

us, the resurrection of Lazarus would serve this purpose too. For the Spirit is the source of life (*ζωοκώρατον*, Philo calls it, *Creation*, 7); and, therefore, just as the doctrine of the living water is preceded by the miracle of the water changed into wine, and the doctrine of bread by the miracle of bread, and the doctrine of the supersession of the intermittent sabbath by the continuous loving activity of the Father and the Son (v, 17) is preceded by the miracle of sabbath-healing vouchsafed to the man to whom the intermittent spring was useless, and the doctrine of the Light of the world is preceded by the miracle of giving light to the blind, so is it natural, and, as it were, proportionate, that the doctrine of the quickening Spirit (*cf.* vi. 63, τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστι τὸ ζωοποιῶν) should be preceded by some miracle of quickening the dead.<sup>1</sup>

The anointing and the triumphal entry into Jerusalem having been discussed above, we pass to the last discourses (xii. 20 to xvii. 26). The last discourses in the synoptists treat of the second coming of Jesus in the clouds of heaven, and of the day of judgment; the last discourses in the Fourth Gospel treat rather of the continuous and increased presence of Jesus in the hearts of the disciples, of the re-proving or judgment of the world by the Holy Spirit, and generally of the function of the Spirit in the church. In other words, the Fourth Gospel exhibits in a spiritualized form that which the synoptists set forth through material imagery. The promise of the future presence of Christ had been expressed by the synoptists in the legacy of His body and blood, which Christ is described as bequeathing to His disciples. The Fourth Gospel, which omits this incident (possibly as being already sufficiently known and receiving sufficient attention), lays more stress on the presence of the Spirit as Christ's substitute. It is important to observe that both the synoptic account of the last supper, and the last discourses in the Fourth Gospel, are founded on one and the same basis of historical fact, viz., that Christ approached death with the expressed conviction that His work would not be frustrated by it, but that He would remain for ever a living power in the hearts of His disciples. There is also, even in the Gospel of St Mark, an intimation that His disciples were to be aided by a "Holy Spirit," which should speak for them before princes and kings: "And when they lead you away, betraying you, take no forethought what ye shall speak, neither rehearse it; but whatsoever shall be given to you in that hour, this speak: for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Spirit" (Mk. xiii. 11). To the same effect Jesus speaks in the parallel passage of Luke (xxi. 14, 15), bidding His disciples not to rehearse their defence (*προμελετᾶν ἀπολογηθῆναι*), for He will give them "a mouth and wisdom," which their adversaries shall not be able to gainsay. Thus, even from our earliest Gospel, it would seem that to those unlettered Galilean peasants, diffident (as Moses had been before them) of the sufficiency of their rhetoric to plead their cause before the bar of the great ones of the earth, a promise had been made of a "mouth" that should plead for them. The Holy Spirit was to be their Advocate. It is not likely that Jesus should have uttered these two expressions (quoted above) and no more, about the Spirit which was to be His substitute. Therefore, if the author of the Fourth Gospel had access to any apostolic sayings and

<sup>1</sup> The complete discussion of this, the crowning "sign" in the Fourth Gospel, is not adapted for these pages. It would require a close examination of Lu. xvi. 20-31, together with Lightfoot's (*Horæ Hebraicæ*) comment on "Lazarus." On this point see also Wunsche, *Neue Beiträge zur Erläuterung der Evangelien*, p. 467; and compare Philo on the meaning of Eliezer (Lazarus) in *Who is the Heir?* 11, 12. The greater part of Origen's commentary on this portion of the Fourth Gospel has unfortunately perished; but some light may be thrown on it by a study of his *Comm. in Ev. Joann.*, xxviii. 5, 6, 9, as well as by Augustine, *In Joann. Evang. Tract.* 49. The reasons usually alleged for the omission of this "sign" by the synoptists would also require careful consideration.

traditions that illustrated the teaching of Christ during the last two or three days before His death, we might naturally expect to find in these traditions something more about the Spirit which was to be the Advocate of the disciples when pleading without their Master before the sanhedrin, and before princes and kings. Accordingly, finding in the last discourses of the Fourth Gospel an ampler doctrine on this subject, we have no ground, *a priori*, for regarding it with suspicion. True, the doctrine is set forth here, as elsewhere, in the peculiar language of the writer, so that we are absolutely certain that we have not the exact words uttered by Jesus; but this need not hinder us from accepting the thoughts as the thoughts of Jesus, if we can throughout trace the synoptic doctrine. In the synoptists Jesus predicts that He will "rise again"; obviously the letter of this prediction, though important, implies a still more important spiritual meaning beneath it. For this prediction would not have been satisfied by any amount of literal fulfilment if Jesus had merely walked from His grave and exhibited Himself alive, by tangible as well as ocular proof, to thousands of curious observers, hostile as well as friendly, unless He had at the same time poured a new influence or influent spirit into the hearts of those to whom He manifested Himself. It is characteristic of our evangelist that he realized (1) that the essence of the resurrection of Christ consists in His spiritual resurrection and intensified presence in the hearts of His disciples; (2) that this resurrection, triumphing over death, and making death the stepping-stone to a more active life, is as much in accordance with law, as is the growth of the corn of wheat which (xii. 24), "except it fall into the ground and die, abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." This law—illustrated daily by the increased influence of the dead upon the living, no less than by the fruitful death of the "corn of wheat"—a law so simple and yet so profound, like all the other laws enunciated by Jesus, can hardly have proceeded from any other than Jesus Himself. The spiritual depth of the doctrine, and the similarity which it bears to the synoptic prediction (in spite of the difference of outward form), furnish strong arguments that, in the last discourses of the Fourth Gospel, we have much of our Lord's own teaching, though modified by the medium through which it is conveyed to us.

The doctrine of the Spirit, regarded not now as the purifying element in conjunction with water, but as the Advocate or Paraclete—being the highest and most esoteric doctrine of all—is reserved for the inner circle of His disciples. First, therefore, it is necessary to bring to an end the doctrine of Jesus to the outside world; and the battle between light and darkness, between Jesus and the Pharisees, ends with a recapitulation and conclusion of the doctrine of light. The Gentile world, appearing on the stage in the person of some inquiring Greeks, stretches out her hand to the Messiah (xii. 20); a voice from heaven attests His glory (xii. 28). The Son of God pronounces the fall of the evil one, and, almost in the same word, His own victorious death (xii. 31, 32). Then the light is hidden from the rebellious nation (xii. 36); the evangelist pronounces against them the sentence of condemnation, that they are blinded because they loved darkness more than light, and the praise of men more than the praise of God; and for the last time the voice of Jesus is heard, as it were from behind a cloud, warning those whom He has left in darkness that in rejecting Him they have rejected the Father also (xii. 37-50).

The esoteric doctrine begins with a parable of action, in which the Lord, by washing the feet of His disciples, teaches them humility. Two classes of heretics seem aimed at in this parable,—those who reject the washing of Jesus, to whom Jesus replies, "If I wash thee not, thou

hast no part with Me;" and those who laid stress on repeated baptisms or purifications, "He that is (wholly) washed (*λελουμένος*) needeth not save to wash (*νίπτειν*) his feet." Now Judas, the child of darkness, goes forth from the chamber, and the evangelist seizes the moment to tell us that "it was night" (xiii. 30). Yet in this hour of darkness the hour of glorification is hailed by Jesus; and He conveys to His disciples, not indeed a new testament, but a new commandment, "that ye love one another" (ver. 34). How could this be called a new commandment for those who had been commanded long ago by Jesus to love even their enemies, much more their friends? The answer is found in the context: "As I have loved you, that ye also love one another," the meaning being, that after the death of Jesus, the memory of His love, enhanced in His absence, would spring up as an entirely new power within their hearts, so that "love" would assume a new meaning, and the command to love—though as old as the first influence of the Word, and therefore as the creation of man—would become essentially a new commandment. These words occur almost verbatim in the First Epistle of John (ii. 7), and, from their language, they can hardly be accepted as giving the letter of the words of Jesus; but they go down to the very roots of His teaching. The importance here attached to this new commandment of love leads us to observe that, throughout the whole of these discourses, love, almost as much as the Spirit, occupies the thoughts; and, indeed, in chapters xiii., xiv., xv., and xvii.,<sup>1</sup> the word *ἀγαπᾶν* occurs 24 times, against 10 times in all the rest of the Gospel. The connexion is obvious: step by step we are being led up to God; and God is love. The doctrine of the Spirit can reveal no higher manifestation of Him than this; and the Spirit itself is a Spirit of love, which will find its home only in the hearts of those that love.

Although Jesus has not expressly predicted His death, yet the warnings of betrayal and departure have troubled the hearts of His disciples. To comfort them Jesus promises that He will return, and be still present with them. But neither is the path of His departure and return, nor is His presence itself—so He warns Thomas and Philip—to be regarded as material. He will (spiritually) be more present with them, when, and because, He will be (materially) absent. Greater works will they do than He has done, because He, abiding with the Father above, will lift up their hearts to heaven—their home henceforth because their treasure, Christ, is there—and will make them one with Himself and with the Father, in will and in power. And here is repeated the saying, also found in the synoptists, that whatsoever the disciples pray for they shall obtain,—joined with the assurance that they shall do greater works (*ἔργα*) than He Himself does (xiv. 12). Note here that our evangelist brings out more clearly than the synoptists the spiritual meaning of the promise concerning prayer, and makes it evident that, as above, the works (*ἔργα*) meant are not "miracles" (*δυνάμεις*),—not the casting of a material mountain into the sea, as might be inferred from a misinterpretation of the synoptists,—but the Messianic "works" of forgiveness and regeneration.

The nature of Christ's future presence in the hearts of His disciples is differently described in different passages. At one time (xiv. 30) He declares that He Himself, together with the Father, will take up His abode in every heart that loves Him; but more often He uses the word used by Mark above, and speaks of a *Spirit* which shall be sent to them by the Father. He applies to the Spirit the very title we have been led to apply to the Spirit as described by Mark—the Advocate (*Παράκλητος*, or *Advocatus*). As a paracletus or advocatus was wont to explain the law to Greek or

<sup>1</sup> Note the curious break in chapter xv., where the word *ἀγαπᾶν* does not occur at all, and *φιλεῖν* is twice used, xvi. 27.

Roman clients, and to put words into their mouths, or rather to be himself their spokesman, so the spiritual Paraclete or Advocate would not only put words into the mouths of the disciples when they stood before the bar of kings (Mk. xiii. 11), but would also teach them all things, and bring to their remembrance all the spiritual laws laid down by their lawgiver Christ (xiv. 26). In one sense, the Spirit is a witness, because He testifies of Christ (xv. 26); but even here He is in reality an advocate, for the testimony is regarded as not uttered by the Spirit directly, but indirectly through the mouths of the inspired disciples who are to be "martyrs" or witnesses (*μάρτυρες*) for Christ (xv. 27). It was very natural that that aspect of the advocate's work which most impressed the editor of our earliest Gospel should retire into the background when the first brunt of the collision between the church and the world was over; and that gradually the work of the advocate should assume a wider province than that of merely educating the disciples to plead the cause of Christ in the presence of Gentile judges. Hence Paul regards the Spirit as teaching the disciples not so much what to say in their defence before earthly kings as rather in their prayers before the King of Kings: "We know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered" (Rom. viii. 26); "The Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God, . . . which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Spirit teacheth" (1 Cor. ii. 10-13). But this conception, carried a stage further, makes the paraclete an advocate not revealing the laws of the celestial kingdom to the enfranchised citizen of it, nor yet revealing the will of the Father in heaven to the child on earth, but rather pleading the cause of the child before the offended Father; and in this sense Philo seems to use the word when he describes the high priest as clothed in the garb which is typical of the invisible universe, *i.e.*, typical of the Logos or Son of the Supreme Father of the world—because it was necessary for the priest consecrated to the Father of the world that he should have as his paraclete the Son, in order (through Him) to obtain pardon of sins and supply of blessings (*Life of Moses*, 14); and he also introduces Joseph (ch. 40) saying to his brethren, "I forgive you; seek no other paraclete," *i.e.*, no one to act between me and you as your advocate; and lastly, in this sense, the First Epistle of John (i. 1, 2) seems to use the word in the passage, "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and He is the propitiation for our sins."<sup>2</sup> But though our evangelist uses the word in this somewhat lower sense in the Epistle, in the Gospel he nowhere uses it thus. There the Paraclete's function is to be, as in Luke, "a mouth, a wisdom" (Lu. xxi. 15); to be a substitute for the helping presence of Christ (xiv. 16); to teach and remind (xiv. 26); to testify and to aid the disciple to testify (xv. 26); and to convict the world of sin (xvi. 8);—but nowhere to obtain forgiveness of sins from the Father by pleading the cause of the disciples in His presence. It is not an unreasonable inference that the evangelist's different use of this word in the Gospel and the Epistle may have arisen from the fact that in the former he is adhering more closely to the original use of it as handed down by Christ Himself.

Besides describing the work of the Paraclete as a consequence of the departure of the Son to the Father, the discourse touches upon the enmity which the disciples must be prepared to meet, and enforces the necessity of unity

<sup>2</sup> *Cf.* Schoettgen, vol. ii. p. 639, where it is shown that the Jews adopted the Greek word *συνήγορος* (not in its classical sense of "prosecutor," but in the sense of "advocate for the defence"), under the form מוֹדֵינִי, and applied it to Michael, who defends Israel from the accusations brought against him in the presence of God.



through love. Only in two points does the thought seem to suggest the influence of Philo; and in both of these Philo is rather corrected than followed. Philo says (*Giants*, 7) that it is impossible that the Spirit of God should remain for ever in the soul (though it may for a time) because of our inseparable connexion with the flesh; he adds (in language which is at least liable to the interpretation of asceticism) that, as Moses fixed his tent outside the camp, so those who would have the Divine Spirit as a permanent tenant of their souls must put off all the things of creation; the safest course being to contemplate God, not even through the uttered word, but without utterance, as absolute, indivisible existence (*ib.* 11, 12); with the mass of mankind the Spirit remains only for a moment, nor would it ever have visited them but to convict (*διελέγξει*) them of choosing what is disgraceful instead of what is good (*ib.* 5).<sup>1</sup> The Fourth Gospel emphasizes no less the work of the Spirit in "convicting" (*ἀλέγειν*) the world of sin; but it is also careful to say that the gift of the Spirit shall be permanent, "not as the world giveth give I unto you" (*xiv.* 27), and that the disciples are to remain in Jesus, while nevertheless not taken out of the world (*xvii.* 15). The Saviour is no more in the world, and the disciples are in the world (*xvii.* 11); yet He will not pray that they should be removed from the world, but only that they should be delivered from the evil (*ver.* 15). The discourse concludes with the prayer that all future believers may be knit together into one great body, which shall be in the Father and the Son, while at the same time the Father and the Son are in it (*ver.* 21, 23); and the last words of all, after innumerable periphrastic metaphors to describe the promised presence of Christ with His disciples, recur at last to the plain expression of His presence, "and I in you"—not greatly differing from the promise in the First Gospel (*Mat.* xxviii. 20), "I am with you always."<sup>2</sup>

There is doubtless a purpose in this accumulation of obviously inconsistent statements of the local relations between the Father, the Son, the Spirit, and the Church: "I am in the Father, and the Father in Me;" "Ye in Me, and I in you;" "I go unto the Father;" "The Holy Spirit whom the Father will send in My name;" "The Comforter whom I will send unto you from the Father;" "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world;"—the intention being to prevent the mind of the reader from attaching any importance to mere local relations between the Three Persons, and to force him to form spiritual conceptions instead of local by showing that the most opposite local relations may be simultaneously predicated. Thus contradiction after contradiction leads the reader at last to pierce beneath the literal integuments to the spiritual truth concealed below them; and, aided by the bold analogy (*xvii.* 21) derived from human unity ("that they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us"), we are led at last to discern that the unity is not that of place,

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Philo, *Quod Deus Immutabilis*, 26: "When the high priest, conviction, like a pure ray of light, flashes on our minds, we realize our pollution; and thus conviction may be said, as it were, to pollute our former imaginary and self-satisfied righteousness."

<sup>2</sup> There is an attractive symmetry in the supposition of Canon Westcott (*Introd. to St John's Gospel*), that these discourses (*xiii.* xiv., xv.), in which alone is any mention made of "commandments," are intended to be a kind of Sermon in the Chamber, corresponding to the Sermon on the Mount. The Sermon on the Mount sets forth the new law of Christ; the Sermon in the Chamber vivifies the new law with the new Spirit. This supposition exactly corresponds with the "spiritual" (Muratorian fragment) motive of the Gospel; and the esoteric nature of the doctrine is not inconsistent with the statements which are said to be mainly "based on direct knowledge of Papias's book" (Westcott, *Canon*, p. 76), that Papias, "a dear disciple of John," wrote five books entitled "exoterica." For "exoterica" imply "esoterica."

but of will; and that the bond of unity is not sight working through material presence in material light, but Love working through spiritual sight or the spirit of truth, independently of material presence. And so, after all, the evangelist leads his reader to see that the coming of the Paraclete (like all things else in his Gospel) is according to law; "If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you" (*xvi.* 7); "The Holy Spirit was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified" (*vii.* 39). Not until the dead has passed away from us does the "idea of his life" creep into our minds—

"Apparelled in more precious habit,  
More moving-delicate and full of life  
Than when He lived indeed;"

and the Eternal Word, who subjected Himself to the laws of human nature in birth and life, may be supposed without irreverence to have subjected Himself to, or perhaps rather we should say to have availed Himself of, the same laws of human nature which regulate God's ordinance of death.

The crucifixion having been considered above, we pass to the narrative of the resurrection. Matthew and Mark imply that Jesus manifested Himself to the disciples in Galilee; Luke mentions none but manifestations in Judæa; the Fourth Gospel mentions manifestations in both places. Compared with Matthew and Luke, the Fourth Gospel may be said to handle the subject more familiarly, taking the resurrection, so to speak, more as a matter of course, and representing Jesus as moving in a more human fashion among His disciples after He had risen from the grave, helping them in their fishing, holding long conversations with them, and, in a word, renewing almost without a break the intercourse of the days before the crucifixion. In Matthew, the Christ after death appears once, upon a mountain, doubtfully discerned by some, and emits one final message, sending His disciples to evangelize the world, and promising them His perpetual presence. In Luke the risen Christ "vanishes," causes fear and terror to His disciples, and is supposed to be a "spirit" till He eats food in their presence; finally He is "parted from them." In John, the ascension, though alluded to, is not described; and everything else that might give the manifestation a phantasmal character is studiously kept in the background. No mention is made of the angel who descends (*Mat.* xxviii. 2) from heaven to roll away the stone from the sepulchre, terrifying the keepers of the grave, and bidding the women "fear not." It is rather assumed that, by His own unaided strength, Christ burst the bars of the grave, and after leisurely laying aside the grave-clothes, and the "napkin in a place by itself" (*John* xx. 7), went forth to converse with His disciples. It is true that the Fourth Gospel does not attempt to conceal the fact that the manifestations of Jesus were more than once not recognized by His disciples at first; but, in the cases of non-recognition, it is suggested (as in Luke), not that the manifestation was faint or shadowy (as seemingly in *Mat.* xxviii. 17, "And when they saw Him, they worshipped Him; but some doubted"), but that they mistook Him for a stranger (*xx.* 14; *xxi.* 4). That Jesus ate in the presence of His disciples is not stated, nor can it be said to be implied; but His familiar presence at the meal of the disciples (*xxi.* 13) suggests a real presence almost as effectively as the narrative of the eating of the fish and honeycomb in Luke. Additional conviction is also obtained by taking one of the apostles, Thomas, as a type of resolute scepticism, refusing to believe unless he touches the body of the risen Saviour, and by describing how even such scepticism as this was converted into certainty. Moreover, as the water and the blood were visibly given by Jesus on the cross, so—lest the giving up of the breath on the cross should be a scarcely sufficiently noticeable type of the gift of the holy breath or Spirit—

our evangelist records that Jesus breathed on His disciples and said, "Receive ye the holy breath" (or Spirit)—at the same time connecting with this highest gift the highest activity for which a human soul can be inspired by God, the faculty of forgiving sins. It is probable that the Gospel originally ended at *xx.* 31: "But these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through His name." This is a most appropriate termination; and what follows bears every appearance of being an appendix added by the author, describing a miraculous draught of 153 fishes, and a meal of Jesus with seven of the disciples, followed by a dialogue between Jesus and Peter, in which the death of the latter is predicted, and the erroneous tradition that the beloved disciple should not die is shown to be baseless.

Three inferences seem probable from this last narrative:—(1) that there had been at Ephesus a tradition (arising perhaps from the extreme old age of John and from some such expression as is recorded in *John* xxi. 22) that John would not die till the Lord had appeared; (2) that John had died when this account was written (for if he were living and past his ninetieth year, at a time when the church daily expected the coming of the Lord, the Ephesian Christians would not have needed any explanation or softening away of a prediction which would seem to them very likely to be fulfilled); but (3) if John was dead, it must seem that the words "we know" could not have been added (as they might be supposed to have been added, according to the Muratorian legend) by Andrew and Philip, who in all probability died before John died; and if John was dead, it must seem that the words would not have been added by any elders of Ephesus representing the generation after John; for how could they—who stood on a footing altogether subordinate and inferior in point of reputation, and with no opportunities of information—have ventured to ratify the testimony of the "beloved disciple?"

It is more easy to arrive at negative than at positive results, when evidence is so slight; but it seems probable that the author, attempting to give the spiritual essence of the gospel of Christ, as a gospel of love, and assigning the Ephesian Gospel to the beloved disciple who had presided over the Ephesian church, by way of honour and respect (for the same reasons which induced the author of the 2d Epistle of Peter to assign that Epistle to the leading apostle), and being at the same time conscious that the book (though representing the Ephesian doctrine generally, and in part the traditions of John the apostle, as well as those of Andrew, Philip, Aristion, and John the elder) did not represent the exact words and teaching of the disciple—added the words "We know, &c.," partly as a kind of *imprimatur* of Andrew, Philip, and the rest; partly in order to imply that other traditions besides those of John are set forth in the book; partly to characterize the book as a Gospel of broader basis and greater authority than the less spiritual traditions issuing from non-apostolic authors, which our evangelist desired to correct or supplement. Nor is it in the least unlikely that this Gospel does represent the teaching of Andrew and Philip, and Aristion and John the elder, as well as that of John. If Papias of Hierapolis gathered up the traditions of these apostles and elders, why not also our author, writing in Ephesus perhaps several years before Papias? It is assuredly not for nothing that the name of "Matthew," mentioned in Matthew, Mark, and Luke, is not found in the Fourth Gospel; nor is it without significance that the Gospel begins and ends with an inner apostolic circle. The "twelve" are indeed mentioned, but as in the background. The beloved disciple, Andrew and Peter, Philip and Nathanael,—these, and these only, are mentioned as called by Jesus in the beginning; Peter and

Thomas, Nathanael and the sons of Zebedee, and two other disciples (presumably the same list as those above, with the addition of James, the son of Zebedee, and Thomas), are mentioned as alone admitted to the sacred meal which closes the Gospel. This fact marks the whole character of the book; it is esoteric and eclectic, and designedly modifies the impression produced by the tradition previously recorded by the synoptics.

*The criticism of the first three Gospels.*—For fourteen centuries the church was content to follow Augustine (*De Consensu Evangelistarum*, i. 4) in believing that Mark was "as it were the humble companion (pedissequus) and abridger" of Matthew. Towards the end of the 18th century this dogma was shaken, and two different hypotheses were put forward: (1) that the evangelists had borrowed from one another, either Matthew from Mark, or Mark from Luke, or even (so capricious and baseless were the hypotheses which now started into existence) Matthew and Mark from Luke; (2) that all the three Gospels depended upon an original and common Gospel. The first of these hypotheses may for convenience be called the "borrowing" hypothesis; the second may be called the "traditional" hypothesis. Eichhorn was the first to systematize the "traditional" hypothesis, maintaining (1794) that the original tradition was a written Aramaic Gospel, known to the three synoptists, but afterwards (1804) so far modifying his views as to recognize that the Aramaic tradition had been translated into Greek, and passed through several documentary stages, before it assumed the form preserved in the triple version of our synoptists.

Inside the circle of those who maintained the traditional hypothesis there now arose inner divisions upon the question, which evangelist most closely approximated to the "original" tradition. Eichhorn had assigned (1804) the priority to Matthew, Grätz (1812) to Mark. Moreover, a new form of the hypothesis was shaped out by Schleiermacher (1817), who maintained that our Gospels were composed on the basis of a number of disconnected documents; while Gieseler (1818) showed that it must have been, in any case, oral tradition which served the needs of the earliest disciples,—tradition stereotyped by time, and reduced to some kind of similar pattern before being committed to writing by the synoptists. Still no certain conclusions were arrived at. De Wette (beginning from 1826) assumed a common oral tradition for Matthew and Luke, and treated Mark as an epitomizer. Credner (1836) joined Schleiermacher in tracing our Gospels back to a collection of words of the Lord, which he supposed Matthew to have combined with the oldest Gospel, viz., Mark; similarly Lachmann (1835). Bleek (1862-1866) relapsed into Griesbach's view (1784-1790) that Mark was based on Matthew and Luke.

All these conflicting hypotheses might naturally induce those who had not themselves closely studied the synoptic texts to believe that the truth of the matter was unattainable, and that, in any case, the synoptic narratives (not being the records of eye-witnesses, nor being preserved in unaltered documents written contemporaneously with or soon after the events) must necessarily be untrustworthy. Accordingly, in 1835, Strauss maintained that the whole synoptic narrative was legendary or otherwise untrustworthy. The defenders of the synoptists against Strauss found little consideration, and the hypothesis that Mark contained the original Gospel was discredited by the extravagance of its supporters. In 1846-7 Schwegler and Baur, recurring to the "borrowing hypothesis," issued it in a new form as an "adapting hypothesis." The original Gospel was now supposed to be the Gospel of the Hebrews (see p. 818 above), which was imagined to contain in all its bare truthfulness the Ebionite doctrine of the early church. Matthew combined this original Jewish-minded document with some other document of more liberal sentiments. Luke was at first a Pauline protest against Judaism, but was afterwards supplemented, in a conciliatory spirit, with passages coloured with Ebionitic and Jewish thought; Mark was treated as a neutral and colourless adapter of Matthew and Luke,—"*pedissequus et breviator*." This was the Tubingen doctrine, sometimes called the "tendency hypothesis," because the adaptations were supposed to proceed from theological "tendencies."

Ewald (beginning from 1849) combated the Tubingen theory, maintaining that (1) there was an original Gospel, perhaps composed by the evangelist Philip; (2) in addition to this, there was a collection of "logia" made by Matthew; (3) and, out of both these documents, or by an author acquainted with these documents, was formed Mark, or, at all events, Mark in its original shape; (4) Matthew contains (1) (2) and (3), together with extracts from a "book of higher history"; (5) three anonymous evangelists revised this narrative, which received its last form at the hands of Luke (see the account of Ewald's theory in Westcott's *Gospels*, p. 203). From this time the compilatory and artistic character of Luke began to be generally recognized; and even the Tubingen school gave up the theory that Mark had adapted Luke. Hilgenfeld, "in a five years' literary struggle with Baur" (see Holtzmann, in Schenkel's *Bibel-Lexicon*, art. "Evangelien"), proved Mark's independence. Köstlin (1853)



advocated an original Mark as the groundwork of the synoptists; together with a "Gospel of Peter" as the basis for the parts common to Matthew and Luke. Ritschl (1851), recanting his former opposition, and Meyer (1853) became converted to the belief in an "original Mark." Volkmar (1857) and a number of other theologians took the same view; Weiss (1861) advocated a parity of originality, or rather a common original source, from which Matthew and Mark borrowed equally, while occasionally Matthew borrowed from Mark itself. But the work which most approximates to a proof of the originality of the tradition contained in Mark is Holtzmann's *Die Synoptischen Evangelien*, &c., 1863, from whose summary of the criticism of the first three Gospels (Schenkel's *Bibel-Lexicon*, "Evangelien") these statements are mainly drawn. The author of *Jesus of Nazara*, Dr Keim, of whom, for the sake of that interesting work, we would speak with all respect, was almost alone in defying, in his last work (p. vii. *Aus dem Urchristenthum*, 1878), the "mane-shaking of the Mark lion;" but even he, with qualification (*ib.* p. 30).

The work of Dr Holtzmann last referred to is of great value; and so are Dr Weiss's *Marcusevangelium* (1872) and *Matthäusevangelium* (1876); but it is truly lamentable that nearly a century has passed in the accomplishment of so little. The reason is perhaps to be looked for (1) in the amount of personality which has been introduced into discussions of this kind; (2) in the haste with which theories have been erected upon the basis of single causes; (3) in the general absence of attempt to classify and concentrate evidence; (4) in the failure to recognize the distinction between probabilities and certainties, and the amount of labour necessary to attain certainty; (5) most of all, in the absence of mechanical helps. It is probable that the publication of Bruder's *Concordance* in the middle of this century has done more than all the rest of the hypothesis inventors, from Augustine to Hitzig, to forward the scientific study of the synoptic Gospels; nor could Dr Holtzmann's valuable work have been written but for the humble assistance of Bruder. It is lamentable to think how much industry, ink, and paper, and occasionally intellect as well, might have been saved if there had been in common circulation from the beginning of this century, along with Bruder, a harmony of the Gospels, printed after the manner suggested above (p. 790), from which any one, almost without knowing Greek at all, could have seen at a glance that the "pedissequus" theory of Mark was not for a moment tenable, and that Mark contains—by no means, necessarily, is—the original tradition from which, at least in some places, Matthew and Luke independently borrowed.

There are signs that a similar waste of industry is to be apprehended in the further discussion of the question whether the common tradition is derived from oral or documentary sources. When, for example, we find so able a critic as Dr Holtzmann (Schenkel, "Evangelien," p. 210) laying stress on the irregular form ἀπεκατέστη occurring in the same place in all the three synoptists (Mat. xii. 13; Mk. iii. 5; Lu. vi. 10) as a convincing proof that the copying of documents (and not oral tradition) can alone explain so strange a similarity, we naturally suppose that this irregularity is nowhere else found in the Old or New Testament. But so far is this from being the case that the irregular form may be with greater truth said to be the only form current in the Old and New Testament, occurring not only in the three passages above, but also in Mk. viii. 25 (ἀπεκατέστη); in Jerem. xxiii. 8; in Exod. iv. 7; in var. interpret. Gen. xxiii. 16 [Trommius quotes 3 (1) Esdr. i. 36 (133), but Tischendorf reads ἀπέστησεν]; and the only passage in which the regular form is found, Gen. xl. 21, contains a var. lect. ἀπεκατέστησεν, which, no doubt, ought to be inserted in the text. This may serve as an example to show how ultimately circuitous the path must be through these attempted short cuts to certainty. The truth is that the question of oral or documentary sources is not to be settled without a great deal more of labour and of judgment than the subject has hitherto received. For a statement of the oral hypothesis, which is generally adopted by English scholars, the reader is referred to Westcott's *Introduction to the Gospels*, pp. 161-208. It has been pointed out, however, by Dr Sanday (*Academy*, Sept. 21, 1878) that there has been of late an increasing tendency in the three theories—the Tübingen or adaptation theory, the documentary Mark theory, the oral tradition theory—to approximate to each other; so that the tendency theory has given less weight to dogmatic tendencies and more weight to literary considerations. The documentary Mark theory allows the previous influence of tradition, only stipulating for some lost documentary links between the oral tradition and our Mark; while the oral theory approaches to the documentary Mark theory in assuming that the oral Gospel is represented most nearly by our present Mark. Nevertheless, says Dr Sanday, between the two last theories (for the Tübingen theory may be left out of account) "the struggle has yet to come. The division between these is almost national. In Germany no one of any significance as a critic holds the oral theory. In England none of our prominent writers hold anything else. France is divided. Godet ranges himself on the side most popular in England. Réville was an early supporter of a view similar to that which is gaining the ascendancy in Germany; and the same is substantially adopted by M. Renan."

It is greatly to be desired that, in this "struggle," the disputants may illustrate the subject in a somewhat ampler manner than has been hitherto common. Different versions of the same original—tales, histories, ballads—transmitted through documentary and oral sources should be compared together; and more especially the phenomena of the ante-Jerome versions of the New Testament should receive the most careful study, before even the ablest commentator should allow himself to use the dogmatic tone which unfortunately characterizes Dr Weiss's *Matthäusevangelium* in deciding against the oral theory. But this is a natural characteristic of an author who sees in a single ἱεροσολίμια convincing proof of an Aramaic original (see p. 805 above), and to whom a καὶ ἰδοὺ settles all critical disputes. With this dogmatism the tone of Canon Westcott's remarks on the oral Gospel contrasts advantageously. Nevertheless, it will probably be hereafter found that the phenomena of our present synoptists are due not to one, but to all, of the causes advocated by the various disputants of the 18th century. Tradition, documents, theological tendencies, literary modifications, misunderstanding of metaphorical parable, misunderstanding of eucharistic language, misunderstanding of spiritual language—all these causes will be found to have contributed to produce the present synoptic result; and it will not improbably be found, as Dr Sanday shrewdly suggests, that early documents have been much more modified, and early oral traditions much less modified, than modern associations might have led us to suppose. Future investigations will receive a considerable stimulus and help, as soon as a harmony of the synoptists showing the Triple Tradition as well as the double traditions (pp. 795-800 above) becomes a recognized text-book for all students of the Gospels. It will also be a useful check, if no demonstration of different documents (in Luke, for example) be recognized as sound until it has been tested by application to other authors. For example, the proof from καὶ, δέ, τε, εἶπε, λέγει, λαλεῖ, ἱεροσολίμια, κύριος, ἐνάπιον, εὐθύς, καὶ ἰδοὺ, is by no means to be despised; but it requires expression in a clear picturesque way by the well-known means of curves; and no proof of this kind ought to be accepted until it (or corresponding proof) has been applied,—first (a) negatively, to several passages recognized as genuine productions of the same author (Plato, for example), and then (b), positively, to several passages, some of which are recognized as genuine, others as spurious. In the first case (a) the curves will exhibit no fluctuations; in the second (b) the curves will exhibit fluctuations corresponding to the fluctuations in Luke; and this will be a strong and clearly intelligible proof (even to those who know no Greek—for the same illustrative proof might be deduced from the application of the test to *Titus Andronicus* and to *Hamlet*) that the fluctuations of the curves are caused in each case by the incoming of different documentary strata. But perhaps, to do this thoroughly, it would be necessary to do it four or five times over for each of the four or five principal ancient MSS. (nor ought, perhaps, even varieties of spelling, and certainly not varieties of form, such as ἡλαθαι, &c., to be neglected, as possibly pointing to the incoming of different documents); and the labour is so great that, even with the avoidance of all broaching of hasty theories and all personalities, a single worker could hardly accomplish it with the devotion of a life,—at least that is the conclusion to which the present writer has been forced after devoting some years to this labour. Yet, in any case, one signal advantage will result from our keeping before ourselves a high standard of demonstration, viz., that, although we may bring forward theories for discussion, we shall draw a very distinct line between what is proved and not proved, and shall shrink with a just horror from short cuts to knowledge.

*The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel.*—No criticism of a systematic kind, says Dr Holtzmann (Schenkel's *Bibel-Lexicon*), began till the publication of Bretschneider's *Probabilia* (1820), which provoked so much opposition that the author retracted it. The apostolic authorship was supported by Schleiermacher, and by Credner (1836), even while admitting that the Gospel could not be regarded as a purely objective work. Similarly De Wette, after some doubt and hesitation (1837), and Reuss (1840-64) decided for the Johannine authorship,—the former being influenced by a comparison of the Fourth Gospel with the other works of the 2d century. The attack of Strauss, in his *Life of Jesus*, being passed over (as indicating no attempt, or possibly ability, to appreciate the depth of the spiritual doctrine in the Fourth Gospel, in spite of the suggestiveness and occasional accuracy of his method), we come to Baur (1847), who pronounced the Gospel to be a religious ideal poem, composed in the 2d century. A great number of writers accepted this theory; among them, Zeller and Hilgenfeld, and Schenkel and Keim in their lives of Christ, together with Réville (1864) and Scholten. In the meantime an hypothesis of "partial authorship" had been suggested, some (Weisse in 1838, and Freytag in 1861) believing that the discourses, others, as Renan (1863), believing that the historical narratives, were genuine; while some wished to detach the Judean from the Galilean portion of the Gospel, as being distinct in authorship and origin. Lücke, Ewald, Brückner, and Wittichen, adopting in various forms the view of a divided authorship, recognized in the Gospel a framework of historical fact, but noted also the promi-

gence of the ideal, the want of historical development, and the subjective colouring given by the author to the discourses of Christ—views which find a full expression in Weizsäcker's *Untersuchungen über die evangelische Geschichte* (1864). Canon Westcott, in his *Introduction to the Gospels* (5th ed., 1875), maintains apostolic authorship, which is also in a special treatise (*Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel*, 1872) maintained by Dr Sanday. The latter work lays perhaps somewhat too much emphasis on the geographical expressions which are used to prove that the author was a Jew of Palestine. Many of these would appear natural for an Alexandrian Jew who had spent two or three passages at Jerusalem, and had travelled through the country. Still more doubtful is the canon assumed throughout the treatise, that graphic details, particularities of name, place, &c., imply an eye-witness—the contrary being suggested by the phenomena of the apocryphal Gospels. Nor does Dr Sanday make any attempt to illustrate the Fourth Gospel (except in respect of the Logos doctrine) by the teaching of Philo. Nevertheless the book is eminently candid, and there is no other book in English to compare with it for the light it throws, not only on the Fourth Gospel itself, but also on the history of its criticism. Dr Sanday also recognizes, even more fully than Canon Westcott, the subjective nature of the Gospel, at least so far as to

GOSPORT, a fortified seaport and market town of Hampshire, England, on the western side of Portsmouth harbour, near its mouth, directly opposite and about a mile from Portsmouth, with which it is connected by a floating bridge moved by a steam engine working on two fixed chains. The old fortifications built at the end of last century are now obsolete, and a line of new forts has been erected about two miles from the town, extending from the Solent to the upper part of Portsmouth harbour, with accommodation for two regiments of infantry and a brigade of artillery. Near the town is the royal St Clarence victualling yard, with brewery, cooperage, powder-magazines, biscuit-baking establishment, and storehouses for various kinds of provisions for the royal navy. Adjoining this yard there are large Government powder magazines and a laboratory for making fuses and rockets. Within the old fortifications a fine new barracks has been erected with accommodation for 1100 men, and another barracks with accommodation for 1600 men adjoining it. The principal other buildings are the town-hall and market-place, the church of Holy Trinity, erected in the time of William III., and the magnificent Haslar naval hospital, capable of containing 2000 patients. Gosport has an extensive establishment for the manufacture of anchors and chain cables, and it is also celebrated for its yacht-building and sail-making establishments. The coasting trade is considerable. The town is said to have received its name, Gosport or God's Port, from Bishop Henry de Blois, who put in here for shelter during a severe storm in 1158. It was then only a small fishing village. According to another supposition its original name was Gorse Port, and it was so called from the gorse and furze with which the commons in the neighbourhood were thickly covered. The population in 1871 was 7366.

GOSART, JAN, born at Maubeuge towards the close of the 15th century, is better known to Englishmen by the name of Mabuse than by that of Jenni Gossart, with which he signed some of his pictures, or that of Jennyn van Hennegouwe (Hainault), under which he matriculated in the guild of St Luke, at Antwerp, in 1503. We know nothing of his life before he attained to manhood; but his works at least tell us that he stood in his first period under the influence of artists to whom plastic models were familiar; and this leads to the belief that he spent his youth on the French border rather than on the banks of the Scheldt. In no seat of artistic culture is this feature more conspicuous than at Tournai, Douai, or Valenciennes, and it may be that in one of these cities Mabuse learnt to commingle the study of architecture with the gaudy system of

make this admission, that the words of Jesus himself and the words of the evangelist are, in more than one instance, so inextricably intermingled that it is impossible to tell where the former end and the latter begin. In the *Introduction to the Gospel of St John*, published (1879) in the *Speaker's Commentary*, Canon Westcott has greatly amplified the valuable remarks on the Fourth Gospel contained in his *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, and states most forcibly the views of those who see in the multiplicity of detail in the Fourth Gospel one among many proofs that the Gospel was composed by an eye-witness of the events which it records. For the doctrine of the Logos Canon Westcott gives the following list:—Gfroerer, *Philo u. d. Jud.-Alex. Theosophie*, 1835; Dachne, *Jud.-Alex. Religions-Philosophie*, 1834; Dornier, *Person of Christ* (Eng. trans.); Jowett's "St Paul and Philo" (*Epistles of St Paul*, § 363 ff.); Heinze, *Philo's Lehre v. Logos in Griech. Philosophie*, 1872; Siegfried, *Philo von Alexandria*, 1875. Grossmann (*Questiones Philonae*, 1829) gives a complete summary of the use of the word in Philo. An account of the Logos literature up to 1870 is given by Dr Abbot in his appendix to the article on "The Word" in the American edition of the *Dictionary of the Bible*, and Soulier includes several later works in *La doctrine du Logos chez Philon d'Alexandrie*, Turin, 1876. (E. A. A.)

colouring familiar to tints of stone. Without the subtlety or power of Van der Weyden, he had this much in common with the great master of Tournai and Brussels, that his compositions were usually framed in architectural backgrounds; and this marked characteristic is strongly displayed in the pictures which he executed in the first years of the 16th century. But whilst Mabuse thus early betrays his dependence on the masters of the French frontier, he also confesses admiration for the great painters who first gave lustre to Antwerp; and in the large altar-pieces of Castle Howard and Scawby, he combines in a quaint and not unskilful medley the sentiment of Memling, the bright and decided contrasts of pigment peculiar to coloured reliefs, the cornered and packed drapery familiar to Van der Weyden, and the bold but Socratic cast of face remarkable in the works of Quentin Matsys. At Scawby he illustrates the legend of the count of Toulouse, who parted with his worldly goods to assume the frock of a hermit. At Castle Howard he represents the Adoration of the Kings, and throws together some thirty figures on an architectural background, varied in detail, massive in shape, and fanciful in ornament. He surprises us by pompous costume and glaring contrasts of tone. His figures, like pieces on a chess-board, are often rigid and conventional. The landscape which shows through the colonnades is adorned with towers and steeples in the minute fashion of Van der Weyden. After a residence of a few years at Antwerp, Mabuse took service with Philip, bastard of Philip the Good, at that time Lord of Somerdyk and admiral of Zeeland. One of his pictures had already become celebrated—a Descent from the Cross (50 figures) on the high altar of the monastery of St Michael of Tongerlo. Philip of Burgundy ordered Mabuse to execute a replica for the church of Middleburg; and the value which was then set on the picture is apparent from the fact that Dürer came expressly to Middleburg (1521) to see it. In 1568 the altar-piece perished by fire. But its principal features were preserved in a large arras hanging, recently exhibited at the Archaeological Museum of Brussels. In 1508 Margaret of Austria sent Philip of Burgundy to Italy to negotiate for the treaty of Cambrai. On this mission he was accompanied by Mabuse; and by this accident an important revolution was effected in the art of the Netherlands. Mabuse appears to have chiefly studied in Italy the cold and polished works of the Leonardesques. He not only brought home a new style, but he also introduced the fashion of travelling to Italy; and from that time till the age of Rubens and Van Dyck it was considered proper that all Flemish painters should visit the peninsula. The Flemings grafted Italian mannerisms