

The whole of the next chapter (iii.) deals with purification by water and the spirit. The learned but timid Nicodemus, "the teacher" of Israel (iii. 10), exhibits the blindness of carnal learning as contrasted with the knowledge that belongs to those who are born of the spirit. A third prediction of "the hour" is expressed through a third figure, the serpent in the wilderness. But this figure introduces a new conception, that of faith, an intense looking towards Christ, even as the children of Israel looked on the healing serpent.<sup>1</sup> This thought of faith as sight, illustrated perhaps by the statement that Nicodemus had come by night, introduces a few remarks on a subject hereafter to be more amply treated by the evangelist—the difference between the children of light and the children of darkness (iii. 18-21). In the second section of this chapter the subject of water-purification is taken up again by the Baptist, who contrasts his own inferior purification with the higher purification of the Messiah, and his own decrease with Christ's increase, describing himself (almost in the language of Paul) as "earthly," whereas the Messiah is "from heaven." But the Baptist also introduces the subject of faith; the path of life is through faith in the Son of God: "He that believeth in the Son hath everlasting life" (iii. 22-36).

Particularly to be noted is verse 24 of this chapter, in which it is expressly stated that "John was not yet cast into prison." It will be remembered that the synoptists give no account of the public appearance of Jesus till after the imprisonment of John. It was therefore open to the enemies of the church to maintain that Jesus was but a pupil of the Baptist, and that He did not venture to teach till His master John had been shut up in prison. Much more might this be asserted in Ephesus, where, as we have seen, there were some who were baptized only with the baptism of John, and who knew nothing of the Holy Spirit. On this account probably it is that our author introduces Jesus as working by the side of John, before his imprisonment, and even then inevitably, and against His own will, drawing multitudes from the Baptist to Himself. The apostle John himself is one of the first to leave the Baptist for the Greater Teacher (i. 37); but the Baptist also is made to witness, and to rejoice in, the desertion: "He must increase, but I must decrease." And finally, we are told that the superiority of Jesus over the Baptist had become so manifest that the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John, and upon this, desiring to avoid this appearance of superiority, Jesus retired to Galilee<sup>2</sup> (iv. 1). It would not be possible more effectively to repel every suggestion of the pupilage of Jesus, or of his subordination—even His temporary subordination—to John the Baptist.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> According to Philo; the brazen serpent represents temperance, the antidote of pleasure; and he who has strength to behold the beauty of temperance, and to "discern God through the serpent" shall live (*Allegories*, ii. 20).

<sup>2</sup> The insertion of the remark that "Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples," serves two purposes:—(1) to magnify the Messiah; (2) to disparage the mere baptism with water.

<sup>3</sup> It is, of course, possible that here (as in the matter of the last supper) the Fourth Gospel may have preserved some historical traditions concerning the acts of the Lord in Judæa, which have not been preserved in the synoptic record. Nor is it denied that elsewhere, e.g., in the matter of the three passovers, the Fourth Gospel may be historical. There is scarcely evidence enough to admit of absolute demonstration on either side. All that is contended is that, whether historical or not, the incidents recorded in the Fourth Gospel are suggested (1) often by a clearly discernible motive in the mind of the writer contrasting forcibly with the motiveless, simple, inartistic narrative of St. Mark; (2) sometimes by a desire to supplement, if not to correct, the previous narratives of the synoptists. The presence of such a motive and desire is not, of course, absolutely inconsistent with historical accuracy; but, the more we consider the synoptic narrative to be objective, and the more we consider the Fourth Gospel to be subjective, the more we shall be disposed to believe that, in proportion as incidents in the latter are suggestible by motives and desires, in that proportion are

Now follows (ch. iv.) what may be called the foreign section of the Gospel. We noticed that, even in Luke, the Samaritans assume a prominent position, their faith and unconventional goodness being twice contrasted with the carnal formalism of the Pharisees, at one time in a miracle (Lu. xvii. 16), at another time in a parable (Lu. x. 34). We are now to see how the contrast between Samaria and Judæa is handled in the Fourth Gospel in the dialogue on the living water, which might fairly be called, from its subject, as from its scenery, the "Dialogue of the Well." The well is a frequent figure in the books of Philo. To all men, says Philo (*Planting of Noah*, xix.), there is, in common, the desire to find drink; but some seek drink for the body, others for the soul. The seekers after truth are as those who dig wells, and many seekers have dug wells without finding water; and taking the LXX. version of Genesis xxvi. 32, "We have not found water," he comments on the well of the oath (Beersheba), which is discovered to be "dry"; and he declares that the dry well illustrates the failure of all human search after knowledge, as compared with the ideal God-given knowledge which is like a gushing spring. Elsewhere (*Dreams*, ii. 2, *et seq.*) he says, even more explicitly, that the well is the emblem of knowledge; that its depth signifies the difficulty of the attainment of knowledge; and that concerning all knowledge the well-diggers have to make but one sad confession, "We can find no water." Moses sits by the well "waiting to see what water God will send forth for his thirsty soul" (*Alleg.*, ii. 4); Israel "sang the song of the well," i.e., sang a song of triumph at the discovery of knowledge (*Dreams*, ii. 4); and the remark of the daughter of Samaria (iv. 11) that "the well (*φρέαρ*) is deep," followed by the contrast of the "fountain" (*πηγή*) of water that "leaps up" (iv. 14); at once suggests Philo's contrast between the bond-woman Hagar at "the deep well" and Rebecca who nourishes those who come to her with "the fountain that never fails" (*Posterity of Cain*, 41). Origen, in the same way, considering Jacob's well to mean the Old Testament, contrasts Samaria leaving her *ιδρυα* (the old implement of knowledge) with Rebecca at the fountain (*Comm. in Ev. Joann.*, xiii. 10 and 29). The four wells dug by the patriarchs Abraham and Isaac represent (*Dreams*, ii. 3, 4) four departments of knowledge. The fourth and dry well represents the search after the fourth and incomprehensible immaterial element corresponding to the material heaven—a search that is necessarily fruitless. This being Philo's interpretation (and he indignantly protests against any other, as being unworthy of wise men), we shall also see a singular propriety in placing the dialogue on the living water in the neighbourhood of "the parcel of ground that Jacob gave to his son Joseph" (iv. 5); for here also Philo has prescribed a metaphorical interpretation, declaring that "Jacob gave Joseph Shechem, mean-

they likely to be non-historical, especially if they appear to be difficult to harmonize with the earlier narrative of the synoptists. It has been suggested that the lamentation over Jerusalem (Mat. xxiii. 37; Lu. xiii. 34), expressed in the words, "How often did I desire to gather together thy children . . . and ye would not," implies many previous visits. These words were no doubt spoken in Jerusalem, where Matthew (not Luke, see p. 800, above) places them; but still, may they not refer to the many occasions in Galilee where the Redeemer, striving to "gather together" the children of Israel, had surely included the "children of Jerusalem" in the scope of his efforts? Even if the words "thy children" are to be taken literally, they may refer to the occasions when the scribes and Pharisees had come down from Jerusalem to test the Messiah, and Jesus had proclaimed the new kingdom to them in vain. Though preaching in Galilee, Jesus was really conflicting with the spirit of Jerusalem, and striving to "gather together" the children of Jerusalem." In any case the supposition that *πρασείν* refers to previous public visits to Jerusalem results in an incompatibility. For no one maintains that Jesus had made more than two previous public visits to Jerusalem; and it is impossible that "how many times" can mean twice.

ing thereby the bodily things which are the objects of the outward senses" (*Allegories*, iii. 8). But there is also an appropriateness in the use of the name (iv. 5) "Sychar." For whether the name be a corruption of "Shechem" or of "Askar" (Sanday, *Fourth Gospel*, p. 93), in either case the name contains a possible reference to "drunkenness" (Isaiah, xxviii. 1, 7; *Dict. of Bible*, s.v.), and serves as a suitable contrast to the Living Water. The next point for consideration is the "five husbands" of the woman of Samaria. Is there any special meaning in the number "five?" Turning again to Philo, we find, a little after the passage about wells quoted above, the statement that "the number five is appropriate to the outward sense" (*Planting*, 32), and that it represents material enjoyment. This is certainly a natural use of the number, if it is to be used emblematically.<sup>1</sup> Further, the number "five" is connected also by Philo, not indeed with "husbands," but with "seducers." Philo (*Allegories*, iii. 88) says that the lawful husband is the mind (*νοῦς*), the unlawful husband or seducer (*φθορεύς*) is represented by the five objects of the senses working through the five senses.<sup>2</sup> Immediately before the passage, Philo adopts the more common metaphor of the Old Testament in speaking, not of the mind, but of the Lord Himself, as the Husband, being the Father of the perfect nature, and sowing and begetting happiness in the soul. Samaria is supposed by Justin (*Dial.* lxxviii.) to represent in Isaiah (viii. 4) "sinful and unjust power;" but here it rather typifies sense-wrapped ignorant unbelief. The whole of this imagery seems so well connected and so appropriately transferred from the pages of Philo to the pages of the Fourth Gospel, that one hesitates to accept another explanation (Keim) which would otherwise seem extremely probable—an explanation borrowed from the five religions of the five nations of Samaria (2 Kings xvii. 30-37). In either case, the sixth "husband" may very well refer to Simon Magus, who, as we know from the Acts of the Apostles (Acts viii. 11), had very early in the history of the church "for a long time" held the Samaritans "bound with his enchantments."<sup>3</sup>

Like all the other narratives of our evangelist, this narrative is in the highest degree dramatic. From her previous repellent attitude, the woman of Samaria is led, first into wonder, then into interest, then into conviction of sin (becoming ashamed of her false husbands), and into admiration of the New Prophet; lastly, she receives from the Messiah a draught of that spiritual water which alone can satisfy the longing soul; and in the climax she is brought to the very brink of the eternal fountain—"I that speak unto thee am He."

The journey into Galilee adds one more to the instances in which the Fourth Gospel corrects the synoptists. The saying that "a prophet is not without honour save in his own country" is stated by the synoptists to have been

<sup>1</sup> Origen (*Comm. in Ev. Joann.*, xiii. 9) speaks of "the five husbands as corresponding to the five senses;" and he says that Samaria is the type of a soul which has once been wedded to the objects of sense, but has recently divorced herself from these and allied herself to a "sixth husband," a false semblance of spiritual truth. If this stood by itself, we might regard it as one of many other specimens of Origen's baseless allegory; but it assumes importance when we find Philo, who wrote long before the composition of this Dialogue of the Well, using nearly the same language as Origen, who wrote after it and (apparently) without any knowledge of Philo's pre-existing metaphor.

<sup>2</sup> Elsewhere (*Migration of Abraham*, 37) he says that the "five daughters" of Salpaad represent the "outward senses." The same thing is represented (*Abraham*, 5) by "the five cities of Sodom."

<sup>3</sup> Yet the "sixth husband" may possibly be illustrated by the contrast which Philo (*Abraham*, 5) draws between the "seventh power," the "power of peace," and the "six powers of turbulence," which consist of "the five senses" and uttered "speech" (*ἡ προφορικὸς λόγος*) which prates of things that should not be uttered (*ἀχαλῆφ στόματι μύρια τῶν ἡσυχαστίων ἐκλαλῶν*): see Rev. xiii. 5.

uttered by Jesus in Galilee (Mat. xiii. 57; Mk. vi. 4; Lu. iv. 24) after the unexpected rejection of Him by His countrymen; and Mark adds one of those passages which were early "stumbling-blocks" to the church, viz., that "He was not able to do there any mighty work, . . . and He marvelled because of their unbelief." Not content with Luke's considerable modification of this passage, the author of the Fourth Gospel boldly places this saying of Jesus before the visit to Galilee, and assigns it as a reason for His going thither: "After two days He departed thence (from Samaria) and went into Galilee; for Jesus Himself testified that a prophet hath no honour in his own country" (iv. 44). The motive is obvious: Jesus is desirous of escaping from notoriety. He has found that the Pharisees (iv. 1) are aware of His superiority to John the Baptist, and that His disciples exceed John's in number; and for this very reason He leaves Judæa, and comes to Samaria, a hostile district. Even here, however, He cannot help making converts. But having made them, He leaves them and goes into Galilee, where at least He is sure to find "no honour." Yet even here, adds the author, He was honoured; for "the Galileans received Him, having seen all the things that He did at Jerusalem at the feast" (iv. 44). Thus skillfully, after his manner, the author takes those very sayings and traditions which had been turned against Jesus, and, by his delicate handling, uses them to enhance the glory of the Messiah, "who knew what was in man" (ii. 25).

Passing over the cure of the nobleman's son, which has been discussed above, we come to the first "sign" wrought on the sabbath (v. 2-9). Once more there is a contrast between the water of the law and the fountain of the Messiah. The rejection of this divine act of mercy, simply because it was wrought on the sabbath, introduces, almost for the first time, the conception of "judgment" or "condemnation." The word "judgment" had been mentioned in the dialogue with Nicodemus, as a necessary result, though not an object, of the coming of the Light, which, by its very presence, distinguishes and "judges" those who love the darkness (iii. 17-21); and now we have an example of the way in which the Light divides all who hold it into two classes—those who love it, and those who hate it. This is in accordance with the spirit of the synoptists, who (Mat. xxiii. 13; Mk. xii. 40; Lu. xx. 47) describe Jesus as addressing the sabbatarian sign-hinderers as "hypocrite," and as pronouncing on "hypocrites" greater "judgment" or condemnation (*περισσότερον κρίμα*). But that part of the discourse in which Christ describes Himself, in the presence of the multitude, as having received all power to judge and to quicken the dead, does not resemble anything in the synoptic narrative, except the discourse—"All things are delivered unto Me of My Father" (Mat. xi. 27; Lu. x. 22); and that was uttered privately to the disciples, after their return from their mission. It is possible that the author here (as elsewhere) sets down, as a public discourse, some sayings that may have been uttered privately; and the words "that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father," remind us at once of the synoptic saying, "He that receiveth you receiveth Me, and He that receiveth Me receiveth Him that sent Me" (Mk. ix. 37, &c.); which again, in the synoptists, was a private, not a public saying.

The author's fidelity to the spirit rather than to the letter of the words of Jesus appears also in the reference to the quickening and raising from the dead. Jesus had in Matthew (x. 8) bidden His disciples to "raise the dead," and this precept is amplified, in the Fourth Gospel, into "The hour is coming and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live" (v. 25),—a saying that would naturally be inter-

preted in a purely spiritual sense.<sup>1</sup> No less spiritual is the doctrine here enunciated on faith. As elsewhere in this Gospel (i. 50; iii. 1, 2; iv. 39-41; xx. 29; and, if rightly considered, vi. 26), the author lightly esteems belief based on "mighty works" or wonders. The right faith is that of the Samaritans, who, rising out of the lower wonder-faith, attain to the higher faith which comes from hearing Christ (iv. 42). For to this, and to no other testimony, does Christ, in the Fourth Gospel, make His ultimate appeal. Christ does not indeed despise the testimony of John to Himself, but He does not accept it as a final basis for the true faith (v. 32-34). He appeals to the Scriptures, it is true, but rather as an unerring guide to the true source of faith than as being of themselves able to generate faith in the reader (v. 39). What then is the living final testimony to which He appeals? It is to His "works,"—not the "mighty works," or "wonders," but all "the works (*ἔργα*) which the Father hath given Me to do," meaning the whole of His life, and including both words and deeds. In other words, the Fourth Gospel appeals to that which we should call the influence of the life of Jesus, but which the evangelist better calls the "Spirit" of Jesus, passing from Jesus to His disciples, and from those disciples to others who had not seen Jesus—as the final testimony, convincing every honest heart, and generating in every conscience that loves the light a belief in Jesus as the true Light. In the synoptists, "faith" is, for the most part, that half physical thrill of trust in the presence of Jesus which enables the limbs of a paralysed man to make the due physical response to the emotional shock consequent on the word "arise," so that in the strength of that shock the paralytic is enabled to shake off the disease of many years; or, at the highest, it is a thrill through the inner being, whereby the soul shakes off the burden of sin. But in the Fourth Gospel faith implies even more than in Paul's Epistles; it is a faculty that tests, transmutes, and develops the recipient soul; it means a trust in Christ, not only as a sacrifice, nor as propitiation, nor as miracle-worker, nor as Son of God, but as source and object of all love, and the be-all and end-all of every human life. If such a Being is best expressed by "Word," then the human receptiveness of such a Being will be best expressed by the metaphor of "hearing." Accordingly the Samaritans believe, not because of miracles, nor because He told the woman "all that ever she did," but because they had enjoyed His presence for two days, and had heard Him. "Now we believe, not because of thy saying; for we have heard Him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world." Here we have at last a doctrine not borrowed from Philo, a doctrine that constitutes the great difference between Philo's philosophy and the religion of the Fourth Gospel, making the latter a powerful and life-inspiring motive for all classes of men, while the former remains a barren philosophy fit only for meditative hermits. For in Philo, faith, as in the Old Testament (Lightfoot, *Galatians*, pp. 154-162), has a passive meaning—trustworthiness, stability, constancy,—rather than the active meaning of trust, by which the lower nature is raised to the level of the higher; the "dog" to the level of "man" (Bacon, *Essays*, xvi. 79); the man to the level of Christ, and, through Christ, to God (1 Cor. iii. 23). Faith, in Philo, is a prize rather than an effort, a harbour rather than a voyage; it is "the only sure and infallible good, the solace of life, the fulfilment of worthy hopes" (Lightfoot, *Gal.*, p. 158); whereas, in the New Testament, it is the faculty by which one is able to trust in Christ, to love Christ, and to serve Christ—a faculty implying continuous effort, loyal and enthusiastic service, and progressive activity. The

<sup>1</sup> Compare Philo, *De Profugis*, 10, "Some that are living are dead; and some that are dead live."

nearest approach in Philo to the Pauline and Johannine faith is perhaps in the words that describe it as "the entire amelioration of the soul which leans for support on Him who is the cause of all things, who is able to do all things, and willeth to do those which are most excellent" (*ib.* p. 158); but even this, though the same in theory, is very different in practice from the faith of the New Testament. For—faith being neutral and colourless and taking its colour from its object—how different must needs be even the faith that is based upon the things that are "most excellent" from the faith that rises to the Father through such a one as Jesus of Nazareth, concerning whom even the most incredulous must admit that He made peace in man's troubled heart, banished sin from those who trusted in Him, and "constrained" (2 Cor. v. 14) even His bitterest persecutor to join in laying the foundations of His empire.<sup>2</sup>

In the discourse that follows the miracle of the feeding of the five thousand,<sup>3</sup> it is noteworthy that the author speaks of the eucharistic food not as the Lord's body and blood, but as His "flesh" and blood. Most characteristically: for "flesh" is, as in Paul's epistles, a principle, an element, and the author desires to show that the Lord's flesh and blood are the only satisfying element for the human soul. He has before spoken of blood and flesh and man (i. 13) as antagonistic elements to the divine elements; now he wishes to point out the divine elements themselves, and they are the flesh and blood of the Word, who "became flesh" (i. 14, *σὰρξ ἐγένετο*) for men. Here, as before, we must add that the use of this language—"Whoso eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood"—in a public discourse is quite unlike anything in the synoptists, and though it represents the essence of the teaching of the Lord's supper, somewhat amplified, it can hardly be considered in its chronological, or even perhaps in its artistic place, as a public discourse here. Yet it is necessarily placed here to account for the desertion of many of His followers. In the synoptists the desertion is otherwise explained. There we see Jesus, as He develops the constitution of His Kingdom, alienating, step by step, the Pharisees, Herod, the patriots or Galileans, the followers of John the Baptist, and at last the whole of His countrymen, till He is compelled to flee from Herod to the neighbourhood of Caesarea Philippi, where, as an exile with no more than twelve other outcast companions, He who had never revealed Himself to be the Messiah finds, upon questioning His disciples, that they have been led by the divine guidance to the sense that He and He alone must needs be their Redeemer; so that the seed of

The confession of Peter.

<sup>2</sup> It is a remarkable fact that this evangelist never uses the noun *πίστις*, which is frequently used by the synoptists, while he uses the verb *πιστεύω* about twice as often as it is used by all the synoptists put together. He appears to prefer to contemplate faith, not as in itself a virtue, but rather as a mental act or state taking its quality from its object. Note also that he seems to distinguish between *πιστεύω μοι* and *πιστεύω εἰς ἐμὲ*. The former is generally used in questions and negations (v. 38; viii. 45, 46; x. 38), or else of temporary and progressive trust, e.g., trust in God, in the word of Jesus, or in the Scriptures; all of which are regarded as preparatory acts leading to that final state of trust which can only be obtained by coming to Jesus (iv. 50; v. 24; v. 46; v. 47 (*his*); x. 38). The latter (*πιστεύω εἰς*) denotes the final state of fixed trust and repose on Jesus, and it is only once used by the synoptists (Matth. xviii. 6; ? Mk. ix. 42).

<sup>3</sup> Nothing has been said here about the difference of John's chronology from that of the synoptists, because, if the Fourth Gospel is a spiritual rather than an historical composition, it is scarcely to be expected that its chronology should be limited by historical considerations; and, in any case, the subject is too large a one to be discussed here. Canon Westcott remarks (*Gospels*, p. 285) that "a very strong case has been made out by Mr Browne (*Ordo Saeculorum*) for the limitation of the Lord's ministry to a single year. If there were direct evidence for the omission of τὸ πᾶσχα in John vi. 4, his arguments would appear to be convincing." The context suggests that the words τὸ πᾶσχα may not improbably be an insertion based on a sense of the spiritual meaning of the narrative rather than on history.

faith has at last begun to germinate, and He can now prepare to leave them, because He discerns already the temple of the new kingdom founded upon the inspired confession of Simon Peter. In the Fourth Gospel, on the other hand, the desertion of the disciples is represented as due to another cause, namely, their unspiritual dulness and their inability to understand the doctrines of their Master. Here and there in this discourse appear glimpses of the synoptic utterances,—for example, in the words "No man can come unto Me except My Father draw him" (vi. 44); and in the words "It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing" (vi. 63), one seems to recognize a version of part of the blessing of Peter, "Blessed art thou Simon, son of Jona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but My Father which is in heaven." But elsewhere, in the greater part of this discourse, the author departs entirely from the synoptists. In the confession of Peter, a very striking peculiarity is presented. Not only do we find brought out in a very touching manner what may be almost called the despairing faith of the confessing apostle—"Lord, to whom shall we go?"—as though the disciples were driven in desperation to remain with Jesus because, if they deserted Him, they had no hope, no refuge, elsewhere; but we also find Peter avowing the cause of his belief, and it is the same cause as moved the believing Samaritans; it is not the "signs" but the "words" of Jesus—"Thou hast the words of eternal life."<sup>1</sup>

Hitherto the Gospel has dealt with the Word as purifying and nourishing; now it has to speak of it as enlightening. The types have hitherto been water (under various aspects), wine, flesh, blood, bread; now we are to read of Jesus as Light. This is the highest or nearly the highest doctrine; for it is another aspect of the doctrine of the Spirit. The two doctrines are closely connected in Philo, who (*Creation of the World*, 8) declares that God assigned a "pre-eminence to the elements of spirit (or breath or air) and light, calling the former the spirit of God because it is the most life-giving element, and God is the cause of life;" and the visible light Philo declares to be the image of the invisible light, which is the image of God. In the short summary of Christ's doctrine set forth to Nicodemus (iii. 3-21), a brief suggestion of the doctrine of the light follows on the doctrine of baptism; now the higher doctrine is to be expanded. But light implies darkness, and therefore the development of the doctrine of light connects itself naturally with the period of conflict between light and darkness, i.e., between the Word and "the Jews,"—a conflict that becomes from this time more and more prominent.

First of all, however, comes a climax of the doctrine of water, and a preparation for the doctrine of light. This section (vii. 2-40) begins with a very distinct indication, differing widely from the synoptic treatment, of the relations between the Lord and his brethren. It is possible that the Ebionite school based their low views of Christ's

<sup>1</sup> Although the word used by Peter (*ῥῆμα*) is not the same as that used by the Samaritans (*λόγος*), yet a comparison of a great number of passages in which the "word" of Jesus (*λόγος μου*) is said to be the object of belief, and the source and province of spiritual life (ii. 22; iv. 50; v. 38, the word of God; viii. 31; viii. 37, 43, 51, 52; xii. 48; xiv. 23, 24) seems to show that the name *λόγος* itself had some influence in leading the author to insist so frequently upon the "word" rather than "the work" as being the prime cause by which the incarnate Word generated faith in the souls of men. In the Fourth Gospel the plural *λόγοι* is only once used by Jesus of His words (xiv. 24); and there in a passage where (seemingly) it is desired to distinguish the separate from the collective "words": "Ὁ μὴ ἀγαπᾶν με τοὺς λόγους μου οὐ τηρεῖ· καὶ ὁ λόγος ὃν ἀκούετε, οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐμὸς ἀλλὰ τοῦ πέψαντός με πατρός." On the other hand, the synoptists frequently represent Jesus as speaking of "my words" and of "the word," but never of "my word." Note also the remarkable passage (xii. 48) where it is said that Jesus does not judge men, but that the word which He has spoken will judge them.

nature upon traditions derived, or supposed to have been derived, from the Lord's brethren, and that the author is here striking at a particular school of thought. Comparing Mk. iii. 21 with Mk. iii. 31, we see clearly that the mother and brethren of Jesus, alarmed perhaps for His safety, and deceived by false reports about His sanity, desired to place Him under restraint; and Matthew and Luke unite in asserting that the mother as well as the brethren desired to speak to Him, and were rejected. But there is no mention of the mother in the Fourth Gospel as ever doubting or ever alarmed concerning her Son; the brethren alone doubt, and their doubt amounts almost to an antagonistic scepticism. They do not "believe in Him," yet they urge Him to go to "Judæa that the disciples may see the works that Thou doest. If Thou doest these things, show Thyself to the world" (vii. 3-5). No reproof could be more severe (from the point of view with which the Fourth Gospel regards the "world") than the reply of Jesus: "The world cannot hate you; but Me it hateth." So imbued are the Lord's brethren in fleshly worldliness, that the world recognizes in them that familiar darkness which it loves, because its works are dark, while it hates the convicting light. It is not surprising, after this, that Mary, who throughout this Gospel is regarded with affectionate reverence, is not committed to the guardianship of these sceptical brethren of the Lord.

The discourse itself is, as has been said, mainly preparatory. After one brief appeal to the conscience as the final test of the truth of His teaching (vii. 17), the conflict is predicted: "Why go ye about to kill Me?" A hint of the synoptic saying "He casteth out devils through Beelzebub" is perhaps contained in the reply of the people, "Thou hast a devil;" but the author deviates from the synoptists, in the justification of the sabbath-cure, not from the "ass" or the "ox" in the pit (Lu. xiv. 5), but from the practice of circumcision on the sabbath (vii. 22, 23). The violent spirit first manifested after the cure of the impotent man (v. 16, 18) now breaks out again, and a direct attempt made by the Pharisees to arrest Him (vii. 32), frustrated by the wonder of His words (vii. 35; and compare xviii. 6), leads Jesus once more to predict that He will soon pass away from them, and finally to conclude the "doctrine of water," by exclaiming in "the last day, the great day of the feast, . . . he that believeth in Me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water"<sup>2</sup> (vii. 38). The spiritual climax thus given to the doctrine of water is very striking. The well of living water, before promised to the woman of Samaria, is now not merely to spring up in the believer, as there stated (iv. 14), but it is also to flow forth from Him to others, thus preparing the way for the higher doctrine of the Spirit of fellowship which the author touches on in the next verse: "But this He spake of the Spirit, which they that believe on Him should receive" (vii. 39).

The method of the author is admirably illustrated by the dialogue between the people (vii. 41, 42): "Others said, This is the Christ, But some said, Shall Christ come out of Galilee? Hath not the scripture said that Christ cometh

<sup>2</sup> These words have caused perplexity, as not being found in any book of the Old Testament; but they are probably a corrupt reading or reminiscence of the LXX. version of Isa. xlii. 3, 4, "I will give water in the midst of drought to them that walk in a waterless land; I will place My spirit upon thy seed, and My blessings upon thy children—καὶ ἀνατελοῦσιν ὡς ἀνὰ μέσον ἕδατος, &c." The Greek words quoted above were probably separated from their context; ἀνατελοῦσιν was taken transitively and connected with ἕδαρ (ἕδαρ ἀνατέλλειν, Pind. *Is.*, 6 (5) 111, being a recognized phrase for "to make water gush forth"); and ἀνὰ μέσον was rendered "the middle parts," ἐκ κοιτίας. Such corruptions of the Old Testament are readily paralleled from Barnabas and Justin, although altogether unlike the method of quoting the Scripture assigned to our Lord by the synoptists.

of the seed of David, and out of the town of Bethlehem where David was?" It is a curious instance of the degree to which the dramatic character of the Fourth Gospel has been ignored, that even an acute commentator has inferred from this passage that John "was not aware of the birth at Bethlehem." The fact is that the author uses these and similar errors and blind gropings of the people, the enemies, and even the disciples of the Lord, to enhance the majesty and insight of Him who walks above them all, high in the light of heaven, while they are creeping in the mist around His feet. He does not stop to correct these vulgar errors, for he presupposes that his readers are in the light, and able to see through them all; and it is with a frequency almost betokening enjoyment that he repeats this device over and over again, in every case holding up the error in silence to the contempt or pity of his reader, and delighting to exhibit human folly glorifying the wisdom of God. Instances of this device occur in this very chapter. "Who goeth about to kill Thee?" says the ignorant multitude (vii. 20), at the very time when the arrest of Jesus is being planned by the Pharisees: "Out of Galilee ariseth no prophet," say the learned students of the law (vii. 52), so blinded by their malignity that they cannot even read the books that describe the birthplaces of Elijah and Jonah; "We have found Him of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph," says Philip, happy in the completeness of his new-fledged knowledge (i. 45), and ignorant that a time will come when he will hear from "the son of Joseph" this humiliating rebuke, "Have I been with you so long, and hast thou not known Me, Philip?"

Passing over the story of the woman taken in adultery as being an interpolation, we are led to that section of the Gospel which treats of the doctrine of light. The mention of the Father and the Son, as being two witnesses, bearing witness to the Son—according to the saying of "your law" that "the testimony of two men is true" (viii. 12-17)—is a subtle use of the words of Scripture, such as we look for vainly in the teaching of Christ as preserved by the synoptists.<sup>1</sup> But the connexion between the light and the truth, and between truth and freedom, and the dialogue that follows upon the genuine children of Abraham, remind us, in part, of the synoptic version of the Baptist's teaching about the children of Abraham (Mat. iii. 8; Lu. iii. 8); in part, of the teaching of St Paul concerning the freedom of "Jerusalem which is above" (Gal. iv. 26; and compare Rom. vi. 16-20).<sup>2</sup>

The climax of hatred and insult of the Jews is most appropriately expressed (viii. 48), "Say we not well that Thou art a Samaritan and hast a devil?" and it is also appropriate to a discourse on "the Light that lighteth every man coming into the world" that the Jews should be informed that even Abraham saw that light and rejoiced. It is probable

<sup>1</sup> It appears to mean the Son, on the one side, manifesting Himself by *εργα*, and the Father, on the other side, abiding in the heart of the hearer, and influencing the conscience to acknowledge and believe in the Son.

<sup>2</sup> Ver. 35 and 36 seem difficult to connect with ver. 34, "Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin. And the servant abideth (*μεινει*) not in the house for ever, but the Son abideth ever; if the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." The italicized words seem to confuse the thought. The argument that seems required is this. "No mere servant, such as Moses, is a safe patron for those slaves who desire the master of the house to enfranchise them; the safe patron is the Son, whose influence in the house is permanent." Just such an argument is found in the Epistle to the Hebrews (iii. 5; viii. 3). "Moses was faithful in all His house as a servant, . . . but Christ as a son over His own house, whose house are we;" and in the same epistle Christ is said to "abide" (*μεινει*) a priest continually, and to be able (Heb. vii. 24, 25) to save men to the uttermost, because He "abideth" (*δια το μεινειν αιδων εις τον αιωνα*). It seems probable, therefore, that some early teaching of the church is here confused by the addition of the italicized words.

that both here and in xii. 36 we ought (in spite of the LXX. usage) to translate *εκρυβη* "was hid" (cf. Lu. xix. 42; Heb. xi. 23), and that we must suppose the intervention of some supernatural agency in a judicial retribution hiding the Light from the children of darkness who seek to destroy it.

The section on light terminates with an appropriate sign, the opening of the eyes of the blind man, who is sent to wash his eyes in the waters of a pool named Siloam. The evangelist sees a mysterious meaning in the name of the pool. As the Baptist had baptized in *Enon* near to Salim, i.e., the "waters" near to and preparing the way for "peace";<sup>3</sup> and the Samaritan woman had boasted of her well of Sychar or drunkenness, and the impotent man had been healed in Bethesda or the "house of mercy," so now the opening of the eyes of the blind man is effected in part by the direct action of the Light of the world, but in part also by the instrumentality of water at a pool named "Sent,"—a word which may apply to an aqueduct, "*missio aquarum*," or to Him whom the Jews expected as the "Sent," i.e., the Messiah. The conclusion of the section on light (ix. 39), "For judgment I am come into this world; that they which see not might see, and that they which see might be made blind," accords with the passage in Matthew and Luke where Christ acknowledges to the Father that it hath seemed good to Him to reveal these things to babes and to hide them from the wise and prudent (Mat. xi. 25; Lu. x. 21); and the climax appropriately introduces the Pharisees, confident in the "lamp of the law," asking, in a tone which suggests the utter impossibility of an affirmative answer, "Are we blind also?" The answer of Jesus distinguishes two kinds of darkness in the soul—the involuntary darkness arising from inexperience of the light, and the voluntary darkness which arises from experience and rejection of the light. His answer explains the sense in which the word "hypocrite" was so often applied to the Pharisees by Jesus in the synoptists. The Pharisees were in darkness, and, like all other men, had received gleams from "the light which lighteth every man," convicting them of their darkness, and leading them to say, "We see not," if they had but been honest. But they persisted in saying, "We see."<sup>4</sup> Therefore, it is said to them, "Your sin remaineth" (ix. 41). These latter words, whether uttered or not by Jesus in the exact shape in which the Fourth Gospel gives them, are undoubtedly true to the spirit of His teaching; and they furnish a suitable end to the discourses on light, bringing prominently forward that "reproving" or "convincing" power of light which is one of the special attributes of that Holy Spirit to whom, step by step, the Fourth Gospel is leading us.

The metaphor of the good shepherd suggests an important difference between the Fourth Gospel and the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, viz., the absence of all allegory and almost all parable in the former. Why did the author, who rejected so many other parabolic subjects, retain only this parable of the shepherd in common with them? The answer may be, partly that it is a parable based upon the teaching of Philo, who distinguishes between mere indulgent "keepers of sheep" and "shepherds," somewhat in the same way in which our parable distinguishes between "hirelings" and shepherds; and he adds that the Supreme Shepherd is God, who orders all His flock of created things through the Logos, His first-born Son (*Plantatio*, &c., 11). In part, perhaps, the author may have

<sup>3</sup> Philo (as well as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews) emphasizes the fact that Melchisedek, the true High Priest, the giver of wine instead of water, is the King of Salim or peace (*Alleg.*, iii. 25).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Philo, *Who is the Heir?* 15, "Look up, so as to convict (*ελεγχειν*) the blind race of common men, which, though seeming to see, is blinded."

felt that the synoptic picture of the shepherd "leaving the ninety and nine sheep in the wilderness" while He seeks the single wanderer, requires at least to be supplemented by the picture of Him who putteth forth His sheep, and is followed by them, so that none of them wander. But a principal reason for introducing this parable at the conclusion of the doctrine of light, and before the narration of the death of Christ, is to prepare the way for that death, by exhibiting the reason for it in a clear light. It is true that Jesus has, before now, predicted that He is to be "lifted up" (iii. 14, viii. 28) and slain (vii. 19, viii. 40); but it needs to be distinctly stated that Jesus will not only be slain, but voluntarily slain; and the motive requires to be expressed. This is explained in the synoptists by saying that He came to give His life as a ransom (*λυτρον*) for many (Mat. xx. 28; Mk. x. 45). But to whom was this "ransom" to be paid? To God or to the evil one? The question was a difficult one to answer; and the Fourth Gospel avoids, though it does not solve, an insoluble difficulty by substituting a new metaphor for that of ransom: "I am the Good Shepherd. The Good Shepherd giveth His life for the sheep." Then, in a master-piece of delicate spiritual subtlety, while the expression "the Good Shepherd will even be slain by the wolf for the sheep's sake"—which would have introduced all sorts of intricate difficulties—is avoided, the same thing is, by antithesis, indirectly suggested—"But the hireling seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep, and fleeth." A repetition of this statement leads to a more emphatic reiteration that the Shepherd will lay down His life of His own free will (the essence of sacrifice), "in order that He may take it again" (x. 17)—thus entirely neutralizing the suspicion (so carefully avoided above) that the Good Shepherd may be doomed to succumb to the wolf.<sup>1</sup>

Two points remain to be considered in this chapter (x.). The words, "All that ever came before Me are thieves and robbers," have naturally caused some difficulty; but it is possible that some words, such as "in comparison with Me," are to be understood; and if the meaning was, "all previous redeemers of mankind have been, in comparison with the true Redeemer, self-interested and ambitious," then, such language becomes compatible with the author's point of view; and, even looked at from the synoptic side, it presents little more difficulty than the saying that John the Baptist, though the greatest of the prophets, was less than the least in the kingdom of God.<sup>2</sup> But the second point is of more importance. In defending Himself (x. 35) against the charge of making Himself God, Jesus is made by the author to argue that, if the judges of Israel in the Psalms are addressed as, in a certain sense, divine and gods,—"I have said ye are gods,"—a *fortiori* might He Himself without blasphemy call Himself the Son of God. But, if this argument might be adopted, then it might be urged that the Son of God differed from other sons of God only in degree, or, if in anything else, only in pre-existence, and the special privilege of pre-existence has been already destroyed by the evangelist; for, in the introduction to the healing of the blind man, he has caused the disciples of Jesus to take for granted, and Jesus not to impugn, the doctrine that all men exist before birth: "Master, who

<sup>1</sup> The use of *εθουον* ("exalt") to denote what the synoptists (Mat. xx. 19; xxvi. 2; Lu. xxiv. 7) denoted by *σταυρωθην* ("crucify") is very remarkable. In the synoptists, *εθουον* always means "to honour highly" ("every one that exalteth himself shall be abased" (Mat. xxiii. 12; Lu. xiv. 11); but, in the Fourth Gospel, Jesus uses it in addressing (viii. 28) His future murderers, "When ye exalt (*εθασητε*) the Son of Man": comp. viii. 40, "Ye seek to slay Me." Strictly speaking, of course, we must say that *εθουον* is not the *σταυρωθην*, but the result of it.

<sup>2</sup> Compare Philo, *Abraham*, 44, where a similar contrast is drawn between the distinctive "kingdoms" of human rulers and the beneficent "kingdom" of the ideal man.

did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind? Jesus answered, Neither this man nor his parents; but that the works of God should be made manifest in him" (ix. 2, 3). But if all men pre-exist, and if to all men, in a certain sense, may be addressed the title of "God," it would follow that even the Eternal Son of God, by whom the world was made, would be but the eldest among many brethren. It is scarcely possible that the evangelist intended his readers to follow out this train of thought; but it is unquestionable that in spite of the readiness to admit supernatural incidents, the author's habit of referring all phenomena to the action of certain elements—water, spirit, light, darkness, flesh, blood, and the rest—leads him (perhaps unconsciously) into a habit of describing and perhaps even conceiving the life and work of Christ Himself as conforming itself to an unalterable law, which is none the less a law, because it is also a will, the will of our Father. The works that He does are "prepared by the Father." His sheep hear Him; those that are not His sheep do not hear Him. The same thought is expressed, whether the law be regarded as the fixed order of things or as the will of the Father: "No man can come unto Me except the Father which has sent Me draw him."

Again and again He disclaims caprice, and even the exercise of an independent will: "I came down from heaven not to do Mine own will but the will of Him that sent Me" (vi. 38). Though judgment is committed to Him by the Father, yet so rigidly is His power and desire to judge restrained by facts or laws (or by whatever other name the truth may be called), that He solemnly declares that He does not really judge, it is the facts that judge. "I do not judge," He says (xii. 47), but "the word that I have spoken shall judge him;" and even where He accepts the task of judging, He declares that He judges "as He hears" (v. 30), and "with the Father that sent Him" (viii. 16), i.e., according to truth. The same conception of the work of the Word as being (like the working of the elements) universal, continuous (v. 17), and according to law, is expressed both in the prologue to the Gospel (John i. 1-9), and in the Epistle also, where the writer declares that the commandment which he gives to the church from Christ is "no new commandment," but an old commandment which men had had "from the beginning."

We come now to the last of the pre-resurrection "signs" of the Jesus—the raising of Lazarus. Even those who maintain the historical accuracy of every detail of this narrative will scarcely deny that its symbolic meaning goes down, and is intended to go down, to an act far deeper and far vaster than the revivification of the brother of Mary and Martha. Remembering the teaching of Paul (1 Cor. xv. 45) that there are two men,—the former the "living soul" or fleshly animal nature (*ψυχη ζωσα*), the latter the "quickening or life-giving spirit" (*πνευμα ζωοποιον*); the former the first Adam, the latter the second Adam—we see at once in this miracle the second Adam raising up the first Adam from spiritual death, by imparting to him His own life. The very word used by Paul to describe the second Adam (*ζωοποιειν*) is used by our author to describe the prerogative of the Son—"the Son quickeneth (*ζωοποιει*) whom He will" (v. 21). Other meanings may, no doubt, be conveyed beneath this central incident of the Fourth Gospel; nor is it impossible that the author, before describing how the Saviour laid down His life for mankind, wished to give the best possible proof of the spontaneity of the action (asseverated above, x. 17, 18) by showing that He was actually the source of life to others. As a preparation for His resurrection on the third day, what could be better than that He should raise from the dead one who had been four days lying in the grave? If, also, a preparation was needed for the doctrine of the Spirit, which is soon to come before