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PREFACE

Dr. Bernard’s many friends will be glad at last to have his Commentary. Fortunately he had completed the manuscript of both volumes before his visible presence was taken from us in August 1927, so that I have been responsible only for seeing it through the Press. Dr. L. C. Purser saw the proofs as far as Chapter XIX., but I have been through the whole, trying to gather up the fragments that remained. The Indices have been prepared by the Rev. R. M. Boyd, Rector of Shinrone. I would thank him gratefully for his help, but he needs no thanks.

A. H. McNeil.

Dublin, October 1928.
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ABBREVIATIONS

The evangelist has been designated throughout as Jn., to distinguish him from John the son of Zebedee as well as from John the Baptist. This abbreviation is not intended to imply that he must be identified with John the presbyter, although the editor regards this as highly probable; but it is convenient to have a brief designation which stands for the writer of the Gospel, without prejudging his personality. A few other abbreviations that have been adopted are the following:

(1898–1904).

D. B. . . . . . Smith’s Dictionary of the Bible, 3 vols.,
2nd ed. (1893).

D. C. G. . . . . Hastings’ Dictionary of Christ and the

Diat. . . . . . E. A. Abbott’s Diatessaron, including
his Johannine Vocabulary and
Johannine Grammar, Parts I–X.
(1900–1915).

(1899–1903).

E. R. E. . . . . Hastings’ Encyclopaedia of Religion
and Ethics, 12 vols. (1908–1912).

J. T. S. . . . . Journal of Theological Studies (1900–
1926).

Moulton-Milligan . Vocabulary of the Greek Testament,
illustrated from the papyri, by J. H.
Moulton and G. Milligan (1914–
). This is being completed by Dr.
Milligan; it is indispensable.

1 See p. lxxviii.
INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I

THE TEXT

(i) Authorities for the Text.
(ii) Dislocations of the Text.
(iii) The Structure of the Gospel.

(i) Authorities for the Text

Full accounts of the manuscript material available for the text will be found in Gregory’s Prolegomena (1891), in his Textkritik (1902, 1909), and in von Soden’s Das Schriften des neuen Testaments (1902). During the last twenty-five years several additional manuscripts and versions of first-rate value have come to light. Only a few of the more important authorities for the Gospel, in whole or in part, are named here, von Soden’s notation being placed in brackets, and the century to which each MS. is ascribed being given in Roman numerals. No attempt has been made in these volumes to print an apparatus criticus. Tischendorf’s (1872) is still the most useful, von Soden’s (1913) being constructed on the basis of a new classification of textual authorities, which has not commanded general acceptance. Westcott and Hort’s Notes on Select Readings (1884) are indispensable, although their doctrine of the inferiority of the “Western Text” is now regarded as too strongly stated. A. Souter’s brief critical apparatus is valuable, and his table of MS. authorities admirably clear (Nov. Test. Graec, Oxford).

Papyri

The earliest extant remains of Gospel manuscripts in Greek were written in Egypt on papyrus. Of these some of the most interesting were found at Oxyrhynchus, and have been published by Drs. Grenfell and Hunt. A few contain frag-
ments of the Fourth Gospel. They are generally in the form of a book or codex, and not in the form of rolls of papyrus. Most of those mentioned here present a text similar to that of B:

Pop. Oxyrh. 208 (von Soden, ε 02) and 1781 form fragments of the same MS., the oldest extant text of Jn. (ssco. iii.), and are at the British Museum. They give in a mutilated form Jn. 1:13-41 17:24-30 20:11-28. This MS. was a codex, made up of a single quire of some twenty-five sheets. See p. xxix.

Pop. Oxyrh. 1228, Glasgow, iii. This has a good text of Jn. 15:20-16:21.


There are many other papyrus fragments, some of early date; the above are mentioned as specimens of the available material.

Uncials

Information as to most of these will be found in the textbooks. We give brief references for those which have been recently brought to light:


S = Sinaiticus (δ 2). Leningrad. iv.

A = Alexandrinus (δ 4). British Museum. v. Cc. 659-843 are missing.


D = Beza (δ 5). Cambridge. v-vi. Graeco-Latin. Cc. 1842-203 are missing in the Greek text, and the gap has been filled by a ninth-century scribe (D99).


§1] Authorities for the Text

N = Papyrus Petropolitanus (ε 15). Dispersed through the libraries of Leningrad, Patmos, Rome, Vienna, and British Museum. vi. Some pages are missing. Edited by H. S. Cronin in Cambridge Texts and Studies (1899).


Δ = Sangallensis (ε 76). St. Gall. ix-x. Graeco-Latin.

Secondary uncials are not specified here; nor has reference been made to two fragmentary palimpsest uncials of the fifth century, at Leningrad and the British Museum respectively (von Soden's ε 1 and ε 3).

Cursives

Of the vast mass of minuscules, only a few need be mentioned.

The following are notable: 33 (548), Paris, ix-x, perhaps the best of all the cursive, akin to BD at many points; 28 (ε 168), Paris, xi, 157 (ε 207), Rome, xii; 565 (ε 93), Leningrad, ix-x; 700 (ε 733), London, xi, ed. Hoskier (under the numbering 604).

The twelve cursive numbers 13, 69, 124, 239, 346, 543, 783, 826, 828, 583, 1869, 1709, are descended from a lost common ancestor. Salmon directed Ferrar's attention to 13, 69, 124, 346; and Ferrar began a collation, which was completed and published by T. K. Abbott in 1877. The group may be cited as fam. 13. See above on Θ, and for the position of 783-82 in this group, see note on the Pericope.

Nos. 1, 118, 131, 209 are also akin to each other and to Θ, and may be cited as fam. 1. (see K. Lake, Cod. 1 and its Allies, 1902).

Ancient Versions

The Old Latin MSS. are cited under the letters a, b, c, f, f, etc., Jerome's Vulgate being vg. The relative value of the

2 Cf. also Rendel Harris, The Ferrar Group (1906).
African and European texts of the O.L. is too intricate for discussion here.

The Old Syriac version probably goes back to Tatian's Diatessaron, and in any case to sec. iii sub init. We have it in two MSS.; Syr. sin. of sec. iv, discovered at Mt. Sinai in 1892, and Syr. cur. of sec. v, edited by Cureton in 1856, both being accessible in Burkitt's indispensable Evangelion de Masharethi (1904). The Peshitta or Syriac vulgate is of sec. v.

The Coptic vss. have been fully edited in the Sahidic and Bohairic texts by G. Horner (1901-1924). The Sahidic generally follows ε, but has a Western element.

The oldest MS. of Jn. in this version (sec. iv) was discovered in 1513 and edited by Sir H. Thompson in 1924. By him it is called Q, and it is now in the Bible Society's House in London. It is in codex form, made up of twenty-five sheets of papyrus, folded together so as to make a single quire (cf. p. xlv above). It has a good text like ε, but omits the Periplus de adulteris.

The text printed in this volume is similar to that followed by Westcott and Hort, and by Bernhard Weiss, although not identical with either. It is convenient to indicate here the more important instances in which the reading that has been adopted after due consideration of the evidence (of the manuscripts and of the context alike) differs from that accepted by most recent critics. At 1:19* 10* 8* readings have been suggested or adopted which have very little manuscript authority (if any), but which must be judged on their own merits as emendations. Other weakly attested readings are accepted at 10* 11* 12* 13* 14* 15* and at * 14* 15* reasons have been given for following the textus receptus rather than its modern rivals. In each case, the variants have been examined in the notes in loc.

(ii) DISLOCATIONS OF THE TEXT

There are some passages in the Fourth Gospel which present difficulties in their traditional context; and critical opinion has, during the last half-century, been favourable, on the whole, to the conclusion that, whether by accidental transposition of pages of the original, or by perverse editorial revision, they have been removed from their proper position.

1 For harmonistic rearrangements of the text in Syr. sin., cf. p. xxvi.

§ 14. DISLOCATIONS OF THE TEXT

Of such instances of dislocation of the text, perhaps the strongest case can be made for the transposition of c. 5 and 6. The first modern critic to urge that the order of these chapters should be interchanged was Canon J. P. Norris, and his suggestion has been accepted by many scholars.

The words of 6:1, "After these things (μετὰ ταῦτα) Jesus went away to the other side of the sea of Galilee," are oddly chosen if a journey from Jerusalem is in the author's mind, which must be the case if the events of c. 6 are consecutive to those of c. 5. To know which the "other" side of the lake, we must know the point of departure. In 6:21 περ ἐν τῆς βαλαναίς means the eastern side, in 6:23 the western side; just as in Mk. 5:1 the same phrase means the eastern side, and in 5:51 the western side. No doubt, for one who followed the ordinary road from Jerusalem northward, the "other" side would be either the northern or the eastern coast. But a journey from Jerusalem through Samaria and Lower Galilee, which extended either round the northern end of, or across, the lake to the neighbourhood of Bethsaida Julias, would be described very elliptically by the sentence, "He went away to the other side of the sea." On the other hand, the phrase is quite natural if we suppose Him to start from Capernaum, i.e. if we treat c. 6 as following immediately on c. 4. Then all is clear. The nobleman's son at Capernaum has been healed by Jesus (24), who is in the neighbourhood, that is, near the western shore of the lake; and the next thing recorded is that "after these things Jesus went away to the other side" (i.e. the north-eastern shore) of the lake, where, it is added, "a great multitude followed Him because they beheld the signs which He did on them that were sick." Among the more noteworthy of these was the "second sign" in Galilee, i.e. the healing of the nobleman's son.

Again, the opening words of c. 7, "After these things Jesus walked in Galilee, for He would not walk in Judæa, because the Jews sought to kill Him," do not follow naturally upon c. 6. The whole of c. 6 is occupied with Galilean discourse and miracle; why, then, should the fact that "He walked in Galilee" be emphasised at 7:1? And no hint has been given in c. 6 that "the Jews" were so indignant at His words that they sought to kill Him. On the other hand, the words of 7:1 come naturally in succession to the narrative of c. 5 (but see below, 1).

1 In the Journal of Philology, 1897, p. 107. Norris added later that the suggestion had been made by a fourteenth-century writer, Ludolphus de Saxonia.
p. xix), which contains the controversy of the Jews consequent on the healing of the impotent man on the Sabbath, after which it is expressly said that the Jews sought to kill Jesus (§68). A retirement from Jerusalem to Galilee was quite natural then; but it was only for a short time, and He went back to Jerusalem to resume His ministry there at the Feast of Tabernacles (§23). That no very long interval of time elapsed between the controversies of c. 7 and those of c. 5 is shown by the allusion in §25 to the healing of §. We cannot insert a blank between these two points a long ministry in Galilee.

The narrative proceeds smoothly if we adopt the order, c. 4 (Samaria and Galilee, c. 6 (Galilee), c. 5 (Jerusalem, a period to which we must assign, as we shall see, §18-24; see p. xix), c. §-8 (a retirement to Galilee), c. 7-14, 38-52 (another visit to Jerusalem).

It should be added, that if the traditional order of cc. 4-7 be followed, there is a difficulty in identifying the Feast mentioned at §1. the Passover, Pentecost, Dedication, Tabernacles, Purim, being advocated in turn by various expositors. But if we place c. 5 after c. 6, the identification is obvious. It is the Feast of the Passover, which has been mentioned at §6 as "at hand."

Of independent evidence for this transposition of cc. 5 and 6, there is none that can be relied on.

Irenaeus, e.g., a very early commentator on the Fourth Gospel, regards the feast of §1 as the Passover, and does not mention the feast of §6. But, nevertheless, he takes cc. 5 and 6 in their traditional order, and places the Feeding of the Five Thousand after the Healing of the Man at Bethesda (Har. ii, xxii. 3).

Origen, too, has a phrase which, if it stood by itself, would favour the view that cc. 5 and 7 are consecutive. When commenting on c. 4, he says (p. 256) that the feast of §1 was not likely to be the Passover, because "shortly afterwards it is stated, "(πέτω δὲ ἵνα διώκησιν ἔσται ἐπὶ ἐκείνη τοῖς ἦπου ἐγέρθη ἡ ἑσυχία τῆς ἁγίασμος," in other words, he says that §2 comes "shortly after" §1, a quite reasonable statement if c. 6 preceeds c. 5, but hardly defensible if c. 6, with its seventy-one verses, separates c. 5 from c. 7. However, in the same commentary (pp. 263, 266), he clearly takes c. 5 as following on c. 4 in the traditional order.

Tatian's distribution of Johannine material in his Diatessaron is remarkable. He does not scruple to disturb the Johannine order of incidents, as we have them in the traditional text; and, in particular, he adopts the order cc. 6-4-5-7. He was probably led to this by internal evidence; but it is possible (although not likely) that he may be following the authority of texts or documents no longer accessible to us. In any case, the evidence of the Diatessaron provides a corroboration, usque quantum, of the conclusion that cc. 5 and 6 are not now in their right order.

B

A second case of "dislocation" of the original text of Jn. has already been mentioned (p. xivii). If we remove the section 715-24 from its traditional position, and append it to c. 5, we shall find not only that its language is more appropriate as the conclusion of c. 5, but that §24 follows most naturally upon §14.

The allusion to the γράμματα of Moses (§7) provokes the question "How does this one know γράμματα" (§7)?; i.e. the writings of the Law with their interpretation. But there is nothing in §14 which suggests any such query, for nothing has been said in §14 as to the learned nature of the teaching which Jesus is giving. The more natural sequel to §14 is §24, where the citizens of Jerusalem express surprise that such a teacher should be an object of suspicion to the rulers.

Again in §14 the question, "Why seek ye to kill me?" is very abrupt, and is hardly consistent at this point with the favourable reception from the people of which §14 tells. But it is quite in place if the section §15-24 is a continuation of the controversy of c. 5; one of the consequences was that the Jews had sought to kill Jesus (§15). Indeed, the themes of §15-24 are throughout the same as in c. 5; and at §24, §15 Jesus defends Himself, exactly as at §20, by explaining that His doctrine was not His own, but given Him by the Father, whose will He came to do.

Again at §15 He reverts to what has been said at §20, about the untrustworthiness of those who seek only their own glory. At §22 He turns against themselves the appeal to Moses as the exponent of the Law, as He had done at §24.

And at §22 He makes a direct reference to the cure of the impotent man at Bethesda (§5), which, because it was wrought on a Sabbath day, was the beginning of their quarrel with Him. It is very difficult to interpret §22 if we suppose it to refer to something which had happened months before; it is evidently present to the minds of His interlocutors, whose feelings are aroused by it. He describes in the present tense, ἐγείρεται . . . γίορτασε (§22, 24). And, finally, the mention of "just judgment" at §24 brings us back to §20.

It is possible that the transference of the section §15-24 from
its true position was due to the mistake of a抄写人, who took the words "Is not this He whom they seek to kill?" in 7\(^{20}\) as requiring 7\(^{19}\) in the immediate context, forgetting that 5\(^{18}\) 7\(^{1}\) are both equally possible.

But, however that may be, that a dislocation of the text is here apparent has been accepted by Wenden,\(^1\) Bacon,\(^2\) Moffatt,\(^3\) Paul,\(^4\) and many other critics.

C

We proceed next to consider the difficulties presented by the traditional order of cc. 13, 14, 15, 16, 17; and some reasons will be given for the conclusion that the order adopted in this commentary, viz. 13\(^{24-20}\) 15, 16, 14\(^{31-28}\) 14, 17, more nearly represents the intention of the original writer.

It is plain that "Arise, let us go hence," at the end of 14\(^{2}\) is awkward in this position, if the teachings of cc. 15, 16 follow immediately. This suggests that cc. 15, 16 should precede c. 14; and then 14\(^{23}\) would be the last word of the discourse delivered in the upper room, c. 15 (the high-priestly prayer) being offered as the Lord with the Eleven stood up before they left the house for Gethsemane. Again, "I will no longer talk much with you" (14\(^{28}\)) is followed by two chapters of further discourse, in the traditional order of the text, whereas it would be a natural phrase, if the discourse were reaching its end, and 14\(^{20-21}\) were the final paragraph of farewell.

There are several sayings in c. 16 which suggest that it should come before c. 14. Thus Jesus says (16\(^{6}\)) "None of you ask where I am going." But Peter asked this very question (1\(^{23-20}\)), and Thomas implied that he would like to know the answer (14\(^{3}\)). These queries more naturally come after 16\(^{19}\) than before it.

Another point emerges on comparison of 16\(^{23}\) with Mk. 14\(^{25}\). Both of these passages tell how Jesus warned the Eleven that they would shortly be put to a severe test of faithfulness, in which they would fail. "All ye shall be made to stumble: for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered abroad" (Mk. 14\(^{27}\)). The hour is come when ye shall be scattered, every man to his own, and shall leave me alone." (Jn. 16\(^{25}\)). Now Mk. places the confident assurance of Peter, and the sad prediction of his denial, immediately after this. We should expect the same sequence in Jn.; and we find it very nearly, if 13\(^{31-28}\) is placed after 16\(^{23}\), for the incident of Peter’s boast and rebuke is narrated in 13\(^{31-28}\),

\(^1\) Gospel according to St. John, p. 85.
\(^2\) The Fourth Gospel, p. 429.
\(^3\) Iweth, in N.T., p. 354.
\(^4\) Ehrhert Journal, April 1909.

§ 11.

DISLOCATIONS OF THE TEXT

Again, 14\(^{19}\) seems to come more naturally after 16\(^{24}\) than before these verses in which the disciples express bewilderment at the enigmatic saying, "A little while and ye behold me not," etc. The language of 16\(^{17}\) suggests that this saying was new to the hearers, whereas it occurs with an explanation in 14\(^{19}\) (cf. 15\(^{20}\)). See also on 14\(^{19}\) for the priority of the verse 16\(^{24}\).

We now turn to c. 15. The allegory of the Vine in the traditional text begins abruptly, nor is there any sequence with what precedes in the last verses of c. 14. But, as we have shown elsewhere,\(^5\) if we place c. 15 immediately after 13\(^{20}\), the point in the narrative at which the Eucharist was instituted, we find a complete explanation of the sacramental thoughts which appear in 15\(^{3-8}\). And there are other clues which point to the sequence of 15\(^{16}\) with 13\(^{20}\).

Thus the unfruitful branch of 15\(^{9}\) has an obvious allusion to Judas, who has just gone away to his act of treachery, if c. 15 follows 13\(^{20}\) directly. The words ἐὰν ἐκαθαρίσῃ ὑμᾶς of 15\(^{9}\) become more forcible the nearer they are brought to ἐὰν καθαρίσῃ ὑμᾶς, ἀλλ’ ἐν δόξῃ πνεύματος of 13\(^{10,11}\) (where see note). So the nearer that 15\(^{18}\) 30 can be brought to 13\(^{18}\), being the verses to which they respectively carry an allusion, the easier are they to explain. Again, in our arrangement of the text, 15\(^{11}\) give the first statement of the duty of Christians to love each other (which has been amended 13\(^{3-5}\), but it is not described as a New Commandment (13\(^{10}\)) until it has been thoroughly explained what love implies.\(^6\)

Similarly, the teaching about prayer of 14\(^{24}\) shows an advance on the teaching of 15\(^{16}\) 16\(^{23}\), in that at 14\(^{24}\) it is Jesus, not the Father, who is described as the answerer of prayer. See the note on 14\(^{14}\).

It is not suggested here that we are to look for exact logical sequence, such as would be appropriate in a philosophical treatise, in the Last Discourses of Jesus as reported many years after they were spoken. On the contrary, cc. 14-16 of the Fourth Gospel abound in repetitions of the same thoughts and phrases, held in the memory of an aged disciple, but not necessarily put together in the order in which they were originally delivered. Yet, where sequence can be detected, it is worthy of notice.

The teaching about the Paraclete seems to fall into shape more readily if we place cc. 15, 16 before c. 14. In 15\(^{16}\) 16\(^{6}\) we have the παρακλητός described as the Advocate of Christ, confusing the hostility of the world and confounding its judgments. This is the primary meaning of παρακλητός (see on 15\(^{20}\)); and so far, the idea of the παρακλητός as the Helper or \(^7\) See on 15\(^{2}\); and of p. ccxii. 1.

\(^1\) See, further, note on 15\(^{18}\).
Guide of Christian disciples has not appeared. Then, at 16:13, we pass to a new thought: the παρακλήτος is to guide the apostles into all truth about Christ, and is to reveal future things to them. He is now the Paraclete of the Church, not of Christ. Then, at 14:18, it is promised that He will abide with the Church until the end of time, so that Christian disciples may not be left ἄφικα, without a Friend. Finally, at 14:19, we return to the idea that He will lead them to the truth, which is now described as "teaching" them, and will always keep in their memory the words of Jesus Himself. At this point, for the first time, He is explicitly identified with the "Holy Spirit" of God.

The only phrase 1 which would be favoured by the traditional order of chapters rather than by the order cc. 15, 16, 14 is, "He shall give you another Paraclete," at 14:16. This, it may be thought, is more naturally said at the first mention of the Paraclete than at a point in the discourse after He has already been named three or four times. But (see note in loc.) this phrase is apposite here, and here only, because Jesus has just been speaking of His own office as the Advocate with God who secures an answer to the prayers of the faithful, although He has not explicitly claimed the title παρακλητός for Himself.

It may be added, in conclusion, that the consolations of 14:2. 3 seem to come more appropriately towards the end, than at the beginning, of the Farewell Discourse. The disciples have been assured that the world will one day be proved to have been wrong in its rejection of Jesus (15:23; 16:2;); they are told that, so long as they believe this, Jesus will be with them until the end of time (16:27). This concerns them, and Peter asks why they cannot follow Jesus to death even now (15:38); but He is again warned that He will be with them until the end of time (16:27). Then, and not until then, is explained to them the great assurance of life after death in the heavenly places which Jesus will prepare for them (15:32). This is a consolatory promise of a quite different kind from any of those given in cc. 15, 16, for it leads the thoughts of the disciples beyond this earthly life.

On grounds such as these, I follow Spitta 4 and Moffatt 5 in supposing a dislocation of the text at 15:10. Wendt 6 and Paul 7 find the break at 13:36, but vv. 33 and 36 f. seem to be in complete sequence.

D

The position of the verses, 31-36, provides another example of difficulties of interpretation, probably due to a disturbance of the textual order.

As the verses 31-36 stand in the traditional text, it would seem at first sight that they were intended to be a continuation of the Baptist's "witness" to our Lord, contained in vv. 27-30; and many of the older commentators (e.g. Meyer, Alford) held this to be the case. But most modern exegesis recognises that in this section, as in 31-36, we have an evangelistic commentary on what has preceded. The style of 31-36 is unmistakably that of Jn., when writing in his own person. However, it does not bear any clear relation to what immediately precedes in the traditional text. Abbott (Diot. 2501 f.) endeavours, indeed, to interpret 32 of John Baptist; it is the Baptist, he holds, that is said to have sealed his attestation that God is true. But, if so, the words in v. 32, τὸν μαρτυριόν ἄνωθεν ὁ Ἰωάννης must also be interpreted as Jn.'s paraphrase of the Baptist's account of the ill success of Jesus' mission. This is entirely inconsistent with the report of the Baptist's disciples about Jesus, σώζει ἔργα πρὸς αὐτόν (v. 26), which drew from their master a confident and joyful assurance that Jesus was, indeed, the Coming One, the Christ Himself (vv. 27-30).

An examination of the section 31-36 shows, on the contrary, that it is a continuation of Jn.'s commentary (vv. 16-22) upon the pronouncement of Jesus in vv. 11-15. Thus v. 32, in both its clauses, reproduces almost verbatim the words ascribed to Jesus in v. 11; and v. 31 goes back to v. 12. V. 35, "He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life," has been said already at v. 16; and the same warning to the unbeliever or disobedient at v. 36 has been given before, although less explicitly, at v. 18. "He whom God hath sent," (v. 34) recalls v. 17. There is no saying in vv. 31-36 which naturally arises out of the section vv. 22-30, but everything in vv. 31-36, on the other hand, goes back to vv. 11-21.

Hence, it suggests itself that vv. 22-30 are out of place; and this conclusion has been reached by several scholars. Lewis proposed to transfer 32-36 to a position immediately after v. 21.
following 3:18, and this has been approved by Moffatt,1 Lewis,2 J. M. Thompson,3 Garvie,4 etc. That 3:23 speaks of καθαρτισμός is thought to recall 3:6, and the bridegroom of 3:29 to suggest the image of 3:28. But the sequence of μετὰ ταῦτα in 3:18, followed by μετὰ ταῦτα in 3:23, would be strange and not like the style of Jn. Nor can it be said that there would be any special appositeness in such a position of 3:29–30. To place these verses before the Cleansing of the Temple and the subsequent 'signs' at Jerusalem (3:29) makes it difficult to explain the crowds who flocked to the ministry of Jesus (3:30). For, according to this arrangement of the text, Jesus has not been in Jerusalem at all, and the miracle at Cursa of Galilee is the only 'sign' that has attracted attention.

A simpler explanation is that 3:29–30 originally followed, instead of preceding, 3:18–21. Everything then falls into place. The evangelist's commentary or paraphrase, 3:22–31, 33–35, is continuous; and a new section (3:32–35) of the narrative beginning with μετὰ ταῦτα, as usual in Jn., deals with the second witness of the Baptist, and connects itself directly in the opening verses of 4:4 with the journey to Samaria. It may be added that the sequence between 3:29–30 and 4:1, 2 is as natural as that between 3:28 and 4:1, 2 is unreal.

Another example of 'dislocation' may be found, if we mistake not, in c. 10, the traditional order of verses being difficult to interpret, and the order vv. 19–29, vv. 1–18, vv. 30 f. suggesting itself as preferable. The first as is pointed out in the note on 10:1, the introductory 'Verily, verily,' is employed to begin a new discourse on a new topic in a manner without parallel in the rest of the Gospel. There is no connexion between the end of c. 9 and the beginning of c. 10, which opens (as we see it) with the allusion of the shepherd and the sheep. This has nothing to do with the controversy about the healing of the blind man, which occupies the whole of c. 9. On the other hand, it is plain that 10:18–21 comes naturally after 10:41. The end of the long and tedious argument about this miraculous cure was that the Pharisees who were inquiring into the matter were not unanimous in the conclusion they reached. Some said that Jesus was mad; others that He really had restored the man's sight, and that
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this could not be explained away by saying that He was a madman. There is no connexion apparent between 10:18 and 10:26–28. The traditional text represents the allegory of the shepherd and the sheep following (after an undefined interval) the condemnation of the Pharisees for refusing to recognise in the cure of the blind man a confirmation of Jesus' claims; and then, abruptly, at vv. 19–21, we turn back to the Pharisees still in controversy about this very matter. The end of the story of the blind man is in vv. 20–21, and this naturally follows on 3:4.

This controversy had gone on for some weeks, and by the time that we have reached the end of it, a couple of months have elapsed since the feast of Tabernacles, and so a new paragraph begins by telling us that the Feast of Dedication (see on 10:42) had now arrived. The hostile Jews are determined to get a plain answer to the question 'Art thou the Christ?' (10:24), and Jesus tells them that their unbelief is due to their not believing His word. Assigning a moral cause for their want of faith as He had done before (see 10:36). If they were His sheep, they would hear His voice and follow Him, and so would be safe in His keeping (10:27–28). Then follows, quite naturally, the allegory of the shepherd and the sheep, introduced by ἀκούειν ὀνόματι as much as it takes up and enlarges the theme already suggested by vv. 27–28.

We believe, then, that vv. 1–18 are out of their true position, which was lost owing to some accident. The scribe who placed them immediately after 9:42 noticed no doubt that the sequence of vv. 29, 30 was intelligible, and it satisfied him. In v. 28 Jesus had said that His sheep were safe in His hand, and in v. 29 (even more strongly) that they were safe in the Father's hand. 'I and my Father are One' is a declaration which would be quite in place here. But it is in even a more appropriate place if it follows (as we have argued it should follow) v. 18: 'I have authority to lay it down, and authority to take it again. This commandment did I receive from my Father. I and my Father are One.' It is this unity which explains the seeming inconsistency of the assertion, 'I lay it down of Myself,' with the former statement, 'the Son can do nothing of Himself' (10:18 and see on 1:13)—an inconsistency which, as the text stands, is not relieved by the assertion of unity with the Father, which is essential to the argument.

A sixth example of 'dislocation' appears at 15:44–50, a section which comes in more naturally after 15:43, the verses 15:20–43 following 15:42.
At v. 36 it is said that Jesus went away and "was hidden," the evangelist noting the incredulity of His hearers, in which he finds a fulfillment of prophecy (vv. 39-41), and adding that nevertheless many of the rulers were secretly believers, although they were afraid to confess it (vv. 42, 43). But then at v. 44, the public and authoritative teaching of Jesus begins again, the word ἐπέστη being inconsistent with ἐπίστην of v. 36. And, moreover, the topics of vv. 35, 36 are continued in vv. 44 ff. Thus the contrast between the believer who walks in the light and the unbeliever whom darkness overtakes is carried on from v. 35 to v. 46. But in vv. 35, 36 it has not yet been explained what the Light is to which reference is made; to go back to 8 is easy for a modern reader, but it would not be suggested by anything in vv. 35, 36. We get the explanation in v. 46, "I am come as a Light into the world," etc., an explanation which is not only natural, but necessary, if vv. 35, 36 are to be intelligible in their original context. And then Jesus reverts to the theme, frequent throughout the Gospel, that His claim for attention is not "of Himself," but because He is God's messenger.

There is no change of scene between v. 36 and v. 44. Vv. 35-36 and vv. 44-50 form a continuous discourse, the effect of which is summarized vv. 36-43.1

To this argument, the evidence of Tatian's Diatessaron gives corroboration. For, whatever his reason may have been, Tatian rearranges the text of Jn. 12. His order is, Jn. 12-50, then verses from Mt., Lk., Jn. 12-40, verses from Lk., Jn. 12-41. He differs from the conclusion which we have reached as to vv. 42, 43; but either he noticed that 12-40 could not stand in the text in the position in which we find them, or (less probably) he was following manuscripts which placed these verses in the order that we have adopted as the true one.2

Mention must be made here of a rearrangement of the text in c. 18 which has been adopted by many good critics, but which is not followed in the present commentary.

In 1893 F. Spitta,3 taking the view that δύκαστερον of 18 must mean Caiphas, and noticing the repetition of the phrase ἔρχονται καὶ ἐρμανθένως in vv. 18, 25, suggested that, perhaps owing to the displacement of a leaf of papyrus,

1 Cf. Wendt, l.c. p. 96, and Moffatt, l.c. p. 556.
3 Gesch. und Lit. d. Urchristenthums, 1893, p. 158.

the text of vv. 13-27 was in disorder, and that the original sequence was vv. 13, 19-24, 14-18, 25-28, 25 being a copyist's addition. This conjectural restoration of the text was thought to be confirmed shortly afterwards by the discovery of the Sinai Syriac codex, in which the verses are found in the order 13, 24, 14, 15, 19-23, 16-18, 25-28. F. Blass accepted this as the true text,4 stating that the traditional order of verses was only a narrative of blundering scribes.5 Later, G. G. Findlay and Moffatt adopted the order vv. 13, 14, 19-24, 15-18, 25-28, which only differs from Spitta's in the place assigned to v. 14, an unimportant variation.

It will be observed that while Spitta's proposal and that of Moffatt involve only a transposition of sections of nearly equal length—in Spitta's case vv. 14-18 and 19-24, and in Moffatt's case vv. 13-18 and 19-24—the Sinai Syriac, besides transposing the sections vv. 16-18 and 19-23, also divorces v. 24 from its traditional place and inserts it after v. 13. It is in the highest degree improbable that this double divergence of the normal text from the Sinai Syriac can be the result of accident; something more, therefore, is involved in the traditional order than the mere displacement of a leaf of the exemplar.6 In other words, there is a presumption that the text of Syr. sin. has been rearranged from harmonistic motives just as those of Spitta and Moffatt have been.7 See also on 4.

The advantage claimed for these rearrangements is that they present a more coherent story. In the case of Syr. sin. the removal of v. 24 to a place after v. 13 enables us to get rid of Annas altogether, except for a short halt at his house. As in Mt., everything is done by Caiaphas, who conducts the preliminary examination of Jesus (26-47), as well as presiding at the formal meeting of the Sanhedrin (27). Again, the title ἀρχιερέας is thus strictly reserved for Caiaphas, who was the recognized high priest at the time, Annas having been deposed from office previously. And the bringing together of the sections vv. 25-18 and 25-27 is thought to be helpful in regard to an understanding of the story of Peter's denials.

In the text as reconstructed by Spitta and Moffatt, Jesus remains in the house of Annas for the preliminary cross-examination, after which (v. 24) He is sent to Caiaphas. But

2 C. H. Turner (J.T.S., Oct. 1900, p. 101) suggested that the O.L. codex e, from which the leaf between 184 and 189 has been cut, might have supported Syr. sin.; but cf. Burkitt in Καὶ. ὁ Ἐφαστήρ., ii. 316 contra.
3 Cf. Wendt, Fourth Gospel, p. 164, and see also Schmiedel (E.B. 458), who takes the view adopted in this commentary that no re-adjustment of the text is necessary.
this does not bring the narrative into harmony with Mt., unless we suppose that Caiaphas (although in the house of Annas) conducts the inquiry of vv. 19—23; and in that case v. 24 is extraordinarily clumsy after v. 23.

It is argued in the notes on this chapter (see on 1818 for a brief summary of the sequence of events) that two erroneous assumptions underlie these rearrangements of text. First, ἀπεξέλθων, as a title, was not confined to the high priest at the moment of office, but was used of ex high priests, such as Annas, as well (see on 736 11 15 1819). In 1818 Annas is the ἀπεξέλθων, but Caiaphas was the ἀπεξέλθων τοῦ ἱεραρχοῦ βασιλέως. And, secondly, we cannot get rid of 25, as is done by Syr. sin., as well as by Moffatt, without removing a characteristic note of Johannean style (see note in loc.). Further, the separation of the later denials of Peter from his first brings out the interval of time (occupied by the cross-examination of Jesus) which elapsed since Peter began to wait in the courtyard (see on 1818, 24).

These considerations, which are given more fully in the notes, show, I believe, that the traditional order of verses in 1818—26 is more probably original than those which have been proposed in substitution for it. It may be added that the traditional order is followed by Tatian, who did not scruple to transpose verses where the sense seemed to demand it.

H

That a document may contain genuine, but misplaced, passages is, as Moffatt has shown, a legitimate hypothesis; and profane, as well as sacred, literature supplies illustrations. But where manuscript evidence is wholly lacking, and internal evidence alone is available, hypotheses as to transposition of sections are necessarily precarious, and ought to be accepted only when the internal evidence is very strong. A method, however, of obtaining objective corroboration of such hypotheses has been adopted during recent years by several scholars, which must not be ignored.

If we knew the number of lines of writing, or of letters, in a single leaf (recto and verso) of a manuscript in codex form, we should know the length of a section that would be involved by the accidental displacement of a leaf. Let us count the letters in the various sections in which we have found traces of
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displacement. It is not possible to be certain as to the exact numbers in the original, because we cannot be sure what contractions were used. But the following figures, derived from our printed text, will give at any rate the comparative lengths of the sections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Letters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>5 3630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>7 1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>12 3720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>3 730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>10 1495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.</td>
<td>12 559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let us suppose that each leaf of two pages (recto and verso) of our manuscript contained about 750 letters. This would not be abnormal, and might happen in a variety of ways; e.g. a page of 34 lines, each of 11 letters, would have 374 letters, and thus the leaf would have 748 letters. The same result would be reached if the writing were in double columns, and each column were of 17 lines. Or, as Thompson suggested, we might have an arrangement of 25 lines of 15 letters each to a page, which would give us 750 letters to the leaf.

A leaf might carry from 700 to 1500 letters of our printed text. Thus the oldest extant Greek MS. of Jn. is the Oxyrhynchus Papyrus numbered 208 and 1781 (see p. xiv), which goes back to the end of the third century. This MS. was in book form, consisting of a single quire of some 25 sheets, and it is demonstrable from the fragments which remain that each page contained about 750 letters, and each leaf 1420. On the other hand, the papyrus codex 1780 (see p. xiv) carried only about 700 letters a leaf. Both of these provide examples of early Gospel manuscripts written on papyrus, the leaves being fastened together so as to make a codex. Scribes are conservative people, and it is probable that the normal Gospel book was similar to this pattern in the first century, whatever its size.

We take, then, 750 letters for each leaf, and make no other hypothesis, leaving as an open question the disposition of the lines of the manuscript of Jn. under consideration. It appears at once that §§ II. and IV. occupy approximately one leaf each; § V. occupies almost exactly two leaves; § I.

1 If v. 2 were included, we should have 3703 letters.
2 Codex a is probably derived from a MS. having 11 letters to the line (H. S. Grant, J.T.S., 1922, p. 563); and the same may be true of B (Clark, Primitive Text, etc., p. 31).
3 Thompson also finds traces of a unit of 208 letters; Clark, on the other hand, attaches special significance to a unit of 150 to 160 letters.
4 See Oxyrhynchus Papyri, vol. II. (1899), and vol. xv. (1922).
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occupies nearly five leaves (750 x 5 = 3750, which is slightly in excess of 3630, or only 45 letters less than 3795, the number if the verse 5 is included); § III. has 3120 letters, which is only 120 letters in excess of four regular leaves (750 x 4 = 3000); § VI. would not quite fill a leaf, having only 598 letters, but the quotation marks in this section would take up space that would normally be occupied by text, and moreover on the hypothesis of dislocation, § VI. would conclude Part II. of the Gospel, after which a blank space would naturally be left before entering on Part III.

These figures are remarkable. If the leaves on which the Gospel was written became disarranged from any cause, a faulty rearrangement of them would produce in §§ II., IV., V., almost exactly the displacements of text to which internal evidence has pointed; and in §§ I., III., VI., the figures would be close to what we should expect.\footnote{1}

The argument drawn out above stands quite apart from, and is independent of, the arguments based on internal evidence; and even if it fail to win acceptance, the conclusions as to the dislocations of the text in Jn. must be considered on their own merits.

(iii) The Structure of the Gospel

The Gospel falls into three parts, preceded by a Prologue and followed by an Appendix.

Part I. (cc. 1-12 with c. 6) begins at Bethany beyond Jordan, goes on to Galilee, thence to Jerusalem, and back to Samaria and Galilee. It deals with the ministry of Jesus, and extends over a second year.

Part III. (cc. 13-20) is wholly concerned with the Passion and Resurrection.

More at length, the structure may be exhibited as follows:

THE PROLOGUE\footnote{2}

This (1-18) is primarily a Hymn on the Logos, interspersed with explanatory comments by the evangelist.

\footnote{1} The unit of about 750 letters appears again in Jn.'s account of the Cleansing of the Temple, viz. 241-242 = 964 letters. Reasons have been given (cc. 214) for the opinion that this section is also out of place, but we cannot be sure that Jn. did not deliberately place the Cleansing of the Temple at the beginning of Jesus' ministry, and it has accordingly been left in its traditional position. It would remove some difficulties to place 214-242 after 216, but new difficulties would arise. E.g., the Jews' question τι συνειδότος δενιζήσει; (216) would not be suitable after the Raising of Lazarus.

\footnote{2} See p. CXXVIII.
Announcement of His Passion: His agony of spirit: perplexity of the bystanders.
A last warning: a last appeal to those who rejected Him.
Evangelist’s commentary on Jewish unbelief as foreordained in prophecy.

PART III

The Last Supper; the Feet-washing; its spiritual lesson.
Jesus foretells His betrayal: Judas departs.
The Last Discourses.

The Last Prayer.
Jesus arrested and brought to Annas.
Peter’s first denial.
Examination before Annas: Jesus sent on to Caiaphas.

Peter’s second and third denials.
Jesus accused before Pilate; His first examination by Pilate, who fails to secure His release.
The scourging and mockery: Pilate fails again to save Jesus.

His second examination by Pilate, who fails a third time to save Him, and pronounces sentence.
The Crucifixion: the soldiers.
Three sayings of Jesus from the Cross.
The piercing of His side: His burial.
The sepulchre found empty.
Appearance of the Risen Lord to Mary Magdalene.

His first appearance to the disciples: their commission.
The incredulity of Thomas dispelled at His second appearance to them.

Colophon: scope and purpose of the Gospel.

APPENDIX

Appearance of the Risen Christ by the Sea of Galilee.
Prediction of Peter’s martyrdom: a misunderstood saying about John.

Concluding notes of authentication.

The concluding sentences in each of these sections are noteworthy, as indicating the careful planning of the narrative.
The last words of the Prologue are a summary of the theme of the Gospel, viz. the Manifestation of the Father through His Son (1:1).

Part I, is mainly occupied with the Ministry of the first year, which was largely in Galilee. Its happy progress is recorded, but this ends with the defection of many disciples (6:68). Here is the first suggestion of failure.

Part II tells of the Ministry at Jerusalem, the success of which would be fundamental, and of the fierce opposition which it provoked. Its climax is the final rejection of Jesus by the Jews, upon which the evangelist comments in a few sombre words (12:40-43).

Part III narrates the Passion, which seemed the end, and the Resurrection, which was really the victorious beginning. The final words explain the purpose of the writing of the Gospel which is now concluded (20:30-31).

The authentication at the end of the Appendix (21:31-32) has its own special significance. For the Appendix, see on 21:16.

NON-JOHANNINE GLOSSES

It is generally recognised that the story of the adulterous woman (7:3–8:11) is not Johannine, and that it was interpolated by scribes at an early date. This is discussed in the note on the Pericope. There are three or four other passages which suggest a hand other than that of Jn., and are probably due to editorial revision, being added after the Gospel was finished, perhaps before it was issued to the Church. Thus 4:1–2 is a passage which has been rewritten for the sake of clearness, but the style is not that of Jn. So 9:3 is an explanatory non-Johannine gloss. The verse 5 of modern editors from the text as insufficiently attested, but linguistic evidence alone would mark it as non-Johannine. 11:28 is undoubtedly an explanatory or parenthetical comment, but it is possible that it is added by Jn., although there are non-Johannine touches of style: cf. 11:24. There is also some doubt about the comment at 12:18, which reads as if it was not due to the original evangelist, but to some one who had the Synoptic, rather than the Johannine, story in his mind at this point.

EVANGELISTIC COMMENTS

These non-Johannine glosses must not be confused with the comments which Jn. makes, as he proceeds, on his narra-
of sufficient substance to employ servants (Mk. 11:19). His
mother, Salome, was a sister of the Virgin Mary (see on 19:5
28), so that John was a maternal cousin of Jesus. With
his brother James, he obeyed the call of Jesus to follow Him as a
disciple (Mk. 1:20); and it is probable that he had been attracted
to His company at an even earlier period (see on Jn. 4:50).
In the earliest list of the Twelve (Mk. 3:18) James and John 1
are given the next place after Peter, but that is only due to the
order in which they appear in Peter’s reminiscences of Peter,
James, and John are specially associated with Jesus three times
in the Synoptic narrative (Mk. 5:37 5:24 14:53), these incidents
disclosing their intimacy with Him. In the last week of His
ministry they are found, with Andrew, questioning Him
privately (Mk. 13:32).
John was rebuked for his uncompromising temper of ex-
clusiveness (Mk. 9:38, Lk. 9:80), a story which agrees with the
report of Irenaeus that John would not stay under the same roof
as the heretic Cerinthus (Har. iii. 4, 4). Lk. 6:40 adds another
illustration of his intolerance, James and John being desirous
of invoking the Divine vengeance on those who would not
receive their Master hospitably. Finally, the two brothers
awoke the indignation of the other apostles by asking that
when Messiah’s kingdom was established they should be
given the two principal places of honour as His viziers (Mk.
10:42; cf. Mt. 20:26, where it is their mother Salome that makes
the request). It is clear that they regarded themselves as in
no way inferior to Peter; nor is he represented as specially
agrieved by their claim; nor, again, does Jesus in His reply
suggest that they were not entitled to the chief place among
the Twelve (cf. note on 13:32). But He declares that earthly
precedence is reversed in His Kingdom, only asking of James and
John if they are able to drink His cup and be baptized with
His baptism. They assure Him that they can, and He tells
them that so it shall be (Mk. 10:42).
James is generally mentioned before John, but in Lk. 8:1
9:10, Acts 1:18, the order is Peter, John, James. Lk. specially
associates Peter with John. He notes (Lk. 22:3) that it was
Peter and John who were entrusted with the preparation for
the Last Supper. In Acts 1:11 42, Peter and John together
bear the brunt of Jewish hostility; and, again, these two are
selected by the apostles as delegates to confirm the Samaritans
(Acts 8:16). As early as the year 55, Paul mentions Peter and

1 Mk. (37) adds that Jesus gave them the title Ιεσοῦ, which he
interprets "sons of thunder." But no Aramaic word has been sug-
gested, corresponding to Ιεσοῦ, which could mean son Ιεσοῦ,
and the title remains obscure (cf. D.C.G. i. 210).
John, with James the Lord's brother, as the pillars of the Church at Jerusalem (Gal. 2). Peter is always represented as the spokesman, but John shares with him the responsibilities which leadership brings.

John is represented in Acts 4 as being, like Peter, ἀπόστολος καὶ διάκονος. That is, he was not learned in the lore of Rabbinical schools. To call him "illiterate and ignorant" would be to exaggerate, but the words employed do not suggest that he was a man of learning or of literary gifts.

John the son of Zebedee is not mentioned by name in the Fourth Gospel, and "the sons of Zebedee" collectively appear only in the Appendix (21:2). Having regard to the important position given to John by the Synoptists, it would be strange if he were ignored by the Fourth Evangelist. As has been said above, he may be indicated at 8 (where see note); and we now inquire if any disciple is mentioned by Jn., without being named, who is specially associated with Peter, as John is by Luke.

An unnamed disciple is mentioned (18:29) as having, in company with Peter, followed Jesus after His arrest; being known to the high priest, he was admitted to the inner court, while Peter had to stay outside. This might have been John the son of Zebedee, but there is no real evidence that it was one of the Twelve (see note on 18:29).

In three passages, however, an unnamed friend of Peter is described as "the disciple whom Jesus loved." First, the Beloved Disciple has a place next Jesus at the Last Supper, and Peter beckons to him to discover the name of the traitor. This must have been one of the Twelve (see on 13:28), and so his identification with John the son of Zebedee is suggested.

Secondly, Peter and "the other disciple whom Jesus loved," run together to the sepulchre which Mary Magdalene had reported to be empty (20:2). The Beloved Disciple's eagerness to be first at the tomb, his hesitation to enter it when it was reached, and his "belief" when he saw that it was empty, are graphically described.

Thirdly, the two disciples whose fates are contrasted in 21:30, are, again, Peter and ὁ ἀπόστολος ἦν ἐν οἴκῳ ὁ Ἰούσσα; and the latter is, apparently, a fisherman, as we know John the son of Zebedee to have been. The narrative of the Appendix helps the identification in another way. The "Beloved Disciple" must be one of the seven persons indicated in 21, and among these the sons of Zebedee are expressly included. James is excluded, for the tradition of v. 23 could not have arisen in regard to him (Acts 12), so that if the Beloved Disciple were not John the apostle, he must be either Thomas, Nathanael, or one of the two ἄνωνυμοι (see on 21:8 for the possibilities).

Now the constant tradition of the early Church was that the name of the Beloved Disciple was John. Irenæus (Har. III. i. x) and Polycrates (see p. I. below) are explicit about this. So are the second-century Acts of John (ἀποκαλυπτεί εἰς τῷ ἱερῷ συνόδῳ Ἰησοῦ, § 89). So is Origen (cf. Eusebius, H.E. vi. 25). This is a point on which tradition could not have gone astray, and there is no other tradition. There can be no reasonable doubt that the name of the Beloved Disciple was John, and therefore Thomas and Nathanael are excluded. If there was another John among the two ἄνωνυμοι, we might claim him as the Beloved Disciple, but for this there is no evidence.

The only other mention of the Beloved Disciple in Jn. is at 19:25, where he is standing near the Cross in company with the Virgin Mother, whom he received—as ἰσός—"to his lodging." This (see on 19:25) is not inconsistent with his being the "witness" to whom appeal is made in 19:35, for ample time had elapsed to permit of his return to the Cross. And when we find at 21:22 that it is the Beloved Disciple who is designated as "the disciple who bears witness of these things," it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the "witness" of 19:35 is the same person (cf. p. lxix below).

(ii) JOHN THE APOSTLE DID NOT SUFFER DEATH BY MARTYRDOM

Accepting the identification of the Beloved Disciple with the apostle John, the tradition of the early Church that John lived to extreme old age, which is suggested in 21:20 (see note in loc. and cf. p. xlvii f.), is consistent at every point.

This tradition has, however, been challenged; and some critics have put forward the theory that John the apostle, the son of Zebedee, died as a martyr early in his apostolic career; 5 so also is Lazarus, of whom it is said three times that Jesus loved him (Jn. 11:3, 5, 41). He was suggested as possibly the beloved disciple by W.K. Flaming, Guardian, 19th Dec. 1896, but he must be ruled out.

The theory that the Beloved Disciple is an ideal figure, and not a man of flesh and blood, has been put forward by a few critics, e.g. Râville: "Il apparaît comme un être irréel . . . le disciple idéal qui est sur le sein du Christ, comme le Christ est sur le sein du Dieu," quoted by Latimer-Jackson, The Problem of the Fourth Gospel, p. 135. But to dismiss the vivid notice of the Beloved Disciple in this way is a desperate expedient of exegetes.

5 This view is favored by Schwartz, Weilhausen, Schmiedel (E.B. 2509), Moffatt (Intro. p. 602), Bacon (Fourth Gospel, p. 131),
while a different person, viz. John the Beloved Disciple, lived to be an old man, and died peacefully at Ephesus. In a seventh-
or eighth-century Epitome of the History of Philip of Side (fl. circa 450) the statement is found that "Papias in the second book says that John the Divine and James his brother were killed by the Jews." A ninth-century writer, George the Sinner, reproduces part of this, and claims the fact that both of the sons of Zebedee met a violent death as a fulfilment of the Lord's prediction, Mk. 16. 28. For this story there is, however, no other authority than the epitomiser of Philip of Side, while, since the second century, the Christian Church has always accepted the statement of Irenaeus that John died a natural death.

The problem as to the death of John the apostle is so important in view of the inferences which have been drawn from it, that the method adopted by the epitomiser of Philip of Side, and also his trustworthiness, must be examined in detail, however tedious.

A

The series of extracts from ecclesiastical histories, one of which is here in question, are headed by the rubric: "A collection of different narratives, from the birth of our Lord according to the flesh, beginning from the first book (loýo) of the ecclesiastical history of Eusebius." The collection falls into seven sections, all of which borrow matter from Eusebius, but in one or two instances make use of tradition not found in that author's extant works. The sixth of these sections is concerned with Papias, and is printed in full in Lightfoot's Apostolic Fathers, p. 518. Much of the collection is in Eusebius; and it must be borne in mind that the Epitomiser does not profess to quote Papias at first hand. He only gives a summary (like a series of notes) of what he found in Philip of Side, who may or may not have had direct access to the writings of Papias. We shall describe him throughout as the Epitomiser, leaving it an open question (as we must) whether he correctly represents Philip of Side or not.

Burkitt (Gospel History and Transmission, p. 252), Charles (Revelation, i. p. xiv), and others. It is rejected by Lightfoot (Essays on Supernatural Religion, p. 212), Drummond (Character and Authorship, etc., p. 228), Zahn (Forsch. vi. 147), Chapman (John the Presbyter, p. 93), Harnefs (Chronol. i. 664 f.), Loch, Clemen, Armitage Robinson (Historical Character of St. John's Gospel, p. 64). I have discussed the problem at some length in Studia Sacra, p. 260 ff.

§ 11. JOHN DID NOT DIE BY MARTYRDOM

(a) The Epitomiser begins: "Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, who was a hearer of John the Divine and a companion of Polycarp, wrote five books (loýo) of Oracles of the Lord." The description of Papias as ἐκκοιτῶν Ἰάννου, Πολύκαρπος ἐκ ζώδευ is in Eusebius (iii. 39. 1), who is avowedly quoting from Irenaeus (v. 33. 4). The context in Irenaeus (v. 30. 3) is explicit as to John, whose hearer Papias was, being the author of the Apocalypse. The title ἐκ ζώδευ cannot have been in Papias, as it does not appear before the fourth century. The Epitomiser proceeds: "Wherein [i.e. in Papias' work], when giving a list of the apostles, after Peter and John, Philip and Thomas and Matthew, he included among the disciples of the Lord, Aristion and another John (Ἰάννου Διδών), whom also he called ἱναντίον." This again is abbreviated from Eusebius (iii. 39. 4), Andrew and James being omitted.

The next sentence, beginning ἵνα ἑκούσῃ, probably does not reproduce statements of Papias, but is a comment of the Epitomiser, although Lightfoot takes it differently. "So that some think that [this] John is the author of the two short and catholic epistles, which are published in the name of John, because the ἰναντίον [i.e. the early Church leaders] only accept the first epistle. Some, too, have wrongly thought the Apocalypse also to be his [i.e. John the presbyter's]." Papias himself would never have spoken of the ἰναντίον as authorities who passed judgment on the Johannine writings. The comment evidently comes from a later age, when questions of authorship and canonicity had arisen. It may be found in substance in Eusebius (iii. 35. 3). The Epitomiser depreciates the idea that the Apocalypse was not written by John the apostle.

(b) The Epitomiser proceeds: "Papias also goes wrong about the Millennium, and from him Irenaeus also." This also comes from Eusebius (iii. 39. 12), who says in connexion with it that Papias was a man of limited intelligence. The reference to Irenaeus is to v. 33. 4, as before.

(c) We pass by the next sentence, viz. about the martyrdom of John and James, until the rest of the Epitomiser has been examined.

(d) "The aforesaid Papias stated on the authority of the daughters of Philip, that Barsabbas, who is also called Justus, when challenged by the unbelievers, drank viper's poison in the name of Christ, and was preserved scathless." This is reproduced from Eusebius (iii. 39. 9). Eusebius does not

1 The Papias memoranda in the Epitomiser have been analysed also by Dom Chapman, John the Presbyter, p. 95, with whose general conclusion, that they are mainly derived from Eusebius, I agree.

2 See p. iii for this passage.
mention the nature of the poison (cf. [Mk.] 16:8), and he cites Philip's daughters not as the authority for this story, but for something similar to the next.

(3) "He relates also other wonderful things, and particularly the story about the mother of Manaimus, who was raised from the dead." Eusebius (Iii. 39. 9) notes that Papias had a story about a resurrection from the dead, and it is no doubt this to which the Epitomiser refers, giving, however, the additional detail of the name of the resuscitated person.

(4) The last note is: "as those raised from the dead by Christ, that they lived until the time of Hadrian." The Epitomiser does not say expressly that this comes from Papias, although it is among the Papias memoranda. It may have been added only because of its similarity to (3). In any case, it was told by Quadratus in his Apology addressed to Hadrian (Eusebius, iv. 3. 2) that some of those raised by Christ "survived to our own times." It is hardly doubtful that the Epitomiser is here again borrowing from Eusebius.

We observe, then, that the paragraphs a, b, d, e, f give no information about Papias or his writings that is not in Eusebius, except in regard to the name Manaimus, which may be a detail of independent tradition. If these memoranda were directly taken from Papias' writings, it is hardly credible that Philip of Side should have chosen exactly those points as notable which had already been selected by Eusebius. In short, it is doubtful that Philip of Side knew anything about Papias except what he found in Eusebius.

We now go back to the fragment of importance: (c) "Παπας ἐν τῇ δυτικῇ λόγῳ λέγει: ἦταν Ἰωάννης ὁ θεολόγος καὶ Ἰάκωβος δ ἀδελφοί κατὰ τῷ Ἰουδαϊκῷ ἑνδήμου." As in (a) the title ὁ θεολόγος has been added by the Epitomiser (or by Philip); it could not have been used by Papias.

The statement then is that "John and James his brother were killed by Jews." Now James the son of Zebedee was not killed by Jews, but by Herod (Acts 12:1), and Christian historians have never laid the guilt of his death upon the Jews. It is impossible to believe that Papias had any different tradition on the subject. Again, if Papias said that John the son of Zebedee was killed by Jews, we should have expected that in the Epitome incredulity would have been indicated.

1 Philip's contemporary, Socrates, says of him that he was a laborious student who had amassed many books, but that his history was underlaid by both loose and inexact, especially chronological (Socrates, Ecc. Hist., vii. 27). This agrees well with the mistakes and omissions that are to be observed in the fragments of the Epitome (including those about Papias) which have been printed by De Brec. Either Philip or his epitomiser was a blunderer.

§ 5.] JOHN DID NOT DIE BY MARTYRDOM

Epitomeriser believed (see p. xxxix above) that John wrote the Apocalypse, but this would have been impossible had John suffered martyrdom at the hands of the Jews. Nevertheless, the Epitomiser adds no adverse comment upon the belief with which he seems to credit Papias here, as he does in paragraph (b). This statement, then, both in regard to John and to James, provokes the suspicion that it is a misrepresentation or corruption of what Papias said.

I have shown elsewhere that the clue to the corruption is found in Jerome's version of the Chronicle of Eusebius; "Iacobus, frater domini quem omnem Justum appellantem, Judaicea lapidibus opprimitur." If we compare this with the Armenian version and also with the Greek history of Syncellus which is based on Eusebius, we find that the Greek text of the Chronicle at this point was: δ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ κυρίου Ἰάκωβου δ θεολόγος ὁ διδασκαλόων ὑπὸ τῶν δίκαιων ὡμοών ἐπὶ τῷ Ἱουδαϊκῷ δικαίωματι. Now the story of the martyrdom of James the Just is reproduced in Eusebius' History in full from Hegesippus, Josephus also being cited (ii. 23. 18, 26), both writers specially emphasising the fact that he was killed by Jews. When Eusebius comes to record this in his Chronicle he uses the very words ascribed in our Epitome to Papias ὑπὸ τῷ Ἰουδαϊκῷ δικαίωματι. The Epitomiser has used of the martyrdom of James the Great a phrase which really belonged to the martyrdom of James the Just.

It is true that the Epitomiser expressly assigns his statement to Papias, and appears to specify (for the only time in his whole work the actual book of the Εὐαγγέλια from which his memorandum is derived. It is in the second λόγος, this term being used by him, as in paragraph (a), for a volume or section of Papias' work. But these sections were called βιβλία, not λόγος, by Irenaeus (v. 33. 4), as well as by Maximinus Confessor (7th cent.), who shows direct acquaintance with the Εὐαγγέλια. No doubt λόγος may be only a slip on the part of the Epitomiser for the more accurate βιβλία. But it is suspicious that λόγος is the very term used by Eusebius (not by Papias) for the divisions of his History, and the Epitomiser knew this (see p. xxxviii). Is it not then probable that when the Epitomiser gives ἐν τῇ δυτικῇ λόγῳ as his reference, he is quoting from the

2. So it is restored in Migne's text; cf. also Schoene's edition of the Chronicle, ii. p. 154.
4. Eusebius describes the Five Books of Papias as εὐαγγελίατα (iii. 39. 1).
5. This was first pointed out by W. Lockton (Theology, Aug. 1925, p. 81).
§ 41. JOHN DID NOT DIE BY MARTYRDOM

Also in the Calendar of Carthage (505 A.D.) we find:


Dec. 27. S. Iohannis Baptistae et Jacobi apostoli quem Herodes occidit.

Dec. 28. Sanctorum Infantum quos Herodes occidit.

It is argued that, as John Baptist is commemorated in the same Calendar on June 24, the entry S. Iohannis Baptistae here must be a mere mistake for S. Ioannis Evangelista, whose day is Dec. 27 in later Calendars of the West. And the conclusion is drawn that, in the Syriac Martyrology and in the Carthage Calendar alike, John is commemorated as a martyr.

This argument misconceives the principle on which the early Calendars were constructed. The Syriac Martyrology may be compared with a passage in Aphrahat (†344): "After Christ was the faithful martyr Stephen whom the Jews stoned. Simon also and Paul were perfect martyrs. And James and John walked in the footsteps of their Master Christ." 1 It will be noticed that it is not said explicitly here that James and John suffered a martyr's death. Now the selection of Stephen, Peter, James, John, Paul, as the great leaders whose memory was celebrated after Christmas, is specially mentioned by Gregory of Nyssa (circa 385) as customary. He explains 2 that they were commemorated as "leaders of the apostolic chorus" (τε οι παντοκράτοροι ἀρχοντες τοῦ ναοῦ) and adds that they endured the combat with different kinds of martyrdom (τοις παντοκράτοροι παθησαν χριστιανούς). Peter being crucified, James beheaded, and John's witness being fulfilled, first in his trial when flung into the cauldron of boiling oil, and secondly in his continual willingness to die for Christ. The praise of the proto-martyr is followed, Gregory says, by a commemoration of apostles, "for neither are martyrs without apostles, nor are apostles separated from them." The insertion of names in the Church Calendars did not depend on their title of μάρτυς in the restricted meaning of one who suffered death for his Christian witness. And the same principle is enunciated by Gregory of Nazianzus about the same time in his panegyric on St. Basil the Great. 3 He compares Basil to the great men of the O.T. and N.T., mentioning in order John the Baptist, "the zeal of Peter, the intensity of Paul... the lofty utterance (μεγαλοθυμος) of the sons of

Zebedee, the frugality and simplicity of all the disciples,” adding that he did not suffer Stephen’s fate, although willing to face it. Like Aphrathus, he mentions the five great leaders, making it plain that the pre-eminence of Peter, Paul, James, and John, which made them worthy of special commemoration, did not rest on their martyrdom, for this is only mentioned in the case of Stephen.

Thus the evidence for John’s death by martyrdom, which is derived from the evidence of Church Calendar, must be dismissed; for Calendars included the names of great leaders, whether they were “red” martyrs or no.\(^1\)

C

A third, and minor, plea in support of the theory that John the apostle died a martyr’s death is based on a statement quoted by Clement of Alexandria (\textit{Strom.} iv, 9) from the commentary of Heracleon on Lk. 18:34. Schmiedel observes that Heracleon, while expressly mentioning Matthew, Philip, Thomas, and Levi among many who did not suffer death by martyrdom, does not mention John the apostle, who would have been entitled to the first place had Heracleon known of his peaceful end.\(^2\) But this is to misunderstand Heracleon, who is combating the extravagant claims sometimes made on behalf of “confessors.” We must distinguish, he says, those who have been called to make public confession of their faith before a magistrate from those who have only made their Christian confession in peaceful ways of life. For instance, we must place Matthew, Philip, Thomas, etc., in the latter category. Heracleon does not claim these apostles as “confessors with the voice.” And he does not put John the apostle among them, because he inherited the general Christian tradition that John had made confession and had been exiled to Patmos \textit{διὰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Τριγών} (Rev. 1:9). Whether Heracleon were right or wrong as to the fortunes of the apostles whom he names is not to the point. But, on his view, it is certain that he could not have excluded John from those who bore public witness to their faith. The example of John would not have served his purpose on any view of the apostle’s end. I submit that Schmiedel’s argument based on Heracleon must be set aside.

\(^{1}\) For a fuller discussion, I may refer to \textit{Studia Sceena}, pp. 275 ff. The view here has been accepted by Flinders (\textit{West. Literature}, 1909, p. 11), by J. A. Robinson (\textit{Hist. Character of St. John’s Gospel}, p. 60 ff.), and others.

\(^{2}\) E.B. 2517.

\[\text{§ iii.]}\]  \textbf{THE APOSTLE AND THE PRESBYTER}  \[\text{xiv}\]

Lastly, the idea that Mk. 10:42-43 contains a prediction of John’s death by violence rests upon a forgetfulness of the context and a misunderstanding of the words employed. (1) None of the apostles believed at the time that Jesus was going to die, and the affirmation of James and John that they could drink his cup and be baptized with His baptism did not contemplate death for themselves any more than for Him. He knew this, and knew, too, that a prediction of violent death for them both was a prediction which they could not have understood. (2) The present tenses \textit{ποιεῖ, βλέπετε, οἴκηται}, do not point to what was still in the future for Jesus, but to that ministry of sorrow which had already begun for Him. (3) To “drink the cup” is a familiar O.T. metaphor, often descriptive of accepting tribulation appointed by God (Ps. 18:7, Isa. 53:11, Jer. 23:9). It always involves pain, but not necessarily a violent death. (4) \textit{βλέπετε} means here “to be overwhelmed” as it were with a flood of calamity, the verb being used thus Isa. 21:1 (LXX), Ps. 69:1 (Symmachus), and Ps. 55:9. For the image of an afflicted saint being overwhelmed with tides of misfortune (which do not always end in death), cf. Ps. 43:4, 42:3, 69:14, 88:5. (5) \textit{οἴκηται} is a literal Greek rendering of an Aramaic expression meaning “to be overwhelmed,” i.e., by the deep waters of God’s appointment (cf. Lk. 18:38). (6) To suppose that \textit{οἴκηται} carries allusion to a “baptism of blood” is an anachronism suggested by the patristic notion that death by martyrdom was like baptism, in that it too brought remission of sins. This idea is found nowhere in the N.T. (7) Origen, even while struggling to relate Mk. 10:33-40 to a “baptism of blood,” regards John’s baptism to Patmos and James’ execution by Herod as equally fulfilments of Christ’s saying that they would drink his cup and be baptized with His baptism. (8) The plain meaning of Mk. 10:33-40 is that they should both endure tribulation and pain even as He was enduring it; and so it came to pass.

\[\text{\textbf{\textit{iii. John the Apostle and John the Presbyter}}}\]

In the preceding section (\textit{iii}) of this chapter we have reached the conclusion that the evidence alleged in favour of the martyrdom of John the apostle by Jews is worthless. We continue to follow the tradition of the second century, that he died in

\(^{3}\) See \textit{Wend}, \textit{Hesychia, in loc.}

\(^{4}\) \textit{Comm. in Matt.} tom. xvi. 6.

\(^{5}\) I have treated Mk. 10:33-40 more fully in \textit{J.T.S.}, Apr. 1927.
extreme old age at Ephesus, where he was buried. The first allusion to his long life is found in the Appendix to the Fourth Gospel (Jn. 21:1-25), a passage which is harmonious with the earliest tradition.

There is no doubt as to the belief of the second century, which was followed by all Christendom, that John the apostle was the author of the Fourth Gospel, at any rate in the sense that his apostolic witness was behind it. Papias, Ireneus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Hippolytus, Tertullian, and others are clear as to this, as we shall see; and most of them ascribed to John the apostle the authorship of the Apocalypse and of the Johannine Epistles as well. We shall examine in detail the evidence of Ireneus, Polycrates, and Papias, as much depends on the precise words which they use. We shall find ourselves compelled by Papias to recognize the existence of two Johns, both of whom lived at Ephesus at the end of the first century; although the literature of the second century, outside Papias, betrays no knowledge of that.

The evidence of second-century writers cannot be interpreted until we have apprehended the meaning which they attach to the words ἀπόστολος, πρεσβύτερος, διδάκτης. Most of our evidence as to this terminology must come from Ireneus, as little is extant of the writings of Papias and Polycrates, while Justin has not much to tell about John.

A. IRENEUS

The term "apostles" stands primarily for the Twelve, Paul also being an apostle (cf. Justin, Dial. 81, Ireneus, Ebr. iii. 13. 1, iv. 21. 1). As in Acts 12:1, 1 Cor. 9, the essential condition is that an "apostle" has "seen the Lord," and can therefore give his testimony at first hand. Clement of Alexandria speaks of Barnabas as an ἀπόστολος (Strom. ii. 6), while in another place (Strom. ii. 29) he calls him ἀποστόλους, as a companion of apostles. Tertullian distinguishes ἀποστολικός from ἀπόστολος in the same way (de Præser. 33, adv. Marc. iv. 2).

As in Acts 15:2-28, the distinction between ἀπόστολος and πρεσβύτερος is clearly marked, the ἀπόστολος being the original leaders, while the πρεσβύτεροι were those who carried on their work. Ireneus uses the term πρεσβύτερος to designate those who, whether officially or unofficially, had succeeded to the position of leadership which the apostles held. Thus "quaupræter comes qui in ecclesia sunt, presbiteris obsequentibus, et qui successionem habent ab apostolis" (v. 26. 2); "τοὺς ἀπόστολους μαθητὰς" (v. 5: 1); "praebiteri qui Ioannem discipulum domini uiderunt" (v. 33. 3); "dicunt presbyteri apostolorum discipuli," etc. (v. 36. 2; cf. Demontr. § 2). Again, the term ἀποστόλος is sometimes used by Ireneus of men of the third Christian generation: "quemadmodum audieti a quodam presbitero, qui audierat ab his qui apostolos uiderant et ab his qui didicerant" (v. 27. 1). That is to say, presbyters are either disciples of apostles, or disciples of their disciples; they are the leaders of the Church in the second and third generations. There is no example, in the literature of the second century, of the equation ἀποστόλος = ἀποστόλους.

The term "the Lord's disciples" is used sometimes, as it is still in the widest sense. Those who leave all and follow Jesus are thus described by Ireneus (iv. 8. 3), while the phrase discipuli Christi is used more generally still (v. 22. 2). But the term is also applied in a stricter sense to those who were among the first disciples, a circle including, but wider than, that of the Twelve. Thus Ireneus in one place distinguishes the "apostles" from the "disciples of the Lord." Commenting on Acts 4:27, he says, "αὐτοὶ γὰρ τῶν ἀποστόλων, αὐτοὶ γὰρ τῶν μαθητῶν τοῦ Κυρίου" (iii. 12. 5). Among the company present on that occasion were others besides the Twelve, and "the disciples of the Lord" would have included those who were μαθηταί although not of the inner circle. Some of these early disciples, including some who had actually seen and heard Jesus in the flesh, may well have outlived the original apostles; and "Ariston and the presbyter John" are described by Papias as οἱ τῶν κυρίου μαθηταί, some of the apostles being described by him in the same way. To this passage from Papias we shall return presently (p. liii).

We must collect now what Ireneus says about John (as distinct from John the Baptist). The title "the disciple of the Lord" in the singular is applied by Ireneus to so one but John; and he speaks a dozen times of "John the disciple of the Lord." E.g. this is the designation of the author of the Prologue to the Gospel (i. 8. 5, ii. 2. 5, iii. 11. 3), as of the author of the Gospel itself (ii. 22. 3, iii. 16. 3). In. 28th and 29th being quoted. Ireneus is explicit about this (iii. 1: 1): Ἰωάννης ὁ μαθητὴς τοῦ Κυρίου ὁ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ στήριγμα αὐτῶν ἀναστησάθη, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔλαβε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ἐν Ἐφεσος τῆς Ἀσίας διαστρήματα. In this passage "John the disciple of the Lord" is he who "lay on His breast," and "gave out" the Gospel at Ephesus, the verb ἔδωκεν being used rather than ἔδωκεν. Ireneus also mentions John the disciple of the Lord as the author of Epp. i. and ii. (I. 16. 3, iii. 16. 3); and as the seer of the

1 See p. liii below.
Apostle John and Fourth Gospel

Apocalypse, the vision being seen towards the end of Domitian’s reign (IV. 30. 4, V. 26. 1, 30. 3). He cites Papias as his authority for a Chilastic prophecy, introducing it in the words “the presbyters, who saw John the disciple of the Lord, relate that they had heard from him how the Lord used to teach concerning those times and to say,” etc. (V. 33. 3); and adding at the end, ταύτης δὲ καὶ Παπίας, Ἰωάννου μὲν ἀκούσαν, Ἰωάννου δὲ ἔφη αὐτοῖς γεγονός, ἄρχοντας δήν, ἐγγράφον ἐπιμερισμένον τεκ. (V. 33. 4). Thus the habit of Irenaeus is to describe the Beloved Disciple as “John, the disciple of the Lord,” as if he were pre-eminently entitled to that designation. He explicitly names him as the author of Gospel, First and Second Epistle, and Apocalypse.

Finally, for Irenaeus, John was an apostle. Having cited the language of the Prologue, which ascribes to John, he notes: ὅτι δὲ εἰς τῶν συνεχῶν αὐτῶν διὰ ὑποτύπου εἰρήκεν (i. 9. 2). Again, mentioning a tradition handed on by John the disciple of the Lord to “all the presbyters who had intercourse” with him in Asia, he adds that these presbyters had the tradition not only from John, but from other apostles (ii. 27. 3). So again: “the Church in Ephesus founded by Paul, John remaining with them until the times of Trajan, is a true witness of the tradition of the apostles” (iii. 3. 4). And, speaking of Polycarp’s observance of Easter, Irenaeus adds that Polycarp followed the custom of “John the disciple of our Lord, and of other apostles with whom he had associated” (Eusebius, H.E. v. 24. 16), explaining in another place that John was one of those who had seen the Lord (Eus. H.E. v. 20. 6).

We have already seen that apostol for Irenaeus (as for other writers) means one of the Twelve, or some one of similar status, such as Paul. Hence to call John the disciple of the Lord an “apostle” means that he is to be identified with John the son of Zebedee. And Irenaeus makes no attempt to distinguish two Johns. He mentions the early preaching of Peter and John (iii. 12. 3, “Petrus cum Iohanne”), and describes it as the teaching of apostol (ii. 12. 4). “The apostles whom the Lord made witnesses of every action and every doctrine” included “Peter and James and John” who were everywhere present with Him (iii. 12. 15; cf. also iii. 21. 3).

Irenaeus became bishop of Lyons about 177 A.D., and his great work on Herecists was written about 180. He tells in his Letter to Florinus (Eus. H.E. v. 20) that when a boy he had often seen Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna (born about 70 A.D., martyred in 155), who had been a disciple of John, and who used to tell what he had heard from him and other apostles about our Lord. Irenaeus was born about 132, and lived until 201 or thereabouts, having left Asia Minor for Rome and the West not later than 155. It is difficult to suppose that he had misunderstood what Polycarp had been accustomed to tell about John, or that Polycarp could have been mistaken as to the career of John the apostle. Irenaeus tells the story of John’s sorrow of Cerinthus and his doctrine (iii. 3. 4) on Polycarp’s authority, although he does not say that he got it directly from him. He alleges in another place (iii. 11. 2) that John’s purpose in his Gospel (pro evangeli annotatione), and especially in the Prologue, was to combat the heretical teaching of Cerinthus.

Irenaeus, then, only knows of one John at Ephesus, whom he speaks of as John the Beloved Disciple and an apostle; he regards him as the author of the Gospel and the Apocalypse, as well as of Epp. I. II.

B. Polycrates

We possess part of a letter written by Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, to Pope Victor, about 190 A.D., on the subject of the observance of Easter. Polycrates defends the Quartodeciman practice, not only as “in accordance with the Gospel,” but because it was the tradition of the Church in Asia Minor. Accordingly, he begins by naming “the great lights” (μεγάλα σωροῦν) of that Church, viz. Philip the apostle and his daughters, John, Polycarp, Thraseas, Sagaris, and Papias, the last being perhaps the same as Papias of Hierapolis.

1 See, for details, Lusius in Dict. Chr. Biogr., iii. 253 f.

3 Apparently the Asian Quartodecimans celebrated Easter on Nisan 14 (the day of the Jewish Passover), irrespective of the day of the week, while the Western Church had the celebration on the Sunday, irrespective of the day of the month. But the arguments by which the Quartodecimans supported their practice are not very clear. If it was because they celebrated, in particular, the institution of the Eucharist, and held that this was at a Passover meal, of which Jesus partook, then they would seem to follow the Synoptic chronology (see p. 201). It, however, the stress was laid on Jesus being Himself the true Paschal Lamb, they relied on the Fourth Gospel. But the probability is that what was intended by all Christians on Easter Day was to commemorate the Redemption of Christ generally, which included the Last Supper, the Crucifixion, and the Resurrection alike. No conclusive argument for or against their reliance on the Fourth Gospel can be made on their practice as to the day of the month. See Stanton, The Gospels as Historical Documents, i. 399. 279-297, for an admirable account of the matter.

4 Polycrates has been thought to have confused Philip the apostle with Philip the evangelist, but of this there is neither evidence nor probability.
and Melito as eminent persons whose example should command respect in the matter of Easter observance.

Philip’s memory was revered at Hierapolis, where he died (cf. Acts of Philip, §§ 107, 135). He is not called μάρτυς, nor is there any early tradition that he died by violence (cf. Clem. Alex. Strom. iv. 6).

Polycarp of Smyrna, Thraseas of Eumenia, and Sagaris are briefly described in the same way, viz. εὐσεβεῖς καὶ μάρτυρες, the two first being buried at Smyrna and the last-named at Laodicea. On Pageirus the Blessed and Melito of Sardis we need not delay. Melito had written a book relating to Quartodecimansm.

Polycrates, however, has something more to say of John, who is mentioned immediately after Philip: ἔντυσεν δὲ ἦν τὸ στέφανον τοῦ κυρίου ἐκατερού, ἢς δεξίων ἐρωτότο κατὰ πάλαιον στέφων, καὶ μάρτυρα καὶ διδάσκαλον σώζει τίς ἔφεστε κακώστηρα. Like Irenæus (ii. 1. § 1), Polycrates describes John by quoting verbatim from Is. 13, viz. ἀνασκονών ἐν τῷ στήριγμα τοῦ ἱεροῦ, thus identifying him with the Beloved Disciple. He, as bishop of Ephesus, is an even weightier authority than Irenæus, when he associates John’s last years with that city.

By Polycrates John is called μάρτυς. We have already examined and set aside the idea that John the apostle came to his death by martyrdom at the hands of the Jews in early days (p. xxxviii.). But Polycrates cannot mean that John the apostle was μάρτυς in this sense, for, if that were so, he would have had no connection with the Church of Ephesus, and he could not have been cited as one of the great lights of the Church in Asia Minor. And if it be suggested that Polycrates has here in mind some other John, it must be rejoined that no one with that name is known to the tradition of the first or second century (or even later) as having come to a violent end at Ephesus because of his Christian profession.

Further, had Polycrates meant to describe the John to whom he refers as having ended his life by martyrdom, the fact that he was μάρτυρα would have been mentioned last, after his career as διδάσκαλος had been noted. In the cases of Polycarp and the rest, εὐσεβεῖς καὶ μάρτυρα is the description of their Christian course. They were bishops before they were martyrs, and to have written μάρτυς εὐσεβεῖς would have been both clumsy and ambiguous.

It is clear, then, that μάρτυς as applied to John of Ephesus by Polycrates must mean “witness” or “confessor” rather than “martyr.” We have already referred to the description

1 Not as a less important person than Philip, but because he came to Asia Minor later than Philip.

§ III.]  

of John in later literature as a “martyr,” the idea going back to Rev. 19 (see p. xlii). But the famous person to whom Polycrates refers, viz. the Beloved Disciple, is specially noted in the Fourth Gospel for his μαρτυρία. “This is the disciple which beareth witness (μαρτυρίας) of these things... and we know that his witness is true” (Jn. 21:24). It was because of the value of his μαρτυρία that the recollectionsconstituted John were regarded with such veneration, and were certified as authentic by the Ephesian Church when the Fourth Gospel was first published. He was the witness to whom solemn appeal is also made at Jn. 19 (cf. 3 Jn. 12). To the Ephesian Church, where this Gospel was first put forth, John the Beloved Disciple, as the final authority for the facts which it records, was pre-eminently μάρτυς after a fashion that no other Ephesian Christian could ever be.

Polycrates also calls John of Ephesus διδάσκαλος. This is a title which might fittingly be used of any Christian teacher. But it is perhaps significant that the second-century Acts of John have preserved this title as applied to John the apostle. In § 37 Andronicus is made to say of him, ἀνθρωπισταὶ δὲ διδάσκαλοι θυγατέρες, τοῖς πορευόμενοις (cf. also § 73). It does not appear that any other apostle is described in the apocryphal Acts, or elsewhere, as διδάσκαλος, “the Teacher,” par excellence.

Like Irenæus, Polycrates does not suggest that there were two eminent Christian leaders called John in Ephesus at the end of the first century. Had there been a second John of such wide reputation that his name and position were known and respected at Rome, we should have expected the bishop of Ephesus to include him also among the “great lights,” whom he mentions in his letter to Pope Victor. It does not follow, however, that Polycrates had never heard of a second John. That might be true of Irenæus, but the traditions of the see of Ephesus could not have been unknown to its bishop. All that can be inferred from the language of Polycrates is that, if there were at Ephesus in the first century a John other than John the Beloved Disciple, he was not adduced as an authority on the Paschal controversy.

An argument based on silence is generally precarious. In this instance, Polycrates does not mention at all the name of Claudius Apollinaris of Hierapolis, who took an active part

1 Müller (Introd. to N.T., p. 458) explains “Witness” and “Teacher” as allusive respectively to the Apocalypse and the Epistles.


For the statement of Polycrates that the Beloved Disciple wore the priestly frontlet, see Additional Notes on Jn. 19.
at Laodicea in supporting the Quartodecimans practice, about the year 165, and wrote on the subject. It could not be argued that Polycrates did not know of him, although it is not clear why he does not name him as one of the "great lights" of Asia. Equally, we must not infer that he did not know of a second John, whose existence, as we shall see, Papia had mentioned (p. liii) half a century before.

So, too, Polycrates does not speak (at least in the extant fragment) of John the Beloved Disciple as the actual writer of the Fourth Gospel. It is remarkable that Polycrates does not adduce as a notable honour to Asia Minor the fact that the Fourth Gospel was produced there; but, again, no argument built on omissions of this kind can be conclusive. To the fact, however, we shall return presently.

C. PAPIAS

Papia, who was bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia, was born about A.D. 70, and died about 146, being thus of the generation preceding Irenæus. A fragment of his λογίων εὐρειών ἵσσηνες tells of the sources from which he gathered information as to Christian origins: "I shall not hesitate to add whatever at any time I learnt well from the presbyters (σομα τῶν προσβυθέρων καθὼς ἰδίως). . . . If I met anywhere with any one who had been a follower of the presbyters, I used to inquire what the presbyters had told (τοῖς τῶν προσβυθέρων δόκουν λέγοντες); (viz.) what Andrew or Peter said (καὶ οὗ), or Philip or Thomas or James or John or Matthew, or any other of the Lord's disciples; and also what Aristion and the presbyter John (καὶ προσβυθέρος Ἰωάννης), the Lord's disciples, say (λέγουσιν). For I did not expect to gain so much from books as from a living and abiding voice." 8 (Eus. H.E. i. 39).

(a) The opening sentence claims for Papia that he had had opportunity of learning directly from προσβυθέρων, i.e. from followers of the apostles. Papia was hardly of an age to begin collecting information until the year 90 or 85 at earliest. The only apostle alive at that time was John, and Papia might, indeed, as a man of twenty, have heard him speak. Irenæus calls Papia Ἰωάννου λέοντος (v. 33. 4), which means that Irenæus believed him to have been a hearer of John the apostle.

1 It is possible that Apollinaris was alive at the time of writing, and that Polycrates only cites the authority of those who had passed away.

2 The Syriac translation (ed. Wright and M'Lea, 1896) has "Neither did I compare," which makes havoc of the sense.

3 It was probably from traditions of this kind that the story of the adulterous woman was derived.
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(see p. xlviii.) But Papia does not say so, as Eusebius (H.E. iii. 39. 2) is careful to point out. προσβυθέρος in the opening sentence does not stand for Ἰωάννου (and it never does so, see p. xlviii above), but for those who were followers of the apostles, Christians of the second generation. Such men as these Papia had naturally met and conversed with, although he was probably younger than they.

(b) He proceeds to say that he had also seized every opportunity of making inquiry of their followers (i.e. Christians of the third generation) as to anything they could report about the sayings of ἀποστολικεῖς, viz. Peter, John, and the rest. And (c) Papia had sought to find out what sayings were ascribed to two of the disciples of the Lord, still living at the time when he made his inquiries, viz. Aristion and the presbyter John. That is, Papia speaks of Aristion and the presbyter John as the last survivors of the presbyters who were successors of the apostles, being indeed themselves "disciples of the Lord." 1 Of the outer circle of the original μαθηταί, some of the younger people must have survived the original Twelve. Themselves in time reckoned as presbyters, and being specially respected in the next generation as those who had seen Jesus in the flesh, some who were only boys at the Crucifixion, lived on as younger contemporaries of the apostles. There would be nothing surprising if one or two of these survived until Papia had reached full manhood, and were able to tell (although Papia only learnt from hearsay what they told) of the sayings of some of the Twelve, e.g. of John the apostle.

Eusebius (iii. 39. 7) reports that "Papia says that he was himself a hearer of Aristion and the presbyter John." This does not appear from the passage cited, and Eusebius seems to have been uncertain about it, for he adds: "At least (ὅτι) he mentions them frequently by name, and gives their traditions in his writings" (cf. iii. 39. 7, 14). That is a different matter, and there is nothing to discredit it. Of the John who is mentioned first by Papia, along with Peter and the rest, Eusebius says that Papia clearly identified him with the evangelist; and he adds later in the chapter (iii. 39. 17) that Papia had "used testimonies" from the first Epistle of John. 8 Eusebius is, in our view, right in holding that Papia distinguished the apostle John from "the presbyter John."
For the sayings of the first John, Papias apparently had to make inquiry at a time when John had passed away; but for the sayings of the second John he was able to inquire while John was yet alive. In both cases his informants were the followers of the presbyters who had succeeded the apostles. It is implied that the apostle John died before the presbyter John. Probably the former lived to a great age, as Irenaeus implies (cf. p. 57vii); but that a yet younger disciple of Jesus, who may only have been a child during his Master's public ministry, outlived the aged apostle is in no way improbable.

Another passage from the ἑγγέροντος of Papias, quoted by Eusebius (H.E. iii. 39. 15) begins with the words καὶ ὥσπερ τὸ προεισάγησθαι ὅπερ καὶ. Here the context in Eusebius shows that ὅ προεισάγησθαι is none other than John the presbyter, some of whose traditions Papias had received. That is, the designation ὅ προεισάγησθαι is treated as sufficiently identifying John the presbyter, although his name is not given. To this we shall return (see p. 1xii).

We conclude that Papias knew of the presbyter John, as distinguished from his elder namesake, the apostle John.¹

D

No writer for a hundred years after Papias seems to have supported the tradition that more than one John had to be reckoned with. Dionysius of Alexandria (250 A.D.) distinguished two Johns, but he reached this conclusion on critical grounds, as a modern scholar would do. Observing that the style of the Apocalypse differs from that of the Gospel and Epistles,² he claimed the apostle John as the author only of the latter, while the other John (whom he does not call the προεισάγησθαι) was held by him to be the seer of the Apocalypse.³ In confirmation of this he says that he had heard of two monuments at Ephesus, each bearing the name of John. Eusebius takes up this idea from Dionysius, and mentions it ⁴ as corroborating the existence of two Johns which he had noted in the work of Papias.

It will be convenient at this point to summarise what is said about John by other writers before the time of Dionysius. For none of them is there a Johannine problem.

Clement of Alexandria (fl. 190-200) does not mention a

¹ The distinction has often been challenged, e.g. by Zahn (Einleitung, ii. 217f.), Salmon (Dict. Christ. Biog. iii. 407), Chapman (John the Presbyter, p. 28f.), and Lawlor (Hermathena, 1922, p. 205 f.).
² Cf. p. 18iv below.
³ Eusebius, H.Ee. vii. 33.
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second John. As to the son of Zebedee, he is unambiguous. The apostle John, "when on the tyrant's death he returned to Ephesus from the isle of Patmos, went away to the neighbouring districts to appoint bishops to set in order whole churches and to ordain" (Quis dixit salutarem, § 42). As to the composition of the gospels, Eusebius preserves (H.E. vi. 14. 7) a tradition recorded by Clement: "Last of all, John, perceiving that the external facts (τὰ σαρκασμοὶ) had been made plain in the gospels, being urged by his friends and inspired by the Spirit, composed a spiritual gospel." This he cites (Προτ. 1. 6. 35) as the "Gospel according to John," and quotes as well the Apocalypse (Strom. vi. 13) and Epistle I. (Strom. iv. 16) as the work of John.

Origen (fl. 210-250), who was Clement's pupil, says that John the Beloved Disciple wrote both Gospel and Apocalypse (Comm. 438, Eus. H.E. vi. 25. 9), and in another place expressly ascribes the Apocalypse to John the son of Zebedee (Comm. 26). He notes (Eus. I.c.) that, while John wrote the first Epistle, it is not universally admitted that he wrote the second and third. He tells elsewhere that the emperor (probably Domitian) banished John to Patmos.¹

The Gnostic Acta Ioannis (second century) in like manner speak of John as an apostle and the brother of James (§ 38), also as the Beloved Disciple (§ 85); these Acta tell of John's residence at Ephesus (§ 18), and use language which betrays knowledge of the Fourth Gospel (§§ 97, 98).

In the West, the tradition is the same. On the Chair of Hippolytus (fl. 190-236) both the Gospel and Apocalypse are ascribed to John, whom Hippolytus describes (ed. Lagarde, p. 172) as ἄνδρα ἁγίου καὶ μαθητὴν τοῦ κυρίου.

Tertullian (c. 208) ascribes Gospel, the first Epistle, and the Apocalypse to the apostle John (adv. Marc. iii. 14, iv. 5. v. 15), and describes the churches of Asia (cf. Rev. 2, 3) as John's αὐθαυστική ecclesiæ.

None of these writers mentions a second John, except Papias.

(iv) THE MURATORIAN FRAGMENT AND THE LATIN PREFACES ON THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE GOSPEL

We have seen that, with the important exception of Papias, no Christian writer before 250 A.D. mentions the presbyter John as a person distinct from the apostle John; and also that the apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse was accepted without argument by Irenaeus, Hippolytus,¹ Comm. in Matt. cem. xvi. 6.
APOSTLE JOHN AND FOURTH GOSPEL [Ch. II.

Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and Origen. The unanimity of these writers shows how deep-rooted was the early tradition that the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse alike were the work of the apostle John. In the case of the Apocalypse this was afterwards challenged on the ground of style by Dionysius of Alexandria about the year 250 (see p. liv above).

But we have now to reckon with the fact that the early traditions as to the way in which the Fourth Gospel was given to the Church do not suggest that it was written by the unassisted pen of John the apostle, although he was reckoned (and, as we hold, correctly) to be its author in the sense that it rests upon his authority. These traditions must be examined.

A

The famous Muratorian Fragment on the Canon of the N.T. is part of a book produced at Rome about the year 170, perhaps written by Hippolytus. The fragment is in Latin, but Lightfoot held that probably it had originally been written in Greek. It preserves a remarkable story about the composition of the Fourth Gospel. John, ex discipulis, wrote the Fourth Gospel. At the instigation of his fellow-disciples and bishops to write, he bade them fast with him for three days, in order that they should relate to each other afterwards whatever revelation they had received. It was revealed to the apostle Andrew that, with the revision of all (recognoscitibus cunctis), John should describe all things in his own name. "... What wonder is it that John brings forward details with so much emphasis in his epistles ... " 1 Jn. 1, 1 being then cited. "... For so he professes that he was not only a spectator (uisorem), but also a hearer (auditorem), and moreover a writer (scriptorem) of all the wonders of the Lord in order." Later on, the Fragment mentions among the canonical epistles two of John (superscripti Johannis duas). The author also names the Apocalypses of John and Peter as received by him, although some were unwilling that they should be read in church.

The circumstantial story about the composition of the Fourth Gospel cannot be historically exact. That the apostle Andrew (and apparently the other apostles as well) lived up to the time when the Gospel was produced is inconsistent with all the evidence on the subject. But that others besides the

§ 17. MONARCHIAN PREFACE

apostle John were concerned in the publication of the Gospel of Ephesus is probable, and, as we shall see, is a tradition that appears elsewhere. The sentence, "ut recognoscitibus cunctis Johannes suo nomine cuncta describeret," does not give the whole credit of authorship to John, whose name, nevertheless, the Gospel bore from the time of its issue. That John was not only uisor and auditor, but actually scriptor, might be taken to lay stress on his being the "penman, as well as the witness, of what is narrated. But, as we have urged in the note on Jn. 21, ypero in that passage does not necessarily mean more than "dictated to a scribe."

B

Mention must next be made of the well-known Latin Preface to the Vulgate text of Jn. 4 Here tradition again reproduces the belief that Johannes evangelista unus ex discipulis dei wrote the Gospel in Asia after the Apocalypse had been written in Patmos, and his death is thus described: "Hic est Johannes qui scies super tune diem recessus sui, commocat sui discipulis suis in Epheso, per multa signorum experimenta promem Christum, descendens in deosos sepulchrae locum facta oratione posuit est ad patres suos, tam extraneus a colore mortis quam a corruptione carnis inuenitur alienus." This goes back to the second-century Acts of John, where it is told at greater length (§§ 211-215). The legend that John's body did not taste corruption, but that the earth used to tremble over his grave as if he were breathing, is mentioned by Augustine (In Jn. 27) as held by some.

In this Preface (and the corresponding prefices to the Synoptic Gospels) Corssen 3 has found traces of Monarchianism. The phrase discipulis dei for discipulis domini is significant; and special stress is laid on the virginity of John. The Preface, as originally written, implies that St. John's Gospel came next after St. Matthew's in the accepted order of the books; i.e. that the order was Mt., Jn., Lk., Mt.

Here, the expression "commocat discipulis suis in Epheso" is to be noted, for although this is not directly connected by the author with the composition of the Gospel, as is the similar phrase in the Muratorianum, both go back to some early tradition based on, or interpretative of, Jn. 21. Corssen ascribes these Monarchian Prefaces to the first quarter of the third century.

1 Printed in Routh, Reliq. Sac., i. 394, in Westcott, Canon of N.T., p. 349, and elsewhere.
2 Lightfood, Clement, ii. 408.
4 See his essay in Text und Untersuchungen, xvii. (1896).
C

More important than the Monarchian Prefaces just mentioned, is another Latin Preface to Jn., found in a tenth-century Bible at Toledo, 1 which contains the following passage:

"The apostle John, whom the Lord Jesus loved most, last of all wrote this Gospel, at the request of the bishops of Asia, against Cerinthus and other heretics, and specially against the new dogma of the Ebionites, who say that Christ did not exist before He was born of Mary." Another reason is added for the writing of the Gospel, viz., that the evangelist wished to supply information, lacking in the Synoptic Gospels, as to the first two years of the public ministry of Jesus.

This is found in substance in Jerome's de utr. illustr., § 9, but the Codex Toletanus gives the earlier form. The phrase postulantibus Asia episcopis recalls the Muratorian tradition.

But the writer goes on: "This Gospel, it is manifest, was written after the Apocalypse, and was given to the churches in Asia by John while he was yet in the body (ad haec in corpore constititum); as Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, a disciple of John and dear to him, related in his Exegetica, at the end of the five books, viz., he who wrote this Gospel at John's dictation ( Johanne subdistantis)."

This paragraph is also found in a ninth-century Vatican codex. 2 It was apparently translated from the Greek; e.g., ad hai in corpore constititum is a rendering of ἐπὶ τῷ σώματι καθομένῳ, as Lightfoot pointed out. That it goes back to an original of the third or fourth century is a reasonable inference. Burkitt holds that we have in the Toletan Preface the earliest known form of the tradition that the Fourth Gospel was dictated by the aged apostle to a disciple. 3

The idea that Papias was the disciple who wrote the Gospel at John's dictation must be rejected, although it is found at a much later date in a Greek Catena, in the form Todounys διαγγελλει το εὐαγγελίον το ἐν τωνυ μαθητῇ Πατρί. 4 Corssen suggested that there is some confusion between Papias and Prochorus, as in the fifth-century Acta (quite distinct from the second-century Gnostic Acta). Prochorus, a disciple of

---

2 In Exegetica sui, id est in extremis quinque libros. Lightfoot (Sturrowald, Religion, p. 213) proposed to read ekklesiis and externus, and a similar assumption is given by Corssen (Gnostica, iii. viii.), l.c. p. 114.
3 Quoted by Wordsworth-White, I.e. p. 491.
4 Cf. Corssen, l.c. p. 116, and Burkitt, l.c. p. 68.

---
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John, claiming that John dictated 1 the Gospel to him at Patmos not long before his death at Ephesus, adding that fair parch-ment had to be obtained that a fair copy might be made (καὶ ἀνθρωπογράφης τοῦ δύον εὐαγγελίου). 2

No one accepts this as historical, whether it applies to Papias (see p. liii) or Prochorus. But we note once more the widely current tradition that the Gospel was not written by John's own hand, but that it was dictated to a disciple. We have already seen that the Muratorianum has the curious clause that the Gospel was ultimately to be produced in the name of John ( suo nomine), others apparently having had some share in its production. Further, the expression of the Toletan Preface that the Gospel dothum est eusebisis in Asia recalls the careful phrase of Ireneus, εἰς οὗτοι το εὐαγγελίον ἐν Εφέσῳ, to which attention has already been drawn. 3 The writer of the Preface, like Ireneus, was satisfied that the ultimate author of the Gospel was John the apostle, the Beloved Disciple; and he also, again like Ireneus, regards Papias as a hearer of John, while he exaggerates this by calling him a cursus discipulis (if indeed the text is not corrupt). The language of Ireneus as to John's authorship of the Gospel, while it is more definite than that of Polycrates, who will only say that John was the μάθητα behind it (p. 1), suggests something less than that John wrote it with his own hand, and is entirely consistent with the view that a disciple had a share in the writing of it out. The apostle John was ultimately responsible for it, εἰς οὗτοι το εὐαγγελίον: but it may have been written by another's pen.

This last conclusion is supported, so far, by direct statements of Christian tradition and by some phrases of Polycrates and Ireneus. But, as we have seen (p. 41), there are traces in the Gospel itself of the writer as distinct from the person whose testimony is behind the narrative. Jn. 19 52 and 21 24 (see notes in loc.) clearly distinguish the writer from the witness. The language, in particular, of 19 52 is emphatic as to this. The evangelist appeals to the testimony of an eye-witness, and he does not suggest at all that he himself saw the incident which he describes. We are, then, in a position to examine the Epistles and the Apocalypse with a view to determine, first, if they are all written by the same hand; and secondly, if there is any hint of the person whom Papias calls John the presbyter having a share in the authorship of any of these books.

1 A frontispiece to Ιν, in Cod. 1 (twelfth cent.) represents John dictating to Prochorus the Deacon.
3 Cf. p. xlvii.
A. THE FIRST EPISTLE

The Church has been accustomed to describe 1 Jn. as a "general" or "catholic" epistle, its appeal being applicable to all Christians alike. It does not mention any individuals, nor does it allude to any historical incident, except the supreme event of the Incarnation. This epistle, however, seems to have been intended in the first instance for the edification of a group of Christians or of Churches, with whom the writer was associated so intimately that he could call them "my little children." He speaks of himself as one who had been a personal witness of the life of Jesus (1:4); and this, apart from his long Christian experience, gave him a claim to write with authority on the Christian life. He was one of those whom the next generation described as οἱ μαθηταί τοῦ κυρίου.

This Epistle is so closely allied with the Fourth Gospel, alike in its doctrine and its phraseology, that internal evidence confirms the traditional belief that it is written by the same hand that wrote the Gospel.  

The two works proceed from the same theological environment, and (omitting the narrative portions of the Gospel) deal with the same themes. The doctrines of Eternal Life, of the mutual indwelling of God and man, of Christian believers as the children of God, begotten with a spiritual begetting, of the Love of God and love of the brethren, of the Son of God as come in the flesh, are specially characteristic of both books. In both, Jesus is the "Saviour of the world" and the "Only begotten Son" of God.

The opening sentences of 1 Jn. form a prologue to the Epistle, similar in several respects to the prologue to the Gospel. Thus we have in 1 Jn. 1:3, δ ὑπὸ ἀρχ珅ς ἐκ θεογονίας, θεωδοσίας καὶ ζωῆς ζωῆς ἐξηράνθησαν, ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς ζωῆς—καὶ ἡ ζωή ἐφανερώθη καὶ ζών. δ λόγος τῆς ζωῆς εἰσιν ἐκ τῆς ζωῆς ἡ ζωή, καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἀλήθειας ἡ ἀλήθεια. 

1 Holtmann and Pfeiderer do not accept this. But the unity of authorship is upheld by the majority of critics, e.g. Tüxen, Wrede, Harnack, E. A. Abbott, as well as by more conservative scholars. Dionysius of Alexandria was the first to argue the matter, and the reasons which he produced for the unity of authorship are still convincing (Eus. H. E. vi. 25).

(§ 2.) THE FIRST EPISTLE

(whence see note). ἀρχὴν ἀρχήν does not refer here to the beginning of the Incarnate Life or of the public ministry of Jesus (as at Jn. 1:1, where see note), but to the eternal and prehistoric origins of that life (as at Jn. 8:4; cf. 1 Jn. 2:13, 14, 3:6). Here, again, we go back to ἐκ ἀρχῆς ἐκ λόγους (Jn. 1:1). ἀριστερά ἐκλήθη is the verb used (Jn. 1:4) of actual bodily seeing, and ἀριστερά is the right word for the manifestation on earth of the Life of the Word (see on 1 Jn. 1:1). "That which was in being eternally, that which we have seen with our own eyes and touched with our own hands of the Word of Life, the Life which was made manifest in the flesh—that we declare to you." 1

In this preface, the writer of the Epistle, while he does not offer any personal witness as to the historical incidents of the ministry of Jesus, claims to have seen Him in the flesh, just as the writer of the Prologue to the Gospel does: ἠθεωροῦσα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ (1:14, where see note). The use of the first person plur. for testimony to the broad facts of Christian experience appears both in the Gospel (1:14, 15, where see note) and in the Epistle (1 Jn. 4:13); while in the body of the Epistle, the personal relation of the writer to his correspondents is shown by the frequent use of "I," as contrasted with "you." The number of verbal coincidences between the Gospel and Epistle is very large. Lists have been printed by Holtmann, and also by R. Law, and need not be reproduced here. The similarity extends to grammar as well as to choice of words and of phrases; cf., e.g., the elliptic use of ἀλήθεια λεγομένη (Jn. 5:36, 1 Jn. 5:10), the emphatic use of ἐκ λόγου ἐκάθεν with a pres. part. (Jn. 3:19, 1 Jn. 5:10, 1 Jn. 5:13), the collective use of ἐκ λόγου ἐκάθεν (Jn. 6:55, 1 Jn. 5:13). ἐκλήθη is used sometimes of Christ as the main subject of the sentence, as it is in the Gospel (see on 1 Jn. 1:1). The constr. προβάλλειν αὐτὸν (see on 1 Jn. 1:1) frequent in the Gospel, is found also in 1 Jn. 5:10, 13. There are, indeed, some differences, especially in the use of particles. ἐν, so frequently expressing historical transition in the Gospel (see on 1 Jn. 1:1), does not appear in the Epistle, which is not a narrative. ὅτι, which is found 212 times in the Gospel, very often in dialogue, is only used 8 times in the Epistle. But, on the whole, the linguistic similarities are far more striking than the divergences.

The Epistle probably is a little later in date than the Gospel, the characteristic doctrines of which reappear occasionally in a slightly modified form. In both books the spiritual presence...
of Christ with His people is taught, as in both Eternal Life is at once a present reality and a future hope. But in both, again, judgment is a present fact, as well as a *spoue* of the future, which was its significance for Judaism (cf. Jn. 5:26, 28). But the Epistle (4:7) lays more stress on the judgment of the future than the Gospel does; to the writer in his later work it seems as if Antichrist has come already (4:5), and that "the last hour" is at hand (5:18, 20). In the Gospel (cf. 14:9) as well as in the Epistle (2:20), the Parousia or Second Coming of the Lord is contemplated; and there is a difference of emphasis.

In the Epistle, the controversies with Judaism, with which the narrative of the Gospel has much to do, have dropped out of sight; and Gaoticism, only hinted at in the earlier work, has come into full view as the most formidable opponent of the Christian religion (1 Jn. 4:2). The necessities of the case prompt a fuller (although not a deeper) treatment of sin and of the atoning and cleansing efficacy of the Passion of Christ than is found in the Gospel. Cf. 1 Jn. 1:1-2:2, 3:9-22 with Jn. 1:29; 3:34, 35. It is implied, but not asserted, in the Gospel (1:43) that Jesus is the first Paraclete, the Spirit being "another" whom He will send; but Jesus is explicitly described only in 1 Jn. 2:2 as our Paraclete or Advocate with God.

The doctrine of the mutual indwelling of God and man, again, appears in a slightly different form in the Gospel and in the Epistle. In the Gospel the disciple abides in Christ, and Christ in him (6:6, 5-15); but in the Epistle He who has faith in Christ abides in God and God in him (4:12, 18). "The Gospel is Christocentric, the Epistle Theocentric." In the former Christ's own teaching about His Person is reproduced; in the latter its practical significance for the children of God is expounded.

We have elsewhere called attention to the verbal citation by Polycarp of 1 Jn. 4:4 and to the statement of Eusebius that Papias "used testimonies from this Epistle." The evidence of its acceptance by Irenaeus, the Epistle to Diognetus, the Epistle of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne, and Clement of Alexandria, is as clear as that for the Gospel.

**B. THE SECOND AND THIRD EPISTLES**

The two short letters, 2 Jn. and 3 Jn., which might each have covered a single sheet of papyrus, are private letters of exhortation; 3 Jn. being addressed to one Gaius, and 2 Jn. either to a Christian lady of position or to a particular Church.

---

§ 7. THE SECOND AND THIRD EPISTLES

Origen mentions that they were not accepted by all, and Eusebius says that some placed them among the ἀποκρίσεως or controverted books; but their occasional character may well have prevented them from being ranked as Canonical Scripture, in some quarters, when the idea of a Canon of the New Testament was being anxiously examined.

That they were written by the same hand that wrote the First Epistle has been often disputed, both in ancient and modern times. But the internal evidence which the three Epistles present to a common author is strong. Thus emphasis is laid on ἐπιστολή (2 Jn. 1, 3, 3 Jn. 1, 12) and on "walking in the truth" (2 Jn. 4, 3 Jn. 5); on ἐπίσκοπος (2 Jn. 8, 3 Jn. 5), which is the love of the brethren, after the "new commandment" of Christ (2 Jn. 5, 3 Jn. 5); on "abiding" in the teaching of Christ (2 Jn. 8); on the joy of Christian disciples being fulfilled (2 Jn. 12; cf. 1 Jn. 4); on the value of ματρικία (3 Jn. 12); on the confessing that Jesus Christ came in the flesh, as opposed to the doctrine of Antichrist (2 Jn. 1, 3 Jn. 4); on sin forbidding the vision of God (3 Jn. 12, 1 Jn. 3); These are all doctrines and precepts characteristic of John.

There are also in 2 and 3 Jn. turns of phrase which recall both Gospel and First Epistle. Cf. 2 Jn. 12 ὦ ἔρωτι τῷ ἴσιν with 1 Jn. 5:20 ὡς ἐν τῷ ίσῳ 3 Jn. 12 ὁ ὧν ἔδωκεν ἰδαν ἐπίσκοπος with Jn. 2:24, 3 Jn. 12 καὶ ἐρωτεύθην with Jn. 13:12 καὶ ἐρωτεύθην, Charles calls attention to the use of ῥ with the participle, which is found in Jn. (12 times), 1 Jn. (6), 2 Jn. (6), 3 Jn. (1), although never in the Apocalypse.

We hold that the cumulative evidence thus available from the style and diction of two short letters sufficiently proves that they are written by the same hand that wrote the Gospel and the First Epistle.

We next observe that the writer of 2 and 3 Jn. describes himself to his correspondents as ἐπισκόπους, as if that were a description of his personality which would identify him without question. He is the Presbyter, although there were, no doubt, many other presbyters in the Christian community. Now, as we have already pointed out, ἐπισκόπος is never used (for 1 Pet. 5 is not really an exception) of one of the Twelve. And, further, 3 Jn. shows that a certain Diotrephes had actually repudiated the writer's authority. This would have been strange indeed if the writer had been recognised.

1 See Charles, *Restoration*, i. p. xxxiv, for other minute points of grammar which support the view that the Gospel and all three Epistles are from the same hand.

2 See p. xlvii above.
as one of the original apostles. But the writer has a distinctive title; he is The Presbyter, ὁ πρεσβύτερος, a title which is only found elsewhere in its use by Papias as descriptive of "John the Presbyter, the disciple of the Lord." 1 We thus go back for the authorship of 2 and 3 Ḥn. to the conclusion which Jerome mentions 2 as held by some in his day, viz. that they were written by John the presbyter.

C. GENERAL CONCLUSION AS TO AUTHORSHIP OF THE GOSPEL AND THE EPISTLES

The author of 2 and 3 Ḥn. is also the author of 1 Ḥn.; and we have already observed that this longer Epistle was written by one who claims to have been in the company of Jesus when on earth, i.e. that he heard and saw and touched Him. 3 This corroborates our identification of "the Presbyter" of 2, 3 Ḥn. with John the presbyter, who was a disciple of Jesus—that is, who belonged to the outer circles of disciples although not one of the Twelve. 4 Hence we conclude that, since as to style and diction and theological standpoint, the Gospel is not to be distinguished from the First Epistle, John the presbyter was the writer and editor of the Fourth Gospel, although he derived his narrative material from John the son of Zebedee. 5 John the presbyter, in short, is the evangelist, as distinct from John the apostle, who was the witness to whose testimony the evangelist appeals (15:2). To the mind of the early Church at Ephesus, it was the evidence for the words and deeds of Jesus' life and death that was the important matter; and for this they had the testimony of the last of the apostles. The language of Polycrates 6 and of Irenæus, 7 not to speak of the widespread tradition that the Gospel was not written by the apostle's own hand, but was dictated to a disciple, is consonant with the conclusion that has emerged from an examination of the style of the several Johannine works.

(vi) THE APOCALYPSE IS NOT BY JOHN THE PRESBYTER, BUT PROBABLY BY JOHN THE APOSTLE

An examination of the style and diction of the Fourth Gospel shows that it is not from the same hand that wrote the

---

1 See p. 1li above. 2 De mir. ill. 9. 3 P. ix. 4 P. xlii. 5 This is, substantially, the view of Ehrman: "That in some way, John, the son of Zebedee, is behind the Fourth Gospel must be admitted, and hence our Gospel is to be considered as a Gospel of John the presbyter, according to John the son of Zebedee" (Chronol., i. 677).
6 P. li.
7 P. xliii.
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2 Jn. 3, Jn. 3), while the Apc. has it a dozen times. διάμοιο, ἡλικία, κράτος, used in the Apc., do not appear in Jn., although we might have expected to find them in his report of the Gospel miracles. The Apc. has ἀπόνοια (for Christ), μεγαλοπρεπής, φανερός, υπομονή, while Jn. uses the synonyms ἀνευρές, ματαιότης, πέπεφυλαχθείσης, ἀνθρωποκτόνος, ψυχοτροπή. Where the Apoc. uses ἀγαθόν, Ἰαν., Jn. has Ἰησοῦς (see on 21).

With the use of prepositions, adverbs, and connecting particles, Jn. is more at home than is the Apoc. None of the following appears in Apc.: ἐνεργεῖ (16 times in Jn.), ἐνεργεῖ (3), στενάει (3), πρὸς (9), ἔχω (18), ἐκκοίμησα (43), μετά (8). ἐνεργεῖ, on the contrary, is four times as frequent in Apc. as in Jn. To these may be added ἀλλαζε (120 Jn., 13 Apc.), γη (70 Jn., 17 Apc.), and Jn.'s favourite ἡ (see on 1.1.; in the Apc. it occurs only 6 times and always as illative). On the other hand, the prep. ἐνεργεῖ with the gen. is only used thrice by Jn.; but 34 times by the Apoc., where it is probably due to Semitic influence. The instrumental use of ὕπερ in the Apc. is found 33 times, although hardly at all in Jn. (see however, on 1.33).

The origin names Ἱούνιος and Ἰωάνης are always anamorphous in Apc.; whereas the usage is different in Jn. (see on 26.40). The ἱερός never uses the possessive pronouns ἡμῖν (twice in Jn.), ἡμῖν (3), ἡ (6), ἡ (15), while ἡμῖν, which is used by Jn. forty times, appears only in Rev. 26.

More remarkable than any differences in diction are the differences in the constructions used by Jn. and the Apoc. The grammar of the Apoc. has been thoroughly studied by Charles, who brings out its Hebraic character. Its Greek is unique in its selectisms, and points to a certain awkwardness in using the Greek language on the part of its author, who thinks in Hebrew or Aramaic throughout. The Greek of the Apoc. has none of the idiomatic subtleties which meet us in the Fourth Gospel (see, e.g., note on 3).

It was held by some critics in the nineteenth century that the Apoc. was written in the time of Nero; and thus a period of perhaps twenty years intervened between it and the issue of the Fourth Gospel. Here, it was supposed, we may find time for a fuller mastery of Greek style being acquired by the author of the Apoc. before he wrote the Gospel. However, the Neronian date of the Apoc. is now abandoned by most scholars, who have reverted to the traditional date in

§ vi.] THE APOCALYPSE

the reign of Domitian, so that we cannot reckon on any long interval between the issue of the two books. The differences between the Greek of Gospel and Revelation are so marked that we cannot account for them by the assumption that the common author altered his style so fundamentally in a short period.

Reference must here be made to Dr. Burney's theory that the Fourth Gospel was of Aramaic origin, and that its Greek is only translation-Greek, betraying its Aramaic base at every point. Despite the established facts that behind the Fourth Gospel there was a Jewish mind, and that an under tone of Semitic ways of thought and speech may be discerned in its language (see further, p. 1xxxii), Burney's view has not been generally accepted by scholars. Many passages that have been cited by him and others as Aramaic in form are quite defensible as Greek; see, e.g., on 20. 71. 58. 10. 13. See also the notes on 12. 58. 12. 120. Classical parallels can be produced for the diction in 47. 51. 43. 51. 16. 17. 9. 10. 12. 9 (see notes in loc.), which show that Jn.'s Greek in these places is not the Greek of a mere translator. At 3. 10. 36. 10. 36. it is true that a precise Greek parallel cannot be cited, but even at these points an Aramaic origin is not suggested, nor can Jn.'s Greek be challenged. Another difficulty in the way of accepting Burney's theory is the identity of style between the Gospel and the First Epistle. The latter is, admittedly, an original Greek letter, and its author is not to be distinguished from the writer of the Fourth Gospel (see p. 1xxi).

To return to the Apocalypse. There are, indeed, some similarities in language as in thought with the Gospel.

The author, e.g., quote Zech. 12. with ἱεροσολύμων, which is not the LXX rendering (see on Jn. 19). But this only proves the common use of a prevalent translation of the Masoretic text. ἱεροσολύμων in Rev. 17 does not refer to the piercing of the Lord's side, which is mentioned only by Jn., but to those who crucified Him. The phrase παρὰ τοῦ λόγου or παρὰ τοῦ ἑρωτάκατο is frequent both in Jn. and in Apc. (cf. Rev. 3. 20. 22. 5. 12. 14. 14, and see on Jn. 8. 16. 14).

1 Hort, who was a supporter of the Neronian date, acknowledged that without a considerable interval of time between the two books, identity of authorship cannot be maintained (Apocalypse of St. John, p. 21).

2 The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel, by C. F. Burney (1822). He assigns both Gospel and Apocalypse to John the Presbyter (see pp. 149-152).

3 Lightfoot, who urges the Aramaic flavour of the Greek, goes so far as to say that there are "no classicalisms" in Jn. (Biblical Essays, p. 153).
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Cf. also ὁ δὲ Ἰωάννης ἵππηκόμα (Rev. 21:7) with Jn. 7:17, where see note. The verb κυρίων, "to overcome," is applied to Christ both in Jn. and in Apoc., but nowhere else in the N.T. (see on Jn. 16:8). Both writers express the same idea when they speak of Christ as ὁ δώρα τῆς ὑποκλίσεως (Jn. 19:38), or ὁ δώρα (Rev. 5:12). The phrase τοὺς ἐμοὺς introducing great utterances of Christ is also used, in both Apoc. and the Fourth Gospel, in the same way. ¹

Apart from verbal correspondences of this kind, the Christology of Apoc. has marked resemblances to that of the Fourth Gospel. That Christ is Judge (Rev. 6:6), that He was pre-existent (Rev. 1:12 3:14), and that He had divine knowledge of men's hearts and thoughts (Rev. 2:29) are thoughts familiar to Jn. And the abiding of God with man is a permanent issue of Christ's work is a specially Johannine dogma (cf. Rev. 2:10 21:21 with Jn. 14:23). The application of the mysterious title "the Word of God" to Christ in Rev. 1:18 prepares the reader for the more explicit Logos doctrine of the Prologue to the Gospel. ²

These similarities ³ cannot outweigh the differences which compel us to recognise that the Gospel and the Apocalypse proceed from different hands; but they point to some contact between the two writers. The simplest explanation is that the writer of the Fourth Gospel had sat at the feet of the Apocalyptist as a disciple. If the Apocalyptist was John the son of Zebedee (a view which seems to the present writer to be reasonable ⁴), then from a new angle we reach the conclusion that John the son of Zebedee is the "witness" behind the Fourth Gospel, which was, however, written by a younger disciple of Christ.

(vii) SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT AS TO AUTHORSHIP

1. John the apostle was the Beloved Disciple (p. xxxvii). He did not suffer a martyr's death (p. xxxviii f.), but lived to extreme old age in Ephesus (p. xlvii).

2. The tradition that John the apostle was himself the actual writer of both Gospel and Apocalypse must be rejected. ¹ See p. cxviii. ² See, Charles, Revelation, vol. i. p. xxxii, for other resemblances.

³ This is too large a question to be asked here. Charles holds that John the seer is a personage distinct not only from John the presbyter but also from John the apostle, and his careful study of the authorship of the Apocalypse challenges scrutiny. But much of his argument depends on the hypothesis that John the apostle was put to death by the Jews at an early date. This I am unable to accept for the reasons set out above (pp. xxxviii-xlv).

³ See, Eus. H.E. iii. 39. 15.

§ VII. ARGUMENT AS TO AUTHORSHIP

because of the far-reaching difference of style between the two books (p. lxi).

3. The theory that John the apostle was the sole author of the Gospel is not established by its general recognition (p. lix) in the second and following centuries as "the Gospel according to St. John." That may hesitatingly be accepted, in the sense that John was behind it, and that it represents faithfully his picture of Jesus Christ, and reproduces His teaching. It was this that the early Church deemed to be of importance, and not any literary problem as to the method by which the reminiscences of John the apostle came to be recorded. The reason why the Second Gospel was regarded as authoritative was because it reproduced the witness of Peter, and not because it was known to have been compiled by Mark. The ground of its authority was belief in its apostolic origin, as Papias tells us. ¹ This it was which was claimed for the Fourth Gospel by the elders of the Church at Ephesus (1:14), where, as Irenæus says (p. xvii), it was first published, and this it was which gave it authority. There could be no higher testimony than that of John the Beloved Disciple. But that he wrote it with his own hand is not asserted by the second-century Fathers; and the only traditions that remain as to the manner of its composition (pp. lvi ff.) reveal that John was not regarded as the sole author by those who accepted his Gospel as canonical.

4. Further, the internal evidence of the Gospel indicates that the writer was a distinct person from the "witness" to whom he appeals. The certificate of authentication in 21:24 is written by the same person who wrote the Gospel as a whole, for the style is identical with the style of Jn. throughout. No doubt it is the certificate not of the evangelist averedly, but of the elders of the Church; nevertheless it is written for them by him, and the writer is distinct from the Beloved Disciple whose witness is certified as true. And the language of 19:26 (where see note) is even more conclusive, as distinguishing between the evangelist and his authority.

⁵ We shall see that the evangelist not only sometimes corrects the statements of the Synoptists (p. xxvii f.), but that he occasionally adopts the actual words used by Mk. and Lk. (p. xxvi f.). Now that he ventures to correct anything told in the earlier Gospels, shows that he is relying on an authority that cannot be gainsaid. Jn. depends on the Beloved Disciple, and is careful to reproduce his corrections of the current evangelical tradition. On the other hand, he is thoroughly familiar with the phrases in which Mk. and Lk. embody that
APOSTLE JOHN AND FOURTH GOSPEL [Ch. II.

tradition, and he does not scruple on occasion to make them his own. This is quite natural on the part of one who is telling a story as to the details of which he has not personal knowledge, although Jn. was, in a sense, μαθητής τοῦ κυρίου (p. iii). He follows his authorities verbally, for such was the literary habit of the time. But it is improbable that the aged apostle, John the son of Zebedee, would have fallen back on the words of others when he could have used words of his own. This is specially improbable when we remember that John was not slow to correct when necessary what Mk. and Lk. had recorded. An examination of the relation to the Synoptics of the Fourth Gospel thus reveals the presence of two persons concerned in the production of the latter, viz. the apostle who was an original authority, and the evangelist who put the reminiscences of his teacher into shape.1

6. The actual writer (as distinct from the "witness") of the Fourth Gospel is also the writer of the Johannean Epistles. This is not only shown by identity of style (p. lxii f.), but is confirmed by Church tradition. 7. The name of the writer cannot be given with as complete confidence. But, if the writer, like the Beloved Disciple, had the name "John," a very common name among Jews, we may find here a plausible explanation for some confusion of him in later times with his greater namesake. There is, indeed, no likelihood that Irenæus associates any John the apostle with the Fourth Gospel (p. lxii); or that the Christian writers of the second and third centuries had any special curiosity as to the name of the writer who compiled the Gospel on the apostle's authority (p. lxiv). But the fact that master and disciple had the same name might readily lead to a forgetfulness of the distinct personality of the lesser man.

8. The Second and Third Epistles attributed to "John" claim to be written by one who calls himself ὁ πρεσβύτερος (p. lxiii), which at once suggests John the presbyter of whom Papias tells us (p. iii). 9. The writer of Epp. II. III. was, however, also the author of Ep. I., and of the Fourth Gospel (p. lxiii); and thus we reach the final inference that the Fourth Gospel was written by John the presbyter from the reminiscences and the teaching of John the apostle (p. lxiv).

No claim can be made for absolute certainty in the solution of so intricate a problem as the authorship of the "Gospel according to St. John." There are many links in the chain of

1 For a criticism of this argument, first developed by Walzacker, see Drummond, Character and Authorship, etc., p. 398.

§ viii.] EARLY CITATIONS

argument, and each must be tested separately. In this short summary an attempt has been made to bring out the main points at issue, which have been examined in detail in the preceding sections.

(viii) Early Citations of the Fourth Gospel

The date of the Epistle of Barnabas is uncertain. Lightfoot tentatively placed it between 70 and 79 A.D. In any case it is of too early a date to make it possible for Barnabas to have quoted the Johannine writings. In the notes on 20th 31st 64th we have suggested, however, that Barnabas may refer to sayings of Jesus which were traditionally handed down, and which were afterwards definitely ascribed to Him in the Fourth Gospel. For other phrases of Barnabas which elucidate in some slight degree passages in Jn., see on 8th 16th 19th 26th 31st 34th 18th.

Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, suffered martyrdom between the years 110 and 113. His Epistles to the churches of Asia Minor and of Rome are deeply impressed with the doctrine of Jesus Christ as having come in the flesh (as opposed to the prevailing Docetism) which is characteristic of the Fourth Gospel (and the first Epistle), and also with the Pauline conception of the redemptive efficacy of the Passion. The idea of canonical books of the N.T., as distinct from the O.T., had not been formulated or accepted by the Church at the early date when Ignatius wrote; and he never quotes directly or avowedly from the Gospels or the Apostolic Epistles. He moved in the circles where the Johannine presentation of Christianity first found explicit expression; and this may account, in part, for the remarkable likeness of his thought and religious diction to the writings of Jn. It does not follow that in the Ignatian Epistles there is any conscious literary obligation to the Fourth Gospel, although this is possible. But it is in accordance with all probabilities, that Ignatius had read this famous book which had been produced with the imprimatur of the Church at Ephesus a quarter of a century before he wrote to the Christians of that place. He uses several Johannine phrases after a fashion which is difficult to explain if they are no more than reflexions of current Christian teaching. See, e.g., the notes on Jn. 11th 18th 41st 49th 67th, 68th, 71th 59th 88th 15th 9th 10th 12th 13th 14th 15th 16th 17th 20th 25th, where the Ignatian parallels are cited.2

In the Antiochenus Acts of Martyrdom (end of fourth

1 Cf. Lightfoot, Ignatius, i. 403.
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... century), Ignatius is styled δὲ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου Ἰωάννου μαθητή, but there is no early evidence for this. In his letter to the Ephesians, Ignatius does not mention John, although (§ 12) he bids them be Ἡμῶν συμμόρφοι τοῦ μεταμορφωμένου. But it must be borne in mind that Ignatius was on his way to Rome, to suffer martyrdom as Paul had suffered, and this gives special point to his mention of Paul. He could not have cited John in this context, for John died a peaceful death at Ephesus and was not a martyr. In another place (§ 11) he recalls the fact that the Ephesians were ever of one mind with the apostles, i.e. not only Paul the founder of their Church, but other apostles as well; and this is most simply explained as carrying an allusion to John. Indeed, that a bishop who had visited the churches of Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles, Philadelphia, and Smyrna (as well as Polycarp himself) was not familiar with the activities of the great John of Asia, is highly improbable.

Ignatius does not name John, nor does he mention his writings; but his circumstances could not have left him ignorant of the personality of the man, while the phraseology of the Ignatian Epistles betrays acquaintance with the teaching, and probably with the text, of the Fourth Gospel.

Polycarp of Smyrna (born about 70 A.D. and died a martyr's death in 155 or 156) was a disciple of John (see p. xlviii.). There is no chronological difficulty in this. If, as is possible, John lived until 150 A.D., although 155 is more probable, then Polycarp would have been thirty years old at the time of his death; he may indeed have been appointed bishop by John, as Tertullian states (De Praesc. 32). There is no reason to doubt that he had some intercourse in his young days with the old apostle. In his Epistle to the Philippians (§ 7) 1 John 4:2 is quoted almost verbatim, δὲ μὴ ἴματω τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν σαρκὶ ἐλλοθεὶς ἀντίχριστος ἐστιν. There is no certain reminiscence of the Fourth Gospel, although Lightfoot compares 1 John 5:14 with § 12.

A Christian Apocalypse, called The Rest of the Words of Baruch, contains a clear reference to John 19 (see note in loc.). If Rendel Harris is right in dating this Apocalypse about the year 136 A.D., we have here one of the earliest of all extant citations of the Fourth Gospel.

We have already examined (p. liv) the relation of Papias (d. 146 A.D.) to John the presbyter and John the apostle; but it should be noted here that Eusebius tells that Papias quoted the First Johannine Epistle (H.E. iii. xxxix. 17), and his recognition of this as authoritative involves also the recognition of the Gospel.

§ VIII.

EARLY CITATIONS

... Basilides, a Gnostic teacher of Alexandria, flourished in the reign of Hadrian (c. 117-138 A.D.; cf. Clem. Alex. Stromm. vi. 17). In an abstract of a work by Basilides, found in Hippolytus (Ref. vii. 42), the words of 1 John 1 are quoted verbally. "This, says he, is what is called in the Gospels Ἱεροσόλυμα τὸ δρόμον τοῦ ἀντίκυρος ἐκ τῶν ἑσπερίων." In a later reference to 1 John (Ref. vii. 27), if Hippolytus is quoting here the work of Basilides himself, as distinct from books written by members of his school, the citation of 1 John seems to prove not only Basilides' use of 1 John, but his acceptance of it as among the Gospels generally recognised. This may be a too bold inference, but the attention paid to the Fourth Gospel by Gnostic teachers of the middle of the second century shows that at an early date, certainly before 150 A.D., it was reckoned by them to be a Christian book of special significance.

The earliest commentary upon the Fourth Gospel, of which we have any considerable remains, was that of the Gnostic Hesychias, who wrote towards the end of the second century. It is not to be held that he pointed support for the doctrinal system of Valentinus, as he understood it, in the Fourth Gospel, which he regarded as authoritative Scripture. In his extant fragments the name of the author of the Gospel does not expressly appear; but it is implied in the comment of Hesychius on John 18, which he says proceeds not from the Baptist but from the Disciple (οὐκέτα τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ ἀλλὰ ἄρα τοῦ μαθητοῦ). This is plainly meant to distinguish words of John the Baptist from that of the Disciple who had the same name.

Moreover, the Fourth Gospel was accepted and used by some, at least, of the Valentinian heretics against whom Irenæus directed his polemic (Hær. iii. 11. 7). It is even probable that Valentinus himself recognised its authority, as is indicated by Tertullian when he contrasts Valentinus with Marcion, as one who did not, like Marcion, mutilate the Gospels, but used the "entire instrument." The acceptance of the Fourth Gospel by many Gnostics as well as Catholics creates a strong presumption that it had been given to the public as an authoritative work at a time before controversy had arisen between Christian heretic and Christian orthodox. And this pushes the date back to a period before the time of Basilides.

There is nothing, then, extraordinary in the fact that Basilides quoted the Fourth Gospel, as the simplest interpretation of the words of Hippolytus assuages us that he did.

Of other Gnostic writings produced not later than 150 A.D. the fragmentary Gospel of Peter and the Acts of John disclose clear traces of the Johannine tradition.

_Pseudo-Peter_ (§ 3) suggests 18 (see note); he agrees (§ 3) with Jn. as to the relation of the Crucifixion to the first day of unleavened bread (16); he refers to the nails by which the hands of Jesus, the feet not being mentioned, were fastened to the Cross (§ 6; cf. 20); he tells (§ 4) of the _crucifragium_, in a confused manner (cf. 19); and the end of the fragment reports the departure of some disciples, after the Passover solemnities were over, to the Sea of Galilee for fishing, apparently being about to introduce the narrative of Jn. 21. These points of the apocryphal writer are not derived from the Synoptists. See also on 18a, 26, 41, 43.

The latter part of the _Acts of John_ tells of John as reclining on the Lord's breast, when at a meal (§ 89; cf. 132). In these _Acts_ (§ 97) the Crucifixion is on Friday at the sixth hour (cf. 16), and allusion is made to the piercing of the Lord's side (§ 97 ἔκτης ἡμέρας μεσημβρίας καὶ κατάρας, and § 101 ἐνίσχυσα; cf. 96 and note thereon). In the Gnostic hymn (§ 95), Christ claims to be both _Dom_ and _Weg_; θύρα ἐμοὶ σοι κατέκειται. Ἀλήθη ἐμοὶ σοι πάροδος (see on 104 145). The Fourth Gospel is distorted, but that it was known to the writer of these _Acts_ is certain.

It is true that some persons in the second century rejected the Fourth Gospel as authoritative. Ireneus mentions some who would not accept the promise of the Paraclete, and so “do not admit that form [of the Spirit], which is according to John’s Gospel” (Har. ii. 11. 9). Epiphanius in his account of heretical systems (probably based in a confused way upon Hippolytus) mentions people to whom he gives the nickname of _Alogi_, because they rejected the Logos doctrine of John; “they receive neither the Gospel of John nor the Apocalypse,” which they ascribed to the heretic Cerinthus. Whether these persons were few or many, they held (according to Epiphanius) that the Fourth Gospel was of the first century, as Cerinthus was a contemporary of John. It is probable from what Epiphanius adds, that they are to be identified with the impugners of the Fourth Gospel mentioned by Ireneus. We are not, however, concerned here with the history of the N.T. Canon, but only with the time of the appearance of the

---

2 Har. ii. 2. 3.
3 See above, p. 354.

Gospel “according to St. John”; and this cannot be placed at a later date than the end of the first century.

Justin Martyr wrote his _Apologetics_ and _Dialogue with Trypho_ about 145-150 A.D. He mentions John the apostle once, and then as the seer of the Apocalypse: “A certain man among us (τὸν Ἰωάννην), by name John, one of the apostles of Christ, prophesied in a revelation (ἐν θεωρήσει) which was made to him,” etc., alluding to Rev. 20:4 (Dial. 81; cf. Dial. 43). This _Dialogue_, according to Eusebius, is the record of a controversy held by Justin with Trypho at Ephesus; § 2 places Justin at Ephesus soon after the Bar Cochba revolt, or about the year 136. When writing then of John the apostle as τὸν Ἰωάννην, he is writing of one who was at Ephesus forty years before, and of whose influence and personality he must have been fully informed.

It is noteworthy that Justin does not speak of John the apostle as the writer of the Gospel, only the Apocalypse being specially mentioned as his work. This may be taken in connexion with the carefully chosen language used by Ireneus, when speaking of the relation of John to the Fourth Gospel and its publication at Ephesus. It is possible that Justin was aware of the tradition which associated another personality with that of John the apostle in the composition of the Gospel.

However that may be, Justin’s doctrinal system is dependent as a whole upon the Fourth Gospel, and especially on the Prologue. He was undoubtedly familiar with its general teaching. His books being apologetic (for Roman use) and controversial (with the Jews) rather than exegetical or hortatory, we could not expect him to cite verbatim and as authoritative the books of the N.T., after the fashion of Ireneus in the next generation. None the less, the traces of his acquaintance with the text of the Fourth Gospel are apparent.

A conclusive passage is _Apol. 61_. Justin is explaining how converts are “new made through Christ.” They are brought where there is water; and “after the same fashion of regeneration (ἀναπολεμοῦμεν) with which we ourselves were regenerated, they are regenerated,” for in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, “they receive the washing of water (τοῦ ὑδάτος ὑπό τοῦ λαμπροῦ σώσεως);” for Christ said, Except ye be regenerated (ἀναπολεμοῦμεν), ye shall not enter the kingdom of heaven. It is plain that it is impossible for those who were born once for all to enter into their mothers’ wombs.” Here we have an almost verbal reproduction of Jn. 3:5-6 (see

1 H.E. iv. 18. 6. 2 Cf. p. xlvii. 3 The details are discussed at length in Ezra Abbot’s _The Fourth Gospel_, pp. 35–48 (ed. 1890).
note in loc.). Again, in Dial. 88, αἰτία δὴ Ἡρῴδης, ἀλλὰ Ἰωάννης (see note in loc.) The allusion in Dial. 60 to Christ’s care of those blind from birth (καὶ ὡς ἐκ νησίων), and the lame and deaf, presupposes φιλ. (where see note). Attempts to get rid of these allusions to the Fourth Gospel are unreasonable. See also notes on Jn. 4:33 12:10 16:13 18:17 19:12, 22 20:18 21, where other parallels from Justin are given. With x Jn. 3:1 may be compared Dial. 123.

Justin, then, used the Fourth Gospel a little before 150 A.D.; and at one point (Apol. 61) quotes it as authoritative for a saying of Jesus. The “Diatessaron” of Tatian sufficiently shows the co-equal authority of Jn. with that of the Synoptists, when his Harmony was composed. Tatian was born about 115 A.D., and had been in intimate relationship with Justin at Rome. His acceptance of the Fourth Gospel would, almost by itself, suggest that Justin took the same view of its importance and its authority.

The Shepherd of Hermas was written at Rome about 140 A.D., or perhaps at an earlier date.6 The allegorist’s allusions to Scripture are few, as might be expected from the nature of his book. He speaks (Sim. ix. 12) of baptism as a condition of entrance into the kingdom of God, a doctrine which recalls Jn. 3:5 (where see note). His allusion to Christ as the Gate (γάτα) (Sim. ix. 12), through which those who are to be saved enter into the kingdom of God, is reminiscent of the teaching of Jn. 10:9. He speaks of the law (τὸν νόμον) which Christ received from the Father (Sim. v. 6. 3); this is Johannine in its thought (cf. 10:16). The phrase δὲ τὸν νόμον ἀρχῆς ἐν τῶν ἁγίοις καὶ γὰρ τῶν ἀστέρων ἡμῶν (Mand. iii. 1) is verbally similar to x Jn. 2:2. These are suggestions of the prevalence of Johannine teaching at Rome in the middle of the second century; but no more definite proof is forthcoming of the acquaintance of Hermas with the text of the Fourth Gospel.

The Epistle to Diognetus is dated about 150 A.D. by Lightfoot.7 In x. 3 he speaks of God’s love for men (δὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἱερόν), adding that to them He sent His only begotten Son (Ἰησοῦς Χριστόν Ἰησοῦς τοῦ θεοῦ), and then suggesting that their love for Him who thus loved

6 Cf. p. c.
7 See Lightfoot, Apostolic Fathers, p. 204.
ments in their present form were in existence before the time of Origen.

The use made of the Fourth Gospel by Christian writers before 175\(^4\) enables us, therefore, to fix the time of its appearance within narrow limits. It is hardly earlier than 90 A.D.,

and cannot be later than 125. Probably the year 95 is the nearest approximation to its date that can be made.

C H A P T E R I I I
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE EVANGELIST

(i) The Evangelist was a Jew.

(ii) The Literary Method of the Evangelist is not that of Allegory.

(iii) The Idea of "Witness" is prominent.

(iv) Philo and the Fourth Gospel.

(i) The Evangelist was a Jew

Reference is made elsewhere\(^8\) to Burney’s explanation of the style of the Fourth Gospel, viz., that it was translated into Greek from an Aramaic original. This explanation has not commanded the general assent of scholars; but that there is an undertone of Semitic ways of thought and speech behind the Gospel can hardly be gainsaid. The evangelist, in our view, is dependent for many of his facts upon the aged disciple John, the son of Zebedee, who was a Jew of Palestine, and whose native speech was Aramaic. It is natural that the record, however carefully edited, of such a disciple’s reminiscences, should bear traces of his nationality. More than this, however, can be said. We observe the Semitic undertone, not only in the narrative, but in the evangelist’s comments upon it. The style, e.g., of such passages as 3:1-21, 21-26, or 12:28-43 is unmistakably Semitic; and, speaking generally, one cannot distinguish, by any features of internal evidence, those parts of the Gospel narrative which plainly rest upon the report of an eye-witness, and those which may be referred to the evangelist, whom we identify with the writer of the Johannine epistles.\(^4\)

The evangelist prefers to string together independent sentences by the use of "and," rather than to use subordinate

\(^1\) See p. lxvii for notices of Jn. in Christian books written between the time of Irenæus, whose testimony is explicit, and 250 A.D.

\(^2\) P. xxiii.

\(^3\) P. lxvii.

\(^4\) P. lxix.

\(^5\) Cf. 5:10, 4:1-3, 17-18, 21.

\(^6\) E.g. Lightfoot, Biblical Essays, p. 136 f.; and Burasey, Aramaic Origin, etc., p. 114 f.

\(^7\) It is possible that many of Jn.’s O.T. citations are taken from a volume of Testaments compiled in Greek for Christian use.
Hebrew Immanuel. Even Lk. gives the Greek meaning of the names Barnabas and Elymas in Acts 11:26 13:9, although he does not interpret Aramaic names in his Gospel. All that we can say is that Jn. relies on Palestinian tradition, or on a Palestinian Jew (if he had not been himself in Palestine, which is quite possible) for his native names, and he finds it convenient (as Mk., Mt., and Lk. do on occasion) to interpret them for Greek readers. But we must not infer that his knowledge of Aramaic went very far, or that he was a native speaker.

Jn.'s familiarity with the topography of Jerusalem is, however, more noteworthy. The Synoptists know of Bethany, the Temple, the Praetorium of Pilate, and the place Golgotha with its sinister interpretation. Jn., however, has more intimate knowledge of the Holy City than the Synoptists display. He is aware how far from Jerusalem is the village of Bethany (11:18); he knows not only the Temple, but Solomon's Porch (20:57); not only the Praetorium, but Gabbatha or the Pavement (19:18); he does not mention Cethsemene by name, but he knows its situation "beyond the brook Kidron, where was a garden" (see on 15:3); he alone mentions the Pool of Siloam, and knows why it was called Siloam (see on 9); also the Pool of Bethesda or Bethatha, of which he (quite unnecessarily) says that it had five porches and was ἑπτάθρησκον (see on 5:2). The Synoptists do not tell of the visits to Jerusalem at which the men were healed at Bethesda and Siloam, so that they have no necessity to use these place-names. But in his account of the Passion Jn.'s knowledge of the various localities at Jerusalem appears to be more detailed than that of Lk. or even of Mk.

Jn. gives geographical notes with equal confidence, when he has need to mention places outside Judea. "Cana of Galilee" (2:11); "Aenon near to Salim" (4:6); "Bethany beyond Jordan" (Jn. being specially careful to distinguish it from the other Bethany, which he knows: see on 1:29); "the city called Ephraim;" in the country near the wilderness (11:54), are obscure places, which, however, have been identified to a reasonable degree of probability. But that their situation should have been expressly indicated by Jn. shows that he is not depending upon vague general knowledge, such as an occasional pilgrim or tourist might pick up. It is interesting that his one site as to which it is not easy to speak with confidence is Sychar, which he says was near the traditional Well of Jacob (see on 4). The indication of the Sea of Galilee as "of Tiberias" is probably due to an editor other than Jn. (see on 6:21).

§ 1.

These topographical allusions, taken together, point to the reliance of the evangelist on evidence given him at first hand and incidentally in conversation, unless we might suppose that he himself had personal knowledge of the places to which he refers. The latter explanation is inevitable for those who hold that the evangelist was, himself, John the son of Zebedee; but the allusions in question are sufficiently explained if we take the view that John the apostle is the "witness" behind the evangelist's record,1 but not the actual writer of the Fourth Gospel.

The frequent explanatory allusions of the evangelist to the manners and customs of "the Jews" have been supposed by some to indicate that he was not himself a Jew. "He speaks as if they and their usages belonged to another race from himself," is the comment of Matthew Arnold.2 The "feasts of the Jews" (6:4, 5); "the purifying of the Jews" (8); "the chief priests of the Jews" (11:54), "the custom of the Jews" (19:19), "the Preparation of the Jews" (19:41), are thus designated. But Paul did not separate himself from his own people when he wrote of "the Jews" (1 Thess. 1:18, 2 Cor. 11:31): nor does the evangelist when he thus invites the attention of his Greek readers to Jewish observances unfamiliar to them. Indeed, Jn. shows an intimate knowledge of these matters. He alludes several times to the Jewish regulations about ceremonial purification (3:22 11:55 18:19 19:19), upon which the Pharisees laid much stress (Mk. 2:23). He gives details, as to spices being used at burials, not found in the Synoptists (19:40). His use of the word ἐπαναρέω is significant (see on 11:26). Again, he knows the time of year at which the Jews celebrated the feast of the Dedication, which was not one of the great obligatory festivals of Judaism (10:22). The strongest proof, however, that a Jew is behind the Fourth Gospel, whether as "witness" or as author, is the familiarity which it displays with Jewish doctrine current in the first century, as well as with Rabbinical methods of argument.

The universal claim which the evangelist makes for the gospel of Jesus is preceded by what is for him fundamental, viz. that Jesus is the Messiah (20:35). This thesis is continually present, while we might antecedently have expected that it would be kept in the background by one who had reached the

1 Cf. p. lxxix.

2 God and the Bible, p. 142. Lord Chalmers's comment is more penetrating: "In style and mind he is an intense Jew. His very anger with his own race is that of a Jew. No Gentile, though he might dislike Jews, would have shown it in the same way; he would have felt, e.g., no interest in shifting more blame on to the JewishSanhedrin off the shoulders of Pilate." (According to St. John, p. 32).
more profound doctrine of Jesus as the Logos of God. Yet that Jesus is the Christ was for Jn., as it was for Paul, the essential germ of the fuller belief that He was the Saviour of the world. Jn. was well acquainted with Jewish popular beliefs as to the form of the Messianic expectation (1:19, 20). He knew that it was expected that Messiah would be a worker of miracles, for the Jews expected this of any Divine messenger (2:13; 2:23; 3:4; 1 Cor. 1:12); and that the miracles would be of specially convincing character (7:15, 16; 8:12). Again, 7:5 alludes to the current idea that Messiah, when He appeared, would emerge suddenly from obscurity. The note on 12:44 shows that the eternal reign of Messiah was not unfamiliar to Jewish thought. The Messiah was expected to have prophetic powers (1:46, 47). Little is known of the Samaritans' doctrine as to Messiah, but Jn. is aware that they looked for Him (4:48). He recalls also not only their feud with the Jews (which was doubtless well known) but their veneration for their special sanctuary on Mount Gerizim (4:48).

The evangelist moves with ease in his reports of the controversies about Sabbath observance, and the emphasis placed upon it by the Pharisees (2:16). He knows not only that it was much debated at Jerusalem, but also that the casuistry of the Rabbinical schools had dealt with it (7:22). So, too, he is aware of the contempt of the native Jew for the Jew of the Dispersion (7:20); he knows the accepted Jewish doctrine that no human being can ascend to heaven (7:10); he gives the Jewish title 'the prince of this world' to the Evil One (1:43, 14:38, 1:51); he knows of the Rabbinical superstition as to the merit gained by searching the Scriptures for fantastic arguments (9:2); and he makes allusion to the visiting of the father's sins upon his children (8:3). He knows that in Rabbinical arguments a claim to originality would damage the case of him who put it forward (7:19); and he knows the Rabbinical rules about evidence, and the inconvenience of bearing witness about oneself (7:1, 9:34, 8:40). Finally, the polemic described in ch. 5, 7, 8, 9 is thoroughly characteristic of Jewish controversies and quite unlike a Greek dispute. The argument placed in the mouth of our Lord at 10:35, depending as it does on nice verbal points, is of special interest in this connexion.  

1 Cf. p. 269.  
3 Many Talmudic and Rabbinical parallels to the Fourth Gospel have been collected by Schütz (Die Sprache und Heimat des vierten Evangelii), who specially quotes Midrashim of the second century. "Most remarkable," wrote the Rabbinical scholar Dr. A. Abrahams, "has been the cumulative strength of the arguments adduced by Jewish writers favourable to the authenticity of the discourse in the Fourth Gospel, especially in relation to the circumstances under which they are reputed to have been spoken" (Cambridge Biblical Essays, p. 125).  
narrative. To seek for the spiritual meaning of history is an exercise with special attractiveness for men who believe that history is controlled by Divine Providence.

Thus, when Paul says that the story of Abraham, Sarah, and Hagar contains an "allegory" (Gal. 4:22), he does not suggest that it was not a true historical record of what had happened in the olden time; he means that the history symbolised a spiritual lesson (cf. also 2 Cor. 10:4). In like manner, Philo sought a spiritual meaning behind the narratives of the O.T., of many of which, however, he rejected the literal truth. He treated the O.T. as the allegorising Greeks treated Homer. Philo is, in truth, the father of the allegorical interpretation of the O.T., which occupied so large a place in patristic exegesis, and which has always appealed to those who feel the charm of poetry. The incidents, names, and even the numbers of the Jewish Scriptures had for him a mystical significance, in which their true value resided, and by which their divine inspiration was most readily established. Because the O.T. was divine, it was natural to seek a deeper meaning in its every phrase than was apparent to a superficial reader.

The Christian fathers inherited this Jewish tradition of the allegorical interpretation of the O.T., but it was first applied to the N.T. by the Gnostics, with whose doctrine of a secret gnosis it was congruous. The aged Simeon taking Jesus in his arms and giving thanks was a type of the Demurge who on the arrival of the Saviour gave thanks. That Jesus was twelve years old when He discoursed with the doctors in the temple was an indication of the Duodecad of the Alpha. And the healing of the woman afflicted with an issue of blood for twelve years in like manner typified the healing of the twelfth Ekous. These allegorisms of the Synoptic Gospels are denounced as blasphemous by Irenæus, and Tertullian afterwards took the same line. But in the next generation the allegorical interpretation of the N.T. was adopted by teachers of influence such as Clement of Alexandria and Origen; and it has ever since been favoured by Christian expositors of high repute, from Cyril of Alexandria and Augustine down to our own time. Most of those, however, who have found a mystical meaning in Gospel incidents or Gospel conversations have been firmly persuaded, nevertheless, that these incidents and conversations were historical. They allegorised history, but they did not challenge its literal truth.

Origen went a little further than this. He explains that, as man consists of body, soul, and spirit, so there are generally three senses in Scripture, the corporeal, the moral, and the spiritual. But occasionally, although not often, the corporeal or literal meaning is lacking, and this applies to the N.T. as well as to the O.T. "Non solum in uteri testamento occidens litera deprehenditur: est et in nouo testamento litera quae occidit eum, qui non spiritualiter, quae dicuntur, aduerterit." This applies primarily to the interpretation of precepts, e.g. Lk. 10:4, "salute no man by the way," but it may also be applied to incidents. Even the Gospels, Origen says, do not contain everywhere a pure history, but have things interwoven according to the literal sense, which, yet did not happen. He only gives one example, viz. the story of our Lord's Temptation, which (he points out) could not literally be true, for you could not see all the kingdoms of the earth from one mountain in Judæa. Thus Origen leaves it open to an interpreter not only to find a spiritual meaning beneath the letter of a Gospel story, but also to reject the literal meaning, if it is manifestly absurd or impossible. But it is plain that he would only have admitted this plea in rare cases, such as the story of the Temptation where the language used is figurative; like all his contemporaries he would have repudiated the suggestion that the miracle stories are only parables of edification, although they are pregnant with spiritual truths (see on 2:10).

B

It is now to be observed that none of the early masters of the allegorical method, whether Jewish or Christian, invented an incident or constructed a number, in order to teach a spiritual lesson. Just as they deemed the Scriptures to be divinely inspired, they were sure that they must be edifying in every phrase; and if the plain meaning of the words was not edifying, they sought edification beneath the surface. Indeed, the Gnostics always looked for a meaning that was not plain or obvious. But none of these allegorical interpreters composed fictitious narratives for the purpose of moral or spiritual instruction. That is a quite legitimate method of teaching, as it is a method of extraordinary power. The Table of Esop were, frankly, constructed to convey moral lessons. Our Lord gave to this method the sanction of His own authority, for He habitually taught by parables, "earthly stories with a heavenly meaning"; and His example has been followed by Christian teachers in every age, from the Shepherd of Hermas in the

1 de princ. iv. 11.
2 Hom. in loci. vii. 5.
3 οὗτοι γινόμεν καθέναν τὴν ἐποίησιν τῶν προγορωμένων κατὰ τὸ ἑαυτοῦ ὑπομονὴν, μὴ γεγονότος (de princ. iv. 16).
4 Cf. de princ. iv. 19.
second century to the Pilgrim’s Progress in the seventeenth. But the allegorical enterprise and the author of parables follow distinct paths, and are not to be confused, the one with the other.

It is one thing to spiritualise history; it is quite another to put forth as history a narrative which is not based on fact. Neither Philo nor any of the Alexandrines adopted the latter course; i.e. they never wrote books of which the literal meaning was not the intended meaning. The allegorists would have been the first to admit that a spiritual sense, underlying the literal sense, was not claimed by them for their own writings. Neither Philo, nor Clement, nor Origen, were writers of parables.

Nor did the Gnostics compose books in the form of parable. For them the highest knowledge of spiritual things was not for the vulgar; it was only to the elect that the true meaning was accessible. Accordingly, they applied the method of allegorical interpretation to the N.T., in order to draw out the deeper meaning (as they supposed) of the Gospels. They also rewrote some N.T. narratives in the interests of Gnostic doctrine, a notable example of this being the Gospel of Peter, which tells the story of the Passion from the Docetic point of view. Other Gnostic books are filled with alleged revelations to the Apostles, or to the Virgin Mary, these revelations, of course, supporting Gnostic tenets. But their books are not written in the form of history which requires to be spiritualised before its purport can be determined.

We have now seen that the phrase “allegorical method” requires careful definition. Many writers of the apocalyptic and sub-apocalyptic age were drawn to “allegorise” the narratives of the O.T. and some to apply a like operation to the N.T. But that is not to say that they themselves wrote in the form of parable, viz. that their writings have an inner meaning which is not apparent on the surface.

Thus the Fourth Evangelist saw a Christian meaning in O.T. sayings and customs (e.g. xxxvi. 12) and in that sense, he was an allegorist as Paul was. But it does not follow that his Gospel was intended by him to be treated as the Gnostics treated the O.T. viz. that its literal meaning should be discarded, and its spiritual teaching alone remembered. Indeed, the significance of Jn. to his contemporaries was that he was steadily opposed to Gnosticism of every type. He insists that Jesus Christ came in the flesh (1 Jn. 4) it is the very spirit of antichrist to explain this away or to spiritualise it. That

§ 11. NOT AN ALLEGORIST

the Word became flesh is his starting-point. He lays special stress on the true humanity of Jesus (e.g. 4:12, 25, 29 etc.). His purpose and his method alike are wholly inconsistent with the view that his narrative is a congeries of parables. So little inclination has he for the parabolic method, that he is the only evangelist who reports no parables of Christ. Whether we accept Jn’s Gospel as historically trustworthy or not, it was written that his readers might accept as facts, and not only as symbols, the incidents which he records.

Those who find symbol rather than fact in the Fourth Gospel have called special attention to the numbers which occur in the course of the narrative; and what has been said above about the allegorical method in general may fitly be illustrated by one or two examples of the way in which it has been applied to Scripture numbers, both by Jews and Christians.

Philo finds esoteric meanings in the statement (Gen. 5:11) that Enoch’s age was 365 years; just as he finds in Gen. 6:6, which gives the average age of patriarchal man as 120 years, “a divine and sacred number.” The Christian fathers take the same line. Barnabas (§ 9) finds in the number of Abraham’s servants, viz. 318 (Gen. 14:15, 29), a prophecy of the Crucifixion. So does Clement of Alexandria (Strom. vi. 11), who proceeds in the same passage to take over from Philo the idea that 120 in Gen. 6:5 is a mystery, explaining that 1 + 2 + 3 + . . . + 5 = 15, while 15 is a specially significant number, because the moon at 15 days is full. The later fathers inherited this doctrine of the mystical value of numbers, and some of them applied it to the Fourth Gospel. The 153 fishes of Jn. 21 provide scope for much ingenious speculation. Thus Augustine (Enarr. in Ps., xlx. § 9) tells us that 1 + 2 + 3 + . . . + 17 = 153, while 17 is formed by adding the two sacred numbers, 10 for the Law and 7 for the Spirit. It is no more likely that Jn. intended this, than that the author of Gen. 6 intended the like comment to be made upon his text. See, for other examples, on 11:24, 15

Numerical coincidences such as these are supposed by their discoverers to reveal the significance of Johannine numbers, which are believed to have an esoteric meaning. It remains, however, for some one to show that books were really written in this way. Can any parallel be produced to support the theory that the numbers in Jn. (35, 46, 153, etc.) were con-

1 See below, p. xc, on the value attached to “witness” by Jn.
2 Quest. in Gen. 1. 85 f.
structed by him to provoke his readers, in pursuit of the true gnosis, to discover what he meant. "The idea," said Hatch, "in ancient literature consists of riddles which it is the business of modern literature to solve has passed for ever away." The idea still survives, and in unexpected quarters, but it is certainly not applicable to the Fourth Gospel, in which not gnostics but plaitis i is the supreme aim of the writer. The true inheritors of Gnostic methods of interpretation are the commentators who find in the Gospel according to St. John a hidden purpose and an esoteric meaning. Jn. was not an allegorist; that role has been assumed by his critics, who teach that his Gospel is written in the form of a parable, of which the literal meaning was not meant by him to be the true meaning.

Something must be added about the alleged adoption by Jn. of a sevenfold arrangement in his work.

The number seven appears in religious or mystical literature in many parts of the world, as well as in folk-lore. Its significance may go back to the periods of seven days which correspond to the moon's phases, for it is thus that the choice of a week as a definite unit of time probably originated. In the O.T., besides the use of seven as expressing an exact number, a use which is inevitable in all narrative, it sometimes indicates merely a round number (e.g. sevenfold vengeance, Gen. 44. 13; Ps. 79. 18, or sevenfold restitution, Prov. 6. 22), and it occasionally serves to indicate completeness (e.g. the seven nations of Deut. 7 or the seven wise of Judg. 16), and especially as a feature of ceremonial or ritual observance (e.g. seven bowings to the earth, Gen. 33. 3, or the blowing of seven trumpets round the walls of Jericho, Josh. 6. 4, or Balaam's seven altars, Num. 23, or the seven beasts of each for a sin-offering, 2 Chr. 29. 24). Seven is a number that is common in stories (e.g. the seven castles of Pharaoh's dream, Gen. 41. 4, or the woman who married seven husbands, Mk. 12. 24). It appears in Apocalyptic (e.g. the seven weeks of Dan. 9, or the seven mountains in the Book of Enoch), as the Hebrew idea of seven planetary powers, plays a part in Gnostic systems. Some have thought that the sevenfold repetition of the Name of Yahweh in Ps. 92 is deliberately devised by the poet so as to make it suitable as an "Psalm for the Sabbath day."

Similar uses of the number seven are found in Christian literature, early and late, sacred and secular. The medieval idea of seven deadly sins may go back to Prov. 6. 12, or to that of

---
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possession by seven evil spirits (Lk. 8. 25). That there are seven gifts of the Spirit goes back to the LXX, which has added the seven gifts of Is. 11. 8, a seventh, no doubt with the idea of seven as a mystical number. The Seven Sleepers of Ephesus illustrate Christian folk-lore.

The number of deacons was fixed at seven (Acts 6. 20), and this may have been deliberate. There is not much in Lk. which calls attention to this number; but he, with Mt., reproduces from Q the command to forgive seven times (Lk. 15. 7), and the parable of the seven evil spirits (Lk. 11. 43). Both Mt. and Lk. follow Mk.'s story of the woman with seven husbands. Mt., however, shows a partiality for sevenfold grouping. He has seven parables in c. 13, and the seven woes are gathered in c. 23. This indicates deliberate arrangement, such as does not appear in Mk., Lk. Mt. follows Mk. in telling of the feeding of the four thousand with seven loaves (Mt. 59).

In the Apocalypse, the tendency of the seer to dwell on the number seven is inherited from previous apocalyptic literature, and is unmistakable, ἑπτά occurring over fifty times. Here is a marked contrast to the Fourth Gospel, where ἑπτά does not occur at all, and ἑπτάμαχοι only once (465). It has been thought by some that Jn. avoids ἑπτά deliberately, because of its abuse in Gnostic literature. That may be the case. But it has also been suggested that the arrangement of the Gospel betrays a deliberate sevenfold grouping, although it is skilfully concealed. We shall examine presently (p. xci) the sevenfold witness to Jesus which may be discovered in the Gospel; but it is not clear that these forms of ἑπτάμαχοι are meant to be, significantly, seven in number, neither more nor less. And similar difficulties beset other attempts to find an intentional sevenfold arrangement.

The sevenfold repetition, in c. 6 (see on 670) or in the Farewell Discourses, of solemn refrains (see on 157) is striking when it is discovered, but it is not clear that the number seven is intended thus to convey any special meaning, or that it was present to the writer's mind. Exegeta have often commented on the seven similitudes by which Jesus describes Himself in the Fourth Gospel, beginning with ἐγώ ἐμέ (562; 49. 10), 15. 3. But with these must be associated ἐγώ ἐμέ ἡ παροικία ἡ ἑπισκέψεως (818), which brings the number of these Divine Pronouncements up to eight.

Or, again, the number of the "seven signs" of Jesus which are recorded in the Fourth Gospel has been sometimes

---

1 See p. lxxv. 2 cf. Abbott, Diat. 655. 6. 3 See p. cviii.
thought to imply deliberate arrangement. But, as we have shown on another page, the wonderful works called σημεία by Jn. are only in number five, although a sixth might be included by way of inference. To Jn. the incident of the Storm on the Lake is not a σημείο at all (see on 5:14).

Indeed, if Jn. attached mystical importance to the number seven, and dealt in allegory, as some suppose, we should have expected him to select for record the story in which the multitudes were miraculously fed with seven loaves and seven baskets of fragments, rather than that in which the loaves are but five (6:9). Both of the miracles of feeding are recorded by Mk. (6:38, 7:12), whose Gospel was known to, and used by, Jn. If he were an allegorist, the seven loaves would have presented a mystical meaning, which the five loaves do not offer.

The conclusion seems to be that Jn. did not set any special value on the number seven; it is not prominent in Jn. as in Mt. The intentional presence of the number seven in the narrative and the structure of the Fourth Gospel is not proved. He does not deal in allegory, but in facts.

The view that is taken in this commentary on the Fourth Gospel is that, primarily, the evangelist intended to present narratives of fact, of the truth of which he himself was fully persuaded. He is not only a historian, but he is an interpreter of history, as is shown not only by his comments on his narrative as he proceeds, but also by his selection and arrangement of his materials so as to persuade his readers most effectively of his main thesis (20:31). That he is insistent upon the importance of “witness,” μαρτυρία, in relation to matters of fact, must next be shown to be part of his historical method.

§ 31. THE IDEA OF “WITNESS” IS PROMINENT

The narrative of the Fourth Evangelist is, to a considerable extent, a narrative of controversy. He relates more fully than the Synoptists the story of the hostility with which the claims of Jesus were greeted at Jerusalem; and he recalls the “evidence” (as a modern writer would call them) or the “witness” to which Jesus pointed as justifying and explaining His claims. “Witness” is a necessary correlative of intelligent belief.

But there is another, and a more far-reaching reason for the prevalence of the idea of μαρτυρία in Jn. It is due to the circumstances in which the Fourth Gospel was produced, and to the purpose of the evangelist in writing it. The book

1 P. xxvii. 2 Cf. p. xxvi. 3 P. xxxiv. 4 See on 5:14.

was not written in the earliest days of the Church’s life, when terms of allegiance to the Church’s Master were still unformulated, and when the disciples in the first flush of enthusiasm and devotion had hardly asked themselves what was the intellectual basis of the faith in which they had found strength. The clear definitions of Christian theology had not yet been elicited by the growth of error and of misunderstanding which had to be repressed. But by the end of the first century in intellectual centres such as the Greek cities of Asia Minor, it became imperative that the false μαρτυρία should be expelled by the true, and that the faith in Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God, should be justified to thinking men.

On what evidence did this wonderful faith rest itself? So men asked, and an answer had to be given. It is natural that the Gospel which originated under such conditions should lay emphasis on the “witnesses” to which the early preachers and Jesus Himself had appealed. The author is conscious, as he writes, that the facts which he narrates will be scrutinised by keen critics, and that his interpretation of them may be challenged.

1 He begins, then, as the Synoptists did, with the witness of John the Baptist, upon which he lingers, however, longer than they. The Forerunner came εἰς μαρτυρίαν (7:26, 5:38). He bore witness that He who was coming was the Pre-existent One (1:18), while He Himself was only the herald (1:27; cf. 3:34). When Jesus came, John bore witness that he saw the Spirit descending upon Him (5:33), and that this was the appointed token that He was the Son of God (1:22).

2 Of other human witnesses, who may be summoned to give their testimony, Jn. mentions:

(a) The Samaritan woman, whose witness did not go further than her own limited experience would justify, and was therefore all the more impressive—τὸ γυναῖκος μαρτυροῦσα ἐν τῇ εἰρήνῃ μετὰ τῶν ἀνάγκων (4:16).

(b) Similar to the Samaritan woman’s witness is that of the blind man whose sight was restored (9:16), although the word μαρτυρία does not occur in this story.

(c) The multitude who had seen the raising of Lazarus bore witness to the fact—μαρτυρεῖ ὁ ἄνθρωπος (11:17).

(d) The Twelve, whose authority rested on the intimacy of personal companionship—ὑμεῖς ἐστε μαρτυροῦσαι καὶ ἐν δραχμῇ μετὰ ἑαυτῶν ἔδωκαν (15:24); cf. also 3:11.

1 So in the Pauline Epistles, it is not until we reach the later phase of his teaching that we come upon the assertion τὸ μαρτυρίον ἐδίδετο ἐκ νόμου Ἀβραὰμ (Tit. 2:14). Generally, in Paul, the verb μαρτυρεῖ bears the sense of painful testifying, rather than of bringing forward evidence to prove something that is in dispute.
deliverance. Thus the historical witness yields place to the moral; the "witness of God" is greater than the "witness of man" (1 Jn. 5:9). The "witness of God" is that God gave eternal life to us in Christ (1 Jn. 5:11; cf. 1 Jn. 5:5), of which we are assured not on historical grounds only, but also on those of present spiritual experience—δι' ὑπακουάς ἐν τούτῳ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγέρθη τὸν μάρτυραν ἐν αὐτῷ (1 Jn. 5:10).

(iv) PHILO AND THE FOURTH GOSPEL

Philo of Alexandria (b. 20 B.C., d. 49 A.D.) set himself to reconcile Hebraism and Hellenism, and to that end his aim throughout his voluminous writings was to expound the spiritual and philosophical meaning latent in the O.T. literature. His influence was far-reaching among Alexandrian Jews, and the teaching at Ephesus of the learned Alexandrian Apollos (Acts 18:24) was probably not carried on without occasional reference to Philo and his theological speculations. In any case, we should expect to find among educated people at Ephesus some acquaintance with Philo's doctrine of the Logos, as well as with his interpretations of Hebrew Scripture.

A comparison of the thoughts of Philo with those of the Fourth Gospel shows that in many instances Philo provides useful illustrations of Johannine doctrine, which might be expected a priori in so far as both writers deal with similar topics. But that there is any literary dependence of the Fourth Gospel upon the earlier writer has not been fully proved, although there is no reason to doubt that Jn. might have used the language of Philo on occasion when it suited his purpose.

Thus the doctrine that genuine worship must be of the spirit appears in Philo, as well as in Jn. 4:23 (see note). The mystical saying that the Son cannot do anything except what He sees the Father doing recalls Philo's language about the προσέρχομαι ὃν ὁ θεός ἐμπνεύσει (see on 4:8). Philo contrasts the ἰδιός ποιήσῃ with a mere herd, in a fashion that is similar to 1:13 (where see note). So, too, Philo distinguishes the ἀληθής of God from His ἀδιάθλητος (see on 1:16). Even more noteworthy is Philo's comparison of the manna to the Divine Logos, which is the heavenly, incorruptible food of the soul (see on 6:48). And the doctrine of 1 Jn. 2:23, "If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him," is remarkably like the following: ἀληθῆς συνεπάγων τῷ πρὸς κόσμον ἀγάπην τῇ πρὸς τὸν θεόν ἀγάπην, ἐς ἀληθῆς συνεπάγων ἀλλήλων φίλοι καὶ σύνεται. These are close and remarkable Philonic parallels, and

1 Fragm. ex Joh. Damascus, Sac. Parall. p. 370 B.
CHAPTER IV

THE FOURTH GOSPEL IN ITS RELATION TO THE SYNOPTICS

(i) The Use made by Jn. of the Synoptists.
(ii) The Chronology of Jn. and of the Synoptists.
(iii) The Words of Jesus in Jn. and in the Synoptists.

§ 1 USE MADE OF SYNOPTISTS

say that he was the brother of Peter (16), of whom everybody knew. Every one knew, again, of the fact that John the Baptist had been imprisoned; it is alluded to only as marking the time of his ministry near Salim, viz., before his imprisonment (38). Jn. does not attempt to tell over again the story that has already been told to Christian disciples from the beginning. He omits much that is present in the Marcan tradition, e.g., the Transfiguration; or that was found in that common source of Mk., Lk., Mt., now generally described as Q, e.g., the Temptation, the Sermon on the Mount, the Lord's Prayer. In Part I. of the Gospel, at any rate, the scene of which is largely laid in Galilee, we might expect to meet with publicans, lepers, and demons, or to read of the preaching of repentance or forgiveness, as in the Synoptic Gospels. But Jn. introduces none of these people and neither of these topics (cf., however, 204).

Yet Jn. does not avoid the Synoptic stories altogether. He has, e.g., the Cleansing of the Temple (44), The Healing of the Nobleman's Son (46), the Feeding of the Five Thousand (51), the Storm on the Lake (51), while he treats these and other incidents in his own manner.

All this is self-evident. And since the time of Eusebius, at any rate, it has been recognised that Jn. knew the general story which we now have in the Synoptists. Eusebius, indeed, accepts a tradition of his day that Jn. wrote his Gospel in order that he might supply what was lacking in the earlier narratives, especially in regard to the beginnings of the ministry of Jesus. This does not give us the only or main purpose of the composition of the Fourth Gospel; but that Jn. wrote with a knowledge of what had previously been written about the Life of Jesus is, a priori, probable.

We have now to ask, Had Jn. ever seen the Synoptic Gospels in their present form? Is there any trace of his having used Mk., Lk., or Mt.? Does he reproduce phases which are found in any of the earlier Gospels? Such questions may be approached quite dispassionately. The study of the Synoptic problem, which has now been continued for a century, has resulted in a general acceptance of the conclusion that both Lk. and Mt. used Mk. in addition to a source now lost, which is commonly described as Q. The words of Mk. were adopted in many instances both by Lk. and by Mt., sometimes without change and sometimes with corrections, which in the judgment of the later evangelists improved the style or made for accuracy.

1 Here Jn. seems to have amplified and altered the Marcan narrative (see notes in loc.). Cf. also p. xxx.

2 H.E. III. 24. 7.
It is possible that Jn. (i.e. the evangelist, not John the Beloved Disciple) may have used the Synoptists in like manner. It would have been quite consistent with the literary habits of the time if he occasionally borrowed a sentence from his predecessors. There will, then, be nothing to surprise if we find in Jn. not only traditions which he shared with earlier evangelists, as well as with the whole Church of his day, but also traces of the actual incorporation in his text of descriptive phrases from the Synoptic Gospels, or from their sources.

It will be convenient to state briefly at this point that the conclusions which have been adopted in this commentary^1 are (a) that Jn. almost certainly uses Mk.; (b) that most probably he uses Lk., or perhaps we should say uses Q; and (c) that there is no good evidence that he used Mt. at all, or was aware of the Matthean tradition as distinct from that of Mk. (see nevertheless 6^6 16^4 20^3 for passages with some similarity to Mt.). It is, indeed, possible that the "Gospel according to St. Matthew" is in its present form the latest of the four canonical Gospels; but upon this I do not enter here.

A. COMPARISON OF JN. WITH MK.

1. The most remarkable agreements in language between Jn. and Mk. occur in the narratives of the Anointing at Bethany (Jn. 12^4-8, Mk. 14^3). These narratives, and also that of Lk. 7^38-42, have been compared and examined in the Additional Note on Jn. 12^4-8. Here we note only the verbal coincidences:

Jn. 12^4: μύρον παθητικόν πολυπεπόρων reproduces Mk. 14^3: μύρον παθητικόν πολυπεπόρων, the word παθητικόν being both uncommon and obscure.

Jn. 12^3: δει τὸ τούτον τὸ μύρον ὅπερ ἑτοίμασαν διηρήσαντες καὶ ἔδοθεν πτωχοῖς; reproduces Mk. 14^3: ὁ δικτυωτος γὰρ τούτο τὸ μύρον προθέθηκε ἐπάνω διηρήσαντες καὶ βαφθάτων τοῖς πτωχοῖς.

Jn. 12^1: ἤδει αὐτὴν, ὡς εἰς τὴν ἤμορφον τὸν ἀναποκαλυμμένον μοι παραδόθη αὐτῇ; reproduces Mk. 14^3: ἤδει αὐτὴν... προδίδασιν μοι τὸ σημά μου ὡς ἐπὶ τις ἡμῶν τῶν κατακεφαλαίων.

Jn. 12^2: τοῖς πτωχοῖς γὰρ πάντοτε ἔχει μεθ᾽ ἑαυτῶν, ἢ δὲ οὐ πάντοτε ἔχετε reproduces Mk. 14^3: πάντοτε γὰρ τοῖς πτωχοῖς ἔχει μεθ᾽ ἑαυτῶν... ἢ δὲ οὐ πάντοτε ἔχετε.

These verbal coincidences are so close that they cannot reasonably be explained by reference to a common oral tradition being the source of the story in Jn. as in Mk. And the care with which Jn. has amplified and corrected the course of his narrative certain statements of Mk. (see notes on Jn. 12^3-8) shows that he follows Mk. verbally, he does so deliberately. See below.

2. A second example of the reproduction of Mk.'s words by Jn. appears in the story of the cure of the impotent man at Bethesda.

The command ἐγέρετε ἐπὶ τὸν κράββατον σου καὶ περπάτητε (Jn. 5^7) is repeated from Mk. 2^5 ἐγέρετε καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν κράββατον σου καὶ περπάτητε. So, too, the result ἐσώθη ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ θησαυροῦ, καὶ ἔπεσεν τὸν κράββατον αὐτοῦ καὶ περπάτησε (Jn. 5^7) recalls Mk. 2^11 ἐσώθη εἰς ἐκ θησαυροῦ καὶ ἐπέκει εἰς τὸν κράββατον ἐξελέξεις ἐκ θησαυροῦ. No doubt the narratives describe two quite distinct incidents; although, on the other hand, it may be contended that the words urging the paralytic of Mk. and the impotent man of Jn. to make a special effort would probably be similar in both instances. Yet, as Streeter points out,^1 Jesus must be supposed to have spoken in Aramaic, and that the Greek version of what He said in one case should be so close to an independent version of what He said in the other (both including the vulgar word κράββατον, which is not used in the parallels Mt. 9, Lk. 5) is unlikely. And there is also a close verbal similarity (see on 5^7) in the reports of the man going off immediately carrying his pallet. It is more likely that Jn. here allows himself of words used by Mk. in describing a somewhat similar scene than that these verbal coincidences should be accidental. This, be it observed, is not an instance of Jn.'s correction of Mk., but of his use of Mk.'s vocabulary.

3. The Johannine stories of the Feeding of the Five Thousand and of the Storm on the Lake (6^1-21) recall the words used in Mk. 6^30-32 at some points. The detail σωσίαν διασώσαντες δεσμους, which does not appear in Mt., Lk., is verbally identical in Jn. 6^17, Mk. 6^50; the verb διασώσασθαι, used in Jn. 6^17, is also used in Mk. 6^30, but not in Mt., Lk.; the χαῖρες of Jn. 6^19 is reproduced from Mk. 6^50 (so Mk. 14^29), but is not in Lk.; the pronunciation ἐγερθείς, ἐκ φαθινοῦ (Jn. 6^20) is identical with Mk. 6^60 (followed by Mt. 14^22). Lk. does not tell of the Storm on the Lake. These verbal similarities between Jn. and Mk. are the more remarkable by reason of the tendency in Jn.'s narrative to correct Mk.'s report at other points.

Thus the sacramental suggestiveness of Jesus lifting up His eyes to heaven and breaking the bread in blessing (Mk. 6^41,
Mt. 14:10, Lk. 9:19 does not appear in Jn. (see on 6:13), and the omission is probably deliberate. So, too, Jn. avoids the word ἀγάμος (see on 6:15) which Mk. has at 6:8. And he retells the Marcan story of the Storm on the Lake in such a way that he removes any suggestion of the miraculous walking on the sea (see on 6:19), while he retains some of Mk.'s words.

That Jn. knew these Marcan narratives, but adopted their phraseology only after scrutiny and correction, seems to be the most probable explanation.

4. In regard to the order in which the incidents at the Last Supper are narrated, there is remarkable agreement between Jn. and Mk., as contrasted with the divergent order suggested by Lk. This is discussed in the note on 13. It does not follow that Jn. is using the text of Mk. in c. 13, but that both adopt the same order of events recommends it as most probably historical.

5. Peter’s three denials of his Master are described in Jn., as in Mk., as having happened while he was waiting in the courtyard of the high priest, while the preliminary examination of Jesus was proceeding; and both Jn. (13:27-28) and Mk. (14:62-67) mention twice that Peter was warming himself (ὄρνηστον) during his parley with the slaves and the police. Perhaps Jn. here follows Mk., while he departs from the Marcan story in other particulars (see on 13:19, 18, 21, 22). When the first examination of Jesus by Pilate has taken place, the question ἔδρασαν ἐν ἀναίλει ἡμῶν ἥσσον τὸν Ἰησοῦν Ἰουδαίων; is recorded by Jn. (18:29) in words almost identical with those of Mk. 15:1, but not of Mt. or Lk. There is thus a probability that Jn. 18 goes back at some points to Mk. 14, 15; but this is not certain.

6. The account of the mock coronation of Jesus by Pilate’s soldiers and of His investment with a purple robe (Jn. 19) is similar in several phrases to the Synoptic narratives, and suggests Mt. 27:26-28 and Lk. 23:11 as well as Mk. 15:17. But having regard to the differences as well as the agreements it is not proved that Jn. is conscious either of Mt. or of Lk. at this point, while it is probable that he is using the text of Mk. (see for details on Jn. 19).

7. The passage 12:22 shows traces of the language of Mk., and in a less degree of Lk. (see notes in loc.). It would be rash to conclude that Jn. is here reproducing, consciously or unconsciously, phrases from the earlier Gospels; for he seems to be following an independent tradition as to the words which the Synoptists ascribe to Jesus at Gethsemane. But the verbal similarities are striking.

8. The verse 20:17 (see note in loc.) seems to indicate the adoption by Jn. of words ascribed to the Risen Lord in Mt. 28:9, where they were probably derived from the last conclusion of Mk. Jn. here is aware of, but corrects, the Marcan tradition.

§ 1.] KNOWLEDGE OF LUKE

1. A comparison of Jn. 12 (see Additional Note on the Anointing at Bethany) with Lk. 7 shows that Jn., for whatever reason, tells the story of the anointing at Bethany in terms of the Lucan narrative. The words ἐξ οὗ ἐπήηκαν ἐκ τούτων, ἀπὸ τούτων, which are common to both narratives, disclose not only a traditional, but a literary, relation between them. That Jn. is using words which he derived either from Lk. directly, or from Q (the source of Lk.’s narrative), is difficult to gainsay.¹

2. The prediction by Jesus of Peter’s denial and of the cock-crowing in Jn. 13:37 is verbally very close to Lk. 22:34, while it is conspicuously different from Mk. 14:30. But the prefatory ἐνῶ ἐμὴ ἡμέρα ἐν τῷ ἀνεκδοτικόν, ὡς τὸ μνήμην ἐν ἑαυτῷ τοῖς ἱστορίαῖς; recalls Lk. 22:33 ἐν μνήμην ἑαυτών ἐν ἑαυτῷ τοῖς ἱστορίαις. That the tomb had not been used before is not told by Mk., nor by Mt., who, however, adds the word κατανεύθανεν to Mk.’s statement. The verbal similarity between Lk. and Jn. suggests that Jn. is here using Lk., substituting ἐν ἑαυτῷ for ἐν ἑαυτῷ (see on 19:12).

4. Jn. agrees more nearly with Lk. than with Mk., Mt., in his account of the Resurrection, both evangelists recording appearances of the Risen Lord in Jerusalem (see on 20:2). The mention, e.g., of two angels at the tomb (20:16) is another form of Lk.’s tradition (Lk. 24:4). In two other instances (Jn. 20:13, 14, 20), Jn.’s language recalls two passages in Lk.’s text (Lk. 24:13, 26), which are treated by Hort as “Western interpolations,” and as inserted by scribes in Lk. from Jn. It is not certain that Hort’s view can be pressed, and it may be that Jn. is here correcting and adapting Lucan texts (see on 20:19). The relation between Jn. 20:27 and the Western text of Lk. 24:8 is not easy to explain, but here, again, Jn. may be correcting Lk.

¹ For the relation between Jn. and Lk., see Harnack’s brief study of “komische Worte” in the vocabulary (Lukas the Physician, p. 204 L.). He holds it possible, but not certain, that Jn. used Lk. Cf. also Gaisen, J. T. S., July 1908, for words and ideas common to both.

² The addition to the text (in #3C) of Mt. 27:9 is undoubtedly derived from Jn. 19:26 (where see note).
From a survey of these passages, we conclude that, although Jn. does not use Lk. as frequently as he uses Mk., he was nevertheless acquainted with the Third Gospel as well as with the Second.

C. SAYINGS IN DIFFERENT CONTEXTS IN JN. AND IN THE SYNOPTISTS

Several sayings of Jesus recorded by the Synoptists, whether derived from the Marcan tradition or from Q, also appear in Jn. in a different context. It is probable that many of His sayings were repeated by Him more than once. See notes on τὰ τρία ἑκατόν, 15:23. In none of these cases, however, is the form of expression in Jn. identical with that in Mk., Lk., or Mt., while the matter of the precept or aphorism or warning remains the same. It is possible that έγνωσάθης έγγυμίου of 14:33 was taken from Mk. 14:43, where the same words appear. But Jn. places them in a somewhat different context, which may represent a more accurate tradition than that of Mk. (see on 14:23). In any case, that this brief command is reproduced in the same terms by both evangelists is not sufficient to establish a literary dependence of Jn. upon Mk. at this point.

D. THE BAPTIST IN JN. AND IN THE SYNOPTISTS

The Fourth Gospel, like that of Mk., begins with the preliminary ministry of John the Baptist, as ordained in the Divine counsels to prepare for the greater ministry that was to follow. Jn.'s account of the Baptist's proclamation of Jesus, which he reports as explicit and unqualified, is marked by vivid details derived apparently from a contemporary witness; while at the same time the language used reproduces phrases already familiar from the Synoptic narratives.

(a) Jn. describes the Baptist as a man "sent from God" (1:23; cf. 3:26). This is implied in the quotation of Mal. 3:1 in Mk. 1:2 and Q (Mt. 1:23, Lk. 7:27). Mk. 1:2 was probably present to the writer of Jn. 1:23; or we may say that Mal. 3:1 was a familiar text from its presence in Christian baptismal controversy.

(b) To the Baptist is applied ἐκ τῶν αἰωνίων by Mk., Mt., Lk., but Jn. 1:23 represents him as claiming the prophecy for one of himself.

(c) Jn.'s proclamation of the Coming One is found in similar, but not identical, terms in Jn., Mk., Mt., Lk.

Jn. 1:21: ἄρα ὁ ἐν τούτῳ ἐσμένεις ἐντάξει ἔχει; τι πράττει μόνος ἦν.

§ 1.] THE BAPTIST IN JN.  ci

Mk. 3:1: ἔργα ὑπερείρεται σὺν ἐνεσίᾳ μοι, ὅπως εἰμὶ ἐνεσίας κάρας εἰς τὸ ἱερότητα τῶν ἐνδεικτικῶν αὐτῶν.
Mt. 3:1: ἐς ἐνεσίᾳ μοι ἐργάζεσθαι ἐνεσίας μοι ἐς τὸ καθεύνον οὐκ ἔστω ἐν ἐνεσίας ταύτης τῶν ἐνδεικτικῶν αὐτῶν.
Lk. 3:1: ἔργα ὑπερείρεται σὺν ὑπερείρεται σὺν ἐνεσίᾳ τὴν ἱερότητα τῶν ἐνδεικτικῶν αὐτῶν.

It is clear that Jn. 2:14 (see note) puts into fresh words the Synoptic phrase ἐνεσίας ὑπερείρεται σὺν, which is also found in Justin (Tryph. 49, 58). Jn. has ἔργα for the Synoptic Ἐνεσίας, but ἔργα is the adj. used in Acts 13:2 (see note on Jn. 1:23). Mk. is alone in adding κάρας, ἔργα ἔργα ἔργα ἔργα οὐκ ἔστω ἐν ἐνεσίας τῶν ἐνδεικτικῶν αὐτῶν.

Mt. has the different image of carrying the sandals or shoes (see on Jn. 1:23), but it is remarkable that Justin (Tryph. 49, 58) also has ἐνεσίας ἐν ἐνεσίας ἐν ἐνεσίας. Jn. characteristically adds ἔργα for emphasis before ἔργα. Also ἔνα λέγων is the constr. with ἔργα which he favours rather than λέγων (see on Jn. 7). He agrees with Mk., Lk. in the constr. ἔργα ἔργα ἔργα ἔργα.

When these variations are examined, it becomes doubtful whether it can be claimed that Jn. here follows Mk. rather than Lk. Perhaps the true inference is that Jn. and Mk. are following Q at this point, as was suggested by Salmon. 1

(d) Jn. differs from the Synoptists in some details as to the Baptism of Jesus; e.g. he omits any mention of the heavens being opened, or of the Voice from heaven (see on 1:29). In particular, the sight of the dove descending on Jesus at His baptism is, for Jn., no spiritual vision seen only by Jesus (cf. Mk. 1:10), but was perceived by the Baptist with his bodily eyes (see on 1:29), and was acclaimed by him as a Divine sign that Jesus was the expected Messiah. This was the beginning and the foundation of that "witness" of the Baptist on which stress is laid throughout the Gospel (cf. 10:4). 2

(e) Neither in Mk. nor Lk. is it expressly stated that the Baptist recognised Jesus as the Messiah, when He presented Himself for baptism, although this is indicated in Mt. 3:14. And the clearness of the Baptist's perception that Jesus was the Coming One, as indicated by Jn. 1:26, 30-35, has been thought by some to be inconsistent with the Synoptic presentation of John's ministry, and in particular with John's hesitation as to the Messiahship of Jesus at a later stage, which was described in Q (Mt. 11:26, Lk. 7:19). Such hesitancy is, however, not incompatible with a previous outburst of enthusiastic conviction, as every student of psychology will recognize. And,

1 Human Element in the Gospels, p. 53.
2 Cf. p. xci.
apart from such considerations, the Synoptic tradition of the
disparagement of the ecclesiastical authorities by the simple
question, “The baptism of John, was it from heaven?”
(Mk. 1:2, Lk. 20:6, Mt. 21:26) proves decisively that the Baptist
did not even proclaim Jesus as the Expected One. “Why
then did ye not believe him?” There would have been no
force in this retort, if it had not been common knowledge that
the witness of the Baptist to the Divine authority of Jesus had
been express. It is entirely a result of which Jn. 1:34 implies, as
also Mt. 3:14, although it is not stated explicitly in Mk. 1 or
Lk. 3. The announcement of the Baptist’s conviction in the
stating words, “Behold the Lamb of God,” probably marks
a later rendering of the Christian doctrine of Redemption (see
on 1:28); but for the fact that the Baptist recognised in Jesus
the expected Christ, the Synoptists are (implicitly) witnesses
as well as Jn.

(ii) THE CHRONOLOGY OF JN. AND OF THE SYNOPTISTS

The Fourth Gospel seems to have been constructed on a
rough chronological plan more precise than appears in the
Synoptists. Jn. does not attempt to tell the Life of Jesus in
full; and he warns his readers about this (21:20). He only
describes selected incidents: perhaps because they have a special
bearing on his chosen thesis (20:1); perhaps too because of the
role he is able to write with special authority, or can correct
what has been written by earlier evangelists.

There is no such thing as a chronological scheme, properly
speaking, in the Synoptic Gospels, although Lk. (1:1) recognises
the value of orderly presentation of facts (cf. also Lk. 3:1). But
Jn. likes to tell of things in historical sequence. His report
of the opening week of the public ministry of Jesus distin-
guishes five distinct days at least on which something happened
(cf. 1:26, 13:2, 2:2, and see on 10:21). The former “(6 to 2)”, “six
days” (1:27), “two days” (4:20), “four days” (1:17), “not
many days” (3:14), “after eight days” (20:29) exhibit not only
his anxiety to mark the sequence of events, but the confidence
with which he indicates their order. Jn. is especially careful
to mention the visits of Jesus to Jerusalem, which are character-
istic of the Fourth Gospel, must be examined both in regard to
their precision and their intrinsic probability.

1. The three great festivals of the Jews were Passover,
Pentecost, and Tabernacles. All male Jews above the age of
twelve years were under obligation to attend these at Jerusalem;

1 See, for this, J. O. F. Murray in Expository Times, Dec. 1925.
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and it would have been out of keeping with a reputation for
piety for any one to absent himself. There was no similar
obligation to be present at the Feast of the Dedication or the
Feast of Purim, although even at these Jews were accustomed
to assemble from all quarters. According to Jn., Jesus
followed the normal custom as to the attendance at feasts,
of which the following are mentioned:

(1) The Passover of the year 27 (21:6). This was held
at the beginning of the sacred year, about the time
of the spring equinox, on 14th Nisan.

(2) The Passover of the year 28 (5), which is mentioned
as near at hand in the earlier passage (6). (See
above, p. xvii, on the transposition of 8o 5 and 6).

(3) The Feast of Tabernacles of the same year, i.e.
28 a.d. (7). This was the most important of all the
national festivals, and began on 15 Tishri (about the
month of October). Jn. takes special note of what
Jesus said on the last day of this feast (7:37), as well as
during the middle of the celebration (7:14).

(4) The Feast of Dedication of the same year, i.e. 25
Chislev (December, 28 a.d.). This was attended by
Jesus (see 10:23).

(5) The Passover of the year 29 a.d., at the time of the
Passion (1164) (12:1).

These records, if the order of the traditional text is trust-
worthy, prove that the public ministry of Jesus extended over
at least two years, and there is nothing intrinsically improbable
in this. But it has been thought by some that so long a period
of ministry is inconsistent with the report of the Synoptists,
who tell only of one Passover, and from whose records the
prima facie inference would be that Jesus was crucified at
the Passover season which followed His baptism. This would
involve that the public ministry of Jesus lasted for one year
only.

I have suggested elsewhere the possibility that the Cleansing
of the Temple is mentioned in the ordinary text of Jn. (see
on 2:22, 23). If we could take it in connection with the last
visit of Jesus to Jerusalem, as the Synoptists do, then the Johannine
narrative does not involve a longer ministry than something
more than one year, viz. the whole year described in Part II.,
and as many months as are necessary for the incidents of
Part I. There would, in that case, be no chronological in-
consistency between the Synoptists and an original text of
Jn., which placed c. 211, somewhere after 12:18. But, taking

1 This is the period expressly assigned to the ministry by Origen: δια των 
συνειδησιων των επισημων διηνεκεων (Phil. 1:3).
the text of Jn. as we have printed it, the ministry of Jesus lasted for more than two years, which is not suggested by the Synoptists, who do not mention explicitly that He went to Jerusalem for the purpose of keeping the national feasts.

In connexion with this omission in the Synoptic narratives, we must bear in mind their character and structure. None of them professes to give a complete account of the public ministry. Mk., which is the oldest of them, is a record of the Galilean ministry only, until the last scenes. Mt. and Lk. are based partly on this, and partly on a collection of discourses of Jesus, which contained also a few notable incidents. None of them aims at telling the story in complete detail or in exact sequence. It is unreasonable to assert that events undescribed by them could not have happened. Positive evidence is always more weighty than a mere argumentum a silentio, and hence, unless the Synoptic accounts definitely contradict what Jn. tells about the visits of Jesus to Jerusalem for the feasts, the latter must be allowed to stand. No such contradiction can be alleged.

According to Lk. (2:2), it was the habit of the family at Nazareth to go up to Jerusalem "every year" for the Passover, as all pious Jews were accustomed to do. We cannot doubt that, during the thirty years of preparation for His work, Jesus did the same. It is difficult to believe that, even if His public ministry lasted but for one year, He would have abstained from going up to Jerusalem in that year for Pentecost, or for the Feast of Tabernacles, which was the greatest of the religious celebrations. Such an attitude would have shocked the piety of His disciples, and would naturally have provoked the charge of carelessness in observation of the Law. Yet there is no hint anywhere that it was one of the counts in His indictment by the priests, that He neglected to attend the national festivals. His opponents were quick to point to the freedom with which He treated the laws about the Sabbath; it would have been an additional breach of law and tradition, which the people would have viewed with grave suspicion, could He have been accused of disregarding the obligation to attend the Feast of Tabernacles. That the Synoptists make no mention of such an accusation indicates that none such was made—that it is probable, therefore, that it could not have been made with truth—and hence that their narratives are not inconsistent with visits to Jerusalem paid by Jesus during the period of which they treat. But if one such visit be admitted, there is nothing to prevent the acceptance of several, such as Jn. records, and hence of the extension of the public ministry of Jesus over a longer period than one year.

Moreover, when we remember what Jesus conceived His mission to be, even if we limit ourselves to what the Synoptists tell of Him, it is difficult to suppose that He made no effort to appeal in person to Jerusalem, the home of the national religion and the central seat of its authority, until the last week of His life on earth. Unless Jerusalem were approached, His mission as the Messiah of the Jews would be incompletely fulfilled. It is, on the other hand, entirely in agreement with what we should have expected from One who claimed to be the Fulfiller of the Law (Mt. 5:17), that He should, again and again, have endeavoured to gain the allegiance of the citizens of Jerusalem, as is indicated in the report of Jn. 1.

One positive piece of evidence is supplied by the Synoptists themselves in corroboration of this conclusion. The source called Q, from which both the First and the Third Gospels have taken large part of their material, places in the mouth of Jesus a lament over the obduracy of Jerusalem, in the face of frequent appeals. "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem . . . how often would I have gathered thy children together . . . and ye would not" (12:31; Mt. 23:37; Lk. 19:44). Mt. and Lk. do not agree as to the occasion on which these words were spoken; but, whenever spoken, they point back to previous ministries of exhortation and warning. They are not sufficiently explained by a reference to mere aspirations such as Jesus may have felt on visits to Jerusalem before His public ministry had begun;* they seem to imply definite appeals which were rejected by those to whom they were addressed. And of these the Johannine record provides adequate illustration, Jn. 12:38-43, 44-50 corresponding to the lament preserved in Q.

Further evidence of former Jerusalem ministries may be found in such passages as Lk. 19:40-41, which show that Jesus, on the occasion of His last visit, was already known to persons dwelling in or near the capital. The owners of the ass, riding on which He made His triumphal entry, did not demur when the animal was borrowed; 6 οὖν κύριος καὶ παρθών ἔμεινεν οὖν was sufficient excuse. And the master of the house where the Last Supper was eaten received Jesus as a welcome guest. Yet, as Drummond urges, these acquaintanceships or friendships may have been formed during earlier visits to Jerusalem which were not associated with any public teaching.

1 The mention of the Temple in Mt. 4* Lk. 4 suggests an agony of Temptation occasioned by a visit to Jerusalem.
2 This is the explanation of Drummond, Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel, p. 45.
3 Loc. cit.
and it would be precarious to build an edifice of theory upon them. But the use in the passages cited (from Lk.) of the titles διάκονος and διάκονος suggests that these Jewish acquaintances of Jesus were accustomed to speak of Him thus, and such a designation marks the relation of a master to his disciples (see on 2.31). They were not mere acquaintances and well-wishers; they were among those who recognised that He claimed at least to be a Rabbi and an authoritative Teacher. And this brings us round again to the conclusion that this claim had been made by Him before at Jerusalem as well as in Galilee. Thus the Johannean account of several ministerial visits to Jerusalem on the part of Jesus is corroborated by several Synoptic touches. And this confirms the view that the length of the ministry of Jesus is more accurately indicated by Jn. than by the Synoptists.

2. The discrepancy between Jn. and the Synoptists as to the actual date of the Last Supper and consequently of the Crucifixion has been the subject of much discussion. The Synoptists treat the Last Supper as the Paschal Feast. Jn., on the other hand, does not represent it as a Paschal meal, holding that the Passover was celebrated on the day after the Supper, and that Jesus died on the cross at the time that the Paschal lambs were being killed.

The account of Jn. is without ambiguity. At the Supper some present thought that Judas departed in order to buy some things for the Feast, which had therefore not yet been celebrated (13-18). The eating of the Passover was still to come when, on the morning after the Supper, the priests refused to enter the Praetorium lest they should contract ceremonial defilement (18-20). When Jesus died on the cross, the soldiers did not break His legs, the O.T. precept that the bones of the Paschal Lamb should not be broken being thus fulfilled, in the view of Jn. An older view took the same view of the death of Jesus as that of the true Paschal Lamb (1 Cor. 5.7-8), this being the earliest tradition on the subject that is extant. See also on 19.42. When we speak of the Synoptic tradition about the date, we must remember that it ultimately rests on Mk., from whom Mt. and Lk. take the framework of their narratives of the Passion. As Burkitt points out, in regard to this matter, we

1 So Justin regards the Paschal Lamb as a νυπόλος of Christ (Tryph. 40); and Irenæus is explicit as to the Crucifixion being on the actual day of the Passover: "in eadem ipsa, quae ante tanta die velatorium, Moses praedicata est, passus est dominus adsimulatus.\" (v. 10.2). Earlier still, Pseudo-Peter follows the Johannean tradition (Gospel of Peter, § 3). See above, p. 216, on the Quartodeciman practice.
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are not dealing with a consensus of three independent authorities. There is no doubt that Lk. (22:13) and Mt. (26:19) follow Mk. (14:18), when they all say of the preparations for the Last Supper, "they made ready the Passover." Mk. 14:13 introduces this by recording, "On the first day of unleavened bread, when they sacrificed the Passover," the disciples asked Jesus where were they to prepare for the Feast. That they came into Jerusalem from Bethany for the supper is quite consistent with a regulation that the Passover was to be eaten in the city area (cf. Dout. 1.2), but this is no proof. Nor is it the fact that they sang a hymn (Mt. 26:30) after supper any proof that this was the Paschal Hallel. Indeed, there are some difficulties in the Synoptic narratives as they stand. According to Mk. 14:14, the Sanhedron had decided not to arrest Jesus during the Paschal Feast, and yet they actually did so (Mk. 14:21). The carrying of arms during the Feast was, at any rate, unlawful, although perhaps the disciples would not have refrained from doing this in the circumstances (Lk. 22:30; Mk. 14:14; see on Jn. 18:22). To hold a formal trial before the high priest on the Feast day would, again, be unlawful (Mt. 26:5). And the purchase of a linen cloth (Mt. 27:59), and the preparation of spices and ointments (Lk. 23:56) during such a Festival, would be strange, if not forbidden. Finally, the language of Lk. 22:18 (even though Mk. regards the Supper as the Passover Feast) implies that, although Jesus eagerly desired to celebrate one more Passover with His disciples, yet in fact He did not do so.

These considerations indicate that the Johannean tradition as to the occasion of the Last Supper and the day of the Crucifixion is preferable to that of the Synoptists, who are not consistent with themselves. That the Johannean reckoning seems to have been adopted in the second century by the Quartodecimans is a further consideration.

The attempts which have been made to harmonise the two divergent traditions by identifying the Last Supper with the Chagigah or the Kiddush, or by amending the text of Mt. 26:4 with Chewesohn, are not convincing. It emerges from the discussion that Jn.'s chronology must not be treated as inferior to that of the earlier Gospels; and that as to the date of the Crucifixion he is more probably right than they. So also as to the hour of the Crucifixion, placed by Jn. at

2 J.T.S., April 1916, p. 292, a valuable article; cf. also J.T.S., July 1906, p. 345.
3 See p. 316 above.
5 See references in Moffatt, Intro. to N.T., p. 545.
noon, which is more probable than Mk’s ὅπερ τῆς ἡμέρας (see on Jn. 15:5).

Reasons have been given in the notes on 213, 23 (see also p. xxx) for preferring, on the contrary, the Marcan tradition that the Cleansing of the Temple took place during the last week of our Lord’s ministry at Jerusalem, to accepting the early date assigned to it in the traditional text of Jn. It may be added that Tatian in his Diatessaron removes both the Cleansing of the Temple and the Nicodemus incident from the beginning of the ministry of Jesus. Tatian adopts the following order of events and discourses: the Parable of the Pounds, the Cleansing of the Temple, the Parable of the Pharisees and Publican, the Cursing of the Fig Tree, the Conversation with Nicodemus, the Discovery that the fig tree has withered away. He does not place these events in the last week of the ministry of Jesus (for he puts the Triumphal Entry a good deal later), but he treats them as happening at Jerusalem on His last visit but one to that city.

3. In connexion with Jn’s notes of time, his use of the expressions μετὰ τοῦ νύκτα and μετὰ τοῦ ναῦρα should be noticed.

μετὰ τοῦ ναῦρα, which is not found in the Synoptists, appears four times in Jn. (2:13 17:11 19:27), and always implies that only a short interval of time has elapsed.

μετὰ τοῦ ναῦρα is not so precise; it is used at 5:24 15:12 19:50 as equivalent to “subsequently” or “afterwards.”

It is used in an even looser way in the Apocalypse (Rev. 4:1 7:1 12:1 19:5) to introduce a new vision, and in the Fourth Gospel to introduce a new section of the narrative (3:18 6:1 7:1 21:1), the idea of causal or immediate sequence not being present at all. It would seem that in 3:2 6:1 7:1 μετὰ τοῦ ναῦρα merely indicates the beginning of a new set of reminiscences of the aged “witness” behind the Gospel, which were taken down from his dictation by the evangelist who subsequently put the whole in shape. In these passages μετὰ τοῦ ναῦρα is not strictly chronological.

(iii) THE WORDS OF JESUS IN JN. AND IN THE SYNOPTISTS

The contrast between the words of Jesus as found in the Synoptists and in the Fourth Gospel respectively has been observed even by superficial readers. Differences in the various books might have been anticipated. Perhaps the first collection

1 It is used thus in Lk. 5:7 10:4 (Mk) 16:8, Rev. 9:4, not appearing in Mt. or Mk.; in the LXX (as at Lk. 12:1 17:18, Acts 15:189) it generally connotes strict sequence.
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of Jesus’ sayings was that included in the documentary source behind all the Gospels which critics designate as Q. This doubtless contained some stories of what Jesus did, but it was mainly concerned with what He said, especially with the parables, which were so characteristic of His method of teaching, and the terse, pointed epigrams which arrested the attention of all who heard Him. Then we have the Marcan Gospel, representing in the main the Galilean tradition of the Ministry, said by Papias and Irenaeus to depend on the recollections of Peter. Mt. and Lk. use both of these sources, with others. Jn. was later in date than Q or Mk. or Lk., all of which sources he had probably read, but he depends mainly, for his facts, on the reminiscences of the apostle John, then in his old age. It is not the purpose of Jn. to retell the story of the Ministry, as it was told by Mk. and Lk., but to tell it from a new point of view. The story of Jesus is being misunderstood and in some ways perverted by Gnostic Christians. Jn. not only relies for his new narrative on the sole survivor of the apostles, but he selects for special record such facts and sayings as seem to him to need restatement, or which have hitherto remained unwritten. The authority for his facts is not mere vague tradition, but the “witness” of the Beloved Disciple himself. The purpose of the Fourth Gospel is not to set down all that the writer has learnt about his theme; but to tell what may persuade Christian disciples of the truth of his great thesis that Jesus is the Son of God, in whose Name they, believing, may find Life (20:17). Jn. is not only an historian; he is an interpreter of history. And, moreover, he himself was one of the first disciples, although not of the inner circle; 2 he had heard Jesus speak, and he knew how He was accustomed to speak, when in controversy with Jewish opponents, no less than in His discourse with simple people.

In books, then, which came into being under such different conditions, we should expect differences in the several reports of the discourses of Jesus. Further, we need not be surprised if there are also differences of arrangement and of style, corresponding to the temperament, education, design, and authority of the several writers. We are presented, moreover, with discourses, now expository, now argumentative; now exoteric for the public, now esoteric for the most intimate disciples of the Speaker; now addressed to Galilean peasants, now to the Rabbin of Jerusalem. That there is a wide difference between the sayings collected in either version of the Sermon on the Mount (Mt. and Lk.) and the sublime arguments of Jn. 5, 6, 9, and especially the sacred farewells of ch. 14, 15, 16, is obvious. But

1 Ecce, H.E. iii. 39, 15, v. 6, 3.
2 Cf. p. xvi. i.
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if such differences were not apparent, we should have to conclude that some of the reports were unduly coloured.

We pass on to some comparisons in detail of the Synoptic reports and those in Jn. of the sayings of Jesus; and we find that some of the similarities are quite as striking as the differences.

1. Naturally, all accounts record the authority with which Jesus spoke. It astonished the people in the synagogue at Capernaum (Mk. 1:23; Lk. 4:32), as it astonished the Sanhedrin police at Jerusalem who had been so overawed that they did not arrest Him (Jn. 7:48). It was the same tone as that which He used to Pilate (Jn. 18:29).

2. "Brief and concise," says Justin Martyr, "were His sayings, for He was no sophist." Justin is referring to those terse, short sentences of which the Synoptic Gospels are full; other examples of which have been preserved in non-canonical sayings, some cited by the early Fathers, others only discovered in papyrus collections in our own time. It should be remembered that these telling aphorisms are exactly the kind of saying that would become traditional at once, would pass from mouth to mouth, and would be incorporated in a document such as Q.

Paradoxes have been called the "burs" of literature, because they "stick"; and one of our Lord's methods was to teach by paradoxes. Mk. 12:17, 27; 4:10; 10:38 are examples of sayings which provoke the attention and make men think. Of such sayings Jn. mentions some which the Synoptists also have, e.g. Jn. 13:38 (the most famous of all) and 13:39. In addition, he has preserved some which are not found elsewhere, e.g. "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me" (Jn. 4:34); "Work not for the meat which perisheth, but for the meat which abideth unto eternal life" (6:27); and "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends" (15:13); cf. also 12:34. These are all addressed to inquirers and disciples, and are of a type with which the Synoptic Gospels have made us already familiar. So, too, the beautiful illustration of the woman in travail (16:41) recalls the manner of the speech of Jesus in the Synoptists.

3. It is common both to the Synoptic and to the Johannine tradition that while Jesus spoke in parable or mystery to outsiders (Mk. 4:24; Jn. 10:9) He was accustomed to explain His meaning more fully to His disciples (Mk. 4:32; 7:12; Jn. 12:21, 28). Yet even they did not quite understand His words (Mk. 9:34; Jn. 16:13); always there was a certain aloofness in His bearing, and despite His tender affection for His near friends they were afraid of questioning Him too far (Mk. 9:38; 10:2; Jn. 2:1). This
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becomes even more apparent in the post-Resurrection narratives, but it is present throughout the ministry in its early stages.

4. A feature of the discourses of Jesus in Part I. of the Fourth Gospel must now be examined, because it discloses a similarity to some of His speeches in the Synoptists which has often been overlooked. Some critics have rightly called attention to the form in which the discourses in cc. 3, 4, 6 are cast, and which has been called their "schematism." A saying of deep import is uttered by Jesus; His hearers misunderstand it, after a fashion that seems stupid; and then He repeats the saying in a slightly different form, before He explains it and draws out its lesson. At least six instances of this may be noticed in Jn.:

(a) Jesus says, "Except a man be born from above, he cannot see the Kingdom of God" (3:3); Nicodemus asks, "How can a man be born when he is old?" (3:4); and then Jesus repeats the saying in the form: "Except a man be born of [water and] the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God" (3:5), explaining it further in vv. 6, 7, 8. Nicodemus does not understand all at once (3:4).

(b) Jesus tells the Woman of Samaria that if she had asked Him, He would have given her "living water" (4:10). The woman is puzzled. How could He provide spring water, when there is no other well but the old well of Jacob, and He has no bucket to draw with (4:11, 12)? Jesus repeats that He can give "water" which shall become in the heart of the recipient a well of water springing up unto eternal life (4:13, 14). The woman does not understand all at once (4:15).

(c) Jesus says to His attendants disciples, "I have meat to eat that ye know not" (4:42). They think that He speaks of ordinary food (4:43). He explains that His meat is to do the Father's will (4:44).

(d) Jesus says to the multitudes who had been fed, "Work not for the meat which perisheth, but for the meat which abideth unto eternal life" (6:27). They think He is referring to manna, and they ask Him to produce it (6:31, 32). Jesus tells them that He is Himself the Bread of Life (6:35), and explains that those who come to Him shall never hunger (vv. 35-40). The hearers are not satisfied (6:43).

(e) Jesus says again, "I am the Bread which came down from heaven" (6:26). The inquirers ask how could that be, since they know His father and mother (6:42). He explains again, and repeats, "I am the Bread of Life." (f) Jesus utters another, even harder, saying, "The Bread which I will give is My Flesh." (6:51). The puzzled questioners
ask, “How can this man give us His Flesh to eat?” (68). Jesus says again, “Except you eat the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, you have no life in you” (69), and then He expands and explains. Upon this many would-be disciples leave Him (69).

Thus the Discourses of Jesus, with Nicodemus about the New Birth (3-18), with the woman of Samaria about the Living Water (4-10), with the disciples about the spiritual nourishment which sustains Him (3-18), together with the three connected, but distinct, sections of the Discourse about the Bread of Life (67-68, 41-51, 55-58), all follow similar paths. But these similarities do not by any means prove that the discourses are constructed thus by the evangelist, without any historical tradition behind them.1

It is a remarkable circumstance that discourses such as those in cc. 3, 4, 6 do not occur anywhere in Part II of the Gospel. Cc. 5, 7-12 are full of the discourses of Jesus, but Jn. does not report them on the lines of those which have been cited, viz. Sayings of Jesus; Misunderstanding of it; Saying repeated, expanded, and explained. If the method or plan of the discourses indicated in Part I is entirely the invention of the evangelist, adopted monotonously to bring out the nature of the teaching which he ascribes to Jesus, how is it that no trace of this method is found in Part II? The fact is that the discourses in Part I of the Fourth Gospel are not reported as polemical arguments; they were addressed to sincere inquirers and well-wishers who were seeking discipleship. We have already seen (p. xxxiii) that Part I is a record of the early welcome which the teaching of Jesus received, mainly in Galilee, but also in a lesser degree in Jerusalem. That is, it deals with situations similar to those described in the Synoptic Gospels, and specially in Mk. And, accordingly, the method which Jesus used in teaching as set out in Part I of Jn. is indicated also in the Synoptic narratives. It is the method of paradox (to arrest the attention of the hearer), followed (after the hearer has shown himself puzzled and therefore curious) by an explanation. In this, it resembles the method of teaching by parables.

Thus at Mk. 7-18, Jesus puzzles the disciples by saying: “Nothing from without the man, going into him, can defile him; but the things which proceed out of the man are those that can defile him.” The disciples see that this is a “parable,”

1 For this view see Jülicher, Intro., p. 392; and for an even more extravagant inference cf. Loisy (on Jn. 3), who says that the Nicodemus discourse was constructed at first “comme poème didactique sur la régénération spirituelle que procure la Fible.”

but they do not understand. Jesus then repeats the saying and explains it. Again, at Mk. 8 and 9 Jesus says to His disciples, “Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees.” The disciples are dull enough to think He is speaking about some kind of bread. He explains with a rebuke what He means, and repeats His precept again (cf. Mt. 16). This is similar to the method by which Nicodemus was taught.

In short, the plan on which the teaching of Jesus to inquirers and disciples was fashioned, according to the Synoptists, recalls at critical points the discourses addressed to such hearers according to the Johannine report of them in Part I of the Fourth Gospel. The parallels to Jesus’ method of argument with hostile critics in the last week of His public ministry as recorded by the Synoptists are found, on the other hand, in Part II of Jn.

5. The form of the polemic against Jewish objects in Part II of the Fourth Gospel has disco nected some readers as favourable of Rabbinical subtility,1 rather than of what is thought to be evangelical simplicity. In particular, the Rabbinical arguments at Jn. 7 to 11 (where see notes) do not appeal directly to a modern mind as very convincing or on a lofty plane of thought. But if Jn. 7, 102 et be only an argumentum ad hominem, the same might be said of the puzzling query, “The baptism of John, was it from heaven or from men?” (Mk. 11). Neither argument did more than exhibit the incoherence of the Pharisees, and this is not the highest type of reasoning as we understand it. Or, again, the argument in Mk. 3 which begins, “How can Satan cast out Satan?” is rather satire than close reasoning. It is not logically convincing, since Satan might very well sacrifice some of his subordinates for the sake of a greater victory, and it reaches a conclusion which is true from premises, those of the scribes, which are false or shaky.” The truth is, that the polemic which Jn. records in cc. 7, 8, 10 is not dissimilar from the kind of argument which is represented by Mk. as being used against similar opponents, viz. the scribes and Pharisees. Such opponents had to be met with their own methods of argument, and this is brought out by the Synoptists as well as by Jn., although they are so much less familiar with the story of the rejection of Jesus at Jerusalem than he is. The kind of argument against the Pharisees reproduced in Part II of the Gospel is not recorded by Jn. with the view of convincing Greek readers. It is included by the evangelist to bring out the profundity of the thoughts of Jesus, who even while He had to dispute with the Rabbis as to the validity of His claims knew 2 See p. xxxiii above. 2 A. Menzies, The Earliest Gospel, p. 102.
that nothing could really be set against the tremendous pronouncement, "I am He that beareth witness of Myself" (8:28). And, as has been noticed above, the faithfulness with which these controversies have been recorded is illustrated by the very feature which the modern mind is apt to repudiate. It is not to be overlooked, moreover, that in these reports the commentary of the evangelist cannot always be distinguished from the sayings of Jesus which he has set down. The Discourses of Farewell (cc. 15, 16, 13:31-14:1) stand alone, and are not strictly comparable with any other sayings in the Gospels. They are not like the parables or sermons to the multitudes which the Synoptists preserve; nor do they recall the arguments by which (either in the Synoptists or in Jn.) Jesus strove with those who rejected His claims. They were for His faithful and sorrowing friends, and spoke of them in particular and their future needs and duties. "I go," is behind every word (16:21-22 13:38 14:6). There are precepts of life, both practical, "bear fruit" (15:2-8, 16), and mystical, "Abide in me" (15:4-10), for to observe this last is to be enabled to obey the other. There are warnings (15:18-23 16:3); promises (16:22 16:14 14:6); consolations (14:1-27); counsels and assurances of love (15:12, 13, 17 13:26, 30). These sayings are unique, because as the circumstances were unique, the Speaker is unique. And this is also true of the Last Prayer (see on 17:1). We cannot expect to find literary parallels to utterances such as these. They are not the invention of good disciples, even though they were men of high spiritual genius. The record of these sacred words is a record of faithful memories, quickened, we need not hesitate to say, by the Divine Spirit, whose help had been promised (so the evangelist tells) for this very purpose (14:26).

We have, indeed, no title to invoke miraculous intervention in such guidance of the evangelist's pen, if that would imply that every syllable of the Master's last words has been infallibly preserved. The evangelist sat at the feet, as he made his record, of the last survivor of the men who heard Jesus speak on the eve of His Passion. The aged apostle had been pondering these words all through his long life. Hardy did he remember all, but he remembered without any misunderstanding the purport, and very likely, in some instances, the actual words that had been used. The evangelist takes them down from the lips of the old saint, possibly not all at once, but on more than one occasion. Their original language was Aramaic, but they must be translated into Greek, for this is to be a Greek gospel. And, besides, an evangelist has his own methods of literary workmanship.

The wonderful record, e.g., in Mt. of the Sermon on the Mount is not quite the same as that in Lk., while it contains more. But no one supposes that what we call the "Sermon on the Mount" was a discourse that could be delivered in thirty minutes, in which time Mt. 5, 6, 7 could be read aloud, or that the vast volume of teaching in these chapters, packed with counsel, epigram, illustration, was ever included in any one discourse. These teachings of Mt. 5-7 are certainly authentic; no one doubts that they express, with complete lucidity, the message of Jesus to those whom He addressed as well as to succeeding generations. But we must recognize that the record has been put into shape, and that it is not the less precious because it has been arranged with such rare skill.

No doubt the record in Jn. 14, 15, 16 is not put into shape, as it were, with the same freedom as that employed in Mt. 5, 6, 7. In the "Sermon on the Mount" the author is putting materials together which he has gathered from more sources than one. For the Last Discourses the evangelist has only one authentic source of information, and that has doubtless been followed closely and reverently. At one point, indeed (16:23), we seem to have an example of that method of teaching by paradox and repetition, which as we have seen (p. cxvi) was a favourite method of the Master when dealing with His disciples. Again, these discourses recall those terse, illuminating, compelling phrases, which the Synoptists teach us were characteristic of the way in which Jesus spoke. Not to recall (see p. cxv), 12:18 or 16:5, is there anything in literature more arresting than, "In my Father's house are many mansions" (14:2)? No saying about the future life is more familiar. And this brings us one of the most remarkable features of Jn. 14, 15, 16. These are among the most difficult passages of the N.T. Every phrase challenges an explanation. They contain teachings of such profundity that he who attempts to explain them must feel that he has essayed too hard a task. Yet no chapter in the Bible is more greatly beloved by simple Christian folk than Jn. 14; as no text in the Bible has brought more consolation than, "Let not your hearts be troubled . . . if it were not so, I would have told you"; although, at the same time, its exact meaning is exceedingly obscure (see note on 14:3). That is, the Last Discourses of the Fourth Gospel appeal to all men, and not merely to the philosopher or the theologian. The directness and universality of their appeal are not easy to reconcile with the view that they proceed, in
the last resort, from any speaker other than the Son of Man Himself.

The style of Jn. is, nevertheless, impressed on cc. 14–16, as on the other discourses in the Fourth Gospel. It is Jn.’s habit to repeat words and thoughts again and again; and it is probable that this was the habit of Jesus Himself, which the evangelist has caught from listening to the reminiscences of the old apostle. It is not always easy to disentangle Jn.’s commentary from his report of the Lord’s words; e.g. in 5:28-29 commentary and quotation are intermingled (see note in loc.). The most striking example of an evangelical commentary, elucidating and enforcing the teaching of Jesus, is in 3:14-21, 31-36 (see on 3:16). The verses preceding 3:16 show how naturally the report of the words of Jesus slips into free paraphrase (see on 3:15); but nearly all exegetes recognise that from v. 16 onward the evangelist is speaking in his own person.

Now the method of teaching by iteration, by going back upon a word, by recalling a thought already expressed that it may be put in a new setting, is clearly apparent in cc. 14–16. The key-words abide (15:1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10), bear fruit (15:5, 8, 16), love (15:12, 13, 17), friends (15:13, 14, 15), hate (15:19, 20, 23-25), recur again and again in c. 15. The solemn refrain, “These things have I spoken unto you,” appears seven times in cc. 14-16 (see on 15:11; and cf. the refrain in 3:38, 40, 44, 45). There is no more reason to suppose that the use of such refrains is a literary artifice of the evangelist’s (although it might be so), rather than a reminiscence of our Lord’s habit of speech, than to suppose that He was not accustomed to say, “Verily, verily” (see on 1:4).

The view of the Last Discourses which has been adopted in this Commentary is, accordingly, that while the evangelist has left his mark upon the report of them, by arranging the sentences, by shortening them, by bringing together counsels which may have been repeated more than once, by using the Greek phrases and constructions with which he himself is specially familiar, the Teaching is not that of a pupil, however spiritually gifted, but that of the Master Himself, whose last words had been preserved in the memory of the Beloved Disciple, the last of the apostles.

7. A special feature of the way in which Jn. reports the words of Jesus outside the Last Discourses is the use of the phrase ἐγὼ εἶμι, by which Jesus in the Fourth Gospel frequently introduces His august claims. There is nothing quite similar

§ iii.

The phrase “I AM”

to this in the Synoptists, and the Johannine use of ἐγώ, ἐγώ ἐμ, must now be examined in detail.

(9) The frequency with which the personal pronouns ἐγώ, ἐμ, ἐμ ἐμ, occur in Jn. is a marked feature of his style. Thus ἐγώ is found 134 times in Jn., as against 29 occurrences in Mt., 17 in Mk., and 23 in Lk. In large measure this is due to the emphasis which in the Fourth Gospel Jesus lays upon His claims and His personality, whenever the pronoun often appears when no such reason can be assigned. Thus we have ἐγώ ἐκ τοῦ μεταβάλλειν τὸν Ἰθανάτῳ (5:29); ἐγώ ἐμ αὐτός ἐστιν ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ ἰδιώτη (5:28); ἐγώ ἐμ ἐσμέν ἐς τὴν φύσιν μου ἐς πάντα λόγω αὐτῆς (5:35); ἐγώ ἐγώ ἐμ ἐκ τῶν κληρῶν ἐλλειποῦσι (11:40), etc. In these and the like instances the use of ἐγώ adds dignity and impressiveness to the sentence, just as it does in the hymn on Wisdom in Eccles. 24, where Wisdom makes her majestic claims: ἐγὼ ἐμ ὁ οἴκωμοι Ἰμιάν ημνήμεν (v. 3); ἐγώ ἐς κατοικίαν κατασκεψάμην (v. 4); ἐγώ ἐς ἰστίαν κλίδων μου (v. 16); ἐγώ ἐς ἱματισμὸς βλαστήσεις χεριον (v. 17).

(9) We have next to consider the combination ἐγώ ἐμ, which is specially frequent in Jn. ἐγώ ἐμ often appears, of course, in the Greek Bible, followed by a proper name or by a descriptive clause or word. Thus Peter says ἐγώ ἐμ ὁ Ἰησοῦς (Acts 10:41). Jesus says after His Resurrection ἔστη τάς χειράς καὶ τοὺς πόδας μου, ὅτι ἐγώ ἐμ ἐστι (Lk. 24:39). ἐγώ ἐμ is often used in deliberate affirmations as to the speaker’s personality. Thus we have ἐγώ ἐμ Ιωσὴφ (Gen. 40:21), ἐγώ ἐμ Ἰαβού (Lk. 19:15), and ἐγώ ἐμ Ἰησοῦν ὁ σὺ δεικνύει (Acts 9:22, 26).

But we have to reckon with a more distinctive use of this introductory phrase. In the O.T. ἐγώ ἐμ is often the style of Deity, and its impressiveness is unmistakable. A few instances may be cited from the LXX, in each case Yahweh being the Speaker:

ἐγώ ἐμ ὁ θεός σου (Gen. 17:1).
ἐγώ ὁ ὁ ἐμ Κύριος ὁ θεός σου τῷ ἱματίῳ σου (Ex. 15:20).
σωτηρία σου ἐγώ ἐμ (Ps. 35:4).
ἐλέησον ἐγώ ἐμ (Jer. 3:29).
θεον ἐγώ ἐμ (Jer. 23:5).
ἐγώ ἐμ Ἰησοῦς ὁ δοκιμοσύνης (Isa. 53:1). 

1 Burney held that the personal pronouns in Jn. often “represent close translation of an Aramaic original in which the pronoun was expressed with the participle” (Aramaic Origin, etc., p. 81). Cf. p. lxvii.
In all these passages ἐγὼ ἐμί is the rendering of ὦμ, while in the specially emphatic passages—

ἐγὼ ἐμί, ἐγὼ ἐμί δὲ παρακάλεις (Isa. 51:12),
ἐγὼ ἐμί, ἐγὼ ἐμί δὲ ἐξελέησόν τίς ἄτιμος σου (Isa. 43:15),

the doubled ἐγὼ ἐμί is the rendering of the doubled ὦμ.

We find this style in the Apocalypse, where it rests on the O.T. Thus the Divine words ἐγὼ ἐμί τῷ Ἀλφα καὶ τῷ Ω (Rev. 1:8, 10, 11, 17) go back to ἔγω Θεός πρῶτος, καὶ εἰς τὰ ἐπηρεάσματα ἐγὼ ἐμί (Isa. 44:6); or τὸ ἐγὼ ἐμί πρῶτος καὶ ἐγὼ ἐμί τῶν ἀλών (Isa. 48:9), or some such passage. Moreover, words like these or like Isa. 44:6 ἔγω πρῶτος, καὶ ἐγὼ μετὰ γάνατα are placed in the mouth of the Risen Christ in Rev. 1:17, viz.:

ἐγὼ ἐμί δόρυ καὶ δύναμις καὶ δέξιον.

Again in Rev. 2:18 the Son of God declares that all the churches shall know ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐμί ἐν αἰει πρωτόστος καὶ κατά κάθε, which goes back to Jer. 1:10, 17, where it is Yahweh who searches the reins and the heart. And finally in Rev. 21:18 Jesus says:

ἐγὼ ἐμί καὶ τὸ γένος Δαβίδ, δόρυ καὶ λαμπρόν, δόρυ πρωτόν,

which, although not a citation of any single O.T. passage, depends on the prophetic teaching, e.g. Isa. 11:6a.

It is, then, clear that the ἐγὼ ἐμί of these sentences from the Apocalypse is a reflection of the manner of speech appropriate to God in the O.T., and being placed in the mouth of Jesus involves His Divinity, which the author thus claims for Him. We now approach the Similitudes by which Jesus describes Himself in the Fourth Gospel:

ἐγὼ ἐμί δὲ πάντα πάντα ζωὴ (6:28),
ἐγὼ ἐμί τὸ φῶς τῶν κάρτον (8:9),
ἐγὼ ἐμί ἡ θύρα τῶν προβάτων (10:9),
ἐγὼ ἐμί ἡ ποιμὴν καὶ καλός (10:14),
ἐγὼ ἐμί ἡ ἀνάστασις καὶ ἡ ζωή (11:25),
ἐγὼ ἐμί ἡ ἐκκλησίας καὶ ἡ Διδασκαλία (15:2),
ἐγὼ ἐμί ἡ δόξα καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωή (17:5).

With these we may compare: ἐγὼ ἐμί καὶ μαρτύρω περὶ ἀμαντότος (19:34).

2 The LXX translators of certain books of the O.T. render ὦμ (to distinguish it from ὦ) with curious pedantry by ἐγὼ ἐμί, even when a verb follows. Thus Jephthah is made to say ἐγὼ ἐμί ὦς ἡμᾶς ἀμαντοί (Judg. 11:3 6; cf. Judg. 11:17; 2 Sam. 11:1). But this eccentricity does not concern us in the present discussion. (See Thackeray, J.T.S. Jan. 1907, p. 272.)
3 Cf. p. lxxviii.
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This is clearly the style of Deity, of which we have already had examples from the O.T. and from the Apocalypse; and it can hardly be doubted that the author of the Gospel has cast the words of Jesus into this particular form. Its force would at once be appreciated by any one familiar with the LXX version of the O.T. It is further to be observed that this style would also have been familiar to Greeks who knew the phraseology of the Egyptian mystery religions. Deissmann quotes a pre-Christian Isis inscription, which was graven about 300 A.D., containing these lines:

Ἡλία ἐγὼ ἐμί καὶ πάντας πάντας χάρας . . . Ἐγὼ ἐμί Κρονοῦ θυγάτερος προεξελεύθη

Ἐγὼ ἐμί η παρὰ γυναικεὶ παρακάλεσθαι.

And, in like manner, in an Egyptian magical papyrus (also quoted by Deissmann) we find:

ἐγὼ ἐμί Οὐσίαν ἀλλὰ ἀρχήν ἐστιν καὶ κατ᾽ ἀρχήν ἐστιν ἐστιν καὶ κατὰ ἀρχήν ἐστιν.

More familiar is the Isis inscription, given by Plutarch:

ἐγὼ ἐμί πάντα τὸ γεγονός καὶ δόκιμον καὶ τῶν ἐμῶν πάντων μονής τοῦ θεοῦ ἀποκάλυψιν.

This is of the first century A.D.

In a Mithraic liturgy we come on:

ἐγὼ ἐμί δόρυ . . . ἐγὼ ἐμί μαχητήν . . . and again ἐγὼ ἐμί καὶ ἀμαντοί καὶ δόρυ.

Instances of like phraseology are not infrequent in the magical literature current during the first three centuries in Egypt and Asia Minor, e.g.,

ἀνακώπαι μοι πάσα γλῶσσα . . . διὰ ἐγὼ ἐμί Περσαίοι.

(iii) There is yet another use of ἐγὼ ἐμί. It appears sometimes without any predicate, although the predicate may be clear from the context. Thus, in answer to the question, “Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?” Jesus says ἐγὼ ἐμί, according to Mk. 14:25 (cf. Lk. 22:27), meaning, “Yes, I
am the Christ." So, at Jn. 4:26, ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ λαός σου may mean, in like manner, "I that speak to you am the Christ." But see note in loc. Or, again, the blind beggar of Jn. 9:5admits his identity by saying simply ἐγώ εἰμι, "I am he of whom you have been speaking." It is probable that a similar explanation is to be given of Jn. 18:6, where Jesus says to those who are seeking Him, ἐγώ εἰμι. Yet another explanation is possible here, for the sequel, "they went backward and fell to the ground," might suggest that they recognised in the words ἐγώ εἰμι not merely an admission of identity, but a claim of mystery which inspired them with dread. See, however, note on 186.

An examination of the passages in the LXX where ἐγώ εἰμι is used absolutely, shows that in general it is the rendering of ἄνωθεν, which is literally "I (am) He," and that this Hebrew phrase appears to occur only when God is the Speaker. Instances of this usage in the LXX are:

Deut. 32:9: οὐκ θαύμα ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι,
Isa. 43:10: ίσα συνήκατο ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι,
Isa. 46:4: ἔσον γιγαντεύον ἐγώ εἰμι,
καὶ γας ἐν καταγγέλσει ἐγώ εἰμι—

such proclamations being usually followed by the assertion of the Unity of God, viz., "And there is none other beside Me."

It has been suggested that ἐγώ εἰμι is used in this way in the narrative of the Storm on the Lake. Both the Marcan and Johannine versions make Jesus say ἐγώ εἰμι μὴ φοβεῖσθε (Mk. 6:50 Mt. 14:27 Jn. 6:20). And it is argued that to render ἐγώ εἰμι by "I am," and treat the words as a simple affirmation that it was Jesus the Master who had appeared, is to do violence to the Greek language. So Abbott regards ἐγώ εἰμι in 6:20 as a rendering of the Hebrew מַעַן, 1 (am) He, which is the comforting assurance, several times repeated in the prophets, of a Divine Deliverer. This is possible, but does not seem necessary. We have εἰμι used for ἄνωθεν in Jn. 7:9 (see note there), and clumsy Greek as ἐγώ εἰμι for "I am present" may seem, it cannot be ruled out as certainly wrong (cf. 97).

A more plausible case may be made for this mystical use of ἐγώ εἰμι in Mk. 1:1, Lk. 2:41. Here Jesus foretells that false Christs will arise saying ἐγώ εἰμι. The parallel place, Mt. 24:23, has ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ Ἑρωδαῖος, which is obviously the meaning; but neither Mk. nor Lk. supply ὁ Ἑρωδαῖος. There is no predicate

1 ἐγώ εἰμι translates מַעָּן (without so) in Isa. 4:22 Zeph. 2:4, where the careless city says in arrogance, "I am, and there is none else because I," which is almost an assumption of the style of Deity.

2 Dirks. 2220 f.
CHAPTER V
CHRISTOLOGY

(i) The title "Son of Man" in the Synoptists and in Jn.
(ii) The Doctrine of Christ's Person in the Synoptists, Paul, and Jn.
(iii) The Doctrine of the Logos and the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel.

THE TITLE "SON OF MAN" IN THE SYNOPTISTS AND IN JN.

A

The title "the Son of Man" as a designation of Jesus is found in the N.T. outside the Gospels only at Acts 7:42. It is never employed by Paul, nor was it adopted by Christian writers of the sub-apostolic age. In the Gospels it occurs about eighty times, and always (for Jn. 12:41 is not an exception) in the words of Jesus as a designation of Himself. It is never used of Him by the evangelists, when reporting His deeds or His words.

That Jesus should have made a practice of speaking of Himself in the third person is very remarkable, and it is not less remarkable that no one seems to have thought it curious. But that He did so speak, describing Himself either as "the Son of Man" or less frequently as "the Son," is attested by all four Gospels, and by the several strata of narrative which modern scholarship has detected as underlying the evangelical records. A table drawn up by Dr. Armitage Robinson 4 conveniently exhibits the distribution of the title in the Synoptic Gospels, and shows that it appears (1) in Mk., (2) in the document which critics call Q, (3) in the matter peculiar to Lk., (4) in the matter peculiar to Mt. So deeply rooted is this title in the traditional report of the words of Jesus, that in two passages at least it has been inserted by the later evangelists where it is absent from their Markan source. Thus Mk. 3:8, "All their sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men," becomes "Whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him," at Mt. 12:32, Lk. 12:10, the sense of the saying being materially affected. And again the momentous question, "Who do men say that I am?" (Mk. 8:27, Lk. 9:18), assumes at Mt. 16:13 the form, "Who do men say that the Son of Man is?" (or (according to some MSS.), "Who do men say that I am?"

2 Cf. Abbott, Hist. 2998 (n. 113).
3 Cf., however, Jn. 12:44.
4 The Study of the Gospels, p. 50 f.

B

A further inference may be derived from Mt. 16:28. The evangelist who reported the question of Jesus in the form, "Who do men say that I, the Son of Man, am?" or the like, could not have thought that "the Son of Man" as a recognized title for "the Christ." Had he thought so, his report of the Confession of Peter and its context would be unintelligible. For it would represent Jesus as announcing that He was the Christ in the question which asked His disciples to say who He was; and also as solemnly blessing Peter for a confession which only repeated what he had been told already. According to the Matthean tradition, then, the title "the Son of Man" as used by Jesus of Himself did not necessarily convey to His hearers His claim to be the Messiah. It was not a customary or familiar designation of the Messiah in the first century.

The Synoptic narratives represent the Confession of Peter (Mk. 8:29 and parallels) as marking a critical point in the training of the Twelve. They had been accustomed to the title "the Son of Man" on the lips of Jesus before this point, but they had not understood hitherto that He who called Himself the Son of Man was the Christ. Henceforward this method of self-designation may have connoted for them the claim of Jesus to be the promised Deliverer of the Jewish race, but in the earlier days of their association with Him it could not have carried this meaning. Nor would it at any stage of His ministry have conveyed to His hearers, who were not among the chosen Twelve, that He claimed to be Messiah.

Two instances of the prevailing ignorance that the title had any Messianic significance appear in the Fourth Gospel. At Jn. 5:28 (according to the true text), Jesus asks the blind man who had been cured, "Dost thou believe on the Son of Man?" The answer is one of complete bewilderment, viz., "Who is He that I should believe on Him?" He had not been a listener to the teaching of Jesus, and so he was not aware that He designated Himself "the Son of Man," and it is also clear that he did not recognize "the Son of Man" as a Messianic title. At Jn. 12:34 we have another illustration of the same ignorance. The multitude at Jerusalem had heard Jesus saying, "The Son of Man must be lifted up,"; like the blind man, they did not know that He spoke of Himself when
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He spoke of "the Son of Man." He had been speaking of the judgment which was impending, and they had been wondering if He was going to assert Himself as Messiah. But, on the contrary, He began to speak of "the Son of Man." Who might this be? This was not a Messianic title known to them (see on 12:44).
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Ordinance instituted for his benefit, and the stress of the reply would seem to reside in the word man, even in the phrase "the Son of Man." Some have thought that "the Son of Man" in this passage is an Aramaicism for man in general, and that a parallel usage may be found in Ps. 8:4-14:4. Jesus is vindicating against the Pharisees not His own freedom only, but the freedom of the disciples, and incidentally of every man, in regard to the rabbinical rules as to Sabbath observance, and so He says "man is lord of the Sabbath." If this were the only occurrence on His lips of the phrase "the Son of Man," such an explanation might suffice, although the thesis that "man" (if by that is meant "every man") is free to observe only such rules of Sabbath rest as he may frame for himself, would go beyond anything ascribed elsewhere on the subject to Jesus. And, in fact, Mt. and Lk. when reporting this incident give quite a different turn to the argument by omitting the words, "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath" (cf. Mt. 12:4, Lk. 6:5). It is because of the dignity of the "Son of Man" and His superiority to ordinary men that, according to Mt. and Lk., He—and apparently He alone—may claim to be above Sabbath regulations. "A greater than the temple is here" (Mt. 12:6). Cf. Jn. 5:17, "My Father worketh hithero, and I work." The argument there, as in Mt. and Lk., is that not every man is free to keep the Sabbath just as he pleases, but rather that Jesus, because of His unique relation to God, who gave the Sabbath, may be justly regarded as its Lord. We conclude, then, that even in Mt. 12:4, the title "the Son of Man" implies something more than "man in general" or "the son of man" of the Psalter. Undoubtedly the emphasis is on the word man, but it rests also on the uniqueness of Him who was in such special relation to humanity that He could, and did, call Himself "The Son of Man." It is not to be supposed that the Pharisees who rebuked Him for allowing His disciples to break the Sabbath (Mk. 2:27-28) attached any very precise significance to this title which He assumed. They must have seen that by its use He meant to designate Himself, but they did not regard it as Messianic, or they would immediately have accused Him of blasphemy.

Something similar may be said of the phrase as it appears in Mk. 2:40 (Mt. 9:1, Lk. 5:19). Here Jesus healed the paralytic as an indication of His far-reaching power; "that ye may know that the Son of Man has power on earth to forgive sins," it being added by every one that God has this power. Here again, is no affirmation of His Messiahsip. But at the same time the sentence suggests a certain mysteriousness of
personality. He did not say that man in general has the power to forgive sins, but only that He—the Son of Man—had it.\(^1\)

D

We must now ask, however, if there is any trace in pre-Christian times of the use of "the Son of Man" as a title of Messiah, and if it be possible that Jesus chose it as a self-designation because it included the Messianic prerogatives.

In the Psalter "the son of man" is a poetical way of designating man in general (Ps. 84:14; cf. Job 25:35); and throughout Ezekiel the Divine Voice addresses the prophet as "son of man." A similar use of this pleonasm for "man" appears at Dan. 7:21, a passage which deeply affected Jewish speculation as to the future: "I saw in the night visions, and, behold, there came with the clouds of heaven a man like unto a son of man (αὐτὸς ὁ ἀνθρώπος), and He came even to the Ancient of Days . . . and there was given Him dominion . . . and a kingdom.\(^2\) This passage lies behind the vision recorded in 2 Esd. 13 (about 80 A.D.), where one comes out of the sea "as it were the likeness of a man," who "flew with the clouds of heaven," and who is plainly regarded by the seer as Messiah.\(^3\) The Messianic interpretation of Dan. 7:21 is also found in a Rabbinical saying of the third century A.D.\(^4\)

There is, however, no trace in the O.T. of the title "the Son of Man" being used as a descriptive of Messiah, the earliest instead of this usage being found in the Book of Enoch, and for the most part in that part of the book which is entitled the Similitudes of Enoch, and which is judged by Dr. Charles to have been composed about 80 B.C. The first passage in Enoch which need be cited is based on Dan. 7:21. It runs as follows (xlv. 1-5): "I saw One who had a head of days, and His head was white like wool, and with Him was another being whose countenance had the appearance of a man . . . and I asked the angel concerning that son of man who was, etc. And he answered, 'This is the son of man who hath

\(^1\) With the Pauline phrases οὐκ ἔχειν 'Αμήν or οὐκ ἔχειν ἀκροβασίαν (1 Cor. 15:4-6), the title "the Son of Man" may be compared, but there is no evidence of any literary relation between them.

\(^2\) See J. M. Creed, J.T.S., Jan. 1923, p. 131, who holds that Dan. 7:21 does not sufficiently account for the picture of the Son of Man in the later Jewish Apocalypses, and suggests that the conception of the Heavenly Man entered Judaism from without, perhaps from Persian sources.

\(^3\) See Driver, Daniel, p. 108; and Dalman, Words of Jesus (Eng. Tr.), p. 243.
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righteousness . . . because the Lord of spirits hath chosen Him . . . and this son of man will . . . put down the kings from their thrones," etc. There follows an account of this son of man (it will be noted that the phrase is not yet used as a title) executing judgment at the Great Assize. Next follows a passage at xlviii. 2: "At that hour, that son of man was named in the presence of the Lord of spirits, and His name before the head of days . . . He will be a staff to the righteous . . . all who dwell on earth will bow before Him . . . and will bless the Lord of spirits. And for this reason has He been chosen and hidden before Him before the creation of the world and for evermore." Then the days of affliction of the kings of the earth are mentioned, and it is said of them, "They have denied the Lord of spirits and His Anointed," a sentence which identifies the son of man, who has been the subject of the preceding chapters, with Messiah.

These passages do not seem to exhibit the phrase "the son of man" used as a title. We get nearer to such a usage in ixix. 26, 27: "There was great joy among them, and they blessed and glorified . . . because the name of the son of man" (i.e. the son of man who has been mentioned already) "was revealed unto them. And He sat on the throne of His glory, and the sum of judgment was committed to Him, the son of man, and He caused the sinners . . . to be destroyed from off the face of the earth." At ixix. 29 we have: "The son of man has appeared and sits on the throne of His glory, and all evil will pass away before His face, but the word of the son of man will be strong before the Lord of spirits. Here we approach, but do not actually reach, the usage of the phrase "the son of man" as a title of Messiah. It does not appear that it ever became a popular or well-established title, while it is certain that, as it is used in Enoch, it goes back to Dan. 7:21.

E

When, with this in our minds, we examine the passages in the Gospels in which Jesus calls Himself "the Son of Man," the significant fact emerges that a majority of these passages relate to the Advent of Jesus in glory and triumph as the judge of nations and of individuals, an Advent which is to be catastrophic and unexpected. These eschatological passages occur in all the strata of the evangelical record. We begin with some which belong to the Marcan tradition:

Mk. 14:28, 41: "The high priest asked Him, Art Thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed? And Jesus
said, I am; and ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven" (Mt. 26:64, Lk. 22:27). The high priest, who denounced this reply as blasphemous, seems to have detected the allusion to Dan. 7:13 (and perhaps also to Ps. 110:1), but this is not quite certain. At any rate, Jesus had openly claimed to be Messiah, and had also declared that as the Son of Man He would come again in the clouds to the confusion of His accusers.\footnote{See p. cxxix below.}

Mk. 8:38: "Whosoever shall be ashamed of me . . . the Son of Man also shall be ashamed of him, when He cometh in the glory of His Father with the holy angels" (Lk. 9:26; cf. also Lk. 12:8). In the corresponding place Mt. has: "The Son of Man shall come in the glory of His Father with His angels; and then shall He render unto every man according to his deeds. . . . There be some of them that stand here which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the Son of Man coming in His Kingdom." (Mt. 16:27, 28.\footnote{No mention is made in Dan. 7:13 of angels accompanying the descent from heaven of "one like unto a son of man." But this additional feature of His Advent is mentioned by Justin (as well as in the Gospels). Cf. Tertull. 31: Deū nōh υπὲρ ἔρευνος ἐκείνος περιβάλλεται, ὡς δὲναὶ εἰμὶς, ἀπαθεῖαι ὅπως αὐτοὶ ἐριθείουμεν. (Cf. also Apol. i. 32.)}

\footnote{See p. cxxix below.}

Mk. 13:27: "Then shall they see the Son of Man coming in clouds with great power and glory. And then shall He send forth the angels, and shall gather together His elect from the four winds, from the uttermost part of the earth to the uttermost part of heaven." (Mt. 24:30, Lk. 21:27). This is preceded in Mt. by the words: "Then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven, and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn," the report of Mt. thus carrying an allusion not only to Dan. 7:13 but also to Zech. 12:2 (cf. Rev. 11 for a similar combination).

Some critics have thought that underlying Mt. 24 is a fragment of a lost Jewish Apocalypse, but however that may be, there are four occurrences of the title "the Son of Man" in the non-Marcan material (Q) common to Mt. 24 and Lk. 12 and 17, 42 as follows:

Mt. 24:27, Lk. 17:24: "As the lightning . . . so shall be the coming of the Son of Man."
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experience which Nathanael was to enjoy. They must refer
to some vision of the Last Things (see note in loc.).
In 313, "No man has ascended into heaven, save He who
descended from heaven, viz., the Son of Man," primarily refers
to the Incarnation, but it also recalls Dan. 7:14, as well as the
Book of Enoch (see note in loc.).
In 683, "What if ye should see the Son of Man ascending
where He was before?" the doctrine of the pre-existence of
the apocalyptic "Son of Man" is again suggested, as in
Enoch.
In these passages of the Fourth Gospel, the title "the
Son of Man" is used with that suggestion of its reference to
a wonderful, heavenly Being, which we have already seen is
frequent in the Synoptists.
There are two other passages in Jn. 6 where the title is
used, which are not so explicit in their eschatological sug-
gestion, but which should be noted as indicating that for Jn.,
as for the Synoptists, "the Son of Man" always points to the
uniqueness and mystery of the personality of Jesus as One
whose home is in heaven. Jn. 6:32, "The meat which endures
unto eternal life, which the Son of Man will give you," is
expressed even more powerfully at Jn. 6:58, "Except ye eat the
flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, you have no life
in you." The narrative here implies that the hearers of Jesus
understood that by "the Son of Man" He meant Himself.
"How can this one give us His flesh to eat?" (6:55). No
Messianic doctrine is implied or suggested in these passages.
But "the Son of Man" is the solemn title which is used of
One Who has descended from heaven (6:58) that He may give
life to the world (cf. 6:32).

F

The passages that have been cited, while they do not
suggest that "the Son of Man" was a Messianic title in
common use, seem to show that Jesus used it of Himself with
the implication that in Him was the fulfillment of the vision of
Dan. 7:13. He was conscious of an infinite superiority to the
sons of men among whom His Kingdom was to be established.
He did not call Himself the "Christ," although He did not
deny, when pressed, that He was the Christ (Jn. 4:42, 5:28, 10:36).
He preferred to use a greater and a more far-reaching designa-
tion of Himself. He was not only the Deliverer of the Jewish
people. He was the Deliverer of humanity at large, being
"the Son of Man," who had come down from heaven. He took
over the phrase from Jewish Apocalyptic, but He enlarged its
meaning. It is a title which, properly understood, includes all
that "Christ" connotes; but, unlike the title "the Messiah,"
it does not suggest Jewish particularism. In the only place
where He suggested a form of consecration as a test of faith,
it is not, "Dost thou believe in the Son of God?" (for that was
a recognized synonym for Messiah), but, "Dost thou believe
in the Son of Man?" (Jn. 9:28). Nothing short of this would
satisfy Him. And it is an irony of history, that since the first
century His most familiar designation by His disciples has
been Christ, and the religion which He founded has been
called Christianity, rather than the religion of Humanity,
the religion of the Son of Man. The Gospel has been preached
with a Jewish accent, ever since the disciples of Jesus were first
called "Christians" at Antioch.1

G

While, then, the actual title "the Son of Man" may have
been suggested by Jewish Apocalyptic, on the lips of Jesus it
was used in an enlarged and more spiritual significance.
Another feature of its use by Him must now be noted. It is
the title which He specially employed, when He was fore-
telling to His disciples the Passion as the inevitable and pre-
destined issue of His public ministry. Such forecasts, it
may be observed, do not appear in the non-Marcan document
behind Mt. and Lk. (Q); but they are found both in Mt. and
Jn., with a similar employment of the title "the Son of Man."2

In Mk., these forecasts do not begin until after the Confession
of Peter that Jesus was the Christ, which marked a turning-
point in the education of the apostles.

Mt. 8:1: "He began to teach them that the Son of Man
must suffer many things and be rejected . . . and be
killed, and after three days rise again" (Mt. 16:28, Lk. 9:22; cf. Lk. 24:7).

Mk. 9:1: "The Son of Man is delivered up into the
hands of men, and they shall kill Him; and when He
is killed, after three days He shall rise again" (Mt.
16:28, Lk. 9:22).3

1 The majority of patristic interpreters (e.g., Justin, Tryph. 100)
found in the title "the Son of Man" an allusion to His death on the
human side: and it may be that early theologians avoided the use of
the title, because they dreaded the suggestion of human 
fatherhood
in the case of Jesus.

2 This is pointed out by J. A. Robinson, i. a. p. 52.
Mk. 10:38: "The Son of Man shall be delivered unto the chief priests and the scribes, . . . and they shall kill Him, and after three days He shall rise again (Mt. 20:18; Lk. 18:33).

In these three passages the prediction of the Resurrection is associated with that of the Passion; and it is probable that the comment of Mk. 9:31, "They understood not the saying," has special reference to this (cf. Mk. 6:10). The announcement of the Passion disconcerted (Mt. 5:28) and grieved (Mt. 13:12) the Twelve; but they did not believe that it was to be taken literally.²

Next, we have:

Mk. 10:45: "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many" (Mt. 20:28).
Mk. 14:11: "The Son of Man is betrayed into the hands of sinners" (Mt. 26:49).
Mk. 16:16: "The Son of Man is delivered up to be crucified" (the title is not given in the parallel Mk. 14:1; Lk. 23:2).

And, finally, two Marcan passages speak of the Passion of the Son of Man as the subject of O.T. prophecy, while this is not said (in these contexts) of the Resurrection, viz.:

Mk. 9:12: "How is it written of the Son of Man that He should suffer many things and be set at nought?" ²
Mk. 14:12: "The Son of Man goeth, even as it is written of Him; but woe unto that man through whom the Son of Man is betrayed!" (Mt. 26:24; Lk. 22:28).

The title "Son of Man" is associated with predictions of the Passion in Jn., as in Mk.:

Jn. 12:34: "As Moses lifted up the serpent . . . so must the Son of Man be lifted up," i.e. on the Cross (see note in loc.).
Jn. 8:51: "When ye shall have lifted up the Son of Man, then shall ye know that I am He!"; cf. also 12:46.
Jn. 12:23: "The hour is come that the Son of Man should be glorified" (see note in loc.).
Jn. 13:31: "Now is the Son of Man glorified, and God is glorified in Him."

In these passages Jesus speaks of Himself as the Son of Man who was destined to suffer and die. There is nothing in

² See p. xlv.
Thou art the Christ (Mk. 8:29), marks a crisis in their training, when a new vision of the meaning of Jesus’ ministry came to them. Further, the Synoptic narratives represent Jesus as dazzling the onlookers from making known His miraculous doings (Mk. 3:5, 4:40), although they did not altogether refrain from talking about Him (v. 9). In the Q tradition, there is a hint that Jesus was not always so reticent in this matter. When John the Baptist sent anxiously to inquire whether Jesus was really the Messiah, He directed the messengers to report His wonderful works as His credentials (Lk. 3:16–17; Mt. 11:4), with an allusion to the Messianic forecast of Isa. 35:4. The meaning of this could not have been misinterpreted, so that He departed here at any rate from His practice of reticence and reserve. Cf. also Mk. 9:4. At the last His claim is explicit and final (Mk. 14:62).

Now in the Fourth Gospel, the impression left is somewhat different. It is true that in this Gospel, as in the Synoptists, Jesus prefers to speak of Himself as the Son of Man—an unfamiliar and ill-understood title—rather than as the Christ (5:28, 6:68, 9:28). The Jews accuse Him of being ambiguous as to His claim to Messiahship (10:42), and only once does He explicitly affirm it in the early stages of His ministry (4:28). But Jn. does not describe the gradual development of the disciples’ acceptance of Him as the Christ. Jn. does, indeed, relate Peter’s confession as marking a turning-point in the ministry of Jesus (6:69), just as the Synoptists do. But he makes Andrew and Philip recognize Jesus as the Christ almost immediately after they came into His company (1:41–42). He does not tell this expressly of Peter, but his story suggests it (v. 26). Nathanael at his first introduction to Jesus greets Him as “King of Israel,” that is, Messiah in the sense of the political deliverer who was expected (v. 49). John the Baptist’s cry, “Behold, the Lamb of God,” probably represents a form of words which are a later paraphrase of what was said (see on v. 29), but that the Baptist recognized Jesus as the Messiah from the moment of His baptism (although he hesitated about this later) is clear not only in Jn. (1:29), but also in Mt.

The truth is that it is not the purpose of the Fourth Evangelist to describe the Training of the Twelve. For him, the important matter is to bring out the impression which was left upon them at last of His Person. Nathanael in v. 49 has not got as far as Peter in v. 69, still less as far as Thomas in 20:28; but Jn. does not dwell upon this; and he may have antedated the complete conviction of Jesus as Messiah, which he ascribes to Andrew and the rest in c. 18. What is of supreme impor-
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Christ in the Synoptists

ance for Jn. is to expound the true conclusion which the original disciples reached, and which he desires all future disciples to accept, viz. that “Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God.”

This conception of the purpose of Jn. in his Gospel marks a difference of standpoint between the earlier evangelists and the last. Jn. is anxious to prove the truth of Jesus as the Son of God to a generation which had not seen Jesus in the flesh, and at a time when He had been the object of Christian worship for more than half a century. Christian reflection and Christian experience had reached a doctrine of Christ’s Person which had not been clearly thought out by Christians in the first enthusiasm of devotion to their Master. The Synoptists draw a picture of Jesus as viewed by His contemporaries; the Fourth Gospel is a profound study of that picture, bringing into full view what may not have been clearly discerned at the first.

It used to be argued in the middle of the nineteenth century that the Christology of Jn. is so markedly different from that of the Synoptists, that if we wish to get “back to Jesus,” we shall do well to confine ourselves to the Marcan picture of Him as more primitive and less sophisticated than the Johannine narrative. A closer inspection of the narratives has failed to recommend such counsels. The distance of time between the publication of the Marcan Gospel and that of the Johannine Gospel cannot exceed thirty years—a time all too short for the development of any fundamental change in the picture of Jesus as accepted by Christian disciples.

The claims made for Jesus in Mk. transcend any claims that could be made for a mere human being of genius and magnetic personality. We have seen that the claim to Messiahship, made for Jesus and by Himself, in the Marcan narrative, while only gradually understood and accepted by the Twelve, reaches very far. The Jesus of Mk. claimed the power of forgiving sins (Mk. 2:5); Jn. does not mention that, while he implies it in the terms of the Commission to the apostles, of which he alone tells (Jn. 20:22). The Jesus of Mk. claimed to be the final judge of mankind (Mk. 14:61); the doctrine of Christ as judge in Jn. (see 12:47 and p. ciii) hardly goes beyond this. Indeed, the only hint of any limitation of the powers of Jesus in Mk. is in reference to His vision, when on earth, of the time of the Last Judgment; what such limitation involves may be asked of the exegete of Jn. 14:8, as justly as in the case of Mk. 13:31. Or, again, the sacramental efficacy of Jesus’ Death is not more definitely stated in Jn. 6:6 than in Mk. 14:48, το αἷμα μοι τῇ δακτυλίᾳ τῷ ἐξονθεύσαμεν ἐντὸς πολλῶν.

We do not cite the uncorroborated testimony of Mt. in this
to use the personal designation Jesus, a primitive touch which he shares with Mk., but which is seldom found in Paul.

In the four great Epistles (Rom., 1 and 2 Cor., Gal.), Paul has many phrases which recall Johannine teaching. Jesus is not only "the Son" (2 Cor. 5:20), which is common to all the evangelists (see on Jn. 3:3), but is God's "own Son." οικογενειάς (Rom. 8:18; cf. Jn. 8:16). That God "sent His Son" (Rom. 8:38; Gal. 4:4) is a conception common to all the Gospels, but cf. Jn. 3:16 in particular. For the phrase του θεοῦ (Rom. 8:17, 18) cf. Jn. 1:14. For Paul, Christ is ἐκ τῶν θεόν (Rom. 8:2); cf. ἐκ πάντων ἐκκλησία (Jn. 3:21). xρωτός is a characteristic term in Paul; it is only used particularly by "the Prologue to the Gospel by Jn., but Paul means particularly by "grace" what Jn. means when he writes, "God so loved the world" (see note on 1:14). The Pauline contrast between "law" and "grace" (Rom. 2:6, 8, 16, 18, Gal. 5:2) is again, explicitly enunciated in the Prologue (see on 1:10). Jn. does not use Paul's word σωτήρ in the Gospel, but the emphasis laid on "believing" is a prime feature of Johannine doctrine (see on 1:11). Finally, Paul's "Christ in me" (Rom. 8:30, 2 Cor. 5:21, Gal. 2:20) and "I in Christ" (Rom. 5:6, 2 Cor. 5:17, Gal. 2:20) are conjoined as inseparable in Jn. 15:3. Paul's ἐν Χριστῷ is not less mystical than anything in Jn. descriptive of the Christian life (see on Jn. 12:28, 15:17, 17:6).

The Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians belong to a later period in Paul's career. We should expect to find resemblances in Jn. in their Christology, associated as they are by name with Churches in that portion of Asia Minor where Jn.'s literary activity was put forth. These Epistles specially illustrate the doctrine of the Prologue of the Gospel as to the Person of Christ. His Pre-existence (Jn. 1:1) is laid down, "He is before all things" (Col. 1:17). He is the Creative Word (Jn. 1:1), and, as Jn. says, "That which has come into being was, in Him, life" (1:3), so in Col. 1:17 we have, "In Him all things hold together or cohere." The Pauline ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ἐγένετο (Phil. 2:6) is the doctrine of Jn. 1:4, even as ὁμοιόμορφος ἡγίασα ὑπὸ τούτου ὁ θεός is brought out at Jn. 1:10.

The teaching of Jn. 1:16 as to Christ's ἐν Θεῷ which His disciples share is anticipated in Col. 1:16, "It was the good

1 Cf. p. xvi above.
2 See note on 4.  
3 We take them as Pauline; but in any case they are later in date than those already cited.
4 See on Jn. 14.
5 Cf. also Jn. 1:14 for the ἐκ τῶν ἐκκλησίων which the μεταφθαρτικός receives from the Father.
pleasure [of the Father] that in Him should all the πλήρωμα dwell" (cf. Eph. 4:12). Again, "In Him dwelleth all the πλήρωμα of the Godhead." συμμετοχή (Col. 2:9) brings us very near to the cardinal thesis, "the Word was made flesh" (Jn. 1:14). And with this, both in Paul and Jn., is combined the doctrine of the invisibility of God. God is ἄρας, and Christ is ἐστιν, the πρῶτος κύριος κτιστός (Col. 1:18); cf. Jn. 1:18: "No man hath seen God... but the μονογενής, who is God... hath declared Him." These are more than verbal coincidences. They show that hardly anything is missing from the doctrine of Christ as set out in the Prologue (except the actual term λόγος), which is not implicit in the Epistles to the Colossians, Ephesians, Philippians. Much that is enunciated in the Prologue was not a new discovery of the writer; it had been familiar to the Churches of Asia Minor for some time before it was put into the words which were henceforth accepted by Christendom as the supreme philosophical statement and charter of its deepest faith.\footnote{See p. ccxliii.}

(ii) THE DOCTRINE OF THE LOGOS AND THE PROLOGUE TO THE FOURTH GOSPEL

The thesis of the Gospel is that Jesus is the Revealer of God (14:10), its practical aim being given at the end (20:16). The Prologue, however, is more than a mere preface, for it offers a philosophical explanation of the thesis. Jesus is the Revealer of God, because He is the Logos of God. This is a proposition which does not appear at all in the body of the Gospel, any more than the theological words and phrases, πλήρωμα, συμμετοχή, μονογενής θεός, εἶναι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, ἐξηγώμεναι, which are found in the Prologue. Not only does Jesus never claim the title "Logos" for Himself, but Jn. never applies it to Him in the evangelical narrative.

The Prologue is undoubtedly by the same hand that wrote the Gospel, but it is written from a different point of view, entirely consistent with the Gospel but not derived from the history which the Gospel narrates. Jn. prefixes a short Preface to his hortatory First Epistle, and there again he introduces the conception of Jesus as the Λόγος (v. Ἰν. 1:1; cf. p. lx), while he does not in this later passage elucidate his meaning. But the Prologue is, as I have said, more than a Preface. It is a summary restatement of the Christian gospel from the philosophical side; and was probably written after the narrative was completed,\footnote{Cf. p. ccxiv.} not now to record or summarise the words of

\[\text{§ III.} \] THE LOGOS

Jesus, but to express the writer's conviction that Jesus the Christ was Himself the Divine Logos.

The influences which contributed to the formulation for the first time in the Prologue of the Christian Doctrine of the Word were, no doubt, various.

1. The Hebrew Scriptures have much about the Divine Voice in creation, the Creative Word (see on 1:1). In the Targums, or paraphrases of the Old Testament, the action of Yahweh is constantly described as His "Word" (א反腐), the term מבר comunicación of the Old Testament, the action of Yahweh is constantly described as His "Word" (א反腐倡廉), the term מבר_communication being sometimes used as of a Person. Thus the Targum of Onkelos on Gen, 28:17 says that Jacob's covenant was that "the Word of Yahweh should be his God." This kind of quasi-personification extends to the Psalms, particularly to the Book of Proverbs, where personal qualities are repeatedly ascribed to Wisdom (סֶפֶת), cf. Prov. 3:16, 4:8, the most remarkable passage being Prov. 8:22: "Yahweh possessed me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was." This is poetry, not metaphysical prose; but it treats Wisdom as the expression of God, co-eternal with Him. This quasi-personification of Wisdom is continued in the teaching of the son of Sirach, Eccles, 44, which has much about Creative Wisdom, actually claiming for her, "I came forth from the mouth of the Most High."

2. When we turn from Palestine to Alexandria, from Hebrew sapiential literature to that which was written in Greek, we find this creative wisdom identified with the Divine λόγος, Hebraism and Hellenism thus coming into contact. God is addressed as ὁ πανίσχυς ὁ πάντα ἐν λόγω σου (Wisd. 9:1). The λόγος is the universal healer (Wisd. 16:10). This Almighty λόγος is said to have leaped down from heaven, as a warrior, bringing God's commandment as a sharp sword... "it touched the heaven, but stood upon the earth" (Wisd. 18:18). This last pronouncement suggests the personification of the λόγος who came to earth, but so much is not consciously present to the writer's thought. The language of the Book of Wisdom betrays Stoic influence at several points,\footnote{P. xxii above.} but with the Stoics λόγος was not personal.

3. The doctrine of the λόγος in Philo's writings has been frequently examined; and here it can receive only a brief notice. We have already called attention to some striking verbal parallels between Philo and the Fourth Gospel,\footnote{Cf. Rendel Harris, "Stoic Origins of St. John's Gospel" (Bulletin of John Rylands Library, Jan. 1922).} and such may be traced also in what Philo says about the λόγος;
but the differences in the underlying thoughts as to this are manifest, and far-reaching. Some of these must now be summarised:

(a) The doctrine of the Personality of the Logos is vague in Philo, and especially so when he comes to the association of the Logos with Creation (see on 22). Thus Philo has the expressions ὄργανον ἐκ λόγου θεοῦ, ἐκ ὧν κατακατατάσσεται (de Cherub. 35): τὸ μὲν βραχύτατον ἐκ τῶν ἄλλων νοικόν (de Mund. oth. 3): when God was fashioning the world (ἐν ἐκοσμολατρίασι), He used the Word as a tool (ὑπόθεσαν ὄργανον τούτῳ, de migr. Adv. 2): Philo speaks of the creative power (ψηφισμόν), according to which the Creator made the world with a word (ἀφότεν τῶν κόσμων ἐστὶ πρῶτον τὸν λόγον, de pref. 18). In other passages the λόγος ἐστὶ ἑκάστω θεῷ (cf. Col. 11): ἐκ τούτων θεοῦ, ἐκ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ κόσμου ἐκκόσμημεν (de Monarch. 2, 5; cf. de confus. ling. 20 and 28, where he speaks of τὸν ἑκάστων θεοῦ, τὸν ἑκάστατον λόγον).

The earliest Christian writers take up the Jewish thought of the Creative Word from a different standpoint, while they employ language similar to that of Philo. To Jn. the Word is a personal Divine Agent who co-operated with the Creator in the work of Creation, even Jesus Christ, the Son of the eternal Father. Paul does not use the term λόγος, but his language about the work of Christ in creation is almost identical with that of the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel. Cf. ἐκ κόσμου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι’ αὐτὸ σώζοντα (1 Cor. 15); τὰ πάντα δι’ αὐτού ... ἐνσωματισμοί (Col. 1): also ἐκ σου ἐκοσμημένος τῶν αἰώνων (Heb. 2). Like Philo, and like Jn., these writers employ the phrase βραχύτατον διὰ to describe the mediating work of the Word (or the Son) in Creation; in John, however, Divine personality to this mediating Agent, they agree with each other and with Jn., while they differ from Philo. Paul and Jn. do not borrow from Philo, nor are they directly dependent on his speculations; but they and Philo represent two different streams of thought, the common origin of which was the Jewish doctrine of the Memra or Divine Word.

(b) The pre-existence of the Logos is not explicit in Philo, whereas it is emphatically declared in the opening word of the Prologue to the Gospel. Philo applies, indeed, the epithet προσβάτατος to the λόγος more than once (de confus. ling. 28, quod det. pot. 22): but such a phrase does not imply eternal pre-existence. See on 21.

(c) The Johannine doctrine of the connexion between Life and Light, which appears in the Logos teaching of the
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Prologue (14; cf. also 22), does not appear in Philo, although it suggests a line of speculation which would, one supposes, have been congenial to him.

(d) Most significant of all differences between Jn. and Philo, is that Jn.'s philosophy rests avowedly on the doctrine of the Incarnation (see on 21), while this is absolutely precluded by the principles of Philo. "There are," he says, "three kinds of life: one which is πρὸς θεοῦ, another πρὸς λαόν, and a third which is a mixture of both. But the πρὸς θεοῦ has not descended to us (ἐντόθι πρὸς ἄνθρωπος), nor has it come as far as the necessities of the body." (Quis ver. div. her. 9).

4. In addition to these various philosophies, with which the Christian doctrine of the Logos has been associated by scholars, attention has been directed of recent years to the Mandean and Hermetic literature, as possible homes of the Logos idea. Many parallels to Johannine phraseology have been collected from the writings of Lidzbarski, Reitzenstein, and others by Walter Bauer in the last edition of his commentary on the Fourth Gospel. Some of these are striking, especially those from the Mandean Liturgies: "I am a Word, a Son of Words"; "the Word of Life"; "the Light of Life"; "the First Light, the Life, which was out of the Life"; "the worlds do not know thy Names, nor understand thy Light." 1 There is, however, no evidence that Mandean teachings had any influence on Christian philosophy in its beginnings. Christian or Jewish belief may have affected the development of Mandaeism, but Mandaeism was not a source from which Christian doctrine derived any of its features. 2 Probably, as in other cases, the parallels that have been cited are only verbal. To build up community or similarity of doctrine upon coincidences of language between two writers is highly precarious; and when the Johannine doctrine of the Logos is compared with that of Philo or the Stoics or the Sapiential Books, or even that of the Mandean Liturgies, this should always be borne in mind. 3

2. For the Mandean doctrines and their growth, see W. Brandt, in E.R.E. viii. p. 580 ff.
3. A passage may be cited from Plato to illustrate this: καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος τὸν λόγον ἐμῆ σοι παρατέθηκεν καὶ ἐν στροφῇ τὸν τόπον ἐπὶ τὸν λόγον ἐκ τῆς σοι καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς σοι ἐπὶ τοῦ λόγου ἐμῆς σοι παρατέθηκεν. καὶ ἐν στροφῇ τὸν τόπον ἐπὶ τὸν λόγον ἐκ τῆς σοι καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς σοι ἐπὶ τοῦ λόγου ἐμῆς σοι παρατέθηκεν. καὶ ἐν στροφῇ τὸν τόπον ἐπὶ τὸν λόγον ἐκ τῆς σοι καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς σοι ἐπὶ τοῦ λόγου ἐμῆς σοι παρατέθηκεν. καὶ ἐν στροφῇ τὸν τόπον ἐπὶ τὸν λόγον ἐκ τῆς σοι καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς σοι ἐπὶ τοῦ λόγου ἐμῆς σοι παρατέθηκεν. καὶ ἐν στροφῇ τὸν τόπον ἐπὶ τὸν λόγον ἐκ τῆς σοι καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς σοι ἐπὶ τοῦ λόγου ἐμῆς σοι παρατέθηκεν. καὶ ἐν στροφῇ τὸν τόπον ἐπὶ τὸν λόγον ἐκ τῆς σοι καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς σοι ἐπὶ τοῦ λόγου ἐμῆς σοι παρατέθηκεν. καὶ ἐν στροφῇ τὸν τόπον ἐπὶ τὸν λόγον ἐκ τῆς σοι καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς σοι ἐπὶ τοῦ λόγου ἐμῆς σοι παρατέθηκεν. καὶ ἐν στροφῇ τὸν τόπον ἐπὶ τὸν λόγον ἐκ τῆς σοι καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς σοι ἐπὶ τοῦ λόγου ἐμῆς σοι παρατέθηκεν. καὶ ἐν στροφῇ τὸν τόπον ἐπὶ τὸν λόγον ἐκ τῆς σοι καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς σοι ἐπὶ τοῦ λόγου ἐμῆς σοι παρατέθηκεν. καὶ ἐν στροφῇ τὸν τόπον ἐπὶ τὸν λόγον ἐκ τῆς σοι καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς σοι ἐπὶ τοῦ λόγου ἐμῆς σοι παρατέθηκεν. καὶ ἐν στροφῇ τὸν τόπον ἐπὶ τὸν λόγον ἐκ τῆς σοι καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς σοι ἐπὶ τοῦ λόγου ἐμῆς σοι παρατέθηκεν. καὶ ἐν στροφῇ τὸν τόπον ἐπில.
It is now apparent that the doctrine of a Divine λόγος was widely distributed in the first century. The Hebrew Targums or paraphrases of the ancient scriptures; the Wisdom literature of Judaism, both in Palestine and Alexandria; the speculations of Philo; the philosophy of Heraclitus, and that of the later Stoics, all use the idea of the Logos to explain the mysterious relation of God to man. We may be sure that the Logos of God was as familiar a topic in the educated circles of Asia Minor as the doctrine of Evolution is in Europe or America at the present day, and was discussed not only by the learned but by half-instructed notaries of many religions.

Christian disciples, Docetic and Ebionite no less than simple, unspeculative followers of Jesus, were conscious of the wonder of His life. It was inevitable that the Pauline teaching of the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians should quicken deep thoughts as to the relation of Jesus to the Eternal God. The Epistle to the Hebrews uses language about the “Word of God” (Heb. 4:12) which naturally provoked questionings as to the relation of this energising and heart-searching Logos to the great High Priest Himself. An earlier writer, the Seer of the Apocalypse, actually gives the title “the Word of God” (Rev. 19:16) to the Leader of the Christian host, probably having the conception of the Logos as a Warrior (Wis. 18:16) in his mind. Jn. must have been not only conversant in some degree with the philosophical speculations of Ephesus as to the Divine Logos, and with such teaching as that of Heb. 4:12, but above all with the application of the title “the Word of God,” by the author of the Apocalypse, whose discipline he was. Such a phrase in the Apocalypse did not solve problems, but it must have suggested a remarkable problem to the followers of Jesus in the next generation, who asked what it meant. To call Jesus the λόγος of God without further explanation might well suggest that Docetic theory of His Person which it is one of the purposes of the Fourth Gospel to dispel as wholly irreconcilable with His earthly life.

Jn.’s chief aim was to show (it was his deepest conviction) that Jesus is the Revealer of God. But the philosophers, whether Hebrew or Greek, whether they took Logos as meaning speech or as meaning reason, had for centuries been occupied with the idea that the Divine Word is the Revealer, and had not found it possible thus completely to bridge the gulf between God and man. How can we reconcile Spirit and Matter, the One and the Many, the Infinite and the Finite? It was left for Christian philosophy to proclaim that the only solution of these problems, which metaphysics had failed to solve, was historical. And the first statement of this is in the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel, ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν. The philosophers had said that the Word is the Revealer of God. That is true for Jesus is the Word.

Whether any one before Jn. had said explicitly, “The Word became flesh,” we do not know; nor can we say that this express and fundamental proposition was present to his mind when he penned the narrative of the Fourth Gospel. It may have been so, but it nowhere appears explicitly except in the Prologue, as has been pointed out already. When Lorty wrote, “La théologie de l’incarnation est la clef du livre tout entier, et qu’elle le domine depuis la première ligne jusqu’à la dernière,” he was not accurate if he meant that the Logos doctrine of the Prologue dominated the entire Gospel. On the contrary, the Prologue is the recommendation of the Gospel to those who have approached it through metaphysics rather than through history; but the evangelist never allows his metaphysics to control his history. He appeals to no “witness” to corroborate the doctrine of the Word which he sets out in the Prologue, while the appeal to “witnesses,” Divine and human, appears in every part of the evangelical narrative. He puts it forth as the philosophical solution of the great problem, “How can God reveal Himself to man?”—a solution latent in the Wisdom literature of the Hebrews, although not perceived by the philosophers of Greece. This is Jn.’s great contribution to Christian philosophy, that Jesus is the Word; but nowhere, as Harnack has pointed out, does he deduce any formula from it. It was for later ages to do this, and to treat the Johannine presentation in the Prologue of the Word who became flesh, as the secure basis for far-reaching thoughts and hopes as to the destiny of man. “He became what we are that He might make us what He is,” is the saying of Irenæus, not of Jn.

For Jn. it is sufficient to preach as gospel that “God so loved the world that He sent His Son”; he does not put forward

---

1 See on iv. for a parallel to Jn.’s Logos doctrine in Enoch xxii. 1 on the Divine Wisdom.
2 Cfr. p. cxxviii.
3 Cfr. p. xviii. See on 5v. for a simpler use of the phrase, “the Logos of God.”
4 See on 1v.
the tremendous paradox, "the Word became flesh," as the
gospel which he has received, although it supplies for him as
he ponders it the \textit{rationale} of the revelation of God in Jesus
Christ.

In the Sapiential Books of the O.T., the praises of Wisdom
are several times put into poetry or rhythmic form; Prov. 8
is a familiar example. The \textit{hymn} on \textit{Sophia} in Wisd. 7\textsuperscript{22},
points back to that of Prov. 8, and the traces of its use in
Heb. 1\textsuperscript{4} 4\textsuperscript{2} are apparent. Yet another Wisdom hymn, Eccles.
24\textsuperscript{4} 22, takes up some thoughts from the two earlier hymns,
and may have influenced the language of Jn. 1\textsuperscript{13} 14 (cf. Eccles.
24\textsuperscript{4} 9, 15). It is, then, not without precedent if it be found that
the doctrine of the Logos in the Prologue to Jn., like the doctrine
of Sophia in the Sapiential Books, should have been put into the
form of an Ode or \textit{Hymn}, the profundity of the subject being
better suited to poetry than to prose. The following arrange-
ment of the Logos \textit{Hymn} embodied in the Prologue is here
offered for examination:

\textbf{THE LOGOS HYMN}

1. Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος,
kai ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν,
kai θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος.

2. σύγχρος ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν θεόν.

3. πάντα δὲ αὐτὸν ἐγένετο,
kai χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐκ ἦν.

4. δὲ γένοντο ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν,
kai ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ ὕδω τῶν λαμβάνων.

5. καὶ τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει,
kai ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ ἀπὸ αὐτῷ οὐκ ἐκπέμβατο.

6. ἐν τῇ κατοχῇ ἦν,
kai ὁ κόσμος δὲ αὐτὸν ἐγένετο, καὶ ὁ κόσμος αὐτὸν ὡς ἐγένετο.

II.

7. ἐν τῷ ἅβαθεν,
kai οἱ ἄνθρωποι αὐτῷ παρέμεινον.

8. καὶ ὁ λόγος ἄρα ἐγένετο, καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐν λόγῳ,

9. καὶ ἡ ὥσπερ αὐτῶν ἦσαν ἐν φώνῃ,

10. σοφία καὶ δικαίωμα παρὰ πάντων,
pλήρης χάρισμα καὶ ἀληθείας.

The \textit{hymn} is a philosophical \textit{rationale} of the main thesis
of the Gospel. It begins with the proclamation of the Word
as \textit{Pre-existent} and \textit{Divine} (vv. 1, 2). Then appear the O.T.
thoughts of the Word as creative of all (v. 3), life-giving (v. 4),
light-giving (v. 5). But the whole universe (v. 10), including
\textit{man} (v. 11), was unconscious of His omnipresent energy.

He became Incarnate, not as a \textit{momentary Epiphany}
of the Divine, but as an abiding and visible exhibition of the
Divine Glory, even as the Son exhibits the Father (v. 14).
Thus does the Word as Incarnate reveal the Invisible God
(v. 18).

Two parenthetical notes as to the \textit{witness} of John the
Baptist, to the coming \textit{Light} (vv. 6–9), and His \textit{pre-existence}
(v. 15), are added. We have also two exegetical comments by the
\textit{evangelist},\textsuperscript{1} at vv. 12, 13, to correct the idea which v. 11 might
convey, that no one received or recognised the Word when He
came; and again at vv. 16, 17, to illustrate the "grace and
truth" of v. 14.

The great theme of a Divine Revealer of God is implicit
in the first and last stanzas of the \textit{hymn} (vv. 1, 18), the rest
being concerned with the method of the revelation.

The \textit{Hebraic} style of the \textit{hymn} is plain. The repetition in
the second line of a couplet of what has been said already in
the first line (vv. 3, 5); the elucidation of the meaning of the
first line by the emphatic word being repeated in the next
(vv. 4, 5, 11, 14), which provides an illustration of what has
been called "climactic parallelism" (cf. Ps. 29\textsuperscript{9} 93\textsuperscript{8}); the
threefold repetition in the first three lines of v. 14, all of which
involve the bodily visibility of the Logos—sufficiently show
that the model is not Greek but Hebrew poetry.

It will be noticed that the \textit{hymn} moves in abstract regions
of thought. The historical names—John, Moses, Jesus Christ—
are no part of it: they are added in the explanatory notes of
the \textit{evangelist}. Nevertheless, v. 14 states an historical fact,
and points to an event in time; but the history is told \textit{sub
specie aeternitatis}.

The treatment of the Prologue as embodying a \textit{hymn} on the
Logos has been suggested more than once in recent years.
An analysis of it from this point of view was published by
C. C. C. \textit{Cyrus} in 1914.\textsuperscript{2} In 1922 C. F. \textit{Burney} treated the Prologue

\textsuperscript{1} This is in the manner of Jn.; cf. p. xxxiv.

\textsuperscript{2} \textit{Expository Times}, July 1924, p. 440.
as a hymn (with comments) originally composed in Aramaic; and Rendel Harris suggested that it was based on a Hymn to Sophia, although he did not work out the details of any rhythmic arrangement. He developed the parallels between the Prologue and the Suppiantia literature of the O.T., comparing also some Stoic phrases.

The arrangement of the stanzas which is printed above is not identical with those adopted by Burney or Cryer, an important difference being that the hymn proper does not embody argument (cf. vv. 12, 13, 16, 17) or contain the Personal Name of Jesus Christ. It is a Logos hymn of a triumphal philosophy, directly Hebraic in origin, but reflecting the phrases which had become familiar in Greek-speaking society. In the Christian literature of the first two centuries a good many traces of rhythm and verse arrangement may be found in impassioned passages of prose. Eusebius (H.E. v. 28. 3) cites a writer who remarks on the number of Christian Psalms and Odes which from the beginning (διὰ δρόμου) sung of Christ as the Word (τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν Χριστίαν τησυκοτες δειονόουσης). Such a collection of Christian hymns were those known as the Odes of Solomon, which present so many points of contact with the Johannine writings, and especially with the Prologue to the Gospel, that they demand mention at this point.

The Odes of Solomon were first published from the Syriac by Rendel Harris in 1909. He regarded them as of first-century date, and to this Harnack gave his adhesion. I have given reasons elsewhere for regarding this date as too early, and for treating them as Christian hymns composed about 70 or 170 A.D.

These beautiful hymns are composed in cryptic fashion, and they contain no avowed verbal quotations either from the O.T. or the N.T. But the doctrine of the Logos is repeatedly dwelt on, in a way which recalls Johannine teaching. The Word is the Thought (λόγος) of God (Odes xvi. 20, xxvii. 18, xli. 10); this Thought is Life (Ex. 3) and Light (xiii. 7), "Light dawned from the Word that was beforetime in Him" (xiii. 15), so that the pre-existence of the Word is recognised (cf. xvi. 19). He is the Agent of Creation, for "the worlds
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were made by His [God's] Word and by the Thought of His heart" (xiv. 20). The Incarnation of the Word is expressed by saying "the dwelling-place of the Word is man" (xvii. 11; cf. xxii. 12); and God continually abides with man, for "His Word is with us in all our way" (xvii. 11). Were these sublime phrases as early as the first century, we should have to treat the Odes not only as arising in an environment like that which was the birthplace of the Fourth Gospel, but as being actually one of the sources from which its distinctive doctrines were derived. This, however, cannot be maintained. The Odes, nevertheless, provide a welcome illustration of that mystical aspect of Christian teaching which has sometimes been erroneously ascribed to Hellenic rather than to Hebrew influences. They catch the very tone of John, and show how deep-rooted in Christian devotion was the Johannine doctrine of the Word, within seventy years of the publication of the Fourth Gospel.

CHAPTER VI

DOCTRINAL TEACHING OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL

(i) The Authority of the O.T.
(ii) The Johannine Doctrine of Life and Judgment.
(iii) The Kingdom of God and the New Birth.
(iv) The Eucharistic Doctrine of John.
(v) The Johannine Miracles.

(i) The Authority of the O.T.

(i) The Old Testament was, for a Jew, the fount of authority, and in the Fourth Gospel it is frequently quoted to establish a fact, or to clinch an argument, or to illustrate something that has been said.

Thus the people by the lake-side (58) quote Ex. 16:12 to confirm their statement that their fathers had been given bread from heaven. The O.T. was their book of national history.

Jesus is represented in John, as appealing to the Law (Deut. 1.) This is not only true of their Logos doctrine. With x 1. 40 we may compare, 'I should not have known how to love the Lord if He had not loved me' (Jude iii. 3). In the note on 17:6 below, I have cited another parallel from Odes xxxi. 4, 5. See also notes on 17:20, 57:28, 57:18, 51:1. The Odes dwell continually on the great Johannine themes: Love, Knowledge, Truth, Faith, Joy, Light; he never mentions sin, repentance, or forgiveness (cf. p. xcv).
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and to the Psalms (Ps. 825) in support of His arguments with the Jews (526 and 1252). The Synoptic narrative agrees with this representation of His mode of argument (Mk. 1226 and parallels; Mt. 4.6.11=Lk. 4.6.13). Paul appealed to the O.T. in the same fashion, as every Rabbi did (Rom. 3:19, 1 Cor. 15:6, Gal. 3:11, etc.).

Again, the Fourth Gospel represents Jesus as illustrating His teaching by the citation of Scripture passages; e.g. He quotes Isa. 53 at 6:26, and his quotation (7:30), "Out of his own beloved came rivers of living water," seems to be illustrative rather than argumentative. There are many instances in the Pauline Epistles of the use of the O.T. (e.g. Rom. 4: "); and the Synoptists ascribe it to Jesus just as Jn. does (Mt. 4:21, 16:43, etc.). So far there is no difficulty in the report of the Fourth Gospel as to the use said to have been made of the O.T. by Jesus and His hearers.

(ii) The Jews, however, did not only hold that the O.T. was authoritative; they held that it pointed forward to Messiah, and to His Kingdom which was one day to be established among them. It was a prophetic volume, and for them prophecy included prediction. They believed that the actual words of the O.T. were intended by God to have a future as well as a present application.

Thus Jn. represents the people as expecting that Messiah would come one day, because the prophets had so predicted; and expecting Him to be born at Bethlehem (38; cf. Mt. 2:5) of the seed of David; to vindicate Himself by wonderful works (64:9) because the Scriptures of the prophets had assured them that so it would be; and to "abide for ever" (12:24) because so it had been indicated in "the law." The Synoptists do not give any details as to the nature of the Messianic expectation, but they are clear that Messiah was looked for, by the priests (Mk. 14:43); by pious folk such as Simeon, Anna, the two at Emmaus (Lk. 2:26, 50:24); by John the Baptist, who expected Messiah to work miracles (Mt. 1:14, Lk. 2:25); and by the people generally (Lk. 24:44). The hope that the Messianic prophecies would one day be fulfilled was in every pious Jewish heart, and Jn.'s report that this expectation was vivid is borne out by all the other evidence we have.

(iii) The evangelists, Jn. as well as the Synoptists, were convinced that this expectation had been satisfied, for they believed that in Jesus the Messiah had been found. The purpose of Jn. in writing his gospel was that his readers might believe that "Jesus is the Christ" (20:30); and he is quite assured that Isaiah (xvi) as well as Zechariah spoke of Jesus. He applies,
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etc., Zech. 12:24 to the piercing of the Lord's side on the Cross (19:34). Jn. tells of John the Baptist applying to himself the prophecy of the Forerunner (1:28); cf. Mk. 1:5, Lk. 3:19, cf. 20, Mt. 3:3), and accepting unhesitatingly Jesus as the Messiah (19:25; and he ascribes the same belief to other disciples (21:6, 606, 609, etc.). Martha makes the same confession (11:25). The disciples are represented as applying Messianic Scriptures to Jesus both before (20:17) and after His Resurrection (20:14). The author of Hebrews finds Jesus as the Christ frequently (xvii) in the Psalms and in the Law; and in one passage at least Paul elaborates an argument (Eph. 4:8) which depends for its force upon a mystical and forward reference to Jesus in Ps. 68:4.

Indeed, that Jesus is the Messiah of O.T. prophecy is the burden of the earliest gospel sermons (Acts 2:38, 3:26, 5:32, etc.).

(iv) Jn. agrees with the Synoptists in representing Jesus as accepting this position, and as claiming therefore to be the subject of O.T. prophecy. The difference is that Jn. puts the recognition by His disciples as the Messiah (16:30), and His acceptance of their homage, earlier than the Synoptists formally do (Mt. 5:30); but it is not to be overlooked that Lk. (4:14) represents Him as conscious of His Messiahship at a date prior to the call of Peter and James and John by the lake-side. Jn. also puts into His mouth the plain affirmation to the Woman of Samaria that He was the Christ (4:26). At a later stage the Synoptists will that He said the same thing to the high priest (Mk. 14:59; cf. Lk. 22:67, Mt. 26:64), which is not told explicitly by Jn., who does not go into full details about this examination by Caiaphas (18:34; but cf. 19:7). There can be no doubt that, according to Jn. and the Synoptists alike, it was implied in Jesus' claim and explicitly asserted once and again that He was the Messiah of the O.T. "Moses wrote of me," and the Scriptures "bear witness of me" (7:27, 50, 44) are words that Jn. places in His mouth.

(v) Hence we are not surprised to come upon the expression that in Jesus and His ministry "the Scripture was fulfilled." (ἐν εὐαγγελίῳ). It does not seem to say more than, as we have seen, was accepted ἐν αὐτῷ by all His early disciples. Yet the expression is not found in Paul or in Hebrews or in the Apocalypse or in the Johannine or Petrine Epistles. The idea of the "fulfilment" of the Scriptures in Jesus appears but once in Mk., four times in Lk. and the Acts (as well as twice with the verb ἐπληρωθη, instead of πληρωθη), six times in Jn. (and once with τελειωθη), and twelve times in Mt. It occurs once in


James (30), but with no Messianic reference, being applied to the fulfillment of Gen. 15:6 in the later promise of Gen. 25:46. These passages from the Gospels must presently be examined separately, but it is plain from their distribution that the idea of the "fulfillment" of a particular Scripture as an incident of Christ's Ministry and Passion is more conspicuous in the later writings of the N.T. than in the earlier. Whatever the dates of Jn. and Mt. may be, they are later, in their present form, than the Epistles of Paul or than Mk. and Lk., and it is in these later Gospels that the phrase becomes frequent, either in the form "the Scripture was fulfilled," or "in order that the Scripture might be fulfilled." This way of speaking of the "fulfillment" of Scripture does not appear at all in the sub-apostolic age, although the belief was universal in Christian circles that the O.T. rites and prophecies pointed onward to Christ. Barnabas, for instance, who is full of "types," and who finds Christ in the most unlikely places in the O.T. (see § 9, where he finds in the number of Abraham's servants a forecast of the Cross of Jesus), never speaks of the "fulfillment" of a Scripture. The same is true of Justin Martyr. Nor is the formula of citation "then was fulfilled" a formula which Irenæus used, except when (as in Hær. iii. 9. 2) he reproduced it from the Gospels (Mt. 19). The only instances of πληρωμα being used of Scripture in his writings are in Hær. iii. 10. 4, where he says that the angels proclaimed the promise made to David as a promise fulfilled (πληρωματος . . . πεπραγμένου εἰς γενέσεως), and perhaps in Dem. 38, where he writes that "This," (i.e. Amos 31) "our Lord Jesus Christ truly fulfilled." But in neither of these passages is the formula of citation "then was fulfilled" used by Irenæus. The earliest appearance of the phrase, subsequent to the First and Fourth Gospels, is in Hegesippus, who wrote about 160-180 A.D. In a passage where Hegesippus (quoted by Eusebius, H.E. ii. 23. 13) is describing the martyrdom of James the Just by the Jews, he adds, καὶ ἐπάλαθον τῷ γεγονότι τῷ τῷ Ἰσαίας γεγραμμένῳ, Ἀρμναέν τῷ δικαίῳ (Isa. 59, cf. Wisd. 28). The passage he quotes has not any such reference, but Hegesippus has been attracted by the word δικαίως, and so he ventures to say that the Jews "fulfilled" this Scripture. In every Christian age it has been a fault of piety, when searching the O.T., to mistake verbal coincidence with fact for a veritable fulfillment of prophetic words.

1 Barnabas (16) applies the words to Christ's Passion; and Cyprian quotes Wisd. 28 to illustrate a general thesis, "Quod ipse sit iustus, quem judaei coosuri essent" (Test. ii. 14).
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It should be added that this formula of citation is not used (except when reproducing Mt. 21, 27) by the authors of any of the earlier Apocryphal Gospels. It is not found in them until we come to Evangelium Pseudo-Matthai, a work of the fifth or sixth century; and its presence here is probably to be explained by the fact that this apocryphal writer aims at imitating the manner of the canonical Matthew.3

The probable reason that the phrase "then was fulfilled the Scripture" is frequent in Jn. and Mt., but does not appear again until Hegesippus, and then rarely until post-Nicene times, is that the phrase was peculiarly Jewish. Jn. and Mt. are full of Hebraisms, and Hegesippus was a Jew. In the O.T. "to fulfill" is used of a petition (Ps. 20) or a Divine promise (1 Kings 8), but rarely of a prophecy (1 Kings 27, 2 Chr. 36, Dan. 4, 1 Esd. 4). It seems that the word came into use in the Rabbinical schools after the O.T. canon had been closed. "To fulfill that which was said" and "then was fulfilled" are formulas of citation that are occasionally found in Jewish writings (so Bacher, Exeg. term. i. 174).

It has often been thought that there existed in Apostolic days a Jewish collection of O.T. passages held to be predictive of Messiah. If this were the case, it would be natural that it should be utilized by the writers of the Gospels, at any rate of the later Gospels, Mt. and Jn. Allen has suggested that the quotations in Mt. introduced by a formula are derived from a written source of this kind, and not directly from the canonical Old Testament. The same might be true of the quotations in Jn.; but the existence of such a collection of testimonia in the first century has not yet, as it seems to the present writer, been established.

To return to the phrase "the Scripture was fulfilled," as it appears in the Gospels. It always has reference to a particular verse of the O.T. (γραφή), the words of which fit the incident that the evangelist has recorded. There are two notable instances in Mt. The evangelist finds (Mt. 27) in Jer. 31 words prophetic of the Massacre of the Innocents; and again (Mt. 26) he says that in the buying of the Potter's

3 This apocryphon says "then was fulfilled" of Hab. 3, Isa. 14 (the Nativity), of Ps. 149 (the dragon serving Jesus), of Isa. 13 (a legend of the Flight into Egypt), of Isa. 19 (the prostration of the idol), and of Ps. 69 (the wisdom of the Child Jesus). It is curious that it does not cite Jer. 31 or Hos. 12, which are cited as testimonia in the canonical Matthew.

4 See, in particular, Rendel Harris, Testimonia, who holds that the existence of such a collection of Messianic prophecies has been proved.

5 W. C. Allen, Mt. Matthew, p. 97.
Field with the blood money "was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremiah" (Zech. 11:12; cf. Jer. 31:24). In both of these cases we are dealing only with the comment of the evangelist, and it is probable that he was misled by verbal coincidences, just as Hegesippus was when he quoted Isa. 34 of the martyrdom of James the Just (see p. cl). Having regard to the historical contexts both of Jer. 31:15 and of Zech. 11:12 (Jer. 32:41), it cannot be maintained that they are more than vaguely descriptive or suggestive of incidents in the Gospel history.

The case of Lk. 4:21 is different. Here the evangelist tells that Jesus read aloud in the synagogue the passage Isa. 61:1-3, and that He began His comment upon it by saying, "To-day hath this Scripture been fulfilled in your ears." There is no improbability in this, and it is entirely in agreement with the claim which, as we have seen, Jesus made repeatedly for Himself, that He was the subject of O.T. prophecy.

(vi) We come next to a more difficult conception, yet one which is logically connected with the belief in prophecy as understood by a Jew. Jn. represents Jesus as saying "the Scripture cannot be broken," αὐτὸν ἐστὶ χριστόν ἡ γραφή (19:29). This is not said in reference to the fulfilment of prophecy, but parenthetically as an assertion of the permanent authority of O.T. words. But where prophecy was in view, it was held that the prediction once made was carried with it the assurance of its accomplishment. The more strictly the verbal inspiration of the sacred books was taught by the Rabbinical schools, the more deeply would it be felt that the punctilious fulfilment of the Messianic predictions was fore-ordained of God. This was believed by every pious Jew, and the belief emerges distinctly in the Fourth Gospel, the evangelist ascribing this conviction to Jesus Himself. We may recall here some Synoptic passages which show that the belief that "the Scripture cannot be broken" was shared by Mt., Mk, and Lk. (especially by Lk.), and that all three speak of it as having the authority of their Master.

(e) At Mk. 10:38 (cf. Mt. 26:38) Jesus predicts His condemnation and death at Jerusalem, τὰ μέλλοντα αὐτῷ συμβαίνειν, or, as Lk. (18:34) more explicitly puts it, "all the things that are written by the prophets shall be accomplished (τελεσθήσεται) unto the Son of Man." (d) According to Mk. 14:61, Mt. 26:64, Jesus said at the Last Supper, "The Son of Man goeth, even as it is written of Him," or as Lk. has it, "as it hath been determined," καὶ τὸ δομήματος (Lk. 22:22). Cf. also Lk. 21:22.

(c) Lk. (22:25) alone records that Jesus said after the Last Supper γνωρίζεται ἐν ἀμώμῳ, τὸ Χριστός μετὰ ἑαυτοῦ προφήτου ἡ σοφία τοῦ οὐρανοῦ; and then interpreting the Messianic prophecies to them.

(vii) So again, according to Lk. 24:24, Jesus said to the company in the Upper Room, δεῦ τινα εἶναι γνωρίζεται ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ Μωσέως καὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ φασίν λόγου τῶν ἡσυχάσεως; it was necessary that all that had been written should be fulfilled.

In like manner Luke ascribes to Peter (Acts 2:26) the saying that it was necessary that the Scripture about Judas should be fulfilled.

This conception, then, of the inevitableness of the fulfilment of O.T. prophecies is ascribed by all the evangelists to Jesus, but it comes out most frequently in Lk. and Jn., the Fourth Evangelist generally expressing it, as we shall see presently, in another way.

(viii) We have now to consider the meaning of the expression, common in Mt. and Jn., that certain things happened in order that the Scripture might be fulfilled.

A similar expression is found two or three times in the O.T. "thet he might fulfill the word of the Lord which He spake concerning the house of Eli" (1 Kings 22:9). The LXX has had πληρώθηται τὸ βήμα Κυρίου. It may be that in this passage we need not suppose Solomon's motive to be that he might fulfill 1 Sam. 28:8, but that the writer only means that the event corresponded with what had been predicted. In like manner it has been suggested that in some passages where ἐν πληρώθηται γραφή is found in the Gospels, we need not give ἐν a telic force. It may be used loosely on occasion with πληρῶθησα, as it is certainly used loosely, without telic force, in other contexts (e.g. Mk. 5:43, 6:9, 9:5, in all of which cases the other Synoptists discard Mark's δι; cf. Jn. 1:17 11:50 etc.). But thus to evacuate ἐν of its telic force in the phrase ἐν πληρώθηται γραφή, however agreeable to our modern ideas of the Bible, is to do violence to the contexts, and to fail in appreciation of the Jewish doctrine of prophecy.

(viii) When the Chronicler places the rise of Cyrus "after the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah had been accomplished," (μετὰ τοῦ πληρωθῆναι βῆμα Κυρίου, 2 Chron. 36:23), he means more than that the event corresponded with what had been predicted. He means that the event was overruled by God with a view to the fulfilment of His own
eternal purpose, which had been proclaimed by Jeremiah the prophet.

Both Mt. and Jn. express themselves in the same way. Mt. uses the phrase ἱνα πληρωθῇ, or ἄνω πληρωθῇ, eight times of a testimoniwm quoted from the O.T., viz. 12 (Isa. 7:14), 215 (Hos. 11:1), 22 ("He shall be called a Nazarene," the source of which is uncertain), 414 (Isa. 9:1. 2), 817 (Isa. 53:7), 2127 (Isa. 44:25), 314 (Ps. 89:21), 214 (Zech. 9:9). This was his doctrine, that the words of the prophets, quite apart from their context, had a forward Messianic reference, and that the incidents of the ministry of Jesus were divinely overruled, in order that the prophecies might be fulfilled. And in one remarkable passage, where he is following Mk., Mt. places this doctrine in the mouth of Jesus. Mark 14:57, cf. Mt. 26:64 reports that Jesus said at His betrayal that the manner of His violent arrest was ἵνα πληρωθῇ ἀπὸ γεραφῆς. No special "Scripture" is quoted, and it may be that only the general trend of O.T. prophecy about Messiah and His sufferings was in the mind of the Speaker, or in that of the evangelist who reported His words. Yet that the evangelist believed Jesus to have said that an incident took place, in order that the Scriptures might be fulfilled, is significant.

We now come to the use in Jn. of this phrase. It occurs four times in a comment by the evangelist upon something which he has recorded, and he attributes the use of it to Jesus three times.

(a) Jn. says 12:37-38, that the people did not believe on Jesus, despite His signs, ἵνα αὕτως ἤγγιστε ἡτανοσ ἡ μορφήσεως παρηγώρησεν, quoting Isa. 53:9, "Lord, who hath believed our report?" etc. The same prophecy is quoted in Rom. 10:4, a similar interpretation being given to it, except that Paul does not use the formula ἵνα πληρωθῇ.

Jn. makes it clear that ἵνα here has a telic force, for he proceeds ὥστε τούτων ἵνα ἐπιστεύσητε, ὥστε τούτων ἵνα ἐπιστεύσητε, quoting Isa. 60:9, "He hath blinded their eyes," etc. This testimoniwm from the O.T. is also cited by Mt. (13:10) in the form "unto them is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah," words which Ms. ascribes to Jesus Himself.

The other instances in which Jn. comments thus on a recorded incident occur in the narrative of the Passion.

(b) In Jn. 19:24 the parting of Jesus' garments among the soldiers is said to have been ἵνα γραφή πληρωθῇ, the words of Ps. 22:18 being cited, "They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots." The Synoptists mention the parting of the garments, but do not expressly quote Scripture for it. See note in loc.

§1. AUTHORITY OF THE O.T.

(a) In Jn. 19:30 the saying of Jesus on the cross, "I thirst," is recorded, and Jn. adds that it was said ἵνα γραφῇ πληρωθῇ, presumably having Ps. 69:21 in mind. The Synoptists do not record this word from the cross. See note in loc.

(b) Jn. 19:35, "These things came to pass, ἵνα γραφῇ, A bone of Him shall not be broken" (Ex. 13:14), cf. Ps. 34:20, Jesus being the true Paschal Lamb.

It is noteworthy that Jn. twice comments on recorded words of Jesus in the same way, that is, speaks of them as if they were inevitable of fulfillment, like words of Scripture. In 11:7-8 we read: "Jesus was divinely overruled, in order that the prophecies might be fulfilled. And in one remarkable passage, where he is following Mk., Mt. places this doctrine in the mouth of Jesus. Mark 14:57, cf. Mt. 26:64 reports that Jesus said at His betrayal that the manner of His violent arrest was ἵνα πληρωθῇ ἀπὸ γεραφῆς. No special "Scripture" is quoted, and it may be that only the general trend of O.T. prophecy about Messiah and His sufferings was in the mind of the Speaker, or in that of the evangelist who reported His words. Yet that the evangelist believed Jesus to have said that an incident took place, in order that the Scriptures might be fulfilled, is significant.

We now come to the use in Jn. of this phrase. It occurs four times in a comment by the evangelist upon something which he has recorded, and he attributes the use of it to Jesus three times.

(a) Jn. says (12:37-38) that the people did not believe on Jesus, despite His signs, ἵνα αὕτως ἤγγιστε ἡ μορφήσεως παρηγώρησεν, quoting Isa. 53:9, "Lord, who hath believed our report?" etc. The same prophecy is quoted in Rom. 10:4, a similar interpretation being given to it, except that Paul does not use the formula ἵνα πληρωθῇ.

Jn. makes it clear that ἵνα here has a telic force, for he proceeds ὥστε τούτων ἵνα ἐπιστεύσητε, ὥστε τούτων ἵνα ἐπιστεύσητε, quoting Isa. 60:9, "He hath blinded their eyes," etc. This testimoniwm from the O.T. is also cited by Mt. (13:10) in the form "unto them is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah," words which Ms. ascribes to Jesus Himself.

The other instances in which Jn. comments thus on a recorded incident occur in the narrative of the Passion.

(b) In Jn. 19:24 the parting of Jesus' garments among the soldiers is said to have been ἵνα γραφή πληρωθῇ, the words of Ps. 22:18 being cited, "They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots." The Synoptists mention the parting of the garments, but do not expressly quote Scripture for it. See note in loc.
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(a) In Jn. 19:30 the saying of Jesus on the cross, "I thirst," is recorded, and Jn. adds that it was said ἵνα γραφῇ πληρωθῇ, presumably having Ps. 69:21 in mind. The Synoptists do not record this word from the cross. See note in loc.

(b) Jn. 19:35, "These things came to pass, ἵνα γραφῇ, A bone of Him shall not be broken" (Ex. 13:14), cf. Ps. 34:20, Jesus being the true Paschal Lamb.

It is noteworthy that Jn. twice comments on recorded words of Jesus in the same way, that is, speaks of them as if they were inevitable of fulfillment, like words of Scripture. In 11:7-8 we read: "Jesus was divinely overruled, in order that the prophecies might be fulfilled. And in one remarkable passage, where he is following Mk., Mt. places this doctrine in the mouth of Jesus. Mark 14:57, cf. Mt. 26:64 reports that Jesus said at His betrayal that the manner of His violent arrest was ἵνα πληρωθῇ ἀπὸ γεραφῆς. No special "Scripture" is quoted, and it may be that only the general trend of O.T. prophecy about Messiah and His sufferings was in the mind of the Speaker, or in that of the evangelist who reported His words. Yet that the evangelist believed Jesus to have said that an incident took place, in order that the Scriptures might be fulfilled, is significant.

We now come to the use in Jn. of this phrase. It occurs four times in a comment by the evangelist upon something which he has recorded, and he attributes the use of it to Jesus three times.

(a) Jn. says (12:37-38) that the people did not believe on Jesus, despite His signs, ἵνα αὕτως ἤγγιστε ἡ μορφήσεως παρηγώρησεν, quoting Isa. 53:9, "Lord, who hath believed our report?" etc. The same prophecy is quoted in Rom. 10:4, a similar interpretation being given to it, except that Paul does not use the formula ἵνα πληρωθῇ.

Jn. makes it clear that ἵνα here has a telic force, for he proceeds ὥστε τούτων ἵνα ἐπιστεύσητε, ὥστε τούτων ἵνα ἐπιστεύσητε, quoting Isa. 60:9, "He hath blinded their eyes," etc. This testimoniwm from the O.T. is also cited by Mt. (13:10) in the form "unto them is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah," words which Ms. ascribes to Jesus Himself.
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Otherwise we have to suppose that Jesus taught that the causeless hatred with which He was rejected had been fore-ordained in words of the Psalmist which had to be fulfilled.

(ii) The Johannine Doctrines of Life and Judgment

In Jewish thought the conception of a Day of Judgment when the future destiny of men shall be determined does not appear until after the Exile. One of the earliest allusions to this is in Dan. 12:2: "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to eternal life and some to shame and eternal contempt," a passage which (although it does not speak of a general resurrection) contemplates a separation of men into the righteous and unrighteous, and so presupposes judgment.

The growth of the idea is intimately connected with the growth of the Messianic hope. Judgment is the prerogative of kings, and so it was the office of the Messianic King. "A throne shall be established in mercy, and one shall sit thereon in truth, in the tent of David, judging and seeking judgment" (Isa. 63; cf. Isa. 32:1). The theocratic King of Ps. 2 executes judgment in response to the petition, "Give the King Thy judgments, O God, and Thy righteousness unto the King's son"; or as the Targum has it, "Give the precepts of Thy judgment to King Messiah." It is noteworthy that the vision of Dan. 7, which tells of One to come "with the clouds of heaven like unto a son of man," does not ascribe the office of judgment to this Coming One, but rather to the Ancient of Days. Who is the fount of all true judgment (cf. Deut. 1:17).

However, when we come to the Book of Enoch, we find the doctrine of world judgment clearly expressed, and the office of judgment committed to the Son of Man. The various forms which the doctrine of judgment takes in this book are summarised by Charles on Enoch 45: "The Elect One will sit on the throne of His glory, 45, 55, 56, 57, being placed thereon by the Lord of Spirits, 61, 62; and His throne is likewise the throne of the Head of Days, 47, 54, a typical passage being: "He sat on the throne of His glory, and the sum of judgment was committed unto Him, the Son of Man" (60). How far the eschatology of this book was prevalent in Palestine in the first century we do not know precisely; but it is clear that the orthodox believed that the dead, or at any rate the righteous dead, would rise again. The Book of Jubilees (32-34) speaks of "the day of the Great Judgment," and the Apocalypse of Baruch (53-54) tells of a resurrection at the Advent of Messiah for the purpose of judgment. The Second Book of Esdras belongs to the latter half of the first century, and is tinged with Christian thought; but its testimony is relevant here. In 2 Esd. 12:5 it is said of the wicked that Messiah "shall set them alive in His judgment, and when He hath reproved them, He shall destroy them." By Mk., Jesus is represented as saying of Himself: "Ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming with the clouds of heaven (Mk. 14:28; cf. Mk. 13:26). The picture of Him as the Judge at the Last Judgment is explicit in Mt. 25:41, His judgment being: "These shall go into eternal punishment; but the righteous into eternal life." The office of Judge is assigned to Him by the apostolic preachers: "This is He which was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead" (Acts 10:42); and again: "God hath appointed a day in which He will judge the world in righteousness by the man whom He hath ordained" (Acts 17:31). Paul has the same doctrine; he speaks of "the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ" (Rom. 2:15; cf. 2 Cor. 5:10).

It is, therefore, highly probable that Jewish doctrine in the first century conceived of Messiah as the Judge at the Last Judgment; and it is certain that in Mt., in the Acts, and in Paul it is taught that Jesus is to be that Judge. In claiming to be the Messiah of Jewish hopes, He claimed, as it would seem, to be the Judge of mankind at the Last Assize.

Thus the language in which Jesus spoke to His Jewish disciples about the final judgment of mankind was the language of Jewish Apocalyptic. The images and the figures which He employed to bring home to His hearers the severity and certainty of the Divine judgments were not unfamiliar to them. He always spoke to men in language which they could but understand; and, as the first disciples were Jews, He spoke to them as a Jew would speak, conveying to them at the same time deeper and more spiritual truths than any of which Jews had dreamed. He was, in truth, the Messiah of their ancient traditions.

In the first years of bewildered hope after His Ascension, the expectation was strong in many hearts, as the Pauline Epistles show, that the Son of Man would speedily come again in judgment to vindicate the Divine righteousness, and to fulfill the Divine purpose of the ages. But time went on; and, as the first generation of Christian believers passed away, it became evident that the Promise of the Lord's Coming, as
they had understood it, was not certainly to be fulfilled all at once. Jerusalem had fallen. The Temple was destroyed. Christianity was no longer a phase of Judaism. The thought of Jesus as the Messiah ceased to be the dominating thought of those who called Him Master. He was Messiah, but He was more. And it was the task of the last of the evangelists to remind the Church how much there was in the teaching of Jesus Himself as to the judgment of Mankind, and the Coming of His Kingdom, that had been neglected in the eager faith of the little community which had so unerringly perceived in the Risen Lord the Christ of their fathers.

Accordingly, we find in the Fourth Gospel, on the one hand, phrases entirely in the manner, so to speak, of Mt. and of the Acts and of Paul, as to Messiah and Messiah's judgment at the last; and, on the other hand, a wider and more catholic presentation of Jesus as the world's King and Saviour, whose Kingdom is already established in some degree.

(1) To Jn., Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, just as He is to the Synoptists. Indeed, Jn. is the only evangelist who reproduces the Jewish title Messiah (§ 40). If Jesus had not been Messiah, He could not have been the Light of the World of Jew as well as of Greek. To Jn., as to the Synoptists, Jesus was the Son of Man of Daniel's vision. The words addressed to Nathanael (15) could not have been understood by any one not a Jew: "Ye shall see the heaven opened, and the angels ascending and descending upon the Son of Man." That recalls the vision of the Son of Man of the Synoptists (Mt. 14:30 and parallels). Jn. is not unmindful of this aspect of the teaching of Jesus, viz. that He proclaimed Himself as the Jewish Messiah, of whose judgment the Jewish Apocalypses had spoken.

Moreover, it was becoming clear that the expectation of an Advent of the Son of Man and of the establishment in its fulness of the Kingdom of God in the near future was a mistaken expectation. There will, indeed, be a final consummation. Jn. is the only evangelist who uses the expression "the Last Day" (see on 6); he does not deny, rather he explicitly declares, the doctrine of a Great Assize, while he does not look for any immediate Advent of Christ in majesty, such as the first generation of Christians had expected. But the outlook of the Last Discourses (cc. 14-16) is directed to the future of the Church on earth rather than to any sudden and glorious Coming of the Master from heaven (cf., however, 14). And this surprised the Apostles: "Lord, what is come to pass, that Thou wilt manifest Thyself to us, and not unto the world?" (1426). They had been told, "I will manifest myself unto him that loveth me" (1422); this was an Advent of Jesus to the faithful soul. But they were hardly content. And Jn. reports that Christ gave no other answer to their curiosity about His Coming than the quiet promise, "If a man love me, he will keep my words... and we will make our abode with him." (1428)

Thus Jn. will not dwell on the prospect of the Final Judgment of the world as it had presented itself to Jewish minds. He knows that it was involved in the teaching of Christ, and he says so in the Gospel, stating it with greater explicitness in the First Epistle. But there was another element in that teaching which needed fresh emphasis. The Judgment of the individual is determined in the present by his own attitude to Christ: "he that believeth not is judged already" (3, where see note). This judgment is not arbitrary, but inevitable,
and is the issue of a moral necessity. In the sight of God, to whom a thousand years are as one day, the predestined future is as certain as the past, and it may be discerned in the present. Die Weltgeschichte ist das Weihergicht: "he that believeth not is judged already." And so, on the other hand, with the believer in Christ: "he comes not into judgment, but has passed from death into life" (4:25). Those who believe in Him shall be safe at the last (15:9; cf. 12:18), and He will "raise them up" (6:40, 44, etc.). In virtue of the Life which they share with Him, they will be sharers of the Resurrection unto eternal life.

A third doctrine which Jn. expounds with greater fulness than the Synoptists is the doctrine of life here and hereafter. In the Synoptists, indeed, the teaching of Jesus is explicit as to a future life and a resurrection to judgment both of righteous and unrighteous, while at the same time He points out that the conditions of this future existence are necessarily dissimilar to those of our bodily life here (Mk. 12:23-24). In Jn., the thought emerges that the μοίαν αἰώνιαν of the future may begin in the present. It is already possessed by him who believes in Jesus (10:10, 11, 38, 50, 47) or in the Father who sent Him (5:33). It is both a present possession and a hope of the future. This is the reason why Jn. can speak of judgment being already determined; it begins here and is fulfilled hereafter, as life also is.

It is to be observed, however, that this doctrine of μοίαν αἰώνιαν is not peculiar to Jn., but is also found in the Synoptists, although it is by them expressed in a different way, in terms of the Jewish concept of the Kingdom of God to which the Synoptic references are so frequent. In Jn., "eternal life," the life of the citizenship of the "Kingdom of God," is that on which a man enters after he has been born ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος (3:3). The Kingdom of God, according to the Synoptist presentation, is at once present and future. It is future, if we contemplate its complete fulfillment (e.g. Mt. 8:11, 12-17; 25:1-46; Mk. 9:1, Lk. 13:19), or "My Kingdom come," (Mt. 6:10). But, in another sense, it is present now. "The Kingdom of God is within you" (Lk. 13:21; cf. Lk. 6:23, 27). And to enter into it one must become like a little child (Mt. 18:3, Mk. 9:36, Lk. 15:21), a condition which should be compared with Jn. 3:3. To enter into the Kingdom of God and to enter into life are, indeed, treated by Mk. as identical expressions (Mk. 9:36, 37). It thus appears that the spiritual doctrine of μοίαν αἰώνιαν of which Jn. is so full, is implicit in the Synoptic Gospels, which speak of the Kingdom of God coming and come, just as in Jn. we read of eternal life as both future and already present.

1 See, further, p. cxxi.

§ 14. LIFE AND JUDGMENT

Hence there is no inconsistence, as has sometimes been suggested, between the two sides of the Johannine teaching about eternal life. "He that believeth on me hath eternal life," and "I will raise him up at the last day," express the same doctrine, viz. that whether in this world or in the world to come, life, that is, the spiritual life, which is "life indeed," is found in Christ alone. This is the perpetual theme of the Fourth Gospel.

In Christ is life (1:4). This He has in Himself as God has (5:16). He has the words of eternal life (6:68). His words are life (6:68). To know Him is eternal life (17:3). He is the Life (14:6). He gives the living water which continually and eternally vivifies the energies of the spirit (14:10, 15). He came that His flock might have life (10:16). He is the Bread of Life (6:56), the Bread which sustains life. The Bread which He gives is His Flesh, given for the life of the world (6:54). Without this no one has life (6:54); but He that eats of it abides in Christ (6:61). They who follow Him have the light of life (8:12). That is the secret of eternal life in this present stage of being. (See further on 21:28.)

So, too, it is after death. Christ quickens the dead, as the Father does. ὁ νεκρὸς ὑπὸ τοῦ ζωῆς ἡμῶν ἀνέζω καὶ ζήσεται (5:21). Those who keep His word shall not taste of death (5:24). He is not only the Life; He is at once "the Resurrection and the Life" (11:25). Those to whom He gives eternal life never perish; no one plucks them out of His hand (10:28).

Others will perish (3:19); those who are rebellious shall not see life, but God's wrath rests upon them (3:20). "If ye will not believe that I am He, ye shall die in your sins" (3:29).

"If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch and is withered; and they gather them and cast them into the fire, and they are burned" (15:6).

Such is the doctrine of Judgment and of Life expounded in the Fourth Gospel. The evangelist is at once Hebraism and Hellenist. He wrote: "that ye may believe that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God." (a Jewish belief, for Greeks and pagans had no thought of Messiah, and also "that believing ye may have life in His Name," a universal message which it is of supreme consequence to all men to apprehend.

There are, then, in Jn. these two contrasted views of the future life, one pointing back to Hebraism, the other more akin to Hellenism, but both accepted by the evangelist. To rule out either as foreign to his thought is not scientific criticism. Thus Wendt has been followed by some scholars in his view

1 St. John's Gospel, p. 130.
that the phrase ἴδον ὅμορον ἡμῶν is an interpolation added by an editor in 6mo. 24. 43. 19. 20.; his reason apparently being that the doctrine of a "last day" or "day of judgment" is inconsistent with the spiritual doctrine of eternal life which Jn. unfolds. But there is nothing in the style of these verses to suggest that they are not Johannine. If we extrude from the text of a book every phrase which does not seem to us to be congenial to the argument, we may indeed reduce the residuum to a consistent whole, but it does not follow that we are doing justice to the author's opinions or that we have got nearer to what he originally set down. We may think it strange that a Hellenist should be a Hebraist in certain regions of thought. But the writer of the Fourth Gospel was both.

(iii) The Kingdom of God and the New Birth

The Kingdom of God, coming and come, is a principal topic in the Synoptic reports of the teaching of Jesus. Many of His parables are concerned with the explanation of its significance. In a sense, it is a present reality (Lk. 17:20), but it is more frequently named in the Synoptic Gospels as an ideal to be realized in the future (Mt. 6:33. Mk. 10:31, etc.), the signs of its approach not being always apparent (Lk. 17:20). The phrases, "the Kingdom of Heaven," "the Kingdom of God," were not unfamiliar to the Jews, of whom some looked for a political arc social Utopia, a happy future for their race and nation; while others, more spiritually minded, understood that righteousness rather than prosperity was the ideal of a community over whom Yahweh was King. Of this Kingdom Jesus taught: no one could become a citizen without a spiritual change, without turning away from material things, and approaching God with the simplicity and single-heartedness of a little child (Mt. 18:3. Mk. 10:15. Lk. 18:17). It is this last conception that is expounded with startling emphasis in the discourse of Jesus with Nicodemus: "Except a man be born from above, he cannot see the Kingdom of God" (Jn. 3).

The idea of rebirth is not peculiar to Christianity. The Brahman, the spiritual aristocrat of India, is "twice born." In the Novelles of Justinian (xxviii.) it is asserted of a manumitted slave that he has τὴν ἐκ τοῦ νεογέννητος Ἰησοῦ. Wetstein, who quotes this, quotes also the saying of Apuleius that the day of a convert's initiation is his birthday. The idea, indeed, is frequent in the Mystery religions which had a vogue at the end of the first century. Mithraism may have been affected by Christian phraseology, but in any case the expression used of one who has been initiated, renatus in aeternum, is noteworthy. More to the point, when examining Jn. 3:16, is the language used in Rabbinical writings of Gentile proselytes who have accepted Judaism. "A man's father only brought him into this world; his teacher, who taught him wisdom, brings him into the life of the world to come." Weilstein quotes: "The stranger who is proselytised is like a child newly born, because he must break away from his former teachers and principles, as well as from the ties of kinship." The germ of this metaphor, which is a very natural one, appears in such passages as Ps. 87:1; and it may have been familiar to the Rabbis of the first century, although the Talmud, as we have it, being of later date, does not prove this to demonstration. The narrative of the discourse with Nicodemus (16) seems to represent Jesus as expressing surprise that he, a master of Israel, should not be acquainted with the doctrine of rebirth, but this is not quite certain. See notes on 3:16.

In any case, Nicodemus, as one of the Sanhedrim, must have been familiar with the phrase "the Kingdom of God," which he and his fellows were accustomed to interpret in terms of the Messianic expectation of future prosperity and peace. It was for the future, rather than the present; and its ideals were political and social rather than spiritual, although spiritual ideals were not wholly absent from it. But he was hardly prepared to be told that he was not following the path which led to the Kingdom, and that without a complete change of attitude he could not enter it. He must become like a child before its Heavenly Father; he must be "born again."

This phrase, however, is expanded in v. 5, where it takes the form "born (or begotten) of water and of the Spirit." This has generally been interpreted of baptism, and the interpretation demands careful analysis.

It must first be observed that the representation of baptism as a new birth is infrequent in the N.T. We find it, perhaps, in 1 Pet. 3:21, where Christians are described as "beggred again not of corruptible seed but of incorruptible," and it appears in the phrase λατρεύειν τὸν Θεόν (Tit. 3:7), Paul generally speaks of baptism, not as a new birth, but as a "burial with Christ." in the baptismal waters followed by a rising

1 See above, p. clx.
again thence from (Rom. 6:4; Col. 2:12). But, at the same time, for Paul a man in Christ is "a new creation" (2 Cor. 5:17), and this thought is not far from that of the "regeneration" of the Christian believer, and the image of baptism as a new birth.

At any rate, this image is used in the literature of the second and third centuries, more frequently than any other, to illustrate baptism. In the note on §3 passages are quoted from "2 Clement" (about 140 A.D.) and Hermas, which treat §3 as having a baptismal reference. So Justin says: We bring the catechumens "where there is water, and after the same manner of regeneration as we also were regenerated ourselves, they are regenerated"; and he proceeds to cite §3 (loosely, after his wont). Christ, he says in another place, "was made the beginning of a new race which is regenerated by Him through water and the saving word, which contains the Mystery of the Cross." Both Hippolytus and Irenaeus speak of the "laying on of hands." And Irenaeus more than once describes baptism as "the power of regeneration unto God." Clement of Alexandria in like manner uses the verb "to be regenerated" as equivalent to "to be baptized." Hence, although the doctrine of baptism as a new birth is not prominent in the N.T., it was probably recognized by the end of the first century, as it certainly was in the second century; and if we are to take Jn. §3 as accurately reporting a saying of Jesus, He gave to the image the seal of His authority.

There are, however, grave difficulties in the way of this, the usual interpretation of the passage. That Jesus is the Author of the terse and pregnant aphorism, "Except a man be born of water (ἀπόβαλτον) he cannot see the Kingdom of God" (Jn. 3:3), need not be doubted; it is, as we have seen, but a picturesque and arresting statement of the Synoptic saying, "Except ye become as little children, ye cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven" (Mt. 18:3). But if, in His discourse with Nicodemus, He explained "being begotten of water and the Spirit" (v. 3), and this latter phrase is to be understood of baptism, it can only be John's baptism §8 which was indicated, for Christian baptism was not yet instituted as an initiatory rite. As Jn. observes (§22, where see note), "the Spirit was not yet given because
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Jesus was not yet glorified." But John's baptism could hardly have been described as "being born of water and the Spirit." It is true that Ezekiel (36:26) speaks of the new spirit that comes by sprinkling (cf. Ps. 50:6; Zech. 12:10); but Jn. expressly distinguishes the baptism of John which was "to the Jews only from that of Jesus which was to be ἀπὸ νεοτίμων δύνας" (v. 33). At a later date it was reported that John's adherents did not know of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:38). If Jesus in the words of Jn. §3 recommended to Nicodemus that he should submit himself to baptism by John, He ascribed a spiritual efficacy to that baptism which was unknown to John's own adherents.

It is difficult to resist the inference that the words ἐκ πνεύματος were not part of the original Saying of Jesus which is reproduced by Jn., but that the form which the Saying takes in §3 is due to the evangelist (or to a later editor) who is expressing it in the language of the next generation, and with an application wider than, and differing from, that which it bore when addressed to Nicodemus. That Jesus enforced upon Nicodemus the necessity for a spiritual change, for "regeneration," is, indeed, highly probable; but that as the road to this He should have recommended the baptism of John, and above all that He should have described this as "being born of water and of the Spirit," is improbable.

What has happened here is that Jn. has taken a great Saying of Jesus (v. 3), addressed, it may be, to Nicodemus in the first instance, and that he has restated it in v. 5, in terms of the doctrine of Christian baptism which was beginning to take shape at the end of the first century. The Saying of Jesus, it can hardly be doubted, laid stress on the spiritual change which candidates for the Kingdom of Heaven must undergo; they must be born ἀπόβαλον (v. 3); and it was natural in early days of persecution and trial that the critical moment should be identified with the moment of baptism, when the new convert deliberately professed faith in Jesus as the Son of God, and accepted the resulting obligations and perils.

We have to reckon, of course, with the doctrine of baptism as applicable to adult proselytes. When it became customary (as it did at an early date) to baptize infants, the doctrine underwent necessary modifications. In the beginning, conversion meant the change of mind and heart consequent on a conviction of the unique claims of Jesus—was indistinguishable from regeneration, the new birth into a world of larger and freer opportunity. But once the practice of baptizing infants was adopted, as agreeable to the mind of Christ, it became obvious that the initial regeneration was not a conversion, in any intelligible sense, for an infant has no settled purpose or habit.
of mind or mental outlook which needs to be changed; and thus the term conversion was reserved for that subsequent awakening of a spiritual sense and of a turning to God, which may be either sudden or gradual, according to the life-history of the individual concerned. The neglect of these elementary considerations has been mischievous in keeping alive controversies about baptismal regeneration which have sometimes been only disputes about words.

At v. 16 the discourse with Nicodemus passes into an exposition of the doctrine of eternal life, which is apparently (see on v. 16) due to the evangelist himself. The topic is, however, not a new one. It is the same topic as that of the “Kingdom of God” with which the discourse opens; but the evangelist expounds it after his own manner and in language which may appeal to Greek no less than to Jew. “Eternal life” is the desire of all mankind; and the spiritual movement which is requisite if the desire is to be satisfied is an act of faith in Jesus as the Son of God. This is the perpetual theme of the Fourth Gospel.

(iv) The Eucharistic Doctrine of Jn.

A

The author of the Fourth Gospel gives no explicit account of the institution of the Lord’s Supper. That he knew of it is certain, for at the earliest date to which the Gospel can be assigned the Eucharist was an established Christian rite (1 Cor. 10:16, Acts 20:28) whose significance was fully realised. Jn. tells of the Last Supper (c. 13), but he does not identify it with the Paschal Feast as the Synoptists do, placing it on the eve of the Passover. He has in this particular departed from the Synoptic tradition, which, seemingly, he wishes to correct. For Jn. the Passover Victim was Jesus on the Cross, and it may be that his omission to record the institution of the Lord’s Supper is due to his desire to avoid the suggestion that the Eucharist is the Christian Passover; just as, unlike the Synoptists, he avoids sacramental language (see on 61:) in his account of the Feeding of the Five Thousand, which took place shortly before a Passover celebration.

B

We next observe that the discourse which, in Jn.’s narrative, follows the Feeding of the Five Thousand is reminiscent
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of sacramental language, more particularly towards its close; and this must be examined in some detail.

That some words were spoken at Capernaum (50-53) which told of the heavenly Bread as superior to the loaves provided for the hungry multitude is not difficult of credence. But that the whole discourse, as it is found in 50-58, belongs to this occasion is improbable. It falls into three sections, vv. 46-49, vv. 51-52, vv. 51-58. The first section tells of the Bread from heaven which God gives to those who believe in Jesus, and it announces that Jesus is, Himself, the Bread of Life. The second section is introduced by objections raised by “the Jews,” and speaks further of Jesus as the Bread of Life, but does not say explicitly that this Bread is the gift of the Father. The objectors seem to be Galileans (v. 42), although they are called “Jews,” the term that is used throughout the Gospel for the opponents of Jesus. In the third section the terminology is changed, and not only the terminology but the doctrine as well. For Jesus speaks now, not of Himself as the heavenly Bread continually given by the Father to believers, but of the Bread which He is, Himself, to give them in the future (51). This gift is described as His flesh and blood, which He will give for the life of the world, and which when appropriated by the believer will be the source and the guarantee of eternal life.

The three sections of this discourse are bound together by Jn., and he represents them as forming a whole. The refrain “I will raise him up at the last day” occurs in all three sections (vv. 39, 40, 44, 54). The same is true of the expression “who (or which) came down from heaven,” which occurs seven times (vv. 33, 38, 41, 42, 50-51, 58). And the reference to the manna in the wilderness (v. 31) is answered in v. 49 and again in v. 58. There is a general unity of theme, the doctrine expounded from beginning to end being the main Johannine doctrine, viz. that the only way to life is belief in Jesus, a belief which involves continuous ‘feeding’ on Him, i.e. the refreshment and invigoration of man by perpetual communion with the Son of Man.

C

The discourse as a whole, and especially its third section, is couched in Eucharistic language. Jn.’s doctrine of “feeding” on Christ is, indeed, a spiritual and mystical doctrine; but it is not doubtful that he means, in vv. 51-58, to suggest that at any rate one mode of this “feeding” on Christ is through the sacrament of the Holy Communion. To speak of eating Christ’s flesh and drinking His blood is a metaphor
intensely realistic and quite extraordinary, going far beyond the teaching about the heavenly bread in the verses which precede. Perhaps the emphasis laid here upon the "flesh" and "blood" of Christ is in polemical reference to the Docetism which Jn. always had in view. But, in any case, the language is Eucharistic and was recognized as such so soon as the Fourth Gospel began to be read. Two or three witnesses may be cited here in proof of this.

1. The Eucharistic language of Ignatius (about 110 A.D.) is clearly influenced by Jn. 6.

2. ἀργοὶ διεθνεῖσθαι ὁ διὰ τὸν θάνατον... καὶ σώμα ἥλθε τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἢν ἀφάντητο ἐσφαγμενον. Here we have the ἐσφαγμαθεὶς of Jn. 6.66 identified with the σώμα of Jn. 6.63, and the words about the drinking of Christ's blood go back to the same source. Despite his realism, Ignatius is a mystic like Jn. (cf. also Trall. viii., Philad. 1; and his doctrine of the Eucharist is like Jn.'s in this, that he does not state it so as to exclude other methods of approach to God.

3. In Philad. iv., the reference to the Eucharist is explicit. σωματεύεσθαι ὁ με τὸν εὐαγγελίον ἔχων Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἐν πνεύματι τὸ ἔνα ἐν τῷ ἐν τῷ ἐν αὐτοῦ. The point to be noted is the use of σώμα for the Body of Christ in the Eucharist, as in Jn. 6, a phraseology not found elsewhere in the New Testament.

4. The same inference may be drawn from Smyrn. vi., where Ignatius says that the Docetas εἰκονομάκεια καὶ προσφοράς ἀπέκτεινεν ἐν τῷ μνημοσύνης τῷ ἀγάθῳ Χριστοῦ καὶ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ Χριστῷ, a passage as startling in its realism as Jn. 6.

5. Justin (about 145 A.D.) uses similar language. He says (Apol. i. 60) that as the Word was made flesh, and as Jesus had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so also the Eucharistic food is, we are taught, the σώμα and αἷμα of Christ. The reference is, again, to Jn. 6.63.

That Ignatius and Justin should have applied the language of Jn. 6.63-65 to the Eucharist is not surprising, for this has been done in every Christian age. But inasmuch as they provide the earliest patristic allusions to Jn. 6, their testimony is especially apposite, as indicating the obvious interpretation of "eating the flesh and drinking the blood" of Christ.

In Ezek. 39.18 there is mention of eating the flesh and drinking the blood of men; but this refers to the slaughter and destruction of enemies.

Cf. Pliederer, Prim. Christianity, iv. 38 ff. So Ignatius (Smyrn. vi.) uses the argument that the Eucharist implies the reality of Christ's flesh.

This is the interpretation adopted in the Prayer of Humble Access.

It will be observed that the promise of eternal life which is attached in vv. 54, 58, to the eating of the flesh and drinking of the blood of Christ, did not derive the second-century Fathers from giving this passage a Eucharistic reference. For Ignatius the Eucharist was a means of union with Christ, and so of sharing in His Passion and Resurrection. A strong passage is Lk. xx: ἡ ἀφάντητο δι’ ἔκτισιν ἐναντίον τοῦ μὴ ἀρνηθεὶ γίνεται ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ δι’ ἐρμονίας. Ignatius (Her. iv. 18. 5, v. 2) even argues that our earthly bodies must inherit eternal life because they partake of the Eucharistic food. The date of the Didache is uncertain, but if it were of the second century, then the language of the Post-Communion prayer would be noteworthy here: "Thou didst bestow upon us thyself a body and a spirit and a spirit of truth also." 3.

3. Both the Old Syriac (about 200 A.D.) and the Peshitta Syriac (about 450 A.D.) render σώμα in the seven places where it occurs in Jn. 6 (vv. 51-56, 63) by the Syriac word eβαστάζω, which is the rendering of σώμα in the Synoptic accounts of the Institution of the Lord's Supper. That is, the Syriac version of Jn. 6.63 runs: "The bread which I will give is my Body, for the life of the world," which at once suggests Lk. 22:18: τοῦτο εἶναι τὸ σῶμα μου [τῷ ἤφθαν ὕμων δοξάσωσι] or 1 Cor. xi:24: τοῦτο μοί εἶναι τὸ σῶμα τοῦ εὐφήμου. As early, then, as 200 A.D., the Syriac Church translated Jn. 6 in such a way as to make a Eucharistic reference explicit and unmistakable. To this translation we shall come back presently.

Thus a Eucharistic reference in Jn. 6.63-65 is not to be evaded. This does not mean that a non-sacramental explanation might not be placed by a Christian reader upon the mystical phraseology of the passage. No one would deny that there may be ways of "eating the flesh and drinking the blood" of Christ in a spiritual manner which do not involve sacramental feeding. But the language is sacramental, and was so understood throughout the second century.

D.

If we accept literally the Johannine statement that the words of Jn. 6.51-58 were addressed to Jews in the synagogue of Capernaum, after the Feeding of the Five Thousand, then the further statement that they were treated by the hearers as incredible and as a "hard saying" (v. 60) follows as of course. It could not have been otherwise. Even those who had in the Anglican Liturgy, where it is derived from the Order of Communion of 1549.
been disciples of Jesus would naturally be shaken in their allegiance.

It is true that in Jn. (see on 316) the prediction of Jesus that death would be the end of His ministry is placed at an earlier period than in the Synoptics, and therefore such a prediction at this point is consistent with the Johannine narrative as a whole. But it is specially perplexing to find a prediction addressed to "the Jews," that outside the circle of Jesus' immediate followers, to the effect that He would give His flesh for the world's life. This can hardly be historical. And again, the language in which this momentous announcement is couched is definitely sacramental. It would thus appear that Jesus took this opportunity, before the Eucharist was instituted, of making prophetic reference to it as a means of grace and as the appointed way of communion with Him. This has been held by many expositors, but it is very difficult to accept, having regard to the audience and the occasion of the discourse.

The conclusion which seems to emerge is that the discourse of Jn. 6:51-58, either in whole or in part, is out of its historical context. We have seen that, at any rate, vv. 51-58 are reminiscent of the words spoken by Jesus at the institution of the Eucharist on the eve of His Passion. Very little is told by the Synoptists of what was said by Him on that occasion, and it may well be that, as in other cases, the Fourth Gospel here supplies what is not to be found in the narratives of its predecessors. An examination of the word σάρξ, as represented in Syriac, provides, as we shall see, reason for accepting Jn. 6:51 as the Johannine version of the actual words used at the institution of the Lord's Supper.

Let us ask the question, "Is the Aramaic word behind σάρξ in Jn. 6:51 the same as the Aramaic word behind σῶμα in Mk. 14:24?"

The general distinction between σάρξ and σῶμα in the N.T. is no more than this, that σῶμα is the organised σάρξ, the bodily nature regarded as an organic whole. In Eph. 2:10 the σάρξ of Christ is mentioned where we should expect σῶμα, probably because σῶμα is used in v. 16 of His mystical body. In Col. 1:16 we find the expression τὸ σῶμα τῆς σκηνῆς αὐτοῦ, both words being employed to describe the body of Christ. Jn. avoids the word σῶμα, using it only (see on 311) of a dead body; and prefers σάρξ (cf. 119), probably because he wishes to emphasise the fact of the Incarnation, as against the nascent
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Docetism of the age.1 And so the word σῶμα, which is common to the Synoptic and the Pauline narratives of the institution of the Eucharist, does not occur in Jn. 6.

In the LXX σάρξ and σῶμα are both used to render the Hebrew וָנָח, a word which is nearly always behind σάρξ and more frequently than any other word behind σῶμα. And if the Aramaic form כֹּל was the word used by Jesus when He said "This is my Body," it might be rendered σώμα or σάρξ according to the idiosyncrasy of the translator.

There is, however, another Aramaic word which may have been actually used at the institution of the Lord's Supper, viz. the Aramaic form of the Hebrew וָנָח. In the O.T. כֹּל is rendered only three times by σῶμα, and then always in the sense of dead body (Gen. 15:11, 2 Kings 19:23, Isa. 37:36); but by the first century of our era it is quite possible that it may have been used to denote a living body. As we have already seen, the Syriac versions of Jn. 6 always give פֹּгар as their translation of σάρξ; viz. the same word as they use in rendering "This is my Body." And this Syriac פֹּгар in Jn. 6 may well be a reversion to the actual word used by Jesus at the institution of the Eucharist.

In any case, whether the original word used at the Last Supper was the Aramaic כֹּל —Hebr. כֹּל—or the Aramaic form of כֹּל, it is clear that it might have been rendered by σῶμα or by σάρξ according to the habit of the translator.2

That the memory of the Aramaic word actually used by Jesus should not have been preserved may be thought surprising, but it is not more surprising than the variety of the forms which the Greek version of the words of institution has assumed.3

The words following the blessing of the bread are as follows in the various reports:

1) In Mk.: "Take; this is my Body."
2) In Mt.: "Take, eat; this is my Body."

This, in the Apostles' Creed, the earlier versions have "resurrection of the flesh," which afterwards became "resurrection of the body," no doctrinal difference being intended.

Abbott (Disp. 1326 f.) holds that τοιούτῳ μοι in the words of institution is to be interpreted as "myself"; but this does not adequately represent σῶμα.

See, for textual discussion of these passages, Sanday in D.B. II. 636 f.
(3) In the Western text of Lk.: “This is my Body.”
(4) In the later and fuller text of Lk.: “This is my Body, which is given for (εἰσήλθεν) you; this do in remembrance of me.”
(5) In Paul: “This is my Body, which is for (εἰσήλθεν) you; this do in remembrance of me.”
(6) In Jn.: “The bread which I will give is my Body (so the Syriac has it), for (εἰσήλθεν) the life of the world.”

It may be taken as certain that the words “This (bread) is my Body” were used; and also that, either in connexion with the Bread or the Cup, it was said by Jesus that what was given was “on behalf of” men. Thus Mk., Mt., Lk., connect the words τὸ ἑπί θαλάσσην (οὐ θάλασσην) θεοῦ ἐκείνου (nominative) with the giving of the Cup, while Paul and the longer text of Lk. have also εἰσήλθεν of the σῶμα which is given; the allusion to the impending sacrifice on the Cross being obvious. We have the same in Jn., who reports that Jesus said, “The bread which I will give is my Body, for the life of the world.” The universal efficacy of Christ’s sacrifice is a favourite doctrine of Jn. In 15: 25 the Baptist points to Jesus as taking away the sins of the world. In 1 Jn. 3: 5 he is not content with stating that Christ is a propitiation (θανάτου) for (εἰσήλθεν) our sins, but he adds, “and not for ours only,” ἀλλὰ καὶ προς ἦλθεν τοῦ κόσμου. So in his account of the eucharistic words he goes beyond the εἰσήλθεν of Lk. and Paul, and even beyond the εἰσήλθεν of Mk.; the content of these sacred words to him was ἐπες τὸν κόσμον εἰσήλθεν.

The idea that the Eucharistic rite was instituted as a memorial, εἰς τὴν εἰρήνην ἀνάρτησιν, is peculiar in the N.T. to Paul and the longer text of Lk. It does not appear in Mk., Mt., or the Western text of Lk., nor do we find it in Jn. The earliest appearance of this belief outside the N.T. seems to be in Justin, who quotes (Apol. 1. 66) τοῦτον ταύτα ἐπες εἰς τὴν εἰρήνην μου, τοῦτον τοῦτο τὸ σῶμα μου, apparently from Lk. 22:19. Cf. also Justin, Tryph. 41, 70. We have to bear in mind throughout the examination of sacramental passages in Jn., that (like Mk.) he gives no hint of the Pauline and Lucan doctrine that the Eucharist was instituted as a memorial. It is, for him, a means of spiritual “feeding” on Christ, the assimilation of His humanity.
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So far, we have had under review the eucharistic language in c. 6 only. But an examination of 15: 19-23 also discloses allusions to the Eucharist.

It is argued elsewhere1 that c. 15: 19-23 are out of place in the traditional texts of the Fourth Gospel, and that c. 15 should follow immediately after 13: 20. Judas has left the Upper Room, and it appears that this is the point in the narrative (see on 15: 1) at which Jesus must suppose the Eucharist to have been instituted.2 Now there are only two passages in which Jesus is said to have mentioned the vínno, although in two or three parables He spoke of vineyards. The first is Mk. 14: 26 (see the parallels Mt. 26: 29, Lk. 22: 19): “I will no more drink of the fruit of the vínno (τὸ γίνομαι τῆς ἁμαρτίας) until that day when I drink it new with you in the kingdom of God.” The words are full of difficulty, but they mean at least that Jesus announced to His disciples His approaching death: He would never drink wine again on earth with them. But for “wine” the unexpected and unusual paraphrase “fruit of the vínno” or “juice of the vínno” is used, the thoughts of the hearers being directed to the source from which the wine on the table was derived. It is remarkable that the discourse which for other reasons we have placed at this point should begin “I am the True Vine,” and should proceed to develop the lesson that the life of the branches is dependent on their sharing the life of the Vine.

The eucharistic wine is described by Clement of Alexandria as τὸ ἅμαρτον τοῦ δαμάσκ (Quis dives sine miseria, § 29), and one of the eucharistic thanksgivings in the Didache (§ 9) is Εὐχαριστοῦντος τοῦ Τριάδος οὐκ ἔχουσαν τοῦ δικαίου νόμον, ἣς ἐγέρατο ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παθῶν σου. Origens, too, uses the words “before we are inebriated with the blood of the true vine, which rises up from the root of David.”3 These passages only show that the idea of Jesus as the Vine was associated with eucharistic thoughts. But in another passage (on Ps. 102: 15) Origens brings together the two verses Mk. 14: 26 and Jn. 13: 25, when he is speaking again (in allusion to Ps. 23: 5) of the spiritual inebriation of the eucharistic Cup, τὸ γίνομαι τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἐλευθερώσεις δὲ κράτησον,4 and add (cf. below).

We have seen that the language of the latter part of c. 6, while definitely sacramental, does not exclude the possibility of a spiritual feeding on Christ by the faithful soul. It is

1 P. xx. 2 Τατιαν places the institution after 13: 20.
3 Lommel, xi. 258. 4 B, ad xi. 450.
equally true that the allegory of the Vine and the branches which are sustained by its life permeating and quickening them, does not refer (and was never taken to refer) solely to the Eucharist; but that it was suggested in the first instance by the words of institution seems probable, nevertheless.

As we have already pointed out, there is no trace in Jn. of that aspect of the Eucharist in which it is a Memorial, ἐκ δοξησθελον. He reproduces "This is my Body" at 68, and proceeds to lay stress on the necessity for the Christian of feeding on it. He speaks in like manner and in the same sentence of "drinking" the "Blood" of Christ, (68), and records words of Jesus signifying that without such "eating" and "drinking" the Christian disciple has no "life in himself." The wine represents the Blood of Christ and of this all His disciples are to drink, thus assimilating His Life. Now this is the same teaching as in 15:1. Jesus is the Vine, through which and from which the wine of life flows, and this wine must be assimilated by the branches of the vine, or they will die.

Just as Jesus claimed to be ὁ ἄρης ὁ ἐλαφρός (69), so He claims (15) to be ὁ ἀμπελος ὁ ἐλαφρός. He is the Real Bread (as contrasted with the earthly bread which typified it), and so He is the Real Vine (as contrasted with the vine of whose juice the disciples had partaken at the Last Supper). In c. 6, the immediate consequence of the disciple's feeding on this Bread and drinking this Wine is, "He abideth in me and I in him." (69). And so too in 15, this mutual abiding is the secret of the branch's life and fertility. "He that abideth in me and I in him, heareth the commandments and abideth in me and I in him; and I in him, and I the same beareth much fruit, for apart from me you can do nothing." (70). This doctrine of the mutual indwelling of Christ and the believer, "that we may dwell in Him and He in us," is found in the Fourth Gospel only at 15 and 69 (where see note), which is an indication that in both passages it is to be interpreted in the same way.

Again, the teaching of 15 leads up to the doctrine of the mutual life (ἄσυλωτος) which Christian disciples should have for each other, and to the New Commandment (15:13) (15). This springs out of the thought that they are all alike branches of the True Vine, whose mystical "juice" is assimilated by all. There is no trace of this idea of the unity of communicant disciples, or of their mutual love, in c. 6, where stress is laid rather on their faith (vv. 35, 40, 47), and on the gift of life which they receive in eating the Heavenly Bread (v. 51). The Flesh and Blood of Christ are both indeed the subject of vv. 53-57; but the teaching of vv. 52-58 is mainly occupied with drawing out the meaning and the power of that Bread which is His Flesh, as distinct from the Wine which is His Blood.

Here must be cited some additional passages from Ignatius, whose eucharistic doctrine resembles that of Jn. very closely. Both in the apparent crudeness of the language in which it is expressed (he prefers, like Jn., to use the word ἀληθώς instead of ἐν τῇ), and in the fact that he does not confine the promised blessings to those who actually receive the eucharistic elements. Both are mystics, with a profound and awful sense of the mystery of the Eucharist.

In *Trall. 8*, Ignatius describes the bread and wine as representing, respectively, faith and love: ἐν πίστει, δ ἐν τῷ ἐσώμενῳ τῷ κυριόν, καὶ ἐν ἀγάπῃ, δ ἐν τῷ ἀματὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. "Faith is the flesh, the substance of the Christian life; love is the blood, the energy coursing through its veins and arteries." (Lightfoot).

It will be observed that Ignatius, at any rate in *Trall. 8*, associates faith with the Bread (as in Jn. 6), while he associates ἀγάπη with the Wine (as in Jn. 15). So he says again (Rom. 5): ἐν τῷ ἀληθώς ἐν τῷ ἐσώμενῳ τῷ Χριστῷ καὶ τῷ ἔρωτι τῷ ἀματὶ ἀνύπω, δ ἐν τῷ ἀγάπῃ ἀφοράς. It is therefore no passing idea but a settled thought with Ignatius that the Blood of Christ is *Love*. Once more, when speaking of the unity of the eucharistic feast, he says that as there is μὲν ἐσώματος τοῦ Κυρίου, so there is also ἐν ποιμανίν ἐν ἀγάπῃ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀματίν (Phil. 4), which Lightfoot renders "so that all may be one by partaking of His own Blood." All this is very like the doctrine of Jn. 15:12, in its association of mutual love and common life with the sacrament of Christ's Blood, once the eucharistic reference is perceived; although Ignatius does not allude directly to Jn. 15.

Origen, however, brings the similitude "I am the Bread of Life" into direct comparison with "I am the True Vine." He says, after his curious manner, that to understand the latter similitude, you must go back to Ps. 104:16, where it is said that while bread strengthens man's heart, wine gladdens it (ἦρας ἄλφων, ἐν κοινωνίαις). And elsewhere he pursues the same idea, identifying the inebriating Cup of Ps. 23 with the eucharistic chalice, and adding, "This drink is the fruit of the True Vine, who said, I am the True Vine." Origen's identifications are often fantastic, but the passages that have

---

1. *Note*: wine is repeatedly called the *blood* of the grape (Dent. 30:14, Ecclus. 30:20, 31:18, 1 Mac. 6:45).

2. No emphasis seems to have been laid on this indwelling in most of the early liturgies; it appears, however, in the Liturgy of the Syrian Jacobites (see Brightman, *Eastern Liturgies*, p. 186).
now been cited show that the eucharistic reference of Jn. 15:1 is not a modern fancy.

(v) THE JOHANNINE MIRACLES

A

The Fourth Evangelist teaches explicitly that Jesus exhibited in His works the Divine glory (cf. 21:11), which had been His from eternity (1:18); and not only so, but also that Jesus Himself claimed that His works bore witness to His august origin and mission (5:17; 10:38; 15:24). Jn. does not suggest that the faith which is evoked by miracle is of the highest type (cf. 20:31); and in one place he represents Jesus as deprecating an appeal to "signs and wonders" (4:45), which is in correspondence with the Marcan tradition (cf. Mk. 8:23). But nevertheless Jn. lays stress on "signs" as truly witnessing to the claims of Jesus.

The common opinion of the first century was that the doing of wonderful works, such as an ordinary human being could not do, showed that the wonder-worker had been sent by God, whose help he had (3:2). Jn. shared this opinion, and he likes to call the works of Jesus His σημεία, as significant of His superhuman personality (2:11; 4:46; 6:14; 12:18; etc.). There were many such signs (2:22; 2:5; 3:14; 11:40; 13:7), but Jn. has selected only a few for detailed record, choosing such, as to his mind, show in a special manner that Jesus was the Son of God (3:22).

Jn. uncompromisingly attributes to Jesus the power of working miracles, but he omits many which the Synoptists describe, some being so remarkable that the omission is surprising; and in one or two instances he seems deliberately to alter a Synoptic story so that it no longer implies miracle. Thus Jn. says nothing of Jesus stilling the storm by a word of authority, which Mk. narrates as an extraordinary instance of Jesus' control of inanimate nature (cf. Mk. 4:39), even more convincing, as it would seem, than the turning of water into wine at Cana. Jn. does not tell of Peter walking on the sea (cf. Mt. 14:26); and his story of the great draught of fishes seems to give a version of that incident which is wholly devoid of a miraculous element (2:11). So too (see note on 6:21), Jn. retells Mk.'s story of Jesus "walking on the sea" in such a manner as to correct it, by omitting any suggestion of miracle.

There is a further omission by Jn. in his report of the miracles of Jesus which is in striking contrast with the Synoptic records. Jn. tells nothing of any cure by Jesus of demons, such as

1. Jn. does not call it a σημείων.
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the cures which appear so prominently in Mk. (cf. Mk. 1:21-24; 3:1-5; 7:24-30; 9:17; cf. 6:1). That disorder of the brain is due to demonic possession was believed by the Jews of the first century generally, and Jn. mentions such a belief (2:50; 3:16; 10:8), but he does not imply, as the Synoptists do, that Jesus believed it. Nor does he adduce any cure of mental disturbance by the word of Jesus as a proof of His supernatural power. Jn. does not exaggerate the supernatural element in the works of Jesus, while he sometimes refuses to assert its presence where the Synoptists fasten on it as of deepest moment.

B

Only six of the wonderful σημεία of Jesus are described by Jn. —three in Galilee, and then three in Jerusalem and Bethany —as follows:

i. The turning water into wine (2:1-11).
ii. The healing of the nobleman's son (4:42-54).
iii. The feeding of the five thousand (6:10-13).
iv. The healing of the impotent man (5:2-9).
v. The healing of the blind man (9:7-11).
vi. The raising of Lazarus (11:14-46).

Of these, i, ii, iii, and vi. are explicitly called σημεία (cf. 2:2; 4:46; 5:14; 12:18). The allusion in 2:2 marks v. also as a σημείον; while iv. is not thus spoken of at all, although it may be included in the σημεία to which Jesus alludes at 2:2.

In each of these six cases the evangelist describes the σημείον as arising out of the circumstances of the case. Jesus does not deliberately set Himself to perform any wonderful work on the occasion for which He has not been suggested by human need. All of these miracles may be regarded as signs of μαρτυρία, as well as of ρέωσις, with the single exception of the first. As described by Jn., the magnitude of the miracle at Cana seems to be quite disproportionate to its immediate purpose, viz. that of relieving some awkwardness at a village wedding. It can hardly be called a "sign" of the infinite compassion of Jesus, as the other Johannine miracles may be called. It was such a sign of His δόξα, that it stabilised the faith of disciples (1:12); but Jn. says no more about it.

C

It has been suggested by some scholars that the σημεία of Jesus which are described by Jn. were chosen by him so

1. The incident of Jesus walking by the sea is not, of course, called a σημεῖον by Jn.; see on 2:23.

as to bring out the force of some special discourse or saying of Jesus with which they are associated. That is possible in some instances, to which we shall return; but it cannot be said of Nos. i., ii., or iv. The sign at Cana is a sign of nothing except the ὤν ὢν, which Jesus exhibited in this display of His power (a\(\text{a}\)), nor is any word of Jesus associated with its lesson (see on a\(\text{a}\)). So, too, the healing of the nobleman’s son, although an indication of the compassion of Jesus as well as of His power, is not associated by Jn. with any commendation by Jesus of the man’s faith, such as concludes the similar story in Lk. 7\(\text{a}\). Jn. does not hint in his narrative (44\(\text{a}\)-54\(\text{a}\)) at anything more than an exhibition of power. Nor, again, does the healing of the impotent man at Bethsaida (5\(\text{a}\)-47\(\text{a}\)) clearly lead up to any discourse disclosing the spiritual meaning of his cure. It excited immediately a dispute about Sabbath observance, the formal breach of which suggested to the Pharisees the charge of impiety. Jesus answers them by claiming to be in the same relation to the Sabbath that God is: “My Father worketh hitherto, and I work” (57\(\text{a}\)). In other words, He compares His own beneficent activity on a Sabbath day to that of God, who is always and every day exercising His omnipotence for the benefit of mankind. And the rest of c. 5 draws out the relation of the Son to the Father. But no stress is laid on the miraculous character of the healing (if, indeed, that was its nature), and the discourses of c. 5 do not discuss this at all.

The healing of the man born blind, on the other hand, leads up, although by a circuitous route, to a saying of Jesus. The story begins, like that in c. 5, with a charge of Sabbath-breaking (9\(\text{a}\)), and the Pharisees, having failed to disprove the alleged cure, reiterate the charge that the healer must be a sinner. The long and elaborate disputation of 13\(\text{a}\)-84\(\text{a}\) may have been related in order to exhibit to the reader how blind the Pharisees really were; and at 930 a single sentence of Jesus suggests that the miracle symbolised the mission of Him who came to impart the faculty of spiritual vision to those who were spiritually blind. The story, in short, may have been inserted at this point to illustrate the claim of Jesus to be the Light of the World (8\(\text{a}\)). But that is not to be taken as the evangelist’s sole purpose in narrating it. He wishes also to impress upon the reader that the hatred with which Jesus inspired the Pharisees had its roots in His refusal to accept the Sabbath Law as a final statement of the will of God.

The healing of the five thousand is closely connected by Jn. with a long discourse on the Bread of Life (5\(\text{a}\)-6\(\text{a}\)). The miracle is treated as leading up to the discourse at Capernaum, although this association presents serious exegetical difficulties.1 The miraculous feeding is not treated by Jn. as sacramental (see on 6\(\text{a}\)), while the eucharistic reference of 6\(\text{a}\)-6\(\text{a}\) is unmistakable. This part of the discourse suggests the institution of the Eucharist (6\(\text{a}\)) more definitely than it recalls the feeding of the five thousand. The discourse is probably placed by Jn. out of its historical setting, but its position as following the σημεῖον (6\(\text{a}\)) of the miraculous feeding has, no doubt, been deliberately chosen by the evangelist.

Lastly, it is to be observed that no formal discourse is associated with the raising of Lazarus, which, nevertheless, is also called a σημεῖον (12\(\text{a}\)). This, as is usual with Jn., means a sign of Divine power (cf. 11\(\text{a}\), 404\(\text{a}\)) rather than of Divine compassion, although the pity of Jesus for the sisters of Lazarus has a prominent place in the story. The spiritual teaching of the miracle is, no doubt, clearly expressed at 11\(\text{a}\), “I am the Resurrection and the Life.” But it would be going beyond the evidence to claim that such teaching suggested to Jn. the story of the raising of Lazarus from the dead; nor is such a literary method that of the Fourth Gospel.

D

Something must now be said about the “miraculous” element in the “signs” of Jesus, which Jn. reports in detail.

The healing of the impotent man at Bethsaida is not called a “miracle” or a “sign” by Jn. (see on 7\(\text{a}\)). The man’s infirmity was chronic, having lasted thirty-eight years, like that of the woman in Lk. 13\(\text{a}\) who “had a spirit of infirmity eighteen years”; although Jn. does not ascribe the man’s bodily condition to the influence of a “spirit,” as Lk. does.3 Probably Jn. thought the cure to be so extraordinary that it could not have been effected by any means short of the exercise of Divine power. It was indeed one of the beneficent “works” of Jesus (5\(\text{a}\)), but not all of these suggest “miracle.” And we are not compelled to suppose any miracle in the incident of 5\(\text{a}\). The cure has many parallels in the modern treatment of some forms of nervous intensity. Examins quae Jesu dederantur.

The healing of the nobleman’s son (44\(\text{a}\)-54\(\text{a}\)) is called a σημεῖον by Jn. (4\(\text{a}\); cf. 4\(\text{a}\)), who regards it apparently as an instance of telepathic healing, as is more expressly indicated in the parallel story of Mt. 8\(\text{a}\), Lk. 7\(\text{a}\) (see on 4\(\text{a}\)). Telepathic healings can hardly be ruled out as impossible by those who
recognise the extraordinary spiritual power of Jesus, even if they do not accept His Divine claims. But it is generally overlooked that Jn. does not say that Jesus spoke an effective word of healing. All He is represented as saying is, “Thy son liveth,” i.e. “he will recover.” We may assume that the symptoms had been described by the father, who believed his son to be dying. Jesus told him that his son would live. There is no record of a “miracle” here. Many a physician, having heard detailed the course which a disease has taken, would be able to predict either that it would end fatally, or that it would not. The moment for anxiety had passed. Jn. would have regarded such prescience as superhuman, and therefore a “sign,” of Divine knowledge; so would most Orientals at the present day. But those who have experience of the scientific diagnosis of disease would be slow to treat such prescience as beyond human powers.

The cure of the man blind from birth is more difficult to interpret. Jn. represents it as a σήμα (σήμανον), and as miraculous (cf. ἀγγελία). Yet he tells that it was effected after the use of natural remedies such as those which were used at the time by practitioners of the healing art (see on σήμα, and cf. Mk. 7:33). The cure may not, indeed, have been brought about as simply as this. The patient, after his cure, claimed that the healer must have been more than an ordinary man (σήμανον, ἄγγελον), the point of the story being that the blindness was congenital (see on σήμα). The only case in the Synoptists which seems to be a cure of blindness from birth is that of Mk. 8:22, and there the language used is not quite explicit. We cannot be sure of what happened in the case described by Jn. No one can assert with confidence that congenital blindness, whether complete or partial, could never be relieved by the use of natural remedies; and it must be remembered that the cure in Jn. 9:12 is not said to have been instantaneous. The border line between possible and impossible is not easy to define in such cases.

The story of the feeding of the five thousand is deep rooted in the evangelical tradition, found in all the Gospels; in Mk. it is a “miracle,” outside the ordinary course of nature, quite as much as in Jn. Jn. calls it a σήμανον (σήμανον), which suggested to the people that Jesus was a prophet, because He was able to do such wonderful things. Nothing is said expressly by Jn. of this “sign” being a manifestation of the Divine σήμανον, which was disclosed in the works of Jesus (cf. 2:11), but that is substantially what is implied. No Gospel suggests any doubt as to what happened. Jesus literally multiplied the loaves, so that five of them fed five thousand; and yet, after the multitude had eaten, more bread was left (for the fragments filled twelve baskets) than had originally been provided.

Many explanations have been offered of this extraordinary incident with the motive of rendering it more credible; but no naturalistic hypothesis is completely satisfying. Strauss urged that the tradition grew out of Old Testament stories about miraculous meals (see note on 6:15). Others think that the narrative of the feeding of the multitude arose out of the Institution of the Eucharist, which is thus placed at an early period in the public ministry of Jesus; but this is to rewrite the narrative of the Last Supper (see further on 6:26). Others, again, appeal to some hypnotic power of suggestion possessed by Jesus, which enabled Him to persuade people that they had seen what they had not seen. This will not commend itself to any who find in Him the Divine attribute of truth as well as that of power. He did not deceive men by illusory pretense, or by a trick which would impress the simple folk who came to hear Him. If, as we hold, the narratives of Jn. and Mk. alike go back to those who were eye-witnesses of the scene, it is not easy to dispose of the available evidence, scanty as it is, by supposing this miracle story to rest on a mistaken tradition of what really happened.

The story of the miracle at Cana is even more difficult to believe, and it is not at all so well attested as the miraculous feeding. It rests upon the Johannine tradition alone; and, as has been observed above (p. clxxvii), the occasion for working so stupendous a miracle was hardly adequate, as compared with that which is apparent in the feeding of the multitude. The latter was a work of kindly charity; the former only prevailed a little awkwardness at a village wedding. The miracle at Cana is described as a sign of power over inanimate nature, in that water was literally turned into wine; and the only motive assigned by Jn. is that Jesus thus “manifested His glory, and His disciples believed on Him” (2:11). There is nothing quite like this anywhere else in the Gospels, and in the ἰνάσας or prodigy which Jesus is said to have performed we

---

4 Holtmann (Life of Jesus, p. 133) cites a case of cure of "atrophy of the optic nerve of a man of standing" resulting when the Holy Ghost of Treves was displayed in 1891. There were ten other cures for which physicians of repute could find no medical explanation, including those of arms and legs impotent through rheumatism. Holtmann thinks that these cures were due to "suggestive" made by the spiritual authorities of the Roman Catholic Church, who exhibited the relic as efficacious to cure; and he cites them as possible parallels to some of the Gospel miracles.

1 See, for various hypotheses, Schweitzer, Quest of the Historical Jesus, pp. 61, 62, 65, 74, 325.
can find no inner meaning, except in so far as it indicated superhuman power.

Various ways of escape from the literal truth of the narrative have been mentioned in the Additional Note on 219 (see also on 219), but none of them carries complete conviction. The most plausible of these is that suggested by Wendt who thinks that the story grew up round some traditional saying, such as that of keeping the good wine until the end. It is noticeable, indeed, that Jn. does not tell the story as if he were telling it for the first time (see on 219); he tells it as a story already in currency. But, nevertheless, its particularity of detail, its psychological interest, its reference to the setting aside of the authority of Mary, its coherence, all indicate that an actual incident lies behind 219-21, rather than that it has been developed out of a single verse saying.

That there was a feast at Cana, and that Jesus unexpectedly supplied the needs of a wedding party, is in no way unlikely. That some of His disciples who were present (and it is probable that John the son of Zebedee was one) discerned in His action a sign of His superhuman power is expressly stated. But it is not said that Jesus Himself claimed to do anything miraculous on the occasion, or that He acquiesced in any such interpretation of His intervention. His complete power over nature can hardly be challenged by those who recognise His personality as Divine, and believe that He afterwards rose from the dead. But the question of His power over nature and its limits does not arise for us here, unless we can be sure that what some disciples (the other guests do not seem to have been specially impressed) interpreted as miracle would have been interpreted in the same way by ourselves had we been there.

In regard to the raising of Lazarus, we must first examine an alleged difficulty which does not present itself in the case of the other Johannine miracles.

It is asked, How could Mk. be silent about so notable a miracle, if he knew that it had taken place? The argument e silentio is always precarious, and in this particular instance it is especially so. None of the Synoptists mentions the raising of Lazarus, but they pay little attention to the development of the ministry of Jesus at Jerusalem. On the other hand, from c. 5 onward Jn. devotes himself to describing the increasing hostility of the Pharisees to Jesus, and in his narrative the climax of their opposition was reached when the Lazarus miracle attracted the attention and inspired the enthusiasm of many people at Jerusalem and its neighbourhood.1 The point
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in the story, as told by Jn., is not, primarily, that the miracle was a stupendous one, but that it did, in fact, hasten the final decision of the Jewish authorities to secure the death of Jesus (1186). The Synoptists tell nothing of the words or works of Jesus which are reported in cc. 5, 7-12 of the Fourth Gospel. For some reason, this whole ministry and not merely the raising of Lazarus is omitted in the narrative of Mk., upon which Lk. and Mt. primarily depend, and which is the framework of their Gospels.

No serious examination of Mk. can fail to observe the fragmentary character of his Gospel. It consists of a number of incidents and discourses, which, as is generally held, owe their preservation to the reminiscences or the preaching of Peter. There is no pretence that the Marcan Gospel is a complete narrative. Now Peter does not appear once in Part II. of the Fourth Gospel (cc. 5, 7-12). He is not represented as having been present in Jerusalem or Bethany until the Last Supper (13), although it is probable that he was present at the supper at Bethany of which Jn. tells 12 (cf. Mk. 14). He appears to have come up to Jerusalem for the Passover. More particularly, Peter is replaced by Thomas as the leader and chief spokesman in the story of Lazarus, and there is no reason to suppose that he was present on the occasion of the dead man being raised, or for some little time afterwards (see on 116). If he were not an eye-witness of what happened, it is not surprising that he did not include the story among his reminiscences. He had been present when Jairus' daughter was raised from the dead, and this was duly recorded by Mk. (5), as one of Peter's experiences. There was no special reason why a second miracle of revivification should be mentioned, if Peter did not see it; indeed, it would weaken the crediblity of any man's reminiscences if he included in them an incident so extraordinary, of which he had not first-hand knowledge.

But more than this should be said about Mk.'s omission to note the miracle of the raising of Lazarus, in which he is followed by Mt. and Lk. The Synoptic account of the triumphal entry of Jesus into Jerusalem provides no explanation of the extraordinary enthusiasm with which He was received on this His last visit. Up to c. 11, Mk. tells of no visit of Jesus to Jerusalem. How then did it come to pass that the people of the city treated His entry as a royal progress? "Many spread their garments upon the way ... they cried, Hosanna, Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord" (Mk. 11-9). The only evangelist who gives a sufficient reason for this is Jn., who says explicitly that it was the report of the raising of Lazarus at Bethany
which so excited the people that even the Pharisees had to confess "the world is gone after Him." It is Jn.'s habit to correct Mk., where he deems it necessary (see p. xcvii); and at this point, by rectifying a serious omission in Mk., he makes the story of the triumphal entry coherent for the first time.  

We now come to the details of the miracle as told by Jn., for miracle (whether rightly or wrongly) he held it to be. As compared with the Synoptic miracles of reviving the dead, from one point of view it is much more surprising. For the revivification of a corpse more than three days dead would be more impressive than the raising up of a child only just dead (Mk. 5:39), or of a young man brought out for burial (Lk. 7:11), as that speedily follows death in the East. Indeed, in these Synoptic stories the hypothesis that death had not actually taken place before Jesus spoke the word which restored them, is not formally excluded. Jesus said that the daughter of Jairus was not dead, although no one believed Him; and instances are not lacking of persons being prepared for burial who were really alive. Even those who reject all miracula need find no difficulty in Mk. 5:39 or Lk. 7:11.

There is a certain similarity in Jn.'s narrative of the raising of Lazarus to these stories in Mk. and Lk. The revivification was brought about in all cases by the voice of Jesus (11:44). Again, Jesus is made by Jn. to say that the sickness of Lazarus was not unto death (11:4) and that His friend had fallen asleep (cf. Mk. 5:39): "I go that I may awake him out of sleep" (11:11, where see note). It has often been suggested that Lazarus was in a kind of death-like trance, which his sisters had mistaken for death, which persisted for three days in the tomb, but which was dispelled when the tomb was opened, and the loud voice of authority was heard. Martha, indeed, said that the body was decomposed (11:38), but that is only what she would expect on the fourth day after death, and there is no hint in the narrative that she was right about it. Vv. 41, 42, would, on such a theory, represent the joy of Jesus in finding that His friend was still alive.

There is no doubt that, even if this naturalistic explanation represents the truth of the matter, the effect produced on the spectators would be overwhelming. They would conclude that one possessed of such powers in recalling a buried man to life must be superhuman. Their report would draw to Jesus many adherents, and the enthusiasm with which His entry into Jerusalem was received would be a natural consequence.

But the narrative of c. 11, as it stands, is not consistent with such a theory. Jn.'s comments on the words of Jesus (cf. v. 13) cannot always be regarded as final (see on 22); but here at v. 14 he records that Jesus had said plainly, "Lazarus is dead." The evangelist accepted this as a fact, and he depicts the demeanor of Jesus throughout, not as that of one who was serene in His conscious knowledge that His friend was still living, but as that of one who knew that Lazarus was dead, and who proposed to use the supernatural forces which He possessed to restore him to life, in order that the disciples and the other bystanders might "believe" (vv. 15, 42). We cannot, indeed, claim on any hypothesis that we have in c. 11 the exact words which Jesus used in speaking about the death of Lazarus and in the consolation of Martha. There is no trace of the story having been written down until half a century or more after the event; and if, as we hold, it represents an historical incident, it depends on the memory of a very old man, who has all his life pondered on it as the greatest of his Master's works of mercy, and as a signal illustration of His words of mystery, "I am the Resurrection and the Life" (v. 25).

It has been thought, indeed, that the whole story was built up round this saying. But it cannot be treated as a mere invention or as a parable constructed to convey spiritual truth, like the parable of Dives and Lazarus, which has been regarded by some critics as its germ. The literary method of Jn. is quite different (cf. p. lxxvii). He means to narrate something that really happened, and he has drawn a vivid picture. The distinction, e.g., of the characters of Martha and Mary is remarkably exposed (see on v. 20). The description of the agitation of Jesus (vv. 34, 35) is not such as a romancer would have ventured to set down. The Jews at v. 37, instead of referring to the Synoptic raisings from the dead, as they would certainly have been made to do by a writer of fiction, refer instead to the recent healing of the blind man at Jerusalem (see note in loc.).

We conclude, then, that the narrative of c. 11 describes a remarkable incident in the ministry of Jesus. It may be that the details are not reproduced by Jn. with such precision as a modern historian would desire. In that case, there is room for the hypothesis that Lazarus was raised from a death-like trance by an extraordinary effort of will, and exercise of spiritual power, by Jesus. Those who do not accept "miracle" in any form may be inclined to adopt some such
hypothesis. But that Jesus could literally recall the dead to life is not impossible of credence by any one who believes that He Himself "rose from the dead." The miracle of Lazarus is on a different level from the recorded miracle at Cana, where it is not the spiritual forces at the command of Jesus that are in question, but the transformation of water into wine by a mere fiat of His word, comparable to the fiat lux in the ancient story of Creation. But he is a bold dogmatist who, in the present condition of our knowledge, will venture to set precise limits to the exercise of spiritual force even by ordinary human beings, still less when He who sets it in action has all the potentialities of the spiritual world at His command.

CHAPTER VII

COMMENTARIES

Of patristic commentaries on the Fourth Gospel, the earliest is that by Heracleon, of which only fragments, dealing mainly with ch. 1, 4, are extant. It illustrates the Gnostic application of the text. Origen's commentary is strikingly original, but, after his manner, is often fantastic; it is essential to the student of the exegesis of the third century. Chrysostom's eloquent and vigorous, but, full as his homilies are, I have not found his exposition of much service. The Fathers were generally better theologians than critics, and this is especially true of Chrysostom. He does not reach the heights of Augustine, who can pack a sermon into an epigram and who has always been reckoned among the very greatest of commentators; but even his commentaries are valuable rather for his insight into great spiritual truths than for their precise exposition of the text. The metrical paraphrase of the Fourth Gospel by Nonnus (c. 400 A.D.) is a remarkable feat, its Homeric hexameters following the text closely enough, but it is not instructive to the modern reader. As a translation, Jerome's Vulgate is in no need of praise. I have found the writings of Ignatius, Justin, and Irenaeus more valuable than any of the set commentaries by the Fathers: Ignatius for his theological

presuppositions, which are markedly like those of the Fourth Evangelist; Justin and Irenaeus for their use of the Gospel, which is often of great value as bringing out the original meaning.

I have made no attempt to collect or collate the views of modern commentators, although I am very sensible of obligations to many of them. During the last quarter of a century great commentaries on the Fourth Gospel, such as those of Brückner, Meyer, Westcott, Goclet, of former generations, have not been produced. Scholars have devoted themselves rather to the historical and critical problems of the "Gospel according to St. John" than to the exposition in detail of the text. I have given references in the Introduction and Notes to many essays and treatises on these problems, published both in Europe and in America, which are full of valuable and illuminating comment. It is needless to dwell on the aids to Johannine study to be found in the learned Biblical Dictionaries and Encyclopaedias of our time. Particular mention should be made of E. A. Abbott's Johannine Grammar, which is now as indispensable to the expositor for its grammatical distinctions (sometimes too subtle) as Westcott's great work is still indispensable for its critical parallels to the language of the N.T.

The treatment of the historical and critical problems involved is very difficult. Perhaps we have not data for their complete solution. But all such inquiries are subsidiary to the exposition of the sacred text itself. This is at once more important and more difficult. It is vastly more important to learn what the evangelist meant to teach, and what was the picture of our Lord that was present to his mind, than to know whether the book was written by an apostle or by the pupil of an apostle, important as this is in its place. Again, the expositor's task is specially difficult, if he tries to place himself in the position of those who read the Gospel when it was first published. Its appeal to the twentieth century cannot be unfolded until the lesser task has been in some measure accomplished, of setting forth its appeal to the second century. Before we venture to appraise the permanent value of the writer's teaching, we must first discover what he meant to say. And this discovery is sometimes disconcerting, perhaps because the author moves in spiritual regions of thought.

1 See p. lxxiii.
2 The best edition is that by A. E. Brooke (Cambridge University Press, 2 vols., 1896).
3 Chrysostom's Homilies on St. John are accessible in English in the Oxford "Library of the Fathers."
too high for us, perhaps because his convictions are un-
welcome to the scientific temper of our time. The most
profound book of the New Testament can be truly interpreted,
as it was written, only by a disciple, by one who is willing to
learn.
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO
ST. JOHN

THE PROLOGUE (I. 1-18)

1. Ἰν ἀρχὴ ὁ ὄρος,  

The Prologue to the Gospel is in the form of a hymn, whose theme is the Christian doctrine of the Logos, explanatory comments being added at various points. Speculations about the Logos of God were current among Greek thinkers, and Jn. does not stay to explain the term, which was in common use at the time. But he sets out, simply and without argument, what he believes the true doctrine to be; and he finds its origin in the Jewish teaching about the Word of God rather than in the theosophy of Greek Gnosticism. Its final justification is the Life and Person of Jesus Christ.

Paul had declared that “a man in Christ is a new creation” (σωματίζεται, 2 Cor. 5:17). This thought is connected by Jn. with the Jewish doctrine of the creative Word, and accordingly he begins by stating his doctrine of the Logos in phrases which recall the first chapter of Genesis.

The Divine Pre-existent Word (vv. 1, 2)

1. I. Ἰν ἀρχὴ ὁ ὄρος. The book of Genesis opens with ὁ ἄρχῃ παρὰ ὁδὲν ὁ θεός τῶν ὁμοιών καὶ τῆς γῆς. But Jn. begins his hymn on the creative Logos even farther back. Before anything is said by him about creation, he proclaims that the Logos was in being originally—ὁ ἄρχῃ ὁ, not ὁ ἄρχῃ φύσεως (see for the distinction on 2:6). This doctrine is also found in the Apocalypse. In that book, Christ is also called the Word of God (19:16), and He is represented (21:12) as claiming pre-existence: “I am the Alpha and the Omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the end.” Paul, who does not apply  

Cf. Introd., p. cxxiv.
the title “Logos” to Christ, yet has the same doctrine of His pre-existence: “He is before all things” (Col. 1:17). With this cf. the words ascribed to Jesus in 17.

Philo does not teach the pre-existence of the Logos (see Introd., p. cxx); but a close parallel to Jn’s doctrine is the claim of Wisdom (Sophia) in Prov. 8:22, κόσμος...πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνα ἀποκλειόμενος με ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸ τοῦ πάντων παρελθόντας. Philo never employs the word sophia (or σοφία), while he uses logos of the Personal Christ only here and at v. 14: but it is the Hebrew doctrine of the Divine Word going forth (logos proswpikos) rather than the Greek doctrine of immanent Divine Reason (logos enndètheros) which governs his thought of the relation of the Son to the Father.

logos is apparently used of the Personal Christ at Heb. 1:18 (this difficulty need not be examined here); as we hold it to be in 1 Jn. 1:1, ὁ ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ ἐν ἡμῖν παρελθόντας...πρὸ τοῦ λόγου τῆς σεβασμοῦ (see ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ in 1:15 below, and cf. Introd., p. lxxi).

καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν. ἐναὶ πρὸς τὰν ἐναὶ is not a classical constr., and the meaning of πρὸς here is not quite certain. It is generally rendered ἐπί, as at Mk. 6:33 14:18, Lk. 9:14; but Abbott (Dict. 2366) urges that πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν carries the sense of “having regard to God,” “looking toward God” (cf. Jn. 5). This sense of direction may be implied in 1 Jn. 4:2, παρελθόντας ἐμοὶ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, but less probably in 1 Jn. 1:1, τὸν Θεὸν τὴν ἀλήθειαν οὐκ ἦν ἐν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, which provides a clear parallel to the present passage. In Prov. 8:22, Wisdom says of her relation to God, ἐπὶ πάντα ἀνέσα: and in like manner at Jn. 1:4, Jesus speaks of His pre-incarnate glory as being παρὰ σοι. It is improbable that Jn. meant to distinguish the meanings of παρὰ σοι at 1:4 and of πρὸς τὸν Θεόν at 1:1. We cannot get a better rendering here than “the Word was with God.”

The imperfect ἦν is used in all three clauses of this verse, and is expressive in each case of continuous timelessness. καὶ ἦν ἐν τῷ λόγῳ, “the Word was God” (the constr. being similar to παρὰ σοι ἐν Θεῷ of 4:28). Θεός is the predicate, and is anthropomorphic, as at Rom. 9:5, ὁ ὅτι ἐκλάθησαν Θεός. L reads ἐν Θεῷ, but this would identify the Logos with the totality of divine existence, and would contradict the preceding clause.

This, the third clause of the majestic proclamation with which the Gospel opens, asserts uncompromisingly the Divinity of the Logos, His Pre-existence and Personality having been first stated; cf. 15:25 16:38, and Phil. 2:5

2. ὁ λόγος ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν.

3. πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ ἐγέρθησαν, καὶ χρόνος αὐτῶν ἐγέρθησαν ὑπὸ ἐν.

The Creative Word (v. 3)

8. πάντα (all things severally, as distinct from ὁ λόγος, the totality of the universe, v. 10) ἐν αὐτῷ ἐγέρθησαν, “all things came into being (for creation is a becoming, as contrasted with the essential being of the Word) through Him.”

In the Hebrew story of creation, each successive stage is introduced by “And God said” (Gen. 1). The Psalmist personifies in poetical fashion this creative word: “By the word of Yahweh were the heavens made” (Ps. 33:6; cf. Ps. 144:3, Isa. 55:11). In later Judaism, this doctrine was consolidated into prose; cf., e.g., “Thou saidst, Let heaven and earth be made, and Thy Word perfected the work” (2 Esd. 6:9, cf. Wisdom 9). This was a Jewish belief which Philo developed in his own way and with much variety of application, sometimes inclining to the view that the λόγος was a mere passive instrument employed by God, at other times, under Greek influence, regarding it as the cosmic principle, the formative thought of God.

3. καὶ χρόνος αὐτῶν ἐγέρθησαν ὑπὸ ἐν. This expresses negatively what has been said positively in the previous line, a common construction in Hebrew poetry (cf. Ps. 18:20, 39; etc.). Jn. uses this device several times (e.g., 1:10, 3:16 6:56, 1 Jn. 4:2). “Apart from Him nothing came into being,” the sentence excludes two false beliefs, both of which had currency, especially in Gnostic circles: (a) that matter is eternal, and (b) that angels or ãeons had a share in the work of creation.

The interpretation of this passage during the first four centuries implies a period or full-stop at ὑπὸ, whereas since Chrysostom the sentence has been generally taken as ending with ἐγέρθησαν: “apart from Him nothing came into being that did come into being.” ἐγέρθησαν, if we adopt the later view of the constr., is redundant and adds nothing to the sense.

1 See Introd., p. cxii.
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN [I. 3-4.

4. δέ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ ὁ λόγος ὃς ἦν,

But this kind of emphatic explicitness is quite in accordance with the style of Jn. It is also the case that Jn. favours ἐν with a dative at the beginning of a sentence, e.g., ἐν τῷ ἁλίῳ τοῦ λευκοῦ, ἐν τῷ ἀναστήσει τοῦ ἁλίου, 1 Jn. 2:2, 10, 12, 19, 4:7, so that to begin with ἐν αὐτῷ in v. 4 would be in his manner.

The early uncials, for the most part, have no punctuation, while the later manuscripts generally put the point after γέγονεν. But the evidence of MSS. as to punctuation depends upon the interpretations of the text with which scribes were familiar, and has no independent authority. In the present passage the Old Syriac, Latin, and Sahidic versions, as well as the Latin Vulgate, decidedly favour the placing of the point after ἐν, the O.L. δέ putting this beyond doubt by inserting autem in the next clause: "quod autem factum est, in eo ulla est." The interpretation which places the point after ἐν was adopted by Catholics and Gnostics alike in the early centuries; cf. Irenæus (Ep. ii. 4. iii. viii. 3), Hippolytus (c. Noetum, 13), Origen (in Ioannis, 36, etc.), Clem. Alex. (Ped. i. 11, Strom. vi. 11), and, apparently, Tertullian (adv. Prax. 21). It is difficult to resist their witness to the construction of the Greek, provided that the next sentence as read by them yields an intelligible meaning.

Harris defends the construction "without Him was not anything made that was made," by citing a passage from the Stoic Chrysippus which is alike redundant in form: Fute is "the λόγος according to which all things that have been made have been made, and all things that are being made are being made, and all things that are to be made will be made."

The Word issuing in Life and Light (vv. 4, 5)

4. δέ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ ὁ λόγος ὃς ἦν, "That which has come into being was, in Him, Life," i.e., the life which was eternally in the Word, when it goes forth, issues in created life, and this is true both of (a) the physical and (b) the spiritual world. (a) Jesus Christ, the Son and the Word, is the Life (1 Jn. 14), the Living One (6 LXX, Rev. 1), and it is through this Life of His that all created things hold together and cohere (τὰ σώματα ἐν αὐτῷ συνόρκησαν, Col. 1:17). (b) In the spiritual order, this is also true. The Son having life in Himself (5) gives life to whomsoever he wishes (καὶ θὰ δώσῃ, ἐκ 1 Jn. 3, and 4.)

1 Also the Peshitta; see Burkitt, J.T.S., April 1903, p. 436. 2 See the origins of St. John's Gospel, in Bulletin of John Rylands Library, Jan. 1912, quoting Stobaeus, Phys. 150.

L 4-5] THE WORD ISSUING IN LIFE AND LIGHT 5

καὶ ὁ λόγος ἐν τῷ φως τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ

5. καὶ τὸ φῶς ἐν τῷ ἑωρακεῖ φως, καὶ ὁ ἑωρακεῖ αὐτῷ ὁ καθαλαβεῖν.

καὶ ἐν τῷ φως τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ (Gen. 1:3). This was the first manifestation of Life in the κόσμος, and the Psalmist speaks of the Divine Life and the Divine Light in the same breath: "With Thee is the fountain of life, and in Thy light shall we see light" (Ps. 36:9). God is Light (1 Jn. 1:5) as well as Life, if indeed there is any ultimate difference between these two forms of energy (see on 1:5).

In this verse, Jn. does not dwell on the thought of the Word's Life as the Life of the κόσμος, but passes at once to the spiritual creation; the Life of the Word was, at the beginning, the Light of men. Cf. 12:6, 26, and see especially on 8:12 for the Hebrew origins and development of this thought, which reaches its fullest expression in the majestic claim τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ κόσμου (8:12).

Philo speaks of the sun as a paraédëmu of the Divine Word (de somni. i. 11); but he does not, so far as I have noticed, connect life and light explicitly.

καὶ ὁ λόγος ἐν τῷ φως τοῦ σωμάτος φαίνει, The guiding thought is still the story of the creation of light, which dissipated the darkness of chaos. But this is a story which ever repeats itself in the spiritual world; Jn. does not say "the Light shines," but "the Light shone." In 1 Jn. 2 he applies the thought directly to the passing of spiritual darkness because of the shining of Christ, the true light (ᾧ σωματικὰ ταράγεται καὶ τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ἰδεῖ φαίνει).
the vulg. has tenerac eam non comprehenderunt, the note of tragedy being struck at once, which appears again, vv. 10, 11 (where, however, the verb is παραλαμβάνει); see on 319.

But καταλαβεῖν often means also to "overtake" (Gen. 318, Ex. 136, Ecclus. 116, 1 Thess. 5); Moultoun-Milligan illustrate from the papyri this use of the verb, viz. of evil "overtaking" one. This is its meaning in the only other place where it occurs in Jn., viz. 122. εἰς τὸ πόλις ὑπὸ καταλαβεῖν, "lest darkness overtake you." 1 Origen (with other Greek interpreters) takes καταλαβεῖν in this sense here, explaining that the thought is of darkness perpetually pursuing light, and never overtaking it. 2 The meaning "overtake in pursuit" readily passes into "overcome"; e.g. 2 Macc. 818, where it is said that God is able "to overtake those who come upon us" (τὸς ἵχνους εἰς ἡμᾶς...καταλαβεῖτιν). A classical parallel is cited by Field from Herod. i. 87, ὥστε ἀπό τῶν κἀκεῖνα καταλαβεῖν τὸ πῦρ, δι' αὐτῶν καταλαβεῖν, i.e. "when he saw...that they were unable to overcome the fire." That this is the meaning of the verb in the present verse is supported by the fact that the thought of Christ's rejection does not appear, and could not fitly appear, until after the statement of His historical "coming into the world" (vv. 9, 10). We have not yet come to this, and it is spiritual interpretation of the Creation narrative that is still in view. Thus in the Hymn of Wisdom (Wis. 7) we have: "Night succeeds the Light, but evil does not overcome wisdom" (σκοτεινὸς οἱ λόγοι ἡμῖν). The darkness did not overcome the light at the beginning, and the light still shines. This is not the note of tragedy, but the note of triumph. Good always conquers evil. "The darkness did not overcome the light" (so R.V. marg.).

Philox's commentary on Gen. 11 is in agreement with this interpretation. He says that τὸ γενέσθαι φῶς is the image of θεὸς λόγος, which is the image of God. This may be called παραλαμβάνει, "universal brightness" (cf. 819). On the first day of creation this light dispelled the darkness: εἰς τὸ γεν. τὴν ἰώτα ὧν ἐγένετο, σκοτεινὸς κἀκεῖνα καταλαβεῖν. 3 Darkness yielded to it and retreated." Jn. applies this thought to Christ as the Light of the world. There is never an eclipse of this Sun.

C. J. Ball suggested 4 that behind καταλαβεῖν lies a confusion of two Aramaic verbs, לאריש, "take, receive," and לארש, "darken." He holds that, both here and at 124, the original

1 See also the reading of MD at 61 and the note there.
2 In Lounis, 86; cf. also Brooke's edition, II. 214.
3 eigd of Judges, 9.
4 Quoted by Burney, Aramaic Origin, etc., p. 30.

6. ἰδρυσεν ἀρραβώνας πέταλοιν παρὰ Θεόν, διόρα αὐτῶν
Aramaic (which he finds behind the Greek) was נָעָנה, "obscured it not," and that this was misread נָעָנה, "received it not." 5 This is ingenious, but as we have seen, καταλαβεῖν is good Greek for "overcome," so that there is no need to suppose any corruption of the original text.

Explanatory Comment: John the Baptist was not the Light (vv. 6-9)

A feature of the style of Jn. is his habit of pausing to comment on words which he has recorded (cf. Intro., p. xxiv). Here we have a parenthetical note to explain that the Light of which the Logos hymn sings is not John the Baptist. It has been suggested that this was inserted as necessary to combat the pretensions of some Christians who exalted the Baptist unduly (cf. Acts 1820, 1957); but see on v. 20 below.

For Jn., as for Mk., the "gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God" (Mk. 14), began with the preaching of the Baptist. Jn. does not stay to record stories of the Birth of Jesus, as Lk. and Mt. do. He opens his Gospel with a mystical hymn about the Logos, which reminds the reader that the true beginnings of the wonderful life are lost in the timeless and eternal Life of God. But in the Gospel Jn. is to describe the historical manifestation of the Word, and this was prepared for, and introduced by, the preaching of the Baptist. Upon this Jn. dwells more fully than any other evangelist, probably because his informant, the aged son of Zebedee, was himself one of the Baptist's disciples. For the use made by Jn. of Mk. see Intro., pp. xcvii, c; and the correspondences between Mk. i and Jn. in regard to what they tell about the Baptist and his sayings are remarkable.

Mk. 1 introduces the Baptist by quoting Mal. 3, "I send my messenger before my face"; Jn. introduces him as a man "sent from God." Both Mk. 1 and Jn. 1 apply to him the prophecy of Isa. 40. Mk. 1 gives two utterances of the Baptist about Christ which reappear Jn. 15, 16, 20. Mk. 1 and Jn. 1 both report the emphasis laid by the Baptist on his baptism being with water. And the allusions to the baptism of Jesus in Jn. 1, 30, 31 are reminiscent of Mk. 1, 26, 27.

6. ἰδρυσεν ἀρραβώνας πέταλοιν ("There arose a man," etc.). There is no introductory particle connecting this with v. 5. It is a sentence quite distinct from the verse of the Logos Hymn which goes before.

1 Cf. F. C. Burkitt in Theology, July 1922, p. 49, for a criticism of Ball's emendation.
I. 7-8.] JOHN THE BAPTIST WAS NOT THE LIGHT

ςάλτος, λοιπός πυρείνας δέ αὐτοῦ. 8. οὗ ἦν ἐκεῖνος τὸ φῶς, δὲν ἦν μαρτυρημένος περὶ τοῦ φωτός. 9. ἦν τὸ φῶς τοῦ Δαίμονος δὲ common constr. in κοινή Greek, and is specially frequent in Jn. 1. Burney held that this linguistic feature is due to the Aramaic origin of Jn., and that behind ἦν is the particle η or η. But the colloquial character of Jn.'s style provides a sufficient explanation. (see 114 and 118).

περὶ τοῦ φωτός. John Baptist says (v. 33) that it was revealed to him that Jesus was the Coming One.

ςάλτος πυρείνας δὲ αὐτοῦ (“that all might believe through him,” i.e. through, by means of, the testimony of John the Baptist). Ultimately the Baptist’s mission would affect not Israel only, but all men (σαρκας). As the Divine Law is said to have come διὰ Μωυσέως (v. 17), so there is a sense in which Christian faith came διὰ Ιωάννου. Abbott (Didat. 2302 f.) inclines to the view that αὐτός refers here to Christ, ἄτρον throughout the Prologue being used for the Word; but Jn. never uses the expression πυρεύων διὰ Ίωάννου (see on 30). Jesus, for him, is the end and object of faith, rather than the medium through which it is reached (see on 138).

Jn. uses the verb πυρεύων about 100 times, that is, with nine times the frequency with which it is used by the Synoptists, although the noun πυρεύς common in the Synoptists, never occurs in Jn., except at 1 Jn. 5:3. See further on v. 12.

Here πυρεύων is used absolutely, the object of faith being understood without being expressed; cf. 10:4 14:10 16:4 20:13 55 12:18 14:10 20:28 20:29 33.

8. ἦν is used substantially, whether as subject or obliquely, with unusual frequency in Jn., the figures for its occurrence are the four Gospels being (according to Burney) Mt. 4, Mk. 3, Lk. 4, Jn. 53. Jn. uses it often to express emphasis, or to mark out clearly the person who is the main subject of the sentence, as here. It is used of Christ, τε 8 26 51, 1 Jn. 2 3 7 12.

οὗ ἦν ἐκεῖνος τὸ φῶς. The Baptist was only ἐκ τοῦ λόγου, the

lamb; cf. 526. δὲν ἦν μαρτυρημένος περὶ τοῦ φωτός. This is an elliptical constr. of which somewhat similar examples occur 93 13 15 55, 1 Jn. 2 19 (Abbott, Didat. 2106 f.). The meaning is, “but he

1 Aramaic Origin, etc., p. 31.
2 Aramaic Origin, etc., p. 70.
3 Per contra, πυρεύων never occurs in the Apocalypse, while πυρεύς occurs 4 times. See Introdc., p. 42.
4 Aramaic Origin, etc., p. 82.

tame that he might bear witness, etc. The repetition of the whole phrase εις μαρτυρίαν περὶ τοῦ φωτός is thoroughly Johannine.

Burney suggests that here (as also at 6:6ος 28ος 14ος) ημα is a mistranslation of an Aramaic relative, ης, "who." The rendering then is simple, "he was not the Light, but one who was to bear witness of the Light"; but the correction is unnecessary.

8. ης τοῦ φως κτα. The constr. of the sentence has been taken in different ways, and the ambiguity was noticed as far back as the time of Origen.

(2) The Latin, Syriac, and Coptic versions take ηρῴμενον with ἀληθῶς. The Light enlightens every man who comes into the world. But if this were the meaning, (a) we should expect πιστῇ τοῦ ἁρῴμενον rather than πιστῇ ἀληθῶς ἁρῴμενον; (b) these words are wholly redundant, for they do not add anything to "every man." (c) the expression "coming into the world" is not used elsewhere by Jn. of a man being born (16ος is no exception). This last consideration excludes also the rendering "every man, as he comes into the world," apart from the fact that, although Wordsworth suggests it in his O.D. the idea of any special Divine enlightenment of infants is not Scriptural.

(2) It is better to take ηρῴμενον with φῶς (so R.V.). Jn. several times uses the phrase "coming into the world" of the Advent of Christ (6:14ος 16ος 18ος 18ος); and elsewhere (29ος 26ος) in the Gospel Christ is spoken of as "light coming into the world." And if we render "the Light, which lighteth every man, was coming into the world," the constr. of ης with the present participle as used for the imperfect is one which appears frequently in Jn. (see on 15ος below). ης ... ἁρῴμενον means "was in the act of coming."

Westcott, while retaining this meaning, endeavours to combine with it the conception of the Light having a permanent existence (ης, the verb used in v. 1). "There was the Light, the true Light which lighteth every man; that Light was, and was more, that Light was coming into the world." This seems, however, to attempt to get too much out of the words, and on our view of the whole passage the meaning is simpler.

We are still occupied with Jn.'s comment (vv. 6-9) on what the Logos Hymn has said about the Light (vv. 4, 5). The Baptist was not the perfect Light, but he came to bear witness to it; and this perfect Light was then coming into the world.

1 Aramaic Origin, 46ος, pp. 52, 75.
2 In locum, (ed. Brooke, ii. 216).
3 It is found, however, several times in the Talmud; see Lightfoot, Hor. Hebr., in loc.; and cf. Schlatter, Sprache u. Heimat, u.s.w., p. 15.

1.9.] John the Baptist was not the Light

φουσίνα πιστῇ ἀληθῶς ἁρῴμενον εἰς τὸν φῶς ἁρῴμενον.

When Jn. wrote the First Epistle he could say, "The true Light already shineth" (1 Jn. 2ος), but it was only coming at the time when the Baptist's mission began. Jesus had come into the world, indeed; but He had not yet manifested Himself as the Light.

ἀληθινός. Christ is το φῶς το ἁληθινόν, not to be interpreted as the 'true Light' (although such a rendering is convenient), for that suggests that all other lights are misleading, which is not implied; cf. 5ος. ἁληθινός is distinguished from ἁρῴμενος as the genuine from the true. The opposite of ἁληθινός is not necessarily false, but it is imperfect, shadowy, or unsubstantial. "The ἁληθινός fulfils the promise of his lips, but the ἁληθινός the wider promise of his name. Whatever that name imports, taken in its highest, deepest, widest sense, whatever according to that he ought to be, that he is to the full" (Trench, Synonyms of N.T.). Thus ἁληθινός here is significant. Christ is not "the true and only Light," but rather "the perfect Light," in whose radiance all other lights seem dim, the Sun among the stars which catch their light from Him.

There are indeed a few passages where ἁληθινός cannot be sharply distinguished from ἁρциальнος: thus ἁληθινός at 15ος stands for the veracity of the witness, just as ἁληθινός does at 21ος. Moreover, the fact that ἁληθινός and its cognates are not found in the Apocalypse, while ἁρциальнος occurs in its 10 times, might suggest that the choice of the one adjective rather than the other was only a point of style. In the same way, ἄρμοσ is used 7 times in Jn. for a παραστ. but the word in the Apocalypse is ἁρциальнος.

Nevertheless the distinction between ἁληθινός and ἁρ全资子 in Jn. is generally well marked. We have το φῶς το ἁληθινόν here (cf. 1 Jn. 2ος); of ἁληθινοὶ προσκυνηται, 4ος; δο δος, δο ἁληθινός, 8ος; δο δος δος, δος, 1ος (cf. 7ος 1 Jn. 5ος); ἡ ἁληθινή κρίσις, 8ος; ἡ ἁληθινή, 1ος. In all these passages the meaning "genuine" or "true" will bear to be pressed, as also in the only place where the word occurs in the Synoptists, for το ἁληθινόν of Lk. 16ος is the genuine riches. Even at 4ος, where ἁληθινός is applied to a proverb, something more is implied than veraciousness (see note in loc.).

Less clearly, but still with some plausibility, can the distinctive sense of ἁληθινός be pressed in the Apocalypse, where it is applied to God's ways (15ος). His judgments (16ος 19ος). His words (19ος 19ος 22ος), to Himself (6ος), and to Christ (3ος 15ος). See further on 17ος.

φουσίνα. This verb does not occur again in Jn., but cf. Lk. 11ος, 2ος.
10. Εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἦν
καὶ ὁ κόσμος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο,
καὶ ὁ κόσμος αὐτῶν ὁ ὁμός ἦν.

God may easily pass into an attitude of hostility to God, and the phrase "this world" (see on 8:19) calls special attention to such enmity.

According to Philo (Quod Deus imm. 6 and de mund 7), the κόσμος is the father of time, God being the Father of the κόσμος; a picturesque expression which brings out his view that the universe was created by God, who brought Cosmos out of Chaos, while its genesis goes back beyond the beginning of time.

A striking parallel to this verse is found in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (Levi, c. 14): τοῦ φιλο τοῦ κόσμου τὸ δοῦν τὸ διὰ τοῦτο εἰς φυσικὸν πάντως καθήκοντα. Charles, indeed (note in loc), holds that Jn. 10 is based on this passage; but the date of the Greek versions of the Testaments is by no means certain, and there is no sufficient evidence of their existence in their present form before the time of Origen.

There are unmistakable allusions to the verse in the Christian Apocrypha known as "The Rest of the Words of Baruch," where Jeremiah addresses God as τὸ φιλο τὸ δικαίωμα τὸ φυσικὸν μα (ix. 3). In the same section the writer calls Christ τὸ φιλο τοῦ αἰῶνα πάντως εἰς δικαιον τοῦ λόγου (ix. 13), and speaks of Him as ἐκ τῶν κόσμων καὶ τοῦ δικαίου εἰς τῶν λαών (ix. 18). See Intro., p. lxxii.

For the citation of the verse by Basilides, as quoted by Hippolytus, see Intro., p. lxxiii.

The Logos Hymn resumed (vv. 10, 11)

10. ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἦν. ἥν, as in vv. 1-4, stands for continuous existence. The Logos was immanent in the world before the Incarnation, which has not yet been mentioned in the hymn, although suggested in the evangelist's comment in v. 9.

καὶ ὁ κόσμος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, repeated from v. 3, "the world came into being through Him," the creative Logos being personal all through the hymn.

καὶ ὁ κόσμος αὐτῶν ὁ ὁμός. The paratactic constr. καὶ...καὶ is continued, as in vv. 1, 4, 5. At this point καὶ is used adversatively, "and yet," the world not recognising the Word although the Word was immanent in it.

This use of καὶ for καί (which Jn. never employs) is

1 Cf. Trench, Synonyms of N.T.
2 Dalman, Words of Jesus, pp. 162, 171.
characteristic of the Fourth Gospel, e.g., 3:15 21 7:30 7:38 7:39 9:10 15:23. Burrow \(^1\) claims this as a Semitic usage, but it occurs in classical Greek; e.g., Thucyd. v. 6, 1, 39, Ἴσωνειον προβαλλεῖ . . . καὶ ὥστε ἄλλα, and Eurip. Ἴσωναί, 508, διὰ ὥστε ἵτη συνεχῇ πρῶτη ἀναγορεύσει τρᾶπωσιν, καὶ μ. ἀφελεῖ ἡ τύχη. ἢ κοίμιοι αὐτῶν ἢν ἦμάς. Primarily, the reference is to the world’s ignorance of the Pre- Incarnate Logos, immanent continuity in nature and in man.

Pfeiderer points out the similarity of this language to what Heraclitus says about the eternal Reason: τὸν ἐκ λόγου παύειν ἐντὸς αὐτοῦ δι᾿ ἐντὸς τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀνθρώπος . . . γινομένοις γὰρ πάσιν κατὰ τὸν λόγον τάν ἀπειρώσεως ἐλέειν, ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ, 

1 men are without understanding of this Logos, although it is eternal . . . although everything happens in accordance with this Logos, men seem to be ignorant (of it).\(^2\) Heraclitus was one of those whom Justin accounted a Christian before his time, having lived μετὰ λόγου and his writings were probably current in the circles where the Fourth Gospel was written. But although Jn. used similar language to Heraclitus when writing of the Word, his thought goes far beyond the impersonal Reason of the Greek sage.

Even here, the meaning of “the world knew Him not” cannot be confined to the Immanent Logos. Jn. several times comes back to the phrase, applying it to the world’s failure to recognise the Incarnate Christ; e.g., 6:10 ἦν ἐγώ αὐτὸν ἢν ἦμα (Jn. 21); ἦν ἴσωναί ἢν ἦμα (16). Cf. 1:1 17:12 1 Cor. 2. In the next verse (v. 11) the Incarnate Word is clearly in view, for the aorist ἤδειν expresses a definite point of time, although the Incarnation of the Word is not explicitly asserted until v. 14.

A saying about wisdom very similar to the thought of this verse is in Enoch xlii. 1: “Wisdom found no place where she might dwell; then a dwelling-place was assigned to her in the heavens. Wisdom came in, made her dwelling among the children of men and found no dwelling-place; then Wisdom returned to her place and took her seat among the angels.” What the Jewish apocalypticist says of Wisdom, the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel repeats of the Logos.

11. εἰς τὸ Ἱδο τῆς Ἡλίαν. This (see on 193) is literally “He came to His own home.” And the following words, “His own

1 Aramaic Origin, etc., p. 66.
2 See Hippol. Ref. ix, 8, cited by Pfeiderer, Primitive Christianity, iv. 78.

Comment to avoid misunderstanding of v. 11 (συν. 12, 13)

12. “His own received Him not” might suggest that no Jew welcomed Him for what He was. Accordingly (cf. Introil, p. cxiv), the evangelist notes that there were some of whom this could not be said. ἰδοὺ δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἐξαπολύσεως προσσαράσσεσθαι αὐτοῖς of the following "receiving" Christ, cf. 5:42 13:30.

12. δοῦνα δὲ Ιακωβοῦ αὐτῶν, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξαπολύσεως προσσαράσσεσθαι αὐτῶν. This is the first appearance of a constr. which is very frequent in Jn., viz. the reinforcement of a casse pended by a pronoun. It is a common, if inelegant, form of anaphora, more often met with in colloquial than in literary Greek. Jn. employs it 27 times (as against 21 occurrences in all three Synoptists). Burney suggests that this is due to the Aramaic original which he
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finds behind Jn., the casus pendens being a favourite Semitic idiom. The Jews rejected Christ; but His message was addressed to all mankind. He gave to ‘as many as received Him’ the right to become children of God. ἐκπορεύονται occurs again 153 154 157 150 11; it stands for authority rather than power. The privilege and right of those who ‘receive’ Christ, i.e. those who ‘believe on His Name,’ is that they may become γένος θεοῦ; but this (Jn. suggests) is not an inherent human capacity.

The conception of the faithful as ‘children of God’ has its roots deep in Jewish thought. Israel conceived of herself as in covenant with Yahweh (see on 20), and the prophets speak of her as Yahweh’s wife (Hos. 2, 2). ‘Thy sons whom thou hast borne to me’ are words ascribed to Yahweh when addressing the nation (Ezek. 16). Thus the Jews were accustomed to think of themselves as peculiarly the children of God (see on 24). But the teaching of Jesus did not encourage any such exclusive claim of Judaism. He taught the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God as having a more catholic range. To enter the kingdom of God is to become the child of God and the possessor of eternal life (for all these phrases mean the same thing; cf. 20), and the gate of the kingdom is the gate of faith in Christ. This is the message of the Fourth Gospel (20), and it is addressed to all who will hear it. We have here (in vv. 12, 13) a summary of the teaching of 3 about the New Birth and Eternal Life.

The phrase γένος θεοῦ is not placed either by Synoptists or by Jn. in the mouth of Jesus Himself. He is represented as speaking of γένος θεοῦ (Mt. 5); and this is also the title for believers generally used by Paul (Gal. 3), who employs the notion of adoption, as recognized by Roman law, to bring out the relation of God to the faithful. But γένος θεοῦ is thoroughly Johannine (cf. 16 and 1 Jn. 3. 1 15 59), and the phrase implies a community of life between God the Father and His children, which is described in v. 13 as due to the fact that they are “begotten” of God (cf. 20). γενοντας is from the root γεν-, “to begat.”

The “children of God” are all who “believe in the Name” of Christ. The idea of the Fatherhood of God as extending to all mankind alike, heathen or Jewish, prior to belief in Christ, is not explicit in the Gospels (cf. Acts 17), however close it may be to such a pronouncement as that of the love of God for the world (for see §44). But for Jn., the “children” are those who “believe.”

2 Aramaic Origin, etc., p. 64.
2 Paul has τέκνον θεοῦ at Rom. 8. 14, Phil. 2 (from Deut. 32).

17 σάθες, τοὺς πιστεύοντας εἰς τὸ δόμα αὐτοῦ, 13. ὅσον ἔστι αὐτοί πάντες ὅστις ἐκ δόματος πάντα ἐκ δόκημασται ἀπὸ δόματος ἄθροι ἐκ θεοῦ ἐμνημοσύνας.

τοὺς πιστεύοντας εἰς τὸ δόμα αὐτοῦ. The frequency of the verb πιστεύω in Jn. has been already noted (17). Here we have to mark the form πιστεύοντες εἰς ... The phrase “to believe in Christ,” in Him as distinct from believing His words or being convinced of certain facts about Him, is, with one exception (Mt. 18), not found in the Synoptists; but in Jn. we find πιστεύοντες εἰς ... 35 times, always referring to God or Christ, except εἰς τὴν μαρτυρίαν (1 Jn. 5). The phrase πιστεύοντες εἰς τὸ δόμα αὐτοῦ occurs again 19, 30 (cf. 1 Jn. 5), but not in the speeches of Jesus Himself. In the O.T. the “Name” of Yahweh is often used as equivalent to His Character or Person, as He manifests Himself to men (cf. 2 Sam. 7, Isa. 19; see on 25 below). It is possible that this usage of δόμα in the N.T. is an Aramaic. We have it several times in the expression δόμα Πατερα ἐκ τὸ δόκημα τοῦ (cf. Mt. 16). But, whether it is Aramaic or no, to believe in “the Name” of Jesus for Jn. is to believe in “Him” as the Son of God and the Christ.

18. For δ... ἐμνημοσύνας, the O.L. version in b gives qui natura est, the verse being thus a reference to the Virgin Birth of Christ. Irenæus (adv. Haer. iii. xx. 1, and xx. 2), and possibly Justin (Tryph. 61; cf. Apol. i. 32, 63 and ii. 6), hear witness to the existence of this (Western) reading. Tertullian (de carne Christi, 19) adopts it formally, adding arguments against the common text “who were born,” which he says is an invention of the Valentinians. In recent years the verse to Christ, and the reading qui natura est, have been approved by Reisch (Ausserechristliche Parallellen, iv. 57) and by Blass (Philoedivia of the Gospel, p. 234). But the MS. evidence is overwhelming for ἐμνημοσύνας, which moreover, as we shall see, is in accordance with the characteristic teaching of Jn.

The children of God are “begotten” by Him by spiritual generation, as contrasted with the ordinary process of physical generation.

1 Note that πιστεύειν is the present participle, and expresses the continual life of faith, not an isolated act of faith (see on 24). See, further, for the unclassical constr. πιστεύειν εἰς, Abbott, Dict. 1974 f. 1 I have discussed this expression in Studia Sacra, p. 66 f. A similar use of the construction εἰς τὸ δόκημα δομοῦ occurs in Acts 1. 6. εὐγενετος εἰς τὸ δόκημα δομοῦ is a “petition to the king’s majesty,” the name of the king being the essence of what he is as ruler. Cf. Deissmann, Bible Studies, Eng. Tr., 136 f., 196 f.
2 Cf. also Bursey, Aramaic Origin, etc., p. 43.
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It was a current doctrine in Greek physiology that the human embryo is made from the seed of the father, and the blood of the mother. Thus Wisd. 7:1, "In the womb of a mother was I moulded into flesh in the time of ten months, being compacted in blood (πανάσσα ἐν αἷμα) of the seed of man and pleasure that came with sleep." Cf. 4 Macc. 13:18 and Philo (De opif. mundi 44). The plural αἷματων is unexpected, but Brückner quoted the parallel δαίμονας παράδειγμα αἱμάτων (Eurip. Ion, 693). Augustine (De Gen., ch. 4) explains αἷματων, "mixtis sanguinis, masculi et feminae, commixture carnis masculi et feminae," which may be right; but more probably the plural is used to indicate drops of blood.

οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος σάρκος, "nor yet of the will of the flesh," i.e. of sexual desire. θέλημα is used once or twice in the LXX in the sense of delictatio, e.g. Isa. 64:6 and Eccles. 12:4. Hippolytus (Ref. vi. 9) has the phrase ἐκ αἷματων καὶ άνθρωπων σαρκας, καθὼς καὶ ὁ λόγος, γεγονότων, which is apparently a reminiscence of this verse, of which at any rate it gives the meaning, identifying σάρκα with σάρκις (cf. 1 Jn. 2:4).

The passage is also recalled by Justin (牧者. 63), οὐ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἐκ άνθρωπων σπέρματος γεγονότων ἀλλ’ ἐκ θελήματος θεοῦ. οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος ἀνθρώπου, "nor yet of the will of a man," i.e. a man, for so αὐτή is always used in Jn., as distinct from ἀνθρώπου.

The threefold negation emphasizes the point that the "begot" of the children of God has nothing to do with the normal begetting of children.

ἀλλ’ ἐκ θεοῦ (God being the immediate cause of the new spiritual life which begins in the believer). The metaphor of God as "begetting" children is strange to a modern ear, but it is frequent in Jn. Cf. also 1 Pet. 1:23, δ. . . . ἀνεγέρθησαν ἡμᾶς ἐκ ὑπόστασις ζωῆς, and see J. B. Mayor on Jas. 1:18.

The verb γεννάω in the active voice generally means "to beget," and is used of the father, e.g. ἐκ θεοῦ γεννήθης τῶν Ἰσραήλ (Mt. 2:23). Sometimes this is followed by ἐκ and the mother's name, e.g. γεγένηται ἐκ αὐτῆς Μαρίας (Tobit 1:2).

γεννάω is also, but rarely, used of the "bearing" of children by a woman, e.g. μιὰ μῆτρα γέννησεν ἡμᾶς ἄνδρον (Lact. Philippi, 11).

In Jn. the verb (with one exception, 1 Jn. 5:1) is only found in the passus-γεννάω. Sometimes this means "to be born," e.g. γεγένηται, 18th. ζώς; cf. Marius, ἐκ τῆς γέννησας Ἰησοῦ (Mt. 1:10).

1 See H. J. Cadbury (Expositor, Dec. 1914, p. 435), to whom these references are due.
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Cal καὶ ὁ λόγος οἰκή ἐγένετο. The repeated καὶ introducing the next three clauses should be noticed.

Here we have the climax of the Johannine doctrine of Christ as the Word. That the Son of God became man is unmistakably taught by Paul (Rom. 1:4, Gal. 4:4, Phil. 2:6): He was "manifested in the flesh" (1 Tim. 3:16). So, also, according to Heb. 2:4, He partook of our flesh and blood. But the contribution of Jn. to this exalted Christology is that he expressly identifies Christ with the "Word of God," vaguely spoken of in the Wisdom literature of the Hebrews and also in the teaching of Philo and his Greek predecessors. The Logos of philosophy is, Jn. declares, the Jesus of history (cf. v. 11); and this is now stated in terms which cannot be misunderstood. That the "Word became flesh" must have seemed a paradox to many of those who read the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel when it was first made public; but the form of the proposition is deliberate. It would have been impossible for Philo (see Introd., p. cxxxi).

The heresy of Docetism was always present to the mind of Jn. (while it is most plainly in view in the First Epistle); the
idea of Christ as a mere phantasm, without human flesh and blood, was to him destructive of the Gospel. "Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God" (1 Jn. 4:3). But it is the deceiver and the antichrist who "confess not that He is come in the flesh" (2 Jn. 7). The lofty teaching of the Prologue identifies Jesus with the Word, and the explicit declaration that the Word became flesh was necessary to exclude Docetic teaching. A characteristic feature of the Fourth Gospel is its frequent insistence on the true humanity of Jesus. He is represented as tired and thirsty (6:9; cf. 10:28). His emotion of spirit is expressed in His voice (see on 11:28). He wept (11:35). His spirit was troubled in the anticipation of His Passion (12:13-19). And the emphasis laid by Jn. on His "flesh" and "blood" (6:56), as well as on the "blood and water" of the Crucifixion scene, shows that Jn. wrote thus of set purpose. Cf. also 20:31. At one point (20:28) Jn. attributes to Jesus the use of the word ἄνθρωπος as applied to Himself.

οὗτος ἀνθρώπος. Here ἀνθρώπος signifies man's nature as a whole, including his rational soul (cf. 1 Thess. 5:23). Thus the rendering here in the Old Syriac (although not in the Peshitta) of σάρξ by πάγας, sc. "the Word became a body" — a rendering known to Ephraim and Aphrahat—is inadequate and might mislead. The Logos did not become "a man," but He became "man" in the fullest sense; the Divine Person assuming human nature in its completeness. To explain the exact significance of εἰκόνωτε in this sentence is beyond the powers of any interpreter.

καὶ ἐκδύσασθαι τοῦ θανάτου. This sentence has generally in modern times been understood to mean "and He pitched His tent among us," or dwell among us, θανάτου referring to those who witnessed the public ministry of Jesus, and more particularly to those who associated with Him in daily intercourse. ἐκδύσασθαι, on this rendering, would be equivalent to απελθεῖν or εἰσελθεῖν, a use of ἐκ with the dative which may be defended by 10:18 i. A σκηνή or tent is a temporary habitation, and ἐκδύσασθαι might thus indicate the sojourn on earth for a brief season of the Eternal Word. In the N.T., however, the verb does not connote temporary sojourning in any other place where it is found.

Origen 6 and Chrysostom 6 understand the clause differently.

For them, it is parallel to the preceding clause, "the Word became flesh," and is another statement of the Incarnation. The Word took humanity as His tabernacle, διατελήσας δὲ τοῦ θανάτου τὸν Κοσμὸν τούτον τοῦ ἁγίου (Oriigen, loc. cit.). This would be in harmony with Paul's great phrase πάσας τιμίας σαρκί (1 Cor. 15:45), and gives its proper force to ἐκδύσασθαι. Cf. Ecclus. 24:1 ἐκδύσασθαι τοῦ θανάτου, as addressed to Wisdom.

In the N.T. the verb only occurs again Rev. 12:1-2, where it is said that in the New Jerusalem God σκηνήσεται μετὰ αὐτῶν. So the prophets had foretold, e.g. κατασκευάζω τοῦ μυστήριον τούτου τοῦ κατασκευάζων μου ἐν αὐτῶι (Ezek. 37:24). Cf. Lev. 26:41, Ezek. 43:7. Such language goes back to the thought of the σκηνή or tabernacle in the desert (Ex. 25:4), where Yahweh dwelt with Israel. The verb σκηνώσεως would always recall this to a Jew. Philo says that the sacred σκήνη was a symbol of God's intention to send down to earth from heaven the perfection of His Divine virtue (Quis div. her. 23).

The language of this verse recalls Ps. 85:10:

His salvation is nigh them that fear Him,
That glory (δόξα) may dwell (κατασκευάζω) in our land;
Mercy (ἔλεος) and truth (ἀλήθεια) have met together,
Righteousness and peace have kissed each other.

The connexion of δόξα and the verb σκηνώσιμον will presently be examined more closely.

καὶ θεωρεῖμεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ. δόξα is never used in the N.T. of spiritual vision, while it is used 22 times of "seeing" with the bodily eyes. Cf. 12:32 34 36 καὶ ἴδε, 1 Jn. 4:14 (ὃς ἐκδύσασθαι πάντοτε ἐπιθύμησε... ὡς ἐκδύσασθαι... διὸ ἐπιθύμησε ἀπός τοῦ λόγου, 1 Jn. 1:18 διὰ τοῦ δοθηντος κατασκευαστος λόγου, ἐκ θεοσοφίας καλ. Neither here nor at 1 Jn. 4:2 is there any question of a supersensuous, mystical perception of spiritual facts, in both passages the claim being that the author has "seen" with his eyes (the apostle points to a definite moment in the historic past) the manifested glory of the Incarnate Word.

The use of the first person plural when speaking of his Christian experience is characteristic of Jn., and runs all through the First Epistle (cf. 1 Jn. 1:1-14 4:12 5:18, 24). He speaks not only for himself but for his fellow-believers (cf. 3:7); and in this passage for such of these (whether living or departed) as

1 Burkitt (En. de Mepharreske, ii. 397) favours this mode of rendering the Syriac.
had been eye-witnesses of the public ministry of Jesus. (Cf. also 2 Pet. 1:17, and see Intro., p. lx.)

δίκας, δοκεῖσθαι are favourite words with Jn. (although they are not found in the Johannine Epistles). Certain shades of meaning must be distinguished.

As in Greek authors generally, δίκας often means no more than "honour," and δοκεῖσθαι means "to honour greatly," e.g. δίκας φυλής, δοκεῖσθαι εὐλογία (see on 6:43).

But Jn. uses these words sometimes with special reference to that δίκας which belongs to God alone, e.g. 17:11 recalls the glory of the Eternal Word. According to one interpretation (see above) of εὐλογεῖται ἐν θεῷ, δοκεῖ here (cf. 2:11 11:40) stands for the Divine glory exhibited in the earthly life of Jesus which was perceived by those who companied with Him, and this must in any case be part of the meaning of ἱδαν ἡμᾶς τὸν δίκας αὐτοῦ. The crisis of this "glorification" in Jn. is the Passion (7:38 12:28) consummated in the Risen Life (13:28).

See especially on 13:28.

We must, at this point, recall the later Jewish doctrine of the Shekinah or visible dwelling of Yahweh with His people. The word יְשׁוֹנָה, "that which dwells," is appropriated in later Judaism to the Divine presence. When in the O.T. Yahweh is said to dwell in a place, the Targums, to avoid anthropomorphism, preferred to say that He "caused His Shekinah to dwell." The Shekinah was the form of His manifestation, which was glorious; but the glory is distinct from the Shekinah, which is used as equivalent to the Divine Being Himself. Thus the Targum of Isa. 60:3 is: "In thee the Shekinah of Yahweh shall dwell, and His glory shall be revealed upon thee." Again, Lev. 26:11: "I will walk among you and be your God," becomes in the Targum "I will place the glory of my Shekinah among you, and my glory shall be with you." Or again, Isa. 6:5, "I saw the Lord," becomes in the Targum "I saw the glory of the Lord" (see on 2:24).

Now by bilingual Jews the representation of Shekinah by ἰδρ Verb was natural, and when ἰδρ Verb is used in the later books of the LXX or the Apocalypse of the dwelling of God with men, the allusion is generally to the doctrine of the Shekinah (cf. Rev. 7:12). Accordingly, ἰδρεῖται ἐν θεῷ καὶ ἰδαν ἡμᾶς τὸν δίκας αὐτοῦ also carries a probable allusion to the glory of the Shekinah which was the manifestation on earth of God Himself. 8


Generally in the LXX, δίκας is the rendering of σωτήρ (as in Ps. 83:13).
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δύσας θεογονίας παρὰ πατρός. The glory of the Word is described as "a glory as of the Only-begotten from the Father." Neither Son nor Father has yet been mentioned, and the sentence is a parenthesis explanatory of the δύσας of the Word. We may connect παρὰ πατρός either (a) with μονογενῆς or (b) with δύσας.

If (a) be adopted, then we have the parallels 6:43 = 10:16 7:4, in all of which passages Jesus says of Himself that He is παρὰ πατρός or like, a phrase which means more when applied to Him than it means in 4:4, where John Baptist has been described as ἀγαθὸς ἐν πατρὶς, or in 10:28, where the Pharisees say that Jesus was not παρὰ πατρός. But μονογενής παρὰ would be an unusual combination, especially in Jn., who always has ἐν πατρί, not παρὰ πατρός, when he wishes to say "begotten of God" (cf. 1 Jn. 3:8 4:9 5:14, 19). It is true, indeed, that the distinctions between παρὰ, ἐνπο, and ἐν were being gradually obliterated in the first century, and that we cannot always distinguish παρὰ from ἐν (see on 6:43), but the point is that Jn. never uses παρὰ with γενεσιῶν.

(b) If we connect δύσας with παρὰ πατρός, the meaning is "the glory such as the only Son receives from his Father." Cf. 5:22 for δύσας παρα τοῦ μόνου πατρός. "No image but the relation of a μονογενὴς to a father can express the twofold character of the glory as at once derivative and on a level with its source." The manifested glory of the Word was as it were the glory of the Eternal Father shared with His only Son. Cf. 8:43 ἐστιν δόγματος ἡμῶν ὑπὸ δύσας μα, where see note.

The word μοιχεύω is generally used of an only child (e.g. Judg. 11:14, Tob. 3:14, 15:1, Lk. 1:36, Heb. 12:7), the emphasis being on μοιον—rather than on μοιχ. Thus Plato speaks of μοιχεύω οἰματος (Tim. 31); and Clement of Rome (6:23) describes the legendary bird, the phoenix, as μοιχευομένη, s.c. it is the only one of its kind, unicium (cf. the LXX of Ps. 80:16). Some of the O.L. texts (a e g) render μυεων here by unicium, which is the original meaning, rather than by unicium, which became the accepted Latin rendering so soon as controversies arose about the Person and Nature of Christ.

An only child is specially dear to its parents; and μοιχεύω is used to translate יְנֵי in Ps. 22:30, 33, where we should observe that Ps. 60:1; but in Exod. 2:10 it represents יְנֵי, which is the word commonly used in the Targums.

1 So the original Nicene Creed ran, γενόστηλα ἐν τῷ πατρὶς μοιχευμένην.


4 Justin (Tryph. 105) associates Ps. 22:30 with Jn. 1:14, using the term μοιχεύω.
expect ἄγγελος. Conversely ἄγγελος is used for an only son, Gen. 23; cf. Amos 8:11. And in every place where Jn. has μονογενής (except perhaps in this verse), viz. 18:18; 19:18, 1 Jn. 4:9, we might substitute, as Kattenbusch has pointed out, ἄγγελος for it, without affecting the sense materially. At this point, however, the meaning is clear. The glory of the Incarnate Word was such glory as the only Son of the Eternal Father would derive from Him and so could exhibit to the faithful. 

πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας. If καὶ θεοσάμενος . . . παρόν is parenthetical, as we take it to be, then πλήρης is in apposition to λόγος at the beginning of the verse, and the construction is regular and simple. If the adj. πλήρης were always treated as declinable (as it is, e.g., Mk. 2:28, Mt. 14:20 25, Acts 6:2), this would be the only possible construction of the passage. 

πλήρης, however, is often treated as indeclinable by scribes, in the N.T., the LXX, and the papyri; and it is possible, therefore, to take it in the present passage (the only place where it occurs in Jn.) as in apposition either to δείκνυμι or to οὖν or μουσαγένες in the previous line. For πλήρης here D reads πληρός, which apparently was meant by the scribe to be taken with δείκνυμι. Turner has shown 4 that Irenæus, Athanasius, Chrysostom, and later Greek Fathers did not connect πλήρης with δείκνυμι, but (generally) with δείκνυμι. And the Curetonian Syriac (Syri. sin. is deficient at this point) will not permit πλήρης to be taken with λόγος. 5

On the contrary, Origen seems to favour the connexion of πλήρης with λόγος or μουσαγένες. 6 The O.L. (followed by vulg.) has πλήρος in apposition with κύριον; and internal evidence seems to favour this construction, despite the authority of most Greek Fathers. For to speak of the glory of Christ as being full of grace and truth 7 is not as intelligible as to speak of Christ Himself being πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας; cf. Acts 6:2, Κύριος πληρός χάριτος καὶ δυνάμεως, and for this constr. of πλήρης as descriptive of a man's quality, see Acts 8:19. 12

Further, in v. 16 the πλήρης from which Christians receive grace is that of Christ Himself, which shows that πλήρης here refers to Him.

The problem is one of grammar rather than of exegesis, for on any rendering grace and truth are specified as characteristic attributes of the Incarnate Word, or of His manifestation of Himself in the world. These two words χάρις and ἀληθεία must now be examined.

The characteristic Christian word χάρις does not appear in Jn. except at 14:18, 19, in the Prologue. It is never placed in the mouth of Jesus by any evangelist (except in the sense of thanks, Lk. 6:22, 54), and is not used at all by Mk. or Mt. In Lk. it is applied occasionally to the special favour of God to individuals (2:20; 4:33), as it is several times in the LXX (e.g., Gen. 6:5). But its Christian use as grace is derived from Paul, who habitually employs it to designate the condescending love of God in redemption, as contrasted with the legalism of the Mosaic economy (Rom. 5:21 8:24 and passim); and the influence of Paul's terminology appears in Acts (e.g., 20:29 τῷ οὖν ἐπιταγματίζων τὸν λόγον τῷ θεῷ), Heb. 10:18 x Pet. 1:12, etc. So we have χάρις in the specially Christian sense in Barnabas, § 5, and Ignatius (Magn. 8), and thenceforth in all Christian writers.

But Jn. never uses χάρις except here and vv. 16, 17, and this is an indication of the faithfulness with which the primitive Christian phraseology is preserved in the Fourth Gospel. He does not even speak of the grace of God, when he writes γὰρ πάντως δ' ἔδει τὸν λόγον (κρύπτων), although what Paul meant by χάρις is behind his thought.

On the other hand, ἀληθεία is one of the keywords of the Fourth Gospel. The question of Pilate, "What is truth?" (18:38) has received its answer. It was the purpose of Christ's mission that He should "bear witness to the truth" (18:37), cf. 5:24. The Word of the Father which He came to proclaim is truth (17:6). He emphasizes the truth of His pronouncements to His disciples (16:15); and to the multitude (8:42). He is a "man that hath told you the truth" (8:40). Truth came through Him (9:41). He is "full of truth" (14:7). He is the Truth itself (14:6). So He will send the Spirit of truth (15:26; 16:14; cf. 1 Jn. 4:2), who is to guide the faithful into all the truth (16:13). Christ's disciples will "know the truth, and the truth shall make them free" (8:32): "be that doeth the truth cometh to the light" (21; cf. 1 Jn. 19); and Christ's prayer for His chosen is that they

1 J. A. Robinson (Epistles, p. 224), in a valuable note on χάρις, does not think that Paul introduced the word in its new sense to the Christian vocabulary, but that he did much to develop its use, especially in connexion with the extension of the Gospel to the Gentiles.
may he "sanctified in the truth." (17:19, 18). Every one that is of the truth hears His voice (18:28).

The word ἀληθής occurs 25 times in the Gospel and 20 times in the Johannine Epistles, while it is only found 7 times in the Synoptics and not at all in the Apocalypse. The distribution of ἄληθεν and ἀληθής is similar, while that of ἀληθός (see on v. 9) is somewhat different, as it is common in the Apocalypse. These figures show that the idea of Truth is dominant with Jn., and that the truth of Christ's teachings is one of His deepest convictions. He represents Christ as claiming to teach and to be the Truth; and although the Synoptics do not dwell upon it, yet this feature of Christ's claim appears in their account of His controversy with the Pharisees at Jerusalem during the last week of His public ministry (Mk. 12:18, Mt. 21:18, Lk. 20:25).

"We know," they said, "that thou art true, and teachest the way of God in truth"; i.e. they began by a verbal recognition of the claim that He had made for Himself, a claim directly recorded by Jn. alone. While then, the emphasis laid in the Fourth Gospel upon the truth of Christ's teaching is partly due to the circumstances in which the book was produced, and the desire of Jn. to assure his readers not only of the spiritual beauty but also of the solid foundations of Christian doctrine, we need not doubt that it gives a representation faithful to historical fact, when it describes Jesus as Himself claiming to be the Ambassador and Revealer of the Truth. In the Galilean discourses we should not expect to find this topic prominently brought forward, and the Synoptists are mainly occupied with Galilee. But when they bring Jesus to the critical and intellectual society of Jerusalem, they indicate that His claims to the possession of absolute truth had been noticed by those who wished to disparage and controvert His teaching.

Various explanations have been offered of the combination "grace and truth" as the two pre-eminent attributes of the Incarnate Logos. As we have seen, grace is what Jn. prefers to describe as love (God's love descending on men), and truth brings light (cf. Ps. 43:3); accordingly some exegesis refers back to v. 4, where the Divine life issues in light. But even if we equate χάρις with ἄληθεν, we cannot equate it with ἀληθής; and further Jn. does not represent ἀληθέα as issuing from χάρις. Rather are χάρις and ἀληθέα co-ordinate.

The combination is found again in v. 17, where grace and truth, which came through Christ, are contrasted with the Law, which was given through Moses. In the O.T. χάρις and ἀληθέα are not explicitly combined, but ἄληθεν and ἀληθής occur often in combination as attributes of Yahweh (Ps. 40:9). As it is with Paul (cf. 2 Thess. 2:18),
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15. Ἰδοὺ ὁ λόγος ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἰκαργείας ἔλεγεν ὁ λόγος Ἰησοῦ ἐν ἀτόμῳ Ο' ἄληθεν ἐν αὐτῷ ἢ ἐκ τοῦ ἀτόμου ἢ ἐν ἀτόμῳ ἤ ἐξ ἀτόμου μὴ ἐν ἀτόμῳ μὴ ἐπιστεύετε ἢ ἐν ἀτόμῳ ἦ πρῶτος

894; cf. Ex. 34:10), and in Ps. 62:1 as attributes of the Messianic King. As we have seen above (p. 21), the meeting of ἄληθεν and ἰκαργείας is associated in Ps. 8:9; 10 with the dwelling (καταπραγματεύεται) in the Holy Land of the Divine σῶμα. And it is to this passage in the Psalter, more than to any other passage in the O.T., that the words and thoughts of Jn. 14:14 are akin. The idea of the Divine compassion (δόξα), of which the O.T. is full, is enlarged and enriched in the N.T. by the idea of Divine grace (χάρις).

The Baptist's witness to the pre-mundane existence of the Word (v. 15)

15. The verse is parenthetical, interpolating at this point the Baptist's witness to the pre-existence of Christ, which has been implied in v. 14.

μαρτυρεί, the historic present. What John said is, and remains, a witness to the pre-mundane dignity of Christ.

καὶ καρποθεν, "and he hath cried aloud"; his voice was still sounding when the Fourth Gospel was written. For κραίζω, see on 20:28. ὡς ὁ λόγος ἐποιείτο κατακραίζων.

οἶχεν. See on 1:12. οὖν ἐν ἀτόμῳ, "this was He of whom I spoke"; cf. 8:17 10:16 for the constr. ἐν ἀτόμῳ. At v. 30 we have the more usual ἐν ὑπάρξει ἐν ἀτόμῳ. The awkwardness of the construction is responsible for variant readings. ἐν ἀτόμῳ is read by Πολικανος, but this is impossible; ἐν ἀτόμῳ is found in A Β C D L 6, and must be accepted despite the inferiority of its attestation. ἐν ἀτόμῳ. It would seem from all four Gospels that the Baptist proclaimed "the Coming One" (ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἄληθου before he had identified Him with Jesus. The terms of John's proclamation are repeated in v. 30, almost verbatim, and must be placed beside the Synoptic forms. We have seen on v. 6 above that the correspondences between Jn. and Mk. as to the Baptist's witness are very close; and it is clear that at this point ἐκ τοῦ ἄληθου is intended by Jn. to express what Mk. (and also Mt., Lk.) meant by ἐκ τοῦ ἀληθεύματος μου (see also on v. 27). Thus ἐκ τοῦ ἄληθου does not indicate priority in time as at 3:17 (that is

2 Cf. Augustine (de gen. mor. ii. 21), who notes that when you compare Jn. 11:4 with Ps. 88:10, you have to substitute gratia for misericordia.

3 See further, for the variants, Abbott, Dist. 2507a.

4 See introd., p. cl.
CHRIST THE GIVER OF GRACE

16. ἐν ... ἐν introduces vv. 16, 17, v. 16 being explanatory of v. 14, and v. 17 elucidating v. 16 further. ἐν is here read by WBC*DL 33, and must be preferred to the rec. καὶ (AW9), which is probably due to scribes not understanding that v. 15 is a parenthesis.

33 ἐν τῷ πληρώματι οὐδὲν κτλ. The Incarnate Word is indeed “full” of grace and truth, for (ὅτι) out of His “fulness” we have all received. Stephen is described (Acts 6:5) as ἄγνωστος χάριτος as well as His Master, although in a lesser degree; but he was only one of many disciples of whom this might be said.

33 καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια ἡ ἀλήθεια. “We, all of us,” ἢπειρον being prefixed for emphasis, i.e., all Christian disciples. The subject of

4. For ὧν χάρις, see Lightfoot, Colossians, p. 255 f., and J. A. Robinson, Ephesians, p. 255 f.

5. Εφεσοί, p. 223.

6. The LXX of ἐνεχθεῖται has the difficult phrase ἐνεχθεῖται χάριτος χάριτος, but the resemblance to χάρις ἀντὶ χάριτος here seems to be only verbal.

Explanation of vv. 14: Christ the Giver of grace (vv. 16, 17)

16. ὡς ἐν τῷ πληρώματι οὐδὲν ἡ ἡ ἀλήθεια ἡ ἡ ἀλήθεια. "We, all of us," ἢπειρον being prefixed for emphasis, i.e., all Christian disciples. The subject of
Here it is explicit; it had become a Christian commonplace by the time that the Prologue came to be written, but Jn. never returns to it in the body of his Gospel.

The contrast is between ἡμέρα and χρόνος, as in Paul, but πρὸς ἥλιος was added by Jn. after χρόνος, the two having been combined in v. 14. The thought of the freedom which truth brings appears again at 8:32, and ἀλήθεια is very opposite here. Its addition to χρόνος is Jn.'s contribution to Paul's contrast of law and grace. It is not that the Mosaic law was not true, as far as it went; but that the truth of Christ emancipates the believer from the bondage of the law.

That the law was given through Moses is repeated 7:19 (cf. 6:15); but the grace and the truth (ἡ ἀλήθεια; cf. 14:1) came through Jesus Christ. Moses was only the mediator through whom God gave the law; but Christ is Himself the source of grace and truth.

The full historical name "Jesus Christ" appears here for the first time in Jn. It was not used by the contemporaries of Jesus in His public ministry, and is only found in the Synoptists Mk 1, Mt. 1. It appears again Jn. 17, and also in Jn. 18, 21, 3:3, 4:6. In the Acts it occurs 2:13, 3:10, 16, 19, five times in the Apocalypse, and often in Paul (see Introd., p. cxxxvii).

The Logos Hymn concluded: "The Logos the Revealer of God (v. 18)

18. Θεὸς οὖν ἀλήθεια ἐστὶν πάντως. That God is invisible to the bodily eye was a fundamental principle of Judaism (Ex. 33:22; Deut. 4:18). The Son of Sirach asks, "τὸν θάνατον αὐτῶν καὶ ἠλπίζονται;" (Eccles. 4:22), to which Jn. supplies the answer here (cf. ἐγγίζων at the end of the verse). Philo, as a good Jew, has the same doctrine. God is ἀποροσ (de pass. Calsi, 3), even though Moses in a sense may be called ἀποροσ (de mut. nom. 2), and the name "Israel" means ὦς ἦ τειν ἡμῖν δεσμόν (see on ταύτα below). ἀποροσ is applied to God in like manner, Col. 1:18, 1 Tim. 3:17.

The doctrine that God is invisible is not, indeed, peculiar to Hebrew thought; cf. the verse from the Orphic literature quoted by Clement Alex. (Strom. v. 1:2):

οὐ θεοὶ τις αἰθῶν
ἐλευθερίᾳ θυγατήρ, αἱδεῖ γε πάντως ἀκραίαν.

2 See Drummond's Philo Judaeus, ii. 9, 206.

3 See Introd., p. cxxxviii.

But we incline to a Hebrew origin for the Prologue, rather than a Greek.

Jn. is specially insistent on the fact that God is invisible. Cf. 3:17, ὁ θεὸς οὖν ἐστὶν ηὐλάκασα, and (a passage closely parallel to 1:18) 6:48, ὥσπερ ἐν τῷ πάντως ἐστι, εἰ μὴ ὁ ὅμοιος τὸν θεὸν, ἀλλὰ ἀληθεύει τὸν πάντως. See note on 14:1, and cf. 1 Jn. 4:12. In the Greek Bible τάσσομεν always occurs with a negative. Jn. has it again 3:19, 4:9, 1 Jn. 1:1, cf. also Ezk. 20:26. This is the reading of nSC*D 33 (the best of the cursives), Peshabit, Clem. Alex., Origen, Epiphanius, etc., while the rec. ἡ μοναγένης τοῦ θεοῦ is found in all other uncials (D is lacking from v. 16 to 3:9) and cursives, the Latin vs. and Syr. cur. (Syr. sin. is lacking here) Chrysostom and the Latin Fathers generally. An exhaustive examination of the textual evidence was made by Hort, and his conclusion that the true reading is μοναγένης θεοῦ has been generally accepted. There can be no doubt that the evidence of MSS., versions, and Fathers is overwhelmingly on this side. μοναγένης occurs again in Jn. only at 1:14, 2:14, 9, 1 Jn. 4, 26, and in the last three instances in connexion with νῦν, so that the tendency of scribes would be to replace the more difficult θεοῦ here by the more familiar νῦν, as they have done; while there would be no temptation to replace νῦν by θεοῦ. μοναγένης θεοῦ was an expression adopted by Arius and Eunomius as freely as by the orthodox Catholics, so that its occurrence in a Gospel text would hardly have been used for polemical purposes by either party. It is an expression unfamiliar to the modern ear, and is therefore hard of acceptance by any to whom the cadence "only begotten Son" seems inevitable. However, it is probable—although the patristic testimony does not altogether favour this view—that μοναγένης is not to be taken as an adjective qualifying θεοῦ, but that μοναγένης, θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τοῦ πάντως are three distinct designations of Him who is the Exegete or Interpreter of the Father (cf. Abbott, Exeget. 1938).

That the Word is θεοῦ (not ὃς θεοῦ) has already been stated without qualification in v. 1. In v. 14 His glory is said to be like the glory which a μοναγένης receives from his father, which prepares the way for giving Him the title of μοναγένης. This title suggests that relation of Christ to God, as the Son to the

1 Two Dissertations (1876), the most valuable of commentaries on Jn. 1:18.

2 μοναγένης θεοῦ is cited by Harris from the Orphic literature as a title of Persephone (Bulletin of John Rylands Library, July, 1928).
Father, which has not yet been mentioned, but which is prominent in the Fourth Gospel. And, finally (as is also suggested by κοινωνία; see on εἰς τὸν κόσμον τοῦ πατρός above), this relation is one of eternal love. The Word may be described as ὁ ἐν οἷς τὸν κόσμον τοῦ πατρός.

We translate, therefore:

"God hath no man seen at any time: The Only-Begotten, who is God, who dwells in the Father's bosom,
This is He who revealed God."

ὅθεν οὖσιν κ.λ. Jn. generally begins such a sentence with οὖσιν, but here οὖσι is put first for special emphasis; cf. 3:28 13:1 15:2 16:22, where similarly οὖσι is not put in the forefront.

εἷς τὸν κόσμον. "The wife of one's bosom" is a phrase, used in many languages, for "beloved wife." Cf. Num. 11:2, Deut. 31. The metaphor is even applied to friendship between man and man; e.g. Cicero (ad Fam. Ep. xiv. 4, 3). "Cicero meus quis ager? ite neco sit in simum semper et complexus meo," and Plutarch, Cat. minor, 35 Acu. Taphion Δλλα, κ. τὸν Πενηγόνον κόσμον διήρωσον.

Hence δὲ ἐν εἷς τὸν κόσμον τοῦ πατρός expresses the intimate relationship of love between the Son and the Father; the Word shares in the secrets of Deity. ἐν stands for eternal being (cf. 6:38 and Rev. 19); it is the relation between Son and Father prior to the Incarnation, that is in the writer's thought.

εἷς τὸν κόσμον. Without a verb of motion, occurs elsewhere neither in the Greek Bible nor in Greek literature generally (Abbott, Hist. 2732), the more usual constr. being ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ (as at 1:18, which does not, however, help us). It is possible that εἷς is used here in the same sense as ἐν (cf. 10:18), as it often is in Mk.; 1 on the other hand, δὲ ἐν εἷς τὸν κόσμον τοῦ πατρός recalls δ λόγος ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ (v. 1), where ἐν may carry a sense of direction (see note in loc.).

Ignatius has a phrase which may be reminiscent of v. 18, viz. ἐν εἰς Χριστὸν τῶν ἐν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ πατρός προσελθεῖται καὶ εἰς ἐν εἰς καὶ χαρακτίζεται (Magn. 7); see on 13.

For δὲ ἐν εἷς τὸν κόσμον τοῦ πατρός Harris 2 appositely quotes Spenser's Hymn to Heavenly Beauty:

"There in His bosom Sapience doth sit,
The sourestane dearing of the Deitie,

where Spenser seemingly identifies the σοφία of the Sapiential Books of the O.T. with the λόγος of the N.T."


PART I. (I. 19-IV. 54 and VI).

The Baptist's witness as to the Coming One (I. 19-25)

19. This is the beginning of the Gospel, as distinct from the Prologue, and it opens, as Mk. does, with the witness of John the Baptist, differing, however, from Mk. in that the Baptism of Jesus is already over, reference being made to it at vv. 32, 33.

The indications of time in cc. 1, 2 are remarkable and precise. If the incident described vv. 19-23 is dated Day i., then Day ii. (τρίτην) is taken up with vv. 29-34. Again,

1 See Intro. p. cxlv. vol. i—3
Day III. extends from v. 35 (Ἱερός) to v. 39. Then, if we read ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ (see note in loc.) at v. 41, the incident of vv. 40-42 belongs to Day IV. Day V. extends from v. 43 (Ἑβραίοι) to the end of the chapter. Nothing is told of Day VI, but Day VII. (17 Ἡμέρα ἡ τρίτη) is the day of the Marriage at Cana (see further on 27). That is, the Gospel opens with the detailed report of a momentous week.

καὶ ἀνέγινεν καθὼς εἴπετο. “Now the witnessing of John is this …,” αὐτὸς being the predicate of identification, and καὶ referring back to v. 7 or v. 15, where John’s witness has been mentioned. We have now a threefold testimony of John, given on three consecutive days (v. 19, 29, 35), the first being the announcement of the Coming One, the second the designation of Jesus as He who was to come, and the third having as its consequence the following of Jesus by two of John’s disciples. The particularity of detail points to the story coming ultimately from an eye-witness, probably from John the son of Zebedee, whose reminiscences lie behind the Fourth Gospel (see on v. 35, 40). For the idea of μαρτυρεῖν in Jn. cf. Intro. p. xci, and see on v. 7.

καὶ ἀνέγινεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰουδαῖος κλ. So BC* 33, but νοLLAW om. πρὸς αὐτὸν. Αἔ γενν. 13 add πρ. αὐτὸν after ἐνεγίνετο.

John the Baptist was now carrying on his ministry, and his work had aroused intense interest (Lk. 3:19). It was natural that the Scribes (see on 25) should send representatives to inquire into his purpose and personal claims. John the Baptist’s father being a priest, his activities would be of special interest to the whole priestly order. Accordingly the authorities at Jerusalem sent “priests and Levites,” a combination that does not occur again in the N.T. Levites are mentioned elsewhere only at Lk. 15:29, Acts 4:5; and Jn. does not employ the term ἱερεῖς again, although he often has ἱερεῖς.

ὁ Ἱουδαῖος. The use of this term in Jn. is remarkable. Except in the phrase, “the King of the Jews,” the Synoptists only use the word Ἱουδαῖος five times (Mt. 23:23, Mk. 15:29, Lk. 7:25), while it occurs more than 70 times in Jn. When Jn. refers to the social or religious customs of “the Jews” (e.g. 2:14 4:15 6:2 7:1 1:25, 49), he does not exclude Galileans, who were at one in religion and habits of life with the inhabitants of Judea. But he generally means by “the Jews,” the people of Judea and particularly of Jerusalem, the scene of so large a part of his narrative. The Fourth Gospel is pre-eminently the story of the rejection of Jesus by these “Jews,” who were deeply imbued with national sentiment, intensely conservative in religious matters, bigoted and intolerant in their pride of race (cf. 510). Their popular leaders were the Pharisees, and we find from v. 24 that the commission of inquiry about John the Baptist’s doings had been sent by them. In v. 19 of Ἰουδαῖοι are not to be distinguished from Ἰουδαῖων of v. 24. It is the “Jews” and the “Pharisees” who are represented throughout the Fourth Gospel as especially the opponents of Jesus and His claims.

In one passage (5:1, 21), indeed, objectors who appear from the context to have been Galileans are explicitly called “the Jews,” perhaps because they represented the Jewish party of hostility; but see note in loc. In the present verse, there is no doubt that of Ἰουδαίοι are the leaders of religious thought in Jerusalem.

ὁ ἔφησαν. The Hebrew ἔφησα was transliterated ἔφησαν in the LXX, whence we have “Jerusalem.” This primitive form of the name is not found in Mt. (except 237), Mk., or Jn., while it is nearly always used by Lk., and always in the Apocalypse (3:12 21:10, of the New Jerusalem).

The Hellenised form ἔφησαμεν came into vogue about 100 B.C., and is the form usually employed in the Books of the Maccabees (cf. 1 Macc. 3:6) and in Josephus. It is generally treated as a neuter plural, but in Mt. 24 and Tob. 14 it appears as a feminine singular, perhaps being taken to represent “the sacred Sibylla.”5 This is the form ἔφησαμεν, as a neuter plural which is always used in Jn., as well as in Mt. and Mk. See further on 25.

ὁ ἔφησαν αὐτὸν, “that they should interrogate him.” They asked him, ἦν ἐν ᾧ; “Who are you?” not meaning thereby to ask him his name or parentage, for that his father was Zacharias, the priest must have been well known to the authorities. But they meant to ask him who he claimed to be, and he understood their meaning, for he disclaimed at once any pretence of being the Christ.4

For the answer given by Jesus to the same question, ἦν ἐν ᾧ; see 800.

1 Westcott-Hort do not adopt the rough breathing, “as due to a false association with ἔφης”; but see Moulton-Milligan, a.v. ἔφησαν.

5 For the vagueness, and also the prevalence, of the expectation in the first century that a divinely appointed leader, popularly called Messiah, should appear, see G. F. Moore in The Beginnings of Christianity, i. 356.
The pronoun αὐτός is used with extraordinary frequency in Jn., his tendency being to lay stress on personality (cf. Abbott, *Diat.,* 1726, 2402).

20. καὶ ὁ ὄρονσις αὐτοῦ ἦσαν μετὰ τοῦ οἴου; Ἡλίας εὗρε; καὶ λέγει οὐκ εἰμί. Ο ἐφοράθη εὐ οὐ; καὶ ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁμοθύμως ἦσαν μετὰ τοῦ ὄρονσιν αὐτοῦ. The alternation of affirmative and negative statements, so as to make explicit what is meant, is also thoroughly Johannine; cf. 1 Jn. 3:1-27. See above on v. 3.


21. καὶ ἐφοράθη αὐτῷ 5:14 12:18, 1 Jn. 1:15; see also John 5:10.

Join the Baptist is bold and direct in his reply to them, saying Εὐάμεν εἰς εἰμί ἦσαν ἦσαν μετὰ τοῦ ὄρονσιν αὐτοῦ; "I am not the Christ," the form of his answer suggesting that they might have to reckon with the Christ, nevertheless. Lk. (5:26) tells in like manner of John's disclaimer, which is mentioned again 5:28 below (cf. also Acts 13:28).

22. ἐφοράθη αὐτῷ. So Acts LW 33; rec. has αὐτός εἰμι Εὐάμεν (O"). In 5:1, the Baptist's use of εἰμί is a feature of the narrative (vv. 23, 26, 27, 30, 31, 33), his distinctive ministry being thus brought into clear view.

In 5:14, John dwells with special emphasis on the acceptance by John the Baptist of a ministry quite subordinate to that of Jesus (cf. 1:30-31; 5:20). Disciples of the Baptist had been found by Paul at Ephesus (Acts 19:6); and there is some evidence that by the end of the first century a Baptist community was prominent there, whose members offered allegiance to their founder rather than to Christ. As late as the middle of the third century, the *Clementine Recognitions* mention such a sect explicitly: "Ex discipulis Johannis qui . . . magisterium sumum ueluti Christum pradicanunt" (I, § 54 and § 60). The necessity of refuting such claims made for the Baptist in Ephesus and its neighbourhood sufficiently explains the importance which the Fourth Gospel attaches to John the Baptist's confession. "I am not the Christ." 21. καὶ Ἐφοράθη αὐτῷ; Τί ὕλιν; "The argumentative τί ὕλιν; quid ergo? appears in Rom. 6:18 17.

22. Ἐφοράθη αὐτῷ. The variants are puzzling. B has αὐτῷ εὐ οὐ οὐ; which can hardly be right; neither om. αὐτῷ; C* 33 insert αὐτῷ before Ἡλίας; while A* NT*G with the Latin vss. have Ἡλίας αὐτῷ οὐ. Perhaps αὐτός has been interpolated from the next clause; it is not necessary for the sense. We omit it, with Tischendorf, accordingly. Ἡλίας αὐτῷ; There was a general belief that Elijah would return to earth to prepare the way of the Messiah. This was founded on Mal. 4:5. In Mk. 9:12 it is mentioned, as commonly recognised, that "Elijah must first come" (cf. Mk. 6:14 and parallels). His mission was to be the establishment of order (Mk. 9:9), as is also explained in the Mishnah. Justin quotes (1:8) Jewish doctrine to the effect that Messiah was to be hidden until pointed out and anointed by Elijah.

In a sense, John the Baptist was the Elijah of Jewish expectation, and so Jesus declared (Mt. 11:14; cf. Lk. 1:17), but in the sense in which the Jewish emissaries put the question, "Art thou Elijah?" the true answer was Νο; for, while the Baptist fulfilled the preliminary ministry of which Malachi had spoken, he was not Elijah returned to earth in bodily form.

26. Ἐφοράθη αὐτῷ. This was another alternative. The Jews held that not only Elijah, but others of the great prophets, would return before Messiah's appearance. Cf. 2 Enoch 37, "For thy help will I send my servants Isaiah and Jeremiah," a passage which may be pre-Christian. One of the rumours about Jesus during His Galilean ministry was that He was "the prophet like unto Moses" (Mt. 7:27; cf. Mk. 9:13). See also 5:28 below. But more specific than this expectation of the return of one of the older prophets was the expectation of one who was pre-eminently "the prophet," whose coming was looked for on the ground of Deut. 18:18. This idea is not in the Synoptists, but appears three times in Jn. (5:27 6:6 8:42). Christian exegetes from the beginning (Acts 3:22 5:37) found the fulfilment of Deut. 18:18 in the Christ; but pre-Christian, i.e., Jewish, comment distinguished "the prophet like unto Moses" from the Messiah, as is clear from the present passage and from 7:42; see on 6:18. To the question, "Art thou the prophet?" the only answer was Νο; for the Jews were mistaken in distinguishing ὁ ὄρονσις αὐτῷ ἦσαν ἦσαν μετὰ τοῦ ὄρονσιν αὐτοῦ from the Christ, whose herald John was. 22. Ἐφοράθη αὐτῷ; "And so they said to him, Who are you?" αὐτός is a favourite connecting particle in the Fourth Gospel, seldom expressing logical sequence, but generally historical transition only (as in Homer). It occurs 195 times,
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κτίς εἰς ὑμᾶς καὶ γέννησε ὑμᾶς; 23. ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα μισθοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἦν ἡ ἐσθία καὶ τὸ ποτό. 24. Καὶ ἐκεῖ ἦσαν ὄσον ἦσαν τῶν Φαρισαίων. 25. καὶ ἔφθασαν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπαν αὐτοῖς ἦν ὁ κρίτης ἐν σοὶ ὁ κρίτης δὲ καὶ ἐσθία καὶ τὸ ποτό ἐσθία τῶν ἐσθίων καὶ τοῦ ποτοῦ ποτό τῶν ποτῶν.

and is used as ἔσθιος is used in Mk. In a few passages Jn. places it in the mouth of Jesus, indicating logical consequence, e.g. 6:14 10:14 13:26. It does not occur in 1 Jn. at all.

ἐν ἀνάρροσι ἐκλ. The context is elliptical, as at 2.56, where see note. ἀναρροσία occurs again 9.23.

23. ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἔσθιος τῆς ὕπαρξεως. The Synoptists (Mt. 1.1, Mt. 2.3, Lk. 2.2) apply the words of Isa. 40:3 to the Baptist and his mission; but Jn. represents him as applying the text to himself when answering the interrogation of the Jews. The source of the citation, viz. the prophecy of Isaiah, is explicitly given in all four Gospels.

The Synoptists quote from the LXX, but Jn. seems to reproduce a citation made membrorum from the Hebrew. Instead of ἀναρροσία τῆς ὕπαρξεως, he has ἔσθιος, ὑπάρξεως, from the second clause of Isa. 40:3, where the LXX has ἔσθιος ὑπάρξεως.

Theologians, both Eastern and Western, have noted the contrast between φωνή and λόγος. John "was the Voice, but not the Word" (Epiphanius, Epiphanius Hymnus, l. 9). So also Augustine (serm. 293.3): "Ioannes vocat ad tempus, Christus eternum in principio aeternum." Cf. Origen, Comm. (ed. Brooke, ii. 233).

24. The rec. text (so NW6) inserts of before ἀναρροσίαν, i.e. "And certain had been sent from among the Pharisees," as distinct from the questioners of v. 19. But αὐτα is omitted by M*AB*EC*L; and we must render "And they, i.e. the priests and Levites of v. 19," had been sent from the Pharisees.

And, in fact, v. 25 shows that the argument is carried on from v. 21.

The Pharisees (mentioned again 4.7 8.13 9.16 11.24 12.24, 42) were the true representatives of the old Jewish spirit (see on v. 19). Strictly conservative, they were intolerant of all innovations, whether of doctrine or ritual, and the baptizing ministry of John aroused their suspicions. See on 7.28.

25. δὲ καὶ ἀναρροσίας; Hitherto, no hint has been given that

1 Cf. Burkitt, Evangelion da-Markharnith, ii. 89, and Abbott, Dict. 1889, 2450. Jn.'s usage of αὐτή corresponds somewhat to the Hebrew "same consecrated."

2 Justin reproduces (Tryph. 88) this peculiar feature of the Fourth Gospel, and represents the Baptist as saying αὐτή ἐστί ἡ ἡμέρα, ἡ ἡμέρα φωνῆς Βοῶντος (v. 20. 23).

3 See Lightfoot, Biblical Essays, p. 139, and Barney, Aramaic Origin, etc., p. 114.
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Χριστὸς οὖν ἤλθεν Ὦ Ναζαρηνὸς ἐπὶ τὸν δικαίους; 26. ἀναρροσίας αὐτοῦ ὡς ἡμέρας λέγει ἢ ἡμέρας ἐπισκόπης ἐν οἷς ἦσαν ὄσον. But the ministry of John the herald was one of baptism. It is assumed that all readers of the Gospel will know that. The question, "Why are you baptizing?" is put to him by the Pharisees of the deputation from Jerusalem, who were the conservative guardians of orthodox practice.

The baptism of proselytes from heathenism was a recognised, if not a universal, practice in Jewry at this time. But why should Jesus be baptized? And what authority had John to exercise this ministry? Baptism, as a syncretic rite of purification, would indeed be a token of the approach of the Messianic kingdom; "I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean" (Ezek. 36:25) were prophetic words (cf. Zech. 13:1). But John had admitted that he was not Messiah: he was not even Elijah or the prophet (v. 21). His claim to be the Voice in the wilderness of Isa. 40:3 did not satisfy the Pharisees as to his authority for exercising so novel and irregular a ministry as that of baptizing Jews seemed to be.

26. The attitude of the Baptist to Jesus is explained more clearly in vv. 25-34 than it is in the Synoptists, whose source of knowledge about him was tradition and not personal acquaintance. We may therefore expect if the ultimate author of the Fourth Gospel were John the son of Zebedee, for he seems to have been one of the Baptist's disciples (see on v. 33). Jn. does not narrate the Baptist's interview with Jesus directly, but what he tells is consistent with the Marcan story.

We have, first, the Proclamation of the Coming One (Mt. 1.2, Mt. 3.11, Lk. 3.16), to which reference is made several times in this chapter. But when the proclamation was first made, the Baptist did not know (except in Mt.'s account; see on v. 31) that Jesus was the Predestined One for whose Advent he looked. Both in the Synoptists and in Jn. is the contrast drawn out between baptism in ἄρρητα (which was all that John offered) and baptism in πνεῦμα ἁγία (which was to be the work of the Christ). When Jesus presented Himself for baptism, the Baptist noticed a dove alighting on His head (v. 32); and as he looked he became conscious that this was the sign of the Spirit, and that Jesus was the expected One who should baptize in πνεῦμα ἁγία. All this is now to be set out in detail.

ἀναρροσίας αὐτοῦ ὡς ἡμέρας λέγει. In Jn. we nearly always have the constr. ἀναρροσία καὶ ἔσθιος (see on v. 59 below), but here and at 12.24 ἀναρροσία λέγει seems to be the true reading.

The Baptist had been asked, "Why do you baptize?" What authority have you? (v. 25). He gives no direct answer;
I. 28-29. Baptist's Witness as to Coming One

λίστω αὐτὸ τὸ ἴματα τοῦ ὑπόδηματος. 28. Ταῦτα ἐν Βεθανίᾳ

γενόμενος ἐν τῇ τέσσαραν ημέρᾳ τῆς σελένος. Both are used of man's knowledge of God and Christ: γνώσις at 14:3, 17:1, 1 Jn. 3:1, 4:9, and Acts 4:33, 44. The word used for the Father's knowledge of the Son is γνώσις (10:49), and not ἀλήθεια as we should have expected.

With this array of passages before us, we shall be slow to accept conclusions which are based on any strict distinction in usage between the two verbs.

27. ὁ ἐντὸς τοῦ ἱλασμοῦ κτῆσις. This clause (see v. 13) is in apposition to μέσον ἰδίων στήκει κτῆσις of the previous verse. Through misunderstanding of this variants have arisen. The rec. with ACTIΔ prefixed ἀνάμεσα κτῆσις (as if v. 27 began a new sentence), and adds (with Θ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἤρθε γένεσα (from v. 13), but neither of these insertions is found in kēB*LT* TH. 

For the Syoptic forms of the Baptist's proclamation, see Intro., p. c. Mt.'s alteration of 'loosen the thong of His sandals' (ἐλευθερά μετὰ τῶν πολλῶν) may point back to the form in Q. Either duty was that of a slave; and Wetstein (Mt. 3:2) cites a Rabbinical maxim (Cethoth, f. 90 r.) to the effect that a disciple might offer any service to his teacher which a slave did for his master, except that of unfastening his shoes, which was counted as a menial's duty.

ζησοῦ does not occur elsewhere in Jn. (cf. I K. 14:9), and the constr. ἐξαιτίας ἐς... is not found elsewhere in the N.T. Jn. never uses ἔξωος (ἐν ἔξω οὐκ ἔσται... is found again Mt. 8:3, Lk. 7:9). Perhaps εζησοῦ is the more appropriate adj. here (cf. Acts 17:26, where it is found in the citation of the Baptist's proclamation, instead of the Syoptic ἐξωσοῦ); but cf. 2 Cor. 1:24 πρὸς ταῦτα τῆς ἱερατείας;

38. The situation of the place is uncertain, and the variety of reading perplexes the topographical problem still more.

Βεθανίᾳ is read by k*ABC*WNΘ and must be accepted, although a Bethany beyond Jordan is not mentioned elsewhere. The rec. reading Βεθανίᾳ was adopted by Origen on geographical grounds (Comm. vi. 40). The Sinai Synax has Βήθ Αβί, which Burkitt thinks must rest on local tradition similar to that followed by Origen.
Conder identified Bethabara with the ford called 'Abrah, N.E. of Bethshean.1 Jordan had many fords and ferries, and the name Bethabara would suit any place near a ford, its root being ἄραρ "to cross"; but it is in favor of Conder's identification that the name is not found elsewhere (cf. Beth-sheban, Judg. 1:24). 'Abrah is barely 20 miles from Cana as the crow flies, but would be about 40 miles by road, so that it would be a possible site, if we take into account the time spent on the journey (21). It is, however, too far from Jerusalem to suit the Synoptic narrative (Mk. 1, Mt. 3), and the traditional site is much further south, near Jericho.2

Beth-Nimra, on the E. side of Jordan, N.E. of Jericho, will meet all the conditions of the problem. In Jos. 15:5 (B) Beth-Nimra becomes Baathara, and this form might be corrupted either into Bethany or Bethabara. We incline to accept this identification, which, made at the first by Sir George Grove, was accepted by Sir Charles Wilson,3 and favoured by Cheyne.

ὅτων ἂν ἡ ἡσυχία βαπτίζων. This coupling of a participle with the verb ἐφορέω, where we should expect an imperfect (ὑπηρέτος) denoting continued action, is common in Jn. We have the phrase ἄν ἰδοὺ βαπτίζων repeated 5:1016; cf. also 5:1011 1519. It is also found in the Synoptists (e.g. Lk. 3:16 Mt. 19:2). This may be an Aramaic constr., but it is also found in classical Greek.

Abbott notes (Diss. 2171) that ἄνω after the name of a place (a constr. which appears again 12:1015, and in Mk., Mt. occasionally) is not in accordance with classical usage. Milligan cites from a second-century papyrus, εἰς διήτροφον ἄνω Ἡμῶν . . . Χριστίαν, an excellent parallel.

The Baptist’s designation of Jesus as the Christ (vv. 29–34)

29. ἦν ἡ ἡσυχία. We now come to the second day of this spiritual diary (see on v. 19). One of the characteristics of the Fourth Gospel is the precision with which the author gives dates (see Intro., p. cli).

ἦν ἡ ἡσυχία. The name ἡσυχία generally takes the article in Jn. (as in the Synoptists), except where an appos-
lamb was typical of the blood of Christ. At the institution of the Passover, indeed, the blood of the Paschal lamb was not primarily piciarul or redemptive; it was sprinkled on the doorposts, that the destroying angel might "pass over" the house (Ex. 12:23). Nevertheless, the conception of its redemptive efficacy prevailed in later Jewish thought; and Hort quotes (on 1 Pet. 1:19) an apposite Midrash on Ex. 12:18: "With two bloods were the Israelites delivered from Egypt, the blood of the Paschal lamb and the blood of circumcision." The reference to 1 Pet. 1:19 then, relates to the Paschal lamb rather than to the lamb of Isa. 53.

In the Apocalypse, the application of ἄρηστος to Christ has primary reference to the idea of a lamb as a victim (Rev. 5:6, 9, 14), whose death is an expiatory sacrifice, efficacious for all mankind. And the association in Rev. 15:9 of the "Song of Moses" with the "Song of the Lamb" suggests that, as in 1 Pet. 1:19, the slain Lamb of the Apocalypse is compared with the Paschal lamb, rather than with the lamb of the daily sacrifice.

The comparison of Christ with the Paschal lamb appears also in a document earlier than either 1 Peter or the Apocalypse, viz. 1 Cor. 5:7, "Christ our Passover has been sacrificed for us." And, inasmuch as this thought is conspicuously present in the Johannine narrative of the Passion (see on 19:34), it would be legitimate to interpret "the Lamb of God" in the present passage in the same way, and to find here the thought that "the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world," is the true Paschal Lamb, of whom the Passover victims of the past had been a type.

(c) It seems, however, that in the Johannine use of the title, "the Lamb of God," there is a reference to Isa. 53:7: "Yahweh hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all . . . as a lamb that is led to the slaughter . . . He opened not His mouth." The passage is directly applied to Christ in Acts 8:32, and other phrases from the same prophecy are treated as having a Messianic reference in Mt. 27:11, 1 Pet. 1:19, Heb. 9:14. It is certain that, soon after the Passion, Christian believers found in Isa. 53 a forecast of the sufferings and the redemption of Jesus Christ. And the author of the Fourth Gospel, writing at the end of the first century, could not have been unaware of this Christian interpretation of Hebrew prophecy, which would be quite sufficient to explain the majestic title, "The Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world." Indeed, Jn. treats Isa. 53 as a Messianic chapter at 12:18, see on 19:34.

Such considerations help us to understand Jn.'s use of the title. But it is the Baptist's use of the title that presents difficulty. That had been led to identify Jesus with Messiah who was to come, whether by private converse with him before His baptism, or by the sign at the baptism which he believed himself to have received (v. 23), is in accordance with all the evidence that is available. But that John the Baptist should have spoken of the Christ as "the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world," and have done so, not only before His Passion, but before His public ministry had begun, requires explanation.

The idea of a Suffering Messiah was not prevalent among the Jews of the first century (see on 12:34). The apostles never reconciled themselves to the idea that Jesus was to die by violence (Mt. 27:22 and passim; cf. Lk. 22:24). Yet here we find the Baptists represented as foreseeing from the beginning that the climax of the ministry of Jesus would be death, and as announcing this publicly by acclaiming Him as the true Lamb of sacrifice, foreordained of God. It has been urged, in explanation, that the Baptist was the son of a priest, familiar with sacrificial ideas all his life. He certainly thought of himself as the Forerunner of the Christ, and Jn. represents him as believing that he was the forerunner of Isa. 40 (see on v. 1). He was, therefore, a student of the Isaiic prophecies which tell of the ideal Servant of Yahweh, the chosen One in whom Yahweh delights (Isa. 42). Later he was reassured, when in perplexity, by learning that the mighty works of Jesus were such as had been predicted of this Servant of Yahweh (Mt. 1:23, Lk. 2:29; cf. Isa. 11:1, 42). And so more natural than that he should apply to Jesus the most striking of all the prophecies about Yahweh's Servant, viz. Isa. 53? If he identified in his thoughts this great prophetic ideal with the person of Jesus, it would be explicable that he should call Jesus "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world."

Dr. C. J. Ball held that the title "Lamb of God" has an even closer connexion with Isa. 53 than is indicated by the word ἄρηστος in Isa. 53. The Hebrew word ἄρης "lamb" came in its Aramaic form ܪܐܢ to mean "child," "boy," "servant," and he suggested that what the Baptist really said in Aramaic

1 See Introd., p. 42.
2 Cf. also Justin, Tryp. 39, and Introd., p. 322.
3 See Hurley, Aramaic Origin, etc., p. 76.
was, "Behold the Servant of God, who takes away the sin of the world," the Greek rendering in Jn. 1:29 being an excusable mistranslation. Ball urged further that δὲ ἁλὸς τοῖς δῶεν in v. 34 is a more correct rendering of the same Aramaic phrase, in both cases the explicit reference being to the αἰών of Isa. 42:1-5, Acts 3:14-17.

The main difficulty in the way of all such explanations is that there is no good evidence that the Messianic application of Isa. 53 was current among the Jews in pre-Christian times. As has been said above, it became current among Christians immediately after the Passion of Christ; but it does not appear that either the Jews or the early disciples during the earthly ministry of Jesus conceived of Isa. 53 as foretelling a suffering Christ. It is, therefore, hard to believe that John the Baptist, alone among the witnesses of the ministry of Jesus, and before that ministry had begun, should have associated Him with the central figure of Isa. 53; and that he should have so markedly anticipated the conclusions reached by those who, after the Passion, looking back upon the life and death of Jesus, found them to fulfill the predictions of the Hebrew prophet.

To sum up. John Baptist believed Jesus to be the Christ of Jewish expectation, and announced Him as such, probably in the hearing of John, the son of Zebedee. Looking back, the aged apostle in after years realized how momentous an announcement this was, even more so than the Baptist had understood. And when dictating his recollections of an incident on which he had pondered long and deeply, it is intelligible that he should state the Baptist’s cry, "Behold the Christ," in terms which unfolded all that Jesus had come to mean for himself. Jesus was "the Lamb of God, who takes away the world’s sin." We do not suppose that the speeches in the Fourth Gospel were all spoken exactly as they are set down, although they may have been in some instances. But here, whether we attribute the form of the Baptist’s announcement to John the son of Zebedee, or to the scribe and editor of the Gospel who put in order the old man’s reminiscences, we must recognize the probability that the Baptist’s actual words were simpler, and a less perfect expression of the Gospel of Redemption. Cf. Introd., p. cfr.

δὲ ἄρα ὁ τέμνων τὸν κόσμον. In 1 Jn. 3:8 we have δὲ ἁλὸς ἀποκατάλη λή ὁ ροπάρις ἄρα. Here the "taking away" is in the present tense, the futurum instans (like μαρτρύνει in v. 13). δὲ ἄρα is Ἡ ἀναφήκτων who takes away and is always taking away the

1 Burkitt, Christian Beginnings, p. 39, points out that the application of Isa. 53 to the Passion was made by Greek-speaking Christians in the first instance. Cf. Theology, July 1922, p. 39.
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30. οὖσα ἄρα ἄρδι ὡς ἐρημία ἰδων. Οὐκ ημεῖς μοι ἀνέχετε ἄρδι ἐν ἡμεροθηκήν μοι γένοις, δόν προϊμος μοι ἄρει. 31. καί ὅτι οὐκ ἠδειν ἀνάθεσιν, ἀλλὰ ἡ ἀναφήκτων τῆς Ἰσραήλ, διὰ χάθων ἄρει ἐν ὑπηρεσίᾳ world’s sin, a profound Christian conception, formulated first in this verse, and reproduced with fidelity in the liturgical "Lamb of God, which takes away (not that took away once for all at Calvary, although that also is true) the sins of the world," For the Atonement is not only an event in time, but an eternal process.

The sin of the world—not sins in the plural, as at 1 Jn. 5:8—is here contemplated. Western liturgies have followed 1 Jn. 5:8 rather than Jn. 19 in pleading "Agnus Dei qui tollis peccata mundi, miserere nobis." But the sin of the world is a deeper stain than the sins of individual men and women; and the Fourth Evangelist, who views the mission of Jesus sub specie aeternitatis, sees that it is the sin of the κόσμος (cf. v. 3), the lawlessness and rebellion of all created being, that is the subject of redemption. This includes, indeed, the sins of all men, but it is the sin of the κόσμος, which knew not Jesus (v. 10), that is in view in this tremendous phrase.

ἀναφήκτων κυ. "This One," pointing to Jesus, is He of whom I spake. The reference is not merely to v. 26, 27, but to Jn.’s proclamation of the Coming of Jesus, before He began His ministry, which is common to the Synoptists and Jn. (see on v. 15, and Introd., p. c).

The rec. text has οὖσα ἄραν ἡμεῖς ἐν ὑπηρεσίᾳ, with οὐκ ΑΧΘΕΝΔΟΣ, but οὐκ ΒΧΘΕΝ give ἄναθεν ὡς, "in whose behalf," the Baptist always regarding himself as the herald of Jesus. Blass points out that λέγων ἄναθεν = λέγων ἡμείς, "to speak about," is common in classical Greek, and that ἄναθεν for ἡμείς is found in Paul (e.g. 2 Cor. 8:9). But in Jn. (with whom it is a favourite preposition) ἄναθεν always means "in behalf of." Cf. 6:1 10:11 11:40 50:5 52:13 55:11 15:12 15:18 16:8, 3 Jn. 3:10. See on 14:4 for ἄναθεν, which seems to be the true text in that place. ἄναθεν is applied, as here, to Jesus, Acts 2:27 17:5; see on 2:18 above for its Johannine usage.

31. καί ὅτι οὐκ ἠδειν ἀνάθεσι, repeated v. 33, "even I did not know Him" (cf. v. 26), sc. as the Messiah. That John the
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πνεῦμα καταβαλθον ὡς περιστερὰν ἵνα ὁμορραγή, καὶ ἣμων ἐν' αὐτῶν.

All the evangelists, that is, agree in recording that a dove alighted upon Jesus when presenting Himself for baptism. The dove was regarded in Palestine as a sacred bird. Xenophon (Anab. 1. iv. 9) reports that it was not lawful in Syria to hunt doves; and this is suggested by Tibullus (i. 7. 17):

Quid referam ut usitete crebras intacta per urbes
Alta Palatincino sancta columna Syro.

So Lucian explains that to the Syrians a dove is saurus, and that any one unwittingly touching a dove is counted unclean (Dea Syria, 54; cf. 14). Philo 2 comments on the great number of doves at Ascalon, and upon their timeliness, due to the circumstance that from ancient times the people were not allowed to eat them, so that they were never caught (ap. Euseb. Prep. Evangel. viii. 14. 64).

Furthermore, the dove was regarded among the Semites as a symbol of the Spirit. Of ιερός τῆς προφητείας, "the voice of the turtle" (Cant. 212), there is a Chaldee interpretation, reported by Wetstein, "the voice of the Spirit." And by the Jewish doctors the Spirit hovering over the primal waters (Gen. 17) was compared to a dove: "Spiritus Dei forebatur super aquas, sicut columba, qua fertur super pullos suos nec tangit illis." 3 Hence we can understand why a dove alighting upon Jesus should have been regarded as a symbolic of a descent of the Divine Spirit. 4 The words ascribed to the Baptist are explicit. He saw the dove, and forthwith recognised it as the sign which he had been expecting (v. 33).

For the expression καταβαλθον ἵνα ὁμορραγή, see on 33.

Some other divergences from the Synoptics accounts of the Baptist should be observed. Jn. says nothing of the heavens being opened (Mt. 319 and parallels); or of the Voice from heaven (see on 128 below); and having regard to his knowledge of Mk, 5 with whose account of the Baptist he has so much in

1 In Quis rer. div. har. § 25, Philo, when discussing on Gen. xv. 9, interprets the turtle dove and pigeon (τροπαια καὶ πουτεραπείδη) of divine and human wisdom respectively, the separato standing for human wisdom, as being gentle (εὔπνοος) and food of the haunts of men.

2 Clement of Alexandria says that the Syrians venerate doves, as do the Eleusinians Zeus (Protrept. ii. 33).

3 See Wetstein, p. c.

4 In Mk, 14. 6, Lk. 1. 32, cf. Lk., ἔδωκα, laying emphasis on the objective and physical nature of the incident.
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common (see on v. 6), it would seem that these omissions are deliberate. Here, as in v. 31, the Johannine narrative appears to be more primitive than that of the Synoptists.

καὶ ἐπέλεξεν ἐπὶ ἀγώνιον (cf. for the constr. 38). This is, on the other hand, a detail not found in the Synoptic narratives, perhaps added here with a reminiscence of Isa. 40:3, where it is said of the Messianic King, ἀναμεταύμη στὸν ἀγώνιον τοῦ Θεοῦ. In Jeremias (on Isa. 40:3) quotes the following from the Gospel of the Hebrews: "When the Lord was come up out of the water, the whole fount of the Holy Spirit descended and rested upon Him, and said to Him: My Son, in all the prophets was I waiting for thee that thou shouldst come, and I might rest in thee. For thou art my rest, thou art my first-born Son that reigneth for ever." This is a doctrinal combination of the Synoptic and Johannine narratives, probably intended to teach the permanence of the spiritual gift here vouchsafed through Christ to mankind.

The form in which the Dove and the Voice from heaven at the Baptism of Jesus are mentioned in the Odes of Solomon is curious. Ode xxiv. begins: "The Dove fluttered over the Christ, because He was her head, and she sang over Him and her voice was heard," sc. in the world. The singing or cooing of the dove is as it were a Heavenly Voice; and "fluttering" recalls the verb used by Justin, ὅσως παρεκάλεσεν τὸ ἄνω τῶν λόγων ἑμών, ἐπεζύγεσεν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ (Did. 88). The verb ἐπεζύγεσεν is also found, in reference to the Baptism of Christ, in the Sibylline Oracles (vii. 67) and in Origen (Cels. i. 40, 41), and its rendering volare or devolare in Tertullian (adv. Val. 27) and in Hilary (in Ps. liv. 7), showing that it had a place in some extra-canonical record. This idea of the dove "fluttering" is, as we have seen, associated in Hebrew thought with the idea of the Spirit "brooding" over the waters; cf. Gen. 1:2, Deut. 33:2.

33. ἐφέστη ὁ θάνατος ᾗ ἐφέστη ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν τῶν ἁρμάτων. The Baptist repeats, as an essential part of his witness, that he did not recognize Jesus for what He was until the dove lit upon Him; and he recognized Him then only because he had been divinely warned that there would be a sign. The Baptist is not represented as saying that he knew that the sign would be forthcoming in the case of a candidate for baptism.

I. Baptist's designation of Jesus as Christ 51

διαμαρτυρήσεις μοι ὁπως ἦν ἐν ἰδίᾳ τὸ Πνεῦμα καταβαίνον καὶ μένον ἐν αὐτῷ. ὅταν ἦν τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς Ἀγίας, διαμαρτυρήσεις μοι. Cf. v. 6. John's mission to baptize was from God.

ἐκείνη (explicit and emphatic, see on v. 8) μοι ἐπὶ ἀγώνιον. The Hebrew prophets had claimed that "the word of Yahweh" came to them, and John, the last of them, makes the same claim, "God said to me;" of that he was assured.

ἐν ἰδίᾳ τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς Ἀγίας. Upon whomsoever the Spirit descended and abode, He would be the minister of a greater baptism than that of John. John had doubtless (although this is not recorded) had many opportunities of observing the intense spirituality of the early life of Jesus, and his intercourse with Jesus previous to His baptism (according to Mt. 3:16) had led John to see something of His unique personality. But, as the story is told, the Baptist was not finally assured of the Messiahship of Jesus until the dove rested upon Him. He had not been told that the descent of the Spirit would thus be indicated; but the sign was sufficient, and he accepted it joyfully.

οὕτως ἦν ὁ Πνεύματος ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. For ὁπως, cf. 18, and note that Πνεῦμα is a prophetic present (cf. αὐραμον in v. 29). The Spirit descended on Jesus, so that He might baptize men therewith, and that the Spirit might rest on them as it rested on Him, although not in the same plenitude (cf. 39).

ἐν ἰδίᾳ τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς Ἀγίας. Baptism as administered by John was, according to the Synoptists, symbolic of purification of the soul. It was, according to Mk. 11, ἐφέστη στὸ ἄνω τῶν λόγων ἑμών. There may be a hint at 36 of some association of John's ministry with the idea of purification, but there is no suggestion anywhere in the Fourth Gospel that his baptism was one of repentance with a view to the remission of sins. It has been pointed out that the language of Josephus (Ant. xviii. 5. 2) about John's ministry of baptism suggests that it was not addressed so much to penitents as to those who were dedicating themselves very specially to an ascetic life of virtue. That it was symbolic, at any rate, of dedication, as well as of purification, is plain from the circumstance that Jesus submitted, at the beginning of His ministry, to be baptized by John.

In all the Gospels the primary contrast between the ministry of John and the ministry of Jesus is that the first was ἐν δάκρυσι, the second ἐν πνεύματι Ἀγία. Jn. makes the Baptist insist three times (vv. 26, 30, 33) that his baptism was only ἐν δάκρυσι—
is, it was only the symbol of a baptism in pνεύμα which he could not minister. In the prophets water is used several times as an image of the Spirit (cf. Isa 44:3, Ezek. 36:25, and note the verb in Joel 2:28, "I will pour out My Spirit upon all flesh"). Jn. is fond of this image (cf. 4:13-16); and the contrast of "water" and "spirit" in the Baptist's references to his ministry of baptism is intended to convey that it was only preparatory to, and symbolical of, a greater ministry that was at hand.

Mt. 3:11 and Lk. 3:16 (but not Mk. 1:9 or Acts 1): speak of the ministry of Jesus as a baptizing "with the Holy Spirit and with fire." But Jn. says nothing about a baptism with fire. Fire is the symbol of judgment, and Jesus "came not to judge the world, but to save the world" (12:47; cf. 9:27), in the Johannine presentation of His teaching.

34. θαύμα δέρακα, καὶ μεταφάγημα. John's testimony was that of an eye-witness. He had seen the sign of the dove, and he bears witness accordingly, the perfect μεταφάγημα indicating that his testimony was continuous up to the time of speaking, that Jesus was the Son of God.

In Jn., δώρος τοῦ Θεοῦ is a recognised title of Messiah, Nathanael (1:50) and Martha (11:5) employing it as the Baptist does here. With this the Synoptists agree (Mk. 4:4, Mt. 14:48 26:1-7, Lk. 20:27), the title had a definite meaning to Jewish ears, and was applied in the sense of "Messiah." 1 In this sense it had its roots in the O.T.; cf., e.g., Ps. 2, where the theocratic king is Yahweh's Son, and Ps. 89:47. The evidence for its use in Apocalyptic literature is scanty, only one instance being found in Enoch (1:2) of Messiah being called "my Son." Cf. 2 Esd. 7:13 12:28, 28:14.

Jn. is the only evangelist who represents Jesus as using this title of Himself (5:10 10:15, where see notes). In these passages, if they stood alone, no higher meaning than "Messiah" need be ascribed to it; but when they are taken in connexion with the peculiar claims of sonship made by Jesus, in the Synoptists as well as in Jn. (see on 3:3), the phrase "the Son of God" seems intended by Jn. to have a deeper significance (cf. 2:22 5:24 10:22).

For δώρος here there is a Western reading, δεξαμενέω (Lat. Syr. cur. probably supported by Pesh. Orxy. 208). Cf. Mt. 27:24 with Lk. 23:26.

1 Cf. comms., Dalman, Words of Jesus, Eng. Tr., p. 279; Burkitt (Christian Beginnings, p. 25) regards "Son of God" as the most primitive of the Christological titles.

35. ὁ ἐξορίζων πάλιν δείχνει ὅτι Ἰακώβος καὶ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ δῶν. 36. καὶ ἔκβλεψεν ὁ Ἰουσίαν περιστατέον λέγει τις ὁ Ἀμώνταυ Θεοῦ. 37. καὶ ἤκουσαν οἱ δύο μαθηταί αὐτοῦ ἀληθῶς καὶ

The first disciples of Jesus (vv. 35-39)

35. τὸ ἐξορίζων πάλιν δείχνει ὅτι Ἰακώβος καὶ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ δῶν. 36. καὶ ἔκβλεψεν ὁ Ἰουσίαν περιστατέον λέγει τις ὁ Ἀμώνταυ Θεοῦ. 37. καὶ ἤκουσαν οἱ δύο μαθηταί αὐτοῦ ἀληθῶς καὶ

This form (ppl. with sense of impt.) "was standing," occurs again 2:16 10:15 20:1. The MSS. vary between δείχνει and ἔκβλεπε, the latter being always adopted by Westcott-Hort.

2 Cf. Introd., p. xxxvii.
clear sense of a difference between them. Either might be rendered "Sir," without going wrong. Thus, in the Synoptic narratives of the Transfiguration, where Mk. (69) has ῥαββί, Lk. (109) renders it by ἑστιάωθα, and Mt. (179) by κύριε. So in the story about the storm on the lake, where Mk. (289) has διδάσκαλε, Lk. (589) has ἑστιάωθα, and Mt. (829) has κύριε. But while κύριε may thus sometimes represent ῥαββί, or be used (as at 1112 2115) merely as the equivalent of the English "Sir," it generally points to an original πάροι or μάρτυριον. The Johannine usage of these terms is interesting. In the early part of the Gospel the disciples are always represented as saying ῥαββί, while others, as the woman of Samaria (411), the nobleman of Capernaum (442), the sick man at Bethesda (57), the blind man after his cure (692), Mary and Martha of Bethany (1113, 17, 28, 32, but cf. 1115 and note there), say κύριε. The multitude who were fed with the five loaves first say ῥαββί (692); but, after they have heard the discourse about the heavenly bread, say κύριε (694). The first occasion on which a disciple is represented as saying κύριε is at the conclusion of this discourse, when Peter says, "Lord, to whom shall we go?" (695). We have ῥαββί used again by the disciples at 1115, but κύριε at 1116; and henceforward ῥαββί disappears from their speech, and they say Lord (1113, 20, 140, 16, 22, 2115, etc.), the change in address indicating a growing reverence. The title ῥαββί was not employed after the Resurrection of Jesus, who was afterwards spoken of as Μαραὰν or κύριος (cf. 1 Cor. 1610, and see note on 49).

Thus Jn.'s report as to the use of these titles by the disciples is not only consistent, but is probably historical. Nothing of this kind can be traced in the Synoptists, who do not distinguish between διδάσκαλος and κύριος as modes of address, both being in use, as they represent the facts, at all stages of the association of the Twelve with Jesus. Indeed, Lk. (1116) puts the phrase κύριε διδάσκαλον ἐμῶς into the mouth of the disciples. In this regard, a more primitive tradition is preserved in the Fourth Gospel. The Aramaic ῥαββί is not found in Lk., and in Mt. only in the greeting of Judas to his Master (2615, 28). Mk. has it in the corresponding place (Mk. 1415), and also places κύριε twice in Peter's mouth (Mk. 9111). ῥαββίσων is found in Mk. 1010. With these exceptions, the Synoptists always translate παῖς and do not reproduce the title itself.

2 Nicodemos, naturally, says ῥαββί (99).
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN [I. 38-39. 40-
41.]

I. 38-41.] THE CALL OF PETER

40. " monitor, 56:26, 19:26-28, 19:29-30, and his exactitude suggests that he is reproducing the report of an observer of the events recorded.1

The call of Peter (vv. 40-42)

40.  Andrew. Jn. alone tells that Andrew was a disciple of the Baptist (v. 35). The Synoptic story of the call of Peter and Andrew (Mk. 1:16 and paral.) may be another version of vv. 40-42, but it probably narrates a more formal call to apostleship which came later (see on v. 37, and introd., p. xxxv). Andrew is introduced as "Simon Peter's brother," being the less famous of the two (cf. also Mk. 1:16, Mt. 4:18-20, Lk. 5:10); and, except at 1:28, he is always associated with Peter. Jn. assumes that every one will know who Simon Peter was, a similar assumption being made by Lk., who mentions "the house of Simon" and "Simon's wife's mother" (Lk. 5:10), before anything is told about Simon himself. See, further, on 6:16 for the prominence of Andrew in the Fourth Gospel.

1 The idea (adopted by Westcott) that Jn. follows a method of counting the hours from midnight has been shown by W. M. Ramsay (D.B., 475-479) to be untenable; cf. A. Wright, N.T. Problems, pp. 147 f.
being no suggestion of John looking for any one, or of any other disciple being found by either of them. The emphasis on ἤδειον, "his own brother," would be consistent with this.

Whether we read πρῶτον or πρῶτον, a good deal of time elapses between v. 39 and v. 43. Andrew and the ἐν δύοις, presumably, have a full and convincing conversation with Jesus, staying with Him for the afternoon and night; Andrew goes out and finds Peter, who is brought back to Jesus, welcomed, and renamed Kephas. Modern editors (Alford is an exception) try to find time for all this between 4 p.m. and the next morning (ἦλθον, v. 43), although this is not stated. It would be easier to understand the sequence of events if we suppose "that day" (v. 39) to mean a full day of twenty-four hours, from sunset to sunset, and allow two nights, instead of one only, to intervene between ἦλθον of v. 35 and ἦλθον of v. 43. This would be consistent either with πρῶτον or πρῶτον, both being awkward on any hypothesis.

But there is another reading, τῆς, supported by the O.L. texts †, ‡, and (apparently) τῆς, all of which have τῆς. A βεβαίως, πρῶτον ἔλθον would readily be corrupted to πρῶτον ἔλθον, which leads to πρῶτον ἔλθον. We conclude that τῆς is the true reading. Τῆς uses this form (not πρῶτον) again at 18:20; and it gives an excellent sense here. "He finds early in the morning his own brother Simon," having stayed the night at the lodging where Jesus was. Then ἦλθον in v. 43 stands for the day after the finding of Simon, which occupies Day iv. of the spiritual diary covered by this chapter (see on v. 29 above). This is certain if τῆς be accepted as the true reading, and even if we read πρῶτον it is highly probable.

τῶν ἰδίων τῶν Μωσέων. This was (and is) the Great Discovery. Andrew speaks for his unnamed companion as well as for himself: "We have found the Messiah." τῶν Μωσέων. The Aramaic title τ userinfo is found in the N.T. elsewhere only at 45:21. See on v. 38 for the preservation of such Aramaic forms in Jn., although not in the Synoptists, the Greek interpretation being added. Cf. Ps. 2:3, Dan. 9:26, 30.

According to Jn., the recognition of Jesus as the Christ by Andrew, by Philip (v. 45), and by Nathanael (v. 49) was swift and unhasting; although it is noteworthy that nothing of this kind is told of Peter, whose confession of faith is not recorded until 60:20. The Synoptists suggest, as is probable a priori, that the disciples did not reach full conviction at all once, but that: it came to them gradually, the critical point being Peter's confession (Mk. 8:29, Mt. 16:15, Lk. 9:22). Perhaps we should regard the full assurance which Jn. ascribes to Andrew, Philip, and Nathanael on their first meeting with Jesus as antedated. It is, however, legitimate to treat their utterances (v. 41, 45, 49) as the expressions of an enthusiasm which became dulled, as the novelty of their intercourse with Jesus passed away, and which did not become a reasoned conviction until later.1

The rec. has Ἰωάννης (with ἈΒΓΔ) for the better supported Ἰωάννου (νόμος LW 33, etc.). A similar variation appears at 21:25.

ἐλθον, τά, "having looked intently on him." This verb has already (v. 36) been used of the Baptist's earnest look at Jesus; it is used by the Synoptists of the piercing, scrutinising gaze of Jesus (Mt. 19:7, Mk. 10:21, Lk. 20:15), and of His "I am looking" upon Peter after his denial.

It is plain from this verse (cf. 21:27 and Mt. 16:15) that Simon was known as "Simon, son of John," to distinguish him from others bearing the common personal name "Simon." By the Synoptists he is generally called "Peter," but often simply "Simon;" in the lists of the apostles it is being added that he was surnamed "Peter." (Mk. 6:30, Mk. 10:21, Lk. 6:14), this addition being necessary to distinguish him from the other apostle called Simon. The designation "Simon Peter" marks a later date than "Simon;" simply; and it is noteworthy that while in Jn. he is described as Σίμων Πέτρος 17 times (see further on 19:26), this double name appears in the Synoptists only at Mt. 16:14 (a passage peculiar to Mt. and later than the Marcan tradition) and at Lk. 5:8.

Jn. states here that Jesus gave Simon the Aramaic name or nickname of Kephas, which became Πέτρος in Greek, when He saw him for the first time, discerning his strong character at a glance. Mk. (1:19) rather suggests (although he does not say expressly) that Simon was given the name of Peter when he was named Peter of the Twelve, much as John and James were called Βαυναργες or "sons of thunder." This is not suggested, however, in the lists of the apostles in Lk. (6:15) and 1:19, 20.

1 Cf. Introd. p. xxixiv.
2 See a full note on "The Names of St. Peter" in Hort, 1 Peter, p. 152.
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN [I. 48-45.

48. Τῇ ἐκδήλωσι ἡβλέπειν ἡβλέπειν εἰς τὴν Γαλαλείαν, καὶ ἐφησεν Φιλίππος. καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Ἀκολούθει μοι. 44. ἤν

Mt. (τε); Mt. has Σίμων ὁ Ἀρείων Πέτρος). It is obviously appropriate that Mt. should call the apostle [Simon Peter] (16th) when relating his great confession, and that Jesus, addressing him on that occasion as [Simon, son of John], should have reminded him of the name Κεφαλή: οὔ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς πέρας αὐτοῦ ἀκολούθει μοι τὴν ἑκάστην. Τοῦτο may have ante-dated the giving of the new and significant name, but there is no proof of this.

To give a new name in the O.T. history sometimes marked the beginning of a new relation to God; e.g. Jacob was called Israel (Gen. 32:28), and Abram became Abraham (Gen. 17:5), after a spiritual crisis (cf. also Isa. 62:5 65:19). When adult converts from heathenism are baptized, they are given a new name for a similar reason. But there is no evidence that it is in Jn.'s mind to suggest this when he recalls that Jesus called Simon, Καφασ, "the rock man," although such an inference might be drawn from Mt. 16:18, if it stood alone. Jn.'s narrative here is quite simple, and there is no subtlety in the telling. See, however, on δό.

The Aramaic name Καφασ (perhaps the same as Καφαράς) is familiar in Paul, who uses it to designate Simon always in 1 Cor. (10:23 16:19) and generally in Gal. (2:1 2:11, 14; but cf. 2:6). It appears in no other Gospel but Jn., and the retention of the Aramaic δός is a touch that could hardly have occurred to any one whose mother speech was not Aramaic (see on vv. 38, 41, and cf. p. Ixxii). By the end of the first century Simon was best known as Πέτρος, and he has been generally called by this name ever since.

The call of Philip and Nathanael (vv. 43-51)

48. τῇ ἐκδήλωσι, i.e. on Day v. of this eventful week (see on v. 9), Jesus resolved to go forth into Galilee; for ἡβλέπειν εἰς τὴν Γαλαλείαν cf. 4:19, and note that Jesus is now on the E. side of Jordan. Either as He was starting, or on the way, He found Philip, who was a Galilaean like Andrew and Peter, and who was probably brought into touch with Him by their means.

The rec. text adds ὁ Ἰωάννης after ἡβλέπειν, omitting the name after Ἰωάννης, but the better reading (καθὼς ἡβλέπειν) omits it after ἡβλέπειν and inserts it after Ἰωάννης.

Thus, we might suppose from the order of the words that

1 See Moffatt, Intro., p. 524.

I. 48-45.] THE CALL OF PHILIP AND NATHANAEL 61

αὐτῷ ὁ Φιλίππος ἐν Βεθσαίᾳ, ἐν τῇ πόλει τούτῳ Ἀνδρέα καὶ Πέτρου.
45. Ἐφραΐμος Φιλίππος τὸν Ναθαναήλ καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Ἀκολούθει μοι. 44. ἤν

the subject of ἡβλέπειν and ἐφραίμως is not δ Ἰωάννης, but Πέτρος, who has been mentioned immediately before. Then we should have the attractive sequence: Andrew finds Peter, Peter finds Philip, Philip (in his turn) finds Nathanael (v. 45), all being fellow-Galileans and friends. But if Πέτρος is the subject of ἐφραίμως, it must also be the subject of ἡβλέπειν.

44. Philip is said to be ἐν Βεθσαίᾳ, i.e. from Bethsaida, Julias, at the N.E. end of the Lake of Galilee (see on 6:14 12:21). Bethsaida had been rebuilt by Philip, tetrarch of Ituraea (Lk. 3:1), as Josephus records (Ant. xviii. 2. 1); and it is possible that the apostle Philip was named after the ruler of the district.

After Βεθσαίᾳ, Jn. adds ἐν τῇ πόλει τούτῳ Ἀνναρίου καὶ Πέτρου. The house of Andrew and Peter was not at Bethsaida, but at Capernaum (Mk. 1:21 29), a town which Jn. mentions, 2:12 4:36 5:11 21:31, and of which he knew the situation precisely. The discrepancy is unimportant.

Attempts have been made to distinguish in Jn. between ἄνδρος, as indicating habitation, and ἔρχομαι, birthplace (see Abbott, Dial. 2a39). If this could be sustained, we might say that Philip was a native of Capernaum, whose home was at Bethsaida. But it appears from 5:28 6:41 5:40, that ἄνδρος and ἔρχομαι are used almost interchangeably, as they were beginning to be in Greek authors generally. Cf. Ps. 140:1,

ἐκεῖνος μὲν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ποιηθεὶς ἄνδρος ἀνθρώπων μὲν, where no distinction can be traced. Moulton-Milligan, s.v. ἔρχομαι, quote from papyri the phrase ἐν τῇ πόλει τούτῳ τῶν ἐκκλησιάσεων (not necessarily the nates of a village. See further on 11:13).

ἀκολούθει μοι. This probably means no more, in this context, than that Jesus asked for Philip's company on the journey into Galilee. The same call was afterwards addressed to others with a more exacting meaning (cf. Mk. 2:14, Mt. 8:19, and especially Jn. 21:19).

It has been suggested that Philip is to be identified with the disciple who wished to bury his father before he obeyed the call to follow (Mk. 9:3), but this is mere conjecture.

45. Nathanael is a Hebrew name, נאתנאל, meaning "God has given," the equivalent of the Greek Θεόδωρος. He was of Cana of Galilee (2:1), and it was perhaps there that Philip found him, as Cana is the next place mentioned (2:2).
I. 46-48. THE CALL OF PHILIP AND NATHANNAEL.

Nathanael has been identified, e.g. by Renan and Zahn, with Bartholomew, because (1) in the Synoptic lists of the apostles, Philip is associated with Bartholomew as he is here with Nathaniel, and (2) while the name Nathanael does not occur in the Synoptists, Bartholomew (which is only a patronymic, Bar Tholomai) is not found in Jn.

This group of disciples are represented as students of the O.T. As Andrew says, "We have found the Messiah" (v. 41), so Philip says, "We have found Him of whom Moses and the prophets wrote." This is what was explained to the disciples at Emmaus (Lk. 24:25). The reference to "Moses" includes all at any rate Deut. 18:16.

The Person in whom these prophecies were fulfilled is described by Philip as "Jesus, a son of Joseph (not the son, τῶν τῶν of the rec. text being erroneous), the man from Nazareth." It is certain that the author of the Fourth Gospel did not regard Jesus as a "son of Joseph"; for him Jesus was οἱ οὐκ οἱ οὐκ (v. 55). But he does not stay to explain that Philip's confession fell short of the truth, just as he does not comment on the query, "Is this not Jesus the son of Joseph?" (51a) Jn. is sure that his readers are of one mind with himself as to the Divinity of Jesus, and that they will not misunderstand this characteristic of Jn.'s style has been called "the irony of St. John," and it appears several times. (Cf. 6:24, 7:38, 10:19.)

τὸν ἄνω Ναζαρηνόν. "The man from Nazareth" (so Acts 10:19) was the natural designation of Jesus by those who only knew where He lived (see on v. 16). "Jesus of Nazareth" is still a descriptive phrase on the lips of many who are assured that He was θεός καὶ θάνατος (v. 15).

46. Nathanael's rejoinder has been taken by some to be a meditative comment on what Philip has said rather than a question, viz. "Some good might come out of Nazareth." But the order of the words is in favour of it being taken interrogatively, "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" Nazareth is not mentioned in the O.T., so that there was nothing to connect the place with the prophecies of Messiah. See on 2:1.

But Nathanael's question has something of scorn in it, as if Nazareth had a bad name; however, of this there is no evidence. Nathanael was of Canaan, and the rivalry between neighbouring villages might account for his expression of incredulity as to Nazareth being a prophet's home. That he does not seem to have heard of Jesus before shows how retired His life had been before He began His public ministry.

47. There is no suggestion that Jesus overheard Nathanael's incredulous query. He speaks from His previous knowledge of the man (v. 48).

I6. See on v. 29.

δύναται Ἰσαακαζώντος αὐτῶν ἑαυτῶν οἷς ἦσαν. Isaac complained of Jacob's guile (δόλος, Gen. 27:35); but that was before he received the new name of Israel and had a vision of heavenly things. The Psalmist hails as blessed the man "in whose spirit there is no guile" (Ps. 32); and of the ideal Servant of Yahweh it was declared, "neither was any guile found in his mouth" (Isa. 59:19). Thus he who is truly an Israelite (cf. Rom. 9:33), representing Israel at its best, must be without guile, and such a man Nathanael was declared by Jesus to be.

Jn. has ἐνδιώκει again, 4:16, 7:20, 8:3, 1:25.

48. μήδεν με γνῶσις; "Whence do you know me?"

Nathanael had heard the remark of Jesus, and expresses wonder that He should have known anything about him. γνῶσις is a favourite word with Jn., occurring about twice as frequently as it does in the Synoptists, which is all the more remarkable as Jn. never uses the noun γνώσις (Lk. 12:22, and often in Paul). For the supposed distinction between εἰδον and γνῶσις, see on v. 26; cf. 24.

ἀπεκρ. ἦν. Μὴ ἤπειρο διὰ τῆς Ἰσαακαζώντος, but om., ABVFG; see on vv. 29, 50.

πρὸ τοῦ δὲ Φίλιππου ἀφορμῆσαι. φορμή is the word used in Jn. for calling any one by his personal name or usual title, cf. 10:21, 13:17, 13:12, 18.

καὶ τὴν συνήθειαν ἔδωκεν. "I saw thee under the fig tree." Εἶδον is not found with the acc. elsewhere in Jn. (see on ἔδωκεν in v. 50). Perhaps it indicates here that Nathanael had withdrawn to the shelter of the fig tree, under which Jesus had seen him.

καὶ τὸν συνήθη. The fig tree is a very familiar object in Palestine, where it was specially valued for the grateful shade of its leaves. National tranquillity is often pictured by the image of every man sitting "under his vine and under his fig tree" (1 Kings 4:23, Mic. 4:4, 1 Macc. 14:18). When Jesus says to Nathanael, "When thou wast under the fig tree," i.e. probably the first three nights of His own house, He alludes to some incident of which the evangelist gives no explanation. What-
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εἶναι σο. 49. ἀνεκρέθη αὐτῷ Ναζανάζ Ἡραβαίας. Ὅρρων χαί, σο ἐν τινώ τοῦ Θεοῦ, σο Ἑβασσλεόν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ. 50. ἀνεκρέθη Ἱσραήλ καὶ ἔτην ever it was, the fact that Jesus should have known it impressed Nathanael so much that he broke out into the confession, "Thou art the Son of God, Thou art the King of Israel." The power which Jesus had of reading the secrets of men's hearts is alluded to again in v. 45.

This episode has been compared with the story of the prolonged meditation of Gaucoma under the Bodhi tree, where he attained Buddha-hood, and thenceforward began to gather disciples. But there is no real parallel. It was not Jesus, but His disciple Nathanael, who meditated under the fig tree, nor is there any hint (as in the Buddha legend) that Jesus received "enlightenment" thus.

Cheyne gets rid of the fig tree by the supposition that there has been a misreading of the Aramaic original, the words μήν καίρω "when thou wast making supplication," being mistaken for μήν καίρῳ "when thou wast under the fig tree." This is not convincing.

Other fanciful hypotheses about Nathanael are that the incident indicated here is another version of the story of Zacchæus in the sycamore tree (Abbott, Dial. 3375 f.); or that in him we are to see a figure symbolical of Paul, an Israelite who broke through the prejudices of his early training (sufficiently answered by Moffatt, Introd. to N.T., p. 366); or that we are to equate him with the Beloved Disciple (cf. Introd., p. xxxvii.). But the simplest interpretation is the best. Nathanael was a real figure, and his call was vivid in the mind of the aged disciple whose recollections are behind the Fourth Gospel.

49. Ἡραβαίας. See on v. 38.

Σο δὲ δὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ. Cf. Peter's σο δὶ δὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ (69), and Martha's σο δὶ δὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ (1127), and see below on v. 51. Nathanael sees in Jesus One who has displayed a wonderful knowledge of his past life (cf. 48 f., 29); and so he identifies Him with the expected Messiah. For the title δὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, see on v. 34 above.

Σο Βασσλεόν ἐν τῷ Ἱσραήλ. This, to us, is a lesser title than δὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, but not so to Nathanael; see on 148. Nathanael has been hailed by Jesus as an "Israelite," a worthy and representative son of Israel, and he replies out of the fulness of his heart, "Thou art the King of Israel," and therefore Nathanael's King. Both Messianic titles, "Son of God," and "King of Israel," have their roots in Ps. 2.

1 By Seybold. See D.C.G., ii. 288.
2 E.S., i.e. Nathanael.

I. 50.] THE CALL OF PHILIP AND NATHANAEL 55

αὐτῷ ὅ τι ἔτην τοῦ Θεοῦ εὐκατάγεται, παντεχείρια, μᾶλλον τοῦτοι δῆροι. 51. καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ Ἰσραήλ Αμών λέγεις Ἰμών, δεικνύει 50. ἀνεκρέθη Ἰωάννης. In the Synoptists (except at Mk. 9°) the formula is δἰ ἀνεκρέθης ἔτην, but in Jn. the almost invariable use is "answered and said," two co-ordinate verbs being used (see on v. 26). In the LXX both constructions are found.

Burney (Aramaic Origin, etc., p. 53) claims ἀνεκρέθη Ἰωάννης as a literal rendering of an Aramaic original, as it is in Theodotion's Daniel. The constr., however, is common in the LXX, where the original is Hebrew (not Aramaic), e.g. 1 Sam. 16. 22; 2 Chron. 25. 34, 36; Joel 2. 9 (of Yahweh). A more plausible argument for an Aramaic original of Jn. is found by Burney in the large number of axyndelem sentences. This is a specially Aramaic (not a Hebrew) characteristic. If, however, the narrative parts of the Gospel were dictated (as we hold to be probable) by one to whom Aramaic was his native language, we should expect to find them reproduced sometimes in Greek with an Aramaic flavour.

Ἰωάννης often—perhaps generally—takes the def. art. in Jn. (see on v. 29); but the phrase ἀνεκρέθη Ἰωάννης is common, e.g. 48. 51, 20; 64. 31; 18. 26; 20. etc.

δὲ ἔτην σοι ἦν Ἑβασσλεόν. The second δὲ introduces the words actually said. The first δὲ is "because," a favourite use with Jn., and is here employed suspensive at the beginning of the sentence, as again at 148 18, 156 20 (and also in the Apocalypse; cf. Abbott, Dial. 2176).

ἀπεκαθέω is not found again in Jn.; it is more emphatic than ἔσοι of v. 48, and perhaps indicates concealment "under the cover of the fig tree." But the variation ἔσοι τῷ οἴκῳ . . . ἄνωθεν τῆς αὐχείας is thoroughly Johannine; when repeating a phrase, Jn. is apt to alter it slightly, either by a change in the order of the words, or by using a different word.

μάλλον τοῦτοι δῆροι. Perhaps there is an allusion here to the designation of Nathanael as ἄγιος Ἰσραήλαυνίος (v. 47). Jacob, to whom the name of "Israel" was given, was pre-eminently a man of vision. The ancient (although erroneous) interpretation of his new name equated it with βαζελαύνιος. This etymology was adopted by Philo, who, commenting on the story of Jacob at Peniel (Gen. 32), says (de somn., i. 47): "The compels him to wrestle, until He has imparted to him irresistible strength, having changed his ears into eyes, and called this newly modelled type, Israel, i.e. one who sees" (Ἰσραήλ, ἰσαάτος).

Nathanael, who is "an Israelite indeed," must also be a man
of vision, and the vision which is promised him is greater even than that which he has already recognised, viz. that Jesus is "the King of Israel" (v. 49).

51. καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ᾧμί. Despite the singular ἀμὴν, the plural ᾧμί suggests that the words which follow were addressed to others besides Nathanael. When Jesus prefixes a saying addressed to an individual by this solemn introduction, He is represented by Jn. as putting it in the form ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι (3:11, 12, 21, 16). Further, although the promise is in the singular κολοσσῶν ἔρημας, the vision is described as to be seen by more than one. "Nathanael only one of those who are to see [the heaven opened and the angels ascending and descending," etc.

ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ᾧμί. The authority with which Jesus was accustomed to speak has been noted above (Intro., p. cx).

His authoritative manner of speech is indicated sometimes in the Synoptists by the mere addition of λέγω σοι or λέγω ᾧμί, e.g. Mt. 2:12, 11, Lk. 5:9, 20, 10, 15, 16, 18, 18, 19, etc., Mt. 5:4, 16, 18, 22, 25, etc. This is often found in the expanded form ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ᾧμί (30 times in Mt., 23 in Mk., and 6 in Lk, who also translates it by καί, ἀμὴν ἀμὴν ἀν καὶ ἄλλοις). Jn. always gives it in the form ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ᾧμί (25 times; cf. 4:12, 14, 46 for λέγω ᾧμί simply). In Jn. the formula is usually associated with sayings not given by the Synoptists; but cf. 3:16, 18. It is clear from the Gospels that this was a characteristic usus logendi of the Lord (Himself the Amen, Rev. 4:8; cf. Isa. 64:1), who never restored His sayings on the authority of others, as the Rabbinical habit was, but spoke as One possessed of the secrets of life.

Why the ἀμὴν is doubled in the Johannean reports cannot be confidently explained. There are instances in the other Gospels of Jesus repeating at the beginning of a sentence the name of the person addressed, for greater emphasis, e.g. Martha, Martha (Lk. 10:41), Simon, Simon (Lk. 22:38), Eloi, Eloi (Mt. 27:50); but this does not provide an exact parallel. It would appear that ἀμὴν was for Him a form of solemn attestation (see also on 4:28); and it may be that the solemnity was emphasised by Him sometimes by doubling the ἀμὴν. He forbade oaths (cf. 4:22), but where people wished to be emphatic He allowed them to say Yes, yea, καὶ καὶ (Mt. 5:25). This is verily, verily.1 See Lk. 7:11, 16, 20, 21 for καὶ as equivalent to ἀμὴν. Hence, in Mt. 7:11 Jesus recommends as a form of solemn affirmation ἀμὴν ἀμὴν, which we find from the report of

---

1 Allen, in Matthew 5th, writes: "The Talmud Sanhed. 36a discusses whether Yes and No are oaths, and decides that they are oaths if repeated twice."
is, in part, a quotation (see, for the patristic interpretations of the passage, Additional N, p. 90 f.). The promise to Nathanael, as an “Israelite indeed” that he (with others) shall see angelic visions, is couched in terms which recall the vision of Jacob, the father of his race, of whom Nathanael is no unworthy descendant. That the vision of Bethel was seen by Jacob before he received the new and pregnant name of Israel does not constitute a difficulty, for we are not concerned with the details of Jacob’s vision. The evangelist’s report does not indicate that he thought of it as fulfilled in Nathanael. The words ascribed to Jesus have to do with Jacob’s vision only in so far as they suggest to Nathanael that he was not the first Israelite to have visions of heaven and the angels.

What is to be the occasion of the vision promised to Nathanael and his companions? The direction in which an answer must be sought is indicated by the use, for the first time, in the Gospel of the strange designation of Jesus as “the Son of Man.” We have already seen (Introd., p. cxxvii) that the title “the Son of Man,” applied by Jesus to Himself, and to Nathanael alone appears in eschatological passages, which have reference to His final and glorious Advent, after which His indestructible kingdom is to be fully established (cf. Dan. 7:13). The vision of this Advent seems to be promised to Nathanael and his believing companions. Nathanael is represented as acknowledging that Jesus is “the Son of God, the King of Israel” (v. 49), i.e. that He is the Messiah as looked for under the aspect of King, the “political” Messiah (see on v. 44) of Israel’s hope. But there was a higher conception than this, a more spiritual picture than that of an earthly prince; and it was to this (as suggested by the words of Dan. 7:13) that Jesus pointed His followers, when He spoke of Himself as the Son of Man. It was a greater thing to see Him as the Son of Man than as the King of Israel. The vision which would be the condemnation of the high priest who pretended to condemn Jesus, viz. δρέπανον τῶν αἵματος καθ’ ευαγγελίαν, cannot be the vision described by the words of Dan. 7:13, for it would be the reward of disciples who faithfully accepted Him as the Messiah.

The parallel to this passage in the Synoptists is the promise which followed upon the confession of Peter and the rest. Peter’s confession, like that of Nathanael, was ὅτι ἐστιν ἐσχάτος, and in making it he was the spokesman of the others. And the promise which follows is the counterpart of the promise to Nathanael, viz.: “The Son of Man shall come in the glory of His Father with His angels. Verily I say unto you. There be some of them that stand here which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the Son of Man coming in His Kingdom” (Mt. 16:28). The parallelism with Jn. 10:16 is remarkable, and the difficulty of explaining both passages (for they are left unexplained by the evangelists) shows that, alike in the Synoptists and in Jn., they embody a genuine reminiscence or tradition. See on 6:19 for Jn.’s version of Peter’s confession.

There is in Jn. a third confession of faith, which should be placed beside that of Nathanael and that of Peter, viz. that of Martha (v. 15), who says καὶ εἶπεν ἡ Μαρτα, καὶ οἶδας ὅτι οὗτος οἶδας ὅτι ἡ χειρὶ τῶν ἀναμενομένων. No reply of Jesus is recorded until we reach v. 40, when He says, with apparent reference to her previous confession, “Said I not unto thee, that if thou believedst, thou shouldest see the glory of God?” That is, again, as in the case of Nathanael, Vision is the reward of Faith: the vision of the Divine glory, as exhibited in the power over death which Jesus had (see on 1:49).

The attempts which have been made to trace a detailed correspondence between what is said about Jacob’s vision at Bethel and the vision promised to Nathanael are quite unsuccessful. Nathanael, it must be borne in mind, is here typified by Jacob or Israel as “the man who sees.” It is, therefore, impossible to take Jacob as the type of Christ or the Son of Man; and this rules out several modern interpretations. E.g., to take (see Meyer) the angels ascending and descending as typical of the continual intercourse between God and Christ, the Father and the Son (see on 5:18), presupposes that Jacob at Bethel typifies Christ, not to mention that the idea of the intercourse between the Father and the Son being carried on by the ministry of angels is quite foreign to the Gospel.

Burney points out that the Hebrew זָכָה, which is rendered at Gen. 28:12 יָבִיאוּ הָאָדָם by the LXX, and by the English versions “on it,” sc. on the ladder, might also be rendered “on him,” sc. on Jacob. He cites a Midrash where this interpretation is proposed, and where it is said of the angels at Bethel that they were ascending on high and looking at Jacob’s sleep (which was in heaven), and then descending and finding his sleeping body. Burney suggests that the heavenly θιάσωμα of Israel was the Son of Man, and that Gen. 28:13 is quoted here by Jn. from the Hebrew, Ζ to being rendered “on Him,” i.e. the heavenly Ideal of Israel. If the heavens were opened, Nathanael would

---

\(1\) Both Justin (Apol. i. 6) and Irenæus (Adv. haer. 10) speak of angels as following and attending the Son. Cf. J. A. Robinson, St. Irenæus and the Apostolic Preaching, pp. 27 ff.

\(2\) Aenmaeis origin., p. 176; cf. for Rabbinical speculations about the angels and Jacob’s ladder, Abbott, Did. 2958 (nib.).
then see the angels of God "ascending and descending upon the Son of Man." But, as we have said, Jn. certainly does not intend Jacob at Bethel to be taken as the type of the Son of Man, and so this interesting interpretation does not help us.

**ADDITIONAL NOTE ON THE PROMISE TO NATHANIEL**

I. 51. No commentator before Augustine suggests any connexion between Gen. 28:12 and Jn. 1.48. When the proneness of the early exegetes to seek O.T. testimonia is remembered, this is remarkable. A few passages may be cited to illustrate the various interpretations that were placed on both texts.

(a) Philo, as one would expect, has much to say about Jacob's vision at Bethel (De somn. i. 28). Between heaven and earth, he says, there is the air, the abode of incorporeal souls, immortal citizens. The purest of the beings who pass to and fro are angels, who report the Father's orders to His children, and their needs to Him. Here (§ 23) is an image of man's soul, of which the foundation, as it were, is earthly (terraea), but the head is heavenly (caelestia). And the ἀγγελος of God moves incessantly up and down, ascending that they may draw the soul heavenwards; condescending that they may impart life from above. This, despite some verbal similarities, has no bearing on the exegesis of Jn. 1.48.

(b) Origen (c. Celsum. vi. 21) recalls the Platonic doctrine, favoured by Celsus, that souls can make their way to and from the earth through the planets, and speaks with approval of Philo's exposition of Gen. 28:12 which has been cited above. He says that Gen. 28:12 either refers to the Platonic view or to "something greater," but he does not explain what this is.

(c) Origen quotes Jn. 1.48 several times. In Hom. in Luc. xxiii. (Lommatsch, v. 178) he quotes it to show that visions of angels are seen only by those to whom special grace is given; and similarly in de Orat. xi (Lommatsch, xvii. 126) he says that the angels ascending and descending are visible only to eyes illuminated by the light of knowledge (φως φῶς). In another place (c. Celsum. i. 48) he interprets the phrase τῶν ὄρων ἔρημος of the opening of the heavens at the Baptism of Christ, forgetting that Jn represents the Baptism as prior to the call of Nathanael. In none of these passages is it suggested that Gen. 28:12 had occurred to him as a parallel.

(d) Tertullian refers twice to Jacob's ladder. Just as some men behave badly in time of persecution, and others well, so in Jacob's dream some mount to higher places, others go down to lower (de Pug. 1). More interesting is his comment in another place (c. Marci. iii. 24): By the vision of Jacob's ladder, with

God standing above, is shown the way to heaven, which some take and others fall from. "This," said Jacob, "is the gate of heaven," and the gate is provided by Christ. Tertullian never mentions Jn. 1.48. It may be added that Cyprian quotes neither Gen. 28:12 nor Jn. 1.48.

(e) Ireneus (Dem. 45) says that Jacob's ladder signifies the Cross, "for thereby they that believe on Him go up to the heavens," adding that "all such visions point to the Son of God, speaking with men and being with men." He does not quote Jn. 1.48 anywhere.

(f) Justin (Tryph. 58, 86) quotes in full the story of Jacob at Bethel. He urges that it was not God the Father who stood above the ladder (Gen. 28:12), but the Angel of His presence; and he finds the type of Christ, not in the ladder, but in the stone which Jacob had used for a pillow, and which he anointed (Gen. 28:19). He does not allude to Jn. 1.48.

(g) Chrysostom (in loc.) regards the ministry of angels in Gethsemane (I. k. 22) and the Resurrection (Jn. 20) as a fulfillment of Jn. 1.48, an inadequate explanation. In an obscure passage (in Col. ii. 6) he refers to Gen. 28:12 as a sign of the Divine Sonship of Christ, but he does not associate it with Jn. 1.48.

(h) Jerome alludes to Jacob's ladder several times (e.g. Epp. 98. 3, 118. 7, 123. 15, and Tract. de Ps. cxix.). It represents, he says, the Christian life, the Lord standing above holding out His hand to help those going up, and casting down the careless. Like Justin, he takes the stone of Jacob as a type of Christ the cornerstone; but he does not quote Jn. 1.48 in this context.

(i) Augustine is the first exegete to find in Jn. 1.48 an allusion to Gen. 28:12. He, too, regards Jacob's stone as a type of Christ; and he suggests that the confession of Nathanael that Jesus is the Son of God is the anointing of the stone by Jacob (Gen. 28:19). The "angels, ascending and descending," typify the preachers of the Gospel. Augustine, however, introduces two ideas not altogether consistent with each other. First the angels "ascend and descend upon the Son of Man," because He is at once above and below, in heaven and on earth. "Filius enim hominis simul in caelesti et in corpore suo, quod est Ecclesia." Secondly, he explains that the Ladder is a type of Christ, who said, "I am the Way"; and it is notable that Augustine is the first Christian writer to suggest this thought (c. Faustin. ii. 4). He refers again to the association between Gen. 28:12 and Jn. 1.48 in de Cio. Dei. xvi. 39, and in Serm. cxi. 3, 45; but he does not elsewhere speak of Jacob's
II. 1. Καί τῷ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ γάμου ἔγνετο ἐν Κανᾶ τῆς Γαλαής, καὶ ἐν οὗ μεγάλη τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἑκάστη. Εἰς τῇ δὲ ἤδην καὶ ἐκ

ladder as typifying Christ. Augustine does not seem to be clear as to the correspondence between the details of Jacob's vision and the promise to Nathanael; and, in fact, the correspondence cannot be set out precisely. But his general idea has left its mark on modern exegesis.

The First Sign: the Marriage at Cana (II. 1-12)

II. 1. Cana of Galilee, to which the narrative now brings us, is named twice again in Jn. (4:15 21), but nowhere else in the N.T. It is mentioned by Josephus (Vita, § 16) κώμη τῆς Γαλαής ἡ προσευχομένη Κανά, and is not to be confounded with another Cana in Caesarea-Poictia. Its exact situation is not certain. The traditional site is Kefr Kenna, 33 miles N.E. of Nazareth; but 'Ein Kana, a little nearer Nazareth, and Khirbet Khaled, 8 miles N. of Nazareth, have also been suggested.

Jesus reached Cana on the third day after the call of Philip and Nathanael (148), when a start was made from the neighbourhood of Bethabara for Galilee. This is a journey that would occupy two days (148), and no incident is recorded of the last day of travel.

It has been pointed out (on 149) that we have in the first section of the Gospel (1:19 to 2:11) a record of six or (more probably) of seven eventful days at the beginning of the public ministry of Jesus. Which of these days was the Sabbath? Most probably it was the day of the call of Andrew and John, who "abode with Him that day" (1:29). There was no travelling, such as there was on the days of the journey from Bethany to Cana. If this be so, we reach an interesting coincidence, for then the day of the Marriage at Cana would be the fourth day of the week; and a Talmudical direction ordained that the marriage of a virgin should be on the fourth day,1 or our Wednesday. Marriage feasts in Palestine were, and are, generally held in the afternoon or evening.

1 μετὰ τοῦ 'Ημ. Never gives her name (cf. 2:16 6:15 15:20), just as he does not mention the name of John the son of Zebedee or that of James his brother. Mary, who had apparently some special interest in the wedding (2:1-4), had come over to Cana

1 See Lightfoot, Hor. Heb., 162.; so too there is an old English rhyme which declares that for weddings Wednesday is the best day of all.

II. 1-2.] THE MARRIAGE AT CANA

from the neighbouring village, Nazareth, or from Capernaum (see 2:11). Perhaps it was the wedding of a relative, which would account for Jesus being invited to attend.

Joseph is not mentioned, and it is probable that he was dead at this time.

1 A Sahidic apocryphal fragment edited by Forbes Robinson, Mary is said to be the sister of the bridgroom's parents. The fragment (which seems to be part of a sermon on the Marriage at Cana) adds that the parents told Mary that the wine was running out, and asked her to use her influence with Jesus, who replied to her "in a kindly voice, Woman, what do you want me to do? " (see on v. 4 below). According to this account, the water-bottles were prepared that the guests might wash before the meal (see on v. 6).

The Monarchian Preface to the Gospel (see Intro., p. viii) begins: "Hic est Iohannes evangeliista unus ex discipulis dei, qui virgo electus a deo est, quem de nuptiis sollemnis nubere vocavit deus, etc." This legend that the bridegroom was John, the son of Zebedee (whose mother Salome was sister of Mary) had much currency in later times. That Jesus had dissuaded John from marriage is told in the second-century Gnostic Acts of John (§ 13).

2. μαθητής. In all the Gospels the followers of Jesus are so described, the title sometimes indicating members of the apostolic Twelve or all of them, sometimes being used in a wider sense. Thus in Mk. 2:16 3:1, Mt. 8:20, Lk. 6:13, Jn. 6:60 8:1 20:30, μαθητής is not restricted to the Twelve.

At first the followers of Jesus were called oi μαθηταί αὐτοῦ, thus distinguishing them from the disciples of other Rabbis (cf. on 1:30); but as time went on they began to be described absolutely as oi μαθηταί, "the disciples" being a Christian phrase which no one would mistake. The earlier description is found in Mk., as is natural, much oftener than the later, and the same habit of phrase is found in Jn. 8.

Thus oi μαθηταί αὐτοῦ stands for the general body of the apostles in 5:23 6:30 8:24 12:26 13:21 14:19 20:22. The phrase is used in a wider sense at 21:7 21:8 21:26, and perhaps 20:29. At 4:37 5:2 it is not clear which or how many of oi μαθηταί αὐτοῦ were present, and the same is true of the present verse.

The later phrase, oi μαθηταί, used absolutely, is only applied once in Jn. to the collected Twelve (1:40), and perhaps 1:49. It often stands for the disciples already mentioned, e.g. 20:12 (two), 21:12 (seven), 20:18 20 (ten). At 4:39 and

1 Coptic Apocryphal Gospels, p. 164.

2 Cf. Turner, J.T.S., April 1923, p. 235.
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II 6-8. THE MARRIAGE AT CANA

The marriage at Cana. At the wedding of Cana the water was changed into wine. This was a sign of the coming of the Kingdom of God. Jesus performed this miracle in order to显示 the power of His name and to begin His public ministry.

In the Gospel according to St. John (1:12), Jesus says, "Behold, the hour has come for the Son of Man to be glorified. If I glorify Myself, My glory is nothing; it is My Father who is glorified in Me, and He will glorify Me on the last day. For it is written, 'I will open My hand once more, and fill the measure of His people,' and He will give them the Manna, and the water of life abundantly. He who believes in Me shall not thirst, but the river of water shall flow from him into an everlasting fountain." (Jn. 7:37-39)
would have been a large over-provision for the needs of the guests at the end of the feast, when they had already consumed what had been provided by the host. In the story of Bel and the Dragon, six firkins, or 50 gallons of wine, offered daily to the idol are regarded as sufficient for 70 priests with their wives and families. A hundred and twenty gallons would be so unnecessarily large a supply that the residue of the twelve baskets left after the Feeding of the Five Thousand (D2) does not furnish any analogy. Here there would have been a prodigality, not indeed inconceivable in the case of One whom the narrator describes as the Agent of creation (19), but without parallel in the record of the other “signs” of Christ.

The difficulty arising from the quantity of wine that would have been left over perhaps affects modern readers more than it would have affected contemporaries. Wine might be abused, and drunkenness was always blameworthy; but the idea that it is wrong to use wine in moderation, like any other gift of God, would have been foreign to primitive Christianity or to Judaism.1 The modern notion that “wine” in the N.T. means unfermented, non-intoxicating wine is without foundation.2 Indeed, it was just because Jesus did not condemn the use of wine that He was reproached as a “winebibber” (Mt. 11:19, Lk. 7:34) by those who wished to disparage Him. Unlike John the Baptist, Jesus was not an ascetic.

It must, however, be observed that Jn. does not say explicitly that the entire contents of the water-jars were turned into wine. “The water which had become wine” was that which was served to the ruler of the feast, and Jn. says nothing of any other. Nor is it clear that he means us to understand that the servants had noticed any change in the beverage which they served. They knew that they had taken it from the waterpots (or from one of them); that is all.

To change one pitcher of water into wine is no less “supernatural,” than to change 120 gallons; and we do not escape difficulty by refusing to exaggerate the story as it stands. Jn. certainly implies that some objective change took place in the water served for drinking purposes (cf. 4:9). To reduce the powers of Christ to human standards was no part of his design. It has been thought, indeed, by some that a suggestion made by Jesus that the water had become wine may have wrought so powerfully on the minds of those present that they were convinced that it was even so. The belief of the αὐτοὶ τῶν ἀποκριτῶν that he had been drinking wine, when he had only been drinking

---

1 See Abbott, Dial. 2281-2.
2 Or. L. C. Purser refers me to illustrations of ἱδρία and συκῆ in Darmesteter and Saglio’s Diction. des noms., Figs. 3921-3926, 3935-3239; and to the passages next cited.
3 There is a reference to the Marriage at Cana in a characteristic discussion of drunkenness by Clem. Alex. (Ped. ii. 16. 31).
ADDITIONAL NOTE ON MIRACLE AT CANA

Some exegesis have supposed that this incident foreshadowed (or was intended by the evangelist to indicate) the replacement of the inferior dispensation by the superior, the Law by the Gospel. Such a view of Jn.'s literary method has been discussed in the Introduction (p. lxxxv); but it may be pointed out that the arguments assembled to prove that this particular narrative is an invention of the evangelist, designed to teach spiritual truth in an allegorical way, seem peculiarly weak.

(1) Six, it is said, is a significant number—the perfect number—and so there are 6 waterpots. But there is no number from 1 to 10 which could not be given a mystical interpretation; and the idea that 6 represents the 6 days of creation, which

See further i.e. “Miracles” in D.B. III. 388.
is the best that Origen can do with the waterpots, is not very convincing.

Origen also suggests that the "two or three firkins" in each waterpot of purification intimate that the Jews are purified by the word of Scripture, receiving sometimes "two firkins," i.e. the *psychical* and *spiritual* sense of the Bible, and sometimes "three firkins," i.e. the *psychical*, *spiritual*, and *corporeal* senses. That is, he thinks that on occasion the literal or corporeal sense is not edifying, although it generally is (see Introd., p. lxxxv). But Origen does not say that he abandons the literal or historical sense of Jn. 2:11, and it is probable that he did not mean this, while he found allegorical meanings in some details of the story. In the same way, Gregory of Nyssa is not to be taken as questioning the historicity of the narrative when he says that "the Jewish waterpots which were filled with the water of heresy, He filled with genuine wine, changing its nature by the power of His faith." That an incident can be treated by a commentator in an allegorical manner does not prove that he regards it as un-historical, and still less that the narrator had invented it to serve a spiritual purpose.

For example, there must be few preachers who have not drawn out lessons of a spiritual sort from the incident of the wine that was served at the end of the wedding feast being the best. It is a law of nature, and therefore a law of God, that the best comes last, being that for which all that goes before has prepared. So it is, to take the illustration suggested by the story, in a happy marriage. The best wine of life comes last. The fruits of autumn are richer than the flowers of spring. So perhaps it will be in the next life:

"... the best is yet to be,

The last of life for which the first was made."

Such reflections are legitimate. But there is nothing to show that they were in the mind of the evangelist, or that the story of the Marriage at Cana was invented to teach them.

(2) A modern attempt to explain the story of the Sign at Cana as merely a parable of edification is that of E. A. Abbott. He finds the germ of the story in the account of Melchizedek given by Philo, as bringing forth "wine instead of water" (*Leg. Alleg.* iii. 26); and he explains that "the six waterpots represent the inferior dispensation of the weekdays, i.e. the Law, preparing the way for the perfect dispensation of the Sabbath, i.e. the Gospel, of which the wedding feast at Cana is a type." He adds a Philonic quotation about the number 6 "being composed of 2×3, having the odd as male and the even as female, whence originate those things which are according to the fixed laws of nature... What the number 6 generated, that the number 7 exhibited in full perfection" (*De septem.* 6).

Moffatt favours yet a third Philonic explanation of the number 6, suggesting that the six *εφιάλα* correspond to Philo's principle that six is the "most productive" (*γονουδέν*) of numbers (*decal. 30*).

These are desperate expedients of exegesis, and if Jn. really had any such notions in his mind when he said there were six waterpots prepared for the use of the wedding guests, he wrote more obscurely than is his wont. The truth is that mention of this unusually large number of *αποίκια* is more reasonably to be referred to the observation of an eye-witness, who happened to remember the circumstance, than to elaborate symbolism of the narrative.

(3) The case for treatment of the whole story as due to a misunderstanding of some figurative saying can be put more plausibly. Wendt puts it thus: "It is quite possible that an utterance which the apostle originally made in a figurative sense—Jesus turned the water of legal purification into the wine of marriage joy—was afterwards interpreted by the circle of Johannine disciples as recording an actual conversion of such water of purification into wine for a marriage." This is not to say that Jn. did not mean to narrate the incident as historical; it is to say, on the contrary, that he was mistaken in doing so, and that the story, in all its intimate detail, has been built up from vague hearsay. Quite different is such a theory from that which would regard the narrative as invented in order to teach that the wine of the Gospel, which Jesus provides, is better than the unsatisfying water of the Law; but it has its own difficulties. See Introd., p. clxxiii.

**Interlude at Capernaum (v. 12)**

10. μετά τοῦτο. This phrase does not occur in the Synoptists, but appears 4 times in Jn. (cf. 11:11, 199), and always connotes strict chronological sequence, as distinct from

---

1. De prisc. lv. 1. 12.
2. Hippolytus (*Ref. v. 3*) reports that the Naassenes allegorised the water turned into wine, but he gives no details.
3. *Leg. Alleg.* iii. 26; and he explains that the six...
in v. 37). Their names were James, Joseph, Simon, and Jude (some of the commonest names in Palestine), and they had sisters (Mt. 13:55, Mk. 6:3). James, “the Lord’s brother,” became a believer after the Resurrection of Jesus (Acts 1:14); St. Paul reports that the Risen Lord appeared to him (1 Cor. 15:7); and he was the first bishop of Jerusalem (see Acts 12:15-19). Grandsons of Jude (who probably also confessed Christ afterwards, Acts 1:19-20, 31) were leaders of the Church in the time of Domitian (Eus. H.E. iii. 19, 20, 32).

The ancient problem of the term “brethren of the Lord” cannot be fully discussed here. (1) The theory known as the Hieronymian, because it was started by Jerome, is that they were the nephews of Alpheus, who is identified with Clopas, and Mary, who is regarded as the Virgin’s sister (but see on 19:26 as to both these equations). Thus they were maternal cousins of Jesus, and were loosely called His “brethren.” This would involve the identification of “James the Lord’s brother” with James the son of Alpheus, who was one of the Twelve. But the Lord’s brethren remained incredulous throughout His public ministry, and could not therefore have been numbered among the Twelve (see on 7:3). That James the Lord’s brother is called an “apostle” at Gal. 1:19 is nothing to the point, for the circle of “apostles” was much larger than the circle of the Twelve. Further, despite the vague use of ἀδελφός in a few passages in the LXX, where a cousin is addressed or indicated (cf. 2 Sam. 20, 1 Chron. 25:1-25, Tobit 7:4), we cannot equate ἀδελφος and ἀδελφός or give any reason for the evangelists’ use of the word “brethren” when “cousins” would have been more literally exact. (2) The Helvidian theory, against which Jerome’s polemic was directed, is that these “brethren” were sons of Joseph and Mary, born later than Jesus, and appeal is made by its advocates to the phrasing of Mt. 12:43-45 as indicating that Mary did not remain a virgin. But it is difficult to understand how the doctrine of the Virginity of Mary could have grown up early in the second century if her four acknowledged sons were prominent Christians, and one of them bishop of Jerusalem. (3) The most probable, as it is the most ancient, view is that expounded by Epiphanius, viz. that the “brethren of the Lord” were sons of Joseph by a former wife. Thus they were really the stepsons of Mary, and might naturally be called the “brothers” of Jesus; the fact, too, that Mary shared their home would be accounted for. Hegesippus (K. 129; cf. Eus. Z.E. iii. 12, iv. 21) stated that Clopas (Jn. 19:25) was a brother of Joseph, a view which Epiphanius adopted.

It thus appears that we have to distinguish three groups of persons bearing the same names, viz.
i. James the son of Zebedee, James the son of Alphaeus; Simon Peter, Simon Zelotes; Judas the son of another James, also called Thaddaeus, and Judas Iscariot, were all of the Twelve (Mt. 10:23, Mk. 3:18, Lk. 6:14).

ii. James called the Just, the first bishop of Jerusalem, Simon, Judas, and Joseph, the Lord's brethren, were sons of Joseph by his first wife (Mk. 6:3, Mt. 13:55).

iii. James the Little (βαρβάτος), of whom we know nothing more, and Joses were sons of Clopas and another Mary (Mk. 15:40, Mt. 27:55; see on Jn. 19:25). They had another brother, Symeon, who was second bishop of Jerusalem, and was appointed to that office, according to Hegesippus, because he was the Lord's "cousin" (Eus. H.E. iii. 11, iv. 22). This phrase is used because Clopas was brother of Joseph, the foster father of Jesus.

Hence it would seem that James, Joses, and Symeon in Group iii. were first cousins of James, Joseph, Simon, and Judas in Group ii.

The Cleansing of the Temple (vv. 13-22)

13 sq. This incident is placed in the traditional text of Jn. at the beginning of the ministry of Jesus (2:13-22), while the Synoptists place it at the end (Mk. 11:15-17, Mt. 21:12-19, Lk. 19:45-48). Before examining this discrepancy, we must review the differences between the Synoptic and Johannine narratives, and also come to some conclusion as to the significance of the action of Jesus on this occasion.

The Synoptic tradition is based on Mk.; Mt. and Lk. having no details that are not in Mk., and omitting some of his. It is convenient, then, to begin by comparing Jn. with Mk.; and it appears at once that Jn. (as often elsewhere) knows Mk.'s narrative, which he amplifies and alters in some details.

Both evangelists tell of the upsetting of the tables of the moneychangers. Jn. omits, as do Mt. and Lk., a point preserved by Mk., viz. that Jesus forbade the carrying of goods or implements through the Temple courts, a practice probably due to the desire to make a short cut between the city and the Mount of Olives (Mk. 11:13). Jn. alone states that sheep and oxen were being sold in the precincts (τὰ λεπόν), the sale of pigeons only being mentioned by Mk. Jn. adds that Jesus used a whip to drive out the beasts, while he ordered their owners to take the pigeons away, with the rebuke, "Make not my Father's house a house of business." The rebuke in Mk. is different, being made up of quotations from Isa. 56:7 and Jer. 7:11, "My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the nations, but you have made it a den of thieves." That is to say, Mk. represents Jesus as denouncing the dishonesty of the traffic which was carried on within the Temple precincts; while from Jn. it would seem as if the traffic itself, apart from its honesty or dishonesty, were condemned. The Scripture which the burning zeal of Jesus recalls to Jn. is Ps. 69:9; and he notes that the Jews asked for a sign of His authority, to which Jesus replied by saying, "Destroy this temple, and I will raise it up in three days"—enigmatic words which (according to Jn.) the Jews misinterpreted. None of this is in Mk., who adds, however, that the chief priests and scribes began to seek the death of Jesus, fearing Him and being alarmed at the effect of His words upon the people.

What was the meaning of the action of Jesus in "cleansing" the Temple? It does not seem to have been suggested by any special incident. According to all the accounts, it was quite spontaneous.

Perhaps the best answer is that the action of Jesus was a protest against the whole sacrificial system of the Temple. The killing of beasts, which was a continual feature of Jewish worship, was a disgusting and useless practice. The court of slaughter must have been like a shambles, especially at Passover time. And Jesus, by His bold action, directed public attention not only to the impropriety of buying and selling cattle in the sacred precincts, with the accompanying roguery which made the Temple a den of thieves, but also to the futility of animal sacrifices. He had declared Himself against Jewish Sabbatarianism. He now attacks the Temple system. This it was which set the temple officials against Him. The cry, "Thou that destroyest the temple," disclosed the cause of their bitter enmity.

There is, indeed, no hint that Jesus interfered directly with the work of the priests. He quoted a prophetic passage (Hos. 6:6) which deprecated the offering of animal victims (Mt. 11:27), but not on this occasion. Nor is He said to have prevented any animal from being led to sacrifice. What He interfered with was a market, not held in the court where the altars were, but in the outer Court of the Gentiles. Yet some

1 For full treatment of this problem, see especially Lightfoot, Galatians, pp. 252-291; J. B. Mayor, Ep. of St. James, introd., c. i; and C. Harris, D.C.G., s.v. "Brethren of the Lord." Dom Chapman defends the Hieronymian view in J.T.S., April 1905.

2 Cf. introd., p. xevii.
such market was necessary, if animal sacrifices were to go on. It was inevitable that oxen and sheep and pigeons should be available for purchase, in or near the precincts of the Temple, by the pilgrims who came up to worship at the great feasts, and particularly at the Passover. If this practice were stopped, the whole system of sacrificial worship would disappear. It may therefore have been the purpose of Jesus, by His action of “cleansing the Temple,” to aim a blow at the Temple system in general (cf. 4:18). But if so, it was not immediately perceived to be His purpose by His own disciples, who continued to attend the Temple worship after His Passion and Resurrection (Acts 2:46; cf. 6:7).

Whether this be the true explanation of the drastic action of Jesus, or whether we should attach a lesser significance to it by supposing that His purpose was merely to rebuke those who profaned the Temple courts by chaffering and bargaining, it is not possible to decide with certainty. We pass on to consider whether it is more probable that the incident occurred at the beginning or at the end of His ministry. Mk. (followed by Mt. and Lk.) places it at the end; Jn. seems to place it at the beginning. Which is more likely?

It is true that Mk. only tells of one visit of Jesus to Jerusalem; and so, if he mentioned the Cleansing of the Temple at all, he had to put it at the end of the ministry. Nor is the Marcan dating of events in the last week always to be accepted as accurate. As to the date of the Day of the Crucifixion, e.g., Jn. is to be preferred to Mk. (see Intro. p. cv). So that it is not to be taken for granted that, in a matter of this sort, Mk. must be right and Jn. wrong. But if we reflect how deep must have been the indignation aroused by such an act as that recorded in Jn. 2:13, how the vested interests of the cattle-dealers must have been affected by it, how little disposed men are to yield to opposition which will bring them financial loss, we shall find it hard to believe that Jesus was a comparatively unknown person in Jerusalem when He “cleansed” the Temple. The one moment at which such an action could have been carried through without instant retaliation was, apparently, the moment after His triumphal entry, when even the Pharisees began to despair of diverting the crowds from following Him (12:15). On psychological grounds, the incident is hardly credible, if it is to be put at the beginning of the ministry of Jesus. At that time the Temple officials would have made short work of any one who attempted to stop the business of the Temple courts by violence.

Our conclusion accordingly is that there is some mistake (which cannot now be explained) in that account of the Cleansing of the Temple which places it immediately after the miracle of Cana, as the traditional text of Jn. places it. Some expositors have postulated two cleansings, one at the beginning, the other at the close of Jesus’ ministry; but, apart from the fact that this duplication of similar incidents is improbable, we find it difficult to suppose that this particular incident, or anything like it, could have happened at so early a stage in the ministry of Jesus as is suggested by the traditional order of the chapters in the Fourth Gospel.

13. ἦν ἡ ἱεροπαράστασις τῶν Ἰουδαίων, καὶ ἀνέβη ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐκ του Τιμώτατος. τοῦ ἱεροπαράστασις. Jn. is accustomed to describe the Passover festivals which he mentions as “of the Jews” (cf. 2:11; 11:54), and he speaks in the same way of the Feast of Tabernacles (7). The Synoptists never speak thus. Westcott suggested that the qualifying phrase “of the Jews” implies the existence at the time of writing of a recognised Christian Passover, from which Jn. wishes to distinguish those which he records. But this explanation will not cover the language of 7, for there was no Christian Feast of Tabernacles. It is simpler to say that Jn. is writing for Greek readers, and that the qualifying clause is explanatory for them (cf. v. 6 and 19). Paul was proud of being a Jew, but he speaks nevertheless of “Josephus” (Gal. 1:16) as something quite foreign to his present religious convictions; and so there is nothing in the addition “of the Jews” inconsistent with the nationality of John the son of Zebedee, even if we were to suppose that he wrote these words with his own hand, at the end of a long Christian life, lived for the most part out of Palestine, during which he had dissociated himself from his Jewish past.

ἀνέβη ἐστὶ Χριστιανός. ἰεροπαράστασις is the verb regularly used of “going up” to Jerusalem for the feasts (1:41; 2:12; 12:15). In this context it does not connote the idea of ascending from lower to higher ground (as in v. 12), but of journeying to the metropolis.

14. 15. The ἱεροτεύμων, or sacred precinct, must be distinguished from the ναός, or Temple itself. Here, the ἱεροτεύμων is the Outer Court, or Court of the Gentiles, where the animals needed for sacrifice or offering were brought. To those coming from a

1 See Intro., p. xxx.
2 See Drummond (Character and Authorship, etc., p. 61) and Cadoux (J.T.S., July 1919).
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πρόβατα καὶ περιτεμαία καὶ τοὺς κηρυκτικὰς καθημέρους, 15. καὶ ποιηθήκει φαγέτται ἐν σχοινίων πάντας ἐξήθησαν ἐν τῷ λόφῳ, τὰ τέκνα τῶν προβάτων καὶ τῶν βεβαίων, καὶ τῶν κολλυβιστῶν ἔζεξαν τὰ κήρυκτα καὶ τὰ τραπέζας ἀντίθεν, 16. καὶ τὰς τέκνας περιτεμαίας παλαισθεὶς
distance, as well as to Jews of Jerusalem, it was a convenience to be able to buy on the spot the oxen or sheep or pigeons (Lev. 5: 10, 17, etc.) that were required for sacrifice or for offerings of purification. So, too, the trade of the money-changers was necessary one, because Roman money could not be paid into the Temple treasury. The capitation tax or “atoning money” of half a shekel (see Ex. 30: 12, Neh. 12: 36, Mt. 22: 21) had to be tendered in the orthodox coinage.

κῆρυς signifies a small coin, and hence we have κηρυκτικὰς, “a moneychanger.” So too, κολλυβιστής, κολλυβιστῆς, with like meanings (v. 15). Lightfoot quotes a Talmudic rule: “It is necessary that everyone should have a half a shekel to pay for himself. Therefore, when he comes to the exchange to change a shekel for two half-shekels he is obliged to allow him some gain, which is called πόρος or κολλυβισμὸς.” That is, the κολλυβισις was the discount charged by the moneychanger for exchanging a shekel into two half-shekels.

For τὰ κήρυκτα (BLTBW 33, with Papi. Oxy. 847) the rec. has τὰ κῆρυκα with ΣΑΝΑΘ, apparently treating it as a collective noun: “He poured out the coin (pecuniae) of the moneychangers.”

For αὐτοῖς (BW30, with Papi. Oxy. 847) the rec. has αὐτοῖς with ΑΛΝΔΑΘ, apparently treating it as a collective noun: “He paid out the coin (pecuniae) of the moneychangers.”

αὐτοῖς is not used in the N.T. in the sense of “setting up”; for αὐτοῖς, cf. 2 Tim. 5:18.

ταπάρεια is classical for a moneychanger’s table, and we have τὴν ταπάρειαν ἀνατρέπειν “to upset the table” in Demosthenes (403: 7). For the redundant ἄσβαλλεν ἐκ, see on 6:7.

σχοινίων means a “bunch of rushes,” while σχοινία is a “cord,” and some have thought that the scourge or whip used by Jesus was made from the rushes used for bedding for the cattle. It may have been so, but παρατέλων ἐν σχοινίων is adequately translated by “a whip of small cords.” The whip is not mentioned by the Synoptists, and the detail is suggestive of the recollections of an eye-witness.

πῶς ἐξῆθος... τὰ τέκνα τοῦ πατρός καὶ τῶν βασιλέων. It would seem that the whip was used on the owners of the cattle as well as on the sheep and oxen. πῶς ἐξῆθος in the Synoptist accounts (Mt. 21:12; cf. Mk. 11:19, Lk. 19:2)

II. 15-17.] THE CLEANSING OF THE TEMPLE 91

ἀπερ’ Ἀρατη τῶν ἀνεμένων κυνήγεων, μὴ τοιοῦτον τὸν αὐτόν τοῦ Πατρός μου ὁ Ὀλοκλήρων. 17. ἐμπρόσθησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ δι’ ἑκατομμυρίων λατρευτῶν, καὶ ἐκπεφέρεσαν ὑπὸ τοῦ τούτου ἀνίσταντας. 18. οὐδὲν ἔδωκαν ἀπὸ τῶν ὁσίων ἡμῶν ἔκτοτε ἑκατομμυρίων λατρευτῶν. 19. ἐμπρόσθησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ δι’ ἑκατομμυρίων λατρευτῶν. certainly applies to the men; the Synoptists do not mention the driving out of the cattle.

Jerome (in Mt. 21:16) says that the cattle-dealers did not resist Jesus: “a certain fiery and starry light shone from His eyes and the majesty of Godhead gleamed in His face.”

The doves or pigeons could not be driven out as the cattle were; but the order to those who sold them is peremptory: δοῦτο τὸν ἀνακτόν, “take them hence.” For the aor. imper. ἀπαίτε, see on v. 5.

The reason given for this action is different from that given by the Synoptists. They represent Jesus as indignant at the dishonesty of the traffic pursued in the Temple: “Ye have made it a den of thieves.” According to Jn., Jesus seems to object to the traffic in itself, honest or dishonest, as secular business that ought not to be transacted in a sacred place: “Make not my Father’s house a house of merchandise” (but see above, at p. 87). The remarkable phrase “my Father”—not “our Father”—is not found in Mk., but it occurs 4 times in Lk., 16 times in Mt., and 27 times in Jn. We have thus the authority of Mt. and Lk., as well as that of Jn., for regarding it as a phrase which Jesus used habitually. It indicates a peculiar relationship between Him and God, the Father of all, which is not shared by the sons of men (cf. Jn. 20: 17).

ὁ Θεός τοῦ Πατρός μου is the earthly Temple. So the Lord is represented by Lk. (23: 44) as saying, “Wist ye not that I must be in my Father’s house?” (ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Πατρός μου).

But ὁ Θεός τοῦ Πατρός μου (140), “the Dwelling Place of my Father,” in which are many mansions, is the heavenly temple, the Eternal and Changeless Home of the Eternal.

The Temple is often described in the O.T. as “the house of God,” and Jesus so described it (Mk. 11: 15, Lk. 19: 46). It was to make an unmistakable claim for Himself to substitute for this familiar expression the words “the house of My Father.” Here is an express assertion that He was Messiah, the Son of God, as Nathanael had already perceived Him to be (18). Cf. 31.

17. οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, sc. who were present (see on 2: 5). They saw in the action of Jesus in purifying the Temple courts an illustration of that burning zeal of which the Psalms had sung, and this zeal of thy house hath consumed me’ (Ps. 69: 9). No Psalm is so frequently quoted in the N.T. as this. The rest of v. 9, “The reproaches of them that reproach thee are fallen

1 See James, Apocrypha N.T., p. 8.
priest (Mt. 14:6; Mt. 26:6; cf. Mk. 15:20 Acts 6:4). That by the
words which would be destroyed Jesus was understood to mean
Herod's Temple is certain from the report of the Jews (see on
v. 20). But the precise form of words is uncertain, nor were the
witnesses at the trial agreed about this. According to Mk., the
witnesses falsely reported saying the form in, "I will destroy
this temple made with hands, and in three days (δύο τε χεῖρας
ὁ θεός με) I will build another made without hands"  
(Mk. 14:60). This is softened down by Mt., according to whom the witnesses
alleged that Jesus said, "I can destroy the temple of God and
build it in three days" (Mt. 26:64). According to Jn. in the
present passage, Jesus only said that if the Jews destroyed
the Temple, in three days He would raise it up. It is a question
whether any of these reports precisely reproduces the words of
Jesus at the Cleansing of the Temple. On another occasion
He is reported by the Synoptists (Mk. 14:3, Mt. 24, Lk. 21)
to have predicted the downfall of the Temple, and this is un-
doubtedly authentic. But it is not probable that He should have declared that He would rebuild it or raise it up again.

A rebuilding of the Temple would mean the restoration of the old
Jewish system of ritual and sacrifice, and we know that this
was not the purpose of Jesus (see above, pp. 87, 88). He told the
Samaritan woman that He did not accept the principle which she
attributed to Him, that Jerusalem was the special place
where men ought to worship (4:21). The worship of the
future was to be of a spiritual sort, and not to be confined to
any one centre. To the vision of the seer of the Apocalypse,
there was no temple in the New Jerusalem (Rev. 21:22).
That Jesus should have said that He would rebuild the Temple at
Jerusalem if it were destroyed, is not credible. The Temple
was, indeed, the chief obstacle to the acceptance of His gospel
by the Jews.

But the Marcan version of His words, or rather the Marcan
version of the witnesses' report of His words (Mk. 14:60), has no
such improbability. It lays stress on the contrast between
the temple made with hands and the temple made without hands
(cf. Acts 6:4; Heb. 9:21), between the temple built by Herod,
which was the centre of Jewish worship, and the "spiritual
house" of Christian believers, which was to offer up "spiritual
sacrifices" (1 Pet. 2:5; cf. 2 Cor. 6:16). That Jesus foresaw the
passing of the Temple, and its replacement by a less exclusive
and less formal worship is certain, however we try to explain
His precise words.

Next, we observe that it is common to all the reports of this

1 Notwithstanding a suggestion in Ezech xiv. 28 that Messiah was
to reconstruct the Temple (based on Hag. 2:4).
saying of His that He asserted that the replacement of the old
by the new would be "in three days." Salmon suggested1
that Jesus may have had in His thoughts the words of the
prophet about reconstruction after apparent destruction:
"After two days will He revive us: on the third day He will
raise us up, and we shall live before Him." (Hos. 6:3).
The Synoptists, however, tell again and again that Jesus predicted
the Antithesis between the Jewish temple of stone and the
Christian temple of faithful hearts was familiar to the sub-
Apostolic Age. We have it again in Justin (\textit{Tryph.}, 86), who
says that Jesus made His disciples to be "a house of prayer and
worship" (οἶκος ἐκκλησίας καὶ προσκυνήσεως). The idea
probably goes back to sayings of Jesus such as Mk. 14:49
and the present passage, although it is not suggested here that
Barnabas knew the Fourth Gospel.

"In three days I will raise it up." The Agent of the
revival is to be Jesus Himself. This suggests at once that it
was not to His own bodily Resurrection that Jesus referred
here. For by the N.T. writers God the Father is \textit{always}
designated as the Agent of Christ's Resurrection (Acts 2:24; 3:15
Rom. 4:11; Heb. 10:10; 1 Cor. 1:22; 2 Cor. 14; Gal. 1:2;
Eph. 1:3; Phil. 3:20; 1 Pet. 1:3). Jesus is not
represented as raising Himself. Hence we have a confirmation
of the conclusion already reached, that it was not the
Resurrection of the Body of Jesus from the tomb that was in
His thought here, but rather the passing of the old (and material)
temple and the beginning of the new (and spiritual) temple of
Christian believers. See on v. 21, and note the passive ἐγέρθην
at v. 22; but cf. also 10:13.

90. Jn. relates several conversations of Jesus, cast in somewhat
similar form to this. That is, there is first a difficult saying of
His. It is misunderstood and its spiritual significance is not
discovered, until material interpolation being given to it by His
hearers. Then either He Himself, or the evangelist, adds an
explanatory statement. Cf., for instances of this, 3:4; 4:4; 8:16;
9:35. See \textit{Introd.}, p. cxii.

1 εἰς τρεῖς ἡμέρας, "within three days," not "after three
days," the preposition perhaps being significant.1

1 \textit{Human Element in the Gospels}, p. 218.
2 \textit{Tertullian (ad. Judæos 13)} and \textit{Cyprian (Test. ii. 23)} both cite it.
to be satisfactory. Heracleon refers the words to Solomon's Temple, which Origen refutes, but gives no satisfactory explanation of his own. It seems more likely, as has generally been held by modern editors, that Herod's building was the subject of the allusion in this verse.

The Greek word ἐκκίστησιν does not imply that the building was completed, as may be seen from a parallel sentence in Ezra 4:17 (appropriately cited by Alford) describing the building of Ezra's Temple, ἦς τό τε ἐκκίστησιν ὁ Ἰσραήλ ἐπέτειλεν: it only implies that building operations had been in progress for forty-six years. In fact, Herod's Temple was not completed until 64 A.D., in the time of Herod Agrippa.

According to Josephus, Herod the Great began to repair and rebuild the Temple in the eighteenth year of his reign (Ant. XV. xi. 1), i.e. 20–23 B.C. This would give either 27 A.D. or 48 A.D. as the year of the Passover indicated in these verses. The year of the Crucifixion is not certain, but it was probably 29 A.D. or 30 A.D. It is not possible to draw exact chronological inferences from the "forty and six years" of this verse, but the phrase agrees well enough with the probable date, as gathered from other considerations. It is difficult to account for the attribution of so definite a statement of time to the Jewish objectors if it did not embody a reminiscence of fact. As to the fact itself, the Jews must have been well informed.

As at other points in the Gospel (v. 6 21), some critics have supposed that the number mentioned here is to be interpreted in an esoteric fashion, after the methods of Gnosticism. The name Adad has 46 as its numerical equivalent, and thus the bulk reference in "forty-six years" is properly spoken of as the Temple of God in building would be to some contrast between the first and second Adam. It is unnecessary to dwell upon such extravagances. Hardly less fanciful is it to suppose, as Loisy does, that the forty-six years refer to the actual age of Jesus at the time, He being taken for a man forty-nine years old (85), near the end of His ministry.

21. ἠκούσας ὧν ἦν Ἰωάννην καλ., "but He was speaking about the temple of His body." ἠκούσας is emphatic, "but He, on the contrary." See on 19:13.

For Jn.'s habit of commenting on sayings of Jesus, cf. Introd., p. xxxiv. This comment seems to convey that by the

22. οὗτος ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐστιν ἐκ τῆς γραφῆς ὥστε τὴν γένεσιν ἐπείπτεται. Words of Jesus, Jn. 1:22; ἔκ τῆς γραφῆς, ὥστε τὴν γένεσιν ἐπείπτεται. ἔκ τῆς γραφῆς means here "the general tenor of the Scriptures."
23. Τί λέγει μετ' αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα τῇ δύναι ἐν τῇ σκοτεινει ἀναβάσει πρὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον καὶ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐρχεται ἐκ τῶν ὀμοιών αὐτοῦ, διότι τῷ γεγονός ἡ μυστήρια αὐτῶν ἀναλύει. 

Ps. 16:10 was the "proof text" to which the Apostolic age referred.

καὶ τῷ λόγῳ δὲ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦ, "καὶ τὸν λόγον ὁ θεὸς ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ λόγῳ καὶ τῷ χριστίῳ τῷ οὐρανῷ πατρὶ τῷ ὄντω καὶ τῷ ἐναντίω (4:5) εὐθείᾳ διὰ τούτων οὐκ ἦσαν ἡμῖν ἀνόητοι ἢ ἄδικοι (2:28, 23:2, 21:2). Διὰ τοῦτο εἴπεται μετά τοῦ λόγου τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ προφήτου τοῦ θεοῦ, οὐκ ἦσαν ἁμαρτωλοί ἢ ἄδικοι ὑπὸ τούτου οὐκ ἦσαν κατὰ τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς ἡμέρας τοῦ θεοῦ. 

Sojourn at Jerusalem (υ. 23-25)

II. 23-XXI. 1] THE DISCOURSE WITH NICODÉMUS

οὐκ ἔχεις ἀνάλυσιν τῶν ἀκούσας, καὶ διά τοῦ ἀκούσας ἦν τοις μυριάκοις τῶν ἀκούσας, καὶ διὰ τοῦ ἀκούσας τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς ἡμέρας τοῦ θεοῦ. 

θεωρέω is a favourite verb with Ἰησοῦ, occurring 23 times; cf. also Ἰ. 3:9. It only occurs twice in the Apocalypse (11:11, 13), and never in Paul. It may be used either of bodily vision (20:12) or of mental contemplation (12:4 14), but always connotes intelligent attention. The English word which most nearly represents θεωρέω, as used by Ἰησοῦ, is "to notice." Here and 1:2 4 it indicates the notice which the observers took of the "signs" of Ἰησοῦ. See for the difference between θεωρέω and ἀποδιδόμενον in 1:2, and 16:14.

ἀκούει οὖν ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπος, "He was not trusting Himself to them." The kind of faith that is generated by "signs" is not very stable; cf. 4:40 and 4:14, 15.

διὰ τὸ ἀκούει οὖν ἄνθρωπος, "because He knew all men." See 12:48 for other instances of this penetrating insight into men's characters (γνώσις being used in both cases), and 6:14, 13:11 (where θέω is used in the same way; see on 21:2, above). Another illustration of the same faculty of insight is found in 21:28. Cf. Mt. 9:4, Jn. 2:27.

ἀκούεις ἵνα διώκησιν τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς ἡμέρας, "He knew what was in man," διότι ἄνθρωπος ἐγνώκειν τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς ἡμέρας. This, to be sure, is a Divine attribute, and is so represented in the O.T., e.g. Jer. 7:18, where Yahweh is said to "search the heart and try the reins." But it is also, in its measure, a prerogative of human genius, and (with the possible exception of 1:48) it is not clear that Jn. means us to understand that the insight of Ἰησοῦ into men's motives and characters was different in kind from that exhibited by other great masters of mankind.

The Discourse with Nicodemus (III. 1-15)
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XIII. 1. Nicodemus appears three times in the Fourth Gospel (see on 19:19), but is not mentioned by any other evangelist, unless we may equate him with the άρμαθειαν of Jn. 13:28 (see below on v. 3). The attempt to identify him with Joseph of Arimathaea has no plausibility (see on 19:38); and the suggestion that he is a fictitious character invented by Ἰησοῦ to serve a literary purpose is arbitrary and improbable (see Intro. p. lxxiii f.). ἰσσούμοσις is a Greek name borrowed by the Jews, and appears in Josephus (Ant. xiv. iii. 2) as that of an ambassador from Aristobulus to Pompey. In the Talmud (Zewi, 20, 2) mention is made of one Buri, commonly called Nicodemus ben Gorion, and it is possible (but there is no evidence) that he was the Nicodemus of Ἰησοῦ. He lived until the destruction of
III. 1. "He δὲ ἀνήρωσεν ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων, Νικόδημος δὲ ὁ ἀνήρ, ἐξοικονομών τῶν Ἰουδαίων." 2. ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἴδεν καὶ ἤλεγχε καὶ ἤλεγκεν καὶ ἤλεγκεν τὸν Νικόδημον. Jerusalem, which would accord very well with the idea that Jn. has the "young rulers" of Lk. 18:18 in his mind, although in that case γινώσκω of v. 4 must not be taken to indicate that the person in question was really "old" at the time of speaking. All that can be said with certainty of the Nicodemus of the text is that he was a Pharisee, and a member of the Sanhedrin (Jn. 7), and apparently a wealthy man (19). He seems to have been constitutionally cautious and timid (see on 7). Some points in the narrative of 3-12 would suggest that the incident here recorded did not happen (as the traditional text gives it) at the beginning of the ministry of Jesus. First, at v. 2, mention is made of σύμμεια at Jerusalem which had attracted the attention of Nicodemus; but we have already noted on 20 that no σύμμεια in that city has yet been recorded. On the other hand, the "signs" which had been wrought at Jerusalem during the weeks before the end had excited much curiosity. That Nicodemus should have come secretly during the later period would have been natural, for the hostility of the Sanhedrin to Jesus had already been aroused (7); but that there should have been any danger in conversing with the new Teacher in the early days of His ministry does not appear. Again, at v. 14 (where see note), Jesus predicts His Passion; but if this prediction be placed in the early days of His ministry, we are in conflict with the Synoptists, who place the first announcement of His Death after the Confession of Peter. No doubt, Jn. is often in disagreement with the earlier Gospels, but upon a point so significant as this we should expect his record to agree with theirs.

However, there is not sufficient evidence to justify us in transposing the text here; and we leave the story of Nicodemus in its traditional position, although with a suspicion that the original author of the Gospel did not intend it to come so early.

For E. This, 16. Nικόδημος δὲ ὁ ἀνήρ, see on 16. 2. For the rec. τῶν Ἰουδαίων (N), ἈΒCLT Theo. have ἀνήρ. ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἴδεν καὶ ἤλεγχε καὶ ἤλεγκεν τὸν Νικόδημον. This was the feature of the visit of Nicodemus which attracted attention: he came by night. Cf. 7:50 10:42. He was impressed by what he had heard, and he gradually became a disciple; cf. 12:27.

The form into which the conversation is thrown is similar to that in 4:5. There is a mysterious saying of Jesus (3:27),

3 See Intro., p. xxx.

4 See, for a fuller discussion, Intro., p. cxxi.
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ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἴδεν καὶ ἤλεγχε καὶ ἤλεγκεν τὸν Νικόδημον. at which the interlocutor expresses astonishment (II. 411, 10), whereupon the saying is repeated (II. 4:11, 10), but still in a form difficult to understand. That, in both cases, there was an actual conversation is highly probable; but the report, as we have it, cannot in either case be taken to represent the ἐσχήσισια verba. Nothing is said in c. 3 of any one being present at the interview between Jesus and Nicodemus; but, on the other hand, there is nothing to exclude the presence of a disciple, and hence the account of the interview may be based, in part, on his recollections.

Kal Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ἰουδαίων. See on 20. Nicodemus was ready to address Jesus as Ἡρῴδης, because he recognised in Him a divine nature. This was not to recognise Him as Messiah; but Nicodemus and others of his class (note the plural ἐσχήσια, "we all know," as at 9:13 and Mk. 12:31,1) like the blind man of 30, were convinced by the signs which Jesus did that He had come ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ (cf. 15:20). That "signs" are a mark of Divine assistance and favour was a universal belief in the first century; and Jn. repeatedly tells that this aspect of His signs was asserted by Jesus Himself (see on 21 above, and cf. Intro., p. cxxi). The declaration of Nicodemus that no one could do the miracles which Jesus did, εἰπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ὁ θεός μετ' ἀνθρώπων, however foreign to modern habits of thought, expressed the general belief of Judaism. That Jesus went about doing good and healing, ὅταν ὁ θεός ἑκάστῳ ἄνθρωπῳ, is the declaration ascribed to Peter in Acts 10:38. The σύμμεια to which Nicodemus referred were those mentioned 20 as having inspired faith at Jerusalem. See note in loc.

5. For the phrase ἄκηρτος Ἱησοῦς καὶ ἔκρης, see on 20. ἘΚ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ read ἐκ Ἰουδαίων, but LBLT omit ἐκ: see on 10, 20. cf. "Verily, verily," see on 21.

Jesus answers the thought of Nicodemus, rather than his words. Nicodemus was prepared to accept Him as a prophet and a forerunner of the Messianic kingdom; but he misunderstood the true nature of that kingdom. It was a spiritual kingdom, "not of this world," as it is described in the only other place in Jn. where it is mentioned (18:37). It did not come with observation (Lk. 17:20, 21), and no appreciation of signs or miracles would bring a man any nearer the understanding of it. A new faculty of spiritual vision must be acquired before it can be seen. The answer of Jesus is starting.
and decisive: ἀλήθεια (see on 22) λέγω σοι (the saying is of general application, but it is personally addressed to Nicodemus), ἵνα μὴ τις γηνηθῇ ἄνωθεν, ὥσπερ ἐνθέκο μητρὸς αὐτοῦ δεινοτέρων ἄνωθεν καὶ γενηθῇσα. — ἀλήθεια ἢ ἄνωθεν

This saying is the Johannine counterpart of Mk. 10:17 ἀλήθεια λέγω σοι, δε ἵνα μὴ δέχηται τὸν βασιλέα τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς παιδίον, ὥσπερ ἐνθέκο μητρὸς αὐτοῦ (cf. the parallels Mt. 19, Lk. 18). It is to be observed that this saying in Mk. and Lk. comes immediately before the colloquy with the rich young man, whom Lk. describes as a "ruler," and it is not impossible that this "ruler" is to be identified with Nicodemus (see on v. 1). In any case, "the kingdom of God" or "the kingdom of heaven" is a main topic in the teaching of Jesus as reported by the Synoptists; and it is noteworthy that in this passage (the only passage where Jn. reproduces the phrase in full) the saying which introduces it is terse and epigrammatic, quite in the Synoptic manner. That we have here a genuine saying of Jesus is certain, given in another shape at Mk. 10:18. It is repeated in an altered form at v. 5 (cf. v. 7), and reason is given in the note there for regarding the form in v. 3 as the more original of the two. For the repetitions in Jn., see further on 24.

ἀνῶθεν, in the Synoptists (generally) and always in the other passages (31-19) where it occurs in Jn., means "from above," δεινοτέρων; so also in James 2:10 2:13. This is its meaning here, the point being that spiritual birth is a repetition, but that it is being born into a higher life. To be begotten ἄνωθεν means to be begotten from heaven, "of the Spirit." 3

No doubt, to render ἄνωθεν by denovo, "again," "again," as at Gal. 4:1, gives a tolerable sense, and this rendering may be defended by Greek usage outside the N.T. Wetstein quotes Artemidorus, ὁμοίως. 1. 13, where a man dreams that he is being born, which portends that his wife is to have a son like himself: ὁποῖος ὅν ἄνωθεν ἄνθρωπος βέβαιος γεννήσῃ. So Josephus, Antt. ii. xviii. 3. ἐν αὐτῷ ἄνωθεν παρθένος πρὸς αὐτοῦ, "he made friends with him again." But δεινοτέρων suits the context better in the present passage than denovo.

οὐ δύναται ἵνα τὴν βασίλειαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. "To see" the kingdom of God is to participate in it, to have experience of it, as at Lk. 19:7. For this use of ἰδεῖν, cf. Acts 2:31 "to see corruption," Lk. 2:28 and Jn. 8:24 "to see death" (cf. Ps. 89:36).

1 This view is taken by Bacon, Fourth Gospel, pp. 382, 320.
2 See Abbott, Dist. 9573.
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γεννηθῇσα γῆρων ἢ; μὴ δύνασαι εἰς τῷ καλλίον τῷ μητρὸς αὐτοῦ δεινοτέρῳ ἄνωθεν καὶ γενηθῇσα; — ἁμαρτήσας Ἰσραὴλ ἢ ἄνωθεν

Heb. 10, Rev. 18 "to see mourning." 1 Macc. 13 "to see distresses," Eccl. 9 "to see (that is, to enjoy) life." No doubt, a distinction may be drawn linguistically between "seeing the kingdom of God" and "entering into the kingdom of God," which is the phrase used in v. 5. Thus in Hermas, Sim. ix. 15, the wicked and foolish women see the kingdom while they do not enter it. But no such distinction can be drawn here; v. 5 restates v. 3, but it is not in contrast with it. "Seeing the kingdom of God" in Jn.'s phraseology is "entering into it"; it is identical with the "seeing" of life in v. 36, where see note. 2

3 ἄλογος πρὸς αὐτὸ δ ἀ πληθυνόθη. For this constr. of ἄλογος, see on 2.

Nicodemus is represented as challenging the idea of rebirth. From one point of view this is easy to understand. He was probably familiar with the Jewish description of a pre-electe as "one newly born" (see Introd., p. 16). But for Jews a Gentile was an alien, outside the sheltering providence of Yahweh. Certainly, he must begin his spiritual life anew, if he would be one of the chosen people. But it was incredible that any such spiritual revolution should be demanded of an orthodox Jew.

Yet this is not the objection which Nicodemus is represented as urging. The words placed in his mouth rather suggest that he took the metaphor of a new birth to mean literally a physical rebirth. "Can a man be born again, when he is old?" (as may have been his own case, but see on vv. 1, 3). "Can he enter a second time into his mother’s womb?" This would have been a stupid misunderstanding of what Jesus had said, but yet it is to this misunderstanding that the reply of Jesus is directed. It is not a fleshy rebirth that is in question, but a spiritual rebirth, which is a different thing.

Nicodemus says δεινοτέρων, where Jesus had said ἄνωθεν, thus mistakenly understanding by ἄνωθεν, denovo rather than δεινοτέρων; see on v. 3 above.

ὅτι δύναται καὶ ἐν Θεῷ. This is a favourite turn of phrase in Jn. Cf. 2:16 6:22 5:16.

5. δ must be omitted before τηροῦντα, as in v. 3. See on 10.

For ἐν κατασκευῇ nearly all the Latin versions have renatus (f alone has natus), which may point to a Western reading

1 Cf. also Dalmian, Words of Jesus, Eng. Tr., 108.
2 Cf. Tertullian, de bapt. 22: "nisi natus ex aqua quis sit, non habet vitam."
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Spirit" and does not mention the water. The passage from
Justin (Apol. i. 61) by which Lake supports his argument is as follows: ἐπειτὰ ἀγαθῶν ὑπὸ πάντων ἀναθήματος πατρὸς ἢ ἐν τῷ κοιμήθη τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τῆς βασιλείας τῶν θεών. 6. τοῦ ἀναγινωσκοῦντος ἐκ τῆς
ἀναγινωσκῆς. But probably the Latin rendering is of the
nature of an interpretation (with a reminiscence of γεγονός
ἀναγινωσκῆς in v. 3), the verb ἀναγινωσκῶν occurring in N.T. only at
1 Pet. 1. 22.

Another Western variant1 is τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν for
the rec. τῆς θεοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, which is supported by 
<ABLWTAE.> καὶ συν τῷ θεῷ, which is also read in Justin
(Apol. i. 61), Hippolytus (Ref. viii. 10), Irenaeus (frag. xxxiii.,
ed. Harvey), and p.-Cyprian de Exsultate Dom. 3. Tertullian
has in regnum caelestium (de Bapt. i. 13); but in another place
in regnum dei (de Anima 39). Origen's witness is alike
uncertain, his Latin translation giving both caelestium (Hom.
xiv. in Lucam, and Comm. in Rom. ii. 7) and dei (Hom. v.
in Ecad.). Perhaps, as Hort says, the Western reading was
suggested by the greater frequency of the phrase ἀναγινωσκῶν ἐκ
τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν in Mt.

The seal of the baptismal waters is thrice mentioned by
Hermas (Sim. ix. 15, 16) as a pre-requisite to entering the
kingdom of God; and in 2 Clem. 6 (before 140 A.D.) we have
"if we keep not our baptism pure and undefiled, with what
confidence shall we enter into the kingdom of God?" It is
possible that here we have reminiscences of the language of
v. 5. See Introd., p. cxxvi.

The reference in the word ἀστρος is clearly to Christian
baptism (see Introd., p. clxiv). But, so far as Nicodemus was
concerned, this would have been an irrelevant reference; the
argument being darkened by the presence of ἀστρος καὶ before
πνεύματος. Jesus explains that Nicodemus must be "begotten
from above" before he can enter the kingdom of God,
that a spiritual change must pass upon him, which is
described in v. 6 as being "begotten of the Spirit." The
words ἀστρος καὶ have been inserted in v. 3 by a d e, etc. (see
note in loc.), although they form no part of the true text; and it
has been suggested that, in like manner, in the verse before us
they are only an interpretative gloss.3 There is, however, no
M.S. evidence for their omission here (although the Sinaic Syriac
transposes the order of words and testifies to a reading "being
begotten of Spirit and of water"), nor is there extant any patristic
citation of the verse which speaks of "being begotten of the

1 Many examples of this are given by Eras Abbot. Fourth Gospel,
P. 33.
2 See Kirsopp Lake, Influence of Textual Criticism on Testaments of
N.T. (1904), p. 18, and Wendt's St. John's Gospel, p. 120.
3 Cf. Introd., p. cxxv.
III. 8. THE DISCOURSE WITH NICODÉMUS

Bar. 616: τὸ δὲ ἀνόητον καὶ νεκρόν ἐν τῷ βίῳ ἡμῶν πνεύμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστιν, καὶ ἐστὶν ἡ γνώμη, ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος, ἐκ τοῦ δὲ πνεύματος ἐστὶ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ γνώμη. 

νευράματος or νευράματος, ἐστιν καὶ τὸ νεκρὸν ὁμοίον ἄλλῳ φυσικῷ. 

πνεύμα, ἐστίν δὲ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τὸ βίον, ἐστὶν ἑαυτῷ ἄλλῳ φυσικῷ, ἐστὶν δὲ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τὸ βίον, ἐστὶν ἑαυτῷ ἄλλῳ φυσικῷ. 

πνεύμα, ἐστιν δὲ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τὸ βίον, ἐστὶν ἑαυτῷ ἄλλῳ φυσικῷ. 

πνεύμα, ἐστιν δὲ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τὸ βίον, ἐστὶν ἑαυτῷ ἄλλῳ φυσικῷ. 

πνεύμα, ἐστιν δὲ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τὸ βίον, ἐστὶν ἑαυτῷ ἄλλῳ φυσικῷ. 

The verb πνεύμα occurs 5 times elsewhere in the N.T., and is always applied to the blowing of the wind (cf. 64). In the LXX it is found 5 times with the same application, there always being in the context some allusion to the Divine action. Cf.
III. 10-11.] THE DISCOURSE WITH NICODEMUS

λέγω σοι δι' οὗ ὁ οὖαν λαλάμεν καὶ ὁ ἐμφανίζεται μαρτυρόμεν, καὶ

“Art thou the authorised (pr, the well-known) teacher of the
Israel of God?"

καὶ τάῦτα ὁ γεγονός; He might have been expected to recognize, when he was told it, the doctrine of the various
manifestations of the Spirit in man's life.

11. For the introductory ἀκούσι τότε, see on 3.13.

With this verse, 35 is closely parallel : δὲ ψωμοὶ καὶ ἡ ψωμοῖ,
τὸν ἵππον καὶ τὴν τροφήν ὁδῷ Ṽοδῷ, ὅπως ἀντιλοφῆναμε. We should
expect κατακεφαλήθη τοῖς ἴπποις καὶ κατ' τὸν θρόνον τοῦ ἱπποῦ,
οἵ τε ἐν τοῖς καθίσμασιν ἐν τῷ ἱππόν, καί τῷ ἱπποῦ τὸ τόπον καὶ τῷ ἱπποῦ τὸ

The verb λαλάμεν is used with special frequency in Jn. It
occurs nearly 60 times in the Gospel; and 30 times it is placed
in the mouth of Jesus in the first person singular, the only
Synoptic instance of this latter use being Lk. 24:44. The general
distinction between λέγω and λαλάμεν, viz. that λέγω relates
to the substance of what is said, while λαλάμεν has to do
with the fact and the manner of utterance, holds good to a
certain extent in Jn., as it does in classical Greek. But in Jn.
the two verbs cannot always be distinguished in their usage
and meaning, any more than “say” and “speak” can always be distinguished in English. Here διὸλοιον λαλάμεν
should be rendered “we speak of what we know,” the words
spoken not being given; but then τοῦτο τά γράμματα ἐλάγχην
(868) means.” He spoke these words,” viz. the very words
that have just been cited (cf. 1668 171, etc.). See, in particular,
165 124, 164, 168, in which passages the verb λαλάζω is used
exactly as λέγω might be; cf. 868.

If there is any special tinge of meaning in λαλάζω as com-
pared with λέγω in Jn., it is that λαλάζω suggests frankness or
openness of speech. Jn. “assigns it to Christ 33 times in the
first person, whereas it is never thus used by the Synoptists,
except at Lk. 24:44 after the Resurrection” (Abbott, D. 2912). See on 45.

The plural forms ὁδῷς, ἱπποῖς, etc., arrest attention.
The verse is introduced by the solemn ἀκούσι τότε, and so is
represented by Jn. as spoken by Jesus. Now the plural of
majesty is not ascribed to Jesus anywhere, and in v. 12 He
employs the singular ἀκούσι. Abbott (D. 2428) suggests that the
plurals here associate the Father’s witness with that of
the Son (cf. 3:37); but this would be foreign to the context.
Further, v. 35, δὲ τῶν καὶ ἡ τροφή, τὸν ἵππον μαρτυρεῖ is clearly
a repetition of what is said in this verse.

The plurals ὁδῷς are, therefore, explained (cf. 45) by
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οὗτος ἀναβήκεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν εἰ μὴ ὦ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβὰς,

nature and purpose (εἰσόμενος), of which no one could tell except “He that cometh from heaven” (v. 35).

προσέτητε. So ἀπαλ. προσέτητε is read by ΓΔΘΥΣ, 13, etc.

οὗτος ἀναβήκεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ οὐκ ἔχει αὐτῷ συνετήρησιν. The argument is that none can speak with authority of τὸ ἐσόμενον, except one who has been ἐκ οὐρανοῦ, and has come down from thence. And no one else can so say but the “Son of Man” (see Intro. p. cxxx), for no man has ever ascended thereto. To the question of Prov. 30:6 ἀνθίζει τίς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ καταβαίνει; the suggested answer is “God alone” (cf. Deut. 32:37 and the reference thereto in Rom. 10:6). So too in Bar. 129, “Who hath ascended to heaven and taken her (σφεδρικόν), and brought her down from the clouds?” the answer is “No one.” There is a Talmudic saying which taught this explicitly: “R. Abbahu said: If a man says to thee, I ascend to heaven, he will not prove it.” — i.e. the thing is impossible. This was the accepted Jewish doctrine.

On the other hand, the Jewish apocalypses have legends of saints being transported to heaven that they might be informed of spiritual truth, e.g. Enoch (Enoch Ixx. 1, etc.), Abraham in the Testament of Abraham, Isaiah (Assumption of Isaiah, 7), etc. But of such legends the Fourth Gospel has no trace. “No one has ascended into heaven, save He who descended from heaven, viz. the Son of Man.”

There is no reference to the Ascension of Christ in this passage (cf. Acts 2:34), which merely states that no man has gone up into heaven to learn heavenly secrets. It is only the Son of Man who came down from heaven, which is His home, who can speak of it and of τὸ ἐσόμενον with the authority of knowledge.

The phrase καταβαίνειν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ is used again of Christ's coming in the flesh at 6:52, 4:44, 6:36, 6:46, but in that sense nowhere else in the N.T. In 2 Thess. 4:13 καὶ ἐφανέρωθη is used of the Advent of Christ in glory, and in Acts above of the Descent of the Spirit at the Baptism of Jesus. καταβαίνειν is also used Eph. 4:9 of the Descent into Hades. The phrase here, however, undoubtedly refers to the Descent of Christ to

1 Quoted by Schlier from Fer. Taalm. ii. 1


3 See my passage in Jesus (Her. iv. xii. 4) speaks of the Word of God being in the habit of ascending and descending for the welfare of men ("αὐτὸν ἀναβήσεται Βεβραμ διὰ αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ", with allusion to Ex. 3:14).
right hand, i.e. of the Ascension. Cf. Phil. 2 and Isa. 53, where it is said of the Servant of Yahweh ἡφαίστειται καὶ ἀνασκηνώθηται σάββατα. But the word is not used thus in the Fourth Gospel, where it is always applied to thelifting up of Jesus on the Cross, and is always found in connexion with the title "Son of Man" (see Intro., p. cxxvi). Jesus said to the incredulous Jews (John 6) ἐστιν ἡ δύναμις τῶν ὑλῶν τοῦ αἰθρούσαν τὸ σταυρόν ὅπως ἔστω καὶ τοῖς ἄγγελοις, "When ye shall have lifted up the Son of Man, then ye shall know..." This "lifting up" is to be the act of the Israelites, not of God (as in Acts 2:23), and it is therefore clear that it does not refer to the Ascension, but to the Crucifixion. Again in 2 Cor. 12:1 we have τοῦ ἀνασκήνων τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ ἐμφάνισθαι τῷ ἁγιῷ, on which Jn.'s comment is, "this He said, signifying by what death He should die." And that the people understood the word thus appears from their rejoinder (12:2); while they knew that the Christ "abides for ever," they were puzzled by the saying that the "Son of Man" was to be "lifted up." If ἡφαίστειται were to be understood merely as "exaltation" (as the Ascension was) they would have had no difficulty in admitting τοῦ ἠφαίστειτο τῶν ὑλῶν τοῦ αἰθρούσαν (see note in loc.).

In the present passage, there can in like manner be no reference to the Ascension of Jesus, as in that case the type of the brazen serpent would not be applicable. In the story in Num. 21, Moses set his brazen serpent "upon the standard," or, as the LXX turns it, ἐπάγαγεν ἐντὸς ἐπὶ σημεῖον, so that those who had been bitten by the poisonous serpents might look upon it and live. As the story is explained in Wisd. 14:7, the brazen serpent was a ἄρτεμιθον σωτηρίας; "he that turned towards it was not saved because of that which was beheld, but because of thee, the Saviour of all (τῶν σωτῆρας)." The word ἐφαίστειται is not used anywhere in the LXX of the act of Moses in "lifting up" the serpent and exposing it to the gaze of the people, nor is the word used anywhere in the N.T. outside Jn. of the "lifting up" of Jesus on the Cross. But this is undoubtedly the parallel which is drawn in the words of Jesus in 2:24. Those who looked in faith upon the brazen serpent uplifted before them were delivered from death by poison; those who look in faith upon the Crucified, lifted up on the Cross, shall be delivered from the death of sin.

The early Greek interpreters are quite unanimous about this. Thus Barnabas (§12) says that Moses made a brazen serpent, the τύπος of Jesus, that he set it up conspicuously (ἐξεστίν ἐνδόθεν), and bade any man that had been bitten "come and look upon the serpent which is placed on the pole (ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄρτος ἐνδόθεν) and let him hope in faith that the serpent being
himself dead can yet make him alive (αὐτὸς δὲ νεκρὸς ζωντανεῖ, Ἰσαμώνος), and straightway he shall be saved." This is but an elaboration of the idea in Jn. 3:14, going beyond what is there said, for Barnabas emphasizes the point that the brazen serpent is a type of Jesus, while all that is said in Jn. 3:14 is that as the first was lifted up, so must the Son of Man be lifted up.

Origen (Exeget. ad marty. 50, arguing that death by martyrdom may be called θάνατον), and Cyprian (Test. ii. 10) apply Jn. 3:14 to the Crucifixion of Jesus; cf. Justin, Tryph. 94. Claudius Apollinaris (about 171 A.D.) writes of Jesus as θάνατον ἐν θάνατοι, where θάνατος evidently means to lift up on the Cross; cf. Ps. 22:21 (Routh, Relig. Sacri., i. 161). See also the passage from Artemidorus quoted on 21:18 below, for the connexion between the ideas of θανάτος and of crucifixion.

We have then here a prediction placed in the mouth of Jesus, not only of His death, but of the manner of that death. The Synoptists represent Jesus as more than once foretelling His death by violence (Mk. 8:31 9:28 10:33 and parallels), but only in Mt. 20:19 is death by crucifixion specified; cf. Lk. 22:34. But by the use of the word θανάτος (cf. also 8:10 and 12:23) Jn. consistently represents Jesus as predicting that He would be crucified, which would carry with it the prediction that He would suffer at the hands of the Roman authorities, and not by the Jews (cf. Jn. 18:33).

It is not consistent with the Synoptic tradition (cf. Mk. 8:31, Mt. 16:21, Lk. 22:39) to represent Jesus as foretelling His Passion so early in His Ministry. We should expect not to find any indication of this until after the Confession of Peter (60:69). And if vv. 11-15 are intended by the evangelist to be taken as words of Jesus, rather than as reflections of his own (see on v. 13), then it is probable that they are recorded here out of their historical context. See on v. 1 above.

It has been suggested, however (e.g., by Westcott and E. A. Abbott) that we must see a deeper significance in the word θανάτος as placed in the lips of Jesus. Abbott holds3 that the Aramaic word which is rendered by θανάτος was רעה, and that this actually has the double meaning (1) to exalt, (2) to crucify. But Burkitt has shown that this cannot be accepted because רעה could not be used of a "lifting up" such as the Ascension was.4 In short, (a) Jn. clearly states his own view of what Jesus meant by the words which he ascribes to Him here; (b) all the early Greek exegetes agree with him; (c) if we try to get back to the Aramaic word lying behind θανάτος, we cannot find one which has this special ambiguity. ἤλθεν will fit θανάτος

3 See a discussion of the predestinarian teaching of Jn. in Westcott, Epistles of St. John, p. 91.

4 "I must work the works of Him that sent me, while it is day" (9:4); "Other sheep I must bring" (10:16); and again in 12:27 the people charge Jesus with saying as here, ὃ ἐπήρθεν ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν τοῦ ἄνθρωπος. Cf. also 5:28. There is nothing peculiar to the Fourth Gospel in this. The Synoptists and Paul alike share the belief that it is not Fate but Providence that rules the world, that God foreknows each event because He has predetermined it, and that therefore it must come to pass. To reconcile this profound doctrine with human free will was the problem of a later age.

16. Before ἅγια the rec. text interpolates μὴ ἄνωθεν ἄνωλαν. See a discussion of the predestinarian teaching of Jn. in Westcott, Epistles of St. John, p. 91.
The Evangelist's comment on the preceding discourse

16. οὕτως γὰρ ἦ γένοιτο: δ Θεός τῶν κόσμων, ὢστε τὸν Υἱὸν τῶν

The Evangelist’s comment on the preceding discourse (vv. 16–21, 31–35)

16. This “comfortable word” is described in the Anglican Liturgy as one of those which “our Saviour Christ saith.” But it would seem that Jn. does not mean to place vv. 16–21 in the mouth of Jesus; these verses are rather reflexions and comments by the evangelist on the words which he has already ascribed to Jesus in His discourse with Nicodemus. The dialogue framework is dropped; past tenses, ἐπὶ, ἀνέπτυξε, ἤσιολθεν, are used, as would be natural if the writer is meditating on the great events of the past; the word μονογενής, which occurs twice, vV. 16, 18, is not elsewhere placed on the lips of Jesus, while it is thoroughly Johannine (see 11.10, 1 Jn. 4.2). Indeed v. 16 is repeated almost verbatim in Jn. 4:6 ἐν ταύτῃ ἐκταχθηκέν ἡ ἐμπνευσία τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐμπνεῦσα τὸν ὄρος ἐπὶ τὸν κόσμον ἵνα ξαναμεταβητεῖν δὲ αὐτῷ.

The passage vv. 16–21 is introduced by οὕτως γὰρ . . . , which is quite in Jn.’s style when he is making a comment: cf. ἀνέπτυξε γὰρ . . . (20), οἱ μαθηταὶ διήγοντο (4), ἐπὶ θαυμάζων . . . (5), ἐγὼ παρήγαγεν (20), αὐτός γὰρ ἦν . . . (6), ἦν ἔνα τὸν . . . (6), οὐδὲν γὰρ η Christie . . . (20). Further, it is to be observed that οὕτως does not occur again in Jn. and that the constr. ὡστε . . . διὰ with indicative, although classical, does not appear elsewhere in the N.T. (see Abbott, Dict. 2203, 2697). No new theme is introduced at v. 16, but the teaching of the discourse with Nicodemus is recapitulated, the opening sentence being a summary of the “Gospel according to St. John.”

It is the constant teaching of Jn. that in the order of redemption God’s Love precedes the movement of man’s soul to Him. “We love because He first loved us” (1 Jn. 4:19; cf. 1 Jn. 4:10). Cf. “Ye did not choose me, but I chose you” (15:24) and also 13:8. See Rom. 5.8. In this verse the Love of God is represented as prior to the faith of man. Indeed, God is Love (1 Jn. 4).

The verb διαστάω is generally used by the Synoptists for the love which man has for man or for God (Mt. 12:20); and Jn. in like manner uses it of the love of man for his fellows (13:20, 13:20, 17), or for Jesus (6:32, 14:12, 21, 22, 21, 13) or for God (1 Jn. 4:9). It is used once in the Synoptists for the love of Jesus by Nicodemus (Mt. 27:6), and this is frequent in Jn. (13:1, 24, 14:21, 15:2, 12, 21, 20). διαστάω is never used in the
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Synoptists of the Love of God for man, although this central fact is behind many of the parables; but Jn. employs it thus, not only here but at 14:23, 17:19, 1 Jn. 3:10 (cf. Rom. 8:17, Eph. 1:4, 2 Thess. 2:16). The mutual love of God and Christ is implicit in the Synoptists (cf. δύο μονοσ δούλους, Mk. 11:25, Mt. 5:25, Lk. 13:24), but Jn. is explicit in using φιλάνθρωπος to describe it, e.g., 3:16, 15:13, 14:24, 21:36, and 14:19. See, further, Additional Note on 21:18 on φιλάνθρωπος.

Here the Love of God for man is an all-embracing love: ἀγάπης ὁ θεὸς τοῦ κόσμου (for κόσμος see on 1:1). It was manifested by His giving … "His only begotten Son" (for φιλάνθρωπος see on 1:1), "His Beloved Son," δύο μονοσ δούλους (Mt. 3:17). The language is perhaps reminiscent of Gen. 22:18, where it was said to Abraham οὗτος εἶναι τὸν αὐτὸν που τελείων, the simple δούλος conveying the sense of a complete "giving up." Cf. Rom. 8:32.

τὸν θεὸν τοῦ μονογενοῦς. So ΝΒΩ, but ΝÇΛΘΘ add αὐτὸν after νῦν.

Rea πᾶς ὁ πατήρ κλ. This was the motive of the Gift, that all men might have eternal life (see on v. 15) through faith in Christ. For the phrase πιστῶν ἐστὶν αὐτῶν, see on 1:11.

To perish (δοκίμων) is contrasted again with "to have eternal life" at 10:28 (cf. 17:11). It is the word used for "losing" one's soul; and it refers here to a man's final destiny (cf. Mt. 25:46), σύμων ἐκπληκτος εἰς γένος. Hence ἡμί πίστεως in this verse must be interpreted of the future (see on 3:16) rather than of the present, although it includes this.

The repetition of the phrase ἦν πᾶς ὁ πιστῶν ἐστὶν αὐτῶν ἴδη ἐν γένοις from v. 5, with a slight change (viz. the addition after αὐτῶν of μονοσ ἀρνάται ἄλλα), is a feature of Johannine style. Jn. frequently repeats phrases or themes of special import, often with slight verbal changes, as if they were a refrain. Cf., e.g., 3:14, 21, 6:14, 18, 28, 46, 48, 58, 10:39, 11:13, 15:1, 15:23, 15:11.

17. ἀποστείλαν δ θεὸς τοῦ οὐν κλ. The "sending" of Jesus by God is a conception common to the Synoptists, to Paul, and to Jn. Two verbs are used, πέμπει and ἀποστέλλει, the former being more frequent in Jn., and the latter in the Synoptists. No distinction of meaning between them being traceable (cf. 17:18 and 26:19). Paul has πέμπει only (Rom. 8:9); Lk. has πέμπει once (Lk. 20:19), but the parallels Mk. 12, Mt. 21:7 have ἀποστέλλει. Elsewhere the Synoptists always mean "sent," as opposed to "sent," without a sense of "immediate sending" as in Jn. Thus Jn. is closer to the Synoptists than Bo horrible. But his primary office is that of Saviour, 1 Cf. Intro., p. 23vi.

37. COMMENT ON PRECEDING DISCOURSE

have ἀποστέλλει of God sending His Son, e.g. Mk. 9:7, Mt. 10:10, 15:25, Lk. 4:43, 46, 10:18. It may be added that πέμπει is infrequent in the LXX, which generally has ἀποστέλλει. There is a fine passage in the Ep. to Diognetus (§ 7) about "sending" His Son, in which both verbs are used.1 Westcott attempts to distinguish Jn.'s usage of πέμπει and ἀποστέλλει (see his Additional Note on 20:5), and so does Abbott (Bibl. 1724, 28) who renounces the meanings that Westcott proposes. No distinction can safely be drawn.

For ἀποστέλλει in Jn. in similar contexts to the present (i.e. of God sending his Son), cf. 5:31, 36, 50, 57, 71, 8:42, 10:25, 11:13, 16, 21, 22, 28, 31, 32, 70, 75, 81, 10, 44, 49, 50, 60, 62, 94, 124, 14, 15, 16, 113, 15, 15, 16.

Πρῶτος. The rec. text adds αὐτόν, with ΑΠΑΘ, but om. 1

1BLTW, fam. 1.

This usage of ἀπόδεικται absolutely, as contrasted with ἀποθέτομεν, is common to all the evangelists, and by all of them is attributed to Jesus when speaking of Himself. See Mk. 1:13, Mt. 11:27, Lk. 10:22, and Jn. 5:19, 6:6, 6:28, 14:21, 17, besides Jn. 2:2, 1 Jn. 2:18, 4:4, where the evangelist thus describes Jesus. He uses ἀπόδεικται absolutely, at this point for the first time. Cf. 1 Cor. 5:13.

This verse is in close connection with v. 16. The Divine purpose in redemption embraces all humanity. It is not confined to Jews only, or to elect nations or individuals, but embraces the whole world. This Divine intention may be thwarted by man's abuse of his free will, but none the less it is directed to all mankind (cf. 1 Tim. 2:4, Tit. 2:11).

But in the current Jewish eschatology the Messiah was to come as the Judge of mankind, and so Jesus taught, both according to the Synoptists (Mt. 25:31) and to Jn.: cf. Jn. 5:22, where we have the Son given "authority to execute judgment, because He is the Son of man," the context showing that the Last Judgment is indicated. So, again, in 18 we have πρῶτος, διδοτα τὸν κόσμον τοῖς θεοῖς, the reference being indeed to a present rather than a future judging, but still the coming of Jesus being represented as πρῶτος, as issuing in judgment. See further on 3:5.

How, then, is this to be reconciled with the universal purpose of love in the mission of Christ? Jn. is quick to supply the answer. The purpose of this mission in the mind of God was that εὐχαρίαν to be received by all who believe. Thus the Son of Man is to be the Judge of mankind; he does not question that, and later on he says it explicitly (20:23). But His primary office is that of Saviour.
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κόσμον ἵνα κρίνῃ τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' ἵνα σωθῇ δ' κόσμος δ' αὐτῶν. 18. ὁ πατέρας εἰς αὐτῷ οὐ κρίνεται: ὁ μὴ πιστεύων ἄγη κόσμος,

and it was to save that He was sent. That some should reject Him is no part of the Father's will; but if they do reject Him, they bring judgment on themselves. And so Jn. declares, 'οὐ γὰρ ἀπήκουσεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἵνα κρίνῃ τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' ἵνα σωθῇ δ' κόσμος δ' αὐτῶν. This is in John 1:19, where Jesus is represented as saying, 'οὐ γὰρ ἔδωκα τὸν γινώσκειν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' ἵνα σωθῇ τὸν κόσμον. Εἰς τούτο, not ἵνα κρίνῃ (as Jewish-Apocalyptic believed), expresses the final cause of the mission of the Son of Man. Cf. Zech. 9:9 at βασιλείας σου ἐρχεται σὺ πᾶσι δικαιοίς καὶ σωθής.

For the universality of this redemptive purpose, see 4:4 ὁ σωτήρ τοῦ κόσμου, and the note there. It was one of the last prayers of Jesus that the world should come to recognise at last that God loved it, and that therefore He had sent His Son (17:23).

σωθής, σωθήκαν occurs only 6 times in Jn., σωθήσεται once (4:49), and σωτήρ twice (4:49, where see note, and i Jn. 4:14).

In the LXX it generally represents ἐστατος, which primarily means "enlargement," and hence "deliverance," προσ, being, at last, almost equivalent to "victory," and often used in the O.T. of the final Messianic Deliverance. In the N.T. σωθής sometimes stands for deliverance from bodily sickness, or healing (see 11:13 and cf. Mk. 5:36; 6:56; 10:52, etc.); frequently it carries with it the idea of rescue from physical death (e.g. 2:27, Mk. 4:39; 5:43); and in other passages the thought is of spiritual deliverance (e.g. 5:24; 10:12; 12:17, Mk. 10:14; 13:12), i.e. of the transition from death to life, conceived of either as present or as future (in an eschatological reference), wrought by the life-giving power of Christ, and applied to the individual soul by an act of faith. This, the deepest meaning of σωτήρ, is constantly present in the mind of Jn. See on 4:49 for σωτήρ.

To the thought of Jn., ᾧ ἀναμένει begins in the present, and is not only a hope of the future (see on 3:16 above); so also the κρίνων, or the inevitable distinction between man and man, determined by the use or abuse of his free will, begins in the present life.

Here for Jn. is the supreme test of the human spirit, whether the man "believes in" Christ or does not believe. ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν ἀπεστάλεται, εἰς τοὺς κοσμίους, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοὺς θανατοὺς εἰς τὴν ζωήν (5:24). The believer has eternal life in Christ; he has passed into life. There is no uncertainty as to the final judgment for him.

But there is also the man who is not willing to come to Christ that he may have life (5:6), i.e. not willing to "believe." Of him Jn. says, μὴ πιστεύων ἄγη κόσμος, "he has been judged already" by his unfaith, the present judgment being anticipatory of the future. This is, indeed, the judgment which will declare itself at the Last Day (12:38). But that the judgment will be manifested at the Last Day is not inconsistent with its having already been determined in the present life by the unbelief and blindness and disobedience of the man. So it is said of the prince of evil that he "has been judged" (16:11), although the exhibition of this tremendous judgment is not yet.

The rec. text has δι' ἐκπαίδευσιν κοινωνίας, with ALT.; but KJV δοκεί σου ΜΩΣ ἐκπαίδευσις, καὶ κακίας καὶ σωθής. The two sentences δὲ πιστεύων . . . and δὲ πιστεύων are co-ordinate and complementary; and it is quite in the Johannine manner to place them side by side without any adversative or connecting particle.

Jn. uses μὴ with a pres. part. over 20 times.

δὲ μὴ πιστεύοντες . . ., "because he has not believed," a continuing movement of unbelief being indicated by the pf. tense. Abbott (Dict. v.8) compares with δὲ μὴ πιστεύων . . . δὲ μὴ πιστεύοντες . . . of this verse, the passage i Jn. 5:10 . . . δὲ μὴ πιστεύων . . . δὲ σωθής πιστεύοντες . . . . In the latter δὲ σωθής states the fact objectively; in the former δὲ μὴ states it subjectively, as the judgment pronounced by the Judge. δὲ μὴ is a very unusual construction (see Dict. 2699), and demands some such explanation here. ¹

For the phrase πιστεύων εἰς τὸ δόμα, see on 11:18.

For μωσειοτητος, see on 11:4. It is possible that the repetition of the adjective here is intended to mark, not only the greatness of the Father's love (as in v. 16), but also the uniqueness of Jesus as a Saviour. There is no other (cf. Acts 4:22).

伝え δὲ σωθής κρίνων. The form of the sentence, introducing an explanation, is thoroughly Johannine; cf. i Jn. 5:10 5:11, 12. "This is the judging," i.e. not the sentence of judgment (κρίνων), but the way in which the judgment is accomplished. It is no arbitrary sentence, but the working out of a moral law. The root of unbelief in Christ is the refusal to turn to His Light, because the man's conduct will not bear scrutiny. Jn. traces unbelief to moral causes.

The Light came into the world," so he has already in the

¹ The uncial fragment ἔχων has the unique reading δὲ σωθής πιστεύοντες, which indicates that the scribe felt the difficulty.
31. "ο ἀνωθεν ἥχομαι ἐκάνω πᾶνων ὑπὸν ἔχων" ἡ ἐ ποίησεν ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐστιν καὶ ἐκ τῆς γῆς λαλεῖ. ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἥχομαι

This is a universal saying, not to be confined to those who are already believers in Christ. As Christ Himself said: τὸ αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ ἄλλῃ οὐκοι ὡς καὶ τῇ φωστή (180). Jn. states that every honest doer of the truth comes into the light, and (as Christ is the Light) he therefore approaches Christ; he does so because "his works may be made manifest" (cf. v. 9). See on 184.

ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἐστιν εἰρημένα. ὥστε may mean "because" or "thus.

The latter rendering seems preferable. The honest man ("in whom is no guile," 184) comes to the light that it may be made plain that his deeds have been done in ἑαυτῷ, a remarkable expression for which there is no exact parallel; cf. κοινωνίας ἐν πνεύμ. (Rom. 1618). See Ps. 13938, 34 for the prayer of the righteous man, who does not shrink from the closest scrutiny of his life.

The evangelist's commentary continued (vv. 31–36)

32–36 Reasons have been given in the Introduction (p. 23) for taking these verses in sequence to v. 16–21, v. 22–30 having been displaced from their original position.

The argument of this paragraph is as follows: He that is of the earth can testify only to earthly things (v. 31; cf. v. 12). Christ, who is from heaven, in testifying of heavenly things, testifies to that which He has seen and heard, and His witness is not accepted (v. 32; cf. v. 11). Nevertheless, He who does accept it, agrees that Jesus was the promised Messenger of God (v. 33; cf. v. 17). He speaks the message of God, and thereby shows that He was sent by God (v. 34). He speaks this message in its completeness, for the Spirit is not granted to Him in part only (v. 34); He is the Beloved Son (v. 35; cf. v. 16).

31. εἰς τὸν ἄγιον τό τελέσαντα κατά τὸν διακονισμὸν τοῦ θεοῦ. Jn. is fond of repeating phrases, with a slight verbal change (see on v. 16).

ο ἀνωθεν ἥχομαι, i.e. Christ. ἀνωθεν has its usual Johannine significance of desiner, "from above" (but see on 18); cf. ὡς ἐ σῶ τινα ἐλπίδα (189) and 1 Cor. 1517.

This is expressed by Paul in the same way ὡς ἐπὶ τῶν μισθῶν (Rom. 92; cf. Eph. 12).

ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐκ πᾶσαν παρασκευήν τῶν ἐκ τῆς γῆς λαλεῖ. There is a similar thought in 1 Jn. 4: αὐτοὶ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου εἰσὶν ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου λαλοῦντες,
only difference being that κόσμος carries the idea of the moral condition of the world (see on 18), while γῆ is the physical "earth" simply. Cf. 2 Esd. 4:22, "Qui super terram inhabitant quae sunt super terram intelligere solum modo possunt, et qui super caelos quae super altitudinem caelorum." See on 33.

ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἔστιν. Jn. is inclined to the constr. ἐκαίνι ἐκ . . . as indicating origin and affinity; cf. 8:58 and passim. The constr. γεγενέσθαι ἐκ has already been discussed (5:1 and 19).

For λαλάω, see on 38.

32. ΑΓΩG read καί διάφορον, but ΚBDL1W om. καί. In this verse the words of v. 11 are repeated, the evangelist taking them up and amplifying them.

διάφορον. This is one of the few passages in Jn. where ἐκαίνι in the perf. tense is used of spiritual vision (see also 8:14, 15, and cf. 1:18).

διὰ τοῦτο, ταύτα μαρτυρεῖν. It is the constant teaching of Jn. that Jesus proclaimed what He had "heard" from the Father (8:28; 12:49; 16:25). Jesus is the "Faithful Witness," according to the Apocalypse (Rev. 1). Cf. Introdt., p. xxii. καί τὴν μαρτυρίαν αὐτοῦ ὁδηγεῖ λάβανες. This is reproduced from v. 11, where see note. In the traditional order of the text, this sentence would be inconsistent with v. 26, which tells of the crowds that fingered to hear Jesus; but it is plain that John the Baptist is not the speaker here (see Introdt., p. xxiii).

Jn. hastens in v. 33 to correct the rhetorical ὁδηγεῖ, just as he corrects 12 by 18; cf. also 18:14, 15, and 19.

For the position of ὁδηγεῖ in the sentence, see on 18.

38. ὁ λαβὼν αὐτοῦ τὴν μαρτυρίαν καί, i.e., who has accepted it, is used of convincing the witness of Christ about eternal life and God's love; cf. v. 18, upon which all this is commentary.

ἐνθέσθαι here and at 67 (where see note) is the equivalent of "to attest," the metaphor of sealing being a common one. He who accepts the witness of Jesus thereby attests that Jesus speaks the words of God as His accredited Messenger, and in this attestation virtually testifies to his belief that God is true (ὅ δεις ἀλήθειαν). So at 8:38 it is urged that God, who sent Jesus, is true (ὅ ἐστις ἡ ἀλήθεια). And that Jesus speaks what He has heard from God, the implied conclusion being that the hearers of Jesus may believe in Him and trust what He says. The argument of 1 Jn. 5:4 puts the same thing in another way, viz. God has testified of His Son, and so he who does not believe this testimony makes God a liar.

Lightfoot (Hebr. Heb. in loc.) quotes the Rabbinical maxim that "the seal of God is truth."

39. τὰ οὐσία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος. See on this Divine mission of the Son, the note on v. 17 above. He whom God has sent speaks God's words; cf. 8:28 and 17:20 τὰ οὐσία τοῦ πνεύματος.

In Jn. οὐσία never occurs in the singular; we always have τὰ οὐσία (no art. at 69), and in Jn. they are always "the" words of God (cf. 8:58) or of Christ Himself. In contradistinction to this, τὰ οὐσία never occurs in the Apocalypse, while we have instead ὁ λόγος, used for Divine words or sayings (cf. Introdt., p. xxvi). In Jn., λόγος is always in the singular, except τὸν Λόγον (see on 16).

τὰ οὐσία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος. τοῦ πνεύματος. ὁ λόγος, but [God] does not give the Spirit [to Him] by measure," but in its fulness.

The rec., with ACBDGδ, adds ὁ Θεός after ἀλήθειας, but om. ΚBDL1W 33; it supplies, however, the correct interpretation of the words. Origin rightly understands "God" to be the subject of ἀλήθειας, although some have supposed "Christ" to be the subject and the meaning to be that Christ gives the Spirit in its fulness to those who believe in Him; but this latter interpretation destroys the argument of the passage, and introduces a thesis which is very questionable. Christ gives the Spirit to His own (cf. 7:28, 15), but could it be said that He gives it ὁ λόγος ἐκ μετρόν? Only of One could it be said that the Spirit was given in its fulness. The Talmudical saying that "the Spirit of God did not dwell upon the prophets, nisi mensura quam" is true, whether it be an original Jewish saying, or one which owes its form to Christian influence. ἐκ μετρόν is, apparently, equivalent to μετρόν; "by measure;" but the constr. ἐκ μετρόν is not found again in the Greek Bible, nor has any parallel been produced from Greek literature.

God the Father gives the Spirit in its fulness, and not "by measure," to Christ, because He is His Beloved Son, as v. 35 explains.
use the verb ἀγάπαω of the mutual love of God the Father and Christ (see on 3:18 above). In 5:8 we find ὑμῖν παρέχω φιλεῖν τὸν υἱόν, in a context similar to that of the present passage; but it does not seem probable that, in describing the immost mystery of the Divine Love, Jn. would have ventured to differentiate between φιλεῖν and ἀγάπαω. As to the alleged distinction between them, see on 21:16.

For the absolute use of οὐς in Jn., see on 3:17 above.

πάντα διδάσκεται εἰς τὸ χρείαν αὐτοῦ. So in 13:1 (where see note) πάντα δίδονται εἰς τὸν καιρόν. It is a favourite thought in Jn., that the Father has given all things to the Incarnate Son; e.g., judgment 5:18, 22, to have life in Himself 5:26, authority 17:10, glory 17:10, His Name 17:11. His commandments 13:36 (cf. 14:28), and even His disciples 17:26 (where see note). The parallel in the Synoptics is πάντα μοι παρέχει οὐκ Ἰησοῦς Ἰουδαίων ὑμῖν, and to ἔργας μοι εἰς τὸ τρέφεσθε λέγει. The expression does not appear in the Synoptic reports of the words of Jesus, and He may never have used it, preferring to dwell on the fatherly love of God rather than on His hatred of sin. The phrase ἐργα τοῦ Θεοῦ has nothing in common with Greek philosophy or religion, but it has its roots in that conception of God as essentially a moral Being, to whom therefore sin is hateful, which is behind all the teaching of Christ.

ἵνα is the pres. tense, not the future (μενέω), as some Latin authorities take it to be. Not only in the world to come, but in this world, the "wrath of God" abides upon him who is continuously rebellious, in will and deed, against the heavenly vision.

The second witness of John the Baptist (vv. 22-30)

22. μετὰ ταῦτα Ἰάκωβου ὁ Ἰρονος καὶ οἱ μαθηται αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίων γῆν, καὶ τεθηκεὶ διδάσκων μετὰ αὐτῶν καὶ ἐκπίπτοντες. 23. ἦν and this "eternal life" is God's commandment (ἡ ἐν τούτῳ αὕτη ἀλώνιος ἠπόκρισιν, 1:5); so that "to believe" is "to obey.

ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἡμῶν. Cf. v. 3, where διὰ τός πάντων τῶν μαθητῶν τούτων, and also 3:16, where "seeing" death is equivalent to "tasting" death. The rebel (ἀκριβέως) will not "see" life, because he cannot appreciate or assimilate it. 14:19, and esp. 1 Jn. 5:9, ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς Ἰουδαίων τῶν ἀκούων τῆς λόγου, ἐκπίπτοντα. Ἐν ἑνεκ τοῦ Θεοῦ is not mentioned again in Jn., although often in Paul (Rom. 1:18, Eph. 5:2; and cf. Rev. 19:1 et al.). It is a thoroughly Hebraic conception, the phrase being common in the LXX.; and John the Baptist spoke of "the wrath to come" (Mt. 3, Lk. 3). The expression does not appear in the Synoptic reports of the words of Jesus, and He may never have used it, preferring to dwell on the fatherly love of God rather than on His hatred of sin. The phrase ἐν ἑνεκ τοῦ Θεοῦ has nothing in common with Greek philosophy or religion, but it has its roots in that conception of God as essentially a moral Being, to whom therefore sin is hateful, which is behind all the teaching of Christ.

ἵνα is the present tense, not the future (μενέω), as some Latin authorities take it to be. Not only in the world to come, but in this world, the "wrath of God" abides upon him who is continuously rebellious, in will and deed, against the heavenly vision.
not baptize in person, that being the work of His disciples. This is the only ascription in the N.T. of a ministry of baptism to Jesus, whether in person or with the aid of others (see on ἐπονομάζω). But there is no historical improbability about it. He had Himself submitted to baptism at the hands of John, thus (at the least) giving the seal of His approval to the ministry which John was exercising. His first disciples were taken from among the disciples of John. There is no question, at this stage, of Christian baptism, i.e. of baptism as a sacramental rite. That was only to be instituted after His Resurrection (Mt. 28:19); cf. 7:20. The baptism of John was symbolic of a cleansing of the soul (cf. 3:21 below), and making a fresh start in the spiritual life. "Repent ye," was an early message of Jesus ( Mk. 1:15), as it was the chief message of John Baptist. See further on ἐπονομάζω.

23. For the constr. ἐπονομάζω, where we would expect ἐπονομάζω, (as in the preceding verse), see on ἐπονομάζω. συμμετρίζω not occur again in Jn.

John also was carrying on his ministry of baptism in the same neighbourhood, viz. at Aenon.

Ἀλών ἐξῆς ἄνω Χαλεμ. These places cannot be identified with certainty. There is a Salim to the E. of Shechem, and a village called 'Ainun to the N.E.; but (1) there is no water at 'Ainun, and Alôw was a place of ἄσσα τολλάτσα; (2) 'Ainun is 7 miles from Salim, and this could hardly be described as "near" (cf. 1:18-19, 30:42); and (3) it is not likely that John the Baptist was labouring among the Samaritans (cf. 4:46). The site assigned by Eusebius and Jerome (and shown to the pilgrim Aetheria in the fourth century) is probably the true site, viz. in the Jordan valley about 3½ miles south of Betsan, the ancient Scythopolis. "Aenon near to Salim" is marked at this point on the mosaic map of Madaba. There is still here a remarkable group of seven springs, all lying within a radius of a quarter of a mile, which answers well to the description ἄσσα τολλάτσα. It is on the W. bank of the Jordan, and this is confirmed by v. 26. Cheyne would read "Jerusalem" for "Salim," and finds Aenon in 'Ain Karim, which is near Jerusalem on the W. side. But this is merely guess-work.


32, 38. ἐγέρθησαν οὖν τέκνα. "So there arose a questioning on the part of (the) John's disciples with Jews about purifying," i.e. about the purificatory baptisms which Jesus, as well as John, was encouraging. The turn of the sentence (ὑπὲρ) shows that it was the Baptist's disciples who began the dispute; they were puzzled that Jesus, to whom John had pointed as One far superior to himself, should carry on a ministry, outwardly similar to John's, and thus divert disciples from their own master, who was pre-eminently "the Baptist." Naturally, they would cross-examine the Jews who flocked to Jesus' ministry of baptism, and would ask them what was its special virtue.

Finally, they came to John with their complaint, addressing him as their Rabbi (see on ἐπονομάζω): "He who was with thee on the
II. 28-30.] SECOND WITNESS OF JOHN BAPTIST

καὶ ἄκουσαν ἰσόν τῷ χαρῷ γείμυντα διὰ τὴν φωνήν τοῦ νυμφίου. ἀκύρως ἢ χαρὰ ἤ ἐφώτησεν ἕκατον. 30. ἐκεῖνον δὲ ἀξιόθεντα ἔμει δὲ ἐλευθεροθαιρεῦν τοις Ἥσσαῖοι (Hos. 2:19), and we have the explicit statement, "Thy Maker is thy husband: Yahweh of hosts is His Name" (Isa. 54:5). The Rabbinis held that Moses was the paraclym and "friend of the bridegroom." In the N.T. Christ is represented as the Bridegroom, and the Church, the spiritual Israel, as the Bride. The image appears in Paul (Eph. 5:28), and a Cor. 11:3; in the latter passage, Paul regarding himself as the paraclym), and also in the Apocalypse, where the New Jerusalem descends from heaven as a bride adorned for her husband, the Lamb (Rev. 19:11). This doctrine, according to the Synoptists, goes back to the teaching of Jesus Himself. The parables of the Marriage Feast and of the Ten Virgins (Mt. 22:11-30) imply as much; and, above all, there is the reply of Jesus to the question why His disciples did not practise fasting, while the disciples of John the Baptist did: "Can the sons of the bride chamber fast, while the Bridegroom is with them?" (Mk. 2:19). In this saying Jesus claims to be the mystical Bridegroom Himself, and thus answers those who would put Him on a level with John the Baptist.

The answer of John in the present passage is similar. His disciples complain because his work is being invaded by Jesus; but he reminds them that while Jesus is the νυμφίος, who naturally has the Bride for His own, He, John, is only ἐσγεγεικὸς τοῦ νυμφίου, the Bridegroom's friend, the paraclym, whose office it was to bring the Bride and the Bridegroom together. That being done, his task is accomplished.

The ἀγαθὸν, or παραμυθητος, was a well-recognised personage in Judaism (not in Galilee, and there is no mention of him in the account of the marriage at Cana). He stands expectant (ὁ τωρίζων; cf. 12:19), and rejoices when he hears the voice of the bridegroom in converse with his bride (for ἐν αὐτῷ τοῦ νυμφίου, cf. Jer. 7:16; 6:14; Rev. 18:1). χαρὰ γείμυνσι does not occur again in Jn., but is found Isa. 66:15: 1 Thess. 2:8. It is not necessarily a Hebraism; cf. Plato, Sympos. 195 B, φιλοῦντος φιλέτ μιμᾶτα τοῖς γύροις.

We have had the word καθαρισμός, of ritual or ceremonial purification, at 28 above.

27. ἦν ἐκεῖνος μὲν ἀκόουσαν τινὰ, καὶ καθαρισμός ἔμει δὲ ἐλευθεροθαιρεῦν, τοις Ἥσσαῖοι.
IV. I. The Baptist's ministry should recede into the background, while that of Jesus drew "all men" (v. 36) more and more. "He must increase, while I must decrease," is the final message of the Baptist. So Jesus had said, "The least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he" (Mt. 11:11).

Jesus leaves Judea for Galilee by way of Samaria (IV. 1-4)

IV. I. δὲ κύριος. This is read by ABCLTW, but the Western reading (κύριος) is plain that the text has been tampered with. The verse is clumsily expressed and seems to have been re-written, δὲ κύριος having probably been inserted in the later draft to remove any ambiguity as to the subject of the sentence.

It has been pointed out (on 1:26) that His disciples were accustomed to address Jesus either as Rabbi (Teacher) or as Μαριάμ (Lord). And in His absence, according to the Synoptists, they used both terms, either saying δὲ διδάσκων (as Jesus bade them do, Mk. 14:36) or δὲ κύριος (Mk. 11:19), an appellation which He approved (Mk. 8:39). In Jn., Martha says δὲ διδάσκων (1:49); Mary Magdalene says δὲ κύριος (20:16), and so do the disciples (16:23).

In direct narrative, when the evangelists are using their own words and not reporting the words of others, a distinction must be made. In Lk. (7:13 10:1 11:20 12:2 17:20 22:42), "the Lord" is often used by the evangelist. So in the Marcan Appendix (16:20 20) we have "the Lord" twice. This also is the usage of the Gospel of Peter. But Mk. (followed by Mt.) never writes "the Lord," but always "Jesus." The primitive narratives, that is, took the form "Jesus said . . . " "Jesus did . . . " The form "the Lord said . . . " is later.

Now in the direct narrative of the Fourth Gospel we find "Jesus" as in Mk., and not "the Lord" as in Lk., with five exceptions which are instructive. In 4:6 5:21 11, δὲ κύριος is the true reading; but these verses are all explanatory glosses, not taken from the hand of Jn., but written after the first draft of the story had been completed. In 20:21 21, however, where we have δὲ κύριος, we are in the middle of the post-Resurrection narrative, and it is not unnatural that special reverence should be exhibited in writing of Him who had risen.

Soon after the Resurrection, the title began to imply that larger and deeper meaning of δὲ κύριος as the representative of LORD which is frequent in Paul and is found in the Acts (28:9ff).

That "Jesus is Lord" (1 Cor. 12:5; cf. Phil. 2:11) has become the central thought of the Christian profession; but now the phrase from the lower to the higher sense begins with the citation of Ps. 110:1 by the Master Himself (Mk. 12:30).

Thus the use by Jn. of the form of narrative in which the central figure is designated as "Jesus" (save in the exceptional passages cited) rather than as "the Lord," illustrates well the primitive characteristics which the Fourth Gospel exhibits.

Probably some time had elapsed since Jesus had begun His ministry in Judea (cf. δὲ συνελήφθη, 3:9); and it is possible that His departure was subsequent to John's imprisonment (cf. 15:4). The Pharisees (see on 1:26) had begun to take notice of Him, being perhaps even more suspicious of Him than they had been of John (1:26), because they had heard that (δὲ recitantis) "Jesus is making more disciples than John." So He moved to another place (cf. 7:1 12:26). At this stage He was anxious to avoid open collision with the Pharisees. It will be noticed that we have the "making of disciples" and "baptizing" associated closely thus early, long before the charge is said to have been given to the apostles μαθητήσατε . . . Βαπτίσατε αὐτοὺς (Mt. 20:28).

The art is omitted before Ἰησοῦς μαθητὴς μαθ. ποιεῖ, contrary to the general usage of Jn., who prefers to write δὲ Ιησοῦς (see on 1:26). We have the same omission at 4:35ff, and for the same reason as here, viz. that δὲ introduces the words which were actually spoken; the construction is not oblique, but that of δὲ recitantis.

2. If this verse is part of the original draft of the Gospel, it is a parenthetical comment or correction by Jn., and is quite in his manner (see on 2:28). He wishes to prevent his readers from making any mistake; the Pharisees had heard that Jesus was baptizing disciples in large numbers, but Jn. pauses to explain that the report which reached them was inaccurate in so far as it suggested that Jesus baptized in person. And it may be that this correction of Ἐβαπτίσατε in 20 (where see note) is well founded.

But it is probable that the verse 4:2 is not from the hand of Jn., but was added at a revision of the text, because of the idea that it would detract from the dignity of Jesus to perform the ministry of baptism, which even Paul was accustomed as a 1 See introd., p. xxxii.
IV. 5-6.] DISCOURSE WITH SAMARITAN WOMAN

γοῦ τῆς Ἰακώβ, ὦ και Ἰσραήλ ἐκ τῆς ὀδοντοφορίας ἐκθέτει οὖσα ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ ὧν ἦν ὁ ἐκ τῆς Σαμαρίας. Ἀκούει τοῦ Ἰσραήλ ἐκ τῆς ὀδοντοφορίας ἐκθέτει οὖσα ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ ὧν ἦν Ῥευματικοῦτος. Ἀκούει τοῦ Ἰσραήλ ἐκ τῆς ὀδοντοφορίας ἐκθέτει οὖσα ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ ὧν ἦν Ῥευματικοῦτος. The Gospel According to St. John, IV. 5-6.

"Askar is situated about five furlongs N.E. of Jacob's Well."

E. A. Abbott finds Sychar in the root ἱσχαρ, "drunkenness"; i.e. it is an opprobrious name for Shechem (cf. Isa. 28:2); this, it suggests, is suitable to the moral of the dialogue, which has to do with drinking. But there is no need to find such subtle and obscure allegory in a place-name.

The verb is used again by Jn. only at v. 38. ὄδοντοφορία appears elsewhere in the N.T. only at 2 Cor. 11:20.

ἐκαθιστατο, "He was seated"; cf. 11:20 2018. καθίσμα in the N.T. is always used in a durative sense. ἔστω may mean "just as He was," sc. without waiting to select a place deliberately; but more probably it refers to καθίσαντος ἐκ τῆς ὀδοντοφορίας, "tired with His journey, He was seated by the well." Cf. 1 Kings 2:1 for a somewhat similar use of εἰσέρχεσθαι εἰς ἐκεῖνα omits εἰς in some cursives and in Latin, Syriac, and Coptic vs.

For καθίσαντος, see on 11:4 for Jn.'s emphasis on the true humanity of Jesus. He saw nothing in speaking of Jesus as "tired" which was inconsistent with His oneness with Him of whom the prophet wrote, "The Everlasting God, the Lord, fainteth nor, neither is weary." (Isa. 40:28).

"Jacob's Well" is at a fork in the northern road to Samaria; one branch, the ancient caravan road, going N.E. to Scythopolis, the other going W. by Nahal and thence N. to Gessanum. The well is about 100 feet deep, and at the bottom the water collects, probably by infiltration. The double title πηγή (v. 6) and φιλαμ (vv. 11, 12) is thus explicable. Why any one should have taken pains to sink a deep pit, when there is abundance of water both at Nahal and 'Askar, we cannot tell; any more than we can explain why a woman should come half a mile from 'Askar to draw water which she could have got in the village. But, at any rate, the well is there, and probably has been there since the days of Jacob. In the absence of knowledge of the exact position of the woman's

1 See, for a full discussion of the site, G. A. Smith, Hist. Geogr. of Holy Land, ch. 18.

2 E.B. 1801.

3 For difficulties in the way of accepting the tradition that the well of Sychar was "Jacob's Well," cf. Pal. Explor. Fund Quarterly Statement, April 1909, p. 151.
house, it would be idle to speculate as to the motive which drew her to this, which was even then a sacred well, rather than to the 'Ain at 'Askar.

"It was about the sixth hour," that is, about noon (see on i. 39), the natural time to rest while the sun was at its height. The account given by Josephus of Moses resting by a well in Midian (Ex. 2:18) provides a striking parallel: καθήσοντος ἐπὶ τοῦ θινακοῦ ἐν τῷ οἴσκῳ καὶ τῇ ταλαιπωρίᾳ δύο μεγαθρών ἅπας ἕκαστος ἐν τῷ τάφῳ τῆς τάφους (Ant. ii. xi. 1). As in the Gospel story, Moses was sitting by the well at midday, weary with his journey, when the women came to draw water for their flocks. No doubt, the usual time for this was in the evening, but there is no improbability in water being drawn sometimes at noon, as Josephus represents it, and as Jn. says that the woman came to do.

7. "A woman of Samaria" (ἐκ τῆς Σαμαριάς; cf. 14). In later days she was commemorated as St. Photina, on March 20.

For ἄντλημα, the regular word for drawing water from a well, see on 26. above.

δῶς μοι πάν. So Νέβας; the rec. has πίε. This is a common Greek constr.; cf. Xen. Cyrop. vii. 1, τῷ δὲ Κυρίῳ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐμαυτοῦ καὶ πίε, and see v. 33.

8. ὅτι γὰρ μοι αὕτη τὴν ἄντλημα. For His disciples had gone into the city (see Sychar, vv. 5, 30) to buy food." Had they been with Him, they would have been the natural persons to draw water for their Master, and He would not have had need to ask of a stranger. Probably they carried with them an ἄντλημα, or skin-bucket, as part of their travelling equipment, in which water could be drawn. The woman notices that Jesus has no ἄντλημα (v. 11).

We do not know which of His disciples were with Jesus on this journey (see on 21), or how many there were. See further on v. 18.

Syr. sin. places this clause in its chronological order after πώρος (v. 6), a rearrangement of the text made for the sake of clearness; but the use of parenthesis is quite in Jn.'s style (see, e.g., 24).

τροφάς, victuals, only here in pl. number.

That the disciples should buy victuals in a Samaritan town shows that the barrier between Jew and Samaritan was not impassable. The rule as to food seems to have varied from 1 See Intro., p. xxvii.

9. λέγει δὲ αὐτῇ ἢ γυνή ἡ Σαμαριτείας πώς ὅτι Ἱσαάκιος ἐν παρ' ἐμὸν πάντα ἄγαν καὶ Σαμαριτείδιος ἄμεσης; ὅτι γὰρ σχοινίωσιν Ἰσαάκιος Σαμαριτείας. 10. Ἀπεκριθεὶς Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἔκαµη αὐτῇ ἐλέει τὴν δωρεάν time to time. One Rabbinical precept is, "Let no man eat the bread of the Cutheans, for he that eateth their bread is as he that eateth swine's flesh" (M. Sheb. viii. 10), and Samaritan wine was forbidden to a Jew. But, on the other hand, "the victuals of the Cutheans are permitted if not mixed with wine or vinegar" (Jus. Ah. Zer. v. 4), and their unleavened bread was allowed (Bab. Kidd. 76a). There was continuous traffic of Jews through Samaria—from Galilee to Jerusalem, and from Jerusalem to Galilee—and it is unlikely, except at moments of intense theological excitement, that a hungry traveller would have scrupled to buy bread in a Samaritan village, or that a Samaritan villager would have scrupled to sell it.

6. Ἰσαάκιος ἐν κτή. The Samaritan woman afflicts surprise—for her words are ironical—that a Jew should ask her for water. There was nothing strange in asking a woman for water, as it was women who generally drew it from the wells; cf. Gen. 24. However bitter the feeling between Jew and Samaritan, we cannot suppose that a draught of cold water in the noon tide heat would be likely to be refused by either to other. It was counted the mark of a wicked man "not to have given water to the weary to drink" (Job. 22); and the precept of kindness was universal: "If thine enemy be thirsty, give him water to drink" (Prov. 25:21). Yet the woman makes her little gibe—half-jest, half-earnest—recalling to Jesus the enmity between Jews and Samaritans. She recognised Jesus as a Jew, perhaps by His dress or perhaps by His manner of speech (cf. Mt. 26). The narrative does not say explicitly that she granted the request of Jesus, δῶς μοι πάν, but the reader is intended to understand that she did so.

The explanatory comment ἀντὶ συνεχόμενοι Ἰσαάκιος Σαμαριτείας, "for Jews do not treat familiarly with Samarians," is omitted by W. But it must be retained with M. This, again, does not occur again in N.T., but it appears in Ignat. Magn. 3, ἐν χρΑίθα μὴ πρῶτον Σαμαριταίας μὴ συχνάζουσα τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ τοῦ ἐκκλησίαν, "it becomes you not to presume upon the youth of your bishop," to treat him with undue familiarity.

If συνεχόμενοι is translated "have dealings with," ἐκκλησίας, the comment would not be accurate; for although Jews and Samaritans were intolerant of each other (cf. Lk. 9:52; Jn. 8:42), of necessity there was much business intercourse. As v. 2

1 See, for these Talmudical references, D.C.G., s.v. "Samaria."
10. ἢ τάπερ καὶ ἐκδοχήν τις δυνατον καὶ ἐδειξεν ἐν σοι ὁ διόρωμος Χριστός, ἵνα λέγητε ἵνα γνωτε Κύριε,
indicates, Jews could trade with Samarians, as indeed they could do with heathen (cf. Neh. 13:15).

The comment is not that of the Samaritan woman, but of the evangelist, and is quite in his manner (cf. Intro., p. xxiv).

10. ἢ τάπερ καὶ ἐκδοχήν. For the constr., see on 100.

εἴ τις λέγητον, "If thou knewest the gift of God":

Of a free gift, occurs in the Gospels adverbially (Mt. 10:9), and is always used in the Acts and Epistles of a divine gift. It refers here to the "living water" mentioned in the next sentence, i.e. to the gift of the Holy Spirit (which ὅποιον always indicates in the Acts). Some commentators have referred to John 3:5, and have interpreted it of the gift which God gave of His Son, and the revelation of salvation through Him.

εἴ τάπερ καὶ ἐκδοχήν ὑπήρχε. The woman had taken Him for a Jew. But He was no ordinary Jew, and if she had understood who He was, she would have been the suppliant (ἐπετέλεσεν καὶ ἐρώτησεν), "It is you who would have asked Ἰησοῦς, and He would have granted her request" (cf. Mt. 7); He would have given her "living water."

ἐδειχεν ἐν σοι ὁ διόρωμος Χριστός. This saying was paradoxical in its form, like the saying with which the attention of Nicodemus was arrested (3:5). The woman did not understand it (v. 11), nor could she have been expected to do so. But Jesus is here following the method by which He was accustomed to convey instruction to simple people who were willing to learn; and the discourse which follows may be particularly compared with 20:8. The plan of these instructions, for which there are Synopsis parallels, has been discussed in the Introduction, p. cxx.

ὁ διόρωμος Χριστός. "Living water" is water issuing from a spring or fountain, unlike the water in Jacob's Well, which was due to percolation and rainfall,1 being collected in a kind of cistern or pit (ὁ δείπνος, v. 12). This was good water, but had not the virtues of "running" or "living" water, such as was always preferred, especially for purposes of purification (Gen. 26:19, Lev. 14:5, Num. 19:7).

Water was full of symbolism to Eastern thought, and in the O.T. it is often symbolic of the Divine Wisdom which is the source of life. Thus the law of the wise (Prov. 13:14; cf. Prov. 14:19). The Son of Strach declares that he that possesses the law shall obtain wisdom: "with bread of understanding shall he feed him, and give him water of wisdom to drink" (Eccles. 15:3-4). Zechariah's vision of hope is that "living waters shall go out from Jerusalem" (Zech. 14:8; cf. Ezek. 47, Joel 3:18), i.e. that in the glorious future the blessings of the Law shall be extended far and wide. The promise of Isaiah (44:2) is that "with joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation," a passage specially parallel to the declaration of Christ here.

"If thou hadst known who it is that speaketh to thee, thou wouldst have asked Him, and He would have given thee living water." To appreciate the depth of this saying, it must be remembered that, according to the O.T., it is Yahweh Himself who is the Fountain of living waters (Ps. 36:8; Jer. 2:13; Cant. 4:14, where the mystic Bride is described as ἡ φραγμὴ δαρῶν (πετροὺ)). So also in the Apocalypse, the river of the Water of Life proceeds from the throne of God and of the Lamb (Rev. 22:1; cf. Rev. 7:1). Thus the statement of Jesus to the Woman of Samaria that, had He been asked, He would have given her living water, implies His claim to be One with the Lord of the O.T. prophets, who is alone the Source and Spring of the living waters which refresh the soul and assuage the spiritual thirst of men. See further on v. 14.

Note that Jesus does not call Himself the Living Water, although He calls Himself the Living Bread (6:32). It is from Him that the Living Water proceeds, for this is the symbol of the Spirit which He was to send (7:38).

There is no clear parallel in Philo to this doctrine of the Living Water which flows from the Word, although the similar idea expounded by St. Paul (1 Cor. 10:4) of the mystical meaning of the Rock in the Desert from which water flowed forth for the refreshment of Israel is found in Leg. Alleg. ii. 21: ὁ γὰρ ἐκ βράχου ἱπποτῇ ἐν ὁμιλίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ ἔστη, ὃν ἐκάρακεν καὶ προετείνατο ἐκεῖνον ἀντὶ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ δυνάμεων, ἐφ' ἐντολής τοῦ φιλόσοφου ψυχῆς.

In the Messianic forecast of Isa. 35:1, one of the promised blessings was ἐκ τῶν βράχων ἐγένετο νεών ἡ φράγμα ἡ διάπερ, and at v. 26 below (where see note) Jesus is represented as declaring that He was Messiah. See on ᾧ for a quotation of this Messianic passage by Justin Martyr.

11. κύριε. She is impressed by the Speaker, and so addresses Him now (cf. vv. 15-19) in terms of respect (see on 19). How could He provide spring water, or water of any kind, without a bucket (ἀλαγηματία; cf. v. 8)?

For ἐρωτευται and its depth, see on v. 6. The broken constr. εἰσε ὅτι is found only once again in N.T., at 3 Jn. 10.
IV. 14.] DISCOURSE WITH SAMARITAN WOMAN

Δυσώ καταστα, ο μη διψήσεις εἰς τὸν ἄλμων, ἀλλὰ τὸ δῶμαι τὸ δῶμον αὐτῷ γενήσεται εἰς αὐτὸ πηγὴ ὕδατος ἐλλομένων εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

presents some parallels to these thoughts. The stream of the waters of Wisdom comes originally from God: "Her thoughts are filled from the sea, and her counsels from the great deep." (v. 29). Of the wise man increasing in wisdom it may be said, "My stream became a river, and my river became a sea." (v. 31); these waters of Wisdom lose themselves at last in the same eternal Ocean whence they sprang. Cf. Ps. 36:7 που ὡς θηρίον. The water of life is, as Jesus says here, πηγὴ ποιμένος ἐλλομένου εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, leading forth to eternal life. C. Wesley puts it all in familiar words:

"Thee of life the Fountain art, 
Freely let me take of Thee; 
Spring Thou up within my heart, 
Rise to all eternity."

The verb ἀλλομέναι does not seem to be applied elsewhere to the action of water. But water in this passage is symbolic of the Spirit (cf. 7:38); and ἀλλομέναι or ἐφ᾽ ἀλλομεναι in LXX is applied to the action of a 'spirit of God,' forcing its way or falling violently on Simon, Saul, and David." It may be, therefore, as E. A. Abbott has suggested, that ἀλλομενον is used here with special reference to the action of the Holy Spirit, vehement like that of rushing waters. If that be so, εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον expresses the purpose of this spiritual torrent of grace; it is "with a view to eternal life."

There seems to be a reminiscence of this passage in Ignatius, Rom. 7; ὡς ὁ χερσὶ δοκεῖ καὶ λαλεῖ ἐν ἔνθα, where Lightfoot supposes the MS. reading to be a corruption of δοκεῖ δοκεῖ εἰς ἐλλομενον. It is possible that there is also a trace of it in Justin (Tryph. 69). Commenting on Isa. 35:8 he says: πῆρα ἔδωκεν καὶ ἐξελέξει, ἐξ ἐνέβαλεν (i.e. has gushed forth) ὕδωρ ἐκ θαλάσσης. Cf. also Tryph. 114, and see on 76. Verses 10 and 14 are quoted explicitly in Pseudo Sophocles 141.

In one important particular, at least, the promise of Jesus about the Living Water transcends what is said about the Water of Wisdom by the Son of Sirach: "They that drink me shall yet be thirsty" are the words of Eccles. 24:12; the spiritual thirst is insatiable, so far as the Hebrew sage knew. But Jesus said: "Whosoever shall drink of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst." (cf. 4:14). To him who has appropriated the revelation of God in Christ, there is no sense of imperfection in the Divine gift, no dissatisfaction with it as insufficient. The Living Water is always quickening, always

2 Abbott, Dia. 2315; cf. Judg. 14:10 17, 1 Sam. 10:6 16.
flowing in correspondence with human need. As Bengel puts it: "ubi sitis occurrerit, hominis non aquae defectus est." The promise of Jesus is that those who thirst after righteousness shall be filled. (φανερώθη, Mt. 5).

With εἰς τὸν θάνατον τῶν ἡμῶν, cf. ἀναπάντεσιν, with the Lat. and Syr. vss. generally, insert εἰς before the second δώσει; but om. ΑΒΓΔΘ. ἐξάτως λέγει, "for ever." This is a common phrase in the LXX and occurs elsewhere in the N.T.; but it is especially frequent in Jn. (6:11; 8:15; 10:28; 11:12; 12:17; 13:14; 17; 1; Jn. 2:17.

The phrase εἰς τὸν θάνατον first appears in 4 Macc. 10, where a mother prefers to the temporal safety of her sons τῷ εἰς τὸν θάνατον . . . τῷ σώζων εἰς αὐτῶν ζωήν παρὰ θεῷ. It appears again in Jn. 4:16; 6:11; Rom. 5:21; 1 Tim. 1:18; and Jn. 2:17, and in each case the reference is to the future life, the life after death (see note on 33).

15. λέγει τῷ συνήκει. For the constr., see on 33. For κόμε, cf. v. 11.

δόσο μοι τοῦ τι σώζει. Cf. 6:11 δόσοι τῶν ἀναπάντεσιν. The woman did not understand Jesus' words about the Water which assuages thirst for ever; and her reply is a puzzled request: "Give me this water, that I may not thirst, and need not come hither continually to draw from the well." She speaks half in irony; for she does not believe in any ζώον εἰς τὸν θάνατον such as Jesus had incommunicably spoken of as being "in" the recipient of His gift.

The rec. text has ἐρχομαι with ACDWΓΔΘ; but Ν support διέρχομαι. As Field points out, διέρχομαι may have arisen from a mistake in transcribing ἐρχομαι; but in any case the prep. διὰ does not add special force to the verb here (cf. Lk. 1:23).

16. ἐν μυθίστῃ κτῆλ. For ἐν with the pres. subj., cf. 6:10, 1 Jn. 2:27, 5.

18. The exact bearing of the words of Jesus, "Go, call thy husband, and come hither," is not easy to determine. Perhaps the woman was going off, after her last retort, and Jesus bade her come back again with her "husband," as He wished to carry on His ministry at Sychar (v. 33). He had observed her intelligence, and He knew her need. Another interpretation of the words is that Jesus wished, by mentioning her "husband," to recall her to a sense of her condition, that thus the way might be opened for a fuller presentation to her of His message. We cannot in any case assume that more than a fragment of the conversation has been preserved, and much that was said is, no doubt, omitted in the narrative of Jn. (see on v. 18).

19. For the verb ἔρχεται, see on 167; and for the aor. imper. φανερώθη, see on 33.

27. καὶ εἶπεν. So νεΔΛΝΓΔΘ, but BCW Syr. sin. and Syr. cur. add ἐστιν.

The woman, by this time, feels that she is in the presence of One to whom she cannot lie, and she confesses, "I have no husband." Jesus gently shows her that He knows all about that, and about her past. "You had five husbands, and he whom thou hast now is not thy husband." Jn. frequently lays stress on the power which Jesus had of reading men's hearts (cf. 1:46, 24:25). If the report of His words here is precise, He showed more than natural insight, and this the evangelist evidently means to suggest. But (see on v. 18) we have to remember that the record of this conversation probably depends on the subsequent report of the woman (v. 27), and in regard to some details she may have confused what her own guilty conscience told her with what Jesus saw in her face. On the other hand, to have had five husbands in succession would be an unusual experience, and the woman may have been notorious for the number of her marriages. But there is no hint in the narrative that Jesus had heard of her before, although there is nothing to exclude this possibility.

18. πέντε ἄνδρας. It is remarkable that Heracleon (according to Origen) read ἤγας ἄνδρας, a reading unknown elsewhere. Origen, himself, finds allegory in the number ἄγας, and says that it refers to the fact that the Samaritans only recognised as canonical the five books of Moses.
shipped side by side with Yahweh. Here then are the five ‘husbands’ of the Samaritan woman, while the husband who was ‘not a husband’ stands for the spurious cult of Yahweh, which to the Jews was little better than heathenism.1 But this ingenious interpretation will not bear analysis. It appears from the narrative in 2 Kings 17:30, 31 that not five, but seven, strange deities were introduced into Samaria from Assyria.2 Further, these were not the objects of worship in succession, but simultaneously, so that the supposed analogy to the successive husbands of the Samaritan woman breaks down. Again, the allegory would imply that the heathen deities had been the legitimate gods of Samaria, while Yahweh whom she came to worship was not a true ‘husband’ at all, and that therefore Samaria’s relation to Yahweh was that of an illegitimate and shameful sort, shame equally resting on her and Him who was not her ‘husband.’ No Christian writer of the first century, or of any century, would have ventured to construct an allegory so blasphemous when its implications are examined. This fancy may safely be rejected.

Another suggestion is that ‘he whom thou hast is not thy husband’ alludes to Simon Magus, who had a great influence in Samaria (Acts 8:9-11).

But the simplest interpretation is the best. The narrative is a genuine reminiscence of an incident that actually happened, recorded many years after the event, and probably—so far as the words of the conversation are concerned—with much freedom. That Jesus expressed Himself so tersely and even enigmatically, to an ignorant woman, as the deep saying of v. 24 would suggest, without explaining what He said more fully, is improbable. On the other hand, the vividness and simplicity of the story have the note of actuality. The narrative brings out clearly the main features of the interview between Jesus and the woman, and it is easy to follow the general lines of their conversation.

When the woman got back to her friends (v. 29) she reported in eager haste what her experience had been, and told them what Jesus had said to her. She may have exaggerated or confused words here and there, but that the incident became known to any one was probably due to her own talk about it. Jesus seems to have been alone with her (v. 27), but this is not certain. If we could suppose that one of the disciples remained with his Master at the well, while the others went into Sychar to make their purchases (which would a priori be probable), then we should be able to refer the report of the conversation to the disciple’s recollection, as well as to the woman’s account of it. And that the disciple who remained with his Master is not mentioned by the evangelist would not surprise us if he were John the son of Zebedee, who is kept so much out of sight in the Fourth Gospel, while at the same time his reminiscences are behind large parts of it. But this only can be affirmed with certainty, that the woman told the story to her fellow-villagers, and with such emphasis that many of them ‘believed on’ Jesus, so that He (and no doubt His disciples) stayed at Sychar for two days (v. 40). All the disciples who were present (see on v. 8) must have become thoroughly familiar with her report.

10. For κύριος, see v. 11, and for the shades of meaning of θεωρεῖν see on 2:23.

κύριος, θεωρεῖν καλ., “Sir, I perceive.” i.e. from what you have said, “that you are a prophet” (cf. 5:2, Lk. 7:18, “a prophet,” “the prophet”). A prophet was one who had special powers of insight, as well as of foresight. Cf. Lk. 7:28, where the Pharisee objects that if Jesus were really a prophet He would have known that the woman with the cruse of ointment was a sinner. The Samaritan woman was astonished at the knowledge of her personal history which Jesus displayed, and, by her reply, she virtually confesses that it is with her even as He had said.

20. The woman diverts the conversation to another subject, and proceeds to raise a theological difficulty, either to evade the personal issue, or because she was honestly anxious to learn what a prophet with such wonderful insight would say about the standing controversy between Jews and Samaritans. Probably both motives affected her.

οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν καλ., “Our fathers worshipped in this mountain,” i.e. Mount Gerizim, at the foot of which Jacob’s Well is situated. Abraham (Gen. 22:2) and Jacob (Gen. 33:20) had set up altars at Shechem; and the Samaritan Pentateuch at Deut. 27:4 records the setting up of an altar in Mount Gerizim (the true reading being Mount Ebal); cf. also Deut. 11:29, 27:12. After the Return from the Babylonian Captivity, the Jews and Samaritans parted company, and a temple was erected on Mount Gerizim about 400 B.C. It was destroyed by John Hyrcanus about 129 B.C.; but the odism theologicum grew more bitter thereafter, and in the first century the hatred between Jew and Samaritan was ready to break out at any moment.

καὶ Ἰμᾶς Μηνές καλ., “and you (i.e. the Jews) say that
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IV. 21–22. DISCOURSE WITH SAMARITAN WOMAN

That the phrase occurs 7 times exactly is noted by Abbott (Dial. 625).

It is not ἱερός, for the thought of the inevitability of the predestined hour (see on 23) is not present here; cf. Lk. 15.

οὖν . . . οὖν . . . “not (only) in Gerizim and not (only) in Jerusalem.” These ancient rivalries will disappear when the spirituality of true religion is fully realised. The prophets had already taken this wide view. “Men shall worship Yahweh, every one from his place,” was the vision of Zephaniah (2:11): “in every place incense is offered unto my Name, and a pure offering,” was Malachi’s forecast (1:11).
The words ascribed to Jesus here are in entire harmony with His saying about the destruction of the Temple, and its replacement by the spiritual temple of believers (see on 20). Cf. Acts 4:11, 15:21.

“The Father,” not as contrasted with “the Son” (see 22), but as the Father of all men. The Samaritan woman had referred to “our father Jacob,” and “our fathers (who) worshipped” in Gerizim (vv. 22, 20), but pride of ancestry is to be replaced by the thought of the universal Fatherhood of God, when questions pertaining to worship are being answered.

ὁ ποιητής is a very frequent designation of God in Jn.; but it nearly always occurs in connexion with the thought of the Sonship of Christ. Here, however, it is rather “the Universal Father”; perhaps we may compare 317:16:Mt. (see on 69).

22. This verse is an assertion of the superiority of the Jewish religion to the Samaritan, not based on any difference as to the place of worship, but rather on the difference as to their knowledge of the Object of worship. “Ye,” i.e. the Samaritans, “worship that which ye know not” (cf. ὡς οὖν οἱ οἱδασεν in v. 32). They accepted Yahweh for the true God, indeed, but they knew little about Him. By refusing to recognise the writings of the prophets and their Canaanite idolatry, they shut themselves off from all revelation of God except that which was contained in the Law. The Athenian inscription Ἀργοστίς δέος quoted in Acts 17:29 provides no parallel to the ignorance of the Samaritans.
The Samaritans knew, as the Athenians professedly did not know, the Name of the God to whom they erected their altar on Mount Gerizim; but their ignorance was an ignorance of His character and purposes.

“We,” on the other hand, i.e. the Jews, “worship that which we know” (but cf. 7:20), the same God as the God of the Samaritans, but known to Jews as He was not known to
Samaritans; cf. Ps. 147:10, 10. The Jews were the chosen people, "whose is the adoption and the glory and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service (of God), and the promises." (Rom. 9). Paul's enumeration of their prerogatives is not more emphatic than the calm statement, "We worship that which we know." The woman of Samaria is not permitted to suppose that the Speaker believes the Samarian religion to be as good as the Jewish, although He tells her that in the future their poor rivalries as to their respective sanctuaries will be disregarded as of no consequence. He gives the reason why the Jewish religion is, and must be, superior: διὰ σωτηρίας ἐκ τῶν Ιουδαίων ἐστιν.

Score, "the salvation," the Messianic deliverance (see on 3:15), was the central thought of Jewish national expectation (cf. Lk. 19:10, 11; Acts 13:33, 38). It was to come from the tribe of Judah, εκ τῶν Ιουδαίων, as distinct from the other tribes; cf. Gen. 49 (a passage which Samaritans accepted as canonical, although they do not seem to have taken it as Messianic), Is. 50 (quoted Rom. 11:26). Later Judaism held firmly to this conviction of Jewish prerogative. Cf. Test. of XII. Patr., Dan. v. 10, "There shall arise unto you from the tribe of [Judah and] Levi the salvation of Yahweh;" see also Gcd viii. 1, Naph. viii. 2. See further for σωτηρία, σωτηρία on 4:18. Here the point is that the Messianic deliverance was to be εκ τῶν Ιουδαίων. For the construction, εκ...; see on 3:15.

The plural αἵματα of Ἰουδαίων (and for "the Jews" in the Fourth Gospel, see on 1:19. The force of ἰδεῖς must be observed: "We worship that which we know," Jesus, here, definitely associates Himself with the Jews; He ἦσαν Ἰουδαῖοι. Their God is His God. Nowhere in the Gospels is there another passage so emphatic as this, in its assertion of the common nationality of Jesus and the Jews who rejected Him; cf. Mt. 15:14. Here He associates Himself with the Jews in a common worship. The plural αἵματα in 3:1 is not a true parallel to this. See on 15:25.

In this verse are expressed the worthiness of Jewish worship and the supreme privilege of the Jewish race; but in v. 23 we have on the other hand the simplicity of the ideal worship of God and the catholicity of true religion. Both aspects are included in the Fourth Gospel. The evangelist is not forgetful of the debt which Christianity owes to Judaism, while he views Christianity sub specie aeternitatis as for all men and for all time. The repetition of τοὺς προσκυνοῦσας seems to have misled scribes and translators, so that there are a good many minor variants, but none calling for special notice. Syr. cur. exhibits extraordinary confusion here, for in it v. 24 runs as follows: "For God is a Spirit, and those that worship Him in spirit, and in truth, worship, and believe, even those that in spirit and in truth worship Him." 3

28. ἔχοντος, repeated from v. 21 (where see note), the theme of that verse, which has been temporarily abandoned in v. 22, being resumed. It is a question whether καὶ τὸν κόσμον, both here and at 5:9, should not be treated as an editorial comment on the words of Jesus. But probably the words "and now is" are appended to "an hour is coming," to obviate any misunderstanding. Jesus has told the Samaritan woman that the rivalries as to sanctuaries are passing away, and that in the future "the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth." But that is not confined to the future; it may be equally asserted of the present, that true worshippers worship thus. See on 4:26.

For the word ἀληθινός, "genuine," see on 1:29. Here αὐτὸς ἀληθινὸς προσκυνητὴς is equivalent to "the genuine worshippers": at whatever altar they worship, they worship αὐτὸς προσκυνητής and ἀληθινος.

The πνεῦμα is the highest in man, for it associates him with God who ἐστιν. In so far as a man walks κατὰ πνεῦμα, does he realize the dignity of his being (cf. Rom. 8). To worship εἰς πνεῦμα is, then, to worship in harmony with the Divine Spirit, and so to worship in truth (cf. 15:18 το πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας). This is a general statement, and we must not bring in here thoughts which are peculiar to Christian doctrine, because of that fuller revelation of God which was granted in the Incarnation. Indeed, Philo has a passage precisely parallel: γῆρας [θεοτόκοι] ἐκεῖν ἐφιέμεθα πνεῦμα καὶ μόνον τῶν ἕνων φυσικῶν ἀληθινῶν, εἰς. "Genuine religious services are those of a soul offering the plain and only sacrifice, viz. truth." (quod. det. pot. instid. 7). Cf. Ps. 145:18.

καὶ γὰρ only occurs again in Jn. at 4:46; it seems to mean "for indeed" (but cf. Abbott, Dial. 12167). ἡ πατέρας, the Universal Father; see on v. 21.

ἔχει, "sees." It is not only that the true worshippers are accepted of God, but that He seeks for such. The approach

3 See Burkitt, Evangelion do Theophrastuk, i, 219, and cf. Rendel Harris, Cod. E孜α, p. 249, who would trace the error to the Western copyist of D.
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN (IV. 24–26.)

προσκυνοῦτε ἐν τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἐλπίδα διὰ προσκυνήματι. 25. λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ γιων Ολόκληρα ἃ Μεσσίας ἔρχεται, ἐλέγαμεν Χριστός ὁ θανάτου of man to God is not initiated by man; the first movement of love is on the side of God. This is the constant teaching of Jn.; cf. i Jn. 4:17; and Jn. 3:14 18. It is a phase of that doctrine of predestination which underlies the Fourth Gospel; see note on 3:14. The gift of the Spirit is a necessary preliminary to spiritual worship.

24. πνεῦμα ὅ ἐστι. The spirituality of God was an essential tenet of Judaism (cf. i Kings 8:11, Isa. 3:1), although all its implications were not recognised. It was a tenet common to Jews and Samaritans, but it is here for the first time put into three words, and its bearing on the nature of worship drawn out. The similar phrases ὁ θεὸς φυσική ὁ θεὸς ἐκτὸς ἡμῶν (I. Jn. 4:4), show that we must render "God is Spirit," not "God is a spirit." It is the Essential Being, rather than the Personality, of God which is in question.

The consequence of this, as regards worship, is repeated from v. 23. For true worship there must be affinity between the worshipped and the worshipper.

ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἑλπίδα, ὧν has the aberrant reading ἐν πνεύματι ἑλπίδας (from 14:18). For the repetition of the phrase "worship in spirit and in truth" from v. 23, see on 3:21 above. Such refrains or repetitions are a special feature of Johannine style.

26. Little is known about the Messianic doctrine of the Samaritans, but that they cherished Messianic hopes, although less clearly than the Jews, is known from other sources. Josephus (Ant. xvi. iv. 7) tells of a rising in Samaria, quelled by Pilate, which was evidently due to a kind of fanaticism, similar to that of Simon Magus in the same district (Acts 8) who gave himself out to be "some great one." 1 The Samaritan woman thought of Messiah as a prophet, like the prophet foretold in Deut. 18 (cf. v. 29 below). This was common to Jew and Samaritan, that Messiah was to be a Revealer of new truths about God and man: ἔσται ἄγγελος ἡμῶν, ἀναγγέλλων (cf. 16:22 ἡμῖν ἑσπερίαν). Thus in the Similitudes of Enoch (xlv. 3) there is a description of the Son of Man "who reveals all the treasures of that which is hidden, because the God of spirits hath chosen Him."

24, 25. N.T. Jam. 13 have ὁμομοιοῦν.

The Samaritan woman had already confessed that Jesus was "a prophet" (v. 19); but now she begins to wonder if He

1 Cf. Justin, Apol. i. 53, for a vague statement of Samaritan doctrine as to Messiah, similar to Jewish belief.

IV. 25–27.]  THE DISCIPLES WONDER

16. ἐστιν ἐκεῖνος, ἀναγγέλλω ἡμῖν ἑσπερίαν. 25. λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Ἐγώ εἰμι, ὁ λαλῶν σοι. 27. Καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἄγνωστον ἔλθαν καὶ ἔδαφος αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔθαμβαζον ὅτι may not be more. "I know," she says it wisely, "that Messiah is coming; when He comes, He will declare all things to us." Her words are almost a query; they invite a further declaration on the part of Jesus, which He gives forthwith.

Messiah is here without the article, and the title may have been used as a kind of proper name. At 1:54 (where see note) it has the article, and there as here is explained by Jn. for his Greek readers (cf. 1:28). ὁ λαλῶν is not "which is interpreted "ὁ ἄγνωστος ὁ λαλῶν τῶν ἑσπερίων, 14) but is equivalent to "which is commonly called," Χριστὸς being used like a proper name by the time that the Fourth Gospel was written. See, for a similar usage, 1:54 and cf. 5:1.

26. Jesus declares Himself. "I who am talking to you (λαλῶ) am He." So, to the blind man whose sight had been restored, He said ὁ λαλῶν μετὰ σαῦ ἐκεῖνον ἐστιν (6:5). The usage of the phrase ἐγώ εἰμι in Jn. has been discussed in the Introduction, p. cxx; and it is probable that this is one of the cases where, although the predicate is not expressed, it is implied in the context: "I that talk to you am the Christ." See on v. 10.

Nevertheless, the phrase ἐγώ εἰμι αὕτος ὁ λαλῶν is placed in the mouth of Yahweh at Isa. 48, and it may be that Jn. here intends ἐγώ εἰμι to indicate the style of Deut., as at other points (see Intro., p. cxxi). Cf. esp. 8:51 ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ λαλῶν σοι, then, if not an assertion of the Speaker's Divinity, is at any rate an assertion of His Messiahship. That it should have been made so early in His public ministry is not in accordance with what we should gather from the Synoptists. Perhaps Jn. has antedated this momentous declaration; or perhaps it was actually made on this occasion, although unheard or unnoticed by Peter, who may not have been present with Jesus on His journey through Samaria (see on v. 8 above).

The disciples wonder (v. 27)

28. ἐκ τοῦ ἄγνωστον ἐλθοῦν, "upon this came His disciples," i.e. at this point in the story. ἐκ τοῦ ἄγνωστον is not used elsewhere in the N.T. in this sense, but the reading is well attested, only N.T. having ἐν τοῦ ἄγνωστον.

ἐθαμβάζω, "began to wonder" or "kept wondering."
31. Ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ ἔφυγον αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ λέγοντες Ἐαρίβης, φίλε. 32. ὅτι εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν ἐγὼ βρῶμον ἔχω φαγεῖν ἐν οἷς ὑμεῖς ἐστε. 33. Ὁ λογος οὗ οἱ μαθηταὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἦν τῷ φήγωμεν

Messianic hopes. The men of Sychar were so much impressed by what the woman told them that they left the village and “were coming” (ἀρχαὶς) to Him. The impft. tense is used as indicating that they were on their way while the conversation between Jesus and His disciples which follows was being carried on.

The rec. text has ὄν after ἐξῆλθον, which is rejected by ABLE. But καὶ have it, and it would be quite in Jn.’s style. The omission of ὄν by a scribe after ἐξῆλθον would be a natural slip, εἰς ἀλλήλους passing into εἰς ἀλλήλους.

The redundant ἐξῆλθον καὶ occurs again διότι, τοῖς, I Jn. 28; and cf. 18.

Discourse with the Disciples (vv. 31–38)
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αὕτη ἡμέρα; 34. λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Ἠλίαν ὁ βραδύς ἡττᾶν ἵνα ποιήσῃ τὸ Θεόν τὸ πάντως με καὶ τελείωσιν αὐτῶν τῷ θρόνῳ.

μὴ τίς ἥγεγεν αὕτη ἡμέρα; For constr., see on 41; and cf. v. 29 for the form of the sentence.

34. ποιήσῃ is read by BCDLNTsw; the rec. text has ποιῆσῃ, with ΝΑΤΑ. Yet ποιήσῃ may be due to assimilation of tense with τελείωσιν which follows.

Jesus answers the disciples by reminding them that it was in the fulfillment of His mission that He had His strength and His joy. He had been tired and, no doubt, hungry; but the joy of perceiving the receptiveness of the Samaritan woman and the eager welcome which the villagers gave Him was sufficient to renew His vigour of body as well as of spirit.

To do God’s will is the supreme obligation of man at every moment of life, and to it is attached the supreme reward (Mk. 3:16, Mt. 28; Jn. 21), as is evident from the prayer of Christ (Lk. 22:46, Mt. 26:46) at Gethsemane. Christ’s “meat” was to do the will of God, the metaphor being similar to that suggested by “Man doth not live by bread alone, but by every word of God” (Deut. 8), which was the Scriptural thought that supported Him in His Temptation (Mt. 4, Lk. 4); cf. Job 33:19, Ps. 119:106. It was in Him that the words of the Psalm, “Lo, I come to do thy will, O God,” received their complete fulfilment (Ps. 40:7, Heb. 10).

ἐν ἥν ὁ βραδύς ἡττᾶται ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ: ἢ ἔνα μη αἰσχρόν ἔριν ἐνθέλεται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνοις πάντα.

βραδύς is found in Jn. only in this verse; see above (v. 32) on ἐνδύω. The thought is one which appears many times in Jn.; e.g., “I seek not mine own will, but the will of Him that sent me” (5:30), and “I am come down from heaven not to do mine own will, but the will of Him that sent me” (6:38); cf. 1:34 and Acts 13:22.

τοῦ ποιήσασιν μας. For the conception of Jesus as “sent” by God, see on 31, καὶ τελείωσιν αὐτοῦ τῷ θρόνῳ, “and to accomplish His work.”

35. ὅπως ἠρετε ἕως ὅτι ἠττᾶτον ὡς καὶ ἰδίαις ἄρκετα; ἵνα λέγω τὸν ἄλλον ἐνθέλεται ἐνθέλεται ἐνθέλεται βράσειν τὸν σώματος ἡμῶν καὶ διδάσκωνται

plished the work which Thou hast given me to do” (17); and from the Cross came the word τελείωσιν (19).

38. The illustration of the harvest used by Jesus to unfold to the disciples the significance of the incident just narrated brings Jn. into line with the Synoptists, who repeatedly tell of His parables of the seed.

He was the Great Sower (cf. Mk. 4:26), and the seed just now sown in the heart of the Samaritan woman was springing up already. The harvest of souls at Sycamore followed forthwith upon the sowing, contrary to the natural order in which he who wishes to reap must have patience and wait. Natural law does not always prevail in the spiritual world. The spiritual harvest was ready to be reaped with joy (v. 35), so that Sower and reaper might rejoice together (v. 36). But the reaping would not be for Him. It was the apostles who were to reap at a later date the harvest which originally sprang from the seed that He had sown in Samaria.

So ἀποκριθεὶς, as against the rec. ἀποκρίθης, does not occur again in the Greek Bible, although ἀποκρίθης (used as a substantive) is read by A at Judg. 19:19, 20. The meaning “four months long” is not doubtful, and the words ἀποκρίθης ἡμῖν καὶ ἰδίαις ἄρκετα mean “the harvest comes in four months’ time.” But we cannot interpret this as indicating that the harvest of the fields of Sycamore would not be ready for four months from the date of the interview of the woman of Samaria with Jesus, for that would involve the scene being laid in January or early in February. That was the rainy season, and there would have been no difficulty in getting water to drink, such as is suggested (vv. 6, 7). The words ὅπως ἠρετε ἕως, “Do you not say? which introduce the sentence, suggest that it was a proverbial phrase.

J. Lightfoot (Hor. Hebr., in loc.) quotes a passage from a Rabbinical writer, showing that the agricultural year was divided into six periods of two months each, viz., seed-time, winter, spring, harvest, summer, and the season of extreme heat, so that the interval between sowing and harvest would be reckoned roughly as four months, although actually it might be a little longer. Thus Jesus here reminds His disciples of a rural saying, “Harvest does not come for four months,” and then he points to the contrast with the spiritual harvest already ripe for gathering in the hearts of the Samaritan villagers, although the seed had been sown only that day.
The words of this proverbial saying, with a trifling change, form a line of iambic verse:  

τετράμηνος ἔτους καὶ διήμην ἐρχεται.

If Jn. represented Jesus as quoting Greek iambics, then there would be some ground for treating the narrative of #4 as an allegory rather than as an historical reminiscence, freely edited. But this would be at variance with the general lines on which the Gospel is written. The disciples elsewhere (see on #4) address Jesus in Aramaic, and doubtless He spoke in the same language to them. That Jn. should represent them as familiar with a Greek proverb in verse is incredible. Further, not only is this proverb unknown in Greek literature, but it would be hard for it to have currency among Greeks. There is no evidence that the Greeks had a sixfold division of the agricultural year as the Hebrews had; and if they did not adopt this division, four months would not be as likely an interval to be contemplated as normal between seed-time and harvest as five or even six months.

Again, it precedes τετράμηνος ἔτους καὶ διήμην in ABCNT[WAD], and has to be retained, although it is omitted by DL fam. 13 Syr. cut. But it spoils the iambic semains, and yet it must be reckoned with; for the saying which Jesus quotes as familiar to the disciples is, "There are yet four months (sc. from the time of sowing), and then comes the harvest."  

We conclude, therefore, that the rhythm of δ' θερμάριος ἐρχεται is an accident, and that we are to regard the whole verse as the Greek rendering of an Aramaic agricultural proverb. See #4 for another accidental Greek verse.

With the paratactic condr., δι' τετράμηνος ἔτους καὶ διήμην ἐρχεται, Milligan 3 compares the iambic P. F. 184 δι' ἑξήμην Ἴρμιν καὶ πάθεσιν εἰς Πυλον.  

ὃς λέγει διόν. ὃς is unusual in Jn., occurring again only in 1546 195 (115 is a LXX quotation). Jn. generally has ὃς (see on #40). ὁδοὶ here and at 1546 is almost equivalent to "but"; it introduces a contrast with what has gone before.  

τετράμηνος ἔτους εὐθαλάμως is an expressive phrase, suggesting careful and deliberate gaze, which we have both in O.T. (Gen. 1315, 2 Sam. 184, 1 Chron. 2118, Ezek. 189) and in N.T. (Lk. 1528, 1818, Mt. 179). See on #6 (cf. #140 171), where, as here, the phrase is followed by the verb θεάω, which in the N.T. (see on #140) is always used of seeing with the bodily eyes.  

1 See Westcott, St. John, p. 179.
2 Vocabulary of Greek Testament, p. 314.
3 Abbott (Dict. 264) attaches a spiritual significance to Jn. 's mention of our Lord's "lifting up" His eyes.
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τὸς χώρας, δι' λακων ἠτατό θεωροῦσαν ἔτη. 36. δ' θερμάριον

The disciples could see for themselves that the fields (cf. Lk. 214 for this use of χώρας) were whitening for the harvest already. Jesus does not say that the material harvest of the fields of Sychar was springing up immediately after it had been sown; the harvest of which He speaks is expressly contrasted with the harvest that takes months to grow and ripen. The allusion is to the spiritual receptiveness of the Samaritan woman, the measure of faith which she has already exhibited (v. 29), and the eagerness with which her friends and neighbours were even now coming to inquire of Jesus for themselves. These were the fields for the spiritual harvest, which was patent not to the eye of faith only, but to the bodily eyes of the disciples, for these people were hastening to meet them even at the moment of speaking.

ἤρθη may be taken either with what precedes, or with what follows. But the word "already" seems to go more impressively with what has just been said than with the saying of v. 36.

Nothing, then, can be certainly inferred as to the time of year from this verse. The fields may have, literally, been ready for the reapers, and so, it was the harvest season. That, in itself, would bring home to the disciples the meaning of the Lord's words about the spiritual harvest; but it is clear that it is the spiritual harvest which is primarily referred to in v. 35, while it is the natural harvest which is the subject of the proverb of v. 35.

36. The terse, pithy aphorisms of vv. 35-37 recall the sayings of Jesus recorded in the Synoptists, by their form no less than by the use of the illustration of sowing and reaping. See Introd., p. cx.

δ' θερμάριον μισθὸν λαμβάνει. Cf. the more general saying, true of all labour and not only of that in the fields, ἄξιος γὰρ ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ (Lk. 109); and also 2 Tim. 5. Here the reaper reaps in spiritual fields, and his reward is that he gathers fruit unto life eternal. (For this phrase, see on #147.) The reaping is itself the reward, because of the joy which it brings; the "fruit" which is gathered is that of the spiritual harvest, the outlook being not only that of the present life, but of that which is to come.

Jn. does not use the word μισθὸν again, but of καρπὸς he has much (154) to say. The apostles were chosen (1547) ὅπως ἐναίδησησί καὶ καρπὸν φέρητε, καὶ δ' καρπὸς θεωρήται. Just as Paul speaks of his converts as καρπὸς (Rom. 109), so here...
IV. 87-88. DISCOURSE WITH THE DISCIPLES

37. γενετον γαρ και θερεών. 38. καὶ ἀνέστησα μὴ θερεῖς τὸν εὐημερίαν ἐνοπλοῖον καὶ ἔλασεν μὴ θερεῖς.

38. This is to repeat what has already been said, but puts it into plainer language. 梵 is emphatic; it was 者 who sent you to reap in a field which you had not sown.

If we connect the words γενετον γαρ καὶ θερεων to the incident just narrated, the verse yields a quite intelligible sense. The disciples had not been labouring in Schar; the seed was sown there by Jesus Himself, and in some measure by the Samaritan woman. Primarily, Jesus and the woman were the αὐτοὶ into whose labours the disciples had entered, not to speak of every prophet and priest of the past who had prepared the way in Samaria for the message of Christ.

The verb ἀνέστησα is frequent in Jn. (see on iv. 27); it is only used once again by Jn. of Jesus sending forth His disciples, viz. at 17, but does Jn. use the title ἀνέστησα of them (cf. 13). But ἀνέστησα μὴ θερεῖς at once suggests a mission such as those recorded Mk. 3:4 6; although Jn. has not described anything of the kind; and it might be thought that these words placed by Jn. in the mouth of Jesus here have reference to a former sending forth of the Twelve, such as the Synoptists report, rather than to any mission confined to the disciples (see on v. 8) who were with Jesus at Schar. But the missions of the Twelve and of the Seventy were of men who were sent to sow rather than to reap, nor could they be justified by the words, "I sent you to reap where you had not laboured." Nor can we be sure that the missions of Mk. 3:4 6 had been initiated before this Samaritan journey took place (see on 6).

Pécicerer suggests that the words of this verse, which might fitly be applied to the later work of the apostles (e.g. Acts 8:4-7, 14), are carelessly applied by Jn. to an early incident in Jesus' ministry. But the fact is that the words "others have laboured and you have entered into their labours" will fit every period of the Church's life, as they would fit every era of scientific discovery. That, however, does not supply any ground for refusing credence to the statement that they, or

1 The similarity between this passage and Gal. 6:1 ὥστε τινὰ εἰς τὸ πνεύμα ἐκ τῶν πνευματικῶν ἐπέκειν ἄλογον, is only verbal, although remarkable; cf. Rom. 6:18.
The faith of the Samaritan villagers (vv. 39-42)

39. The Samaritan villagers who, on another occasion, rejected Jesus and His disciples had not heard Him teach; their objection to His presence was not personal, but rested on the fact that, as a Jew, He was going to Jerusalem to keep a feast (Lk. 9:4). The people of Sychar, on the other hand, were won by His words (v. 42).

The first believers at Samaria were won, not by visible miracles or signs (cf. 2:7, 7:1, 10:42, 11:1, 12:2), but by the woman’s report of what Jesus had said to her. Many more believed because of His sayings which they themselves had heard (v. 42; cf. 8:12). But v. 39 illustrates the normal way in which men are drawn to Christ in the first instance; cf. His prayer for those who were to be led to Him through the apostles’ teaching; ἐν τῷ τοῦ λόγου οὗ εἴπεν (17:22).

For ὅσα of the rec. text the better reading (NEC75L) is ὅσα, as at v. 29.

40. ὅσον ἦν ἔδωκεν καὶ ἵματιν. For Jn’s frequent use of ἔδωκεν, see on 1:48. He likes the introductory ὅσον (cf. 11:18, 20:1, 21:1), which is not found in the Synoptists.

The Samaritans who had been impressed by the woman’s story desired to listen themselves to the teaching of Jesus, and at their request He lodged in Sychar two days. For Jn’s habit of recording dates, or intervals of time, see Intro., p. cii. He repeats in v. 43 that the stay of Jesus in this village was for two days only, τὰς ἀκούσκαι (cf. 11:9).

41. ἐλλατίνων καὶ ἅπασαν ἀκούσκαι, “many more believed because of His word.” Cf. τῶν ἀκούσκαι λαλεῖτο ἐλλατίνων (8:7).
In the Synoptists, σωτήρ occurs only twice, Lk. 1:51 (where it is applied to God, as in the O.T.), and Lk. 2:11 σωτήρ δὲ ἐστιν ἥραμα Χριστός κύριος, "a Saviour (not the Saviour) who is Christ the Lord." Cf. Acts 13:25 and Acts 5:21 ἄργον καὶ σωτήρ, which suggests δ ἄργον τῆς σωτηρίας of Heb. 2:16.

The first unanimous instance of the application of the title in its full sense to our Lord is Phil. 1:30 σωτήρ . . . κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν. See also 2 Tim. 1:10; Tit. 1:3; 2 Pet. 1:20 2 Tim. 3:16; and cf. Eph. 5:23, 1 Tim. 1:4.

The evidence shows that σωτήρ, as a title, began to be applied to Christ as readily as to God the Father, as soon as the Gospel message of redemption was understood and appropriated. The title has its roots in the O.T., and there is no need of the hypothesis that it is imported into the N.T. from the pagan mysteries or from the Emperor cults. But that it was recognized as a Messianic title before Christ came is unproved and improbable.

The universality of salvation (at any rate so far as Jews were concerned) had already been declared by the prophets; cf. Joel 2:12 ἵνα θαυμασία σώσωσαι τὸ ἐνθέως κύριον σωθήσῃ (quoted Acts 2:23, Rom. 10:13). God is called τὸν σῶμα σωσία (Wisd. 16:7); cf. 1 Tim. 4:14 σωτήρ σάντων ἀνθρώπων. But the magnificent title δ σωτήρ τῶν κόσμων is found in the Greek Bible only in the verse before us, and at 1 Jn. 4:14. It is one of the distinctive phrases of the Johannine writings; cf. 1:18 and especially 3:16, where the purpose of Christ's mission is declared to be ὁ δ σωτήρ τῶν κόσμων ὁ δ' αὐτοῖς. See note on 3:16, and for κόσμος on 14.

It has been suggested by G. Vor 8 that a parallel for δ σωτήρ τῶν κόσμων may be seen in 2 Esd. 13:44, where it is said of Messias liberalit creaturam suam. But it is doubtful if creature is equivalent to "the universe of creation," and further the passage may be affected by Christian influence.

A nearer parallel is Philo's δ σωτήρ τῶν παιδών (quod deus imm. 34), which he applies to God. The passage presents some superficial resemblance to the story of the Samarian woman at the well. Philo has quoted Num. 20:13, where the Israelites seek permission to pass through Edom, promising not to drink water from the wells, or, if they did, to pay for it. To be able to pass by the attractions of earth befits the heavenly soul; such is Philo's reflection, and he adds that it is folly to drink from cisterns contrived by the distrustfulness of man, when the Saviour of the Universe has opened to us His heavenly treasury

1 The title is often bestowed on the Emperors, and especially on Hadrian, in inscriptions. See Deissmann, Light from the East, p. 359.

2 D.C.G., ii. 375.

43. Μετά δὲ τὰς δύο ἡμέρας ἐξῆλθεν ἐκεῖνος εἰς τὴν Γαλαήνην.
44. οὗτος γὰρ Ἰησοῦς ἐξῆλθεν ὑπερψάλλον ἐν τῇ ἑδρᾷ παρὰ τῷ διδάσκαλῳ, ἵνα καὶ ἑξηκούσατε τῶν τοῦ Πατρὸς λαλήσεων τῆς Ισραήλ, ὥσπερ καὶ ταῦτα τῶν ἑαυτοῦ λαλήσεων.

Departure from Sychar and reception in Galilee (vv. 43-45)

43. τὸς δὲ δύο ἡμέρας, sc. the two days mentioned in v. 40. After eating the rec. text, with ANT, adds καὶ ἐξελεύνθη from v. 4, but the addition is not found in Alexandrian rec. texts, and is unnecessary. τὸ ἐξηκούσατε for ἑλθέτε; καὶ ἐξηκούσατε.

It seems to have been Jesus' intention to enter Galilee, where he had left Judea because of the attention with which the Pharisees were suspiciously regarding His work there (v. 3), and was moving into Galilee (v. 3). The teaching at Sychar was only an episode of His journey (v. 4-42), and the narrative is now resumed.

44. προφήτης ἐν τῇ ἑδρᾷ παρὰ τῷ διδάσκαλῳ, ἵνα καὶ ἑξηκούσατε τῶν τοῦ Πατρὸς λαλήσεων τῆς Ισραήλ. The writer does not say that Jesus quoted this familiar proverb when He was passing from Samaria into Galilee. The verse is an editorial comment, illustrative of the context, and only notes that Jesus quoted the saying either then or on some other occasion. The aor. ἐκκοιτασαν seems to be used like an English pluperfect; cf. the similar aorist ἐκκοιτοσαν and ἐλαθον in v. 45, "He had done," "they had come"; cf. also ἐσκοίτον at 5:22. For the verb as applied to explicit sayings of Jesus, cf. 1:53.

The saying is placed in the mouth of Jesus in the Synoptic narratives, at Mt. 6:1, Mt. 13:26, in the form ἀνέφη προφήτης ἄνιπος ἐν τῇ παρθαρίᾳ αὐτοῦ, and in Lk. 2:49 as ἀνέφη προφήτης δικαιόν ἐν τῇ παρθαρίᾳ αὐτοῦ. In these passages the παρθαρία is Galilee, where He was teaching and where His friends and kinsfolk were amazed that "the car-

1 Its equivalent is found in Plutarch, Flavius, and Senecca; see D. Smith, i.e. "Proverbs," D.C.G., ii. 445.
penter, the Son of Mary,” should exhibit such wisdom as His words revealed.

As Jn. applies the proverb, the circumstances were wholly different from those at Nazareth. Jesus had left Judea, where the Pharisees were beginning to watch Him with suspicion (4:43), and was moving via Samaria into Galilee. What does the writer mean here by His having “no honour in His own country”? Alternative explanations have been offered.

(i) If 4:44 refers to the departure of Jesus from Judea, because His mission was not sufficiently true there, then by His return Jn. must mean Jerusalem or Judea. Origens (in Joh. n. 268, and Fragm. in Joh. 4:44) adopts this view. He says that Jerusalem was the παρεκκλήσιον of all the prophets, and of Jesus as well. Thus 411 εἰς τὰ πάντα ἢλθεν, καὶ οἵ οὖν αὐτῶν ὁ παράλογον would provide a parallel for the present verse. But (a) Jesus had made many disciples in Jerusalem already (2:20), and it was His success that had aroused the suspicion of the Pharisees (4:1). And (b) Jn. knew quite well that Jesus was “of Galilee,” which implies that His home or παρεκκλήσιον was there (see 1:29 and 7:42-43). It is unlikely that Jn. should allude to Jerusalem as Christ’s παρεκκλήσιον more particularly as there are good reasons for holding that he was familiar with Mk., who applies the word to Nazareth.

(a) Some commentators apply 4:44, not to what precedes but to what follows. Jesus had been attracting much notice in Judea; it was His habit to withdraw Himself, at least in the early stages of His ministry, from a hostile environment (7:1 et seq.), and to seek retirement. He wished, then (so it is urged), to go from Judea to some place where He might escape unwelcome attention, and He knew from former experience that His old friends in Galilee would not be likely to make too much of Him. According to this view, the citation of the proverb here is a suggestion of the writer that Jesus deliberately chose to go into a territory where He expected that His mission would not arouse public interest. This is highly improbable; and, besides, Jesus was, in fact, cordially received by the people of Galilee (v. 45), and the miracle of the healing of the nobleman’s son is recorded immediately (vv. 46 ff.).

The verse, then, is a gloss the applicability of which to the context is not immediately clear. Perhaps it has been misplaced, but there is no evidence for this. Jn. is prone to insert explanatory reflexions or glosses in the body of his narrative, which are not always convincing to modern readers; and this gloss seems to be Johannine. μαρτυρίαν and δοκεῖ are favourite words with Jn.; he is apt to introduce his explanations with

IV. 44-46. HEALING OF THE NOBLEMAN’S SON

οἱ Γαλιαταῖοι, πάντα ἀραιάττει ἡ διάφορος ἤτοι ἐν τῷ Ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ ἐν τῇ ἴμαρτη καὶ ἀρτιοὶ ἤγακεν εἰς τῷ ἡπότην.

γὰρ (cf. esp. 5:18 ὑπὰ Ἰησοῦν ξύνεον, where, as here, the aor. stands for the pluperfect). τιμὴ, indeed, is not in Jn.’s vocabulary, and instead of it he always uses δόξα when he speaks of the honour paid by one man to another (see on 1:27); but the proverb as quoted by Mk. has δόμη (although τιμὴ commonly occurs in the Synoptists in the sense of “honour”); cf. Mt. 11:28. It is remarkable that the true text of the verse before us gives ἀπὸ τῶν Ἰησοῦν κατὰ (Aλ. BCDWιες) without οἱ, while Jn.’s use is to prefix the def. article to the name Ἰησοῦς (as the rec. text does here); see on 2:28.

We conclude that v. 44 is a gloss, introduced by Jn. or by some later editor from Mk. 6, suggested by the mention of Galilee, but not apposite in this place.

45. ἀπὸ is the true reading, but καὶ D have αὐτῶν.

For δοκεῖ (A=ABCLNWo3), οὖν is read by the rec. with καὶ. See, for a similar variant, vv. 29, 30. ὅτα ἀπὸ τῶν κατὰ, “When, then, He had come into Galilee,” οὖν not connoting causation but sequence only (see on 2:23).

The Galileans, among whom He came, had seen His “signs” at Jerusalem at the feast (2:23, 3), and αὐτής ἦν ἡ δοξα καὶ τῆς ἐπανάληψις, κατὰ “for (note the introduction of the explanation by γὰρ) they also had come for the feast” (the aor., δόξα, as well as the preceding ἐπανάληψις, being used with a pluperfect sense). The Samaritans did not go up to Jerusalem for the feasts, and so Jesus and His activities there were not known to them; but the Galileans were orthodox and went up regularly. The words of Jesus alone, without “signs,” were sufficient to convince the villagers of Sychar of His claims.

ἀνακεφαλαίως ἤγακεν εἰς τὴν ἐπανάληψις. Ἐξουσιασμὸς is naturally used of coming up to the feast, when the standpoint of the writer is Jerusalem (e.g. 1:12, 14); but when the scene is in Galilee, as here, and mention is made of worshippers “going up” to the feast, we should expect ἀναβασίαν (as at 7:38). In this sentence of explanation the writer seems to be recalling what he had noticed at Jerusalem, viz. that the Galileans came up for the Passover mentioned in c. 2.

Healing of the nobleman’s son (vv. 46-54)

46. Despite the differences between the story of the healing of the centurion’s servant (Mt. 8:5-13; Lk. 7:1-10) and Jn.’s story
of the healing of the nobleman's son, the two narratives probably recall the same incident. The differences are obvious. In Jn. the anxious inquirer is βασιλιάς; in Mt. Lk., he is ἡ τιμία. In Jn. the patient is sick of a fever; in Mt. he is παραλύτικος. In Mt., Lk., Jesus is asked only to speak the word of healing, but He offers to go down to the man's house. In Jn. He is asked to go down, but he only says that the boy will recover (v. 50); nor does Jesus express surprise at the man's faith, as He does in Mt., Lk. In Mt., Lk., the patient is the servant (Mt. has μαύρος, Lk. has both μαύρος and σέβαςμα), while in Jn. he is the man's son (καρπον, ἁμαρτάνω). Further, it has been argued that the strong faith of the centurion in Mt., Lk., becomes intelligible, without ceasing to be admirable, when we reflect that he was evidently aware of the miracle formerly worked for another inhabitant of the same city, an eminent person, one of the court which his own sword protected.1

It has also been supposed that while the centurion of Mt., Lk., was a Gentile (Mt. 8:4), the nobleman of Jn. was probably a Jew; but of this latter conjecture there is no evidence. There is no hint in Jn. as to the nationality or religious belief of the βασιλιάς.

Yet the stories are not so dissimilar that they could not have been confused. Ireneaus actually treats them as one and the same: "Filium centurionis absent verbo curavit dicens, Vadis, filius tuus vivet," are his words (Herm. ii. 22. 3). In both cases the patient's home was at Capernaum, and in both cases it is suggested (although not expressly stated by Jn.) that he was healed from a distance; that is, that the healings were "telepathic" in modern phrase. The only other instance of this in the Gospels is the case of the Syrophoenician woman's daughter (Mt. 15:22, 30, Mt. 15:28). The faith of the nobleman, as indicated in v. 50, "the man believed the word which Jesus spake to him," was very strong, and he cannot be placed, in this respect, on a lower level than the centurion of Mt., Lk. It is probable that one of the most obvious discrepancies in the two narratives, "servant" and "son," is due to the ambiguity of the word παῖς, which may mean either. That Jn. uses παιδί in v. 51 (and there alone in the Gospel), although he has ἁμαρτάνω in vv. 46, 47, 50, 53, may be significant in this connexion.2

1 Chadwick, *Expositor*, v. v. 443 f.; so Westcott, in loc.
2 There is a miracle story in the Babylonian Talmud (Bab. 36b) which looks like another version of this. When a son of Camael was sick, the father sent messengers to Rabbi Channa ben Dose to ask for his intercessions. He prayed, and then said, "Go, for the fever has now left him." They marked the time, and going back found

---

**IV. 46-47.** HEALING OF THE NOBLEMAN'S SON

46. Ἡμέραν τοῦτον ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς Καράτα τῆς Γαλαάσας ἔτοιχεν τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ. Καὶ ἦν οὗ πατρὶς ἔτοιχεν ἐν Καπερναούμ. 47. ὁ γὰρ ἄνθρωπος ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἄνθρωπος ὑποτεθήκη ὑπὸ τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς Γαλαάσας, ἀράθεμεν πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ ἐρωτήσατο χρήσιμον καὶ ἀνάρτητον ἀνώτατον τῶν ἱερατῶν ἢμελέλει γὰρ ἑαυτῷ ἢμελέλει. 48. Ῥητος ὁ γὰρ ἦν ἐν Καπερναούμ.

See, for the "miraculous" element in the story, Introd., p. 149.

46. ἥμεραν ὡς κ. ὦ ὁ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ ἄνθρωπος. An explanatory note reminding the reader of the narrative of 146.

καὶ ἦν. So ABCDEFUV; KDLMNT have ἦν ἦ.

βασιλιάς, i.e. one of the courtiers of Herod, tetarch of Galilee; D has βασιλιάς, regulus, which would convey the erroneous idea that this courtier was a petty king. Some have identified him with Chusa, Herod's steward (Lk. 8:9), or with Manaen (Acts 13:3); but this is only guess-work. The man was eager to invoke any help that might cure his son, quite independently of his religious principles or position.

47. ἄνθρωπος ὁ γὰρ ἄνθρωπος τοῦτον ἐπέστη αὐτόν. The man left his son for a time, in his eagerness to secure the aid of a healer.

After ἀράθεμεν the rec. has αὐτοῦ, but om. KBCDFUVW. Καὶ ἦν ἐπέστη αὐτόν. See on 148 for "going down" from Cana to Capernaum.

καὶ ἤσορος ἀντικείμενον. idiom occurs in Jn. only once again (148), except in a quotation where it is used metaphorically (156). Presumably the "signs" which had impressed the people at Jerusalem (156) were works of healing, but Jn. does not say so explicitly. He assumes that his readers will know why it was that a man whose son was sick should seek Jesus, sc. because of His reputation as a healer.

ἡμελέλει ἐνίσχυσε, incontinent mort. The phrase is used at 114a 143a 148a of the impending death of Jesus; but in the present passage there is no suggestion in ἡμελέλει of the inevitability or predestined certainty of the boy's death; it expresses futurity only, "was going to die." that in that hour the boy had been cured. See Trench, *Miracles*, p. 149.
48. εἶτα ἐν τῷ πρὸς αὐτὸν. For the constr. of λέγων here and at v. 49, see on 21.

The answer of Jesus was neither "Yes" nor "No." It almost conveys a feeling of disappointment that the working of "signs" should be expected of Him. The Samaritan villagers had accepted Him because of His words alone, without any signs (44-48).

The collocation σημεῖον καὶ τέμπεσα does not occur again in Jn., but it is frequent in the Greek Bible (Ex. 7, Is. 37, 20, Dan. 4, 5, 6, Mt. 24, Mk. 13, Acts 4, 28, 40, 8, 6, 15, 15, Rom. 15, 2 Cor. 1, 2 Thess. 2, Heb. 2), τέμπεσα, "a prodigy," never occurs in the N.T. except in conjunction with σημεῖον. No doubt a σημεῖον need not be miraculous, but the Jews, like all the peoples of early ages, were more ready to see the Divine power in what seemed to be "supernatural" than in the "natural" order; and it is not likely that they would have distinguished sharply a σημεῖον from a τέμπεσα. Jn. is specially prone to use the word σημεῖον when speaking of the "works" of Jesus (see Introd., p. cxxvi), and also on 21, where the relation between faith and "signs" in the Fourth Gospel is considered.

οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε. This might be interrogative: "Will you not believe without signs?" But more probably it is categorical: "You will not believe, etc." That the Jews "seek signs" (1 Cor. 13) was as true then as in Jerusalem. The plural πιστεύσητε may indicate that the words, although addressed to an individual, include in their reference a whole class of people to which the nobleman belonged.

49. κύριε. "Sir." For this mode of address, see on 21.

καταβέβλητον. The man perceives that his request has not been definitely refused, despite what Jesus had said to him and to the bystanders as to the imperfection of a faith based on "signs."

πῶν ἐπολοθεῖν τῷ ν. μ. In like manner, Martha and Mary (11, 53) thought that for Jesus to rescue their sick brother from death He must be by his bedside. "Duplex imbecillitatis rogantis, quasi Dominus nescie haberet adesse, nec posset aequae resuscitare mortem. Aqui eliam ante quam descendit parum, vita restauratus est filius eius" (Bengel). τὸ ν. μ. οὖν. A fam. 13. have ν. μ. for τ. μ. But not only is ν. μ. the word in the best texts; it is obviously right. "My little child," the father says in his anguish; cf. Mk. 9:24 ὁ παῖς τοῦ ν. μ.

50. The answer of Jesus tests the father severely. "Go thy way; thy son lives." When the father had left the boy, he was at the point of death (v. 47); but the only assurance that Jesus gave was that the boy was still living. See Introd., p. cxxviii.

Before ἀπείστησεν the rec. inserts καί (ACNTΔΘ), but om. αΣΔΒW. ἀπείστησεν τῷ λόγῳ. For the constr., cf. 57; and note that the man believed without any corroboration of Jesus' words. See 20.

καὶ ἐπορεύετο. The impt. marks the continuous progress of the man's journey, and not any sudden movement of departure. Cf. Mt. 24, Lk. 2, 10, 23, 24, 29, for ἐπορεύετο.

By some commentators a difficulty has been found in the statement of v. 52, that the anxious father did not reach home until the next day, although Jesus' words of assurance had been addressed to him at 1 p.m. (see on v. 52). But even if we are to apply such strict tests of time and circumstance to the Johannine stories, there is no special difficulty here. It is 20 miles or more, the way being rough and billy, from Cana to Capernaum. Presumably the βασιλεία had a retinue with him, and it would take some time to get them together for the journey. Even if an immediate start had been made in the midday heat, it would not have been easy to reach Capernaum the same evening. If we are to speculate about such a matter, it seems probable that the father got home early the next morning, for his anxiety would have prevented him resting all night on the way. If he left Cana at 3 p.m. and got home at 2 a.m. next morning, all the time conditions of the story would be satisfied.

51. ἀνέπτυχαν. So ΣΒCDLΝΘ; the rec. has ἀνέπτυχαν. Cf. 11, 20, 21.

After ἀνέπτυθαν the rec. adds καὶ ἀνέπτυχαν (κΔ have ἀνέπτυχαν); om. BLN.

αῖα. This is the only appearance of αῖα in Jn., and it is replaced (wrongly) by νῦν in DL fam. 13. See on v. 49.

οὐ μὴ αὕτην (NABCW), the rec. has ρα (with DLNAΘ), as if ὑπὲρ after λέγατος were ὑπὲρ reciuntis, introducing the actual words of the servants.
VI. 12. The Feeding of the Five Thousand

The incident of the Feeding of the Five Thousand is the only one in the public ministry of Jesus before the last visit to Jerusalem which is found in all four Gospels; Mk., Mt., and Jn. (but not Luke) adding an account of the Storm on the Lake. The Synoptists (Mk. 6:31, Mt. 14:14, Lk. 9:16) agree in placing the miraculous feeding after the return of the Twelve from their mission, and after the beheading of John the Baptist. The labours which the apostles had undertaken made a period of rest desirable (Mk. 6:31); and also it was but prudent to go into retirement for a time, as Herod’s suspicions had been aroused, and he was desirous of seeing Jesus (Lk. 9:9). The setting of the miracle in Jn. is not inconsistent with these somewhat vague indications of the period in the ministry of Jesus at which it was wrought.

Reasons have been given already for the conclusion (see Introd., p. xvi) that cc. 5 and 6 have been transposed, so that in the original draft of Jn., c. 6 followed directly after c. 4. At the end of c. 4 Jesus and His disciples are at Cana, and we now find them crossing the Sea of Galilee to its north-eastern side. They probably followed the road familiar to them (218), and went down from Cana to Capernaum, where they had their heavy *7 fishing-boat (γό πλοίον, Mk. 6:21). Mk. (followed by Mt.) says that the place to which they went by boat was **“a desert place,” as Jesus wished to retire for a time from public view, but that the crowd followed them by road, evidently being able to observe the course the boat was taking, and arrived before them (Mk. 6:31, 32). Jn. rather implies that Jesus and His disciples arrived first (68). Lk. (69) gives the name of the place as Bethsaida, by which he must mean Bethsaida Julias (at Tell) at the extreme north end of the lake, on the eastern side, for no other Bethsaida is known. These data are all fairly consistent with each other, if we suppose that the place was the little plain a short distance from the lake shore (about a mile south of Bethsaida Julias) which is now called el-Batshah. This was grazing ground, and there would be abundance of grass there at the Passover season (cf. 6:10, Mk. 6:39). A hill (69) rises up behind it. This plain is about 4 miles by boat from Tell Hüm (the most probable site of Capernaum; see on

---

1 As it held thirteen persons, it must have been a large boat.
2 The supposition that there was another Bethsaida on the western shore lacks evidence, and is improbable. Cf. 13.
3 It is said that grass is found there at all seasons (W. M. Christie, D.C.G. ii. 589); cf. Rix (Testa. and Testamenti, pp. 485 ff.) for the geographical problem.
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1. Μετὰ ταῦτα ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς πέραν τῆς βαλάντιας τῆς Γαλιλαίας τῆς Τιβερίας. οὐ μοιλίζεται εἰς αὐτῆς ἕξω πολὺ, ἵνα ἐχῶμεν τὰ σάμα τὰ ἐκεῖ ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποισιν. 2. ἔρθε οὖν ἦν οἰκήτης καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῷ ποταμῷ τούτῳ ὁ ποταμὸς ὁ Ἰωνᾶς. 3

and perhaps 6 miles from it by following the path along the western shore and crossing the fords of Jordan, where it flows into the lake from the north. It was the latter route that the crowds took who followed Jesus. See further 6.

2. μετὰ ταῦτα. For this phrase, see Intro., p. xxvii.

ἡ ἐλάσσωσις τῆς Γαλιλαίας is the name given in M, and Mk. 1 to the lake called in the O.T. the "Sea of Chinnereth" (Num. 34, 11, etc.). It is called ἡ λίμνη Γεννησαρήτου in Lk. 5, and ἡ ἐλάσσωσις τῆς Τιβερίας in Jn. 21. Tiberias was a town on the western shore, founded A.D. 22 by Herod Antipas, and named after Tiberias, which shows that the designation "the Sea of Tiberias" could hardly have been current during our Lord's ministry. Accordingly the double designation found here, τῆς ἐλάσσωσις τῆς Γαλιλαίας τῆς Τιβερίας, shows the use of the contemporary name "the Sea of Galilee," followed by the explanatory gloss "that is, of Tiberias," added to identify the lake for Greek readers at the end of the first century. If we ascribe τῆς ἐλάσσωσις τῆς Γαλιλαίας to the aged apostle, John the son of Zebedee, when telling his reminiscences, the addition τῆς Τιβερίας would naturally be made by the evangelist, whom we call Jn. Cf. v. 23 for the town of Tiberias.

2. μοιλίζεται ἐκεῖ. So ΣΣΔΛΝΩ. But the rec. καὶ μοιλίζεται (Ἔλαθεν) is quite in Jn.'s manner, who often uses καὶ for ἐκεῖ (see below v. 21).

"A great crowd was following Him" (cf. Mt. 14, Lk. 61; and see Mk. 6, i.e. not only did they follow Him now, when He wished to be in retirement, but they had been following Him about before He crossed the lake; μοιλίζεται is the impf. of continued action. Their reason was "because they were noticing the signs that He was doing on the sick." διὰ τῶν ἄσθενων (BDLNW) is the better reading, as preserving the idea that they had been continually observing His powers of healing (for θεραπούν in a like context, cf. 229), but ΘΓΔ have ἄσθενων. W has θεραποῦντες.

As Jn. represents the matter, it was previous works of healing that had attracted the attention of the crowds; e.g., presumably, the cure of the nobleman's son, which has just been narrated (46). Cf. also the works of healing narrated in Mk. 1, 2, 4, 21, 31, 41, but not described by Jn. Mt. 14, 24

3. See Intro., p. xxvi. Streeter, The Four Gospels, p. 131. See also the works of healing narrated in Mk. 1, 2, 3, 4, 21, 31, 61, but not described by Jn. Mt. 14, 24
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εἰς τὸ δύον Ἰησοῦν, καὶ ἐκεῖ ἐκάθισεν μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτῶν. 4. ἦν δὲ ἐγώ ἐκ τῶν πάντων ἕκαστος ἔχων ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων. 5. ἔκαστος δὲ ἔστειλεν αὐτῷ and Lk. 9, however, record that Jesus began the day on this occasion by healing the sick. This is not mentioned by Mk. On the other hand, Mk. 6, 51 (followed by Lk. 9, 51, but not by Mt.) says that the earlier part of the day was spent in teaching the people; but neither for this nor for works of healing is there room in the Johannine narrative (see below on v. 5). Jn. seems to know the Marcan story (see on v. 7), but he corrects it as he proceeds. See Intro., p. xxvii.

3. ἄνευδε δὲ εἰς τὸ δύον Ἰησοῦν, "Jesus went up to the hill," i.e. the hill rising out of the little plain by the shore. Mk. (66), followed by Mt., mentions the hill after his narrative of the miracle; but Mt. (1529), in telling what preceded the parallel miracle of the Feeding of the Four Thousand, says, as Jn. does here, ἀνείπερον ἐν τῷ δύον ἔλθον Ἰησοῦς. Perhaps Jn. has borrowed here from Mt., but this is unlikely.

It was the habit of Jesus to sit when He taught, as the Rabbis were accustomed to do (cf. Mk. 4, 30, Mt. 26, 59, Lk. 4, 7, 5 [Jn. 8, 9]); and He was wont to go up to the hills, whether for teaching (Mk. 5, 24) or for prayer (Mk. 6, 48, Lk. 6, 46).

The verb ἄνευδε occurs again in N.T. only at Gal. 1, 18; and v. 7 gives ἄνευδε here.

This narrative represents Jesus and His disciples as having arrived at the eastern side of the lake before the crowd, who according to Mk. (68) had arrived there first. According to Mk. 6, 39, Mk. 9, the disciples who were with Jesus were the "apostles," and this is implied in Jn.'s narrative, though not explicitly stated, for the twelve baskets of fragments of v. 13 indicate that the number of disciples present was twelve. See on 2.

4. It has been pointed out that, although τὸ πάντως is read here by all MSS. and vss., yet there are patristic comments on the verse which suggest that some early writers did not treat the "feast" of 6 as a Passover, and that therefore the texts before them did not include the words τὸ πάντως at this point. Thus Irenaeus (Heb. xi. 22). 3 is silent as to this Passover, although it would have been opposite to his argument to use it. If τὸ πάντως were omitted here, it would be natural to identify the feast of the Passover with the Feast of

1 Josephus (B. f. iii. 3, 5) has τῆς πόλεως Τιβερίας λίμνη, which Niese notes as having been altered in inferior MSS. to Τιβερίας.

2. Most explicitly by Hort, Select Readings, p. 77.
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Tabernacles noted in 7. Having regard to the importance of the synagoguría, it might properly be described as pre-eminently ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν 'Ιωβανόων (see on 7). But it would be precarious to omit words so fully attested as τὸ πάγαγα; and on the hypothesis, which has been adopted in this Commentary, that c. 5 comes after c. 6 (see Introd., p. xviii), all is clear. The Passover mentioned here as 'near' is the feast whose celebration is narrated in 5; i.e. it was the second Passover of the public ministry of Jesus (that mentioned in 218 being the first), and was probably the Passover of the year 28 A.D.

For the phrase "feast of the Lord," see on 218; and cf. 29 τοῦ πάγαγα) (41).

It has been suggested that this note about the approaching Passover was introduced into the narrative to explain the large concourse of persons who were present on the occasion of the miracle, and who are supposed to have been thronging the roads on the way to Jerusalem for the observance of the feast. But the north-eastern corner of the lake is hardly a point at which we should expect to find thousands of such travellers. Jn. is fond of introducing notes of time into his narrative (see p. cii), and he has similar notes about approaching festivals at 289 216. e_PROP is a favourite word with him, both in relation to time and to distance.

6. ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν τῷ ἔδαφῳ. For this phrase, see on 426, where, as here, it is followed by the verb ἡσθανεῖ. It is used again of Jesus at 171; cf. also 414 and Lk. 650. For ἐσθανεῖ see on 148.

τὸ πόλις ὄχλος, i.e. apparently the ὄχλος πολιῶν of v. 2 (see on 127), who had followed Jesus and His disciples round the head of the lake. But, no doubt, once it was known where He was, people would flock to the place from the neighbouring villages to see and hear Him. According to the Synoptists (see on v. 2), the crowd came upon Jesus early in the morning, and the day was spent teaching or healing their sick. Then, towards evening, the disciples suggest that the people should be sent away that they might buy food for themselves. Jn. tells nothing of teaching or healing on this occasion, and he represents Jesus as having foreseen, as soon as the crowd began to gather, the difficulty that would arise about food. When He saw the great multitude coming, He asked Philip, "Whence are we to buy loaves?"

1 Burkitt (Ev. of the Mattathias, ii. 373) shows that the Syriac tradition is against omitting τὸ πάγαγα.
Jn. does not write thus of Jesus elsewhere. On His way to the tomb of Lazarus, Jesus asks where it is (11:38). When He saw the fishing-boat on the lake, He asked them if they had caught any fish (21:1, where, however, He may be represented as knowing that nothing had been caught). It is by a mistaken idea of reverence that the later Synoptists often omit questions which Mk. represents Jesus as asking, e.g.: "Who touched my garments?" (Mk. 5:30, Lk. 8:43, omitted by Mt.). "Seest thou that?" addressed to the blind man who was healed by stages, is found only in Mk. 8:22. "How long time is it since this hath come to him?" asked of the epileptic boy's father (Mk. 9:22), is omitted by Mt. and Lk.

The simple question, "Where can bread be bought?" asked by Jesus of a disciple who was familiar with the locality, needs not to be explained or explained away.

περιλαμβάνει does not occur again in Jn., but that by itself does not prove the verse to be a later gloss, although it raises the question if it may not have been added after Jn. had completed his work.

περιλαμβάνει does not occur again in Jn., but that by itself does not prove the verse to be a later gloss, although it raises the question if it may not have been added after Jn. had completed his work.

The word περιλαμβάνει does not occur again in Jn., but that by itself does not prove the verse to be a later gloss, although it raises the question if it may not have been added after Jn. had completed his work.

There is no mention of the "two hundred pennyworth" in Mt. or Lk., but Mk. 6:38 makes the disciples say: "Thou hast bread enough;" Mk. 6:38 makes the disciples say: "Thou hast bread enough;" Mk. 6:38 makes the disciples say: "Thou hast bread enough;" Mk. 6:38 makes the disciples say: "Thou hast bread enough;" Mk. 6:38 makes the disciples say: "Thou hast bread enough.

A denarius was the ordinary day's wage of a labourer (cf. Mt. 20:2). Even if the disciples had as much as two hundred denarii in their common purse (13:29), which is improbable, Philip points out that they would not purchase enough bread to feed five thousand people, nor would it be easy to find so much bread in the vicinity without notice.

There is a reminiscence of the phrase οὐκ ἔστι πλοῦτος ἐκ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου in a passage quoted below (v. 11) from the second-century Acts of John.

8. ἐσὶ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ. This description of an apostle is not found in the Synoptists (except at Mk. 13:1, without

9. ἐσὶ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ. This description of an apostle is not found in the Synoptists (except at Mk. 13:1, without

9. ἐσὶ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ. This description of an apostle is not found in the Synoptists (except at Mk. 13:1, without

9. ἐσὶ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ. This description of an apostle is not found in the Synoptists (except at Mk. 13:1, without

9. ἐσὶ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ. This description of an apostle is not found in the Synoptists (except at Mk. 13:1, without

9. ἐσὶ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ. This description of an apostle is not found in the Synoptists (except at Mk. 13:1, without
article, for τος or τι (cf. Mt. 8:19 26:50); but this is not the style of Jn. (cf., however, 11:4 29:20).

κριτίσεις. It is only Jn. who tells that the loaves were of barley.—Barley bread, being cheaper than wheat, was the common food of the poor; cf. Judg. 7:13 and Ezek. 12:18. Reference has already been made to ἄρτους κριτίσεις in the Elisha story (2 Kings 4:4).

δύο ἱδέα. The Synoptists say δύο ἱδέα; and Mt. and Mk. in the parallel narrative of the Feeding of the Four Thousand say οἷς ἱδέα ἤδεια.

The word ἱδέα (only found here and at 2:5. 10. 11 in the Greek Bible) is a dim. of ἱδὼν, which originally meant "cooked food," and thence came to be used of any relish taken with food; e.g. in Pap. Fay. 1191, ἐκ τῆς γενέσεως Γερμανίας πώσις ἱδέα. The δύο ἱδέα were delicacies for a birthday feast. Thus δύο ἱδέα in the present passage stands for dried or pickled fish. The curing of fish was an important industry on the shores of the Sea of Galilee, and is alluded to as such by Strabo. Neither in Jn., nor in the Synoptic narrative is there any mention of lighting a fire and cooking fish on the occasion of the miracle; and it is not to be supposed that the meal was raw, fresh fish and bread. See, however, on 2:10.

πάντας (for the aor. imper., see on 3) τῶν ἄρθρωσε αναπαίης . . . άνεπτοσ ὡν οἱ ἄρθροι. The R.V. distinguishes ἄρθρα from ἱδέα: "make the people sit down . . . so the men sat down," suggesting that the women (or children), if present, remained standing. But no such discrimination is indicated in the Synoptic accounts, and it would, in the circumstances, be improbable, despite the Oriental subordination of women: ἄνεπτος ὡν ἄρθρα τῶν ἄρθρωσε is Mk.'s statement. ἄρθρο is an infrequent word in Jn., occurring again only 13:20 and 14:8 17. 18 (of a husband); and it may be that its introduction here is due to a reminiscence of Mk.'s ποιήσεις ἢ το κάτω τὸν ἄρθρον, to which Mt. afterwards added the gloss ἡ ὀψωνία γυναικών καὶ παιδίων, as he did also in the parallel narrative of the Feeding of the Four Thousand (Mt. 14:17 20). Jn. returns to the word ἄρθρον at v. 14. ἄρθρωσε is "to lie back" or "recline," whether on the

1 About 100 a.d., cited by Milligan, Vocab.
2 xvi. c. 2, § 45, quoted by G. A. Smith, Hist. Geogr. of Holy Land, p. 3, who adds: "The pickled fish of Galilee were known throughout the Roman world."
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we cannot be sure how far back it goes (cf. 112. 17), and see on 496."

In another detail, per contra, Jn.'s narrative of the Feeding of the Five Thousand suggests the Last Supper more clearly than the Synoptists do. In Jn., it is Jesus Himself who distributes the loaves to the multitudes, διδάσκειν τοῖς αναξιομένοις, just as He distributed the Bread to His disciples on the eve of His Passion (cf. also 2119); but in the Synoptists, it is the Twelve who, acting under His direction, bring the loaves round, which probably was what actually took place. Jn.'s δίδασκειν, however, need not be taken as excluding the assistance of the Twelve in the distribution, although this is not explicitly mentioned. 

Qui facti per alium, facti per se.

The rec. text inserts after δίδασκειν the words τοῖς μαθηταῖς (so Ντίσλαφ), but this is a harmonising gloss introduced from Mt. 1419. The intercalated words are not found in ἀμβλώνω or in most vss.

We must now examine the word εὐχαριστήσες, "having given thanks." εὐλογέω is the verb used in the Synoptic parallel (Mt. 621, Mt. 1414, Lk. 918); but Mt. 69 and Mt. 1418 have εὐχαριστεῖν in a similar context in their narratives of the Feeding of the Four Thousand. In the accounts of the institution of the Lord's Supper, Lk. (239) and Paul (1 Cor. 1123) use εὐχαριστήσεως of the Blessing of the Bread, while Mt. (269), Mk. (1418), and Lk. (2121) use it of the Blessing of the Cup, the Cup being called by Paul τοῦ τιμίου τῆς εὐλογίας εὐχαριστείν (1 Cor. 1016). In these passages it is not possible to distinguish in meaning between εὐχαριστήσεως and εὐλογεῖν, although εὐχαριστήσεως and εὐχαριστεῖν soon came to be used in a special sense in connection with the Holy Communion (cf. Ignat. Philad. 4 συνάγεισκας σοι μὴ εὐχαριστείς, and see Justin, Apol. 1. 66, and Iren. Heir. iv. 18. 5).

But the verb εὐλογεῖν is never used in Jn. (except once in a quotation, 1218); and he uses εὐχαριστεῖν elsewhere (111, ἐπὶ τοῦ εὐχαριστεῖν σοι) where no sacramental reference is possible. In this general sense, "giving of thanks," εὐχαριστεῖσ is a few times in the later books of the LXX (Judith 825, 2 Mac. 121, and in Philo, as well as frequently in the N.T., e.g. Lk. 1418, 18), and very often in Paul.

It may be that the "giving of thanks" or "blessing" which all the evangelists mention in their narratives of the miraculous Feedings of the Multitudes was the grace before meat which the Lord used, and which was the usual habit of piety before a meal (cf. Deut. 810). The form of Jewish "grace" which has come down to us is, "Blessed be thou, O Lord our

God, king of the world, who bringest forth bread from the earth." But if this is the allusion in εὐχαριστήσεως σε εὐλογεῖν in the evangelical narratives of the Miraculous Feedings, it is curious that no such phrase occurs in connexion with the other meals described in the Gospels at which Jesus presided or was the principal Guest (Lk. 2430 is sacramental). Jn. does not hint that "a blessing" was asked or pronounced at the Marriage Feast in Cana (27), or at the supper in Bethany (12), or at the meal by the lake-side (2118). Cf. Mk. 142, Lk. 529. In Acts 27 it is said, indeed, of Paul λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας τῷ θεῷ εὐλογεῖν τὸν ἄρτον καὶ κλάσας ἔδωκεν τοῖς ἁγιοις (cf. 1 Cor. 1016), but it is not clear that this was an ordinary meal preceded by a "grace." Knowing and Blass regard it as a sacramental celebration.

Whatever be the reason, it would seem that the evangelical traditions handed down the incident of Jesus "blessing" the loaves at the Miraculous Feedings as an incident of special significance. The similarity to this verse of Jn. 2118, λαμβάνον τὸν ἄρτον καὶ δίδων τοῖς αὐτοῖς καὶ τὸ ἄρτον ἐρμόπω ἄρτον, brings out the more clearly the omission of any such word as εὐχαριστεῖν or εὐλογεῖν in the latter passage.

The stress that was laid in early times on the blessing of the loaves, in connexion with their multiplication, is apparent in a legend preserved in the second-century Acts of John (§ 93): "If at any time He were hidden by one of the Pharisees and went to the bidding, we accompanied Him; and before each was set one loaf by him that had hidden us, He also receiving one loaf. And, blessing His own loaf, He would divide it among us; and from that little each was filled (καὶ τῷ βρέχον ἐκαστος εὐφράγετο: see v. 7 above), and our own loaves were saved whole, so that they who bade Him were amazed." The act of blessing is a preliminary condition of the miracle, according to this writer. See on 626 below.

δόν τὸν ἔδωκαν. All the evangelists agree in the statement that the multitudes "were filled," i.e. that they had a substantial meal, and not merely a scrap of food; but Jn. is even more explicit, saying that of the fish as well as of the loaves they had as much as they wished for.

12. ἐπιλελογητας. The Synoptists have ἐκλογήσατον, as Jn. has at v. 26. The phrase μετὰ τοῦ ἐπιλελογήσατο used of the Eucharist in the Didache (x. 3) probably comes from this passage.

τὸ περαιτέρον κλάσμα. Mk. (618) has the curious
expression κλάσματα διάκειται κοφίνων πληρώματα, but Mt. (14:20) has τὸ περιστέριον τῶν κλάσματος, and Lk. (9:17) has τὸ περιστέριον αὐτοῦ κλάσματα. Jn. uses περιστέριον only here and in v. 13 (he has περιστερα at το); and it has been suggested that he is here dependent either on Lk. or Mt., rather than Mk. But he was quite capable of correcting Mk.'s πληρώματα, just as Lk. and Mt. have done, and the verb περιστέριον is the natural one to use. Jn. uses the word πληρώματα only of the "fulness" of Christ (10), and avoids it in all other contexts, perhaps because of its misleading employment in Gnostic systems.

κλάσμα is a word used in the N.T. only in the Gospel accounts of the miraculous feedings. It is rare in LXX, but we find κλάσματα ὄρνην in Ezek. 13:18 and κλάσματα ὄρνην in Judg. 10: (A text). It is used of the Bread of the Eucharist in the Didache (ix. 3).

Lightfoot 1 recalls a Jewish custom at meals of leaving something over for those who served: this was called κρήση. This possibly is behind the incident recorded here. The apostles had each his travelling-basket or κόφινον (cf. Judg. 6:16); and having ministered to the people they went round and collected what was left over. Juvenal mentions the κόφινον as a basket characteristic of Jews: "quorum copiosun foenumque supellex" (Sat. iii. 14). All four evangelists have the word κόφινον, while in the parallel narrative of the Feeding of the Four Thousand the word is σφραγῖς or σφράγις, which was a hamper large enough to hold a man (Acts 5:26).

It is Jn. alone who tells that it was the bidding of Jesus that the fragments were gathered up, and he alone adds a reason, viz. ἵνα μὴ τῆς ἀπόλυσης. This is one of those comments upon his narrative to which Jn. is so prone (see p. xxxiv), and no doubt it gives an excellent sense at this point. But the Synoptists know nothing of this, and the Jewish custom of leaving a peah or morsel at the end of a meal for the servers provides a sufficient explanation of the matter.

There is no suggestion that the bread, miraculously provided, was like the manna of ancient days, which could not be kept over from one day to another (Ex. 16:24); and the objection of the people recorded at v. 31 shows that they did not consider the supply of bread that they had witnessed as at all comparable with the manna from heaven which their fathers had enjoyed.

But in Jn. 6:15. This suggests that all the original apostles were present.

1 Hor. Hebr., i. 302.

VI. 18-19. JESUS ACCLAIMED AS MESSIANIC KING 185

14. Οἱ δὲ ἔθραμμοι ἔθραμμα δὲ ἐκπαύσαντο σημεῖον ἵππων ὡς Οὐλία ἦτοι ἢπέθραμμεν ἢ προφήτης ἢ ἐρμήνευς εἰς τῶν σκυλῶν. 15. Ἰησοῦς δὲ γενοῦσα ἀπὸ μελλοντος ἐρμηνευὴς ἢ τῶν σκυλῶν ὄντων ἱππὸν ἠμαρτάνει τινα ἡ ποιήσεως βασιλείας, ἀναφέρθηκεν τάλας ἕν τῷ ὄρῳ κατὰ δόξα.

ἐκ τῶν πέντε ὄρων κτλ. Mk. (6:4) speaks of fragments of the fishes being gathered up along with the fragments of the loaves, but Jn. (as also Mt., Lk.) speaks only of the fragments of bread.

βεβαιοῦμαι. The verb does not occur again in the N.T.

Jesus acclaimed as the Messianic King (v. 14, 15)

14. ἢ προφήτης δὲ ἐρμήνευς εἰς τῶν σκυλῶν. The people had already been attracted because of the "signs" of healing which Jesus did (v. 2); now this greater "sign" led them to think of him as "the prophet that cometh into the world." The woman of Samaria had been convinced that He was "a prophet" (4), as the blind man whom He healed said of Him afterwards (p.101); but the miracle of the loaves and fishes inclined the eye-witnesses to go further, and to identify Jesus with the prophet of popular belief whom Israel expected (see on 2:21) as the fulfilment of the prophecy of Deut. 3:21. "They began to say" (μεταλαβοῦντας), "This is truly the prophet that is coming into the world" (see on 1:19). Cf. v. 31.

σημεῖον is a favourite adverb with Jn.; cf. οὖν ἂν ἤτοι ἐλήμων ἢ προφήτης (v.76), and see on v. 45.

γενοῦσα ἡμών, not δὲ σημεῖον, is the true reading, the reference being to the particular "sign" which has just been described.

The rec. with ΑΛΝΤΙΑΘ, ins. ἢ ισχεῖν after σημεῖον, for clearness, but om. κατὰ δόξα.

16. Jn. generally writes ἢ ισχεῖν (see on 2:21), but we have ἢ προφήτης (without the art.) followed by ὡς, as here, several times; cf. 11:26 18:1005 ἢ προφήτης.

γενοῦσα ἡμῶν εἰς ἔρμηνευσιν κτλ. The excited people, having concluded that Jesus was the prophet of their expectation, began to plot how they might seize Him (ἐμφάνιον) and make Him king, that is, the Messianic king. The Jerusalem crowds had the same idea when they cried "Hosanna," and greeted Him as "King of Israel" on His entry to the city (11:9). Indeed, it was made part of the charge against Him, that He had claimed to be "King of the Jews" (18:36). But He would not accept the title in the sense in which they understood it. He was not a political revolutionary. And so
16. ὃς δὲ ἔδοθα ἐγκατατομαζόμενον καταβήσαντα οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν ἡμέραν, "He withdrew again to the hill" (see v. 3), from which He had come down to feed the people.

Mk. and Mt. tell nothing of the fanatical excitement of the crowds, or of their being so much impressed by the miracle as to think of Jesus as Messiah; 1 the only hint the Synoptists give of this being supplied by Lk., who follows up the narrative of the feeding by the story of the various answers to the question, "Who do the multitudes say that I am?" (Lk. 9:19) which Mk. and Mt. put in another context.

Indeed, Mk. and Mt. give as the reason of Jesus' retirement to the hill, that it was to pray, which is perhaps here suggested by μόνος. That was His habit, and such a motive for His retirement is not inconsistent with His other motive, viz., to be freed from the embarrassing attentions of the crowds. Mk. and Mt. tell that He dismissed the crowds (Mk. 6:34, Mt. 14:23), while Jn. suggests rather that He escaped from them. Probably He tried to disperse them, but some, more obstinate and excited than the rest, would not leave. It is these latter who come before us in v. 22 as having remained until the next morning. Again, Jn. does not mention that the return of the disciples was ordered by Jesus, as Mk. and Mt. do; but it is evident that they would not have left Him had they not been told to do so. He may have wished to remove them from the atmosphere of political excitement which had been generated. Apparently Jesus had not told His disciples exactly where and when they would meet Him again.

The storm on the lake (vv. 16-21)

16. ἐκείνη ἡ ἡμέρα may indicate any time in the late afternoon (cf. v. 30 and Mt. 14:22). The sun set after the disciples had started, and it became dark (οὐκίσκος, v. 27) while they were on the lake. Mk. notes that Jesus met them "about the fourth watch of the night," i.e., about 3 a.m.

καταβήσαντα, "they descended," sc. from the slopes of the hill.

16 ff. The incident is described with vividness. It was late in the evening when the boat started on the return journey to Capernaum (v. 17; see on v. 1). The wind had risen, and the lake was stormy. Mk. does not say that the destination of the boat was Capernaum, although that is what we should have expected; his words οὐκ ἤτοι γεγονεῖν τὸν μαθητὰν πρὸς τὸν Ἰακώβα, "he had not told His disciples exactly where and when they would meet Him again."
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θάλασσαν, 17. καὶ ἐβράτας ἐν πλοίῳ ἴχνουτο πίεραν τῆς θάλασσας

ἐν τῷ πίεραν τῷ Ἰωάννῃ Βαρθαού (Mk. 6:49), and he goes on to tell that, driven by the storm, they landed ultimately at Gennesaret, which is a little to the south of Capernaum. That is to say, according to Mk., they made for Bethsaida in the first instance; whether because they wished to take Jesus on board there, or to land one of the party (it was the home of some of them; see on v. 24), or because they wished to keep under the lee of the land, in view of the impending storm, we cannot tell. In any case the storm caught them, and when they had rowed 25 or 30 furlongs, that is, about 3 or 4 miles, they see Jesus walking on the sea, and coming near the boat. Now by this time, having rowed nearly 4 miles, they must have been close to the western shore of the lake, and so Jn. says: ἠρέτος τὸ πλοῖον ἐγκατά τῇ γῆς ἐκ τῆς ἡμέρας. If we had only Jn.'s account of this incident, we should have no reason to suppose that he intended to record any "miracle." The phrase ἐν τῷ πειρατείαν (v. 19) is used by Jn. again at 21:2, where it undoubtedly means "by the sea shore"; and it is probable that he means here that when the boat got into the shallow water near the western shore, the disciples saw Jesus in the uncertain light walking by the lake, and were frightened, not being sure what they saw. Jn. does not say, as Mk. does, that Jesus was received into the boat; he only says that they were desirous to have Him with them, when they found that the voyage was already over (v. 21). Nor does Jn. say anything about a miraculous stilling of the storm (cf. Mk. 5:41). Nor does he follow Mk. 6:48, Mt. 14:26) that the disciples thought they had seen a phantasm (μάνταιαμα). So far from it being true that we always find in Jn. an enhancement of the miraculous, in this particular case, while the story as narrated by Mk. (followed by Mt.) is miraculous, in Jn. there is no miracle whatever. Nor does Jn. call the incident a "sign," as he is accustomed to speak of the miracles which he records (cf. v. 14). In short, this story, as told by Jn., is exactly the kind of story that we might expect from John the son of Zebedee, a fisherman with experience of the lake in all its moods, well accustomed to its sudden storms, and knowing the distance from one point to another (v. 19). See Introd., p. cxxvi.

17. ἐβράτας ἐν πλοίῳ. The same phrase occurs for embarking 21 and 1 Macc. 15:7. ADÒEcW insert τό before πλοίῳ, which no doubt gives the sense, it being probably their own boat that they took for their return voyage; but ἀπὸLΔ omits τό.
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN [VI. 17-19.

eis ἀποκαθαρίσμων. καὶ κοινόν ἡ ἐγγενεία καὶ οὐδὲν ἐλθόντα ἔρχεται ἃ ἡμέρας αὐτῶν ἵνα ἦσσον ἡ Ἰρινα. τ. σ. τ. ἐβέλαφαν ἄδικαν μέγαν πέξανος διεγέρσον, τ. ἡμικλάκατο οὐ χεῖν διάθεσις εἰκάνει πέττε πιάνων ἡ ὑμνατία τοῦ ἔρχεται, "they were going," the impf. being used for an incomplete action.

For καὶ κοινόν ἡ ἐγγενεία, ND read κατάλαβεν δι' αὐτός ἡ κοινόν, "but darkness overtook them" (cf. 12:26 and 13, where see note). This again, gives the sense, but we follow ABLTANW with the rec. text, although κατάλαβεν αὐτός ἡ κοινόν is a thoroughly Johannine phrase.

οὐς is read for οὕς by ATAE, but οὐς is better attested (καὶ BDLNW) and gives the better sense. Jesus had "not yet" come to them. They had expected to meet Him at Bethsaida Julias (see on 6:1 above), or at some other point, but their course had been embarrassed by the storm. They were probably keeping close to the shore on the lookout for Him, before the storm broke.

18. The sea was rising because of the squall. We have the same expression ἡ βλάστησις..., ἐξετάζοντο, John 11:18.

19. Ἀρκαίοι. Cf. βεσαντινοὶ ἐν τῇ πλανήτῃ (Mk. 6:48). πλανήτῃ occurs again in N.T. only at Lk. 8:22, Jas. 3:2, 1 Pet. 2:21. They had rowed about 25 or 30 stades, i.e., as a stade was 600 feet, nearly 4 miles, and therefore, as has been shown above (v. 16), they were close to the western shore. Mk. says they were in μιχων τῆς βλάστησις (Mk. 6:48), which need not mean more than that the water was all round them. Mk. adds to Mk.'s sentence, according to the text of B (although the other uncials do not confirm this), στεγάζοντο (Θ has ἰσακίοι) ἔστω τῆς γῆς ἑως, which is a gloss derived from the narrative of Jn., but intended, after the manner of Mt., to emphasise the miraculousness of the story.

In some texts of Mt. 14:18 we have ἦν ἐν τῇ βλάστησις for the ἦν τῆς βλάστησις of Mk. 6:48 and Jn. 6:19. The latter does not necessarily mean more than "by the sea shore": to read ἦν τῆς βλάστησις would indicate beyond question that Jesus literally "walked upon the sea." Jób says of the Creator that He "walks upon the high places of the sea," περιεβαλλόντα ὡς ἐν ἐδώδεις ἐν τῇ βλάστησι (Job. 9:2); and Wisdom declares (Ecclus. 24:3), ἐν βάλει δίδασκων περιεβαλλόντα, from which passages it might be concluded that "walking upon the sea" is a Divine prerogative. It is possible that some such idea may account for the transformation of the Johannine tradition, which is void of miracle, into the supernatural story in Mk. Mt. See on v. 15 and Introd., p. clxxi.

Thεσπροφανέν, "they notice"; see on 20 for ἅπαξ.

VI. 19-22.] JESUS IS FOUND AT CAPEMERUM

19. ἦγεραι τοῦ πλοίου γυμνόμενον, sc. "getting near the boat," a use of ἔγαμος for ἡγεμόνας which we have again in v. 25; cf. Acts 20:2 21:17 25:12 ἔφηβοις, "they were afraid," and so Jesus says—

20. ἔγαμος ἐμὲ ἐφικμαίει. These comforting words are reported in identical phrase in the Marcan and Johannine narratives (cf. Mk. 6:48, Mt. 14:25, both of which prefix ὑποτεθεὶς). They probably mean simply "It is I: be not afraid," the Marcan account suggesting that the reason of the disciples' alarm was that they thought Jesus was a spirit (πνεύμα). Another explanation has been offered of ἔγαμος, viz., that it stands for the self-designation of Yahweh in the prophets, λέγεται ὅτι ἐμοί ἐμέ; cf. 5:3 13:19. But this explanation is not necessary here,1 and such a mystical use of words would be foreign to the style of Mk., although there are parallels in Jn.

21. ἦδεν οὖν λαβεῖν αὐτόν εἰς τὸ πλ., "they were wishing to receive Him into the boat, and straightway the boat was at the land." ἦδεν is used here as at 7:24, 10:18, the wish not being translated into action. Here Jn. is at variance with Mk. (6:48), who says, as also Mt. does (with an amplification about Peter's going to Jesus on the water, Mt. 14:26-27), that Jesus climbed into the boat. The narrative of Jn. is simpler.

It has been objected to this view that we should expect ἄλλοι εἴδον τῷ πλ. τ. ἀντι rather than καὶ εἴδον, if the meaning intended was that they did not receive Jesus into the boat, because they found their voyage already ended. But Jn. is prone to use καὶ, where ἄλλοι or ὢς would be employed by another writer (see on 1:14).

For εἴδον in Jn. see on 8.

The people cross the lake and find Jesus at Capernaum (vii. 22-25)

22 ff. The readings of N* in vv. 22-24 are curiously aberrant, and the text from N* must be transcribed in full: τῇ ἐκπαθερικῷ ὅ ὁμοι ὅ ὅτι ἔτι τῷ πλοῖῳ τῆς βλάστησις ἐδείξεν ὅτι πλοῖον ἂν ὦν ἦν ἐκεῖ ἐμὲ ἐν τῷ ἔκβησθαι εἰς τὸ πλοῖον ἂν ἂν ἂν μισθηθήτω τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ. καὶ τὰ ἀνθρωπολογικὰ αὐτοῖς ἢ ἡ ἐγκαθιστήσει τὸ πλοῖον ἂν μισθηθήτω τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ. καὶ ἀναπτύχθητο τῶν πλοίων ἐν τῇ καταραγμένῳ ἔγγοις σῶσον καὶ ἐφαγον ἄρτος, ἐνδομητρίσατος τῷ κρώπιον, καὶ ἔδοκεν ὅτι εἰς ἦν 1 Cf. Introd., p. cxxx.
23. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἠρεμήσατο τῆς καθαραίας τῆς ἁλώσεως... 24. ὥσπερ εἶπεν ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἐκ τῶν ἑτέρων ἀνθρώπων ἁλώσαι τεθηκεν σάρκα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὸ πλωῖον ἡμῶν ἠμᾶς ἀφέναι αὐτῶν ἄγρινα τὸν... 25. ἐγέρθησαν ἀπὸ τῶν πλοίων, λέγοντες: "Πρῶτος ἀπέστειλεν ἡμᾶς οὗτοι καὶ ἔδωκεν τὸν ἄρτον.

This is evidently a rewriting of the original, which has a clumsy parenthesis at v. 23.

Other variants are ἐλθὼν (rec. reading with ἸΔΩ, a καστα σάντεμον) for ἔλθαν (Ἀλληλον), ΦΩΤΟΝ terminated by ἔλθαν; αὐτῷ ἐλθὼν αἱ ἑαυτής ἡ καθαραία τῆς ἁλώσεως of the rec. text; for πλοῖα (the true reading) at the end of v. 23, ἸΔΩ give πλοῖα; after ἀλλα, the rec. text with ΑΔΩ inserts ἡ; BW have πλοῖα for πλοῖα (the true reading); see exegetical note in v. 23; for gratias agentes domini, many Latin texts have gratias agentes domino, as if it was the multitude that had given thanks; and in v. 24, the rec. text with ΑΔΩ has πλοῖα for πλοῖα (ἡμᾶς ἔδωκεν πλοῖα)

29. τῆς ἑαυτῆς. See on 11.28. Some, perhaps the more zealous of the crowd, had remained all night on the scene of the miracle, in the hope that they would succeed in their attempt (v. 13) to set up Jesus as king, the more apathetic, or the more submissive, having dispersed to their homes.

The construction of the sentence is difficult, and attempts to make it more concise have led to various readings. The balance of authority is for ἔλθαν (see above), but the rec. ΦΩΤΟΝ would be more natural. The meaning is: On the next day the crowd which had stood (ἑπτής) on the other (ἐκ τῶν αἰωνίων) side of the lake, having seen (τῇ νύχῃ τῆς ἀποβάσεως) that only one boat was there, and that the disciples had embarked in their boat without Jesus, started for Capernaum in the little boats that came from Tiberias during the night. There had been only one boat on the beach the previous evening, which they had seen go without Jesus; but they could not find Jesus in the morning, and so they decided to go after Him in the little boats that had since been driven in by the storm. These, apparently, were for all the zealous watchers, so that their number could not have been very large.

A πλοία, "little boat," is mentioned in N.T. only at Mk. 3:1, Jn. 21:8 (where it is the skiff or dinghy belonging to the πλοίον of 21:4), and in this passage τὸ πλοῖον was the big fishing-boat, able to carry Jesus and the Twelve, which has been mentioned already (v. 17, 20, 21); there had been no other πλοία on the beach the previous evening (perhaps Jn. means no other πλοία, besides the dinghy belonging to the πλοίον, which had gone with it). But several small boats...
Discourse: Jesus the Bread of Life, which is given by the Father (vv. 25–40)

26. Jn. states (v. 55) that the long discourse which follows, interrupted at several points by questions, was delivered in the synagogue at Capernaum; and it is represented as marking a turning-point in the ministry of Jesus, many, even of His former disciples (v. 66), being repelled by the strange and lofty mysticism which it teaches. There is no reason to question the statement that a discourse about the Bread of Life followed the Miracle of the Loaves, in correction of the failure to appreciate its significance by some of those who had been fed. But it can hardly be doubted that the whole discourse, as we have it, has been arranged by Jn. so as to bring out special (and often repeated) teachings of Jesus about His own person, and to illustrate the growing opposition of the Jews (v. 41).

The plan of the discourse in all its parts is similar to that in the discourses with Nicodemus and with the Samaritan woman. It falls into three sections (vv. 26–40, 41–51, 52–58), but cf. note on v. 51, and Introd., p. cxvi

ἀπεκρ. αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησ. καὶ ἐκεῖνοι. See on τοῦ Ἀ. See on τὸ δόξα. See on τῆς ἐκκλ. ἐκ τῆς σημεία. They had seen a σημεία in the Miraculous Feeding (v. 14), and if they had interpreted it aright, the faith which would have ensued would have been acceptable, although not of the highest type (see on κ. η. But they were following Jesus about because of the material benefits which they had received at His hands (ὁ ἔφυγεν ἐκ τῶν δρόμων, "because you ate of those loaves"), rather than because they discerned in Him the spiritual Deliverer of their race. They mistook His mission, as some of them had shown already (cf. vv. 15 and 30).

καὶ ἐν ἔκκλ. καὶ σατ. See on v. 12, where Jn. has ἐν καλ. instead of the Synoptic ἐν ἔκκλ. But bodily satiety does not last. They would be, perhaps were already, hungry again.

1 See Introd., p. cxii.

This is the only place, as Wendt points out, where the word σημεία is placed in the mouth of Jesus by Jn.
Christian literature at an early date; cf. Hermas, Sim. ix. 16, and a Clem. 8. In the Odes of Solomon the "sealing" by God is explicitly mentioned: "On their faces I set my seal" (Ode viii. 15; cf. also iv. 8).

Christian literature at an early date; cf. Hermas, Sim. ix. 16, and a Clem. 8. In the Odes of Solomon the "sealing" by God is explicitly mentioned: "On their faces I set my seal" (Ode viii. 15; cf. also iv. 8).

For the constr. here and at v. 37 see on 28 τοῦ θεοῦ (ΝΑΒΛΝΤΔ) is the true reading, not τοῦ θεοῦ of the rec. text. Θω σαμ. 13 have τοῦ θεοῦ.

τοῦ θεοῦ: "What shall we do?" The question is not mere carping. They understand that they must please God, if they are to have the food which endures unto eternal life; and they ask quite naturally, "What then are we to do? What does God require of us?" (cf. Lk. 3:16).

In ἐργαζόμεθα τό ἐργα τοῦ θεοῦ, i.e. the works which God desires of men (cf. 1 Cor. 15:28). Cf. τό ἐργα Κυρίου (Jer. 31:30, LXX). The phrase in Num. 8:1 ἐργαζόμεθα τοῦ ἐργα Κυρίου is no true parallel; and the ἐργα τοῦ θεοῦ of Jn. 9:3 denote the works which God Himself does.

To their question, Jesus replies that works are the issue of the life of faith, that faith in Him is the condition of doing τό ἐργα τοῦ θεοῦ.

The answer of Jesus contains, in small compass, the gist of the Pauline teaching about faith. Jesus will not allow the Jewish inquirers to begin by speaking of working the works of God. They must get away from the legalism which counted up good works as meriting from God the recompense of eternal life. There is one ἐργον τοῦ θεοῦ which must precede all others, because it alone places the man in his true relation with God, viz. faith in Christ.

The ἐργα, or spiritual food, of the Incarnate Christ Himself was to do God's will and accomplish His work (4:33, where see note); but man cannot do this without sharing in the humanity of Christ which He imparts to those who have faith in Him (v. 51). Here is the βοῶσις which He gives, and which endures ἐπί τῶν ζωῆς αἰώνων (v. 47). This mystical doctrine of union of Christ is the core of the Fourth Gospel; see, for earlier statements of it, 3:14, and the notes there.

The question and its answer are like the question of the jailor at Philippi and the answer of Paul and Silas: τί με δὶς ποίησες ὑμῖν σοι; (Acts 16:19, 21).

ἐργάζεσθαι (ΝΑΒΛΝΤΘ) is the true reading; the rec. text

with DW has πιστεύεις, but this does not convey the teaching of Jn. about faith, ἡ πιστεύεις points to a definite act of faith at a particular moment (cf. 13:19); but this does not suffice. τό ἐργον τοῦ θεοῦ is διὰ πιστεύεις, "that you may have faith continually," that you may live the life of faith. An act of faith in Christ at a definite crisis is a good thing, but a better (and a harder) thing is to keep in perpetual contact with Christ, and nothing less than this is what is needed εἰς τήν ζωήν αἰώνων (see above on 3:14, and cf. 15:1).

See for this frequent phrase on 317.

εἰς τετελείως. See for this phrase on 317.

εἰς τοῦτο, i.e. God, is placed at the end of the sentence for emphasis. See on 18 for Jn.'s use of εἰς τοῦτο.

τοῦτο εἰς τοῦτο; A similar demand made by the Pharisees for a "sign from heaven" is placed in Mk. 8:39 (see Mt. 12:32, cf. Mt. 12:32) as following on the Feeding of the Four Thousand. There, as here, Jesus is represented as having declined (and with indignation) the request. Lk. does not tell the story of this second miraculous feeding, and he puts the request for a sign in a different context (11:22; cf. also 20:32).

Like the Pharisees in Mk. 8:39, the interlocutors in the Johannine story were not convinced that by the miraculous feeding Jesus had established His claim to be a messenger from God. Some, at least, of those who had seen it said that He was the expected prophet, and were for making Him a king (vv. 14, 15). But by the next day all were not so fully persuaded. If Jesus were really a Divine messenger, they expected something more. They were not satisfied as to the character of the action which had been acclaimed by them as a σήματος (v. 14). So, like the Jews in 2:22, who had asked τί σήματος δεικνύει ημῖν, they now ask τί ποιήσεις ἐν σήμαιν; the emphatic word here being σήμα, "What sign do you show?"

ἐν τήν ζωήν και ποιήσεις ἐν σήμαιν. They did not understand what He had meant by "believing in Him" (v. 29), for they took up the words in the altered form "believe me." They imply that if they saw a really convincing sign, something greater than anything they had witnessed yet (vv. 2, 14, 26), they would believe Him, that is, believe His words (cf. 28:1). But this is not what Jesus claimed of them. To believe His words would be, no doubt, the beginning of discipleship, and of faith in His Person (see on v. 29), but it would not be enough εἰς τήν ζωήν αἰώνων.

They think that Jesus has been referring to manna, and they ask Him to provide it (see Introd., p. cxxi). ἐργάζεσθαι refers back to vv. 28, 29.
31. To appreciate the significance of this allusion to the manna, it must be borne in mind that there was a general belief, more or less explicit, that Messiah when he came would undo Moses, the great national hero of Israel, in the wonders which he would accomplish. Thus there was a Rabbinical saying: "The former redeemer caused manna to descend for them; in like manner shall our latter redeemer cause manna to come down, as it is written, 'There shall be a handful of corn in the earth.'" (Ps. 72:16). Accordingly the questioners of Jesus are here represented as telling Him that something more wonderful than the miracle of the loaves was expected of one who claimed to be the Messiah (cf. vv. 24, 27). We have here a reminiscence of an objection to Jesus which is historical: "The key to the understanding of the whole situation is an acquaintance with the national expectation of the greater Moses. But this knowledge is not obscured upon us by the evangelist. It is tacitly assumed. In fact, the meaning is unintelligible, except to one who is brought up among the ideas of his time, or to one who, like a modern critic, has made them his special study." 2

32. As Chrysostom notes, this corresponds to the reference made by the Samaritan woman to "our father Jacob" (v. 2, see above, p. cxxi). The provision of the manna (Ex. 16:14; Num. 11:20, Deut. 8:3; Wisd. 16:10) was counted by the Jews as the greatest achievement of Moses. Josephus says of the manna that "it is the most important of the prohibitions of the Messiah." (Ant. iii. 1, 6). Thus the question is by far the most important. This is the usual form of citation in John. (see on v. 30).

32. Jesus corrects a twofold misapprehension on the part of His questioners. First, it was not Moses who was the giver of the manna, but God, whose instrument he was; and, secondly, the manna, while it was in a sense "bread from heaven," was not the true Bread of God. This momentous saying is introduced by the solemn διὰ δύναμιν (see on v. 19).

33. The objectors had not named Moses, but Jesus knew what was in their minds, and that they were disparaging Him in comparison with Moses. θάνατος (BDLW) is the true reading, rather than δίδωσιν of the rec. text (NATEG). The aor. points to a definite historical date in the past.

34. The aor. δείκνύει (BDLW) is the true reading, rather than δίδασκεος of the rec. text (NATEG). The aor. points to a definite historical date in the past.

35. Moses did not give you that (τῷ) bread from heaven; but had been given to their fathers might be spoken of as given to them who were the heirs and descendants of the ancient race that came out of Egypt. The manna of old was in a true sense the gift of God; that is not questioned in the reply of Jesus: what He questions is that it was given by Moses.

36. For this significant phrase, see above, p. 24.

37. "Gives," not "gave." The Divine gift now to be revealed is continuously offered.

38. All bread is the gift of God (Matt. 6:11), but the Bread which can be described as peculiarly διὰ δύναμιν (see on v. 19), but such as coming down imparts life and not merely bodily nourishment. Chrysostom notes that the manna supplied μορφή but not ζωή. But the first characteristic of the Bread of God is that it brings life (see on v. 27). And the second is that it is offered to all men, and not only to a particular nation; ἐν διδασκόντω, "giving life" (in the present tense, that is, continually giving life) τῇ κόσμῳ. See on v. 28 for κόσμον, which is one of the master words of John; and also on v. 51 below. Cf. 1.

The phrase occurs Ignatius, ad Rom. viii.; cf. vv. 51, 53.
descends) from heaven." It is not until v. 35 that Jesus says that He is the Bread of Life. This expression, "who came down from heaven," or "which comes down from heaven," is repeated seven times in this discourse (vv. 33, 38, 41, 42, 50, 51, 58), recurring like a solemn refrain. It was afterwards incorporated in the Nicene Creed. See on 28 above.

The idea that the manna typified heavenly bread for the soul often appears in the Jewish commentaries. Wetstein quotes several passages in illustration, e.g. "secundo haec de manna est una ex prestantibus sectionibus legis quae non solum res gestas historice narrat, sed et typum continent utae ac felicissimae hominis ultimae et aeternae." Again, the comment in Bereshith R. lxxxii. 9 on the good of Prov. 12 is "saturabitur pane saeculi futuri."

The same conception of heavenly bread for the soul is frequent in Philo. Wisdom offers σμύρνην τροφήν by means of λόγος and λόγια (de ogrif. mundi, § 56). The βίος λόγος divides equally among all men the heavenly food of the soul which Moses calls manna (Quis rer. div. her. § 30). So in an earlier passage (§ 15) Philo speaks of the man who contemplates τὸ μάνη, τὸν βιοῦ λόγον, τῷ οίκον τῆς ψυχῆς διαλειτούργου ἀφθηγμὸν τροφήν. Again, the βίος λόγος are the manna, the heavenly food, which nourishes men (de congress. erud. gr. § 30). What nourishes the soul is βίος λόγος καὶ λόγος βίου, from which flow all kinds of wisdom (de prof. 25). Cf. also the question and answer in Legg. all. iii. 59 ὑπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς τροφῆς ὡς ἐκτι βιοῦ τεβίν συντριβή. See further on v. 35.

More familiar than any of these passages is 1 Cor. 10, where Paul, allegorising the story of the manna, describes it as βρώμα συνεμπαντίου, "spiritual food."

The questioner who are represented by Jn. as arguing about the manna were probably acquainted with this idea of it as a type of heavenly food for the soul. So when Jesus says that the true Bread of God is that which comes down from heaven and gives life, they do not cavil at such a thought. Indeed, they welcome it. This was what they were waiting for. Moses had given manna. The Messiah was to give a greater gift (see above on v. 31). So their answer is, "Give us evermore this bread." Here, again, Jn. faithfully reproduces the theological temper and expectation of the times which he describes. The Jews would not have stumbled at the idea of spiritual food, of heavenly bread, as typified by the manna, and Jn. does not represent them as finding any fault with it. Their objection comes later (v. 41, where see note).

Wetstein gives the reference "Isaacus Aruma in Akodas Jisbaa."
nothing difficult of credence in Jn’s report that Jesus taught that He was Himself the Bread of Life, such teaching being not only congruous with the Synoptic representation of His words at the institution of the Eucharist (Mk. 14:22, Mt. 26:26, Lk. 22:19), but being specially apposite in the context in which Jn. has placed it (see above on v. 26 f.). But, for all that, when reporting the claim of Jesus to be the Bread of Life, Jn. may have had in mind Philo’s words about the *θεός λόγος* as the heavenly nourishment of the soul (*Quis rerum divinarum inventio*). Jn.’s conception of the Logos as a personified, Himself God Incarnate, is so widely different from Philo’s conception of the λόγος as representing Divine forces, and the λόγος as the Divine Reason, that similarities of language between the two writers do not establish dependence of thought, or any borrowing of ideas from Philo on the part of Jn. 1

The “Bread of Life” *means* primarily the Bread which *gives* life, as we see from v. 33. But for this phrase is substituted in v. 51 ὁ ἄρτος ἐκ τοῦ ζωοῦ, the “living Bread,” i.e. the Bread that has life in itself. This second, larger meaning is virtually involved in the first, for life can only proceed from life, *omnia vivum ex vivo*; and so that which gives life must itself be “living.” See on 15:46.

There is the same double sense in the similar phrase “the water of life” (Rev. 21:1, 22:1, 2), i.e. the water which gives life, and is therefore “living water” (see on 4:7). Cf. the expressions the “Light of life” in 2:9, where see the note, the “Tree of life” (Gen. 2:9, Rev. 2:7, etc.), and the “Word of life” (1:14), i.e. the Word which gives life. Cf. v. 68. ὁ λόγος ἀληθινός ἐκ τοῦ ζωοῦ. “Coming” and “believing” are put side by side here and at 57:7. The “coming” is the initial act of the soul in its approach to Jesus; the “believing” is the continuous rest in His fellowship (see on v. 29). As Jn. has much about “believing,” so he has much about “coming,” and reports many sayings of Jesus about its importance. Inquirers “come” to Jesus (3:24, 4:28, 7:29, 12:38, 18:24); all candid and truthful souls come to the Light (26:1); e.g. Nathanael (1:49), or the two disciples whose call is the first recorded by Jn. (1:35). The first reward of “coming” is εἰσίν, ἐρώτησε λέγειν... (12:28); the second (and ultimate) reward is life (5:24). All are welcome, κἀν τις διάφορος, ἐρώτησα πρὸς με (5:27). He who comes will not be cast out (6:32). To approach God a man must come to Jesus, οὐκ ὑπομένει ἐπὶ τοῦ πατρὸς εἰ μὴ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν (14:4). This is the Only Way. And yet, free as is this approach, no one can come to Jesus, except the Father draw him (6:6). This teaching is fuller than that of the Synoptic Gospels, but in

1 Cf. Introd., pp xcix, xci.

VI. 38-87.] JESUS THE BREAD OF LIFE

οὐ θαμάζεις, καὶ ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ ὁδήγησα πάντως. 36. Ἰδοὺ ἐντὸν ἑαυτῷ καὶ ἑωράκατε καὶ ὁ πιστεύετε. 37. Πάντες, γερμίζεται αὐτῷ. It is all contained in Mt. 11:26 δεῖ γρών με . . γὰρ ὄντως ἐμάτισθεν ἔρµα. This is the Matthean counterpart of the utterance before us in this verse, “He that cometh to me shall never hunger”; the desire of the soul will be satisfied. οὐ θαμάζεις. τινῶν does not occur again in Jn. καὶ ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ, “he who believes on me” (see on v. 29 and on 15:10 above). This is the τὸν θεὸν spoken of in v. 29.

οὐ μὴ δύστηρε. So NAABDWE; the rec. has δύστηρ. The promise is the same as that given to the woman of Samaria where πείς τοῦ κόσμου οὐκ ἐχεῖς δόρατα αὐτή, οὐ μὴ δύστηρες εἰς τὸν άλισσων (4:14, where see the note and esp. the quotation from Exclus. 24:21; cf. Rev. 14:18).

πίστευτον. See on 14:18.

38. The rec. text, with BD W Fa G, adds με ὠφελεῖται, but om. Να a δ e g, Syr. cu. and Syr. sin. It is probable that με ought to be omitted. The words “I said to you that ye saw and do not believe” then clearly refer back to v. 26, where Jesus had said, “Ye seek me not because ye saw signs, but because ye ate of the loaves, etc.” Seeing is not always believing (cf. 5:27). The kind of faith that is generated by the seeing of signs is not the highest (see on 24:15), but it is not without its value (cf. 14:14). The best kind of all has the bless-

39. “Blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed” (20:29); cf. ἐπὶ πολλῶν ἔχει ζωήν αἰώνιαν (v. 47).

On the other hand, if ἔρωταὶ με is the true reading, we must suppose that Jesus is represented as alluding to some saying of His which has not been recorded by Jn. This is not impossible; see, for other instances, 10:36 11:40.

37. The questioners of Jesus did not believe or accept Him, but that rejection of theirs does not alter the Divine purpose, which is that all who shall have eternal life. Upon this Jesus testifies, despite incredulity on the part of some who heard Him. “All that the Father gives to me shall come to me”: that is enough, for He came to do the Father’s will, and the Father knows best as to those whom He gives. For the predestinarian doctrine of the Fourth Gospel, see on 1:34.

For the thought that His disciples are “given” to the Son by the Father, cf. vv. 39, 65, and 10:17 17:3. v. 11 14 18. See note on 3:16.

τις, sc. all men. This collective use of the neut. sing. is not unknown in classical Greek. Jn. has it several times (17:4, x 1 Jn. 5:2, as well as at v. 39 and here), and always of the sum
those who have been "begotten of God" and "given" by the Father to the Son. The ideal for those who believe in Christ is ἵνα πᾶντες ἐν σωτηρίᾳ (17\textsuperscript{st}), "that they all may be one," and it is possible that this great conception may be behind the use of πᾶν for πάντες here and in 17\textsuperscript{st}.

For the broken construction of the sentence, a casus pendens (πᾶν δὲ τίκλ.) followed by a pronoun, see on 18\textsuperscript{st}. This is frequent in Ἰακχ. πάν δὲ ἔδωκαν μου refers to πάν δὲ ἔδωκαν μου of v. 37. That none of them should perish finally is the will of the Father, and they are all therefore in the safe keeping of Christ. This is repeated in somewhat similar words at 18\textsuperscript{st}. 28; and there is a close parallel at Mt. 18\textsuperscript{st} ἵνα ἐπισκυπέτου πάντος πάντως ἐν τῷ δικαίῳ ἐπιτυγχάνει τοῦ πατρὸς ἐν τῷ τοῦ δικαίῳ ἐπιτυγχάνει. Cf. also 17\textsuperscript{st} (18\textsuperscript{st}), where the exception of Judas is mentioned.

ἀποκαθήθαι ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας ἡμέρας. "His finest is, ultra quem periculum nultum" (Bengel). This great assurance is repeated four times, in vv. 39, 40, 44, 54, and recurs with the majesty of a solemn refrain (see on 30\textsuperscript{st} and on 14\textsuperscript{st}). The expression ἡ ἁγίας ἡμέρας is found in Ἰακχ. only. In 7\textsuperscript{st} it is used of the last day of the Feast of Tabernacles; but at 11\textsuperscript{st} 12\textsuperscript{st} it refers, as it does in this chapter, to the Day of Judgment.\textsuperscript{1} For the Christ, the Son of God, as the Agent of the Resurrection, see on 31\textsuperscript{st}. 5\textsuperscript{st}. It is He that will quicken the dead at last. Cf. 1 Cor. 15\textsuperscript{st}.

Here it is only the resurrection of the righteous that is in view, whereas at 26\textsuperscript{st} a general resurrection of the dead is spoken of as brought about by the Voice of the Son of God.

For "my Father," cf. v. 32, and see on 2\textsuperscript{st}. ἐν τῷ ἰησοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ, "who beholdeth the Son," ἐκ, not with the bodily eyes, but with the eye of faith perceives Him for what He is. Cf. 12\textsuperscript{st} ἰησοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ τέμνοντος με. See on 1\textsuperscript{st} for ἴδων τοῦ δωρεάν, and on 3\textsuperscript{st} for ἴδων used absolutely. It is the Father's will that "he who beholdeth the Son and believeth on Him should have eternal life"; cf. 31\textsuperscript{st}, 46 and the notes thereon. This ἔνα ἀλώνιον

\textsuperscript{1} Cf. introd., pp. cix, cixii.
VI. 42–44.

BREAD FROM HEAVEN

42. ἐγένετο δέ ὁ Ἰσραήλ, οὗ ἦμεις ὁμαων τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα, 
πῦρ ὁ λέγει ὑμῖν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβεβληκα: 43. ἀπεκρίθη Ἰσραήλ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ἢ ἐγὼ γνώριζε μετέ ἄλληλων. 44. οὐδεὶς δὲνέστερον ἐλάδων πρὸς με ἢν μὴ ὁ Παῦλος ἐγνώριζε με ἐλάδων ἣν ἀποστάσεως, κἀκεῖνος 

with the household at Nazareth. The Synoptists (Mk. 6:1, Mt. 15:24, Lk. 5:4) mention a similar criticism (the words in Lk. are οὗτος τὸν Ἰσραήλ ὁ οὐρανοῦ καταβλήθη) as having been passed on Jesus in the synagogue at Nazareth at an earlier point in His ministry. The criticism was probably made more than once, and it is natural in the context where Jn. places it. But it is possible that he has taken the episode out of its historical setting; as in 4:44 (where see note) he has introduced the proverb about a prophet being without honour in his own country, which the Synoptists place in sequence to the criticism, “Is not this the son of Mary?” “Is not this the son of Joseph?”

As at 41 (where see note), Jn. does not stay to comment on the mistake which is involved in the question, “Is not this Joseph’s son?” It is unnecessary for him to explain to Christian readers that this was not so. There is nothing in the form of the question to suggest that Joseph was alive, and the probability is that he had died before the public ministry of Jesus began (see on 21).

ποῦ νῦν λέγει κτλ. For ποῦ, the rec. text (with ΝΑΔΒΑΝ) has οὖν, but ποῦ is read by BCTW, and has a special force, “Where does he say now that, etc.” ποῦ to us who have known him from a child. οὖν is inserted again after λέγει by ΝΑΔΒΑΝ, but is redundant. ποῦ λέγει, the words following being a citation.

εἰκονομεν, the order of the words being changed, ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβλήθη, the order of the words being placed first for emphasis. This was the incredible thing, that it was from heaven He claimed to have come down.

48. Jesus does not answer the objection as to His parentage being known. As at 41, He proceeds to point out a fundamental misunderstanding on the part of His interlocutors. They must be “taught of God” before they can accept His heavenly origin.

For the construction ἀπεκρίθη Ἰσραήλ καὶ εἶπεν, see on 16. The rec. adds οὖν after ἀπεκρίθη with ΝΑΔΒΑΝ, but om. BCLT. So, too, the rec. prefixes the def. art. ὁ before Ἰσραήλ with ADNW, but om. βλ. See on 18 above. μὴ γνώριζε μετέ ἄλληλων. They will not reach a true understanding by whispering to each other. They must seek enlightenment from God.

44. οὐδεὶς δὲνέστερον ἐλάδων πρὸς με ἢν μὴ ὁ παῦλος...
made from Isa. 54:12, and does not agree precisely with either the Hebrew or the LXX. Literally, the Hebrew gives, "And all thy sons shall be taught of Yahweh," which the LXX turns by kai οἱ γυναικεῖς ... πάντας τούς νῦν δοκεώσεις τοὺς.

To be δοκεώ τούς is to be "drawn" by God; we have θεολόγων at 1 Thess. 4 (cf. 1 Cor. 2:13, Phil. 2:13, for the idea), and Barnabas (xxi. 6) has the precept γενέσθαι θεολογηταν τῶν. Cf. τῶν, v. 37, 39. Aldo add οὖν, but om. ABCDLNTH.

δοκεώς παρά τοῦ πατρός. The same phrase occurs again 38a. 10 f. 35. See for the constr. on 40.

καὶ μαθήμα. It is not sufficient for a man to have heard God's voice; he must also learn, which is a voluntary act. Predestination, in the Johannine doctrine, does not exclude free will or personal responsibility. But every one who has heard the Divine voice, and has learnt its teachings, "comes" to Christ. See on v. 37 for ἐρχέται πρὸς οὐκ. 40. This "hearing" of God's voice is, however, not by way of immediate personal communication; it is not "seeing the Father." Only One has "seen" God (1:18), although it is true, in another sense, that he who has "seen" Jesus has "seen the Father" (1:14).

οἷς ἐν τῷ πατρί ἐγραμμένα πρὸς τοὺς διδασκαλέων. So ABCDLNTH; the rec. has τινὰ παρὰ τούς. Καὶ ἔχει τῶν θεοῦ τοῖς πατρίᾳ, a reminiscence of 1:18, where see note. Cf. 57.

εἰ μὴ δὲ ἐν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰς τὸν θεοῦ, αὐτὸς οὐκ ἔχει τούς διδασκαλέων. For the things which He has seen παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς (cf. also 325). See on 47.

For the repetition (οὕτως) of the subject of the sentence, in the interests of emphasis, cf. 1:17 115, and see 1036.

47. ἄφημον ἤμην κατά. See on 314. This opening phrase introduces a saying which is the keynote of the Fourth Gospel, ἀρτοῦ (used absolutely as at v. 36) ὡς ἐν παράθυρῳ αἴωνων (cf. 20:1, and see on 314).

After ἀρτοῦ the rec. adds εἰς ημᾶς with ACDI'AN (from such passages as 3:18, 36); but ΒLBTH om. εἰς ημᾶς. Jn.'s
VI. 50.-51.] THE FLESH OF CHRIST

εἰμὶ δὲ ἄρπος ὅς ἔσυν ἔκ τοῦ αἵματος καταβασάς ἐν τῇ φέρῃ ἐκ τοῦ ἄρπου τοῦ ἄρπου, ἐφεξής εἰς τὸ αἷμα.

for ἀνάθημαν in the present tense, Ps. 82:4, Deut. 17:9. But this is unnecessary, and ἀναθήματος is too well attested to be set aside for the variant ἀναθήματος.

51. The first half of this verse repeats what has been said already in v. 50, but in an even more emphatic form. The second half of the verse, as we shall see, introduces a new conception. ἔγω εἰμὶ δὲ ἄρπος τῶν ἔσυν, "the living Bread," which as its own life can impart life (see on v. 35 above). ἐν τῷ ἄρπῳ τῷ ἀναθήματος, "the living One," is the claim of Jesus for Himself in Rev. 1:17; so here δὲ ἄρπος τῶν ἔσυν is the Bread which is always inherent with Life, which continues to live from age to age. See on 49 for the phrase "living water"; and cf. the expressions "living oracles" (Acts 7:55), "living sacrifices" (Rom. 12:1), "living hope" (1 Pet. 1:3), and "living stones" (1 Pet. 2:5), which do not, however, present more than verbal resemblances to the phrase "Living Bread" here.

51. δὲ τοῦ αἵματος καταβασάς. See on v. 33 above. Here the aorist participle points to the crisis of the Incarnation.

For δὲ τοῦ τοῦ ἄρπου (BCDLTWΘ), ἀν ἔκ τοῦ ἄρπου, but this is inconsistent with the sense of the passage. The Living Bread is Jesus Himself.

εἰμὶ δὲ τὸ φάτνευτον, "if any one eat of this Bread, he shall live for ever," sc. as God does (cf. Rev. 2:10; 15:5, and Deut. 32:28, Ecles. 18:1). "ἐπεξῆς εἰς τὸ καθαρὶ" is repeated v. 58: the phrase is used of the righteous man, Wisd. 5:16.

There is perhaps an echo of this thought in Barnabas, § 11. Barnabas is speaking of the trees by the river of Ezek. 47:12, and he adds δὲ ἐν φατνεῦτον ἐν αὐτῶν ἀφήσας εἰς τὸν αἵματον. But see Introd., p. lxii.

The rec. (with BCTTA) has ἐφεξής γιὰ τὸ σῶμα (καὶ τὸ κρατεῖ). There is a similar variant at vv. 57, 58; cf. 58:14.59.

The third part of the Discourse: Jesus will give the Bread which is His flesh for the life of the world (vss. 51-53).

51. The MSS. vary as to the order of the words in the second part of the verse, but the meaning remains unaltered. BCDLTW have the text which we print, while u s support καὶ δὲ ἄρτος ἐν δηλοῦν ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν κομοῦν ζωῆς ἡ σάρκα μονοὶ ἀπόκτενος, a less awkward construction. The rec. text has got rid of the awkwardness by reading καὶ δὲ ἄρτος δὲ ἐν δηλοῦν ἡ σάρκα μονοὶ ἀπόκτενος, ἐν δηλοῦν ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν κομοῦν ζωῆς, the insertion of ἐν δηλοῦν making all clear.
A new idea is introduced at this point. 1 Hitherto Jesus has spoken of the Bread of Life as coming down from heaven, and of Himself as that Living Bread, giving life to all who feed upon it and appropriate it. Now He goes on to speak of this Bread as His Flesh, and of the feeding upon Him as eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood. The transition from the one way of speaking to the other is marked by a change in the tense of the "giving." The Father gives the heavenly bread (v. 32); it gives life to the world (v. 33). But now Jesus says, "The Bread which I shall give (δώσω) is My Flesh, etc." (but see on v. 27). Moreover, up to this point (except at v. 27), Jesus has spoken of Himself, as the Bread of Life, coming down from heaven, given by the Father. Now, He speaks of the Bread which He Himself will give for the life of the world, namely His Flesh. Difficult as the Jews had found the thought (v. 41) that Jesus was Himself the heavenly bread, divinely given, for which they had asked (v. 34), they find much greater difficulty in the new and strange suggestion that Jesus was to give Them His Flesh to eat (v. 52). And, according to the Gospel as we have it, Jesus then proceeds to develop and enlarge this conception (vv. 53-58). 2 

καὶ ἐδυνατός ἦν δώσων ἳππας μοι ὡς τὴν ζωὴν τοῦ κόσμου ἀνήκῃ. 52. Ἑμέχαστον τῶν πρὸς ἀλλήλους οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι λέγουσι.

VI. 51-58.] THE FLESH OF CHRIST

Πῶς δένεις αὕτης ἴππος δώσων τὴν σάρκα φαγεῖν; 53. ἐκείνοις δὲ λέγειν ἀναλύεται ἡ θυσία λέγοντας ἢν μὴ φέρεις τὴν σάρκα τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τίποτε ἄτομο τὸ αἷμα, ἵνα ἴχθυς ἄρῃ ἐν καταλύσει.

"hic panis quem ego dabo pro huius mundi uita corporis meum est."

69. The Jewish interlocutors had murmured (v. 41) before this point had been reached; but now they begin to dispute with each other (καὶ καταλύειν does not occur again in the Gospels) as to the meaning and trustworthiness of the words of Jesus. They were not of one mind (cf. 51f., 40f., 10f.); some probably discerning that a spiritual meaning lay behind this mention of the "Flesh" of Jesus.

τῶν δένεται κλ.; The question is like that of 36. 9 (where see note). For ἄτομο, "this person," see on v. 42 above.

After σάρκα BT (with most vss.) insert σώμα, to elucidate the sense; but om. ἐναλλώσασθε. In any case, the meaning is: "How can this person give us His flesh to eat?" Their difficulty was a real one, even if they (or some of them) recognised that the σάρκα represented the whole humanity of Jesus, on which they were to "feed;" for that one human being could impart his nature to another, even spiritually, would be hard to understand.

68. The answer of Jesus repeats (see on 3) what He has said already, but in even more difficult terms. For while in v. 51 He spoke only of His Flesh, He now goes on to couple the drinking of His Blood with the eating of His Flesh. Such an expression as "I to drink Blood" would be especially startling to a Jew, for whom the Blood of animals was ἐκδοθή, and was expressly forbidden to be used as food (Gen. 9:4 Deut. 12:23). The prohibition was based on the doctrine that "the blood is the life" (Deut. 12:23), i.e., that the blood was the seat of the "soul" or ψῡχή, the vital principle.

The phrase πῶς τῷ αἵματι does not occur again in the N.T. It should be noted, further, that the use of this expression, as distinct from φαγεῖν τὴν σάρκα, indicates that the Flesh and Blood have been separated, and thus it suggests death, even more definitely than φαγεῖν τὴν σάρκα does.

ἀμὴν ἀμὴν κλ.; See on 43.

For φέρεις, D (supported by a) has λάθος. See on v. 56.

Τὴν σάρκα τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. The form of expression is changed from ἠ σάρκα μοι of v. 51, after a fashion frequent in the Johannine discourses. But no new idea is introduced by the change, for "the Son of Man" has already (v. 27) been mentioned as the future giver of the heavenly food. For this title, see Introd., p. xxx.
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1 Cf. Introd., p. clxvii.

2 For the sacramental bearing of vv. 51—58, see Waterland, Doctrines of the Eucharist, c. vi.
VI. 54-55.] THE FLESH OF CHRIST

54. ἐδόγκιμον τῷ θαματίῳ καὶ πίνων τῷ θάμα της ἀληθείας ἔσχατον ἡμῶν. οὗτος ἀληθῶς ἐμπρόσθεν τῷ ἐσχατῷ ἡμῶν. 55. ἡ ἡμέρα εὐφορίας ἐστιν ἀληθώς, καὶ τῷ θάμα της ἀληθείας ἐστιν ἡμών.

56. ὁ γὰρ πᾶς ὑμῶν ἀληθώς ἐστιν ἡμῶν, καὶ τῷ θάμα της ἀληθείας ἐστιν ἡμών. οὗτος ἀληθῶς ἐστιν ἡμών. οὗτος ἀληθῶς ἐστιν ἡμών. οὗτος ἀληθῶς ἐστιν ἡμών. οὗτος ἀληθῶς ἐστιν ἡμών. οὗτος ἀληθῶς ἐστιν ἡμών.

infants, in order that being thus nourished from the breast of His flesh (ἡμέρα ἐσχατών της ἀληθείας), "we might become accustomed to eat and drink the Word of God (τρόφιμον καὶ πίνων τῷ θάμα της ἀληθείας), and contain within ourselves the Bread of immortality (τοῦ τῆς θαματίας ἐσχατοῦ), which is the Spirit of the Father."

The language of Ignatius (Rom., 7, in like manner, reproduces words of this chapter: ἐσχατοῦ θαματίῳ ἡμῶν, ἡ ἡμέρα εὐφορίας, ἡ ἡμέρα τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ τῷ θάμα της ἁματίας καὶ ἂμα). See Intro. p. cxviii.

54. ὁ γὰρ πᾶς ὑμῶν ἀληθῶς ἐστιν ἡμών, καὶ τῷ θάμα της ἀληθείας ἐστιν ἡμών (the whole phrase is repeated verbatim in v. 56) seems to mean, "he who continually feeds with enjoyment upon my Flesh and continually drinks my Blood," or "he who is in the habit of feeding, etc.," for the present participles must be given their force. See above on v. 25.

ἐπὶ τῷ θάμα της ἀληθείας, ἡ ἡμέρα εὐφορίας, ἡ ἡμέρα τῆς ἀληθείας, which is the promise of life in the future. The twofold assurance is repeated from v. 49, the difference being that while there it is for him who has spiritual vision of Christ and believes in Him, here it is given to the man who "eats His Flesh and drinks His Blood." See above on v. 54.

For the refrain καὶ τῷ θάμα της ἀληθείας, ἡ ἡμέρα εὐφορίας, see on v. 39, and cf. Intro. p. cxviii.

The rec. text inserts ἐν προφητείᾳ τῆς θαματίας, but om. Matthew. See on v. 39.

55. ἡμέρα. So πιθ. 4CLTW, but πιθ. 4DGκα read ἡμέρα.

56. ἡμέρα ἐσχατών τῆς ἀληθείας. "for my Flesh is true meat," etc. it is really to be eaten, and it nourishes as meat ought to do. For ἰματία of the thing eaten, see on 49.

καὶ τῷ θάμα της ἀληθείας, "and my Blood is true drink." The verse is a comment on, and corroboration of, the assurance of v. 54.

For the refrain καὶ τῷ θάμα της ἀληθείας, see on v. 54, the reason for the promise being now given. The man who spiritually feeds on Christ "abides in Him," and so he has the assurance of eternal life.

μάνη is a favourite word with Jn., and he uses it much more frequently than the Synoptists do. They have not the
again 1311. 13, 1 Jn. 4. v, of the comparison between the life of the Incarnate Christ and that of believers. It is not καθός...οὑος, for the comparison or parallelism can never be exact or complete; it is καθός...καλ, “As Christ...so (in a sense) even those who are His.” See on 17. 13.

παρήγια is a phrase unique in the N.T.; but cf. δοὺς Ἰησοῦν τὸν παρθένον νήπιον ἐκ τοῦ μωρίου τῆς μαρτυρίας “(cf. earlier see note) “The living God” is a title found both in O.T. and N.T., e.g. Deut. 34, Mt. 16, Acts 14, 2 Cor. 6.

The meaning of this passage is, then, as follows: As the Father, who is the Fount of Life, has sent Christ on earth, and as Christ’s life is derived from and dependent on the Divine Life, so the believer who “eats” Christ, that is, who is in continual communion with Him, assimilates His life and thus lives in dependence on Him. δὲ τῷ παρθένῳ would mean that the Father was the Agent; but δὲ τῷ παρθένῳ signifies that He is the spring and source of the Life of the Son.

But with the accusative may mean either (i) for the sake of...or (2) thanks to...

For (1) Wette and Legets quote δέ ἐμοὶ μόνον τὴν ὀδόντι “I wish to live for your sakes.”

Dio Cassius,” LXXVII. iii. 2; and Abbott (Diat. 2708) adds several examples from Epictetus, e.g. ἀνέλεις διὰ τὰ μαθεῖς, “escape for the sake of the children” (Epicht. iv. 1, 163). This view of δέ will not suit the context here. That the Life of Christ was δὲ τῶν παρθένων, “for the Father’s sake,” is clear, for He did His Will, is true (cf. 44), but the argument requires the conception that the Life of Christ is derived from and due to the Life of God. (2) For this sense of δέ, Abbott (Diat. 2297) quotes Plutarch, Vit. Alex. § 8: Alexander said he owed life to his father, but good life to Aristotle δὲ ἐκ τῶν μαθείων μνήμην, δεῖ τούτην δὲ καλῶς τινὰ παρεῖναι. This is a close parallel to the use of δέ in the present passage. Christ lives, διὰ τῶν παρθένων, “thanks to the Father,” as sharing the Father’s Life; and believers live δέ αὐτῶν, “thanks to Him.” The meaning, then, of δένιον ἔστιν δὲ ἔργον is, practically, the same as that of the related passage 1 Jn. 4. τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ πατρὸς, ἣν ἐξανέγερσα δὲ αὐτῶ, where δέ takes the genitive. See on 15.

Godet’s comment brings out the general sense excellently: “As the infinite life of nature can only be appropriated by man so far as it is concentrated in a fruit or a kernel of bread; so the divine life is only put within our reach so far as it is incarnate in the Son of Man. It is thus that He is to us all the

1. At 4. Christ’s “food” is the doing the Father’s Will. Here the thought is rather that the Son “feeds” on the Father’s Life, assimilating and sharing it.
Bread of Life. But as we have to appropriate and assimilate bread to obtain life through it; so also must we incorporate the Person of the Son of Man by an inward act of faith, which is the way of spiritual manuculation. By thus feeding on Him who lived by God, we live by God Himself and henceforth actually live as Jesus does.”

The metaphor of eating Christ’s “Flesh and Blood” is dropped; it is the feeding on Himself, the communion with His Person, that is the essential thing.

For τραγοῦν, D has λωμβιάνιον; cf. v. 56.

For Ἰουσαῦν (κΒCLTΝΘ), the rec. has Ἰουσαῦν with ΓΔ (cf. v. 52).

καθὼς ἔσται λαμβάνειν. The promise is here that ἔσται αἰῶνιος which begins in the present; the parallel saying of 14:16 διὰ Ἰησοῦν ζωὴν καὶ ἀμένας ἕξεσθαι, has special reference to the future. See on 11:25, and cf. Introd., p. cxxi.

58. This verse contains a summary of the whole discourse, and so it goes back to the saying about the heavenly Bread (v. 33), ending with what was said in v. 51, that he who feeds on it shall live for ever. Jn.’s report of the words of Jesus often passes without pause into his own comments (see on 3:5), and it has been suggested (Abbott, Νταβ. 1957) that v. 58 was intended to be the evangelist’s short statement of what has gone before. But if so, ταῦτα ἔστω in v. 59 is clumsy. We can hardly separate v. 58 from what precedes, despite some slight changes in the form of expression, which are duly noted below. As has already been said (p. cxxi), Jn. is prone to vary words and the order of words when reiterating something already recorded.

οὗτος ἐστιν κύριος, repeated from v. 50, except that here the aor. participle καταβάς is used (as in v. 52) of the descent from heaven of the mystical Bread. For the rec. ἐκ τοῦ ὄντος (κΔLNWΘ), BCT have ἐκ ὄντου, and this may be right; but on the six previous occurrences of the phrase “descending from heaven” (vvs. 33, 38, 41, 42, 50, 51), τοῦ ὄντος is the best-supported reading.

οὗτος ἦ σῶμα τοῦ κυρίου, repeated, with slight variations, from v. 49. The sentence is a good example of Jn.’s partiality for the constr. called anacolouthis.

For ὁ σῶμα, cf. 14:7, v. 14, 16; the only other occurrence in the N.T. being 2 Cor. 5. 18.

οἱ παράγοντες. The rec. with DΑΝΘ and Syr. sin. adds ἰδίοις (from v. 49); om. κΒCLTW. The expression of
The disciples are perplexed by the words of Jesus (vv. 60-65)

60. τολμαὶ... ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ εἶναι Σιλωπὸς ἠτίν δὲ λόγος αὐτοῦ τὸ δύνατα αὐτοῦ ἀδελφόν; 61. εἴπον δὲ οὐκ ἤκουσαν ὅτι ὑποκάμηλοι τούτοις ἦσαν ἀπόκρυφοι Ταῦτα ὑμᾶς σαφεῖται; 62. ἐὰν οὖν θεωρήσῃ τῶν Βασίλεων τοῦ τόπου...

The meaning of vv. 62, 63 is best brought out if we take them in connexion with v. 58 (cf. v. 52), which had seemed to the hearers of Jesus to be hard of acceptance. He had said two things: (1) that He was the Bread which came down from heaven, and (2) that the man who ate of it should live for ever. There are two distinct points of difficulty, and they are taken separately.

(1) That One moving among men in the flesh had descended from heaven seemed incredible, but is it not still less credible that He should ascend to heaven? Yet the former had happened (in the Incarnation); the latter will happen at the Ascension, and some of those present might be there to see it.

(2) There is a real difficulty in believing that the eating of "bread" or "flesh" (v. 52) can give life for ever (v. 58). "The flesh profits nothing." Flesh cannot transcend its own limitations. But to those who feed on the flesh of the Son of Man, He will impart eternal life (v. 57), for although He "became flesh" (34), His origin and essential being is spiritual, and it is the characteristic of spirit to give life: "τὸ πνεῦμα ἄνω τοῦ φύσεως. This is the promise to all future believers (see on 78). The words which He had spoken to them, and to which they took exception, are Spirit and Life: these are the key words of His teaching about Himself and His salvation.

Some commentators, e.g., Meyer of a former generation, and Abbott (Dict. 2112), take ἀναβαίνων in this verse as referring to the Death of Jesus, as the beginning of His passage from the earthly to the heavenly sphere. But the usage of the verb in the N.T. is decisive against this. It never refers to the Crucifixion, but to the Ascension, and it provides a notable illustration of Jn.'s manner of writing, that here and at 20 he introduces an allusion to the Ascension of Christ, whilst he does not state explicitly that it took place.
68. -license ἄνω τῆς λειτουργίας. See for λειτουργίας as applied to the work of Christ, 5:49; and note i Cor. 15:4.

The contrast between flesh and spirit has already been before us in 3:1 where see the note; cf. also Mk. 1:45, 1 Pet. 3:3.

οὸς γὰρ ἐκ τῶν ἄρχων, “flesh avails nothing.” For ἄρχων, cf. 1:18. There is no contradiction with what has been said before (v. 54), for Jesus does not say “my flesh” here. In every case it is true that flesh, without spirit, cannot quicken to eternal life.

69. τὸ πνεύμα ἔνακ τῆς λειτουργίας. So BCDLNW, against λαλοῦ of the rec. text. The “words” in question are the words of the preceding discourse. For τὸ πνεύμα (never in the sing. in Jn.), see on 3:4. The πνεύμα of Christ are words of God (5:37), and as such belong to the sphere of spiritual reality for God is Spirit (4:26), and of essential being, that is, of true life. They are spirit and they are life.

For λαλεῖν, see on 3:11; and cf. 8:2.

64. But although His words were words of life, they were life only to those who believed, and so Jesus adds ἀλλὰ εἰς τί ἡμᾶς τιμή οὐ κοινωνίαν. πιστεύειν is used absolutely, as at vv. 35, 47 (see on 1:7).

Jn. is prone to comment on sayings or actions of Jesus that might not be easy for a reader to understand, and here he adds μνεῖς γάρ τιλα (cf. 1:16), to emphasise the point that Jesus had not been speaking great words of mystery (vv. 62, 63) without realising that some among His hearers could not appreciate them.

μνεῖς γάρ τινα ἄρχης ἀν ἠν. τί ἄρχης occurs in the N.T. only here and at 16:18, although it is found in the LXX (e.g. Isa. 40:21, 41:26, where it means “from the beginning of things”), but we have seen on v. 38 that ἀρχαὶ and ἄρχης are not always distinguishable in Jn. He uses τις ἄρχης as equivalent to ἄρχης (ταῦτα ἄρχης), which occurs 15:17, 1 Jn. 2:11, 24 (but cf. 1 Jn. 1:1) in the same sense as here, viz. “from the time when Jesus first drew disciples round Him.” From the moment when He began to observe their characters, He distinguished unerringly those who were faithful from those who were not (see 2:24). That Jn. means his readers to understand that from

For patristic comments on this passage, see Gore, Dissertations, P. 303. 2 Cf. Introd., p. xxxiv.

VI. 64–65. THE DISCIPLES PERPLEXED

καὶ τῆς ἑτοίμης παραδοσίας αὐτῶν. 65. καὶ ἔλεγεν Διδάσκειν ἵνα μάθηται ἡμῖν.

the moment of His call, Judas was known by Jesus to be the man who would betray Him is not certain. If that be his meaning, the passage provides a remarkable instance of Jn.’s doctrine of predestination (see on 10, and especially on 13). But we need not press ις ἄρχης so far that we must suppose that Jesus chose Judas as one of the Twelve, being conscious at the time that he would be a traitor; that would make the choice difficult to explain, in connexion with the true humanity of Christ. If the knowledge that Judas was untrustworthy came as soon as Jesus had studied him at close quarters, then ἴς ἄρχης is adequately interpreted. In any case, Jn. takes care, both here and in c. 15, to repudiate the idea that the treachery of Judas took Jesus by surprise.

τις ἐτύλιξεν τις παραδόθησαν αὐτῶν. Abbott notes (Diat. 2467) that παραδόθησαν (D has δ παραδόθωσαν) is the only instance in Jn. of a future participle with the article.

The meaning of παραδόθησαν is often misunderstood, as Abbott (Paradosis passim) has shown at length. It means “to deliver up,” but not necessarily “to betray.” Thus it is used of the Jews giving up Jesus to Pilate (18:32, 38, 39), and of Pilate giving up Jesus to be crucified (19:16), and also of Jesus’ “giving up” His spirit, i.e. dying, on the cross (19:30).

In none of these passages is treachery connoted or implied; and thus in the passages where παραδόθηκε is applied to the action of Judas (5:31, 12:12, 21:22, 21:8) we are not entitled to render it “betray.” προδόθηκε (a verb not found in the Gospels, although Lk. 21:1 calls Judas πρώτοπορος, as he undoubtedly was) is “to betray,” but παραδόθηκε is simply “to deliver up,” and is a colourless word not conveying any suggestion of blame.

Jn. does not record any early predictions by Jesus that He would be “delivered up,” to the Jews, as the Synoptists do (cf. Mk. 14:10). In Jn. Jesus Himself does not use the word παραδοθῶσαν until 13:21.

65. καὶ ἔλεγεν. Jn. occasionally uses ἔλεγεν of the utterances of Jesus (21:1, 21:2, 21:8, 21:17, 21:21, 21:35), and the force of the imperfect tense must not be missed. Here reference is made to the saying of v. 44, a cardinal doctrine in Jn. (cf. v. 37 and 13), viz. that the impulse to faith comes in the first instance from God; there were some who did not believe (v. 64), and one who would be a traitor among them, but this did not surprise Jesus. “He was saying” (all the while) that it was a fundamental principle that God must “draw” a man to Christ. See Abbott (Diat. 2467), who, however, holds that in all cases
The defection of many disciples: the steadfastness of the Twelve, as indicated in the Confession of Peter (vv. 66–71)

Verses 66–71 form the conclusion of Part I. of the Gospel. Hitherto the mission of Jesus has been accepted by many disciples, and has appeared to be full of hope (223 41, 40, 65). But He had not trusted Himself to all these adherents, for "He knew what was in man" (225). When the reach and difficulty of His doctrine begin to be realised, there is a failing away of disciples. Only the Twelve remain (and even of these one will be unfaithful). Here, at the end of c. 6, is the note of failure, suggested for the first time at v. 26. Henceforth the record is to be of a growing hate, culminating in rejection (see on 123).

66. εκ πάνω. "thereupon." The great defection began at this point, and its immediate cause was the nature of the teaching which had been given. Cf. 19. εκ πάνω in a causal sense is common in the papyrus.

οὐς is added after εκ πάνω by κὴρω and φαντ. 13, but is unnecessary and is om. by BCLTNW. τοιχοποιόω might easily become τοιχοποιόω, and thus οὖν would get into the text (see Tischendorf, in loc.).

πολλοί τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ. BT insert εκ before τῶν μαθ., but om. nCDLWe. Cf. v. 60; and see on 120 671 125.

τῶν μαθητῶν refers to the outer circle of disciples (see on 20), which would include the Twelve, although none of the Twelve failed Jesus at this point. A tradition ascribed to Hippolytus says that Mark and Luke were among the "seventy disciples who were scattered by the offence of the words of Christ," Jn. 63 being quoted loosely.

VI. 66–68. The defection of many disciples

καὶ οὖν καὶ οὖν πολλοί περιελθοῦσαν. 67. οὖν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῶν δώδεκα Μάκη ἡ δὲ θέλει ὑπάγεις; 68. ἀπεκρίθη ἀφεῖς Σίμων

ἀνήλθος εἰς τοὺς ὄρους, a phrase used again 18. They withdrew or retreated from association with Jesus. For τοὺς ὄρους in a figurative sense, cf. Ps. 44. 18.

οἴκετε μετ' αὐτῶν περιελθέω. "they walked no more with Him," a phrase which vividly suggests the itinerant character of His ministry. Cf. 72 114; and for the larger sense of περιελθέω, see on 812.

67. ἔστε . . . τοῖς δώδεκα. This is the first time that "the Twelve" are mentioned by Jn. (cf. v. 15). He introduces this familiar designation without having given any account of their being set apart by Jesus, as the Synoptists do (Mk. 314). So, too, he brings in Pilate (18) and Mary Magdalene (18), without explaining who they were. This is a feature of his way of writing: he assumes, on the part of his readers, an acquaintance with the story of Christ's ministry (cf. p. cxiv).

Jn. mentions "the Twelve" by this collective designation only 4 times (cf. vv. 70, 71, and 2025), and in every case there is a suggestion of desertion or unbelief in the context.

μὴ καὶ οὐκ ἔστω μὴ ὑπάγεις. "Would you also go away?"

The form of the question, μὴ καὶ . . . , suggests that a negative answer is expected. Cf. 77 50 381 75; and see 21, the only other place in the Gospel where an interrogation beginning with μή is put into the mouth of Jesus.

ὑπάγεις, "to go away," is a favourite word with Jn. It is applied to the disciples here and at 16. See on 282 and 165.

68. The Confession of Peter here recorded is not to be distinguished from the similar confession narrated by the Synoptists (Mk. 811, Mt. 1616, Lk. 911), although the details are different. The crisis in the Lord's public ministry which called it forth took place, according to Lk. as well as according to Jn., some time after the Feeding of the Five Thousand (Mk., followed by Mt., places it a little later, after the Feeding of the Four Thousand). Jn. says that the place was Capernaum, while Mk. and Mt. give Cassarea Phillipi, 30 miles to the north; Lk. does not give any indication of place. In all the Synoptists, the Confession of Peter was followed by the first prediction by Jesus of His Passion. There is no indication of this in Jn., who does not assign to any particular crisis the first announcement by Jesus that He was to suffer.

Cf. 77 50 16 25 21; and see Intro., p. cxii. But in Jn., as in the Synoptists, the faithfulness of the apostles, for whom Peter was spokesman, as contrasted with
the defection or incredulity of many in the outer circle of the Lord's followers, is brought out clearly.

Σήμερα Πέτρος. This is the only place in Jn. where Peter is represented as speaking on behalf of the rest, although he appears later as foremost to question or to intervene (cf. 13:28. 26. 32. 20).

πρὸς τῶν ἀπελευθερωθέντων. At an earlier stage, Peter had said, "Depart from me" (Lk. 5), but that was only a hasty word of humility. The question ὡς καὶ ἡμῖν δέλεα ὑπάρχειν; is answered by another question.

Peter's Confession is twofold in Jn.'s version. (1) "Thou hast words of eternal life"; this is the acceptance of Jesus as Prophet. (2) "Thou art the Holy One of God"; that is the recognition of Him as the Priest of humanity.

ῥήμα τις ἐξ αὐτῶν ἔχει. The immediate reference is to v. 63, and the teaching of v. 58. "Thou hast words (not the words) of eternal life," i.e. words which give eternal life, or the knowledge of it; see on v. 35 for the phrase "the Bread of Life." For ῥήματα see on v. 63; and cf. Acts 50. 51 ἐπείδη τα ῥήματα τῆς ὁμοίας. For ἐπείδη, see on 3:16; and cf. v. 27, 40. This is a favourite expression of Jn., who puts into his own accented phraseology Peter's confession of trust in Jesus.

69. καὶ ἰσχύς (emphatic; see, at least, the chosen Twelve) πεπουτάγματα καὶ ἐγκαύματα ἐκ. The order of verbs is different at v. 11 ἐριστεῖτο καὶ πεπουτάγματα καὶ ἐγκαύματα. But, while Jn. does not lay down formulæ as to the relative precedence of faith and knowledge in regard to the things of the spirit, his teaching is nearer the credo ut intelligam of the saints than the intelligo ut credam of the philosophers. The apostles had "believed" in Jesus, and therefore they "knew" who He was. So, at any rate, Jn. makes Peter say. See on 5:1, and cf. 11:27.

6:69. Cf. the Confession of Nathanael, ὡς καὶ ὅπερ τούτῳ εἰπεν. The Confession of Peter does not really transcend either this or the announcement of Andrew εὐφημάζειν τῶν Ματθαίων (4:21). The Synoptic presentation of a gradual development of spiritual insight on the part of the followers of Jesus, in accordance with which it was only after a time and not all at once that they recognised Him as the Christ, has no place in Jn.'s narrative. His purpose in writing the Gospel is to convince men that Jesus is the Christ (20:31), and the stages
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θεῷ. ἦν ἀπερρίθησαν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς. Οὐκ ἦν ἄρα τοῖς διδάσκει καταρρέας; καὶ εἰ ἦρες ἐμαύει διδασκόλου εἰσιν. 71. εἶγεν δὲ τῷ by which he, or others, reached such a supreme conviction he does not stay to record.

δὲ ἰδὼν τὸν θεόν. This is, undoubtedly, the true reading (אאC泠DLW). The rec. (with N6) has ὁ Ἰησοῦς, δὲ ὁ πάντας τοῖς διδάσκεις, which is the reading of Mt. 16:17, and has naturally crept into the text here, by assimilation. Cf. also the confession of Martin, ἐμβασκέναι δὲν ἐν διδασκόλου τῶν (11:29).

δὲ ἰδὼν τὸν θεόν is the designation of Jesus by the unclean spirit of Mk. 1:24, Lk. 4:34. It is not a Johannine phrase, but may be taken here to mean Him whom God consecrated as the Christ (cf. δὲ τὸ πάντα γείωσθην, 10:26). Cf. Acts 4:10. 33, ἰδὼν θεόν is used of a Nazarite at Judg. 13:167; and cf. ἰδὼν σταυροῦ of Aaron at Ps. 106:18. See 11:17 πάντα ἱδεῖν.

The condemnation of Peter in response to his Confession, which is recorded by Mt. 16:17, has no place in the other Gospels, and it does not appear here. But perhaps a reminiscence of it has already been recorded at 13:28, where see note.

70. Peter had spoken for the rest of the apostles as well as for himself, and Jesus understands this to be so. "He answered them," ἀπερρίθητε αὐτοῖς (O om. αὐτοῖς). After αὐτοῖς, κΒΔΚΕΝΝ69 have ὁ Ἰησοῦς, but om. ΠΑ.

ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἁμαρτίαν, "Was it not I (but being emphatic) who chose you, the Twelve?" (for αὐτῶν, see on v. 67). Cf. Lk. 6:13 ἐξελέξατε ἡμᾶς αὐτῶν διδάσκαλον. and also Jn. 15:16 and 15:18 ἐμε Ζωει καθὼς ἐξελέξατε ἡμᾶς, ἐμε Ζωει καθὼς ἐξελέξατε ἡμᾶς. The Twelve, the leaders of the new Israel, chosen to be the intimate companions of Jesus, were deliberately selected by Him from a larger number of disciples and followers. See on v. 64.

Peter had spoken for the Twelve, and Judas did not dissociate himself from the great Confession of v. 69. None of the others suspected that he was less trustworthy than they. But Jesus, although he does not reveal who the traitor is, warns that they are not all of one mind. "Of you," even of you whom I chose, "one is a devil."

διδάσκοις δὲ ἐσται ἀνέγειρον (the word is applied to Ἰησοῦς, the Jews' enemy, in Esth. 7:8), but is used by Jn. always for Satan or one inspired by Satan (6:64 13:3, 1 Jn. 3:10). At 13:30 Jn. says that ὁ διδάσκω ἔχει τινὰ τραùτερον ἐν τῷ καρδίᾳ τοῦ Ἰουδαίου, and at 13:7 that ὁ διδάσκω ἐξέκοιτο εἰς τὸν Ἰωάννην. One thus inspired is, himself, a "devil." Here the process of moral deterioration had only begun, but Jesus detected its
VII, V. 1.] JESUS GOES UP TO JERUSALEM

as to be of the chosen companions of Jesus should be either incredulous or unfaithful (see on v. 67 above).

It has been pointed out on 18 that Jn. prefers the form ἐκ to ἐς only when followed by a gen. plur., whereas the Synoptists generally omit ἐκ. Westcott suggests that ἐκ in the present passage marks "the unity of the body to which the unfaithful member belonged." But this is too subtle an inference from what is only a habit of style; cf. ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ (Jn. 12).

A. Wright (Synopsis, p. 31) suggests that ὁ ἐκ τῶν δοκεῖν, applied to Judas (Mk. 14[4]), means "the chief of the Twelve," and compares τοῦ μικροῦ τῶν συμβαθῶν (Mk. 16). It is difficult to believe that ὁ ἐκ could be written for ὁ πρῶτος; or that an evangelist writing many years after the event, when the name of Judas had been held up to opprobrium for a generation, should call him "the chief of the Twelve," without adding any qualifying words. See, for the precedence of Judas, on 14[8].

PART II. (V. VII.—XII.)

Jesus goes up to Jerusalem for the Passover (V. 1)

V. 1. The conclusion of Part I, the continued faithfulness of the Twelve (67. 68); and it can hardly be doubted that they went up to Jerusalem for the Passover as well as Jesus on this occasion. Hence, behind the story of the cure of the impotent man (52[4]) there may have been the original testimony of some who were present. And inasmuch as in the Fourth Gospel ἀνετέλεσα is the phrase which seems to mark the beginning of a new set of reminiscences dictated by John the son of Zebedee to the future evangelist, it is quite possible that the witness of John is behind cc. 5 and 73—81, allowing for evangelical commentary and expansion in 58[30].

ἐκ τῶν δοκεῖν, i.e. the Passover, which has already been mentioned in 68 as near at hand. This was probably the Passover of the year 28.

but the article is rightly omitted by ABNDWv. Its insertion is readily explained by the

1 For the position of c. 5 in the text, cf. Introd., pp. xxvii, xxx.
2 Introd., p. cviii.
3 Introd., p. cxvii.
4 See introd., p. ciii.
2. *Esoi dé en tois Ἱεροσόλυμοι, ἐπὶ τῇ προβατικῇ κολυμβήθρᾳ, preceding ἦν. If ἦν were the true reading, the reference ought to be to the Feast of Tabernacles, which was pre-eminently the feast of the Jews. One minor uncial (א) for τῶν Ἰσραηλῶν reads τῶν ἔμπροσθεν, rightly identifying the feast as that of "unleavened bread," i.e. the Passover.

For the expression "a feast of the Jews," see on 213.

καὶ ἀνήφα ἢ ἤρησεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. The Passover was a feast of obligation, and so Jesus went up (ἀπῆρησεν), the regular word for going up to the metropolis; cf. 213); but, as it seems, He went up privately and unaccompanied by His disciples. There had been danger of popular enthusiasm (69), which, if exhibited at Jerusalem, would have caused trouble. So it appears that He went up without making it known who He was; even the man whom He healed did not know His name (v. 13). His disciples, i.e. the Twelve, may have gone up to the feast, as would be possible men, but they do not seem to have been in attendance upon Jesus.

ἀπῆρησεν. So AD א, but B C D א. See on 193.

For the form Ἱεροσόλυμα, see on 193.

Healing of the impotent man at the Pool of Bethesda (vv. 2-9)

2. Ἰδίως δὲ τοῦ Ἱεροσσολῦμα. The present tense (instead of ἦν, as at 49) has been taken, e.g. by Bengel, as proof that the Fourth Gospel was written before the destruction of Jerusalem; but this would be a precarious inference, even if it were not ruled out on other grounds. An old man looking back on the city as he knew it, might naturally say "it is" especially if he had in mind a pool or spring. The Sinai Syriac changes "is" to "was," and so does Nonnus.

κολυμβήθρα (from κολυμβᾶω, I dive) is a pool deep enough to swim in; it occurs again in N.T. only at 5 of the Pool of Siloam, but is a LXX word.

The text of this verse is uncertain. Ἱεροσόλυμα (which may mean "house of mercy") is the rec. reading, following "Syrian" authorities (e.g. τοῦ AD א); Ἱεροσόλυμα is read by BW and also by Tertullian, an unusual and strong combination, but this spelling may be due to some confusion with Bethsaida of Galilee; Ἱεροσόλυμα has the support of N.D, and is

1 Cf. Torrey, Harvard Theol. Review, Oct. 1925, p. 334, who presses the force of τῶν as representing an Aramaic original, and holds that the Gospel must have been composed before Jerusalem had been destroyed.
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ἡ ἐπανάστασις Ἠβραίων Ἑβραίων, πίνακες στῶν Ἰσχαρίων. 3. εἰ probably original. Bethzatha was the name of part of the city, north of the Temple.

ἐπὶ τῇ προβατικῇ is the best attested reading (BCΔιW), and it would mean that the pool was "by the sheep gate" or "by the sheep market," the adj. προβατικός requiring a substantive to be supplied. In Neh. 3:12 mention is made of the building of ἡ πύλη ἡ προβατική, which is believed to have been north-east of the Temple, and close to the present St. Stephen's Gate, by which flocks from the country enter Jerusalem.

καὶ Δικαίῳ have the aberrant reading εἰς τῷ προβατικῷ which some Latin vas, pervertedly render in inferiorum portam. The Western reading προβατικός κολυμβήθρα, "a sheep pool," is supported by τοῦ να, Eusebius, and others.

It appears, then, that ἵππο τῇ προβατικῇ κολυμβήθρᾳ must be adopted. But it has been suggested that behind προβατικός lies the Aramaic κολομβήθρα, which means a bath; and then the original text would have been, "There is a pool at the Bath, which is called in Hebrew Bethzatha (House of the Olive)."

The situation of this pool is as uncertain as its exact name. There are twin pools north of the Temple area, near the fortress of Antonia, which Schick identified with the κολυμβήθρα of the text, but it is doubtful if these existed before the destruction of the Temple. Others have identified the "Pool of Bethzatha" with the "Pool of Siloam" (5); but they seem to be specially distinguished by the evangelist. Many writers are inclined to find the Pool of Bethzatha in the Virgin's Well, anciently called Gihon, i.e. "the Gusher," which is periodically subject to a bubbling of its waters caused by a natural spring. This is south of the Temple, in the Valley of Kidron, and we believe it to be the most probable site of "Bethzatha."

ἡ ἐπανάστασις Ἠβραίων Ἑβραίων. Ἠβραίων occurs only in Jn. 1:32 191, 192 and Rev. 9:4 16:1; it signifies not the classical Hebrew of the O.T., but the Aramaic in common use. See on 191 for instances of Jn.'s habit of giving the Hebrew name of a person or place, along with a Greek equivalent. Here and at 19:16,17 he describes the place first in Greek, and then adds its Aramaic designation: he is not interpreting the Aramaic name (see on 196).

For Ἠβραίων, τοῦ τῶν τῶν Ἰσχαρίων. These would have been cloisters or arched spaces round the pool similar to those which are

1 See G. A. Smith, Jerusalem, ii. 556, and Lightfoot, Biblical Essays, p. 170; cf. also D.C.G., s.v. "Bethesda."
found in India near tanks. Schick claimed that such were to be seen at the twin pools which he discovered; but this has not been generally admitted.\footnote{Cf. Sunday, Sacred Sites of the Gospels, p. 55.}

Whoever interpret the narrative symbolically, find the Five Books of Moses in the "five porches."\footnote{Intro., p. lxxvii.}

We have already considered this method of interpreting Jn.\footnote{Idem.}

While symbolic meanings may easily be read into the narrative once written, there is no probability that it was originally constructed in so artificial a fashion.

3. The picture of the sick people lying under the covered arcades (it would have been too cold at the Passover season to lie out in the open air) waiting for the bubbling up of the intermittent spring, which was supposed to have healing properties, is most natural and vivid.

On ταύτας, etc., in the στοιχείοι arches. The verb does not appear again in Jn. The rec. text inserts πολλά after πλήσο, but om. καθοδεύειν.

τυφλοί, κεφαλαί, ἔγραφαι, "blind, halt, withered." Εὐρύς were those who had atrophied limbs (cf. Mt. 12:20, Lk. 5:8). The Western text (D a 3 ) adds παραλυτικοί, but this is only a gloss explanatory of ἔγραφαι: om. καθοδεύειν κατά ΚΑ
c* C* L9

After ἔγραφαι, παραλυτικοί, the rec. adds ἐκείσαντος τῆς τοῦ ἔσχατος κατά τόπον. This, again, is a Western (and Syrian) amplification; it is omitted by καθοδεύειν κατά ΚΑ
c* C* L9, although supported by DWG. It was suggested by the mention in v. 7 of the disturbance of the healing waters.

4. Verse 4, like the words κατά τόπον . . . κατά τόπον, is no part of the original text of Jn., but is a later gloss. The best attested text of the gloss is thus given by Hort: ἐγέρθης δὲ (ἐν γήρω) κατά τόπον κατάβαινεν (κατὰ οὐσίαν) ἐν τῇ νεκροτήτῃ καὶ ἐπερατονεύετο (ἐν ῥάσασθεν) ἐν ὅψιν τῶν πρῶτον ἔμοι [κατὰ τόπον τοῦ ἔσχατος] ἐγέρθη ἐγέρθης ὡς (ἐν ῥάσασθεν) ἐγέρθης ὡς (ἐν ῥάσασθεν) κατά τόπον νεκροτήτῃ.

The verse is wholly omitted by καθοδεύειν κατά ΚΑ
c* C* DW3 35, the Old Syriac, the early Coptic versions (including O), and the true text of the Latin Vulgate. In the Latin MSS, in which it is found, it appears in three distinct forms, the diversity of which provides an additional argument against its genuineness.

The earliest patristic authority for it is Tertullian (de bapt. 5), the earliest Greek writer who shows knowledge of it being Chrysostom; his comment on the passage is: "An angel came down and touched the water, and endured it with healing power, that the Jews might learn that much more could the Lord of

5. Ἐπεὶ δὲ τῶν ἄνθρωπων ἑκάστοτε τρώγοντα καὶ ἔτοιμον ἔτη ἔχων ἐν τῇ ἀνθρώπινῃ σελήνῃ, οὗτοι ἔτοιμοι θαυμαστικοί, καὶ γνώσθη ὅτι angels heal the diseases of the soul." It is a marginal gloss which is given in some Western and Syrian texts, the chief uncials which contain it being 4 Θ 8 Π 3.

Linguistic evidence also marks the verse as not original. Thus, the words ἐκείνων, κατά τόπον only in N.T.; κατά τόπον (cf. Rom. 3:19, Num. 5:22), εἰσβάλειν (of going into the water; cf. 6:7), ἄρας (here only in the N.T.); κατά κατά (here only in the N.T.) are non-Johanne.

The healing virtues of the intermittent spring were explained by the Jewish doctrine of the ministry of angels, and the first time found a place in the margin and, later, in the text. Cf. Rev. 16:19 for the angel of the waters, i.e., the angel who was believed to preside over the mysterious powers of water.

6. The constr. τρώγοντα καὶ ἔτοιμον ἔτη ἔχων appears again in v. 6 πολλά χρόνον ὑπέρ. Cf. also 9:19, 20, 11:2 for an acc. of the length of time, governed by ἔχων. Κατὰ θεσμον before ὑπέρ is om. by HT, but ins. καθοδεύειν; ὀψιν after ἐπείρατο is om. by AT, but ins. καθοδεύειν κατά ΚΑ
c* C* DW3 35.

The man had been infirm for thirty-eight years; it is not said that he had been waiting all that time by the pool. That his paralysis had lasted thirty-eight years is mentioned to show that he was no temporary infirmity from which he was suffering, just as it is told of the woman in Lk. 13:13 that she had been infirm eight years, or of the lame man whom Peter cured that "he was more than forty years old" (Acts 4:1). There is no more reason for finding an esoteric significance in the number 38 than in the numbers 18 or 40. Or, again, in Acts 5:14, Aneas, whom Peter cured of paralysis, is described as ἐξ ἔτων ἑκάστων κατακαμάκης ἐπὶ μεθαμφίως. These eight years are not supposed to be significant as regards their number; and there is no more reason for supposing the thirty-eight years of the text to be of symbolic anything.

Those who seek for hidden meanings in the Johanne numbers point here to the thirty-eight years of wandering mentioned in Deut. 24. But if Jn. had wished to indicate that the years of the paralytic's infirmity were like the years of Israel in the wilderness, it would have been more natural for him to have said forty, not thirty-eight; for it was forty years before the Promised Land was reached. Cf. 2:11; and see Intro., p. lxxvii.

6. Jesus came, unknown by sight to the sick who were assembled at the pool. καὶ γνώσθη ὅτι πολλά χρόνον ἔχων ὑπέρ.
and when He knew that the man had been ill for a long time," He addressed him. It is neither stated nor implied that this knowledge of the man’s sickness was supernatural. It may have been the common talk of the crowd at the Pool. See on §4 for the insight of Jesus into the character of men, and cf. §2.

He knew your disease; sc., as we would say, “Would you like to be well?” There is no need to press the force of ἀλλάς, as if Jesus meant that the man’s own conscious effort of will must co-operate in the work of healing. That may be true in such cases, but ἄλλας here only conveys the simple question, “Would you like to be healed?”

We do not know why Jesus chose this man out from the crowd of sufferers at the pool. Perhaps attention was specially directed to his pathetic case by the onlookers. There is no suggestion that the man had any faith, nor did he display gratitude for his healing. He must have known that to point out Jesus as the agent of his cure (v. 15) would bring his benefactor into danger.

Abbott (Diat. x. iii. 365 f.) suggests that we must take the act of Jesus in connexion with His own comment. He did not select the object of His pity by arbitrary caprice, but the Son can do nothing Himself, except what the Father does (§6 on v. 19 below). His “saw” this particular act of healing performed by the Father in heaven, and therefore appointed to be performed by the Son on earth. But not only is such an explanation too subtle; it really explains nothing, for why should this particular sick man have been selected by the Father any more than by the Son?

The healing is perhaps, but not certainly, regarded by Jn. as supernatural (see §20), although he does not call it a “sign.” But it is not represented as having any relation to the faith of the man that was cured. In this it is like the Synoptic story of the healing of a paralytic (Mk. 2, Mt. 9, Lk. 5), where it is the faith of those who brought the man to Jesus rather than the faith of the man himself that is commended. It is unlike the Synoptic story, in that the cure in the Johannine narrative does not seem to have impressed the onlookers at all. There is nothing here corresponding to the wonder and gratitude God, saying, “We never saw it on this fashion” (Mk. 5). In Jn’s story, everything turns on the fact that it was on the Sabbath that the man was cured, and it was this, and not the wonder of the healing, that attracted attention. See Introd., p. clxxxviii.

THE IMPOTENT MAN AT BETHESDA

κόρη, ἄνθρωπος ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ὅταν τὸν τῶρα ἐπὶ τὸ ὅπωρ βάλενε με τῇ τῇ κολοκυθώματι ἐγέρθη καὶ ἔλθος πρὸς ἡμᾶς καταλύμασι. ἢ, λέγει τῷ Ἰωάννῃ τοῦ Γαβριήλ τῶν κρατάτων κ.τ.λ.

The sick man explains that it is not his will that is deficient, but that he is unable, because of his infirmity, to get quickly enough down to the water when it becomes “troubled,” because he has no one to assist him. (The paralytic of Mk. 2 was helped by four friends to get access to Jesus.)

Apparently the popular belief was that, when the water began to bubble at a particular spot, the person who first bathed at that point received relief, but that the spring did not benefit more than one. He who came second had to wait for cure until another overflow.

καὶ... βάλενε με τῇ τῇ κολοκυθώματι. βάλενε, “to cast,” implies rapidity of movement, which would be impossible for an invalid without assistance.

Thus, so ΝABCDWE: the rec. has βάλενε... τῇ τῇ κολοκυθώματι. But while I (in being emphatic) am coming, another steps down before me.”

Jesus ignores the belief of the sick man about the healing waters of the pool, to which He makes no reference. Nor does He, as in the case of the Synoptic paralytic, give him a word of spiritual consolation (Mk. 2) before He heals him. Nothing is said to the man, except the sharp command, ἐγερθε ὑμῖν τῶν κρατάτων σου καὶ περιπάτητε, “Get up, take your pallet and walk.” The words are almost identical with those of Mk. 21, but there the evangelistic comment is that they were effectively spoken in order to show the wondering bystanders that He who spoke them had really the spiritual authority to forgive sins. Here is nothing similar. As has been said (v. 6), there is no clear proof that Jn. regarded the healing of the man at Bethesda as miraculous, nor need we do so. The patient obeyed a sudden, authoritative order to stand up and walk, and when he tried he found that he could do it. That may be the whole of the matter. However, no disciple is expressly said to have been present on the occasion; and the story, which may have come to the evangelist at second or third hand, is told in barest outline.

Σώματος (NABCDWΘ) is to be preferred to the rec. Σώματος. An exubeban (graptō), a pallet or mattress, such as was used by the poor, is said to be a late word of Macedonian origin, and is not approved by Phrynichus. It occurs in the N.T. again only in Mk. 5:23 (56), Acts 9:3, and always stands for the bed of a sick person.
The Jews object to Sabbath healings, and Jesus replies by the analogy of God's working (vv. 10–19)

10. For αἱ ἀναβαστά, see on 19. This is the designation throughout the Gospel of the leading opponents of Jesus, i.e. the strict Pharisees, as distinct from the simple folk whether in town or country (δύσκολο). Cf. vv. 13, 15, 16.

τὸ τεθραπευμένον. Τεθραπευμένον is found only here in Jn., while it is common in the Synoptists. Cf. v. 13 below.

σώζειν αὐτοὺς, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν σοι δια τοῦ κραβματος. The bearing of burdens on the Sabbath was forbidden (Neh. 13:18, Jer. 34:1). The Rabbinical law was, "If any one carries anything from a public place to a private house on the Sabbath . . . intentionally, he is punished by cutting off (i.e. death) and stoning." (Shabb. 6a, quoted by Lightfoot, Hor. Hebr.).

After κραβματον, Μἑν DLNWΘ add σοι (as at vv. 8, 9), but om. ABC*PA.

11. The rec. text omits δὲ before ἀναρίθητι with D; but AB ins. the words, γε*LWΘΝ giving δὲ.

For ἀναρίθητι, ΜὁW have ἀναρίθητο; but see on 17. δὲ τοιοῦτος με ἔργον, ἔστιν δὲ με ἐστων καλ. For this emphatic use of ἐστιν in Jn., see on 8. The man's excuse was reasonable. He who had cured him, by giving him power to get up and walk, had hidden him carry away his bed; surely it was pardonable to obey His command? The excuse was accepted, and the man was not blamed by the Jews: they go on to ask who it was that dared to give such an order.

12. After ἔφεσαν, the rec., with ACLWΘΔΘ, ins. οὖν; om. κεβΔ.

τὸς δεῦτε τὸ ἀνθρώπος τὸ εἰστὶν σοι, "Who is the fellow that said this to you?" ἀνθρώπος is used contemptuously. The Jews do not take any notice of the fact that the man said he had been healed; they complain only of the breach of the Sabbath law involved, not in the healing but in the order to carry the bed. As Gratian says: "Querunt non quod mirentur, sed quod calumniatur." But from 7 it is apparent that the real gravamen of the charge made in this case by the Jews was that a work of healing had been done on the Sabbath, although they prefer here to put forward the technical point about carrying the bed home.

See on 19, where the Sabbath was broken in a different way.

The rec. text has τῶν κραβματῶν σου after ἄρω, but om. ABC*Δ. The words have come in from v. 11.

13. The man that had been healed did not know who his benefactor was. Jesus was not yet a familiar figure to all and sundry at Jerusalem. He had gone up to the Passover, privately, unaccompanied by His band of disciples (see on v. 2) which would have marked Him out as a Rabbi. This must also have made it easier for Him to slip away unnoticed in the crowd.

For τολάο, see on 47. D has θανάσων.

ἐξεῖσαν ἐξεῖσαν ἐκ τοῦ τεμέπ. "He (had) turned aside (cf. 4 for this use of the σοῗς) a crowd being in the place."
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN [V. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17.]

V. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. JEWS OBJECT TO SABBATH HEALINGS


For νῦν, καὶ has the variant νῦν. 14. μενεῖ τοῦτο, ἀλλὰ subsequently, not immediately afterwards. See Introd., p. cviii.

dιδάκτοι τῆς ἡμέρας. Apparently, Jesus sought out the man, as He sought for the blind man whom He cured on a later occasion. (τοῦτο: cf. 10.) It has been conjectured that the man had gone to the Temple to offer thanks for his recovery, but there is no evidence for this. The λειτουργία, or sacred precinct, was a common place of resort; and Jesus, finding him there, gave him a word of grave counsel.

15. a favourite word with Ἰωάννης; see on 230 νῦν ἐγένετο μετὰ ἡμέρας ο竫να. For μετά ἡμέρας, see 881. We cannot tell what the man's sin had been, but quite possibly it had been the immediate occasion of his loss of health; if so, it had been terribly punished by an infirmity continuing for thirty-eight years. There was a prevalent belief that sickness was always due to sin (cf. Ps. 39 107 107, 1 Cor. 11 26, and a Talmudic saying asserts that "the sick arielh not from his sickness until his sins be forgiven." But the moral of the Book of Job is that sickness is not always to be regarded as punishment for sin, and this seems to have been suggested by Jesus, when the case of the man born blind was put to Him (see on 98). In the absence of knowledge as to the antecedents of the impotent man of the text, "Sin no more, lest a worse thing befall thee" is not susceptible of complete explanation.

Cyprian (Test. ii. 27) quotes "inam non pecare, ne quid tibi deterrimus fiat," to illustrate the danger of sin after baptism, by which a man has been "made whole"—a characteristic comment.

J. H. Moulton 3 has called attention to the curious fact that the Greek words here fall naturally into anapæstas:

διήκονεν ἐγένετο μετά ἡμέρας,
τὸν μὴ χεριάν σαύ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

—a tolerable, if not perfect, couplet. This is, of course, a mere accident. Cf. 488.


2 For νῦν, καὶ see for illustrations from the papyri, Moulton-Milligan, S.V. ἐπεραθή.

3 Dial. 257; see, for illustrations from the papyri, Moulton-Milligan, S.V. ἐπεραθή.
18. Did τοῦτο ὁ Μάιλαῖος ἠξούντων αὐτῶν ἢ τοῦτο ἠξούντων, ὅτι ἐκ μῶν ὑπὸ τὸ άδικήματος, ἢ ἀκόλου Πάθη τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἢ ἐκ θυσίων τοῦ Θεοῦ.

The future rest when He shall be all in all.1 And the Syrian commentator Isho'dad, who wrote in the ninth century, but whose interpretations preserve much older material, in like manner explains Christ as saying here: “Do I allow the circuit of the sun... . the flowing of the river... . the birth and growth of men together and the energies of all living beings about everything? These are things which are accomplished by means of angels, according to His will, and these things are done in the feasts and on the Sabbaths and at every hour.”

Thus the ancient interpretation of ἄνέργος μου ἄνερ ἀργάζεται is clear. The words express the idea (obviously when it is expressed) that God does not keep the Sabbath by itself; that is, ἀκολουθεῖ (see 238; cf. Jn. 62). God’s workings goes on working uninterrupted, under the law. The rest of God is for the future, as Origen points out.

καίδο ἄνεραμα, “And I also work,” in the same way. That is, Jesus claims not only that He may call God ἄνερ γόνης (my Father,” in a unique sense; see on 238), but that His relation to the Sabbath law is not different from that of God Himself. This is the Johannine form of the Synoptic saying, “The Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath,” expressed in mystical and uncompromising fashion.

18. This declaration provoked the Jews to indignation. διὰ τοῦτο (see on v. 16) eis (com. MD), but ins. ABCL) μᾶλλον ἠξούντων αὐτῶν ἢ τοῦτο ἠξούντων. The phrase “sought to kill Him” is repeated 17-18, 28, 30-46.

καὶ μᾶλλον ἠξούντων ἀδικήματος. For λέγω in the sense of “break,” “set at naught,” as in Mt. 519, cf. 520, Moule-Milligan’s Greek, (p. 324) cites from papyrus of the third century B.C. ἐν δὲ τοῦτον ἢ θεὸν, κατάραντος ἐστιν, and also λεγοῦν τοῦ τέλους, “to break the period of mourning,” i.e. to go out of mourning.

That Jesus was setting Sabbatical rules at naught was the primary cause of the Jews’ hostility to Him, but it was a much graver offence that He claimed to have Divine prerogatives. This they treated as blasphemy (cf. 520, Mk. 2, Mt. 26).

It must not be doubted that the breaches of the Sabbath which Jesus countenanced provoked the first suspension of His

---

1 Origen, in Numb. Hom. xxiii. 4 (Lommatsch. x. 282).  
V. 18-19.

19. Ἀπεκρίθησαν δὲν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ Ελευθέριος τοῦτον Ἀμήν ἀθών λέγων ἦσιν, ὡς δέθεται ὁ Θεός ποιήσῃ ἀργόν ἀκαύσον ὑδάτι, ἐν μοι τι βλέπῃ τὸν Πατέρα ποιήσαι ὡς γὰρ ἐκείνος ποιήσῃ, ταύτα καὶ ὁ Θεός ὄντως

Discourse on the relation of the Son to the Father (vv. 20-29)

20. Vv. 20-29 form a section by themselves. They deal with the secrets of the Divine Life, and unfold in some degree the relation of the Son to the Father, thus providing an explanation of, or commentary on, the mystic words of v. 17.

My Father worketh hitherto, and I work,” and of v. 19, “The Son can do nothing of Himself.” As at other points in the Gospel (see on 3:17), it is impracticable to distinguish precisely the evangelist’s own commentary from the words which he ascribes to Jesus. The formula “Verily, verily, I say unto you,” which precedes vv. 19, 24, 25, always introduces words of Jesus Himself, and this must be the intention here. And vv. 28, 29, seem also to be placed in His mouth. But the use of ὅσπερ γὰρ at the beginning of v. 21 and again at v. 26 (ὅσπερ does not appear again in Jn.) suggests that vv. 21-23 and vv. 26, 27, may be comments of the evangelist on the sayings of Jesus introduced by ἐγὼ ἡμεῖς in vv. 19, 24, 25. This is like Jn.’s use of γὰρ elsewhere (see on 3:18). It will be observed that the third person is employed throughout in vv. 21-23, 26, 27. We do not return to the first person until v. 30, where the opening words are the words of v. 19.

It is possible that the sayings of vv. 24, 25 and 28 and 29 belong to some discourse different from that which was addressed to the Jewish cavaliers about work on the Sabbath day; but the argument of this section (vv. 20-29) is quite consecutive (see on v. 28).

ἐν ἁλώνι ποιήσῃ τὸν ὄνομα. D reads ὅσπερ from 3:17 (where see note). “The Father loves the Son, and so exhibits to Him the things which He Himself does.” φιλῶν expresses

2 See Abbott, Dist. 2:516.
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN [v. 20-21.

Δὲ ἀεὶς τὸν καὶ μείζων τῶν δείξει αὐτῷ ἔργα, ἢ ἡμεῖς θαυμάζοντες. 21 δὲ δέθεν γὰρ ἐν Παῖτε ἐγέρθη τῶν νεκρῶν καὶ more than the intimacy of friendship; it is here equivalent to ἄγων (see on 3:28 and 21:7), and expresses the mystery of the Divine Love, of the Father for the Son. This is so complete and unreserved that all the Father's works are displayed, as they are being wrought, to the Son. No reference is made to any limitation of the Incarnate Son's knowledge of the future, such as is indicated in Mk. 13:21; the statement is that the Son has complete cognizance of all that the Father does in the present.

καὶ μείζων τῶν δείξῃ αὐτῷ ἔργα, "and greater works than these (sc. healing miracles such as the cure of the impotent man, which had disquieted the Jews so much) shall He show Him." In the following verses, these "greater works" are specified, viz. that of raising the dead, and that of judging mankind.

The miracles of Christ are described in Mt. 11:25 as His ἐγων, and Jn. applies this description to them frequently (12:31, 15:25, 17:13), as he does to the "works" of God (2:16; cf. Ps. 103). For God there is no distinction in kind between "natural" and "supernatural" works. And the works of Christ are actually the works of God: δὲ πάτηρ ἐν ζωή μένων ποιεῖ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν (14:1). See on 7:24.

ἐν ὑμῖν θαυμάζετε. ὡς is emphatic, "you, incredulous Jews." The healing miracles did not so much arouse their wonder, as their jealous indignation (there is no hint that the cure of the impotent man any wonder); but the "greater works" of raising the dead, and of judgment, could not fail to make them marvel. Such astonishment may pass into admiration, and thence into faith (cf. Acts 4:14).

Later on, it is promised to the faithful disciple that, in the power of Christ's Resurrection, he too should do "greater things" than those which had attended the Lord's public ministry: μείζονα τῶν τούτων. But this is not in contemplation here. See note on 14:12.

21. The first of the "greater works" specified is that of the "quickening" power of Christ, in raising the dead. The power of death and life is a Divine prerogative (Wis. 16:28), "Yahweh kills and makes alive" (Deut. 32:39; 1 Sam. 2:8 ἐκαίνιοι καὶ ἄνοιγες, 2 Kings 2:18 ἐκαίνιοι καὶ ἄνοιγες). Several times in the prayer of the Jews, the ἡμέρα τῶν ἐν ζωή, in which substance goes back to a period before the first century, is God invoked as One who "quickens the dead." See C. Schüer, Jewish Prayers in the Time of Christ, Eng. Tr., Div. II. p. 83.

V. 21-24. THE SON AS JUDGE 241

ἐν ζωή καὶ ἰσότροπος, ἵνα εἰς ὑμᾶς ἱσωτοτοῖς. 22. ὁ δὲ γὰρ ἐν Παῖτε κρίνει οὖν, ἀλλὰ τὴν κρίσιν πάνω δεόμενος τῶν ἐν Ζωή, τό 23. ἵνα τὰς τιμήσῃ τὴν Ζωήν καθὼς τιμῶσαι τὸν Παῖτα. ἀμὴρ προς τῶν ἐν Ζωήν ὁ τιμῶσαι τὸν Παῖτα τὸν τιμᾶντα αὐτὸν. 24. ἀμὴρ

 Cf. τὸν θεόν ζωοποιοῦντα τῶν νεκρῶν (Rom. 4:25), and also Rom. 12:1 ἐνεργεῖ ἐκ νεκρῶν Ἰησοῦν Ἰησοῦν ζωοποιοῦν θεόν τε καὶ θυμίαμα ἰσώματος. So here we have ἀμὴρ ἐγέρθη τῶν νεκρῶν καὶ ζωοποιοῦν θεόν ζωοποιοῦντα τῶν νεκρῶν καὶ εὐχαρίστησαι τῷ θεῷ ζωοποιοῦντα. ὡς έκεῖνη τῇ ἐν Ζωήν ὁ τιμῶσαι τὸν Παῖτα τὸν τιμᾶντα αὐτὸν. 24. ἀμὴρ

This Divine prerogative also appertains to the Son: οὐκ ἂν καὶ ὁ ὄρας οὐκ ἦλθε ζωοποιοῦν. Paul has the same doctrine of Christ, as πουλεί τὴν ζωοποιούσα (1 Cor. 15:56; cf. 1 Cor. 15:25), reviving the dead. ζωοποιοῦν is not used here in a spiritual sense only (as at 6:22; cf. Eph. 2:5), although that is included in its meaning; the significance of the verse as specifying one of Christ's "greater works" is that He is declared to be one who has power over the death of the body, so that it is His to "quicken" whom He will. He is the Resurrection as well as the Life (11:26).

ὅπως ἔσῃ. His will is final as to who are to be "quickened," just as there is no appeal from God's will (Rom. 9:13).

28. The second of the "greater works" of Christ is that of judgment, a prerogative which has been already implied in οὐκ ἔσῃ of the preceding verse, for all judgment or separation between the evil and the good is a select process. Judgment is the prerogative of God (cf. Deut. 1:17), for to be perfectly administered it demands omniscience. But this tremendous office has been "given" (see on 3:26) by the Father to the Son. δὲ πάτηρ κρίνει οὖν, ἀλλὰ τὴν κρίσιν πάνω δεόμενος τοῦ ἐν Ζωή. The doctrine of the Son of Man as the final Judge of mankind has been already examined (see Introd., pp. ccxxvii, cclvi; cf. 3:15). Here is added the Divine reason for this delegation of judgment to the Son by the Father. It is ἵνα τίμησῃ τὸν πάνω κάθες τιμᾶν τὸν πατέρα.

The Jews were disdaining Jesus (cf. 8:48) in accusing Him of blasphemy (v. 18), but worship is His due, for the honour due to the Father is His. With the thought that they who dishonour Him dishonour the Father, cf. 15:23, 1 Jn. 2:28, and Lk. 10:16.

τιμᾶι is found in Jn. again at 8:28 12:28, and is generally used by him of the honour due to Christ or to His Father.

ἐν Ζωήν ἐν Ζωή. In v. 20, 24, 25, the thought is of spiritual life and death, the believer in Christ possessing already eternal life, and the
THE SON THE LIFE-GIVER

The words of eternal life being proclaimed in the ears of the spiritually dead, that they too may hear and live. In vv. 28, 29, the reference is to the future life, the voice of Christ being a voice of power at the Last Judgment, even as it is now. See on v. 28.

ἀμήν ἀμήν . . . . sec on 1st. Here this formula introduces two distinct assertions, both surprising in their majestic claims of power, in vv. 24 and 25 respectively.

ὡς τὸν λόγον μου δείκνυτε . . . . “He that hears my word” (cf. 8⁴; and for δείκνυσιν, followed by an accusative, see on 37), and πιστεύσεις τῷ πάροιχῳ με, “believes Him that sent me,” To hear with the outward ear is not enough; the inward response is essential. There must be the belief in Christ (3⁴, where see note), which is the same thing as belief in the word of Him who sent Him (1, 2). For the “sending” of the Son by the Father, see on 31.

ἐχει υἱὸν αἰώνος. The obedient believer has eternal life, as a present possession. See on 38, and cf. 1 Jn. 5³⁸.

καὶ εἰς κρίσιν δέχεται. Cf. 3⁸ ὁ πίστεως εἰς κόσμον τῆς κρίσεως. The believer “comes not to judgment;” that has already been determined. None less, the prayer of humility will always be μη εἰσέλθῃ εἰς κρίσιν μετὰ τοῦ βασιλέως (Ps. 143, 2).

καὶ μεταβάθαις ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὴν ζωήν. Some Latin versions try to escape the force of the pt. tense by the renderings transit, transit, and Nonnus in his paraphrase has εὔθετον ἐκ θανατοῦ; but this is through misunderstanding. John is quite clear that the believer has “passed from death into life,” into the eternal life which begins here. Cf. ὅταν μὴ μεταβάσθω καὶ τὸν θανάτον εἰς τὴν ζωήν (1 Jn. 3⁸), the reason for such assurance being added, διὸ γινομένων τοῖς θελόντοις.

28. τὸν λόγον δείκνυσιν καὶ οἱ λεγομένοι αὐτοῖς. Even those who do not believe, who are spiritually dead, are not beyond the range of Christ’s words. They, too, may hear and live. This is one of those extraordinary assurances which must be introduced by the solemn adverbial ἀμήν ἀμήν. It is, as it were, a corollary or sequel to v. 24; see on 38.

Of the quickening of the physically dead at the Last Judgment, it is said in v. 28 ἐφικταῖς ἀρσ. but of the spiritually dead in the present, ἐφικταὶ ἀρσ. καὶ τῶν ἑως, as at 4³⁸, where see note. To treat καὶ τῶν ἑως as an editorial interpolation here is to misunderstand the sequence of thought in vv. 24-29.

οἱ νεκροὶ here are the spiritually dead, as at Eph. 2 ²⁴. They shall hear (cf. δείκνυσιν in v. 24) the voice of the Son of God.” It is not only His sheep who may hear His voice (10⁸), but those also who have not yet learnt to follow. Note that δείκνυσιν with the gen. carries the meaning of “hearing with appreciation;” see on 39.

τοῦ θανάτου: see on 1st. It is only in Jn. that this title is put into the mouth of Jesus (to ²⁸, ²⁴); while He often employs it when writing in his own person.

ὁ λόγος, δείκνυσιν, but ἩΛW read δείκνυσιν, the rec. having δείκνυσιν. Also the rec. ἐγένετο (ΑΙΔΩ) must give place to ἐγένετο (ΑΣΔΩ).

39. ἀπευθείας γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ καλ. Verses 26, 27, repeat (from vv. 21, 22) that the Father has given to the Son (α) the quickening power and (β) the authority of judge, which are prerogatives of deity.

Verse 26 deals with the power of life. To Hebrew thought, no less than to Greek, God is the Living One: “With thee is the fountain of life” (Ps. 36). Thus the Father “has life in Himself,” and so He gave “to the Son to have life in Himself,” εἰ ἐκείνῳ being emphatic. (For ἀπευθείας, see on v. 20 above.) To “have life in Himself” involves the power to give out life, or to quicken.

This “giving” has been interpreted of the mystical communication of life sub specie aternitatis by the Father to the Son in His pre-Incarnate state; and the statement would then point to the Logos doctrine of the Prologue (cf. esp. 1, “In Him was Life,” and the note in loc.). This is possible (see on 17⁴); but the thought of the Father “giving” to the Incarnate Son is frequent in Jn. (see on 3⁴ above). It is better to interpret ἐγένετο as in the other passages in the Gospel, where it is applied to the Father’s gifts to Christ as manifested in the flesh (see on 17⁴). Christ is, in any case, “the Living One” (Rev. 1:18); but the significance of ἐγένετο here is the same as that suggested by the words, “I live because of the Father” (6⁸). The Divine power of life is delegated to Him, as is the Divine prerogative of judgment, which Jn. sets forth in v. 27.

27. The rec., supported by DIA and some O.L. texts, has καὶ before κρίσιν; but om. ΝABLW.

ἐξουσία ἐγένετο αὐτοῖς: see v. 22. The ἐξουσία is that of
V. 28-29. A BODILY RESURRECTION

pantes ois en tois meroimiesi keioi oumon tis fainei adelphi, 29. kai ekperissomeni ois tis aghmati pouxasteis eis anastasisin kai, ois tis fainei prakartes eis anastasisin kritias.

but the greater marvel is what will happen at the Last Day, when the dead in the tombs shall be quickened by the voice of the Son of God, and final judgment shall be pronounced by Him on good and evil.

Such a doctrine, no doubt, has its roots in Jewish eschatology, but the Fourth Gospel cannot be understood unless it be realized that Jn. has not abandoned this, while he lays his emphasis on the spiritual conceptions of eternal life and judgment in the present, which were taught by Jesus (see Intro., p. clxxi). Verses 28, 29, have been thought to be “materialistic,” but they cannot be torn from the text as an interpolation or later addition; they are an integral part of the argument.

With μη βαπτίζετε, cf. 3:1 and 1 Jn. 3:14.

ἐρχεται δέρα: see on v. 25 and on 4:23.

With διακοινοῦντων τῆς φωνῆς ἀδελφί, cf. 1:49 ἄνωθεν μεγάλη ἑρκυρίωσεν, ἀδελφοὶ ἡμῶν.

πάντες οἱ ἐν τῷ μνημόσυνῳ κτλ. This is a plain statement of a general bodily resurrection, both of good and bad, such as is suggested in Apoc. of Baruch 50, 51, 2 Esdr. 5:1. In the N.T. it is explicitly asserted in Mt. 27:63, Acts 24:26, 2 Cor. 15:51; and it is frequently implied in the Synoptic reports of the words of Jesus (e.g. Mt. 5:20, 20:18, Lk. 11:25). That Christ is the Agent of this Resurrection, so far as the righteous are concerned at any rate, has appeared 664. He “makes alive” both in this world and at the Day of Judgment; such is the consistent teaching of Jn.

As at v. 25, the MSS. vary as to διακοινοῦντος (B), διακοινοῦν (AΔLΣ), and διακοινοῦσα (AD19).

28. The word ἀναστάσις is used by Ἀσχίλος (Exx. 648) of “rising up” from the grave, that is, of “resurrection.” In the LXX it is infrequent, and occurs with this meaning at 2 Macc. 7:11 12:2 only (cf. Ps. 66:22). The Synoptists have it in the narrative of the questioning Sadducees (Mk. 12:18, Mt. 22:23, Lk. 20:27); and, besides, Lk. has the phrase “the resurrection of the just” (14:34). We have ἀναστάσις in Jn. again at 11:24, 25.

There are the two resurrections: one of Life, the other of Judgment. For the former, cf. 2 Macc. 17:10 ἐν μέσῳ ἀναστάσις τῆς λίβης ὑπὸ θεοῦ. The two are mentioned together Dan. 12:2.

For ὁ πάθος τῶν πάθων (πάθων), see on 3:20.

Wendt (Gospel according to St. John, pp. 135 et al.) argues that vv. 28, 29, cannot belong to the original form of the discourse.

This is the true construction, as supported by Syc. cur., the O.L., Origen, and Paul of Samosata; see on v. 28 for Chrysostom’s rendering.

1 See v. 25, and Introd., p. cxxvii.
Life and judgment begin in this world, but the Life once secured continues eternally, the future judgment being already anticipated. The evil-doer is to rise after death, for a judgment which, although predetermined, has not yet been fully exhibited or revealed. See on 3:19.

Jesus appeals to the witness to His claims provided by God (v. 32, 37), by the Baptist (v. 33), by His own works (v. 36), and by the O.T. (v. 35).

80. The discourse returns to the first person, from the third; the thought, “I can do nothing of myself,” returning to v. 16, where see note (cf. 8:28 ὁμοιὸς ὑμῶν τῶν ἄνθρωπων).

καθὼς ἀκοῦεις κρίνει, i.e. “as I hear from the Father (see on v. 19). I judge.” The authority to judge is delegated to Him (v. 27); and His judgments are righteous because they reflect the judgments of God Himself. ὁ κρίνεις ἐστιν (cf. Ps. 73 of God, the righteous Judge) is repeated 8:16 in the form ὁ κρίνεις ἐστίν ὁ δικαίως ἐστίν. There is no self-will in the passing of these judgments, ὁ γὰρ τὸ κρίνεις τὸν ἴδιον, but rather τὸ κρίνεις τὸν κρίνεις με. For this last phrase, see 6:16, 36, where it recurs, and 4:39. Cf. especially the notes on 7:18, 21, 18.

Thus to seek that God’s will be done, in every decision of life, was perfectly realised only in the Son of Man Himself. But the precept of Rabbi Gamaliel may apply to every man, however imperfectly it may be obeyed: “Do His will as if it were thy will, that He may do thy will as if it were His will.”

The rec. adds παρὰς after τὸν κρίνεις με (cf. 6:9), but om. ΚΑΒΔΝΩ

81. The argument in vv. 31–37 is that the proclamation by Jesus of His own claims and authority did not depend, as the Pharisees naturally urged, upon His individual testimony. He admits that if the witness which He bore to Himself was merely that of one man, it would not be sufficient. “If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true,” i.e. it need not be taken as true, for (of course) a single witness may speak truth even in his own case. But He urges that, apart from the “witness” to Him which was given by John the Baptist to the Pharisees when they made inquiry (v. 33), upon which He does not rely (v. 34), there is the “witness” of Another, greater immensely than John (v. 35, 36). The “witness” of the “works” which He did is really the “witness” of God (v. 36), without whom they could not have been done, and in whose Name and by whose authority they were done. The argument in 8:14–17 is different. He does, indeed, appeal there, as He does here, to the fact that the “witness” of the Father corroborates His own, and that therefore the requisite “two witnesses” are present in His case (8:17); but He goes on to claim that His consciousness of Divine origin (v. 14) and the intimacy of His union with the Father justify Him in the assertion, paradoxical as it might seem to His opponents, that His self-witness must be true. ἔγω εἰμι ὁ μαρτυρῶν περί ἐμαυτοῦ is the claim and the style of Deity (8:28).

Here, however, He is represented only as saying that His individual witness is confirmed by the witness of God.

ἐγὼ ἐγὼ μαρτυρῶ τῷ ἐμοὶ, ἐγὼ μαρτυρῶ μοι ὅσα ἔτυμν ἄληθες. This challenges comparison with 8:28, where the sentence is verbally repeated, with the omission of ὅσα: “If I bear witness of myself, my witness is true.”

The Jewish maxim as to evidence were rigidly and pedantically observed in the subtle disputations of the Rabbinical schools. One was that two witnesses at least were always necessary for the establishment of any matter of fact (Deut. 19:16). To this maxim allusion is made 2 Cor. 13:1, 1 Tim. 5:19, and Jesus quotes it as a rule at Mt. 18:16. Another, not less weighty, rule was that a man’s evidence about himself was suspect. Weilstein quotes the Mishna (Ket. 9:5), ὁμοιὸς ἐστιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος καὶ ἔφυγεν ὡς ἄρα ἐν ἀνθρώπων ἐστιν. That, indeed, is a common maxim of law everywhere; cf. Demosthenes, a contra Sophr. §9 μαρτυρόμενον ἐδώκατο τοῖς ἐν τῷ τάξει ἐπηρεάσατο καὶ ἐκκαθημένος. Now when Jesus enunciated lofty claims for Himself and for His mission, He was challenged to substantiate them, and all arguments conducted with the Rabbis had perforce to fall in with their doctrine as to what constituted valid evidence. The arguments here (vv. 31–37) and at 8:14–17 seem to a modern reader pedantic and unattractive in form, precisely because they reproduce modes of thought and speech which are foreign to our Western culture. They are not like the arguments of Greek disputants; but their Rabbinical flavour is an indication that they have been faithfully reported by one who was himself a Jew, and to whom Jewish scholasticism was not strange or unfamiliar. In arguing with the Rabbis, Jesus did not shrink from arguing on their
...the Baptist's witness...
is the true reading, μενων of ABW being due to misunderstanding of του 'ελεβον τα γαρ εργα διδωκεν μοι το Πατερ ηνα τελειωσεν αυτα, ας τα εργα ματησει μεν ημας ειναι αυτος, ελκους μεν ματηση το πατερ με απαντεσθαι. 37. και τα περισσα με Πατερ ηνα εκενος μεμηρμερησαν περι εμας. ας τε

Divine revelation is the Father's own witness, although invisible to the world.

The key to vv. 37, 38, is found in x.Jn. 25-36. αυτος την επαρχειαν τον οικουμενην με ματηση τον οικουμενην και μεμηρμερηση ημας ειναι αυτος. ας περισσα τοις των οικουμενων οικουμενης ημας ειναι αυτος. The believer has an internal witness, which is in reality the witness of God. We are not to think of voices from heaven or visible epiphanies as indicated by the μαρτυρια of the Father; such are recorded by the Synoptists at the Baptism and the Transfiguration (cf. also Jn. 12b). It is the confident assurance of the believer which is here in question.

οις φωνεις αυτοις παντοσε δεικναι, "you have never heard His voice," much less heard it with intelligence. See on εν γαρ την επαρχειαν ημας εκενος with the acc. in Jn., who uses this constr. as equivalent to a mere perception by hearing, without definite appreciation of what is said. What is stated is that the Jews could not have heard the voice of God with the outward ear.

For παντοτε, and its use in the N.T., see on τοις. ουτε ειτος αυτοις εκενος, "nor have you seen His form." So 25 τοις ονειδες οπαντην πασην, and x.Jn. 4b; cf. 64. This was admitted by Jew and Greek alike. Peniel, the place of Jacob's wrestling, is called indeed in the LXX ελεος τος (Gen. 32), the reason given being δια της γαρ ανθυσας της προσωπου των πορτων. But no Jew regarded that as an ordinary experience, or one that he might expect to be repeated in his own case. Man cannot see with bodily eyes the ειτος of God; and so God cannot appear as a witness to give legal evidence.

From ουτα φωνης to δεικναι is a kind of parenthesis, interpolated to avoid misunderstanding. Then follows the description of the true μαρτυρια of the Father.

38. και τον λογον αυτοις εκενεν ειναι εις μενων μελημα. και (as in v. 40 και ατ δεικναι) stands for and yet, as often in Jn. (see note on τοις). The sequence of thought is: The Father has borne witness of me, and yet you have not His word abiding in you, you have not appropriated this Divine word of revelation.

The λογος of God is used sometimes by Jn. to signify the message or revelation or command which God has given. Thus in 10b there is allusion to the λογος of God which came to men of the olden time with the revelation "Ye are gods . . . ye are sons of the Most High" (Ps. 82). Such a word of God, when it comes to a faithful heart, abides there. To the young men whom Jn. commends, he writes, δ λογος του θεου εις μεν μελη
V. 38-41.

THE WITNESS OF SCRIPTURE

διακατε ἐν αὐτοῖς λόγων ἀδιάνοιαν ἐξεζ. καὶ ἐκεῖαν ἔσων ἃς μαρτυροῦσαν περὶ ἠμῶν Ἀδ. καὶ ὃ θέλητε ἠλείων πρὸς με ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἔχετε.

If ἡμεῖς is imperative, Jesus is not exhorting the Jews here; He is arguing with them, and rebuking them for their stubborn rejection of Him. Their fault is ὃ θέλητε ἠλείων πρὸς με.

It was a Rabbinical saying that ‘he who has acquired the words of the Law has acquired eternal life’; and it is this kind of superstition to which the words “Ye search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life” refer. ἰδίως ὁικουμένη here means “future life,” as often in Jn. (see on 3:15), and the word δοκεῖ is significant. In categorical sentences δοκέω in Jn. (see 5:11-12, 13:21, 16:20) always indicates a mistaken opinion or inaccurate opinion: ὅπερ δοκεῖ means “you think, wrongly.”

It is not possible to treat ἡμεῖς as an imperative, and do justice to these considerations. Why should the Jews be bidden to search the Scriptures because they held a wrong opinion about their sanctity? The reading of them in the formal manner of the Rabbis did not carry with it the possession of eternal life. Their true sanctity lay in their pointing onward to the Christ. ἰδίως (these very Scriptures, which you misuse) ἔσων αἱ μαρτυρίαιας περὶ ἠμῶν, which the Jews did not appreciate.

The argument, then, is, “Ye search the Scriptures because of your mistaken belief that this close scrutiny of words and syllables in the sacred books assures you of the life to come. There you are wrong. The true value of the Scriptures is that they bear witness of me. And you are doubly wrong, for you will not come to me in person, when the opportunity is given.”

οὐ δὲ θέλετε ἠλείων πρὸς με. This is the tragedy of the rejection of Messiah by the Messianic race; cf. Mt. 23:7, with the same sombre conclusion, ὡς ἐφυλάττεσαν. The use of καὶ (cf. v. 38), meaning “as yet,” before ὃ θέλετε is a feature of Jn.’s style. See on 1:10.

Explanation of the unbelief of the Jews (vv. 41-47)

Verses 41-47 are an expression of the source of the Jews’ unbelief. It is this, that they do not love God, and so they

1 Aquila, v. 8, quoted by Scholten, i. p. 536.
2 V. 38 hái; (110) is a question, “What do you think?”
3 Abbott points out that ἡμεῖς or ἡμεῖς does not occur elsewhere in the Greek Bible as an imperative, the aorist being generally used where there is a command; cf. 3:14 (Dial. 2435).
do not appreciate Him who came in God’s Name. They are concerned rather with the approval of their fellows, than with God’s approval. Nevertheless, Jesus says that He will not accuse them to God. Moses will be their accuser: he wrote of Messiah, and the Jews did not appreciate what he wrote. It is not to be expected, if they reject the written teaching of Moses, that they should accept the verbal teaching of Jesus. His words of rebuke do not spring from any warranted pride because they did not accept His claims. Their approval is of no weight with Him (50); cf. the similar repudiation made by Paul, 1 Thess. 2). That the honour (δόξα) which is bestowed by men on their fellows is not to be greatly prized is not a peculiarly Johannine doctrine (51), 7, 9, 12, but appears in Mt. 6. 2, and elsewhere. Cf. “The good inclination receiveth not glory or dishonour from men” (Introit of XII. Patriarchi, Rom., vi. 4). For δόξα, see on 4.14.

42. ἀλλὰ ἡ ἡμείαν ὑμᾶς, “but I have known you,” sc. with the knowledge that comes from personal experience; cf. 28, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ ἡμείαν ἦν ἐν κοινωνίᾳ, “that you have not the love of God in yourselves.” In Paul “the love of God” always means the love which God has for man, and “the love of Christ” is the love which Christ has for man. But the usage in Jn. is not so uniform.

δόξα is used 7, 10, 11, 15 of the love of man for man; in 5, 10 of the love of Christ for man: and in 15, 17, 18 of the love of God for Christ. In the First Epistle, in like manner, in 1, 19, 10, 18, is the thought of the love of God for man; and in 3, 18, 11, 13 we must interpret ἡ ἡμείαν τοῦ θεοῦ or the like phrase as signifying the love which man has for God. See on 21.

We see, then, that the meaning of ἡ ἡμείαν τοῦ θεοῦ in the present passage must be determined from the context, and we conclude that it must mean the love which men have for God. No doubt, as Abbott argues (Diat. 2040), the phrase in v. 38 τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἐν ἑαυτῷ, suggests that as λόγος there is the λόγος that proceeds from God, so ἡμείαν here should mean the love that flows out from God. But it could hardly be imputed for reproach to the Jews that God did not love them. The point of the reproach is that they did not love God, and so were not in spiritual sympathy with One who came in the name of God. And, as we have seen, this sense of ἡ ἡμείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, sc. the love of man for God,
Moses will be their accuser. They will speak falsely about the Lord, and He will judge them. 

The cause of the Jews’ unbelief is traced here to the desire for popular applause and favor. "All their works they do for their own sake" is a judgment on the Pharisees found in Mt. 23.4. "They loved the glory of men more than the glory of God" is Jn. 2:19. But the saying recorded in this verse goes deeper. Faith, Jesus seems to say, is impossible in any vital sense for the man who measures himself only by human standards. He who has that vivid sense of the unseen, which is faith, instinctively seeks in his conversation and conduct to win the approval of God, in comparison with which nothing else seems to be important. 

As with the Pharisees, the priests, the scribes, and the people, so it is with the Jews themselves. They will be judged by God for their own deeds. 

This verse has all the marks of historicity. No one would think of inventing a denial by Jesus of the suggestion that He was to be the Accuser of the Jews at the Last Judgment. But it is quite natural in the context in which it appears, "as in whom you hope, in quo nos speratis, as the Vulgate correctly renders. ἄνθρωπος does not occur again in Jn., but the use here of the perfect tense to indicate that the hope continues in the present and is not merely an emotion of the past, has parallels at 1 Cor. 15:13, 11, 2 Cor. 1:20, 1 Tim. 1:11, 12, 5:6, 6, 6. The aor. ἁπαντα occurs only twice in the N.T., 2 Cor. 3:8, 1 Pet. 1:25, which is remarkable, as in the LXX the perfect ἀπαντα is never used, but always the aorist (e.g., Ps. 21:16; etc.). Again, the constr. ἀπαντησα εἰς ὑμᾶς is rare in the LXX (cf. Ps. 119:14, 14:18, Isa. 46:5), where the prep. ἐν is nearly always used. In the N.T., too, we generally have ἐν, but εἰς in Acts 16:27, 2 Cor. 1:10, 1 Pet. 3:1. Thus the only exact parallel in the Greek Bible to the phrase in this verse is εἰς ὑμῖν ἀπαντήσαν of 2 Cor. 1:10, a sound Greek construction.3 

Abbott (Diat. 1:42-44, 1:73) traces the Johannean perfect to Hebrew influence, and says that we should leave the aor. or the pres. rather than the partic. at 3:1. But, on the contrary, the

1 The Anti-Christ Legend, p. 133.
VII. 15. Ἰδαμαρίων ὁδοὶ ἵστορίας λέγεται Ποῦ ὁτι τοῖς γραμματαῖς ὁτὲν ῥηθή ἔργα ἔβαλεν Ἡ ἔργον διά σχετικῶν ὕπερ ἄγνωστον ἀνθρώπου ἡμών ἦσαν. Ἡ ἔργα ἔβαλεν ἀνθρώπου ἡμών ἦσαν. Ἡ ἔργα ἔβαλεν ἀνθρώπου ἡμών ἦσαν.

Jesus has appealed to the γραμματα of Moses as establishing His claims, and had probably (see on 50) quoted specific passages, commenting on them as He went along. This amazed the Jewish leaders, who had thought that such learning was confined to those trained in the Rabbinical schools, and they had never heard of Jesus as a disciple of any prominent Rabbi.

διαμαρίων ὁδοὶ, “So they began to express wonder”; cf. v. 46 and Mk. 13:37, Lk. 20:42.

τὸτε ὁτι τοῖς γραμματαῖς ὁτὲν ῥηθή ἔργα ἔβαλεν. It was not so much the wisdom of His words that astonished them as His knowledge of the Jewish writings, which probably included the Rabbinical traditions that had gathered round the Old Testament, as well as the Old Testament itself. In Isa. 29:4 ὁ ἑπτάχθος γραμματα means a man who cannot read, an “illiterate.” For ἑπτάχθος in Acts 4:12, see Intro. p. xxi. But in the present passage, ὁ τοῖς γραμματαῖς ἔβαλεν seems to mean rather not having been the μαθητής of a recognised teacher.” The tradition of His scribbling upon the ground [52] shows that Jesus was not illiterate in the strict sense; and it is unlikely that this would have been suggested by the Jewish Rabbis who had engaged in controversy with Him.

VII. 15-24. They wonder at His learning.

VII. 15. We have given above (see Intro., p. xix) the reasons for taking vv. 15-24 of ch. 7 as following directly on 50, perf. is right here and the aor. would be wrong, as it is wrong in the LXX often. See also Field, in loc.
7. He is the one who speaks for魔鬼 and claims to be the Son of God. He follows his own path of evil, not of God. He claims to be God's son without the knowledge of God himself. He claims to be the Messiah, the Son of God, but he is a false prophet, speaking lies and deceiving the people.

8. He is the one who speaks for魔鬼 and claims to be the Son of God. He follows his own path of evil, not of God. He claims to be God's son without the knowledge of God himself. He claims to be the Messiah, the Son of God, but he is a false prophet, speaking lies and deceiving the people.

9. He is the one who speaks for魔鬼 and claims to be the Son of God. He follows his own path of evil, not of God. He claims to be God's son without the knowledge of God himself. He claims to be the Messiah, the Son of God, but he is a false prophet, speaking lies and deceiving the people.

10. He is the one who speaks for魔鬼 and claims to be the Son of God. He follows his own path of evil, not of God. He claims to be God's son without the knowledge of God himself. He claims to be the Messiah, the Son of God, but he is a false prophet, speaking lies and deceiving the people.

11. He is the one who speaks for魔鬼 and claims to be the Son of God. He follows his own path of evil, not of God. He claims to be God's son without the knowledge of God himself. He claims to be the Messiah, the Son of God, but he is a false prophet, speaking lies and deceiving the people.

12. He is the one who speaks for魔鬼 and claims to be the Son of God. He follows his own path of evil, not of God. He claims to be God's son without the knowledge of God himself. He claims to be the Messiah, the Son of God, but he is a false prophet, speaking lies and deceiving the people.

13. He is the one who speaks for魔鬼 and claims to be the Son of God. He follows his own path of evil, not of God. He claims to be God's son without the knowledge of God himself. He claims to be the Messiah, the Son of God, but he is a false prophet, speaking lies and deceiving the people.

14. He is the one who speaks for魔鬼 and claims to be the Son of God. He follows his own path of evil, not of God. He claims to be God's son without the knowledge of God himself. He claims to be the Messiah, the Son of God, but he is a false prophet, speaking lies and deceiving the people.

15. He is the one who speaks for魔鬼 and claims to be the Son of God. He follows his own path of evil, not of God. He claims to be God's son without the knowledge of God himself. He claims to be the Messiah, the Son of God, but he is a false prophet, speaking lies and deceiving the people.

16. He is the one who speaks for魔鬼 and claims to be the Son of God. He follows his own path of evil, not of God. He claims to be God's son without the knowledge of God himself. He claims to be the Messiah, the Son of God, but he is a false prophet, speaking lies and deceiving the people.

17. He is the one who speaks for魔鬼 and claims to be the Son of God. He follows his own path of evil, not of God. He claims to be God's son without the knowledge of God himself. He claims to be the Messiah, the Son of God, but he is a false prophet, speaking lies and deceiving the people.

18. He is the one who speaks for魔鬼 and claims to be the Son of God. He follows his own path of evil, not of God. He claims to be God's son without the knowledge of God himself. He claims to be the Messiah, the Son of God, but he is a false prophet, speaking lies and deceiving the people.

19. He is the one who speaks for魔鬼 and claims to be the Son of God. He follows his own path of evil, not of God. He claims to be God's son without the knowledge of God himself. He claims to be the Messiah, the Son of God, but he is a false prophet, speaking lies and deceiving the people.

20. He is the one who speaks for魔鬼 and claims to be the Son of God. He follows his own path of evil, not of God. He claims to be God's son without the knowledge of God himself. He claims to be the Messiah, the Son of God, but he is a false prophet, speaking lies and deceiving the people.

The people were listening to his teachings with eagerness, eager to believe what he was saying.
defence of sabbath healing

Furthermore, stress is laid here on the singularity of the “work” that has been “done” by Jesus. “I did one work.” But in the course of the preceding argument He had appealed to the “works,” in the plural, which bore witness to His claims (5:16, where see note). There would be no point in now singling out one ἑργον only, as having excited wonder because of its extraordinary character; and it would be surprising if that one were singled out, of which it is not recorded that it caused any astonishment.

Accordingly we render ἑργον ἑργάτης, “I did one work,” sc. of labour, and interpret it as having reference to the matter originally in dispute, sc. that He had broken the Sabbath. The law was, πάς ἐν ὕδατι ἑργον τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδομάδι (Ex. 20:10). Jesus admits, in terms, that He has broken this law on the particular occasion to which His critics refer. Ἐν ἑργον ἑργάτης ἐκλή, “I did one work,” sc. on the Sabbath, “and you are all astonished,” ἐφημάριως indicating that they were puzzled, as at 3:24. Their astonishment was not caused by the extraordinary nature of the cure, but by the circumstance that Jesus had ventured to cure the man on a Sabbath day.

We take ἐφημάριως with διὰ τοῦτο which follows: “you are all astonished by this.” Cf. ἐφημάριως διὰ τοῦτο αὐθέντην (Mk. 6:6), where the reason of astonishment is indicated by διὰ with the acc. as here. διὰ τοῦτο is often used by Jn. in relation to what follows (see on 5:27); while the more common usage, in accordance with which it relates to what has gone before, is also adopted several times in the Gospel (see on 9:3), although there is no other instance in Jn. of διὰ τοῦτο coming at the end of a sentence.

The tendency of the versions is to take διὰ τοῦτο as beginning the next sentence: “Therefore Moses, etc.” But, in that case, διὰ τοῦτο is difficult to interpret, and involves a very elliptical construction. It would mean “For this very cause, Moses gave you the ordinance of circumcision, knowing that it would conflict with the strict law of the Sabbath; sc. in order that he might teach you that the Sabbatical precepts admit of exceptions and are not always to be enforced literally.” This would give a tolerable sense, but it strains the force of διὰ τοῦτο too far, and introduces a very subtle reason (not suggested elsewhere) for the rule that circumcision must always be on the eighth day after birth. It is simpler to take ἐφημάριως διὰ τοῦτο as one sentence, “You are all astonished at this act of mine.”

1 Wendt (Gospel according to St. John, p. 64 n.) takes this view. Cf. ἐφημάριως in 2:13 and Lk. 3:24.
VII. 24, VII. 1.] RETREAT TO GALILEE
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VII. 1. Kαὶ μετὰ ταῦτα περιεβαίνει ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ ΓαλILE arou ὄροι ᾠδέλεων ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαιίᾳ περιπατεῖν, δι’ εἷς τούτων αὐτός αἱ Ἰουδαίαι

24. δὲ ἐρίματα καὶ ἀδίκημα, "do not judge by looks," i.e., superficially, the too frequent weakness of the Pharisees, which is rebuked again ὁμοίως καὶ τὰ τῆς σφαίρας κρίματα (5:28). Cf. Is. 1:17: ὁ καθήμενος καὶ τοῖς κέλευχοις καὶ δὲ Cor. 10:13: ἀπεκδοτεῖ again in the N.T. only at 12:44 and Rev. 1:14, and then in the sense of "face."

καὶ τὴν δικαίαν κρίσιν κρίνει, "but judge righteous judgment," i.e., be fair. The expression is used of the judgments of God, Tob. 3:4. Cf. also Zech. 7:9 κρίμα δικαιοσύνης κρίνει. The const. κρίμα κρίνει is common (Isa. 11:7) and is also classical (Plato, Rep. 360 E).

ἀλὰτο have κρίμα κρίνει (the authoritative act of impera- tive; see on 26), but BDLTNW give κρίμα.

This is the last word of the controversy which arose out of the healing of the impotent man at Bethesda, xc. 51-47; 51-24; and naturally, the Jewish leaders were indignant. Cf. 7:1.

Retreat to Galilee; His brethren urge Jesus to show Himself at Jerusalem (VII. 1-9)

VII. 1. καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα περιεβαίνει τῇ ΓαλILE arou ὄροι ᾠδέλεων ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαιίᾳ περιπατεῖν, δι’ εἷς τούτων αὐτός αἱ Ἰουδαίαι

24. δὲ δικαια καὶ ἀδίκημα, "do not judge by looks," i.e., superficially, the too frequent weakness of the Pharisees, which is rebuked again ὁμοίως καὶ τὰ τῆς σφαίρας κρίματα (5:28). Cf. Is. 1:17: ὁ καθήμενος καὶ τοῖς κέλευχοις καὶ δὲ Cor. 10:13: ἀπεκδοτεῖ again in the N.T. only at 12:44 and Rev. 1:14, and then in the sense of "face."

καὶ τὴν δικαίαν κρίσιν κρίνει, "but judge righteous judgment," i.e., be fair. The expression is used of the judgments of God, Tob. 3:4. Cf. also Zech. 7:9 κρίμα δικαιοσύνης κρίνει. The const. κρίμα κρίνει is common (Isa. 11:7) and is also classical (Plato, Rep. 360 E).

ἀλὰτο have κρίμα κρίνει (the authoritative act of impera- tive; see on 26), but BDLTNW give κρίμα.

This is the last word of the controversy which arose out of the healing of the impotent man at Bethesda, xc. 51-47; 51-24; and naturally, the Jewish leaders were indignant. Cf. 7:1.

Retreat to Galilee; His brethren urge Jesus to show Himself at Jerusalem (VII. 1-9)

VII. 1. καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα περιεβαίνει τῇ ΓαλILE arou ὄροι ᾠδέλεων ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαιίᾳ περιπατεῖν, δι’ εἷς τούτων αὐτός αἱ Ἰουδαίαι

24. δὲ δικαια καὶ ἀδίκημα, "do not judge by looks," i.e., superficially, the too frequent weakness of the Pharisees, which is rebuked again ὁμοίως καὶ τὰ τῆς σφαίρας κρίματα (5:28). Cf. Is. 1:17: ὁ καθήμενος καὶ τοῖς κέλευχοις καὶ δὲ Cor. 10:13: ἀπεκδοτεῖ again in the N.T. only at 12:44 and Rev. 1:14, and then in the sense of "face."

καὶ τὴν δικαίαν κρίσιν κρίνει, "but judge righteous judgment," i.e., be fair. The expression is used of the judgments of God, Tob. 3:4. Cf. also Zech. 7:9 κρίμα δικαιοσύνης κρίνει. The const. κρίμα κρίνει is common (Isa. 11:7) and is also classical (Plato, Rep. 360 E).

ἀλὰτο have κρίμα κρίνει (the authoritative act of impera- tive; see on 26), but BDLTNW give κρίμα.

This is the last word of the controversy which arose out of the healing of the impotent man at Bethesda, xc. 51-47; 51-24; and naturally, the Jewish leaders were indignant. Cf. 7:1.

Retreat to Galilee; His brethren urge Jesus to show Himself at Jerusalem (VII. 1-9)

VII. 1. καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα περιεβαίνει τῇ ΓαλILE arou ὄροι ᾠδέλεων ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαιίᾳ περιπατεῖν, δι’ εἷς τούτων αὐτός αἱ Ἰουδαίαι

24. δὲ δικαια καὶ ἀδίκημα, "do not judge by looks," i.e., superficially, the too frequent weakness of the Pharisees, which is rebuked again ὁμοίως καὶ τὰ τῆς σφαίρας κρίματα (5:28). Cf. Is. 1:17: ὁ καθήμενος καὶ τοῖς κέλευχοις καὶ δὲ Cor. 10:13: ἀπεκδοτεῖ again in the N.T. only at 12:44 and Rev. 1:14, and then in the sense of "face."

καὶ τὴν δικαίαν κρίσιν κρίνει, "but judge righteous judgment," i.e., be fair. The expression is used of the judgments of God, Tob. 3:4. Cf. also Zech. 7:9 κρίμα δικαιοσύνης κρίνει. The const. κρίμα κρίνει is common (Isa. 11:7) and is also classical (Plato, Rep. 360 E).

ἀλὰτο have κρίμα κρίνει (the authoritative act of impera- tive; see on 26), but BDLTNW give κρίμα.

This is the last word of the controversy which arose out of the healing of the impotent man at Bethesda, xc. 51-47; 51-24; and naturally, the Jewish leaders were indignant. Cf. 7:1.

Retreat to Galilee; His brethren urge Jesus to show Himself at Jerusalem (VII. 1-9)
The narrative of the events in Jerusalem after Jesus went up to the Feast of Tabernacles (v. 10) is full of movement and of local colour. Presumably (see on 51) the Twelve attended the Feast of Tabernacles, and were again in the company of Jesus after He went up.

The name given for the itinerant ministry of a Rabbi accompanied by His Disciples; cf. 641 111. (For the larger meaning of παντελεήμονα, see on 81.) Jesus was “walking in Galilee,” because the Jews, as has just been said (519), were seeking His life.

For the phrase ἐπεταξάω αὐτῶν ἵνα ἴκνουν ἀποκρύφως, see on 518. 3. ἐπεταξάω αὐτῶν ἵνα ἴκνουν. This was the Feast of Tabernacles of the year 28 A.D. See on 51.

The Feast of Tabernacles (σεπωνητήν) was originally a Feast of Ingathering or a Harvest Festival, and was not at first held on a fixed date, but “at the year’s end” (Ex. 3420), according to the time when the harvest was gathered. The Deuteronomistic Code calls it “the Feast of Tabernacles” (Deut. 1619), and prescribes that it is to be kept for seven days.

The reason for the name assigned in the Priest’s Code is that “I made the children of Israel to dwell in booths, when I brought them out of the land of Egypt” (Lev. 2320). In the same Code the annual date is fixed; it was to begin on the fifteenth day of the seventh month (Tishri), going on for seven days (Lev. 2430). That is, it was held at the end of September or the beginning of October. In Num. 298 an eighth day of observance appears, on which was to be “a solemn assembly,” and we find this eighth day observed in post-exilic times (Neh. 818, 2 Macc. 19). Josephus, who mentions the eighth day (Ant. i. i. 4), calls this feast ἴδον αὐτῶν, which is the same ἴδον as used in Luke 10:38, 21:38, thus marking its importance place in Jewish life, it being, pre-eminently, the Feast of the Jews. For the ritual observed, see on 77 and 811.

For the phrase ἴδον αὐτῶν, see on 218. 3. For the “brethren of Jesus,” see on 229. They were older than He was, and this may explain their venturing to offer Him advice as to His conduct. The discussion between them and Him, which is reported vv. 3-5, could only have been known to one who was in intimate relations with the family; and there could be no motive for setting it down in narrative, if it had not actually taken place.

μεταναστέω, “depart hence”; μεταναστέως is used 153 of departing from this world, and metaphorically 54, 1 Jn. 23.

καὶ ἤλεγχε (a favourite word with Jn.; see on v. 23) ἵνα ἴκνουν ἰκνεύσης, ἵνα καὶ ἴκνουν ἰκνεύσης τῷ ἴκνεύσῃ ἵνα καὶ ἴκνουν. The advice seems to have been ironical, for they go on to express doubts about His alleged “works,” saying ἵνα τῇ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ, “if you do such things.” The suggestion is that the rumour of these ἴκνουν was confined to Galilee, and that if He were to establish His reputation in Judea, it would be desirable that His disciples there should have an opportunity of seeing what He could do.

We have already heard of many disciples in Judea (25 4); indeed, it was because their number excited the jealousy of the Pharisees that He had left Judea on a former occasion (49). But there was little of miracle there on His last visit; the curse of the impotent man is not described as a “sign,” and it had attracted attention rather because it had been wrought on a Sabbath day, than because of its marvellousness (55); and cf. 21, where see note). The “works” to which the brethren of Jesus make reference here are those of Galilee, perhaps the Miracle of Cains (214) or the Healing of the Nobleman’s Son and other sick folk (44, 63), or the Feeding of the Five Thousand (56), or more probably healings wrought between His departure from Jerusalem and His going up again for the Feast of Tabernacles (vv. 1, 14), i.e. during the summer of the year 26. Nothing is told about them by Jn., but the words τῇ ἴκνεύσῃ τῇ, “the works which you are doing,” suggest that the reference is not to anything that He had done months before the date of the conversation, but to quite recent events. And, as has been suggested on v. 1, some of the Galilean miracles recorded by the Synoptists may be placed at this period in the ministry as narrated by Jn.

The allusion to the μαθηταί here cannot be to the Twelve, for they had been witnesses of many of the wonderful things that Jesus had done, and were already convinced of the truth of His claims. Nor can the allusion be to the Galilean disciples who were disheartened by the difficulty of His teaching and left Him on a former occasion (60), for they would not be in the way of seeing miracles wrought at Jerusalem, whither His brethren advised Him to transfer His activities. We conclude, then, that the μαθηταί whom His brethren suggested He should confirm in their allegiance by displays of His power, were those in Judea and at Jerusalem. If, indeed, He was to succeed
in the Mission for which He claimed the highest sanctions, He must convince Jerusalem. And His brethren were right in the view they took of this. They did not accept His claims, as yet at any rate (v. 5), but they understood clearly that it was at the Holy City that they must either be proved or disproved.

So ἡ ΒΔΛΝΩ, although ΙΔ with the future indic. is rare in Ἰω. (cf. 17). Ἡ has διωκόμενος, and ΓΔ read διωκομενος.

He places ιδον before το εφαι, but om. ιδον.

4. The principle laid down by the brethren of Jesus is sound, sc. that no one who seeks public recognition can afford to keep His deeds a secret. ιδον γαρ το εν κρυπτῇ ποιει και ομαι αυτὸς εν παρεσεσθαι εναι, "No one does anything in secret, and (at the same time) himself seeks to be in the public eye."

ιδον is used like καιρος (see on 19).

For αὐτός BDΛW have αὐτό, through misunderstanding. παρεσεσθαι (from τῶν ἐγείρασθαι) expresses primarily a complete openness and freedom of speech (cf. Mk. 818), the only place where the word occurs in the Synoptics, and in this sense it is a favourite word with Ἰω.; cf. 311, 313, 1613, 1318, (where ἐν κρυπτῇ and ἐν παρεσθαι are again contrasted). It is, therefore, according to Prov. 119, that Wisdom speaks: "ἐν παρεσέθαι παραγωγις ὑπα. The word then comes to connote intrepidity or courage; and it is used in 1 Ἰω. 281, 341, 417, 514 of boldness in man's attitude to God (cf. Job 716).

In this passage ἐν παρεσεσθαι εἰναι signifies "to be boldly in public view," as in 1 Ἰω., where we have εἰναι παρεσεσθαι περιανί τοις ἱερασίοις; cf. Wisd. 5, 27, Col. 24. What the brethren of Jesus suggest is that to hide Himself in Galilee is incompatible with the claim for public recognition, as One sent by God, which He makes for Himself.

αὐτός τοιεσθε, "if you do these things," sc. the wonderful works with which rumour associated His name. The brethren do not express definite unbelief, but they are sceptical.

ἵνα γαρ εἰς ἄμοιον καὶ παραστασιν (DL have ἐπιστολας, which is plainly wrong) εἰς αὐτόν. The form of the sentence suggests that it is remarkable that His own kinsfolk did not believe in Jesus, the imperfect tense indicating their general attitude. For the constr. πιστεύσει τοι εἰς αὐτόν, see on 118. It is a favourite constr. in Ἰω., and it implies a belief in Jesus, as distinct from mere belief in His doctrine. It is used thus throughout this chapter (vv. 31, 38, 39, 41; and cf. 389), and its use at this point means that the brethren of Jesus did not believe in Him as Messiah. Their incredulity, as reported by Ἰω., is in accordance with the Synoptic narratives (cf. Mk. 3, Mt. 12, 13).

6. Μετα αὐτον. So ἩΒΔΛΝΩΔΑ, but om. αὐτον ΑΔ and syr. For αὐτον in Ἰω., see on 118.

ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐμὸς οὖσαν πάρταςιν, "my time is not yet come," καιρός is a word which Ἰω. uses only in this passage; it stands for the moment of opportunity, the fitting occasion, rather than for the "predestined hour" (ἡμερα), on which the Fourth Gospel dwells with such insistence (see on 2). The fitting time had not yet come. Jesus says in reply to the suggestion, "reveal Thyself to the world" (v. 4); and by this is meant not the hour of His Passion, but rather the best time for that public manifestation of Himself as Messiah, which Ἰω. would make when He went up to the Feast of Tabernacles (v. 8). Such public declaration was made, when He did go up: cf. vv. 20, 33, 53, 7 etc.

ὁ δὲ καιρὸς ὁ δικαιος πάρταςιν ἑτοι ἔτοιμος. Their case was different from His. It did not matter when they went up to the feast; it was one of strict obligation, but the exact day on which they would present themselves in Jerusalem was of no consequence, provided that they attended. Any day would be a fitting day (καιρός) for them to arrive, for they would not be received with hostility, but rather with indifference.

7. οὖς διανοεῖται οἱ κόσμοι μετα παρεσεσθαι, "the world (see on v. 4) cannot hate you," διανοεῖ becoming emphatic. We have adopted (see on 119) the ancient belief that "the Lord's brethren" were children of Joseph by His first wife, and were not numbered among the Twelve. The language of this verse shows, at any rate, that Ἰω. did not regard them as members of that select company, for it assumes that there was no reason why they should be regarded with disfavour by the Jews who were hostile to Jesus, as His accredited followers would certainly be (cf. 1213).

ὁ δὲ μετα. Cf. 518, 19, 24. The κόσμος which "hates" Jesus is that world which Ἰω. describes as lying in wickedness.
Jesus goes up secretly to the Feast of Tabernacles (v. 10-13)

10. ὁ δὲ ἠδύνασθαι κυθ. "When His brethren had gone up to the feast," the aor. being used like a pluperfect (cf. 2b and 4c).

This was His farewell to Galilee, as the scene of His public ministry.
Jesus teaches the people, but the Sanhedrin seek His arrest (vv. 24, 25-36)

14. Ἠλθεν δὲ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ μησούσης ἁνδρὸς Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ ἠδῶνας. 25. Ἐλεγεν δὲν τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἔθνος οὗτος ἢδονας.

In both cases, as here, the reference being to the ecclesiastical authorities who terrorised the people; cf. 9:32, 12:15. The common people were afraid to express any opinion in favour of Jesus, recollecting that, on His last visit, the Jews had been anxious to put Him to death (3:18).

Jesus teaches the Temple: He attracts the people, but the Sanhedrin seek His arrest (vv. 24, 25-36)

14. Ἠλθεν δὲ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ μησούσης καθ., “When the feast was half over.” The Feast of Tabernacles lasted for eight days (see on v. 2), so that this note of time (see Introd., p. cli, for Jn.’s liking for such notes) means that it was about the fourth day of the feast that Jesus presented Himself publically in the Temple. The verb μεταυοθη was not found again in the N.T., but it occurs in the LXX; cf. μεταυοθή γείτονας (Ex. 12:29, Judith 12:6).

ἀνδρὸς Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν. The Temple was on a hill, so that Ἰησοῦς is the appropriate word (cf. Lk. 18:39). The art. ὁ is omitted before Ἰησοῦς here by MBBT, appearing in DNTLBD (but see on v. 2).

καὶ καὶ ἠδῶνας, “and began to teach.” cf. v. 28, 300, 18:30.

This is the first notice of the public teaching of Jesus in Jerusalem, as distinct from the answers to objectors recorded in c. 5.

26. The section introduced by v. 14, and then including vv. 25-36, has no reference to the Sabbatical controversy. 1 The discussion about the breach of the Sabbath by Jesus, begun in c. 5, and ending with 7:35, is not continued on this visit to Jerusalem, which took place some months after the former one (see on 7:1). About the fourth day of the celebration of the Feast of Tabernacles (7:14) Jesus began to teach publicly in the Temple, and His teaching attracted the attention of the citizens, who began to ask themselves if He might not be the Messiah after all, although the Jewish leaders were seeking to arrest and silence Him (7:25-27). At this point, Jesus declares openly that His mission is from God, and that in a short time He will return to them (7:28-29). His strange language about Himself disconcerts the Pharisees, who say earnest words (7:29), but they do not arrest Him on this occasion.

Some of the Jews were impressed by the public teaching now begun (v. 14). τῶν ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἔθνων, sc. the

1 See Introd., p. xix, and on v. 1 above, for the dislocation of the text.

VII. 25-57.] Jesus Teaches in the Temple 273

26. καὶ καὶ οἱ παραφέροντες λαλοῦν, εἰς οὗ δὲν εἶναι ἡνίοχος ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς δέν ἐκ τῶν ἱερατευμένων Ὀχεῖς ἕνας ἢ ἕνας ἀνθρώπον ἡμῖν. 27. καὶ καὶ τίνος τίθεντος πάντων ἐκ τῶν ἱερατευμένων Ὀχεῖς ἕνας ἢ ἕνας ἀνθρώπον ἡμῖν. 28. καὶ καὶ τίνος τίθεντος πάντων ἐκ τῶν ἱερατευμένων Ὀχεῖς ἕνας ἢ ἕνας ἀνθρώπον ἡμῖν. 29. καὶ καὶ τίνος τίθεντος πάντων ἐκ τῶν ἱερατευμένων Ὀχεῖς ἕνας ἢ ἕνας ἀνθρώπον ἡμῖν. 30. καὶ καὶ τίνος τίθεντος πάντων ἐκ τῶν ἱερατευμένων Ὀχεῖς ἕνας ἢ ἕνας ἀνθρώπον ἡμῖν.
VII. 28-30.] HIS DIVINE MISSION

29. ἀγαπή αὐτοῦ, ὅτι παρ' αὐτῷ εἶμι κακὼς με ἀπέστειλεν. 30. ἔσχονον σὺν αὐτῶν πίσω, καὶ οὕτως ἐκαίνειν ἐκ

"knew what they worshipped" (4:12), they did not know God's character and purposes, and this scathing rebuke is addressed to them again (6:6, 14). That it might be said of heathen was not surprising (Gal. 4:4; 1 Thess. 2:11), and the persecutions of Christians in the future were mainly to spring from this ignorance (cf. 1:22); but here the sting of the words "whom ye know not," is that they were addressed to Jews, the chosen people.

29. After ἔγω, καὶ ἔνδικα; but om. BLTWNY. έγώ οἶδα αὐτόν. This is repeated verbally 8th, and again at 11th in the form έγώ δέ σα ἐγών. These three words contain the unique claim of Jesus, which is pressed all through the chapters of controversy with the Jews. But it is not more explicit, although it is more frequently expressed, in Jn. than in Mt. 11:27, Lk. 10:25.

30. παρ' αὐτῷ εἶμι, "because I am from Him." See on 6:3 for similar phrases in Jn., which imply a community of being between the Father and the Son (cf. 1:14 and 10:27, 30). καί ἐμοὶ με ἀπέστειλεν. This sentence is not dependent upon 29. ἔγω, I know Him, because I am from Him, is the first point. "And He sent me" is the second (see on 3:31), ἐν τούτῳ emphasizing the main subject of the sentence, as it often is in Jn. (see on 1:14).

For ἀπέστειλεν (BLTNW), ND have ἀποστέλλειν.

30. ἔσχονον σὺν αὐτῶν πίσω, "Then (ἐν, in consequence of the claims for Himself made by Jesus, vv. 28, 29) they (ἐν, the Jewish leaders already indicated as His opponents, vv. 1, 25) sought to arrest Him." This had been their purpose ever since the healing at the pool of Bethesda on a Sabbath day (4:13), their desire being to put Him to death (4:16, 5:2). The infin. ἔσχον marks in each case that the action was not completed; and so again at 7:4 (ὁ παρακαταστάλη) and 10:28 (ὡς ἐσόμενος). The original offence, of breaking the Sabbath (5:16, repeated 9th), comes less into prominence now, because of the greater offence of blasphemy (5:21) with which they henceforth charge Him. παρὰ τίς, to "take," is not found in the Synoptists; Jn. uses it again vv. 3, 45, 38, 10:28 of "arresting" Jesus (cf. Acts 1:19; 2 Cor. 11:25), and at 21:26 of "catching" Him.

οὐ δεδοθεὶς ἐπιστεύειν εἰς αὐτὸν τὴν γείρη, "and yet (οὐ being used for καίναι, as often in Jn.; see on 1:10) no one laid his hand on Him," the ecclesiastical authorities, no doubt, fearing to arrest one who had won attention from the people (cf. Mt. 21:40). These words are repeated almost verbatim at
VII. 31-32. ORDER FOR HIS ARREST

Φαρισαίοι τοῦ ὄχλου γαγγάζοντο περὶ αὐτοῦ ναῦτα, καὶ ἀνέστειλαν αὐτὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς ναύτου. Καὶ ἔστησαν τὸν ὄχλον τοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ ἐξάγοντος αὐτοῦ ὑπέρ τῆς ναύτου. Καὶ ἔστησαν τὸν ὄχλον τοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ ἐξάγοντος αὐτοῦ ὑπέρ τῆς ναύτου.

The evangelist is true to the historical situation when he notes that the Jews expected "signs" from Messiah, as indeed they did from any one claiming to be a prophet (2.18; 3.6; 9.2; cf. 1 Cor. 12). And the aim of the Fourth Gospel is to record selected "signs" of Jesus with the express purpose of proving Him to be the Christ (20.27).

The Sanhedrin (συνεδρίον) was the supreme council or high court of justice in Jerusalem during the period of the Roman occupation, and successive procurators left the administration of the law for the most part in its hands. It had no power to carry into execution a sentence of death, but it was the uniform policy of the Roman administration to support its authority. Three classes of members may be distinguished:

(1) The ἀρχιερεῖς, that is, the acting high priest, all ex-high priests, and probably some of their sons. They were the political, as well as the ecclesiastical, aristocrats of Jerusalem; and they occupied a position not unlike that of the Holy Synod in Russia before the Revolution, which comprised only the leading bishops, and had as presiding officer a highly placed layman. Their interests were centred in the Temple, and they had little concern for the synagogues, large part of those played in Jewish religious life. They were of the party known as that of "the Sadducees," a designation occurring only once in Mk., and not at all in Jn. (2) A second class, also belonging to the Sadducee interest, were known as ἀρχιερεῖς or elders: they were not priests, but were generally associated with them in policy, both the ἀρχιερεῖς and the ἀρχιερεῖς being in opposition to (3) the third class, who were the Pharisees or scribes or lawyers (the títles ἀρχιερεῖς and νομικοὶ are not found in Jn.). They were learned in the Jewish law and in the traditions that had grown up around it, being the party of austere and strict religious observance. Their influence showed itself in the synagogues rather than in the Temple, for the details of the ceremonial worship there did not come within their province. They regarded with apprehension the departure from traditional doctrines which

---

1 See Schürer, History of Jewish People, Eng. Tr., ii. 177 f., 203 f.
2 Thus Annas and Caiaphas are both called ἀρχιερεῖς (Lk. 3:1); and in Acts 4:6 we have ἁγιασμὸς ἀρχιερεῖον καὶ ἱερείων, although Annas was out of office at the time.
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN [VII. 32-34.]

Jesus encouraged, and it was they who first brought His teaching before the Sanhedrin (cf. 12:45). They associated themselves with the priestly or Sadducean party in bringing about His arrest and condemnation (18:1, Mt. 27:3), although the chief priests appear as the principal agents. Cf. 11:48.

Perhaps we should add that the arrest of Jesus was not recognized by the Sanhedrin. Cf. Mark, but NBDLThW. The rec. text, however, is not to be considered "firstly in order, which is obviously right. Without the consent of the archies, the arrest of Jesus could not have been ordered by the Sanhedrin. Of arches and of arches are coupled together again 11:48 (as also Mt. 27:3, 27:4), and the combination stands for the Sanhedrin as an organized council or court. They now sent officers of the Sanhedrin, or, as we might say, "Temple police" (apostolos; cf. v. 44, 15:12, 16, 16:16), to make the arrest, which some of them had been seeking (μετ' Ἰησοῦ, v. 30) to bring about.

33. ἐκεῖνος ἐδέχθη δ᾿ ἵν. If we press the causative force of ede, the meaning is that Jesus said that He would be only among them a little while longer, so that there was nothing to be gained by arresting Him. ede, however, (see on 12:30), is not always to be rendered "therefore," and may be only a conjunction, "and so,"

The rec. adds εἰς τέλος after ede, but om. NBDLThW.

περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τοῦ ἔλεγε. The end of His ministry was near, and He knew it; it would come in "a little while":—in fact in about six months. The phrase μετὰ τῶν ἁρών (or μετὰ alone) is repeatedly on His lips henceforth, according to Jn. (12:13-14:16). Cf. 9:11.

The rec. has μετὰ τῶν αὐτῶν (DNTG), but NBDLThW give the order μετὰ τῶν αὐτῶν. This was a saying of mystery, and the Jews could not understand it.

ἐπάγαγεν is a favourite verb with Jn., and it is often used in the Gospel of Jesus "going to God," (cf. 8:41, 13:2, 3, 33, 38, 14:6, 15:14, 16, 16:27). It means strictly "to depart," and so is specially appropriate of the withdrawal of Christ's visible presence from among men, and His "going to be Father," or "going home." See on 15:16; 16:7; and cf. Mk. 14:1 ὁ μίαν μῖαν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐφόσον καθὼς γέγραφαν.

34. ἵπτετε. This is certainly the true text, only two

VII. 34-35.] HIS WORDS PERPLEX THEM 279

...οὐδεὶς διὰ σκέπασμα ἔλλειπεν. 35. ἦσαν αὐτοί οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι πρὸς ἑαυτούς. Πῶς οὗτος μέλλει περιεχεῖται, ὅτι ἦμεν ἐγὼ ἐφήσαμεν αὐτοῖς; μή ἐστιν τὴν διατομὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων μέλλει περιεχεῖται καὶ διδάσκειν τούτος ΜSS., II and 69, reading ἐπεμεῖνε. None the less, the Vulgate has guanirtex, this being one of the renderings which suggest to some that Jerome followed a type of Greek manuscript of which we know little.

With arrest and condemnation (18:1, Mt. 27:3), although the chief priests appear as the principal agents. Cf. 11:48.

The rec. text, however, is not to be considered "firstly in order, which is obviously right. Without the consent of the archies, the arrest of Jesus could not have been ordered by the Sanhedrin. Of arches and of arches are coupled together again 11:48 (as also Mt. 27:3, 27:4), and the combination stands for the Sanhedrin as an organized council or court. They now sent officers of the Sanhedrin, or, as we might say, "Temple police" (apostolos; cf. v. 44, 15:12, 16, 16:16), to make the arrest, which some of them had been seeking (μετ' Ἰησοῦ, v. 30) to bring about.

33. ἐκεῖνος ἐδέχθη δ᾿ ἵν. If we press the causative force of ede, the meaning is that Jesus said that He would be only among them a little while longer, so that there was nothing to be gained by arresting Him. ede, however (see on 12:30), is not always to be rendered "therefore," and may be only a conjunction, "and so,"

The rec. adds εἰς τέλος after ede, but om. NBDLThW.

περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τοῦ ἔλεγε. The end of His ministry was near, and He knew it; it would come in "a little while":—in fact in about six months. The phrase μετὰ τῶν ἁρών (or μετὰ alone) is repeatedly on His lips henceforth, according to Jn. (12:13-14:16). Cf. 9:11.

The rec. has μετὰ τῶν αὐτῶν (DNTG), but NBDLThW give the order μετὰ τῶν αὐτῶν. This was a saying of mystery, and the Jews could not understand it.

ἐπάγαγεν is a favourite verb with Jn., and it is often used in the Gospel of Jesus "going to God," (cf. 8:41, 13:2, 3, 33, 38, 14:6, 15:14, 16, 16:27). It means strictly "to depart," and so is specially appropriate of the withdrawal of Christ's visible presence from among men, and His "going to be Father," or "going home." See on 15:16; 16:7; and cf. Mk. 14:1 ὁ μίαν μῖαν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐφόσον καθὼς γέγραφαν.

34. ἵπτετε. This is certainly the true text, only two
THE WATER OF LIFE

38. ὁ πνεῦμα ἐλήμεν ἡ γραφή, πονηρόν ἐκ τῆς καλούς observances. The ritual on each day, and probably on the eighth day also (although this seems to be uncertain), comprised an offering of water, perhaps (when the rite was initiated) symbolizing abundance of rain to ensure a good crop at the next harvest. Rabbi Akiba says as much: "Bring the libation of water at the Feast of Tabernacles, that the showers may be blessed to thee. And accordingly it is said that whoever will not come up to the Feast of Tabernacles shall have no rain." At any rate, a golden vessel was filled with water from the Pool of Siloam, and the water was solemnly offered by the priest, the singers chanting, "With joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation" (Isa. 12).

This water ceremonial may have suggested the words of Jesus: "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink." (38. καθὼς ἦλθε ἡ γραφή κηλ. ἡ γραφή always indicates a specific passage in the O.T. (see on 220), although (cf. v. 42 below) the quotation may not always be exact. Here, the source of the quotation cannot be identified with certainty, although, as we shall see, the idea of v. 38 is scriptural. The fact that we cannot precisely fix the quotation makes for the genuineness of the reminiscence here recorded. A writer whose aim was merely to edify, and who did not endeavour to reproduce historical incidents, would not have placed in the mouth of Jesus a scriptural quotation which no one has ever been able to identify exactly.

The passage has been punctuated in various ways:

(1) Chrysostom confines the quotation to the words "be that believeth in me," taking the rest of v. 38 as words of Jesus. Thus the "scripture" might be Isa. 28, quoted in Rom. 9, in the form ὁ πνεῦμα ἐς ἀνετὸ ὧν καταυθισμέναι. But this exegesis is a mere evasion of the difficulties.

(2) Some ancient Western authorities connect πνεῦμα with ὁ πνεῦμα ἐς ἀνετοῖς which follows, putting a stop after ἀνετοῖς: "If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and let him drink that believeth on me." As the Scripture saith, Out of His belly shall flow rivers of living water." By this arrangement, ἀνετοῖς is understood of Christ, not of the believer.

The colometry of the O.C. codices δ and ε would agree with this punctuation. The Letter of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons has... πνεῦμα τῆς ὑδάτος ὧν ἐκέλευσις ἐκ τῆς ἀγγελίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ, which takes ἀνετοῖς as meaning Christ.

1 See on 228 for this form.
So also Cyprian has "clamat dominus ut qui sitem uniet et bibat de fonte vitae ut sine copula de eis non diluculet." Many Western Fathers are cited to the same effect by Turner. Loisy and some other modern exeges favour this view.

Burckle held that this arrangement of clauses represented the sense, the Greek κολλήν being due to a misunderstandings of the underlying Aramaic, and a confusion of ἐσσόμενον "fountain." He rendered v. 38 accordingly, "As the scripture hath said, Rivers shall flow forth from the fountain of living waters," the allusion being to Ezek. 47. C. C. Torrey also appeals to the Aramaic, rendering "As the Scripture hath said, Out of the midst of her (i.e. Jerusalem) shall rivers of living waters," the reference being to Zech. 14. These explanations are ingenious, but they do not disclose any exact citation from the O.T.

(3) We prefer the Eastern exegesis here. Origen is explicit in his reference of ἡ υδρόποτος to the believer in Christ: ἐν τῷ νερῷ ζωῆς ἐκπράξει ἐν τῷ νερῷ τῆς ζωῆς ἐν τῷ νερῷ τῆς ζωῆς ἐν τῷ νερῷ τῆς ζωῆς. So, too, Cyril of Jerusalem (Car. xvi. 12), Basil (in Ps. 46), and Athanasius (Pistil. Lat., ix. 7, xiv.). That Christ is the ultimate source of living water, which represents the Spirit, is common to all interpretations; but these writers understand also that those who receive it from Him hand it on in their turn to others. So in the Odes of Solomon (vi) we have Christ the χείμαρρος ποτήριος of living water spreading over the world, while the ministers of this draught of the Spirit relieve many. This is the Johannine doctrine of the Spirit, appearing again in another form at John 7.

The reference of ἡ υδρόποτος to the believer in Christ is in strict correspondence with the earlier passage 48-34, where it is said of the water which Christ gives that it will be in the believer πνεύματος ἐν ἐνεσθην εἰς αὐτῶν ὁ δεύτερος γέρον is of the water which Christ gives that it will be in the believer πνεύματος ἐν ἐνεσθην εἰς αὐτῶν ὁ δεύτερος γέρον.

The κολλήν is regarded in the O.T. as the seat of man's emotional nature (Prov. 295). Water is often symbolic of the Divine Law (see on 46), and the Law is in the heart "(Ps. 46) of Yahweh's servant, or, as some LXX texts have it, ἐν μέσῳ τῆς κολλῆς μου. The Psalm goes on: "I have not hid thy righteousness within my heart, I have declared thy faithfulness" (Ps. 46). So again in Prov. 18 we have: ἐν κολλῇ δύναται ὁ λέγων ἐν κολλῇ δύναται ὁ λέγων. Hence the O.T. conception is that the Divine Law is in the heart (κολλή or κολλή) of one inspired by the Spirit of Yahweh, like a fountain which cannot be repressed, but which perpetually sends forth a stream of living water. This is the Johannine teaching of 7.

The use of κολλή is in accordance with the Semitic habit of expressing emphasis 1 by mentioning some part of the body, e.g. "the mouth of Yahweh hath spoken it," "His arm brought salvation." "Out of his belly" is only an emphatic way of saying "From him shall flow." The living waters to the thought of the prophets (Zech. 14, Ezek. 47) flowed from a holy place, viz. Jerusalem; but here they are said to flow from a holy man, viz. one who has believed in Christ.

There is no difficulty in the construction, διὰ πνεύματος εἰς ζωῆς being a suspended subject; cf. 15 διὰ λαβων εἰς ζωῆς τῶν μεταποιήσεων, and see on 113.

98. τῷ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς τὸν μεταπόστ. We have here an additional commentary by the evangelist on the words of Jesus which precede it; see, for similar comments, Introd., p. xxxiv. In this passage, at any rate, there can be no question of the accuracy of the interpretation. The Living Water sym-

1 See Barnes. J.T.S. July 1022, p. 421.
bolizes the Spirit, which believers in Christ (not only the original disciples) were (XXVII, cf. 67) to receive (cf. 1:28, 1:28). As Paul has it πνεύμα τό πνεύμα τοῦ θεού (1 Cor. 13:10), the metaphor of the Spirit as water, being the same as here.

Lightfoot (Hor. Hbr. iii. 322) quotes a passage from the Talmud, showing that even by the Jews the libation of water at the Feast of Tabernacles (see v. 37) was taken to symbolise the outpouring of the Spirit: "Why do they call it the house of drawing? Because hence they draw the Holy Spirit." (Bereskh. Rabba, fol. 70. 1). The Jews held that the Holy Spirit had departed after the deaths of Zechariah and Malachi, the last of the prophets, and they looked for a future outpouring (Joel 2:28, cf. Acts 2:7).

The various readings are mainly due to attempts at interpretation. πνεύμα have πνεύμα, but BLTW have πνεύμα, the words primarily referring to the reception of the Spirit by the original group of disciples. πνεύμα has for the better attested πνεύμα. In the second clause of the verse, scribes have defined πνεύμα by the insertion of ἄγων (NTWIA). πνεύμα ἄγων ἐν τῷ ἅγων, and ἄγων ἐν ἅγων. LNTWIA have ἄγων for ἄγων (the reading of NDIB) before διδασκάλιον.

For the force of πνεύμας ἐν τῷ ἅγων, see on v. 5. πνεύμα γὰρ τῷ πνεύμα, i.e. the Spirit was not yet operating or not yet present, ἄγων being used for παραβία, as in Acts 15:9 ἄγων ἐν τῷ πνεύμα ἄγων ἐστιν ἡ κοινωνία. The Ephesian disciples could not have doubted the existence of the Holy Spirit; it was His presence or His operation of which they were doubtful. See also on 6:15.

Attempts have been made to distinguish τῷ πνεύμα, with the article, from πνεύμα without it; the former standing for the personal Spirit, the latter for a gift or manifestation of the Spirit. The distinction may hold sometimes, but here it is hard to maintain it: "He spake περὶ τῶν πνευμάτων, which they who believed on Him were to receive: for πνεύμα was not yet." We should expect, if the proposed rule about the article were sound, that at its first occurrence in this verse πνεύμα should be without it. See above on 5:24.

πνεύμα γὰρ τῷ πνεύμα, ὅτι τῷ Ἰησοῦς φῶς ἐξανεβάλεν. Here Jn. introduces a conception, not explicit outside the Fourth Gospel, of the Passion of Jesus as His "glorification" (see on 1:12). It is the word used by Jesus Himself (1:28, and by anticipation 1:4), and Jn. uses it again in his narrative (1:16). This is the supreme illustration of the saying that "be that hasteth his life shall keep it" (see on 12:26). It is the continual paradox of the Gospel that death is the beginning of new life. And so it was not until Jesus had been "glorified" in death that the Spirit came upon those who were "in Him." The seed is not quickened except it die, and, to the thought of Paul, it was not until His Resurrection after death that Christ became a quickening Spirit, πνεύμα ζωοποιοῦντος (1 Cor. 15:55). Not until He had passed through death could His Spirit descend. Not until the Passion was over could He say ἐστήκατε πνεύμα ἄγων (20:21). Pentecost was, necessarily, after Calvary. This great conception is common to Paul and Jn. (cf. 10:7 15:21); and it follows from it that the death of the Incarnate Word was His "glorification." Cf. 17:1, and see further on 16.

The verb ἀναπτύσσω is used more than once in the death of a Christian martyr in later literature. Not only in the case of Christ (15:18, 21) it might be said that martyrdom was a "glorification" of the martyr himself; e.g. in the Canons of Peter of Alexandria (circa 300 A.D.) we have: ἀνέστη τὸ πνεύμα τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἁγίων τῶν μαρτύρων λαοῦ τῆς Χριστοῦ ἐλευθερίας. The martyr's sign of victory, was the place of his death. 2

40. That many of the multitude (ἐπληθυία) believed in Jesus' claims has been told already (v. 31).

ἐν τῷ ἅγων ἄνεστε τῶν λόγων τῶν ιδιων ἐκτ. We must supply τινὲς (as at 10:22): "some of the crowd." The rec. text inserts ἀνεστή (from v. 31), but om. NDIBLNTW. Again, the rec. text reads τῶν λόγων, but NDIBL have τῶν λόγων τῶν ἱδιων.

We are not to take vv. 40-43 as referring exclusively or particularly to the effect produced by the great pronouncement of vv. 37, 38. τῶν λόγων τῶν ἱδιων includes the whole of the teaching which Jesus had given during the feast (vv. 25-38).

This teaching was appreciated by some of His hearers, for ἀνεστή followed by a gen. implies (see on 3:5) an intelligent and obedient hearing (a point which is obscured by the acc. τῶν λόγων of the rec. text).

No doubt, the climax of the teaching was reached vv. 37, 38. The hearers of the words, "Out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water," recognised that the claim involved was that He, of whose disciples such a thing could be asserted, was inspired in a peculiar degree by the Spirit of Yahweh. He must be the authorised exponent and missionary of the Law.

1 Reinhart, Rel. Sacr., iv. 34. 2 E.B. 4594.
Accordingly, some identified the speaker with "the prophet," the predestined successor of Moses. (See on 11 and 14.)

41. ἄλλοι δὲ λέγοντες ἦσαν ὁ Χριστός· οἱ δὲ λέγοντες Μὴ γὰρ ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ὁ Χριστός ἔρχεται; 42. συν ἦ γὰρ ἔτεκεν ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ πέρατος Δαυίδ, καὶ ἀνὰ βυθίων τῆς κοίμησις ἔζηκεν τῇ Δαυίδ, ἐρημώτα τῷ Χριστῷ; 43. σχέσις δὲ μὲν ἐν νησίῳ ἐν τῷ θαλάσσῳ δὲ αὐτῶν; 44. τάν τις δὲ ἱδρυετός ἐν τοῖς κατακόρους τῶν ἱδρυῶν, ἔλλοι αὐτός ἔγειρεν εἰκόνες.

Others went further, and said He was the Messiah Himself (cf. vv. 35, 37; and see on 19). The imperfects ἔλεγον... λέγοντες indicate that such was the common talk.

For οἱ δὲ λέγοντες in the second clause (BLTN)&, ἄλλοι λέγοντες is given again by καὶ τοι, and this may be right; cf. ἄλλοι... ἔλεγον at 99.

The introductory ἰφίλετα... implies a negative answer.

41, 42. "Dost the Christ come out of Galilee?" They were incredulous, because the Scriptures had led them to believe that He would be "the seed of David" (2 Sam. 5:5, 2:18-19, Ps. 132:11a), and from David's village (Mic. 5:2), and from Bethlehem (Mic. 2:2), and they were surprised that one coming from Galilee should be regarded as fulfilling these conditions. It is characteristic of the "irony of St. John" (see on 10a) that he does not stay his narrative to make any comment. His readers were, he was sure, well instructed in the Christian tradition that Jesus was born at Bethlehem, while His home was at Nazareth in Galilee. See on v. 52.

The suggestion (see on 198) that in Jn. the prepositions ἐν οίς and ἐκ may be distinguished in usage, the former applying to dominium and the latter to berthopie, will not apply here. Micah (5:5) said of Bethlehem ἐκ ὧν ἐγένετο, but this is changed to ἐκ ὧν ἔγενετο (v. 42); and not only so, but the preposition ἐκ is applied to Galilee, where ἐν ὧν would be more appropriate, if the distinction could be sustained. See on 191.

43. σχέσις δὲ μὲν ἐν νησίῳ ἐν τῷ θαλάσσῳ δὲ αὐτῶν. The people were divided in opinion about Him, as before (v. 22). A similar schism among the "Pharisees" and "Jews" is noted again, 98a

44. This verse is repeated, with slight changes, from v. 30, where see note; cf. also 99.

The answer to the question, "Why did you not bring Him?" is surprising and unwelcome: "Never did man so speak." These official servants of the Sanhedrin had been impressed, as the Galilean peasants had been impressed (Mt. 27:28), by the power of Jesus' teaching. It is not to be supposed that vv. 33, 34, 37, 38, give more than fragments of what He said since the order was given for His arrest (v. 32); but it is noticeable that it was His words, not His works, that attracted attention, and it must have been disconcerting to those who were habitual teachers of the Law, to learn that the words of the new Teacher had made so deep an impression. His words were unique and without parallel, as also were His works, which He said were such as "none other did" (158).
INTERVENTION OF NICODEMUS

50. Ἀλλὰ τὸ πρῶτον ἐπὶ αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ τοιοῦτο οὔτε ἕνεκος ἐξελέγη, ἢ ἕνεκος ἢ ἔδρωσε. Αἰτηθῶντες τὸν Ἱουσσαφοῦς αὐτοῦ τοῦ Φαραώου ΜΗ καὶ ἡμᾶς πεπλήθησαν; 48. μὴ τις τοῦ ἄρχοντος ἑπτάκοντα εἰς αὐτὸν ἢ εἰς τοὺς Φαραώους; 49. ἄλλα δὲ ὄχλος ὁ τοῦ ἔκτροφος αὐτῶν ἢ μὴ γινόμενος τῶν νόμων ἐπεφάρτο τίνων αὐτῶν. 50. Λέγει Νικόδημος πρὸς αὐτοῖς, ἢ ἀλλιώς πρὸς αὐτὸν πρότερον, εἰ μὴ ἔν τις αὐτῶν, μὴ τοῦ ἔκτροφος ἑπτάκοντα εἰς αὐτὸν τόμος μηδὲ τοῦ Φαραώους άλλῃ μὴ

After ἐπέκακαν ὁ οὕτως ἐδρώσε, καὶ ὁ Ἱουσσαφός ἐπὶ τοῖς ἔδρωσε. These additional words are omitted by καὶ ὅστε δὲ καὶ τοῦ βλεπτοῦν τοῦ ἐκτροφοῦς αὐτῶν. αὐτῶν. See on 67 for the form of the question, which suggests that a negative answer is expected. Cf. v. 12 for πλῆθος.

48. μὴ τις τοῦ ἄρχοντος ἑπτάκοντα εἰς αὐτῶν. "Did any one of the rulers believe in Him?" the form of the question, μὴ τις, implying that a negative answer was the only possible one. Yet, a little later, this astonishing thing had come to pass, ἢ τῶν ἀρχῶντων ἑπτάκοντα εἰς αὐτῶν (126); but at this moment it seemed incredible. See on v. 32 for the ἐπέκακαν, and cf. v. 50. ἢ τοῦ ἱουσσαφοῦς; "Or a single one of the Pharisees?"

Only a select few of the Pharisees were in the Sanhedrin, but the Pharisees generally were the most orthodox of all the inhabitants of Jerusalem (cf. 134, 141).

The ἐπέκακαν are blamed severely because they did not do as they were told, and it is truly remarkable that they had not arrested Jesus. Subordinate officers, the Pharisees seem to say, have no right to judge of the expediency of an order which they have received.

49. ἄλλα δὲ ὄχλος ὁ τοῦ μὴ γινόμενος τῶν νόμων ἐπεφάρτο τίνων αὐτῶν. The Rabbis had a profound contempt for the unlettered multitude, ἡμῖν ἐπὶ, who were not learned in the Torah. ἐπεφάρτος does not occur again in the N.T.

Intervention of Nicodemus (vv. 50–52)

50. Λέγει Νικ. πρὸς αὐτοῖς, τοιοῦτο to the Pharisees. For this constr., see on 24. εἰς ὅν ἐπὶ ἐνδήμην, etc. being a member of the Sanhedrin, and so taking up the challenge of v. 48. For the constr., see on 24. Most MSS. add ἢ δὲ ἔν τις πρὸς αὐτὸν πρότερον, thus identifying Nicodemus with the person described in 31. καὶ omit...
Galilean proverb, as such was a proverb, as the form of the sentence might suggest. It is a merely contemptuous assertion, "Out of Galilee is not arising a prophet" (cf. v. 42). See on 1.

ἀπώ is not to be translated "for," but "that."

For the verb ἐπάω, see above on 5, the only other place where it is found in ΙΝ. Possibly ἐπάω has reference here also to a searching of the Scriptures; but it is more probable that the meaning is "if you will take the trouble to look, you will see that out of Galilee no prophet is arising." Cf. 2 Kings 10 ἑκατοντάρχαι καὶ στεφάνη, where ἑκατοντάρχαι is only ampliative of ἑκατος, as here.

[For 7-8 see the notes at the end of Vol. II. on the Pericope de Adultera.]