

art, about Mark's detail than about John's. John's omissions and additions all point to one object, the desire to heighten the Logos and to subordinate the disciples and the crowd. Mark begins by saying that "Jesus had compassion on the multitude;" but the Logos, knowing beforehand "what He would do," determines His course at once as soon as He "lifts up His eyes" and discerns the multitude. In Mark, the disciples come to Jesus begging Him to send the multitude away; in John, it is Jesus who first "proves" one of the disciples with the question, "Whence shall we buy bread that they may eat?" Then (giving a picturesque variety to the story) Andrew, as well as Philip, and a servant-lad (*παῖδιον*) are introduced, the latter carrying the *viaticum* of the apostles. The loaves, a new circumstance not found in the synoptists, are of an inferior kind, "barley;" and Andrew bases an expostulation on the smallness of the provision. After the command to "sit down," Mark says that they sat "down on the green grass," an epithet natural enough for a speaker perhaps, but inartistic, because too prominent, in a written narrative. John, on the other hand, turns a defect into an excellence, by judiciously connecting the "grass" with the command to sit down, so as to enhance the forethought of the wise Master of the feast, who made provision for the comfort of His guests in the minutest details: "Jesus said, Make the men sit down. Now there was much grass in the place." Lastly, in the synoptic narrative, the gathering of the fragments is the spontaneous act of the disciples; but in John, the feast ends as it began, with the display of the wisdom of the Master, even in the smallest matters, "Gather up the fragments that remain, that nothing may be lost." It is scarcely possible to deny that, in the symmetrical manner in which the story gathers itself around the Logos as its object and centre, the narrative of the Fourth Gospel is far superior to that of the synoptists, and that many of the additional touches of the former are dictated by what has been happily described by Canon Westcott as "an instinctive perception of symmetry in thought and expression."<sup>1</sup>

The same remark applies to the other miracle which John has in common with Matthew and Mark, viz., the healing of the "nobleman's" son.<sup>2</sup> Every detail of difference in John heightens the dignity of the Saviour. In the synoptic account, Jesus offers to go to the house to heal the youth; in John, no such offer is made, and the nobleman and his companions are accosted with a rebuke, "Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe." In the synoptists, the man is represented as living at Capernaum, and Jesus as entering Capernaum, so that the father sends but a short distance; in John, Jesus is represented as remaining at Cana, while the suppliant father journeys thither in person from Capernaum, a distance of twenty-five miles. In the synoptists, the father sends a message, praying Jesus not to trouble Himself to enter his roof, but to "speak the word only;" in John, the father piteously supplicates the Saviour to "Come down, ere my child die." In the synoptists, it is recorded that Jesus "marvelled"; in the Fourth Gospel, He simply pronounces the authoritative words,

<sup>1</sup> The only points in which this narrative can be illustrated by Philo's remarks (*Alleg.*, iii. 56-8) on the manna are two or perhaps three:—(1) As Philo says that the soul is fed not by earthly food but by "words," so the Gospel says that "words" are the source of life (vi. 63); (2) Philo, speaking of the manna, praises those who seek the food for its own sake and not for ulterior advantage; compare John vi. 26 on the "loaves and fishes;" (3) Philo, speaking of the object of the miracle, quotes Exod. xvi. 4, "that I may prove them;" this may possibly, but not probably, illustrate John vi. 6.

<sup>2</sup> It is here assumed (with Dr Sanday, *Fourth Gospel*, p. 100) that they are the same. The assumption of their difference involves even greater difficulties than the assumption of their identity.

"Go thy way, thy son liveth." In the synoptists, Jesus avails Himself of this incident to proclaim, almost as if it were (and probably it was) a development of His work suddenly revealed to Him by His Father, that many of the Gentiles shall be admitted into the kingdom; in the Fourth Gospel, which exhibits no development, these words would necessarily seem out of place, and are omitted. Contrast could scarcely be more complete; and it is not surprising that many commentators, rather than identify such opposites, prefer to suppose that, about the same time in the life of Jesus, two men, both in high positions, had sons at the point of death, in the same place (Capernaum), both of whom petitioned Jesus to heal their children, and both of whom obtained from Him miraculous cure, performed at a distance from the two patients. To some, however, as to the candid author of *The Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel*, it will appear more probable that we have the same event, differently described. But those who accept the theory of identity ought to consider how much is involved in it. For the defenders of the difference of the two miracles are undoubtedly justified in drawing a contrast between them in almost every point of spiritual importance (*Augustine, Ev. Joh. Tract.*, 16). If, therefore, the Fourth Gospel is historically accurate, then (on the supposition of the identity of these two narratives) the three synoptic Gospels are historically inaccurate; but if the synoptic narrative is historically accurate, the narrative of the Fourth Gospel must be considered rather a new dramatic version, than an independent historical account; and the same remark will necessarily apply to, and affect our estimate of, all the accounts of miracles in the Fourth Gospel.

Gaining light thus from the comparison of the Fourth Gospel with the synoptists, wherever they occupy common ground, we shall find it useful, before proceeding to the summary of the Fourth Gospel, first to touch on the few remaining points which the fourth has in common with one or more of the three. Luke contains most of these. For example, if we accept the passages Lu. xxiv. 12, xxiv. 40, as being not interpolations, though perhaps additions made by the author to a subsequent edition of his Gospel, it will follow that, in the account of the resurrection, Luke and John agree identically in adopting the traditions (1) that Peter "beheld the linen clothes laid by themselves in the sepulchre;" (2) that the Lord showed His disciples, after His resurrection, His wounded body in token of His identity. In both these cases several minute details are added by John; and this also applies to another important incident which Luke and John have in common, viz., the "entering of Satan" into Judas. Luke records it briefly in two words (xxii. 3), and makes the "entrance" occur some time before the last supper; but John, in a far more powerful scene, reserves the "entrance" for the moment when the "sop" is handed to the traitor by the Saviour, and the disciples seated at the last supper. Here again the incident is the same; but the treatment is very different.

The agony described by Luke (xxii. 44, and, without Luke's additions, in Mat. xxvi. 39 and Mk. xiv. 35, 36), when the Lord prayed that "the cup might pass from Him," and when an "angel" appeared from heaven strengthening Him, may seem, at first sight, to have no counterpart in John. And indeed the synoptic description of the agony in Gethsemane is not adapted for the Fourth Gospel. Inserted in any page of that Gospel it could not fail to jar upon us as being out of harmony with the context. Nevertheless, a remarkable passage in John (xii. 27) appears to bear a striking resemblance to the account in Luke; "Now is My soul troubled." Thus the Saviour

avows a certain conflict in His heart, yet by the very deliberateness (as well as by the publicity) of the avowal takes from it something of the intense and almost passionate humanity of the synoptic narrative. Immediately after these words the Saviour, in the Fourth Gospel, deliberately suggests to Himself the synoptic prayer, and repeats it: "What shall I say? 'Father, save Me from this hour?' But for this cause came I to this hour." At once triumphing over the—from the point of view of the Fourth Gospel—unworthy suggestion, He exclaims, "Father, glorify Thy name." Upon this comes the heaven-sent message, but not (as in Luke) an angel to "strengthen" one "in an agony praying more earnestly;" on the contrary, the voice does but ratify the Saviour's utterance: "I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again." Finally, the author adds, as usual, the babble of the multitude, as a foil to the all-knowing wisdom of the Divine Word: "The people therefore that stood by and heard it said that it thundered; others said, An angel hath spoken to Him." No answer to their doubts and questionings is given by Jesus; but we are left under the impression that the "I" is uttered, neither by thunder nor by any mere angel of God, but by the Father Himself. A soul "troubled"; a prayer to be saved from the trouble; the suppression of that prayer, after more or less of conflict, and the substitution of another prayer in its place; and lastly, a message or messenger (*ἄγγελος*) from heaven—the facts are much the same both in Luke and in John, yet how different is the treatment of the facts, and what a world of difference in the spiritual result!

Almost the only passage in which John adopts a few consecutive words of the synoptic narrative is the narrative of the anointing (xii. 3-8). There is much less similarity between Peter's confession, as recorded in Jo. vi. 68, and as recorded in Mat. xvi. 16; Mk. viii. 30; Lu. ix. 20; but the narratives appear to refer to the same event, and if so, the comparison between the two is most instructive. In Matthew and Mark the confession of Peter constitutes a turning-point in the life of Jesus; it is the sign which convinces Him that, the seed of a living faith having been sown, His work is now done, and that the hour of His departure is at hand: "From that time forth" (Mat. xvi. 21; Mk. viii. 31) "began Jesus to show unto His disciples how that He must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer," &c.; and accordingly the Lord prepares the disciples with the greatest care, and even tenderness, for the all-important answer to the question which He is to put to them, "Whom say ye that I am?" and when the question is answered, pronounces a fervent blessing on Simon, the son of Jona, but better called Cephas, a rock, whose faithful confession is the token of the laying of the foundation stone of the new temple. If Jesus is to be regarded as a man, "who, though He were a Son, yet learned obedience by the things which He suffered" (Heb. v. 8), then in the whole synoptic narrative of the life of Christ there is not a more important crisis than this. But in the Johannine narrative crises are altogether out of place, where all is pre-ordained; and instead of the tender questioning, the inspired confession, and the fervent blessing, we have simply an almost casual appeal of the Lord to His disciples, "Will ye also depart?" which, when a response has been made by Peter, is followed, not by a blessing, but by sad words conveying the assurance that the Word of God, who chose the twelve, knows all their weakness as well as their strength, and cannot be surprised either by confession or by betrayal: "Jesus answered, Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?" Both in the Fourth Gospel and in the synoptists (Mat. xvi. 23; Mk. ix. 33), immediately after the blessing of Peter, mention is made of "Satan" or "Devil." To bless Peter, and to call him

"Satan" immediately afterwards, is consistent with the human Christ described by Mark and Matthew. The difficulty is avoided, in Luke, by omission; but the Fourth Gospel, retaining the traditional mention of the word "Satan," or "Devil," directs it to Judas; upon whom elsewhere the Fourth Gospel (xii. 4-8) concentrates the faults imputed by Matthew (xxvi. 8) not to Judas alone but to all the disciples.

Readers who may think that this last dislocation of the words of Jesus appears somewhat improbable should consider carefully the patent instance which follows. In the synoptic account of the betrayal, Matthew and Mark represent Jesus as awaking the sleeping disciples (at the moment of the arrival of the traitor and his band), with the words, "Rise, let us be going (*ἐγείρεσθε, ἀγούμεν*). Behold, he that betrayeth Me is at hand" (Mat. xxvi. 46; Mk. xiv. 42). Luke alters this; it is too human for him, seeming to imply flight; and therefore he substitutes a command, in the second person, "Rise up and pray, lest ye enter into temptation" (Lu. xxii. 46). But John, while averse to this change of the traditional words, neutralizes their questionable effect by taking them completely out of their context. Accordingly, he places them between the discourse on peace in ch. xiv. and the discourse on the vine in ch. xv., just at the point when we may suppose the Master with His disciples to be rising from the table, purposing shortly to pass quietly from the lighted upper-room where He had been celebrating the last supper down into the streets of Jerusalem, on His way to Gethsemane. Taken in this context, the words are free from all suspicion of haste or trepidation; on the contrary, they betoken authoritative decision. Rising from the sacred meal, and going forth to welcome "His hour," the Saviour says,—as if with the consciousness that He is the High Priest of the World, going forth to celebrate the sacrifice foreordained before the foundations of the world,— "But that the world may know that I love the Father, and as the Father gave Me commandment, even so I do. Arise, let us go hence (*ἐγείρεσθε, ἀγούμεν ἐντόθεν*)."

The entry into Jerusalem, the crucifixion, and resurrection, are almost the only remaining events common to the Fourth Gospel with the synoptists. The entry is much condensed, and closely connected with the raising of Lazarus (xii. 18); the lengthy account of the sending for the ass is passed over in the words—"Jesus, when He had found a young ass, sat thereon"; and the acclamations of the multitude and the pomp of the procession are all omitted or lightly touched, as if the gleam of popular favour which so impressed the synoptists scarcely deserved the attention it had received from them. It was a mere consequence of the raising of Lazarus: "For this cause the people also met Him, for that they heard that He had done this miracle." Yet in Matthew (xxi. 11), when the city asks "Who is this?" the crowd replies, "This is Jesus, the prophet from Nazareth of Galilee"—making no mention of the wonder which—according to the Fourth Gospel—was the sole cause of the procession.

After this, John omits the purification of the temple, which he has placed earlier, at the first visit of Jesus to Jerusalem (ii. 15),<sup>1</sup> and passes rapidly to the last supper. Here, as is well known, there are great difficulties in recon-

<sup>1</sup> The purification of the temple, placed as Christ's first public act, is as suitable an introduction to the life of Christ in the Fourth Gospel as the sermon in Nazareth is to the life of Christ in the Third Gospel. In Luke (the Gospel of mercy), the proclamation of the "healing of the broken-hearted" to His friends at Nazareth; in John (the Gospel of the Word of God, in which the words *ἐλεος, ἐλεῖν, σπλαγχνίζομαι*, so often repeated by the synoptists, are altogether absent), the purifying of the temple of God,—is the most appropriate commencement of the Saviour's public work. Besides, the prophecy of Malachi



ciling the account of the Fourth Gospel with that of the synoptists. In the synoptists the last supper is (apparently) the passover, in which the Lord bequeathes Himself to His disciples as their sacrifice, giving them His body and blood; in John the last supper, so far as he describes it, is merely the last meal shared by the Master and His disciples, at which He washes their feet, and exhorts them to humility, patience, and peace; and it is expressly described as being "before the feast of the passover" (John xiii. 1). Again, in the synoptists, Mark places the crucifixion at the third hour (9 A.M.), and the darkness is made by all the synoptists to last from 12 to 3 P.M.; but John (who is describing in the crucifixion the sacrifice of the passover, the slaughter of the Lamb of God which was to take away the sins of the world) naturally places the crucifixion later, in order that the Lamb may be slain "between the two evenings," as prescribed in the law; and therefore he does not place even the delivery of Pilate's verdict till the sixth hour, i.e., 12 o'clock, and the crucifixion, consequently, later still. The symbolism which prevails in the Fourth Gospel may incline us generally to accept the synoptists' narrative in preference. But there are special reasons why, at a very early date, a slight misunderstanding, among the Gentile churches, of Jewish custom and of the common tradition may have led to an erroneous supposition that the last supper was the passover meal; and the explanation suggested by Canon Westcott (*Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, p. 344) seems a very reasonable one. In this case, therefore, the Fourth Gospel must have the credit of dissipating an error which had very early crept into the synoptic narrative (namely, the insertion of the words "The first day of unleavened bread," Mat. xxvi. 17; Mk. xiv. 12; Lu. xxii. 7); nor is it at all unlikely that this rectification came from the apostle John himself. But as regards the hour of the crucifixion, it seems more likely that the account of Mark is correct, not only because it leaves more time for the burial before sunset, but also because the later hour implied in the Fourth Gospel appears naturally suggested by the same symbolism which afterwards finds in the wounded body of Christ a fulfilment of the two prophecies, "A tone of Him shall not be broken," and "They shall look on Him whom they pierced."

Passing now to those details of the crucifixion wherein the Fourth Gospel differs from the synoptists, we find in almost each case but one motive—to enhance the majesty of the Saviour. Even in the arrest of Jesus this motive appears. The synoptists tell us that He was arrested by a "crowd" (ὄχλος), servants, sent apparently from the houses of (παρά Mat.; ἀπό Mk.) the chief priests and elders; and as the moon shone at the full, so brightly that the disciples could discern their Master from some distance (a stone's cast), and perceive His agony, as well as hear the words of His prayer in the stillness of the night, they do not think it necessary to make mention of "lights" or "torches." The Fourth Gospel describes how the "cohort" of the citadel of Antonia is called out, together with the servants of the priests, making up in all, if the whole cohort is meant, five or six hundred men; and these approach, not with "swords and clubs" (as Mk.), but with "torches and lights and arms." Jesus goes forward to meet them, and intrepidly declares that He is the person whom they are

(iii. 1).—"Ἰδοὺ ἐξαποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου, καὶ ἐπιβλήσεται ἔξω πρὸ προσώπου μου (John the Baptist), καὶ ἐξαίφνης ἔξει εἰς τὸν ναὸν ἑαυτοῦ κύριος ὃν ὑμεῖς ζητεῖτε,—predicts a "sudden" coming of the Lord into the temple, following on the steps of his "messenger." This prophecy is better fulfilled, if the Lord comes to the temple immediately after the preparation of John the Baptist; and, besides, the "sudden" coming is better fulfilled in the early entry of Jesus (John ii. 14) than by the later entry in the synoptists, which was preceded by a public procession. Thus prophecy, as well as appropriateness, might induce an account of an early purification of the temple.

seeking, upon which they "recoiled and fell to the ground." Nothing of all this is found in the synoptists.

Though John agrees with Luke in the tradition that the servant's ear cut off by Peter was the "right" ear,<sup>1</sup> he entirely omits Luke's narrative of Christ's examination before Herod; but this is in accordance with his fixed purpose—while by no means neglecting graphic and picturesque detail—to ignore all petty local distinctions, and to draw none but large and clear outlines on his canvas. Rome and "the Jews" alone appear round Christ on the stage of his drama; not one of the Herods is so much as once mentioned from the beginning to the end of it. The irony of providence, by which Pilate is made to proclaim that Jesus is "King of the Jews" (xix. 20), reminds us of the similar irony by which Caiaphas, not speaking "of himself" but inspired by God, is forced to publish the suffering of the Saviour (xi. 51); and both passages are quite in the manner of the Fourth Gospel. So also is the very natural application of the prophecy, "And for My raiment did they cast lots," to the seamless tunic of Christ. Remembering what stress is laid by our author's teacher, Philo, on the high priest's garments (*Moses*, 14; *Dreams*, 37), which "represent the universe," we shall readily perceive that while the outer garment of Christ is freely given to the four quarters of the world, the inner seamless tunic (χιτών), that which He wears next to His heart, is not to be rent, representing as it does the regenerated world, "those who receive remission of sins through Him" (*Dialogue* liv.).<sup>2</sup>

*The Motive of the Fourth Gospel illustrated by the First Epistle of John.*—It has been said above that the 1st parison Epistle of John is most closely connected with the Gospel. The connexion is so close, in thought as well as in language, that the former may almost be called a summary of the latter. In the Epistle, even more clearly than in the Gospel, we see the author's habit of dealing rather with elements than with nations or individuals. With the exception of the illustration of "Cain," which he possibly borrowed from Philo (who uses Cain and Abel to denote the earthly and the spiritual principle, *Sacrifices of Cain and Abel*, 1), he prefers to dispense with personal illustrations of principles. He does not, like Paul, speak of Abraham, or Hagar, or Sinai, or Isaac, or Melchisedek, or the Jews, or the Gentiles; but of the world and the flesh, the water, the blood, and the spirit, light and darkness, life and death. In the Epistle, as in the Gospel, we see the rejection of Christ explained, not as a casual outcome of individual caprice or wickedness, but as an inevitable result of the eternal antagonism between light and darkness. In the Epistle, as in the Gospel, the author insists that the new commandment of Christ to "love one another" is really an old commandment which men have had from the beginning; a commandment as old as the promptings of the Light which from the beginning has "lighted every man coming into the world,"—an old commandment only so far made new as it has been brought home to the hearts of men with a quite new intensity by the manifestation of the incarnate Love of God. In the Epistle, as in the Gospel, it is recognized that the antagonism between the world and the spirit, between light and darkness, must go on without truce till one has prevailed; and each man must take one or other side, putting away all hope of compromise. There are two principles, says Philo, contrary to and at variance with one another,—the one represented by the God-loving Abel, the

<sup>1</sup> Note also that the Fourth Gospel is the first to give the servant's name, Malchus. In the same way the *Acta Pilati* for the first time give the names of the two thieves, Dysmas and Gestas.

<sup>2</sup> Only the Fourth Gospel thus distinguishes between the *ἱμάτια* and the *χιτών*. But compare Lev. xvi. 4, where the *χιτών ἱμασμένος* is prescribed as the dress for the high priest on the day of atonement; and see also Philo (*Dreams*, 37); and especially note Philo's remark that this *χιτών* is "not easily rent" (*ἀρραγέστερος*).

other by the self-loving Cain, which must needs be at variance when born, "for it is impossible for enemies to dwell for ever together." In precisely the same way does our author illustrate the same antagonism by the same personality: "Not as Cain, who was of that wicked one, and slew his brother. And wherefore slew he him? Because his own works were evil and his brother's righteous"; and then, relapsing from the unfamiliar method of personal illustration into his habitual language about principles or elements, he substitutes for Cain the "world," and for Abel the "children of God," and bids his readers "marvel not if the world hate you."

In this continuous strife between light and darkness the victory is to be gained by faith,—but faith supported by witnesses; and we read in the Epistle that the object of our victorious faith is "He that came through (διὰ) water and blood, Jesus Christ; not with the (ἐν τῷ) water only, but with the water and the blood; and the Spirit is that which beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth; because they that bear witness are three, the spirit (or breath, τὸ πνεῦμα) and the water, and the blood, and the three are united so as to make up the one" (εἰς τὸ ἓν εἶσι) (1 John v. 6-8).

Passing over many differences of interpretation, and asking, What is the meaning of the water and the blood? we turn to the Gospel, and, in the account of the crucifixion, we find (xix. 34) especial stress laid upon the fact that from the side of Jesus "there came out blood and water; and he that hath seen hath born witness (μαρτυρήσας), and his witness (μαρτυρία) is genuine (ἀληθινή), and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye might believe." In what sense is the "blood" here to be understood? As nourishing? or as cleansing? Almost certainly as cleansing; because above, in this very Epistle, the blood of Jesus is described (i. 7) as cleansing us from all sin. Inferring, then, that the blood signifies a superior purifying or baptismal influence, we necessarily infer simultaneously that the water signifies an inferior baptismal influence. Two purifications are mentioned in all the four Gospels, an inferior and preparatory, and a superior and final: the former is the baptism with water, the latter is the baptism with the Holy Spirit, or (as in Lu. iii. 16) with the Holy Spirit and fire (cf. also Lu. xii. 49). But the conception of "baptism with fire,"—though it is based on the early history of Israel (Num. xxxi. 23), and appears occasionally in the shape of a "fiery trial" of faith, as well as in the fiery tongues of Pentecost—was soon supplanted by one of two other conceptions, either sprinkling with sacrificial blood, or baptism with the Spirit. This higher purification, or baptism with blood, Jesus brought into the world. He not only came working by means of it (διὰ with gen., as above in the passage quoted, 1 John v. 6), but also, in a certain sense, in it (ἐν). That is to say, He himself underwent the higher baptism with blood as well as the lower purification with water, which He received from John the Baptist. "Can ye be baptized with the baptism wherewith I shall be baptized?"—He said to the sons of Zebedee (Mk. x. 38). The agony in Gethsemane, which was that baptism, was typified by Luke in an exudation of "sweat, as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground" (Lu. xxii. 44). But this baptism was scarcely public enough to be a sufficient fulfilment of the prophecy which predicted that "In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for sin and for uncleanness" (Zech. xiii. 1). When it became recognized that the Lord was this "fountain," and that His blood was the cleansing stream, then the piercing of His side and the visible emission of the purifying blood from the wound became an effective and almost necessary type of the spiritual purification, and the type of the blood of sprinkling, suggested

perhaps by Luke in his description of the agony, fell into the background, being supplanted by the more natural type of the pierced side.

Such a type would all the more commend itself because, without it, the crucifixion might almost seem incomplete. The mere piercing of the hands and the feet might seem an insufficient fulfilment of the prophecy of the "fountain"; and besides, since crucifixion was generally a lingering death extending over many hours, and since the body of Jesus was taken down on the same day on which it had been attached to the cross (and, according to John, only three or four hours after the commencement of the crucifixion), the record of His death, without the spear wound, might seem to justify the statements of those who maintained that Christ never died at all, and that He was a man only in appearance. Therefore, as a proof of His humanity and of the reality of His death and sufferings, no less than as a fulfilment of the prophecy of the "fountain," it was natural that the latest Gospel should insert, and that the church should readily accept, the witness through blood as well as water, which is so emphatically related by the author of the Gospel, and here appealed to by the author of the Epistle.

But the question remains, What is meant by the connexion of the water and the blood with the breath or spirit—"They that bear witness are three, the breath (or spirit), and the water, and the blood"? Philo may throw light both on the number and on the nature of the witnesses. Only to earthly matters did the rule apply that "in the mouth of two witnesses shall every word be established:" heavenly matters required, so Philo teaches, "three witnesses" (ἀγίων δὲ πρᾶγμα δοκιμάζεται διὰ τριῶν μαρτύρων, *Posterity of Cain*, 27). He also calls attention to the fact that Moses declares 'with apparent inconsistency (1) in Leviticus (xvii. 11) that blood is the essence of life, (2) in Genesis (ii. 7) that breath is the essence of life; and he reconciles the two statements by assigning to men two kinds of life: (1) the irrational, which they have in common with beasts, which life has for its seat (ἐλαχε) blood; (2) the rational, which flows from the fountain of reason (λογικῆς πηγῆς), which has for its seat breath (or spirit), "not (mere) air in motion, but a kind of type and impress of that divine power which Moses calls by a name especially appropriated to it (κύριος ἐνώματι), image (of God)" (*The Worse plotting, &c.*, 23). Elsewhere (*Who is the Heir*, 11) he says that blood is the essence of the entire soul, but divine spirit (πνεῦμα θεῶν) the essence of the dominant part of the soul. On the metaphor of the water also Philo throws light. Water and earth, he says, represent the origin, growth, and maturity of the human body; consequently, he tells us, purification by water is that preliminary recognition of one's own nature ("know thyself") which is required from those who aspire to the higher purification. Hence purification by water, he asserts, was appointed by the law as a preparation for the purification by sacrificial blood; and hence the Sacred Word thought meet that the high priest, whenever he purposed to perform the sacrifices ordained by law, should previously sprinkle himself with water and ashes (*Dreams*, 36, 37; *Those who offer Sacrifice*, 1, 2).

If now we could find in the Gospel narrative of the crucifixion some mention also of the breath or spirit, nothing would remain wanting to make up the triple purification and triple witness mentioned in the Epistle, of "the spirit and the water and the blood." Such a mention is probably intended in the willing surrender of the "breath" or "spirit," which is mentioned (xix. 30) in the Fourth Gospel alone [Mk. ἐξέπνευσε, Mat. ἀφῆκε; Luke (xxiii. 46) who comes nearest to John only describes the intention, not the fact, παρατίθειμαι]: "He bowed His head,



and gave up His breath" (or spirit). Thus the meaning both in the Gospel and in the Epistle appears to be the same. (1) Jesus took unto Himself not only (a) the dead fleshly nature of man, typified by water, but also (b) the life and passions of man, typified by blood, and (c) that higher life of man (in virtue of which he is described as made in the image of God), typified by the spirit. (2) In these three departments of existence He made three several sacrifices, pouring forth (d) water and (e) blood from His side, and giving up (c) His breath as the last sacrifice of all.<sup>1</sup> (3) Thus these three sacrifices betoken three several purifications:—(a) the purification, by water, of the body in baptism; (b) the purification of the soul by the death of the lower nature (what Paul calls "the old man"), which partakes in the death of Christ; (c) the purified life of the soul rising from the dead through the Spirit, and living with, and in, the risen Saviour. The two latter purifications are two phases of the same (the former implying dying in the blood of Christ, the latter rising again and living in His Spirit); but there is sufficient difference to warrant a distinction. (4) These three purifications go to make up the one perfectly pure and ideal purification and sacrifice for sin, which is the Lamb of God, the Word (εις το εν εινω).<sup>2</sup>

Stress has been laid upon this important passage in the Epistle because it appears to be a key to much that we shall find in the Gospel. It reveals an exaggerated notion of the importance of baptism with water, against which the author feels compelled to contend; "not by water only, but by water and blood." Somewhat in the same way Paul uses not water but earth (Philo using water and earth) to contrast the natural man, the mere "living soul," with the "lifegiving breath, or spirit" (1 Cor. xv. 45, 47). But that which distinguishes John from Paul is the use of mystical imagery, arranged with a certain numerical symmetry. Sometimes the imagery is dual, when it describes incompleteness, such as the conflict between the world and the children of God, between light and darkness, between God and the devil. But in other cases it is triple: he appeals to three classes, the children, the young men, the fathers; contending against three enemies, the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, the imposture (αλαζονεία) of life; and strengthened in their faith by three witnesses on earth, the water, the blood, and the spirit—all of which dimly tends towards that other triple witness which has been inserted in the Epistle by later scribes (v. 7), the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit.

If we could be sure that the Second Epistle was from the same pen as the First, then the very great probability that the "elect lady" and the "elect sister" (2 John 1; ib. 13) represent two churches might prepare us for similar personifications in the Gospel; yet as this personification is disputed by some, we must not lay much stress on it.<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless we have seen enough of the nature of the Epistle to be prepared (in passing to the larger work by the same author) for a Gospel of types and symbols, a Gospel of selection rather than of continuous narrative, a Gospel in which principles on a large scale rather than individual characters shall be represented, and in which light

<sup>1</sup> A somewhat similar compound sacrifice of "blood" and "mind" is described by Philo (*Alleg.*, ii. 15), who represents the High Priest as "having put off the robe of opinion and fancy, and as coming disrobed into (the Holy of Holies) to make an offering of the blood of life (σπείσαι τὸ ψυχικὸν αἷμα) and to offer up as incense all his mind to the God of salvation."

<sup>2</sup> No doubt these three sacrifices are also connected, in the author's mind, with the three gifts: (1) the water springing up into everlasting life; (2) the wine of the Lord's blood; (3) the spirit which He breathed into the souls of His disciples.

<sup>3</sup> Dr Lightfoot (*Col. iii. 12*) accepts the personification in 1 Pet. v. 13 as "probably" intended.

and darkness, death and life, the word and the world, the water and the spirit, and the spirit and the blood, shall play no inconsiderable part.<sup>4</sup>

*Analysis of the Fourth Gospel.*

As was to be expected from a writer conversant with the system and thought which, for brevity, we call the school of Philo, the prologue of the Gospel opens with a protest against Philo's doctrine of an impersonal or quasi-impersonal Logos. The Logos or Word is at once declared to be (i. 1), not the mere instrument by which the world was made, but the companion of God, and God; a Light, from the beginning shining in darkness, received by some, to whom power was given to be born of God, but rejected by others who were the children of the flesh. John the Baptist is introduced, in marked distinction from the Word, as a "man;" not the Light, but a witness to the Light; and the Baptist declares at the very outset of the public life of Jesus (i. 16) that, though the law was given by Moses, the gifts of divine grace and truth came through Jesus, and that He, being the only begotten Son in the bosom of the Father, has manifested the invisible God to men. The baptism of Jesus by John is omitted; but John bears witness to the visible descent of the Spirit upon Jesus, adding that it "abode upon Him," and he bears record that his own baptism with water is but to prepare the way for Him who will baptize with the Holy Spirit; and that He on whom the Spirit thus descended is the Son of God, the Lamb of God that is to take away the sins of the world. Here, then, at the very outset, we see the thoughts, and one may almost say the *dramatis personæ*, of the Epistle re-introduced in the Gospel—light and darkness, the word and the world, the law and grace, the Father, the Spirit, and the Son. The three grades of purification are not as yet mentioned; yet there is perhaps a side-reference to them in the three grades of the world, *i.e.*, of impure existence, which are alluded to in the contrast between those who are born "of God" (i. 13) and those who are born (1) of blood, (2) of the will of the flesh, (3) of the will of man.

The narrative of the calling of the disciples implies unmistakably that this book is not to follow the common tradition, nor to be a complete narrative, but rather a selection; for it only narrates the calling of six of the twelve, and one of these, Nathanael (significantly described as a man of Cana, where two out of the eight miracles in this Gospel are to take place), is so far from being universally identified with one of the twelve that Augustine excluded him from the number. The earlier names are mentioned in the same order as in Papias (see above, p. 820), and suggest the inference that some of these apostles, or their disciples, dwelling in the neighbourhood of Ephesus, furnished some of the materials of which the Fourth Gospel is composed. Two points are further to be noted in this narrative. (1) In order to enhance the dignity of the central character, the writer causes the inferior characters to revolve around Jesus, conversing with and questioning one another, doubting and erring, before venturing to obtrude themselves upon Him (see, besides this passage, iv. 27, iv. 33, vii. 27, 40-43, xi. 16, xi. 37, xii. 20-22, xiii. 24, xvi. 17; and note how, both in xvi. 19 and in other passages, Jesus, after the manner of a king, takes the initiative in addressing His disciples, instead of their bringing their difficulties to Him unbidden, as they do for the most part in the synoptists).

<sup>4</sup> The numerical symmetry that pervades this Gospel is fully recognized by Canon Westcott, who sees "three pairs of ideas" running through the work, and "seven witnesses" corresponding to the seven times repeated "I am" (vi. 35; viii. 12; x. 7; x. 11; xi. 25; xiv. 6; xv. 1), and to the seven "signs" of Christ's ministry on earth, followed by one "sign" of the risen Christ.

(2) The second point is the error of Philip in saying, "We have found Him, of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph" (i. 15). Philip introduced with this slightly pompous and erroneous statement—in a kind of irony highly characteristic of our evangelist—seems intended as a contrast to the humiliated and wiser Philip of the fourteenth chapter: "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known Me, Philip?"

The next chapter (ii.) opens with a "sign," of which the symbolism is obvious.<sup>1</sup> The water changed into wine evidently typifies the substitution of grace for the law. It was a common metaphor among the Jews to express the superiority of the oral tradition to the written law by saying that "the law is water, but the words of the scribes are wine"—a metaphor that exactly recalls the words of Origen about this very sign: "Before Jesus the Scripture was water, but from the time of Jesus it has been made wine for us" (*Comm. in Ev. Joann.*, xiii. 60). A somewhat similar comparison of old wine and new wine had been adopted by Jesus Himself to illustrate the difference between His teaching and the law of Moses. The identity between the purifying blood of Christ's sacrifice and the nourishing blood of His sacrament is understood even by Justin independently of the Fourth Gospel, and would be a natural inference from the Messianic prophecy (Gen. xlix. 11), which identified the cleansing stream that was to purify the robe of the Messiah with the blood of the grape, declaring that He should "wash His robe (*i.e.*, as Justin explains it, His church) in the blood of the grape." Therefore, in changing water into wine, the Messiah is, by His first sign, striking the key-note of all that is to come, indicating the object and nature of His work, *viz.*, the supersession of the law by the gospel, and the introduction of a new spiritual nutriment and purification, which shall at once cleanse and strengthen and gladden the soul—all this to be effected by and in Himself through His blood.<sup>2</sup>

The prediction here made of "the hour" when the "blood of the grape" should stream from His wounded side is at once followed by a second similar prophecy. After leaving Cana for the passover in Jerusalem (where He purifies the temple by expulsion of the money-changers;

<sup>1</sup> It is true that the symbolism of this "sign" is not indicated in the text in the same clear manner in which the symbolism of the feeding of the 5000 is avowed (vi. 32, 33); but there is a clear reference to it in the words (ii. 4) "Mine hour is not yet come," which seem to look forward to the hour when the "blood of the grape" should stream from the wounded side of Jesus. It may be necessary to point out, at the outset of this analysis, that the language of the Gospel may naturally have been affected, not only by the thought and language of Philo, but also by what was called the "Asiatic" style, which was prone to metaphor and symbolism: see Lightfoot's *Galatians*, p. 362, where we find that Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus (born or converted about 130 A.D.) described John (probably metaphorically) as a priest, wearing the *πέταλον* or high priest's mitre, and speaks of Melito as a "eunuch," meaning merely that Melito devoted himself to Christ ("propter regnum Dei eunuchum"). It is noteworthy in this context, that the Epistle to the Ephesians is the only Epistle that appears to contain an extract from one of those early hymns which, as Pliny says, the Christians used to "sing to Christ as a god," and this hymn, as is natural, deals in metaphor: "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light" (Eph. v. 14). Probably from some such Asiatic metaphor (that "John, though dead, still breathed in the church") arose the tradition, of which mention is made by Augustine, that the earth over the apostle's body still rose and fell with his breath.

<sup>2</sup> This narrative may be abundantly illustrated from Philo. (1) He speaks of "the veritable High Priest," who pours forth a libation of "pure wine, namely himself" (*De Somniis*, ii. 27); (2) he connects this High Priest with the Logos by describing the Logos as a priest having for his inheritance the Eternal (*τὸν ἄνρα*), a priest of the most high God (see also *De Somniis*, i. 37); (3) he speaks of this priest (under the type of Melchisedek) as substituting wine for water: "Melchisedek shall bring forward wine instead of water, and give your souls to drink" (*Allegories*, iii. 26).

see above, p. 827), Jesus answers the request of the Jews for a sign with these words, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." It is added that He "spoke of the temple of His body."<sup>3</sup> It is interesting to note four different stages of development in the expression of this prediction. The synoptists Matthew and Mark declare that a very similar charge (differing only in "I will destroy" and "I am able to destroy," Mat. xxvi. 61; Mk. xiv. 58) was brought against Jesus by false witnesses; and they give us no hint that the witnesses erred by a simple and natural misunderstanding. Luke, however, who not only wrote after the destruction of Jerusalem (when it would be a common saying that the Lord Jesus had destroyed the temple), but also modified his Gospel in many respects to suit it to the requirements of the changed times, makes no mention of any false accusation. In his subsequent treatise of the Acts he goes a step further; for there the accusation is repeated (Acts vi. 14), and not denied. Now, lastly, the author of the Fourth Gospel adopts the charge as in the main a true one, or at all events as an inevitable misunderstanding in which His disciples, as well as His enemies, participated. At the same time, this prophecy, like the symbol of the wine, prepares the way for Christ's subsequent doctrine (xiv. 23) that every man is a temple of God, and that He Himself is that Temple in the highest sense. This doctrine had been taught even before Paul by Philo, who scouts the thought of preparing for the Supreme a "house of stone or wood," and declares (*Cain and his Birth*, 20) that the invisible soul is the terrestrial habitation of the invisible God. Yet though Philo's language may have influenced the language of the Fourth Gospel in such passages as xiv. 23, it is most certain that this doctrine is a necessary inference from the teaching of Christ Himself, who taught us that the body must be "full of light." There is therefore no essential misrepresentation in this introduction of the Pauline doctrine of Christ the Temple or Church.

<sup>3</sup> An inference has been drawn from the words *Τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἕξ ἔτησιν ἀκοδομήθη ὁ ναὸς οὗτος* (ii. 20), that because the year so indicated would be the same year as that assigned by Luke to our Lord's commencement of His public work, therefore, by their coincidence, the two Gospels mutually support each other. But it seems natural that the writer of this Gospel, an educated Jew, should know both the date of the commencement of the temple and the date as given by Luke of the commencement of our Lord's ministry; and it seems characteristic of the author, by details of this kind (and especially by numbers), to add picturesqueness and realism to his narrative: cf. the 200 pence (vi. 7), the 200 cubits (xxi. 8), &c. However, it must not be forgotten that Origen (*Comm. in Ev. Joann.*, x. 22) throughout his long discussion of this passage assumes that the meaning is "in" not "during" forty-six years. And this seems to be the natural translation of the words—"the temple was built in forty-six years" (although the dative may be used for duration of time, the acrostic hardly permits the English version); and if so, the author is under a mistake in supposing that the temple was completed. Yet from this passage (ii. 20), and from other indications of a knowledge of Jewish customs, Messianic expectations, and the geography of Palestine, it has been inferred that the author was a Palestinian Jew. A stronger argument is the author's preference of the Hebrew rather than the LXX. version of the Old Testament (Canon Westcott quotes vi. 45; xiii. 18; xiv. 37), which certainly shows either that he used the Hebrew version himself, or that the Ephesian doctrine was based upon that version. The knowledge of the country does not seem to exceed what might be attained by any Alexandrian Jew who had spent one or two passovers in Jerusalem and had travelled for a short time in Palestine; and the geographical argument has been unduly strained by such suggestions as that a "minute knowledge" of the relative positions of Cana and Capernaum is implied in the expression "He went down" (ii. 12). The same argument would show that the author of the book of Jonah had a "minute knowledge" of the position of Joppa (Jonah i. 3), or that the author of the Acts of the Apostles had a "minute knowledge" of the places from which he or Paul "went down" to Attalia, Troas, or Antioch (xiv. 25; xvi. 8; xviii. 22). Any traveller might know that Capernaum was in the low-lying basin of the Jordan, down on the edge of the sea of Galilee, without having a "minute knowledge" of its position relatively to the inland villages of Galilee.

prediction regarding the temple.

Calling of the disciples.