

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

*THE PRESENT POSITION OF THE JOHANNEAN
CONTROVERSY.*

III. RELATION TO THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

As I am just entering upon an examination of the internal evidence supplied by the Fourth Gospel, it may be well for me to preface the remarks I am about to make by explaining my silence upon a point which some may think an essential one. Neither in this paper nor in those which follow do I propose to say anything about the possibility of the supernatural, or the *a priori* credibility of narratives which imply the supernatural. I do this, not because I take it absolutely for granted, but because I think that if we are to set about a systematic and scientific examination of the grounds of the Christian faith, this question of the supernatural is in logical order the last with which we ought to deal, and because, so far as the subject matter of these papers is concerned, we are not yet in a position to deal with it satisfactorily. No doubt there are persons who cannot afford to wait for the solution of so momentous a question. To such I would strongly recommend the second of Mr. Gore's *Bampton Lectures*, or an excellent work entitled *Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief*, by Dr. G. P. Fisher, of Yale. But to those who are content to take what I cannot but think the more excellent way of prolonging their inquiry, and breaking it up into its several steps and stages, I would submit that the proper order is this: First, to determine what documents we can use, and how far we can use them; then, by the help of these documents, to determine as nearly as we can what are the historical facts; and, lastly, and not until that has been done, to consider the cause of those facts, and how far it transcends, or does not transcend, our common experience.

Our present inquiry belongs to the first of these stages.

We are simply trying to ascertain who was the author of one of our documents; and this can quite well be done, as I think it ought to be done, without raising the question of the supernatural. If the Gospel ascribed to St. John is not genuine *with* the supernatural, it will be not genuine *without* it. If it is not genuine, there must surely be other indications that it is not genuine besides the mere presence of miracles. There are certainly a multitude of other *data* which point one way or the other. And my contention is, that when we have thoroughly examined all those other *data*, it will be time, and the proper time, to raise the question of the supernatural. We put it on one side for the present, not because we are not prepared to meet it, or because we cannot, even as it is, give a rough and ready answer to it, but because at that future date of which I speak we shall be able to approach it with far greater firmness, sureness, and precision.

Measured by the standard of the Synoptics, objection has been taken to the Fourth Gospel on five—or throwing in a subordinate point which it may be convenient to treat here, we may say six—main grounds: (1) That the scene of our Lord's ministry is laid for the most part in Judæa rather than in Galilee; (2) that its duration is extended over some two and a half years instead of one; (3) that in particular a different day, Nisan 14th instead of 15th, is assigned to the crucifixion; (4) that there is a further discrepancy of no great moment in connexion with this which involves however the question of the evangelist's reckoning of the hours of the day; (5) that the historical narrative is wanting in development and progression, especially on the important point of our Lord's declaration of His Messiahship; (6) that this goes along with a general heightening of His claims.

Of these six points the first three may be said to be

practically given up. The fourth is really indifferent, though I should be glad to say a few words upon it. It is on the last two that the criticism which is adverse to St. John's authorship concentrates itself most tenaciously, and on these therefore that it will be well for us to give our best attention.

1 & 2. With reference to the scene of our Lord's ministry, and the repeated journeys from Galilee to Judæa, Schürer's judgment is as follows :

"It is well known that the Synoptics only speak of a ministry of Jesus in Galilee, and do not make Him go to Judæa until the last period before His death. The Fourth Gospel, on the other hand, makes Him come forward at the very beginning in Judæa, and then and several times travel backwards and forwards between Judæa and Galilee, and that in such a way as to give the preponderance to Judæa. Now Baur tried to explain all the particulars of this coming and going in St. John as dependent on the design which the evangelist had in view. It cannot be said that this explanation has proved satisfactory. On the other hand, Bleek pointed out that a repeated sojourn of Jesus in Judæa was in itself quite probable, and indeed that many indications in the Synoptics themselves were in its favour. In the more recent treatises there has not been so much stress laid upon this point as Baur and Bleek assigned to it. Rightly so, because it cannot be decisive. The Synoptic version is in this respect so vague, that in no case can it count as an adverse argument. But if the Johannean version is to be preferred, that proves no more than that the author had access to independent traditions."¹

True, there are both possibilities, that the author drew from his own memory, and that he drew from a good tradition. But in any case this point at least must be set down to his credit; it is an argument not against but for the historical character of the Gospel, as far as it goes.

That St. John is right about this Judæan ministry is surely overwhelmingly probable. The silence of the Synoptics, and the detailed allusions to such a ministry, have been excellently treated by Dr. Westcott² and other English commentators; but I doubt if they have quite

¹ *Vortrag*, p. 61 f.

² Page lxxvii, ff.

laid sufficient stress on the broad probabilities of the case. That the Messiah should offer Himself to His people, and only spend the last week of His life at the centre of the national life and the national religion is too great a paradox. If He was aware, as His own lips tell us, that it could not be "that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem,"¹ can we believe that He would have been satisfied only to perish there? Was it not further true, as St. John hints, that Jerusalem was the proper home of the prophets? Had not the Jew—the genuine Jew, and not merely the Galilæan—that prerogative right on which St. Paul so often insists (*Ἰουδαίῳ πρώτον*) to the offer of the gospel? Was it not included in that deep, underlying necessity which marked out the lines of the Lord's manifestation, that He should really go to the heart of Israel and make Himself known there? A number of details in the events of the last week—the crowds that come out to meet Him at the entry into Jerusalem; the prompt recognition of His commands by the owners of the ass's colt and of the upper room; His own words, "I sat daily in the temple"; the solicitude of men like Joseph of Arimathæa—imply that He had so made Himself known there. But these details do not stand alone; if the Fourth Gospel had not come down to us at all, we might have been sure that on this question of the scene of the ministry the Synoptic Gospels were incomplete.

By one little detail they seem to show that they are equally incomplete as to the time which it occupied. When the disciples pluck the ears of corn, quite early in the Galilæan ministry, that means that the corn was ripe, but not reaped. In other words, the time was between Passover and Pentecost.² This fits in well with St. John's statement (vi. 4), that one intermediate Passover was spent in

¹ Luke xiii. 33.

² P. Ewald, *Hauptproblem*, etc., p. 52; McClellan, *Gospels*, p. 553.

Galilee. I am aware that Dr. Hort strains every nerve to eject τὸ πάσχα from this verse. This is quite the strongest piece of argument I know in favour of the one year's ministry. But at the end of his long and important note, I do not gather that even Dr. Hort would contend for more than that the omission should be noted in the margin; and that with full consciousness of the weaknesses of readings which rest on patristic evidence alone, without support from MSS. and versions. We may add, on patristic evidence which is entirely indirect and inferential. Dr. Westcott in his commentary argues for the retention of the words.

The case stands thus: If we could get rid of the words τὸ πάσχα, the Johannean and Synoptic chronologies could be easily harmonized. But even with the words they can still be harmonized; the simple fact being that the Synoptic Gospels are only a series of incidents loosely strung together, with no chronology at all worthy of the name.

3. In regard to the day of the Last Supper and of the crucifixion, they have something better than a chronology. They do not say expressly on what day of the month these two events took place; but they let it appear by incidental allusions that the Last Supper was the Paschal meal, and that it therefore fell on the evening of Nisan 14-15 (the Jewish day beginning at dusk), and the crucifixion in the afternoon of the day following, still called Nisan 15. In St. John both events are to all appearance put back one day: the Last Supper falls on Nisan 13-14, and the crucifixion in the afternoon, as Nisan 14 is ending.

What are we to say to this? Schürer once more sums up with judicial fairness.

“The arguments (he says) in favour as well of the one interpretation as of the other are so weighty, that a cautious person will hardly venture with full confidence to pronounce either the one or the other to be right.”¹

¹ *Vortrag*, p. 63.

The advocate of the genuineness of the Fourth Gospel may well be content with this verdict. The case is certainly one of those which are more common than we might consider antecedently probable, where of two conclusions one only can be right, and yet a really substantial case may be made out for each. The question is, which can be interpreted into agreement with the other with the least forcing? When I wrote on this Gospel twenty years ago, I argued strongly in favour of the *prima facie* sense of St. John. I have not even now formed an opinion which I should regard as absolutely final; but if I were to express the opinion to which I incline at this moment, it would be rather the other way. The considerations on which this different estimate turns are these. (1) I am inclined to rate more highly the indirect evidence that the Supper described in the Synoptics is really the Paschal meal. (2) I satisfied myself with too little inquiry that St. John's phrase, "to eat the Passover" (*φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα*), must refer to the eating of the Paschal lamb. With our associations it is natural to think this, and I have before me a monograph of Schürer's in which this view is held. But Dr. Schürer's opinion is challenged by a higher authority on such a point even than his—Dr. Edersheim.¹ It appears to be certain that the term "Passover" was applied, not merely to the Paschal lamb, but to all the sacrifices of the Paschal feast, especially to the *Chagigah*, or peace offering brought on Nisan 15. It appears also to be proved that the Pharisees by entering a heathen house would be debarred from eating there, but not debarred from eating the Passover in the narrowest sense, because their defilement would only last till evening, *after* which the Supper commenced. Dr. Edersheim puts it thus :

"No competent Jewish archæologist would care to deny that *Pesach* may refer to the *Chagigah*; while the motive assigned to the

¹ *Life and Times*, etc., vol. ii., p. 566 ff., ed. 4.

Sanhedrists by St. John implies that in this instance it *must* refer to this, and not to the Paschal Lamb."¹

Many other writers, notably Wieseler and McClellan, have argued ably to the same effect.² (3) I was also too hasty in assuming that the day when the Paschal lamb was sacrificed would be marked by a more complete cessation from work and trade than the other days. As a fact, it was not so strictly kept as the Sabbath. Work was stopped, but not traffic. There would be no obstacle either to Judas buying *Chagigah*, or to Joseph of Arimathea and the women procuring linen and spices.³ It seems probable that Simon of Cyrene, like so many other pilgrims, lodged outside the city, and was coming in to the temple worship, not from work.

The other difficulties are not serious. *Παρασκευή* alone had come to be the regular Jewish word for "Friday," and *παρασκευή τοῦ πάσχα*⁴ may be quite as well "Friday in Paschal week" as the "day of preparation for the Passover." Or rather, the latter interpretation must be considered extremely doubtful, if, as it is asserted by McClellan and Wieseler, there is no example of the phrase bearing that sense. We should also expect the article in the latter case, not in the former. Another point on which I laid some stress, *πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα* (John xiii. 1), I do not think will hold. It is a rather remarkable peculiarity of the Fourth Gospel that it brings into close juxtaposition events, or events and sayings, which so near together seem almost to contradict each other. For instance, at the marriage-feast at Cana, our Lord is made

¹ *Life and Times*, etc., p. 568.

² Wieseler, *Beiträge*, p. 242 ff.; McClellan, *Gospels*, p. 486 ff.

³ See the Talmudic references in Nösgen, *Gesch. d. Neutest. Offenb.*, vol. i., p. 579; Dillmann-Knobel on Exod. xii. 16; Edersheim, *Life and Times*, p. 508 n., and App. xvii., p. 783.

⁴ See ref. to Josephus in McClellan on Matt. xxvii. 62, and the note on John xix. 14; also p. 485.

to say, "My hour" (*i.e.* for working miracles) "is not yet come," though a few minutes later He acts as if His "hour" had come; in vii. 8 (according to the reading which is perhaps, on the whole, more probable), He is made to say that He will not go up to the Feast of Tabernacles, yet He does go up in time to arrive at the middle of the feast. So here I think it quite possible that "before the Feast of the Passover" may mean an hour or so before, and not a whole day before.

On these grounds I now incline to harmonize St. John with the Synoptics; but I feel that the casting vote upon the question must be reserved for specialists in Jewish antiquities. In any case, there is nothing to prevent the account in the Fourth Gospel from being written by an Apostle.

4. Another smaller question of the same kind, which it may be well to touch upon here, relates to the reckoning of *hours of the day* in the Gospel. This too is to a small extent a question of harmonizing, but nothing of any importance turns upon it. According to St. Mark the succession of events is this:

Delivery to Pilate	about 6 a.m.
	(πρωί, Mark xv. 1.)		
Crucifixion	9 a.m.
	(ώρα τρίτη, Mark xv. 25.)		
Darkness	12-3 p.m.
	(γενομένης ώρας έκτης . . . έως ώρας έννάτης, Mark xv. 33.)		

In St. John the note of time is inserted in the account of the hearing before Pilate: "Now it was the Preparation of the Passover (rather perhaps 'Friday in the Paschal week'): it was about the sixth hour" (John xix. 14). Clearly this does not agree if by the sixth hour is meant, as it usually would, "noon." But all would fall beautifully

into place if by "sixth hour" could be meant "6 a.m.," as with us. Such harmonizing as this is perfectly legitimate where it can be done without putting a strain upon the evidence. Even if the Gospel were written in the middle of the second century, there would be no reason to assume gratuitous contradictions. And it happened that in this particular instance there were a number of similar notes of time,¹ all of which seemed to be a degree more satisfactorily explained in connexion with their context if the reckoning were from midnight and midday as with us. Could St. John have adopted such a reckoning? It is well known that it has often been contended, especially in England, but also by writers like Tholuck, Meyer (not, however, Weiss in the sixth and following editions of Meyer), Ewald, and Wieseler, that he could. Writing with Wieseler's elaborate discussion before me, I nevertheless hesitated to claim more than a possibility for this view. Since then it has been maintained with his usual ability and accuracy by McClellan, and adopted also by Bishop Westcott. The subject has been recently reviewed, rather in a negative sense, by the Rev. J. A. Cross.² This has led me to go over the evidence again as well as I could with the help of two extremely full monographs by Dr. Gustav Bilfinger, *Der bürgerliche Tag* and *Die antiken Stundenangaben*, both published at Stuttgart in 1888. In consequence of this I should be obliged myself to take the negative view. The natural and common reckoning among the Romans, as well as other peoples, was the working day from sunrise to sunset. For certain legal purposes, however, the day was held to begin at midnight. This had a religious or ceremonial ground in the practice of augury. The auspices must be taken at night, and they

¹ i. 39; iv. 6, 7, 52, 53. Cf. McClellan, *Gospels*, p. 742, etc.; Westcott, *St. John*, p. 282.

² *Class. Rev.*, June, 1891, p. 245 ff.

must also be taken on the same day with the action to which they referred. Hence it was clearly necessary to annex a portion of the preceding night to the day. This portion began with midnight. From the sphere of religious ceremony this passed into the sphere of law; anything which happened before midnight was held to fall in the day past, anything after midnight in the day begun. This determined in particular the day of birth. The day so reckoned was called the "civil day."¹

There is however no evidence that this reckoning of the *days* carried with it a corresponding reckoning of the *hours*. And further I agree with Mr. Cross in his general conclusion, if not in quite all of his arguments, that the proof that this mode of reckoning hours prevailed in Asia Minor breaks down. The passage of Pliny on which greatest stress is laid (*Epp.* iii. 5) refers to 1 and 2 a.m. and midnight. Roman habits were very much earlier than ours. And the evidence that the Asiatic martyrdoms took place in the forenoon is much too remote to be conclusive. Bilfinger touches upon the hypothesis, only to reject it peremptorily.²

It will be remembered that Eusebius has a wholly different solution of the difficulty. He explains "the sixth hour" in St. John as a textual corruption, Γ (=3) being misread as digamma F (=6). And the reading is actually found in a rather strong group of authorities with a Western cast, just as the converse change has some slight support in St. Mark. We must leave the discrepancy as we find it.

5. With the next point we pass on to more serious ground. It will be well to take Schürer's statement, because if this held good it would constitute a really formi-

¹ Aulus Gellius, *Noct. Att.* iii. 2 (=Macrob., *Saturn.* i. 3. 2-10); Censorinus, *De Die Nat.*, c. 23. Cf. Bilfinger, *Der bürg. Tag*, pp. 12, 198-206.

² *Die antiken Stundenangaben*, p. 112.

dable indictment. I hope, however, to show (1) that it is not an accurate representation of the facts; (2) that so far as it does represent them, the implied inference does not follow.

The charge is that between the Fourth Gospel and the earliest Synoptic document there is a *deep-seated difference respecting the whole course of the ministry of Christ.*

“According to the version in our St. Mark (says Schürer), it is in the highest degree probable that Jesus did not from the first come forward as the Messiah. (a) He is indeed absolutely certain of His mission. He challenges faith in the fact that through Him God offers His grace and His help to man. But with the claim to be the Messiah, the Son of God, with this title, in true pædagogic wisdom He only presents Himself at a later period and gradually. (b) To this attitude on His part there corresponds also the attitude of His disciples. They join themselves to Him as their Teacher without any question being raised as to His Messiahship. Even at the stilling of the storm at sea the disciples say with surprise (Mark iv. 41), ‘Who is this, that the wind and the sea obey Him?’—an expression of astonishment which would be impossible if they had already recognised Him as the Messiah. Not until Cæsarea Philippi does Peter for the first time break out into the confession, ‘Thou art the Messiah’ (Mark viii. 29). The solemnity with which this is related shows plainly that we have to do with the first breaking forth of this conviction in the consciousness of the disciples. Yet even then Jesus still forbids His disciples to speak of it in public. He wishes not to rouse the unspiritual enthusiasm of the multitude. Only just at the end of His ministry does He allow the multitudes to pay homage to Him as the Messiah. (c) With the whole of this presentation agrees the protraiture of John the Baptist in the oldest Synoptic tradition. The oldest report, as it is preserved in Mark and Luke, knows nothing about John recognising Jesus as the Messiah at the baptism. On the contrary, it is well known how the Synoptics relate that John, even when he was in prison, has the question put to Jesus whether He is the Messiah (Matt. xi. 2–6=Luke vii. 18–23). In the context of the Synoptic narrative this is not the question of one who has, after the fact, become doubtful, but the question of one in whom this belief flames up for the first time. All this gives a thoroughly consistent picture.

“Just as consistent, but in all respects opposed to it, is that which is drawn for us in the Fourth Gospel. Here from the first Jesus comes forward with the full claim to Divine sonship and Messiahship. (a) One of His first acts is that, in virtue of His supreme (*höherem*) autho-

riety, He cleanses the temple from all secular traffic,—an event which the Synoptists put at the very end of the public ministry. Such a step assumes the full claim to supreme, nay Divine dignity. (b) And so, according to the Fourth Gospel, Jesus is from the first acknowledged by His disciples too as the Messiah. ‘We have found the Messiah,’ says Andrew to his brother Simon (i. 41). ‘We have found Him of whom Moses and the prophets wrote,’ exclaims Philip to Nathanael. The disciples therefore attach themselves to Jesus, not only as pupils to a teacher, but because they have recognised in Him the Messiah. (c) And as the disciples, so also is John the Baptist from the first fixed in his belief in Jesus as the Messiah; indeed, his is the first clearly uttered testimony to the Divine mission of Jesus, and it is through him that, at His very first appearance, Jesus receives His credentials before the world.

“It is clear that these two portraits mutually exclude each other. If the first is historical, the second cannot be; but then the hand that drew it cannot be that of an Apostle, cannot be that of an actual disciple of the Lord.”¹

Certainly an impressive argument, if the facts were as they are stated. But before testing them, let us pause for a moment over the inference at the end. Surely if there is one thing which characterizes the action of memory, especially of memory looking back over a wide interval, it is the tendency to *foreshorten*. Events lose their perspective. Features in the picture are inserted out of place. The mind is so full of the significance of what followed, that the traces of that significance are antedated, they are thrown backward to a time when they had not yet discovered themselves. This is a matter of extremely common experience. I could therefore allow that there was some antedating in the narrative of the Fourth Gospel, without denying it to be the work of an Apostle. It would be the easier to do this because the author, whoever he was, had just the kind of mind which is most liable to such displacements. He has not the simplicity or *naïveté* of the second evangelist; but ideas take the strongest hold upon him, and he sees facts in the light of them. That in such a mind, setting

¹ *Vortrag*, pp. 63–65.

itself to write history, there should be an element of anticipation would not be at all surprising.

But is it the case that the Synoptic versions and the Johannean version are so diametrically opposed as they are made out to be? I cannot admit that they are.

We are pursued by the influence of names and the associations which we attach to them. Because Andrew or Philip say, "We have found the Messiah," and because we have learnt to read into that title the whole depth of Pauline and Johannean theology, we at once imagine that they also must have done the same thing. We forget that there were twenty Messiahs in the period between the death of Herod and the Jewish War, most of whom were extinguished before they had time to become formidable. The impulse which led the few friends and neighbours to follow the mysterious intimations of John, and attach themselves to the Person of Jesus, was a most tentative thing. If they did call Him "the Messiah," they knew not what they said. Even John, we may well believe, did not know all that he said. He spoke under the prophetic *afflatus*, which lifted him above his natural level; and when this subsided, his views of things would become more ordinary again. The Triple Synopsis makes him predict the coming of One mightier than himself, who would baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire. The Triple Synopsis also leaves no doubt of the signs which accompanied the baptism of Jesus, and asserts that the Holy Spirit Itself visibly rested upon Him. The Fourth Gospel adds a different feature, "the Lamb of God," but nothing which essentially goes beyond what we have already had in the Synoptics.

It is, I cannot but think, an unimaginative criticism which finds it necessary to explain away the access of doubt which came over John in prison. The wonder is that any one who shared the expectations which all Israel entertained of their Messiah could keep up his faith in

One who so deliberately and persistently contradicted them. Jesus by His reply gave him a sign. He recalled to his mind a forgotten prophecy, which hit the central truth of what the Messiah was to be. By meditating on that, John might be led to recast his own idea and rise to a higher one.

The temptation to round off a telling antithesis has sadly spoiled Dr. Schürer's presentment of the facts. Why is there such lofty assumption involved in the cleansing of the Temple? Is it not an act that any prophet might have done? Again, is it true that St. John takes no note of the reserve of Christ in proclaiming His Messiahship? "According to the Synoptics," says Schürer, "He does not wish to rouse the unspiritual enthusiasm of the multitude." What of that incident where Jesus retires into solitude to escape the crowd which would come "to take Him by force and make Him king"?¹ What, again, of that taunt and the reason alleged for it: "If Thou doest these things, show Thyself to the world: for neither did His brethren believe on Him"? The family of Jesus is incredulous in the Synoptics; it is incredulous also in St. John. The seventh chapter takes us straight into the middle of the public ministry; it gives us a picture of the current feeling and notions about Christ: is that a picture of implicit faith, of commanding and unquestioned Godhead? And quite late in the day we are told how the Jews crowded round our Lord with the demand, "How long dost Thou hold us in suspense (*τῆν ψυχὴν ἡμῶν ἀρρῆς*)? If Thou art the Christ, tell us plainly."²

There are as many and as unequivocal signs of the reserve of Christ in St. John as in the Synoptics, if we will but look for them.

6. Lastly, we have another point, which is no doubt also of serious moment. The Fourth Gospel gives us

¹ St. John vi. 15.

² St. John x. 24.

another *Christusbild*, a portrait of Christ which is all divinity. "That Jesus came forth from the Father, that He is one with Him, that all He says and does is a revelation of God Himself, and that therefore the salvation of men depends upon His acceptance or rejection—these," says Schürer,¹ "are the almost exclusive themes of the Johannean discourses, and they have only one clear parallel in the Synoptics (Matt. xi. 2)."

Again let us begin by allowing that here too there may be a certain selection, and that that selection may be influenced and guided by the meditation of a profound mind upon those "greater things" which had been wrought in the Spirit and Name of Jesus after His departure. Looking back over the fifty or sixty years which had elapsed, the Apostle saw what were the really fundamental truths in the life which he had been permitted to witness. He carefully gathers up and reproduces all the hints which had been given of these truths,—sometimes, it may be, making them fuller and more explicit.

So far we may go, but no further.

In the first place, let us note that the great passage, Matthew xi. 25-27, is reproduced almost exactly in Luke x. 21, 22, where it follows immediately upon the record of the return of the seventy and of their success in the exercise of miraculous powers. This Jesus accepts as proof of the overthrow of the Satanic kingdom; and He goes on solemnly to confer upon them higher powers still from the fulness of those with which He is Himself invested,—though not without a reminder that for them personally there is a yet more excellent way ("Rejoice not that the devils are subject to you," etc.). We may take it that the whole of this passage—in any case the crucial verse—comes from the *Logia*, the oldest of all evangelical compositions. It is introduced easily and naturally, and stands out by no

¹ Page 66.

apparent peculiarity from the surrounding context ; and yet the language is full of what we consider characteristically Johannean expressions (*ὁ πατήρ—ὁ υἱός* ; *παραδιδόναι*, of the entrusting of forces or powers ; *ἐπιγινώσκειν* ; *ἀποκαλύπτειν*). It is clear that such expressions were current as “ words of the Lord ” many years before St. John conceived the thought of writing a gospel. The degree of frequency with which they were repeated in other narratives would be a matter of accident or of the idiosyncrasy of the writer.

The Synoptics, it is true, give a more photographic account of the life of Christ as He went in and out among the peasants of Galilee ; but when we come to look at them a little more closely, we see that they have really the same substratum, the same underlying ideas, as the Fourth Gospel. They are not one whit less *Christo-centric*. The Son of man there too forgives sins, there too legislates for His Church, there too claims the devotion of His disciples, whose acts acquire value from being done “ for His sake,” “ in His Name.” There too the Son is also Lord ; there too He promises to dwell like the Shekinah among His people, and to give them help and inspiration after He is gone ; there too He seals a new covenant with His blood ; there too He declares that He will come again to judge.

What then is wanting ? The criticism of the Fourth Gospel rings the changes upon one idea—the idea of pre-existence. This Schürer urges is in St. John always in the background, while in the Synoptic it is entirely wanting. There are two ways in which St. John teaches this doctrine of pre-existence, and in regard to each of these he employs a different cycle of language. The doctrine of the Logos in the prologue is one thing, the doctrine contained in the discourses of our Lord Himself is another. Still they approximate to each other. The idea of “ sending ” which occurs so often (with both verbs *πέμπω*

and ἀποστέλλω) would not of itself imply pre-existence, because the prophets also were "sent"; but taken as it is in close connexion with the filial relation, "sending by the Father," and also in connexion with the communication of the things of the Father ("we speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen"), it does seem to contain a reference to the pre-existent state. The commonest form of phrase is "He that (the Bread that, etc.), came down out of heaven," "He that cometh from above." But we get very near to the doctrine of the Logos in such sayings as "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see My day: and he saw it, and was glad"; "before Abraham was, I am"; and, still more, in "the glory which I had with Thee before the world was"; and "Thou lovedst Me before the foundation of the world."¹

All these are no doubt remarkable expressions. But let us consider for a moment. Have we heard nothing like them? When St. Peter speaks of the "Spirit of Christ" being in the prophets, and testifying through them to the sufferings of Christ;² when St. Paul speaks of the second Man as "the Lord from heaven," and of God as sending "*forth* His Son"; when he speaks of Him who, "though He was rich, yet for our sakes became poor," of Him who "existed in the form of God," of Him through whom "all things were created," who was "before all things," and in whom "all things consist";³ when the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks of the Son through whom God "made the worlds," who "upholds all things by the word of His power"⁴—we are naturally driven back to some common source from which these three writers are drawing. Already in the year 57, if not earlier, St. Paul implies the existence of the doctrine. He refers to it as

¹ St. John viii. 56, 58; xvii. 5, 24.

² 1 Pet. i. 11.

³ 1 Cor. xv. 47; Gal. iv. 4; 2 Cor. viii. 9; Phil. ii. 6; Col. i. 16, 17.

⁴ Heb. i. 2, 3.

something which he takes for granted, and not as one propounding anything new.¹ Does not this bring us back very near the foundation-head of all Christian doctrine? Should we not be led to suspect, even if we had had no Fourth Gospel, that Christ Himself had laid the foundation on which His followers were building? But if that is so, the absence of this doctrine from the Synoptics and its presence in the Fourth Gospel only means that it has preserved what they had not preserved. And the argument on which so much stress has been laid turns out to be not against but for the ancient view, that we have in it the work of one who had lain on the breast of the Lord.

W. SANDAY.

*SAINT PAUL'S FIRST JOURNEY IN
ASIA MINOR.*

THE intention of this paper is, presupposing as already familiar to the reader all that is said in the careful and scholarly work of Messrs. Conybeare and Howson and in the picturesque pages of Dr. Farrar,² to add some notes and make a few corrections in points where fresh discoveries or more intimate acquaintance with the localities necessitate a revision of their statements. The present writer has seen every place named in the following pages except Perga, and writes as an eye-witness; and his object is to fix more precisely the exact situation of the localities visited by Paul and Barnabas, and the roads along which they travelled, and to draw some inferences as to the direction in which further knowledge may be hoped for.

¹ For this reason I think the view that the doctrine owes its origin to St. Paul, and that the other writers are all dependent upon him, very questionable.

² These works are, for brevity's sake, alluded to throughout as CH. and F.