indorses the general verdict of the Sub-apostolic Age which looked to Peter as having received from the Lord the charge of chief shepherd of the flock,² with apparent dependence on I Pt. 5:1-4. But besides this primacy of Peter which R does not wish to dispute, and which is ultimately crowned with the glory of martyrdom, there remains a function at least equally vital to the welfare of the Church, and assured to it by Jesus' promise of the "abiding" witness. To make clear in just what sense this promise must be understood, and to attach it to the person of "the disciple whom Jesus loved" as none other than the writer of the foregoing Gospel, is R's aim and object in the dialogue of verses 20-24. A "following" of the Lord like Peter's in the sense of glorifying God by the manner of his death had by some been understood to be the fate of this man.³ Others "among the brethren" had applied to him in a literal sense the promise "There are some that stand by that shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his glory." In reality Jesus had made only an ambiguous suggestion. The true sense in which that disciple had fulfilled the promise of an "abiding witness" appears in the Gospel he has given to the Church, the Gospel of a real incarnation. This witness is indorsed in its own consciousness as "true."

If such be the sense and bearing of the second half of the Appendix, what is the object, bearing and significance of verses 1-14? Here too there is manifest employment of symbolism,⁴ and "the beloved disciple" is also introduced,

¹ Lk. 22:32-34; cf. Mt. 14: 28-33 and 16:18.

² Cf. Acts 1:15; 2:14, etc.

³ On the sense of Peter's question in verse 21 as he sees John "following," *κύριε, οὗτος δὲ τί, see above p. 134, note 1.*

⁴ Note the count of fishes as 153, verse 11. Such is the total number of

though less prominently than in verses 15-24. Since the discovery of the fragment of *Ev. Petri*, which breaks off at the point where the group of disciples in sorrow and despair have returned, Peter at their head, to their fishing at the Sea of Galilee, it is scarcely needful to point out that this story, counted in the Appendix as the "third" appearance of Jesus to his disciples, is in its own intrinsic meaning a *first* appearance.¹ It represents that Galilean form of the tradition which in Luke has become completely superseded by the Jerusalem form more acceptable to later believers in that the "scattering" of the disciples and flight to Galilee (Mk. 14: 28) has been canceled, so that there remains an unbroken continuance of the original body of disciples at Jerusalem. It also becomes apparent as part of this process that Luke has rescued the story of Peter's new commission to all the world symbolized in the miraculous draft of fishes by transferring it to the context of his *first* call in company with Andrew and the sons of Zebedee.² R in Jn. 21: 1-14 is confronting the same problem as *Ev. Petri*, how to harmonize the earlier Galilean tradition which revolves around the manifestation to Peter³ at the Sea of Galilee, with the Lukan form revolving around the sepulcher at Jerusalem and the manifestation to the women which is consistently followed in the body of the Gospel. The story of Peter's commission to the world is to R indispensable, because if room is to be found at all for the general circulation of the Johannine Gospel it can only

all existing varieties of fish according to Oppianus Cilix as quoted by Jerome.

¹ See the note above (p. 194) on Lightfoot's "Conversational Character of the Gospel," with references cited.

² Mk. 1:16-20; cf. Lk. 5:4-11.

³ The primary character of this form is attested both by the references of Paul (I Cor. 15:1-11) and by the mode of introduction of its rival, Mk. 15:40-16: 8, as something which had not at first come to light on account of the women's fear (Mk. 16: 8).

be by process of adjustment to the dominant authority. Now in the body of the Gospel this authority is placed in very marked subordination to that of "the disciple whom Jesus loved." At every critical point, whether of the first calling (1:41), the supper (13:21-30), the following to Calvary (18:15-18; 19:25-27, 35), or even the birth of the resurrection faith (20:1-10) another steps in before Peter. This marked subordination of Peter to "the disciple whom Jesus loved" might promote the circulation of this Gospel in Asia; but unmodified it would be well-nigh fatal to its acceptance in Rome, the see of Peter, or in Christendom at large. The old Galilean form of the tradition, centering upon the commission of "Peter and them that were with him" to the world *must* receive at least that measure of consideration which we find in 21:1-14. Only now it takes the "third" place among the manifestations (that to Mary Magdalen, 20:11-18 being apparently not counted), much as the Markan "beginning of miracles" has to give way to the two of Cana (2:1-12; 4:46-54). In the readjusted story of the Manifestation of the risen Lord and Apostolic Commission "the disciple whom Jesus loved" still stands at Peter's elbow, somewhat as in Acts. He does not forego the faculty of deeper insight which in the Gospel makes him first to know and first to believe (20:8). Even here (21:7) Peter's recognition of the risen Lord comes only when "that disciple said unto him, It is the Lord"; but apart from this modicum of tribute to the hero of the substance of the Gospel "Simon Peter" is first in everything. He leads, "the other disciples" follow. He alone draws the net unrent to land,¹ and has in-

¹ Cf. in Acts 11:1-18 Peter's prevention of a disruption of the Church after the bringing in of Gentile believers. In Acts 15 the credit of this is accorded to James and "the apostles and elders in Jerusalem" on motion of Antioch through its delegates Barnabas and Saul. Peter's part becomes less prominent than in the parallel Acts 10:1-11:18.

dividual relations with the Lord. Concession to the primacy of Peter could not be greater if any place at all was to be reserved for "the disciple whom Jesus loved."

But the continuity which makes a unit of the Appendix disappears absolutely when we attempt to pass backward to the substance of the Gospel. Individual "parenthetic additions" such as 19:35 are indeed present, proving, as already noted, that R has not left the work unrevised.¹ In particular the relation of 21:15-19 to Peter's offer to "follow" in 13:36-38 is unmistakable, and we shall have occasion hereafter to scrutinize it in connection with the indirect internal evidence. But quite apart from the mere differences of style and vocabulary often pointed out,² which nullify R's attempt to adjust his own style to that of his model, there is abundant proof in the Appendix and its few connected passages that the writer is *not* the author of the Gospel.

Difference of authorship is implied in what we have already shown concerning the purpose of the Appendix and its endeavor to adjust the Lukan tradition of the resurrection made fundamental by the Gospel proper, to the (proto-) Markan, or Roman. Precisely the converse process has been attempted in the corresponding appendix attached in all save a few MSS. to the Roman Gospel of Mark. Here the Galilean yields to the Lukan. The so-called "longer ending" of Mark (Mk. 16:9-20) treats the resurrection tradition implied in the body of the work (Mk. 14:28; 16:7) to a radical

¹ See Lightfoot, *ibid.*, on "The Conversational Character," etc.

² See *e. g.* Scholten, *Das Evang. n. Joh.*, 1867, and Schmiedel, *Encycl. Bibl. s. v.* "John," § 40. Among the more important, because involving a difference of conception, is the return of the Appendix (and the interpolated section 2:13-22) to earlier usage in referring to Jesus' resurrection (21:14, Jesus "was raised," ἠγέρθη; 20:9, he "rose," ἀνέστη, in accordance with the idea of 10:18). Similarly the Second coming in the Gospel is spiritual and inward, not a manifestation "to the world" (14:22, 23). Here, too, the Appendix reverts to the ordinary catastrophic sense (21:23).

readjustment, forcibly fitting it to the Procrustean bed of Lukan narrative. The appearance "in Galilee" to "Peter and the rest" has been remorselessly amputated and a modified abstract of the Jerusalem tradition of Luke substituted in its place (Mk. 16: 9-20).¹ Less radical is the method by which the author of *Ev. Petri* (160 A. D.) approaches the problem. Harmony by combination is the method of his time, commended by names like Tatian and Theophilus. Indeed the radical treatment exemplified in Mk. 16: 9-20 was no longer practicable. In view of this fortunate discovery in *Ev. Petri* of an attempted combination of the Markan and Lukan traditions of the Resurrection and Apostolic Commission, and the light thus thrown upon the motive of the Markan appendix, how futile appears such an attempt as the following to explain the addition of the Appendix to the Fourth Gospel:

"Though an after-thought, this chapter was certainly written by the author of the Gospel. How soon after it is impossible to say; but there is nothing in the style which requires us to postulate more than a few weeks or a few days. As all the manuscripts without exception contain the chapter and there is no trace of its ever having been wanting from any copies, the probable conclusion is that it was added before the Gospel was actually published.² After the Gospel was written and submitted to his friends, the Apostle may have heard that some misapprehension was abroad respecting himself, or that some disappointment had been expressed because no mention had been made of an incident which they had heard him relate, and which would naturally be interesting to his admirers. He may have then consented to add it as a postscript."³

It was *not* because he thought it might be "interesting to

¹ On the redactional history of the Roman gospel see my *Beginnings of Gospel Story*, 1909, *ad. loc.*

² On this very fallacious argument, see below.

³ Lightfoot, *Bibl. Essays*, p. 195.

his admirers" that the author added a new statement of the resurrection Appearance to Peter and them that were with him in Galilee. It was *not* for such reasons that he attached a new and special account of the Apostolic Commission based upon the ancient Roman form, distributing its responsibilities between Peter and John, after having previously brought his Gospel to a formal and solemn close (20:30, 31) on the basis of a pronounced type of the Jerusalem, or Lukan, tradition, which related the same supremely important events in another interest. The author of the Gospel did *not* stultify his own work by representing the disciples as returning to their occupation on the "Sea of Tiberias," ignorant of the Lord's resurrection (21:4), after he had previously related the overcoming of all their doubts and the equipment of them with their great commission (20:22-23). He did *not* conceive himself to have related but *two* appearances "to his disciples" (21:14), merely because "he was manifested first to Mary Magdalen." He did *not* first forget that Peter was under disgrace (13:36-38; 18:15-18, 25-27), then, recollecting himself, give him his reinstatement at "the *third* time that Jesus was manifested to the disciples" (21:15-19). These are additions by one whose conception of events and of doctrine are different, tending to revert toward the Markan, *i. e.*, Roman, type.

Of course, this editor (R) adjusts his own style to that of the work he edits. Such was the literary method of his time. Besides the instances of easy imitation adduced by Lightfoot and Zahn, there are cases of true stylistic affinity of which notice has been taken already in 21:24 (*cf.* 19:35; I Jn. 6:7 ff., and III Jn. 12) and 21:14 (*cf.* 2:22; 12:33). But these occur in the "parenthetic additions," which as Lightfoot notes are characteristic of the Gospel. Real agreement in vital points of conviction is lacking. The whole object of the Appendix is to so adjust the respective claims to au-

thoritative commission from the risen Christ that room may be left for those of "the disciple whom Jesus loved" without detriment to the accepted claims of Peter. R does this on the assumption that the individual so described is John the son of Zebedee, and also the author of the book; though he shows a timidity in advancing this claim which is very natural in view of the conflicting traditions regarding the fate of John alluded to in verses 20-23. He also identifies him apparently in the "parenthetic addition" of 19:35 with the author of I Jn. 5: 6-8. In neither case can the identification be admitted.

A single plausible argument is advanced to prove that the same peculiar attitude is characteristic both of R and of the evangelist proper, on this point of the identification of "the disciple whom Jesus loved" with the son of Zebedee. It is said that the same "reserve" characterizes both in speaking of James and John, neither apostle being mentioned by name in the Gospel, and the Appendix making but a single passing reference to "the sons of Zebedee." Why this curious silence regarding the two disciples who next to Peter are the most prominent in the other gospels? If the explanation of a peculiar "modesty" on the part of the apostle-evangelist accords but ill with the extreme degree of special honor with which the person of "the disciple whom Jesus loved" is clothed in this Gospel, to the complete overshadowing even of Peter, and is directly antithetic to the bold enunciation of Revelation "I, John, am he that heard and saw these things" (Rev. 22:8), must there not at all events be some cause common to Gospel and Appendix for this peculiar silence? We are convinced that there is; and equally convinced that it is not to be found in the fanciful conjectures of special "reserve," "modesty," or the like, affecting the character of the evangelist.

The silence of the Gospel proper as to the sons of Zebedee

might be due either (1) to some unexplained and inexplicable circumstance affecting the original composition; or (2) to a cancelation, effected in R's revision, of references which seemed to present obstacles to his own theory of the authorship. It is the latter supposition only which can reasonably account for all the phenomena.

In the Appendix R appears in his own personality, referring to the evangelist in the third person, as distinct from himself (verse 24). Accordingly there is no objection here (verse 2) to a reference to "the sons of Zebedee." Indeed, the mention of them is indispensable to the desired identification. In the body of the Gospel he was compelled to proceed otherwise. His theory required that John in speaking of himself should employ the periphrase "the disciple whom Jesus loved." If, then, he found references in the work to "the sons of Zebedee" or "James and John," as in other gospels, it might not disabuse him of his belief, but he would be most apt to remove what would prove an obstacle in his readers' minds by cancelation of this feature. That this has in fact actually taken place is apparent from the altered form given in Jn. 1:35-42 to the Markan story of the calling of Andrew and Peter and *the two sons of Zebedee*. What we have in the "Johannine" form of the story is not simple silence regarding John, or James and John, but a manifest and palpable *gap in the story*, such as would be produced by cancelation without adequate editorial revision. The story reports how

"One of the two that heard John (the Baptist) speak, and followed him (Jesus), was Andrew, Simon Peter's brother. He findeth his own brother Simon *as the first*. . . ." ¹

¹ The accusative (*πρῶτον*) is not adequately rendered in the English versions ("findeth first his own brother") and gives rise to frequent misunderstandings. The author is enumerating those who were found and brought to Jesus and begins the list, as we should expect from Synoptic tradition, with "Peter." Peter is "first," though another, here his (elder?) brother Andrew, is placed before him, as in 20: 8.

In its original form this Johannine version of the Call of the First Disciples can only have continued with mention of the next on the list, certainly one of the sons of Zebedee, unless all traditions of the order of the twelve are at fault. But we have simply *a blank*. Where the story is resumed after the naming of Peter (*cf.* Mk. 3:16, 17) the point of interest is already past, the other of "the two who heard John speak and followed Jesus" has vanished utterly, and even the subject of the verb "he was minded" with which the narrative is picked up again remains problematic. Unless all literary indications fail, the original narrative continued somewhat as follows: "The other disciple that heard John speak was John (or James?) the son of Zebedee. He also findeth his brother and brought him to Jesus. Jesus saith unto them, Ye shall be called Boanerges, that is, sons of thunder."

It would be unsafe in dealing with a writer so inconsequential in narrative as our fourth evangelist to argue from the saying placed in Jesus' mouth in 6:70, "Did not I choose you the twelve, and one of you is a devil?" that any complete account of the Choosing of the Twelve was ever actually given.¹ Even the subsequent rôle given to Thomas (11:16; 20:24-29) and to the two Judases (13:26 ff.; 14:22; 18:2 f.) does not prove that this Gospel ever contained, like the others, a list of the twelve. If it did, however, its variations ("Nathanael" "the disciple whom Jesus loved") would give strong motives for cancelation to editors anxious to avoid conflict with other forms of the tradition. All we can say with confidence is that the sequel to the paragraph 1:35-42 proves a gap at just the point where the sons of Zebedee ought to be mentioned, almost as clearly as the preceding context implies it. It certainly was not Jesus who "determined (*ἠθέλησεν*) to depart

¹ *Cf.* 6:5, where it is assumed that the multitude must be fed, although just arriving, and 11:2, where Mary is identified by actions not yet performed.

(ἐξελθεῖν) on the morrow to Galilee"—and yet did not go. Nor was it he who "findeth Philip," whereas in all the other cases the disciple-to-be is found by a fellow-disciple. The following clause "*Jesus saith to him*" in its parallel to verse 42 shows that the finder of Philip is some other. It may have been John, or James, or Thomas. Whoever it was, the name is lacking, and the lacuna *cannot have been intentional*. The inference is unavoidable that the non-appearance of James and John in this Gospel is not a primary phenomenon, but is due to some process of revision; whether by the hand which introduces "the disciple whom Jesus loved," perhaps the author of the Epistles, or by R of the Appendix, whose interest seems to be to accommodate the claims of this nameless one to other apostolic dignities, on the assumption that he is John the son of Zebedee.

Other proofs of a profound difference in standpoint between the Appendix with its connected "parenthetic additions" and the substance of the Gospel must be deferred to a later occasion, since they would carry us too far into the domain of the Indirect Internal Evidence.¹ Enough has been already presented to show that the latest of our gospels

¹ A possible solution of the problem Whom did the author of the sections which introduce "the disciple whom Jesus loved" mean by this enigmatic figure, as against the identification made by R (21: 24?), is suggested in my article "The Disciple whom Jesus loved" in the *Expositor* [Series VII., iv. (1907)]. It should be noted that the phrase on p. 338 "a very real man has sat for the portrait," *i. e.*, of this ideal disciple, has given rise to misunderstanding, as if the meaning were, The evangelist is cryptically delineating Paul, who wrote in Gal. 2: 20, "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." The artist who paints an ideal figure has a model, but what he aims to delineate is *not* the model. He is not a photographer. He paints an *ideal*. Still in many Madonnas by the greatest masters the model can be identified. "The disciple whom Jesus loved" would seem to have been *originally* (not in the Appendix) an ideal figure. But a key to the ideal is not unreasonably to be found in Gal. 2: 20; that is, it is in part a *Pauline* ideal.

forms no exception to the rule that writings of this character were constantly subject to editorial revision to adapt them to wider circulation, and especially to harmonize them with similar writings already invested with a quasi-canonical authority. The Appendix to the Fourth Gospel bears every mark of such an editorial epilogue and is linked to a number of "parenthetic additions" of a redactional character attached to the substance of the Gospel. The literary usage of the period was not to distinguish such editorial interpolations and postscripts from the text, but contrariwise to obliterate as much as possible the marks of difference. The later MSS. insert their editorial addenda in the form of brief notes, separate from the text, the so-called "subscriptions."¹ In other cases, such as the longer and shorter endings of Mark and Rom. 16, the fortunate survival of a very few evidences from the earliest period proves that what now circulates as part of the text was originally an editorial postscript. Only one solitary manuscript survives to prove—and that only by a difference in the handwriting—that Jn. 21:25 is a post-postscript, while in Matthew and Revelation textual evidence of the process of editorial recasting and supplementation is wholly wanting. And yet there is general admission of the fact in these cases on the basis of the internal evidence alone. In short the further back we go toward precanonical conditions the larger are the editorial liberties thus taken.

Back of the Appendix itself, presupposed and employed by it, though now separated from the Gospel, is another editorial framework, or epilogue of commendation, certainly of Asian origin, consisting of the three "Johannine" epistles. The method may have been suggested by the epistles to the churches of Asia editorially prefixed to Revelation, but this writer (A) has no thought whatever of introducing the name of "John"; neither does he "address seven churches not other-

¹ For examples see the A. V. at the end of the Epistles.

wise than by name”¹ after the plan of the current instrumentum Paulinum. He follows the more specially Ephesian group, Ephesians–Colossians–Philemon, and makes a real separation between the letters and the body of the work. Only when adopted by R the Appendix writer (Jn. 19:35; 21:24) does A’s editorial “we” (I Jn. 1:1–3; III Jn. 12) seem liable to be mistaken for a post-mortem publication committee of the Ephesian church after the interpretation of Matthew Arnold, or for a group of “friends and disciples” (Lightfoot), or for the original body of apostles and elders in Jerusalem (*Muratorianum*).² In the Epistles the “we” who write and testify to the reality of the historic incarnation are unmistakably the witnessing Church; because the Church with its historic and apostolic succession is placed in antithesis to the false witness of the antichrist that is going forth into the world with a denial that Jesus Christ is come “in the flesh.” The “we” of I Jn. 1:1–3 must be placed side by side with the “we” of the Prologue:

“The Logos became flesh and dwelt among us and we beheld his glory, glory as of an only begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth . . . for of his fulness we all received, and grace for grace.”³

It is not a publication committee who are intrusted with this witness of the Spirit, at once historic and inward. It is not “a narrow circle of disciples who had the mental power and the spirituality to understand” the Johannine teaching. It is not a prelati cal clique arrogating to themselves a special

¹ *Muratorianum*. Paulus . . . non nisi nominatim septem ecclesiis scribit.

² Such seems to be the implied interpretation of Jn. 21:24. Cf. Johannes ex decipolis (discipulis) cohortantibus condiscipulis et $\overline{\text{eps}}$ (episcopis) suis dixit. . . . Eadem nocte revelatum Andreæ ex apostolis ut recogniscentibus cunctis Johannis suo nomine cuncta describeret.

³ Jn. 1:14–16. Cf. 3:11 and see Chapter XII.

“apostolic succession.” It, too, has its antithesis in the context:

“He came unto his own (land) and his own (people) received him not. But *as many as received him* to them gave he the right to become children of God, even to them that believe on his name.”¹

It is the “Israel of God” as against the Jews, the historic Church as against the false prophet of heretical antichrist, which is the abiding “witness of Messiah” in the view of the writer of Johannine Prologue and Epistles.

From this “we” of the whole body of Christian witnesses the author of the Epistles plainly differentiates his own individual “I”—simply “the Elder” whose nameless personality is known to, and vouched for by “Gaius,” but not otherwise obtruded on the reader’s attention. There is no pretense whatever to apostolic authority, though the effort to make clear the superiority of the Church’s “abiding witness” to the neologisms of the Docetists might mislead a later generation.

Are we challenged to point to some individual other than the son of Zebedee supposably competent to produce such writings? The Epistle to the Hebrews remains a standing warning against the idea that none but immediate followers of Jesus, or persons of well-known name in the Church, could produce its greater literary works. But let the challenge be accepted. Why should not this nameless “Elder” be the same as that nameless and venerable Elder of Ephesus to whom Justin Martyr, the quondam philosopher, first and greatest of the Roman fathers of the church, owed his own conversion? Justin relates the interview in the opening chapters of his *Dialogue*. While endeavoring to satisfy his philosophical doubts as a disciple of “a sagacious man holding a high position among the Platonists” at Ephesus, Justin reports:

¹ Jn. 1:11, 12.

“I used to go into a certain field not far from the sea. And when I was near that spot one day, which having reached I purposed to be by myself, a certain old man, by no means contemptible in appearance, but exhibiting meek and venerable manners, followed me at a little distance.”

In the conversation which ensues Justin reports how the venerable Christian teacher resolved his philosophic doubts concerning the knowledge of God and the immortality of the soul, by pointing to a revelation unknown to Plato and the philosophers. Let the reader pursue Justin's report, *e. g.*, of the argument which makes the life of the soul not intrinsic as in Plato, but the gift of God, “for to live is not its attribute, as it is God's” (Chapter vi); or the presentation of the “prophets who spoke by the Divine Spirit” as teachers superior to all the philosophers:

“For they did not use demonstration in their treatises, seeing they were witnesses to the truth which is above all demonstration, and worthy of faith; and those events which have happened, and those which are happening compel you to assent to the utterances made by them, although indeed they were entitled to credit on account of the miracles which they performed, since they both glorified the Creator, the God and Father of all things, and proclaimed his Son the Christ (sent) by him: which indeed the false prophets, which are filled with the lying, unclean spirit neither have done nor do. . . . But pray that, above all things the gates of light may be opened to you; for these things cannot be perceived or understood by all, but only by the man to whom God and his Christ have imparted wisdom.”¹

This was Justin's only colloquy with the Elder. He does not seem to have known his name, and declares in so many words “I have not seen him since.” We cannot of course lay stress upon the coincidences with “Johannine” thought and phraseology in the reported discourse; for we cannot tell

¹ *Dialogue with Trypho*, Chapters iii-viii.

how much in the report is Justin's own. But so long as this figure of the venerable Christian philosopher of Ephesus in Justin's youth (110-120 A. D.?) is available we have no need to shrink from the challenge to point to an Elder who could have compiled the Gospel and given it to the Asian churches under cover of the three Epistles.

It is easy to see why a work current first in Asia in such a form, from such a nameless hand, should later, when destined for wider circulation be given out as "apostolic." Its Ephesian origin and accompanying Epistles could not fail to suggest this name in quarters where Revelation was already accepted as written by the Apostle John while staying at Patmos in Asia. We should rather marvel at the caution and restraint of R in his manner of making the suggestion in the new epilogue (Jn. 21) which, as we have seen, prepares the work for wider circulation in competition with other forms of the evangelic tradition, and other apostolic authorities. But concerning the evidences which reveal to us something of the date and history of the Gospel's conquest of canonical standing we shall have to deal in another chapter.

CHAPTER VIII

THE APPENDIX A PRODUCT OF REVISION AT ROME

Inquiry into the relations of the Appendix, of the Revelation and of the Epistles of John to the Gospel has compelled us to anticipate our study, to the extent that these connected writings were involved, of the indirect internal evidence. To appreciate the bearing of these documents on the problem of the authorship of the Gospel it was necessary to scrutinize the internal structure of the subsidiary and connected writings, especially the Appendix, since in the manuscripts as we have them this forms an integral part of the book. The light already obtained indicates for what purpose the Appendix was written, and what were its author's views regarding the authorship of the Gospel. It gives at least a suggestion as to the grounds on which they rested, in the phrases which appear to be taken up from still earlier writings of similar bearing.

We must now attempt a closer determination of the where, when, and why of this first assertion of the Johannine authorship; because it became the source and foundation, as the phraseology proves, of all later accounts; and to do this we shall need to apply both external and internal evidences. They should help us to determine at what place and period the influence of the Appendix begins to be felt, as well as what influences of other writings are traceable in it.

We have already noted Lightfoot's opinion that so far as difference in style (!) is concerned a few weeks' or months' interval is all that need be assumed between Appendix and Gospel; and that the fact that we possess no manuscript evidence of the circulation of the Gospel apart from the

Appendix is proof of its having been added within the lifetime of the evangelist, before the original work had become disseminated. Lightfoot even applies the same argument to the post-postscript (21:25) attributing this also to the Apostle John himself, or at least "one of his immediate disciples," at a date but slightly later still. Zahn and other "defenders" pursue a similar line of reasoning, explaining the apparent reference to the Apostle's death (21:23)—for how could the writer otherwise know that the sense currently given to the saying of Jesus was incorrect?—as due to a sense on his own part that death was not far off. In the language of one of the most eminent of recent "defenders."

"The aged disciple, feeling death stealing upon him, might point out that no words of Jesus justified the expectation which had arisen among some of his devoted friends."¹

This type of exegesis, which takes Browning for a model,² and unconsciously parallels the rabbinic explanations how Moses might write the account of his own death in the closing verses of the Pentateuch, substitutes the play of imagination for serious inquiry into the actual history of tradition and its adaptation to ecclesiastical conditions in the second century. We shall have more to say regarding it at a later time.

It is incumbent upon us first of all to point out how little force there is in the argument of an early date for the Appendix based upon the lack of MS. evidence for the circulation of the Gospel without it.

Those who make this plea show slight appreciation of the power a canonized writing exerts, as shown, *e. g.*, in the history of the Massoretic text of the Old Testament, toward the suppression of earlier and uncanonical forms. How many examples are left to us of the "many narratives"

¹ Drummond, *Char. and Auth.*, p. 387, quoted and indorsed by Sanday, *Criticism*, p. 81.

² Sanday, *Criticism*, p. 254.

which "Luke" aimed to supersede, and has actually superseded? How many of the *Logia* of Matthew? How many of the Diary incorporated by "Luke" in Acts? How many of Romans without the Epistle of commendation of Phœbe, and without the doxology so variously placed but in the printed texts appearing as Rom. 16:25-27? How many examples have we of Mark unsupplemented? How many of Revelation without the framework provided by its Asian editor? Or, to come down to the Gospel itself, how extensive is the manuscript evidence of its circulation without the *post*-postscript 21:25?

But external evidence is not so dumb on this question as is sometimes imagined. Silence, as we have seen, is its only form of witness for the period anterior to the circulation of a given writing; and there are circumstances under which even silence is eloquent. Such in fact are the circumstances already described under which Ignatius, Polycarp, Papias, and Justin successively manifest just enough acquaintance with the X literature to prove that it had some limited circulation, and at the same time by their silence as to any authority attaching to it, and the extreme meagerness of their employment of it, present an insoluble problem to the "defenders." Professor Stanton's statement of the case shows just how great the embarrassment is, which is created by the assumption that Jn. 21:24 already formed an integral part of the Gospel on a footing of complete equality with the rest in the time of Justin Martyr:

"If (as is admitted by most critics at the present day) the evidence shows at least that he (Justin) used this Gospel, he can hardly have taken it for anything else than what it professes to be (*in the Appendix!*), a faithful record of the testimony of a personal and singularly close follower of Christ regarding the words and deeds of Christ."¹

¹ *Gospels*, etc., p. 91.

If on the contrary the Gospel had not yet received this editorial supplement, or if Justin, who, as Professor Stanton has taken great pains to show, was exceptionally careful to avoid dependence on apocryphal or dubious sources, had knowledge of its earlier circulation in other form, either apart from this epilogue, or accompanied only by the Asian epilogue of the three Epistles, we have at once a satisfactory explanation not only of Justin's treatment of the Gospel, but of that of his predecessors.

So much for the argument from silence. But we are not so destitute as many imagine of evidence directly attesting the circulation of the Gospel in unsupplemented form. The earliest of all clearly recognizable references to the Gospel, as already pointed out—and on this point we are glad indeed to have such high indorsement as that of Sanday—is that of Mk. 16:9.¹ But the Fourth Gospel which this reference implies is a Fourth Gospel *without the Appendix*.

The real derivation of the appendix to Mark is completely unknown.² The first traces of its existence are at Rome about the middle of the second century. This agrees with its purpose, already shown to be the adjustment of the Galilean type of tradition regarding the Manifestation to Peter and Apostolic Commission followed in the substance of the Gospel (Mk. 14:28; 16:7) to the Jerusalem type presented by Luke. The method employed is drastic indeed. The Manifestation to Peter, although the references of Paul already show it to have been fundamental (I Cor. 15:5; Gal. 2:8; *cf.* Lk. 24:34), is canceled, and the post-resurrection scenes are restricted as in Luke to Jerusalem. In fact with the sole exception of the opening clause "Now when he was risen early on the first day of the week he appeared first to

¹ See above, p. 69 f.

² On the supposed evidence of derivation from "The Elder Aristo" see above, p. 70.

Mary Magdalen," the writer depends throughout on Luke, or traditions connected with the Lukan writings.¹

Now the leaning toward Jerusalem is even more pronounced in the substance of the Fourth Gospel (chs. 1-20) than in Luke. The tendency naturally increased as the claims of Jerusalem to be the seat of apostolic tradition were enhanced by the growing dependence on "the word handed down from the beginning." In the body of the Gospel (chs. 1-20) Judæa is the original and the principal scene of Jesus' ministry, and Jerusalem the principal seat of his adherents (7:3; 12:17-19). The three resurrection appearances, including the Apostolic Commission (20:21-23), are all in Jerusalem. If Jesus "walks in Galilee" at all, it is only because "he would not walk in Judæa because the Jews sought to kill him" (7:1). When he does return to Galilee a special reason is given (4:44), and it is explained that "the Galileans received him because they had seen the things that he did in Jerusalem" (4:45). Contrariwise, as we have seen, it is a primary object of the Appendix (Jn. 21) to adjust this extreme type of the Jerusalem form of the tradition, at least so far as it concerned the Manifestation to Peter and the Apostolic Commission, to the Roman, or proto-Markan, form. Thus there are exemplified three stages of the tradition: (1) the proto-Markan. This is represented in (a) Mark, (b) Paul, (c) traces in Lk. 22:32; 24:34, and (d) more traces in *Ev. Petri*. We have (2) the Lukan, represented in (a) canonical Luke and (b) Jn. 1-20. We have (3) a harmonistic combination of (1) and (2), represented in (a) canonical Mark, (b) *Ev. Petri* and (c) canonical John. Now of these three types it is not the last, but the *second* which is known and employed in Mk. 16:9-20. Had its author known the combined (third) form, he would surely not

¹The rival "shorter ending" has similar relation to Matthew. See Bacon, *Beginnings of Gospel Story*, *ad loc.*

have chosen that which involves his work in self-contradiction, besides leaving the promise of the angel, "Ye shall see him in Galilee as he told you," unfulfilled, and Peter, his hero, under the unlifted cloud of disgrace! To suppose that he had before him our Fourth Gospel's account of the appearance to Peter and the rest in Galilee with the miraculous draft of fishes, and the beautiful story of the rehabilitation and induction of Peter into the office of chief shepherd, yet passed this all over for the sake of material so ill-adapted to his purpose as Jn. 20:11-18 and Lk. 24:13-35, is to make him out incredibly unfit. In short the appendix to Mark is an example of the same harmonizing effort displayed in the Appendix to John, but is earlier and cruder; so that its author while acquainted with Jn. 20, cannot be supposed to have known Jn. 21.

The earliest known reference to the Fourth Gospel, accordingly, seems to know it *not* as supplemented by the Appendix, but *apart from this*, and with such mode and measure of employment as we have found to be characteristic of the period when no such claims as those of the Appendix had yet been advanced in its behalf.

We may add that if the Gospel was already provided with the Appendix such an editorial envelope as Lightfoot supposes (I Jn.) would hardly have been added. The converse, however, is easily explicable, inasmuch as the Epistles provide only for a local circulation in the region of Ephesus, whereas the Appendix takes account of Christendom at large. In this respect comparison with *Ev. Petri* and particularly with the appendix to Mark is peculiarly instructive. Both appendices represent adjustments of the two great streams of tradition regarding the origin of the evangelic message and the foundation of apostolic authority. In the one case the Galilean has been suppressed in favor of the Jerusalem tradition; in the other the Jerusalem tradition

has been supplemented by the Galilean. It is the latter which represents the later stage.

Herewith we must return to the internal evidence; for internal evidence alone can be decisive as to date and authority. And the internal evidence of the Appendix agrees with the apparent ignorance of all early writers of its claim.

1. Furrer, writing on the "Geography of the Fourth Gospel,"¹ refers to the frequently expressed view of critics that the words τῆς Τιβεριάδος in Jn. 6:1 are a gloss attached before the diffusion of our manuscripts. The phrase πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης τῆς Γαλιλαίας τῆς Τιβεριάδος is at least "awkward and unusual" as Sanday admits.² Jewish writings of the second century and Pausanias, afford, as Furrer shows, the first evidence of the superseding of the old name, "Sea of Galilee," or "Gennesaret," after Tiberias had acquired its later predominant importance.³

But the Appendix has "the Sea of Tiberias" pure and simple. Furrer, therefore, dates it "bedeutend später."⁴

2. The tendency of Mk. 16:9-20, of Luke, of Jn. 1-20, is progressive towards suppression of the Galilean form of the tradition of the resurrection, in favor of that which de-

¹ *Zts. f. n. t. Wiss.*, November, 1902.

² *Criticism*, p. 114.

³ The only mention of Tiberias in the Gospels is Jn. 6:23. It acquired importance as seat of the central synagogue of Judaism, which removed thither from Jamnia after the war of Bar-Cocheba (135 A. D.). In the Talmud "Sea of Tiberias" is consistently employed.

⁴ Lightfoot (*Bibl. Essays*, p. 176) had said in reply to this argument, "The city of Tiberias, built by Herod Antipas . . . could hardly have given its name to the lake as early as the date of our Lord's ministry. The designation however 'Sea of Tiberias' is found in Josephus (B. J. iii, 3, 5), before St. John wrote his Gospel." More careful scrutiny of the evidence from Josephus will show however that its bearing is in reality the other way. Niese reads τῆς πρὸς Τιβεριάδι(-α) λιμνης; "altered in the inferior MSS. to Τιβεριάδος."

nies the "scattering of the sheep,"¹ and beginning with Mt. 28: 9-11 (= verses 7-8) builds up an account which starts with an appearance to Mary Magdalen, and ends with an overcoming of the incredulity of the disciples *in Jerusalem*.

The Appendix, as we have seen, follows the still later tendency to reinstate the Galilean tradition, harmonizing in 21: 14, and presenting it in a form similar to the *Ev. Petri*, wherein the same tendency to combination appears. A similar adjustment seems to be attempted toward the relative claims of Peter and John, those of John being really a later growth.²

In the Appendix Peter is the Lord's φίλος; John his ἀγαπητός (21: 15-17, 20). The function of witness-bearing (μαρτυρία) is divided between the two. Peter receives, besides the office of chief shepherd, the crown of "martyrdom"; John becomes the μαρτύς who abides until the second coming, the "witness of Messiah."³ The speech and action are even more affected than in the body of the Gospel by the later disposition toward an enigmatical and mystical sense.

3. The conception of the function of John as against Peter, just referred to, almost reverses synoptic tradition. Martyrdom (suffering) there is the part of John (Mk. 10: 39). If Peter suffered such a fate, the first trace of it is in Clement of Rome. New Testament writers [except II Pt., 150 A. D. (?)] ignore it.⁴ The specific application to John of the *logion* regarding the "witnesses of Messiah" (Mt. 16: 28;

¹ Mk. 14: 27-28, omitted by Luke, and contradicted by his account of events.

² Cf. Mt. 16: 18; Lk. 5: 1-11; 22: 32; 24: 12, with Gal. 2: 9; Lk. 22: 8, Acts 3: 1, 11; 4: 13, 19; 8: 14; Jn. 1: 35-42 (John the first follower of Jesus; earlier than Peter); 13: 23-25; 19: 25-27, 35; 20: 1-9 (against Lk. 24: 12, John the first to believe in the risen Lord).

³ On the animus of the Appendix, see Klöpffer, "Joh. Kapitel 21," in the *Z. f. wiss. Th.*, 1899. But his views are pushed to an extreme.

⁴ The earlier disposition was rather to feel execution a disgrace, Eph. 3: 13; I Pt. 4: 16.

cf. II Esdr. 6: 26; Rev. 11:3-13) testified to in the "sayings" alluded to in 21: 23, comes in after Mt. 20: 23=Mk. 10:39. It is supposed to have grown up in consequence of the long survival of this Apostle. At any rate it must in the nature of the case be much later. The scoffs alluded to in II Pt. 3: 4 are met in the Leucian-Prochorus legend by the story of John's *metastasis*, or miraculous survival in the grave. Our Appendix meets them by giving a conditional form to the *logion* ("if I will that he tarry"), and making the witness-bearing the point in question.¹ The author not only feels with Papias the need of an acceptable "exegesis" of Mk. 10:39, but of Mt. 16: 28 as well. This latter *logion* has not only received its specific application to John, but the current interpretation of this application itself now requires to be corrected, because this Apostle, too, has "fallen on sleep."

4. The conception of the function and career of Peter is like that assigned in the *Clementines* to James the Lord's brother, as the *episcopus episcoporum*, or even like that of the later Roman hierarchy, rather than the conception we should draw from Paul (I Cor. 9:5; Gal. 2:8, 11), from Acts, or even from Clement (*ad Cor.* v, 4) of his itinerant evangelistic labors. It seems to be based on I Pt. 5:1-5.² The relation of the Commission of Peter of Jn. 21:15-17 to the Commission of the Twelve of Jn. 20: 21-23 is therefore parallel to the relation of Mt. 16:17-19 to Mt. 18:15-20; except that in the Appendix it is not the founding of the Church on the rock of faith in the resurrection, prevailing against the gates of Hades, a pendant to Lk. 22: 32, which the writer has in mind. In Jn. 21:15-17 it is permanent control and leadership. The analogy of the two Matthæan

¹ Cf. Polycrates, "John was a witness and teacher."

² Cf. in Jn. 21:15-19 the direction to "feed the flock" given by the "chief Shepherd," the references to "girding," "elder" age, and the "glory" of faithful service.

passages, generally acknowledged to represent different stages of the same traditional "saying," only accentuates the relative lateness in the point of view of Jn. 21:15-17 in comparison with Jn. 20:21-23.

Considerations such as the above point to a relatively late date for the Appendix, such as the external evidence would also suggest; while against it there is nothing but the fallacious assumption that if the Gospel had had any circulation at all previous to the addition of the Appendix, even were that circulation confined to the churches of Asia, and without explicit pretensions to apostolic authorship, we should have had greater textual evidence of the fact than now survives.¹

But the surest method for dating this supremely important document is to put the question, At what period, under what circumstances, was it essential to the acceptance of the Gospel referred to and commended in 21:24 to be thus introduced? To this question we can find but one answer: At Rome, *ca.* 150 A. D.

It is in the same region at about the same date that we find a similar appendix attached to the Gospel of Mark, making converse adjustment of the Roman gospel to the Antiochian, whose wider circulation is now attested by Basilides in Alexandria, by Marcion and Justin at Rome. With the breaking up of the original seat of apostolic tradition in Jerusalem in the war of Bar-Cocheba Asia obtained no doubt some small

¹ We shall have occasion later to discuss evidences derived from the Gospel itself of its circulation in earlier form. Among these are the addition in 5:3b, 4 which the best texts omit as an interpolation, but which subsequent reference (verse 7) proves to have once formed part of the story. In the article "Tatian's Rearrangement of the Fourth Gospel" reprinted in Part IV from the *Amer. Journ. of Theol.* (Oct., 1900) evidence is adduced to show that Tatian was influenced by something more than the present form of the Gospel in the construction of his *Diatessaron*. In view of its late date (125-175?) the reference in II Pt. 1:14 to Jn. 21:18 f. can only be classed with external evidences for the currency of the Gospel as a whole.

increment of believers "escaped from the war;"¹ but Rome fell heir to the principal substance of apostolic influence and authority. Already with the visit of Polycarp to Anicetus in 154 A. D. we find the bishop of Rome endeavoring to bring the ritual practice of East and West into uniformity. Traditions exist—of how great value it is difficult to say—that so early as under bishop "Xystus" (Sixtus I) in the year 119 A. D. a council was assembled at Rome to deal with questions relating to the story of the infancy of Jesus in the early chapters of Matthew.² It is certainly at Rome that the problem of harmonization between the Markan and Lukan (Galilean and Jerusalem) forms of the tradition is first precipitated by the new prominence given by Marcion (*ca.* 140 A. D.) to the Antiochian gospel. It is during this same period and at Rome that Valentinus becomes the exponent in Gnostic circles of the policy of combination and harmonization of all four (?) of the gospels, which is carried on from the orthodox side by Tatian (160–170 A. D.) to the point of actual combination into a composite *Diatessaron*. It is here at Rome that we find the conflict breaking out, whose history we have still to trace, between the advocates of one gospel, or two, or three; or of the fourfold gospel which finally commands the field. What circumstances in all the known his-

¹ So Trypho the Jew in Justin's *Dial.* i. Papias may have similar refugees in mind in referring to "those who came my way." The *Dialogue of Jason and Papiscus* (140 A. D.?) had a similar *mise en scène* which may have led to its attribution to Aristo of Pella. For Eusebius' account of the effects of the war is quoted from "Aristo."

² See the Syriac MS. entitled, "As to the Star: showing how and by what means the Magi knew the Star, and that Joseph did not take Mary as his Wife" published by W. Wright in *Journ. of Sacred Lit.*, Oct., 1866. The only element of value is the alleged assembling of the council "in the year 430 (Seleucid era = 119 A. D.), under the reign of Hadrianus Cæsar, in the consulship of Severus and Fulgus, and the episcopate of Xystus bishop of the city of Rome." In the judgment of Hilgenfeld ("Das kanon. Mtev." in *Zts. f. wiss. Th.*, 1895, p. 449) this date must rest on authentic data.

tory of the gospel canon can so explain the attachment of this commendatory postscript to the Fourth Gospel as those of Rome *ca.* 150 A. D.? Up to this date we find it scarcely known, current only in proconsular Asia, and making its claims to apostolic authority only in the mystical and (to the matter of fact occidental mind) enigmatic "we" of Gospel and Epistles; thereafter it is first hesitatingly and doubtfully employed at Rome by Justin (a convert of Ephesus), then hotly contested as "new scripture" falsely attributed to "a great Apostle," then, after suppression of the opposition, rapidly disseminated in various forms of the fourfold gospel.

We have seen what generous concessions are made in the Appendix to the claims of the see of Peter, and how the ancient Roman, or proto-Markan, tradition of Peter's Apostolic Commission is revived and adjusted to the claims of "the disciple whom Jesus loved"; how the tradition is here developed of his martyrdom late in life, far from the scene of his tending the flock (21:18), a story which is traceable aside from this passage only in later writers, principally at Rome. Indeed we can scarcely see how it were possible otherwise for the transition to be made from a mystical Ephesian Gospel, accompanied by no higher claims than those embodied in Jn. 1-20 and the inclosing Epistles, to a catholic Gospel of general acceptance and admitted apostolic authority. We cannot conceive the transition as practicable without an editorial revision involving adjustment to Synoptic story, and more especially some new and more general epilogue identifying "the disciple whom Jesus loved" with a "great apostle" himself the author of the book. This once effected it would depend not on critical reasons, which in that age were secondary, but preëminently on doctrinal acceptability, whether the work would or would not come to be reckoned the last and greatest element in the fourfold gospel of the catholic Church.

In the light of such an interest as this the singular cancellation from the body of the work of references to the sons of Zebedee becomes intelligible, together with the veiled and enigmatic manner of the identification of "the disciple whom Jesus loved." The "prophecy" current for some decades in Asia under the name of "John" and stalwartly defended by leading men both in Asia and Rome, as by the Apostle, lent plausibility to the representation. It was the less open to objection because the place of composition could at need (as in the *Muratorianum*) be considered Jerusalem; while at the same time other views of the fate of "this man" recognized as current are explained away. The editor only *suggests* the identification of the author and beloved disciple with John; he diplomatically avoids the responsibility of a direct assertion.

So with the contradictions of Synoptic story so far as such are allowed to stand.¹ It is in connection with these that we find the comments, scattered equally through Gospel and Appendix, which Lightfoot designates "Instances of allusions to misapprehensions or to questionings rife in those about him." The notion of "conversational comments" addressed to a group of disciples who stand about as the author dictates his Gospel may appeal to a poetic imagination like Browning's, quick to follow the lead of the *Muratorianum* in its interpretation of 21:24; but the historic will recall the harmonistic and apologetic interest of the second century and the analogy of many another ecclesiastical writer of the period, who aims to show that

"Although varying ideas may be taught in the several books of the evangelists, there is no difference in that which pertains to the faith of believers."²

¹ On the "veiled" correction of the Synoptists in respect to the occurrence of the crucifixion on the fourteenth (not fifteenth) Nisan, see the discussions below of the Quartodeciman controversy and the relation of the Fourth Gospel to it. Chapter XVI.

² *Muratorianum*.

Applying not the poetic, but the historic imagination we may well adopt Lightfoot's own examples:

" 1: 41 'He was the first to find,' etc.,¹ 2:11 'This was the beginning of his miracles,' 3: 24 'John was *not yet* cast into prison,' 4:54 'This again was the second miracle which Jesus did,' 18:13 'He (Annas) was father-in-law to Caiaphas, who was high-priest of that year,' 19:34 sq. 'There came out water and blood.' Great stress is laid upon this last point, doubtless in allusion to some symbolism which is not explained, because they would understand it.² So 21:14 'This was now the *third*³ time that Jesus manifested Himself, 21: 23 'The saying therefore went abroad among the brethren that that disciple should not die. Yet Jesus said not unto him, He shall not die,' etc. Thus we find the Evangelist clearing up matters which the current tradition had left doubtful, or on which the popular mind wished to be further informed. Through the main part of the narrative we see these parenthetical additions, these conversational comments. At length (19:35; 20:31) there is a direct appeal to these disciples (?) for whom the whole has been written. 'He knoweth that he saith true that ye might believe.' 'These things are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through His name.'"⁴

Into the question of the separation of redactional additions from the body of the Gospel we cannot enter at this

¹ Has even Lightfoot allowed his eye to rest for a moment upon the English, or is he misled by the β text? See above, p. 202, note.

² But cf. I Jn. 5: 6 ff.

³ In this case the italics are ours. The internal evidence shows clearly that this was originally related as a *first* appearance. The same thing has happened in Lk. 24:36-43, which in spite of the previous context was originally a *first* manifestation, as proved by verse 37 which is irreconcilable with verses 33, 34. Here, in the Lukan story, and in the manifestation to James of *Ev. Hebr.* alike, the "eating together" is brought out not merely to prove Jesus' corporeality, but in the interest of justifying church ritual, which "broke fast" in celebration of the resurrection. R here seeks to harmonize by giving the manifestation a "third" place. Cf. the passage in Lk. 24.

⁴ Lightfoot, *Bibl. Essays*, p. 197 f.

point. What the great leader of the "defenders" has noted should suffice for our present purpose. All that need be added is the reminder that the notion of a surrounding group of disciples, to whom the Evangelist addresses "conversational comments" as he writes, rests upon an exegesis of 21:24 based on mere poetic fancy; while the real "matters which the current tradition had left doubtful, on which the popular mind wished to be further informed" are not such vague and shadowy possibilities as here suggested, but are the actual discrepancies between the Gospels which evoked on the one side the taunts of Celsus and of the predecessors to whom he alludes, on the other the explanations of a Papias regarding the differences of order in the narrative and language in the sayings. More especially we have the harmonizing adjustments of the two traditions of the resurrection which begin to appear after the Church has admitted a third to the number of its gospels, to exemplify the real matters on which the popular mind required to be "further informed."

Such then is the situation presupposed by the Appendix and its connected revision. So far as it is possible to fix a date by means of the internal phenomena of a writing adapting it to the needs of a given period, the internal evidences of the Appendix agree with the external. Both seem to converge to the following conclusion: The Appendix forms part of a revision of the Gospel effected at Rome not far from 150 A. D., in dependence on I Pt. and on the Gospel itself, inclosed as the latter then was under its Asian editorial setting of the three Epistles. The reviser aimed, like the nearly contemporary author of the appendix to Mark, to adjust the Gospel to rival forms of the evangelic tradition, and to secure to it the apostolic authority of the John of Revelation, without detriment to the dominant authority of Peter, by a cautiously suggested identification of "the disciple whom Jesus loved" with the son of Zebedee.

There remains one further line of proof for this dating and motivation of the Appendix—the historic effect. An element of such profound and far-reaching importance as a hitherto unknown, or at least unemployed, gospel, so different in character from those already current in the Church, so superlative in its claims to apostolic authority, could not be interjected into the developing life and strife of the infant faith without some degree of commotion. What traces still remain to us of such effects, and whether they do or do not bear out the theory we have advanced of the origins of the tradition of John in Asia and his authorship of the Gospel, is a problem still to be confronted. It brings us face to face with the struggle toward general adoption of the fourfold gospel, at the end of which the Fourth Gospel attains its position of undisputed canonicity.

CHAPTER IX

THE BATTLE FOR RECOGNITION OF ASIAN TRADITION AT ROME

The period of a full human generation between Justin's very non-committal employment of the Fourth Gospel (*ca.* 152 A. D.) and Irenæus' sweeping assertions of its high authority (*ca.* 186 A. D.) is marked at Rome by a series of controversies which involved to greater or less extent the respective claims of Ephesus and Rome as seats of apostolic tradition. Eusebius is our principal reliance for an account of these, and has the qualifications of a true scholar, though, as we have seen in the case of Revelation, he is not without the prejudices of an ecclesiastic, which sometimes affect his testimony. We must remember, too, that he is professedly writing as an apologist for the apostolic authority and authenticity of the generally received writings of the Church, and for its succession of orthodox teachers and leaders. So far, then, as he reports at all questions which had arisen regarding the apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel, especially if they seemed to be raised by a "very learned ecclesiastic" not otherwise open to the suspicion of heresy, we must not expect him to treat the matter from an altogether unbiased and critico-historical point of view. To his age such questioning, from such a source, could only be intelligible if given a less radical bearing. It is therefore no more than we should expect when we find the chapter of his *History* that actually deals with this controversy¹ entitled only "The *Order* of the Gospels"; although something much more vital is suggested both by the adjoining context

¹ *H. E.* III, xxiv. Περὶ τῆς τάξεως τῶν εὐαγγελίων.

(the preceding chapter is entitled "Narrative concerning John the Apostle"; the succeeding "The Divine Scriptures that are Accepted and those that are not") and by the actual contents of the chapter itself. It appears in fact to be the main object of the chapter to explain how

"one who understands this (viz, that 'John in his Gospel records the deeds of Christ which were performed before the Baptist was cast into prison, but the other three evangelists mention the events which happened after that time') can no longer think that *the Gospels are at variance with one another*, inasmuch as the Gospel according to John contains the first acts of Christ, while the others give an account of the latter part of his life."

In other words, Eusebius, while ostensibly dealing only with "the order of the Gospels" is really offering his own (?) solution of the great bone of contention between "Alogi"¹ and advocates of the fourfold gospel, that "the Gospels are at variance with one another"² (*διαφωνεῖν ἀλλήλοις τὰ εὐαγγέλια*, cf., *δοκεῖ στασιάζειν τὰ εὐαγγέλια* of Apollinaris). In what interest he does this is apparent from the adjoining chapters.

In a previous reference where he aimed to substantiate the claim of Rome to have Peter and Paul as its founders he further indicates the principal source of his information as follows.

"It is confirmed likewise by Caius, a champion of the Church (*ἐκκλησιαστικὸς ἀνὴρ*), who arose under Zephyrinus bishop of

¹ Epiphanius (*Haer.* li) coins this punning epithet for those who rejected the Fourth Gospel because this was the gospel of the Logos-doctrine.

² Cf. the *Muratorianum*, which after its defense of the apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel, adds "And therefore, although varying ideas may be taught in the several books of the evangelists, there is no difference in that which pertains to the faith of believers," etc. See also the accusations exchanged during the Paschal controversy that Quartodeciman or anti-Quartodeciman interpretations "set the Gospels at variance with one another."

Rome.¹ He in a published *Disputation with Proclus*, the leader of the Phrygian heresy,² speaks as follows concerning the places where the sacred corpses of the aforesaid apostles are laid: 'But I can show the trophies of the apostles. For if you will go to the Vatican, or to the Ostian Way you will find the monuments (*τροπαῖα*) of those who laid the foundations of this church.' ”³

Caius is boasting against his "Phrygian" opponent of the apostolic authority of Rome, as against the Montanistic succession, which claimed to descend by successive prophets and prophetesses from the prophets of Acts 15:32; 21:10 and the prophesying daughters of Philip the Evangelist. Proclus had pointed to "their tomb and the tomb of their father" at Hierapolis in Phrygia.⁴ In a later controversy we shall find conversely Polycrates of Ephesus offsetting the *τροπαῖα* of Peter and Paul at Rome by the declaration that

"in Asia also great lights (*στοιχεῖα*) have fallen on sleep, which shall rise again on the day of the Lord's coming. . . . Among these are Philip, one of the twelve apostles [sic], who fell asleep in Hierapolis, and his two aged virgin daughters, and

¹ The date is probably too late. It may have been inferred from the reply written by Hippolytus at about the period of this episcopate (198-217 A. D.). But replies were often written at a period long after the appearance of the work refuted, e. g., Origen's treatise *Against Celsus*. Scholars of all schools admit that Eusebius has greatly postdated the rise of Montanism. On the true dates see below.

² Montanism, so called from its Asian provenance. Its advent in the West was not later than 177 A. D., when Eleutherus, bishop of Rome, under pressure from Praxeas (Tertullian, *Adv. Prax.* i) declared against it. Proclus (called Proculus noster by Tertullian, and classed by him, in *adv. Val.* v, with Justin Martyr, Miltiades and Irenæus, as a successful opponent of heresy) was a leader of one division of the Montanists, Æschines of the other.

³ *H. E.* II, xxv, 6.

⁴ *H. E.* III, xxi, 4. Proclus had said "After him (Silas?) there were four prophetesses the daughters of Philip at Hierapolis in Asia. Their tomb is there and the tomb of their father." See also the extract from Apollinaris of Hierapolis in *H. E.* V, xvii, 3, 4, protesting against the Montanists' enrolment of Agabus, Judas, and Silas, the daughters of Philip, Ammia in Philadelphia, and Quadratus in their prophetic succession.

another daughter who lived in the Holy Spirit and now rests at Ephesus; and moreover John, who was both a witness (*μαρτύς*) and a teacher, who reclined upon the bosom of the Lord, and being a priest wore the sacerdotal plate (*πέταλον*). He fell asleep at Ephesus.”¹

Of this claim of Polycrates, addressed to Victor, the successor of Eleutherus as bishop of Rome (189-199 A. D.), in behalf of Ephesian Quartodeciman practice against the Roman observance of Easter, each side appealing to the monuments of buried apostles, we shall have more to say hereafter. It shows the tradition of the death of the Apostle John at Ephesus to be current in the time of Polycrates (190-200 A. D.), together with certain characterizations which we remember to have met in Hegesippus as applied to James. It is cited in the present connection only to illustrate the competition for apostolic authority exhibited, at a slightly earlier time, in the rival claims of Gaius and Proclus, or else of forerunners of these.

For, only four chapters after that on “the Order of the Gospels,” Eusebius quotes again from Gaius (or Caius), showing something more of the nature of his *Dialogue* or *Disputation*:

“Caius, whose words we quoted above, in the *Disputation* (against Proclus) which is ascribed to him, writes as follows concerning this man (Cerinthus the Docetist): ‘But Cerinthus also by revelations which he pretends were written by a great apostle, brings before us marvellous things which he falsely claims were shown him by angels (Rev. 19:10; 22:8); and he says that after the resurrection the kingdom of Christ will be set up on earth, and that the flesh dwelling in Jerusalem will again be subject to desires and pleasures. And being an enemy of the Scriptures of God,² he asserts with the purpose of deceiving men, that there

¹ Letter of Polycrates of Ephesus to Victor of Rome, cited by Eusebius, *H. E.* V, xxiv.

² Cf. the “variance” of the Johannine writings from the (Synoptic) Gos-

is to be a period of a thousand years for marriage festivals (Rev. 20:1-5; 21:1-9).’”¹

Finally he gives an explicit though all too brief description of the *Disputation* itself, with a definition of its purpose:

“There has reached us also a *Dialogue* of Caius, a very learned man, which was held at Rome under Zephyrinus,² with Proclus, who contended for the Phrygian heresy. In this he curbs the rashness and boldness of his opponents *in setting forth new Scriptures.*”³

What these “new Scriptures” were, besides the book of Revelation contemptuously ascribed in the preceding extract to Cerinthus, Eusebius does not inform his readers, confining himself to the evidence afforded on the “disputed” Epistle to the Hebrews, that Caius, like the earlier Latin fathers generally

“mentions only thirteen epistles of the holy apostle (Paul), not counting that to the Hebrews with the others.”⁴

For Eusebius at least they will have included the “Catholic epistle” which Themiso, one of the Phrygian leaders, had addressed to his adherents “in imitation of the Apostle” as was charged by the orthodox. The “new Scriptures” to which the Alogi objected will have included, however, more important writings than Themiso’s, if we may judge from other references.

Fortunately the list of Hippolytus’ works on the base of pels above referred to (p. 227). In the *Heads against Gaius* (see below) Gaius is quoted as accompanying each of his strictures against Revelation by quotations from the O. T., the Synoptic Gospels, and the Pauline Epistles, showing that these presented a different doctrine.

¹ *H. E.* III, xxviii, 1, 2. Hippolytus in the fifth of his *Heads against Gaius* below cited replies to this stricture with the explanation that the “thousand years” are figurative.

² On this date see above, p. 228, note.

³ *H. E.* VI, xx, 3.

⁴ *Ibid.*

his statue in the Lateran museum, with the recently recovered extracts from Ebed-Jesu in the *Commentary on Revelation* by Dionysius Bar-Salibi, entitled *Heads against Gaius*¹ and the borrowings of Epiphanius from Hippolytus² enable us to determine more exactly the nature of the *Disputation*, and (if Bar-Salibi is to be trusted) the "new Scriptures" it protested against. That the tone and temper of Gaius were anything but conciliatory might be inferred from the extract with which Eusebius favors us on Revelation, declaring it a work of Cerinthus falsely claiming to be written by "a great apostle." The inference is confirmed by the great scholar Dionysius of Alexandria who turns against the Chiliast Nepos in his own time (250 A. D.) the weapon his predecessor had forged against the Montanists. Dionysius does not name this predecessor, and of course would not reproduce any strictures he might find upon the Fourth Gospel, which in his day had been for half a century an integral part of the accepted fourfold gospel. But the description of his predecessor in this field of criticism is not difficult to recognize:

"Some before us have set aside and rejected the book (Revelation) altogether, criticising it chapter by chapter,³ and pronouncing it without sense or argument and maintaining that the title is fraudulent. For they say that it is not the work of John, nor is it a revelation (unveiling) because it is covered thickly and densely by a veil of obscurity. And they affirm that none of the apostles, and none of the saints, nor anyone in the Church is its author,

¹ Published by J. Gwynn in *Hermathena*, vol. VI, 397-418. Dionysius Bar-Salibi was bishop of Amid in 1166-1171 A. D. The five fragments of the work of Hippolytus published by Gwynn are extracts from the Commentary of Bar-Salibi on Revelation, Acts, and the Pauline and Catholic Epistles. Of course nothing appears of any strictures Caius may have brought against the Fourth Gospel. The five extant apply to Rev. 8: 8; 8:12; 9:2 ff.; 9:14 ff., and 20:2 ff.

² *Hær.* li, § 4 sqq. See, for the relation to Hippolytus, Lipsius, *Zur Quellenkritik des Epiphanius*, pp. 233-235.

³ Cf. the method of Gaius in the *Heads*.

but that Cerinthus, who founded the sect which was called after him the Cerinthian, desiring reputable authority for his fiction, prefixed the name. For the doctrine which he taught was this: that the kingdom of Christ will be an earthly one. And as he was himself devoted to the pleasures of the body, and altogether sensual in his nature, he dreamed that that kingdom would consist in those things which he desired, namely in the delights of the belly and of sexual passion; that is to say in eating and drinking and marrying, and in festivals and sacrifices and the slaying of victims, under the guise of which he thought he could indulge his appetites with better grace.”¹

Dionysius proceeds to say that he himself “could not venture to reject the book (Revelation), as many brethren hold it in high esteem.” He thinks, however, that it was written by “some other John” than the Apostle.

Professor Stanton, it is true, is not convinced by the argument of Dr. J. R. Harris² that Gaius rejected the Gospel as well as the Apocalypse of John. According to Bar-Salibi “the heretic Gaius” charged John with being “at variance with the other Gospels” in regard to the course of events at the beginning of Christ’s ministry. Whether the name Gaius is here introduced by an editor, as Harris believes,³ or comes from Bar-Salibi, or from Ebed-Jesu, makes very little difference. Neither is likely to have consulted Eusebius for the characteristic phrase “the Gospels are at variance,” nor for the curious limitation to “the course of events at the beginning of Christ’s ministry” which also corresponds to Eusebius’ answer in the same chapter;⁴ for Eusebius here

¹ Eusebius had already quoted this tirade against Cerinthus in immediate connection with his extract from the *Disputation* of Gaius (*H. E.* III, xxviii). The polemic style of the Roman anti-Montanist is not difficult to recognize.

² *Hermas in Arcadia and other Essays*, 1896.

³ This (in the twelfth century) scandalous opinion is attributed elsewhere in the book only to “a certain heretic.” For the reason see below.

⁴ *H. E.* III, xxiv.

takes no account of the point raised in the Quartodeciman controversy of the conflicting date of the crucifixion, nor of the difference in the number of Passovers referred to, but confines himself to the opening chapters of the Gospel. Another remarkable coincidence is the fact that Epiphanius' charge against the "Alogi" in a part of his work which is admittedly based on the work of Hippolytus, should be in precisely the same form; for here too it is a matter of disagreement of the Fourth with the Synoptic Gospels. Moreover, the reply to the objection of the "heretic" against John's Gospel is introduced in Bar-Salibi with the words "of the holy Hippolytus against him" and similar expressions introduce the replies in the quotations from the *Heads against Gaius*.

But Professor Stanton is still unwilling to admit the identity of the work from which the five *Heads against Gaius* are drawn with the *Defence of the Gospel according to John and the Apocalypse* named in the list of Hippolytus' works in the Lateran inscription. Hippolytus might have written two works, he thinks, of similar bearing, only one of which was named on the statue. It might have been the other book which was directed against Gaius, and in this not the Fourth Gospel be defended, but only the Apocalypse. His principal reasons are the following:

"(1) Gaius cannot have shown a disposition to reject the Gospel according to St. John in his *Dialogue against Proclus*, with which Eusebius was familiar; Eusebius could not have ignored so serious a departure from the beliefs of his own time.

"(2) Dr. Harris lays considerable stress on the facts that in the passage in which Barsalibi records the objection of 'a certain heretic' to John's Gospel, the reply is introduced with the words 'of the holy Hippolytus against him,' and that similar expressions introduce the replies in the quotations from the *Heads against Gaius*. But surely there is nothing in this. It would be natural

that Hippolytus, or Barsalibi in quoting him, should give the objection and the answer in a similar manner, even though a different opponent was in question. It may also be asked why, if Gaius was meant, the expression 'a certain heretic' should have been used, instead of his name being given as elsewhere."¹

The reader need only turn once more to the chapter of Eusebius on "The Order of the Gospels" already cited, to find an immediate answer to both of Stanton's objections to Harris' cogent arguments. Eusebius is very far from "ignoring the serious departure from the beliefs of his own time" revealed in the *Disputation*. As we have seen, he interjects an antidote to the poison for the benefit of any who might be led to "think that the Gospels are at variance with one another," confining himself to "the course of events at the beginning of Christ's ministry." He may even, like Epiphanius, be indebted to "the holy Hippolytus" for his harmonizing explanation, though he does not mention explicitly the *Defence* among Hippolytus' works, but limits his account of the strictures of Gaius against the "new Scriptures" appealed to by the Phrygians to Revelation. But why should Eusebius lend weight to the difficulty, and increase the danger to those whom he warns against the idea that "the Gospels are at variance" by admitting it to have been maintained, if not originated, by the "very learned ecclesiastic" and defender of the faith, the revered presbyter Gaius? The same considerate discretion, with perhaps the example of Eusebius to lend it greater weight, may well account for later writers preferring to attribute the scandalous idea to "a certain heretic" rather than to give the name.² Even Epiphanius, whose principal claim to scholarship was his ability to denounce in seven languages the heresies of Origen, an

¹ *Gospels*, etc., "Additional Note to Ch. V. Gaius' Attitude to the Fourth Gospel," p. 240.

² Cf. Dionysius of Alexandria in the extract above, "Some before us."

incomparably greater scholar and nobler man than himself, of more recent date than Gaius, would certainly *not* have followed a different course. Professor Stanton argues:

“We may infer from Barsalibi that in the *Heads* the name of Gaius occurred repeatedly. If the same work lay before Epiphanius it is strange that this name should not have appeared in his pages. He would not have desired to suppress it; on the contrary he would have felt satisfaction in gibbeting a misbeliever.”¹

By similar reasoning we might expect Dr. Orr to “take satisfaction” in pointing out that John Calvin questioned the authenticity of II Pt., because, forsooth, he takes up the cudgels of Pentateuch apologetic with alacrity against the late W. Robertson Smith. Origen was a dangerous heretic. To mention the eccentricity of Gaius by name would only serve to besmirch the reputation of an honored defender of the faith.

On the other hand, we are informed by other opponents of Montanism of the same period as Gaius, that Montanus himself claimed to fulfil in his own person the promise of the Paraclete (Jn. 14:16, 17, 26), his pretensions on this score being naturally even more obnoxious to the orthodox than his millenarianism. Gaius had, therefore, at least as much motive for denying the apostolic authorship of the Gospel as of the Apocalypse, and the silence of later writers on this point cannot offset the clear evidence that Hippolytus defended *both* against him. For a theory which conjectures another treatise of Hippolytus, not mentioned in the list of his works inscribed upon his monument, but similar in character to the *Defence of the Gospel according to John and the Apocalypse*, having also the form of replies to an opponent and differing from this *Defence* only in the single respect that in the latter case the opponent was a Gaius who “cannot have shown a disposition to reject the Gospel according to

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 240.

St. John, comes quite too near the pattern of a "Hülfs-hypothese." The outcome of the argument, accordingly, can only be to make it more probable than ever that in his *Disputation against Proclus* the real Gaius *did* include the Gospel as well as the Apocalypse of John among the "new Scriptures" which he declared were being brought in by the "boldness and rashness" of his Asian opponents. For this reason Hippolytus felt called upon for a *Defence of the Gospel according to John* as well as of *the Apocalypse*. Indeed, it would seem to be just the argument of Gaius, and none other, which Eusebius is tacitly refuting in the chapter discreetly headed "On the Order of the Gospels," which he inserts between two explicit quotations from the *Disputation of Gaius against Proclus*,¹ next after a chapter on "A Narrative concerning John the Apostle" and next before that on "The Divine Scriptures that are Accepted and those that are not."² Even, however, were this not so, the case remains the same for the opposition to the Fourth Gospel. The Alogi presupposed by the *Muratorianum* and by Irenæus become anonymous, but they do not disappear.

But it is maintained by the "defenders" that we have set the date of Gaius much too early. According to Zahn the real Alogi in distinction from the Gaius whom Hippolytus refutes were already in his time (200-234 A. D.)

"an ancient faction, which had declared war upon all the Johannine writings, but more particularly against the Apocalypse and the Gospel. Not till Epiphanius and Philaster of Brescia do we obtain an explicit account of them."³

¹ *H. E.* II, xxv, 6, and III, xxxi, 4.

² Since the enunciation of the above conjecture I find it independently advanced as "a guess" by Professor Sanday, *Criticism*, etc., p. 69.

³ *Kanongesch.* Bd. I, p. 223. The passages cited are Epiph. *Panar.* li; Philaster, *Haer.* lx. In particular Epiph. § 3 οὔτε τὸ τοῦ Ἰωάννου εὐαγγέλιον δέχονται οὔτε τὴν αὐτοῦ ἀποκάλυψιν; cf. Phil. evangelium κατὰ Ἰωάννου et apocalypsim ipsius non accipiunt. Epiph. § 3 λέγουσι γὰρ μὴ εἶναι αὐτὰ

According to Zahn's view the "very learned ecclesiastic Gaius" would merely have borrowed from an eccentric faction of the Church, which had already been crushingly answered by no less an authority than Irenæus, and whose views had already been condemned in such a quasi-official document as the *Muratorianum*. For as he well says:

"In the Canon of Muratori the discussion on the Gospel and First Epistle of John bears an unmistakably apologetic character, whereas the Apocalypse appears to be less in need of defense; unless indeed the sentence in which it was discussed has reached us in a completely confused condition.¹ A serious and threatening assault upon the Apocalypse can hardly at that time have taken place within the ken of the fragmentist (author of the Canon) in Rome, and her dependent churches. But only a very short time can have elapsed before the Disputation occurred in Rome between the Montanist Proclus and the Catholic Gaius, in which the latter laid down the thesis, among other propositions affecting the canon, that the Apocalypse purporting to be by the Apostle was a work of the heretic Cerinthus."²

If the Eusebian dating of the *Disputation* under Zephyrinus must stand, Gaius' work must indeed sink to this level of second-hand heresy. The real Alogi will be not his followers, but certain unknown predecessors, who a full generation before had awakened the opposition of both the Muratorian fragmentist and of Irenæus. Nameless they will have been, but far from voiceless or without influence, since in spite of this opposition in high quarters they won to themselves such

¹ Ἰωάννου ἀλλὰ Κηρίνου; cf. Phil. ut etiam Cerinthi illius hæretici esse (sc. evangelium) audeant dicere, (et) apocalypsim ipsius itidem non beati Joannis evangelistæ et apostoli, sed Cerinthi hæretici. Philaster rests on the same source as Epiphanius.

¹ An allusion to his own conjecture that the words *et Petri* in the sentence "We receive the Apocalypse of John and of Peter only" may be interpolated.

² *Kanongesch.* I, p. 222.

an adherent as Gaius, who adopts even their most incredible tenet, the ascription of Revelation (!) to the Docetist Cerinthus. They even called forth at least one *Defence of the Gospel according to John and the Apocalypse* from the great scholar Hippolytus some fifty years after their objections had been raised.

To ourselves such a conception of events cannot but seem less probable than that defended by scholars so opposite in tendency as Salmon and Schwartz that "the Alogi of Epiphanius are Gaius and nobody else." Unless the expressions of Eusebius in describing the contents of the *Disputation* are most deceptive, as well as the coincidence of his phraseology in the chapter on "The Order of the Gospels" with those of Epiphanius and Bar-Salibi, the real nucleus of opposition to the Asian canon which purported to be by "a great apostle," if not its earliest germ, was the *Disputation* of Gaius against Proclus. In that case of course the *Disputation* must be dated earlier than Irenæus, earlier than the *Muratorianum*, in all probability *ca.* 180 A. D.

Either way it was the advent of Montanism, the Phrygian heresy, to Rome, which aroused aggressive opposition to their "new Scriptures;" and concerning the date of the appearance of Montanism some further evidence is fortunately available. But we must first consider the *Muratorianum*.

The *Muratorianum* contains but one clear indication of its date, the reference to the *Shepherd* of Hermas as having been

"written quite recently in our own times (nuperrime temporibus nostris) in the city of Rome by Hermas, while his brother Pius occupied the seat of Bishop of the church of Rome" (130-155 A. D.).

It seems much like reasoning in a circle to argue that *because* the Alogi cannot have appeared so early as 170-180 A. D., and the *Muratorianum* opposes them, *therefore* it must be

put as late as 200-210 A. D.¹ Moreover, while the Leucian *Acts of John* (170? A. D.) may possibly show an indirect influence we are by no means forced to date the *Muratorianum* so late as 200-210 A. D. by the mere fact that it refers to "the founder of the Kataphrygians of Asia," apparently among the heretics,² nor by the (perhaps) undisputed position it accords to Revelation. The battle for Revelation had been won long since by Papias, Justin, and Melito of Sardis.³ Its "less need of defense" than the Gospel is rather a proof that we have not yet come to the long period of questioning marked by Hippolytus' treatise on that subject, called forth by the reaction against Montanistic "prophecy." The extrusion of the "Kataphrygians" was the work of Eleutherus (174-189 A. D.) under whom Irenæus wrote his work *Against Heresies* (186-189); but the *Muratorianum* is not affected by the epoch-making representations of Irenæus concerning the residence and death of John in Asia. On the contrary, the *Muratorianum*, as we have seen, makes the stay of John in Patmos an episode of his career earlier than the coming of Paul to Ephesus. The writing of the Gospel, on the other hand, is related in manifest dependence on Jn. 21:24 as a joint work of the entire apostolic college (cohortantibus condiscipulis et episcopis suis . . . revelatum Andreae ex apostolis ut recogniscentibus cunctis, etc.). It is represented as "fourth" and last of the Gospels and as settling the debated question of "order" (quæ vidimus . . . et manus nostræ palpaverunt . . . per ordinem profetetur). In the absence of the slightest suggestion of a general migration of the apostles and disciples to Asia à la Irenæus we have no excuse for understanding the scene to be other than

¹ Th. Zahn in Hauck's *Realencyklopädie*, s. v. "Kanon Muratori," p. 798.

² The fragment breaks off with Assianom catafrycum constituto-rem . . . the middle word being a mere mistranslation of τῶν κατὰ Φρύγας. It probably went on to condemn Montanus.

³ On Melito's work *On the Revelation of John*, see below.

Jerusalem, the accepted seat of "the apostles and elders" throughout the second century. A demurrer may therefore be reasonably interposed to dates later than 185 A. D. for the *Muratorianum*, even while we decline to fix it more nearly than in the period of the conflict at Rome over Asian claims to apostolic authority, and rest our case for the course of events on other evidence.

Whether then the Alogi took their rise from Gaius or conversely, there is no dispute that opposition to the Fourth Gospel appears first at Rome about 170-180 A. D. as an outgrowth of resistance to the "Phrygians."¹ On this point the reference of Irenæus (186 A. D.) is decisive:

"These things being so (the correspondence of the four Gospels to the four winds, four elements, four cherubim, etc.) all who destroy the form of the (fourfold) Gospel are vain, unlearned, and also audacious, those (I mean) who represent the aspects of the Gospel as being either more in number than aforesaid or on the other hand fewer. . . . Others again (the Alogi; he has previously spoken of Marcion and those who admit fewer than four gospels), that they may set at nought the gift of the Spirit, which in the latter times has been poured out by the good pleasure of the Father upon the human race, do not admit that aspect presented by John's Gospel, in which the Lord promised that he would send the Paraclete² but set aside together both the Gospel and the prophetic Spirit. Wretched men indeed, who will have it that there are pseudo-prophets, forsooth, but who repudiate the gift of prophecy from the Church (read: infelices vere qui pseudopphetas quidem esse volunt, propheticam vero gratiam repellunt ab ecclesia); acting like those who, on account of such as come in hyprocrisy hold aloof from the communion of the brethren. We should conclude, further, that these (Alogi) would

¹ Harnack (*Chron.*, p. 379) dates the appearance of the Alogi at Rome "not much later than 165." He thinks the *beginnings* of opposition to the Johannine writings on the part of the orthodox at Rome cannot have been so late as 175-180.

² See above p. 235.

not admit the Apostle Paul either, since in his Epistle to the Corinthians he speaks expressly of prophetic gifts, and recognizes men *and women* prophesying in the Church. Sinning therefore in all these particulars against the Spirit of God, they (the Alogi) fall into the unpardonable sin. Those who are from Valentinus, on the contrary, being altogether reckless, while putting forth their own compositions, boast that they possess more gospels than there really are."¹

How comes it that Irenæus in the midst of all this turmoil in Rome about the Montanists and their claims to exercise the spirit of prophecy presents no single reference in all his voluminous writings to the "heresy" save this one, in which he manifestly sympathizes much more nearly with the Phrygians than with their opponents?² To understand this we must look back for a moment at the origin of the sect and the occasion of its prominence in Rome.

Modern authorities are agreed in recognizing that Eusebius has dated the origin of Montanism too late. His date (172 A. D.) appears to be nothing more than a superficial inference from that of the writing of Apollinaris of Hierapolis against the heresy (171 A. D.). On the contrary, the death of Maximilla, last of the Montanistic prophetic succession, which after Montanus had been continued by Priscilla, is securely fixed in the year 179. The Roman bishop Soter, who died in 174, is said to have written against the Montanists,³ and two separate passages of Epiphanius, who though

¹ *Haer.* III, xi, 9.

² The absence of the names connected with the Montanist controversy at Rome from the list of Hippolytus' 32 heretics in the treatise *Against all Heresies*, which professed to reproduce the lectures of Irenæus, so impressed Lipsius that he even carried back the treatise to the time of Victor (188-199 A. D.). Irenæus of course *could* not include Praxeas or Gaius, and *would* not include Proclus or others on the Asian side. The treatise of Hippolytus belongs in the earlier years of Zephyrinus (Salmon, *Dict. Chr. Biogr.* III, p. 94).

³ The statement of Prædestinatus [*Haer.* xxvi (86)] to this effect has been disputed; but see Harnack, *Chron.*, p. 369.

a blunderer himself borrows from good authorities, especially from Hippolytus, give coincidentally the year 156-157 A. D. for the appearance of the movement in Asia.¹ Here it awakened intense opposition among the conservative leaders of the Church, not because of heretical opinion, for its teachings were admittedly orthodox, or even reactionary in what would to-day be called their millenarian evangelicalism. The bishops of Asia were scandalized by the mantic excesses of those who professed to possess "the prophetic Spirit," and especially by the prominence given to the two "prophetesses" Priscilla and Maximilla, suspecting, not without reason, the reappearance in Christian guise of the characteristic religious frenzy of Phrygian heathenism. Miltiades (161-169 A. D.) wrote against them his tract *Περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν προφήτην ἐν ἐκστάσει λαλεῖν* ("That a prophet ought not to speak in ecstasy"). Bishops Zoticus of Comana and Julian of Apamea, or Ælius Publius Julius of Debelum and Sotas of Anchialus, as Serapion of Antioch (ca. 200 A. D.) gives the names, undertook "to cast the demon out of Priscilla" (Maximilla),² but were prevented by the followers of Themiso,

¹ The passages are *Haer.* xlviii, 1 and 2. On the combinations by which Zahn, Harnack and Bonwetsch come to agreement on the year 156-157 A. D. for Montanus see Zahn, *Forsch.* v. 25 ff., Harnack, *Chron.*, 358 ff., and Hauck, *Realencykl. s. v.* "Montanismus." The passage *Haer.* li, 33, contains some blunder, but is probably taken from Hippolytus. Salmon (*Dict. of Chr. Biogr. s. v.* "Montanus," p. 937, note) reasonably conjectures "birth" instead of "ascension," making it read in substance "John, writing 93 years after our Lord's birth (cf. Irenæus on the date of Revelation) had foretold this (destruction of the church in Thyatira), what he says about the woman Jezebel being a prediction of the Montanist prophetess. But now, after 112 years there is again a church in Thyatira which by God's help will increase." The date $93 + 112 = 205$ A. D. is that to which Hippolytus' *Defence of the Gospel and Apocalypse of John* may reasonably be assigned (see above, p. 241, note 2). Epiphanius himself was writing in 375 A. D. so that he is clearly borrowing.

² So Serapion of Antioch (ca. 200 A. D.) *ap.* Eusebius, *H. E.* V, xix, 3. According to Apollonius of Ephesus (196-197 A. D., *ibid.* V, xviii, 13) the attempt was made against *Maximilla* by Zoticus of Comana and Julian of

then the head (or "steward") of the sect, who naturally resented this insult to their "prophetess." The effort to suppress them did not stop with this failure. The anonymous anti-Montanist quoted by Eusebius (Rhodon? *ca.* 192 A. D.) declares that:

"The faithful in Asia met often in many places throughout Asia to consider this matter, and examined the novel utterances, and pronounced them profane, and rejected the heresy, and thus these persons were expelled from the Church and debarred from communion."¹

Even the common suffering of martyrdom could not reconcile the estrangement. A little further on the same writer reported:

"When those called to martyrdom from the Church for the truth of the faith have met with any of the so-called martyrs of the Phrygian heresy, they have separated from them, and died without any fellowship with them, because they did not wish to give their assent to the spirit of Montanus and the women. And that this is true and took place in our own time in Apamea on the Mæander, among those who suffered martyrdom with Gaius and Alexander of Eumenia, is well known."²

The Montanists on their part complained bitterly of this treatment. One of their writers named Asterius Urbanus gave as a word of "the Spirit" uttered through Maximilla:

"I am driven away from the sheep like a wolf. I am not a wolf. I am word and spirit and power."³

The aggrieved parties were not content to remain under the ban without protest. Rome had intervened at Corinth two generations before, and to Rome they appealed. Ter-Apamea (*H. E.* V, xvi, 17). The similarity of the names Zoticus and Sotas, Julius and Julianus, leads authorities such as Lightfoot (*Ignatius*, II, 111) and Harnack (*Chron.*, p. 366) to identify the two attempts.

¹ *H. E.* V, xvi, 10.

² *Ibid.* V, xvi, 22.

³ *Ibid.*

tullian, who himself became later a convert to Montanism, reports that Praxeas, his opponent, came to Rome from Asia

“inflated with the pride of confessorship (martyrdom) simply and solely because he had to bear for a short time the annoyance of a prison. . . . For after the bishop of Rome¹ had acknowledged the prophetic gifts of Montanus, Prisca and Maximilla, and in consequence of the acknowledgment had bestowed his peace on the churches of Asia and Phrygia, he (Praxeas), by importunately urging false accusations against the prophets themselves and their churches, and insisting on the authority of the bishop’s predecessors in the see,² compelled him to recall the pacific letter which he had issued, as well as to desist from his purpose of acknowledging the said gift.”³

Who, then, had come before Praxeas to win from Eleutherus the “pacific letter” by which he would have “bestowed his peace” on the warring churches of Asia?

We are tempted to think of Proclus himself as the one who had so eloquently and persuasively pleaded the cause of the outraged Montanists before Eleutherus; for Tertullian refers to him in connection with Justin, Miltiades, and Irenæus as not only men of an earlier time than his own,⁴ but “contemporary with the (Valentinian) heresiarchs themselves.” Among these authors of “carefully written volumes” against the Valentinians “our own Proculus” was “the model of chaste old age and Christian eloquence.”⁵ But whether Proclus had part in the appeal or not, we have already learned of one who came as bearer of a letter from the martyrs of Lyons entreating Eleutherus to “restore peace to the churches.” The sentiments of Irenæus may be guessed by

¹ Eleutherus; see Harnack, *Chron.*, p. 375.

² Soter (*ob.* 174 A. D.) had written against the Montanists according to Prædestinatus. See above, p. 241, note 3.

³ *Adv. Prax.* i.

⁴ The treatise in question seems to be written in 200-207 A. D.

⁵ *Adv. Val.* v.

what he writes under Eleutherus (before the reversal of his decision?) concerning "those wretched men who . . . set at nought the gift of the Spirit poured out in the latter times by the good pleasure of the Father . . . who will have it that there are pseudo-prophets, forsooth, but who repudiate the gift of prophecy from the Church." Irenaeus, we remember, defended specifically the prophesying of *women* by the example of Paul in I Cor. 11:5.

A factor in the crisis, perhaps the decisive factor in carrying Eleutherus so far toward a nullification of the ban pronounced by the bishops of Asia, must have been the letter addressed to him from prison by the martyrs of Lyons in Gaul, "negotiating for the peace of the churches." The relations of the Gallican Church to the Asian were of the closest; more than one of the most eminent of these martyrs themselves being immigrants from Phrygia and Asia. They wrote, says Eusebius,

"to the brethren throughout Asia and Phrygia, and also to Eleutherus, who was then bishop of Rome, negotiating for the peace of the churches."¹

The bearer of the letter, whose date can be fixed with certainty in 178-179 A. D., was Irenæus, whom the writers recommended as their "brother and comrade" and a "presbyter of the church," hinting very broadly that a similar position at Rome, if open, would be well suited to his capacity.

Eusebius, it is true, would not have referred to the judgment of the Gallican martyrs on the Montanistic schism as both "prudent and most *orthodox*," if it had not condemned the excesses of the new prophetism, so that Pearson and others who think they asked reversal of the ban pronounced in Asia clearly exaggerate. On the other hand, the altogether sympathetic attitude of Irenæus toward the recent mani-

¹ *H. E. V.*, iii, 4.

festations of "the gift of the Spirit," his severe denunciation of the "wretched men who . . . set aside the gift of prophecy from the Church," and his defense of the exercise of prophetic gifts by both men *and women*, would be inexplicable if the object of his mission had been hostile to the Montanists. Indeed, Tertullian's grouping of him some twenty years after with Justin and "our own Proculus" as worthy of gratitude for their defense of the Church against the Valentinians, would be passing strange if Irenæus had taken the part of Praxeas. There remains but a single possibility. It is that which all our knowledge of Irenæus and of the Gallican churches which he represented would suggest. It is the course which we find him repeating in a new clash with Asia under Victor, the successor of Eleutherus, and for which Eusebius commends him as well named (Irenæus="man of peace"). The policy counseled by the Gallican martyrs and by Irenæus their representative *was a mediating one*. Its watchwords were "prudence" and "peace." Doubtless Tertullian exaggerates the favorableness of the verdict Eleutherus would have pronounced had not Praxeas intervened with his detestable intolerance; but Eusebius and Tertullian are at one as to its pacific aim, and the attitude of Irenæus both in relation to "the prophetic gift" and later in the paschal controversy proves how keenly alive he was to the necessity of toleration and catholicity in the face of the inroads of Gnosticism.

CHAPTER X

IRENÆUS THE MEDIATOR AND THE FOURFOLD GOSPEL

The course of events in the matter of "the Phrygian heresy" throws light upon that in another great controversy which agitated the churches of Asia during the same period (150-200 A. D.) and came to involve the respective claims of Asia and Rome to apostolic authority, and in the end those of the Gospel ascribed to John. Once more Irenæus comes to the front, this time no longer as representing the church of Lyons alone, but on his own authority. Still, however, it is the same catholic policy which he pursues, a policy illustrated in the mean time in still a third instance by his letter of remonstrance to the Quartodeciman Blastus, who was "disturbing the sound ordinance of the church at Rome." This was entitled *On Schism*. The very title suggests a view of the dominant motive and attitude of Irenæus which will be of value in our judgment of his testimony.

Both before, and during, and after the turmoil about "the prophetic spirit" and its manifestations, the churches of Asia were torn by disputes about their observance of Passover coincidentally with the Jews on the fourteenth Nisan, those who followed this practice being designated from it Quartodecimans;¹ whereas the churches of the west, as well as those everywhere less affected by inheritance from the Synagogue, merely heightened the weekly observance of the Lord's day at the Easter season. As the fourteenth Nisan might fall on any day of the week, the fast by which the

¹ I. e., "observers of the Fourteenth."

Lord's death was commemorated being broken at dawn of the fifteenth by a "breaking of bread" commemorative of the resurrection, it not infrequently happened that while the church in one place was fasting, in another it was feasting. To the Oriental mind, and in fact the liturgical spirit of the age in general, it was a crying scandal that some Christians might even be engaged in Easter rejoicings on Good Friday itself. Roman practice is unmistakably set forth in the Roman Gospel of Mark, whose carefully marked divisions of time in the section on the Passion and Resurrection¹ are adapted to the vigil, fast, and resurrection rejoicings of this church. Mark determines Synoptic tradition, committing it to the *fifteenth* Nisan as date of the crucifixion. But Asia, as we might expect, followed another practice. For it was from Ephesus that Paul himself had written to the Corinthians exhorting a worthy celebration on Nisan 14th of "Christ our Passover sacrificed for us" and on Nisan 16th, the legal day of "Firstfruits" a remembrance of Christ's being raised "the third day" the "firstfruits" of them that slept."² Asia became the primal seat of Quartodecimanism, claiming to have practised the observance of the day since the times of the apostles. In the year 154 came the first clash of which we have record. The same Irenæus whom we have seen but now expostulating with Blastus for the promotion of schism by his advocacy of Quartodeciman practice at Rome,³ informs us of the circumstances in a letter of expostulation addressed to Victor then bishop of Rome,

"admonishing him that he should not cut off whole churches

¹ Mk. 14:12, 17, 30-72; 15:1, 25, 33, 34 ff., 42; 16: 2, 9. See Bacon, *Beginnings of Gospel Story*, 1909, on these passages.

² I Cor. 5: 6-8; 15: 20.

³ It is pseudo-Tertullian (Hippolytus?) who in his treatise *Against all Heresies* (Chapter VIII) informs us of the nature of Blastus' schism. Pacianus (*Epist. ad Sempron.* ii) adds that he was a Montanist also, which agrees with the general practice of the Montanists of Asia.

of God for observing the tradition of an ancient custom. For the controversy is not only concerning the day, but also concerning the very manner of the fast. For some think they should fast one day, others two, yet others more.¹ Some moreover count their day as consisting of forty hours day and night.² And this variety in its observance has not originated in our time, but long before in that of our ancestors. It is likely that they did not hold to strict accuracy, and thus formed a custom for their posterity according to their own simplicity and peculiar mode. Yet all of these lived none the less in peace, and we also (in Gaul) live in peace with one another; and the disagreement in regard to the fast confirms the agreement in the faith.

“Among these (catholic spirits) were the presbyters before Soter, who presided over the church which thou now rulest. We mean Anicetus, and Pius, and Hyginus, and Telesphorus, and Xystus. They neither observed it (the fast of 14th Nisan) themselves, nor did they permit those after them to do so. And yet, though not observing it, they were none the less at peace with those who came to them from the parishes in which it was observed; although this observance was more opposed to those who did not observe it. But none were ever cast out on account of this form; but the presbyters before thee who did not observe it sent the eucharist (to be used at breaking of the fast) to those of other parishes who observed it. And when the blessed Polycarp was at Rome in the time of Anicetus, and they disagreed a little about certain other things, they immediately made peace with one another, not caring to quarrel over this matter. For neither could Anicetus persuade Polycarp not to observe what he had always observed with John the disciple of our Lord, and the other apostles

¹ According to the varying ideas of the moment of the resurrection.

² Thus the Syriac *Didaskalia* counts the period between the darkness from the sixth to the ninth hour (Mk. 15:33-39) as a night, and the renewed light from the ninth to the twelfth hour, when “the sun shone out and it was found to be the ninth hour, and the Jews rejoiced” (*Ev. Petri*), as an additional day. This with the ensuing 15th Nisan until dawn of the day of “Firstfruits” made a total of 40 hours and at the same time covered the prophecy about rising “after three days.”

with whom he had associated; neither could Polycarp persuade Anicetus to observe it.”¹

We encounter here for the first time the celebrated assertion of Irenæus regarding the personal relations of Polycarp with John the disciple of our Lord and the other apostles “with whom he had associated” which subsequently played so momentous a part, becoming from this time onward the principal reliance of “defenders.”

Had Irenæus, then, any grounds for the assertion that Polycarp had observed the Quartodeciman fast “with John and other apostles,” besides such as Chiliasts like Papias, Justin, and Melito were urging on behalf of the authenticity of Revelation, or Quartodecimans like Blastus and Montanists like Proclus were urging on behalf of the whole *Instrumentum Johanneum* and the apostolic succession in Asia? We are not favorably disposed by Irenæus’ pretensions in regard to Papias, whom in spite of that author’s own testimony, carefully gone over by Eusebius, he insists on making “a man of the earliest times, a hearer of John,” confusing for the purpose the Jerusalem Elder of that name, whose *παράδοσεις* were reported by Papias at second hand, with “John the disciple of the Lord.” Moreover the phraseology here and elsewhere employed by Irenæus, and the reference to “the other apostles” make it apparent that the foreground of his mind is occupied, as usual, by the group of “apostles, elders, and disciples of the Lord” whom he imagines to be the immediate informants of Papias, and whom he also identifies (in this agreeing with the *Muratorianum*) with the group of witnesses who vouch for the fourth evangelist in Jn. 21:24. Nevertheless there are reasons, presently to be examined, for thinking that Irenæus was not exclusively dependent upon these literary data, but had a real contribution of his own to make to the plea of his

¹ *Ep. to Victor*, ap. Eusebius, *H. E.* V, xxiv, 12-17.

Montanist allies in the common warfare against Valentinian *gnosis*. We have seen how these were seeking to maintain the claims of Asia and its succession against the claims of Rome. Proclus could point to the monument of Philip "the apostle" and his four daughters at Hierapolis. Polycrates of Ephesus, champion of the Asian Quartodecimans, if he could not yet point, like Dionysius of Alexandria, to actual "monuments" of John in Ephesus, could at least declare that he "fell asleep" there. Irenæus, however, declared that he could himself remember from his boyhood discourses of Polycarp in which the old man had related

"his intercourse with John and with the others who had seen the Lord, and concerning his miracles and his teaching, having received them from eyewitnesses of the Word of life (Lk. 1:2; I Jn. 1:1). Polycarp related all things in harmony with the Scriptures."¹

This statement to the Valentinian Florinus is introduced by a reference to the scenes of their common boyhood in Asia, and an explanation that,

"what boys learn, growing with their mind becomes joined to it; so that I am able to describe the very place in which the blessed Polycarp sat as he discoursed, and his goings out and his comings in, and the manner of his life and his physical appearance, and his discourses to the people."²

Irenæus, then, had one point of definite individual knowledge of his own recollection. He had been a "growing" boy at the time to which he refers; not a "disciple" of Polycarp, nor in "intimate relations" with him, but simply able to recall through the exceptional freshness of boyhood recollections the external circumstances attending the teaching of "the father of the Christians"³ of Asia, and the striking elements

¹ *Ep. to Florinus*, ap. Eusebius, *H. E.* V, xx.

² *Ibid.*

³ So called in the *Martyrdom*, or *Epistle of the Smyrnæans*, xii, 2.

of "his discourses *to the people*," namely, "the miracles of the Lord and his teachings" which Polycarp had heard from eye-witnesses. This boyhood memory of Irenæus was of itself a unique distinction. To say to a Valentinian gnostic like Florinus that Polycarp's teaching was altogether "in harmony with the Scriptures," and that the old man would have thrown up his hands in horror at the kind of doctrine Florinus was now following adds nothing material; for no more personal intercourse with Polycarp than the above is required by it. On the contrary, the effort of Irenæus to prove to Florinus that he can recall the general outward situation of Polycarp's discourses "to the people" goes to show his inability to point in his own case to those closer relations which he intimates that Florinus, an older lad, was at the time aspiring to. But Irenæus counted himself a providential link in the succession of the apostolic tradition of the Church, because he could remember the discourses of Polycarp "to the people," and the appearance of the old man as he "sat and discoursed," and knew of his own recollection that Polycarp had referred to "John" and to discourses and miracles of the Lord of which the said "John" was an eye (?) witness.

Besides this explicit reference in the Epistle to Florinus Irenæus gave in his work *Against Heresies* another equivalent reference to this relation of Polycarp to the apostles as follows:

"But Polycarp also was not only instructed by apostles, and acquainted with many that had seen Christ, but was also *appointed by apostles in Asia bishop of the church in Smyrna*. We too saw him in our early youth; for he lived a long time, and died when a very old man a glorious and most illustrious martyr's death, having always taught the things which he had learned from the apostles, which the Church also hands down, and which alone are true. To these things *all the Asiatic churches testify*,

as do also those who down to the present time have succeeded Polycarp, who was a much more trustworthy and certain witness of the truth than Valentinus and Marcion and the rest of the heretics. He also was in Rome in the time of Anicetus and caused many to turn away from the above-mentioned heretics to the Church of God, proclaiming that he had received from the apostles this one and only system of truth which has been transmitted by the Church.”¹

We must not underestimate the extraordinary capacity of the age for creating “personal disciples of the apostles” (*γνωρίμοι τῶν ἀποστόλων*), nor the special genius of Irenæus for discovering such in writers who themselves disclaim the honor. The next centuries actually proclaim Hippolytus, Irenæus’ own pupil, a *γνώριμος τῶν ἀποστόλων*, and Irenæus not only dubs Papias such in virtue of his “traditions of John” (*παραδόσεις τοῦ Ἰωάννου*), but writes as follows concerning Clement of Rome, whose epistle is as remote from the claim of personal relations with the apostles as Polycarp’s own:

“In the third place from the apostles (*i. e.*, after Linus and Anencletus) Clement received the episcopate. He had seen and conversed with the blessed apostles, and their preaching was still sounding in his ears, and their tradition was still before his eyes. Nor was he alone in this, for many who had been taught by the apostles yet survived.”²

The palpable exaggeration italicized in the former extract representing Polycarp as “appointed by apostles in Asia bishop of the church in Smyrna,” for which Irenæus invokes the authority of “all the churches of Asia,” is evidence how far this manufacture of links of apostolic succession could be carried in the process of disputes wherein each party appealed to “tradition handed down from the apostles.” The fact

¹ Irenæus, *Haer.* III, iii, 4, quoted by Eusebius, *H. E.* IV, xiv, 3.

² *Haer.* III, iii, 3, quoted by Eusebius, *H. E.* V, vi, 2.

that Papias had reported "traditions of John" seems to have been enough in his case; the fact that Clement had exhorted the Corinthians to set before their eyes as "examples which belong to our generation"—*i. e.*, in contrast with Abel, Joseph, Moses, and David—"the good apostles," Peter and Paul¹ would seem to have been sufficient in his case.² Possibly Polycarp's similar exhortation to the Philippians to study the epistles of the "blessed and glorious Paul" and to "turn from the false teachings . . . to the word which was handed down to us from the beginning," coupled with his appearance at Rome in defense of the "apostolic" practice of Asia in the matter of the Fast, might alone account for the ascription to him of "apostolicity"³ in the age when one must be apostolic or nothing. But the circumstantial statement of Irenæus so many times repeated that he could himself remember Polycarp's claim to "intercourse with John and with the others who had seen the Lord" does not impress the impartial critic as mere exaggeration of a recollection long cherished and constantly appealed to as a source of doctrinal authority. Irenæus clearly does remember having heard Polycarp refer to "John and the others who had seen the Lord" as men with whom he had himself had intercourse. And for Irenæus, bent upon vindicating the apostolic standing of Asia, and persuaded that Papias was a reporter not at second, but at first hand of the "Elders and disciples of the Lord," this was amply sufficient to cover the case of Polycarp also. He, as well as Papias, had reported "traditions of John," and for Irenæus there is but one John. The further question of the Where? would never occur to him. If, however, we turn to the *Life of Polycarp*, probably written

¹ *Ad. Cor. v.*

² Or did Irenæus also have his eye upon Phil. 4:3?

³ In the *Martyrdom* he is in fact called an "apostolic teacher" (*Ep. Smyrn. xvi, 2*).

by Pionius, at all events compiled upon traditions traceable to a period not long after the martyrdom,¹ we find it reported that Polycarp had been brought as a slave in his youth from "the East" (*i. e.*, Palestine; *cf.* Melito) and manumitted in Asia. Moreover, the author of the *Vita*, though anxious to endow the Smyrnæan succession with the highest apostolic authority, has no thought whatever of any connection with John. *Paul*, and only Paul, is the fountain head. Nor is Polycarp brought into direct contact even with Paul. His immediate predecessor in the see is Boukolos, between whom and Strataeas, the appointee of Paul, several others intervene of names unknown. Polycarp, so far from having been "appointed by apostles bishop of the church in Smyrna" was according to Pionius "chosen by the church and its clergy, and installed in his office by the neighboring bishops." This indigenous tradition, so much more modest than the Irenæan, so much more in accord with the witness of the earlier literature, is followed by several later writers in spite of Irenæus. A genuinely historical criticism cannot but give it the preference.

We know at all events from the *Martyrdom* that Polycarp was born in 69 A. D. The references recalled by Irenæus among his boyhood memories will have been, accordingly, references to Polycarp's own boyhood in Syria, where Jerusalem was then still the seat of "Elders and witnesses and disciples of the Lord." These Jewish Christians among other distinctive practices will unquestionably have maintained the observance of the fourteenth Nisan as "the new passover of the Lord"; and this may well account for Irenæus' assertion. On the other hand, the very fact that Irenæus habitually refers to Polycarp's "John" not by him-

¹ Corssen ("Die *Vita Polycarpi*," *Zts. f. nt. Wiss.* V, 4, 1904, pp. 266-302) endeavors to prove this the actual work of Pionius. At least it employs Smyrnæan tradition independent of Irenæus.

self, but in company with a group of "disciples (or apostles) and Elders" indicates that this group is the same to which Papias refers as containing at the time of his inquiries but two surviving disciples or apostles, "Aristion and the Elder John"; so that the references themselves tend to show that the John in question is the Elder of that name in Jerusalem who presided until 117 A. D. over the group of "Elders," "witnesses" and "teachers."

But the Gallic ally of Asian rights to the exercise of the prophetic gift and to the observance of ancient customs inherited from apostolic times was not left to labor alone in his effort to strengthen Asia's claim to apostolic tradition by weaving in the name of "John." His claims do not indeed seem to have had the support he alleges of "all the churches of Asia," as we have just seen; yet the Asian churches were not averse to aid even from outside sources. The letter of protest addressed by Polycrates of Ephesus and a synod of Asian bishops to Victor and the Church of Rome in 191-192 A. D., follows the example of Proclus in citing the great names of the Asian succession as then appealed to against the pretensions of Rome:

"We observe the exact day (of the crucifixion); neither adding nor taking away.¹ For in Asia, too, great lights have fallen asleep, which shall rise again on the day of the Lord's coming, when he shall come with glory from heaven, and shall seek out all the saints. Among these are Philip, one of the twelve apostles [sic], who fell asleep in Hierapolis; and his two aged virgin daughters, and another daughter who lived in the Holy Spirit and now rests at Ephesus; and moreover John who was 'both a witness and a teacher,' who reclined upon the bosom of the Lord, and, being a priest wore the sacerdotal plate (*πέταλον*). He fell asleep at Ephesus. And Polycarp in Smyrna, who was a bishop and martyr; and Thraseas, bishop and martyr from Eumenia, who

¹ As anti-Quartodecimans were obliged to do to make the fast fall on Good Friday and Easter on the Lord's day.

fell asleep in Smyrna. Why need I mention the bishop and martyr Sagaris, who fell asleep in Laodicea, or the blessed Papius, or Melito, the eunuch who lived altogether in the Holy Spirit, and who lies in Sardis awaiting the episcopate from heaven, when he shall rise from the dead? All these observed the fourteenth day of the passover, according to the Gospel, deviating in no respect, but following the rule of faith. And I also Polycrates the least of you all, do according to the tradition of my relatives, some of whom I have closely followed, for seven of my relatives were bishops; and I am the eighth. And my relatives always observed the day when the people (*i. e.*, the Jews) put away the leaven. I, therefore, brethren, who have lived sixty-five years in the Lord, and have met with the brethren throughout the world, and have gone through every Holy Scripture am not scared by terrifying words. For those greater than I have said 'We ought to obey God rather than man' (Acts 5: 29)."¹

Here in the last decade of the second century we find all elements of the Johannine tradition commingled, though even now traceable to some extent by their phraseology to their Palestinian or Asian sources as the case may be. But we interest ourselves first of all in the champions of Quarto-deciman practice whom Polycrates refers to as of a past generation, notably Melito of Sardis, whose two books on *The Passover* written under the proconsulship of Sergius (*var.* Servilius) Paulus prove that at that time (167-168 A. D.) the subject was already in debate. In fact the work of Clement of Alexandria on the same subject was expressly written "on occasion of" Melito's, if not in answer to it. But among the very numerous works of this learned bishop, who on occasion of a journey to "the East" (Palestine) made scholarly inquiry into the canon of the Old Testament² was one whose title Eusebius gives as *The Apocalypse of*

¹ *Ep. of Polycrates to Victor ap.* Eusebius, *H. E.* V, xxiv.

² See the extract from Melitos' preface to his work called *Extracts* (ἐκλογαί) in Eusebius, *H. E.* IV, xxiv, 12-14.

John. It was doubtless called out by the Montanist movement, for it had a companion *On Prophecy*; but we may be very sure that it did not take the radical course of Gaius or of Dionysius against the millenarian fanatics, otherwise we should have heard something of it from Eusebius, if not from his predecessors in opposition to the book. On the contrary, Melito, like his predecessors Papias and Justin, must have maintained at least the ἀξιόπιστον of Revelation, and thus contributed to the belief in John's residence in Asia.

Another of the "great lights" of Asia who took part, it would seem, in the Quartodeciman controversy at Laodicea in 164-167 A. D., although not mentioned by Polycrates, was Claudius Apollinaris (or Apollinarios) of Hierapolis, a city in full view across the valley from Laodicea. Drummond¹ is certainly right in resisting the attempt of some opponents of the Johannine authorship to make out that Apollinaris was at variance in this respect with the rest of Asia and with his own predecessors in the see of Hierapolis, where Polycrates points to Philip "one of the twelve apostles" as the first of his witnesses for Quartodeciman observance. The whole tenor of Apollinaris' denunciation of those who by ignorantly following what they understand as Synoptic tradition bring about discord in the Church and a practice inconsistent with the law (of Moses), implies a pronouncedly Quartodeciman position, as we should expect from the occupant of his see. No less characteristic is the second of the two extracts we possess from his work. Both, as will be seen, have a vital bearing upon the problem of the Gospels and the authority then attaching to them in Asia. Apollinaris writes:

"There are, then, persons who, owing to ignorance, are contentious about these things, being affected in a pardonable way;

¹ *Authorship*, etc., pp. 508 ff.

for ignorance does not admit of blame, but requires instruction. And they say that on the fourteenth the Lord ate the sheep with the disciples, but himself suffered on the great day of unleavened bread (Nisan 15), and they pretend that Matthew speaks in accordance with their opinion. Hence both their opinion is inconsistent with the law (Ex. 12:14-20), and the Gospels seem, according to them, to be at variance (*δοκεῖ στασιάζειν τὰ εὐαγγέλια*)."

The second extract will have been from the same context:

"The fourteenth day is the genuine passover of the Lord, the great sacrifice; the Servant of God instead of the lamb, he who was bound binding the strong man (Mt. 12:29), and he who was judged becoming Judge of quick and dead; he who was betrayed into the hands of sinners to be crucified, who was exalted on the horns of the unicorn (Ps. 22: 21); he who had his holy side pierced, he who poured forth out of his side the two elements of (sacramental) purification, water and blood, word and spirit, and was buried on the day of the passover, the stone being laid upon the tomb."¹

Here speaks a true Asian Quartodeciman, saturated with the "Johannine" ideas of Christ as the passover lamb, insisting on the Johannine date for the crucifixion, and maintaining that those who interpret Matthew inconsistently with this are ignorant disturbers of the peace of the Church, guilty both toward Moses who ordained the fourteenth Nisan as a perpetual memorial, and toward the evangelists, whom he himself holds to be in perfect accord. How Apollinaris interpreted Matthew so as to harmonize with John he does not explain, but just as it is possible to know what he meant by the inconsistency of western practice with "the law" from other Quartodecimans who declared their opponents to incur the curse of Moses upon transgressors of the law,² so it is

¹ *Paschal Chronicle* ap. Charteris, *Canonicity*, p. 194.

² This conception of the binding validity of the Mosaic ordinance probably explains Polycrates' curious expression at the beginning of his remon-

possible to make at least a very probable inference as to Apollinaris' exegesis of Matthew from that of the author of the *Paschal Chronicle*, who quotes him, maintaining that:

"It is clear that Jesus did not keep the passover on the fourteenth, but celebrated a typical (*i. e.*, symbolic) supper before this, when the sanctification of the unleavened bread and the preparation of the feast took place (*i. e.*, the *qiddush* of passover); for he did not give his disciples the sacrificial lamb and *unleavened* bread, but bread and a cup (*i. e.*, the elements of the *qiddush*)." ¹

There is strong reason to believe that the paschal chronicler is absolutely correct as to the historical fact that it was the *qiddush* of passover, and not the passover supper itself, that Jesus ate with his disciples; though such is of course *not* the intention of the Synoptic evangelists, who follow Mark in recasting the older Petrine tradition into accord with Roman theory. For Roman theory identified the Lord's supper with the passover.² This question of the differences of Synoptic and Johannine tradition must be treated later. But Apollinaris at all events finds no difficulty in reconciling Matthew with John, though he originates a phrase ³ which we have found later current at Rome, and is significant of an awakening demand for harmonization.

But another demand would at first be felt even more urgently in a region distracted by controversy, where decisions turned always on the question of apostolic tradition. The authority of Philip the evangelist, now constantly spoken

strance to Victor: "We keep the day ἀραδιούργητον" which Drummond renders "not in a reckless manner." See his references on p. 462 to efforts of Catholics to avoid the charge of departing from "the divine law."

¹ *Paschal Chronicle*, quoted by Drummond, *ibid.*, p. 503. On the *qiddush*, or blessing and distribution of bread and wine on the eve of the sabbath and of feast-days, see Hamburger's *Realencykl s. v.*

² On this see Bacon, *Beginnings of Gospel Story*, 1909, comments on Mk. 14-16, with critical analysis.

³ δοκεῖ στασιάζειν τὰ εὐαγγέλια. See above, p. 227.

of as "the apostle," whose tomb with that of his prophesying daughters was shown at Hierapolis, was appealed to on both sides; doubtless with good historical foundation, since the relations of Paul with this family (Acts 21:8-14) were such as naturally to bring them after Paul's death to Paul's principal mission field. But what of John, whose sojourn in Patmos had become a fixed element of belief since Papias and Justin and Melito had indorsed the trustworthiness of Revelation? Peter whose epistle from "Babylon" had wide circulation was bespoken by Rome; James too was known to have been martyred in Palestine under Agrippa I; but what of Andrew, and other apostles? It is Leucius, or Leucius Charinus,¹ a docetic gnostic of Asia, who in the midst of this period (170-180 A. D.) arises to meet the demand for authentication of apostolic tradition by his legendary *Acts* of the various available apostles; and these romances at once exert their influence, not only on docetists, but (in more or less modified form) on the orthodox as well. Montanists and anti-Montanists alike resort to them. To Pacianus, Leucius is a great churchman of the past, whose reputation must be contended for. According to him

"the nobler class of Montanists who falsely claim to be inspired by Leucius, boast of Proculus as their founder."²

The better informed *Decree of Gelasius*, on the other hand, calls Leucius a *discipulus diaboli*. His recently recovered *Acts of John*, which influenced even so great a scholar as Clement of Alexandria, forges the connecting link by which the Apostle is brought after the death of the tyrant Domitian from his sojourn in Patmos to a final residence and death in Ephesus. Prodigy of course plays a conspicuous part in the romance, the raising of a man from the dead being the most

¹ In the *Gospel of Nicodemus* Leucius and Charinus are separate individuals. Elsewhere we have "Leucius Charinus."

² *Ep.* i, 2. Migne, *Latin Fathers*, xiii, 1053.

prominent feature. Of this legend the echoes long continue to resound on all sides. Apollonius of Ephesus writing in 196-197 A. D. against the Montanists, and "using testimonies" as Eusebius reports "from the Revelation of John," related

"that a dead man had, through the divine power, been raised by John himself in Ephesus."¹

Clement of Alexandria has the tale in rationalized form, accommodated to the conception (derived from the Johannine Epistles) of an "Elder" whose pastoral visitations to the churches confirm the good and rebuke the evil (*cf.* III Jn. 9-14). This story of John and the robber chief, which Clement calls "a myth which is not a myth but a true saying" (*i. e.*, contains a truth), elaborates in edifying narrative the theme of Lk. 15:32, "This thy brother was dead and is alive again, he was lost and is found." Eusebius culls it from Clement to prefix, as we have seen, to his chapter in refutation of Gaius.

Not from Leucius, on the other hand, but probably of Palestinian origin, perhaps as connected with John the Elder, is another tale too trifling for our consideration were it not seriously advanced by "defenders" among the proofs of John's residence in Asia, and because outside the statements of Irenæus of his own boyhood recollections it is absolutely the *only* early datum which connects Polycarp in any way with "John." Irenæus himself relates it, not as something heard by himself, but on the authority of "those who had heard it from Polycarp." It maintained that:

"John the disciple of the Lord, going to bathe in Ephesus and seeing Cerinthus within, ran out of the bathhouse without bathing, crying, Let us flee, lest even the bath fall, because Cerinthus the enemy of the truth is within."²

¹ *Ap. Eusebius, H. E. V, xviii, 13.*

² *Irenæus, Haer. III, iii, 4, quoted by Eusebius, H. E. III, xxviii, 6 and*

This anecdote we find attached to several other names besides John and Cerinthus, but it seems to be connected first with a rabbinic tale of the period of strife between Church and Synagogue leaders in Palestine in the time of John the Elder. It is related in rabbinic literature of the encounter of Rabbi Jehoshua ben Hananiah (110-135 A. D.) with a Christian, who by pronouncing a spell makes the roof fall in at the baths of Tiberias.¹

When, therefore, we come at last to the period of Victor (189-199) and his endeavor to suppress the Quartodeciman practice of the churches of Asia it is not surprising to find vehement declarations on the part of Polycrates and other champions of the ancient Asian tradition maintaining the residence among them not only of Philip "one of the twelve apostles" and his four daughters, from whom the Montanists had derived their succession, but

"John also, who was both a witness and a teacher, who reclined upon the bosom of the Lord, and being a priest wore the sacerdotal plate (πέταλον). He fell asleep at Ephesus."²

Here the elements are mingled. The Fourth Gospel is in circulation in its canonical (Roman) form, and Polycrates appeals to the Appendix (Jn. 21: 20-24). At the same time the expressions "witness and teacher," so singular in application to an apostle, and especially the curious declaration that John was a priest and wore the πέταλον, recall the traditions of Hegesippus concerning the "witnesses and teachers"

IV, xiv, 6. McGiffert notes on the former passage: "This same story with much more fullness of detail is repeated by Epiphanius (*Haer.* XXX, xxiv), but of Ebion (a mythical heresiarch of Palestine) instead of Cerinthus. This shows that the story was a very common one, while at the same time so vague in its details as to admit of an application to any heretic who suited the purpose."

¹ See Herford, *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash*, p. 112.

² *Ep. of Polycrates to Victor*, ap. Eusebius, *H. E.* V, xxiv, 2.

in Jerusalem and the priestly accoutrements and functions of James.¹ There is an adoption of the Palestinian traditions industriously collected by Papias. If any use at all is made of Leucian legend it is limited to the modest claim that "John . . . fell asleep at Ephesus." Of the sweeping claims of Irenæus of prolonged relations "in Asia" between Polycarp and John, and even that Polycarp had been "appointed bishop in Smyrna by John and other apostles" there is not a word. And Polycrates was 65 years old at the time of writing (192-195 A. D.), and seven of his relatives had been bishops in Asia. Had all of them unfortunately failed to come into relations with the great apostle? It is not easy to see why we should have nothing but the bare allegation (from Leucius?) that John "sleeps at Ephesus," not even Polycarp's alleged claim before Anicetus to have observed the fast "with John the disciple of our Lord, and the other apostles with whom he had associated." Even this bare mention of John at Ephesus is tacked on like an afterthought (*ἔτι δὲ καὶ Ἰωάννης*). Such reference is not what we should expect if Polycrates' idea of "John in Asia" was at all like that to which Irenæus gave final and dominant currency in the Church.

Why, then, was the Asiatic tradition, even in the later and exaggerated form imparted to it in the course of controversy by anti-Montanists and Quartodecimans, displaced in the catholic Church by that of Irenæus in far-off Lyons? Not merely because the Irenæan conception by transferring from Palestine to Asia the whole group of apostles and "Elders, disciples, teachers and witnesses of the Lord," rescued to the Church that continuity of apostolic tradition which was its most valued possession, and which seemed to have been utterly abolished when the war of Bar-Cocheba and the subsequent edict of Hadrian dispersed forever the native Pales-

¹ See also, however, Acts 4: 6.

tinian church of Jerusalem. This was indeed a motive of tremendous cogency in favor of indorsing the larger claims of Irenæus; but it was not all. The sympathies of the Church catholic must inevitably be with the great champion of *catholicity* in the struggles of the age to secure uniformity of faith and practice.

The two things Irenæus cannot tolerate are (1) a heretical Gnostic, (2) an intolerant churchman. Irenæus and his Gallican supporters are not Montanists; but they intervene with all their might when Eleutherus is solicited to join part of the bishops of Asia in "repelling from the Church the gift of prophecy." Irenæus himself is not a Quartodeciman. He treats the cantankerous Blastus as a disturber of the peace and author of "schism." He explains the difference of usage between East and West to Victor on the ground that "it is likely that (the forefathers) did not hold to strict accuracy, and thus formed a custom for their posterity according to their own simplicity and peculiar mode." His method of reconciling the Gospels (by a public ministry extending over twenty years!¹) would have made Apollinaris stare as well as the anti-Quartodecimans. But Irenæus intervenes again from Gaul on behalf of the rights of Asia to "observe the tradition of an ancient custom" against the rash intolerance of the bigot Victor. And he necessarily carried with him the consensus of the growing catholic Church.

And there was something more. Irenæus' intolerance of intolerance was only another aspect of his intolerance of Gnosticism. Proclus, whom a Gaius would have cast out of the Church together with the whole body of his Asian "new scriptures," was Irenæus' trusty ally against a real foe far more to be feared than Montanistic millenarianism—the dreaded Valentinian Gnostics. In this too the common sense of the infant catholic Church could not fail to side with

¹ *Haer.*, II xxii, 5.

Irenæus, the "man of peace." Only by a conciliatory spirit toward those within could the Church at large present a united front against the real "Heresies." And for this union the absolutely indispensable prerequisite was adoption of "the fourfold Gospel."

Since Justin's time the Antiochian gospel of Luke had obtained a place, at least in Roman circles, alongside the ancient Roman (Mark), and the south-Syrian (Matthew). It was not for one moment imaginable that Asia could work in harmony with the West if its "Johannine" canon were to be treated as the Alogi and Gaius (or Gaius and the Alogi) proposed. Since the time of Tatian and Theophilus of Antioch the inevitable course of real progress had been marked so plainly that the bigotry of Gaius and his party was fortunately foredoomed from the start. Harmonization is the watchword of the times. Leave to Gnostics like Marcion, or Basilides, their narrow limitations of evangelic truth, or their still more daring impositions of self-made "gospels" is Irenæus' plea. For the Church there can be but one pillar and ground of all evangelic faith, a fourfold Gospel; because a fourfold gospel was in truth, and not merely in the fanciful imagery and symbolism of Irenæus, representative of "the four quarters of the inhabited earth."

As scholar Irenæus is open to the most serious charges of blundering, exaggeration, plagiarism, misrepresentation. His most ardent supporters are prompt to admit that he grossly misrepresents the doctrines of Valentinus. Eusebius abundantly proved his flagrant exaggerations in regard to the relations of Papias to "John." His report that Jesus attained the age of the "presbyter" (40-50 years) attributed to "all the Elders who in Asia conferred with John the Lord's disciple" is admittedly based upon Papias' book. In the same connection he declares that

"some of them saw not only John (as had Polycarp in Irenæus'

idea), but others also of the apostles, and had this same account from them, and witness (testantur) to the aforesaid account."¹

The (present) witness of the Elders can only be on the pages of Papias, who thus appears as even more intimately associated with "the apostles" than Polycarp. With the original passage before us, as Eusebius has kindly furnished it for the purpose, we can easily see that this pretension is utterly groundless. A Gutjahr can indorse it even in modern times, which shows how older Catholics could do the same;² but Professor Stanton has the candor to acknowledge that

"It is not by any means clear that he (the John whom Papias heard) even resided in Asia."³

We have ourselves seen reason for the decided conviction that Irenæus' whole notion of an apostolic group about John in Asia rests on nothing more than the older assertions of his sojourn in Patmos, Polycarp's references to intercourse in boyhood with "John" and others who had seen the Lord, and his own misinterpretation of Papias. As historian and scholar Irenæus was not a trustworthy leader, although far saner than Leucius and his Montanistic and Docetic adherents. But it was not as scholar and historian that the Church followed him. It followed him—and wisely—rather than a Victor, or a Gaius, because he was a truly catholic ecclesiastic and statesman, "well named the man of peace." We, too, while in the field of scholarship and history we reverse his ill-founded assertions, commend his spirit, and rejoice that it preserved to us the last and in some respects the greatest of the Gospels, even if under the aegis of a borrowed name.

¹ *Haer.* II, xxii, 5.

² I am unable to discover anything of value to add to the arguments of Zahn and Gutjahr in the recent treatise of F. G. Lewis, *The Irenæus Testimony to the Fourth Gospel*, Chicago University Press, 1908.

³ *Gospels*, etc., p. 168.

Careful scrutiny of the direct internal evidence on the authorship of the Fourth Gospel leads to the same result as the external. In fact, as we have already seen, the external evidence is not independent, and in its assertions of Johanne authorship betrays the fact that it is a mere echo by its character, its date, its limitations, and its phraseology. The assertions of Irenæus and his contemporary supporters of the fourfold gospel simply reverberate with natural enlargements those which had previously been embodied by redactors and revisers in the substance of the instrumentum Johanneum.

To a certain extent the surviving literature of the second century enables us to follow the process. Much earlier and more positively than for the Gospel the claim of apostolicity under the name of "John" is put forth on behalf of Revelation. Scrutiny of the structure of this book reveals, however, an unmistakably composite origin. Only the outer framework, the prologue of the seven epistles and the epilogue with its claim to canonical authority, belong to Asia and "the end of the reign of Domitian," and it is only in these that the claim appears. The substance of the "prophecy" is imported from Palestine, and conspicuously fails to bear out the assertions of the Ephesian redactor. Such traces as remain of conflict in Asia, at first against those who "denied the resurrection and the judgment," later conversely against the Montanistic millinarian prophets, indicate that the field on which the Revelation of John attained its first general acceptance was Asia.

The claim of apostolicity for the Gospel was put forth later; at Rome, as we have seen reason to believe. At all events Rome was the scene of subsequent dispute, and this involved the entire instrumentum Johanneum. The substance of the Gospel (chapters 1-20) which had long enjoyed a limited circulation in Asia, though as yet without

pretensions to apostolicity, was first supplied with a framework adapted to Asiatic conditions in the form of the three Epistles, the hint perhaps being taken from Revelation. In this framework claims to apostolic authority are still limited to the historic tradition of the Church. The author does not personate "John," like the redactor of Revelation; he merely uses the "corporation we." But the claim is made more concrete in the second revision and supplement with which we find the Gospel supplied in its canonical or Roman form. Even here it still clings to the refuge of ambiguity. Only with the polemic of the Alogi does the counter assertion at last appear full fledged and bold, to dominate henceforth wherever the fourfold gospel is received.

This review of actual conditions in the second century should suffice to meet the demand of Drummond¹ that it be explained how a book published far away from the circle of John's immediate disciples came to be ascribed to him. Such a book is Revelation, whose history prefigures that of the Gospel. Its Asian framework shows how the name of an apostle and martyr of Palestine could become attached a generation later to the Ephesian edition of a Palestinian "prophecy." The ascription at Rome in 160-180 A. D. of an anonymous gospel, known to have been long in circulation in Asia to an author by this time generally admitted, for the reasons stated, to have sojourned in Asia in the end of the reign of Domitian, is not more difficult of explanation. If the indirect internal evidence does not support the claim of Johannine authorship, which was not found to be really supported by the external, certainly the mere claims of editors and writers of epilogues and epistles of commendation cannot do so. They fall far short of offsetting the silence of the earliest times.

¹ *Char. and Authorship*, p. 349.

PART III
THE INDIRECT INTERNAL EVIDENCE

PART III

THE INDIRECT INTERNAL EVIDENCE

CHAPTER XI

THE EVANGELIST'S TASK

If thirty years have witnessed a great change in critical treatment of the external evidence relating to the Fourth Gospel, a still greater change is manifest in respect to the internal. The progress, however, has not been upon the side of the "defenders," and therefore we need feel no surprise if Principal Drummond out of his volume of 513 pages devotes but 32 to "the Internal Evidence in Favour of the Traditional View," referring the reader to Bishop Westcott's *Introduction to the Four Gospels* (1862), Sanday's *Authorship of the Fourth Gospel* (1872), and Lightfoot's articles in the *Expositor* (Series IV, 1890).¹ This meager treatment of that aspect of the question which to some of the greatest writers on both sides has seemed the more important of the two, is explained by the statement

"The internal evidence of the authorship of the Fourth Gospel has been examined with such care and completeness, especially by English writers, that I cannot hope to contribute any fresh material to the subject."²

For the fresh material we must indeed look elsewhere; for Drummond's "rapid survey and judgment of the several lines of argument" is, as he forewarns us, a mere recapitula-

¹ Reprinted in *Bibl. Essays*, 1893, pp. 1-44.

² *Char. and Auth.*, p. 352.

tion of the stereotyped apologetic of thirty years ago: First, the author was a Jew; second, he knows the topography of Palestine; third, he speaks like an eye-witness. A few "evidences" of this type culled by earlier apologists which have particularly impressed Principal Drummond take the place of any comprehensive survey of the Gospel in its general structure, dominant ideas, and adaptation to existent conditions. As none disputes the Jewish birth of the evangelist, which of itself would imply more or less knowledge of Jewish literature and the Holy Land; as, moreover, individual traits evincing the accuracy of an eye-witness could not prove more than the use of good authority for the particular item in question unless shown to characterize the Gospel *as a whole*, the field, thus cultivated, offers little indeed to mere gleaners after Westcott, Sanday, Lightfoot, Andrew P. Peabody,¹ and Zahn.²

Professor Sanday himself, although naturally devoting much the greater part of his recent volume³ to the indirect internal evidence, hardly departs from the mode of treatment which since he himself formulated it more than thirty years ago has become stereotyped for "defenders." Only in the year following the appearance of his *Criticism* was this "atomistic" method, as Wrede has aptly characterized the process, been transcended by an English scholar, whose interpretation of the Gospel against the background of its known historical environment is worthy of the highest praise.

Mr. Ernest F. Scott in his volume entitled *The Fourth Gospel, its Purpose and Theology* (1906) marks an epoch, at least for English readers, in the progress of true appreciation of the Gospel. At last an English scholar treats it for what

¹ Essay in *The Fourth Gospel*. Evidences external and internal of its Johannine Authorship, Scribner's Sons, 1891.

² *Introduction to New Testament*, Engl. transl., 1909.

³ *Criticism*, etc., 1905.

it was to its own generation, and therefore may be to every generation that approaches it through its own. The unproductive quest of the mere polemic or apologist, traversing the X literature only to pick up a phrase here, an expression there as evidence in the pros and cons of critical debate is at last abandoned. It gives way to a comprehensive survey of the Gospel as a whole. Mr. Scott places himself in the admitted situation, Ephesus, in "the first or second decade of the second century," and gives us a *historical* interpretation. On the moot points of debate he makes neither affirmation nor denial, though in the Preface his own position is frankly stated as "that which is now generally accepted by Continental scholars," as against that of Stanton, Sanday, and Drummond. What Mr. Scott has endeavored to give is simply "the real message of John"; and he is justly

"convinced that the Gospel has nothing to lose by a fearless analysis of its teaching in the light of what appears the more probable theory of its origin."

It is indeed not the Gospel but the Church which loses, and that heavily, for lack of such light. Yet the reader will wonder only that so much can already be accomplished toward the illumination of these dark origins, when the Gospel is simply permitted to speak for itself apart both from ancient efforts to obtain for it an apostolic authority to which in its integral elements it makes no pretension, and from modern attempts to bolster up the ancient claim.

Studied by this historical and sympathetic method, free from the distractions of polemic interest, the Gospel proper, separate from its advertising Appendix, exhibits characteristics so broad and unmistakable as to have impressed themselves upon even the earliest observers. Next to the evangelist's own, perhaps the best of all characterizations of the Gospel comes to us from the period of original opposition to

its reception to canonical standing. It is found in the well-known passage quoted by Eusebius from the lost *Hypotyposes* of Clement of Alexandria. Clement reported it as a "tradition derived from the early presbyters" as follows:

"Last of all John, perceiving that the bodily (or external) facts had been set forth in the (other) Gospels, at the instance of his disciples and with the inspiration of the Spirit composed a spiritual (*πνευματικόν*) Gospel."¹

Without attempting to separate tradition from inference in the passage, Professor Sanday enumerates five data as present in it, remarking that it "alone has all the essential points" of primitive belief regarding the Gospel:

"1. The Gospel is the work of St. John. . . .

"2. It was written towards the end of his life.

"3. The three Gospels were in the hands of the Apostle, and he had read and up to a certain point approved of them.

"4. What he himself undertook to write was a Gospel, not a biography; the difference is important.

"5. In contrast with the other Gospels it was recognized as being in a special sense 'a spiritual Gospel.'"²

Of these the first four may be dismissed. Comparison with the *Muratorianum* and the early Prologues shows at once the derivation of the statement (1) that "John" wrote the Gospel "at the instance of his disciples and with the inspiration of the Spirit." It merely echoes the Appendix (Jn. 21: 24), whose data we have already seen to be drawn by inference from the work edited. (2) The late date of the Gospel was probably not mere inference from its employment of the other three. The time could still be remembered when the Johannine writings were "new scriptures" as compared with the Pauline Epistles and Synoptic Gospels. On this there is no dispute. However, there was certainly no difficulty in perceiving on even the most superficial inspec-

¹ *H. E.*, VI, xiv, 7.

² *Criticism*, p. 69.

tion, that (3) the fourth evangelist "had read, and up to a certain point approved of" the Synoptic Gospels. This too argues no authority outside the text itself. (4) As regards Professor Sanday's fourth datum we mean no disparagement either of its validity or its importance, in expressing grave doubts whether either Clement or the "early presbyters" had any such distinction in mind as that between "a gospel and a biography," or desired to make any such assertion as Professor Sanday discovers. This leaves of the five points of primitive belief derivable from Clement's authorities the single one which constitutes the real aim of the passage, and of all the five is most easily accounted for by simple inspection of the Gospel itself. It was (5) intended to supplement the other three as a "spiritual" gospel. The technical term by which this most obviously distinctive feature of the Gospel is expressed is probably coined by Clement himself; or rather Clement employs for it the current term of Alexandrian exegesis. The observation could be made by anybody.

Employed as Clement employs it the term "spiritual" can only mean "exhibiting a higher or symbolic sense." As Philo had distinguished the bodily or external sense of the Old Testament narratives from the higher or "spiritual" sense to be drawn from them by allegorical interpretation without disparagement or rejection of the literal, so the fourth evangelist, Clement would say, aimed to present what would convey the loftier (more philosophical) truths of the faith. Of course he does not mean to suggest that the incidents related are allegories invented to convey the evangelist's theological beliefs. Modern exponents of the theory of allegory as the key to the evangelist's plan, such as Thoma on the radical side or Drummond on the conservative, fail to do justice to a distinction self-evident to ancient rabbi or Christian expounder of the true *gnosis* such as Clement. Such critics pay also too little attention to the evangelist's

own insistent emphasis on the importance of the historical reality of the incarnation. What Clement means is that in the Fourth Gospel as compared with the other three the selection of incidents is made, and the mode and detail of narration is determined, with principal reference to the "higher" (*i. e.*, theological) truths which the evangelist thinks it imperative to bring out. The observation is just; but the distinction between "bringing out" and "putting in" is also vital. The evangelist is no more conscious of composing "fictions," whether in his seven wonders or in his seven I am's of Christ, than is Paul in the "allegory" he educes from the story of Hagar and Ishmael. Both words and deeds of Jesus are for him sacred. But for that very reason they allow—nay they demand—to his mind, just such expository treatment as the Jewish synagogue preacher¹ accords to the teachings and the wonders of the Old Testament in his *midrash*, or haggadic interpretation. He would resent the idea that he *puts in* the smallest iota; but inability to *bring out* the entire system of theological truth as he conceives it would mark only his own incapacity. Its presence there is to him axiomatic.

One must read the epistles of Clement of Rome and Barnabas, or the exegesis of Justin Martyr to obtain a realizing sense of the incredible license of this process of "bringing out" which was the approved method of edification whether for the Jewish or Christian teacher of the early second century. If even "external" evangelists felt at liberty to agglutinate the sayings of Jesus into extended discourses of a doctrinal bearing, and to compose allegorical parables such as the Sheep and Goats (Mt. 25:31-36) or the Usurping Husbandmen (Mk. 12:1-12), we cannot wonder that a "spiritual" evangelist should employ the time-honored form

¹ The *Darshan*, *i. e.*, "treader out"; substantive form of the same Hebrew root as *Midrash*. Cf. I Cor. 9:9.

of dialogue, chosen vehicle since Plato's time for the conveyance of the deeper truths of philosophy and religion, to elaborate the sense of the mystical and oracular sayings in his time understood to be characteristic of Jesus. As to incident, Mark's story of the Cursing of the Fig Tree is not the only instance, even in the Synoptics, of parable recast in pragmatic form, nor of the symbolic application of wonder-stories. We have in fact the fourth evangelist's own word for it that the supply of wonder-stories was superabundant, and that the signs "written in this book" are the merest fraction of the mass from which his selections were made (Jn. 20:30, 31). We need only note what was the principle of selection to realize something of the freedom a "spiritual" evangelist would feel both in selection and in treatment of such material. If of the many "signs" which Jesus did only seven were given, and these were made illustrative, the presentment would have to take a typical or representative form. The third generation after Jesus' ministry had not the means, even if it had conceived the idea, to relate Jesus' "mighty works" with historical regard for the detail of individual cases. Our author's seven "signs" were written that his readers might have *life*, by *believing* in Jesus' name. What he means by the terms "life" and "belief" will become clearer as we examine the formative element of his construction. The material element consists on his own showing of selected traditions of the Lord, a part of which seems to have come from sources other than the Synoptics and probably oral. There were in fact two cogent reasons for transcending Synoptic limits: first, the intense craving of the age which Papias attests;¹ second, the far greater plasticity of materials not protected by the quasi-canonical position accorded to Matthew and Mark, if not to Luke also. If then "John" surprises us by the degree to which he has

¹ Οὐ γὰρ τοῖς τὰ πολλὰ λέγουσιν ἔχαιρον, ὡσπερ οἱ πολλοί.

used the liberty of a "spiritual" evangelist to adapt the material which he takes from the three,¹ we may be sure he has used it to much greater extent in framing to his purpose of edifying symbolism what he borrows from the mass of current oral tradition. As we shall see, the modifications made in material adapted from Synoptic sources are sweeping. In many cases it is difficult to say whether the evangelist is borrowing at first hand, or whether some allegorizing preacher such as he who caricatures the Transfiguration and Resurrection stories in the *Acts of John* (though surely one of better taste and more orthodox purpose) has preceded him. At all events both the dramatis personæ and the incidents seem ultimately derived for the most part from Synoptic material, even where the resultant composite reveals its origin only in mismatched parts. What was required of the seven selected "signs" was that they should furnish complete illustrations of how the incarnate Logos had "manifested his glory." If, then, a Luke can borrow the traits of Mark's anointing in Bethany to embellish his own preferred story of the Penitent Harlot (Lk. 7:36-50), we should not expect a "John" to refrain from combining traits from various sources to set forth a typical healing, or from framing composites to bring out the "spiritual" significance of his seven "manifestations."

There is an element of truth, accordingly, in the representation of some of the early fathers that the fourth evangelist aimed to "supplement" the three, as well as to "correct" them. It is unquestionably true that he aimed to present a "spiritual" gospel; and the undertaking involved not only the free handling of Synoptic material, but resort upon occasion to the still flowing though turbid stream of oral tradition. The names "Nathanael" and "Cana of Galilee" and the explicit reference to the many current narratives of

¹ On this point see below, p. 287, and Chapter XIV.

miracle are not easily explained without admission of a real element of more or less authentic report. We must beware, however, of exaggerating this element. Study of the actual construction of the narrative, its predominant note of symbolism, and its relation to the Synoptic tradition, warn us to expect but small addition to our meager stock of historical evangelic tradition. More influence would seem to have been exerted by midrashic handling through a succession of teachers of the Petrine story familiar to us in its Markan embodiment.

At this point, however, we are brought to a consideration of the formative principle of the Gospel, as defined in the author's own statement of his purpose:

"These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, and that by believing ye might have life through his name."

The design of the evangelist is so to present his typical selections from the tradition of Jesus' words and deeds that they may result in the reader's obtaining *life* through *faith*. Here in a nutshell is the best characterization of the Gospel that could be framed, and the emphasis lies upon the formative principle. Many had taken in hand to write the story; but our evangelist's distinction is his preëminent determination to make it subsidiary to *life* through *faith*.

For reasons almost certainly connected with Gnostic abuse of these technical terms our evangelist systematically avoids the use of the words "faith" (*πίστις*), "knowledge" (*γνῶσις*), "wisdom" (*σοφία*). We must also admit a decided advance beyond the Pauline doctrine of self-surrender, towards an ecclesiastical sense in the various forms of the verb "believe" which take the place of the Pauline "faith." Nevertheless the supreme key to the Gospel is its absolute loyalty to Paulinism. Its author is the "vindicator" (*goël*) of Paul, accomplishing after Paul's death that "unity of the

Spirit" in the universal Church, which was the supreme aim of Paul's life. Even the "alien element" of Greek metaphysic which Scott discovers in the developed mysticism of the Logos doctrine, is there not because the evangelist would consciously add a new feature to the Pauline doctrine, but because Paul himself, or at least the deutero-Pauline epistles of the Asian group, have met him half-way in his Hellenistic cosmology and anthropology. The doctrine of the Logos underlies the whole Gospel; but so it would if Paul himself had written it. The *term* is borrowed from Philo, and some of the symbolism of the discourses. But the term only occurs in the Prologue, whose object is to give the reader the evangelist's own point of view, and the dependence in the symbolism is slight and perhaps unconscious.

No other provenance is imaginable for such a work as this than Ephesus, headquarters of the Pauline mission field, where Paul spent the three most fruitful years of his life, whence he wrote at least one of the greatest of his epistles, and where he left behind him a true college of supporters and interpreters (Acts 20:17-38), as well as opponents and false teachers without and within. Ephesus was the center of that region to which the great deutero-Pauline epistles are addressed, those which we sometimes designate the Christological, because they principally occupy themselves with that doctrine of the Person of Christ which in the Fourth Gospel is formally developed. We must conceive as Paul's successor there some converted Jew of Alexandria, mighty in the Scriptures, such as that great and loyal disciple of Paul, Apollos, whose career, so far as known to us, begins and ends at Ephesus (Acts 18:24-28; I Cor. 16:12). Only such a disciple as Apollos can have carried on there Paul's work, both as disputer in "the school of Tyrannus," as confuter of "the Jews," and persuader of the "disciples of John." Such a disciple of Paul must we conceive as originator of the type

of doctrine embodied in the Fourth Gospel; for it is in terms of Jewish Alexandrianism that the Christology of Paul is here interpreted. We have no means of proving that Apollos ever touched pen to paper; yet it is permissible to say that if any identifiable spirit speaks through the Fourth Gospel besides that of Paul it is such a spirit as that of Apollos. For with all its originality and freedom, with all its comprehensiveness and catholicity, the Fourth Gospel's "spiritualization" of the evangelic tradition is nothing else than the incorporation and application of it in the interest of the Pauline gospel. It aims at catholicity; but a catholicity that is based on Paul's view of the redemptive drama of Incarnation, Atonement, and diffusion of the Spirit of Adoption.

To appreciate the indispensableness of this "unity of the Spirit" so longed for by Paul we must go behind the mere temporary phases of conflict between his followers and those of the Galilean apostles. The surface outbreaks were determined by such external and more or less fortuitous occasions as the "Jerusalem decrees" attempt to meet. Back of these lies the really fundamental difference.

The Galilean apostles had conceived the gospel as a system of ethics and eschatology, of precepts and reward. Their system was distinguished from Judaistic legalism only by a new law and a new reward. It substituted the "easy yoke" of Jesus for that which "neither we nor our fathers were able to bear," and the kingdom guaranteed in the resurrection of Jesus to be "at hand" for "the world to come" which had been monopolized by scribes and Pharisees. Therefore the evangelic tradition current in the Aramaic-speaking portion of the Church began as a compilation of the Precepts of Jesus, perhaps dispensing even with an account of his death and resurrection. To the end, even when enlarged by the addition of Mark's version of Petrine story, the Palestinian Gospel remained, and still remains, an en-

deavor to "teach men to observe all things whatsoever Jesus had commanded" (Mt. 28: 20). To Paul on the contrary the gospel was not ethics but mysticism. The precepts of Jesus were to him merely the better interpretation of the abiding element of the Old Testament. They were all summed up in the doctrine of the Spirit of sonship, whose distinctive characteristic is the disinterested love and service exemplified in the self-abnegation (*κένωσις*) and passion of the Son of God. There is no law save to "Have in you the mind which was in Christ Jesus, who humbled himself and became obedient unto the cross." The gospel is the infusion of this "mind" of Christ; and the possession of this "mind" is antecedent to obedience and conditions it. "Faith" and "life" in the Pauline gospel, therefore, take the place of precept and reward in the Palestinian. What a race "sold under sin," "in bondage to sin and death," requires is a redemption through *grace*. What a lost world really needs is not so much light as life; not *knowledge* of "the law of our mind" impelling to righteousness, but *power* to overcome the law of sin in our members. Therefore Paul felt no need, after the manifestation in him of the risen Son of God, whose Spirit had been so transfused into his own as to make the very life he was living in the flesh no longer his life but Christ living in him, to go up to Jerusalem to them that were apostles before him, to hear their reminiscences of the earthly Jesus, his teachings and his miracles. Therefore the Christ that he knew and preached was exclusively the risen and glorified Christ, whose life in us is both victorious power in the conflict against sin, and also pledge and foretaste of the eternal life to which we are destined. As many as have the Spirit of adoption are sons, and if sons then also heirs, and joint heirs with Christ. Salvation is the apprehending of that "life" for which we were also apprehended. If its full enjoyment is still conceived under the forms of Jewish es-

chatology this is manifestly non-essential. On this point Paul's thought even undergoes marked transformation within the period between the Thessalonian letters and Philippians. Life, conceived as a power or energy resident in God, embodied in Christ, transfused into us by impartation of the Spirit of Christ when in the self-surrender of faith the soul casts itself upon God—this to Paul is the core and kernel of the gospel. The greatest boon he can ask of James and Cephas *and John*, the "apostles of the circumcision," is non-interference. He does not secure even this without a struggle with Peter, the broadest minded of the Jerusalem trio.¹

Of course the earthly story of Jesus is to Paul also of value for its precious sayings, and still more for its exemplification of the nature of the spirit of "sons." Paul was manifestly at a disadvantage here as compared with the eye-witnesses. Per contra he excelled all in his penetration to the essence of the revelation. The redemptive power of the gospel lay in its manifestation of *life* communicated through the channel of *faith*. The message of reconciliation given to preachers of the word was that "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing unto men their trespasses." Those who received the word with the self-surrender of faith were baptized into the likeness of Jesus' self-surrender to obedient death, and in the rite were raised with him, the Spirit of adoption and eternal life suffusing and reanimating their whole nature with a life not their own but "hid with Christ in God." This is the essential and distinctive feature of the "gospel" of Paul, as against the Palestinian represented by James and John; for Peter occupies a position of compromise, or mediation. After Paul's death the very life of the Pauline churches depended upon a systematic presentation of this doctrine of redemption of the

¹ Gal. 2:1-21.

world by incarnation and glorification of "the Son of God." But it could succeed only by virtue of some sort of adjustment to, or embodiment in, the historic tradition of the Palestinian church. It must relate the story.

The fourth evangelist was far from being the first to attempt such a Pauline restatement of the evangelic tradition. The Gospel of Mark, earliest of the Greek gospels, earlier than any save that Aramaic compilation of the Precepts by one of the Galilean apostles of which we know by tradition only, was an attempt to tell the story of Jesus' career as such a manifestation of "the Son of God." Tradition is doubtless correct in attributing its origin to the predominantly Pauline, Gentile-Christian church of Rome, with employment of anecdotes mainly derived from Peter. It pays scarcely any attention to the Precepts of Jesus as such, making the condition of "entrance into life" imitation of the great sacrifice. Its cardinal points of doctrine are (or were, for the original resurrection story is missing) (1) the Baptism, in which Jesus is made the Son of God by entrance into him of the Spirit, which thereafter controls his speech and action, proving him the Son of God; (2) the Manifestation of the Messiahship, interpreted to the disciples by a vision of Transfiguration, exhibiting the Messiah's superhuman character and mission; (3) the Passover of the Passion and Resurrection, whereby Jesus had set the example of dying to live, and been exalted to "the right hand of God." About the Baptism are grouped the incidents having to do with the formation of the community of disciples over against hostile Judaism; about the Supper the teachings respecting the world to come. How small was the residuum of really authentic narrative tradition at command of the Greek-speaking Church may be inferred from the fact that none of the later evangelists have anything of material value to add to the Markan narrative outline. All the Greek gospels are simply attempts

to combine the Petrine story with the Matthæan Discourses, now narrative, now precept, assuming the preponderance according to the evangelist's preoccupation with ethical or mystical interests. These are the distinctive phenomena of the great period of gospel-composition which ensues after the death of Paul, in which, as Papias' inquiries and the internal phenomena alike make clear, the two fundamental factors were (1) the Matthæan Precepts; (2) the Petrine Sayings and Doings.

Neither the more mechanical combination of Mark with the Sayings by our first evangelist, nor the esthetically and rhetorically superior combination by our third, could be expected to meet the deeper need of the post-apostolic age, as that need would be understood in such a Pauline center as Ephesus. Still less could Mark be considered in itself a satisfactory presentment. The Roman gospel was genuinely Pauline in conception and outline, but it scarcely touched the deeper elements of the Pauline evangel. Its Paulinism was of the cruder, external type, a Paulinism of the man in the street, who is aware of current controversy but ignores its underlying causes. Moreover, the deficiencies of Mark were generally recognized. Docetism had laid hold of its account of the Baptism to divorce the locally and temporally limited "Jesus" from the emanation "Christ" more congenial to Greek dualism. Its primitive device of a Transfiguration vision informing the leading apostles by a Voice from heaven of the transcendental nature and mission of Jesus was open to similar abuse, and could not meet the real requirement. For from a Pauline point of view it would be needful to exhibit the entire career of Jesus as a "tabernacling" of the Son of God in human flesh to the manifestation of his glory.¹ Finally, its very "order" and historical trustworthiness were admittedly open to criticism. In par-

¹ So Jn. 1:14 compared with Mk. 9: 2-10.

ticular its account of the Resurrection itself had proved so ill-suited to the times as to have been suppressed almost from the beginning; yet the two versions by which our first and third evangelists had sought to supply the gap were so hopelessly irreconcilable with one another as to make the need now greater than ever. After Rome and south Syria and Antioch had done their best, and still in their embodiment of the evangelic tradition had given no adequate expression to the most fundamental of all the Pauline doctrines regarding the Person of Christ, his Incarnation and Glorification; still less to the Mystical Union of the believer with him, the message of *life by faith*; what else could be expected but that Ephesus should put forth its "spiritual gospel," counteracting on the one hand the ultra-Pauline dualism of the Docetists by emphasizing the historic reality of the Incarnation and atoning death and Resurrection; counteracting on the other the crudities of Jewish legalism and eschatology by the doctrine of eternal life by transfusion of the Spirit. Not during Paul's lifetime nor for long after could such a work be undertaken, for the whole period of Jesus' earthly career was for Paul a period of the humiliation of the Son of God under the guise of a servant, systematically and on principle to be subordinated to that in which he had been "manifested as the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead." Not until a later age had felt the pressure of another type of gospel marked by a larger and larger sense of the divinity manifest in the earthly career of the Nazarene, an age forced back upon the historical tradition of the Galilean apostles by the vagaries of Gnostic speculation, could the combination—indispensable though it was—be effected.

It is the chief merit of Scott's illuminating book that it recognizes this double purpose of the fourth evangelist, and in good degree correlates it with the conditions of the time.

"The author, writing in a period of transition, is continually striving to find place within the same system for opposite types of thought and belief." He has even "incorporated in his work alien fragments which do not enter into its substance," made it a "union of opposites" a "blending of various tendencies."¹

The question to what extent we can attribute this combination of opposites to a single hand is a very delicate one, which we shall have occasion to consider hereafter. Scott applies his principle to the limit in favor of the unity of the Gospel (excepting of course the Appendix), but, on the other hand, sees so different a spirit in the First Epistle as to feel compelled to attribute this to a later author of the same school. The converse application may seem to others more advisable; but the principle is profoundly true, and reveals the real task of the evangelist as he himself conceives it. He aims to reinterpret the evangelic tradition in such manner as to exhibit, whether by sayings or doings, its "spiritual" import. His material is selected and adapted with all the sovereign superiority to historical conditions of a true disciple of Paul, the disciple after the Spirit. The object is to bring out both by dialogue and incident the inner gospel of "God manifest in the flesh," that by belief in it the reader may imbibe the "life." In the Prologue, as we have seen, the evangelist sets forth his personal standpoint and philosophical principles; and here, but only here, he employs the categories of Alexandrian metaphysics; for these were congenial to him, and doubtless would seem to his readers the most natural key to the Gospel. The identification of the pre-existent Wisdom of God, which in Paul's view had become incarnate in Jesus Christ, with the Logos of Hellenistic Stoicism is not obtruded. It merely informs the reader

¹ *Fourth Gospel*, pp. 10, 11. With Mr. Scott's admirable presentation we venture to ask a comparison of the briefer statement here expanded from *The Hibbert Journal* for January, 1905 (III, 2), pp. 359 f.

from what point of view the evangelist approaches his subject. Thenceforth, as in the outline of Mark, the sacraments of baptism and the supper and their significance become largely determinative both of order and selection of material. The historic Christ is he who "came by water and by blood." Ancient tradition had accounted for the absence of chronological sequence in the Petrine narrative by the statement that Peter had used anecdotes as they seemed "fitted to the occasion" (*πρὸς τοὺς χρείους*). Our evangelist follows this example, but employs a chronology of his own based on independent tradition and the "feasts of the Jews" in symbolical treatment.¹ Polemic aims are present. We are grateful to Mr. Scott for his judicious estimate in particular of the view which Baldensperger recalls from the forgotten pages of Michaelis concerning this evangelist's effort to counteract an exaggerated estimate of "John." For in this Gospel the Baptist does not have this title, nor even receive credit as originator of the rite. He issues no call to repentance or warning of judgment, has no relation to the publicans and sinners—this class are altogether non-existent in the Fourth Gospel—nor is the rite he employs a "baptism of repentance unto remission of sins." Only the Lamb of God to whom he points can "take away the sin of the world." Baptism is a purely Christian institution having no sense but the Pauline of the new birth of the Spirit. The Forerunner merely employs it prophetically by special divine direction, as a symbol of the new dispensation of the Spirit, a token to Israel of its Dispenser (Jn. 1: 25-27, 29-34). Certainly the evangelist has adapted his portrait of the Baptist and his rite to the special need of the "disciples of John" at Ephesus, known to the second century as Hemerobaptists; yet even this polemic is subordinate. Scott is certainly right in pointing out that all forms of opposition and misbelief

¹ See below, Chapter XV. Topography and Chronology.

are combined for this evangelist in the attitude of "the Jews."

Apologetic and etiologic aims are present. Ecclesiasticism, sacramentarian interest, the defense of Christological doctrine against Jewish and other aspersion, including perhaps that of Basilides himself, are present. They may conceivably furnish the means of a more accurate dating than hitherto; they at least suffice to determine the epoch of real debate, whereof the disputes of Jesus with "the Jews" regarding his own preëxistence and relation to the Father are a mere reflection. But the question for us is not so much a question of date, as of the evangelist's purpose; and the supreme interest of the evangelist is something more and greater than any temporary polemic. He aims to "bring out" the Pauline gospel of life by faith in the incarnate Son of God, through an interpretation of the current evangelic tradition, and of the sacred rites of the Church. Like the second century compilers of the *Ev. Petri* and those who labored at the formation of a fourfold composite gospel, the fourth evangelist also is a harmonizer; but not in the external, mechanical sense of their work. We should class him rather with our first and third evangelists, whose work cannot have long preceded his own. Both of these are intent on combining the two types of gospel which Papias shows us to have been still dominant in the time of the Jerusalem Elders. But "John's" effort at harmony goes far deeper. The work of Mark is really nearer in purpose to his, as J. Weiss suggests in directing us to the affinity of these two otherwise so different gospels. Weiss calls our attention to their similarity in the symbolic employment of narrative material; but the deepest point of sympathy is in the effort to combine Pauline doctrine with Galilean tradition. Mark also had disregarded the Jewish-Christian idea of Jesus' earthly life as merely that of the "prophet like unto Moses,"

who gives a "new law" as the condition of a millennial kingdom; he too had aimed, however crudely, to present the life and especially the death of Jesus as a manifestation of the Son of God. Mark also had aimed to set forth ministry and passion as the types of life and death "in the Spirit," that men "might believe that Jesus is the Son of God, and by believing might have life in his name." But at the beginning of the second century the supreme demand of the Church was for a deeper, more comprehensive statement of the gospel in its two aspects, ethical and mystical, law and redemption, light and power. For all believers Jesus was "The Way." An Alexandrian Paulinist had compared him to the High Priest of humanity entered within the veil of the great world-sanctuary "a new and living Way" whereby we come to the Father. It remained so to present precepts and story in one, that the eternal Christ might be perceived to be both Truth and Life, that by him men might come unto the Father.

The eternal values of the gospel were certainly those emphasized in Paulinism. A mere new standard of duty summarizing and simplifying the law and the prophets made no revolutionary improvement on Stoic ethics; Jewish eschatology had everywhere been found wanting. To keep abreast of Greek conceptions of "eternal life," it needed to transform itself at a pace well-nigh too rapid for the Church. This was indeed already a Greek-speaking, Gentile, Pauline Church, and could not be fully satisfied with any statement of its gospel not fundamentally based on the great Christological principles of the Pauline epistles, Spirit and Life. It must have a "spiritualized" restatement of the tradition of both the Sayings and Doings. From whence could such a restatement emanate, if not from Ephesus, the great seat of the Pauline school? And what should we expect it to be, if not a "bringing out" under forms borrowed from the mass

of current narrative, and freely adapted to the special needs of the time, of the transcendental, eternal Christ of Pauline theology, the Way to the Father which is both Truth and Life?

The question whether the three Epistles which accompany and supplement the Gospel should be attributed to the same, or to a later hand, will largely depend on the attitude displayed on one side and the other toward the Docetic heretics. The Gospel has its own denunciation of unworthy shepherds, whose access to the sheep has not been by the Door of Christ, but across and over the protecting barriers of the fold. Their mercenary motives and cowardice in time of danger, are contrasted with the conduct of the Good Shepherd in forms drawn from the book of Ezekiel.¹ The flock as a whole, however, have turned a deaf ear to the voice of these "strangers." In the Epistles the situation seems less favorable, or at all events there is a more explicit and direct polemic. The unworthy element have "gone out from" the brotherhood because "they were not of it"; their moral laxity, substituting "illumination" for the New Commandment of brotherly love, is directly denounced; their Docetic presentation of Christ as coming "by water only (*i. e.*, in the sacrament of baptism conceived as the channel of transfusion of the Spirit in the case both of Jesus and of disciples) but not by blood" (*i. e.*, not in the atoning death commemorated in the sacramental cup), is indignantly repudiated; their teaching is stigmatized as the spirit of Antichrist, as against the inspired witness of the Church; in fact the author states in so many words:

"These things have I written unto you concerning them that would lead you astray."

¹ With Jn. 10: 11-16 *cf.* Ezek. 34: 1-16.

These phenomena have a bearing on questions of date and authorship. But the modern world does not require a detailed refutation of the ponderous absurdities of Kreyenbühl to prove that the Gospel is anything but a product of Gnosticism and the school of Menander in Antioch. In Gospel as well as Epistles Docetism is distinctly opposed in a whole series of passages. We need mention only the "becoming" flesh of the Logos; the exposition of the Eucharist as the flesh and blood of Christ, participation in which is indispensable to "life;" the special manifestation of the resurrection *body* to Thomas. Still there can be no question of that double aspect of the Gospel in respect to points of dispute between Gnostic and orthodox which Scott so distinctly brings out. The author goes at least to the verge of self-contradiction in his hospitality toward both Gnostic and Jewish Christian conceptions. Some passages, as we have already seen, are demonstrably due to redactional revision, among them such particularly as come nearer the Synoptic type, and it may be possible to show that instances like the correction of Mark in Jn. 19:17 that Jesus bore his own cross, and the seeming reference of 9:2-3, 24 ff. to Basilides' doctrine of prenatal guilt, are alien to the earliest form of the Gospel. Nevertheless the Gospel must first be treated as a whole and in its present form; and thus treated it cannot be said that its attitude toward Docetism is incongruous with that of the Epistles. The latter, it is true, seem to reflect a more advanced and embittered stage of the conflict; they are openly and professedly polemic, while the Gospel is in high degree irenic and even sympathetic toward some of the leading ideas of Gnosticism. It does not follow that the same hand which originally compiled the Gospel, at all events the hand which contributed most largely to its present form, may not have been the same which under later conditions, in a more embittered stage of the conflict, supplemented

its message by a renewed and greater emphasis on the side of ethical requirement and the historic tradition, coupled with a denunciation of those who had "gone out from" the brotherhood to follow the spirit of Antichrist.

The same profound loyalty to Paulinism which furnishes the real clue to the combined catholicity and freedom of the Fourth Gospel would avail, if adequately applied, to explain other features which to many critics have seemed obscure, or have suggested the intervention of some alien source or influence. The categories of "sources and influences," though instructively employed by Scott, are not in fact fully adequate for the purpose. We have already taken a preliminary glimpse at our evangelist's relation to Synoptic tradition, and shall see later somewhat more fully in what sense it has served him as a "source." It is only rarely that we can apply the term "source employment" to his use of the Pauline writings. Yet surely Paulinism is to him much more than an "influence." We should call it rather his universal solvent in which all elements of mere historical tradition are held in solution until precipitated and recast in his own molds of thought.

The well-known instance of the altercation with "the Jews" regarding the seed of Abraham according to the flesh and that according to the spirit, the bond and the free, in Jn. 8:31-47 may serve in comparison with its parallels in Gal. 4:21-31 and Rom. 6:16-23 as an example of "John's" occasional direct employment of Pauline material. As a rule the relation is far deeper, pertaining to the fundamental doctrines and modes of thought, such as the interpretation of the sacraments, the doctrine of mystic union "in Christ," and the doctrine of the Spirit. Examples of the latter type may be found (1) in the "parable" of the Vine and the branches (15:1-6) adapted from Is. 27:2-6 (LXX), compared with Eph. 4:4-16; (2) in the "high priestly" Prayer for the

Church, substituted in 17: 1-26 for the agony in Gethsemane, compared with Paul's prayer in Eph. 1: 3-23 for the unity of the redeemed Israel of God. One need only penetrate beneath the surface to the really dominant ideas of the Pauline passages, in order to realize how thoroughly the fourth evangelist is mastered by their spirit and reproduces it in forms of his own. But since detailed comparison would carry us too far, we may content ourselves with one further illustration, for which there is the more occasion in that Scott, who seldom fails in this respect, seems not to have done justice to the relation.

"John's" doctrine of the Paraclete (*i. e.*, "advocate" or "preacher") completely transforms the Synoptic, which mentions only a promise of Jesus to the disciples in view of coming persecution, that when summoned before earthly tribunals they should have an "Advocate" to conduct their defense with more than human eloquence. The Spirit of God should speak through them, as through prophets of old, so that they need "take no thought how or what they should speak" (Mt. 10: 17-20). In the synoptic form the recollection of Paul's inspired defenses "before governors and kings" is still fresh, and clearly dominates the form of the reported saying. Something of this original relation of the promise of the Spirit as "Advocate" still remains in the connection of Jn. 15: 18-27 between the predicted hatred and persecution of the world and the promise of the Paraclete, "the Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father," although here the function of defense before tribunals has given place to that of a "bearing witness" of Christ in which the disciples are to share. In the following context (16: 7-14) the function of the Paraclete is described in its two aspects, (1) that which it presents to the world, which is simply convicted by it "in respect of (its own) sin, and of righteousness (as shown in the Church) and of judgment" (in its God-

given triumph over the power of Satan in the world); (2) that which it presents to the Church as Revealer of the things of Christ. In the former we recognize an adaptation of Paul's saying to the Corinthians (I Cor. 14:24, 25) concerning the outsider, who in presence of the spirit of prophecy exercised by the Church,

"is convinced of all, he is judged of all: and thus are the secrets of his heart made manifest; and so, falling down on his face, he will worship God, and report that God is in you of a truth."

In the latter we recognize that wider and continually widening aspect of the promise which finds its fulfilment in the Pentecostal gifts of "prophecy," "exhortation," "insight" (*γνώσις*), and "edification," all of which for the primitive Church are comprised under the term *παρακλήσις* ("exhortation" or "comfort"). It is because of its far-reaching development of this doctrine of the "witness of the Spirit," in line with the Pauline conception of I Cor. 2:6-16, that the Fourth Gospel so commended itself to the Montanists, and conversely was so obnoxious to their opponents at Rome.¹

But in 14:15-24 the coming of the Paraclete is made practically to take the place of the Second Coming of Christ himself. Judas not Iscariot² is disabused of the crude eschatology of Judaism, and taught that the eternal indwelling of the Father and the risen Christ in the believer's heart is the real Second Coming. It is natural to inquire what function then remains for the Paraclete, and why it is necessary to add in verses 25-26 the further promise to send the Spirit, which already in verse 16 had been described as "another Paraclete" (here = "Intercessor"—*i. e.*, another besides Christ himself, who has just promised to intercede for them with the Father). Scott very justly replies that in

¹ See above, p. 235.

² The name of this Judas is possibly chosen to suggest the Jew (*Ἰουδαῖος*) who is merely unenlightened, not an enemy.

strictness there is no logical place in "John's" theology for the Spirit, as distinguished from the risen Christ. But to discard the doctrine of the Spirit would have been an inconceivably revolutionary departure from the most fundamental principle of Paulinism, not to say of Christianity itself. If the outpouring of the Spirit were forgotten, what remained to convict the world? On the other hand, to speak of the Spirit as "another Intercessor" is neither an innovation on the part of the fourth evangelist, nor contradictory, as has sometimes been maintained, of I Jn. 2:1, where we read:

"If any man sin we have a Paraclete (Intercessor) with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation (*ἰλασμός*) for our sins, and not for our sins only, but also for the sins of the whole world."

The figure of Christ as the high priest of humanity entering into the cosmic holy of holies with the blood of the atonement (Heb. 9:24; 10:25) may well have affected the form of this latter passage, and the author of *Hebrews* is quite likely to have in mind the passage often quoted from Philo (*Vita Mos.* iii, 14) on the intercession of the high priest who as he wears the *πέταλον* ("breastplate"?) when he enters before God in the Temple "symbolically makes the whole world (represented in the *πέταλον*) enter in with him."

"For it was necessary that the man (Aaron) consecrated to the Father of the world should employ as Intercessor (*παρακλήτω*) his son (*i. e.*, the ideal cosmos), most perfect in virtue, to ensure forgiveness of sins and a supply of richest blessings."

If there is any relation whatever between Philo's Intercessor represented by the high priest's *πέταλον* and the "other Intercessor" of Jn. 14:16—and of this we are more than doubtful—it is utterly beside the mark to adduce the passage from *Vita Mosis*; not merely, as Scott maintains, because "the *παρακλήτος* of the Gospel has nothing in common with

that of Philo but the name," but because the whole passage about the intercession of the risen Christ in heaven simultaneously with that of the Spirit on earth as "another Intercessor" has a derivation so direct and simple that once our attention has been called to it the relation becomes obvious. The passage in I Jn. 2:1 may evince, as stated, an additional influence from the author of Hebrews; but for that of Jn. 14:12-17 concerning the intercession of Christ in heaven and of the Spirit upon earth no other derivation is possible than Paul's great chapter on the work and witness of the Spirit, where with manifest allusion to the unintelligible, half articulate prayers uttered "in a tongue" or "in the Spirit" he declares first that:

"the Spirit himself maketh intercession (*ὑπερεντυγχάνει*) for us with inarticulate groanings; but he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God,"

and but a few verses farther on continues:

"Who is he that shall condemn? It is Christ Jesus that died (who is the judge), yea rather, that was raised from the dead, who is at the right hand of God, *who also maketh intercession for us.*"¹

If there seems to be confusion of thought between the Intercessor for the saints before the throne of the heavenly Judge and the "other Intercessor" who here upon earth fulfils all the manifold functions of the Church's *παράκλητος* we must blame, not the fourth evangelist, but the Apostle Paul. Nevertheless, as an indication how remote are these "Johannine" discourses from the Sayings of Jesus it is instructive to note that of all the many senses in which the promise is developed, partly on the basis of the Church's experience, partly on that of Pauline doctrine, the only one which has *entirely* disappeared is that which by synoptic re-

¹ Rom. 8: 26-34.

port, as well as by all rules of sound historical criticism, must be considered to most nearly represent the original utterance:

“When they deliver you up, be not anxious how or what ye shall speak: for it shall be given you in that hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you.”¹

In his development of this promise of the “Paraclete” we have an example of the sense in which the fourth evangelist understood his task of “bringing out” the spiritual gospel of Paul from the current evangelic tradition.

¹ Mt. 10: 19-20.

CHAPTER XII

THE DISCIPLE WHOM JESUS LOVED AND HIS RELATION TO THE AUTHOR ¹

Since the problem of the Fourth Gospel is no longer a problem of date, but of authorship,² the main question to be determined by the indirect internal evidence will be that of the personality reflected in the work, and with this is inextricably bound up that of the figure, elsewhere unknown, of "the disciple whom Jesus loved"; a figure unexpectedly introduced in the second part of the Gospel, which deals exclusively with the Lord's Supper, the Cross, and the Resurrection. This portion of the Gospel is doubly marked off from the first twelve chapters, which deal with the public ministry; (a) by the general closing reflections on the results of Jesus' public work in 12:37-50; (b) by the transition in 13:1 to those to whom Jesus now gave himself exclusively, "his own which were in the world," whom as his beloved "he loved unto the end." Among these one is conspicuous as "the beloved disciple" *par éminence*. He is not merely Jesus' "friend" (*φίλος*), as Lazarus was (11:3, 11), but his *ἀγαπητός*, as Jesus himself is the *Ἀγαπητός* of the Father; he is the type of true discipleship.

Even the superficial observer cannot fail to perceive that the problem of authorship is somehow linked with that of this mysterious figure. Elsewhere all evangelic tradition appears inseparable from the personality of Peter. The

¹ The substance of this chapter was published in the *Expositor* (Series VII, Vol. IV (1907), pp. 324 ff.) under the same title.

² See Chapter I.

Markan story, which supplies the entire substance of the narrative outline of both Matthew and Luke, is certainly based, as tradition has always maintained, on the reminiscences of Peter. Even in the meager instances where our first and third evangelists venture to add some slight new feature of narrative the figure of Peter is usually made central, as if to emphasize the completeness of dependence of all authentic early tradition upon this single thread. The outline of Mark is that adopted in general by the fourth evangelist also. He too begins with the Appearance of the Baptist and Call of the First Disciples, marks the culmination of the Galilean ministry by the Feeding of the Multitude, the Walking on the Sea, and the Confession of Peter, and concludes the story of Jesus' career by the journey through Perea to Jerusalem and the Passion and Resurrection at the final Passover. But here, in the three instances of the Supper, the Cross, and the Resurrection another sponsor appears. The first instance is the most conspicuous of our evangelist's departures from the stereotyped Synoptic outline; the other two are conspicuous both for their intrinsic interest and for the admitted failure of first-hand testimony. For according to Mark's narrative the flight of Peter to Galilee before the final catastrophe made this unavailable.

Aside from the Appendix, which has its own answer to the question, Who is meant by "the Disciple whom Jesus loved"? this figure appears only in the three instances named. Except at the Cross he is introduced in association with Peter, but certainly not as of lower rank. Rather he appears in the rôle of one who precedes Peter, the fountain authority of the Church's evangelic tradition, in apprehension of the real significance of what transpires. At the Cross, where Peter's absence is painfully conspicuous, he becomes by appointment of Jesus himself the guardian of Jesus' mother.

No ordinary place or function can be attributed to such a character. The distinguishing trait by which he is first introduced as "lying in Jesus' bosom," and the name "that disciple whom Jesus loved" tolerate no secondary place. The phrases have the symbolic significance characteristic of this Gospel. The Gospel of Mark had made prominent the Jewish "hardness of heart" which had infected the Twelve, so that even they, "having eyes saw not, and having ears heard not,"¹ and in the most conspicuous instances had made Peter the special object of rebuke for this common failing. The Fourth Gospel presents the phenomenon not negatively only, but affirmatively. In contrast to the obtuseness of Peter and the other disciples is the insight of "the disciple whom Jesus loved." The mystery of Jesus' self-surrender to the Cross—incomprehensible to Peter (Mk. 8: 31-33),—nay, his actual stiffening of the faltering purpose of the betrayer; the mystery of the empty tomb, which had left Peter only "wondering" (Lk. 24:12), are to this disciple an open book. To him is delivered the care of Jesus' dearest upon earth. For what significance can the scene of Jesus' mother at the Cross have had to an evangelist bent on "spiritual" meanings, save to symbolize that element of his "kindred after the flesh" which however blindly had yet loyally clung to him. Peter's attempt to solve the knotty question of the standing of the Jewish element in the larger "Israel of God" we know had not been attended with signal success.

Considering the relation in which the Beloved disciple is made to stand to Peter in these three instances of his appearance on the scene we can hardly dispute those students of the Fourth Gospel, both ancient and modern, who see in it a subtle correction of the Petrine story, and understand the figure of the Beloved disciple to be introduced in connection

¹ Mk. 6: 52; 7:18; 8:17-21, etc.

with this purpose, to rectify what had been misunderstood. The Beloved disciple speaks from "the heart of Christ," and sees things as they really are; on this point opponents and defenders of the traditional authorship are at one. The question in debate will be, What *kind* of correction is aimed at? Is it external fact, or internal significance? Does the author aim to present a new and more historically correct account than Mark's of the events experienced in common during the period of the ministry, supplementing its deficiencies, restoring its unhistorical "order," and tacitly correcting its misstatements? Or is his aim doctrinal rather than historical, his effort the "bringing out" of the "spiritual" side rather than the concrete, his "eye-witness," in short, that of the eye which has been "spiritually" enlightened (Eph. 1:18)? And if the latter be the case, is such a design, so carried out as we find it, attributable to the son of Zebedee?

To writers who approach the question from the point of view of the Reverend F. W. Worsley of Durham, whose recent work on *The Fourth Gospel and the Synoptists* awakens expectations by its title,¹ these questions answer themselves. Supplementation and correction at a few necessary points of the substantially historical narrative of Mark was all the fourth evangelist aimed at.

"His plan was not concerned with any theological or Christological opinion, which were rather natural views of one who was under the influence of a closer contact with the Person of Christ than any of the Synoptists."²

On this conception of the task of the fourth evangelist, which is so remarkably convenient for the critical historian of the twentieth century, however foreign to the ideals of the second, we will merely recommend a more careful reading of the works of Drummond and Scott; for Mr. Worsley professes

¹ Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1909.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 29.

high regard for these scholars in spite of their leanings to criticism. We may then turn at once to the main argument on which his assertions are based:

“We have one plain and definite claim put forward by the writer of the Fourth Gospel, ‘And he that hath seen hath borne witness, and his witness is true: and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye also may believe’ (19:35); and again, ‘This is the disciple which beareth witness of these things and wrote these things: and we know that his witness is true’ (21:24).

“Are we to suppose that he is a liar?”¹

The Bible Society prints the Appendix as an integral part of the Gospel, therefore it was written by “the writer of the Gospel.” Therefore that writer was the Beloved disciple; for he says so himself, and who could know better?²

Reasoning of this type would scarcely be worthy our attention were it not for examples in higher places, such as the following:

“The critics who assert that the Gospel is not the work of an eye-witness, and even those who say that the last chapter was not written by the author of the whole, wantonly accuse these last words of untruth.”³

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

² In Mr. Worsley's book debatable points are usually covered by the phrase “I am satisfied,” or “My conviction is” or “I say emphatically,” or “We feel at once” or the like (see pp. 36, 38, 49, 53, 59, 61, 74, 75, 80, 89, 92, 96, 98, 106, 117, 129, 143, 152, 160, 163, 166, 169, 171). This saves the reader the trouble of examining the evidence and guards him from the danger of a wrong conclusion. In the cardinal question of the authorship of the Appendix we find two references in the Index which give the entire argument of Mr. Worsley on the question. The first is on p. 58, as follows: “I am quite satisfied that the Appendix is the work of the author of the rest of the Gospel and that it is all the work of one person.” The other, on p. 148, confirms the reader's faith as follows: “I can see no reason for doubting the historicity of this incident. One thing is quite certain, and it is that the Appendix is the work of the author of the other twenty chapters.”

³ Sanday, *Criticism*, p. 81.

This style of polemic suggests a sense of trepidation lest the chain of reasoning should not hold. But since everything is thus made to hinge upon the identity of the writer, not of the Appendix alone, but in particular of its last (textually genuine) verse (21: 24), it becomes necessary to take this as our point of departure, and ask, Is the exegesis correct which thus (in 21: 24) identifies the Beloved disciple with John the son of Zebedee? Setting aside those late legends, such as Jerome's¹ concerning the aged John continually reiterating the "new commandment" of the Lord "Little children, love one another," whose source is obviously no other than the X literature itself, does the figure of the Beloved disciple in its three occurrences really correspond with our knowledge of John the son of Zebedee *from other sources* than the X literature and dependent legends; or does the context and mode of introduction of the figure imply another, perhaps an ideal personage?

We have seen that there are in the substance of the Gospel but three appearances of the figure, and these to some extent interrelated. It is important to distinguish from these two other groups of passages which fall outside our consideration because they either are (a) indefinite, and need not refer to the same, nor indeed to any specific individual; or else (b) are from a later writer, who may easily have attached a different meaning to the phrase "the disciple whom Jesus loved."

In the former category of indefinite references are to be placed (1) those of Jn. 1:35-42, where the analogy with Mark 1:16-20 may well lead the reader mentally to introduce the figures of James and John. But not only have we here no allusion whatever to "the disciple whom Jesus loved," the phenomenon is not even connected primarily with the introduction of this new personality. Its real explanation must

¹ *Comm. on Gal.*, vi, 10.

be found in connection with the general question, "Why is there no mention in the Fourth Gospel of the *two* sons of Zebedee, James and John, the 'sons of thunder'?"—a problem already discussed.¹

(2) In the account of Peter's Denial, Jn. 18: 15-27, a synoptic story intimately connected with the Appendix (*cf.* 21: 15-19), we have again the indefinite mention of "another disciple known to the high-priest," who procures Peter's admission to the court and then disappears. There is nothing to prove that this was "the disciple whom Jesus loved"; the inference is simply suggested to the reader's mind in view of Mk. 14: 33, perhaps intentionally, as is almost certainly the case in the Appendix. This problem too must be dismissed for the present. It will be treated in our discussion of the editorial revisions which the Gospel has undergone.²

(b) Unlike the Gospel as a whole (1) the Appendix introduces openly "the sons of Zebedee" (21: 2). A penumbra of indefiniteness is secured by the addition to the list of five mentioned by name in 21: 2, of "two other of his disciples," possibly because of interest in the number seven.³ But given "the two sons of Zebedee," the process of elimination becomes so easy that the reader cannot really fail to identify "the disciple whom Jesus loved, which also leaned back on his breast at the supper, and said, Lord, who is he that betrayeth Thee?" (Jn. 21: 20) with the "witness-bearer" who, according to the Appendix, "beareth witness of these things and wrote these things" (21: 24). The author of the Appendix, accordingly, supplies the missing "sons of Zebedee," and, without positively so stating, leads the reader to infer that "the

¹ See above, p. 201 f.

² See below, Chapter XVIII.

³ *Cf.* the seven in Papias, and *Clem. Hom.*, xviii, 14, the patriarchs, as "the seven pillars of the world." In Gal. 2: 9, Peter, James and John are "pillars" (*cf.* Rev. 3: 12). Was the early Church, like "the world," and like "Wisdom's house" (Prov. 9: 1), conceived as built on seven pillars?

disciple whom Jesus loved" is John, the survivor of the two. But we have seen reason to consider the Appendix the work of a later redactor (R), who may, or may not, correctly identify the enigmatic figure.

A further passage frequently cited as if belonging to the group introducing the Beloved Disciple suffers from both objections: (a) indefiniteness and (b) editorial character. It is the passage on Peter's Denial (Jn. 13:36-38; 18:15-18, 25-27), which is so intimately connected with the Appendix¹ as to make it reasonable to infer that the nameless "other disciple known to the high-priest" of this story (18:10 f.) is meant to be understood in the same way. The reader of chaps. 18 f. might well ask, How is it, after the disciples have "gone their way,"² that "the disciple whom Jesus loved" can still be beside him at the foot of the cross, 19:26? The answer (of R) is the introduction in 18:15 f., together with his insertion of the incident of Peter's Denial, of the "other disciple known to the high-priest." The trait may have been suggested by the following of the "young man" (usually identified as John surnamed Mark) of Mk. 14:51 f. Other reasons concur to prove this whole story of Peter's Denial an interpolation by R.³ Were it part of the original stock, whose interpreter of events is "the disciple whom Jesus loved," we should expect this title, and not the indefinite "another disciple known to the high-priest."

Deferring the consideration of the "other disciple" of Jn. 18:15,⁴ we may therefore say as regards the "Beloved disciple" that the editor (R) who commends the Gospel to the reader

¹ On this story as an insertion, along with other material related to Synoptic tradition by the author of the Appendix, see Bacon, *Introd. to N. T. Lit.*, p. 274.

² John 18: 8 f., the Johannine euphemism for the desertion of the eleven, Mk. 14: 27, 50; Lk. omits.

³ Bacon, *Introd. to N. T.*, p. 274 (1900).

⁴ See Chapter XVIII.

in 21:24 wishes at least the latter, if not the former also, to be identified with the son of Zebedee.

(2) Whatever be the derivation in whole or in part of Jn. 19:31-37, the famous crux of 19:35 cannot be fairly interpreted without taking into consideration its manifest relation to 21:24. The phraseology alone would compel us here to recognize the hand of R. Once more we find the indefinite "He that saw it" (*ὁ ἑώρακώς*) brought into the same mysterious relation with "the disciple whom Jesus loved" as in the Appendix. The writer will not say in so many words, "This was the 'disciple whom Jesus loved';" still less "This was John the son of Zebedee," but he makes it impossible to think of anyone else. Phraseology, interest in authentication, method pursued, are those of R. We have no alternative but to class Jn. 19:35 also with the references which are both (a) indefinite and (b) redactional. It is R who speaks, and his intention is that the witness of the "blood and water" from Jesus' side shall be taken to be no other than "the disciple whom Jesus loved" of verse 26. Whether he also means that this disciple shall be identified with the author of I Jn. and III Jn. depends upon our judgment of the relation of Jn. 19:34 f. to I Jn. 5:6-9 and III Jn. 12. The reference in *ἐκεῖνος οἶδεν* would seem to be to the emphatic "witness" of I Jn. 5:6-9. In that case R will be not only asserting his conviction that the phenomenon of the blood and water was witnessed by "the disciple whom Jesus loved" (in his view John), but in addition that it is the same who, in the Epistles whose language he borrows, had laid such stress upon the "water and blood," declaring this to be a "witness of the Spirit" in some sense present and eternal. R's standpoint, in other words, is identically that of subsequent tradition, except that instead of plain statement he shelters himself behind purposed ambiguity.

To test the value of R's answer to the question: Who is

meant by "the disciple whom Jesus loved"? we must now return to the three unequivocal entries of this figure upon the stage, and ask ourselves what their significance is in the light of the original context. We may distinguish between the general context of the writing as a whole, and the individual context of each of the three entries, considering the latter first.

1. Jn. 13:1-30. The extraordinary character of the Johannine story of the Last Supper is quite inadequately stated when it is simply pointed out that it is not the Passover; that it has not the institution of the Eucharist, which this Evangelist, on the contrary, connects with the Feeding of the Multitude (Jn. 6), a narrative of the Agapé cycle; and that it completely eclipses the Eucharist by the emphasis laid upon the new rite of foot-washing, which Jesus institutes in perpetuity (ver. 15), as his own complement to the rite of baptism (ver. 10). All this is surprising enough when we reflect what significance already attached, even in Paul's time, to the story of the sacrament instituted by Jesus on "that same night in which he was betrayed" (I Cor. 11:20, 23 ff.). But it is not the whole truth. In Jn. 13:1-30 the supper is not a Passover, and not a Eucharist. There is a sacrament, with the bread and the cup after supper. But it is a sacrament for only one of those present—"the son of perdition," and for him it is a sacrament of judgment! By it "Satan entered into him."¹

There is no need to exaggerate. The phenomenon has not so startling an effect as it would have if this were new material introduced by the fourth evangelist *de suo*, instead of being a mere retention of the synoptic trait of the Betrayer whose "hand dipped with his Master in the dish" (Mt. 26:21-25 = Mk. 14:18-21 = Lk. 22:21-23). It is significant enough as being the *only* trait which the fourth evangelist sees fit to pre-

¹ On the fourth evangelist's treatment of the Eucharist and Agapé narratives see the chapter below entitled "Johannine Quartodecimanism."

serve from the story of the Lord's Supper. The removal of the institutional teachings to a connection with the story of the origin of the Agapé in 6: 52-58, the removal of connection with the Passover, and the substitution of the rite of foot-washing for the Eucharist have their explanation, no doubt, in the Evangelist's own view of these rites, and of their relation to Judaism on the one side, Gnosticism on the other. This particular trait, retained alone from the synoptic story of the Supper, may be partly explained by the desire to counteract a false value attached by some to the Eucharist. Its full significance, however, cannot be appreciated without a survey of all the passages in which the fourth evangelist takes up and restates the facts related by the Synoptists concerning Judas and his betrayal of the Lord. The apologetic intention thus becomes unmistakable. The taunt is to be met and overcome that the pretended Son of God, who "knew all men, and . . . needed not that anyone should bear witness concerning man; for he himself knew what was in man," had not been able to foresee or guard against betrayal by one of his own chosen circle of disciples.

The first mention of the betrayer occurs in 6: 70, where it takes the place of Mark's account of the rebuke to Peter for rejecting the declaration of Messiah's fate,

"Get thee behind me Satan, for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men."¹

In the Fourth Gospel it is declared that this reproach was addressed not to Simon, but to

"Judas the son of Simon, Iscariot; for he it was that should betray him, being one of the twelve."²

Moreover Jesus *had intended from the beginning that events should take this course*, and made the utterance with express reference to it:

¹ Mk. 8: 33.

² Jn. 6: 71.

“Did not I choose you the twelve, and one of you is a devil?”¹

The Evangelist even inserts in the context the explanation:

“For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who it was that should betray him.”²

This is certainly an important “correction of the Synoptists,” especially as it is one of a connected series, all made in the interest of showing that Jesus intended his death to happen just as it did, and even impelled the unwilling actors to do their part. In fact so far from “being in an agony” and praying for deliverance from “that hour” as reported in Mk. 14: 32-36, when the critical choice is put before him of going to the Greeks and teaching them, Jesus deliberately chooses rather the way of the cross as a better means of “drawing all men.” He *refuses* to pray, “Father, save me from this hour,” because “for this cause came I unto this hour.” His prayer becomes, therefore, “Father, glorify thy name,” which brings from heaven the audible reply: “I have both glorified it and will glorify it again,” and some interpreted this as “an angel speaking to him.” This further “correction” of the Synoptists’ story of the agony in Gethsemane and the strengthening angel is also highly significant. It requires, however, an unusual standard to perceive in it “the testimony of an eyewitness” replacing the inaccuracies of secondary narrators by a more *historical* version of events.³

We come then to the incident of the Supper, when, as Mark had related, Jesus had intimated, though vaguely and ambiguously, his foreknowledge of the impending betrayal:

“One of you shall betray me, even he that eateth with me.”⁴

Matthew had improved upon the indefinite indication of Mark by adding in particular that

¹ Jn. 6: 70.

² Jn. 6: 64.

³ With Lk. 22 *cf.* Jn. 12: 20-36.

⁴ Mk. 14: 18.

“Judas which betrayed him answered and said, Is it I (who am to betray thee), Rabbi? He saith unto him, Thou hast said.”¹

But even this did not make the foreknowledge and intention of Jesus quite undeniable. There must be an “eye-witness” who could testify to Jesus’ inmost intention. The fourth evangelist elaborates the scene with a minuteness of detail which leaves not the smallest loophole of escape. Satan’s “entering into Judas Iscariot” of which Luke had told (Lk. 22:3) was an immediate consequence of receiving the sop which Jesus “dipped in the dish.”² Peter and the rest “doubted of whom Jesus spake.” Even when the signal had been given privately to “the disciple whom Jesus loved,”

“No man at the table knew for what intent Jesus spake this unto him (the command to Judas, That thou doest do quickly)”; for only one who both understood the true intention of the Lord, *and also so completely sympathized with it as to be unwilling even to interpose an obstacle to the nefarious work of the betrayer*, could look calmly on and say no word.³

Finally to complete this particular line of “correction of the Synoptists” Judas appears at the scene of the betrayal accompanied not by a paltry posse of slaves from the high priest’s house, but by the entire Roman garrison of Jerusalem (*ἡ σπεῖρα*—600 men) headed by the military tribune himself (*ὁ χιλίαρχος*) and accompanied by “the officers of the Jews.” Judas has no need to “betray the Son of man with a kiss,” so that here the appearance of verisimilitude in Synoptic story is fallacious. On the contrary Jesus himself,

“knowing all things that were coming upon him went forth and said unto them, Whom seek ye? They answered him, Jesus of

¹ Mt. 26: 25.

² Cf. Mk. 14: 20, “He that dippeth with me in the dish,” *i. e.* (proverbially) my trusted friend.

³ Jn. 13: 21-30.

Nazareth. Jesus saith unto them, I am he. And Judas also, which betrayed him, was *standing with them*. When therefore he said unto them (the military tribune, cohort and officers of the Jews), I am he, *they went backward and fell to the ground*. Again therefore he asked them, Whom seek ye? And they said, Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus answered, I told you that I am he. If therefore ye seek me, let these (disciples) go their way: that the word might be fulfilled which he had spoken (in the high priestly prayer 17: 12), Of those whom thou hast given me I lost not one.”¹

As a vindication of the disciples from Mark's admission that at the approach of the posse of slaves “they all forsook him and fled” this is far more complete than Luke's bald cancellation of the trait. As a vindication of the incarnate Logos from the appearance of having been overtaken by a fate he had vainly sought to avoid, it leaves nothing to be desired—save credibility.

As regards motive and intention this first introduction of “the disciple whom Jesus loved” stands in line with all the previous references to the betrayal by Judas, and exemplifies both the interest of the evangelist himself in his corrections of Synoptic tradition and the function of the Beloved disciple.

It is not merely, however, in the apologetic interest that this figure is introduced. In order to do complete justice to the rôle it plays even in this first appearance we must consider further two passages which connect themselves with the particular scene of the Supper and its contrasting figures of the Betrayer and the Beloved disciple. They are (1) The Evangelist's own teachings regarding the sacrament in 6: 52-71; (2) the teaching of Paul in I Corinthians 11: 29 f. concerning that eating of the bread and drinking of the cup unworthily, which becomes a sacrament of judgment and death to those that “discern not the Lord's body.”

(1) As regards the evangelist's view of the sacrament ex-

¹ Jn. 18: 4-9.

pressed in the chapter on the Agapé (Jn. 6.) I cannot do better than transcribe the excellent exposition of Mr. E. F. Scott.¹

“The discourse in this chapter (Jn. 6) is based on the preceding miracle, which, in accordance with John’s method, becomes the symbolical expression of a permanent religious fact. Christ dispenses to the world the bread of life. He has in Himself an inexhaustible divine life which He imparts from age to age to those who believe on Him. How is this life communicated? It might appear from the earlier portion of the discourse as if the process were conceived as wholly spiritual. Jesus demands a true belief on Himself as the revelation of God, a living communion with Him, an assimilation of our nature to His. But this spiritual process is associated, more and more definitely as the chapter draws to a close, with the ordinance of the Eucharist: ‘The bread that I will give is My flesh, which I give for the life of the world’ (6: 51). ‘Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, ye have no life in you’ (53). ‘He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in him’ (56). In sayings like these we have direct allusion to the Eucharist as the ‘medicine of immortality’ (Ignat. *Eph.* 20), the means of fellowship between Christ and the believer, the real appropriation of the body and blood of the Lord.

“In this chapter, therefore, we seem to have two views wholly contradictory to each other. The imparting of the bread of life, typified in the miracle, is the communication by Jesus of His own mind and spirit to His disciples. It is also identified in a special manner with the outward rite of the Eucharist. The contradiction is partly to be explained as an instance of John’s peculiar method. He does not discard the common beliefs, even when they clash with his own, but accepts them formally in order to interpret and spiritualize them. In the present instance he takes the popular conception of the religious value of the Supper, and sets it in the light of a higher and more reasonable conception. The outward ordinance becomes symbolical of the true communion with Christ by a life of faith and obedience. To ‘eat His flesh

¹ *The Fourth Gospel, its Purpose and Theology.* E. F. Scott, 1906, p. 123.

and drink His blood' is to appropriate His Spirit, to make yourself one with Him, so that He seems to live again in His disciple. John himself points us to some such symbolical import in his words, by the warning with which the discourse closes: 'It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing' (6: 63)."

(2) To this strong reaction against the popular, crudely superstitious, and non-ethical view of the sacrament as a "medicine of immortality," the evangelist joins, however, as Scott correctly observes, a mysticism of his own, producing a conception not wholly freed from the magical element, but certainly able to plead even in this respect the great authority of Paul (I Cor. 11: 29 f.). The sacrament is the means by which one appropriates Christ's spirit, by which one's life is fed by the divine life of the Logos. Because this is something more than an ethical participation, unworthy eating has not merely moral but physical consequences. The open channel of divine grace becomes the opportunity of Satan, to the judgment and death of the unworthy participant. The Communion of the Lord's body and blood has its awful counterpart in a "communion with devils" (I Cor. 10: 14-22). This Pauline doctrine of the *sacrament of judgment* is embodied by our evangelist in his story of the Designation of the Traitor, the sole feature he thinks it worth his while to retain from the synoptic account of the Supper. "The disciple whom Jesus loved" is made the hierophant of this mystery. The question vainly put by the twelve in the synoptic story "which of them it was that should do this thing," is answered to this confidant of Jesus' bosom, who is given to understand its working. It is at the solicitation of Peter that "the disciple whom Jesus loved" obtains the explanation; but it does not appear when, if ever, Peter was told the result. Doctrinally, therefore, the teaching our evangelist finds in the synoptic story of Judas "dipping in the dish" with Jesus at the last Supper is expressed in I Cor. 10: 20-22, "I would not that ye should have

communion with devils. Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils; ye cannot partake of the table of the Lord and the table of devils." He intimates that it is possible for a Judas to make even of the Lord's Supper a sacrament of damnation.

It should be needless to say that this is not history, but doctrinal interpretation. No disciple of flesh and blood could have received the positive assurance of the traitorous purpose entertained by Judas, and permitted the traitor to walk forth before his eyes to its accomplishment, without lifting a finger to prevent it. But the disciple of Jn. 13: 23-30 is *not* a disciple of flesh and blood. He is the *interpreter* of the "Petrine" story of the announcement of the betrayal. And he interprets it on the basis of the Pauline doctrine of the sacrament of judgment.

2. We may pass now to the second context in which the Beloved disciple appears.

Jn. 19: 25-27 deals with the synoptic scene of the Women at the Cross, Mt. 27: 55 f.=Mk. 15: 41 f.=Lk. 23: 49. Among these the fourth evangelist introduces the mother of Jesus, whose presence, in view of the silence of the Synoptics and the statements of Mk. 3: 21, 31 ff., is somewhat surprising. That of a disciple is even more surprising, in view of the desertion of all which forms so conspicuous an element of the earlier tradition. The entire Johannine scene, so contrary even to the representation of Luke, where the women themselves "stood afar off, beholding" (John 19: 25, "stood by the cross"), and to the historical presuppositions of an execution of this character, suggests that here too it is not a flesh and blood disciple, nor a flesh and blood mother, that enters upon the scene. This mother rather, as we have seen, is she of whom Jesus speaks in Luke 11: 27 f., "they that hear the word of God and keep it"; perhaps in a narrower sense the representative of the adherents of an older faith which had not

known the day of its visitation, finding a home with that younger *ecclesia* which took its start from the cross as the essence and substance of the gospel.¹ The author of John 12:20-32 cannot have been less catholic than Paul in interpreting the significance of the cross. The adaptation which he makes, in 19:25-27, of the synoptic scene of the Women at the Cross suggests, therefore, in a writer admittedly devoted to symbolism, a Pauline interest in those who were Jesus' "kindred according to the flesh," and probably were his own as well. Like Paul, he finds in the doctrine of the cross the reconciliation of Jew and Gentile;² he too expects such a dwelling of Shem in the tents of Japheth as Paul foresees (Rom. 11:13-32). But here again the hierophant of the "ministration of the Gentiles" is "the disciple whom Jesus loved."

(3) The third instance of introduction of this personality is that of Jn. 20. This chapter contains the fourth evangelist's only narratives of the Resurrection and the Great Commission. That of the Appendix (21:1 ff.) we have seen to be the work of a later hand. For R's story of a return of seven of the disciples to their fishing in Galilee is clearly out of harmony with the preceding account of their receiving the Great Commission in Jerusalem (20:21-31). Wellhausen³ has even serious objections to urge against the originality of 20:24-29 also, because it introduces Thomas as an absentee on that supreme occasion. Whatever the cogency or the inadequacy of this latter plea, the whole content of the resurrection story as related by the synoptic writers, from their account of the

¹ Cf. the taking refuge by the mother of Messiah in Rev. 12:6 "in the wilderness, where she hath a place prepared of God, that there they may nourish her a thousand two hundred and threescore days," perhaps referring to the flight of the church to Pella from Jerusalem.

² Eph. 2:16-18.

³ On the structural analysis of Wellhausen see his *Erweiterungen u. Aenderungen im Vierten Evangelium*, 1907, and below, Chapter XVIII.

empty tomb to the Great Commission and the Pentecostal endowment with the Spirit, is covered by our evangelist in three scenes, the Empty Tomb (20: 1-10), the Appearance to Mary Magdalen (20: 11-18), and the Mission of the Twelve (20: 19-23).

The first at the tomb, the first to believe, was "the disciple whom Jesus loved." He appears as a kind of invisible companion of Peter in the hurried visit to the tomb borrowed from Luke 24: 12.¹ Neither of the two speaks to, nor appears to notice, his companion. The new-found faith of "the disciple whom Jesus loved" does not express itself to Mary Magdalen, who is left "standing without, weeping"; nor even to any of the disciples. His coming and seeing the empty tomb and believing, is all an episode introduced into the Lucan story of the women at the sepulcher without the faintest trace of an effect upon the course of the narrative. Again we must say *this is no disciple of flesh and blood*. All is precisely as if he were not there. His function indeed has no regard for the persons and conditions of that age. The empty tomb was enough for him. "He saw and believed." He is the type of that faith which does not wait for ocular demonstration, but is quickened to full life by "knowing the Scripture that he must rise from the dead" (ver. 9).

In the light of these three individual contexts is it a son of Zebedee, even a glorified son of Zebedee, that *the original author* intends to present under the mask of "the disciple whom Jesus loved"? Is it both this and his own personality? If so, he uses a strange title,² and has a strange way of describing his hero. We are told that it is modesty which

¹ The verse is omitted in some MSS., but the incident is referred to in 24: 24, which appears in all.

² Zahn seriously considers the possibility of accounting for the title on the basis of the legend in the Leucian *Acts of John*, where John is the *παρθένος* of Rev. 14: 4, prevented from accomplishing his intended marriage in order to be reserved for Christ. This is inverting cause and effect.

accounts for this; the author shrinks from introducing himself by name. Strange modesty, which prefers a title of extreme and exclusive honor to the simple pronoun, and which introduces the personality only to place it in contrast with the weakness and blindness of the rest of the Twelve! We are told that this veiled introduction of "the disciple whom Jesus loved" is one of the "touches of the eye-witness." And yet of all the unreal scenes of this gospel of abstractions none is so unreal, none of the *dramatis personæ* so phantasmal, as the Beloved disciple himself, and the symbolic adaptations of synoptic scenes in which he figures.

Let us then turn from that interpretation of this veiled figure which R has imposed on later tradition by his interpolations in and additions to the Gospel, and frame for ourselves an interpretation on the basis of the broader context of the original work viewed as a whole.

The view many times advanced since Scholten that the Beloved disciple is a purely ideal figure is surely more in accord with the nature of his entry on the scene in the three individual contexts just discussed, than that which R has imposed on all subsequent traditional interpretation. In some sense he is an ideal figure, that ideal disciple whom Jesus would choose, and who reads his soul aright. What, then, is ideal discipleship in the fourth evangelist's conception? What message will he be supposed to obtain, who reads the very soul of Jesus? To these questions "the spiritual Gospel" leaves room for but one answer. Rarely has it been better stated than in the work of Mr. Scott. The essence of the gospel of Christ for our evangelist centers in the great word "life." He makes himself the great vindicator of Paul, for whom the redemption had been simply "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus making me free from the law of sin and death." To the fourth evangelist, as to Paul, the gospel is not precept, but personality and

power; "the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelling in you." The cardinal ideas of the Fourth Gospel are defined in the conclusion of the volume we have quoted in three fundamental principles:

"(1) Jesus Christ in his actual Person is the revelation of God. (2) The peculiar work of Jesus was to impart Life. (3) The life is communicated through union with Christ. It was inherent in His own Person, and before it can reappear in His disciples they must become in some sense identified with Himself." ¹

From these cardinal principles of the Fourth Gospel it should be possible to deduce the evangelist's conception of the ideal disciple.

In one sense he must needs correspond to the author himself, whose insight into the deeper meaning of the gospel is the occasion of his writing. With all those who have not seen and yet have believed, the gospel has come to our evangelist through union with the eternal Christ, the Logos of God. He is of those who, with the great Apostle to the Gentiles, if they had known a Christ after the flesh would know such a Christ no more. He has apprehended him *sub specie eternitatis*, and abides in his bosom, as the glorified Redeemer himself abides in the bosom of the Father. In the sacrament, at the cross, in the resurrection, he has "put on Christ," and in him has appropriated the eternal life of God. The ideal disciple cannot be less. He must be an interpreter of the evangelic tradition of Peter in the deeper, larger sense.

But we should be doing scant justice to the fourth evangelist if we proceeded at once to identify his typical disciple with any one individual, whether himself, or Paul, or John, or some less known figure of the past. This is not his method. His Nicodemus combines traits from the rich ruler of Lk. 18: 18, Joseph of Arimathea, Lk. 23: 50 ff., and Gamaliel,

¹ E. F. Scott, *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 360 ff.

Acts 5:34 ff. His woman of Samaria is a composite of the Syro-phoenician (Mk. 7:24 ff.) and the "woman that was a sinner" (Lk. 7:36 ff.). His family group at Bethany combines the traits of the Peræan scene of Lk. 10:38-42, the Galilean of Lk. 7:36 ff., and of the parable of Lk. 16:19 ff. Even his pool of Bethesda seems to have borrowed its most distinctive peculiarity, the periodic "troubling of the water," from either the Virgin's Fount (Gihon) or the pool of Siloam. It is true that the Beloved disciple always comes to the fore as the Interpreter, supplying and correcting from the evangelist's point of view, and to this extent his voice is the evangelist's voice, the same voice which speaks in the "corporation we" of Jn. 1:14; 3:11 and throughout the Epistles. He does speak for the author, as the author himself speaks for the Church. But to say that he *is* the author is not only a begging of the question, but a solution which would not naturally suggest itself to minds not bent like that of R on securing at all costs the ægis of apostolic authority for the Gospel.

We may return for a moment, apropos of this self-expression of the writer, to the Epistles, in which, as we have seen, he half unveils his personality. First John explicitly declares itself as "written concerning them that would lead you astray." The heretics in question have been clearly identified in both ancient and modern times without serious disagreement as the same Docetists against whom Ignatius launches his fiery polemics in Asia *ca.* 110-117 A. D. The author of I Jn., in a passage echoed not long after by Polycarp, identifies this heresy with the predicted spirit of Antichrist, herein rationalizing on the older apocalyptic eschatology with its visible counterparts to Messiah and his "witnesses" and "prophets." Against this false witness our author undertakes to speak for the Church which has "an anointing from the Holy One and knows all things"

(I Jn. 2: 20-27). This appeal to the indwelling "witness of the Spirit" is an expansion and application of Paul's equally far-reaching claim in I Cor. 2: 6-16 for those who by endowment of this Spirit have become infused with "the mind of Christ." One who is thus "spiritual" can venture, even without new historical evidence, to write a "spiritual" gospel against traducers and dissipators of the evangelic faith. Once more we demand the application of the historic imagination instead of the poetic or apologetic. No man is qualified to interpret the "we" of I Jn. 1: 1-3, of Jn. 1: 14 and Jn. 3: 11, who has not first diligently read and compared I Cor. 2: 6-16 with I Jn. 2: 20-27, interpreting both in the light of the controversies of Asia in 100-110 A. D. Read in the sense it would convey to *contemporary* minds, not even I Jn. 1: 1-3 would suggest the idea that its writer claimed to be an apostle, or a personal disciple of Jesus.

It is his object, as we have seen, to oppose the "false prophets who are gone out into the world" with a true "witness"; and in this he seeks the participation (*κοινωνία*) of his readers (1: 1-4). At first he speaks in behalf of a body of teachers, who perpetuate the historic tradition of the concrete, tangible, human reality of the incarnate Logos, and who transmit his "new commandment." From 4: 12 on, the whole body of those who are conscious of the abiding presence of God and the gift of the Spirit are associated with the writer and his fellow-presbyters in their "witness that the Father hath sent the Son to be the Savior of the world." Thus *the Church* in its continuous life becomes the true "witness of Messiah" against the Antichrist, (1) by its unbroken historic tradition (1: 1-3; 4: 14), (2) by the abiding inner witness of the Spirit (4: 15-16; 5: 7-12). The conclusive evidence that the body of witnesses to the historic, human reality of the manifestation of the Logos spoken of in I Jn. 1: 1-3, is not limited to such as could boast of personal

intercourse with Jesus is the parallel reference to the incarnation of the Logos in the Gospel, Jn. 1:12-16, where it would be absurd to interpret "tabernacled among us" as "among the twelve apostles," even if verse 16 did not similarly make witnesses of all who have shared in his "fulness of grace and truth." The "we" of I Jn. 1:1-3 must therefore be measured by that of Jn. 1:12-16, where it can only mean "as many as received him," the spiritually begotten Israel of God, in contrast with *οἱ Ἰδιου* that "received him not." The case is not radically different even in Jn. 3:11, where the witness of the Church is placed, by what at first might seem a startling anachronism, in the mouth of Jesus himself:

"Verily, verily I say unto thee, We (the true sons of God) speak that we do know, and bear witness of that we have seen (*cf.* Jn. 19:35 and I Jn. 1:1-3; 5:6-12); and ye (unbelieving Jews who falsely claim to know God and thus to be his sons) receive not our witness."¹

The evangelist thinks no more of anachronism in making Jesus debate with a Jewish rabbi the doctrine of the new birth and the witness of the Spirit of Adoption, than when in the next verse but one (3:13) he makes Jesus allude to his own ascension(!). Whether in the incarnate Christ, or in the Church, or in the person of the evangelist himself,

"It is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is the truth. For there are three who bear witness, the Spirit and the water and the blood (the two historic sacraments of the Church) and the three agree in one. . . . And the witness is this, that God gave unto us eternal life, and this life is in his Son."²

For the discourses in which Jesus expounds the doctrine of his own Sonship, and for the general outline of evangelic tradition focused upon the two great themes of "the water

¹ Jn. 3:11.

² I Jn. 5:8, 11.

and the blood" (ministry and passion), our evangelist needed no new figure to serve as Interpreter. Only where particular points of historic fact had assumed controversial or doctrinal importance, as in his bold assertions of Jesus' foreknowledge and prearrangement of his own death, in the scenes at the cross and at the tomb, where the lack of apostolic testimony was most keenly felt, there was need of a more definite sponsor, a "spiritual" disciple to solve the enigmas of disputed historic fact. This is the function of "the disciple whom Jesus loved," and in this sense he speaks for the evangelist himself.

But we have seen that personages as well as scenes and "signs" in the Fourth Gospel are composite, and the Beloved disciple is no exception to the rule. In particular the name by which our author chooses to designate him suggests another factor in his thought. The "disciple whom Jesus loved" is something more than a purely ideal figure. A very real man has sat for the portrait; although, as already stated, this is not a case of self-portraiture.

We have seen that the Beloved disciple enters on the scene only in the drama of the cross and resurrection. His gospel of redemption is his by mystic union with Christ in the fellowship of his suffering and the power of his resurrection. We have seen also that he stands in some special antithetic relation to Peter. We have found that ultimately it must be one who anywhere, in any generation, enters the eternal life, like the evangelist himself, by appropriating "the mind which was in Christ Jesus." But the term "disciple whom Jesus loved" cannot well have been coined, nor his relation to the "first" of the twelve thus depicted, without a primary reference to that great Apostle who, when even Peter was recreant and blind to the real significance of the doctrine he professed to follow, cut into the rock foundation of the Church the true gospel of the redemption. No language ever framed can so express the

whole heart secret of the Fourth Gospel as that great utterance of Paul, wherein, as against the inadequate apprehension Peter had shown of the true meaning of the cross, he pours out his soul's experience of Christ. If the Fourth Gospel be "the heart of Christ," the heart of the Fourth Gospel is Paul's confession of his faith in Galatians 2: 20:

"I have been crucified with Christ; yet I live; and yet no longer I, 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 (τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με), and gave himself up for me."

In this sense Paul, and whosoever has had Paul's experience—whosoever has thus seen the Lord, whether in the body or out of the body, whosoever has come to "know him and the power of his resurrection"—is the "disciple whom Jesus loved." For it is Paul who first set the example of such personal appropriation of the love manifested toward us "while we were yet enemies."

The author of the editorial Appendix has determined for all subsequent "defenders" another sense in which the figure of the Beloved disciple must be taken. For the sake of securing to the "spiritual" Gospel the standing which in his age it could not have unless declared to be "apostolic," he has cautiously and by veiled suggestion, yet unmistakably, introduced his own interpretation, cancelling, it would seem,¹ a few traits which offered obstacles in the body of the work, and attaching at least the direct declaration in 19: 35, perhaps other and longer passages. The enigmatic figure, he believes, was John the son of Zebedee, next to Peter in prominence in Synoptic story. John was suited to the rôle as author of a gospel of Ephesian provenance by the currently accepted representation that he had written the Asiatic book of Revelation. There was indeed the objection that this disciple like his

¹ See above, p. 201 f.

brother James had "fulfilled Christ's prophecy concerning them and their own confession and undertaking on his behalf" by "following" the Lord in martyrdom, even before Peter had glorified God in the manner of his death. But there was also a concurrent and rival tradition, perhaps originating from the long life of "the Elder John" of Jerusalem (*ob.* 117 A. D.), or perhaps starting from the known date of Revelation (93 A. D.), which connected with this apostle the promise of another kind of *μαρτυρία*—that of the abiding "witness of Messiah" who according to Mk. 9:1 should not "taste of death" until the Coming of the Lord. R knows how to adjust these rival traditions to his theory. Although "that disciple whom Jesus loved" seemed also to "follow" after the example of Peter, yet Peter's inference as to his fate was incorrect. Jesus' reply to the inquiry "What of this man?" was only "What is that to thee, follow *thou* me." Conversely the inference was also wrong which had been drawn from the words "If I will that he tarry till I come." This too was not a promise but a mere supposition. What was really meant was the abiding "witness" of the Beloved disciple's writing, the Gospel now presented to the reader, whose contents R, speaking for the Church at large, guarantees to be "true."

The difficulty of the tradition of John's martyrdom thus removed, there might well seem—to R—no insuperable obstacle to his identification of the ideal disciple with the son of Zebedee. And if our ideas of John's character are framed on the lines afforded by the Gospel and Epistles, ignoring Revelation and accommodating the Synoptic and Pauline references to the figure required by Irenæan theory, it is of course easy to follow this lead.

But what do we really know of John the son of Zebedee *after deducting the legends and inferences drawn from the material in debate.* It will not take long to state the sum total.

Once, and once only, does John the son of Zebedee appear

in Synoptic tradition in a separate rôle. The Roman and Pauline Gospel of Mark records a rebuke of Jesus administered to him for a special instance of intolerance:

“John said unto him, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name: and we forbade him, because he followed not us. But Jesus said, Forbid him not: for there is no man which shall do a mighty work in my name, and be able quickly to speak evil of me. For he that is not against us is for us.”¹

The Palestinian Gospel of Matthew not only cancels this rebuke of John, with its sweeping assertion of the Pauline principle that gifts of the Spirit are the supreme token of true discipleship,² but inserts after the saying “By their fruits ye shall know them” in the Sermon on the Mount a completely contrary doctrine:

“Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy by thy name, and by thy name cast out devils, and by thy name do many mighty works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me ye that work iniquity (*ἀνομία*).”³

Even the saying quoted in Mk. 9:40 is reversed in Mt. 12:30:

“He that is not with me is against me.”⁴

Clearly there was difference of opinion between Jerusalem and Rome as to the value of “gifts of the Spirit” as witness to discipleship. But in neither of the earlier gospels is there any difference of opinion as to the position of John with respect to this moot-point of primitive fellowship. John stands where

¹ Mk. 9:38-40.

² Gal. 3:5. Mark, like the Corinthians, takes this principle in the cruder, more external sense.

³ Mt. 7:22-23.

⁴ Cf. the following context (ver. 33) with that of the preceding passage (Mt. 7:19). Mark maintains that gifts of the Spirit are “fruits.” “Matthew” denies this unless those thus endowed are keepers of the law (*νόμος*).

Paul's reference in Gal. 2:9 would lead us to anticipate, side by side with James, a "pillar" of the Jerusalem church, willingly relinquishing to Paul all part or lot in "the gospel of the uncircumcision" as something to which he felt no call. He is not even involved with Peter in the controversy which subsequently broke out at Antioch over the implications of the agreement with Paul; for his name remains utterly unconnected with the whole question of the Gentiles and their affairs. John simply went with James "to the circumcision" (Gal. 2:9). There is no early evidence whatsoever that he ever reversed this momentous decision. All that we have tends simply to confirm it.

"James and John" together, as we have seen,¹ are known to Synoptic tradition in the rôle of martyrs who drink Jesus' cup and are baptized with his baptism; but here again Mark's introduction of the incident is with the primary object of rebuking the spirit of narrow and ambitious self-assertion which the sons of Zebedee had exemplified in their desire to obtain the places of honor in the kingdom. "Matthew" makes his usual minute changes² to relieve James and John of the imputation. Luke omits. Connected, perhaps, with this conception, is Mark's interpretation of the surname Boanerges (Mk. 3:17) and Luke's supplement to the rebuke of John's intolerance in the rebuke of "James and John" for seeking an Elijan vengeance on inhospitable Samaritans (Lk. 9:51-56).

Aside from these two rebukes we have absolutely nothing in Synoptic tradition to distinguish John from the rest of the group of fishermen first called to discipleship at the sea of Galilee, save the grouping with Peter and James in three

¹ See above, Chapter V.

² In Mt. 20:20 the *mother* of James and John makes the objectionable request. Mr. Worsley (*op. cit.*, p. 169) "thinks we should accept the slight correction."

Markan scenes already discussed,¹ and the faint traces in Lk.-Acts of his appearance as a satellite of Peter. If we ask, How can it be imagined that a Galilean fisherman should possess the literary and philosophic culture evinced by the fourth evangelist? we are told that in Zebedee's fishing boat there were also "hired men"! If every characteristic of the great *goël* of Paul is the reverse of what seems to be evinced by the meager references of the synoptists, and even of the position occupied by John so late as Paul's visit to Jerusalem *ca.* 50 A. D., we are assured that after coming to Ephesus John's views became enlarged and Paulinized!

These three, (1) the reference of Paul in Gal. 2:9, (2) the attachment by Mark of his example of anti-Paulinistic intolerance to the name of "John," (3) the references to "James and John" the "sons of thunder" as martyrs and perhaps as avengers of the rejection of the Christ, are the *only* gleams of light the *first* century affords to differentiate John of Capernaum momentarily from the undistinguished group of Galilean peasants and fishermen who are raised for a single hour by their association with Jesus into the light of history, but relapse promptly, with the one exception of Peter, into their natural oblivion. Of the three references not one affords a single trait to recall or suggest the author of the Fourth Gospel. Each and every one, on the contrary, raises its own insuperable objection to the intrinsically improbable identification made by R in the Appendix.

Many will doubtless continue to hold that at least R is not wrong in supposing the figure of the Beloved disciple to have been *intended to represent* John. The present writer himself, until more careful scrutiny of the evidence convinced him of the baselessness of the tradition of John in Asia, clung to this remnant of Irenæan theory. But even were this granted how little of the case would be altered! This Beloved dis-

¹ Chapter V.

ciple will be baptized into the name of John, but the figure itself will gain no appreciable degree of historicity. The change will be from ideality to idealization. It will still be not a real, but an ideal John, not the rough unlettered Galilean, but a Greek-speaking, Pauline Christian of 100 A. D., who in the Gospel is projected in bodiless form into the scenes of the past. For it is not merely the figure of Jesus which in the Fourth Gospel undergoes a perpetual transfiguration. The Beloved disciple too has attained Paul's goal of true discipleship:

“But we all with unveiled face, reflecting as a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transfigured (*μεταμορφούμεθα*) into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord, the Spirit.”¹

For reasons such as these we are constrained to disagree with R's interpretation of the enigmatic figure. R's exegesis of the three passages involved seems to us less consonant with historical and scientific exegesis than with the effort of his own time to magnify the persons of the apostles and to involve their authority. If the reader's patience has been taxed by the fullness of our attempt to set forth the exact nature of our difference with the writer of 19:35 and 21:24, we plead in extenuation the necessity that is put upon us of proving that a difference of judgment with R on a point of exegesis is not equivalent to “calling the evangelist a liar.”

¹ II Cor. 3:18.

CHAPTER XIII

JOHANNINE PRAGMATISM

Our study of The Evangelist's Task, and the use to which he has put his figure of the Beloved Disciple, should prepare us to anticipate a complete recast of the Markan embodiment of evangelic tradition, selective and illustrative in purpose, symbolic in method, with the object of "bringing out" the higher or "spiritual" gospel of Paul whose content is "life" by "believing in the name of the Son of God." Systematic inspection of the changes undergone by Synoptic material in its Johannine embodiment will prove that such is the case. The "supplementations" and "corrections" of the Synoptists are not such as would be made by an eye-witness improving the inaccuracies and oversights of the historically less well informed; but are primarily doctrinal and theoretic, subordinately apologetic and ætiological, but always a priori. In short, the author "perceiving that the bodily (or external) facts had been set forth in the (other) Gospels . . . composed a spiritual Gospel." ¹

In considering this question of the evangelist's use of Synoptic material we are fortunately able to limit ourselves to a few fundamental traits, using merely enough of specific reference to establish the points in question, and postponing such detailed study of the Gospel throughout as belongs properly to the commentator. The excellence of the work already done, especially by Scott ² and Schmiedel, ³ in the

¹ Clement of Alexandria, *ap.* Eusebius, *H. E.* VI, xiv, 7.

² *Ut supra.*

³ *The Johannine Writings*, Pt. I. The Fourth Gospel in Comparison with the first three Gospels. London, Adam and Charles Black, 1908.

line of affirmative and negative criticism, and that of the two Holtzmanns,¹ Heitmüller,² and Loisy,³ in the line of historical exegesis, makes restatement needless.

Unlike the irenic interpretation of Scott, Schmiedel's discussion undertakes the thankless but necessary task of what is called destructive criticism, preparing the way for an adequate and historical appreciation of the Gospel by proving that its reconstruction of the story is not such as the "defenders" maintain, but that from the merely historical standpoint it is both dependent and inferior.

The consistently "subjective" character of the Fourth Gospel, its author's "carelessness" in narrative and "freedom" in reproducing the thought of Jesus in language proved to be the evangelist's own by identity of style with the Epistles are so universally and freely acknowledged by leading "defenders"⁴ that further demonstration of these points may well seem like beating the air. But Sanday, and (indirectly at least) even Drummond, still maintains that "traits of the eye-witness" are so prominent in this Gospel as to imply not merely occasional access to more trustworthy tradition than that of the Synoptists, but personal participation by the author in the scenes narrated. In particular we are referred to the mention of minute details of place and time, including new proper names, as in the scenes of the Call of the earliest disciples, 1: 19-51; the Samaritan Woman, 4: 1-45; the Feeding of the Multitude, 6: 1-21; the Raising of Lazarus, 11: 1-57; and the Resurrection, 20: 1-29. We are reluctantly compelled, therefore, to devote a preliminary

¹ *Das Johannesevangelium untersucht und erklärt*, von Oscar Holtzmann, Darmstadt, 1887; and *Handkommentar zum neuen Testament*, Bd. IV, by H. J. Holtzmann, 1908.

² *Schriften des neuen Testaments*, by J. Weiss, Bd. II, pp. 685-861, 1908, by W. Heitmüller.

³ *Le Quatrième Evangile*, A. Loisy, Paris, 1903.

⁴ E. g., Drummond, *Character and Authorship*, pp. 34-41.

and (in one aspect) "destructive" discussion to what Professor Sanday designates "the pragmatism of the Gospel."¹

For mere purposes of disproof of Sanday's explanation it should be enough merely to point to an instance or two of mistaken dependence on the Synoptists, where on the traditional assumption John, as an eye-witness, must have had better knowledge. A number of examples of such "injudicious reliance on the Synoptics" are given by Professor Schmiedel on pages 81-83 of his little book.² We will cite but one, somewhat independently of Schmiedel.

Following the later tendency to combination already referred to³ Luke in omitting Mark's story of the Anointing of Jesus in Bethany (Mk. 14: 3-9) had reserved the more striking details, the name "Simon" for the host and the "alabaster box of *pistic* (?) ointment," to embellish therewith his own quite independent incident of the Penitent Harlot (Lk. 7: 36-50). The reader of this latter touching narrative will see at once how greatly it gains in simplicity and consistency by simply omitting the three allusions to the "*pistic* ointment" in verses 37, 38, and 46. This woman, *because she is a "sinner,"* dares not like the female disciple of Mark openly approach the head of Jesus, but (as he lies reclining with head toward the table) steals to his feet and standing there bedews them with her tears. Then, as if fearful of the consequences of this "defilement" of the "prophet," and having no other means to remove it, she brushes the tears away with her hair. Jesus beautifully contrasts this *cleansing* of his feet with the omitted courtesy of his Pharisaic host. The costly anointing, editorially in-

¹ *Criticism*, Lecture IV. Professor Sanday uses the term "pragmatism" "to describe a very marked characteristic of the Fourth Gospel, the abundance of detail—to all appearance precise detail—with which it presents its pictures."

² *Johannine Writings*.

³ Above, p. 321.

roduced to heighten the contrast,¹ is both improbable and incongruous, preëminently so when expended upon the feet (!). But the fourth evangelist is not content with the degree of combination already effected by the Lukan redactor. He makes the scene still more composite by identifying the woman with Mary, in whose home beyond Jordan Jesus had been entertained according to Lk. 10: 38-42, and retains only the most extravagant and unnatural features of the (composite) scene, that this Mary anointed Jesus' feet with precious "pistic" nard, and then wiped it away (why?) with her hair! The result is not only to leave us quite in doubt as to the character of this "Mary," but to require a double for "the village of Mary and her sister Martha"; because in Mark the anointing had taken place in Bethany near Jerusalem, whereas in Luke Mary's "village" was beyond Jordan. In the Fourth Gospel, accordingly, we have *two* Bethanys, between which Jesus oscillates in the last weeks of his life, "Bethany nigh unto Jerusalem, about fifteen furlongs off," where Jesus stays with the sisters Mary and Martha and their brother Lazarus (from Lk. 16: 19-31), and a "Bethany beyond Jordan," elsewhere unheard of, whence Jesus comes to them for the purpose of raising Lazarus from the dead (10: 40; 1: 28).²

In textual criticism there is no more positively established

¹ Festal anointing was a not uncommon practice—of course *on the head*—*cf.* Is. 61: 3; Ps. 23: 5; 141: 5. That of Mk. 14: 3-9, however, is more solemn and exceptional. It is intended by the woman as messianic; *cf.* I Sam. 10: 1. As we understand Schmiedel he does not regard these Markan traits in Luke's story as redactional additions to a pre-Lucan source, but regards the entire narrative as a Lucan composition *influenced* at these points by Mark.

² "Bethany beyond Jordan," which also serves as the scene of John's Baptism, is the only Palestinian locality off the direct high road from Jerusalem through Samaria to Capernaum that appears in our evangelist's topography. On his acquaintance with Palestinian geography see below, Chapter XV.

principle than the secondary character of conflate readings as against the factors of which they are made up. In the Fourth Gospel conflation of incidents, scenes and characters is the rule. We have not only composites, but, as we have just seen, composites of composites, and the uniform tendency is that the changes from Mark toward a more theoretical, less historical view in the later gospels of Matthew and Luke are carried in "John" much further still in the idealizing direction. We have seen how this theoretical transformation operates in the case of the Betrayer. It is notoriously the case in regard to the representation of Jesus' person, his sayings and his miracles. We shall see that in other respects also, such as the representation of the Baptist and his function, the controversy with "the Jews," and the like, the same principle holds true. Two points only (1) the evangelist's chronological and topographical equipment, (2) his treatment of the sacraments, in particular of the sacrament of the "flesh" and blood of the Lord, call by their complexity for separate discussion. Reserving these, we may return to what Professor Sanday designates his "pragmatism," showing in the present chapter that the supposed indications of first-hand testimony in "precise details" have in reality a quite different significance. In the chapter following we shall consider the general structure and outline of the story, investigating the Johannine treatment of Synoptic material in its broader phases, whether as to (a) omissions, or (b) supplements, or (c) changes and substitutions. The results of this latter study may even here be anticipated—since the relation is really notorious—to the extent of saying that the changes are *not* those of a better informed eye-witness, but the theoretical reconstructions of a later "theologian" intent on "bringing out" the religious, doctrinal, or apologetic *values*, on the basis of the spiritual gospel of Paul.

Professor Sanday's contention for the "pragmatism" of

the Fourth Gospel is considerably embarrassed at the outset by the fact that his foremost witness, Dr. Drummond, from whom he had quoted a comment on the "variety of character that passes before us, and the graphic nature of some of the descriptions,"

"turns round upon himself, and proceeds to discount the inference that might be drawn from these characteristics of the Gospel. While allowing that they fit in excellently with the external evidence (in favor of the tradition), he will not urge them as an independent proof of authorship, because 'the introduction of names and details *is quite in accordance with the usage of Apocryphal composition.*'"¹

Dr. Drummond, having no interest to defend the historical accuracy of the Gospel, which to him is "of a lower historical value than the Synoptics and . . . to be accepted more in the spirit than in the letter,"² is naturally unwilling to risk his reputation as a historical critic in so precarious a contention as Sanday's. He therefore states with a freedom unwelcome to his more conservative ally the fact, well known to scholars, that such "detail" is characteristic of the later and legendary elaborations of biblical story, whether in Church or Synagogue. To know the names of the obscurer characters—yes even of the angels and demons—is more apt to be a mark of late and legendary writers than of the earlier. The knowledge, *e. g.*, that the name of the servant whose ear (Lk. "right ear") was cut off by a "bystander" in Mark's story of the Arrest (Mk. 14:47) was "Malchus," that "Peter" was the inexperienced swordsman, and that the servant was a "kinsman" of the slave encountered later by Peter in the high priest's courtyard, is paralleled by that of the apocryphal *Acts*. These can inform us, for example, that the centurion who stood at the cross was named

¹ *Criticism*, p. 112. Italics ours.
Fourth Gospel—22

² *Ibid.*, p. 65.

Longinus,¹ know the names of both the thieves, and the name and story of the centurion converted by Peter at Cæsarea. The fourth evangelist's naming of Peter in Jn. 18: 10, 11, and of other interlocutors among the disciples elsewhere (Andrew, Philip, Thomas, Judas not Iscariot, etc.), has precisely the significance of the first evangelist's substitution of "Peter" for Mark's "the disciples" in Mt. 15: 15 and 18: 21, and the third evangelist's substitution of "Peter and John" (Lk. 22: 8) for the "two disciples" of Mk. 14: 13. The only difference is that the phenomenon is most pronounced and frequent in the latest gospel.

Professor Sanday admits indeed that "the examples given (by Drummond) are quite to the point," but pleads that in the Apocryphal Gospels and Acts

"place-names are somewhat less common than names of persons; and where there is any real precision in the use of place-names an inference in regard to the author . . . may be fairly deduced."²

The observation is true, for the obvious reason that place-names if wrongly employed would reveal the fiction, whereas personal names are not subsequently verifiable. "Where there is any real precision" we too shall endeavor to deduce the proper inference as regards the fourth evangelist. Indeed we may say at once that as regards localities *along a single limited line of travel* in Palestine, the evangelist unquestionably has first-hand knowledge. And he makes the utmost of it.³

But what sort of *motive* is it which supplements the Markan story of the blind man healed by clay and spittle (Mk. 8: 22-26 = Jn. 9: 1-7) with the direction

¹ From λόγχη, the "lance" wherewith Jesus' side was pierced?

² *Ibid.*, p. 112.

³ See below, Chapter XV.

“Go, wash in the pool of Siloam, which is by interpretation, Sent (*ἀπεσταλμένος*)”?¹

Such detail is to be classed with that of the precise number of fishes in the miraculous draft specified by R in the Appendix (21:11) as “one hundred and fifty and three,” which corresponds exactly with the supposed number of existing varieties. It stands on a par with the specification (6:9) that the five loaves at the miraculous Galilean Agapé were of “barley” like those of Elisha’s similar miracle in II Kings 4:42; and the “correction” of Mark’s “green litter (*στυβάδας*) from the fields” strewn in Jesus’ way (Mk. 11:8), into “palm-branches” (Jn. 12:13). Symbolically there is gain; for the palm-branch typified triumph and victory (Rev. 7:9). Historically there is loss; for the palm is an exotic in the climate of Jerusalem.

These are not exceptional instances of the fourth evangelist’s “pragmatism” but typical and characteristic. Even the pathos of the supreme tragedy does not make it to him a banality to supplement the Synoptic story of the slaking of Jesus’ thirst by the statement that Jesus had first said “I thirst” which was a “fulfilment of scripture” (Ps. 22:16), and that the partition of his garments corresponded in “detail” with the same psalm (Ps. 22:19), because the soldiers *both* “parted his garments among them” and *also* “cast lots upon his vesture.” Is it psychologically credible that “details” of *this* kind would preoccupy the mind of the sole surviving witness of the Crucifixion?

Deeper study of the much lauded Johannine “pragmatism,” in the light of the known propensities of haggadic interpreters of sacred story to introduce “abundance of detail—to all appearance precise detail—” of time, place and circumstance, especially *where it can subserve a didactic*,

¹ Jn. 9:7; cf. 6:29; 17:3.

symbolic, or apologetic purpose, completely reverses its prima facie significance. At first "this apparent precision, more especially in the notes of place and time" seems a "'trump-card' in the hands of the defenders." When we compare the entire series, and with it the phenomena of contemporary *midrash*,¹ we note that the didactic, symbolic, or apologetic purpose is almost always apparent in Johannine detail, while the larger outline of each scene as a whole, and of the Gospel as a whole, shows the very reverse of the characteristics which are inseparable from the true eye-witness.

The limitations of our knowledge forbid that in every case we should see with the clearness of the original reader what was the intended purpose, symbolic or other. For example, no one doubts that the motive for the remark "and it was night" after the exit of the Betrayer from the scene of the farewell Supper (13:30) is symbolic. Shall we say the same of the note of circumstance in 12:3 "And the house was filled with the odor of the ointment"? The clause takes the place of the Synoptic direction, "Wheresoever the gospel is preached that also which this woman hath done shall be spoken of for a memorial of her" (Mk. 14:9=Mt. 26:13), a direction which nevertheless had not availed to secure mention of the incident in Luke. Moreover, the comparison of deeds of ministering love to the odor of sacrifice ascending as a "memorial" to God, or filling the place of worship, is almost stereotyped in biblical parlance.² Still in this case we are not so sure that there was symbolic purpose. Again, the example of Mk. 15:1, 25, 33, 34, 42, in which the four

¹ As an example of "midrash" to those who may be unfamiliar with the literature covered by the term we may cite the beautiful fable of Jonah, whose relation to the nationalistic prophecies of the Assyro-Babylonian period resembles that of the Fourth Gospel to the Synoptics. The abuse of Jonah in treating it as no more than a narrative of sober fact is equally flagrant.

² Ex. 40:34 f., etc., Tobit. 12:12, 15; Acts 10:4; Eph. 5:2; Rev. 8:4.

quarters of the day of the crucifixion are accurately marked off, probably to correspond with the practice of the church in Rome in its ritual observance of the day,¹ makes it practically certain that the Johannine "correction" (Jn. 19: 14) which has given so much trouble to the harmonizers, making "the sixth hour" the time of Pilate's sentence from the judgment seat, instead of the time of the supernatural "darkness" (Mk. 15: 33), corresponds to Ephesian practice in the celebration. For, as we have already had some occasion to see and as will more fully appear hereafter, there was radical difference between Rome and Ephesus on this matter of "observing the Fast."² On the other hand, we cannot be sure that any such significance attaches to the notes of time in Jn. 1: 29, 35, 41, 43; not even to that of 1: 39, so greatly affected by "defenders," that "it was about the tenth hour" when Andrew and his unnamed companion first came into relation with Jesus, after listening to the preaching of the Baptist. A very ancient note of time embodied in the "Western" text of Acts 19: 9 informs us that Paul's preaching "in the school of Tyrannus" at *Ephesus* was "daily from the fifth to the tenth hour." The gloss very likely gives better information concerning preaching services in Ephesus in the glossator's own time, when "the school of Tyrannus" was doubtless still pointed to with interest as the cradle of the local church, than for the time of Paul. Yet even so it furnishes at least a curious correspondence between an extremely ancient practice of the Ephesian church, and the conception the fourth evangelist has formed of the gathering and dispersal of the hearers of John the

¹ The proof involves the similar, though less careful marking off of the watches of the preceding night (Mk. 14: 17, 37, 68) and of the resurrection day (16: 2), which can be certainly connected with the vigil (*cf.* Mk. 14: 37), fast and breaking of bread distinctive of Easter observance. See Bacon, *Beginnings of Gospel Story*, *ad loc.*

² See Chapter XVI.

Baptist. Here too, however, we emphatically draw the line of self-restraint, refusing to present as fact what our ignorance necessarily limits to the domain of mere conjectural possibility. In this case, complicated as it is by omissions from the original story,¹ we cannot offer more. But a *partial* understanding of the Johannine "pragmatism" is all that can be expected of the modern reader.

The "precision in detail" of the note of time of Jn. 2: 18-22, must be more fully considered later.² At present we merely observe that a symbolic correspondence is explicitly established by the evangelist himself,

"he was speaking (in the saying 'Destroy this temple,' etc.) of the temple of his body."

Jesus is probably assumed to have been at the time forty-six years of age,³ which comes near to one form of Palestinian tradition,⁴ and to have given as "the sign of the Son of man" a prediction of his resurrection "after three days."⁵ The author calculates, apparently, that the consular "year of the two Gemini" (29 A. D.), early fixed as that of the crucifixion, was coincidentally the jubilee year (49th) of the temple and of Jesus' age (*cf.* Jn. 8: 57). The calculation is remarkably accurate; the application is typically haggadic. So with the precision of the "five and twenty or thirty furlongs" (6: 19), by which our evangelist interprets Mark's statement that the disciples' boat, when Jesus came to them walking

¹ See above, p. 202.

² See Chapter XV.

³ See Loisy *ad loc.*, and below, Chapter XV.

⁴ Irenæus, *Haer.* II, xxii, 5; *cf.* Acts 7: 23.

⁵ Jn. 2: 18-22 follows the Matthæan theory of the Sign from Heaven (Mt. 12: 40; *cf.* Lk. 11: 30, and see below, p. 350, note 1.), locating the demand as in Mt. 21: 23-27, *i. e.*, after the purging of the temple. Jn. 6: 30 ff. follows the Lucan theory (Lk. 11: 30), locating the demand as in Mk. 8: 11 f. The duplication with different points of view corroborates other evidence for the later addition of Jn. 2: 13-25. See Chapter XVIII.

on the waves, was "in the midst of the sea." This certainly shows an approximate knowledge of the dimensions of the lake "of Tiberias";¹ but its *motive* is apologetic. The aim is to make it clearer that Jesus had surely traversed this distance on the water, and that the disciples had not simply lost their bearings and mistaken a hail of Jesus from the shore for his miraculous approach upon the sea. For the same reason the Synoptics are "corrected" in the matter of Jesus' entrance into the boat. He merely showed himself to them; he did not get in, but traversed the whole sea by walking on the waves to "the land whither they were going" (verse 21), which was "on the other side of the sea" (verse 22). The boat too was miraculously conveyed "immediately" to the port (verse 21), but Jesus had no need of its aid in crossing, and did not avail himself of it.²

The "precise details" in the dialogue with the Samaritan Woman (4: 1-45), are either topographical, displaying real knowledge of the locality, as in the case just cited of the dimensions of the sea "of Tiberias," and similarly accounted for; or else they concern the dialogue on the abolition of

¹ Cf. the estimate of distance of Bethany from Jerusalem as "fifteen furlongs," 11: 18.

² A symbolic motive perhaps coöperates. In the setting (institution of the Agapé—"John" adds the Eucharist) the coming of Jesus to the terrified and affrighted disciples in the boat, who think they "see an apparition," after they have left him praying alone upon the mountain, is highly suggestive of the separation at Gethsemane followed by Jesus' manifestation of himself in the resurrection scenes at the sea of Galilee, when he is taken for "an apparition." The correspondence becomes convincing when we further consider the supplement of Mt. 14: 28-33, which parallels Peter's offer to go with Jesus "to prison and death," his failure, restoration by the personal intervention of Jesus (Lk. 24: 34), and stablishing of his brethren in the faith that this is the risen Son of God (Lk. 22: 32; cf. Mt. 14: 33). Johannine eschatology, however, would require, to carry out the symbolism, that Jesus should not "enter into the boat" (the earthly Church), but after encouraging them by a brief manifestation await them "at the land whither they were going."

distinctions of locality in worship secured by the gift of the Spirit.¹ The general topic here is completely foreign to the capacity of the supposed character, but the details of argument are really such as prove knowledge—the knowledge of a Jew concerning the story of the Samaritans as related in II Kings 17: 24-41,² and of current disputes between “Jews and Samaritans.” But what has such knowledge to do with the “eye-witness,” even if we indulge in Professor Sanday’s poetic fancies concerning the “Son of thunder” as “a gentle youth,”

“only just out of his boyhood and with something of the fidelity of a dog for his master, who does not like to be long out of his sight”?³

This, doubtless, is to explain why “John,” without any intimation of the sort in the text, is made to stay behind when “the disciples were gone away into the city to buy food” (verse 8)? Is it the same quality which enables the gentle youth to report with even greater “precision of detail” what the high priest Caiaphas said in secret meeting of the conspirators against Jesus’ life (11: 47-53), or Pilate in his private examinations of Jesus (18: 28, 33-38; 19: 8-11)?

We are probably supposed to make the same tacit assumption in the case of Nicodemus (3: 1-21). But here it must be supplemented by the conjecture that through the lateness of the hour the eye-witness was gradually overcome with drowsiness; for while Nicodemus’ entrance, and the beginning of the colloquy are graphically described, the colloquy

¹ Cf. Eph. 2 : 13-18.

² It is sometimes objected to the symbolic interpretation of the reference “Thou hast had five husbands, and he whom thou now hast is not thy husband,” as suggested by II Kings 17: 30-32, 41, that the false gods of the Samaritans here spoken of are not five in number, but six. But Josephus (*Ant.* IX, xiv, 3) shows that whatever *our* count may be the contemporary count was “five” (*πέντε θεούς*).

³ Sanday, *Criticism*, p. 86.

imperceptibly shades off into a soliloquy of the evangelist, while Nicodemus is left to evaporate from the stage.

But the Raising of Lazarus in its depiction of "the different behavior of the two sisters and their Jewish sympathizers" and especially its reference to Jesus' *emotion* (11:33-38), is supposed to exhibit in peculiar degree

"the recollections of one who had himself been present at the events of the day, and who had moved freely to and fro, and very probably talked them over after the day was done."¹

Strangest of all, this preëminently unreal of the unreal narratives of the Fourth Gospel is supposed to exhibit more graphically than the Synoptics the human sympathy (!) of Jesus.

The "notes of time and place" are certainly present [10:40 (Bethany beyond Jordan); 11:1, 6, 17, 18]. Unfortunately for the defenders' argument the motive also for which they are introduced is made superabundantly clear (verses 4, 6, 11, 17). Jesus purposely waited where he was, paying no attention to the piteous appeal of the family that he "loved," until he knew (by his omniscience, verse 11) that Lazarus was dead. He waited until his arrival "to awake him out of sleep," should be "four days" after burial, when the setting in of decay (verse 39) should have left no possibility of objection such as might be urged against the Synoptic raisings from the dead.² This Being who in the interest of apologetic proof completely disregards the feelings of the stricken family, is at the utmost possible remove from the humane and kindly Jesus of Synoptic story. For the Markan Jesus is distracted between his instinctive abhorrence of the rôle of the common miracle-monger and exorciser, and the compassion he feels for the distressed and importu-

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 88.

² Three days marked the limit of time during which according to rabbinic belief the soul hovered near its former abode, seeking to reanimate the clay.

nate multitude (Mk. 1: 21-45). The difference in representation is quite intentional on the part of the fourth evangelist. We know from what Celsus says of Jewish predecessors who before his time had ridiculed the doctrine of the divinity of Jesus; that there had been no failure on their part to point out the incongruity of a divine Being walking about among the lower classes in obscure Galilee, distributing the favors of his miraculous omnipotence at their solicitation, to "Peter's wife's mother" or to "a few sick folk." "Correction" of Mark's account of the "beginning of miracles" was imperative on many accounts, as, *e. g.*, their restriction to Galilee, their too close relation to the works of the "strolling Jews, exorcisers" in bad repute at Ephesus (Acts 19: 13), and other objectionable features. But supremely inconsistent with the conception of an incarnate Logos acceptable to Stoic thought was the Synoptic suggestion of a swaying of Jesus from his original purpose by the importunity of those who sought his miraculous aid. Hence in the Fourth Gospel the miracles are always volunteered by Jesus (5: 6; 6: 5, 6; 9: 1-6). He never yields to importunity. He repels it almost harshly, even in the person of his own mother (2: 4), or of a "royal officer" (4: 48), or of his dearest friends (11: 4-6). Explicit pains are taken to show that the appearance of yielding created by Synoptic story is fallacious. Everything had been foreseen and fixed in advance to its appropriate "hour," especially Jesus' own fate, which, as we have seen,¹ he is so far from struggling against, as rather to compel its unwilling agents to their task. Hence acts of apparent yielding to importunity are carefully pointed out by the fourth evangelist to have been predetermined by Jesus and fixed for their exact place and "hour" in the scheme of "manifestation of his glory." Thus it is with the beginning of miracles (2: 4, 11); thus with the man born blind "that the

¹ Above, p. 312f.

works of God should be made manifest in him" (9: 3-5); thus with the raising of Lazarus (11: 4, 9-15), where even the prayer by the grave is not a real prayer, but uttered "for the sake of those that stand by" (verses 42), like the prayer in regard to Jesus' own fate and its answer (12: 30). It is all a matter of the predetermined "hour," particularly when the question is raised of Jesus' own safety (7: 30; 8: 20; 11: 9). Yes, precision in detail and graphic description abound—where it serves the doctrinal or apologetic purpose.

On the other hand, those who think that the Jesus of the Fourth Gospel is lacking in sympathy in this and similar scenes simply fail to make use of the key which the evangelist supplies in his prologue (1: 14). This Jesus, too, overflows with sympathy; only it is not and cannot be *human* sympathy. It must be *super-human*, divine, the sympathy of an omniscient Being, who "knew all things that were coming upon him" (18: 4), and "needed not that anyone should bear witness concerning man, because he himself knew what was in man" (2: 25). Without the application of this key the depiction of Jesus' emotion in the scene of the raising of Lazarus, an intentionally prominent feature of the story, becomes a hopeless enigma. With it, all is consistent and intelligible.

Why does Jesus remain "two days in the place where he was" in disregard of the sisters' appeal, and then say "Lazarus is dead, and *I am glad* for your sakes that I was not there"? Why, after explaining to the twelve concerning his "hour" and returning to Judea (11: 7-16) does he meet the tears and remonstrances of Martha and Mary only with the general doctrines of present eternal life and future resurrection "in the last day," reserving his own "groaning" and tears for the spectacle of Mary "weeping and the Jews also weeping with her"? *The Jews* when they saw Jesus' tears at the sepulcher said, "Behold, how he loved him." But

“the Jews” in this Gospel are always those who misunderstand and misrepresent the Lord; and the objection immediately raised by “others” to this explanation of Jesus’ emotion (verse 37; cf. 7: 25, 26, 31, etc.) is in reality fatal to it, and is so intended. The *evangelist’s* explanation of Jesus’ emotion requires us to remember, first, that his Jesus is an omniscient Being descended from heavenly glory (3: 12 f., 31 f., 17: 5), to whom the recalling of a beloved friend from Paradise is a calamity only admissible because of the hardness of heart of Jews, who “except they see signs and wonders will not believe” (4: 48). We must remember, second, that Mk. 7: 34; 8: 12 had already set the example of relating this “sighing” and “groaning” of Jesus at the necessity created by Jewish “hardness of heart” for his “signs.” The Jesus of “John” is “glad” when blind mortals weep. Jesus weeps when because of human unbelief a friend that “slept” and was “saved” (*σωθήσεται*) must be “awaked out of his sleep” and return to this vale of tears (verses 11-13).

The story of Lazarus is a typical instance of Johannine “pragmatism” and double meaning. The writer dwells on minute and apparently precise details for a didactic and theoretical purpose, while in the wider view the scene as a whole is impossible to frame into the known history. The *lesson* is lofty, and (from the theological standpoint) a needful “correction” of the too familiar and naive representation of the Synoptists. The interventions of the divine omnipotence are not evoked by the importunities of friendship and personal solicitation. They answer to the requirements of the plan of God in “manifesting his glory.” This doctrine too has its place in our times of sorrow. The Christian world instinctively and rightly turns to Jesus’ tender expostulation with Martha’s tears, and with the timid suggestion of both sisters that a miracle should be wrought to alleviate their individual sorrow, as among the loftiest and

purest expressions of Christian faith in face of bereavement. But we do injustice to this Gospel when we try to force it to our demand for the "historical." It is not historical, but "spiritual." The story of the Raising of Lazarus, absolutely excluded as it is by Synoptic tradition, should suffice of itself alone to settle this point once and for all.

We have not space to discuss the kindred scene of Mary Magdalen at the empty tomb (20: 11-18), similarly touching and beautiful, similarly didactic, similarly unhistorical. For how is it conceivable *historically*, that the Beloved disciple, after being brought to the tomb by Mary, entering in with Peter, seeing and *believing* (verse 8), should "go away unto his own home" (verse 10) without so much as a word of hope either to Peter, or to Mary who had brought them there for an explanation of the riddle, and who now remained "without, at the tomb, weeping"? When indeed has the Beloved disciple any other rôle than that of the *deus ex machina*?

Johannine "pragmatism" elaborates detail (for a purpose) and ignores the larger nexus of history. The "atomistic" treatment of "defenders" follows it. But the instant we turn to the larger outline of Jesus' career, considered as part of human history, even "defenders" hasten to acknowledge that only the Synoptics present an intelligible sequence of events, and that the fourth evangelist is largely indifferent to consistency of cause and effect or place and time.

When we compare Mark's Baptist with the older material embodied in the Sayings of Q we see already a decline from historicity in the interest of Christian apologetic. In the Sayings of Jesus the Baptist still belongs to the older dispensation, a prophet of prophets, warning a sinful people to prepare to meet its God. His baptism, accepted by publicans and sinners as a means of grace and token of forgiveness, but disdained by Scribes and Pharisees, was a sign "from heaven" of the Day of Jehovah, as Jonah's preach-

ing had been a sign to the Ninevites.¹ But aside from his warning to moral repentance in view of impending judgment reiterating the call of an Elijah, an Amos, or an Isaiah, and his *impersonal* proclamation of the coming Executioner of God's judgment, the Baptist of Q is not concerned with the work of Jesus. Up to the very end (Mt. 11: 2 = Lk. 7: 18 ff.) he attains only to the distant hope, as he hears in prison "the works of Christ," that this may possibly be "he that should come," and is consoled by the non-committal reply, "Blessed is he that shall not be stumbled in me." In Mark's fervent apologetic nearly all the independent significance of the Baptist's reformatory work is stripped away. Mark records no utterance of his save the prediction of the Greater than he that should "baptize with the Holy Ghost and fire." His significance in Markan story is not that he proclaimed a baptism of repentance unto forgiveness of sins to publicans and sinners, but that, according to the Jewish expectation that Elias would come to anoint the Messiah and make him known to himself and to Israel,² he had baptized Jesus, and thus "prepared the way of the Lord."³ In their combinations of Mark with Q Matthew and Luke have each introduced slight modifications to still further reduce the figure of the Baptist from its independent significance toward that of forerunner of Jesus, pure and simple. Do the "corrections" of the fourth evangelist, quondam disciple of the Baptist as he is himself supposed to be, tend to restore the distorted outlines? Far from it. In the Fourth Gospel the

¹ Mt. 21: 23-32. The "sign of Jonah" in the parallel (Q) narrative of the Demand for a Sign in Mt. 12: 38-45 = Lk. 11: 29-32 is neither as our first evangelist assumes, the resurrection (Mt. 12: 40), nor, as our third interprets (Lk. 11: 30), Jesus' own preaching, which is compared with the "wisdom" sought by the Queen of Sheba. It is the warning message of John the Baptist.

² Justin Martyr, *Dial. with Trypho*, viii and xlix.

³ See *Beginnings of Gospel Story*, ad loc.

theoretic substitution is carried to a much greater extreme. The Baptist is stripped of the last vestige of his historical, independent, significance; absolutely nothing remains but the function of forerunner and herald of the Christ. There is no warning to flee from the wrath to come; there are no "publicans and sinners"; nothing but disciples whom John points to "the Lamb of God," and representatives of the Sanhedrin, whose questions elucidate the true significance of John's calling and of the rite he practices. Even this rite is not a "baptism of repentance unto forgiveness of sins." There is none such save Christian baptism, and forgiveness cannot be proclaimed until after the sacrifice of the Lamb of God. Until after the resurrection the world is "yet in its sins" (*cf.* I Cor. 15:17). The proclamation, accordingly, must be reserved for the Commission of the apostles after the resurrection (20:22 f.). John is not even Elias (1:21). The miracles expected to characterize this apocalyptic figure (Mk. 6:14) are noted as wanting (10:41). The reader of the Fourth Gospel is even left in doubt whether John baptized Jesus at all. Certainly Jesus was not in need of revelations regarding his own nature and calling, and the revelation which for this reason is transferred to the Baptist (1:31-34) may, or may not, be on occasion of his baptizing Jesus. According to this Gospel the Baptist was simply a "lamp" given to Israel to guide it to Jesus (5:33-36); the rite he employed was borrowed from the new dispensation as a predictive type only, and was totally devoid of significance except as a prophetic, anticipatory token, witnessing to Israel of the person and work of the Giver of the Holy Ghost (1:25-34).

Moreover, Jesus does not come forward as a successor of John. He begins his work independently, before John is shut up in prison, though out of consideration for the disposition of "the Pharisees" to draw invidious compari-

sons, he withdraws from public notice into the obscurity of Galilee (4: 1-3, 43-45). The whole Markan scene of the calling of the first disciples at the Sea of Galilee "after John was delivered up" when Jesus had rallied the scattered following of the imprisoned prophet (Mk. 1: 14-20) is anticipated and its significance nullified. There was, says this Gospel, an earlier calling, at which Andrew and Peter with several others had not merely laid aside their nets to become with Jesus "fishers of men," but had been indoctrinated by the Baptist himself with the Pauline conception of Christ as the atoning "Lamb of God." They had recognized him as Messiah, as King of Israel, as Son of man and omniscient Searcher of hearts. Andrew had anticipated Peter's Confession, and Peter himself had already at this time received from Jesus the name betokening his faith (1: 29-31).

Is this history; or is it apologetics under the forms of midrash? The whole trend of debate regarding the relation of Jesus and his work to that of the Baptist proves that it is the latter. If the revelation of the Messiahship be thus placed at the beginning, or rather *before* the beginning of Jesus' career, instead of at its very close, if three years before the conspiracy of the priests against him Jesus had already thrown down the gauntlet by an affront to their authority in the temple and at that time already had uttered the saying brought up against him at his trial (Jn. 2: 13-19), the whole course of events becomes unintelligible.

This, then, is the unhistorical larger outline at the expense of which we obtain the "precise details of the eye-witness" in the opening scenes of the Gospel. We gain at best an idyllic picture of disciples drawn to Jesus by the Baptist's "witness," including the item that the preaching closed "at the tenth hour." We *lose*—the last remnant of a historical conception of the relation of the great reformatory movement from which that of Jesus took its rise, the last shred

of relation to historical cause and effect in the drama of his career.

The case is not otherwise with Johannine "pragmatism" elsewhere. Of the anachronistic and impossible dialogue with the Samaritan woman we have already spoken, and of the Raising of Lazarus. Drummond himself completely abandons the attempt to dovetail the latter into the Synoptic narrative, and acknowledges it a "fiction," though he still insists that the author was an eye-witness—one who has the characteristic, unfortunate among eye-witnesses, of preferring fiction to fact. As the whole tragedy of Jesus' death is made to hang upon this supreme prodigy (11:45-53), the forgetfulness of all three Synoptists in failing to mention it, and assigning the course of events in Jerusalem instead to Jesus' collision with the priestly authorities in the temple, is indeed somewhat difficult to account for. It seems almost as surprising that in the scene of the Betrayal in Gethsemane, minutely described by all three, none should have noticed the "detail" that the commander of the Roman garrison of Jerusalem was present with his entire cohort of 600 soldiers, and that upon Jesus' mere offer of himself with the announcement, "I am he "

"they went backward and fell to the ground. Then asked he them again, Whom seek ye? And they said, Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus answered, I told you that I am he; if therefore ye seek me, let these go their way."¹

Thus the disciples owed their escape not to a cowardly desertion and flight, but to Jesus' intercession. That nothing of these somewhat remarkable phenomena was observed by other eye-witnesses seems extraordinary; but it may truthfully be replied that reporters who could overlook the Raising of Lazarus could overlook anything.

¹ Jn. 18: 6-8.

Is it still needful to return and point out that the "precise details" of the scene of the feeding of the multitude (6: 1-14) are mere atoms in a mass of unreality? Is it the better knowledge of an eye-witness which makes Jesus ascend the mountain in verse 3 and reascend in verse 15 without descending meantime; or is it a slip of erroneous dependence on the Synoptic model?¹ Is it historicity, or theory combined with literary dependence, which makes Jesus propose to feed the multitude as soon as they appear in sight, before they have even had an opportunity to become hungry?

We have seen already that the appearances of the Beloved disciple are outside the framework of history, and we are not now concerned with those more general characteristics of the Gospel which determine its real relation to its predecessors. The fourth evangelist suppresses entirely from the work of Jesus all reference to his exorcism of evil spirits, imitating in this respect the silence of Paul; he substitutes for the Champion of publicans and sinners and the little ones of Galilee, in their right to a share by repentance and faith in the kingdom of their Father, a theological Hypostasis, who "manifests his glory" by prodigies of omnipotence, and debates with "the Jews" the questions of his own divinity as propounded in the Pauline system. But of these broader traits we must speak later. We are dealing for the present only with the Johannine "pragmatism," endeavoring to show that its "details—apparently precise—" of place and time and circumstance, are not, as the "atomistic" method maintains, a mark of the historical eye-witness, but when more carefully studied in relation to contemporary practice, and in relation to a survey of the Gospel and its scenes as wholes, have almost a contrary character. If further evidence be needed we must refer to Schmiedel. "Constructive" criticism is more to our taste than "destructive." And yet

¹ See Schmiedel, *op. cit.* p. 51.

what "defence of the Fourth Gospel" is so cryingly needful in our day as that which resists the attempt to force its lofty and beautiful mysticism into the service of "the external and bodily things," and which demands that "spiritual" gospels, like other "spiritual" things, shall be "spiritually discerned."

CHAPTER XIV

JOHANNINE TREATMENT OF SYNOPTIC MATERIAL

We may pass over very rapidly Professor Sanday's remaining items of internal evidence for Johannine authorship, none of which has any bearing on the question whether the writer was an eye-witness; because we fully agree that he was a Jew, and a teacher of ripe years. As such he could hardly fail to be familiar with

"(i) the pilgrimages to Jerusalem and the Jewish feasts; (ii) the detailed ceremonies connected with those feasts; (iii) the temple itself; (iv) the state of sects and parties; (v) the Messianic expectation."¹

The mere overthrow of the material temple (whose ruined courts were of course not obliterated) and cessation of the ceremonial *in practice*, was, as we well know, very far indeed from removing them from the arena of Jewish and Jewish-Christian debate. Not the Epistle to the Hebrews alone and the connected *Epistle of Barnabas*, but the entire Talmudic literature abundantly attests how the temple "on paper," a legal and ceremonial system whose only basis was the Torah of Moses, some day, in some sense, to be restored, took the place of the actual temple cult almost immediately after the catastrophe of 70 A. D. Indeed, so thoroughly had the real religious life of Israel become already detached from the hierocratic system of priesthood and temple, and rebuilt itself around that of scribe and synagogue, that the downfall of the oppressive and arrogant Sadducean priest nobility was felt rather as a relief. The overthrow of the priest was

¹ *Criticism*, p. 117.

the exaltation of the rabbi. Legalism attained its zenith when the Sanhedrin fell, and the great Synagogue of Jamnia and Tiberias took its place. It is this period which gives birth to the literature of "colloquies," "debates," "disputations" or "dialogues" between Christians and Jews of which so many examples remain;¹ and all of these turn upon the interpretation of the Old Testament and the doctrine of the divine "Sonship" of Christ. On the Jewish side we have a few echoes from Talmudic sources² reporting more direct and personal collision, in which the same distinctive Christian doctrine is connected especially with the Christian sacrament and Christian thaumaturgy.

A Hellenistic Jew and teacher of ripe years in Asia could also hardly have failed to make at least once the pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and if a Christian would surely have extended his journey to Nazareth and the sea "of Tiberias." Even without the occasion of Jewish descent, Melito of Sardis about the middle of the second century takes this journey with the purpose expressly in mind of securing trustworthy information about the Old Testament. How Papias felt about the seat of historical tradition we have already seen.³

We have no occasion, then, to do more than supplement Professor Sanday's helpful reasoning on the evangelist's noteworthy interest in Jewish Pilgrimages, including their rites of "purification."⁴ We only demur to his assumption

¹ See, e. g., the *Dialogue of Jason and Papiscus, Dialogue with Trypho* (Justin Martyr), etc.; and cf. McGiffert, "Christian Polemics against the Jews," in *Presb. Review*, July, 1888.

² See Herford, *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash*, 1903.

³ Chapter IV.

⁴ The observation (p. 120) on the frequency of "allusions to the laws (practice?) of Levitical purity" is just, and significant. One can realize how conspicuously practices relating to sabbaths and lustrations would stand out, especially after the destruction of the sacrificial system, as distinctive of Judaism, by noting (1) that somewhat contemptuous characterizations of Mark (Mk. 2: 23-3; 6; 7: 1-15; 10: 1-12; 12: 38-40), es-

that "a pious Jew"—by which Professor Sanday means the Friend of publicans and sinners, whose disregard of lustrations, fasts and sabbaths was the chief cause of Pharisaic complaint against him—would not

"neglect to attend the feasts for so long a time, and in the course of a religious mission addressed directly to his countrymen."¹

The fourth evangelist also seems to have thought it "improbable," and doubtless for the same a priori reasons. This is another respect in which his "pious Jew" differs from the Synoptic leader of Galilean insurgents against the religion of "scribes and Pharisees."

As to Professor Sanday's quotation from Chwolson apropos of "Ceremonies" (p. 121) to the effect that

"After the destruction of the Temple all the regulations about cleanness and uncleanness, which were closely connected with the sacrificial system, fell into disuse"

we simply beg leave to omit the commas, after which the statement will be approximately true. As to the evangelist's familiarity with features of "the Temple"—or its ruins—we have no objection to make, though it is instructive to compare the recent apocryphal fragment of dialogue of second (or third?) century origin between Jesus and the high priest concerning purification *in the Temple*, found by Grenfell and Hunt. Its "precise details" are vouched for by excellent scholars.²

pecially 7: 3-4; (2) the references of Juvenal and other classic authors; (3) the almost entire preoccupation of the Talmud with questions of "purification" of "feasts" and of "sabbaths."

¹ P. 118.

² See especially L. Blau, "Das neue Evangelienfragment von Oxyrhynchos" in *Zts. f. nll. Wiss.* IX (1908), pp. 204-215. The statement (p. 215) that "ritual lustrations and baths belong to the weightiest portions of the Halacha" with what follows, is peculiarly instructive, in view of Professor Sanday's quotation from Chwolson.

As to "Sects and Parties," *those which are of concern for the second century debate between Church and Synagogue* are certainly prominent in the Fourth Gospel. We have already mentioned the "disciples of John" as of special interest to the church in Ephesus. There is but one social element which completely disappears from view, and that is—the "publicans and sinners!" Instead of figuring as their champion against the religious oligarchy, as in the Synoptics, Jesus is now simply the champion of "believers" (in his divinity) against "the Jews." As for the political situation, Professor Sanday regards the effort of Jn. 18-19 to throw all the blame for Jesus' fate on "the Jews" and make the Roman power appear only to be unwillingly led, by misrepresentation or otherwise, to the crime of Pilate¹ as a "singularly fine characterization." It is at least in line with the tendency more and more strongly marked from the earliest Synoptic gospel down to the second century apologists. In the third gospel and Acts it is very conspicuous; in Jn. 18-19 it is perhaps a little more conspicuous still. In the *Apologies* of Justin and his contemporaries it culminates.

But the fourth evangelist shows acquaintance with "Jewish Ideas and Dialectic." It certainly would be an exceptional author of Dialogues against the Jews in the second century who did not. We are compelled, however, at this point to take very emphatic exception to the following statements, which seem to us so completely to invert the historical fact that we are at a loss to account for them in a writer familiar with such second century debate:

"'Thou art a Samaritan and hast a devil' 'Abraham is dead and the prophets.' These are exactly the things that would be said and that we may be sure were said. (When?) But I am not satisfied with the hypothesis that the author who wrote them was

¹ See Jn. 18: 28-19: 16, especially 19: 11. "He that delivered me unto thee" probably refers to Caiaphas.

a Jew of Palestine. I believe that he was, and must have been, an actual contemporary and eye-witness of what he is recording.

"The same conclusion forces itself upon us all through the next chapter (Jn. 9), which is steeped in Jewish ideas and customs; and those not Jewish ideas and customs in the abstract, but in direct and close connexion with the Jewish controversy *as it existed in the time of our Lord and centring in his person.*"¹

We find it impossible to obtain any other sense from Professor Sanday's language here than that controversy between Jews and believers on the doctrine of "the person" of Christ was *not* characteristic of the period 100-120 A. D., and *was* characteristic of that of his earthly ministry, *before* he was "declared to be the Son of God with power (better 'miraculously manifested as the Son of God') by the resurrection from the dead."

When we begin to recover from our astonishment, and to ask ourselves what possible grounds Professor Sanday can suppose himself to have for so extraordinary an assertion, we recall the fact that his book also contains a chapter on "The Christology of the Gospel," in which the effort is conspicuous to screw up scattered phrases from the Synoptics to a doctrine of Messiahship having some resemblance to the Johannine Logos doctrine. We are told, *e. g.*, that the Synoptic Jesus

"took upon Himself to forgive sins (?) with the assurance that those whom He forgave God also would forgive."²

"He called Himself (?) in one very ancient form of the narrative, 'Lord of the sabbath.' He did not hesitate to review the whole course of previous revelation, and to propound in His own name (?) (*cf.* Mt. 5: 45-48) a new law superseding the old. He evidently regarded His work on earth as possessing an extraor-

¹ Sanday, *Criticism*, p. 134. Italics ours.

² *Cf.* Mk. 2: 5; Lk. 7: 48, "Thy sins *are forgiven*," Lk. 23: 34, "*Father*, forgive them," and see below, p. 378.

dinary value. He was Himself (?) a greater than Solomon, a greater than Jonah." ¹

On points of historical exegesis we expect to differ with Professor Sanday.² On points of grammar and philology we feel ourselves decidedly his inferior; yet we cannot refrain from asking how the sense "He was Himself a greater (*μείζων masculine*) than Solomon" can be obtained from the Greek *neuter* *πλεῖον* (*i. e.*, "something more," "a greater matter")? ³ But, as might be expected, supreme reliance is placed on Mt. 11: 27 = Lk. 10: 22, often designated "the" Johannine passage, because (as sometimes interpreted) it stands alone and unique in Synoptic representation.

We have given elsewhere ⁴ complete exegetical discussion to this famous saying and here can only summarize results. The very fact of its standing alone should warn us against adopting the sense Professor Sanday would give to the passage; the context should deter us still more. Jesus is vindicating two things, his own right as leader and teacher, and the rights of his "little flock," his Galilean followers, referred to as "babes," or "little ones." Against him are the "scribes," who claim for themselves a monopoly of the

¹ P. 222.

² Professor Sanday accounts for differences in point of view between himself and the critics on the ground that *they* are dominated by "the recollection that they bring with them of what they learnt in their childhood. They do not try to shake it off; it is always there at the back of their minds; and it colors, and I must needs think discolors all the elaborate and learned study that they make of the Gospels in maturer years!"

³ The real sense (pace Professor Sanday) is as above implied (p. 350) a comparison of the Baptist's warning with the message of Jonah, and of Jesus' own *offer of the divine forgiveness* with what the Queen of Sheba came to seek. This winning *message* of the forgiving love of God is a greater *matter* than "the wisdom of Solomon." Where a comparison of *persons* is implied we have *μείζων*, as in Mt. 11: 11, and the later readings of the passage Mt. 12: 7.

⁴ Bacon, "Jesus the Son of God," *Harvard Theol. Review*, July, 1909.

“knowledge of God,”¹ and for their blind followers, the Pharisees, a monopoly of “the right to be called the sons of God,” to the exclusion of “this people that knoweth not the law.” Parallel passages in the Pauline Epistles (Rom. 2:17-20; I Cor. 1:17-25; 2:10; 3:1; 13:12; Gal. 4:8-9; II Tim. 2:19) suggest that we have in Mt. 11:27 a combination of *two* sayings, one on the qualifications of the “scribe of the kingdom of heaven” to teach, the other on the right of his disciples to regard themselves as “sons and daughters of the Highest.” However that may be, the context and Pauline parallels allow no other than a generic sense for the term “the son”² in either occurrence. So far as Jesus speaks of himself and his own relation to “the Father” it is representatively. As against the arrogance of the scribes his utterance may be paraphrased:

“All *my* ‘paradosis’ comes from my Father, neither is there any true knowledge of him or qualification to reveal him save the filial spirit” (*cf.* Mt. 5:8).

As against the exclusiveness of the Pharisees, and the claim of the scribes to hold the keys of the kingdom Jesus denies the right to extend or limit the “adoption” to any whom “the Father” himself has not “recognized” (*ἐγνώ*).³ For himself he claims the authority of an Amos against the professional religionists (Am. 3:8); for his “little ones” he demands release from the grievous yoke and heavy burdens of the scribes, and “in their Father’s love a filial part.” Theology may think itself the gainer, but the Church only loses

¹ In the wider field of Paul’s polemic it is “the Jew” who is guilty of this arrogance as toward the Gentile; *cf.* Rom. 2:17-29.

² *Cf.* Jn. 8:35 “The son (*i. e.*, ‘he who is a son’) abideth in the house forever”—as against the bondservant who is “cast out”; an adaptation of Paul’s application of the story of Isaac and Ishmael (Gal. 4:21-5:1).

³ On the textual questions involved see Harnack (*Sprüche und Reden Jesu*, 1907, Exkurs I), and Chapman’s reply in *Journ. of Theol. Studies* for July, 1909.

when this magna charta of Galilean discipleship is robbed of its pure religious simplicity, and transformed into an oracular utterance on the interior relations of the Trinity, explaining

“the mutual relation of the Father and the Son . . . expressed as a perfect insight on the part of each, not only into the mind, but into the whole being and character of the other.”¹

It is far from improbable, we admit, that the fourth evangelist put, or at least would have put, the same mystical interpretation on this saying of Jesus as his “defender” puts upon it,² just as late transcribers of Mt. 12:7 have anticipated Sanday’s treatment of the phrase “a greater *matter* than Solomon,”³ and as our second evangelist has anticipated his representation of Jesus assuming the prerogative of God and silencing protest with prodigy.⁴ The second evangelist carries his Pauline Christology so far as to place in the mouth of Jesus an appeal to Ps. 110:1. This passage had been employed in Peter’s speech at Pentecost and previously by Paul (I Cor. 15:25) as proof of *the ascension*. Mark transforms it into a refutation of “the scribes’” conception of Messiah as a human descendant of David.⁵ This

¹ *Criticism*, p. 223.

² Mr. Worsley (*Fourth Gospel*, etc., p. 9) presents Jn. 3:35 and 6:46 as cases of “verbal coincidence” with Mt. 11:27. They might reasonably be called “reflections” of Q—after a preliminary “refraction” in Mt. 28:18.

³ The older and better MSS. have *μείζον* giving the sense “a greater matter” (than the sanctity of the temple). Later MSS. alter to *μείζων*.

⁴ We agree with Mr. Worsley (*ibid.*, p. 92) as against Professor Sanday that in Mk. 2:1-12 there is no “effort at veiling in the establishing of the claim to forgive sins by a following miracle,” and that *the second evangelist* is already well advanced on the road toward a doctrine of incarnation. This does not justify us in preferring his view to that which is alone consistent with Jesus’ own language (*cf.* Q) and action. On the editorial character of Mk. 2:5b-10, see *Beginnings of Gospel Story*; Loisy, *Evang. Synopt.*, *ad loc.*, etc., and below, p. 379.

⁵ Mk. 12:35-37. On the editorial character of this supplement to the debates with Pharisee, Sadducee, and Scribe, see *Beginnings*, etc., *ad loc.*

would seem indeed a Markan anticipation of the Johannine debates of Jesus with "the Jews"; but a lesser anachronism cannot condone a greater. Either there is no such thing as historical criticism, and cause and effect are topsyturvy, or else the Christology of the Petrine speeches of Acts, wherein Jesus is "made both Lord and Christ" by his resurrection and exaltation to "the right hand of God" comes first; the Pauline, which ignores his earthly ministry to view him solely as "the Lord the Spirit," came later; while latest of all is the Johannine, which reflects upon his entire earthly career the heavenly glory "which he had with the Father before the foundation of the world," viewing it simply as a period during which

"the Logos became flesh and tabernacled among us, and we beheld his glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father."¹

Professor Sanday sets his own doctrine that the Christological debates of the Fourth Gospel, not the rights of the "lost sons" as against the grievous burdens of the scribes—not a kingdom of God for the "little flock" as against the exclusive spiritual privilege of the Pharisees—was typical of "Jewish controversy as it existed in the time of our Lord," over against "the critical theory." He objects to the latter, as propounded by Professor Wernle, that it attributes too much "originality" to Paul, and too little resisting power on the part of the Jewish Christian element in the Church.² If the scholarly world must choose between the two we may rest secure of the verdict. The "common ground" of the Jewish and Gentile Church is not left obscure by Paul. It is stated repeatedly and explicitly—most explicitly perhaps in I Cor. 15: 1-11. It was the doctrine that by the resurrection and outpouring of the Spirit Jesus had been made "both Lord and Christ," or in Paul's language had been "mirac-

¹ Jn. 1: 14.

² *Criticism*, pp. 226-233.

ulously manifested as the Son of God by the resurrection." What was implied in this as to the nature of his person and work was a matter for individual judgment. It was elaborated among the various parties in the Church in accordance with their (largely preconceived) theories of redemption, whether legalistic, apocalyptic, metaphysical, or mystical. That a Pauline incarnation doctrine, with all its modicum of "originality," should have ultimately prevailed in the Greek-speaking Church over the Petrine Christology of apotheosis is surely no matter for wonderment.

Understanding, then, that it is just this inadequacy of the Synoptic Gospels, and on the point above all others of their Christology, that made a Fourth Gospel indispensable to the Pauline churches, we may turn to the treatment accorded in it to its predecessors, with the expectation that if our conception of its authorship and purpose be correct it will show in its whole structure this relation. We shall expect it to remedy (from doctrinal, not historico-critical motives) those "defects" of Mark which had made this Gospel a favorite with

"those who separate Jesus from Christ, alleging that Christ remained impassible, but that it was Jesus who suffered,"¹

if only because two previous efforts had been made to counteract the impression (just or unjust) that Jesus according to this Gospel *became* the Son of God by adoption of the Spirit at his baptism. We shall expect it to remedy (in the interest of doctrine, not history) the "order" of Mark, admittedly unauthoritative, and the Markan representation of both words and deeds of the Christ, removing the appearance of pettiness attaching to its figure of a Galilean healer and exorciser, and showing that "this thing was not done in a corner." For we have both the ridicule of a Celsus, and the

¹ Irenæus, *Haer.* III, xi, 7.

apologetic example of a Luke, to show how the controversy ran between Church and Synagogue as to the character of the Ministry. We shall expect it to remedy the Markan type of Resurrection narrative; for that had already been suppressed. We shall expect withal a reflection of the changed ideas of later times, an increased sacramentarian interest, a more exalted view of the apostles and their function, a revised and improved eschatology, changes in scores of features which in 110-115 A. D. had made the Roman evangelist's attempt to combine Petrine story with Pauline doctrine look antiquated and inadequate; so that a Papias must apologize for it and the Church at large first mutilate and then neglect it. We have not space to treat after the manner of the Biblical theologies of the fourth evangelist's Logos doctrine, his anthropology, soteriology, and eschatology in comparison with the Synoptic. In view of Mr. Scott's work we are glad to think we need not. But we are required to show in what general relation the Gospel stands to its predecessors. How, then, has the fourth evangelist treated the Synoptic material?

Mr. Worsley finds

"as the result of careful search, that in the Fourth Gospel there is no conscious use made of any of that part of the first Gospel which is peculiar to itself."¹

After the space given to five instances in which it is difficult to imagine any critic discovering a literary relation² we are

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 7.

² Mr. Worsley's "careful search" brings him to (1) a variant reading in Mt. 14: 24, not necessarily related to Jn. 6: 19; (2) another, generally rejected, in Mt. 27: 49; (3) Mt. 11: 27, which is *not* "peculiar to Matthew"; (4) Mt. 13: 55 f., of which the same is true; (5) Mt. 15: 13, which is *not* parallel to Jn. 15: 2. The only one of the six passages adduced which appears to have a real bearing on the question is Jn. 2: 19=Mk. 15: 58=Mt. 26: 61. Here (for reasons entirely unnoticed in Mr. Worsley's superficial treatment) we

somewhat surprised to find no attention paid to Jn. 12:8, which is verbally identical with Mt. 26:11 (Mk. 14:7 expands). The verse, however, is wanting in D and the Sinaitic Syriac, and is therefore probably a "Western non-interpolation." It would also have been well to mention that the silence of Mark and the misstatement of Lk. 3:2¹ as to the name of the high priest are emended in Jn. 18:13 in accordance with the correct statement of Mt. 26:57; and further that the naming of Peter on occasion of his recognition of Jesus as the Christ (Jn. 1:42 = Mt. 16:18) is also peculiar to our first Synoptist.² With a few slight corrections of the evidence, such as the above, Mr. Worsley's observation is correct, and corresponds with what we should anticipate regarding the Evangelist's attitude toward the most anti-Pauline of the Gospels. The only Synoptic writer from whom he quotes verbatim is Mark, and that quite rarely.³ On the other hand, his divergences from Mark are frequently but further developments of changes already begun by Luke, and in several instances combination of Mark with Luke is effected.⁴ Several of the Lukan additions to

judge the relation to Matthew to be the nearer. We have seen already, however (p. 342), that Jn. 2:13-22 is an exceptional passage, whose treatment must be deferred. See Chapter XVIII.

¹ We leave the question open whether Jn. 11:49 ("high-priest *that year*") shows "injudicious dependence" on Lk. 3:2.

² Note, however, that "John" *deprives* the naming of all significance, save that of bare miraculous prediction, by making others precede Peter in the recognition.

³ In Jn. 1:26-27 = Mk. 1:7-8; Jn. 12:13 = Mk. 11:9; Jn. 13:21 = Mk. 14:18. These too are probably memoriter, as transcription is not the method of the fourth evangelist.

⁴ Note, *e. g.*, the carrying back of the Sonship of Jesus, the Samaritan ministry, the "Jerusalem" type of Resurrection narratives, etc. On the combination of Mk. 14:3-9 with Lk. 7:36-50 in Jn. 12:1-8, see above, p. 334. *Cf.* further Jn. 1:24-28 with Mk. 1:7 + Lk. 3:15-16, and Jn. 3:1 ff. with Mk. 10:13-22 + Lk. 18:18 (the rich man a "ruler").

Mark are adopted with characteristic freedom of recasting,¹ and Lukan characters are added to Mark's dramatis personæ, either as separate individuals, or as supplementary traits in a composite whose basis is from Mark.² Anyone who will take the pains to verify the evidence, as presented in the footnotes we here subjoin, can see for himself the general method of the fourth evangelist in dealing with Synoptic material. (1) Matthew is practically ignored; (2) Mark is made the basis; (3) supplements and changes are made with large use of Luke both as to motive and material. The formative principle determining the entire construction is, as we have already made clear and now reiterate, the "spiritual" gospel of Paul. It is this which forbids any such mere transcription as that which characterizes our first and third evangelists in their combination of Mark and Q.

In its general structure the outline of the Fourth Gospel is simple and clear, and reproduces that of Mark *as modified by Luke*. We have a primary division at the end of chapter 12, separating Jesus' public ministry from the farewell discourses to "his own" (chapters 13-17); which are followed by

¹ E. g., Jn. 20: 2-10, recasting Lk. 24: 8-12; Jn. 20: 19-25 recasting Lk. 24: 36-43.

² E. g., Mary and Martha (from Lk. 10: 38-42) in Jn. 11; Lazarus (from Lk. 16: 19-31) *ibid.* The composite Nicodemus (= Naq Dimon of Talmudic tradition, celebrated for his wealth and for having provided at his own expense baths for purifying pilgrims to the temple) is based on Mk. 10: 17, 22 (*cf.* verses 14-16), 12: 28-34, and 15: 42-46 with additional traits derived from Lk. 18: 18 and suggested by Acts 5: 34-40. The Samaritan Woman plays the part of Mark's Syro-Phœnician (extension of the gospel to outsiders) with the Lukan intermediate stage of a Samaritan mission (Lk. 9: 51-56; 10: 29-37; 17: 11-19; Acts 1: 8; 8: 5-25), and traits from Lk. 7: 36 ff. Philip, who plays a separate part only in the Fourth Gospel, is here prominent, and that especially in connection with the wider extension of the gospel (Jn. 1: 43-48; 6: 5-7; 12: 21-22; 14: 8-9). In Acts only Philip appears among the Twelve, apart from Peter, as engaged in the work of evangelization (Acts 8: 26-40a [40b should be referred to Philip the Evangelist, *cf.* 21: 8]).

the scenes of the Passion and Resurrection (chapters 18-20). All that which in Mk. 3:7-6:13 is concerned with the Training and Mission of the Twelve and in Mk. 4:1-34 and 13:1-37 predicts the Establishment of the Kingdom, is transferred, after the example of Lk. 22:35-38 and Q,¹ to a final sending forth of the apostles to the conquest of the world, forewarned of persecution and armed with the Spirit (Jn. 14-16). Thus instead of *two* eschatological discourses, as in Mark,² and *two* Missions of the Twelve as in Luke, we have a single great Farewell Discourse combining their three principal elements (1) the disciples' work (Jn. 15:1-16), (2) their conflict with the world (15:17-16:4), (3) the promise of the Spirit (16:5-33; 13:36-14:31). The parables, which in Mk. 4:1-34 are treated as an esoteric deliverance to Jesus' spiritual kin (*cf.* 3:31-35) of "the mystery of the kingdom of God" intentionally hid from "those that are without," are scattered, as by Luke, throughout the Gospel. They reappear in the form of allegories (*e. g.*, 10:1-16; 15:1-6),³ which deal not with the nature of the kingdom, but with the nature of Christ. On the other hand, the Wonders of Faith, which in Mk. 4:35-5:43 present to the Twelve examples encouraging them to their ministry as workers of miracle by the power of faith, in an ascending series which culminates in the Raising of Jairus' Daughter,

¹ Mt. 10:16-42=Lk. 10:1 ff.; 12:3-9, 51-53 is appended by our first evangelist to Mk. 6:7-13 as if part of a Galilean mission; but its intrinsic character (*e. g.*, verses 16, 18, 27-31) and the duplication of much of Chapter 24 (= Mk. 13) suggest that Q agreed with Jn. 14-16. *I. e.*, the sending and warning of the Twelve, with the promise of the Paraclete, were not provisional and local as in Mk. 6:7-13, but final and general as in Mt. 10, where the setting begins indeed as in Mark, but there is no return of the disciples.

² On the Discourse in Parables (Mk. 4:1-34) as eschatological *in the evangelist's conception* see Bacon, "The Apocalyptic Chapter in the Synoptic Gospels," *Journ. of Bibl. Lit.* XXVIII, (1909) i, pp. 5-7.

³ The seven "I am's" of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel. In this case the number may be accidental.

are also distributed. They are still arranged in a similar ascending series, with similar culmination (Jn. 11). We note, however, the important difference, whose apologetic value is highly significant, that the mighty works are no longer limited, as in Mark (with unimportant exceptions), to the Galilean "corner," but are equally distributed between Galilee and Jerusalem.¹ We note further that the same liberty of transposing the Markan parables and mighty works had been previously taken by our first and third evangelists. Matthew's scheme, however, gives a group of *ten* mighty works, all in Galilee (Mt. 8-9), and a group of *seven* parables (Mt. 13).

Turning from the second half of the Fourth Gospel, whose general structure (aside from the substitution just noted of the Farewell Discourse for the Eschatological Discourse of the Synoptics), merely reproduces Mark's outline of the Passion story as supplemented in Luke,² we may examine a little more closely Part I (Jn. 1-12). This half of the Gospel depicts the public ministry, its close (12:36b-50) applying the Pauline doctrine of the "hardening of Israel" (Rom. 9:14-33) already utilized in Mk. 4:11-12, as it had been previously applied to form the close of the Lukan narrative (Acts 28:25-28). Jn. 12:38-40 even reproduces the Pauline "scripture fulfilments."³

¹ Jerusalem has the Paralytic (5:1 ff.), the Man born Blind (9:1 ff.) and Lazarus (11:1 ff.), as against the two in Cana (2:1 ff.; 4:54 ff.) and two at the sea of Tiberias (6:1-25). But Jerusalem has not only the greatest of the signs (11:1 ff.) but the tokens of the Resurrection.

² We may note that the High-priestly prayer (Jn. 17) is a characteristic substitution for the Agony in Gethsemane, to which only Lk. 22:32 furnishes a link of transition.

³ Jn. 12:38 quotes Is. 53:1. So had Paul (Rom. 10:16). Jn. 12:40 quotes Is. 6:9, 10. So had Paul (Rom. 11:8). The whole structure of this concluding chapter of Part I, Jesus received by the "little ones" but conspired against by the rulers (12:1-19), sought by the Gentiles, but remain-

The public ministry has the same division in the Fourth Gospel into a Galilean and a Peræan period which Luke had adopted from the obscurer Markan scheme and made so fundamental to his own. As in Mk. 8:28-9:50 the Confession of Peter, with its connected incidents and teachings, concludes the Galilean ministry, while the chapter following (Mk. 10) is occupied with the journey through Peræa, so in Jn. 6:66-71 the Confession of Peter marks the same transition. "John" passes from a Galilean ministry concluded with the Sign of the Loaves (Jn. 4-6) to a Peræan (Jn. 10:40; 11:54); though this, like the Galilean, is interrupted by visits to Jerusalem (7:1-10; 10:22; 11:7; 12:1 ff.).¹ Thus the first half of the Gospel falls into two approximately equal parts (chapters 1-6, and chapters 7-12), which correspond with similar geographical subdivisions borrowed by Luke from Mark, and form a counterpart to those of Part II (Jn. 13-17; 18-20).

The same rule already applied—the Markan outline with modifications often foreshadowed in Luke—will carry us still further toward an understanding of the general structure of the "spiritual" Gospel. We have seen that those elements of Mark's story of the Galilean ministry which relate to the choosing, training and sending of the Twelve (Mk. 3:7-6:13) are transferred (by no means without precedent) to Part II (Jn. 14-16). In 110-120 A. D. an Apostle's calling could no longer be treated as a model for mere traveling evangelists and healers. This leaves of the first half of Mark's Gospel only two of its three main divisions.² The

ing to "abolish in his flesh the enmity" (12:20-36), should be compared with Luke and Paul.

¹ On the significance of the visits to Jerusalem at the feasts see below, Chapter XV, Johannine Topography and Chronology, and Chapter XVI, Johannine Quartodecimanism.

² As to these divisions and subdivisions of Mark no difference of opinion exists among modern authorities. The reader is referred to *Beginnings of*

first (Mk. 1: 1-3: 6) might be entitled the Beginning of the Ministry; it includes two parts: (a) the Baptism of John, Call of the First Disciples, and Beginning of Miracles (Mk. 1); (b) the Growth of Opposition (Mk. 2: 1-3: 6). Each of these has its counterpart in the Fourth Gospel, the former (a) in Jn. 1: 1-2: 12; 3: 22-36; the latter (b) in Jn. 5.¹ The remaining division of Mark included (a) the Sign of the Loaves and Walking on the Sea (Mk. 6: 14-52), and (b) the Collision with the Scribes in Capernaum and Ministry in Phœnicia and Decapolis (Mk. 6: 53-8: 27). Both of these again have their counterparts in Jn. 6 and Jn. 4: 1-42, respectively. Notoriously the latter part (b) of this section of Mark has been treated in the most radical manner by Luke, and less drastically by Matthew. In both these Synoptic predecessors of our evangelist the Markan representation of a ministry of Jesus among Gentiles had been suppressed.² Both had added the incident of the Centurion's Servant which conveys nearly the same lesson as the Markan story of the Syro-Phœnician Woman, without fixing on Jesus the rôle of a Jonah needing to be freed from the limitations of a narrow nationalism, and also without suggesting an actual ministry in partibus infidelium. In Jn. 4 the Lukan substitute of a ministry among *Samaritans* is followed in pref-

Gospel Story, pp. xi-xvii, but interpreters agree as to the divisions after 1: 45; 3: 6; and 6: 13, which are here in question.

¹ On the prolepsis of Jn. 2: 13-3: 21 (Temple Cleansing and Nicodemus) and Jn. 4 (Samaritan Mission and Centurion's Servant) see below, and Chapter XIX.

² Mt. 15: 21-28 retains the episode of the "Canaanitish" Woman from Mk. 7: 24 ff., alongside its less radical pendant of the Heathen Centurion (Mt. 8: 5-13 = Lk. 7: 1-10), but makes the woman come "out of those borders," so that Jesus does not leave the sacred soil. Luke retains only the Centurion, but more than compensates for the cancelation by his entire second treatise, whose motive from beginning to end is equivalent to that of the canceled section of Mark. In addition he introduces a work of Jesus in Samaria.

erence to the Matthæan method, which brings the "Canaanitish" woman "out of those borders," so that her case may correspond with the Centurion's, or more closely still with that of "Rahab the harlot." However, the fourth evangelist declines to follow Luke in canceling the Markan episode, preferring to retain it in the modified form of the Dialogue with the Woman of Samaria side by side with its Q pendant of the Centurion's Servant.

With the exception of the interjected material of Jn. 2: 13-3: 21 and 4: 1-42, which has a history of its own,¹ the Galilean Ministry of the Fourth Gospel thus agrees throughout with the corresponding section of Mark (Mk. 1-9). The greater omissions have already been explained.² Such minor substitutions and changes as remain are all explicable by the recognized and characteristic motives of our evangelist. It will be needful, however, to observe the nature of these seriatim, at least for the opening chapters, that we may fully acquaint ourselves with his method.

The Prologue of the Fourth Gospel (Jn. 1: 1-18) corresponds to the prologue of Mark (Mk. 1: 1-13) with characteristic correction of "the *beginning* of the gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God." The attempts of Matthew and Luke to obviate its inadequate Christology had fallen far short of the Pauline incarnation doctrine, much as they improved upon Mark in respect to making the "sonship" of Jesus cover his entire *earthly* life. If the earthly life was to be treated *throughout* as a "tabernacling" of the Logos among us (Jn. 1: 14) and not merely as irradiated at intervals by visions and voices as at the Baptism and Transfiguration, the "sonship" must first of all be carried back to "the glory which he had with the Father before the foundation of the world." In particular the Temptation must be not merely reduced, as in Mk. 1: 12-13, but completely

¹ See Chapters XVIII and XIX.

² Above, p. 369.

canceled; moreover, the Baptism by John must cease to be a revelation to Jesus—for how can the Son who had “descended out of heaven”¹ require a Vocation by Voice from heaven to acquaint him with his own nature and mission? It must become a mere testimony to Israel mediated by the Baptist.² Of the further occasion for reducing the relative importance of the Baptist himself, and for making his rite a loan from Christianity and not conversely, we have already spoken.³ The transformations of Mk. 1:1-13 thus called for are indeed profound, and require the detail of a commentary for full exposition; but it cannot justly be said that we have not a completely adequate key in the basic postulates of Johannine (and Pauline) Christology, to all the transformations effected.

The transformation of Mark's Call of the Four and Beginning of Miracles (Mk. 1:14-45) in Jn. 1:19-2:12 was equally unavoidable, and is equally intelligible on Johannine principles. It is inherently probable that the ready response of the four fishermen to Jesus' proposal to engage in a fishery of men (with Mk. 1:17; *cf.* Jer. 16:16) was historically mediated by previous joint association with the Baptist, whose frustrated work Jesus now proposes to take up. Tradition of such earlier association of Jesus with his earliest followers may very well have been accessible to our evangelist. The motive of his correction of Mark must be judged, however, not by conjectures of superior information accessible to him, but by our real knowledge of his situation, and his systematic treatment of the earlier portrait of the Baptist. In the light of these we can see that he had, doctrinally

¹ Jn. 3:13; *cf.* II Cor. 8:9.

² B. Weiss in his *Leben Jesu* thinks it consonant with historical probability that the experience which results in driving *Jesus* first to the wilderness, afterwards to his ministry and death, should have its psychological origin in the soul of the *Baptist!*

³ Above, p. 349 ff.

speaking, no alternative but to make Jesus' ministry begin independently of the Baptist's, explaining its apparent growth out of the latter by an intentional restraint on Jesus' part (4: 1-3). The best method to this end was to fall back upon some antecedent relation of Jesus to the first group of disciples, *before* the Capernaum period, and *before* John was "cast into prison" (2: 12; 3: 24). We note that in this substitute for the Markan Call of the Four it is not at all a taking up of the Baptist's call to repentance which is in view, nor is anything said of the plebeian status and occupation of the disciples.¹ What is presented to them is simply the doctrine of Jesus' Messiahship, *understood in the Pauline sense as a taking away of the sin of the world by an atoning sacrifice, this to be followed by an opening of heaven and an ascending and descending of the angels upon the Son of man* (Jn. 1: 29, 36, 45, 49, 51). Thus not only Peter, but Andrew and Philip also already know *and fully accept* the revelation found so distasteful in Mk. 8: 27-9: 13. Jesus has already declared himself as the Messiah, the Son of God, the King of Israel, in the non-Jewish, transcendental sense, and has been accepted as such by all the disciples. The Confession and Naming of Peter is anticipated,² and even the much disputed prophecy about the Revelation of the Son of Man (Mk. 9: 1 = Jn. 1: 51). This latter, however, is delivered to "Nathaniel," a new figure characterized like Paul's "Jew which is one inwardly" (1: 47; *cf.* Rom. 2: 28 f.) and declared by R (21: 2) to be of the new locality "Cana of Galilee." Thus the whole ground, not only of Mk. 1: 16-20 but of Mk. 8: 27-9: 13 also, is already covered³ in a way to meet all objections of "the Jews," whether to the obscurity

¹ In the Fourth Gospel the Hellenized "city" of Bethsaida, not the Galilean town of Capernaum is their native place (Jn. 1: 44).

² See above, p. 352.

³ With Mk. 9: 2-8 *cf.* Jn. 1: 14.

of the beginnings of Jesus' work, or its dependence on that of the Baptist.

But the Markan Beginning of Miracles also (Mk. 1: 21-45) was peculiarly unsatisfactory. *Historically* nothing can be more probable than that Jesus' fame as a healer, and particularly as an *exorciser* (Acts 10: 38), had its beginning in such an outcry and word of rebuke followed by restoration of the "possessed" as Mark relates (Mk. 1: 21-39; *cf.* Acts 16: 16-18). The fact that this "exorcism" with its attendant train of "healings" was in reality the starting point of Jesus' miracles is also supported not only by the verisimilitude of this peculiarly simple narrative of the Sabbath in Capernaum at Peter's house, and the uniform representation of all Synoptic material concerning Jesus' casting out of "demons," but more especially by the profound revulsion of feeling it occasions in Jesus' own mind (Mk. 1: 35-38), leading to a complete change of program.

Doctrinally, however, such a "beginning of miracles" was open to the gravest objections from the fourth evangelist's point of view. Not only were such feats as characterized the "strolling Jews, exorcisers" of Ephesus far from such as he would attribute to the incarnate Logos "manifesting his glory"; not only had Jesus' exorcisms been assailed by "the Jews" as evidence of quite other spiritual control than Mark maintains; the complete silence of Paul as to this particular "gift of the Spirit" and the still more marked silence of "John"¹ suggest that the more cultured element in the Church viewed the popular delusion about "evil spirits" as a cause of disease with a skepticism approximating that of the recognized Greek medical authorities of the

¹ There is one allusion to "possession" in the Fourth Gospel—the charge of "the Jews" against Jesus (8: 48)—and one "exorcism." It is the Pauline exorcism of the deposing of the "Prince of the power of the air" from his control of "this world" (Jn. 12: 31).

time. In the Fourth Gospel, accordingly, we should expect as complete a recasting of the Beginning of Miracles (Mk. 1: 21-45), as of the Call of the First Disciples (Mk. 1: 14-20). Such is in fact the nature of Jn. 2: 1-12, which pragmatizes the theme of Mt. 11: 2-6, 16-19 = Lk. 7: 18-23, 31-35 on Jesus' work in comparison with the Baptist's. His healing ministry is purification and life; his message of redemption the song of a wedding feast.¹ It should be superfluous to point out that a "beginning of miracles" of this sort in Cana, where by a stupendous prodigy of omnipotence the Son of God "manifests his glory," makes a subsequent new beginning in Capernaum, exciting amazement by mere exorcisms and healings, psychologically impossible.

The section of Mark which occupies the remainder of his narrative of the beginnings of Jesus' ministry is often entitled the Growth of Opposition (Mk. 2: 1-3: 6). Its constituent incidents are doubtless based on Petrine story, but these in the section as it stands are simply woven into a group based upon, and in Mark's pragmatic fashion reproducing, the older Q group of discourses whose leit-motif is the Stumbling of the Jews at Jesus' conduct, because he was neither a scrupulous observer of the law like the Pharisees, nor an ascetic like the disciples of John (Mt. 11: 2-19 = Lk. 7: 18-50). The study of Jn. 5, which recasts the material of Mk. 2: 1-3: 6 in our evangelist's characteristic manner, is peculiarly instructive, because we are able to com-

¹ For the symbolic sense see the commentaries of Holtzmann, Loisy, and Heitmüller. A traditional basis of the story may have been current. Similar tales of the change of water to wine attach to the river Adonis, sacred to Dionysus, because of its extraordinary annual discoloration. See Epiphanius, *Haer.* LI, xxx, and cf. Irenæus, *Haer.* I, xiii. For those who take the "detail" of the *six* waterpots set "according to the Jew's manner of purification" as indicative of the "eye-witness," we would suggest comparison of Mk. 6: 43, with the note that the huge amphoræ of Jn. 6: 6 (*ἄθραυα ὑδρατα*) require each *two* men to transport.

pare it with Mark's antecedent combination of Petrine story with Q.

The Q discourse was introduced by the incident of the coming of two disciples of John from their imprisoned master to inquire concerning the work of Jesus and what it meant. This work is then described in its two factors of healing and the proclamation of "glad tidings to the poor."¹ In the Lukan form the section concludes with the exquisite intaglio of the Penitent Harlot, illustrating the adoring love and gratitude of the publicans and sinners on the one side, and the offense taken by Pharisees on the other at Jesus' assumption of authority to declare to such penitents "Thy sins are forgiven." In this version Jesus justifies his declaration of God's forgiveness (not his own) by pointing to the woman's manifestation of "love" as proof of the fact.² The central portion in both Synoptic embodiments of Q is occupied by a discourse of Jesus which arraigns the religious oligarchy for its rejection of both the Baptist's message of funereal wailing, and his own of wedding music. It proceeds to justify his "eating and drinking with publicans and sinners," and boldly declares the termination of "law and prophets" with John, who had thrown down the barriers to the kingdom of God erected by the scribes, admitting "Wisdom's children."

In Mark the "disciples of John" appear only for the contrast between Jesus' "eating and drinking" and the ascetic practices which they themselves share with the Pharisees. Jesus' disciples are "sons of the bride-chamber" and there-

¹ The expression "the poor" to designate the "unchurched" classes (*ἀποσυναγώγιοι*) is borrowed from Is. 61: 1. The third evangelist reemploys the passage in a scene of his own composing in Lk. 4: 16 ff.

² This representation agrees with Mt. 21: 31-32: the repentance of the publicans and harlots proves their admission to the kingdom of God. Mark's recast (Mk. 2: 5-10) applies the proof of Q (Mt. 11: 5=Lk. 7: 22) in a very different sense.

fore "cannot fast" (Mk. 2: 18-20). The work of Jesus is concretely exhibited in a particular instance of the healing of a paralytic which the evangelist supplements (quite incongruously) in verses 5-10 with a declaration to the patient (unsolicited), "Thy sins are forgiven." "The scribes who were sitting there" (!) murmur, "He blasphemeth. Who can forgive sins but one, even God?" whereupon Jesus proves that he has this prerogative by proceeding with the interrupted healing. In this pragmatizing version of Q's story of the "stumbling" of the scribes at Jesus' work of healing and proclamation of "glad tidings to the poor" a long step is certainly taken toward the Johannine point of view.

In verses 13-17 Mark pragmatizes in similar fashion upon the objection "a glutton and wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners," giving the concrete instance of "Levi." The rest of the section (2: 21-3: 6) he devotes to the anti-legalism of Jesus (*cf.* Mt. 11: 12 f. = Lk. 16: 16), instanced by two cases of conflict with the scribes regarding the law of the sabbath. The concluding incident contrasts Jesus' interpretation of the law as intended "to save life" with that of the scribes, who use it "to kill." How, then, does the Fourth Gospel handle the theme?

In Jn. 5 the evangelist follows Mark in taking as his point of departure the healing of a paralytic whom Jesus bids "Arise, take up thy pallet (*κράβαττος*) and walk," though the issue of the "forgiveness of sins" has necessarily to be postponed in a Gospel which makes forgiveness of sins a proclamation of the apostles (20: 23) depending on the atoning death of the "Lamb of God."¹ We anticipate also the disappearance of the "publicans and sinners." Since the days of Paul the spiritual monopolists had become "the Jews"; "the poor" on behalf of whom Jesus speaks are

¹ A trace remains, however, in Jn. 5: 14, "Sin no more, lest a worse thing befall thee."

now the "believers." Moreover, the healing (5:1-9) is transferred to Jerusalem on occasion of "a feast of the Jews"¹ and symbolically elaborated.² In verses 10-18 the Sabbath controversy with "the Jews" is brought in (with a side glance at the blasphemy of Jesus in "making himself equal with God"; *cf.* Mk. 2:7) by the statement that the occasion of the healing was a sabbath. Jesus then gives his interpretation of true sabbath observance as the constant imitation of "the works of God," in particular the giving of "life" [*cf.* Mk. 3:4 and Q (Mt. 11:5 = Lk. 7:22)].³ Finally, he shows the true function of John the Baptist on the one side, and of "the law and the prophets" on the other, as mere witnesses to himself. The scribes who "think they have eternal life" in the Scriptures which testify of Jesus, are themselves condemned by Moses in whom they trust, because they reject him, the true Giver of life (Jn. 5:30-47; *cf.* Mk. 2:18-22; Lk. 16:16).

We could scarcely ask a better example of the Fourth Gospel's free combination of Mark and the Discourses, in a manner to "bring out" the doctrinal values. Each is handled with truly Pauline freedom, but with high loyalty to "spiritual" truth. The motive and method are not those of historical criticism, but of haggada and midrash.

After omission of Mark's section on the Choosing, Training, and Mission of the Twelve (Mk. 3:7-6:13) for reasons above explained, we find the Fourth Gospel again in the sixth chapter in close correspondence to Mark's division on the Breaking of Bread as the Sign from Heaven granted to

¹ Probably Pentecost, the feast of the Giving of the Law, was originally intended. See Chapters XV and XVI.

² On the symbolism, see the commentaries above referred to.

³ With this function of the Son of man as "Lord of the sabbath" (Mk. 2:28) is associated its converse, the execution of judgment (Jn. 5:22-29; *cf.* Mk. 3:5-6).

the disciples but refused to the Pharisees, and the Confession of Peter (Mk. 6: 14-9: 29; *cf.* especially Mk. 8: 11-21 with Jn. 6: 30-59). After the example of Jn. 5 detailed comparison with Mark is needless. We only note two things: (1) Our evangelist follows Luke in substituting a *Samaritan* mission for the Gentile mission of Mk. 7: 24-8: 26, reserving his utterance on the calling of the Gentiles for the close of the ministry when Jesus has been definitively rejected by the Jews (12: 20-36). The section combining the equivalents of Mark's incident of the Syro-Phœnician Woman and Q's Centurion's Servant are now found in Jn. 4, doubtless inserted at this point rather than later because of the connection of the former with the doctrine of Baptism and the Gift of the Spirit.¹

(2) Some of the material of Mk. 6: 14-9: 50 is utilized elsewhere in John, after the example set by both Matthew and Luke; in particular the healing of the Blind Man with clay and spittle (Mk. 8: 22-26; *cf.* Jn. 9: 1 ff.); and the connected Denunciation of the Scribes who said, "He hath Beelzebub" as "blind leaders" guilty of the Unforgivable Sin (Mt. 12: 22-37 = Lk. 11: 14-36; 12: 10 = Mk. 7: 1-23; 3: 22-30; *cf.* Jn. 9: 13-41; 10: 19-21). The Transfiguration (Mk. 9: 2-13) has its substitute in the Fourth Gospel as a whole, though reflected in Jn. 1: 14 and 12: 28-30; the Instructions to the Twelve on True Primacy (Mk. 9: 30-50) came later by the evangelist's plan (Jn. 13: 1-17). As for the exorcisms of Mk. 7: 31-37 and 9: 14-29, they were excluded on principle. Nothing accordingly of Markan material remains unaccounted for. The fourth evangelist really employs every available shred of Mark in his own way; nor has he even added, except from Luke.

The section of Mark on the Peræan Ministry (Mk. 10)

¹ On indications of transpositions of material in the Fourth Gospel from its original order see Chapter XIX.

has but a single miracle, the healing of Blind Bartimæus, in which even Matthew and Luke seem already to have incorporated the Blind Man of Bethsaida. Jn. 9 restores the Markan traits of the clay and spittle, transferring the healing, like that of the Paralytic in Chapter 5, to Jerusalem, with characteristic elaboration, manifestly symbolic in purpose (9: 7). On the other hand, while we recognize in Jn. 7: 1-13 a certain resemblance to the situation of Mk. 10: 1, where Jesus and the Twelve are leaving "houses and brethren and sisters" for the way of martyrdom, still we miss, at first sight, the distinctive figure of this section of Mark, the Rich Man who came to Jesus asking the way of eternal life. In Mk. 10: 17-22 he stands opposed on the one side to the "babes" whom Jesus had welcomed to "the kingdom of God," on the other to the disciples who have "left all and followed" him. This "ruler" (so Luke) we have already recognized, however, in the Johannine figure of Nicodemus, rich and acknowledging in Jesus a "teacher come from God," but unable to "turn again and become as a little child" or to accept the doctrine of the Cross (Jn. 3: 1-21). The embodied interpretation of the doctrine of baptism (3: 5) is doubtless responsible for its removal to the earlier context; for it bears many marks of having once stood after Jn. 7: 30, where Tatian has placed it, in the same chapter where Nicodemus reappears in the rôle of a Gamaliel (7: 50 f.).¹

Of the Markan material of the Peræan ministry the only elements not really taken over by the Fourth Gospel are the controversy with the scribes on the Mosaic law of divorce (Mk. 10: 2-12; but compare Jn. 7: 15-24), and the Offer of the Sons of Zebedee (Mk. 10: 35-45). *Both of these had previously been canceled by Luke.* Of the scene of the Raising of Lazarus, compounded of Mk. 5: 35-43 and Lk. 10: 38-42; 16: 19-31, we have already spoken.

¹ On this displacement see below, Chapter XIX.

It is needless to compare the Markan story of the Passion and Resurrection (Mk. 11-16) with the Johannine. We have seen already how drastic the recasting must be which would here do justice to Johannine Christology; also that Luke had already determined its general nature, at least as regards the Resurrection scenes, while the Betrayal and Agony in Gethsemane would suggest their own conditions of recasting. In this section detailed comparison would again prove the evangelist's complete loyalty to the two essential elements of Synoptic story, Petrine narrative and Matthæan discourse, subject always to his formative principle of the "spiritual" gospel of Paul. The wonder is that so little disappears of the Markan basis. The most conspicuous instance is the displacement of the Purging of the Temple (Mk. 11: 15-18) by the Raising of Lazarus as the occasion of the conspiracy against Jesus' life (Jn. 11: 47-53). A later hand, as we shall see, has reinstated the episode, though on a Matthæan basis, and in an impossible context. Of this more hereafter. As a question of historicity we may leave the Markan and the Johannine explanations of the conspiracy against Jesus' life to make their own impression.

Our study of the evangelist's relation to his sources shows him to depend not on external eye-witness, but on "spiritual" insight. He has certain qualifications for his task which belong to the merely external order. He is a Jew and a teacher. He knows Jerusalem and its environs and the northward road through Samaria to the sea "of Tiberias" by personal visit. He can add perhaps here and there a minute trace of much distorted historic tradition. In one conspicuous instance to be separately discussed¹ he brings an important historical correction of Mark's inaccuracy; though even here the motive is not historical but ritual. His

¹ Chapter XVI.

real qualification, as he himself would have defined it, lies in his transcendent ability so to restate the tradition of Jesus' deeds and words as to bring out its "spiritual" values "for teaching, for reproof, for correction (moral and doctrinal), for instruction which is in righteousness."

CHAPTER XV

JOHANNINE TOPOGRAPHY AND CHRONOLOGY

We have already distinguished in Chapter XIII between the "graphic detail" of midrash, imagined or inferred for a doctrinal or apologetic purpose, and detail of the veritable eye-witness, which reveals its true character by a relation to the history in its larger aspects. Detail of the latter type is, as we have seen, almost wholly wanting to the Fourth Gospel. Two points, however, were deferred for more special consideration: (1) the fourth evangelist's topography, which not only differs in a very striking way from the Synoptic, but admittedly indicates a first-hand knowledge of certain Palestinian localities; (2) his chronology, which is equally peculiar, and which also, in our judgment, indicates use of independent Palestinian tradition. The first of these questions may be very briefly discussed in the present chapter. The second is more closely related than the first to the system of correspondences with the Jewish festal and calendar system on which this evangelist has schematized his story. The discussion of it, therefore, must to some extent be carried over to Chapter XVI, on Johannine Quartodecimanism; for Quartodecimanism, as already defined, is simply the retention in Christianized form of the Jewish observance of the Fourteenth Nisan. In Asia this becomes "the true passover of the Lord, the great Sacrifice,"¹ and the Fourth Gospel reflects the practice in its representation of Jesus' attendance at the "feasts of the Jews."

It is needless to repeat what has been well said by others,

¹ Above, p. 247 f.

especially by Professor Sanday, on the evidence for our evangelist's personal acquaintance with scenes in and about Jerusalem, Sychar, and Tiberias. Here we have allusions to sites in the Holy City, its temple and environs, to scenes famous in the story of the patriarch Jacob, and to Galilean villages whose very names are absent from the Synoptics. Bethany "about fifteen furlongs off" from Jerusalem, the "Kidron" valley, the "pavement" called *Gabbatha*, where Pilate's *βῆμα* used to be set up, the colonnades of the temple, including "Solomon's," its "treasury," the pool of "Siloam" and that of "Bethesda" with its "five colonnades" are all mentioned only by "John," and in such a way as could hardly be done without personal acquaintance with the localities. Moving northward through Samaria we pass the "city called Ephraim,"¹ a refuge of Jesus, according to the fourth evangelist, during the last weeks of the ministry. In Samaria we find ourselves in a group of localities almost certainly visualized by our evangelist. Here is "Jacob's well," too "deep" for its waters to be reached by one who "has nothing to draw with," and sunk in "the parcel of ground which Jacob gave to his son Joseph." "This mountain" where the Samaritans worship, overhangs it. The "city (!) called Sychar"² nestles about a mile further north at the foot of Ebal. Three miles eastward, in plain view over the gently undulating "parcel of ground," is Jacob's city of Salim [Gen. 33: 18 (LXX)], while northward some five miles down the valley one sees the ruined tower Burj el-Far 'a surrounded by "many waters" in the most copious

¹ Usually identified with Et-Tayyibeh, near Bethel on a conspicuous height east of the highroad to Nablous (Shechem).

² The identification with 'Ain-'Askar is very probable. The only question is whether this tiny hamlet can ever have been called a "city" (Jn. 4: 5), and may not rather have acquired both name and existence during the pilgrimage period of the fourth century through the inquiries of pilgrims for "Sychar."

springs and pools of the whole hill-country of Ephraim. The name "Ænon" (*i. e.*, "Springs") no longer attaches to them, but only to the miserable modern hamlet 'Ainûn, "without a drop of water," huddled for safety on the summit of a height some two miles further northeast. As this is the only Sâlim known to Palestine, and the only 'Ainûn north of Hebron, we are disposed to be less skeptical than Professor Sanday in identifying the glorious springs and pools of el-Far 'a with the fourth evangelist's scene for the later career of the Baptist (Jn. 4: 23).¹ Again in Galilee our evangelist has traditions (?) concerning "Cana." He knows that one "descends" from Cana in less than a day "to Capernaum" (4: 52; 2: 12), and seems to imply that it is not far from Nazareth (2: 1). He knows the location of Tiberias, and that a boat going thence to Capernaum (Tell Hum) and "in the midst of the sea" is "about five and twenty or thirty furlongs" from shore (6: 19). How could such information be obtained in an age destitute of maps and gazetteers, without an actual visit to these scenes?

On the other hand, how rapidly this notable knowledge, far transcending the meager allusions of the Synoptics, disappears as soon as we leave the beaten track from Jerusalem to the sea "of Tiberias." "Beyond Jordan" is for "John" the scene both of the Baptist's earlier activity, and of the Peræan ministry described by Luke. What becomes of the "graphic realism of the eye-witness" in these regions? One name alone is mentioned, "Bethany beyond Jordan." Diligent search, continued since the time of Origen and

¹ Professor Sanday gives his reasons for rejecting the identification of "Ænon near to Sâlim" with the modern 'Ainûn in *Sacred Sites of the Gospel*, 1903, pp. 33-36. His criticism of the author of Macmillan's *Guide* is justified. We have given reasons elsewhere for the identification *with el-Far 'a*, and for rejecting that of Eusebius, Jerome, and Silvia, who located it at a place then called *Sedima* and pointed to as "the city of Melchizedek." See *The Biblical World*, art. "Ænon near to Sâlim," April, 1909.

Eusebius, has failed to reveal it. Batneh near es-Salt is the latest desperate guess; but at Batneh (= Betonim of Jos. 13: 26?) the Baptist would have had to depend on cistern water and live in a village community.¹ Jericho, so notable a stage in Jesus' last journey in the Synoptics, now fails to appear. According to our evangelist to reach Galilee from Jerusalem Jesus "must needs go through Samaria." From the scene of John's baptizing "beyond Jordan" he arrives with his disciples "on the third day" (!) in Cana of Galilee. The "graphic realism of the eye-witness" seems not to extend "beyond Jordan."

And when we look again at the data which are correct, how singularly they correspond with just the sites, and only those, which could be and would be pointed out to the devout pilgrim. There is no mention of the great city of Neapolis just hidden over the low watershed from the scenes of the patriarch Jacob's life, but only of "Sychar" (= 'Askar), which the pilgrim on the northward road would pass through. The scenes which attract notice in Samaria are "the parcel of ground which Jacob gave to his son Joseph," "Jacob's well," Jacob's city. In Galilee we have mention of "the place where he [Jesus] made the water wine"; or of Tiberias "nigh unto the place where they ate the loaves"; or of scenes immediately connected with Peter's story. True "Bethsaida" is called the "city" of Philip, as well as of Andrew and Peter (1: 44);—but so it was to Josephus also the "city" of "Philip."² Thus the existence here of separate historical tradition becomes questionable again. In Judæa we have mention of "the village of Mary and her sister Martha"; in Jerusalem of the temple, the pools, the Preto-

¹ A visit by the present writer to Batneh, is described, with photographs, in *The Bibl. World* for July, 1907. It lies almost at the summit of the declivity of the eastern plateau, a good half day's journey beyond the Jordan.

² *I. e.*, Herod Philip.—See *Ant.* XVIII, ii, 1.

rium, the Pavement, the Tomb—all sites which no devastations of war could obliterate,¹ and about which sacred legend would begin at once to weave its romance. Admittedly the fourth evangelist has new stores of topographical knowledge, of which he makes ample use to lend graphic touches to his narrative; but of what kind? The limitation of his evidences of knowledge to a particular line of travel and a particular class of data, and still more the interest in which they are adduced, which includes the transfer from Galilee to Jerusalem of the center of gravity of Jesus' work (Jn. 7: 3), bespeak not the companion of Jesus' walks about the villages of Galilee and Peræa, but the pilgrim antiquary of a century after, whose starting point is Jerusalem.

If the Lukan tendency to gravitate toward Jerusalem² is markedly developed in the Fourth Gospel the case is still more pronounced in respect to chronology. Consistently with his attempt to apply the methods of the historiographer, Luke has prefaced his transcript of Mark's account of the ministry with an elaborate though not altogether accurate group of synchronisms to determine precisely the sacred year, "the acceptable year of the Lord" of Lk. 4: 19. For the primitive understanding that the public career of Jesus had covered but a single year is almost unbroken.³ Even the appearance of the Fourth Gospel with its three passovers, if not more, during the ministry did not noticeably affect this generally accepted datum of evangelic tradition until the

¹ Thus the present *ἔστυν* in Jn. 5: 2 is to be accounted for. To this day the pool in question *is* in Jerusalem.

² See *e. g.*, Lk. 1-2; 4: 44 (read "Judæa"), and especially Chapter 24.

³ Note, *e. g.*, *Clem. Hom.* XVII, xix. "Why did our Teacher abide and discourse a whole year?" and see Irenæus, as quoted below, p. 394. With these authorities belong *Clem. Al.* (*Strom.*, I, 145; VI, 279), Julius Africanus, Hippolytus in his later works, and Origen in his earlier. For a two to three years' ministry Melito, Heracleon, Tatian, and Hippolytus on *Daniel* may be cited. The latter are manifestly influenced by the Fourth Gospel.

fourth century. It was, as Drummond justly observes, "too well grounded to be easily displaced."¹ The Asian church claimed, as we have seen, to have maintained its observance of "the Fast" in commemoration of Jesus' death on every recurring fourteenth of Nisan since the days of the apostles.² Under such conditions it would be strange indeed if the year from which the observance started was not soon approximately fixed, as it so easily might be, by some form of absolute dating. In point of fact we know that at a very early time it was so fixed by use of the consular lists as the "year of the two Gemini" [*i. e.*, 29 A. D., whose consuls were L. Rubellius Geminus, and C. Fufius (var. Rufius, Rufus, Fusius) Geminus]. In reality this date, while extremely ancient, and surely not far from the truth, is demonstrably incorrect and artificial.³ Arguments based on the Jewish calendar system are somewhat disputed and precarious, so that to fix positively the year of Pilate's administration in which Nisan 14 (or, according to the Synoptic date for Jesus' death, Nisan 15) can have fallen on a Friday, may be beyond our power. There are, however, certain years which can be certainly and positively excluded; and one of these is the year 29 A. D. We can say with almost absolute certainty, the Crucifixion did *not* occur in 29 A. D.⁴

¹ *Char. and Authorship*, p. 47. See especially the note citing the "great number of references to writers who limited the ministry to one year" in Ezra Abbott: *Authorship of the Fourth Gospel, ut supra*, p. 73, note.

² Above, p. 257.

³ Turner, in his admirable article in *Hastings' Bible Dict., s. v.* "Chronology of the New Testament," is so justly impressed with the great antiquity and historical credibility of this date as to give it his own adhesion. A more exact study of the Jewish calendar system in the Talmudic treatise *Rosh ha-Shana* would have saved him, however, from the error which leads him in this respect to do violence to the astronomical argument. This latter, especially as developed by Fotheringham (see below) is decisive against 29 A. D. as a possible date for the crucifixion.

⁴ The best demonstration is that of Fotheringham (*Journ. of Philol.*, 1903, pp. 100 ff.). Even Achelis, however (*Gött. gel. Nachr., phil. hist. Kl.*, 1902,

Nay, more; we can explain with a very high degree of probability the origin of this date 29 A. D., erroneous as it is. It was probably adopted by the earlier chronographers for the same reason which led Hippolytus later to make it the basis of his own elaborate system. In 29 A. D. *the vernal equinox of the Julian calendar* fell on Friday, March 25. Now we learn from Epiphanius¹ of certain Quartodecimans of Cappadocia who on authority of the *Acts of Pilate*, a work we have found to be employed by Justin Martyr,² observed the anniversary on March 25th of each year, precisely as the church of Rome and the west has adopted December 25th (the Julian winter solstice) as the anniversary of the Nativity. An important exception proves the nature and reason of this rule. Other Asian Quartodecimans who quoted the same authority in a variant reading, observed the anniversary on March 18th. This had not only the advantage of meeting the lunar conditions of the year 29 A. D., in which, as current lunar cycles would show, the full moon occurred on March 18th, but also coincided with *the astronomical equinox* of the same calendar when the sun enters Aries. Our own practice in observing the Nativity on December 25th shows what advantages there would be for Christians concerned to commemorate annually "the exact day" of the crucifixion, in abandoning the complicated Jewish lunar calendar, dependent as it was on the "sanctification" by the Sanhedrin of the new moon of Nisan as the beginning of the year, and substituting the vernal equinox of the Julian calendar already in general use

pp. 707 ff.), who follows the inaccurate method of Wurm, Anger, and Wieseler in dating from astronomic new moon, or a uniform 36 hours after, instead of from actual *phasis*, as the Jews certainly reckoned, excludes 29 A. D. from possible years. He makes Nisan 14 of 29 A. D. to fall on *Sunday*, April 17th. By Synoptic tradition it would have to be Thursday; by Johanne Friday.

¹ *Haer.* I, i; L, i, 23.

² Above, p. 41.

throughout the empire. Practical convenience, and dislike of dependence on the hated Jews, will have had almost as much to do with the adoption of the Cappadocian plan, as the symbolism immemorially connected with the reawakening of life at vernal equinox. The remarkable coincidence that in "the year of the two Gemini" (29 A. D.), which fell about midway in the high priesthood of Caiaphas and procuratorship of Pilate, the two vernal equinoxes March 18th and 25th fell on Fridays, Friday being the known week-day of the crucifixion, is quite sufficient to account for the early and universal adoption of this date as marking the year of the crucifixion.¹

It is much more difficult to determine whether our third evangelist already has this date in mind in fixing the beginning of the ministry with so great pains in "the fifteenth year of Tiberius" (Lk. 3: 1), or whether we should regard it as mere coincidence that his chronology also attains the same result.

As Turner has admirably shown,² *both* dates, Tiberii XV and Tiberii XVI, were current early in the second century as designations of "the year of the two Gemini." Luke, accordingly, cannot be supposed to be following any different tradition, but only employs that common method of dating which reckoned the first year of the emperor as beginning from the next preceding consulship (January 1), or possibly, as Josephus does, with the preceding Passover, thus reaching the equivalence Passover 29 A. D. = Tiberii XVI,³ instead of

¹ The possibility also remains open that the year 29 A. D. was fixed with reference to the Jewish era of the temple (20-19 B. C.), on the assumption (on which see below) that Jesus' life covered one jubilee (7x7) of years.

² Hastings' *Bible Dict.*, s. v. "Chronology of N. T.," p. 413.

³ The accession of Tiberius was August 9, 14 A. D. Efforts to accommodate Lk. 3: 1 to other systems, ancient or modern, by introducing one or more additional years as years of "coregency" with Augustus, are unscientific.

that which failed to reckon in the fraction of a year, and thus made Passover 29 A. D. = Tiberii XV.

However attained, the starting point of gospel chronology was certainly this date for the crucifixion.¹ The fact that it is astronomically inadmissible, but can be accounted for by a priori reasoning, that it appears "in so many authorities that the common source must ascend to a remote antiquity,"² and finally that the Lukan version represents but one of *two* equivalent forms, makes it most probable that its origin, although speculative and unhistorical, is more ancient than the third gospel itself.

We must think of our third evangelist, accordingly, as elaborating his synchronisms of Lk. 3: 1 on the basis of this first century date for the crucifixion. As we have seen, a twelvemonth for the ministry, if not already traditional,³ soon became so. The one new feature added by "Luke," and added, as we have reason to think, in disagreement with an earlier though vague tradition, was the date of Jesus' birth, with the implied determination of his age in the year of the ministry as "about 30 years" (Lk. 3: 23). Both Basilidean and Valentinian *gnosis* took up these two data. The Valentinians in particular brought the twelve months of the ministry and the thirty years of Jesus' age into correspondence with their duodecads and triple decads of *Æons*,

¹ Turner (Hastings' *Bible Dict.*, s. v. "Chronology of the N. T.," p. 414b) rightly distinguishes the greater relative importance to the Church, and hence earlier fixation of the date of the Passover. "Here was to every Christian eye from the first the turning point of the world's evolution, and the Church's confession had always put in the forefront the historical setting 'under Pontius Pilate.'" He adduces not only I Tim. 6: 12, but Ign. *ad Magn.* xi, and the "Apostles' " Creed.

² Turner, *ibid.*

³ The annual recurrence of the celebration of the death and resurrection at Passover would tend to limit the outline of evangelic story to a cyclic year.

“the passion which took place in the case of the twelfth Æon being indicated by the apostasy of Judas who was the twelfth apostle, and also by the fact that Christ suffered in the twelfth month. For their opinion is that he continued to preach for one year only after his baptism.”¹

With both these chronological data the Fourth Gospel takes decided issue, reverting, as will be shown, to pre-Lukan tradition in the matter of Jesus' age, and extending the duration of the ministry (in this respect also coming in all probability nearer to historic fact) over at least two years.

Whether the temple synchronism of Jn. 2:13-22 starts from the same fixed date as those of Luke (Passion at Pass-over 29 A. D. = Tiberii XV-XVI), or not, the insertion of the story at this point corresponds to Luke's setting of the proclamation at Nazareth, “where Jesus was brought up,” of “the acceptable year of the Lord.” We merely have instead of Jesus' offer of himself to his fellow-townsmen and his rejection, an offer of himself in the temple at Jerusalem to “the Jews.” In the Synoptic Gospels, which (historically) withhold the declaration of the Messiahship till the end, this overt act of challenge to the hierocracy marks of necessity the beginning of the final catastrophe. Jesus maintains himself for a few days on the strength of his popularity with the masses. The priests demand his authority for this invasion of their precincts, but to overcome it are forced by their “fear of the people” to resort to conspiracy rather than open violence. This story accounts historically both for the fact of Jesus' death at the instigation of “the chief priests,” and also for the indirectness and delay in bringing it about. The fourth evangelist has little regard for mere considerations of historical interrelation of cause and effect, and therefore thinks nothing of divorcing this opening scene of the final

¹ Irenæus, *Haer.* I, iii, 3. Irenæus himself extends the ministry to twenty (!) years.

conflict in Jerusalem from its necessary conditions and necessary consequences. Considerations of theoretic propriety, such as move the third evangelist to transform Mk. 6: 1-6 into a programmatic discourse of Jesus in his *πατρίς* (Lk. 4: 16 ff.), induce the transfer of this Synoptic scene of the Visitation of the Temple (*cf.* Mal. 3: 1-4) to the place it logically must occupy in a Gospel which makes it Jesus' first task to commend himself to Israel as Messiah and Incarnate Son of God. There is no consideration given to the fact that the purging of the temple, a huge fortress, with its "captain of the temple" ¹ and garrison of organized Levitical police could not be carried out before Jesus had reached the zenith of his popularity with the masses, nor to the fact that *when* carried out all its consequences, including those of the saying on "destroying the temple," could not lie quiescent for a period of two or three years, awaiting Jesus' return to Jerusalem. The one consideration for the fourth evangelist is that if Jesus is to offer himself to Israel as the Christ he should do so at once, at the Passover, before the assembled nation in his "Father's house." For this reason the Purging of the Temple takes the place in the Fourth Gospel of the Lukan Preaching in Nazareth.

But while this writer has properly drawn together the incident of Mt. 21: 12 f. and its sequel related in verses 23-32,² avoiding the interruption of Mk. 11: 19-25, he will not lose, it would seem, the opportunity to bring in a correction of the Lukan chronology by his own favorite method of symbolism. The answer given by Jesus to the scribes' demand for a sign of his authority was a reference to his own resurrection in three days,³ contained in the saying alluded

¹ The so-called *Segan*. See Acts 4: 1, and Schürer, *Jewish People*, etc., § 24, 2 (Second Div., Vol. I, pp. 257 f., Engl.).

² The basis of Jn. 2: 13-22 seems to be more nearly Matthæan than Markan.

³ *Cf.* Mt. 12: 40. The demand of "the scribes" for "a sign from heaven"

to by Mark: "Destroy this temple and in three days I will build it again." He was speaking symbolically, says the evangelist, "of the temple of his body." But not the words of Jesus only must convey a double sense; "the Jews" also, like Caiaphas in 11:49-51 must, it would appear, unconsciously "prophesy." They do so by declaring,

"Forty and six years has this temple been in building ($\psi\kappa\omicron\delta\omicron\mu\eta\theta\eta$), and wilt thou raise it up in three days?"

Here the point of departure, as all admit, is the date of Herod's great undertaking to rebuild the temple, whose date is carefully fixed by Josephus in connection with other authorities in 20-19 B. C.,¹ so that any Christian Jew who reckoned from this epoch of the temple could not fail to notice that the received date for the crucifixion (29 A. D.) fell at exactly one jubilee (7×7) of years from the founding of the temple. Thus, barring the isolated statement of Luke that Jesus at his baptism was "about 30 years old" the symbolism by which the resurrection of Jesus' body in three days was brought into equivalence with the saying "Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up" would easily be extended into a correspondence between the founding of the temple and the incarnation. Now in point of fact we not only find that the saying "Forty and six years has this temple been in building" was understood to symbolize the years of Jesus' life,² but we can trace this reckoning by in Jn. 6:30 ff. seems to be the original Johannine parallel. This also is answered by a reference to the Resurrection. But there is duplication already in the Synoptics.

¹ *War*, I, xxi, 1; *Ant.* XV, xi, 1, on which cf. Schürer, *H. J. P.* § 15, notes 12 and 72 (Engl. I, i, pp. 410 and 438). See also Turner, *Hastings' Bible Dict.* I, s. v. "Chronology," pp. 405 f.

² Augustine (*de Doctr. Chr.* II, xxviii) refers to certain errorists (perhaps successors of Gaius and the Alogi) who maintained that Jesus attained an age of nearly 50 years on the ground not of Jn. 8:57 only, but Jn. 2:20 also. This view is taken by the author of the treatise *de montibus Sina et Sion*, iv (in the works of Cyprian, Hartel, III, 108). Augustine himself, however,

jubilees of years to its fuller form in a fragment of the *Apocalypse of Thomas*, which forecasts "nine jubilees" (450 years) from the Ascension to the Second Coming. As the Nativity was probably dated by this apocalypticist like others of his class in anno mundi 5500¹ and the duration of the world at 6,000 years, in accordance with the stereotyped principle of the hexaëmeron (6 days of creation each = 1,000 years, the sabbath = the millennium), the period of the incarnation will certainly have been reckoned at one full jubilee (50 years), making up the total of ten jubilees (500 years) for the Christian dispensation.² We may therefore reasonably infer that the synchronism with the temple in Jn. 2: 13 ff. represents this type of reckoning by jubilees, the author counting that at this passover Jesus (coincidentally with the temple) was beginning his 47th year, at the unnamed feast of 5: 1, which the fathers, beginning with Irenæus, understand to be a passover,³ was beginning his 48th, at the passover of 6: 4 his 49th, and at the passover of the crucifixion (12: 1 ff.) his 50th, the jubilee year being that of his "glorification." This reckoning, though it may exaggerate the implication of Jn. 8: 57 is at least in harmony with it, a statement which for all the contortions of "harmonistic" exegesis *cannot* be made in favor of the Lukan.

The reckoning of Jesus' life at a jubilee of years can be

attributes an allegorical significance to the 46 years in relation to the body of Jesus (*de Trin.* IV, v).

¹ *E. g.*, Anianus, a chronographer of about 412 A. D., dates the nativity December 25 anno mundi 5501. The conception (Lk. 1: 31) took place as the last day of the year 5500 was passing into the first of 5501. Anianus is one of those who show dependence on the 49 years' duration of Jesus' life probably given currency by Hippolytus in 203-205 A. D.

² See Frick in *Zts. f. ntl. Wiss.*, 1908, 2, p. 172.

³ Incorrectly so. The subject of the dialogue—Christ's authority *vs.* the law of Moses—shows that Pentecost, the Feast of the Giving of the Law, was originally intended. This is a further item of the manifold evidence that Jn. 2: 13 ff. is an editorial addition.

traced much further back than the *Apocalypse of Thomas*, and to no less an authority than Hippolytus himself, if we may trust the scholarly reasoning of Dom Chapman,¹ in his *Defence of the Fourth Gospel and Apocalypse*, which Chapman gives new reason for dating in 203-205 A. D. Unfortunately for inferences regarding the currency of this "jubilee" dating at an earlier time, Chapman gives very cogent reasons for thinking Hippolytus' results, a period of 49 years for the duration of Jesus' life and of twelve years for the ministry, to have been purely fortuitous, a mere result of dependence on the grossly careless statements of Tertullian in combination with the consular lists. Yet this 49-year duration of Jesus' life coincides exactly with the data of an ancient fragment, whose contents purport (justly, so far as we can judge) to be from the "own hand" of "Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem." This Alexander, who had previously held a bishopric in *Cappadocia*, was for several years associated in the episcopate of Jerusalem with Narcissus, under whom the great council was held in Jerusalem (ca. 198 A. D.) which settled for the time being the controversy about the passover, its dates, relation to gospel story and observance. Alexander, fragments of whose letters are preserved by Eusebius, was a friend and host of Origen, formed a celebrated library, interested himself in the paschal controversy and its connected questions of chronology and the "disagreement of the Gospels," and could scarcely fail to know the earlier chronological work of Hippolytus undertaken in the "Defence of the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse of John."² But the fragment, an extract from

¹ *Journ. of Theol. Studies*, VIII (1906-07), pp. 590-606. See also his further article connecting the fragment from Victorinus with Papias. *Ibid.* IX (1907-08), pp. 42-61.

² Epiphanius in his famous chapter against the Alogi (*Haer.* LI), now known to be based on the work of Hippolytus, avowedly introduces his list of consulships from the thirteenth to the forty-second year of Augustus to

the *Commentaries* of Victorinus (*ob.* 304 A. D.) extant in several forms,¹ states expressly that its contents were derived by Alexander from "apostolic autographs" (*de exemplaribus apostolorum*) and were found by Victorinus "among the parchments of Alexander." Its distinctive feature is an attempt to date the birth, baptism, and crucifixion of Jesus in absolute terms of the Julian calendar, obviously for ritual purposes and in a Quartodeciman interest. *I. e.*, the Passion and Resurrection are fixed for annual observance on the 23d and 25th of March ("X" and "VIII Kal. April.") a practice current so far as we know nowhere but in *Cappadocia*.² This certainly would seem to corroborate very strongly the claim of the chronology to emanate from Alexander, a Cappadocian and a writer of authority on paschal questions. Chapman's reasoning, on the other hand, is very convincing for regarding the consular dates (Nativity: Sulpicio Camerino et Poppæo Sabino Coss. = 9 A. D.; Crucifixion: Nerone III et Valerio Messala Coss. = 58 A. D.) which also figure in the fragment, as resting on mere blunders of Hippolytus, Alexander's contemporary. They seem to be due to an attempt to locate the ordinary datings (XLII Aug. and XVII Tiber.) in the consular lists, wherein Hippolytus was misled by the previous misstatements of Tertullian. If, then, we are not to reject as pure falsification the statement about Alexander's dependence on apostolic documents (*transcripsit manu sua de exemplaribus apostolorum*) we must limit his dependence on Hippolytus to the Roman

refute "those who think there is disagreement in the number of years set forth by the evangelists."

¹ See Dobschütz in *Texte u. Unt.* XI, i, pp. 136 f., and J. Chapman in *Journ. of Theol. Studies*, VIII (1906-07), pp. 590-606.

² For some reason Harnack, in discussing the fragment in his *Gesch. d. altchr. Lit.*, Bd. II, 8, p. 506, declares this effort to fix the observance of the Resurrection on March 25, without regard to the day of the week, an unmistakably Quartodeciman trait, to "point to Gaul" (!).

consulships. We have, in fact, every reason to believe that Alexander regarded himself as possessing such "apostolic documents," because the great synod held under his predecessor and colleague Narcissus, and held for the very purpose of deciding these questions, had recorded its finding as made on the basis of

"the tradition concerning the passover which had come to them in succession from the apostles."¹

The nucleus of the library formed at Jerusalem by Alexander will at least have contained, if it did not consist of, the documents of this synod. Corssen,² and Chapman³ are indeed both convinced that Alexander's "apostolic" authority was Papias, and as respects Victorinus, to whom we owe the extract, in his *Commentary on Revelation*, dependence on Papias for chiliastic reckonings is highly probable. But in all the voluminous literature of the paschal controversy none dreams of citing Papias as an authority for *these* dates, which could hardly be the case if he afforded such chronographic material. We must think rather of the *Acts of Pilate*, already known in some form to Justin Martyr (153 A. D.) and accepted by him as authentic, with its connected literature,⁴ one of whose chief aims was the determination of the exact date of the Crucifixion.⁵ Moreover, if we are not to ignore

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.* V, xxv.

² *Zts. f. ntl. Wiss.* II (1901), pp. 202-227 and 289-299.

³ *Journ of Theol. Studies*, IX (1907-08), pp. 42-61.

⁴ *E. g.*, the *Gospel of Nicodemus*. Epiphanius (*Haer. L*, 1) reports that the Cappadocian Quartodecimans who kept the anniversary of the Lord's Passion "on the eighth day before the Kalends of April" (March 25), alleged in support of the practice the finding of this "exact date in the *Acts of Pilate*."

⁵ The appearance of this effort at an exact chronology of the evangelic tradition coincides remarkably with two events each of which would naturally give rise to it: (1) The Egyptian renaissance of chronography springing from the completion of the great cycle of Sirius in 140 A. D.; (2) the first outbreak of the Quartodeciman controversy signaled by the visit of Polycarp to Anicetus in 154 A. D.

the fact that one of the burning questions the Jerusalem synod had been called to face was the alleged "disagreement between the Gospels" in respect to their chronology, we must believe that Alexander had access to "apostolic" deliverances on this particular feature of the controversy.

Now the Alexander fragment gives as its *year* dates (Nativity, 9 A. D.; Baptism, 46 A. D.; Crucifixion, 58 A. D.) a duration of 12 years for the ministry and 49 years for Jesus' life, two periods which coincide with tradition as otherwise known,¹ and which improve upon Irenæus' attempt to maintain an age of "nearly fifty years" for the life of Jesus on the basis of the Fourth Gospel, while at the same time holding fast to the Lukan age of "about 30 years when he began (to teach)." Chapman's results, however, go to show that these periods of 12 and 49 years for Jesus' ministry and life are purely accidental! If it is true that Hippolytus, the disciple and echo of Irenæus,² writing with the special object of refuting

"those who think there is disagreement in the number of years set forth by the evangelists"

was quite unconscious when he transcribed his consular dates that he was bringing out a duration of 49 years for the life of Jesus and of 12 years for the ministry, then we have little or no evidence to carry back the "jubilee" theory beyond 203 A. D. We shall also be obliged to regard everything in the Alexander fragment as of the newest of the new at the time of writing, instead of "apostolic" in derivation, save

¹ See above on the "jubilee" chronology of Jesus' life. The twelve-year period for the ministry corresponds with that adopted in many early writings for his association with the twelve apostles (inclusive of the period after the Resurrection), *e. g.*, the *Kerygma Petri* (140 A. D.), Apollonius (Eusebius, *H. E.* V, xviii, 14), *Acta Petri c. Simone*, V, *Pistis Sophia*, and *Papyrus Bruce*.

² For Irenæus' method of harmonization (20 years! for the ministry, nearly 50 for the life), see below.

the single feature of the dating of ecclesiastical anniversaries by days of the Julian calendar (December 25, March 25, etc.), which, as we have seen, Alexander is most likely to have brought with him from Cappadocia. As the matter stands we can only acknowledge a non liquet. The appearance of a relation in Jn. 2: 20 to the "jubilee" chronology may be merely fortuitous and deceptive.

But is it admissible to suppose that the date of Jesus' birth could be reckoned so much earlier than Luke as Jn. 2: 20 and 8: 57 imply at the early date to which these passages must be assigned? Is not the clause Lk. 3: 23 "And Jesus when he began (his ministry) was about thirty years of age," however casual and isolated, a fatal barrier to the supposition?

By strict application of the principles of historical criticism the statement of Lk. 3: 23 has next to no value whatever, being opposed not only by Jn. 8: 57, which Irenæus justly declared absurd when spoken of a man "about thirty years of age," but by the first evangelist also, who dates the birth of Jesus not *two* merely but an indefinite period of years before the death of Herod in 4 B. C. It is opposed further by Luke's own sources, which in two instances imply for Jesus an age of some *forty* years "when he began"; and finally it is opposed by that extremely ancient tradition of the "Elders and witnesses" at Jerusalem borrowed by Irenæus from Papias and adapted to his defense of the Johannine chronology, which moderns have somewhat superciliously treated as merely one of Papias' "absurdities."¹ In support of the

¹ Even Corssen ("Warum ist das vierte Evangelium für ein Werk des Apostles Johannes erklärt worden?" *Zts. f. nil. Wiss.* II (1901), pp. 202-227, and "Die Töchter des Philippus," *ibid.*, pp. 289-299, does injustice to Papias. He attributes to him the entire substance of the chronographic fragment of Alexander *including the dates by consulships!* In reality Papias may not even have subscribed to the jubilee theory of the duration of Jesus' life. The tradition he reported was a *παράδοσις Ἰωάννου (τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου)*

statement no witnesses appear save the later and dependent chronographers, quick to seize upon a positive and definite date like this "thirty years" of Jesus' age, and, in the case of Basilidean and Valentinian "Zahlensymbolik" to turn it to account in allegory. In reality the 30-year datum is manifestly no more than a necessary inference from Luke's own explanation of the occurrence of the Nativity at Bethlehem instead of Nazareth. Prophecy (Mic. 5:2), and Jewish legend in the Matthæan form, required it to occur in Bethlehem, though Markan narrative had already established Nazareth as Jesus' *πατρίς*. Luke's solution of the difficulty is the famous census referred to both by Mark (Mk. 12:14) and by the speech of Gamaliel (Acts 5:37). Marking as it did the downfall of Judæan independence the Census of Quirinius, with its accompanying insurrection under Judas of Gamala, was an epoch-making event. It was most natural for Luke to find in it the solution of his difficulty, and at the same time a dating for the Nativity. Josephus, it is true, in a portion of his narrative conspicuous for its lack of good authority identifies the insurrection of the Galileans under Judas, suppressed by Quirinius, with the disturbances in *Judæa* occasioned by the deposition of Archelaus in 6 A. D. On several accounts, mainly the identity of the chief actors in the scene, Judas of Gamala with his *Galilean* following, and Quirinius, who is known to have been "governor of Syria" in the period immediately after the death of Herod (3-2 B. C.) but *not* at any other time before or after, we are disposed to agree with Spitta¹ in preferring the chronology

that Jesus had attained the *ætas magistri* of 40 years when he began to teach. The context of Irenæus and his awkward insertion of "et quinquagesimo" (see below) is conclusive evidence of this. That Papias *on his own account* speculated with apocalyptic numbers there is independent evidence to prove (Anastasius of Sinai).

¹ *Zts. f. ntl. Wiss.* VII, 4 (1906). "Chronologische Notizen und Hymnen in Lk. 1 und 2."

of Luke to that of Josephus regarding the Census. We thus consider the Roman intervention implied to be that required by the execution of the will of Herod. The disturbances, accordingly, would be those which accompanied the assumption of control by Rome after Herod's death, some of which are also referred to by Josephus himself. Luke, then, will be correct, as against Josephus, in dating the Census "about thirty years" earlier than "the fifteenth year of Tiberius" (28 A. D.), some two years after the death of Herod (spring of 4 B. C.).

But this is *not* the conception of Luke's own sources. These, on the contrary, look to a dating of the Nativity more in accordance with that of Matthew, the Fourth Gospel and the *παράδοσις Ἰωάννου* of Papias. The opening clause of the narrative "There was in the days of Herod the king" (Lk. 5:1) is certainly intended to cover at least the events concerning the birth of John and of Jesus, interwoven as they are in the ensuing story (1:5-2:39). This contemplates a dating for the Nativity corresponding to Matthew's some years before Herod's death, rather than to Luke's. So also does the typology of Stephen's Speech (Acts 7:17-37), which goes even beyond Old Testament data with its careful establishment of chronological correspondences between the careers of Moses and of Christ. Thus Moses, who is here explicitly made the prototype of Christ (7:37), is declared, *on merely midrashic* authority, to have "attained the full age of forty years" (verse 23, *ἐπληροῦτο αὐτῷ τεσσαρακονταετῆς χρόνος*), when he "visited his brethren, the children of Israel" and was rejected by them. A second "forty years" marks his second and successful manifestation (verse 30).¹ But we must bring this correspondence with Moses, waiting till he had "attained the full age of forty years" before un-

¹ Cf. the 40-year period of "signs and wonders" in verse 36, and the 40 years of Israel's obduracy in Heb. 3:17.

dertaking "to be a judge and ruler over" his brethren, into relation with a third witness to primitive tradition, in order fully to appreciate its significance.

Irenæus, in support of his argument against those who maintained that the Fourth Gospel was "at variance with the others," resorts to the strange harmonistic device of a duration of twenty years (!) for the public ministry. This is to reconcile Lk. 3:23 and Jn. 8:57, the former stating that "Jesus, when he began, was about 30 years old," the latter implying, as Irenæus correctly observes, that he was nearly 50 years old at his death.

To establish this (to us) astonishing estimate of Jesus' age Irenæus combines a certain "tradition of the (Jerusalem) Elders" borrowed from Papias with the passage from Jn. 8:57 as follows:—

"But that the age of thirty years (Luke's 'beginning' of the ministry) is the prime of a young man's ability, and that it reaches even to the fortieth year, everyone will allow; but after the fortieth and *fiftieth* year it begins to verge towards elder age: which was our Lord's when he taught, as the Gospel (Jn. 8:57) and all 'the Elders' witness, who in Asia conferred with John the Lord's disciple,¹ to the effect that John had delivered these things unto them; for he abode with them until the times of Trajan."²

We are not so much concerned with Irenæus' awkward adaptation of the "tradition (*παράδοσις*) of John" (the Elder of Jerusalem, *ob.* 117 A. D.) by inserting the two words italicized (*et quinquagesimo*),³ as with the *παράδοσις* of John

¹ "In Asia" represents Irenæus' view; "the Lord's disciple" reflects the corruption *οι του Κυ* (for *τουτων*) *μαθηται*.

² *Haer.* II, xxii, 5.

³ Corssen (*op. cit.*, p. 220) arbitrarily cancels the words on the ground that they make no sense, and Drummond (*Char. and Auth.*, p. 252), accepts this violent emendation as having "great probability." A scribe wishing to make the correction Corssen supposes would not have added "et quinquagesimo" but simply changed XL to L (*μ* to *ν*).

itself, whose object, as might even be inferred from the Irenæan context,¹ has nothing to do with the harmonization of the Third and Fourth Gospels, but only with synagogal aspersions upon Jesus. The question apparently in debate is whether Jesus when he began to teach had attained "the age which befits the teacher."² The rabbis treated his teaching as an impertinence, because Talmudic law requires that a man shall have attained the full age of *forty* years before assuming this function.³ "The Elders" replied with the assertion, wholly in conformity to all we know on the subject, with the sole exception of Lk. 3: 23, that Jesus had in fact fully attained this age when he began to teach.

The existence of debate on this point of the duration of Jesus' life is attested by the Talmudic sources themselves, which give us at least a hint of the rabbinic counter argument, based on Ps. 90: 10 and 55: 23, to Christian assertions. Herford, who rightly perceives that "Balaam," the "bloody and deceitful man" who seduced Israel to idolatry, in the extract is a mere mask for Jesus, gives us the following colloquy between Rabbi Hanina of Sepphoris (*ob.* 232 A. D.) and a *Min* (Christian):

"A certain heretic (*min*) said to R. Hanina, 'Have you ever heard how old Balaam was?' He replied, 'There is nothing written about it (*i. e.*, in Numbers). But from what is written (in Ps. 55: 23), *Men of blood and deceit shall not live out half their days*, he must have been thirty-three or thirty-four years old. He (the heretic) said, 'Thou hast answered me well. I have seen the chronicle of Balaam (gospels?), and therein is written 'Balaam

¹ The preceding paragraph states that Jesus "came to Jerusalem (Jn. 2: 13-22) when he had attained the full age of a teacher (magistri), so that he might properly be listened to by all as a teacher."

² Irenæus, *ibid.*

³ *Aboda Zara*, Bab. Talm., Frankfurt ed. (1715), f. 19b. Ad quodnam vero ætatis momentum expectandum est antequam vir doctus alios docere possit? *Resp.* ad exactos annos quadraginta. Quoted by Schœtgen.

the lame¹ was thirty-three years old when Pinhas the Robber² killed him.'"³

Herford of course sees the relation of this to Lk. 3:23, but gives no reason why the Jew should make a point of proving against the Christian that Jesus at his death was still less than 35 years of age. The Christian combines Lk. 3:23 with the ministry of three or four years implied in the Fourth Gospel; but the rabbi falls back upon passages which are supposed to prove "the age of Balaam when he died." The anecdote at least reflects contemporary discussion in the Church on the chronology of Jesus' life. It may reflect the older debates as to whether Jesus, when he began, had "attained the age of a teacher."

It appears, then, that Lk. 3:23, so far from representing the older Palestinian tradition, merely correlates the primitive date for the crucifixion (Tiberii XV-XVI = 28-29 A. D.) with this evangelist's own synchronism of the Nativity with the Census of Quirinius (3-2 B. C.). The older tradition, as traceable by all other authorities, merely asserted that Jesus was born "in the days of Herod the King," and that he had "fully attained the age which befits the teacher (40 years) when he began to teach."

We cannot say more with confidence of Jn. 8:57, "Thou art not yet fifty years old" than that it represents the older Palestinian view rather than the Lukan, and may well be regarded for this reason, if for no other, as nearer the historical fact. Even here, however, it does not appear to be so much *historical* interest which occasions the correction, as apologetic. Jn. 2:13 ff., on the other hand, may perhaps imply an interpretation of Jn. 8:57 in the exact sense that

¹ "Balaam" according to R. Johanan was lame of one foot and blind of one eye. Cf. Mk. 9:45, 46.

² *Pinhas Listaah* according to Perles is a corruption of Pontius Pilate.

³ *Christianity in Talmud*, etc., p. 72, quoting B. *Sanh.* 106b.

Jesus on the latter occasion was in his forty-ninth year; but we have repeatedly seen reason for considering Jn. 2:13-25 the insertion of a later hand. Its introduction of the idea of jubilees of years and correspondence with the temple, if not illusive, may well go beyond the intention of the original writer. On any candid interpretation, however, it must be admitted that the Fourth Gospel repudiates the Lukan date of the Nativity, on which Basilides had perhaps already built up his fantastic symbolism of numbers, and reverts to the older tradition that Jesus was born "in the days of Herod the king," and "had fully attained the age of forty years when he began to teach."

So far as concerns the duration of the ministry the difference of the Fourth Gospel with its predecessors should not be exaggerated. Mark had already divided the ministry into two clearly distinguished parts, of which the former, including the Galilean ministry, closed with the great cycle of narratives relating to the Signs of the Loaves and Confession of Peter. Indications such as ancient readers were as quick to notice as modern, were not wanting in Mk. 2:23 and 6:39 that at least one passover season had been spent in Galilee. The fourth evangelist simply brings this passover into relation with the Sign of the Loaves, connecting with it, for reasons which must be considered in connection with the Quarto-deciman practice of his church, his exposition of the Sacrament. This called for a ministry of *two* years instead of one, by no means a radical correction of Synoptic tendencies, and one which besides being suggested, as we have seen, by casual indications in Mark, may well be in consonance with historical fact.¹

¹ Turner (*op. cit.*, pp. 406 and 409b), considers "St. Mark's Gospel . . . to imply, exactly like St. John's, a two-year Ministry." All the fathers (save Irenæus) down to the time of Eusebius who do not subscribe to the one-year ministry, interpret "John" as requiring a ministry of *two* years.

Besides this correction of the duration of the ministry, so simply effected by merely dropping in the remark of 6:4, our evangelist has schematized his story by interjecting into each division of the ministry one visit of Jesus to Jerusalem at each of the three greater "feasts of the Jews," besides one lesser feast (Dedication, Jn. 10:22) and a second visit at Passover. Of these the first visit at Passover (2:13-25) and the visit at the minor feast of Dedication (10:22-39) have no miracle, and remain without development in the dialogue; they are at least of subordinate importance, and may be reserved for future discussion.¹ The visit at Pentecost (5:1 ff.) is signalized by the healing of the paralytic at the pool of Bethesda, introducing a debate with "the Jews" regarding Jesus' own authority as Son of man and Lord of the Sabbath as against the law of Moses. It corresponds, as we have seen, to the section of Mark on the Growth of Opposition (Mk. 2:1-3:6), which modern criticism freely admits to be unchronological in arrangement and setting. This is the only visit of the Galilean period. The Peræan period begins with a visit "in secret" at "Tabernacles" (7:2-10). Its miracle is the healing of the man born blind, which leads to a disputation with the "blind" Pharisees including their accusation "He hath a devil" and the imputation to them on Jesus' part of the unpardonable sin (9:1-10:21; cf. Mt. 12:22-45). In the earlier portion (7:14-8:59) it is occupied with debates which connect themselves in the former part with the rite of water-pouring on "the last day, the great day of the feast" (of Tabernacles), in the latter (8:12-59) with the illuminations which also characterized this feast. This visit distinguishes the Peræan period. Passover, the feast of Redemption from death, has its twofold miracle and its in-

¹ The visit at Passover (2:13 ff.), as previously observed on several occasions, can hardly be reckoned as part of the original scheme. On the relation of Jn. 10:22 to its context see Chapter XVIII.

interpretative dialogue in Chapter 6. The Passover visit to Jerusalem of course does not take place at this time, but is reserved as the distinctive feature of the Judæan period.

The assumption that Jesus actually visited Jerusalem at each of the three great feasts of Pentecost, Tabernacles and Passover, as required in the law (Ex. 23: 14-17) has always been easy to make on the part of those who reason a priori as to what "a pious Jew" would do. Josephus¹ very possibly employs in part this method of reasoning when he reckons the number of lambs slain for persons congregated in and about the little, poorly provisioned city at 256,500, implying some 3,000,000 participants in the feast, without counting the disqualified. In reality the number who seriously and systematically undertook to carry out this (in 20-30 A. D.) absolutely impracticable requirement of Mosaism is likely to be better represented by the 8,000 Pharisees whom the same authority counts as true observers of the law in Israel. Jesus' visits to Jerusalem will have been as rare as those of his humble Galilean followers, whose poverty alone would preclude any attempt to live up to the letter of the requirement. We are far from denying all relations with Judæa and Peræa to the entire unknown period of thirty or forty years before the beginning of the ministry. To greater or less extent they would be almost sure to exist, and may account for Synoptic evidences of acquaintances of Jesus whose homes are in the south. But a priori reasoning from the probable conduct of "a pious Jew" to that of Jesus is, to say the least, unsafe. Still more objectionable from a scientific standpoint are attempts to find "evidence" for previous visits of Jesus to Jerusalem in the quotation from the "Wisdom of God" in Mt. 23: 37=Lk. 13: 34. Attempts by such means to counteract the impression conveyed by the Synoptics that Jesus at the final passover is

¹ *War*, VI, ix, 3.

visiting the temple for the first time in company with the disciples (Mk. 11:11; Lk. 19:41) simply discredit the reasoner. In reality the plaint of "the Wisdom of God" employing the imagery of Ps. 91:4 cannot be applied to the visits of a being in human form without grotesque inappropriateness. Even were it possible to imagine Jesus as referring to visits recently made by him as opportunities for gathering Israel "under his wings," the reference to repeated sendings in the past of "prophets, wise men and scribes" could only apply to the non-incarnate "Wisdom of God." It is when we study the nature of the dialogues on the Authority of the Son of Man, the Bread of Life, the Living Water and Light of the World in Jn. 5, 6 and 7 f., that we perceive the real "Johannine" relation of Jesus to the "feasts of the Jews." It is not historical, but interpretative and doctrinal. We cannot draw from it an itinerary of Jesus' journeys during the ministry; but we may obtain from it, *if we will*, a real insight into the mind of Christ, as understood and interpreted well-nigh a century after, on "the feasts of the Jews" as superseded and glorified in the ritual of the Christian Church.

CHAPTER XVI

JOHANNINE QUARTODECIMANISM

According to Dr. Turner ¹

“St. John’s Gospel distinguishes itself from the other three by its careful enumeration of six notes of time, five of them Jewish festivals, between the Baptism and the Crucifixion; and these precise and detailed recollections of an eye-witness must be allowed decisive weight against the apparently divergent testimony of the third Synoptist, not to say that their very precision may have consciously aimed at a silent correction of impressions erroneously derived from earlier evangelical narratives.

We have seen in the preceding chapter to what extent the fourth evangelist’s corrections of his predecessor’s datings of Jesus’ birth and death deserve the name of “precise and detailed recollections of an eye-witness.” To some extent we have been enabled to form a judgment also concerning this evangelist’s return to a scheme of the ministry more like that of Mark in its two-year duration. His adjustment of the story to “the feasts of the Jews” has appeared, however, to be artificial.

In the present chapter we shall discover another instance in which the practice and belief of Asia has led the fourth evangelist to revert from the conception of the present form of Mark, characteristic of Roman ritual since the earliest times and through Mark dominating the dependent first and third Gospel, toward a conception certainly antecedent, because implied in the material of Mark itself, if not in the independent material of Luke also. The practice in ques-

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 407a.

tion is that, the defense of which by "the churches of Asia" in 150-200 A. D. has already occupied our attention on account of its relation to the claims advanced in behalf of the Gospel during this period,¹ the annual commemoration of the death and resurrection of Jesus coincidentally with "the feast of the Jews" on the fourteenth Nisan. This practice has been designated by ecclesiastical historians Quartodecimanism, a term which may also be extended to cover the divergent ritual of certain sects in Cappadocia which early substituted the Julian solar calendar for the complicated lunar system of Jewish observance. For the real differences of the controversy lie elsewhere.² Throughout its course those who followed the Asiatic practice are distinguished from followers of the Roman as "observers" *vs.* "non-observers" (*sc.* of "the Fast").³ Quartodecimans accused anti-Quartodecimans of "recklessness" in disregarding the law (Ex. 12: 1-28),⁴ which they themselves of course interpreted as applying to the Redemption effected by the Passion and Resurrection. Conversely, anti-Quartodecimans accused Quartodecimans of "Judaizing," because,

"at the season in which the Jews keep their feast of unleavened bread, then they themselves (the Quartodecimans) are eager to hold the (Christian) Passover."⁵

¹ See Chapter X.

² Schürer (art. "Passastreit," etc., in *Zts. f. d. hist. Theol.*, 1870, p. 251) pronounces the declaration of Epiphanius (*Haer. L. 1*) that the Cappadocian observers of Easter on March 25th were Quartodecimans, one of the all too frequent blunders and misstatements of that father. His reasoning, however, is based on the fallacious assumption that Quartodecimans sought conformity with Jewish practice for its own sake, instead of for the sake of fixing the true date of the Passion.

³ See Drummond, *op. cit.* p. 479, note 3 on *ἐτήρησαν, μὴ τηροῦντες*.

⁴ So, *e. g.*, Blastus, whose schismatic disturbance of the peace of the churches at Rome was rebuked by Irenæus. See above, p. 247 f., and Ps.-Tert., *Adv. Hæc.* viii.

⁵ Epiphanius, *Her.* LXX, 9.

The mere substitution of the Julian calendar for that of the Synagogue—if indeed the Jews too in Cappadocia had not made the same reform—did not affect the substance of the matter. The essential difference was that in Asia, where the influences of Judaism were stronger, the Church persisted in observing the greatest of the Jewish feasts; whereas Rome and the West, though in the later phases of the controversy biblical phraseology naturally attached itself to the Easter celebration, took the more radically Pauline ground that all the feasts and sacred seasons of Judaism were done away in Christ.¹ Just as the presence and claims of the X literature reflect themselves on one side and the other of the Montanistic controversy, so was it with the so-called Paschal controversy of earlier origin and longer duration. Only in the latter we have the additional point of connection that subsequent to the appearance of the Alogi (*ca.* 180 A. D.) we observe conflicting methods of reconciling the Fourth Gospel with its predecessors. Gaius of Rome, as we have seen, called attention to the discrepancy of the earlier beginning of the ministry in the Fourth Gospel than in the Synoptics. The charge formed part of his attempt to disparage the Gospel of his opponents the “Phrygians”; others at about the same period, or still earlier, had observed that its period for the ministry requires at least two years instead of the Synoptic one-year period;² and not only this but its still more striking discrepancy with the Synoptics regarding the most sacred season of Christian observance, the “night in which the Lord Jesus was betrayed” (I Cor. 11: 23), and the ensuing day, in which he had “given his life a redemption price (λύτρον) for many.”

¹ The most radical representative of this view was one Aërius, a contemporary of Epiphanius, who wished to do away altogether with the festival as a “clinging to Jewish fables” (see Drummond’s citation, *op. cit.*, p. 490).

² So Melito of Sardis, *ca.* 167 A. D.

In the Fourth Gospel, notoriously, the Last Supper takes place "before the passover" (Jn. 13: 1); the purchases "for the feast" are then still to be made (13: 29); the priests on the following morning have not yet "eaten the passover" (18: 28); the great event of this day—Pilate's condemnation of Jesus to the cross—is clearly and definitely dated as occurring at noon on "the Preparation of the Passover" (*i. e.*, the day on which the preliminaries of the feast, such as putting away the leaven and slaughtering the lamb, were solemnly performed);¹ finally the removal of the bodies from the crosses is accounted for in the Fourth Gospel by the additional reason, beyond the fact specified by the Synoptists of the morrow being a sabbath, that "that sabbath was a high day" (19: 31), as would of course be the case with the first, but not in the same degree, if at all, of the second day of unleavened bread (Lev. 23: 7).

Modern attempts at harmonization² have at least the merit of showing how each side in the second century controversy could discover a mode of exegesis by which the charge of "causing the Gospels to disagree" could be leveled at its opponents.³ Modern scholars are so nearly agreed in

¹ It is true that the same term, *παρασκευή*, could be applied to the sixth day of the week as the "preparation" for the Sabbath. But the fourth evangelist is not counting days of the *week*, nor has he any interest in determining on what day of the week the crucifixion took place except that it was "three days" before the Resurrection "on the first day of the week" (20: 1; *cf.* 2: 19). Previous to 20: 1 he reckons by days "before the Passover" (12: 1). The preparation day of the Passover if it could ever mean "the Friday of passover week," an ambiguous and unexampled expression, could not have this meaning after the count had been begun as in Jn. 12: 1.

² The most recent which has come to hand is from the pen of Rev. David Smith in *The Expository Times* for August, 1909 (xx, 11), an article entitled "The Day of the Crucifixion," aiming to show that "John" agrees with the Synoptists. Jn. 13: 1 is a separate paragraph, not to be connected with 2 ff.; 13: 29 is not explained; 18: 28 refers to the Hagiga of Lev. 23: 6 ff.; "the sixth hour" (19: 14) is 6 A. M. (how about Jn. 4: 6?), etc.

³ Principal Drummond is convinced that both sides had "some way of

admitting the discrepancy, whatever their explanation, that we may consider the fact already established; especially as we are further agreed with the leading "defenders" in opposition to Schmiedel and other opponents of the Johannine authorship, that on this point it is the Synoptists who are in error, and not the fourth evangelist. What we are concerned to show is not the mere fact of error on one side or the other, but the *cause* of both error and correction; seeing that correction may be due either to the superior knowledge of an eye-witness, or to the better tradition prevalent in the region whence the correcting document emanates. We believe it to be capable of demonstration that a true tradition had perpetuated itself among the churches of Asia through their distinctive anniversary; whereas at Rome and in the West generally the absence of a strong Jewish element had permitted the earlier tradition to become obscured—not, however, to the extent of complete obliteration.

Principal Drummond has greatly contributed to the clarification of the much debated question in his admirable chapter on "The Paschal Controversy" ¹ reprinted with slight changes from the *American Journal of Theology* for July, 1897. With due recognition of the great learning and able reasoning of this discussion, wherein all available material seems to be thoroughly, and for the most part judicially, considered, we must venture on one or two points to express a certain degree of dissent.

To Principal Drummond the fundamental character of the forcing the Gospels to speak with one voice." At all events Quartodecimans accused their opponents of "making the Gospels disagree." See above, p. 259. How their opponents reasoned may be seen by the example of Irenæus adduced by Drummond (p. 488), from which, however, we *cannot* infer what was "possible for Asiatics." Epiphanius' mode of reconciling the Gospels while adopting the Johannine date is still more curious (*op. cit.*, p. 496).

¹ *Char. and Auth.*, Bk. II, § 3, Chapter VIII, pp. 444-512.

Quartodeciman observance seems so distinctly marked as "a festival, a time of rejoicing," that it seems to him "needless to dwell on its festive character"; though the point is admittedly of importance. For one of the chief points in dispute is, *What* did the Quartodecimans commemorate in their anniversary? Was it the Passion and Resurrection, the former of which would according to the Fourth Gospel coincide exactly with the slaughtering of the passover lamb? Or was it the institution of the Lord's Supper? In the former case the Fourth Gospel would be the great bulwark of Quartodecimanism. Its author would be strongly opposed to the Synoptic representation, like the other Asian writers on the question, and would entirely justify their confident appeals to it. On the latter supposition the Fourth Gospel would be the one great exception to Asian sentiment, its author really opposing those who made their appeal to it, and treating the Last Supper, of which Quartodecimans took such extraordinary account, with the utmost possible neglect. Strange as it may seem, some of the foremost scholars have taken this view, arguing from it against the Johannine authorship. The contention was that whereas it is conceded that John the Apostle will have been Quartodeciman in practice, the Fourth Gospel opposes this; inasmuch as Quartodecimanism was a commemoration of the *institution of the Supper*, resting on the Synoptic dating of this event.

Nothing could be clearer, or to our mind more conclusive, than Principal Drummond's argument in opposition to this strange idea that Quartodeciman practice was founded on the Synoptic story and chronology, that of the rest of the Church on the Johannine.¹ That which was really com-

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 486 ff. Nevertheless Drummond's own colleague at Oxford, an authority no less eminent than Bigg, in the chapter entitled "The Easter Controversy," in his *Origins of Christianity* written in 1908, merely restates the antiquated theory of Tayler, showing not so much as knowledge of the

memorated in the annual observances of what was called "the Christian Passover" was always and only the Passion and Resurrection. These were considered as constituting the greater Redemption (*ἀπολύτρωσις*), Christ's victory through death over "him that had the power of death" being regarded as prefigured by the "Redemption" from Egypt. This turning point in human history was the event commemorated in the Church's anniversary, whether in Asian or Roman usage; whether on a single day, as we are informed was the general practice of Quartodecimans,¹ or on two days corresponding to the fourteenth and sixteenth Nisan, the day of the slaying of the lamb, and the day of the offering of the sheaf of firstfruits; whether on the same day as "the people" (Nisan 14), or on the Lord's day next following, or on March 25th, or (as in later Cappadocian usage) on the 23d and 25th of March.² The idea of an annual feast to commemorate the institution of a rite is entirely modern in conception, and, as Drummond's citations abundantly show, is utterly foreign to the ancient literature of the subject. More than one citation could be made to the same effect as that of Trecentius in the third century,

"For we have no other purpose (in endeavoring to establish the true date) than to keep the memory of his (Jesus') passion, and at the time when those who from the beginning were eye-witnesses have handed down."³

existence of Drummond's complete and scholarly refutation published in 1897 and republished in 1904.

¹ "One of the objections against Quartodecimans was that although they followed the Jewish reckoning, they did not carry out the legal prescriptions with sufficient care; for they *confined their celebration to a single day*, whereas they ought to have chosen the sheep on the tenth day, and so fasted for five days." Drummond, *op. cit.*, p. 490, citing Epiphanius, *Haer.* L, 1, 3 and LXX, 12.

² So the fragment of Alexander cited in Chapter XV.

³ *Ap.* Drummond, *op. cit.*, p. 477.

Dr. J. J. Tayler had maintained, however, that the Quartodecimans

“kept as the oldest Christian pascha the anniversary of the farewell supper on the evening of the fourteenth of Nisan,”¹

arguing that the festal character of the Christian anniversary is fatal to the idea that it commemorated the death of Christ, because

“If the death-day of Christ was observed on the fourteenth of Nisan, it must have been observed as a fast day, and would therefore have been in harmony with the prolonged course of fasting which preceded the anniversary of the resurrection.”²

The true answer to this argument is that the Quartodeciman observance *did* have just this character of a commemorative *fast* day and is particularly so designated in the oldest and most authoritative reference that we possess:

“For the controversy is not only concerning the day, but also concerning the very manner of the *fast*. For some think that they should *fast* one day, others two, yet others more.”³

Nevertheless this is only partly applicable against Drummond’s view of the character of the anniversary. It still remains true that in its general character the Christian pass-over was, like the Jewish, a *feast*; only, like the Mohammedan feast at the termination of Ramadan, and many similar Oriental rites, it was a feast terminating a fast.⁴ The elements of the observance in East and West alike included a

¹ *Fourth Gospel*, p. 114.

² *Ibid.*, p. 121.

³ Irenæus, Letter to Victor, *ap.* Eusebius, *H. E.* V, xxiv, 12.

⁴ This breaking of the fast, usually between midnight and dawn of “the third day,” is the point (usually missed by moderns) of many of the resurrection stories, in which Jesus “eats and drinks with” the disciples [Acts 1: 4 (συναλιζόμενος); 10: 41]; or distributes food (Lk. 24: 42 f.; Jn. 21: 12). In *Ev. Hebr.* James the Lord’s brother has assumed a vow of fasting since the Supper. Jesus appears to him, orders “a table and bread” and says, “My brother, eat thy bread; for the Son of Man is risen from the dead.”

fast, of longer or shorter duration, commemorating the sufferings of Jesus' martyrdom, a *vigil* borrowed from the observances of passover (Ex. 12:42) and in Roman practice made to correspond with the night of the Betrayal (*cf.* Mk. 14:27-42)—and "at cock-crowing," or "in the fourth watch of the night" a breaking of fast in celebration of the bursting of the "gates of Hades." The fundamental distinction of Roman usage from Asian was its insistence that the sacred mystery of the Resurrection must not be celebrated "*on any other than the Lord's day.*" This insistence on accommodation of the Jewish annual festival of passover to the Christian *weekly* observance of the Lord's day was the fundamental cause of the entire disagreement. As Drummond well says:

"Regard was paid to three measures of time, the solar year, the month (lunar), and the week. The first decided the equinox, after which the festival must be held. The second fixed the fourteenth day, on which under the law (Ex. 12:6), the sheep was to be killed, and on which accordingly Christ was crucified. But a week was observed instead of a single day, partly because a sheep was set apart from the tenth day to the fourteenth (Ex. 12:3), and partly because the events connected with the true Paschal Lamb were not limited to a single day, but comprised the resurrection which took place two days after the passion. The fourteenth day therefore was comprised within the week; but the breaking of the fast, and the celebration of the festival, were postponed until the Lord's Day. If, however, the fourteenth fell on a Sunday, the feast was put off till the next Sunday."¹

As a description of the practice whereby at the Council of Nicæa the great majority of the churches were brought into uniformity of observance the above extract seems to us a clear and accurate statement. Its weakness lies in the attempt to account for the introduction of the week period into

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 485.

the purely lunar datings of the 10th, 14th, and 16th Nisan. These dates mark respectively the choosing and slaying of the paschal lamb and the offering of the sheaf of firstfruits. They correspond to the anointing of Jesus "six days before the passover" (Jn. 12:1 ff.), his crucifixion, and his manifestation of himself to Mary "three" days after it. But this cannot account, as Drummond holds, for the hebdomadal element. It is not even true that Firstfruits would fall on the same week-day (whatever that day might be) as the choosing of the Lamb; for Nisan 10—Nisan 16=6 (not 7) days. Moreover (1) the correspondence of the Anointing of Jesus in Bethany with the Choosing of the Lamb is obtained by the fourth evangelist alone, and this by dint of one of the most startling of his "corrections of the Synoptics"; yet it is just in the Fourth Gospel that the days of the week are least considered. For this supposed starting point "six days before the passover," the day of the week is not fixed at all. Only a roundabout inference from Jn. 19:31 and 20:1 enables the curious reader who will count backward, remembering that the ancient practice is to count both termini of intervals, to discover that in the year in question Nisan 10, "six days before the passover" (Nisan 15 = first of Unleavened Bread) would have been a Monday. The evangelist, however, is not here concerned with the week-day on which Nisan 10 happened to fall that year. He wishes only to make clear that the anointing of Jesus, because (unconsciously) done "against the day of his burying" corresponded with the choosing of the lamb for the sacrifice of the Redemption ordained by the law for "the tenth day of the month" (Ex. 12:3). He cannot, then, be reckoning here by week-days. Much less the Synoptists, who make the period one of four days only.

(2) Strange as it may seem at first sight, there was at first no uniformity in determining the interval between Jesus'

death and his resurrection. It was not even in strictness his resurrection, *i. e.*, his return to earth to manifest himself to his disciples, which was primarily celebrated in "the Christian passover." The *return from the under-world*, when celebrated separately, was celebrated on the day of Firstfruits (Nisan 16), the "third day according to the scriptures" of I Cor. 15: 4; for it is the imagery of the new sheaf of wheat restored from its burial under the soil which suggests the whole tenor of this sublime chapter in which Paul declares:

"Now is Christ risen from the dead, and (by his return to the world of the living as first of a great harvest of souls redeemed from the power of the grave and gifted with the body of incorruption) become the Firstfruits (*ἀπαρχή*) of them that slept."

Where conformity to the Mosaic ritual was less close than among the Corinthians, whom Paul is constantly reminding in this letter of the ritual of passover (I Cor. 5: 7, 8; *cf.* 16: 8), Quartodecimans would observe only the one great day of passover, the feast of Unleavened Bread, introduced by its "night of vigil unto the Lord," and preceded by a longer or shorter period of fasting¹ in commemoration of Jesus' suffering. But as to why this fasting could be turned into feasting already in the very night of the day which commemorated Jesus' death *without waiting for the ensuing Lord's day, or even for the "third day"* (*i. e.*, Firstfruits = Nisan 16) we need not be in the dark. The famous quotation from Apollinaris of Hierapolis, one of the foremost champions of Quartodecimanism and bishop of one of its greatest strong-

¹ Above, p. 419, note 4. We may conjecture from Jn. 12: 1 that in Asia the period recognized at the time as the appropriate one was "six days" (*i. e.*, five by modern count). We can hardly infer from Mk. 14: 1 ff. that the period in Rome was then of "two days," because the date of verse 1 was not originally intended to cover verses 3-9. See below and *Beginnings of Gospel Story, ad loc.* In some cases, as the letter of Irenæus informs us, it covered but 40 hours, *i. e.*, from 3-5 P. M. on Nisan 14 to "the fourth watch of the night" of Nisan 16.

holds, leaves no room for question on this point to minds awake to the distinction between Christ's victory over the powers of darkness and death, and his subsequent reappearance on earth to report the triumph to his downcast followers.

"The fourteenth (of Nisan) is the true passover of the Lord, the great sacrifice, the Servant (*παῖς*) of God instead of the lamb, he who was bound binding the 'strong man' (Mt. 12: 29 = Lk. 11: 21-22, applied by the fathers to the binding of Satan, who 'had the power of death'), he who was judged becoming Judge of quick and dead, he who was delivered into the hands of sinners to be crucified, he who was lifted up on the horns of the unicorn (an allusion to Ps. 22: 21, supposed to refer to the transverse beam of the cross), and who when his holy side had been pierced poured forth out of his side the two media of purification, water and blood, word and spirit, he who was buried on the day of the passover, the stone being laid upon the tomb."¹

The victory which this ardent Quartodeciman and lover of the Fourth Gospel² sees commemorated in "the true passover of the Lord" is one accomplished "on the day of the passover," during the hours while Jesus' body lay buried "the stone being laid upon the tomb." It was on the following day, the day of Firstfruits (Nisan 16; in that year a Sunday) that he came forth from the grave to announce his victory, ascend to the Father, and returning, "the same

¹ *Ap. Charteris, Canoncity*, p. 194.

² Drummond's disproof of Schürer's view that Apollinaris was not Quartodeciman in his sympathies (*op. cit.*, p. 507) is entirely sound. The non-appearance of Apollinaris in Polycrates' list need not be due to his sympathy with Roman practice against the unanimous conviction of Asia (Euseb. *H. E.* V, xxiii, 1) on the main question of the monthly *vs.* the weekly date. It is far more probably accounted for by difference on some minor point such as the Cappadocian peculiarity of using the Julian instead of the Jewish calendar. The differences of Quartodecimans among themselves on this point, or on methods of interpreting the Synoptics in harmony with John, may also account for the "great controversy about the Passover in Laodicea" *ca.* 170 (*H. E.* IV, xxvi, 3).

day at evening it being the first day of the week," bestow upon his assembled disciples the gift of the Spirit, brought with him from the Father.¹

This earlier dating of the victory over death is not peculiar to the Fourth Gospel. Even *Ev. Petri* makes the ascension take place from the cross itself, to say nothing of the docetic *Acts of John* which make the glorification *precede* the Passion. I Pt. 3: 18-22; 4: 6, makes the separation of Jesus' spirit from his body on the cross the *immediate* antecedent of his conquest of the under-world; and this representation is itself only a development of Paul's in his great letters to the churches of *Asia*, wherein Christ's triumph "in the cross" over "the principalities and the powers" of the under-world (Col. 2: 13-15) is connected with the triumphal ode of the Redemption from Egypt (Ps. 68: 18; *cf.* Eph. 4: 8-10). Even the vigil of Israel at Passover, "having their loins girt, their feet shod, and staff in hand ready to go forth" (Ex. 12: 11, 34, 39) is paralleled in Paul's thought, not as in Mark by the vigil of Jesus in Gethsemane, where the disciples in face of approaching trial show the weakness of the flesh, but by the vigil of the Church awaiting as "prisoners of darkness"² the summons of its Leader to an eternal redemption. The enemy is "the world-rulers of this darkness," "the spiritual hosts of wickedness," the "Prince of the power of the air," whose stronghold of death and the grave has been invaded by a stronger than he, delivering his "captivity." The wait-

¹ Jn. 20: 17-23. The Fourth Gospel like the *Epistle of Barnabas* places the ascension on the same day as the Resurrection. This would be another "correction of Luke" were Acts 1: 3 ff. justly taken to place the ascension at the end of the 40-day period of intercourse. In reality Acts means the same as the Fourth Gospel (see Bacon, "The Ascension in the Fourth Gospel and Acts," *Expositor*, Mar. 1909). The ascension in Lk. 24: 44-51 = Acts 1: 4-12, marks the *beginning* of the 40-day period. Pentecost (originally) marked the end.

² So Wisd. of Sol. 17: 2 ff.

ing Church must "stand having their loins girt about with truth . . . having their feet shod with the preparedness (*ἐτοιμασία*) of the glad tidings of peace," ready to follow their triumphant Leader to an eternal Redemption.¹

Because it commemorated Christ's victory over the powers of the under-world, "the Christian passover," independently of whether it was followed or not by a further festival of Firstfruits in commemoration of his return to the earth, took the place both of the Jewish feast of Redemption, and of the many chthonic mysteries and cults which among Asiatic Greeks celebrated the vernal equinox as the season of the reawakening of life. For Quartodecimans and for the fourth evangelist it was an interesting coincidence, but nothing more, that Firstfruits, which when observed at all, marked the close of their celebration, had fallen in that first year on a "first day of the week." The essential dates were the vernal equinox, symbolic to all races, and the full moon of Nisan, of supreme significance to the Jews. The week-day was to their mind unimportant.²

¹ Origen is correct in connecting Eph. 6: 10-17 with Ex. 12: 11 ff. The whole epistle is full of passover rejoicing, in which the Church's redemption in the victory of Christ from the "principalities and powers" of the under-world takes the place of Israel's from Egypt. See especially 1: 14; 2: 5-7; 3: 10; 4: 8-10; 6: 10-18. The passover vigil is similarly treated in I Thess. 5: 4-10; cf. in Wisd. of Sol. 18: 15 f., the description of the Logos of God appearing as the champion of Israel to deliver them out of the house of bondage. In *Ev. Petri*, 9: 40, this description is applied to Christ as he issues from the tomb after his mission to the under-world.

² On this question of *what* was celebrated by Quartodecimans on the 14th Nisan we find ourselves in disagreement with Schürer's masterly discussion (*Zts. f. d. hist. Theol.*, 1870, pp. 182-284). According to Schürer (p. 208) "It is self-evident that the 14th cannot have been celebrated as the anniversary of the resurrection." The assumption is that the victory over death was associated *originally* with the third day. The earliest traces of the resurrection faith indicate the contrary. The third day marked the Conqueror's return. The statement on p. 260 is more correct. Easter was the anniversary of the Redemption as a whole, whether in East or West.

Now if even Paul so greatly appreciated the worth of a Christianized celebration of Passover, and probably Pentecost as well (I Cor. 16:8; Acts 20:16) it is needless to point out the extreme improbability of the older disciples having ever ceased to keep these feasts. But if Quartodeciman practice be the really ancient and apostolic usage, how shall we account for Roman subordination of the annual and lunar date to the merely hebdomadal? Why was feeling so strong at Rome that the mystery of Redemption from the grave should be celebrated only on the Lord's day?—Partly, no doubt, because of an occidental obtuseness to the distinction between the victory itself over death, and the announcement of it to the disciples at the tomb "on the third day"; but more especially because of the stronger reaction at Rome against the ceremonial of Judaism. A separate reading of Mk. 2:18-3:6; 7:1-23 and 10:2-12 may be necessary at this point for those who question whether the Roman attitude toward Jewish observances is really of the radical type corresponding to Gal. 4:9-11; Col. 2:16; Rom. 14:5, rather than to Paul's milder and more conservative mood. At all events indications are not wanting in Romans itself of a prevailing disposition at Rome to override the "Jewish" observances of the "weak" element. We may illustrate to ourselves primitive Roman feeling regarding the keeping of passovers—even Christianized passovers—by the attitude still maintained in conservative churches of Puritan origin against the observance of Easter as savoring of "popery." The weekly observance of the Lord's day, on the other hand, was universal and unquestioned. Its distinctive rite was the breaking of bread in memory of "the Lord's death," which from the earliest times had followed upon the Agapé (I Cor. 11:20 ff.). What more natural than that this rite should be considered to have done away with the Jewish feast? What more plausible than the representation that Jesus himself

had instituted it for the very purpose of superseding the Passover on occasion of his last observance of that rite? As we understand the bearing of the narrative in Mk. 14-16 the effort is apparent throughout to make it appear that the farewell supper of Jesus with the Twelve was in fact the passover meal (though the reasons are exceedingly strong against this having been the case), and that this rite *should no more be observed until fulfilled in the kingdom of God* (Mk. 14: 25), the new ordinance of bread and the cup taking its place until the Coming.¹

Yet the older view (the so-called "Johannine" which is really the Pauline and apostolic) is distinctly traceable beneath the surface even in Mark. The purpose of Jesus' death (Mk. 10: 45) is that of the passover lamb, to provide "a Redemption for many" (*λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν*). The Anointing in Bethany (Mk. 14: 3-9) is brought into a relation now unintelligible with the conspiracy against Jesus' life. Why, unless its original application was that which the Fourth Gospel with its new dating supplies?² The "two days" of Mk. 14: 2 are intended to show why the betrayal must take place on the night immediately following the conspiracy, lest if the execution take place "on the feast day" "there be an uproar of the people,"—and yet as the narrative now stands it does take place "on the feast day." At the supper

¹ Cf. Schürer, *op. cit.*, p. 192, "We see then that according to ancient Christian parlance the sacrificial death of Christ was considered to be the passover offering of the new covenant on the one side; but on the other the memorial supper was also considered to be the passover feast of the New Testament."

² The whole point of the story of the Anointing lies in Jesus' poetic changing of its intended sense. The woman wishes to anoint Jesus for the Davidic throne as Samuel had anointed Saul after the feast at his house (I Sam. 10: 1). Jesus accepts the tribute, but deprecates the sense implied. The anointing will prove not for his enthronement, but his burial. The great stress laid upon its narration (verse 9) is indicative of its connection with the Easter ritual; cf. Ex. 12: 26 f.

there is no trace of passover ritual or surroundings (save the "hymn" ¹), no roasted flesh, no ritual five cups, no ceremonial, no abiding in the house till the morning. All is what we should expect if the meal were simply the *Qiddush* of passover and not the Passover itself.²

But interpretation of the Roman Gospel, its transformation of the older form of the tradition of Passion and Resurrection, with the motives thereof, does not belong to our present task. On these points we must refer the reader to the critical discussion of Mark.³ The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, written from Ephesus itself, out of the very midst of the Easter celebrations of that church, or immediately after (I Cor. 16: 8), remains an impassable barrier to all attempts to make out the ritual implied in the Ephesian Gospel to be the later and that of the Roman the earlier. Paul explicitly declares that the Christian passover is the sacrifice of Christ's body for us (I Cor. 5: 7, 8), and implicitly that the Christian Firstfruits is his resurrection "on the third day" (15: 4, 20 ff.); our "watch-night" (Ex. 12: 42) is an expectation of his return in triumph to liberate us from our bondage after having "spoiled" the powers of darkness.⁴

¹ Part of the Christian ritual; Eph. 5: 19; cf. *Ep. of Pliny to Trajan*.

² We note with pleasure that both Drummond (p. 52, note 1) and Sanday (*Criticism*, p. 153) speak in high terms of the "thoughtful paper" of Rev. G. H. Box, to whom credit is due beyond all others for this helpful identification (*Journ. of Theol. Studies*, April, 1902).

³ See *Beginnings of Gospel Story*, pp. 192-235.

⁴ The "spoiling" is partly an element of the Redemption story (Ex. 12: 36; cf. *Wisd. of Sol.* 10: 20); partly a midrashic inference from Ps. 68: 18 f. (reading לָקַח "distributed spoil" for קָבַץ "received gifts"; cf. Eph. 4: 8-11 and Col. 2: 15); partly an interpretation of the "spoiling" of the Strong man Armed (Mt. 12: 29 = Lk. 11: 21-23). What Quartodecimans made of this appears from one of the arguments urged by Gaius against the authenticity of Revelation, answered in the fifth of Hippolytus' *Heads against Gaius*. "The heretic Caius" argues against the binding of Satan alleged in Rev. 20: 2 f. that "Satan is already bound, according to what is

Certain characteristic tendencies of the post-apostolic age are the real causes of the strange phenomena which mark the history of the Roman Gospel. The principal phenomena are two: (1) the divergence of its present form from primitive tradition in respect to the date of Jesus' death, (2) the suppression of its original narrative of the Resurrection as an appearance first of all to Peter in Galilee, necessarily later than "the third day," in favor of one which makes the appearance to the women at the sepulcher "on the third day" the starting point of all. The tendencies of post-apostolic times to which we have referred will throw light upon the phenomena.

First of these tendencies is the increasing prejudice against things regarded as Jewish in character. "Let there be nothing in common with the most hateful mob of the Jews. We should have no communion with the practices of such wicked men, the slayers of the Lord," urges Constantine in his letter on the paschal question. Where the infusion of Jewish blood and influence was slighter, as in the West, the Church would interpret Paul's language against a Judaizing observance of feasts, new moons, and Sabbath days in the more uncompromising sense, discouraging as much as possible the practice of a continued observance of the feast of the fourteenth Nisan, while at the same time clinging to, and exalting the *weekly* Agapé, with its accompanying commemoration of "the Lord's body." The ultimate and inevitable triumph of the passover anniversary would be conditioned on recognition of the superior claims of the weekly observance, leading to the fixation of the principle that the celebration of the mystery of the Resurrection was permissible on no other but the Lord's day.

A second tendency of the times was a growing disposition (in Mt. 12: 29), that Christ entered the house of the Strong Man and bound him and despoiled him of us his vessels" (*τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ*).

tion in face of docetic volatilizations of the resurrection doctrine, to insist upon the material and concrete character of Jesus' resurrection body, in fact to identify the victory over death with the issuing of his body from the grave. One consequence of this un-Pauline doctrine of the "resurrection of the flesh" (τῆς σάρκος in the "Apostles' " Creed) was the disappearance of the apostolic resurrection tradition starting from the manifestation "to Peter" in Galilee. Paul, as we know, makes this appearance to Peter equivalent to the manifestation of God's Son "in" himself (I Cor. 15: 5, 8; cf. Gal. 1: 16; 2: 8), and ignores occurrences at the sepulcher. In Markan and subsequent evangelic story this resurrection tradition disappears in favor of another, whose starting point is a manifestation to the women at the sepulcher at dawn of "the first day of the week." Thus "the first day of the week" and its newly established connection with the Resurrection¹ becomes the fundamental epoch of the Church, and resurrection traditions and observances which failed to agree with the idea of the victory over death as achieved on "the Lord's day," especially if like those of *Ev. Petri* they reported the manifestations to Peter and the rest as *subsequent* to the experience of the women, necessarily fell into the background.

Nothing, accordingly, in the whole domain of criticism can be more certain than that the Roman Gospel of Mark in its present form has displaced the earlier, Pauline resurrection tradition, which centered on the appearance to Peter in Galilee, when he "turned again and established his brethren" justly redeeming his position as leader of the Twelve. In Mark a later and alien tradition, which focusses attention

¹ "The third day" did not necessarily mean "the first day of the week," but only Nisan 16, the day of Firstfruits. Mk. 16: 8 shows the newness of the tradition by accounting for its non-appearance up to date. The women had not told their experience "because they were afraid."

not on the victory won over the powers of darkness "in the spirit" wherein Jesus "went and preached unto the spirits in prison" (I Pt. 3: 18-22), but on the mere physical wonder of the empty tomb, has been substituted for the apostolic. It is no small merit of the "spiritual Gospel" that while it follows, and even exaggerates—as was unavoidable in its period—the tendency toward the Jerusalem form of the tradition, it remains faithful to the conception of the Easter anniversary as commemorating the victory of Christ over the power of death (Jn. 12: 24-36) in the more truly Pauline and authentic sense. This is the chief significance of its return to the earlier conception of the nature and date of the Last Supper and the sacrifice of Christ on the cross as "our passover;" and this "Quartodeciman" conception it maintains firmly and uncompromisingly, albeit without needless affront to recognized evangelic authorities.

The central feature of the Johannine treatment of the eucharistic sacrament is the bold transfer of it from the Passover, with which Mark and his satellites had made it coincide, to another passover of the preceding year, when Jesus had remained in Galilee. Instead of instituting the sacrament of his body and blood at the farewell supper in Jerusalem, Jesus is now made, by what from the merely historical standpoint is nothing less than a staggering anachronism, to connect it with the Miracle of the Loaves in Galilee (Jn. 6: 30-59). The evangelist attaches his interpretative discourse to a Markan feature of this cycle of Agapé traditions, *viz.*, the Demand of a Sign from Heaven (Mk. 8: 11-13, a sequel to the second Feeding of the Multitude, 8: 1-10). Through this connection the sacrament still remains as in Mark a New Testament counterpart of the Passover—for the Miracle of the Loaves is expressly at "the passover" (6: 4)—without violence to this evangelist's more fundamental principle that the death of Jesus on the cross at the

very hour of Nisan 14 when the passover lambs were being slain (3-5 P. M.; *cf.* Jn. 19: 14, 31, 36), was the real beginning of the Christian passover. By this transfer the Fourth Gospel displays a fundamentally Quartodeciman point of view. The dissociation of the institution of the Eucharist from its connection with the passover supper and association of it with the Agapé, as a rite connected with the Galilean Breaking of Bread rather than with the scenes of the "upper room," is only partly true to historical fact; for the Eucharist really was instituted at Jerusalem as an *adaptation* of the Breaking of Bread. Nevertheless the correction of the Roman misconception: the Eucharist a substitute for Passover, and the return to the Pauline and apostolic: Christ crucified our Passover, his resurrection our Firstfruits, is as true to fact, and as deeply significant, as it is distinctive of the belief and practice of "Asia" in the second century.

We have already noted as proof of this Quartodecimanism the many references in the Johannine passion story which tacitly but firmly correct the Markan dating of Nisan 15. That which so conspicuously begins the series by dating the anointing in Bethany "six days (*cf.* Mk. 14: 1, 'two days') before the passover" (*i. e.*, Nisan 10) is inexplicable save as an attempt to bring the story into correspondence with the law for the choosing of the passover lamb (Ex. 12: 3) and with actual Quartodeciman practice. The clear indications of 13: 1 and 29 that the Last Supper was held "before the feast of the passover," and the substitution of the rite of foot-washing (I Tim. 5: 10) as an example of self-abnegating service (*cf.* Lk. 22: 24-27) for the institution of the eucharist, together with the correspondences subsequently established by date and circumstance in the story of the crucifixion itself between the experiences of Jesus and the treatment of the passover lamb (19: 14, 33) leave no room for reasonable doubt that the fourth evangelist is bent upon restoring the

relation which Paul had already formulated (I Cor. 5:6, 7; 15:20 ff.), but which had been nullified by the Markan perversion. We have seen that even aside from Paul, historical probability is in favor of Nisan 14 rather than 15 as the true date. But is it possible to reason from this "correction of the Synoptics" that the evangelist was an eye-witness of the events?—The whole purpose, manner, and interest of his narrative show that such is not the case. It is the ritual interest which dominates. The anointing, crucifixion, death, and resurrection are dated on Nisan 10th, 14th and 16th respectively, not because the evangelist recalls the true dates, and wishes for the sake of historical accuracy to make these slight rectifications in Synoptic story; but because the great and distinctive ritual observance of the churches which he represents is at stake, an observance which he rightly believes had been transmitted unbroken from the times of the apostles, and which if we ourselves had perpetuated it might have gone far to counteract the materialism with which the doctrine of Christ's victory over death has become infected.

Moreover, in spite of the conspicuous anachronism of the dialogue which marks our evangelist's development of the Markan sequel to the Miracle of the Loaves, it is quite a mistake to suppose that Mark has altogether the right on his side and the fourth evangelist the wrong, in their connection of the Breaking of Bread with the Galilean and the Jerusalem occasions respectively. Box has justly pointed out that Jesus is recognized "in the breaking of bread" by disciples who know nothing of the latter (Lk. 24:35). This implies that the action at the Last Supper was not so much the institution of a new rite (so Mark for reasons already explained) as the adaptation and perpetuation of a practice already characteristic of Jesus' intercourse with his disciples. In asking them to continue the practice "in memory" of him (I Cor. 11:24 f.) Jesus recalled the unselfish generosity

of many months of intercourse, during which he had filled the place of father and host to the little company. Yes, on one occasion he had extended it to a multitude of outsiders whom he bade the disciples treat as guests.¹ And now at the parting repast he was giving all that remained his to give, his body and his blood. He wished the wonted sharing of the common loaf and cup to remain a memorial of the spirit which had dominated his life, and was now to be exemplified in his death—*ἀγάπη*, the spirit of self-abnegating, ministering love. Because the observance instituted by Jesus at the Last Supper was *not* new either in the form of observance, or in the spirit exemplified, but only in its present more tragic application, the Eucharist in the practice of the Church did not become an annual substitute for the Passover, as Mark's narrative would lead us to expect, but was attached to the Agapé or banquet of brotherhood to form its solemn close. It became thus from the outset a rite of weekly, if not of daily, occurrence. In attaching, then, his interpretation of the Eucharist to the story of the Feeding of the Multitude instead of to the Last Supper the fourth evangelist is profoundly true while superficially in error. He violates the mere historical proprieties to an extraordinary degree; but only the better to convey the true, and in a higher sense the historical, meaning of the Church's rite. In connecting his institution of the Eucharist with the Passover in Galilee, not with that in Jerusalem, he has flouted historical fact to convey to us spiritual truth.

The example of the evangelist's treatment of the greatest of the three appointed feasts of the Jewish law should serve

¹ We cannot agree with Schmiedel (*op. cit.*, pp. 103-110) that there is no historical basis for the story of the Feeding of the Multitude, six times related in the Gospels. The very persistence of the rite of the brotherhood banquet (*ἀγάπη*) attests the age of the tradition, which in all its details aims to justify and explain the ritual.

as our key to his treatment of the lesser two. With deeper and more genuine insight into the true spirit of Paul than that which considered only his prohibition of Jewish sabbaths, feasts, and new moons, the Ephesian Gospel emphasizes the affirmative side of the command:

“Let no man judge you in meat or drink or in respect of a feast day or a new moon or a sabbath day: *which are a shadow of the things to come; but the body is Christ's.*”¹

How the passover is continued in the Agapé and Eucharist, even though the Last Supper was not a passover meal, is shown in the two passover narratives of the Gospel, the first in Galilee, the second in Jerusalem.² We have in addition two further chapters devoted to the incidents and dialogues connected with visits of Jesus to Jerusalem on occasion of “the feasts of the Jews.” The former of these (chapter 5) belongs to the Galilean ministry and leaves the feast unnamed.³ We have already inferred from the subject of the dialogue that the feast intended is that of Pentecost, the feast regarded as commemorating the Giving of the Law. We need not here repeat the demonstration that Jn. 5 simply recasts the Markan group of incidents on the Growth of Opposition (Mk. 2: 1-3: 6) itself framed on the model of the Q group on How they were stumbled in him (Mt. 11: 2-19 = Lk. 7: 18-35). Here, as was appropriate to a first occasion of Jesus' observance of the Mosaic feasts, the question of the sabbath occupies the foreground. The sabbatic imitation of God's “rest” is not simply set aside as in Mark, but as in Hebrews and the fathers generally, fulfilled in the imitation of God's *work* of mercy, which is declared to be

¹ Col. 2: 16-17.

² On the reason for disregarding Jn. 2: 13-25, see Chapter XVIII.

³ The reason of the omission (cancelation) is probably connected with the present position of the chapter, immediately preceding the incidents of “*passover*” in Chapter 6. On the probable readjustments of order which this portion of the Gospel has undergone, see Chapter XIX.

unbroken. The dialogue sets the authority of Jesus as Son of man (*cf.* Mk. 2: 10, 28) in contrast with that of Moses, explains his relation to John the Baptist, and concludes with a parallel (7: 15-24)¹ to the conspiracy against Jesus' life of Mk. 3: 6. Even the scenic setting of a visit at Pentecost to Jerusalem is less foreign to Mk. 2: 1-3: 6 than at first sight would appear. Mk. 2: 23 implied a journey with the disciples *at the season of Pentecost*. The conspiracy of Mk. 3: 6 strikingly recalls that of Mk. 12: 13 at Jerusalem. Still the dominant reason for this innovation in Synoptic story must be found in the evangelist's more conservative understanding of Christian continuation of "the feasts of the Jews."²

As regards the other feast which Jesus attends at Jerusalem at the beginning of the Peraean ministry the evangelist is explicit. It is the Feast of Tabernacles (Jn. 7: 2). Here again incidents and dialogue reproduce the distinctive features of the Jewish ritual, water-pouring and illumination. Tabernacles, unlike Pentecost, would not seem to have passed over into Christian observance. Jesus at first declines to go up to this feast (7: 8). Ultimately, however, he goes up at its latter part, only, it would seem, to make use of its symbolism as pointing to himself. Here too we need not further exemplify the principle. What our evangelist gives is not "careful enumeration of notes of time" for the benefit of chronologists nor "detailed recollections of an eye-witness"; but a reconstruction of Markan story in the sense of the deeper and more "spiritual" Pauline doctrine. His belief is that Jesus observed the legal requirement of attendance at the three feasts of the Jews, Pentecost, Tabernacles and Passover, and at the same time that he also transcended and

¹ On the connection of this paragraph with Chapter 5, see below, Chapter XIX.

² For proof that the alleged visits to Jerusalem during the ministry are nevertheless quite unhistorical, see Drummond, pp. 42-46.

fulfilled all in the same manner as he fulfilled the great Feast of the Redemption.

Our discussion of the Indirect Internal Evidence has purposely refrained from those aspects of the problem which have been adequately and judiciously treated by others. We have left the history of the Logos doctrine in its wider aspects to Aall,¹ the relations of the evangelist to contemporary philosophic thought to J. Grill,² the Prologue to Harnack and Baldensperger.³ Even the biblical theology of the Fourth Gospel, including the demonstration of the late and advanced character of the evangelist's eschatology,⁴ his doctrine of sin and redemption and the like we have left to Scott, not to mention others. We have said nothing of the evangelist's oracular style, not merely adopted for himself but put in the mouth of Jesus and more or less of all the characters. The conception of Jesus' mode of speech, and of "inspired" utterance in general, seems to be that of apodictic, enigmatic apothegms on the mystic relations of the soul, whose deeper senses are developed by the misunderstanding they uniformly encounter in the hearers. This form of dialectic, monotonously revolving around the same few great themes, has been sufficiently set forth as characteristic of the "Johannine" style by Schmiedel and Wrede.⁵ It certainly is not primitive or true to fact.

¹ *Geschichte der Logosidee*, Bd. I, 1896; Bd. II, 1899.

² *Untersuchungen über die Entstehung des vierten Evangeliums. Erster Theil*, 1902.

³ *Der Prolog des vierten Evangeliums, sein polemisch-apologetischer Zweck*, 1898.

⁴ On this, see the noteworthy admission of Drummond, p. 37.

⁵ *Charakter und Tendenz des Johannesevangeliums*, 1903. The argument is not answered by counting the number of sentences to a paragraph and showing that the sentences of the fourth evangelist are not longer than the Synoptists'. Drummond (pp. 16-20) has more nearly defined the difference as one of contents; but this is not all.

With all these omissions our results are far from supporting the theory of an eye-witness giving "precise and detailed recollections." On the contrary, the whole structure of the work reveals a non-historical, theoretic purpose. Its whole conception of Jesus' career, and his relation to his environment is patterned on the disputes of the post-apostolic age. His teaching is a more developed Paulinism; the reported incidents of his life are dependent on Synoptic tradition, sometimes misunderstood, more often than not exaggerated and distorted to fit theological assumptions as to his super-human nature. The unhistorical tendencies which already become apparent by comparison of the earlier sources are here uniformly found carried much further still. The "precise details" supposed to speak for the "eye-witness" on closer scrutiny tend to the opposite conclusion, and even the "corrections of the Synoptics" which have some right to be considered really such, find their most reasonable and simple explanation in a tradition and practice older indeed than that represented by the Synoptic Gospels in their present form, but by no means attributable to eye-witnesses only.

If then our decision be adverse to the historicity of this Gospel, as well as to its apostolic authorship, it by no means follows that the foes of true evangelic orthodoxy gain any advantage whatever. A theory of authorship based on the guesses of second century editors will be given up, a theory which has no support in the nature of the writing itself, and only abuses it in the attempt to make the "spiritual" subservient to the material, the metaphysical to the concrete. When we have ceased the barren search for the "precise and detailed recollections of an eye-witness" where none should be expected, and have learned something of the nature of this writing by observing its literary connections and the environment from which it grew, we shall begin to win from it tenfold greater service to our devotion and faith than ever

heretofore. The "precise details of an eye-witness" correcting the imperfect record of Synoptic story seem very precious in the eyes of the historical critic; but they have never been to the average Christian the reason for his love of this Gospel. The reason has been that it gave expression more perfectly than any other to the profound and spiritual gospel of Paul, that apostle who not having known Christ after the flesh yet penetrated more deeply than any other to the true significance of his being and message. It gave men life through faith—taught them "by believing to have life in his name." It is Paul who really speaks again to us through the pages of the Fourth Gospel, and Paul was not deceived when he wrote "and we have the mind of Christ." That disciple to whom his life had become no longer his own but Christ living in him speaks to us through the form of "the disciple whom Jesus loved."

When we can be satisfied to take this Gospel for what it is, the richest, choicest flower of the spiritual life of the Pauline churches a half-century after Paul's death, when we begin to study its spiritual lessons against the background of that inward history, a new era will begin in the appreciation of this great Gospel. But "spiritual things must be spiritually discerned."

PART IV
LATEST PHASES OF DEBATE AND RESEARCH

PART IV

LATEST PHASES OF DEBATE AND RESEARCH

CHAPTER XVII

THE DEFENSE OF THE GOSPEL

A generation ago "the genuineness of St. John's Gospel" was declared by the foremost conservative scholar to be "the center of the position of those who uphold the historical truth of the record of our Lord Jesus Christ given us in the New Testament."¹ The latest supporters of the traditional view of the authorship it is to be hoped are not disposed to throw upon its opponents the odium of disloyalty to the common Lord and Master, or even of enmity to that mystical or Pauline element in our religion, which seems to be represented in it. Still it may be well, since they have chosen for themselves the title of "defenders of the Gospel" to state that those of opposite conviction are equally persuaded that the Gospel does need "defense"—from some of its friends; also that there is a type of criticism which justly deserves the epithet "destructive," because in the interest of a mere ecclesiastical theory of authorship educed by second-century editors from mistaken premises, it undermines all confidence in the historical veracity and sincerity of the author. True "defense," on the other hand, would make clear his real endeavor to set forth the whole truth as he sees it, however he inclines to emphasize its doctrinal side.

¹ Lightfoot. See above, p. 1.

So long as it is maintained that the author *could* have made real historic fact the basis of his "spiritual" interpretation of Jesus' life and teaching, our respect for his message can with difficulty survive the shock of the discovery that he has turned in preference to mere fiction and allegory. If, on the other hand, as we have maintained, his attempt, however anachronistic and a priori, is not consciously false to historic truth, it requires only an adjustment on our part to his circumstances and point of view to welcome his work as full of light and truth. It will prove an illuminating and inspiring revelation of the Pauline conception of the eternal and spiritual Christ, as apprehended by the generation after Paul. Critics who are engaged in the facilitation of this adjustment do not feel that their work is justly designated "destructive," even if it require the demolition of a venerable tradition of the Church. Since the disposition, however, appears to be still strong to identify defense of the tradition with defense of the Gospel, we shall endeavor, at the risk even of a repetition which may seem tedious, to state precisely where the issue lies. For experience warns us that a single positive, and—to our own apprehension—unambiguous statement may prove to be no protection against misunderstanding in even the highest quarters.¹

¹ In the article entitled "The 'Defence' of the Fourth Gospel" (*Hibbert Journal*, VI, 1, Oct., 1907, p. 123) the present author cited as an instance of fallibility in exegesis even in so great an exegete as Professor Sanday, the statements that "Professor Bacon ascribes the main body of the Gospel to John the Presbyter" (*Criticism*, p. 24) and that he follows "those critics of vigour and rigour, Schmiedel and H. J. Holtzmann, who would distinguish the author of the First Epistle of St. John from the Author of the Gospel." In reality Professor Bacon had written (*Introduction*, etc., p. 268): "The main source on which the compiler of John in its present form has relied is unmistakably the work of the writer of the three Epistles"; and in the preceding chapter, on "The Apocalypse and the Epistles" (p. 249), he had written of the latter, "Their author superscribes himself simply 'The Elder.' . . . There remains nothing to indicate that the unknown Elder's name was John rather than Alcibiades or Melchizedek." In the kindest

If our discussion thus far has had any value toward clarification of the issue it must have become apparent that the question really turns first of all upon the credibility of the statement of the last (authentic) verse of the Appendix (21: 24), and second upon the relation of this Appendix and its kindred "parenthetic additions" in the body of the Gospel to the deeper substance. The "defenders'" whole case, so far as the external evidence is concerned, rests absolutely upon the single verse Jn. 21: 24; because there is not one attribution of the Gospel to John, early or late, direct or indirect, which admits of even plausible reference to any other source. We are agreed with the "defenders"—although the matter is still disputed—as to the meaning of this verse. We believe that it really intends to attribute the Gospel to the Apostle John. We also agree—against some "destructive" critics—with conservatives such as Lightfoot and Blass that it is impossible to dissociate the verse in question from the kindred assertion of 19: 35 which "defenders" make one of the cardinal positions (when not *the* cardinal position) in their argument from the internal evidence. We may be pardoned, therefore, if we devote some further consideration to these central positions of the external and internal evidence.

It is to be recalled first of all that we are dealing with an anonymous work, which makes no claim to be from the hand of John,¹ and which is only brought into connection with his name by means of an Epilogue (21: 24 f.), acknowledged by the most ardent "defenders," including Professor Sanday spirit, and with a courtesy proverbial among all who know him, Professor Sanday has privately expressed his regret at the unintentional misrepresentation—not so surprising in view of the wide acceptance of the theory ably represented by Harnack. Since, however, the private expression alone can scarcely overtake the printed word, we feel compelled to guard in the present chapter against further misunderstanding.

¹ On the ambiguous passages alleged to be such, see below.

himself, to be attached at a later time by another and unknown hand.¹ Even the meaning of this unknown editor is a subject of dispute, to say nothing of the value of his opinion. Yet Professor Sanday writes:

“The critics who assert that the Gospel is not the work of an eye-witness, and even those who say that the last chapter was not written by the author of the whole, wantonly accuse these last words (21:24) of untruth. That is another of the methods of modern criticism that seem to me sorely in need of reforming. I hope that a time may come when it will be considered as wrong to libel the dead as it is to libel the living.”

In this hope for better observance of the Ninth Commandment we cannot but concur. As regards “accusations” and “defenses,” the facts are these. To make it appear possible to accept the statement of the writer of Jn. 21:24, in the particular sense attributed to it by Tatian (?), Theophilus of Antioch, Irenæus, and subsequent tradition, two critics in modern times have ventured so far as to describe the story of the raising of Lazarus (Jn. 11) as intentional and conscious fiction. One is Renan, whose stubborn clinging to the traditional authorship was not usually considered to atone for the violence done in its interest to both critical sense and religious feeling. Renan explained the story of the raising of Lazarus as a pious fraud at which Jesus, under pressure of circumstances, was guilty of connivance. The scene was an acted fiction in which Jesus consented to be chief *ὑποκριτής*! The other vindicator of apostolicity at the expense of veracity is Principal Drummond, the appearance of whose book is thus greeted by Professor Sanday:—

¹ See, e. g., Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii, § 66, pp. 485, 487, and Sanday, p. 81. The latter admits that Chapter 21 is an appendix, but “by the same hand as the rest of the Gospel,” written when “the aged disciple, feeling death stealing upon him, might point out that no words of Jesus justified the expectation” (of his survival). The last phrase is quoted by Sanday from

“To one who himself firmly believed in St. John’s authorship of the Gospel, and in its value as a record of the beginning of Christianity, the outlook last autumn seemed very black. A single book dispelled the clouds and cleared the air. Dr. Drummond’s *Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel* is of special value to the defenders of the Gospel . . . the whole work is something more than a defence of the Gospel.”

Principal Drummond attributes the pious fraud to the Apostle John. This “eye-witness,” he conceives, not only invented the whole story of Lazarus “to set forth in a vivid and picturesque form the truth that Jesus is the resurrection and the life,” but expressly intended it as “a repudiation of the older story” of the Synoptic writers, although these, as he admits, had set forth the real facts in substantial truth and soberness.¹

To one who himself firmly believed in the sincerity of both the anonymous evangelist and of his editor in the Appendix, however slight the qualifications of either for historical or literary criticism, Principal Drummond’s book did not come quite as the clear shining after rain. To opponents as well as friends of the traditional authorship it has a very great and special value, as may be seen from our own dependence on it in the preceding chapter. Its discussion of the internal evidence deserves even Professor Sanday’s encomiums. But the attempt to rescue deductions previously made from the external evidence, by resort to an extreme theory of allegory to counteract the inferences naturally suggested by the internal, is a fatal weakness of the book. Attempts to gain credit for a theory of authorship by discrediting the author still seem to us more like “libel of the dead” than the belief that the author of the Epilogue was in

Drummond. He also admits that “at the very end (21: 24) another hand does take up the pen.”

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 63.

error.¹ To Professor Sanday they convey "an enhancement of the value of the Gospel as a record of the beginning of Christianity." The mere unreformed critic might prefer not to be required to take the sacred writer's professed devotion to truth and loyalty to the concrete facts of history (I Jn. 1: 2, 3; Jn. 1: 14-17 f., 19: 35) in a Pickwickian sense, nor to occupy in his own person the position of certain well-meaning rabbis whom Jesus rebuked for "making the word of God of none effect that they might keep their tradition."

The exegesis is not yet wholly obsolete which defends the traditional theory of the authorship of the Pentateuch by declaring that Moses wrote by anticipation the account of his own death which concludes the book. The Talmud even depicts him bewailing his own end as the Spirit dictated the words. Later it was thought wiser to allow that the passages relating to the death of the assumed authors of the books of Moses, Joshua, and Samuel (these passages and *no more*) were written as appendices "by their disciples." The history of the ecclesiastical tradition of Johannine authorship is following step by step in the same course. Does the Appendix appear to refer to the death of the Beloved Disciple?—It was written by him by anticipation. Does the last verse speak in the name of others?—It was written "by his disciples." Does the contrast developed throughout the chapter between the "red martyrdom" of Peter and the peaceful end of "this man" seem to show that the last verse cannot be disjoined from the context? Does the allusion to current associations of the name of John with the earthly "witnesses of Messiah," who according to Mt. 16: 28 were

¹ We hold no brief for Harnack, whom Professor Sanday rebukes for "imputing deliberate fraud" to the writer of 21: 24. Harnack's view is his own. But Professor Sanday extends the charge expressly to all "who say that the last chapter was not written by the author of the whole"!

to be alive and remain at the coming of the Lord, expectations which only the event itself could really disprove, seem to show a knowledge both of John's death and of conflict between the inconsistent forms of the tradition?—All this is nothing. "The aged disciple felt death stealing upon him," seized his pen and wrote the Appendix. The Gospel itself, though long since completed, had been kept from circulation until death should be just near enough to make it certain John would not survive the *parousia*, but not so near as to incapacitate him for his literary task.

But let us refrain from characterizing this type of exegesis and turn rather to a more careful justification of our own.

We have seen that Lightfoot and Sanday were perfectly justified in pointing to the close connection between Jn. 19: 35 and 21: 24 as indicating an intention to identify the "witness" in question as the Apostle John. This interpretation ought never to have been questioned. Even the authority of so eminent a scholar as Bousset is unavailing to make it seem probable that the Beloved Disciple of verse 20 is to be sought among the nameless "other two disciples" of verse 2, rather than "the sons of Zebedee" of the same verse. In his third lecture (pp. 97-108) Professor Sanday does not conceal the strong attraction which he feels toward the theory of Delff, which explains the confusion in second-century tradition between John the Apostle and "John the Elder," by attributing the Johannine writings to the latter and applying to him most of the traditions. The theory unquestionably gains weight from the growing evidence most forcibly presented by Bousset,¹ that the martyrdom of the son of Zebedee predicted in Mt. 20: 23 = Mk. 10: 39, for which Lk. 22: 30 significantly substitutes the *logion* Mt. 19: 28, not only took place in Judæa not long after that of

¹ *Theol. Rundschau*, 1905, pp. 225, 277 ff. See above, Chapter V.

the namesake of his brother,¹ but was actually related by Papias.² Nevertheless the objection which appears to be the most serious in Professor Sanday's view is to us also insuperable. Galatians and Acts certainly have the son of Zebedee in mind as the John who is associated with Peter as nearest in apostolic rank, and in Mk. 3: 16, 17 he is on the road to this distinction. It is not sound and impartial exegesis which would substitute in the Appendix, where the "two witnesses" are balanced over against one another, Peter plus some utterly unknown personage in place of "Peter and John." Delff and Bousset yield here to the laudable but misleading desire to justify tradition and acquit R of error. We have seen already an explanation of the incoming of the name of "John" more in accord with the known facts of second-century debate.

We must further concede to Professor Sanday the real weight of that authority to which he refers as all-sufficient for the proof that the last chapter is by the same hand as the rest of the Gospel.³ Lightfoot adduces some linguistic proof of that close connection of the Appendix with *portions* of the rest of the Gospel which the present writer thought more convincingly demonstrated by the connection of the disarranged material of the Gospel with the Appendix.⁴ The inference drawn in our own study of the relation was that the Appendix was part of a general revision and recasting of the "Johannine" material to bring it into acceptable adjustment to "Petrine" (Synoptic) tradition. Both the

¹ Schwartz, *Tod der Söhne Zebedaei*, thinks of the actual brother, Acts 12: 1, in spite of Gal. 2: 9.

² Fragment vi, *ap. Apostolic Fathers*, Lightfoot-Harmer, 1891.

³ The note (p. 81) has only, "For the proof, see especially Lightfoot." The reference is probably to *Biblical Essays*, p. 194.

⁴ See Bacon, *Introd. to N. T. Literature*, 1900, pp. 269, 274, especially the note (p. 274) showing the connection of 13: 36 f. with 21: 19, 22; also above, p. 198.

superficial resemblances of phraseology and style which every reader can verify (though Lightfoot has given them more careful enumeration) and also the much deeper and more significant differences of conception and view-point to which later critics have repeatedly called attention, have real significance. After the discussion already given to the question the reader cannot be in doubt concerning our judgment of what that significance is. All that concerns us now is to point out that the argument so often brought against critics of their disagreement among themselves has here also its converse application. It is neither surprising nor seriously disconcerting to opponents of the tradition to find their constructive efforts attended by even widely varying results. But "defenders" cannot afford, after having brought down the ark of God into the camp by resting all the future of revealed religion on the assurance that "the last chapter (the Appendix) was written by the author of the whole," to fall into such disagreement as that of Sanday with Zahn, "the prince of conservative scholars." For Zahn finds himself compelled to draw the line not at the concluding verse, but at the concluding chapter of the Gospel, interpreting the phenomena of mingled superficial resemblance and underlying dissimilarity by a less close relation of the author of the Appendix to the Apostle:

"The traces of a hand different from that of the author of the book are observable not in verse 24 f. only, but already from 21: 2 onward. The inference from this that the entire Appendix was attached by the friends of John who come distinctly to the front in verse 24 must be admitted."¹

Since, then, the question whether "the last chapter was written by the author of the whole" is at least a debatable one, we may reasonably devote some further consideration to the alternative explanations, one of which treats 21: 24 and the

¹ Zahn, *Einl.*, Bd. II, § 66, p. 487.

related material, especially 19: 35, as representing the hand and the opinion of a revising editor (R), who has before him not only the Gospel, but also its earlier Epilogue of the Three Epistles, including specifically I Jn. 5: 6-9 and III Jn. 12; the other of which assumes that his information is derived immediately from the Apostle.

Revision and recasting are the phenomena which recent research has brought more prominently than aught else to view. Moreover, they affect not this Gospel only, but all products of the kind. Of the evidences that the Fourth Gospel is no exception to the rule we shall see more in the succeeding chapter, confining ourselves at this point to a protest against classification with the so-called partitionists, Delff, Wendt, and Briggs, in spite of previous endeavor to avoid the confusion.¹

As regards John the Elder and his supposed connection with the author of the "Johannine" Epistles and Gospel we emphatically reject the idea that he has any connection of the kind. "The Elder John," so called by Papias to distinguish him from the Apostle, is a dim and distant figure for Papias himself, utterly unknown in Asia, unquestionably a historical figure, but by all the indications of contemporary usage as regards the seat of the authoritative tradition of "the Elders," a resident of Jerusalem.² No objection exists to Delff's view that some of the tales regarding "John" related by Polycrates and others may have originally applied to this John; but the attempt to set aside the full, plain refutation by Eusebius of Irenæus' confusion, a refutation made with the work of Papias open before him, is

¹ For previous efforts see Bacon, *Introduction*, 1900, p. 268. For the distinction itself, below, Chapter XVIII.

² Cf. Hegesippus on the "succession" in Jerusalem "down to the times of Trajan," *ap. Eus., H. E. III, xix, xx, 1-8, etc., passim*, on "The apostles and elders in Jerusalem," the superscriptions of "James" and "Jude" and the John of Jerusalem, *ap. Eus., H. E. IV, v, 3*.

irrational, and that which seeks to connect the Fourth Gospel with him is equally so. John the Elder cannot possibly have written Epistles or Gospel.¹ The traditions actually traceable to him are at the very opposite pole from the doctrine of these writings. They represent a crude millenarianism of the most pronounced type, utterly irreconcilable with the highly spiritualized eschatology of the X literature.

The whole endeavor somehow or other to connect this Jerusalem Elder with the "Johannine" Epistles and Gospel is due to the notion that the attachment to them of the name "John" must somehow be accounted for. But the attachment accounts for itself the moment we find a previous attachment of it to the Ephesian apocalypse of Revelation. And this we do find made in several writers some decades earlier than the attachment to the rest of the Ephesian canon. The Epistles emanate it is true from an "Elder"; but who else but one who held this office would write epistles to churches? At an earlier point of our discussion we have proposed, simply as a working hypothesis, to identify this nameless Ephesian "Elder" of the Epistles with the revered and nameless teacher of Justin Martyr.² For convenience let us call him Theologos. The Elder *Theologos* will be the author of the Gospel in the form it possessed before the final revision which aims to adapt it to general circulation and identifies its enigmatic figure of the Beloved Disciple with the Apostle John. Whether previous to the form given it by the Elder Theologos the Gospel, or elements of it, had circulated in still simpler form is a more difficult, perhaps a fruitless, question. There are, nevertheless, certain indications that such was the case. The evidence seems, however, to the present writer too precarious to warrant the assertion

¹ The Apocalypse he might, if we distinguish the Palestinian nucleus from the Asiatic envelope.

² Above, p. 207.

that this earliest hand was other than that of Theologos himself. Whoever it was, his qualifications for his task were by no means those of an apostle, or even of an eye-witness, but such as we might attribute to an Apollos.

For the author of the Appendix and recaster of the Gospel, who adjusted the Asiatic or Pauline tradition to the Petrine of Syria and Rome, we have no designation save the title Redactor. This editor (R) gave to the Gospel its authoritative currency by his not unnatural identification of "the disciple whom Jesus loved" with the son of Zebedee, and by ascribing to him the writing and testimony. R was a contemporary of Papias, Polycarp, and Justin, probably a Roman. He doubtless believed with Papias and Justin that "John the Apostle" had been "in the Spirit" in the island of Patmos, whence he had addressed letters to the churches of Asia. What more natural than to attribute to John the anonymous Gospel also? R knew, moreover, that Polycarp claimed to have seen and heard that Apostle—whether correctly or by confusion with some other depends upon the date of the Apostle's death. Polycarp's memories and the Seven Epistles of Rev. 1-3, would tend to make John the natural patron apostle of Asia. Otherwise there is nothing to indicate that R thought of him as having ever been there. On the contrary, it is Peter who is carried away "whither he would not," and John who "abides" with the flock. So the *Muratorianum* understands the Appendix, and so it was probably meant. Even for Ignatius and Polycarp, Paul, not John, is still the Apostle of Asia.

To decline to accept R's opinion on the authorship of the Gospel is not to "wantonly accuse the Epilogue of untruth." No modern scholar feels bound to accept that of "Jude the brother of James" on the authorship of Enoch, any more than that of the *Muratorianum* on the authorship of the Epilogue in its turn; for the *Muratorianum* attributes this to

John's "fellow-disciples and bishops" in the same way that it attributes the Book of Wisdom to "the friends of Solomon." The question of the external evidence resolves itself into that of the internal: Is the writer of 21:24 in personal contact with the principal author, or not? One factor in the determination of this question is that of date; and to this we have already given consideration, and must give more in connection with that of literary structure. Meantime we have another means of judging in his divergence from the author's standpoint, and his misunderstanding and occasional maltreatment of the material.

If indeed it could be maintained that no one could honestly say "We know that his witness is true" who had not personal acquaintance with the author, our difference with R might be held to imply an unfavorable moral judgment. But who can thus argue concerning one of the constant refrains of the Johannine writings,¹ not to say one of the most fundamental ideas of the New Testament, the "witness of the Spirit with our spirit that we are born of God," the assurance of the fulfilment of the Messianic promise in the outpouring of the Holy Ghost upon every one that is baptized into Christ. The truth witnessed by the Gospel is in substance that

"the Son of God is come and hath given us an understanding so that we know Him that is true and are in Him that is true in his Son Jesus Christ."²

Where is there a true Christian who cannot say of this "We know that this witness is true"?

But certain passages anterior to the Appendix are also supposed to make direct claims to emanate from an eye-witness. To dispute these would in that case imply an imputation of insincerity to the author. Here then the question becomes again a question of exegesis.

¹ E. g., III Jn. 12; I Jn. 5: 9-12; Jn. 3: 11.

² I Jn. 5: 20.

Among the "passages which make a direct claim," Professor Sanday cites first of all I Jn. 1: 1-3, the reliance of the *Muratorianum*,¹ a passage which we also attribute to the author (not the redactor) of the Gospel. Sanday disposes quickly and correctly of the interpretation of the reference of *θεᾶσθαι* to mystical vision. Certainly Theologos emphasizes the visibility *and tangibility* of the incarnation of the Logos, just as in Jn. 1: 13, 14, 16,² and 20: 24-31. We have every reason for accepting the ancient belief that the author is vindicating the historic tradition of the Church against the docetism of Cerinthus. Cf. I Jn. 4: 2, 3, and 5: 6-10.

Against the alternative view that the writer "is speaking in the name of a whole generation, or of Christians generally," the only objection raised is the "contrast between 'we' and 'you,' between teachers and taught." Here also we admit the contention (if anybody disputes it) that "the teachers are in any case a small body; and they seem to rest their authority, or at least the impulse to teach, on the desire to communicate to others what they had themselves experienced." Precisely; for they are genuine successors of the Apostle Paul in the great headquarters of his mission field, and therefore they speak with the authority of those who have been "intrusted with the ministry of reconciliation, how that God

¹ "That which was from the beginning, that which we have heard, that which we have seen with our eyes, that which we beheld, and our hands handled, concerning the Word of life (and the life was manifested and we have seen and bear witness, and declare unto you the life, the eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us); that which we have seen and heard, declare we unto you also, that ye also may have fellowship with us; yea, and our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ, and these things we write that our joy may be fulfilled."

² See the passage reproduced below (p. 458). As an illustration of the infelicitous interpolations of R, we have printed also (in other type) verse 15, to show how it interrupts the connection of 14 with 16, and refers to an utterance of which we hear nothing down to verse 30.

was in Christ reconciling the world." Because they are the conscious successors of this Apostle of the present, spiritual Christ, they emphasize and reiterate to the last degree that it is "the life," the life of the Logos, the life which was from the beginning, the life which was historically manifested and which since that manifestation, to which the writer and his associates have been ordained and set apart to bear witness, has been the continual, conscious possession of the whole brotherhood of believers, constituting their fellowship, the life which flows from God, the life that so constitutes the being of the Christian that it is no more he that lives but Christ that liveth in him. The teachers are a small body—not because nobody can teach except those whose physical hands touched the incarnate Logos,¹ but because so few have come into living, conscious contact with the spiritual Logos. Its lines of limitation do not run across the generations at so many years after the crucifixion, but along all generations according as men receive or reject the Spirit. The author uses the same "we" to speak through the mouth of Jesus himself in Jn. 3:11.² The witness is historical in its source, but personal and immediate in its verification. The record is confirmed by the experience; and the experience therefore makes subsequent generations fellow-witnesses with the first. According to Theologos there is no need for Christians to be disputing about the length of life of this "witness of Messiah" or that. With Paul he holds that it is not physical but spiritual contact which gives apostolic authority. The Logos is with them alway, even unto the end of the world. Because his life is in them, they are his witnesses, that shall not taste of death till his *parousia*.

¹ This is the plane to which Theologos relegates the doubting Thomas. Cf. Jn. 20: 26-29.

² "We speak that we do know and testify that we have seen" is the utterance of the Church, conscious of having received the promised Spirit, to unbelieving Judaism.

“Hereby we know that we abide in him and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit. And we have beheld and bear witness that the Father hath sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world. . . . This is he that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ; not with water (of baptism) only (as the Docetists held), but with the water and with the blood (of the passion; denied by the Docetists). And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is the truth. . . . If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater. . . . He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in him. . . . And the witness is this, that God gave unto us eternal life, and this life is in His Son. He that hath the Son hath the life. He that hath not the Son of God hath not the life.”

This is the “witness.” To talk as if it were something which none but the first generation can render, with mere tales about their experiences of the physical senses, is to force upon the writer as his only meaning “the witness of men,” when he insists upon testifying by “the witness of God which is greater.” This apostolic succession he belongs to, and he seeks to extend it. We still have few enough such teachers.

If the nature of the original author’s “witness” is clear from the Epistle alone, it becomes ten times more clear when we bring into comparison the next of Professor Sanday’s “passages which make a direct claim,” Jn. 1: 14, though this he regards as “more ambiguous.”

It forms part of a context (Jn. 1: 11-17), in which, as so constantly in Paul, the spiritual Israel, “which were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God” (*cf.* Gal. 4: 22-31; Rom. 4: 16-18; 9: 7-9), are contrasted with the fleshly, “the Jews,” as they are designated in this Gospel.

“He came unto his own, and his own received him not. ¹². But as many as received him to them gave he the right to become

children of God. . . .¹⁴ And the Logos became flesh, and tabernacled among us, and we beheld his glory, glory as of the Only-begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth.¹⁵ John beareth witness of him and crieth, saying, This was he of whom I said, He that cometh after me is become before me, for he was before me.¹⁶ For of his fulness (of grace and truth) we all received, and grace for grace. For the law was given by Moses. Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ."

Does the author mean by "tabernacled among us," us twelve Apostles; or does he mean us, the spiritual Israel, who "received him"?² When he says, "We beheld his glory full of grace and truth, *for we all received* from his fulness of grace," does he mean to exclude from this experience all but the first generation? If so, the ubiquitous signs of his relationship to Paul are very fallacious. But such an interpretation would be belittling to the Gospel.

Professor Sanday has but one more "passage which makes a direct claim." It is the famous crux of interpretation, 19: 35,³ and as to it Professor Sanday himself, as we have seen (p. 192), is fain to admit that if we accept the ordinary use of *ἐκεῖνος* (and he suggests no other),

"then I should be inclined to think with Zahn that *ἐκεῖνος* points to Christ, 'he who saw the sight has set it down in writing . . . and there is One above who knows that he is telling the truth.'"

But who that was anxious to establish a historical fact would write in this ambiguous fashion? And what then becomes of the "direct claim"? Manifestly it remains to be proved

¹ Verse 15 is borrowed carelessly from verse 30, after the original report had been cut out. See above, p. 456, note 2.

² Cf. Ex. 33: 5 ff.; 40: 34 f.

³ "There came out (from the spear wound) blood and water. And he that hath seen hath borne witness, and his witness is true. And he knoweth that he saith true that ye may believe."

“that the bearing witness is that of the written Gospel, and that the author of the Gospel is the same as he who saw the sight.”

Professor Sanday's only “proof” is a reference to 21:24, and we are (seemingly) back where we were before.

However, we are not quite where we were before, for Professor Sanday refuses to relinquish the favorite among “defenders” of all the “passages which make a direct claim.” He cannot

“agree that there is anything really untenable in what may be called the common view, that . . . the author is simply turning back upon himself and protesting his own veracity. The use of *ἐκεῖνος* to take up the subject of a sentence is specially frequent and specially characteristic of this Gospel; and *as the author systematically speaks of himself in the third person*, it seems to me that the word may also naturally refer to himself so objectified: ‘he who saw the sight has set it down . . . and *he* is well assured that what he says is true.’”¹

In the above extract we have taken the liberty to italicize a clause which to us appears simply a begging of the question in debate. The usual example cited by those who maintain this alleged self-objectifying use of *ἐκεῖνος* by the evangelist is Jn. 9:37, “He that speaketh unto thee is that one” (*ἐκεῖνος*, *i. e.*, the one assumed to be another).² In the absence of any real parallel Professor Sanday's statement should read “*if* the author speaks of himself in the third person.” The assumption that he does certainly calls for some proof. But let us continue:—

“In any case, however, I must needs think that the bearing witness (Jn. 19:35) is that of the written Gospel, *and that the author of the Gospel is the same as he who saw the sight*. The identity is, it seems to me, clenched by 21:24.”

¹ *Criticism*, p. 79.

² To show the absurdity of adducing this as a parallel let the question be asked, What effect would result from the opposite procedure: “He that speaketh unto thee is *myself*”?

Once more we italicize the clause which seems to us to beg the question in dispute. With all the rest we emphatically concur, with the further addition of I Jn. 5:6-8 as part of the witness borne by the author in question. We too feel that this sense is "clenched" by 21:24. We even agree to the italicized clause—if the meaning be that such was the opinion of *the author of the verse*, and are not compelled to make it our own.

But why has Professor Sanday paid no heed to the warning of one of the most eminent scholars of our time in the field of New Testament philology and textual criticism, and one of the most conservative on questions of authorship and date? In 1902 Friedrich Blass had published a minute and scholarly investigation of the textual evidences for "Jn. 19:35."¹ Its conclusion is as follows:—

"What then shall the textual critic do? I fear there remains to him but a single possibility, to let the ordinary text (of 19:35) stand as it is. But he should not permit himself as he values his life (*bei Leibe nicht*) to believe in the correctness of this text; it would be unscientific. Everything in it is uncertain: the whole thirty-fifth verse and its position, as well as its individual parts, except the first, and more especially the *ἐκεῖνος οἶδεν*. Finally, even if we could find firm ground for this, we should still be entangled with the *ἐκεῖνος* and engaged in the old controversy waged 40 years ago in this Journal (*Th. St. u. Kr.*) between Steitz and Buttmann. It ought therefore to be clear, and more than clear: Whoever hereafter attempts to build a theory of the origin of this Gospel upon this verse, will have built upon sand—yes, upon quicksand—and there will be need of no tempest and no torrent to bring about the collapse of his structure."

Blass' evidence is convincing that 19:35 "belongs in the margin." In other words, its omission by some authorities,²

¹ In *Theol. Studien u. Kritiken*, 75 (1902), pp. 128-133.

² Palatinus (e) and Fuldensis of Vlg. omit the whole, Nonnus part.

different position in others,¹ different wording, particularly as regards *ἐκεῖνος οἶδεν* (var. *οἶδαμεν, οἶδατε, οἶδα*) in still others proves it an early marginal gloss of *editorial* character. Blass very naturally, and most irrefutably, brings it into connection, as we have done, with I Jn. 5: 6-8, "which of course does not really refer to the incident (of the crucifixion) here related." What he has left undone, but fortunately had been made unnecessary by the clear assurances of "defenders" such as Lightfoot and Sanday, is the demonstration of the close relation of this editorial gloss—proved such by even the textual evidence—with the Appendix; in particular with 21: 24, which also uses the same expressions borrowed from the Epilogue of the Three Epistles, and also identifies "that witness" with the Beloved Disciple and the author of the Gospel as well. It is true that for reasons already explained we still have little or no textual evidence for the circulation of the Gospel without the Appendix.² We are not, however, altogether without evidence of its circulation without the post-postscript (21: 25) and the same process of tinkering at the passages bearing on the authorship of the Beloved Disciple which is evidenced in 21: 25 is evidenced also, as Blass has shown, in 19: 31-37.

Review of the passages supposed to "make a direct claim" of Johannine authorship has involved, through the dependence of "defenders" on passages demonstrably foreign to the Gospel in its original form, a certain commingling of the two aspects of our inquiry (1) as to the credibility of R, tested by the admittedly authentic passages; (2) as to his own relation on the one side to the "parenthetic additions," on the other to the original author. R's relation to some of the former has with the aid of the "defenders" been already sufficiently proved. To what further extent it can be traced

¹ Cyril of Alexandria seems to have had the order 34, 36, 37, 35.

² See, however, above, p. 213 ff.

is a problem for the succeeding chapter. There remains for present consideration only the question of his relation to the author of the Gospel in the form supplemented by the three Epistles.

2. If R, with his editorial ascription of the Gospel (and Epistles?) to the son of Zebedee, is simply doing what the writers of the *Muratorianum*, of the Monarchian Prologues, of the various *argumenta* and subscriptions, habitually do, presenting as fact his own inferences from the author he is handling, and if his exegetical inferences, together with the whole dependent chain of alleged "external evidence," carries (to put it mildly) no conviction, what is the indirect evidence of the author himself? His "direct claims," as we have seen, are not for himself, but for the body of witnesses to which he belongs, a body not yet divided into a "Catholic" camp which holds to the historic succession by physical contact, and a Protestant camp which declares "the Spirit and the gifts are ours" and despises the historic tradition. His witnesses stand for both. Theologos, as we have called him, merges his own testimony completely in that of the Church. The witness of the Spirit is everything, "because the Spirit is truth." The purest and loftiest Paulinism is reacting from the unbridled fancy of Gnosticism toward the historic tradition of the Church, but without the surrender of Pauline liberty in the Spirit. Space does not here permit the demonstration how far below this level is that of the redactor, who, by his additions and readjustments, particularly in the Appendix, has sought to harness this eagle to the wingless creatures of Synoptic tradition. But we certainly have no need and no inclination to accuse him of untruth.

Many reasonable inferences can be drawn from Gospel and Epistles concerning his personality. We have seen ¹

¹ Above, p. 188.

that he was probably an elderly man, a Hellenistic Jew of Ephesus, and that he was familiar from personal observation with the scenes along a limited line of travel in Palestine. He does not seem to have been himself guilty of the anachronistic reference to "the sea of Tiberias"; for the appending of τῆς Τιβεριάδος in 6:1 is more likely on grammatical grounds to be due to R, who employs this designation (21:1). If he was misled by Lk. 3:2 and Asiatic usage into speaking of Caiaphas as high-priest "for that year" (11:49-52), he has more than atoned for it by correcting from Mt. 26:57. He knows the Scriptures, and that perhaps in the original Hebrew. At least he seems conversant with more than one Greek rendering.¹ His mastery of midrashic method, especially that of a "spiritualizing" Alexandrian type, reminds us of an Apollos, his attitude toward Stoic conceptions and to some of the commonplaces of Greek philosophy recall the venerable Ephesian teacher of Justin Martyr. All reasonable inferences of this kind have value in proportion as they help us to understand the author, his task and his times. Polemically or apologetically employed they are more apt to be productive of confusion than of light.

And after all it is not the individual traits of the author's character which we need to know, so much as those which are not distinctive but representative; we need to know the characteristics of the church and period he represents. Jewish birth is not so great a matter for a Philo in Alexandria, a Paul in Tarsus, or a Spinoza in Amsterdam, as ability to lay hold of and master the greatest thoughts of Gentile philosophy. All mere questions of the precise individual and date are subordinate to those of real importance to the reader for whom the Scriptures are a record of the march of God in history. What is important for such readers

¹ See Drummond, *op. cit.*, pp. 361-365, and Dittmar, *Vetus Test. in Novo, ad loca.*

is the appreciation which only historical study can give first of all of the evangelist's relation to Paul, especially the Pauline Christology as revealed in the Asian group of epistles, above all Ephesians. Next to this must come his relation on the one side to Mark and Luke, on the other to Matthew and the Sayings, as representations of the evangelic tradition. And over against these sources and influences must be set the evangelist's antagonisms and emendations. The docetism of Cerinthus and probably of the Gnostics of Antiochian origin, perhaps the doctrines of Basilides himself, are certainly met and overthrown. Ancient tradition coincides with the express statement of the Epistles on this point; modern criticism abundantly confirms the fact by comparison of the contemporary polemic of Ignatius. On the other hand, the evangelist is certainly conscious also, as tradition maintains, of the shortcomings of his predecessors on the "spiritual" side. A striking instance, all the more curious from the fact that his writings have come to be attributed to the same author as Revelation, a book representing the very opposite tendency in this field, is his eschatology. The nature of the Christian hope for the future was the burning question of the age. Scoffers demanded mockingly "Where is the promise of his Coming?" Gnostic and Docetic heretics etherealized Church doctrine into vague nebulosity. Palestinian apocalyptic "prophecy" materialized it into a concrete, hard and fast millenarianism of the type represented by the Jerusalem "Elders" and later by Papias and the Montanists. Paul had followed both tendencies. In his earlier letters he looks for the Coming of Christ to us, while we are alive and remain; in the latest he expects "to depart and be with Christ, which is very far better." The foundation which did *not* change with Paul was his conviction that our real life, even now, is the eternal life, of which the indwelling Spirit is the essence as well as

pledge, which even now for its center of gravity is "hid with Christ in God." Our evangelist rests firmly on the deeper truth, and follows it out in the direction of Paul's later thinking. All this appreciation of the inner life of the evangelist, his church and his times, is more important than his years of life, his ancestry, or even—since in any event he has not aimed to draw upon the resources of an eye-witness—his historical nearness to the times of which he professes to speak.

And R also has his place in the divine development, though it is far from the lofty one we must concede to A. The accommodation of the "spiritual" to the concrete, the adjustment of the ideal to the practical is not a sphere for transcendent genius. But labor of this kind also deserves to be understood and appreciated. Can we trace probable errors and misunderstandings? Let him that is without sin among us cast the first stone. But let us not be considered to be stoning the prophets because we prefer understanding them, even in their imperfections, to building their sepulchers.

We have seen that the Appendix differs widely in its point of view from the Gospel, and in the direction of the concrete and the commonplace. There is reversion toward the Synoptic type of apocalyptic eschatology (21:22), and recrudescence still more marked in the post-postscript (21:25). Further study of the reviser's work in the body of the Gospel may give further light on this relation.¹ Meantime we deprecate the imputation of "destructive" aims or tendencies to such investigation. Discrimination is the first condition of insight. Undiscriminating reading even of the Fourth Gospel is not to be preferred to the application of the keenest processes of critical analysis.

To one whose conception of the beginning of Christianity

¹ See below, Chapter XVIII.

is confined to the soil of Palestine and the narrations of those who had known Christ after the flesh, light upon the development of the Pauline Gospel in Asia may perhaps be a matter of small moment. The Pauline Gospel is resolutely disregarding of the sayings and doings of Jesus, in favor of the incarnation, crucifixion, and resurrection considered as a drama of the divine economy of creation and redemption. It is the tendency of modern Christianity, however, to look upon Paul's great appropriation of the Logos doctrine, the doctrine in which, from Heraclitus of Ephesus to Cleanthes the Stoic and Philo the Gnostic, Greek monotheistic philosophy had embodied its loftiest interpretation of man and God and the Universe, as having also had something to do with "the beginning of Christianity." An extremist of the school of Roman Catholic criticism, to whom everything that has developed on the Christian stock is Christian, criticizes the principle of an extreme Lutheran, who can admit nothing as of the essence of Christianity that cannot be traced back at least to the first century. But these counteract one another. The *via media* of criticism lies between them. The great insight which criticism is giving to the Church is the perception of Christianity as a vital germ which laid hold of, drew to itself out of the chaos of mingled religions, philosophies, systems, of the first century, which digested, assimilated, organized, whatever was available for the world-religion that was to be, because kindred to its spirit. This germ, so long as it retains its vitality, must also tend to throw off alien and morbid growths. Therefore modern thought sympathizes with the magnificent syncretism of Paul, when he transforms the national messianic hope of Israel into a universal messianic hope, the second David into a second Adam, the redemption of Israel into a redemption of the world; makes the new law of ministering love inclusive of all ethics, and all politics, and the law of the spirit of life shed abroad by the

risen Redeemer, making us free from the law of sin and death in our members, inclusive of all religion. The new dynamic, God emerging in us, the *life* that was and is manifested, and the *love* which is the law of its manifestation, this is to Paul the Essence of Christianity. "This only would I know from you, received ye the Spirit?" The idea of the Israel of God which is to be heir of the world is recast by him in the mold of Stoic thought. It becomes the body of those who died with Christ unto sin, were buried with him in baptism, and were raised to their new life by the Spirit, which vitalizes the whole as the blood flows from the head through all the members. When a man so conceives the Gospel, not the "word of wisdom" of Jesus himself, not the mighty works of a faith that could move mountains will be the main thing; but the drama of the Redemption of humanity considered as a manifestation of the life and the love of God. It will be a message of reconciliation, how that God was in Christ reconciling the world. This is the everlasting gospel of the Gentiles, and it will stand forever alongside the gospel of the circumcision as it always has stood, an interpretation of the significance of Christ's person and work, just as essential to Christianity as the report of his sayings and his deeds.

It is this gospel of the person of Christ which comes to its full expression in Ephesus, the great metropolis of the Pauline mission field. But records fail us after the time when Paul "by the space of three years" taught the word in Ephesus, reasoning daily in the school of one Tyrannus, struggling to make the most of his "great door and effectual" against the "many adversaries," the time when he assembled the elders of his Ephesian churches (was Theologos among them?) for a last warning and farewell at Miletus, the time when he sent to "the Churches of Asia" the twin epistles "concerning Christ and the Church" with their sublime

Christology, the time of the Pastoral Epistles with their increasing emphasis on "the sound doctrine," the "form of sound words" against a *gnosis* that is falsely so called. Between this time, into whose struggles of germinant Christology with all the theosophy wherewith that Phrygian-Ionic soil teemed and luxuriated, the New Testament itself affords us glimpse upon glimpse, and the later time, half revealed to us in the letters of Polycarp and Ignatius, there is a period of darkness in which Paulinism seems to bear fruit only in the great anonymous Epistle to the Hebrews, and that on distant soil. At its close the old conflict is still raging. The antagonists are still those who are puffed up in their proud *gnosis*, forgetful of the love that builds up. The Apostolic authority appealed to by name is still Paul, and only Paul. But now the issue is more definite, the heresy is more clearly defined. Opposed to it is a Logos doctrine, strong and crude in Ignatius, more refined and philosophic in Justin. But most significant for our particular study is the increasing appreciation of the weapons to which Polycarp urges recourse, on which Papias at length lays hold.

"For everyone who shall not confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is anti-Christ; and whosoever shall not confess the testimony of the Cross is of the devil; and whosoever shall pervert the *logia of the Lord* to his own lusts, and say that there is neither resurrection nor judgment, that man is the firstborn of Satan. Wherefore let us forsake the vain talk of the many and the false doctrines, and *turn to the word handed down to us from the beginning.*"¹

It surely is not hard to see what literature has intervened here with its new interpretation of the old doctrine of the anti-Christ, the false witness that exalteth himself against the true witness of the Church. Nor is it difficult to recognize the antagonists against whom "Papias and so many

¹ *Ep. of Polycarp*, vii.

church fathers after him . . . as, for instance, Irenæus," and Justin, and Jude, and II Peter, advanced the Apocalypse of John. Papias and Justin are the first to bring in the authority of "John the Apostle" in favor of (a physical) "resurrection and (an apocalyptic) judgment," Papias, in addition, bringing that of "the Elder John." For their Logos doctrine neither Ignatius nor Justin have any authority to cite save Paul. But in respect to questions about "the form of sound words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ," against those who are "puffed up with a doting *gnosis*,"¹ there is a new development.

The new feature is the turning toward "the Apostles and Elders" for "the word handed down from the beginning, the *logia* of the Lord," which are being perverted by those who do not accept the witness of the cross.² Papias follows this advice, turning from the "vain talk of the many" to "those who teach the truth, and from the false doctrine of those who relate alien 'commandments' to those who relate commandments given from the Lord to the Faith." Against the twenty-four books of Basilides' *Exegetica* on the Antiochian Gospel appear five books of *Exegesis* of the Lord's *logia*, based on the testimony of apostles and elders. The test of trustworthiness is now the historic tradition derived from an apostolic group.³ Historical criticism has begun. Even the metropolis of the Pauline mission field is beginning to listen for the voice of ecclesiastical authority. Soon it will be impossible for even the very embodiment of the gospel of Paul to find standing save as accommodated to Petrine tradition,

¹ I Tim. 6: 3.

² Cf. I Jn. 5: 6-9.

³ As to whether this apostolic group is to be found at Jerusalem, where Luke places it, where all authorities seek it down to Irenæus, down to a time when not merely the Church of "the apostles and elders" had been scattered by Hadrian, but Ephesus and Rome had divided its inheritance and forgotten its distinction, see above, Chapter IV.

even in dialogues misunderstood as literal reports of actual interviews with Jesus.

The significance of the Fourth Gospel lies in its testimony to the growth and self-definition of the gospel of Paul in the heart of the church of the uncircumcision, before the harking back to Jerusalem. When we are able to trace the history of "the Churches of Asia" from the time when Paul conveys their greetings to Corinth down to the annihilation of the church of "the apostles and elders" in the war against Hadrian, and the transfer to Rome under Antoninus Pius of the leading minds in the great school of Ephesus, then we may realize against the background of that history that it is not all enhancement of "the value of the Fourth Gospel as a record of the beginning of Christianity" to wrest it out of its true setting, and attempt to change its witness to "the life which was with the Father and was manifested unto us" into an admittedly defective, unhistorical, and fictitious supplement to Synoptic tradition.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE ANALYTICAL SCHOOL OF CRITICISM

On several occasions the course of our discussion has compelled us to anticipate in some degree the question of the integrity of the Fourth Gospel, *i. e.*, its persistence in its original form. In fact we have found it a matter of general agreement, conceded by the most strenuous "defenders" that the Appendix (ch. 21) is "an afterthought" and that the last two verses, if not more, are from a hand distinguishable from that of the evangelist.¹ The last verse of all (21: 25) is even textually doubtful and is justly omitted in the critical text of Tischendorf. How far back into the body of the Gospel will this process of disintegration extend? Great effort has been made and is still exerted by "defenders" to prove the inseparableness of 19: 35, one of the most important of the "parenthetic additions" noted by Lightfoot, from 21: 24. And for the latter, as we have seen, only an indirect relation is claimed with the original writer. But Blass has proved that 19: 35 is at least as subject to textual suspicion as 21: 25. What then of the other "parenthetic additions"? What of the passages which display internal connection with the Appendix, such as 12: 33, which Lightfoot says must be from the same hand as 21: 19?² What of

¹ Cf. Sanday, *Criticism*, p. 81. "At the very end another hand does take up the pen."

² *Bibl. Essays*, p. 194. Scholten (*Ev. n. Joh.*, p. 67) reverses this reasoning. "If ch. 21 comes from a later hand, does not 21: 19 prove that the supplementer has also added 12: 33 and 18: 32 to the original text?" Whether these mere explanatory comments ("He said this indicating by what manner of death he should die") are additions by R, or R has merely imitated them in 21: 19 is a question of no vital significance.

13: 36-38; 18: 15-18, 25-27, a group of passages intimately related in subject-matter to 21: 15-19? Shall we admit with Drummond that:

“Chapter 21 seems to show that the book underwent some kind of editing before it was given to the public,”

and that the process may have extended to the body of the work;¹ or shall we take our stand with “defenders” who resist at all hazards every suggestion of revision or editorial change?

Besides its “parenthetic additions” and passages related to the “afterthought,” the Fourth Gospel is notoriously full of the gaps and seams, the logical discrepancies and inconsistencies which, if not due to an extraordinary degree of carelessness on the part of the evangelist, can only be explained as we explain them in other writings of the kind. They must be due to later intervention, whether by combination with parallel documents, or by editorial revision, supplementation or readjustment. As a matter of mere text Blass has thus described the case:

“This too (inversion of the order of clauses or paragraphs) seems to be a special feature in the textual condition of John; carelessness in copying, and the leaving out of sentences, which were afterwards supplied in the margin, and from thence came again into the text, but at a wrong place, may have been the early causes of this damage. It seems to have taken place now and then even on a larger scale: Prof. H. Wendt² has proposed a highly probable conjecture on 7: 15-24, which he removes from their present place, putting them at the end of chapter 5.”³

As regards the “early causes of this damage” we must dep-

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 407.

² H. Wendt, *Die Lehre Jesu*, i, 228 ff.; cf. also Bertling, in *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1880, 351 ff. (before Wendt), and F. Spitta, *Zur Gesch. u. Litter. des Urchristenthums*, 199 ff.

³ *Philology of the Gospels*, 1898, p. 239. On this special question of the displacements of John see Chapter XIX.

recate Blass' suggestion of a textual occasion, remembering the disposition of experts in textual criticism who are far from such in the higher, and naturally prefer to account for the peculiarities of a document by the vicissitudes of its transmission rather than of its composition. Blass' attempts to explain phenomena of this kind have not met with marked success. His testimony as to the *fact*, however, is of no small importance. Notoriously the "seamless robe" has proved sufficiently loose in texture to admit a very considerable addition in Jn. 7: 53-8: 11, probably borrowed from the *Ev. Hebr.*¹ The textual evidence by itself alone may have further indications of significant modifications in process of transmission. At all events we must connect with Blass' testimony the evidences of gaps we have already noted in 1: 35-51² and 5: 2-7.³ In the former passage we are simply left in the dark, both as regards the movements of the second of the two disciples of John, and as regards the incident "under the fig-tree" referred to in 1: 50.⁴ In the latter passage (5: 2-7) a friendly hand has kindly supplied *in the later MSS.* after verse 3 the words:

"waiting for the moving of the water: for an angel of the Lord went down at certain seasons into the pool, and troubled the water. Whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole, with whatsoever disease he was holden."

Some explanation of this kind is indispensable, for without it the genuine passage in verse 7 is unintelligible:

¹ This passage is so universally recognized as unauthentic as to need no argument. Eusebius found the story in *Ev. Hebr.* Papias had employed it. His "Elders" read Aramaic.

² Above, pp. 201 ff.

³ Above, p. 219, note.

⁴ Note also the absence of the Baptist's saying referred to in 1: 15, a passage discussed below.

“Sir, I have no man when the water is troubled to put me into the pool: but while I am coming another steppeth down before me.”

The gloss above cited, accordingly, which our R. V. relegates to the margin, is more properly a *reinstatement* than an interpolation, though the phraseology may be that of the glossator only.¹ But whether the transcriber who first supplied this missing explanation invented it, or found it in some related document is immaterial to our present contention. Our present contention is only that the gap was so noticeable in Jn. 5: 2-7 (true text) as to call forth interpolation.

Now as such gaps, discrepancies, dislocations and illogical connections are found repeatedly throughout the Fourth Gospel, the attempt to account for them by some strange accident to the text, after the work had been “published and given out to the churches,” is most improbable. The damage was done before publication, or it would not be most apparent in the best and oldest textual authorities.² Conversely it is not really probable that it was done by the author himself. Drummond is indeed

“on the whole inclined to attribute the apparent displacements to the original writer, who cared more for the associations of thought than for the order of chronology, and who might refer back to what he had recently written without reflecting that the

¹ See Blass' comment on the phraseology, *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 228, note 1. The reading of Nonnus, which Blass wishes to consider as reflecting the original (p. 229), merely shows the same dislike of the superstition which led to R's cancelation.

² Drummond, *op. cit.*, p. 407, would prefer Spitta's appeal to accidental misplacement of pages as an explanation of the dislocation of Johannine material to that of editorial revision advocated by the present writer. He thinks that in connection with the “editing which the book underwent,” as evidenced by the appending of chapter 21, “it is conceivable that some of the author's sheets may have got displaced.”

continuity of thought was supposed, historically, to be interrupted by change of time and scene." ¹

For this conclusion Principal Drummond is able to cite no less authority than that of the veteran H. J. Holtzmann, who well deserves the title of "prince of liberal New Testament scholars," and who takes a similar attitude in his article "Unordnungen und Umordnungen im vierten Evangelium" in the *Zts. f. ntl. Wiss.* for 1902.² But such explanations fail to explain. To go no further than mere balancing of authorities, we have that of Wellhausen, whose opinion is based on a study and experience not inferior to Holtzmann's, and is completely opposite in effect. Speaking of those who like Holtzmann follow in the main the idea of Baur that "the key to all chambers of this extraordinary structure, and the bond which unites the whole, is the idea which is expressed in the discourses and shines through the allegorically conceived narrative," Wellhausen writes:

"Investigators as a rule, their eyes fixed on this guiding star (Baur's idea), give too little heed to their steps. If they do come across a flaw in the unity, it does not trouble them. If they feel obliged to acknowledge disturbances and contradictions, they do not treat them as vestiges of literary construction, but append them as peculiar traits of physiognomy to their portrait of the author, which thereby becomes an incredible caricature. An author may be careless and unskilful, and occasionally even a bit forgetful; but he must understand his own intention, and cannot all in a moment cease to have any conception of the bearing of his own expressions." ³

But let us judge for ourselves regarding this distinction between flaws attributable to carelessness, and faultings due to structural disturbance. We have already referred ⁴ to the

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 407 f.

² III, pp. 50-60.

³ *Das Evangelium Johannis*, 1908, pp. 3 f.

⁴ Above, p. 458.

interruption of the connection of Jn. 1: 14 and 16 caused by the interjection of a reference to John the Baptist in verse 15. A survey of the adjoining material here will enable us to draw some preliminary inferences on our own account.

In the context (of Jn. 1: 11-18) the Christian revelation is being contrasted with the Mosaic. Against the carnal claims of those who had been "his own," yet who, when the Logos came to them (in all the divine visitations of old and new dispensations)¹ received him not, are set those of the spiritual Israel who received him, and who were given a true and indefeasible title to real divine sonship. Believers thus became the sons of God by faith. The Logos "tabernacled"² among them as God had "tabernacled" in the midst of the people redeemed out of Egypt. Through the "tabernacle" of his flesh his followers saw his "glory," a "glory" from God, full of grace and truth, as in the days of the Exodus. And of this theophany surpassing that to Moses no doubt could remain, because believers themselves became visibly partakers of the glory, Christ's "fulness of grace and truth" passing over into them.³ Thus the Mosaic revelation of law was superseded by the Christian revelation of grace, bringing real knowledge of God as our Father. The central thought in this context we will reproduce again just as it stands, including (in smaller type) the interjected addition:

"¹⁴ And the Logos became flesh and tabernacled among us, and we beheld his glory, glory as of the Only-begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth;⁴ ¹⁵ John beareth witness of him and

¹ Cf. Acts 7: 51-53.

² There is a play upon the Hebrew *mishkan* from the root meaning "to dwell," and an allusion to the "glory" which had "filled" the tabernacle. In the New Testament period these conceptions recur frequently, as in Acts 7: 44-50 and Rev. 21: 3. The body in particular is constantly spoken of as a "tabernacle" (*i. e.*, of the soul), *e. g.*, II Cor. 5: 4; II Pt. 1: 13, 14.

³ With Jn. 1: 14, 16 *cf.* II Cor. 3: 6-18; Col. 2: 9 f. and Ex. 33: 17-19.

⁴ An allusion to the privilege accorded to Moses, Ex. 33: 19-34: 6.

crieth saying, This was he of whom I said (1: 30), He that cometh after me is become before me, for he was before me; ¹⁶ for of his fulness we all received, and grace for grace."

Prima facie it does not look probable that an author writing with even the carelessness (!) of the prologue of the Fourth Gospel should interrupt himself after this fashion, or forget (already!) that the saying of John the Baptist, a reference to which is here placed in the Baptist's own mouth, had not yet been given, but was later to be reported in 1: 30. Add to this that the interjection of verse 15 does not stand alone, but has a companion in verses 6-8, where as Wellhausen expresses it "John the Baptist casually drops into eternity."¹ We again reproduce the context, not paraphrasing all of verses 1-9, but merely calling attention to the fact that they deal throughout (interpolation excepted) with the cosmic and eternal aspect of the redemptive drama, not with particular incidents of Jesus' earthly career.

"⁴ In him (the Logos) was life, and the life was the light of men. ⁵ And the light shineth in the darkness and the darkness overcame it not. ⁶ There came a man sent from God whose name was John. ⁷ The same came for witness, that he might bear witness of the Light, that all might believe through him. ⁸ He was not the Light (!) but came that he might bear witness of the Light. ⁹ That was the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world."

There are few passages in literature of equal length with Jn. 1: 1-4, 9-14, 16-18 which give less ground for the suggestion of carelessness in composition. We cannot therefore believe the author of this prologue responsible for mutilation of his own work so flagrant as the interjection of verses 5-8 and 15 produces. In the case of verses 6-8, which seem to be drawn from 5: 35 f., the relation of verse 9 to verse 4 is so obscured as to make its opening clause one of the most noted

¹ "In die Ewigkeit hineinschneit."

cruces interpretum of the entire New Testament. In the case of verse 15, the "fulness" of verse 16 is no longer seen to be the "fulness of grace and truth" of verse 14, and the reader loses the point unless reminded by Col. 2:9 f. Matter interjected after this fashion does not come in by accident after publication, leaving no traces in the history of the text. Neither can it be due to revision by the author himself. As Wendt¹ and others have shown, Jn. 1:6-8 and 15 are interpolations of the same type as those which Lightfoot designated "parenthetic additions" and Blass "sentences supplied in the margin"; only their presence in all manuscripts in the same place and the same form proves their insertion to have been anterior to publication; *i. e.*, it is *redactional*, not textual. It belongs to the domain of the higher, not merely of textual, criticism.

The influence of Baur is partly responsible for the general resistance to the force of evidence of this kind. But we must also realize that the mistaken and uncritical methods of the critics themselves have placed greater obstacles in their way than the arguments of their opponents. A priori assumptions will mislead a critic just as surely as an apologist, and in his case are less excusable. Since the time of C. H. Weisse² analyzers of the Fourth Gospel have too often approached its problems with an ill-concealed desire to rescue a preferred element by the sacrifice of another deemed of less importance. There must be, to their feeling, an apostolic element connected, if not with the Apostle John, at least with a namesake who should be a real "disciple of the Lord." Now the preferred element would be, as with Weisse, A. Schweitzer, and Wendt, the discourses; now it would be the narrative, as with Renan. In either case there could be set over against the preferred element another regarded as interpolated or

¹ *Lehre Jesu*, Vol. I, pp. 219 ff. on Jn. 1:15.

² *Evangelische Geschichte*, 1838.

appended by a later redactor with back broad enough for all responsibilities of error and inaccuracy, a convenient scape-goat for all objections raised by historical criticism. Such has been the aim of the "partitionists," among whom the present writer finds himself unwillingly classified by the author of *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*. An obscurity not apparent to ourselves seems to have lurked in our statement of 1900:

"It would be puerile to proceed at once to the assumption that because a more and a less trustworthy element are present in the discourses and narrative of the Fourth Gospel we have nothing to do but to resort to the methods of documentary analysis to reach offhand the solution of the problem. Against all such rough and ready attempts to distinguish an element which we may deem worthy of the Apostle, and another which shall bear all the onus of the mistakes and misunderstandings, the famous comparison of Strauss holds true; the Gospel of John is like the seamless coat of the Lord."¹

The obscurity seems not to have been dissipated by the following, written at a little later date:

"The general verdict of scholars on such attempts (*viz.* attempts to resolve the Fourth Gospel into *documents* similar to those blended in the Pentateuch) is justly of a discouraging character. The relation of the fourth evangelist to his sources is not a mere matter of scissors and paste, nor is it to be conceived after the analogy of 'redactors' of the historical books of the Old Testament. Even the perplexing question of the sources of Acts is likely to prove less intricate. Certainly the search will not be promoted by ready-made theories as to the personality of the author and his relation to the Apostle,² nor by artificial devices of separation, whether by sweeping classifications, like Wendt's,

¹ Bacon, *Introd. to N. T. Lit.*, pp. 267 f.

² We regret to be obliged to "name the gentleman," but since we seem to be regarded as sharing his opinions, if not depending on them, we will confess that the theory here more especially alluded to was that of Delff.

into narrative material (secondary) and discourse material (Johannine), or by fine-spun distinctions of style and catch-words of vocabulary.”¹

We have endeavored in the preceding chapter to elucidate the distinction between “partitionists” and “revisionists.” So long ago as Scholten it was carefully enunciated.² Partition theories seem either to have been suggested by the documentary theory of the Pentateuch with its evidences of compilation, or by fancies connected with the imaginary Elder John of Ephesus. “Revisionists” start from the actual phenomena of the text in comparison with the known vicissitudes of similar writings. The analyses of Wendt and Delff are typical of the partitionists, with whom we need not further concern ourselves.³ Theories of revision and supplementation are best exemplified by the two very recent discussions of Wellhausen, entitled respectively “Expansions and Alterations in the Text of the Fourth Gospel” (1907)⁴, and “The Gospel of John” (1908).⁵

“Revisionists” regard the phenomena as indicating a *redactional* process, whose latest undulations only are traceable in the textual transmission, but which centers in the Appendix. This implies a method of critical scrutiny which approaches the problem from the side of the Appendix, taking careful account of the textual phenomena, but without

¹ Bacon, art. “Tatian’s Rearrangement of the Fourth Gospel” in *Amer. Journ. of Theol.*, Oct., 1900, pp. 770 f.

² *Das Evang. n. Johannes*, 1864. German transl. Lang 1867, pp. 22-69. See also Holtzmann, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

³ The five articles contributed to the *Theol. Rundschau* by A. Meyer in 1904 and 1906 and in 1905 two by Bousset give an adequate review of these theories.

⁴ *Erweiterungen und Aenderungen des Vierten Evangeliums*, Berlin, 1907.

⁵ *Das Evangelium Johannis*, Berlin, 1903. With these should be compared the work of Blass, who, however, finds his explanation in the *textual* history only, and the contribution of E. Schwartz in *Gött. Gel. Nachr.*, 1907, pp. 342-372.

the delusion of those who imagine that there is no history of the evangelic writings behind that furnished by the textual critic. Mere evidences of a high degree of scribal alteration in the text of John will not therefore of themselves concern us.¹ We shall also reserve for separate consideration in Chapter XIX the special phenomenon of the "apparent displacements." The question for us at present is that of the passages in the body of the Gospel which show intrinsic connection with the Appendix. The latter chapter, as we have seen, has a well-defined viewpoint and an object of its own, clearly distinguishable from those of chapters 1-20. It aims in general to accommodate the Johannine to the common evangelic tradition in its latest synoptic form, which is generally that of Luke. Passages connected with the Appendix, if really due to redactional insertion, may be expected to show traces of the fact (1) in greater or less disturbance to the context; (2) occasionally in a continued reflection of this disturbance in the textual history; (3) in a specially close relation to the synoptic narrative.

The most conspicuous instance of a passage admittedly inseparable from the Appendix has already been sufficiently considered. It is that of 19:35, on which "defenders" so largely build. We have already seen² that even the textual evidence here concurs in marked degree with both the other considerations. As Blass has pointed out,³ not only verse 35 has every appearance of a "parenthetic addition," but verses 34 and 37, if omitted with it, leave the connection

¹ In view of our previous observation of the comparative neglect of Matthew by the fourth evangelist (above, pp. 368 ff.) it is interesting to note that the discovery of the Syr. ^{sin} confirming D and Λ* in their omission of Jn. 12:8 (= Mt. 26:11), removes the only instance of direct use of Matthew from the Fourth Gospel. The verse is certainly a "Western non-interpolation."

² Above, pp. 461 ff.

³ *Theol. St. u. Kr.*, 1902, pp. 128 ff. Blass had previously stated the substance of his argument in *Philology of the Gospels*, 1898, pp. 224 ff.

much improved, to say nothing of the apocryphal character of the alleged incident. It is similarly added in almost all of the earliest texts after Mt. 27:49, and was already known to Celsus (170 A. D.), but in a different form from the Johannine. Whatever the character or derivation of the incident of verses 34 and 37, none will deny that the interest and motive of verse 35 are identical with those of 21:24.

Next to 19:35 in distinctness of relation to the Appendix is the group of passages, wholly synoptic in contents, which relate the story of Peter's Denial in Jn. 13:36-38 and 18:15-18, 25-27. Without the Appendix, these passages remaining where they stand, the Gospel would leave Peter under the unlifted cloud of disgrace. The Appendix relates his reinstatement in his position of leadership, and assurance of ultimately retrieving his failure in the attempt to "follow" unto prison and death (21:15-22). Now from the point of view of the higher critic it is impossible that either the story of the denial or the reinstatement can have formed part of the Gospel in its original condition, because its original concluding chapter—chapter 20 is universally admitted to have been such—pays no attention to Peter's condition of humiliation, but treats him as still one of the leaders in the apostolic group commissioned to the world and endowed with the Spirit. In view of this indissoluble interrelation of the passages Jn. 13:36-38; 18:15-18, 25-27, with 21:15-24, it is interesting to observe the radical treatment of the two paragraphs in ch. 18 by Syr.^{sin.}, concerning which Blass writes as follows:

"Our John is not identical with the real John, and it will be quite clear even from a careful examination of the text as it stands, that John can neither have meant nor have written the commonly accepted account with Annas' house as the scene of the trial. 'They led him away to Annas first, for he was father-in-law to Caiaphas, which was the high priest that same year. Now Caiaphas was he which gave counsel to the Jews that it was

expedient that one man should die for the people (see 11: 49 ff.). And Simon Peter followed Jesus, and so did another disciple: that disciple was known unto the high priest, and went in with Jesus into the palace of the high priest' (Jn. 18: 13 ff.). After having been distinctly told that Caiaphas was the high priest that year, and not Annas, we read that the other disciple went in with Jesus into the palace of the high priest. Whose palace, therefore? Of course that of Caiaphas. How has Jesus come there? The writer, leaving that serious omission unexplained and uncorrected, goes on to speak not of Annas, but of the high priest, and to tell of Peter's being introduced into his palace (ver. 18), and then of Peter's first denial, and next not of the second one, but of the trial of Christ. After that he suddenly says, (ver. 24): 'Now Annas sent him bound to Caiaphas the high priest.' Then he returns to Peter, telling of his second and third denials, and from Peter again to Christ (ver. 28): 'Then led they Jesus from Caiaphas into the hall of judgment' (to Pilate). This narrative is so utterly confused that it is no wonder King James' translators tried to correct it by interpretation, giving in ver. 24 not 'sent' but 'had sent.'¹ But the Greek words give no warrant for this interpretation, and even if it were possible, we could not withhold our censure of the writer, as he would then have told a simple story in the most awkward way."²

Professor Blass is right about the confusion, though the discovery of it is not due either to his critical acumen or to the unearthing of the Sinaitic Syriac, whose text Blass adopts offhand, declaring:

"This is the narrative of a real author; the other one is that of blundering scribes."

The confusion had been recognized centuries before the discovery of Syr. ^{sin.}, and the whole situation clearly set

¹ Luther had observed the confusion at a still earlier time, and attributed it to displacement "in the turning of the leaf, as often happens." Beza adopted a similar view. See Holtzmann, *op. cit.*, p. 57.

² Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, pp. 57 f.

forth by the higher critic F. Spitta, who accounted for it as due to the accidental displacement of a leaf of papyrus.¹ In reality it is due neither to accident to the original manuscript, nor to the work of "blundering scribes." The phenomenon is completely accounted for as soon as we look at the original from which the extract on Peter's Denial has been made for insertion in Jn. 18: 14-18, 24-27. The curious division after verse 18, by which Peter is made to stand warming himself among the servants at the fire in the court of Annas' house, and then in verse 25 to be standing and warming himself in precisely the same situation at Caiaphas' house, Jesus having made the change of scene meantime (verse 24), is simply due to uncircumspect transfer of Mk. 14: 53 ff. to the pages of John. It is Mark who first drew the picture of Peter entering the court of "the high priest" and warming himself at the fire (Mk. 14: 53-54), then passed to Jesus' trial by the chief priests, and then returned again. This trial scene of Mk. 14: 55-65 is a replica of the trial before Pilate (15: 1 ff.) and is so awkwardly interjected as to make the brutal treatment of the victim of verse 65, properly the low pastime of the menials who "led Jesus away" (53a, 54), appear to be indulged in by the members of the Sanhedrin (!). Thereafter Mark resumes his story with a *second* statement of how Peter was warming himself at the fire (verses 66 f.), and relates finally the denials. The insertion in Jn. 18: 14-18, 24-27 has followed this model exactly, inserting the story of the trial between *two* identical statements of how "Peter stood and warmed himself" (verse 18b = 25a). It even reflects the absurdity that the abuse of Jesus took place in the actual presence of the high priest (18: 22 f.; cf. Acts 23: 2 ff.). The interpolator only failed to observe one of the minute "cor-

¹ *Zur Gesch. u. Lit. d. Urchristenthums*, 1893, pp. 158 ff. Blass' reference to this as "getting at part of the truth" is hardly adequate.

rections" of the fourth evangelist (in this case probably a real historical improvement), and herein proves himself another and a later writer. The fourth evangelist not only names the anonymous "high priest" of Mark (correctly) as in Matthew "Caiaphas," but associates him as in Luke, though more precisely and accurately, with Annas. To the house of Annas accordingly, which Talmudic writers locate in the immediate vicinity of Gethsemane, Jesus is brought for preliminary examination and detention, until at dawn he can be delivered up to Pilate. The statement of verse 28, therefore, that at dawn they led Jesus "from Caiaphas to the Pretorium" does not mean, as it is taken to mean in verse 24, "from Caiaphas' house," but "from Annas' house," where Caiaphas had been conducting the examination of the prisoner. But the interpolator by effecting the change of scene in verse 24 has produced the absurdity of Peter's position already noted. The simple omission of verses 14-18 (or 15-18) and 24-27 removes every disturbing feature, and leaves a logical and consistent story. The attempt of Syr. ^{sin.} to cure the trouble by transposing verse 24 after verse 13 and 19-23 after verse 15, ranks with the conjectures of Luther and Beza, or with the mistranslation of the Authorized Version, except in being more drastic. The Syr. ^{sin.} furnishes in fact several other instances of the kind. In chapter 4 it similarly transposes verse 8 into verse 6, and in 21: 7 f. it makes the explanatory parenthesis "for they were not far from the land" to follow verse 7, as the sense requires. While, then, we cannot justify Blass' precipitate adoption of the Sinaitic transpositions as representing the "real author," they do afford entirely unbiased evidence to the gaps and seams of this Gospel which still attracted attention in 170-180 A. D., and led to attempted improvements.

But there remains one further passage of the group connected with the Appendix. It is that which interjects the

account of Peter's offer to follow in Jn. 13: 36-38 after the giving of the "new commandment." This passage employs the same synoptic material as before (*cf.* Mk. 14: 27-31 = Lk. 22: 31-34) but introduces it where it interrupts the connection of the "new commandment" with its development in the parable of the Vine and the Branches. It should come after Jn. 16: 32 f., the counterpart of Jesus' prediction of the desertion of the Twelve in Mk. 14: 27; for this prediction is the occasion of Peter's offer. We have the following parallelism:

Mk. 14: 27, 29 f.; Lk. 22: 33

"And Jesus saith unto them, All ye shall be caused to stumble; for it is written, I will smite the shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered abroad. . . . But Peter said unto him, Although all shall be caused to stumble, yet will not I" (Lk. "And he said unto him, Lord, with thee I am ready to go both to prison and to death") "And Jesus saith unto him, Verily I say unto thee, that thou, to-day, even this night, before the cock crow twice shalt deny me thrice."

Jn. 16: 31 f.; 13: 36-38

"Jesus answered them, Do ye now believe? Behold the hour cometh, yea, is come, that ye shall be scattered, every man to his own and shall leave me alone: and yet I am not alone because the Father is with me. . . . Simon Peter saith unto him Lord, whither goest thou? Jesus answered, whither I go thou canst not follow me now; but thou shalt follow afterwards. Peter saith unto him, Lord, why cannot I follow thee even now? I will lay down my life for thee. Jesus answereth, Wilt thou lay down thy life for me? Verily, verily I say unto thee, The cock shall not crow till thou hast denied me thrice."

Manifestly Jn. 13: 36-38, to make true connection, should have been inserted where we have placed it, after 16: 31 f. The error is due to 13: 33, where Jesus says "Whither I go ye cannot come." But this subject of his departure, here proleptically introduced after a distinctive habit of "John," is not taken up "plainly" until 16: 29. The interpolator has come in too soon. He should have waited for his cue, where

Jesus' discourse, after developing the new commandment in 15: 1-16: 27, returned to the plain statement "I leave the world and go unto the Father" (16: 28).

Independently even of this notable proof that 13: 36-38 is inserted by a hand other and later than that of the original evangelist, we have the displacement which accompanies it. For scarcely any of all the striking instances of this phenomenon of displacement in John has attracted such general comment, often by quite independent observers, as the introduction of the "farewell" chapter (chapter 14) between 13 and 15. At this point it comes in quite prematurely; its true place is after chapters 15-16; for these continue the discourse which draws to an end in 14: 1-24 and is formally concluded in verses 25-31. It can hardly be accidental that so many of the displacements occur in connection with added material of synoptic character.

It thus appears that every one of the passages in the body of the Gospel intrinsically connected with the Appendix gives independent evidence of being alien to its present context, the insertion of a later hand. The interpolator depends on similar sources to those of R, works in the same interest, and produces a disturbance of the original connection which is sometimes reflected even in the textual history.

One more passage of synoptic content stands related to the Appendix, not so much in subject-matter as in phraseology. So long ago as 1864 Scholten, critically reviewing the analysis of A. Schweizer, found his objections to the primary authenticity of many passages inadequately sustained. Regarding two, however, Schweizer seemed to Scholten to establish his case. These were (1) 18: 9, because it seems to mistake the sense of 17: 12; and (2) 2: 21 f., against whose authenticity Scholten brought no fewer than eleven considerations, only two of which need here detain us; for we have already found stronger evidences of entirely independent

character applying to the whole paragraph. According to Scholten:

"the evangelist nowhere else brings forward predictions of Jesus' bodily resurrection; he also shows, by speaking in 20: 9 of γραφή only, that he has no knowledge of the saying 2: 19 as a reference made by Jesus to his resurrection." Moreover, "The reanimation of Jesus is expressed passively as a *being raised*; according to the evangelist on the contrary Jesus *rises* (ἀνάστασις, ἀναστήναι) 11: 25; 20: 9. Only in 21: 14 do we have ἐγερθείς."¹

Indications of connection with the Appendix so inconclusive as these would hardly call for more than passing mention, were it not that on so many previous occasions we have come across independent indications of the alien origin of Jn. 2: 13-25, and that among these are some which imply on the one side an interest in the adjustment of Johannine to synoptic story, on the other a relation to the peculiar chronological system of this Gospel, and the displacement of considerable sections of its material.

The Purging of the Temple is not only what Wellhausen calls "a synoptic story which has no proper place in" a Gospel "whose motivation of the Passion (in the Lazarus episode) leaves no room for an assault of Jesus upon the Jewish authorities made so openly and with such impunity." Historically it is of course inseparable from its synoptic sequel, the delivering up of Jesus to Pilate.² We cannot assume a priori, however, that a writer so indifferent to the historical nexus of cause and effect might not insert a story rich to his mind in doctrinal or apologetic value, regardless of historical consistency. The case is somewhat altered when we observe that the apologetic interest subserved by this report of Jesus' enigmatic reply to the demand of a sign from heaven is met in Jn. 6: 30 ff. quite independently, and in a different manner. To the author of Jn. 2: 14-22 the sign of

¹ *Evang. n. Johannes*, p. 65.

² See above, pp. 394 f.

the son of man is the *bodily* resurrection "after three days." It corresponds exactly to Matthew's interpretation of "the sign of Jonah" (Mt. 12:40). To the author of Jn. 6:30 ff. Jesus himself is the sign, as in Lk. 11:30. Or rather we have the same connection as in Mk. 8:1-13 between the Sign of the Loaves and Jesus' giving of himself, with the eucharistic symbolism made more explicit. Christ himself is the new manna which comes down from heaven and gives life to the world. Mark's story of the Demand of a Sign, followed at once by Jesus' reminder to the disciples of the miracles of the Loaves (Mk. 8:1-14) is thus combined in Jn. 6:30 ff. with the Lukan interpretation of "the Sign of Jonah" (Lk. 11:30) that Jesus is himself the sign. It is true that already in the Synoptics there is duplication. The demand for a sign is connected first as in Jn. 6 with the collision in Capernaum after the Feeding of the Multitude (Mk. 8:11 ff. = Mt. 12:38 ff. = Lk. 11:29 ff.), later, as in Jn. 2, with the collision in Jerusalem after the Purging of the Temple (Mk. 11:27-33 = Mt. 21:23-32 = Lk. 20:1-8). Still a writer such as our fourth evangelist would scarcely be likely to embody so comparatively crude an interpretation of the "sign" as that of 2:14-22 in addition to the more "spiritual" of 6:30 ff. The Matthæan view, as we have seen, does not appeal to him. Why then anticipate his own loftier teaching of the "sign" by this preliminary passover with the variant idea?

For we have also found that 2:14-22, with its connective tissue in verse 13, stands peculiarly related to the scheme of "feasts of the Jews" and to the chronology of the Gospel. Its author counts Jesus' age as 46 at this beginning of his ministry. It is a probable, though by no means a certain inference, that he takes Jn. 8:57 (rightly or wrongly) to imply that Jesus was then close to his fiftieth year. If so he must have treated the unnamed feast of 5:1 as a passover, as most of the early fathers have done. This, however, is certainly a

misunderstanding.¹ Turner has shown that the Fourth Gospel fundamentally agrees with Mark in assuming a duration of *two* years for the ministry. Only at a comparatively late period, in fact, could the idea of a ministry of more than two years make any headway in the Church. The original scheme, then, will have contemplated a Galilean ministry concluded by a passover signalized by the miracle of the Loaves in Galilee, and after the Judæan ministry a second passover signalized by the Passion and Resurrection. The extra passover of 2: 13 ff. would fall, therefore, quite outside the plan. In point of fact we shall see that like the instance of 13: 36-38 already discussed, it stands immediately connected with one of the most notable of the "apparent displacements." The connective verses 23-25 lead over to a paragraph (3: 1-21) full of references and presuppositions which fall out of the implied situation. Of these we must take consideration in the succeeding chapter. Here we note only that, unlike the other visits of Jesus to Jerusalem at the great feasts distinctive of this Gospel, the incident and dialogue have no relation whatever to the ritual of the feast itself. The interview with Nicodemus deals with the doctrine of the "new birth" by water and the Spirit. Both by its relation of dependence to Mk. 10: 13-31,² and by its doctrinal purport, we should expect it to appear in connection with the feast of Tabernacles, when Jesus went up to Jerusalem at the desire of his brethren that he declare himself openly, and on the great day signalized by the rite of water pouring proclaimed the outpouring of the Spirit under this figure (7: 37-39). It certainly has no connection with the symbolism of

¹ See above, pp. 380, 409. Authorities no less important than Hitzig, Hilgenfeld, and van Bebbber have maintained that "the feast" (*ἡ ἑορτή vera lect.*) could only mean Pentecost, citing patristic authority. It seems more probable that *ἡ τῆς πεντεκοστῆς* has been canceled.

² See above, p. 382.

Passover. Only one other visit in the Gospel is thus barren of poetic analogy between the ritual of the feast and the "signs" and teaching of Jesus. It is that of 10: 22 f., which merely interjects the statement that

"It was at Jerusalem, the feast of dedication. It was winter, and Jesus was walking in Solomon's Porch."

So far from having any relation to the context this parenthetical date interposes an interval of three months between the two parts of a continuous dialogue! In 10: 1-21 Jesus has just vindicated his claim to be the Light of the world, already supported by the accompanying "sign" of giving sight to the blind, by the parable of the Good Shepherd. In verses 24-31 the Jews resent the implied claim to messianic leadership (the parable being obviously based on Ezek. 34: 23), and Jesus replies, continuing its imagery:

"Ye believe not because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you. My sheep hear my voice and I know them, and they follow me: and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand."

Advocates of the integrity of the original composition wish us to believe that it occurred to the author, after reaching the interlude of verses 19-21, that it would be a good thing for the audience to take an airing for three months, the lecturer resuming his theme at the next paragraph, his pupils, after their three months' vacation, opening their notebooks at the point of interruption. If this be not the motive it is incumbent on those who attribute Jn. 10: 22, 23 to the same hand as the adjoining context to point to some instance in literature, sacred or secular, of a mode of composition analogous to what they impute to the fourth evangelist. And with the majority of such "defenders" this is supposed to represent the graphic and precise detail of the eye-witness!

Whether the two verses 10:22 f. have simply been editorially transposed, as we were once disposed to think;¹ or as now seems more probable were added simultaneously with the passover incident of 2:13-25 to complete a total of *five* festal self-presentations of Jesus, is a question for our later consideration. At all events the two stand apart from the festal schematization of the Gospel as a whole, and suggest editorial addition by their flagrant violation of the context.

Having already anticipated the question of the dislocation of 3:1-21, anachronistically inserted after the editorial supplement of 2:13-25, we may now call attention to the fact that 2:1-12 is also disconnected from the preceding context; whereas 3:22 ff. resumes the narrative concerning the concurrent work of Jesus and John at the point of interruption, with the same scenes and the same dramatis personæ. The Wedding in Cana is in fact a pragmatized variation on the same theme as 3:29 f., the theme of Mk. 2:16-22 and of Mt. 11:16-19 = Lk. 7:31-35. On grounds independent of those urged by Delff and Wellhausen we must therefore regard 2:1-12 as equally alien to the original context with 2:13-25, though perhaps not added by the same hand. The real course of thought proceeds from 1:19-51 to 3:22 ff.

Starting thus from the Appendix we have been led back step by step to a perception of gaps and seams, structural faultings and dislocations throughout the substance of the Gospel. At first the textual evidence confirmed our inferences and even seemed to offer an explanation of the phenomena in some remarkable vicissitude of the period of scribal transmission. As we proceeded the phenomena proved

¹ This view is taken in the article in the *American Journ. of Theol.* for Oct., 1900, made the basis of Chapter XIX. It is credited by Holtzmann and Drummond to Rev. P. M. Strayer, whose article in the *Journal of Theol. Studies* appeared simultaneously. See below, p. 521, note.

to have occurred on too large a scale, and to be too slightly reflected in manuscript variation to admit of explanation through mere accident in transmission, or even to the archetypal text. Others, in particular Schwartz and Wellhausen, have carried out the investigation in detail with results more or less convincing, more or less affecting the general structure and character of the work. We have first the "parenthetic additions" which occur throughout the Gospel and which impel even an opponent of the higher critics like Blass to say:

"The thing we find does not look like a double form of the text [as in his theory of the Lukan writings] but like an uncommented text on the one side (not always preserved) and a text accompanied with different comments on the other."¹

But between these "parenthetic additions" and the larger phenomena pointed to by critics of the Analytical School it is impossible to draw a line of distinction. The duplications adduced by Wellhausen and others in Jn. 1: 19-23 = 24-28, and even more markedly in Jn. 18: 28-40 = 19: 1-16, have a significance which can no longer be ignored when led up to by the phenomena of both textual and higher criticism already cited. The supplementary manifestation to the disciples for the special benefit of Thomas in 20: 24-29, after in 19-23, eight days before, *all* the disciples have believingly welcomed the risen Lord *and been endowed with their great Commission and the gift of the Holy Ghost*, will certainly justify the very emphatic query which Wellhausen places over against it. Not unlike in motive to this reinforcement of the testimony to the physical character of the resurrection on the basis of Lk. 24: 36-43, are the interjected qualifications and reductions of the lofty "spiritualism" of the evangelist, repeatedly pointed out by critics from Weisse to Wendt. In the words "in the last day" in 6: 39b, 12: 48b,

¹ *Philology*, p. 233.

“and I will raise him up in the last day,” 6: 40b, 44b, and in 5: 28, 29 Scholten found evidence of the same hand “which in 21: 22, 23 represents the *parousia* as a visible return.” Wendt¹ finds the same coarsening of the sense of the context in Jn. 5: 28 f., and adds further instances of supplementation. Thus 12: 36b-43 is shown to cut off the concluding words of Jesus in 44-50 from the situation of 35-36a, so as to leave him without hearers, and 13: 18 f. to separate verse 20 from its connection with 16 f. Wellhausen finds the evidences of later change and supplementation so pervasive as to leave us in doubt whether it is permissible to speak of a Grundschrift at all. What he leaves as such is scarcely more than a heap of fragments. Instead of a Johannine writer we should have an Ephesian school, whose writings were cast in a common mold, but as now agglutinated present scarcely more than the appearance of consecutive story.

But enough. We are not now concerned with the extent to which the work of documentary analysis may conceivably be carried. Sufficient evidence has already been given without consideration of the more doubtful cases, to prove that this Gospel has certainly not escaped the fate of other writings of the kind. It has not retained the form its original author first gave it, but has experienced revision, recasting, and supplementation, perhaps repeatedly. As regards individual instances, especially such as depend exclusively on the critic's own sense of what “must have been” the author's intention, unsupported by textual evidence or direct connection with the Appendix, the prospect of agreement in opinion among the critics themselves is remote. As regards the fact, redactional revision, connected with the attachment of the Appendix and to some extent evincing a similar aim and point of view, is scarcely any longer open to doubt. The Analytical School of criticism has won at least its right to

¹ *Lehre Jesu*, I, pp. 249 f.

exist. As regards one great structural feature of the Gospel, the "apparent displacements," it gives promise of new and helpful light on the history of its composition, and of the meanings it has been made successively to bear. But for this phase of the subject a new chapter will be required.

CHAPTER XIX

DISLOCATIONS OF MATERIAL AND TATIAN'S ORDER ¹

Reference has already been made to a special phenomenon of the Fourth Gospel designated by Drummond its "apparent displacements," and variously accounted for by numerous observers of the fact. Some of these, such as Holtzmann and Drummond, account for it by the carelessness of the author "who cared more for the associations of thought than for the order of chronology." Others, such as Blass and Spitta, attribute it to accident, "omission of whole sentences" afterwards supplied from the margin, but at the wrong place, or accidental disarrangement of leaves in the autograph. Still others find their explanation in the process of editorial revision whose traces remain in other phenomena, notably in the addition of the Appendix.

In the preceding chapter enough of the phenomena have been adduced to prove the inadequacy of the two former explanations. As Wellhausen expresses it

"A writer may be careless and unskillful, and even sometimes a bit forgetful; but he must understand himself, and cannot all in a moment have no remaining idea of the content of his own expressions." ²

If, *e. g.*, Jn. 18:9 takes 17:12 in the physical sense when the spiritual is meant; or Jn. 18:24 misunderstands 18:13 as implying two places of detention where only one is meant, we have no alternative. It can only be another who commits

¹ Based in part upon the article "Tatian's Rearrangement of the Fourth Gospel," *Amer. Journ. of Theol.*, Oct., 1900.

² *Evang. Joh.*, p. 4.

the blunder. The author cannot have misunderstood himself.

Again the theory of accident is excluded almost at once by the magnitude of the phenomena, the paucity of remaining traces in the manuscripts and versions, and the evidences of the context. For the material adjoining these "apparent displacements" shows traces of editorial tinkering if not of some general plan and system in the rearrangement.

It is the question of plan and system which we have mainly to consider in the present chapter; for its bearing is manifestly more positive than negative. The phenomena being admitted, and explanations from the carelessness of the author, or accident in process of the transmission of his work, being found inadequate, are the evidences of editorial manipulation such as to throw any light upon the earlier form of the material and the nature and motives of the alteration?

A convenient and comprehensive summary of the various critical attempts to rectify the apparent disorder, from Hitzig in 1869 to that of the present writer in 1900 is given by H. J. Holtzmann, with his characteristic thoroughness, in the article already referred to.¹ The most important instances are the following:

¹ "Unordnungen und Umordnungen im vierten Evangelium," *Zts. f. ntl. Wiss.*, III (1902), pp. 50-60. The list includes F. Hitzig, *Gesch. d. Volkes Israel*, 1869, pp. 579 f.; Norris, *Journ. of Philology*, III (1871), pp. 107 f.; Bertling, "Eine Transposition im Evang. Joh.," *St. u. Krit.*, 1880, pp. 351-353; Spitta, *Zur Gesch. u. Litt. d. Urchristenthums*, I, 1893, pp. 155-204; Wendt, *Das Johannesevang.*, 1900, pp. 67-101; Burton, "The Purpose and Place of the Gospel of John," *Bibl. World*, XIII (1899); Strayer and C. H. Turner in *Journ. of Theol. Studies*, 1900, pp. 137-139 and 140-142; and the present writer's discussions in *Journ. of Bibl. Lit.*, 1894, pp. 64-76; *Am. Journ. of Theol.*, 1900, pp. 770-795, and in his *Introd. to N. T. Lit.*, 1900, pp. 272 ff. To these we may add as bearing on the same subject though based on a different theory, the analysis of H. Delff in *Das vierte Evang.*, etc., 1890, with its supplement *Neue Beiträge*, 1890, and *Gesch. d. Rabbi Jesus von Nazareth*, 1889. Delff finds the following material (besides chapter 21) due to later interpolation: 1: 1-6, 9-19; 2: 1-11; 4: 46-54; 5: 19-30; 6: 1-30,

1. Chapter 5 intervenes between two scenes of the Galilean ministry. From Cana and Capernaum, the scenes of 4: 46-54, one can go "away to the other side of the sea of Galilee" (6: 1), but not from Jerusalem, the scene of chapter 5. Moreover, all attempts to frame a consistent chronology break down before the juxtaposition of "the feast of the Jews" (var., "a feast") of 5: 1 and "the passover the feast of the Jews" of 6: 4. If the order of chapters 5 and 6 were inverted the feast of 5: 1 might be Pentecost, as the sense requires.

2. Jesus' justification of his healing on the Sabbath, 7: 15-24, continues the discourse of chapter 5, as if no interruption had occurred. Jesus is still defending himself against the charge of 5: 15-18, appealing as in 5: 39-47 to the spirit of Moses' law against those who are condemning him to death for a breach of its letter, although in the meantime the scene has changed to Galilee (chapter 6), and back again to Jerusalem (7: 1-13), where the preservation of his incognito is a condition of safety he feels bound to maintain (7: 1-8).¹

3. The denunciation, 10: 26 ff., continues the figure of the sheep which know their shepherd, 10: 4 f., and the flock kept and redeemed for the Father, 10: 10-18. Yet, in the meantime, situation, date, audience, and provocation are wholly changed (10: 22-25).

37-40, 59; 12: 26-31; 19: 35-38; 20: 11-19. Besides these larger additions he finds minor supplements in 2: 17, 21, 22; 4: 44; 6: 44, 54; 7: 39; 12: 16, 33; 13: 20.

¹ This instance was first pointed out by Bertling in the article "Eine Transposition im Evangelium Johannis," *Studien und Kritiken*, 1880, pp. 351-353. It was subsequently adopted by Wendt (*Lehre Jesu*, I, pp. 228 ff.). Both were unaware of the demonstration by J. P. Norris (*Journal of Philology*, III, 1871, pp. 107 ff.) that it is chapter 5 which has suffered transposition from before chapter 7, and not *vice versa*. The result of the received order is a complete dislocation of the Johannine chronology through 5: 1 and an extraordinary interruption of the account of the Galilean ministry by separating 4: 46-54 from its sequel 6: 1 ff.

4. Jesus' answer to the general disbelief, 12:44-50, is spoken *zum Fenster hinaus*. We reach a carefully elaborated ending of the public ministry in 12:36b-41, explaining the rejection of Jesus by his own people as a whole (*cf.* 1:11), as a fulfilment of the prophecy of Isaiah, so constantly appealed to by the Synoptists and by Paul (Isa. 6:9, 10; *cf.* Mt. 13:14 f.; Mk. 4:12; Lk. 8:10; Acts 28:25-28; Rom. 9:27, 33; 10:16-21). Jesus, after announcing the impending withdrawal of his light, has "departed and hid himself from them" (verse 36b). Yet he resumes again as if still continuing the discourse of 12:20-36, although the changed situation now makes it a "voice crying in the wilderness."

5. Chapter 14 is manifestly a farewell discourse; verses 25-31 explicitly give the parting benediction and declare that the opportunity for extended speech is over (verse 30); verse 31 summons the company to rise ready for departure. In an article, "The Displacement of John xiv," in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1894, the present writer undertook to show, in ignorance of Spitta's substantially identical arguments of slightly earlier date, that the "high-priestly prayer," chapter 17, must have originally followed, while the group is standing (the attitude of prayer, Mk. 11:25) in readiness for the departure, 18:1. The interruption of chapters 15, 16 seriously injures, not only this connection, but its own connection with chapter 13 (*cf.* 15:3 with 13:10; 15:12, 17 with 13:12-15, 34 f.; 15:16-16:3 with 13:20; but contrast 16:5 with 13:36; 14:5 ff.).

6. The story of Peter's denial, 18:14-18, is continued in verses 25b-27, necessitating the repetition of verse 18 in verse 25a. But in the meantime (verse 24) the situation has changed from the house of Annas to the palace of Caiaphas, with the result that Peter, who was standing among a group of servants gathered at a fire of coals in the court of the former, is now in precisely the same situation, in the same

group, and apparently at the same fire, but at the door, not of Annas, but of Caiaphas, before whom the examination of Jesus has been proceeding in verses 19-23.

All but the first two of these incongruities of order have been already touched upon because of their apparent connection with editorial insertions of synoptic material. Others, perhaps not less serious to the critic, though less easy to describe, have been noted in other parts of the Gospel, and are very properly brought by Wendt into relation with the discrepancy in point of view and religious feeling between the evangelist and his material, which we may illustrate in the following passages: 2: 21 f.; 4: 43-45; 7: 1, 14; 10: 7, 8^b, 9; 12: 29 f., 33; 13: 16, 20; 18: 9, and chapter 21 as a whole.¹

We need not wonder that none of the critics who have pointed out these incongruities of order or have attempted rearrangements, should have bethought himself to search for external evidence. But the experience which one after the other has gone through is too singular to be esteemed the result of accident. Bertling, Wendt, and Spitta all argued for the connection of 7: 15 ff. with chapter 5, but in manifest ignorance of Norris' much earlier argument for the transposition of chapter 5 after chapter 6, on largely identical grounds, though principally because of the chronological difficulties of the present order. The present writer, after arguing for the transposition of chapter 14, had the mingled pleasure and mortification of finding himself anticipated in almost every detail by Spitta. Such things must be expected where there is a *prima facie* case. But the anticipations are earlier still. Norris appends a paragraph to his article expressing his surprise to find himself forestalled by Ludolphus

¹ Professor Wendt has restated his views on the problem in his volume, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 1900. The analytical demonstration of composite origin is clearer and stronger than ever. One cannot say as much of the synthesis. The Apostle as author of the Epistles and the discourses of the Gospel is as improbable a character as ever.

de Saxonica, author of a fourteenth-century *Vita Christi*, "who seems to take it for granted that Jn. 6 should precede Jn. 5." Spitta, as we have seen, scarcely a year after the publication of his proposed rearrangement of Jn. 18: 12-27, viz., 18: 12 f., 19-24, 14-18, 25b ff., is shown by Mrs. Lewis' fortunate discovery at Sinai to be merely repeating the work of a second-century translator.

After such a discovery one could not but prolong the search, to see if the second century had not other writers able in like manner with the scribe of Syr. ^{sin.} to anticipate the keenness of the nineteenth-century expert, whether by the critic's method of conjecture based on internal evidence, or because possessed of unexplained sources of information. Our first thought would be of the work of Tatian in combining the four Gospels into a continuous narrative. Tatian's *Diatessaron*, recently brought to light, affords us a text of the Fourth Gospel, practically complete, descending from a date as remote as the radical criticism of but a few years ago was willing to admit for the origin of the Gospel itself. Does the order adopted in the *Diatessaron* throw any light upon the "apparent displacements" of John?

On the question of the plan adopted by Tatian in arranging the contents of the *Diatessaron*, we are glad to have the authority of Zahn, who in his attempt at reconstruction arrived at substantially the same order for its contents as we now find them possessing in the Arabic text. After examining the order with a view to discovering Tatian's method of procedure, Zahn reached the conclusion that

"in general Tatian has given a decided preference to the first and fourth gospels over the other two in fixing the order of events mentioned by more than one evangelist, and this for the obvious reason that, being of the number of the Twelve, and actively concerned in the events they were recording, they would be more likely to be correct in their description of them. Where a choice had to be

made between the first and fourth, he gave the preference to St. John's order, probably because that evangelist wrote later, and with a knowledge of what St. Matthew had already written." ¹

To this restatement and indorsement of Zahn's general conclusions Mr. Hill appends a very careful discussion of cases of displacement within the limits of an individual gospel, supplemented by a table (Appendix II) showing the disposition made of the entire contents of all the Gospels.

According to Hill:—

"Most of these displacements may be attributed to one or more of the following causes: (1) Tatian preferred the order of the event as given by another evangelist; (2) in relating two events which occurred *simultaneously* Tatian considered himself free to put either first, as seemed best to fit with his narrative, since in changing the evangelist's order he was not chronologically wrong; (3) in the case of short comments by the evangelist himself Tatian inserted them anywhere where they would fit in conveniently; (4) he permitted himself to make slight internal transpositions to improve the order of his narrative; (5) where two discourses of a similar nature occur in different gospels Tatian has sometimes blended them together, in spite of the fact that from their respective settings they appear to have been spoken at different dates or places; (6) in one or two instances Tatian has grouped together discourses on kindred subjects—or different aspects of the same subject—as though they had been spoken in immediate succession, which does not appear to have been the case; (7) having identified portions of two gospels, he has inferred that the parts which respectively follow them must have also happened at the same time and place, and has interwoven them accordingly." ²

With all this as describing the method of Tatian "in fixing the order of *events mentioned by more than one evangelist*" we find ourselves in accord, as well as with the inference

¹ From *The Diatessaron of Tatian*, by J. Hamlyn Hill, Introduction, p. 26, quoting Zahn.

² *Ibid.*, p. 31.

drawn that, with the possible exception of the identification of the Purging of the Temple in Jn. 2: 13-22 with that of the Synoptists, Tatian's changes of order of this kind are not due to any lingering oral tradition, but are purely harmonistic. What we have to do with is a totally different class of displacements, distinguished (1) as being limited to the Fourth Gospel, Tatian's principal standard of order; (2) as not due to adjustment to the Synoptists, (a) because it is Tatian's principle to do the reverse of this, (b) because they occur in passages which for the most part have no synoptic parallel; (3) as not due to any of the enumerated causes, such as might partly cover rearrangements independent of correspondence with other Gospels. In fact, they are neither "short comments," nor "slight," nor mere collocations of "discourses on kindred subjects," nor have they been carried over with other transposed material. On the contrary, if we take, *e. g.*, the conversation with the Samaritan woman, we shall find its historical framework, *viz.*, the journey, which might have been brought into harmonistic identification with some synoptic account of Jesus' movements, kept in place; while the incident itself is removed to Part III of the Johannine narrative. More exactly, Tatian leaves Jn. 4: 1-3*a* in its connection with 3: 22-36, but instead of continuing, as we should expect, with the ministry in Samaria, 4: 4-45*a*, he takes out all this and locates it in the journey of Mk. 7: 31, so that Jesus, after healing the daughter of the Syrophenician woman, "came unto the sea of Galilee, towards [*sic*] the borders of Decapolis (Mk. 7: 30-37) . . . and as he was passing through the land of Samaria he came to a city of the Samaritans called Sychar (Jn. 4: 4-42) . . . and after the two days Jesus went forth from thence and departed into Galilee, and . . . the Galileans received him (43-45*a*)."¹ But the only incident of this stay in Galilee is

¹ Jn. 4: 45*b* is utilized a little farther on as an editorial comment.

the Healing of the Leper, Mk. 1:41-45.¹ Jesus passes on immediately to a feast at Jerusalem, viz., that of the fifth chapter of John, which here follows. Relatively to the Gospel of John the result is to transpose, not only the Samaritan ministry, Jn. 4:4-42, but Jn. 5:1-47 as well, whose relation we have seen to be, not with the Galilean ministry which it now interrupts, but with a subsequent feast in Jn. 7 in connection with this very chapter. Is it not possible that we have here an explanation of the unexplained transposition which Norris was so surprised to find in Ludolph de Saxonica? For Tatian's *Diatessaron* circulated in an ancient High German and Latin bilingual translation as early as the ninth century.²

But neither Jn. 4:4-42 nor Jn. 5:1-47 has any synoptic parallel, in "subject of discourse" or similarity of incident, close enough to influence Tatian. He could have let either remain precisely where it stood in position relative to the Fourth Gospel, so far as the rest of his material was concerned. Nor is he influenced by a desire to coördinate the Healing of the Centurion's Son, Jn. 4:48-54, with its Synoptic parallel (Mt. 8:4-13=Lk. 7:1-10); for the two are to him entirely independent incidents.³ Either reflecting on the early particularism of Jesus, Mt. 10:5; 15:24, he was driven by historico-critical motives to disregard the order of his supposedly dominant authority, or—he had reason to think these incidents came later.

¹ Embellished by the substitution of Lk. 5:12 for Mk. 1:40, and Lk. 5:15b, 16 for the last clause of Mk. 1:45. But, although Tatian brings down this healing of the leper of Mk. 1:40-45 to a date and circumstances almost identical with those of the leper healing of Lk. 17:11-19 he makes no identification of the two, for this would of course have involved an alteration of the text.

² Cf. Sievers, *Tatian*, 1872, pp. 1 ff.

³ He places Jn. 4:48-54 before Lk. 4:44; Mt. 4:13-16, as the first event of the Galilean ministry. The data of time and place in Jn. 4:46 compelled this.

We need only tabulate Tatian's resultant order for the Fourth Gospel, underscoring transposed material, to see how inadequate are the causes thus far suggested to account for the changes. The order is as follows:

(§ i) Jn. 1: 1-5,¹ 7-28, 29-31, 32-34, 35-51; 2: 1-11; ² 3: 22-4: 3a ("and he left Judea").

(§ ii) 4: 46-54 (2: 23b-25);³ 6: 1b,⁴ 2b-5a, 5b-9, 10, 12-13, 14-18, 19a, 21b, 22-71.

(§ iii) 4: 4-45a (to "the Galileans received him"); 5: 1-47; (4: 45b).⁵

(§ iv) 7: 1, 2-10a, 10b-31 (5: 1a);⁶ 2: 14a, 14b-15, 16, 17-22; 3: 1-21; 7: 31-52;⁷ 8: 12-11: 57; 12: 1 f., 9-11, 3a, 3b-6, 7b, 8a, 16,⁸ 12 f., 17 f., 19-36a, 42-50, 36b-41.

(§ v) 13: 1-20, 21a, 22, 23-29, 30-32, 33-36, 37b, 38a; 14: 1-31a, 31b; 15: 1-18: 2, 4a, 4b-9, 10 f., 12a, 12b-17, 18a, 18b, 19-25a, 26a, 26b, 28a, 28b, 29 f., 31-38a (to "and went out again unto the Jews"), 39 f.; 19: 2, 3b-15, 16a, 16b, 17a, 17c, 23 f., 19-22,⁹ 25-27, 28-29a, 30a, 30b, 31-37, 38b, 38d-42; 20: 2-17, 18-19, 20b-21: 24, 25.

In the above table the divisions clearly marked by the subject-matter of the Fourth Gospel are indicated by §-marks,

¹ Jn. 1: 6=Lk. 3: 1-3, omitted as duplicate.

² 2: 12 omitted, probably as=Mt. 4: 13-16, which follows Jn. 4: 46-54; 2: 13 is purely connective and duplicate.

³ This editorial comment Tatian has adapted to his own uses by omitting verse 23a. He appends it to the first section of the Galilean ministry before the sending of the Seventy.

⁴ 6: 1a is combined with Mt. 14: 13a. The interruptions and slight omissions in 6: 1-21 are, of course, due to the closeness of the parallel here interwoven from the Synoptists.

⁵ Another editorial comment adapted by Tatian to his own uses, in connection with the Feeding of the four thousand.

⁶ Utilized a *second time* to introduce Lk. 17: 11 ff.

⁷ This verse (7: 31) is repeated. See above.

⁸ The changes of order and omissions in 12: 1-16, including the omission of 14 f., are to be accounted for as in 6: 1-21.

⁹ On chapters 18, 19 see the preceding note.

separating the content into periods: (§ i) the Ministry of John; (§ ii) the Galilean ministry of Jesus; (§ iii) a Journey through Samaria and Galilee, and visit to Jerusalem (*cf.* Lk. 9: 51-56; 10: 38; and especially 17: 11); (§ iv) the Peræan Ministry; (§ v) the Passion and Resurrection. These are, of course, entirely broken through by Tatian, who multiplies journeys between Jerusalem and Galilee in the interest of harmonization. But the distinction we have drawn between transpositions which can be accounted for on the principles established by Zahn and Hill, and those which are impossible to reduce under them, is unmistakably apparent. Wherever the synoptic account runs closely parallel, Tatian in the main reduces it to the order of John, showing his regard for this Gospel not merely thus, but by the reverential care with which he has worked in almost every word of it at the expense of the Synoptists, the only omitted portions being mere connective material or editorial comment, and the rare instances where the fuller account of the Synoptic writers made it impossible to introduce some word or two of the Johannine story without a degree of tautology so palpable as to be absurd. The omissions from John scarcely amount in all to a dozen verses,¹ and the transpositions, if we set aside the three great masses of material underscored in §§ iii and iv, are practically non-existent, affecting only the rearrangement of a brief sentence or two, to adapt it to the composite story.²

¹ Of course, we do not include 7: 53-8: 11, the spurious fragment on the woman taken in adultery, which formed no part of the Fourth Gospel in Tatian's day.

² A complete list of these minor transpositions is as follows: (1) Jn. 12: 1-16 (anointing in Bethany and triumphal entry). (a) Jn. 12: 9-11, which describes the circumstances of the anointing, precedes instead of following it, attaching to the corresponding element of Mk. 14: 3a. This is clearly, as Mr. Hill has noted, "for the sake of neatness in the combined account." (b) Verse 16, the editorial comment on 14 f., is necessarily attached to the

Entirely different motives must have controlled in the transposition of (1) the Purging of the Temple and Dialogue with Nicodemus (2: 14-3: 21), (2) the Samaritan ministry (4: 4-45a), (3) the Feast at Jerusalem (5: 1-47), (4) Jesus' Self-vindication (12: 42-50). Of these five masses of material 2: 14-22 and 3: 1-21 are transposed from the period of the Baptist's ministry to separate occasions of the final stay in Jerusalem and vicinity; 4: 4-45a and 5: 1-47, from the Galilean ministry to the journey through Samaria and Perea after the crisis in Galilee; and 12: 42-50, from after to before verses 36b-41. In only one of these instances is there a Synoptic parallel close enough to suggest harmonization as a motive, and in this (2: 14-22) it is difficult, considering the ease with which modern harmonists resort to the standard device of *two* temple-cleansings, to imagine that Tatian, who resorts to similar devices to a still higher degree, should have been actuated by harmonistic motives alone.¹ The question remains: Was Tatian a higher critic, reasoning from internal evidence and the natural probabilities of the case; or had he external evidence, oral or written, independent of our Synoptic Gospels? The answer is to be found only by careful scrutiny of the transpositions. If the context itself is of a nature easily to suggest the propriety of their removal, while more profound investigation shows a latent suitability to the connection in which we have been accustomed to read them, they will be due to arbitrary con-

substitute, Mt. 21: 3b-5, and thus loses its relative position. (2) The division of Jesus' garments by the executioners, 19: 23 f., precedes instead of following the account of the title on the cross, verses 20-22, the order of Matthew being here followed (exceptionally) in preference to John, obviously because it purports to be chronological, while that of John does not. (3) In three instances (2: 23b-25; 4: 45b; 5: 1a) Tatian has utilized brief touches of editorial comment for his own purposes.

¹ As we have seen, even Mr. Hill admits this as an exceptional case where tradition might have had an influence.

jecture on Tatian's part. We may be astonished at the boldness and skill of this early precursor of German criticism, but it will be certain that the critic must consent to see himself both anticipated and outdone in his chosen field. If, *per contra*, the context gives no such superficial suggestion of displacement, but on closer scrutiny reveals a deep-seated superiority in the order obtained *after* the transposition, especially if this phenomenon be accompanied by apparent lack of appreciation on Tatian's part of the real nature and effect of the change, we may infer that he possessed some source of external evidence inaccessible to us.

It will be simpler to consider first the removals, and afterward the new location assigned, and, beginning with the case most favorable to the idea of unsupported conjecture as Tatian's motive, we may look first at the fifth instance, the removal of 12:42-50. Wendt and others, as we know, had pointed out the incongruity of the situation in 12:44 ff.,¹ though even this was disputed by so able a scholar as Holtzmann; but it seems to have needed the superior acumen of Tatian to perceive that the real break is after verse 41, all that follows serving only to weaken the force of the dramatic conclusion which quotes the prediction of Isaiah.² Let us credit Tatian with the eye to perceive this, and return to the removals from chapters 1-6.

Let it be granted that Tatian removed 2:14-22 to combine it with Mt. 21:12 ff., and omitted verse 12 as duplicating Mt. 4:13-16; we have still to explain why the Passover visit to Jerusalem, 2:13, 23-25, is canceled, and the dialogue with Nicodemus, 3:1-21, removed, in spite of the fact that the journey from Cana of Galilee (2:11) to "the Judean

¹ *Lehre Jesu*, I, p. 236.

² For an independent appreciation of the character of this locus classicus of the New Testament writers see the review of Jülicher's *Gleichnissreden*, by Sanday, in *Journal of Theological Studies*, January, 1900.

country" (3: 22) is retained. Surely we have all read this entire context many times with the mental removal of the incident of the temple-cleansing, 2: 14-22, into the connection of its synoptic parallels, Mt. 21: 12 ff., etc., and felt no incongruity in the remainder. Yet how extraordinarily felicitous, for a purely accidental result, is the connection which ensues when we pass directly from 2: 1-11 to 3: 22-4: 3, and thence back to Cana and Capernaum in 4: 46-54! No longer does the expression "came into the Judean country" sound strangely, when Galilee, not Jerusalem, is the point of departure. Moreover, the entire period of ministry before the imprisonment of John, a unit save for the episode of the wedding at Cana, 2: 1-11,¹ becomes natural and intelligible, a prelude to the opening scenes of the synoptic story, which throws a flood of light upon it instead of contradicting it, and removes the serious difficulties of the chronology.

But the greatest surprise is the transposition of the Dialogue with Nicodemus (3: 1-21) into the midst of chapter 7, where verse 31 is repeated to accommodate its insertion. With all their acumen not one of our modern critics had observed the anachronistic assumptions of this paragraph in its present context. But Tatian, if his transposition was based on critical reflection, observed (*a*) that it is not natural that Nicodemus should speak as in 3: 2, when no particular "sign" done in Jerusalem had been mentioned; (*b*) that the dialogue suggests longer and fuller acquaintance with Jesus' teaching than the assumed circumstances admit; (*c*) that Jesus' reference to his impending rejection and death and

¹ Treated by Delff as secondary (*Beiträge*, p. 18) on the following grounds: (1) the impossibility of the journey from Bethabara to Cana in the time assigned (2: 1); (2) the impossibility that Jesus' disciples, who had only become such a day or two preceding, should have been invited (2: 4); (3) Jesus appears in a character (2: 5) such as belongs only to the period after 2: 12; (4) the character of the *σημεῖον* in contrast with all the other Johannine *σημεῖα*.

the judgment to come, 3: 11-15, 18 ff., is incongruous with 3: 26-30 and the whole period of the early ministry, agreeing better with Jn. 8: 15; 12: 47 f., and the period when Jesus' life was sought. Similarly it is not difficult to perceive, *when our attention has been called to the fact*, that there are serious obstacles to placing a Samaritan ministry before the very beginning of the ministry in Galilee. Jn. 4: 4-42 becomes incongruous at that time in its historical substance. We should expect the Galileans to raise the cry of Jn. 8: 48. And what of the public, unreserved recognition of Jesus as the Messiah, 4: 26, 42? The difficulty is surely great enough, even if we place it with Tatian *after* Cæsarea Philippi, and the dealings with the Samaritans *after* the restriction of Mt. 10: 5 f. had been corrected by the experience of Mt. 15: 24-28, and Jesus' attitude toward Samaritans had altered (Lk. 9: 51 ff.). A historical critic of the first order might conceivably have been moved by considerations such as these to place the incidents of Jn. 3: 1-21 and 4: 4-42 later on in his "Life of Christ." But was this Tatian's idea? Apparently not, since he retained 4: 43-45 (except verse 45^b), which he would surely have treated as he does 2: 23-25 if he had acted on critical grounds.

Our Matthew, the same that Tatian employs, has no relation to the order of Jn. 2-4. But we need only remove the portions known to be derived from Mark, viz., Mt. 4: 18 ff. and 8: 1-4, inclosing the Sermon on the Mount, which all critics recognize as prematurely placed, to come upon an underlying connection in Mt. 4: 12 ff.; 8: 5 ff., which bears a remarkable resemblance to that of Jn. 3: 22-4: 3, 46-54. The correspondence becomes all the stronger when the editorial comment of Mt. 4: 14-17 is removed, and Jn. 2: 12 brought into the relation with 4: 46-54 which the handling of its substitute, Mt. 4: 12 f., by Tatian suggests. Nor does it stop at this point. Take out the next passage borrowed

from Mark, viz., 8: 14-16 (= Mk. 1: 29-34), with the editorial comment, verse 17, and what follows? The verses 18-22, which form so curious an exception to the chain of ten miracles common to Mark, in Mt. 8-9, and which begin: "Now when Jesus saw great multitudes about him he gave commandment to depart unto the other side." Precisely as in *Tatian's order*, Jn. 6: 1 ff. follows upon 4: 46-54! What can account for these facts more simply than the supposition that Tatian was influenced in his arrangement of the order by some unknown source—let us say the *Ev. Hebr.*—in which the order underlying Matthew and Mark still survived unchanged? If so there will be nothing strange in the resultant order seeming often to improve upon our John, for, as Holtzmann has shown,¹ this Gospel has a relation not yet explained to the *Ev. Hebr.*

We need not raise Delff's question whether the marriage in Cana, 2: 1-11, forms part of the original story, for the "original" story lies farther back than we are now attempting to go. The arguments brought against this episode would lose much of their force if we removed it to the position of 4: 46a, in the interval between the close of the work of baptizing with John and the opening of that in Capernaum; cf. 3: 24 (suggesting the omission of a parallel to Mt. 4: 12) and 4: 54. Such transposition, however, is a mere possibility, unsupported by Tatian, who connects 2: 1-11 with 3: 22 ff. Few competent judges, however, will deny the improved connection which results in Jn. 1-4 from the removals *made by Tatian*. His resultant order for §§ i-iii gives the story of the pre-Galilean and Galilean ministries as follows:

(§ i) Prologue, 1: 1-18; ² Jesus and the Baptist, 1: 19-51; [2: 1-11]³ 3: 22-4: 3a ("and he left Judæa").

¹ *Einleitung*, p. 441.

² Verses 6-8 and 15 are assigned by us to R. See above, p. 458.

³ See above, p. 510, note.

(§ ii) Jesus begins his Work, 4: 46-54 (Healing of Nobleman's Son in Capernaum); 6: 1-71 (Feeding of 5,000, Walking on Sea, Discourse in Capernaum, Confession of Peter).

(§ iii) Samaritan Ministry and First Visit to Jerusalem, 4: 4-45*a* (to "the Galileans received him"); 5: 1-47.¹

It is certainly supposable that Tatian reached this surprisingly consistent and reasonable result by mere harmonistic conjecture. If so, two preliminary inferences may already be set down: (1) His abilities as a historical critic have been immensely underrated. (2) He was far less bound than Zahn and Hill suppose by the assumption of superior historical accuracy on the part of John the "eye-witness." It remains for determination hereafter (*a*) whether this order really heals the "apparent displacements" of the Johannine material, and (*b*) whether it agrees with the relation we have seen to subsist fundamentally between the order of this Gospel as a whole and that of Mark. Meantime we have to consider § iv which covers the period corresponding to the so-called "Peræan Ministry" of Mk. 9 f. = Lk. 10-18. For the section on the final Passover in Jerusalem (§ v) naturally contains no change of order, the problem here requiring only the insertion of the farewell discourse and prayer into the Synoptic story.

The transposition of Jn. 12: 42-50 from after to before 12: 36*b*-41, unlike that of 2: 14-22 (Purging of the Temple) which Tatian removes to a position nearer to, though not at the final Passover,² is of course quite independent of Synoptic influence. Tatian shows the consciousness by his change of reading in verse 42 (*καί* for *ὁμῶς μέντοι*) that this verse could

¹ By including the descriptive material 4: 43-45 (verse 45*b* is used for editorial purposes at the end of chapter 5) Tatian brings Jesus back to Galilee before going up to Jerusalem. Cf. Mk. 7: 24 ff., 9: 30 ff., and Lk. 9: 51 ff.

² In Tatian's order Jn. 2: 14-22 is followed by Jn. 10: 22, 40 (Dedication); 11: 1 ff., 54; Lk. 9: 51 ff. and finally Jn. 12: 1 ff. (final Passover).

not follow (unchanged) after verse 36*a*. It may well be that here he is simply trying, as others have since tried, to heal a manifest dislocation.¹ At all events this slight internal transposition manifestly belongs in a different category from those of §§ i-iii., and does not even fully heal the disorder of chapter 12. We cannot infer more from it than a perception on Tatian's part that verses 36*b*-41 containing the explicit statement of Jesus' final withdrawal from public teaching, followed by the evangelist's comment on its result, *cannot* be followed by a resumption of the teaching (albeit without auditors) in verses 44-50. Even this, however, is significant.

If now we return to the three elements excerpted by Tatian from the Galilean ministry to insert at a later point, viz., Samaritan Woman (4: 4-45), Outbreak of Opposition (chapter 5), and Interview with Nicodemus (3: 1-21) it will be in order to put the following questions: (1) What results from the new order in the intrinsic consistency of the Johannine narrative? (2) Is it brought into closer relation with synoptic story? (3) If so, how is the relation to be accounted for?

The incident of the Samaritan Woman we have already seen to be the Johannine counterpart of the synoptic story of the Syrophenician, identically placed by Matthew and Mark *after* the material corresponding to Jn. 6. Luke, however, cancels this Markan ministry to Gentiles, and inserts in nearly the same relative position (Lk. 9: 51 ff.) a visit of Jesus with the Twelve to "a certain village of the Samaritans." So far as the intrinsic consistency and logical sequence of the Fourth

¹ In the original form of the present chapter it was proposed to further transpose 12: 1-19 after 20-36*a* giving the order 11: 47-53, 54-57; 12: 20-36*a*, 1-19, 42-50, 36*b*-41. Thus the Greeks of 12: 20 ff. would approach Jesus in his seclusion at Ephraim (11: 54) through his intimates (12: 20 ff.), and the scenes of 12: 20 ff. be prepared for in 11: 54-57 as those of the visit at Tabernacles (5: 2-47; 7: 15-30) in 7: 11-13. But *cf.* Wellhausen (*Evang. Joh.*, pp. 56-58) and see below.

Gospel is concerned, slight fault comparatively can be found with its present position. True it is not *historically* conceivable that Jesus should engage in such a colloquy on such a subject under the supposed circumstances; nor that he should publicly announce himself to the Samaritans as the Messiah, and "the Savior of the World" (4: 26, 42). But we have no reason to suppose that the fourth evangelist was in the least troubled by such reflections. Indeed the evidence of 1: 29, 36, 45, 49 is conclusive that he did not. Similarly Mt. 10: 5 f. is inconsistent with this early ministry in Samaria. But this is just one of the peculiarities of the Jewish-Christian Gospel with which the Ephesian evangelist is completely out of sympathy. Tatian, then, was certainly not moved by the lack of consistency of this incident with its context to transfer it to another.¹ If he had the sagacity to perceive its subtle relation to the Markan incident of the Syrophenician Woman he may have effected the transfer as the most astute of harmonists, one who at the same time had the keen eye of the trained historical critic. The third alternative is that some other evangelic writing, accessible to him but not to us, enabled him to perceive this relation. We have suggested the *Ev. Hebr.*

Next in Tatian's revised order of Johannine incidents comes the Visit to Jerusalem at Pentecost of chapter 5. Here the context itself gives evidence of structural dislocation. Hitzig wished to place this chapter after chapter 3. Norris after chapter 6. Independently of these, and to some extent of one another, Bertling, Wendt, and Spitta successively

¹ Mr. Hill's statement regarding Tatian's apparently motiveless transfer of this incident from Jesus' northward journey in Jn. 4: 1-3, to the journey "from Tyre and Sidon through Decapolis to the sea of Galilee" of Mk. 7: 24-37 is as follows: "Tatian seems to make this happen on the way from Galilee to Judæa, if we connect it with the opening of this chapter; this is the reverse of John's order (Jn. 4: 3). Yet at the close of this visit (4: 43) Jesus departs from Sychar to Galilee as in St. John's gospel."

showed that the paragraph 7: 15-24 is the real conclusion of chapter 5, improperly removed from it. Their remedy was to move the smaller fragment toward the larger, not conversely. Burton brought their results into accord with those of Norris by proposing the order chapter 6; chapter 5; 7: 15-24, 1-14, 25 ff. He added the further transposition of 7: 45-52 after verse 36, to avoid the absurdity that the officers sent to apprehend Jesus do not report to their superiors till several days after. Here, then, was evidence, "highly probable" in the judgment even of Blass, of real structural dislocation of the Gospel.

How comes it that the removal of chapter 5 by Tatian from between 4: 46-54 and 6: 1 ff. not only results in a connection as perfect as between 2: 11 and 3: 22 ff., but also removes at a stroke many of the inherent difficulties of matter and form observed by the critics? What can be more natural than the connection of 4: 46-54 with 6: 1 ff.? Jesus has done a mighty work of healing in Capernaum. He crosses "to the other side of the sea of Galilee . . . and a great multitude followed him, because they beheld the signs which he did on them that were sick." Intercalate chapter 5, and we have Jesus in Jerusalem defending his life against the rabbis in a great dialectic discourse. The occasion, we learn from an editorial note of the stereotyped form (5: 1), was "a feast of the Jews," but to this day the dispute is unsettled *what* feast, every possible feast being discordant with what immediately precedes (4: 35) and what immediately follows (6: 4). And now the discourse against the rabbis in the temple breaks off abruptly, without a hint of how Jesus escapes, or even whether he did escape, and (from *Jerusalem*) he "crossed over to the other side of (*ἀπὸ τῆς ἄλλης πέραν*) the sea of Galilee," etc. One would almost say in this case Tatian must have seen the incongruity of chapter 5 between 4: 46-54 and chapter 6, and removed it for that reason. And yet readers for eighteen centuries did not

notice it. Harmonists did not notice it. Critics did not notice it. Bertling, Wendt, and Spitta, searching the Gospel for this very matter of dislocations, did not notice it, *even after they had perceived that the close of chapter 5 must connect with 7: 15 ff.* There is, in short, a *partial* repair of the dislocation. The sequence of events up to the end of the Galilean ministry is restored. The broken parts of chapter 5 and 7: 15-24 are brought much closer together. But they do not meet. There is no indication that Tatian had before him any other form of the Fourth Gospel than our own.

But was Jn. 5 simply carried over along with Jn. 4: 4-45a, into the period of wanderings at the very close of the Galilean ministry? Or had Tatian some reason to realize that its contents relate to the same Growth of Opposition which Mark (prematurely) introduces in Mk. 2: 1-3: 6, and Q presents as a series of discourses on How they were Stumbled in Him, Mt. 11: 1-12: 45 (except supplements) = Lk. 7: 18-50; 11: 14-26? We have one or two hints that the latter was the case.

(1) Between the incident of the Samaritan Woman (Jn. 4: 4-45a) and the Outbreak of Opposition in Jerusalem (Jn. 5) Tatian inserts the Healing of the Leper (Lk. 5: 12; Mk. 1: 41-45a; Lk. 5: 15b, 16), the same which immediately precedes the Markan section on the Growth of Opposition, reflecting perhaps the clause of Q "the lepers are cleansed" (Mt. 11: 5 = Lk. 7: 22).

(2) Mark's own narrative continues in 3: 7-35 with the account of how Jesus dealt with the increasing multitude of his disciples, resisting the mistaken *intervention of his mother and brethren*. But the Johannine parallel to this is 7: 1-14, which both in Tatian's order and that of our Fourth Gospel cuts off 7: 15-24, the concluding paragraph of the Outbreak of Opposition in Jerusalem (chapter 5). Moreover, indications are not wholly wanting in the close correspondence of

Mk. 3:6 with Mk. 12:13, and the different setting given in Matthew and Luke to much of the material embodied at this point of Mark's narrative, that in some other early source it was introduced at a later period, perhaps as late as where Tatian has placed it, between the Journey through Phenicia and Decapolis (Mt. 15:21-28) and the Second Miracle of the Loaves (Mt. 15:29-39).

But we must turn our attention finally to Tatian's third great transposition, the removal of the Interview with Nicodemus (Jn. 3:1-21) from a position before the opening of the Ministry in Galilee to the middle of that in Peræa. It is conceivable again that this section (*Diatess.* xxxii, 27^b-47) was carried over in conjunction with the incident of the Purging of the Temple (*Diatess.*, xxxii, 1-11), although the connecting link (Jn. 2:23-25) is employed elsewhere (*Diatess.* xv, 12-14). The synoptic journey to Jerusalem through Peræa and Jericho thus receives as its occasioning feast not the final Passover, mention of which is reserved to *Diatess.* xxxix, 1 = Jn. 12:1, but "the feast of Tabernacles" of Jn. 7:1 ff. (= *Diatess.* xxviii, 1-32).¹ But we are more concerned with the effect of the transposition upon the intrinsic consistency of the Johannine story, and its relation to synoptic, than with Tatian's motive. The effect is as follows. Once insert Jn. 3:1-21 after 7:30 and not only do we have better connection for the section on Jesus and John (Jn. 1-3), but both the story of the Visit at Tabernacles (Jn. 7) and the interjected Interview with Nicodemus (3:1-21) lose their inconsistencies and become reciprocally intelligible. The mighty works referred to in 3:2 no longer require to be sup-

¹ Inconsistent with this is the clause, *Diatess.* xxx, 31a, "After these things was the Jews' feast of Unleavened Bread." But these words are not found in any of our Gospels. They are a mere imitation of Jn. 5:1 which was already employed in xxii, 9. They may have formed no part of the original *Diatessaron*.

plied out of nothing. The reference is to the miracle of 5: 2 ff. already treated as typical in 7: 3. Nicodemus' coming by night is no longer a motiveless timidity; real danger is involved in open association with the sabbath-breaker of 5: 1-18; 7: 15-24. Nicodemus' hints at the high claims of Jesus (3: 1) have good ground in the discourse on the authority of the Son of man exceeding that of Moses (5: 19-47). Jesus, on his part, is prepared to take still higher ground, referring to the unbelief and rejection he has met on the part of the teachers of Israel (3: 11 f.; *cf.* 5: 38-47), predicting his violent death (3: 13-15; *cf.* 5: 18; 7: 19), and declaring the judgment that will fall on the wilfully unbelieving (3: 16-21; *cf.* 5: 27, 30 ff., 42-47). How strange all this, if as yet he has had nothing but acceptance (2: 23; 3: 2)! How incomprehensible the tone of denunciation of the teachers of Israel as a class, and the assumption of rejection and death as a foregone conclusion, if in 3: 26-30 the joy of Jesus' universal welcome is still as that which surrounds bridegroom and bride! But insert 3: 1-21 after 7: 30, and the strange outcome of this first great conflict in Jerusalem is illuminated. After the philippic with which the attempt to kill him for sabbath-breaking had been met, and the pharisaic zealots, though plotting, are cowed for a time (7: 25-30), we have the night visit of the rabbi, who goes from it prepared to play his part of secret friend (3: 1-21). The belief of the multitude, wondering at the miracle, provokes a second half-hearted attempt (7: 31 ff., 45 ff.), but the very boldness of Jesus' appeal (7: 33-36) gives him a partial acceptance with the multitude, while Nicodemus plays the part of Gamaliel (Acts 5: 33-42) in the Sanhedrin (7: 45-52). The section winds up¹ with a picture of the divided state of opinion (7: 37-44).

Are we, then, to suppose that Tatian had the critical

¹ Adopting Burton's transposition.

acumen to see the incongruity of 3: 1-21 in its present setting, and its appropriateness after 7: 30? Hardly; for in that case he would not have introduced the section one verse too far along, viz., after verse 31, so that, having thus broken the unmistakable connection of verse 31 with 32, he is obliged to *repeat* verse 31 before going on with verses 32 ff.¹

On the other hand, we have observed in other connection² that the Interview with Nicodemus is in reality the Johannine counterpart to the synoptic story of the Rich Ruler (Mk. 10: 17-22 and parallels), in its inclosing lessons on becoming as "little children" (verses 13-16) and entering into the kingdom of God along Jesus' way of martyrdom and by his "baptism" (verses 23-45). May it be, perhaps, that Tatian in giving Jn. 3: 1-21 the position of this synoptic story as the central incident of the Peræan ministry had light which we do not have, from evangelic sources that stood between the Johannine and the synoptic?

As we have seen, the transpositions of Tatian do not wholly restore the "apparent displacements" of the Fourth Gospel. Both in ancient and modern times careful readers have found these structural faultings, and in various ways have attempted to restore the logical order. Tatian himself, at least in the transposition of Jn. 12: 42-50 from after 36b-41 to before it, would seem to have been following the same conjectural road pursued by Syr.,^{sin.} Ludolf de Saxonica, Luther and Beza, Hitzig, Norris, Bertling, Spitta, Wendt, Burton and the rest. The most we can reasonably infer from this largely independent consensus is that the dislocations are not merely "apparent" but real. Were it otherwise transposition would not effect improvement of

¹ Cf. the repetition of 5: 1a, and the division of 4: 45. Perhaps Tatian was influenced by the resemblance of 2: 23-25 (which he utilizes elsewhere) to this verse.

² Above, p. 382.

order and consistency, but confusion worse confounded on both sides. Nor can we hope to reconstruct a Grundschrift by all our conjectural restorations, even supported, as they have sometimes turned out to be, by the unexpected testimony of authorities as ancient as Tatian or Syr.^{sin.} We cannot reasonably expect more than to obtain a fleeting glimpse at simpler forms and conditions of the Johannine material, hints of a time when men knew it not altogether and exclusively as it is known to us. Critical restorations will hardly secure unanimous consent. Nevertheless the attempt to go behind the canonical is not fruitless. Internal indications have already sufficed in several of the instances first enumerated to explain the disorder. They may conduct us further still. In particular the apparent dislocations of Jn. 8-10, for which some ten years ago we ourselves sought a remedy in the transposition first of 10: 22-25 to stand at the head of a section devoted to Jesus' doings and sayings at the feast of Dedication,¹ then of subordinate parts as internal evidence seemed to indicate, are capable of a much simpler explanation. It is true that the interruption of 10: 22 f., cutting off the colloquy of 10: 1-21 from its sequel in 24-42 is intolerable. Not only could a colloquy not be thus resumed in fact after an interval of three months. It is not even probable that it could be so resumed in conception. "An author must understand himself. He cannot all at once have no further idea of the import of his own expressions." The date 10: 23 f. is therefore in all probability a later insertion. In its present context, as we have noted,² it falls

¹ Bacon, *Am. Journ. of Theol.*, October, 1900, pp. 790 ff. The Rev. Mr. Strayer's proposal to transpose Jn. 10: 22 f. to the same position, published on the same date in *Journ. of Theol. Studies* (ii, pp. 137 ff.), is not a genuine instance of coincidence in results by independent investigators, Mr. Strayer having been a member of Professor Bacon's *seminar* on the Johannine Literature in the preceding year.

² Above, p. 409. Wellhausen extends this verdict to 6: 4 also. But the

outside what seems to be the festal scheme of the evangelist. Nor is it required to explain the symbolism of the discourses of chapters 8-9, beginning "I am the Light of the world," and the sign of the healing of the man born blind. Dedication was indeed known as "the Feast of Lights" because of the illumination which then as now formed the distinctive feature of its celebration. But Tabernacles also had its "lights" of the golden candelabra in the court of the women, where Jesus stands in 8: 20, "by the treasury." The transposition accordingly is not really required. Standing in its present order 8: 12 ff. would form as appropriate a sequel to 7: 31-52 as to 10: 22-25. We simply find the Johannine counterpart of the synoptic healings of the blind (Mk. 8: 22-26; 10: 46-52 and parallels) and connected discourse (Mt. 12: 22-45 = Lk. 11: 14-36; 12: 10) forming the opening scene (an interjected visit to Jerusalem at Tabernacles) of the Peræan ministry.

Professor Burton's transposition of 7: 45-52 before 37-44 becomes equally needless if verses 37-39 be recognized as an editorial supplement. And such was Scholten's verdict on at least verse 39 nearly half a century ago.¹ Wellhausen calls for the excision of the whole paragraph 37-44 on the ground that it duplicates 25-30, reaching an identical conclusion. Some editorial revision or supplementation seems to be indicated, though we have only internal data to guide us in determining its nature.

Slightly more indication of the derivation of the disturbing element is found in 12: 44-50, whose untenable position Tatian has sought to improve. Verse 36 already reaches a conclusion, verses 37-41 give the narrator's comment upon the close. They form a favorite citation, as we have seen,

case is different. The miracle and discourse of chapter 6 are intimately related to the ritual and symbolism of Passover.

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 64.

wherewith to express the hopelessness of efforts spent upon the stiff-necked people. Verses 42 f. come thus already pretty late for admission to standing with the authentic material. They show a redactional character in the attempt to make room for Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea, repeating 5: 44 in an undeservedly harsh application; they are also characterized by expressions unexampled in the Gospel (*ὄμως, ἥπερ*), or found only in late passages (*μέντοι*).¹ After 42 f. the attachment of 44-50 is impossible. Either it must be transposed to some point before "Jesus departed and hid himself from them," or else it is pure editorial supplement. The loose stringing together of generalities mostly repeating utterances given elsewhere points to the latter as the true derivation.²

The case is somewhat different with the greater "apparent displacements," whose relation to their intrinsic context on the one side, on the other to synoptic story, and in some of the most important cases to Tatian's *Diatessaron*, we have now examined. Here we have strong internal reason, supported in most cases both by synoptic affinities and by the deliberate transpositions of Tatian, for believing that the material once stood in the revised order, though not necessarily in what we should recognize as a form of the Fourth Gospel. It is not only a confirmation of the fact, but something approaching an explanation of its cause, to discover that in every case these displacements occur in conjunction with passages which by their direct connection with the Appendix or otherwise give independent evidence of having been introduced by R.

Conspicuously is this the case with the Interview with Nicodemus, which Tatian's order, synoptic affinity, and the

¹ Wellhausen, *Evang. Joh.*, p. 58.

² Cf. 14: 7-9; 1: 5, 18; 3: 17 f.; 5: 24, 45; 8: 12, 19, 51, 52; 9: 5; 10: 30, 38; 12: 35 f.

intrinsic consistency of the Fourth Gospel alike require should stand after 7: 30. This scene is linked by the editorial comment 2: 23-25 to the incident of the Purging of the Temple, 2: 13-22, a passage which over and over again we have found evincing its alien origin. There was indeed nothing in the content of 3: 1-21 to connect it with Passover; but it dealt with the doctrine of baptism, and this, it would seem, was enough for an editor in search of material for the additional Passover he had interjected into the section on Jesus and the Baptist.¹

No less conspicuously does this relation appear in the case of the noted displacement of chapter 14. This chapter now enters immediately after the synoptic element of Peter's offer to follow Jesus to martyrdom (13: 36-38), an insertion inseparable, as we have seen, from the Appendix.

The same is true of the displacement in 18: 12-27 which we have traced with convincing evidence to its origin in the process of editorial supplementation of John from the synoptic story of Peter's Denial.

The greatest of all the structural disturbances centers in the chapter which of all in the Gospel stands in nearest connection with synoptic story, chapter 6, with its cycle of incidents related to the Agapé. According to Wellhausen:

"The verses 7: 3, 4 are fundamental for literary criticism of the Fourth Gospel. Jesus is called upon to go to Judæa, because Galilee is a mere corner; in Judæa nothing has yet been seen of his miracles. This is a slap in the face to what we read in chapters 1-6; for according to these he has long since and repeatedly come publicly forward in Judæa, and has a group of disciples there."

Wellhausen regards the words "thy disciples" (*οἱ μαθηταί*)

¹ We must also attribute to R the supplement to the Baptist's discourse in 3: 31-36. This paragraph, of similar composition and style to 12: 44-50, reiterates the thoughts and expressions of Jesus' discourse to Nicodemus, placing them now in the mouth of the Baptist!

σου) in 7: 3 as mistakenly supplying the subject of the verb ("falsches explicitum"). "That *they* may see" to his mind must originally have referred to the inhabitants of Judæa generally. In agreement with Schwartz he regards the rest of 7: 1-14 as later, confusing the original sense. Certainly verse 1 is singularly inapposite after chapter 6. We should expect it after chapter 5. Moreover, even in ancient times the incongruity of the statement "I go not up" in verse 8 with verses 10 ff. was so keenly felt as to lead to the corrected reading "I go not *yet* up." We may not altogether indorse the drastic analysis of Schwartz and Wellhausen, but it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that some sort of editorial readjustment has been attempted in 7: 1-14.

The case seems nearly analogous to 10: 22 f., which cuts off the sequel to the colloquy of 10: 1-21, or to 18: 15-18, which cuts off the sequel to 12-14, or to 13: 36-38 which (with the displaced chapter 14) cuts off the sequel to 13: 12-35; except that in chapter 6 we have a large element of synoptic material not directly borrowed, whereas in 13: 36-38 and 18: 15-18 and 25-27 we have small extracts repeating almost verbally the synoptic story. Tatian's order implies that the Samaritan ministry (chapter 4) and the Outbreak of Opposition (chapter 5) once occupied the same relative position toward the Departure from Galilee (7: 2 ff.) as their synoptic counterparts, the Journey to Phenicia (Mk. 7: 24 ff.) and the account of How they were Stumbled in Jesus (Mk. 2: 1-3: 6) may be supposed to have occupied to the corresponding chronological milestone (Mk. 10: 1 ff.). This seems also to be implied by the chronological relation of Pentecost (the feast of 5: 1 ff.) to Passover (6: 4) and Tabernacles (7: 2), and by the connection in Mk. 2: 1-3: 35 of the synoptic equivalents of chapter 5 and 7: 3 ff. respectively. But if this order once obtained how came it to be broken by the removal to this point of chapter 6?

We may possibly find some approach to an answer to this question when we observe that chapter 6 combines in itself the equivalents of two leading synoptic themes, one of which precedes Jesus' departure into "the borders of Tyre and Sidon," the other his final departure from Galilee. These are (1) the Feeding of the Five Thousand, Walking on the Sea, and Collision with the Scribes in Capernaum (Mk. 6: 30-7: 23 and parallels = Jn. 6: 1-59); (2) the Confession of Peter and its sequelæ (Mk. 8: 27-9: 50 and parallels = Jn. 6: 60-71). If, then, Jn. 6, which could not well be divided, was located before the Samaritan ministry (Jn. 4: 4-45), as it should be to correspond with the position of (1) before Mk. 7: 24 ff., (2) would be drawn away from its very manifest connection with the final Departure from Galilee, Mk. 10: 1 ff. It was simpler to put the whole before 7: 2 ff.;¹ but evidences of redactional readjustment in such a context, especially at the points of juncture, should not excite our wonderment.

The structural history of the Fourth Gospel is a problem too intricate for a general treatise, too uncertain and debatable as regards details to warrant unsupported statements of opinion. One result, however, the partitionists and revisionists may congratulate themselves upon as already established. The once almost uncontradicted doctrine of the structural unity of the Fourth Gospel no longer stands unchallenged. On the contrary, the superficial impression of a work "aus einem Guss" produced by the uniform, easily imitated, oracular style is seen to be delusive. Closer inspection both of textual history and inner consistency confirms the probability raised by the admitted later attachment of an "afterthought." Gaps and seams abound everywhere. Particularly unmistakable are additions intimately related to the Appendix, and aiming like it to adjust the "spiritual gospel" to the more widely prevalent synoptic type. Whether the

¹ 7: 1 is clearly out of place.

special phenomena of "apparent displacements," attested not merely by internal inconsistencies but by the relation of the material to synoptic equivalents and by efforts at adjustment dating from the very first appearance of the Gospel, can, or cannot, be brought into connection with that process of accommodation which the external evidence has led us to date at Rome *ca.* 130-150 A. D., the main principle is already far on the way toward acceptance, that the latest of the Gospels has not escaped the vicissitudes common to its kind and most to be expected in those of latest date. It has a history of growth and development, of revision, recasting, cancelation and supplementation. Proofs of this process rightly viewed can make this Gospel of all the greater value to the true student of Christian origins, because like the varied "scriptures of the prophets" given "by divers portions and in divers manners" it will be seen to epitomize, as no mere individual's work could do, the inner life of one of the greatest branches of the Church.

CHAPTER XX

CONCLUSION

Closer scrutiny of the evidences, external and internal, direct and indirect, bearing on the origin and history of the Fourth Gospel has brought us to a conclusion adverse to the tradition. From the latter half of the second century to the beginning of the nineteenth that tradition remained dominant. At its beginnings it met opposition and overcame it, not so much on critical and historical grounds as because of doctrinal interest and practical expediency. For about one hundred years¹ modern criticism has brought all its resources to bear upon the question, fully realizing that our whole conception of the origins of Christianity hinges upon it. The testimony of antiquity has been reinvestigated. It is found to fall into two easily separable classes: (1) References recognizable as envisaging our Fourth Gospel inclusive of the Appendix, in some cases explicitly attributing it to "John"; (2) echoes and influences more or less resembling passages embodied in our Fourth Gospel. Of the former class (1) there are none earlier than *ca.* 170 A. D., the period marked by rapid dissemination on the one side, vigorous opposition on the other to the Gospel's claims to apostolic authorship. Of the latter class (2) there are none to indicate acquaintance with the X literature outside proconsular Asia until slight traces are found at Rome *ca.* 150 A. D. None suggest the idea that the literature was regarded as apostolic in origin by those who show acquaintance with it. There is not, even in the

¹ Bretschneider's *Probabilia*, the first serious critical argument against the traditional authorship, appeared in 1820.

quarters where we have a right to expect it, appeal to the authority of John, or reference to his residence in Asia. Paul alone is the apostolic authority in matters of doctrine, though with an increasing tendency to appeal to the evangelic tradition of the Sayings of the Lord handed down by "the apostles and elders." The seat of this historic tradition, however, is not Ephesus, but Jerusalem. The conception of John as a resident of Asia, and a writer to "the churches" there, appears first in the editorial envelope of the Palestinian apocalypse, which owes to this envelope its designation the Revelation of John. This book attains to authoritative standing both in Asia and at Rome long before the Gospel and Epistles current in the same region. Thus classified into evidences bearing upon the period before and after Tatian the external testimony ceases to wear the aspect it had long assumed in the eyes of defenders. It indicates rather a process of growth in Asia from midrashic expositions of evangelic tradition expounded in the Pauline sense. These were embodied in a form adapted for local circulation and were perhaps commended to the churches by the addition of the three Epistles. The turning point in the history of the Gospel will have come with the addition of the Appendix. But the influence of the Appendix is not reflected until a full half-century after we find distinct traces of the First Epistle in Asia. The process of dissemination of the Gospel as an apostolic writing seems to begin from Rome at about the period of Tatian (175 A. D.). This involves the spread of traditions concerning John in Asia. These, however, make the stay in Patmos their starting point, a highly unreliable foundation in view of the known methods of the apocalyptic writers. The testimony of Asia in 110-150 A. D., albeit necessarily a witness of silence, must here again be distinguished from the witness of Gaul in 186 A. D.

Under the head of Direct Internal Evidence we have

Fourth Gospel—34

classified those elements of all the writings attributed to John on which the early testimonies to Johannine authorship are based. Such passages are sometimes explicitly quoted, sometimes merely reflected in their phraseology. Among passages which make a direct claim Rev. 1:1-4; 22:8 are preëminent. But the inner contents of the Apocalypse are seen to give no warrant for these editorial imputations of the visions to "John." At all events the visions have no relation to Patmos or to the churches of Asia, as the prologue and epilogue aim to make it appear. The Epistles again are quite improperly represented as embodying a profession on the part of their author to be

"himself not only an eye-witness, but a hearer, yea, and a writer as well, of all the wonders done by the Lord in their order."¹

The exegesis which thus interprets I Jn. 1:1-3 is forced, and perverts the real meaning in the interest of a theory of authorship. This theory itself, plainly declared in the Appendix to the Gospel and the connected passage Jn. 19:35, rests on equally violent exegesis, while the additions themselves are in the one case an admitted "afterthought," in the other textually doubtful, in fact rejected as spurious by one of the best textual critics among the "defenders." Other passages adduced from the Gospel as "making a direct claim" are found upon examination to stand in the same category as those from the Epistle. In particular the figure of the Beloved Disciple will not bear the concrete sense put upon it by the author of the Appendix. This interpretation shows on the contrary every mark of originating and attaining to supremacy in the course of the Montanistic and Paschal controversies in Asia and at Rome.

The direct claims called "internal" by virtue of the fact that ancient editors combined their supplements with the

¹ *Muratorianum.*

text, lead us back thus, by their clear dependence upon the documents edited, to an examination for ourselves of the indications of authorship; and these, aside from editorial supplements and "parenthetic additions," are exclusively indirect. Once the compositions themselves, *i. e.*, the three Epistles and the main body of the Gospel, are examined as purely anonymous products, corresponding in this respect to most writings of their kind, their date and general character become apparent from their purpose and structure. Their aim is an *interpretation* of the common evangelic tradition in the "spiritual" sense, *i. e.*, in the light of the Pauline doctrine of incarnation and eternal life by mystical union of believers through impartation of the Spirit of Christ with God the Father. The material employed is mainly synoptic. This material is sometimes wrongly combined and usually exaggerated. It is systematically subordinated to the doctrinal purpose of presenting the career of Jesus as a redemptive incarnation of the divine Logos. Its "pragmatism" is midrashic, though evidences of acquaintance with western Palestine, and with Jewish ideas and literature frequently appear. Superiority from the historian's standpoint to the synoptic tradition appears mainly in the author's resistance, in common with "all the churches of Asia" in the second century, to the occidental disposition to abolish "the feasts of the Jews" in particular the commemoration of the spiritual Redemption on the anniversary (by Jewish lunar reckoning) of the crucifixion and resurrection. At Rome the celebration of the Lord's day next succeeding the Friday of Passover, as an anniversary of the issuance of Jesus' resurrected body from the sepulcher, was rapidly superseding the more spiritual, Pauline ritual of a Christian Passover and Firstfruits, or Passover alone, marking the redemption of the Israel of God from the bondage of sin and death, but quite without reference to the later

story of the Women at the Sepulcher. Our author is loyal to the Asiatic practice, though anxious to combine both elements of the tradition, the physical and the spiritual.

Back of the indirect evidences pointing to authorship at Ephesus by some such Paulinist of Jewish origin and philosophic training as we might imagine Apollos to have been, lie certain others affecting the structure of the Gospel. The period of its principal circulation in Asia would seem to have been one when the danger to the Church was more from heretical perversion of its doctrine than from persecution by the state, *i. e.*, the period of Hadrian or slightly earlier. Back of this lies an obscurer period. A long series of disconnected observations indicates that the material of our Fourth Gospel, so far from being from one casting, has been altered, cut and supplemented, revised and remolded, perhaps repeatedly. Matters here are still sub judice, but alleged uniformity of style is no longer accepted as an answer to the phenomena exhibited both by textual and higher critics. With the evidences of unseen forces working out the "spiritual" Gospel as we know it, not all at once, but by divers portions and in divers manners, after Paul's death, in the great headquarters of his missionary activity, we stand in the midst of the critic's problem of to-day. As one of the noblest leaders of religious thought in our times has written:

"There is the religious belief that things eternal are seen through things temporal, that space and time in all their rich variety, color, and movements are servants of the Highest. This belief leads to the expectation that a correct version of the temporal, in respect to any religion, would prepare the way for a new and more influential conception of the Eternal. Here is a new fountain of enthusiasm for the devout scholar. In his textual criticism, his analysis and rearrangement of documents, his assignment of books to their proper place in the process of human development, he is preparing the way for a closer vision of the coming of the kingdom

of God. It is the hope of serving this ultimate end that turns the detail and drudgery of his work into poetry; that end shines through the entire world in which he works—a world of confusion, sorrow, and contradiction—and that, like the sun, fills it with splendor and life.”¹

We have not minimized the revolutionary effect to be anticipated from the acceptance of the critical as against the traditional view of the origin of the Fourth Gospel. We are even conscious that to a certain order of minds it may be more welcome in its destructive than in its constructive results. It will be heralded as a triumph of the “opponents of revealed religion” instead of a triumph of its friends over the dead hand of ecclesiastical tradition. And yet how evanescent, how relatively trifling are its destructive as compared with its constructive effects.

To the assailants of this long dominant tradition, made sacrosanct by the dependence on it of such masses of theology, the Fourth Gospel marks not the beginning, but the end of the evangelic revelation. Its interpretation of the person and career of Jesus sub specie æternitatis is the maturest expression of the great effort of Paul to know him “not after the flesh, but after the spirit.” Hegel has taught us that it is far from being all of Christianity, or even its greatest factor, to lay hold of the teaching of Jesus as the condition of human welfare. We must also—yes, supremely—contemplate him in his personality, a phenomenon of the life of God in man, of the life of man in God, having permanent significance for the race. For the religious thinker it is impossible not to contemplate Jesus objectively, in his earthly story, in the subsequent effect upon humanity of his life, past or present, as “a representation of the divine idea.”²

¹ G. A. Gordon, *Religion and Miracle*, 1909, p. 174.

² Hegel, *Philosophy of Religion*, vol. iii, p. 85 (Engl. transl.).

In all the field of history there is no problem for the religious thinker comparable in importance to this. The greatness of Paul above all the other apostles lies in the fact that he saw this truth, and applied himself to the task of interpreting Jesus to the world as "a representation of the divine idea."

In the nature of the case the interpretation of one age will inevitably require adaptation to the new conceptions, new modes of thought of another. First attempts, however great, must very soon require restatement. In the chapter on *The Evangelist's Task* we have tried to show the supreme and crying need of the Pauline evangel, as it would appear to the Greek churches a generation after their great apostle had won his "crown of righteousness." Paul had interpreted the Christ of his own experience, the crucified Galilean "manifested as the Son of God with power by the resurrection"; but he had not applied his doctrine of God in man "metamorphosing" into the image of his glory, transforming by the renewing of our mind into the likeness of the Creator, to the earthly career of Jesus. Mark's Gospel is the first attempt we know to depict the life of Jesus in the light of Paul's doctrine of the Spirit of Adoption, imparting all "gifts of the Spirit" here on earth and effecting even the "redemption of our body" by a "quickening through his Spirit that dwelleth in you." It was not adequate. Mark's representation fell far short of doing justice to the Pauline idea. We know not the hand which attempted the greater task. In Antioch and in Palestine others had attempted something of the sort. It was reserved to Ephesus to produce a truly "spiritual" gospel, interpreting the synoptic tradition of Jesus' life and teaching from the standpoint of Paul's doctrine of the redeeming Spirit.

To do this the Ephesian evangelist had no other recourse than the philosophic conceptions of his time. We study the

history of Ionic philosophy, we trace the development of the Logos idea in Stoic and Jewish application, in Alexandria and in Ephesus, in order to appreciate in what sense the fourth evangelist employs it to body forth his Pauline thought. But we do scant justice to his example, still less to the example and precept of the great apostle whose thought he loyally seeks to carry on, if we make his interpretation final. Who is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers through whom we believe? True loyalty to them is shown not in adopting ready made the system of thought with all its local and temporal limitations by which they endeavored to set forth their conception of the life of man in God, the life of God in man. The revelation lies in the fact, not in the particular interpretation by which men seek to fit it into their systems of thought. There may be harm and loss to the cause of revealed religion to-day; but far more by those who seek to identify the revelation with the mere interpretation, whether that of Paul, or that of John, or of any other, however great, than by those who with humble and reverent, though unfettered hand seek to understand these ancient interpretations under the real conditions of their time, in order the better to reach an interpretation for our own.

True loyalty to Paul and the fourth evangelist demands that we apply the categories of a modern philosophy and psychology to the life of the great Elder Brother—yes and to that of his lowliest follower—as well and as fearlessly as Paul and the fourth evangelist applied the Logos doctrine of Ephesus and Alexandria.

Acceptance of the critical view of the Fourth Gospel involves a great challenge and a great responsibility. There will be no longer the apostolic authority of an eye-witness, a confidant of Jesus' inmost consciousness. Still less will it be possible to present the Christology of the fourth evangelist as the personal testimony of Jesus to himself. Having

treated the Pauline incarnation doctrine as representing only Paul's attempt to interpret the eternal significance of this supreme example of the life of man in God, the life of God in man—having treated the fourth evangelist's also as only a further development by unknown hands a full generation later of Paul's deepest thought, we are brought face to face with the problem in our own independent thinking: What significance for the human race has the person and career of Jesus? What rational account shall our philosophy make to itself of the life which first made the filial relation to God actual in itself, and is to-day making of it a reality for multitudes of "brethren"? What the Church of the second century did for its generation should be done again for ours. The story of God in Christ, "changing the relation of the world to himself" should be so told by modern historical research, so interpreted by modern philosophic thought, that men "may believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, and in believing may have life through his name."

INDEX

- Aall, 437.
Abbott, E. A., on date of John, 22;
on Elders, 117.
Abbott, Ezra, 18.
Acts, on heresy in Ephesus, 163; its
references to John, 164.
Acts of John, 82, 91, 261, 280, 424.
Acts of Pilate, 41, 391, 400.
Ænon, 387.
Aërius, 414.
Agapé Narrative, 343.
Alexander of Jerusalem, 398.
Alogi, 90, 227, 266.
Anachronisms, 324.
Analytical School, 472, 495.
Annianus, 397.
Anointing of Jesus, 335, 421, 427,
432.
Anti-Docetism in I John, 322.
Apocalypse, 529, 530; prologue and
epilogue, 160, 176; use by Papias,
104; on witnesses of Messiah, 135;
on spirit of prophecy, 152; claims
of authorship, 157; date of, 173;
author of, 175; a composite work,
179; Palestinian origin, 180; first
current in Asia, 268.
Apocalypse of Thomas, 397.
Apollinaris of Hierapolis, 228, 258,
262, 422.
Apollonius, 401.
Apollos in Ephesus, 282.
Apostles' Creed, 430.
Apostles and Elders, 470.
Apostolic Fathers, use of John, 57, 94.
Apostolic Tradition, 172.
Appendix of John, 86; 129, 445, 446,
450, 482, 529; source of tradition,
86; object, 99; on authorship, 161;
on martyrdom of apostles, 133;
relation to parenthetic additions,
205; date of, 210, 219, 224; pur-
pose of, 221; on sons of Zebedee,
307.
Appendix of Mark, 198, 219; rela-
tion to John, 200; reference to
Jn. 20: 11, 213.
Aristion, 70, 112.
Argument from Silence, 73.
Argumentum (Latin), 75.
Ascension in Luke and John, 424.
Asterius Urbanus, 243.
Augustine, 396.
Balaam (mask for Jesus), 406.
Baldensperger, 290, 437.
Baptism, 290.
Barnabas, Epistle of, 356, 424.
Bar-Cocheba, 219, 264.
Basilides, 52, 408; opposed in Jn. 9,
294.
Baur, 19, 479.
Beginning of Miracles, 376.
Beloved Disciple, 301, 530; at the
Supper, 310; at the Cross, 317;
at the Tomb, 318, 319; as in-
terpreter of Petrine tradition, 321;
a composite, 325; and Paul, 326;
intended for John, 330.
Bertling, 499.
Bethany (by Jerusalem), 335; be-
yond Jordan, 335, 387.

- Bethesda, 386.
 Bethsaida, 388.
 Betrayal of Jesus, 314.
 Bigg, 417.
 Blass, 472; on Papias' use of Revelation, 105; on Jn. 19: 35, 461; on text of John, 473, 494; on Jn. 18: 13 f., 483.
 Blastus, 247.
 Blau, 358.
 Blind healed, 382.
 Boanerges, 140.
 Bousset, 449, 481.
 Box, G. H., 428, 433.
 Breaking of bread, 380, 432, 433.
 Bretschneider, 528.
 Briggs, 452.
 Burton, E. D., 498, 516, 522.
- Caius (see Gaius).
 Call of Disciples, 374, 375.
 Cana, miracle, 377, 493.
 Canon of Asia, 29.
 Cappadocian Calendar, 399, 413.
 Celsus, 483.
 Centurion's Servant, 373.
 Cerinthus, 8, 232, 262, 465.
 Chapman, Dom, 398.
 Christology, 9; of John's Gospel, 12.
 Chronology, 389, 490.
 Chwolson, 358.
 Clement of Alexandria, on Basilides, 53; on authority, 87; against Melito, 257; *Hypotyposes*, 276.
 Clement of Rome, Epistle of, on Apostles, 166; a disciple of Apostles, 253.
 Composite characters in John, 280, 322, 336, 368.
 Constantine, 429.
 Conybeare, 114.
 Corsen, 400, 402, 405; on Papias, 112.
- Defense, 443 ff.
 Delff, 450, 480, 488; on Jn. 2: 1-11, 510.
 Destructive Criticism, 443.
Diatessaron (see Tatian).
Didaskalia, 249.
 Dionysius of Alexandria, 103, 231; on John in Asia, 106.
 Dionysius Bar-Salibi, 231.
 Disciple ("another"), 307.
 Disciple whom, etc. (see Beloved Disciple).
 Displacement, 488, 495, 520; of ch. 5, 499, 516; of ch. 6, 526; of 7: 15-24, 499; of chh. 8-10, 521; of 10: 26 ff., 499; of 12: 44-50, 500, 513; of ch. 14, 500, 524; of 18: 14-18, 500; of 18: 12-27, 524.
 Division of Ministry, 371.
 Dobschütz, 399.
 Docetists, 458, 465.
 Drummond, J., on external evidence, 17; on modern question, 35; his use of term "quotation," 39; on Basilides, 55; on Jn. 21: 23, 211; on Apollinaris, 258, 423; his demands met, 269; on internal evidence, 273; on pragmatism, 337; on Quartodeciman harmonization, 415; on Paschal controversy, 416; on raising of Lazarus, 446; on Appendix, 473; on displacements, 475.
- Echoes and Influences, 30, 43.
 Elders (of Jerusalem), 101; their use of Matthew and Mark, 97.
 Eleutherus, 245.
 Elias as "Forerunner," 138.
 Ephesus, 530; seat of Paulinism, 292; school of, 471.
 Epiphanius, on James, 148; on death of John the Elder, 150; on Alogi, 227-233; on Cappadocian

- Quartodecimanism, 391, 413; on Cappadocian calendar, 400.
 Epistles to churches of Asia, 173.
 Epistles of John, 184; on Antichrist, 206.
 Equinox celebrated, 425.
 Eucharist transposed, 434.
 Eusebius, his purposes in writing, 83; his chronology, 108; Syriac version, 109; on John the Elder, 117; on Gospel order, 226; on Caius, 227; on order of John, 234; on Montanism, 241.
 Evangelist's personality, 464.
Evang. Hebraeorum, 223, 474, 512, 515.
Evang. Petri, 50 f., 98, 196, 215, 424 f., 430; and John, 40.
 Exorcism, 354, 376.
 External Evidence, 17 ff.
 Ezekiel in Jn. 10, 293.
 Farewell Discourse, 369.
 Fast preceding Easter, 419.
 Feasts of Jews, 409, 435; Passover, 409; Pentecost, 409; Tabernacles, 409; Dedication, 492.
 Firstfruits, 421, 423, 429.
 Florinus, 251.
 Fotheringham, 390.
 Fourfold Gospel, 96.
 Fourth Gospel (see John, Gospel of).
 Frick, 397.
 Furrer, 216.
 Gabbatha, 386.
 Gaius, 100, 414; *Heads against*, 230f. *Dialogue with Proclus*, 102, 230, 236; *Disputation* (see *Dialogue*); of Asia, 186.
 Gelasius, Decree of, 261.
 Gemini (Year of), 390, 392.
 Gethsemane in John, 312.
 Gordon, G. A., 532.
 Gutjahr, 267; on Syriac Eusebius, 107; on Irenæan tradition, 119.
 Grill, J., 437.
 Hanina of Sepphoris, 406.
 Harnack, 29, 399, 437; on Alogi, 240; on date of Apocalypse, 174.
 Harris, J. R., 232.
 Hegel, 533.
 Hegesippus, 47, 452; on martyrdom of James, 145; *Memoirs* on Jerusalem succession, 145.
 Heitmüller, 333.
 Hemerobaptists, 290.
 Herford, 406.
 Hermas, *Shepherd* of, 238.
 Hill, J. H., 515; on Tatian's order, 503.
 Hilgenfeld, 491.
 Hippolytus, 100, 230, 391, 398, 401; his *Defense of the Gospel*, 235; a disciple of apostles, 253.
 Historicity, 438.
 Hitzig, 491, 498, 515.
 Holtzman, H. J., 333, 476.
 Holtzman, O., 333.
 "Hour" of Jesus, 346.
 Ignatius, 469; neglect of John, 31, 168.
 Intercession of Christ, 298 f.
 Interpolations in John, of 1: 15, 477; of 2: 1-12, 493, 512; of 2: 14-22, 489; of 10: 22 f., 492; of 13: 36-38, 483, 487; of 18: 15-18, 25-27, 483; of 19: 35, 482; of 20: 24-29, 494.
 Irenæus, on Papias, 76; on apostles in Asia, 101, 106; on Elders of Papias, 121; on Alogi, 240; on Montanists, 241; sent to Rome, 245; against Blastus, 247; to Victor, 248; his recollections of Poly-

- carp, 250; on ordination of Polycarp, 252; on Cerinthus' encounter with John, 262; his ecclesiastical position, 265; his relation to Proclus, 265; as scholar and churchman, 266; on Jesus' age, 405.
- Jacob's Well, 388.
- James (Epistle of), on seat of apostolic tradition, 165.
- James, martyrdom of, 129.
- James and John, 306; their martyrdom predicted, 129, 132; show spirit of Elias, 140; as "sons of thunder," 141; martyrdom, 145; in Luke, 329.
- Jason and Papiscus (Dialogue of)*, 220.
- Jerome's legend of John, 306.
- Jerusalem, 529.
- Jesus (Synoptic Story of), 11; betrayal of, 353; visits to Jerusalem, 410.
- Jewish Ideas and Dialectic, 359.
- Johannine Pragmatism, 332.
- John (the Apostle) in Asia, 127; his martyrdom, 147, 217, 449; in Patmos, 181; metastasis of, 218; in synoptic story, 327; in Gal. 2: 9, 329; in first-century tradition, 330.
- John (the Baptist), 290; in Mark, 349; in Q, 350; in John, 351; does not precede Jesus, 351.
- John (the Elder), 77, 105, 112, 122, 151, 188, 256, 452; *paradosis* of, 78; in Syriac Eusebius, 115; as author of Apocalypse, 178; on authorship of I John, 444.
- John (Epistles of), 187; authorship, 189; anti-docetic, 292.
- John (Gospel of), 28; date of, 22, 25; reserve of, 201; gaps in, 202, 473 f., 493, 526; choosing of first disciples, 204; geography of, 216, 338; growth of traditional authorship of, 268; a spiritual gospel, 277; its symbolism, 279; its design, 281, 291; its task, 288; anti-docetic, 294; its doctrine of hardening of Israel, 303; unreality of, 354; its changes from synoptic ideas, 366; its prologue, 373; its epilogue (see Appendix); its structural history, 526.
- John (Mark), 308.
- Jonah (sign of), 350.
- Josephus, 396, 404; on death of James, 145.
- Jubilees (reckoning), 397.
- Judas in John, 311, 313.
- Justin Martyr, his neglect of John, 23, 37, 92; on Apocalypse, 38; *dialogue with Trypho*, 66; use of Paul, 94; on John the Baptist as Elias, 137; on Revelation, 159; colloquy with Elder, 207; on John the Baptist, 350; his conversion, 464.
- Keim, 20; on *Epistle of Barnabas*, 45; on Hermas, 46.
- Kerygma Petri*, 40.
- Khopper, 217.
- Lazarus, raising of, 345.
- Leucius Charinus, 261.
- Lightfoot, 449; *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, 273; on motive of John, 21; on Papias as amanuensis of John, 75; on Eusebius, 79; on I Jn. 160, 185; on relation of Epistles to Gospel, 190; on Jn. 21: 25, 191, 211; on conversational comments, 194, 222; on Tiberias, 216.
- Loaves, miracle of, 431.
- Logos doctrine, 282, 535; of Hera-

- clitus, 4; of Philo, 5; of Paul, 5, 8; Johannine, 7; of Justin Martyr, 7; of Stoicism, 289.
- Logos (Stoic) unmoved, 346.
- Loisy, A., 333; on Jn. 2: 20, 342.
- Lord's Supper, 312, 415, 417, 431.
- Ludolphus de Saxonica, 501.
- Luke-Acts, 98.
- Luke (Gospel of); on Elias as "forerunner," 139; on seat of apostolic tradition, 165; in John, 368; chronology, 393.
- Mark (Gospel of), 534; appendix to, 70, 71; date of, 72; on Peter, James and John, 142; against Quartodecimanism, 260; contents, 286; its inadequacy, 287; on spiritual gifts, 328; in John, 368; outline of passion, 370; outline followed in John, 371; on Passover, 412, 426; story of resurrection, 430; on Peter's denial, 485.
- Martyria in Jn. 21, 194.
- Mary Magdalen, 349.
- Matthew (Gospel of) on spiritual gifts, 328; in John, 367.
- McGiffert, A. C., on Christian Polemics, 357.
- Messiah, witnesses of, 134, 151; Moses and Elias as witnesses of, 136; Apocalypse as witness of, 135.
- Melito, 258, 414.
- Meyer, A., 481.
- Midrash, 278, 340.
- Miltiades, 242.
- Ministry of Jesus (Duration of), 408.
- Mishkan, 477.
- Mommsen (on Papias), 112.
- Montanism, 238.
- Montanus, 235, 243.
- Moses (prototype of Christ), 404.
- Muratorianum*, 81, 88, 454, 530; on Apocalypse, 177; on provenance of John, 222; on apologetic interest, 222; date, 239.
- Nativity (date of), in Luke, 402; with census of Quirinius, 407.
- Nicodemus, 344, 491, 519, 523.
- Norris, J. P., 498 f., 501, 515.
- Notes of time, 341.
- Oppianus Cilix, 196.
- Opposition, 377.
- Origen (on Basilides), 56.
- Oxford Committee, on Hermas, 49; on *Apology* of Aristides, 50; on *Didaché*, 50.
- Pacianus, 248, 261.
- Palestinian Gospel, 283.
- Papias, 61, 402, 470; neglect of John, 31; quotes Revelation, 32; use of John, 44; tradition from Elders, 58; use of Revelation, 85, 159; groups John with Matthew, 91; the fragment, 110; on the Elders, 116, 124, 474; date, 120; on words of Elders, 125; De Boor fragment, 132, 143; aim of writing, 158; on Apocalypse, 176; on Matthew *vs.* Mark, 171.
- Parables, 369.
- Paraclete, 296.
- Paradoses* (of John the Elder), 405.
- Parenthetic additions, 198, 531.
- Partitionists, 480.
- Paschal Chronicle*, 260.
- Paschal Settlement, 420.
- Patmos, 529.
- Paul, 439; his incarnation doctrine, 365, 536; in John, 370; celebrates Passover, 426; his Logos doctrine, 467; as interpreter of divine idea, 534.
- Pauline Gospel, 284.

- Paulinism in John, 295, 438; in Ephesus, 468.
- Penitent harlot (in Luke), 378.
- Pentecost, 436.
- Peræan ministry, 382.
- Petalon, worn by James and John, 148, 256.
- Peter, martyrdom predicted, 129; trial predicted, 130; First Epistle of, 163; martyrdom of, in Jn. 21, 195, 217; commission of, 218; sponsor of Mark, 302; corrected in John, 304; his denial, 308; appearance to, 429; denial in John, 484.
- Peter and John in the Appendix, 197.
- Philip (the evangelist), 260.
- Philo, on spiritual sense, 277.
- Pliny, *Epistle to Trajan*, 428.
- Polycarp, colloquy with Anicetus, 249; martyrdom of, 251, 254; *Vita*, 255; date of birth, 255; in letter to Victor, 256.
- Polycarp, *Epistle* of, use of John, 60; on the Oracles, 115; on heresy, 469.
- Polycrates, 229; uses Jn. 21, 263; neglect of John, 264.
- Pragmatism, 531; of Apocalypse, 337; haggadic, 339, 342.
- Praxeas, 244.
- Precise details (see Pragmatism).
- Proclus, *Disputation* of, 228 f.
- Prologues and epilogues, 82.
- Purging of Temple, 383, 394, 489.
- Qiddush of Passover, 428.
- Quadratus, 120.
- Quartodecimanism, 247, 391, 412 ff.; of Apollinaris, 259.
- Quirinius (census of), 403.
- Ramadan, 419.
- Redactor, 193, 454, 466, 498, 523 f.; style in appendix, 200; on "Beloved disciple" 204, 320, 326, 462; on Jn. 19: 35, 309; adjusts traditions, 327; uses I-III Jn. 452; his direct claims, 463.
- Redemption, 425, 531; celebrated by Quartodecimans, 418.
- Renan, 446, 479.
- Return from underworld, 422.
- Revelation (see Apocalypse).
- Revelation of Messiahship, 352.
- Sabbath controversy, 380, 435.
- Sabbath of Passover, 415.
- Sacrament of Judgment, 310, 316.
- Salmon, on Alogi, 238.
- Samaritan gods, 344.
- Samaritan ministry, 372.
- Samaritan woman, 343.
- Sanday, 18, 32, 189; on Jn. 21: 24, 305, 446; on date of John, 22; on Clement's testimony, 276; on pragmatism, 336; on fidelity of John, 344; on internal evidence, 356; on Jewish pilgrimages, 357; on disuse of ceremonial, 356; on Christology of John, 360; on synoptic Christology, 361; on Matt. 11: 27, 363; against Wernle on originality of Paul, 364; on Drummond, 447; on I Jn. 1: 1-3, 456; on Jn. 19: 35, 459.
- Sanday and Schürer on John, 95.
- Scattering of apostles, 196.
- Schmiedel, 25, 416, 437; on Johannine use of Synoptists, 332; on Jn. 12: 1-6, 334; on miracle of loaves, 434.
- Scholten, 472, 481, 489, 495, 522; on "Beloved disciple," 320.
- Schürer, 413; on paschal controversy, 424.

- Schwartz, E., 450, 481, 525; on martyrdom of John, 128.
- Schweitzer, A., 479, 488.
- Scott, E. F., 274, 437; authorship of I Jn. 289; on sacrament in John, 315; on essence of the Gospel, 320; on Johannine use of Synoptists, 332.
- Scripture fulfilments, 339.
- Second Coming, 297.
- Sects and parties, 359.
- Self-witness of author, 323.
- Sign from heaven, 395.
- Sign of Jonah, 361, 490.
- Sinaitic Syriac, 484, 502; its correction of Jn. 18: 35 f., 484; its changes of order, 486.
- Smith, David, 415.
- Sonship in Synoptists, 362.
- Soter, on Montanists, 241.
- Spirit as "Intercessor," 299.
- Spirit, gift of, 424.
- Spitta, F., 403, 473, 485, 498.
- Spoiling of strong man, 428.
- Stanton, on external evidence, 19; on date of John, 33; on Hermas, 47; on Apostolic Fathers, 61; on Justin, 65; on the Appendix, 67; on silence of post-apostolic age, 67 f., 162, 169; on silence of Clement of Rome, 168; on silence of Ignatius, 168; on Justin's view of authorship, 212; on Hippolytus' *Defense*, 233; on John in Asia, 267.
- Star of Magi, 220.
- Strayer, P. M., 493, 521.
- Stumbling in Synoptists and John, 379.
- Style, 437.
- Sychar, 386.
- Symbolism of John, 340.
- Symeon of Jerusalem, 150.
- Sympathy of Jesus (in John), 345 f.
- Synchronisms of John, 394.
- Synoptic material (treatment in John), 356.
- Synoptists, corrections of, 332; idea of John, 138, 164.
- Syrophœnician woman, 372, 381.
- Tabernacles, 436, 522.
- Talmud, 448.
- Tatian, 29, 99, 497, 508; his order for Jn. 4 f., 504; resultant order, 506; omissions, 507; motive for transpositions, 508; location of Jn. 12: 42-56, 509; location of Jn. 2: 14-22, 509; location of Jn. 3: 1-21, 510, 518; connection of 3: 22 f. with 4: 46 f., 511; resultant order for 1: 5, 512; location of 3: 5, 514; location of Mark 1: 41-45, 517.
- Taylor, J. J., 419.
- Tertullian, on principle of the canon, 84; on Proclus, 244, 246.
- Themiso, 230, 242.
- Theologos, 453, 456, 463.
- Theophilus, 29.
- Theophilus of Antioch, 90.
- Tiberias, 216.
- Tischendorf, 472; on Jn. 21: 25, 191.
- Topography and chronology, 385.
- Traditions (of Elders), 405.
- Traits of the eye-witness, 333.
- Trecentius, 418.
- Turner, 390, 392 f., 408, 491.
- Tyrannus, 468.
- Unforgivable sin, 381.
- Valentinians, 393.
- Valentinus, 51.
- Van Bebbler, 491.
- Victor, attempt to suppress Montanism, 263.

- Victorinus fragment, 398, 400.
 Vigil (the), 341; of Passover, 420-424.
 Vischer, on Apocalypse, 174.
 Von der Goltz, on Ignatius, 64.
- Weiss, B., 374.
 Weiss, J., 291.
 Weisse, C. H., 479.
 Wellhausen, 25, 481, 495, 497, 521, 522; on Jn. 20: 24-29, 318; displacements, 477; on Jn. 1: 5 f., 478; on duplicates, 494; on Jn. 7: 3 f., 524.
 Wendt, H., 473, 479, 481, 495, 501.
 Windisch, on Basilides, 54.
 Wisdom of God (quoted in Q), 410.
 Wisdom of Solomon, 5, 6.
- Witness of the Church, in John, 323; in I Jn. 324, 457.
 Witness of Jn. 1: 11-17, 458.
 Witness of the Spirit, 455.
 Wonders of faith, 369.
 Worsley, F. W., 304; on Matt. 20: 20, 392; on Mark 2: 1-12, 363; on Synoptics in John, 366.
 Wrede (atomistic method), 274, 437.
 Wright, W., 220.
- Zahn, on Eusebius, 105; on death of John, 132; on Papias' use of I Peter, 185; on Jn. 19: 35, 192; on Jn. 21: 23, 211; on Alogi, 236; on *Muratorianum*, 237; on Montanism, 242; on Appendix, 451; on Tatian's order, 502.

RETURN TO the circulation desk of any
University of California Library
or to the

NORTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
Bldg. 400, Richmond Field Station
University of California
Richmond, CA 94804-4698

ALL BOOKS MAY BE RECALLED AFTER 7 DAYS
2-month loans may be renewed by calling
(415) 642-6753
1-year loans may be recharged by bringing books
to NRLF
Renewals and recharges may be made 4 days
prior to due date

DUE AS STAMPED BELOW

APR 8 1991

251374
400
mt

258046

BS2615

B2

