

traditional sayings of Jesus) is found in Matthew, or Mark, or Luke, or in all three; and there is also a reference to an incident recorded by Mark alone; (5) he never, as from these memoirs, quotes any words, or alleges any incidents not found in our Matthew, Mark, or Luke; (6) he never quotes any rival Gospel, nor alleges any words or facts which make it probable he used a rival Gospel; (7) such non-canonical sayings and facts as he mentions are readily explicable as the results of lapse of memory, general looseness and inaccuracy, extending to the use of the Old as well as the New Testament, and the desire to adapt the facts of the new scriptures to the prophecies of the old. Our conclusion is that the memoirs of the apostles which include so much that is contained in our first three Gospels, and which were continuously read in the services of the church from the time of Justin downwards, cannot have passed into oblivion a few years afterwards, so as to have given place to rival Gospels not known to Justin. They must be identical with the Gospels, to some or all of which testimony is successively borne by Marcion (140 A.D.) in spite of his arbitrary and entirely uncritical excisions; by the heretical Clementine Homilies (160 A.D.) in spite of occasional use of apocryphal sources; by the Muratorian fragment (170 A.D.); by Athenagoras and Ptolemaeus, and the churches of Vienna and Lyons (177 A.D.); till the century closes with the affirmation of Irenæus, who not only uses three synoptical Gospels with the Fourth so fully as to leave no doubt of the identity of his Gospels with ours, but also is so convinced of the essential necessity that there should be four and only four Gospels, that he discerns in the quadriform nature of the cherubim a type of the pre-ordained quadriform nature of the records of the life of Christ.<sup>1</sup>

In the foregoing remarks attention has been mainly directed to definite evidence, whether external or internal. Limits of space, as well as other considerations, prevent the discussion of that more indefinite evidence which might perhaps be called indirect external evidence, and which would treat of the influences amid which the Gospels grew up and by which they were likely to be moulded. For such a discussion it would be necessary that we should place ourselves in the position of a disciple in some early congregation of Jewish or Gentile Christians, and endeavour to realize the influence exerted upon the Christian records—(1) by prophecy; (2) by heathen religions; (3) by Eastern metaphor acting upon Western literalism; (4)

The Gospel of the Hebrews.

<sup>1</sup> As a good deal of stress has been laid upon the apocryphal Gospel of the Hebrews, from which (according to the testimony of Jerome, Kirchhofer, p. 449) Ignatius quoted, it may be well to show that this was later than our Gospels. (1) We have seen above (p. 807) that in the common tradition Ἰησοῦς is habitually employed, and that the use of ὁ Κύριος, "the Lord," in narrative is a sure sign of later origin; but "the Lord" is habitually used in the narrative of the Gospel of the Hebrews (see Kirchhofer, pp. 450, 453, 454). (2) It softens several difficulties: (a) in the story of the rich young man, the Lord says to him, "Behold, many of the brethren, sons of Abraham, are covered with dung and dying for hunger, and thy house is full with many good things, and ought goeth forth at all from thee to them," thereby blunting the point of the young man's rejection; (b) after the words "If thy brother shall sin against thee" (cf. Matt. xviii. 22), Jesus adds, in the Gospel of the Hebrews, "in word, and if he shall make thee amend" (Jb. p. 454) (*in verbo et satis tibi fecerit*); (c) the error in Matt. xxiii. 35, "son of Barachiah," is corrected into "filium Jôjadæ" (Jb. p. 455). (3) It increases the marvellous element: (a) at the baptism of Jesus, "It came to pass when the Lord was come up from the water, the whole fountain of the Holy Spirit came down and rested upon Him, and said to Him, O My Son, in all the prophets I was awaiting Thee, that Thou mightest come, and that I might find rest in Thee; for Thou art My rest, Thou art My first-born Son, who reignest for ever" (Jb. p. 454). (b) hence the Holy Spirit is called the Mother of the Lord, and it is said by the Lord, "But now My Mother, the Holy Spirit, took Me by one of My hairs, and carried Me away to the Mount Tabor" (Jb. p. 451); (c) after His resurrection, it is added that the Lord ordered a table and bread to be brought, and caused His brother James to break his fast, when James had sworn not to eat bread till he had seen the Lord; in this story James is called "James the Just," a title which in itself is a mark of late composition.

To this note we may add that Celsus, towards the end of the second century, speaks of "the writings of the disciples of Jesus" (Jb. p. 330) as the source of his information, and mentions nothing (so far as we know) of any importance that is not found in our Gospels. It is true that Origen (*Cont. Cels.*, ii. 74), in answer to Celsus's boast that he had crushed the Christians with facts taken from their own writings, replies, "But we showed (above) that there has been a great deal of nonsensical blundering, contrary (*παρά*) to the writings of our Gospels," &c.; but if we refer to what has gone before, we find that Origen is referring (1) to Celsus's unfair inaccuracy, e.g., in saying that Jesus was betrayed, not by one disciple, but by His disciples; (2) to such blunders as the confusion of "Chaldeans" with "Magi"; (3) to his ignorance of the number of the disciples, &c. There is therefore every reason to believe—for if Celsus had attacked any apocryphal narratives as representing the faith of Christ, Origen could not have failed to take advantage of the triumphant rejoinder which such a mistake would have afforded him—that an assailant of Christianity, writing before the end of the second century, knew of no writings of the disciples of Christ upon which he could base any effective attacks against their religion, except our four Gospels.

by the ritual and language of the Lord's Supper; (5) by the universal predilection for the marvellous; (6) by the fall of Jerusalem. The results thus obtained would be in a great measure conjectural; but, compared step by step with the results deduced above, they would enable the reader to feel additional confidence in conclusions supported by the double confirmation of indirect as well as direct evidence. The best work in English bearing on this subject is probably the translation of Keim's *Jesus of Nazara* (London, 1876-79); and there is also much valuable information in the Appendices to Canon Farrar's *Life of Christ*.

#### THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

##### Authorship.

*Evidence from earliest Tradition.*—Before considering the subject matter of this Gospel, it will be well to consider the evidence, direct and indirect, bearing on the authorship. The author is not mentioned in the Gospel by name, but only as "the disciple whom Jesus loved" (xxi. 24, 20), "which also leaned on His breast," and to whom Jesus commended His mother from the cross (xix. 26; xiii. 23). The first writer who mentions John as the author in connexion with a passage quoted from our Fourth Gospel is said to be Theophilus, who wrote towards the close of the second century (170-180 A.D.). The Muratorian fragment (170 A.D.) speaks of the apostle as the author of a Gospel, but does not quote from it. But Theophilus quotes Jo. i. 1, as written by John, one of those "inspired by the Spirit" (*πνευματοφύρον*).<sup>2</sup> It is a natural inference that Theophilus (at so late a date), using the name thus without further definition, meant by "John," the "John" best known to his readers, i.e., John, the son of Zebedee, the apostle. But there is unusually strong evidence to show that John the apostle wrote the Apocalypse, so strong that we may assume the apostolic authorship of that book with more confidence than the authorship of any other book in the New Testament, except some of Paul's epistles. The question therefore arises, how far does the style of the Gospel, which was said by Theophilus (170-180 A.D.) to have been written by John (presumably the apostle), agree with the style of the Apocalypse, which we have so good reason for believing to have been written by the apostle John? If we assume John to have been four or five years younger than his Master, he would be, according to the commonly received date (68 A.D.) of the Apocalypse, about sixty-seven or sixty-eight years of age when he wrote that work. By that age (one would suppose) an author's style would, if ever, have reached its maturity. Even if he were ten years younger than Jesus, so that he was only a little over sixty years of age, yet his style would not be capable of a complete transformation. But when the Gospel is compared with the Apocalypse, instead of similarity, we find an almost complete contrast.<sup>3</sup> The vocabulary, the forms, the idioms, the rhythm, the thought—all is different. That the Apocalypse and the

<sup>2</sup> Such at least is the statement of Kirchhofer (p. 153), and it has been reproduced in modern books. But part of the period of Irenæus might precede part of the period of Theophilus; and Irenæus quotes John's Gospel (xx. 31) as from "John the disciple of the Lord," in a passage of his work *Against Heresies* (III. xvi. 5, or ed. Grabe, iii. 18), a passage omitted by Kirchhofer.

<sup>3</sup> It is not necessary, however, to deny that the Gospel exhibits traces of the Apocalyptic doctrine and thought. On the contrary, the impression left by a comparison of the two is, that the Gospel exhibits an attempt to refine and spiritualize some of the more material and concrete expressions of the Apocalypse. From this point of view, we may say that "the Gospel is the spiritual interpretation of the Apocalypse. . . . The active and manifold religious thought of Ephesus furnished the intellectual assistance which was needed to exhibit Christianity as the absolute and historical religion in contrast with Judaism and heathenism" (Westcott, *Introd. to St. John*).

Fourth Gospel should have been written by the same author would be, we will not say impossible, but one of the most marvellous literary phenomena ever authenticated. The change in Shakespeare's style, or in the style of Burke, cannot be compared with this; for those changes can be in part explained by the transition from youth to maturity or old age. Here we have to explain how a writer could completely change language, style, and thought, after the age of sixty or sixty-seven years. It is possible, but *a priori* highly improbable.

It has indeed been suggested that this change of language may be explained by the lapse of more than thirty years, during which the author was living in the midst of a Gentile population. This assumes that the Apocalypse was written in 68 A.D., before John had resided in Ephesus, and that he wrote the Gospel at the age of ninety-eight. But (1) the minute knowledge of the Seven Churches (Rev. i. ii. iii.) makes it probable that the writer had resided for some time in their neighbourhood; (2) the composition of such a work as the Fourth Gospel at the age of ninety-eight is in itself unlikely; (3) it is by no means certain that the Apocalypse was written in 68 A.D., and not rather in 78 A.D., simultaneously with the fourth Sibylline Book (and the later the date of the Apocalypse the shorter the interval between it and the Fourth Gospel, and the more improbable becomes the theory of the change of style). An hypothesis based upon three hypotheses, themselves not proved or improbable, requires much evidence before it can be accepted.

There is yet another difficulty in the way of believing that John the apostle is the author: the words of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel (1) differ altogether in style and rhythm from the synoptic tradition of the words of the Lord, and (2) do not differ at all from the author's own remarks and observations. So great is the similarity between the words of the writer and the words which are assigned by him either to our Lord or to John the Baptist that Dr Westcott, commenting on Jo. iii. 10-21, 27-36, says (*Introduction to the Gospels*, p. 292), "It is impossible not to feel that the evangelist is in fact commenting on and explaining the testimony which he records. The comments seem to begin respectively at verses 16 and 31." The words italicized (not by Dr Westcott) require little comment. It is obvious that a biographer, who so mixes the words of his characters with observations of his own that a most careful and scholarlike commentator is unable to feel sure where the words of the characters end and the observations of the author "seem to begin," cannot be supposed to be exactly recording, scarcely even to be attempting to record with exactness, the words of the characters themselves. Yet it seems impossible that the "disciple whom Jesus loved" should either remember his Master's words so ill, or else deliberately transmute them into entirely different language of his own. A work of this kind, notwithstanding the presence of historical elements, seems rather to deserve to be called a poem, or a drama, than a biography; and accordingly the same careful commentator who is quoted above declares that "the spirit of parallelism, the instinctive perception of symmetry in thought and expression, which is the essential and informing spirit of Hebrew poetry, runs through the whole record" (*Introd. to the Gospel of St. John*). Such a work does not seem likely to have proceeded from one of the sons of Zebedee, a fisherman of the lake district of Galilee, not indeed a poor man, but still not a man of letters nor of any great literary culture.

"The earliest account of the origins of the Gospel is already legendary" (Westcott, *Introduction to the Gospels*, p. 255), as given in the fragment of Muratori (A.D. 170). It is there said that, being requested by his fellow-disciples and bishops to write, John desired them to fast for three

days, and then to relate to one another what revelation each had received either for or against the project. The same night it was revealed to Andrew, one of the apostles, that "while all called (the past) to mind (or while all revised,—*cunctis recognoscentibus*), John should write everything in his own name." Legendary though this account may be, it curiously agrees with a passage in the Gospel itself which implies that others besides the author were "revising," or otherwise assisting in, the work: "This is the disciple which testified of these things and wrote these things: and we know that his testimony is true" (xxi. 24). Yet immediately afterwards—in a sentence which, though omitted by Tischendorf, is supported by the MSS. almost without exception—the singular number is resumed: "I suppose that the world could not contain the books that should be written." This passage certainly seems to indicate some kind of joint authorship or revision, or at all events a desire to convey the impression of joint authorship or revision, such as the Muratorian fragment describes. The theory of joint authorship or revision is confirmed by evidence derivable from the 1st Epistle of John, which is justly regarded (Lightfoot, *Contemp. Rev.*, 1875) as a kind of postscript to the Gospel. It begins (like the Gospel, and unlike the Apocalypse, as also unlike the 2d and 3d Epistles of John) without mention of the author's name, and in the plural number: "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us." Yet at the conclusion of the first chapter, as though it were to be understood that the whole was written "in the name of John" ("suo nomine," as the Muratorian fragment has it), the singular number is used, "these things write I unto you" (1 Jo. ii. 1, 7, 12, 13, 14, 21; v. 16).<sup>1</sup> So far therefore as we have gone, the evidence is very decidedly against the supposition that John the apostle was the sole author of the Fourth Gospel. He may have written it (1) through an amanuensis or disciple, who translated his language (and possibly his thoughts also) in the process of expressing them (just as Paul is said by some to have written the Epistle to the Hebrews in Hebrew, and to have had it freely rendered by one of his followers);<sup>2</sup> or (2) it may have been an attempt on the part of a leading teacher of the Johannine school at Ephesus to reproduce the spirit of their Master's teaching after He had been taken from them by death, an attempt of one of the Ephesian elders to reproduce John once again in their church, surrounded by Andrew and Philip and Aristion and the rest of the disciples of the Lord, the former proclaiming and all the rest assenting to "that which they had heard, and that which they had seen with their eyes."<sup>3</sup> If during the latter years of his life John was infirm and bedridden, obliged to preach and teach by deputy,<sup>4</sup> it is obvious that the "teaching of John" during the last eight years of his life, when the old man was now past ninety years of age, might be

<sup>1</sup> Of course the "we," whereby the writer identifies himself with his readers (ii. 8 and *passim*), is quite different from the "we" mentioned above.

<sup>2</sup> The statement that Papias "wrote out the Gospel at the dictation of John," quoted by Westcott (*Canon*, p. 76) from an argument prefixed to an MS. of the 9th century, is probably worthless, except as indicating an opinion much earlier than the MS., that John did not himself write the Gospel.

<sup>3</sup> That a similar attempt was made to reproduce, as it were, the authority of Peter by a writer in the 2d century, we have seen above (p. 814) in the account of the Second Epistle of Peter. But the circumstances and prolonged infirmities of the apostle John might make such an attempt far more successful and a far more accurate representation of spiritual truth.

<sup>4</sup> Jerome, *Comm. in Ep. ad Gal.*, vi. 10, quoted in Westcott's *Introd. to St. John*.

very different in language, and even somewhat different in thought and substance, from the teaching of the apostle himself; and a spiritual doctrine, taught in the Ephesian church, and based upon three or four traditions affirmed by the aged apostle, such as the tradition of blood and water, might, even in the lifetime of the apostle, become known, within a limited district, as the Gospel according to the apostle John. How different, in language if not in substance, may be a pupil's record of a master's teaching may be perceived from Plato's and Xenophon's records of the teaching of Socrates. But in any case, whatever may be the authorship of the book, it must be admitted to be, so far as we have gone, in the highest degree improbable that John the apostle wrote the Fourth Gospel with his own hand at the age of ninety or nearly a hundred, in the same way in which he wrote the Apocalypse at the age of sixty or seventy or eighty.

*Evidence from Quotations.*—But we pass now to the evidence of the early fathers. Theophilus and Irenæus are the first to quote John by name, but earlier writers, who do not mention his name, quote words contained in the Fourth Gospel. We will take Papias first. He tells us (see above, p. 816) that he used to inquire about the *dicta* of Andrew, Peter, Philip, Thomas, James, John, Matthew, or any other disciples of the Lord, and also about the sayings of Aristion and the elder John, the disciples of the Lord. The order of names is remarkable, and it has been most ingeniously inferred (Lightfoot, *Contemp. Rev.*, Oct. 1875) that John is placed, out of his order of precedence, along with Matthew, because the last two had left written Gospels; moreover the order of the first three, "Andrew, Peter, Philip," quite unlike the synoptic order, is the order in Jo. i. 40-43, which suggests that Papias was aware at all events of the story of the calling of the apostles contained in the first chapter of the Fourth Gospel. We are also told by Eusebius that Papias "used testimonies" from the 1st Epistle of John. This is, of course, no proof that Papias quoted the Epistle with John's name (for quotations of New Testament documents with the name of the author are not common in the earliest writings of the church); but it may be inferred that he regarded the 1st Epistle of John as an authoritative document; and the Epistle is so closely connected with the Gospel that, if the apostle John is proved to be the author of the one, it must follow that he is the author of the other also. But it is important to note that Papias recognized two Johns, both of whom were "disciples of the Lord;" and Eusebius tells us that Papias quoted certain traditions of the non-apostolic John, distinguishing him as "the elder,"—"the elder used to say," &c. Now Irenæus—who speaks highly of Papias, describing him (wrongly) as a "hearer of John" (the apostle),—quotes Papias as one of "the elders who saw John the disciple of the Lord," and who remembered how he (John) had repeated to them certain teachings of the Lord Jesus, to the effect that "the days will come in which vines shall grow, having each 10,000 branches, and in each branch 10,000 twigs, and in each twig 10,000 shoots, and in every shoot 10,000 clusters, and in every cluster 10,000 grapes, and every grape when pressed will give 25 measures of wine. And when any one of the saints shall lay hold of a cluster, another shall cry out, 'I am a better cluster, take me; bless the Lord through me,' &c. (*Apostolic Fathers*, Clark's trans. p. 443). The question therefore arises, Which John is here meant? It seems certain from the context that Irenæus meant the famous John, the apostle; yet he calls him nothing but "disciple," and the tradition imputed to John (though not out of accord perhaps with the imagery of the Apocalypse) is quite unlike anything that we find in the Gospel or 1st Epistle called by John's name. On the

Evidence from quotations. Papias.

other hand, a passage of the Fourth Gospel (xiv. 2) is quoted by Irenæus (*Adv. Hær.*, V. xxxvi. 2) in connexion, not with John the apostle, but with "elders," and possibly as part of the doctrine communicated to Papias by the "elders" ("the context makes it at least highly probable that the passage was quoted from Papias's 'Exposition,'" Westcott, *Introd. to the Gospel of St. John*). But, if this be so, i.e., if a passage of the Fourth Gospel was communicated to Papias, not necessarily by John the apostle, but by "elders," then it follows that among the "elders" who communicated it to him may have been John the "elder." Although this is, in great measure, conjectural, yet, even as a possibility, it becomes deserving of attention, when placed in juxtaposition with the certainty mentioned above; (1) it is possible that a saying in the Fourth Gospel was communicated to Papias, not by John the apostle but by John the elder; (2) it is certain that the only passage quoted from Papias as coming from John (the apostle) is not to be found in the Fourth Gospel and in no way resembles the style or thought of the Fourth Gospel. Again, the 2d and 3d Epistles of John, which have the name of the author inserted, are written, not in the name of John the apostle, but in the name of "the elder," and they were so doubtfully regarded (perhaps on that account) by the church that Eusebius places them among the "impeached (*ἀντιλεγόμενα*) writings," while Origen speaks of them as only possibly genuine, and Jerome attributes them not to John the apostle but to John the elder. Yet Irenæus quotes this 2d "impeached" Epistle, not as the work of John the elder, but (twice) as the work of "John the disciple of the Lord." Evidently there is here, if not confusion, at least a danger of confusion, and one cause of confusion can be immediately indicated. Papias tells us that both John the apostle and John the elder were "disciples of the Lord." Now, for some reason or other, Irenæus, though he quotes Matthew as "the apostle" (*Adv. Hær.*, III. ix. 1) and a speech of Peter as spoken by "the apostle" (*Ib.* xii. 1), appears not to quote the Fourth Gospel except as written by John "the disciple of the Lord," or simply "John" (*Ib.* xi. 1, 2, 3, 7). It cannot indeed be assumed that Irenæus is here (unconsciously) referring to John the elder, and not to John the apostle. On the contrary, the more probable explanation is, that John the apostle was himself called by preference John "the disciple of the Lord," as being "the disciple whom Jesus loved."<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless it remains an unfortunate fact that Irenæus and Theophilus, who are the first to quote John by name, give us no means of ascertaining whether they refer to John the apostle or John the elder, both of whom are described by Papias as being "disciples of the Lord." In this state of confusion we are naturally led to suspect that possibly the two Johns mentioned by Papias (neither of whom, as we have shown above, was probably known to Papias himself) may have really been one; and this suspicion is confirmed by the testimony of Jerome, who informs us that though two tombs were shown in his time at Ephesus, one as the tomb of John the apostle, and the other as the tomb of John the elder, yet some considered the two persons to be identical; "nonnulli putant duas memorias ejusdem Joannis evangelistæ esse" (Jerome, quoted by Kirchofer, p. 159). We have not evidence to prove this theory, but neither have we evidence to disprove it; and we must therefore leave the question who was the author of the Fourth Gospel

<sup>1</sup> Compare *Fragments*, iii., "John the disciple of the Lord and the other apostles with whom he was conversant." Hippolytus doubles the title (*Christ and Antichrist*, ch. 36), "Tell me, blessed John, apostle and disciple of the Lord." In speaking of the author of the Apocalypse, Irenæus (*Adv. Hær.*, IV. xx. 11) describes him not only as the "disciple of the Lord" but also as the disciple "upon whom Jesus had leaned at supper."

(so far as the evidence of Papias and Irenæus can help us) unanswered and unanswerable. Indeed it cannot be denied that the probability is that Papias did not know of its existence as an authoritative Gospel written by the son of Zebedee. For, had he known it, would he have had "nothing to say" about its origin, about the contrast between it and the Apocalypse, about the difference between it and the synoptic narrative, and about the interesting account of its composition given in the Muratorian fragment and therefore current before 170 A.D.? That Papias should have "nothing to say" about Luke's Gospel is intelligible, because the dedication to Theophilus speaks for itself; but why he should describe the origin of the First and Second Gospels and pass over the Fourth, where there was so much to describe and where a joint authorship was not only suggested by tradition but also by internal evidence (John xxi. 24), is by no means easy to explain. In the face of this silence we cannot attach much value to the evidence in Papias for the apostolic authorship, derived from the association of John with Matthew in the list of the apostles. Against that evidence, too, such as it is, must be set the fact that the only tradition detailed by Irenæus as coming through Papias from John the disciple of the Lord is one quite unlike the tone of the Fourth Gospel. The latter negative at least neutralizes the first positive; and the scale is thus left unaltered, pressed heavily downwards against the apostolic authorship by the discrepancy of style (when the Gospel is compared with the Apocalypse) and by the external and internal evidence of joint authorship.

Evidence has been drawn from the epistle of Barnabas, the "Shepherd" of Hermas, the Ignatian letters, the epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians, the works of Justin, and the Clementine Homilies, to show that the authors of these writings used the Fourth Gospel (Westcott, *Canon, passim*; Sanday, *Gospels in the Second Century*, 273-298); and no candid mind can resist the proof that some of them knew and were influenced by the thoughts of the Fourth Gospel, while some even used its language. But it is by no means certain, indeed it is improbable, that they knew of it as a Gospel; and it is still more improbable that they recognized it as a Gospel written by "the disciple whom Jesus loved." Else, how comes it that Justin quotes Matthew about fifty times and the Fourth Gospel once, or not at all?

Moreover, the apparent quotations of the Fourth Gospel in the apostolic fathers show not so much the use of a document from the first, as rather the influence of the common atmosphere of the Asian churches, the floating tradition of the Ephesian school, gradually merging into a definite document. Barnabas, for example, speaks of "water," with a certain mystery, associating it with the "cross"; as also Justin seems to do, mentioning the cross and baptism in consecutive chapters (lx. lxi.) of his *First Apology*. But the Clementine Homilies, amplifying the mysterious efficacy of water, as being the origin of all things, and the direct recipient of the impulses of the Spirit (ch. xxiv.), give a loose quotation of Jo. iii. 5, which seems adapted for the Clementine context by being blended with the baptismal formula previously mentioned by the writer in xxviii. 19: "For thus the prophet has sworn to us, saying, Verily I say to you, Unless ye be regenerated by living water into the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, ye shall not enter the kingdom of heaven." It can scarcely be an accident that this same passage is the only passage from the Fourth Gospel quoted in the whole of the works of Justin Martyr. Moreover, in Justin also, as in the Clementine Homilies, it is not so much the Gospel as rather the substance of the Gospel that is given; and this too in a shape not so developed as that which appears in the Fourth Gospel.

It is worth while to sketch the growth of this passage, for the process is a typical one, and will illustrate many other theological developments. The doctrine of the new birth first appears (but only in its germ) in the synoptic Gospels: "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter the kingdom of heaven" (Mat. xviii. 3: cf. Mk. x. 15; Lu. xviii. 17). But Jesus clearly did not mean that His disciples were to become like little children by becoming ignorant, foolish, or helpless; but only that they must trust the Father in heaven, as earthly children trust their earthly parents; in other words, that they must become children of the heavenly Father, and therefore be born again with a heavenly birth. It was therefore a legitimate development of Christ's teaching to remind Christians (1 Pet. i. 3, 23) that they had been "begotten or born again" (*ἀναγεννηθέντες*); and Paul describes his converts as "begotten" (*γεννηθέντες*) by himself in Christ spiritually, distinguishing such a birth from the "birth according to the flesh" (Gal. iv. 23, 29). It was inevitable that the Christians should early associate this spiritual birth with the rite of purification or baptism, with which they would naturally (as John had done) introduce their converts into the church. But further, as soon as the need of this spiritual "begetting" became a part of the teaching of the church, it would have to be protected against the literalism of misrepresenting enemies and of dull unspiritual friends. Jews and Gentiles would argue, "But it is impossible for a man who has once been born to enter a second time into his mother's womb." This argumentative objection would therefore be naturally placed (in the minds of the teachers and catechists of the first century) side by side with the doctrine of Christ. One teacher, treating the subject dramatically, might put the objection into the mouth of an objector in the shape of dialogue; another might state the answer to the objection in his own person. With this explanation we shall at once understand that Justin, though appearing (in the course of an argument upon baptism) to quote the Fourth Gospel once only (whereas he quotes Matthew fifty times), is not really quoting it, but only the floating tradition of the Ephesian elders. when he writes as follows:—

Justin, *Apol. I.*, lxi.

John iii. 3-5.

"For Christ said, Except ye be born again (*ἀναγεννηθέντες*, Peter's word, 1 Pet. i. 3, 23), verily ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Now, that it is impossible for those who have once been born to re-enter the womb of those that bare them is evident to all." [Here the quotation terminates, without making any reference to water.]

"Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man (*γεννηθῆναι ἀνωθεν*) be born again (or from above) he cannot see the kingdom of God. Nicodemus saith unto Him, How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be born? Jesus answered, verily, verily I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

Note here the inexplicable omission—on the hypothesis that it is an omission. We must bear in mind that in the preceding extract Justin is arguing for baptism by water. How obvious then to quote the words of Christ Himself, "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit," &c. But Justin does no such thing. He gives as a reason for water-baptism the intention that men may not remain "the children of necessity and ignorance," which reason, he says, we have learned from the apostles. He also quotes, suitably enough, the saying of Isaiah, "Wash you, make you clean." Lastly, he quotes a saying of Christ, and omits from it (supposing that he has the Fourth Gospel before him) the very words which tell with greatest force for him, and which indeed make all further argument unnecessary! It is possible, but most improbable, that Justin should quote Matthew fifty times, and a Gospel which he knew to be written by the beloved disciple of the Lord only once; but it is more than improbable—it is inconceivable—that, in this single quotation, he should not only quote inaccurately, but omit the very words that were best adapted to support his argument.

The probability is that Justin's quotation represents one stage, and the Fourth Gospel another stage, of the Christian doctrine of the new birth, and that the Ephesian "usus ecclesiasticus" had not yet come to his knowledge, or, if it had, had not yet superseded the less developed tradition. The stages may be classified as follows: (1) Synoptists, "Except ye become as little children;" (2) Justin, "Except ye be born again;" (3) a third stage is implied in 1 Pet. i. 3, 23, and iii. 21, and it would run thus, "Except a man be born of the Spirit as well as water" (a protest against the Essenitic overvaluing of ablutions, see also *Sibylline Books*, iv. 164-174); (4) the inevitable transition hence was to the form in the Fourth Gospel, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit." Here the authority of the Ephesian apostolic school arrested the development, which would else have issued in (5) the Clementine stage, "Except ye be regenerated by living water into the name of Father,

<sup>1</sup> The argument is not affected even though we adopt in John iii. 3 the reading *ἀναγεννηθῆναι*, which is unquestionably proved by the Latin renderings to have been a very early reading. Whichever be the reading, Justin's omission—as an omission—remains inexplicable.

Son and the Holy Spirit, ye shall not enter the kingdom of heaven." If (6) "living" had subsequently been omitted, the development would have been completed in a sixth and last stage.

Take another case of the apparent use of the Fourth Gospel by Ignatius. "I desire bread of God, heavenly bread, bread of life, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ, . . . and I desire drink of God, His blood, which is love imperishable, and ever-abiding life" (Ep. to the Romans, ch. vii.). Now here it is true that we have a thought peculiar to the Fourth Gospel. Paul speaks of the "blood" always as sacrificial, the "blood of sprinkling;" and indeed to a Jewish mind, taught to "abstain from blood," the thought of drinking "blood" would be at first extremely repulsive, even as a spiritual metaphor. It is very unlike anything in the Apocalypse, where blood is never "drunk," except by the scarlet woman and the murderers of the saints. But it is an image that must have suggested itself to the church as soon as the Gentiles, unfettered by Jewish associations, began to be imbued with eucharistic thought. Indeed, after the first repugnance had worn away, Jewish thought itself—even Pauline thought, and much more the thought of Jewish Christians trained in the school of Philo—would hasten the adoption of the eucharistic metaphor. For was not the blood "the life," according to Moses? And was not a Christian taught to believe, with Paul, that his individual life was merged and "hid" in Christ's life? Again, it would soon be felt that to speak merely of feeding on Christ's flesh was to present the New Testament in an unsymmetrical and almost named aspect. Moses had not only fed his people upon bread from the sky (the manna), but had also given them water to drink from the rock. What had the church to show against this symmetrical display of Mosaic power? It was not enough to say (with Paul) that that same "rock" was really Christ: it was necessary to show that the rock still supplied the faithful with divine drink. And for this purpose, what was more appropriate than the cup of the Lord's blood? Regarded in this way, the metaphor would commend itself speedily even to the Jewish mind. Nay, to the cultivated Alexandrian Jew, it would at once commend itself, as we may perceive from the works of Philo, who uses words so strikingly similar to Christian thought that they might almost seem, to a hasty reader, to have (of themselves) originated the eucharistic miracle of Cana. "Who can pour over the happy soul (which proffers its own reason as the most sacred cup) the holy goblet of true joy, except the cup-bearer of God, the Master of the Feast, the Word?" (On Dreams, ii. 38). When such thought as this was floating in the atmosphere of Ephesus and Alexandria, it is impossible to draw from the vague resemblance of the Ignatian passage quoted above any inference that Ignatius was quoting, or even referring to, the Fourth Gospel.

Nor can we infer any quotation of documents from the fact that Polycarp (Ep. to Philip, ch. vii.) mentions Antichrist in language somewhat similar to 1 Jo. iv. 2, 3. "Every one that doth not confess that Jesus Christ hath come in the flesh," writes Polycarp, "is Antichrist; and whose doth not confess the mystery of the cross is of the devil." The thought indeed is manifestly similar, and the language so far similar as to show that both Polycarp and the author of the epistle lived amid identical traditions of Christian teaching. But the epistle itself testifies that the name "Antichrist," so far from being invented by the author of the epistle, was already current in the church: "Little children, ye have heard that Antichrist shall come." If, therefore, it was a fact that already in Asia there had arisen a sect denying that Christ had come "in the flesh," and that the Ephesian circle of apostles first, and the Ephesian school of elders

afterwards, had denounced such a belief as being of Satan and of Antichrist, and if this was taught to the Ephesian catechumens, and preached in the Ephesian pulpits, in a form sanctioned by authoritative teaching and by repeated use, what more is wanting to explain the similarity between the Epistle of John and that of Polycarp?

Again, it is said that Justin (Dial., ch. 88) imitates John (i. 23) in putting the words "The voice of one crying," &c., into the mouth of John the Baptist, instead of placing them as an evangelical comment (as the synoptists do) on the appearance of the Baptist (Mat. iii. 3; Mk. i. 3; Lu. iii. 4). But this inference is unsound, as can be shown by analogy; for Mark uses also as an evangelical comment (i. 2), "I send My messenger before thy face;" but Matthew and Luke place it in the mouth of our Lord (Mat. xi. 10; Lu. vii. 27); and therefore, according to the reasoning above, we must infer that Luke had copied Matthew, or Matthew had copied Luke, in taking the evangelical comment, and inserting it in a discourse of Jesus! How fallacious would be such a deduction! How much more reasonable to suppose that—in accordance with the inevitable tendency thus to take prophecy, as it were, out of the framework, and insert it in the picture—Matthew and Luke have independently adopted a tradition later than Mark, which transposed Mark's evangelistic application of prophecy, and inserted it in the words of the Lord! But if this is the more probable solution in the case of Matthew and Luke, why not also in the case of Justin and John, the circumstances being precisely the same?

But it has been urged that, although Justin cannot be shown to have quoted the Fourth Gospel, yet his acquaintance with the Valentinians (Dial. 35)—"who freely used the Fourth Gospel" (Iren., Adv. Hær., I. viii. 5)—"shows that the Fourth Gospel could not have been unknown to him" (Westcott, Introd. to Gospel of St. John). Justin's words are these: "There are, and there were, many who, coming forward in the name of Jesus, taught both to speak and act blasphemous things, with whom we have nothing in common, since we know them to be atheists. Some are called Marcians, and some Valentinians, and some Basilidians, and some Saturnilians, and others by other names." Now this mere mention of the Valentinians as one of a number of abhorred sects, with whom the writer has nothing in common, scarcely seems to prove any minute acquaintance on the part of Justin with the opinions or books in use among the Valentinians. But even if it be proved, what is the consequence? Surely this, that Justin, knowing the Fourth Gospel to be freely used by a sect which he stigmatizes by name, altogether abstained from using it himself. Irenæus, who uses the Fourth Gospel, accuses the Valentinians of misusing it; Justin, who does not use the Gospel, brings no such accusation. The natural inference is (if any inference at all is to be drawn from such slight premises) that either he did not know of the existence of the Gospel or of its misuse, or that he knew of its existence and use but did not recognize its authority.

Two more instances must conclude the list. It is found that both Justin and John alter the quotations of Zech. xii. 10 from the LXX. version (ἐπιβλέπονται πρὸς μὲν ἄνθ' ὃν κατορχήσαντο) into ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν: "They shall look on Him whom they pierced;" and the Apocalypse (i. 7) also contains the same word in "they also which pierced Him." But this, as we have seen above, especially as it involves a return to the Hebrew text, is perfectly explicable on the same grounds as those which explain prophecies similarly quoted by the synoptists—viz., a common "ecclesiastical use." Still less can anything but floating tradition be inferred from such an allusion as is contained in Polycarp's Epistle to the Philadelphians: "The Spirit, coming from God, is not to be deceived; for it knoweth

whence it cometh, and whither it goeth." Here, though the words οἶδεν πόθεν ἔρχεται καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγει (ὑπάγει is a word specially disliked by Luke in his Gospel, and not used by Paul), being identical here and in John iii., do certainly, as Dr Sanday points out (Gospels, p. 275), imply "an association of ideas," yet, as the same writer remarks, the thought is different. Polycarp says, "The Spirit knoweth whence it cometh," John says, "We know not whence the Spirit cometh." This indicates that Polycarp is vaguely alluding to oral and traditional doctrines current in his province (familiar, perhaps, but by no means as yet authoritative), rather than quoting from a Gospel known to be written by one of the foremost of the apostles, "the beloved disciple of the Lord."<sup>1</sup>

But it is urged (1) that Justin has the doctrine of the Christian, as distinguished from the Alexandrian, Logos; (2) that he could not have had originality enough to develop this himself, and therefore (3) he must have borrowed this method of thought from the Fourth Gospel. And the following expressions are quoted: "Jesus Christ is, in the proper sense (ὄντως), the only Son begotten of God, being His Word (λόγος), and First-born, and Power (Πρωτότοκος καὶ Δύναμις);" "But His Son, who alone is rightly (κυρίως) called Son, who before all created things was with Him and begotten of Him as His Word, when in the beginning He created and ordered all things through Him," &c.; "Now, next in order to the Father and Lord of all, the first Power (who indeed may also be called Son) is the Word, concerning whom we shall relate, in what follows, how being made flesh (σαρκωποιθεὶς) He became man;" "The Word of God is His Son" (Apol. I., xxiii., xxxii., lxiii.; Apol. II., x., quoted by Sanday, Gospels, p. 284; see also Lightfoot's Colossians, i. 15).

But it can be shown (1) that all these thoughts were suggested, and many of these expressions actually used, by Philo in Alexandria (40 A. D.), about a hundred years before Justin wrote; (2) that the personification of the Wisdom of God (and Logos means Wisdom as well as Word) in the books of Proverbs and Wisdom rendered it necessary for orthodox Christians, who accepted these books, to identify this personified Wisdom with Christ; (3) that the generally recognized Messianic reference of Ps. lxxxix. 27, ἐγὼ πρωτότοκος ἠγόμαυ αὐτῶν, leading to the comment, "I will make King Messiah a First-born," resulted in a recognition of "the First-born" (ὁ Πρωτότοκος, רִבְרִי) used absolutely, as a title of the Messiah (Lightfoot, Col. i. 15); (4) that those elements of the Alexandrian theory of the Logos which are inconsistent with the Christian theory furnish no proof at all that the Christian theory was independent of the Alexandrian. It was inevitable that, when the Christians borrowed, they would adopt what was consistent, and discard what was inconsistent, with the belief in the incarnation of Christ.

There is abundant evidence to prove these propositions. Even before Paul wrote the Epistle to the Colossians, and a fortiori before the composition of the Fourth Gospel, that instinct which compels men to set the First Cause of all at a distance from matter had impelled Alexandrian Judaism to adopt the belief that the supreme God did not Himself directly and immediately create the world, or manifest Himself to mankind, but indirectly and mediately, through some medium or mediator. The simplest and subtlest metaphor to express this mediateness was Word—more especially in the Greek language, where Word (λόγος) might mean reason as well as speech, the word in the thought as well as the word in the sound. Man manifests himself through deeds as well as words; but for the Supreme (with whom to speak is to do) the only necessary manifestation was the Word, the Logos. Dr Lightfoot has shown (Col. i. 16) that Philo sometimes regards the Logos as a merely passive instrument, so that he allows himself to use the simple instrumental dative (ἐ) to describe the relation of the Word to the Creator (ἐ καὶ τὸν κτίσμον ἐργάζετο), "which mode of speaking is not found in the New Testament;" and elsewhere Philo, even where he uses the prepositional construction (ἐ. ὁ), expressly likens the world to a house, the Supreme to the builder, and the Logos to the ὄργανον or tool (Of Cain and his Birth, ch. xxxv.). Moreover, as a city, while as yet only existing in the conception of the architect, may be said to be the reason of the architect, so the world (regarded as perceptible only to the intellect) is said to be the Logos or reason of God busying itself in the work of creation (The

<sup>1</sup> The writer is indebted to Dr Hort for the suggestion that the transition may be from (1) "thou knowest not whence He cometh," to (2) "He alone knoweth," &c., and thence, the "alone" being understood, to (3) "He knoweth," &c. Yet, when all due weight is given to this suggestion, it will be difficult to deny that the context of John iii. 8 has little in common with the context in Polycarp, "the Spirit is not to be deceived," and that Polycarp's words indicate rather a vague reminiscence of tradition than a quotation from a Gospel supported by the authority of the apostle John.

World, vi.). Philo also describes the Logos as "the archetypal model, the idea of ideas." These passages undoubtedly indicate a great gulf between the Christian and Alexandrian Logos. But other passages abound, which Christians could adopt unchanged, applying them to the incarnate Christ; in particular, the passage quoted above (On Dreams, ii. 38), where the Word of God is described as "the cup-bearer of God;" and here follow words which would be fraught with eucharistic meaning for a Christian—"the Master of the feast . . . not differing from the draught itself." Again, the Word is said (Who is the Heir, ch. xxxix.) to divide in equal portions among all that are to use it the heavenly food of the soul which Moses calls manna; and the Word is expressly said to be a Person in the following passage (Questions and Solutions, 62)—Question: "Why is it that He speaks as if of some other god, saying, He made man after the image of God, and not that He made him after His own image?" Solution: "Very appropriately and without any falsehood was this oracular sentence uttered by God; for no mortal thing could have been formed on the similitude of the supreme Father of the universe, but only after the pattern of the second Deity, who is the Word of the Supreme Being." Even where Philo describes the Word as the instrument of creation, he speaks of it or Him as "the image (εἰκὼν) of God" (On Monarchy, ii. 5): "The Image of God is the Word by whom all the world was framed (ἐδημιουργεῖτο)." Further, the Word is frequently called by Philo the "First-begotten (πρωτόγονον) Son" and "Eldest Son." The prophecy of Zechariah (vi. 12, according to the LXX.) "Behold a man, the East is his name," which is twice applied by Justin (Dialogue, cvi. and cxxi.) to Jesus the Son of God, was applied with curious similarity and difference a hundred years before by Philo, who, although he finds it inappropriate for "a man compounded of body and soul," sees in it a singular appropriateness to "that incorporeal Being who in no respect differs from a divine image. . . . For the Father of the Universe has caused Him to spring up as the Eldest Son" (On the Confusion, &c., 24).<sup>2</sup> Many of the very expressions which are sometimes used to show that the Logos of the Alexandrians was impersonal are found applied to God in the Old Testament, or to Christ in the New. For example, if Philo calls the world the "garment" of the Logos, the Psalmist also (Ps. civ. 2), appealing to the Lord his God, says, "Thou coverest Thyself with light as with a garment;" or if the Logos is described by Philo as the "bond" which holds the world together, so also does Paul describe Christ as the Being in whom "all things cohere" (τὰ πάντα συνέστηκεν, Col. i. 17). Nay, further, he attributes to the Logos that function of "reproving" or "convincing" (ἐλέγχειν) which is so strikingly assigned in the Fourth Gospel to the Spirit of the ascended Christ (Jo. xvi. 8), "And when He some, He will reprove (ἐλέγξει) the world of sin;" compare Philo—who also adds a remark that suggests the thought (Jo. i. 9) of "the Light that lighteth every man"—"As long as the divine Word has not come to our soul, all its actions are blameless; but when the priest, conviction (or "reproval," ἐλεγχος), enters our heart like a most pure ray of light, then we see that our actions are liable to blame" (On the Unchangeableness of God, 28).

In the face of all these passages (and many others might be quoted) the difficulty would seem to be, at first sight, not to prove that the Alexandrian theory of the Logos was the parent of the Christian theory, but to find any difference between the two. The difference, however, is in reality very great, and very readily explained. Philo looked on the manifestation of God through the Logos as being the old inferior dispensation, while the new dispensation was to be the manifestation of the Supreme as τὸ ὄν, absolute Being. The Logos manifestation of Philo was a manifestation of God through visible creation; the higher manifestation was to be independent of visible objects. The former was the manifestation of "God as man"—i. e., as liable to anger, change, repentance, &c.; it was also (On the Unchangeableness of God, xi.) an appeal to fear through rewards and punishments, not strictly true, and not intended for the esoteric sage, but only for the unspiritual multitude. The latter, on the other hand, was the manifestation of God as not man—a fatherly revelation, appealing to love. It followed that Philo not only did not identify his Logos with the Messiah, but would have regarded any such identification with one who had "become flesh" as a degradation. It followed also that, although Philo declared the highest revelation to be a revelation of love, there was really no basis for love at all in it. Of God as τὸ ὄν, Philo could not say that He was good, or holy, or loving, because He was superior to all goodness, holiness, and love: "His existence indeed is a fact which we do comprehend concerning Him; but beyond the fact of His existence we can understand nothing" (On the Unchangeableness of God, 13).

<sup>2</sup> Some degree of uncertainty whether to call the Word a person or not appears to be implied in the following passage (Questions, 64): "The expression 'one of us' (Gen. iii. 22) indicates a plurality of being, unless we are to suppose that God is conversing with his own virtues;" but Philo seems to incline to the personal theory.

Imagine the early Christian teachers and preachers, in the cities which were earliest influenced by Alexandria, brought into contact with the Alexandrian theory of the Logos, or possibly in some cases (as in that of Apollon perhaps) themselves trained up in the Alexandrian theory, and now superadding to it the belief in an incarnate Son of God—and what would be the consequence? Not, surely, that they would cast the Logos theory aside as baseless; for how could they deny that “by the Word of the Lord were the heavens made”? or how cancel the words of Wisdom in the book of Proverbs (viii. 22-30), “The Lord possessed Me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old. . . . When He prepared the heavens I was there. . . . I was by Him as one brought up with Him; and I was daily His delight, rejoicing always before Him”? Paul might possibly eschew the actual use of the word Logos, as savouring of men’s philosophy, and alter the *πρωτόγονος*, “First-begotten,” of Philo into *πρωτότοκος*, “First-born,” to prevent the inference<sup>1</sup> derivable from the former title, that the Lord, being First-begotten, was not “Only-begotten;” but how could he, or any Christian who believed Christ to be the Redeemer of all mankind and the Eternal Son of God, do other than adopt the Old Testament theory about the Word of God, and at the same time Philo’s language, so far as it was personal, while discarding all that was impersonal? If Christ was not identical with the Word of God and the Wisdom of God, then there seemed to follow the intolerable inference that He must be inferior to it; but if He was identical with it, then the introduction of Philo’s felicitous language into Christian thought was simply a matter of time.

The introduction would be a very easy process, requiring nothing but a few omissions of expressions implying passive instrumentality (e.g., the instrumental dative), and the addition of an emphatic protest that the manifestation of the Supreme as Love, even though it were through visible objects,—yes, even though it were through the Word of God becoming “flesh,”—nevertheless constituted not an inferior but a superior revelation, the highest revelation of all. To the Logos theory of Philo, which stated that all men were made in the image of the Word, the Christians could add that, through forgiveness and by faith, fallen mankind was destined also to be raised up and conformed to that Word, so that He was the goal as well as the starting-point, the  $\Omega$  as well as the  $A$ ; or, as Paul expresses it, “All things are not only created in Him,” but “to Him (*eis autόν*),” Col. i. 16 (Lightfoot). This is accordingly expressed emphatically in the Fourth Gospel. Although “no man hath seen God at any time,” yet “the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him” (Jo. i. 18); and again, “Have I been so long with you, and hast thou not known Me, Philip? he that hath seen Me hath seen the Father” (Jo. xiv. 9).

This is the full Christian development of Philo’s doctrine, as applied to the “First-born” becoming “flesh.” But there is not only no evidence that Justin quotes from any written document exhibiting this development, but rather evidence to the contrary, that his doctrine of the Logos, though affected by the teaching of the Ephesian school, had not yet been imbued with it. For, in speaking of baptism, he calls attention to the fact that, in that rite, God is mentioned *only* by the name of “God the Father and Lord of the Universe; for,” he continues, “no man can utter the name of the ineffable God; and if any one dare to say that there is a name he is incurably mad” (*First Apology*, lxi.). Looked at in the light of the context, this word *ἄσπῆτος*, “ineffable,” implies a conception of the revelation of God through Christ hardly reaching the level of the Ephesian doctrine, which teaches that, though God had never been seen, He had been *declared* by the only begotten Son, so that whoso had seen Him had seen the Father. But it is in harmony with what Justin says soon afterwards (*Ib.* lxiii.), that Jesus is also called “Angel” and “Apostle” (compare also Heb. iii. 1); and it harmonizes well too with the doctrine of Philo, that “no mortal thing could have been framed in the similitude of the supreme Father of the universe, but only after the pattern of the second Deity, who is the Word of the Supreme Being” (*Solutions*, 62).

It appears therefore that, although Justin knew certain traditions embodied in the Fourth Gospel, yet (1) it was not read in the church services of the district in the same way as the “memoirs of the apostles”; (2) he did not use the Gospel as an authoritative document; (3) his teaching exhibits less of development than the teaching of the Fourth Gospel. An inevitable inference follows that, if he knew of the existence of the Fourth Gospel as a document, he did not believe it to be the work of the apostle John.

<sup>1</sup> Paul nowhere uses the word Logos to denote Christ; but he uses the expression *ὁ λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ* in one place (Col. iii. 16) to denote what is more commonly denoted by the Spirit of Christ, the indwelling presence of Christ in the heart manifesting itself in word; cf. Lu. xxi. 15, *ὁ λόγος καὶ σοφία*.

The general conclusion to which we are thus led by the external evidence of quotations is that, although some of the *doctrine* of the Fourth Gospel, expressed in words similar to the words of the Fourth Gospel, was probably current in the Ephesian church towards the end of the first half of the second century, yet it was not by that time widely used, if at all, as an authoritative document; nor have we proof that it was so used till the times of Irenæus, *i.e.*, towards the end of the second century, by which time the Gospel was authoritatively quoted as a work of John; and those who so quoted it probably meant by “John” John, the son of Zebedee, the apostle.

*Internal Evidence.*

*The Fourth Gospel compared with the Synoptic Narrative.*

—In estimating the Fourth Gospel as a history, we must necessarily attach a special importance to those portions in it which cover the synoptic ground; for these will afford us the best means of judging how far the facts of the life of Christ, as well as the language of Christ, may have been transmuted by the author. We will therefore first consider those parts of the Fourth Gospel which afford us an opportunity of comparing it with the Gospels of the synoptists.

The first point of comparison is the greater scope of the Fourth Gospel as compared with the other three. It includes all past time in its prologue, and exhibits the incarnation of the divine Word as but one act in the drama of the universe.

Nor is its scope in space narrower than in time. The limited scenery of the synoptic stage—Galilee, Samaria, Judea,—is (in spirit, though not in letter) exchanged here for “the world.” As Philo tells us that the tabernacle figured the universe, and that the robes of the high priest represented (*Moses*, iii. 12) the different parts of the world, so the High Priest of the Fourth Gospel, though speaking or working in a narrow province of Syria, is always regarded as officiating at the altar steps of the universe, and bearing with Him the destinies of humanity. “The world” is continually on His lips; and John the Baptist is made to proclaim, even at the very outset of the Messiah’s career, that the Lamb of God will take away the sins, not of “the Jews,” but of “the world.” It is true that Judaism is not ignored. Prophecy is constantly appealed to; and the motive of the Gospel is undoubtedly to show that Jesus is “the Christ” (xx. 31), as well as to show that He is the Son of God. Yet nowhere in the Fourth Gospel is found any marked distinction between the Gentiles and Samaritans on the one side and the Jews on the other, as if the former must be neglected for a time (Matt. x. 5; Lu. ix. 52), and as if the latter were entitled to priority in the offer of salvation; on the contrary, Christ is described, early in the narrative, as preaching to the Samaritans, and the Samaritan faith (far more general than the isolated case of the Samaritan leper in Luke) serves as a foil to the Jewish unbelief. “The Jews,” so far as they are distinguished from others, appear throughout as a nation with whom the writer has no sympathy, as the emblem of rebellious, unspiritual scepticism.<sup>2</sup> Viewing the drama at a greater distance of time than the synoptists, and purposely withdrawing himself to a still more subjectively distant point of view, for the purpose of unity and compression, the author almost

<sup>2</sup> The passages iv. 22; x. 16; xi. 52, though they give a kind of precedence to the Jews, yet treat of the passing of salvation from the Jews to the Gentiles, in the way of climax; and these two or three passages (which occur in dialogue and not in narrative) cannot count for anything against the forty or fifty passages wherein the author, in his own person, speaks of “the Jews” as “murmuring,” “seeking to slay Jesus,” “taking up stones to stone Him,” and always systematically opposing themselves to Jesus.

ignores the minor distinctions of Pharisees, Sadducees, Herodians, scribes, and lawyers, with which the synoptists have made us familiar.<sup>1</sup> Palestine is seen no longer with the distinctions of a neighbouring diversified coast-line, but like a dark mass upon the horizon of the distant East, serving as a foil to the splendour of the rising Sun of Righteousness, which it strives in vain to obscure.

In the miraculous part of our evangelist’s narrative especially, there is visible this artistic power of selection and compression. Few miracles are described, not more than eight in all (including the post-resurrection miracle of the draught of fishes), and among these not a single case of exorcism. The element of mere wonder (which comes too prominently forward, at least for a pupil of Philo, in the synoptic miracle on the Gadarene) is carefully subordinated to the symbolical element. It is true that the whole Gospel breathes a supernatural atmosphere. Although the Logos, becoming “flesh” (i. 14), is immediately afterwards called Jesus (i. 17) or the Son (i. 18), and is never henceforth mentioned by the name Logos throughout the whole of the Gospel, yet in reality it is still the Logos, rather than Jesus, that is described in the following pages. The Logos is never (as in Mark) “unable” to work miracles, never liable to “marvel,” never “in an agony,” never (with the single exception of the scene at the grave of Lazarus in which *ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν*, John xi. 33) “sorrowful and very heavy;” the words *θεός, δεῦρ, τ-λαγχνίζομαι* occur repeatedly in the synoptists, never in the Fourth Gospel; the Logos “knows what is in man,” sees Nathaniel “under the fig-tree,” discerns from the first that one of the twelve whom He had chosen is “a devil”; when He asks advice from His followers, it is a mere form, merely “to prove them, for He Himself knew what He would do”; there is not in the drama of the Fourth Gospel (as in Mark) any development of thought or plan in the chief actor; the development must be looked for in the drama taken as a whole, and including the creation, the fall, and all the preparation of the world for the coming of the Word as flesh; but the life of Christ on earth is, in the Fourth Gospel, only one act as it were, in which the previous action of the drama is simply carried on and sustained; the whole of the future, His destined “lifting up,” His death, His rising in three days, all lie mapped out before the Saviour, so that He walks in a known country and in light, while all around, friends and foes alike, are stumbling or groping in the dark. In this sense, therefore, it is true that the supernatural element is even more prominent in the Fourth Gospel than in the synoptists. But the miracles themselves are subordinated. Though frequent reference is made to the vast number of them (ii. 23; iii. 2; vi. 2; vii. 31; ix. 16; xi. 47; xii. 37; xx. 30), yet, not only are very few described, but even those few are described rather as “emblems” than as “mighty works.” It is remarkable that the word *σημεῖα* (“signs”), which the synoptists almost always use in a bad sense (to denote the “sign from heaven” demanded by the Pharisees, or the “signs” which the false Christs shall work to deceive, if it were possible, even the elect, Mk. xiii. 22), is the very word selected by John to describe the miracles of Jesus; while the word *δυνάμεις* (“mighty works”), which in the synoptists generally denotes the works of Jesus, is never used in the Fourth Gospel. Partly, no doubt, the author may have felt that

<sup>1</sup> It has been ingeniously suggested that a distinction is drawn by the author between the “Jews” in the south and the “multitude” (*ὄχλος*) in Galilee (Westcott, *Introd. to St. John*). But the term *ὄχλος* is also applied to the mixed multitude of pilgrims in Jerusalem at the Passover (xii. 12, 17, 18, 29, 34); and besides, if the author had intended to deny any such distinction, he could hardly have expressed himself more cogently than in xii. 9, where he adds that this “multitude” was of the “Jews” (*ὄχλος παρὰ ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων*).

miracles were made cheap by excessive enumeration, and that the narrative of a multitude of miracles without apparent motive created a stumbling-block rather than a help to philosophic and educated readers. Especially might this be felt in Ephesus, the home of wizards and wonders and “curious arts” (Acts xix. 19), where even the last-called of the apostles had worked cures and exorcisms past numbering (*ib.* 12). Accordingly the author, though he makes mention of very many miracles, describes none but those which are obviously emblematic. It has been stated above that the 1st Epistle of John was not only written by the author of the Fourth Gospel, but must be considered as a kind of postscript or appendix, commending the Gospel to the church. Remembering, therefore, the important passage in the Epistle (1 Jo. v. 8), which describes the three witnesses on earth as breath (or spirit), water, and blood, and bearing in mind that “blood” in all probability has (among other possible meanings) a reference to the eucharistic wine, we shall not be surprised that the first miracle of all describes the changing of the water into wine. Next is a miracle exemplifying the power of the word of Jesus, where faith is present (iv. 50, and cf. iv. 41); then the Messiah manifests (in the cure of the impotent man) the superiority of the ever-flowing fountain of life to the intermittent power of the pool of the law (v. 3); then comes the eucharistic feeding of the five thousand with bread and fishes, wherein “the Lord gave thanks,” *εὐχαριστήσας τοῦ Κυρίου* (vi. 23), followed by the walking on the water, which is also appended by Matthew and Mark to the eucharistic miracle, then the opening of the eyes of the blind by Him who was the Light of the world (ix. 5); the raising of Lazarus by Him who was the Resurrection and the Life (xi. 25); and lastly, the miraculous draught of fishes, taken at the command of Him who had sent His apostles to be fishers of men, and to cast the net of the gospel (xxi. 6).

In all these narratives, although the common people are exhibited as wonder-struck, yet the impression left on the reader is that, for the Word of God, such works are matters of course, and only important because of their inner spiritual meaning. Philo says (*Life of Moses*, i. 38) that such miracles as the production of the water from the rock by Moses and the like are the sports (*παίγνια*) of God, and not so really great or deserving of serious attention as the revolutions of the planets. There is no trace of “sport” in any of the works of the Word of God narrated by the author of the Fourth Gospel; yet both he and Philo agree in looking through the letter of the narrative of every miracle to the spiritual essence contained in it, which alone constitutes the importance of the act. Now Philo, in speaking of the creation of Eve from the rib of Adam, declares at once that the literal meaning is fabulous (*μυθώδες*); whereas he treats the emission of the water from the rock as historical, although he suggests, as a first explanation, that possibly there may have been a latent spring in the rock. Yet Philo proceeds to deduce his spiritual inferences as freely from what he deems “fabulous” as from what he deems historical. It is not necessary to assume in the author of the Fourth Gospel precisely the same indifference to the distinction between spiritual and historical narrative; but it appears certain that, in his writings, as in Philo’s, the historical is subordinated to the spiritual. Not but that the picturesque incidents of each miracle receive from him due attention; but it seems to be for the most part the picturesqueness resulting from the skill of a graphic teacher, rather than from the memory of an eye-witness. Compare, for example, Mark’s with John’s account of the feeding of the five thousand. There is less motive, less