

THE ARAMAEIC ORIGIN OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL

CHAPTER IV

C. F. BURNEY

PRONOUNS

ἐγώ, ἡμεῖς, σὺ, ὑμεῖς.

THE great frequency of the Pronouns of the first and second persons is a marked feature in Jn. The occurrences in this Gospel and the Synoptists are as follows:

	Mt.	Mk.	Lk.	Jn.
ἐγώ	29	17	23	134
καὶ ἐγώ	9	—	4	27
ἡμεῖς	5	3	5	18
σὺ	18	10	27	60
ὑμεῖς	31	11	21	68
Totals	92	41	80	307

To a large extent this phenomenon finds its explanation in the fact that the Fourth Gospel is designed to prove our Lord's Messiahship and His Divinity (20³¹). Thus at the opening St. John the Baptist emphasizes the character of his mission—ἐγώ—in contrast to that of Christ (1^{20,23,26,27,31a,33,34}, 3^{28b}). Our Lord lays stress upon His claims—ἐγώ (4^{14,26}, 5^{30,36}, 6^{35,40,41,44,48,51,54}, 8^{12,42}, 10^{7,9,11,14,18}, 11²⁵, 12⁴⁶, 14⁶, 15¹, 16³³, 18³⁷), or His acts (15^{9,26}, 17^{4,12,14,19}, 18^{20bis}), bringing Himself into antithesis with others—the disciples, the Jews, the world, &c. (4³², 5^{34,45}, 7^{8,29,34,36}, 8^{15,21b,22,23bis,38,45,55}, 10^{10,18}, 12^{26,47}, 13^{14,15,33}, 14^{3,12a,19,20,27}, 15^{5a,10,16}, 17^{14b,25}); or He defines His relation to God the Father (5¹⁷, 6⁵⁷, 8^{16b,18,26}, 10^{30,8}, 16²⁶, 17²³). Emphatic ὑμεῖς is frequently antithetical to ἐγώ, and implied or expressed antithesis often accounts for the use of ἡμεῖς and σὺ.

When all such cases have been taken into consideration, there remain, however, a large number in which the Pronoun appears to be used with no special emphasis. Thus ἐγώ in 1^{30,31b}, 3^{2a}, 4³⁸,

6^{63,70}, 7¹⁷, 8^{14,16a,21a,29,49,50,54}, 10^{17,27,28,35}, 11^{27,42}, 12⁵⁰, 13^{7,18,26}, 14^{4,10b,12b,16,28}, 15^{14,20,26}, 16^{1,7bis}, 17^{9,14a,22}, 18^{20bis,21,37}; *ἡμεῖς* in 1¹⁶, 6^{42,69}, 7³⁵, 8¹⁸, 9^{24,29}, 19⁷; *σύ* in 3²⁶, 4¹⁰, 10²⁴, 14⁹, 18^{34,37b}; *ὁμεῖς* in 1²⁶, 4³⁵, 5^{20,33,34,35,39,44,45}; 8^{31,46}, 9^{19,30}, 11⁴⁹, 13¹³, 14^{20a}, 15^{3,16b}.

Now while in Semitic the use of the Personal Pronouns with greater or less emphasis is extremely common, we also find them employed without special emphasis in order to *mark the subject of the Participle*. In Hebrew, and still more in Aramaic, the Participle is used with great freedom to describe an event as in process of continuance, whether in the past or present, or as in process of coming into being (*Futurum instans*). In such cases, the subject being unexpressed in the verbal form, it is of course necessary to mark it, when it is pronominal, by the Pronoun. This Semitic usage of the Participle being foreign to Greek, the LXX in translating the Hebrew of the O.T. naturally represents it by a Present, a Perfect, a Future, &c., and, so doing, might well have dispensed with the Personal Pronoun. As a matter of fact, however, the translation nearly always retains the Pronoun, and that, almost invariably, in the position which it occupies in the original, before or after the verbal form.

Cases of אנכי, אני, 'I', with the Participle expressed by ἐγώ in Genesis are as follows. 7⁴ אֲנֹכִי מִמָּטִיר ἐγὼ ἐπάγω υֹעֲטֹן, 9¹² אֲנִי ἐγὼ δίδωμι, 15¹⁴ אֲנִי בִן κρινῶ ἐγώ, 30¹ אֲנִי מִתָּה τελευτήσω ἐγώ, 24^{13,13} נָצַב אֲנִי הָיָה ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἔστηκα. So also 16⁸, 18¹⁷, 24^{3,37,42}, 25³², 27⁸, 28²⁰, 31⁵, 32¹², 42¹⁸, 48²¹, 49²⁹. The only cases without ἐγώ are 37^{16,30}.

Cases of אנחנו, 'we', with the Participle expressed by ἡμεῖς in Genesis—Kings are: Gen. 19¹³ הִנֵּה אֲנִי וְהָעָם הַזֶּה אֲנִי וְהָעָם הַזֶּה ὅτι ἀπόλλυμεν ἡμεῖς τὸν τόπον τοῦτον, 43¹⁸ אֲנִי וְהָעָם הַזֶּה . . . ἐλ-דָּבָר הַפֶּסֶף Διὰ τὸ ἀργύριον . . . ἡμεῖς εἰσαγόμεθα, Num. 10²⁹ אֲנִי וְהָעָם הַזֶּה אֲנִי וְהָעָם הַזֶּה ἔξαιρομεν ἡμεῖς εἰς τὸν τόπον. So Deut. 1²⁸, 5²², 12⁸, Judg. 18⁵, 19¹⁸, 1 Sam. 14⁸, 1 Kgs. 22³, 2 Kgs. 6¹, 7^{3,9bis}, 18²⁶. No cases with omission of ἡμεῖς.

Similarly, in Genesis—Kings there are 40 cases of אַתָּה 'thou' with the Participle expressed by σύ (e.g. Gen. 13¹⁵ כָּל-הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר-אַתָּה בָּל-הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר-אַתָּה πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἣν σὺ ὀράς), as against 14 without σύ: and 35 cases of אַתָּם 'ye' with the Participle expressed by ὑμεῖς (e.g. Ex. 16⁸ מִלֵּינִם אַתָּם אֲשֶׁר אֲתִלְחִיתֶכֶם τὸν γογγυσμὸν ὑμῶν ὃν ὑμεῖς

בְּמִיָּין מְצַפֵּעַ אֲנִי אֶתְּנֶה לְךָ. Again, in 1¹⁶ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἐλάβομεν, the ἡμεῖς naturally reproduces the suffix of לְךָ 'all of us'.

Particularly noteworthy is the throwing of σύ to the end of the sentence, whether in a question, as in 1^{21b} Ὁ προφήτης εἶ σύ; 18²⁷ Οὐκοῦν βασιλεὺς εἶ σύ; 19⁹ Πόθεν εἶ σύ; or in a statement, as in 4¹⁹ θεωρῶ ὅτι προφήτης εἶ σύ, 8¹⁸ Σαμαρείτης εἶ σύ. This is never found elsewhere throughout the N. T. except in Acts 13³³, Heb. 1⁵ Υἱός μου εἶ σύ, a quotation of Ps. 2⁷ with accurate reproduction of the Hebrew order אֲנִי אֶתְּנֶה. Hebrew and Aramaic can, in such a statement or query, place the Pronoun after the predicate or before it (as e.g. in Gen. 27²⁴ אֲנִי הֵן אֶתְּנֶה), and Jn.'s use of both orders (cf. σὺ εἶ in 1^{42.49}, 3¹⁰, 7⁵², &c.) looks much like a close reproduction of an Aramaic original.

αὐτός, οὗτος, ἐκεῖνος.

To express the 3rd person αὐτός is fairly frequent in Jn. The figures for αὐτός (-ή) as subject in the four Gospels are as follows:

Mt. 12, Mk. 17, Lk. 51, Jn. 18.

Much more often, however, Jn. prefers to use an emphatic demonstrative οὗτος 'this one', ἐκεῖνος 'that one', and he employs these Pronouns substantively with far greater freedom than do the Synoptists. The figures for οὗτος (αὐτή) as subject are

Mt. 35, Mk. 14, Lk. 36, Jn. 44.

For ἐκεῖνος (-η, -ο) used substantively, whether as subject or obliquely, the figures are

Mt. 4, Mk. 3, Lk. 4, Jn. 51.

ἐκεῖνος is used adjectivally

Mt. 51, Mk. 16, Lk. 29, Jn. 18.

Jn.'s extraordinary fondness for demonstratives in preference to the Personal Pronoun finds adequate explanation in the theory that his Gospel is a close reproduction of an Aramaic original.

In the Aramaic of Dan. the 3rd Personal Pronoun ܐܝܢ *hū* as subject is rendered αὐτός by Theodotion, except where it forms the subject of a predicative statement in which the copula is understood, in which case the Greek represents it by the substantive

verb: e. g. 6⁵ מְהִימִין הָיָה 'faithful (was) he' = πιστὸς ἦν, 6¹¹ כָּרָע הָיָה 'he (was) kneeling' = ἦν κάμπτων.

Aramaic is richly supplied with demonstrative Pronouns. The following, with their Greek renderings, may be noticed.

דְּנָה *d'nā* 'this', fem. דָּה *dā*, plur. c. אִלְלֵן *'illēn*, Dan. and Ezr. *passim*. Targums דֵּן *dēn*, fem. דָּה *dā*; strengthened by demonstrative prefix הָ *hā-*, דְּהֵן *hādēn*, fem. דְּהָהָה *hādā* = Syriac ܠܗܢܐ *hānā* (contracted from *hād'nā*), fem. ܠܗܕܗ *hādē*; plur. c. אִלְלֵן *hā'illēn* = Syriac ܠܗܠܠܝܢ *hāllēn*. דְּנָה both as pronominal subs. and adj. is regularly rendered οὗτος in Dan. and Ezr. (in a few cases of adj. use it is represented by the definite article only).

דִּקְּכֶן *dikkēn* 'this, that', c., Dan. 2³¹ דִּקְּכֶן הָיָה עִקּוֹן עֵלֶיךָ (LXX and Θ.), Dan. 7^{20.21} דִּקְּכֶן תִּרְנָן תִּרְנָן τὸ κέρας ἐκείνο (LXX, Θ.). Plur. c. דִּקְּכֶן 'illēkh, Dan 3^{12.21.23}, 6^{12.16} (also found in Ezr.).

To this corresponds in Ezr.:

דָּֽחַ *dēkh*, fem. דָּֽחַ *dākh* ‘this’. דָּֽחַ הָיְתָה הָפֹלִיס עֵינֵיהֶן Ezr. 4^{13,15,16,19,21};
הָפֹלִיס אִתָּהּ, 4^{16b}; דָּֽחַ שְׁבַעֲרָר, Σαρβαγάρ ἐκείνος, 5¹⁶; דָּֽחַ עֲבָדֵיהֶן τὸ ἔργον
ἐκείνο, 5⁸; דָּֽחַ אֶת־הַבַּיִת, (τὸν) οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκείνον, 5¹⁷, 6^{7,8}, οἶκον θεοῦ, 6¹².

In addition, we find in Talmudic Aramaic הַהוּ *hāhū* = 'that' or 'that one' (i.e. 3rd personal pronoun *hū* + demonstrative particle *hā*), contracted in Syriac into ܗܘܐ *hau* (Pal. Syr. also ܗܘܐ), fem. ܗܝܐ *hāhī* (also ܗܝܐ), contracted in Syriac into ܗܝ *hāi* (Pal. Syr. also ܗܝ), plur. ܗܢܗ *hānhō*, Syriac m. ܗܢܘܢ *hānnūn*, fem. *hānnēn*. This usage is not found in the Aramaic of Dan. and Ezr., though we may notice the use of the Personal Pronoun in Dan. 2³² ܗܘܐ ܥܝܡܐ *that image*' (explained as *Nom. pendens*—'it—the image'). This is remarkably like ἐκεῖνος τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας in Jn. 16¹³, an expression which amounts to 'that Spirit of truth' or 'the Spirit, &c.' (Pal. Syr. ܗܘܐ ܥܝܡܐ ܗܘܐ ܗܘܐ). This version at times uses ܗܘܐ to express the definite article, e.g. ܗܘܐ ܥܝܡܐ = ὁ ἄνθρωπος.)

There can be no question that where *ἐκεῖνος* is used adjectivally it would naturally be represented by הַהוּא. Thus 4⁵³ *ἐκεῖνη τῇ ὥρᾳ* would appear in the Jerus. Talmud as בְּהַאי שַׁעֲתָה (Cur., Pesh. בְּהַאי שַׁעֲתָה, but Pal. Syr. בְּהַאי שַׁעֲתָה). When used substantively as subject—especially when reinforcing a *Nom. pendens* (cf. p. 64)—it is probable that *ἐκεῖνος* represents the Personal Pronoun הוּא; but there are other cases in which it looks much like a reproduction of הַהוּא. Pal. Syr. represents it by ܐܘܢ (ܐܘܢ) in 3³⁰, 5³⁵, 7¹¹, 9^{11, 12},

construction בְּרַחֲמֶיהָ דְּהֶרֶדִּיָּאס 'her daughter of Herodias', i. e. 'the daughter of H.' (noted by Allen, *St. Mark, ad loc.*).

Another peculiarly Aramaic idiom is the anticipation of the direct object of a verb by a pronominal suffix. Thus in Jn. 19¹³ Pal. Syr. renders ܡܠܝܬܐ ܕܡܠܝܬܐ ܕܡܠܝܬܐ 'he brought Him (viz.) the Lord Jesus', 19¹⁶ ܡܠܝܬܐ ܕܡܠܝܬܐ ܕܡܠܝܬܐ 'they led Him the Lord Jesus', 19³⁴ ܡܠܝܬܐ ܕܡܠܝܬܐ ܕܡܠܝܬܐ 'he pierced it His side'.^{*} An example of this idiom is seen in the Greek of Jn. 9¹³ Ἀγούσιν αὐτὸν πρὸς τοὺς Φαρισαίους τὸν ποτε τυφλόν = Pal. Syr. ܡܠܝܬܐ ܕܡܠܝܬܐ ܕܡܠܝܬܐ ܕܡܠܝܬܐ.

* No cases of the direct object of a verb so anticipated are found in Biblical Aramaic. We find the anticipatory pronoun, however, in such phrases as ܒܪܢܝܐܠ ܒܗ ܕܢܝܐܠ 'was found in him in Daniel' (Dan. 5¹²), ܒܗ ܒܠܝܠܝܐ 'in it in the night', i. e. 'in the same night' (Dan. 5³⁰), ܫܠܚܘ ܥܠܝܗ ܥܠ ܐܪܬܝܫܫܬܐ 'they sent to him to Artaxerxes' (Ezr. 4¹¹). A few cases of the construction are found in Hebrew: cf. Brockelmann, *Vergleich. Gramm. der semit. Sprachen*, ii. 227.

CHAPTER V

THE VERB

The Historic Present = Aramaic use of the Participle.

THE Historic Present is extremely frequent in Jn. The occurrences are as follows:

ἄγουσιν, 9¹³, 18²⁸.
 ἀποκρίνεται, 12²³, 13^{26, 38}.
 βάλλει, 13⁵.
 βλέπει, 1²⁹, 20^{1, 5}, 21²⁰; βλέπουσιν, 21⁹.
 δίδωσιν, 13²⁶, 21¹³.
 ἐγείρεται, 13⁴.
 ἔρχεται, 4^{5, 7}, 11³⁸, 12^{22b, 3}, 13⁶, 18³, 20^{1, 2, 6, 18, 26}, 21¹³.
 εὕρισκει, 1^{41, 43, 45}, 5¹⁴.
 θεωρεῖ, 20^{6, 12, 14}; θεωροῦσιν, 6¹⁹.
 λαμβάνει, 13²⁶, 21¹³.
 λέγει, 1^{21, 29, 36, 39, 41, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 51}, 2^{3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9}, 3⁴, 4^{7, 9, 11, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 25, 26, 28, 34, 49, 50}, 5^{6, 8},
 6^{5, 8, 12, 20}, 7^{6, 50}, 8³⁹, 9¹², 11^{7, 11, 23, 24, 27, 39 bis, 40, 44}, 12^{4, 22}, 13^{6, 8, 9, 10, 24, 25, 27, 31, 36, 37},
 14^{5, 6, 8, 9, 22}, 18^{4, 5, 17 bis, 26, 33 bis}, 19^{4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 14, 15, 26, 27, 23}, 20^{2, 13, 15 bis, 16 bis, 17, 19, 22, 27, 29},
 21^{3, 5, 7, 10, 12, 15 ter, 16 ter, 17 bis, 19, 21, 22}; λέγουσιν, 9¹⁷, 11^{8, 34}, 12²², 16²⁹, 20¹³, 21³.
 μαρτυρεῖ, 1¹⁵.
 νεύει, 13²⁴.
 τίθησιν, 13⁴.
 τρέχει, 20².
 φαίνει, 1⁵.
 φησιν, 18²⁹.
 φωνεῖ, 2⁹.

This list gives a total of 164 occurrences.* The figures for the Synoptists, as given by Sir John Hawkins (*HS.*² pp. 143 ff.), are,

* Sir John Hawkins gives the figure as 162 (besides two cases preserved in Tischendorf in 11²⁹). He has, however, kindly lent his MS. list to the present writer, who has added φαίνει 1⁵ (which may be open to dispute) and δίδωσιν 21¹³.

Mt. 78 (21 of which are derived from Mk.: in addition there are 15 Presents in Parables); Mk. 151; Lk. only 4 [or 6]; Acts 13. It thus appears that Jn. closely resembles Mk. in fondness for this usage. If Mk. were as long as Jn., the former would show proportionately 195 occurrences. The higher proportionate figure in Mk. is explained by the higher proportion of narrative to discourse in this Gospel. There are comparatively few cases of the Historic Present in Jn. 5—10 and 14—17.*

The use of the Historic Present in Mk. and Jn. strongly resembles a common Aramaic idiom in which in a description of past events the Participle is employed to represent the action described as in process of taking place. The following instances of this participial usage are found in the Aramaic chapters of the Book of Daniel. Theodotion sometimes renders it by an Historic Present or (more frequently) by an Imperfect; and when this is the case his rendering is added. In other cases he employs an Aorist.

עֲנֶה '(was) answering' (always followed by וְאָמַר 'and (was) saying'), 2^{5,8,15,20,26,27,47}, 3^{14,19,24,26,28}, 4^{16b, 27}, 5^{7,13,17}, 6^{13,17,21}, 7² (this verb is frequently omitted in Theodotion's rendering).† וְנִינִי '(were) answering', 3²⁴.

אָמַר '(was) saying', 2^{5,8,15,20,26,27,47}, 3^{14,19,24,26,28}, 4^{4,11,16 bis,20,27}, 5^{7,13,17}, 6^{13,17,21}, 7². וְאָמְרִין '(were) saying', 2^{7,10}, 3^{9,16,24}, 6^{6,7,13,14,16}, 7⁵. Theodotion, λέγει in 2²⁷, λέγουσιν in 2¹⁰, 6^{13,14,16}, ἔλεγον in 7⁵.

מִתְּכַפְּלִין '(were) gathering together', 3⁸; וְאָמְיִן '(were) standing', 3⁸; קָרָא '(was) crying' (ἐβόα), 3⁴; וְשָׁמְעִין '(were) hearing' (ἤκουον), 3⁷; וְסִקְרִין . . . נִפְלִין '(were) falling down . . . and (were) worshipping' (πίπτοντες . . . προσεκύνησαν), 3⁷; וְנִצְּתִין '(were) coming forth', 3²⁶; מִתְּכַפְּלִין '(were) gathering together' (συνάγονται) 3²⁷; וְנִינִי '(were)

* Cf. HS.² pp. 143 f.

† It is remarkable that, though we constantly find עֲנֶה (participle) coupled with וְאָמַר (participle) in the *singular*—'he (was) answering and (was) saying', we do not (with the single exception 3²⁴) find the participle *plural* וְנִינִי coupled with the participle plural וְאָמְרִין. In the plural the regular usage is the coupling of the *perfect* עָנִי with the participle וְאָמְרִין—'they answered and (were) saying'. This fact suggests the possibility that the singular form should be vocalized, not עֲנֶה 'ānē (Participle), but עָנָה 'ānā (Perfect).

seeing' (*θεωρουν*), 3²⁷; *נָחַת* '(was) descending', 4¹⁰; *קָרָא* '(was) crying', 4¹¹; *שָׁתָה* '(was) drinking', 5¹; *וְנִתְּקוּ* 'and (were) writing' (*καὶ ἔγραφον*), 5⁵; *תָּוָה* '(was) seeing' (*θεωρεῖ*), 5⁶; *מִשְׁתַּבְּחוּ* '(were) being loosed' (*διδέχοντο*), 5⁶; *נִקְּשׁוּ* '(were) knocking' (*συνεκροτούντο*), 5⁶; *קָרָא* '(was) crying', 5⁷; *עָלְלוּ*, *כָּרְעוּ* '(were) entering' (*εἰσεπορεύοντο*), 5⁸; *לֹא-יָכְחוּ* '(were) not being able' (*οὐκ ἠδύναντο*), 5⁸; *מִתְּבַהֵל* '(was) being terrified', 5⁹; *שָׁנְיוּ* '(were) being changed', 5⁹; *מִשְׁתַּבְּשׁוּ* '(were) being perplexed' (*συνεταράσσοντο*), 5⁹; *לֹא-יָכְחוּ* '(were) not being able', 5¹⁵; *שָׁתוּ* '(were) drinking' (*ἐπίνετε*), 5²³; *הוּא בָּרַךְ עַל-בְּרֻכּוֹתָי* 'he (was) kneeling on his knees and (was) praying and (was) giving thanks' (*ἦν κάμπτων ἐπὶ τὰ γόνατα αὐτοῦ, καὶ προσευχόμενος καὶ ἐξομολογούμενος*), 6¹¹; *מִנִּיתוּ* '(were) bursting forth' (*προσέβαλλον*), 7²; *סָלְקוּ* '(were) coming up' (*ἀνέβαινον*), 7³; *הִפְסֵה* . . . *וּמִדְּקָה* '(was) eating and (was) breaking in pieces . . . (was) trampling' (*ἐσθίον καὶ λεπτύνον* . . . *συνεπάτει*), 7¹⁹; *נִגַּד וְנִפְּק* '(was) issuing and (was) coming forth' (*ἐλλκεν*), 7¹⁰; *מִמַּלְלָא* '(was) speaking' (*ἐλάλει*), 7¹¹; *עֲבָדָא* '(was) making' (*ἐποίει*), 7²¹; *יָבִלָה* '(was) prevailing', 7²¹.

The fact that in the 199½ Aramaic *vv.* of Dan. we thus find no less than 99 instances of this participial usage describing a past action shows how highly characteristic of the language the idiom is. That the usage naturally lends itself to representation in Greek by the Historic Present or Imperfect is obvious to an Aramaic scholar. If those who are unacquainted with Aramaic will read a passage of the book in English, substituting the literal renderings given above for those of R.V., and remembering that the time-determination (*was* or *is*) is absent from the original and can only be inferred from the context, they can hardly fail to come to the same conclusion.

It will be noticed that, out of the 99 examples, 23 are found with the verb 'answer', and no less than 36 with the verb 'say', leaving 40 (or considerably less than half the total) to verbs bearing other meanings. In Syriac the use of the Participle under discussion is practically confined to the verb *ܐܡܪ* 'say'.* In the 151 instances of the Historic Present in Mk., 72 are cases of *λέγει, λέγουσιν*. In the 164 instances in Jn. the proportion borne by *λέγει, λέγουσιν* to

* See, however, Burkitt, *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, ii, pp. 63 ff., for instances of its use with other verbs in Sin.

the whole number is considerably higher, viz. 120, or nearly three-fourths.

That the frequent use of the Historic Present in Mk. is due to Aramaic influence is maintained by Allen (*Expositor*, 1900, pp. 436 ff.; *Expository Times*, xiii, p. 329; *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, p. 295) and by Wellhausen (*Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*², p. 17). It can hardly be doubted that in Jn. also the same theory offers an adequate explanation of the same phenomenon.

The Imperfect = Aramaic use of the Participle coupled with the Substantive verb.

Instances of the Imperfect in Jn. (excluding the Substantive verb) are as follows:

- διεγείρετο, 6¹⁸.
 διέτριβεν, 3²².
 διηκόνει, 12².
 ἐβάπτισεν, 3²², 4²; ἐβαπτίζοντο, 3²³.
 ἐβάσταζεν, 12⁶.
 ἐβλεπον, 13²².
 ἐγίνωσκειν, 2²⁵.
 ἐγόγγυζον, 6¹¹.
 ἔδει, 4⁴.
 ἐδίδασκεν, 7¹⁴.
 ἐδίδουσαν, 19³.
 ἐδίωκον, 5¹⁶.
 ἐδόκουν, 13²⁹.
 ἐζήτει, 19¹²; ἐζήτουν, 5¹⁸, 7^{1.11.30}, 10³⁰, 11^{8.56}.
 ἐζώννυες, 21¹⁸.
 ἐθαύμαζον, 4²⁷, 7¹⁵.
 ἐθερμαίνοντο, 18¹⁸.
 ἐθεώρου, 6².
 εἶχον, 17⁵; εἶχε, 19¹¹; εἶχεν, 2²⁵, 13²⁹; εἶχετε, 9⁴¹; εἶχουσιν, 15^{22.24}.
 ἐκαθέζετο, 4⁶, 11²⁰.
 ἐκάθητο, 6³.
 ἔκειτο, 19²⁰, 20¹².

- ἔκλαιεν, 20¹¹.
 ἐκράυγαζον, 12¹³.
 ἐλάλει, 4²⁷, 7¹³, 10⁶.
 ἔλεγεν, 2^{21.22}, 5^{18.19}, 6^{6.65.71}, 8^{23.27.31}, 9⁹, 12^{29.33}; ἔλεγον, 4^{33.42}, 5¹⁰, 6^{14.42},
 7^{11.12 bis.23.31.40.41 bis}, 8^{19.22.25}, 9^{8.9.10 bis 16 bis}, 10^{20.21.24.41}, 11^{36.47.56}, 12²⁹, 16¹⁸,
 19^{3.21}, 20²⁵.
 ἔλυε, 5¹⁸.
 ἐμάχοντο, 6³².
 ἐμαρτύρει, 12¹⁷.
 ἔμελεν, 12⁶.
 ἐμελλεν (ἦμι), 4⁴⁷, 6^{6.71}, 11⁵¹, 12³³, 18³²; ἐμελλον, 7³⁹.
 ἔμενεν (v. l. ἔμεινεν), 10⁴⁰.
 ἐπίστευεν, 2²⁴; ἐπιστεύετε, 5^{46 bis}; ἐπίστευον, 7⁵, 12^{11.37}.
 ἐπέκειτο, 11³⁸.
 ἐποίει, 2²³, 5¹⁶, 6².
 ἐπορεύετο, 4⁵⁰.
 ἐτήρουν, 17¹².
 ἐτόλμα, 21¹².
 ἔτρεχον, 20⁴.
 ἔφη, 1²³, 9³⁸.
 ἐφοβούντο, 9²².
 ἐφίλει, 11³⁶, 15¹⁹, 20².
 ἠγάπα, 11⁵, 13²³, 19²⁶, 21^{7.20}; ἠγαπάτε, 8⁴², 14²⁸.
 ἠγωνίζοντο, 18³⁶.
 ἠδύνατο (ἐδ.), 9³³, 11³⁷; ἠδύναντο, 12³⁹.
 ἠθελες, 21¹⁸; ἠθελεν, 7¹; ἠθελον, 6^{11.21}, 7⁴⁴, 16¹⁹.
 ἠκολούθει, 6², 18¹⁵.
 ἦρχετο, 11²⁹; ἦρχοντο, 4³⁰, 6¹⁷, 19³, 20³.
 ἠρώτα, 4⁴⁷; ἠρώτων, 4^{31.40}, 9¹⁵, 12²¹.
 ἠσθένει, 4⁴⁶, 11².
 ἰσχυον, 21⁶.
 κατέκειτο, 5³.
 παρεγίνοντο, 3²³.
 περιεπάτει, 21¹⁸; περιεπάτει, 5⁹, 7¹, 10²³, 11⁵⁴; περιεπάτουν, 6⁵⁶.
 ὑπῆγον, 6²¹, 12¹¹.
 ὠμολόγουν, 12⁴².

The total is 167. In Mt. the Imperfect occurs 94 times ; in Mk. 228 times ; in Lk. 259 times ; in Acts 329 times.* If Jn. were as long as Mt., there would be proportionately 212 occurrences ; if as long as Lk., 225 ; if as short as Mk., 138. Thus Jn.'s use of the tense, though more than twice as frequent as that of Mt., is considerably less than Lk.'s, and very much less than Mk.'s. The large amount of discourse in Jn. affords little opportunity for the use of the Imperfect. The last discourses, *chs.* 14-17, offer only 8 cases ; while the bulk of the examples occur in *chs.* 4-12, where there are 118 cases.

Among Jn.'s Imperfects, the great frequency of *ἔλεγεν*, *ἔλεγον* attracts notice, and forms a bond of connexion with Mk.'s usage. Jn. has 46 occurrences, and Mk. 50 ; while in Mt. there are only 10, in Lk. 23, and in Acts 11.† It may be remarked that *ἔλεγεν*, *ἔλεγον* are very rare in LXX, Sir John Hawkins enumerating but 40 cases.

A frequent Aramaic usage, closely akin to the single use of the Participle above noticed, is the coupling of a Participle with the Substantive verb in description of past events. Thus, in place of saying 'he did' some action, Aramaic frequently says 'he *was doing*' it, thus pictorially representing the action as in process. The instances of this usage in the Aramaic of Dan. are commonly rendered both by LXX and Theodotion by a Greek *Imperfect* ; though occasionally the rendering exactly copies the Aramaic by employing the Participle and Substantive verb. The following are the instances of the usage in description of past events :

Aramaic.	Literal rendering.	LXX.	Theodotion.
2 ³¹ חֲזָה הָיִיתָ	'Thou wast seeing'.	ἑώρακας.	ἐθεώρεις.
2 ³⁴ id.	id.	id.	id.
4 ⁷ חֲזָה הָיִיתָ	'I was seeing'.	ἐκάθενδον.	ἐθεώρουν.
4 ¹⁰ id.	id.	ἐθεώρουν.	id.
5 ¹⁹ וַאֲעִין הָיוּ וַיִּרְחֹלִין	'They were trembling and fearing'.	<i>vacat.</i>	ἦσαν τρέμοντες καὶ φοβούμενοι.

* Cf. *HS.*² p. 51, where the figure 163 for Jn. requires correction, as also the printer's error 12 for the occurrences of *ἐφη*, which should be 2.

† Cf. *HS.*² p. 12.

<i>Aramaic.</i>	<i>Literal rendering.</i>	<i>LXX.</i>	<i>Theodotion.</i>
5 ¹⁹ דִּי־הוּא צָבֵא הָוָה קָטַל וְרִי הָוָה צָבֵא הָוָה מִחָא וְרִי־הָוָה צָבֵא הָוָה מְרִים וְרִי־הָוָה צָבֵא הָוָה מְשַׁפֵּל	'Whom he was willing he was killing, and whom he was willing he was smiting, and whom he was willing he was raising up, and whom he was wil- ling he was abasing'.	<i>om.</i>	οὗς ἠβούλετο αὐτὸς ἀνῆρει, καὶ οὗς ἠβού- λετο αὐτὸς ἐτυπτεν, καὶ οὗς ἠβούλετο αὐτὸς ὑψοῖ, καὶ οὗς ἠβού- λετο αὐτὸς ἐταπείνου.
6 ⁴ הָוָה מְתַנַּצַּח עַל	'he was presiding over'.	<i>om.</i>	ἦν . . . ὑπέρ.
6 ⁵ הוּוּ בָעֵצוּ	'they were seeking'.	<i>diff.</i>	ἐζήτουν.
6 ¹¹ הוּא עָבַד	'he was doing'.	ἐποίει.	ἦν ποιῶν.
6 ¹⁶ הָוָה מְשַׁתְּמֵר	'he was striving'.	<i>diff.</i>	ἠγωνίστατο.
7 ² תָּוָה תִּוִּית	'I was seeing'.	ἐθεώρουν.	ἐθεώρουν.
7 ⁴ <i>id.</i>	<i>id.</i>	<i>id.</i>	<i>id.</i>
7 ⁶ <i>id.</i>	<i>id.</i>	<i>id.</i>	<i>id.</i>
7 ⁷ <i>id.</i>	<i>id.</i>	<i>id.</i>	<i>id.</i>
7 ⁸ מְשַׁתְּמֵל תִּוִּית	'I was considering'.	<i>diff.</i>	προσενόουν.
7 ⁹ תָּוָה תִּוִּית	'I was seeing'.	ἐθεώρουν.	ἐθεώρουν.
7 ^{11a} <i>id.</i>	<i>id.</i>	<i>id.</i>	<i>id.</i>
7 ^{11b} <i>id.</i>	<i>id.</i>	θεωρῶν ἡμην	<i>deest.</i>
7 ¹³ <i>id.</i>	<i>id.</i>	ἐθεώρουν.	ἐθεώρουν.
7 ¹⁹ הָוָה שָׁנִיחַ	'it was differing'.	διαφθείροντος (sic)	ἦν διαφέρον.
7 ²¹ תָּוָה תִּוִּית	'I was seeing'.	κατενόουν.	ἐθεώρουν.

The use of the Substantive verb with the Participle of אָמַר 'he was saying' is frequent in Aramaic, and especially in Syriac, just as λέγειν, λέγον are particularly frequent in Mk. and Jn. אָמַר הָוָה does not occur in Dan., the writer preferring the simple Participle אָמַר (cf. p. 88).

**The Present sometimes = the Aramaic Participle as
'Futurum instans'.**

The use of a Present to denote the *Futurum instans* is particularly frequent in Jn. with the verb *ἔρχομαι*. We may note the following instances :

- 1^{15,27} ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος.
 1³⁰ ὀπίσω μου ἔρχεται ἀνὴρ.
 4^{21,23}, 5^{25,28}, 16^{2,25,32} ἔρχεται ὥρα.
 4²⁵ οἶδα ὅτι Μεσσίας ἔρχεται.
 4³⁵ τετραμηνός ἐστι καὶ ὁ θερισμὸς ἔρχεται.
 5²¹ εἰς κρίσιν οὐκ ἔρχεται.
 6¹⁴ ὁ προφήτης ὁ ἐρχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον.
 7²⁷ ὁ δὲ Χριστὸς ὅταν ἔρχηται.
 7¹¹ Μὴ γὰρ ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ὁ Χριστὸς ἔρχεται ;
 7⁴² ἀπὸ Βηθλεὲμ . . . ἔρχεται ὁ Χριστός.
 9⁴ ἔρχεται νύξ, ὅτε οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐργάζεσθαι.
 11²⁷ ὁ Χριστός, . . . ὁ εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐρχόμενος.
 14³ πάλιν ἔρχομαι.
 14^{18,28} ἔρχομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς.
 14³⁰ ἔρχεται γὰρ ὁ τοῦ κόσμου ἀρχων.
 21³ Ἐρχόμεθα καὶ ἡμεῖς σὺν σοί.
 21^{22,23} Ἐὰν αὐτὸν θέλω μένειν ἕως ἔρχομαι.

This use of *ἔρχομαι* is found also in the Synoptists, though with not nearly such frequency:—Mt. 3¹¹ (Mk. 1⁷, Lk. 3¹⁶), Mt. 11³ (Lk. 7²⁰), Mt. 17¹¹ (ἐλθὼν Mk. 9¹²), Mt. 21⁵ (quotation), Mt. 24⁴² (Mk. 12³⁵), Mt. 24^{43,44} (Lk. 12^{39,40}), Mt. 27⁴⁹, Lk. 17^{20 bis}, 23²⁹. As might be expected, it is particularly frequent in the Apocalypse—1^{4,7,8}, 2^{5,16}, 3¹¹, 4⁸, 9¹², 11¹⁴, 16¹⁵, 22^{7,12,20}.

Instances of other Presents so used in Jn. are :

- 1²⁹ Ἴδε ὁ ἄμνός τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου.
 12²⁵ ὁ φιλῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπολλύει αὐτήν (contrast Mt. 16²⁵, Mk. 8³⁵, Lk. 9²¹, 17³³, ἀπολέσει αὐτήν).
 17²⁰ περὶ τῶν πιστευόντων διὰ τοῦ λόγου αὐτῶν εἰς ἐμέ.

In Aramaic (as also in Hebrew) the Participle is used as a *Futurum instans* with great frequency. In all cases cited above

in which *ἔρχομαι* has the sense of a *Futurum instans*, Pesh. represents it by the Participle, except in 14³, 16², where the future sense is expressed by the Imperfect. Moreover, in the only cases in Jn. where the Greek uses the Future *ἐλεύσομαι*, we find that Pesh. represents this by the Participle; 11⁴⁸ *ἐλεύσονται οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι καὶ ἀροῦσιν* = ܐܪܘܢ ܕܪܘܡܐܝܐ ܕܠܝܬܐ, lit. 'and the Romans coming, taking away'; 14²³ *πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐλευσόμεθα* = ܕܠܝܬܐ ܕܠܝܬܐ, lit. 'and to him we coming'; 16⁷ *ὁ παράκλητος οὐ μὴ ἔλθῃ* (TR. οὐκ ἐλεύσεται) = ܕܠܝܬܐ ܕܠܝܬܐ ܕܠܝܬܐ, lit. 'the Paraclete not coming'. Cf. elsewhere, Mt. 9¹⁵ *ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι* = ܕܠܝܬܐ ܕܠܝܬܐ, lit. 'but days coming'; 25³¹ *Ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* = ܕܠܝܬܐ ܕܠܝܬܐ ܕܠܝܬܐ, lit. 'When the Son of man coming'; Mk. 8³⁸ *ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ* = ܕܠܝܬܐ ܕܠܝܬܐ ܕܠܝܬܐ, lit. 'when He coming in the glory of His Father' (so Lk. 9²⁶). Instances of the usage in the Aramaic of Dan. are, 2¹³ *וְהָיָה נִפְקָד וְחַכְמָנָא מְתַקְּלִין* 'So the decree went forth and the wise men being killed' (i.e. 'were about to be killed'); 4²² *וְלָקְחוּ מִן הַיָּרְדֵּן מִן הַמַּיִם* 'And they driving thee from men' (i.e. 'they shall drive thee'); so v. 29; 4²² *וְלָקְחוּ מִן הַמַּיִם* 'they wetting thee' (i.e. 'they shall wet thee').

Verbal sequences.

1³⁹ *Ἐρχεσθε καὶ ὄψεσθε* 'Come, and ye shall see'. A similar sequence is idiomatic in Hebrew. Cf. Gen. 6¹⁴, *Make (עָשִׂה) thee an ark . . . and thou shalt pitch (וְנִפְרַחְתָּ) it within and without with pitch*'; so Targ. Onk., *וְנִפְרַחְתָּ . . . עֵינֶיךָ לָקֵחַ*. 1 Sam. 15³ *לֵךְ וְהִכִּיתָ אֶת-עָמְלֵק* 'Go, and thou shalt smite Amalek'; so Targ. Jon. *אֵינִי לְדִבְרֵיךָ עָמְלֵק*. See for further instances in Hebrew, Driver, *Tenses*, § 112. Cf. further in Aramaic, Ezr. 7^{19,20}, 'And the vessels that are given thee for the service of the house of thy God, *deliver thou (וְהִשְׁלַחְתָּ)* before the God of Jerusalem; and whatsoever more is needful . . . *thou shalt bestow (וְתִתְּנָהּ)* out of the king's treasure house'. *Acta Thomae* (p. 13), 'But *conduct yourselves (ܕܠܝܬܐ ܕܝܚܝܬܐ)* in all humility and temperance and purity, and in hope in God, and *ye shall become (ܕܠܝܬܐ ܕܝܚܝܬܐ)* His household-servants'. This form of sequence is not (apart from translations from the Hebrew) so characteristic of Aramaic as it is of Hebrew, except where the sequence is clearly to be

regarded (as in the last instance) as the *result* of the preceding Imperative. This, however, is clearly implied in the expression Ἐρχεσθε καὶ ὄψεσθε. So 16²⁴, αἰτέετε καὶ λήμψεσθε.

Change of construction after a Participle is seen in two passages in Jn.—1³² Τεθέαμαι τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον . . . καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐπ' αὐτόν, and 5⁴⁴ λαμβάνοντες, καὶ . . . οὐ ζητεῖτε. These are exactly analogous to a frequently-used Hebrew idiom; e.g. Ezek. 22³ עִיר שֶׁפְּכָה וְעָשְׂתָה גִּלְגִּלִּים . . . וְעָשְׂתָה גִּלְגִּלִּים, lit. 'a city shedding blood . . . and makes idols' (i.e. 'that sheds . . . and makes', or 'shedding . . . and making'); Ps. 18³⁴ מְשַׁוְהָה רַגְלִי כַּאֲיֵלוֹת וְעַל בְּמֹתַי יַעֲמִידֵנִי, lit. 'Making my feet like the harts', and on my heights He sets me' (i.e. 'Who makes . . . and sets'); Gen. 27³³ הַצֹּדֵר צִיד וַיָּבֵא, lit. 'the one hunting venison and brought it' (i.e. 'who hunted . . . and brought'). See other cases in Driver, *Tenses*, § 117. In accordance with this usage, we should render καταβαῖνον . . . καὶ ἔμεινεν in Jn. 1³², not as R.V. 'descending . . . ; and it abode', but 'descending . . . , and abiding'; and λαμβάνοντες, καὶ . . . οὐ ζητεῖτε in 5⁴⁴, 'receiving . . . and seeking not', or 'who receive . . . and seek not'. This usage is remarkably frequent in the Apocalypse, and the cases have been collected and discussed by Dr. Charles in his Commentary i, p. cxlv; cf. 1⁵ τῷ ἀγαπῶντι ἡμᾶς . . . καὶ ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς 'Unto Him that loved us . . . and hath made us, &c.' (not as R.V. 'and He made us', after semi-colon); 15^{2,3} ἐστῶτας . . . ἔχοντας κιθάρας . . . καὶ ᾄδουσιν 'standing . . . having harps . . . and singing' (A.V., R.V. 'And they sing', after full stop, are incorrect). Other cases may be seen in 2^{2,9,20,23}, 3⁹, 7¹⁴, 13¹¹, 14^{2,3}.*

The construction is rather Hebrew than Aramaic, though we may note Dan. 4²² וְעָשְׂתָא בְּתוֹרִין לֵךְ וְיַעֲמֹן, lit. 'and thou shalt do in torim to go and stand'.

* Not, however, (with Dr. Charles) 1¹⁸ καὶ ὁ ζῶν καὶ ἐγενόμην νεκρός, or 20⁴ (with rejection of οἵτινες as an editorial gloss) τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν πεπελεκισμένων . . . καὶ οὐ προσεκύνησαν τὸ θηρίον. An essential element in the Hebrew construction is that the finite verb expresses the *proper sequence of the Participle*, which may be actually a sequence in time, so that the *ו* connecting the finite verb with its antecedent expresses the sense 'and then', or as introducing the direct result, 'and so'; or a sequence in description in which, though the fact described may properly speaking be coeval with its antecedent, it follows naturally in the gradual unfolding of the picture (especially frequent in description of types of character). We do *not* find cases in which the sequence describes an event *actually prior in time to its antecedent*, as would be the case in the two passages in question. For these quite a different construction would be employed in Hebrew.

'And they shall drive thee (lit. driving thee) from men . . . and with grass like oxen they shall feed thee'. We have it in Jn. 1³² Pal. Syr. . . . ܕܠܗܘܝܢ ܕܡܢܝܢ ܕܡܢܝܢ ܕܡܢܝܢ, Pesh. ܕܡܢܝܢ ܕܡܢܝܢ ܕܡܢܝܢ. In 5⁴⁴ *ξηρερε* is represented by the Participle; Pal. Syr. ܕܡܢܝܢ ܕܡܢܝܢ ܕܡܢܝܢ ܕܡܢܝܢ, Pesh. ܕܡܢܝܢ ܕܡܢܝܢ ܕܡܢܝܢ ܕܡܢܝܢ. In the O.T. passages it is usual, both in Targ. and Pesh., to resolve the opening Hebrew Participle into a Perfect or Imperfect preceded by the relative ܐܝܬܐ, and then to follow it by another Perfect or Imperfect.

CHAPTER VI

NEGATIVES

THE Semitic languages do not for the most part possess negative expressions such as *none*, *never*, but express them by using the corresponding positives coupled with the simple negative *not*. Thus e.g. Hebrew לֹא . . . כָּל, Aramaic לֹא . . . כָּל, ܠܐ . . . ܕܠܐ, 'any . . . not' = 'none'; or, since Heb. אִישׁ, Aram. ܐܝܬܐ, 'a man' is commonly used in the sense 'any one', 'none' may be expressed by this term with preceding negative. So in Heb., Gen. 2⁵ כָּל שֵׁם הָעֵדֶה טָרָם יִהְיֶה בָאָרֶץ, lit. 'any plant of the field was not yet in the earth' (i.e. 'no plant . . . was yet, &c.'). Gen. 4¹⁵ לֹא־יִעָשֶׂה, lit. 'for the not-smiting him of all finding him' (i.e. 'that none finding him should smite him'); Ex. 12¹⁶ כָּל־מְלָאכָה לֹא־יַעֲשֶׂה, lit. 'all work shall not be done' (i.e. 'no work shall be done'); Gen. 31⁵⁰ אֵין אִישׁ עִמָּנוּ, lit. 'there is not a man with us' (i.e. 'no one is with us'); Gen. 41¹⁴ בְּלִעְדֵּיךָ לֹא־יָרִים אִישׁ אֶת־יָדוֹ, 'independently of thee a man shall not lift up his hand' (i.e. 'none shall lift up, &c.'). In Aram., Dan. 2³⁶ לֹא הִשְׁתַּכַּח לְהוֹן, 'any place was not found for them' (i.e. 'no place was found'); Dan. 4⁶ כָּל־דָּן לֹא אָגַם לְךָ, lit. 'every secret does not trouble thee' (i.e. 'no secret troubles thee'); Dan. 2¹⁰ לֹא־אֵיתִי אָנֹכִי עַל־יַבְשָׁתָא דִּי מַלְתָּ מַלְכָא יִבְלַל, lit. 'there is not a man on earth that can show the king's matter' (i.e. 'no one on earth can show, &c.').

We find the Semitism πᾶς (πᾶν) . . . μὴ = 'none', 'nothing', in Jn. in two passages: 6³⁹ ἵνα πᾶν ὃ δέδωκέν μοι μὴ ἀπολέσω ἐξ αὐτοῦ, 12¹⁶ ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ μὴ μείνη. πᾶς . . . οὐ (μὴ) is also found in Mt. 24²² = Mk. 13²⁰ οὐκ ἔν ἐσώθη πᾶσα σάρξ, Lk. 1³⁷ οὐκ ἀδυνατήσει παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ πᾶν ῥῆμα, Rom. 3²⁰, Gal. 2¹⁶ (both quotations of Ps. 143³), Eph. 4²⁹, 5⁵, 2 Pet. 1⁹, 1 Jn. 2²¹ (cf. 2²³, 3^{6 bis.9}, 4³, 5¹⁸, where the renderings 'every one . . . not', 'no one' are equally legitimate), Apoc. 7¹⁶, 18²², 21²⁷, 22³.

'No one' is expressed by οὐ . . . ἄνθρωπος in Jn. 3²⁷ Οὐ δύναται ἄνθρωπος λαμβάνειν οὐδὲν ἐὰν μὴ κτλ., 5⁷ ἄνθρωπον οὐκ ἔχω ἵνα . . . βάλη με εἰς τὴν κολυμβήθραν, 7¹⁶ Οὐδέποτε ἐλάλησεν οὕτως ἄνθρωπος.* In Mk. 11² we find ἐφ' ὃν οὐδεὶς οὕτω ἀνθρώπων ἐκάθισεν, 12¹⁴ οὐ γὰρ βλέπεις εἰς πρόσωπον ἀνθρώπων (but here there is a sense of antithesis to τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ following), but elsewhere in the Synoptists there seems to be no case of οὐ . . . ἄνθρωπος.

'Never' is expressed in Heb. and Aram. 'not . . . for ever'; cf. in Heb. Ps. 30⁷ לְעוֹלָם לְעוֹלָם 'I shall never be moved'; Ps. 31², 71¹ לְעוֹלָם לְעוֹלָם 'let me never be put to shame'; Ps. 119⁸³ לֹא אֶשְׁכַּח 'I will never forget Thy commandments'; Isa. 25² יִבְנֶה לֹא לְעוֹלָם 'it shall never be rebuilt'; in Aram., Dan. 2⁴⁴ 'לָא תִּהְיֶה מְחֻבָּל 'which shall never be destroyed'; *Acta Thomae* (p. 11) ܠܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ 'and they shall be with Him in the kingdom which never passes away'; *id.* (p. 11) ܠܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ 'but this banquet shall never pass away'.

Similarly, οὐ μὴ . . . εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα occurs several times in Jn. in the sense 'never': 4¹⁴ οὐ μὴ διαψήσῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, 8⁵¹ θάνατον οὐ μὴ θεωρήσῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, 8⁵² οὐ μὴ γεύσῃται θανάτου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, 10²⁸ οὐ μὴ ἀπόλωνται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, 11²⁶ οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, 13⁸ οὐ μὴ νύψῃς μου τοὺς πόδας εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. Cf. also 9³² ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος οὐκ ἠκούσθη. The phrase is only found elsewhere in N.T. in Mt. 21¹⁹ Οὐ μηκέτι ἐκ σοῦ καρπὸς γένηται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα = Mk. 11¹⁴, Mk. 3²⁹ οὐκ ἔχει ἄφεσιν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, 1 Cor. 8¹³ οὐ μὴ φάγω κρέα εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

To express 'lest' Hebrew has the single term לֵּשׁ. To this in Aramaic corresponds the compound term ܠܥܝܢܐ (Syr. ܠܥܝܢܐ), formed from ܠܥܝܢܐ + ܝܢܐ, Targ. ܠܥܝܢܐ from ܠܥܝܢܐ + ܝܢܐ, i.e. lit. 'since why?' This properly introduces a rhetorical question deprecating the taking of a certain course (cf. *Oxford Heb. Lex.*, p. 554 a; ܠܥܝܢܐ Dan. 1¹⁰, ܠܥܝܢܐ Song 1⁷, are instances of the equivalent Heb. phrase in late style). This expression occurs once in Biblical Aram., Ezr. 7²¹, and is the regular equivalent of Heb. לֵּשׁ in the Targg. ܠܥܝܢܐ 'that . . . not' = 'lest' in the Aram. of Dan. 2¹⁸, 6^{9, 18}; and in Pesh. ܠܥܝܢܐ 'that . . . not' is used indifferently with ܠܥܝܢܐ 'since why?' in the sense 'lest' as the equivalent of Heb. לֵּשׁ.

* ἄνθρωπος = τις, like indefinite ܐܢܬܐ, is also found in Jn. 3^{1, 4}, 7^{23, 51}.

We have already remarked that in Jn. *ἵνα μή* is regularly employed to the exclusion of *μήποτε*. The occurrences, 18 in all (as against Mt. 8, Mk. 5, Lk. 8), are as follows: 3^{16,20}, 4¹⁵, 5¹⁴, 6^{12,39,50}, 7²³, 11^{27,50}, 12^{35,40,42,46}, 16¹, 18^{28,36}, 19³¹. These occurrences of 'that . . . not' do not all carry the sense '*lest*'; but this force is clear in the following:

- 3²⁰ οὐκ ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸ φῶς, ἵνα μὴ ἐλεγχθῇ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ.
 5¹⁴ μηκέτι ἀμάρτανε, ἵνα μὴ χεῖρόν σοί τι γένηται.
 7²³ εἰ περιτομὴν λαμβάνει ἄνθρωπος ἐν σαββάτῳ ἵνα μὴ λυθῇ ὁ νόμος Μωυσέως.
 12³⁵ περιπατεῖτε ὡς τὸ φῶς ἔχετε, ἵνα μὴ σκοτία ὑμᾶς καταλάβῃ.
 12⁴⁰ ἵνα μὴ ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς.
 12⁴² ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῖς Φαρισαίους οὐχ ὁμολόγουν ἵνα μὴ ἀποσυνάγωγοι γένωνται.
 16¹ ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν ἵνα μὴ σκανδαλισθῇτε.
 18²⁸ αὐτοὶ οὐκ εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὸ πραιτώριον, ἵνα μὴ μανθῶσιν.
 18³⁶ οἱ ὑπηρέται οἱ ἐμοὶ ἡγωνίζοντο ἄν, ἵνα μὴ παραδοθῶ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις.
 19³¹ ἵνα μὴ μείνῃ ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ τὰ σώματα.

μήποτε, which never occurs in Jn., is found in Mt. 8 times, Mk. twice, Lk. 6 times.

A striking proof that Jn.'s *ἵνα μή* = '*lest*' represents the Aramaic *ܠܝܢܐ* is to be seen in the quotation from Isa. 6¹⁰ which occurs in Jn. 12⁴⁰. In this quotation the Heb. uses *לֵא* '*lest*', and this is represented in LXX by *μήποτε*, but in Pesh. by *ܠܝܢܐ* '*that . . . not*'.

Heb.	ܠܝܢܐ ܠܝܢܐ
LXX	μήποτε ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς
Pesh.	ܠܝܢܐ ܠܝܢܐ

The quotation is given in Mt. 13¹⁵ in the *ipsissima verba* of LXX; while Mk. 4¹², quoting more freely, yet has the *μήποτε* of LXX, *μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς* (i.e. *ܠܝܢܐ ܠܝܢܐ ܠܝܢܐ*). Jn., however, rendering *ἵνα μὴ ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς*, departs from the Heb. and LXX phrases in order to use an Aramaic phrase which is actually employed in the rendering of Pesh. What evidence could prove more cogently that his Greek translates an Aramaic original?

CHAPTER VII

MISTRANSLATIONS OF THE ORIGINAL ARAMAIC OF THE GOSPEL

THE most weighty form of evidence in proof that a document is a translation from another language is the existence of difficulties or peculiarities of language which can be shown to find their solution in the theory of mistranslation from the assumed original language. There are a considerable number of such in the Fourth Gospel, and some of them have already been noticed in the preceding discussion. These may first be summarized.

The particle ܐܝܢ with a relative sense mistranslated by *iva* or *oti*.

iva for ܐܝܢ = 'who, which', 1⁸, 5⁷, 6^{30.50}, 9³⁶, 14¹⁶ (cf. p. 75).

oti for ܐܝܢ = 'who', 8⁴⁵, 9⁷; less certainly in 1¹⁶ (cf. p. 76).

iva for ܐܝܢ = 'when' (properly 'which . . . in it'), 12²³, 13¹, 16^{2.22} (cf. p. 77).

oti for ܐܝܢ = 'when', 9⁸, 12¹¹ (cf. p. 78).

ܐܝܢ = 'because, inasmuch as', mistranslated as a relative, 1^{4.13} (cf. pp. 29, 34).

1⁵, 12³⁵. *καταλαμβάνειν* = ܠܝܬܝܒ 'take, receive', a misunderstanding of ܠܝܬܝܒ 'darken' (cf. p. 29).

1⁹. *ἦν* = subst. verb ܢܝܗ, probably a misreading of ܢܝܗ = *ἐκείνος* (cf. p. 33).

The ambiguity of the particle ܐܝܢ has, as we have seen in the cases noted above, caused difficulty to the translator. There are several other passages in which, though the relative force of the particle is clear, the fact that it lacks expression of gender and number has led to misapprehension. These may conveniently be taken together.

10²⁹. *ὁ πατήρ μου ὃ δέδωκέν μοι πάντων μείζον ἐστίν*. This reading has the support of B* 8 9 (boh) 9, and is therefore adopted by

WH. It can only be rendered, 'As for My Father, that which He hath given Me is greater than all'. This is explained by Westcott to mean that 'the faithful regarded in their unity, as a complete body, are stronger than every opposing power. This is their essential character, and "no one is able . . ." Cf. 1 Jn. 5'. The whole context cries out against the falsity of this exegesis. Stress has been laid in the parable upon the weakness of the sheep, their liability to be scattered and injured by the powers of evil, and their utter dependence upon the Good Shepherd. In the parallel clause their safeguard is stated to consist in the fact that 'no one is able to snatch them out of My Father's hand'. But, if Westcott is correct, this would seem to be merely supplementary to the thought of the power of the flock regarded as a unity—which is incredible. Again, the phrase 'greater than all' has, on this text, to be explained as 'stronger than every opposing power'; yet what authority is afforded by the context for thus limiting its scope? Clearly the expression, as it stands without limitation, is applicable to God alone. There can be no doubt that the sense intended is that which is given by the less authenticated reading, adopted by R.V., *ὁ πατήρ μου ὃς δέδωκέν μοι μέλλων πάντων ἐστίν*, which supplies the reason for the parallel clause which follows. Yet there can be little doubt that WH. are correct in regarding the more difficult reading as original, and the more natural one as a correction of it; since, had the latter been original, it is inconceivable that the former could have arisen out of it. Its origin may be traced to an unintelligent rendering of the Aramaic *ܐܬܝܕܝܢ ܠܝ ܕܝܚܝܬܝ ܕܝܚܝܬܝ ܕܝܚܝܬܝ*, in which *ܕܝܚܝܬܝ . . . ܕܝܚܝܬܝ* may be taken to mean either *ὃς . . . μέλλων* or *ὃ . . . μέλλον*. Possibly the first draft of the translation rendered *ܕܝܚܝܬܝ* only as a neuter (*ὃ . . . μέλλον, N L Ψ*), and the other readings are corrections dictated by regard for grammar.

This explanation of the anomaly offered by the Greek might be regarded as less than convincing if the passage stood alone. There are, however, other passages in which the text is similarly and obviously at fault. In 17¹¹ we read, *τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι, ἵνα ὧσιν ἐν καθὼς ἡμεῖς*, and similarly in 17¹², *ἐγὼ ἐτήρουν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι*. Is it possible to believe that the sense intended is, 'Thy name which Thou hast given Me'? Westcott may well observe on 17¹¹, 'The phrase is very remark-

virtually repeated in *vv.*^{27,30}, is most naturally understood as a reference to the fact that our Lord's influence was to displace, or was already displacing, that of His Forerunner (cf. 3³⁰). Instead of *hath become*, we should rather have expected *will become* or *is to become*.¹ He suggests therefore that the Greek γέγονεν may be due to the translator's having supplied a wrong vowel to the Aramaic הוּי, reading it as הוּי *hāwē* (a by-form of the Perfect הָיָה *hāwā*) instead of הוּי *hāwē* (the Participle) which would bear the sense 'is becoming' or 'is about to become'. Further, ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν 'because He was before me' may be due to a misreading קִדְמִי *ḱodāmay* of an original קִדְמִי *ḱadmay*, 'first'. Thus the original text may have run—

דְּאֵתִי בְּתַרִּי קִדְמִי הוּי
מִטָּל קִדְמִי הוּא

'He who is coming after me, before me will become;
Because He was the first (of all)':

i.e. because He existed 'in the Beginning'. The assonance between the kindred words קִדְמִי 'before me' and קִדְמִי 'first' offers a characteristic Semitic word-play.

¹²⁹ Ἰδε ὁ ἀμὺνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἀμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου. Dr. Ball (*op. cit. supra*), while making some valuable remarks about the Aramaic original of the phrase ὁ ἀμὺνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, questions whether the statement 'which taketh away (or beareth) the sins of the world' is original, on the ground that it 'antedates that doctrine of the suffering Messiah, which only came home to the Apostles themselves after the Resurrection (Lk. 24^{21,26})', and 'does not well harmonize with the general tone of the Baptist's teaching about the Messiah, as reported by the Synoptists (Mt. 3)'. He therefore conjectures that the words 'may be supposed to have been added by some editor of the Greek text who recollected Isa. 53⁷, and who wrote in the light of a later stage of Christian knowledge'.

It may be argued, on the contrary, that the whole of Jn.'s presentation of the Baptist's witness, including these words, is fully in accord with the Synoptic narrative. It is agreed that the reference of ὁ αἴρων κτλ. is to Isa. 53, i.e. the culminating passage referring to the mission of the righteous Servant of Yahweh

which forms the main theme of the prophecy of Deutero-Isaiah, *chs.* 40-55, with which *ch.* 61 (the opening passage of which is applied by our Lord to Himself in Lk. 4^{16ff.}), though probably the work of a later prophet, stands in close association as further drawing out the mission of the ideal Servant. The Baptist's description of his own function, 'I am the voice of one crying, &c.' (common to Jn. and the Synoptists) is drawn from Isa. 40³; and it is therefore reasonable to assume that in preparing for his mission he had made a special study of Isa. 40ff., and was impressed with the conception of the ideal Servant of Yahweh which these chapters contain. That he regarded himself as but the forerunner of a greater One is a second fact common to all four Gospels; and the relation of Isa. 40³ to its sequel might in itself serve to justify the conjecture that this greater One was pictured by him as fulfilling the ideal of the Servant. We are not, however, limited to conjecture. Our Lord's reply to the disciples of the Baptist whom he sent to inquire whether He was really *ὁ ἐρχόμενος* (Mt. 11²⁻⁶=Lk. 7¹⁸⁻²³) took the practical shape of performing acts of mercy in their presence; and His answer, based on the things which they had seen and heard, leaves us in no doubt that the evidence suited to carry conviction to the Baptist's mind was *His fulfilment of the acts which had been predicted of the ideal Servant*. We may compare especially *τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν* with Isa. 42⁷ 'to open blind eyes' (part of the Servant's mission),* 61¹ 'to proclaim . . . the opening (of eyes) to them that are blind', 35⁵ 'Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened'†; *χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν* with Isa. 35⁶ 'then shall the lame man leap as an hart'; *πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται* with 61¹ 'Yahweh hath anointed me to preach good tidings to the poor'. The gentle words of reproof with which the message ends—*καὶ μακάριός ἐστιν ὁς ἐὰν μὴ σκανδαλισθῇ ἐν ἐμοί*—would naturally remind the Baptist not to range himself with those of whom it had been written, 'Like as many were appalled at thee, &c.' (Isa. 52¹¹), and 'as one

* The reference in Isa. is of course to the removal of *moral* blindness; but it should be unnecessary to recall the fact that our Lord's physical miracles had always their moral analogue, and depended for their performance upon faith in the recipient.

† Isa. 35, which is late, is based upon Isa. 40ff., and develops its thought.

from whom men hide their face, he was despised and we esteemed him not' (Isa. 53³).

From these considerations we deduce the conclusion that the fact that our Lord was to fulfil the rôle of the ideal Servant, though not understood by the Apostles, *was in some measure realized by the Baptist*. If this was so, since the atoning work pictured in Isa. 53 formed the culmination of that rôle, can it be maintained that the words ὁ αἵρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου are improbable in the Baptist's mouth? In the verses which follow, Jn. 1³⁰⁻³⁴, he states that he had no previous knowledge of Him Whose coming he was heralding, and did not know how to recognize Him till it was Divinely revealed to him that the sign would be the descent of the Spirit upon Him. This revelation was surely deduced from Isa. 42¹ (the first great passage descriptive of the Servant's mission), where Yahweh states, 'I have put My Spirit upon him'; and Isa. 61¹ where the Servant is represented as saying, 'The Spirit of the Lord Yahweh is upon me'.* Thus evidence unites in indicating that it was the coming of the ideal Servant of Yahweh that the Baptist believed himself to be heralding.†

* Cf. the way in which the heavenly announcement at the Baptism, Mt. 3¹⁷ and parallels, is modelled on Isa. 42¹ as quoted in Mt. 12¹⁸ (noted by Allen, *ad loc.*).

† It is perhaps significant that (apart from Jn. 3²⁸) the title Χριστός 'Messiah' is not employed by the Baptist. His titles are ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος Mt. 3¹¹, Jn. 1²⁷, ὁ ἐρχόμενος simply Mt. 11³ = Lk. 7²⁰, ὁ ἄμνός τοῦ Θεοῦ Jn. 1^{29,36}, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ Jn. 1³⁴. The fact is evident that Deutero-Isaiah's conception of the suffering Servant did not enter into the popular Messianic expectation of the time (cf. a sermon by the writer on *The Old Testament Conception of Atonement fulfilled by Christ*, published by the Oxford University Press, pp. 10 f.) Very possibly the Baptist avoided the title 'Messiah' in order that he might not mistakenly be supposed to be heralding the political Messiah of popular expectation. That he was not alone in fixing his hopes upon the ideals of Deutero-Isaiah rather than upon those associated with the Messianic King is proved by the Birth-narrative of Lk., where Simeon is described (2²⁶) as προσδεχόμενος παράκλησιν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ—a clear reference to 'Comfort ye, comfort ye my people', which forms the burden of Deutero-Isaiah's prophecy (Isa. 40¹; cf. also 49¹³, 51³, and in Trito-Isaiah 57¹⁸, 61², 66^{11,13}). Thus, when this latter holds the infant Saviour in his arms and uses the words, εἶδον οἱ ὀφθαλμοί μου τὸ σωτήριόν σου . . . φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν, he has clearly in mind the passage in the second great description of the ideal Servant where the words occur, 'I will give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be My salvation (or, that My salvation may be) unto the end of the earth' (cf. also καὶ δόξαν λαίῳ σου Ἰσραήλ with Isa. 46¹³, 'and I will place salvation in Zion for Israel My glory'). His knowledge of the third and fourth Servant-passages, where the Servant is pictured as meeting opposition, persecution, and death (Isa. 50⁴⁻⁷,

What, however, is the origin of the expression 'Lamb of God' as used by the Baptist, and what is its precise force? The phrase does not occur in Isa. 53, where *v.*⁷, which brings in the simile of a lamb, simply says that the Servant was 'like a lamb that is led to the slaughter (not, 'to the sacrifice'); and like a ewe (LXX ἀμνός) that before her shearers is dumb'. The words ὁ αἵρων κτλ. are based, not on this verse but on *v.*¹¹, 'and their iniquities *he* shall bear', where the simile is dropped and 'My righteous Servant' preceding forms the back-reference of the emphatic '*he*'. 'The Lamb of God' suggests the sense, 'the Lamb *provided by God*' as a fitting offering, which reminds us of Gen. 22⁸, 'God shall provide Himself a lamb for a burnt offering'; and combining *v.*⁷ and *v.*¹¹ of Isa. 53 with *v.*¹⁰ which states that it was Yahweh who was pleased to bruise him, and allowing for the influence of Gen. 22⁸, we may perhaps consider that we have accounted for the use of the phrase.

A more probable solution, however, is suggested by Dr. Ball's remark that Heb. אֵלֶּיךָ *ālē* 'lamb' has come in its Aram. form ܐܠܝܬܐ *al-yā* to mean 'child', 'boy', 'young man', 'servant'.* In the last sense it denotes in Pesh. e.g. Abraham's 'young men' (Gen. 22³; so also in Targ. Jerus.), the priest's 'servant' (1 Sam. 2^{13,15}), and the centurion's 'servant' (Mt. 8^{6,13}). Thus ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ may stand for ܐܠܝܬܐ ܕܥܠܝܬܐ, intended primarily to bear the sense, 'the *Servant* of God', i.e. Yahweh's righteous Servant who, according to Isa. 53^{11,12}, was to bear the sins of many. If this is so, there may well be a word-play in the choice of the term ܐܠܝܬܐ, suggesting as it does the *lamb-like* or *sinless* character of the ideal Servant; thus, 'the *Lamb* of God' is a rendering by no means excluded by this new interpretation. Further, since ܐܠܝܬܐ also bears the sense 'child', it is not unlikely that the thought of 'the *Child* of God' is also present.† In vv.³¹⁻³⁴ the sign by which

52¹⁸—53¹²), obliges him, moreover, to warn the holy Mother that the child is destined to become a σημεῖον ἀντιλεγόμενον, and to predict καὶ σοὺ δὲ αὐτῆς τὴν ψυχὴν διελείσεται βομφαία. Anna the prophetess and her circle seem also to have rested in the same hope (cf. Lk. 2³⁶⁻³⁸). All this is not a later invention; it bears upon its face the unmistakable stamp of historical truth.

* The fem. of this word, *lithā* 'maiden', is familiar to every one from Mk 5⁴¹.

† Dr. Ball renders the assumed Aram. original, 'Behold the Young Servant or Child of God', and does not bring the expression into connexion with Deutero-Isaiah.

the Baptist was to recognize $\delta \epsilon\rho\chi\acute{o}\mu\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$, viz. the descent and abiding on Him of the Spirit, was, as we have already remarked, the sign of Yahweh's ideal Servant. After witnessing this, the Baptist says, $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omega \acute{\epsilon}\omega\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha \kappa\alpha\iota \mu\epsilon\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\upsilon}\rho\eta\kappa\alpha \delta\tau\iota \omicron\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu \delta \nu\iota\acute{o}\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$. It is not impossible that $\delta \nu\iota\acute{o}\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ may again represent the Aram. ܐܢܝܢ ܕܥܠܝܐ , interpreted as 'the *Child* of God' but intended primarily to mean 'the *Servant* of God'. A sufficient explanation for the translation of the same term by $\acute{\alpha}\mu\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$ in *v.*²⁹ but by $\nu\iota\acute{o}\varsigma$ in *v.*³⁴ may be found in the difference of context, the first passage picturing the ܐܢܝܢ as a sacrifice, the second as baptizing with the Holy Spirit.

If it be objected against this explanation of $\acute{\alpha}\mu\nu\acute{o}\varsigma = \text{ܐܢܝܢ}$ in the sense 'Servant' that the term used in Deutero-Isaiah to denote the ideal Servant is regularly Heb. עֶבֶד = Aram. ܐܒܕܐ , properly 'bond-servant', it may be replied that the choice of ܐܢܝܢ rather than ܐܒܕܐ is sufficiently explained by the word-play involved. While $\text{ܐܒܕܐ} = \delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$, $\text{ܐܢܝܢ} = \pi\alpha\iota\varsigma$. Both Greek terms are indifferently used in LXX to render the עֶבֶד of Deutero-Isaiah, but the preference is for $\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma$ ($\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ in 49^{3,5}; $\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma$ in 42¹, 49⁶, 50¹⁰, 52¹³); and it is $\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma$ which is used of our Lord as the ideal Servant in Acts 3¹³, 4^{27,30}.

2²². $\text{Ὅτε οὖν ἡγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἐμνήσθησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι τοῦτο ἔλεγεν.}$ We note the curious use of the Imperfect, 'He was saying', where the context demands a Pluperfect, 'He had said'. In Aramaic an Imperfect sense is indicated by the coupling of the *Participle* ܐܡܪܐ 'amar with the subst. verb, while a Pluperfect is commonly represented by use of the *Perfect* ܐܡܪܐ 'amar similarly coupled with the subst. verb. Thus ܐܡܪܐ ܐܡܪܐ 'amar hāwā 'He had said' may easily have been misinterpreted as ܐܡܪܐ ܐܡܪܐ 'amar hāwā 'He was saying', an unvocalized text in W. Aramaic affording (so far as we know) no distinction between the Perfect and the Participle beyond that which is indicated by the context. In a carefully written unvocalized Syriac text the distinction is marked by use of a diacritic point, below for the Perfect, above for the Participle. Thus ܐܡܪܐ ܐܡܪܐ = 'He had said', ܐܡܪܐ ܐܡܪܐ = 'He was saying'.

6⁶³. $\text{τὰ ῥήματα ἃ ἐγὼ λελάληκα ὑμῖν}$ seems to mean, 'The things about which I have been speaking to you' (viz. the eating of My

flesh and the drinking of My blood).^{*} So perhaps in *v.*⁶⁸ ῥήματα ζωῆς αἰωνίου should mean, 'the things of eternal life'. Aramaic ܠܕܝܢ, like Hebrew דבר, means both 'word' and 'thing'. Cf. for the latter sense, Dan. 2^{8,10,11,15,17,23}, 5^{17,26}, 7^{1,16,28}. It is ordinarily rendered ῥήμα or λόγος by Theodotion; cf. 2⁸ ἀπέστη ἀπ' ἐμοῦ τὸ ῥήμα. Similarly Hebrew דבר 'thing' is often rendered ῥήμα in LXX; e.g. 2 Sam. 12⁶ ἀνθ' ὧν ὅτι ἐποίησεν τὸ ῥήμα τοῦτο.

7^{37,38}. Ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ μεγάλῃ τῆς ἐορτῆς ἰστήκει ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἐκραξε λέγων Ἐάν τις διψᾷ ἐρχέσθω πρὸς με καὶ πινέτω. ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ, καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή, ποταμοὶ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ ρεύσουσιν ὕδατος ζῶντος. The quotation which our Lord here refers to the Scriptures has caused great perplexity. The fact has rightly been recognized that it is a free combination of several O.T. passages which speak of a river of living waters which, in the Messianic age, is to issue from the Temple-mount, and to become the source of life and healing far and wide. The principal development of this conception is found in Ezek. 47¹⁻¹². We may notice especially *v.*⁹, where it is stated that 'it shall come to pass, that every living creature which swarmeth in every place whither *the rivers* come, shall live'. Ezekiel's conception has been taken up by two later prophets. Joel 3¹⁸ (4¹⁸ in the Heb.) predicts that '*a fountain shall come forth* of the house of the Lord, and shall water the valley of Shittim'; while in Zech. 14⁸ we find the statement, 'It shall come to pass in that day, that *living waters shall go out* from Jerusalem; half of them toward the eastern sea, and half of them towards the western sea' (the latter statement is based upon the passage quoted from Ezek., where the word rendered 'the rivers' is vocalized as a dual, נַחֲלִיִּים). We may believe that our Lord had all these passages in His mind; and in each of them the expressions which are most significant are italicized. In addition to these passages, it can hardly be doubted that, in using the words Ἐάν τις διψᾷ ἐρχέσθω πρὸς με καὶ πινέτω, He was dwelling on Isa. 55^{1ff.}, 'Ho, every one that thirsteth, *come ye to the waters*. . . . Incline your ear and *come unto Me*; hear, and your soul shall live'; and Jer. 2¹³, 'They have forsaken *Me, the source of living waters*'.

There still remains the outstanding difficulty, '*out of his belly*

* Cf. Gore, *Bampton Lectures*, note 60 (p. 275).

shall flow, &c.' Even if, as seems more than doubtful, the thought is of the distribution of the blessing 'in fuller measure' by its recipient (so Westcott, who compares 4¹⁴, 6⁵⁷, 5²⁶), the fact remains that this conception as expressed cannot be connected with any O.T. passage; and though we can understand that our Lord may well have combined the sense of the passages noticed above, and that so doing His reference would be immediately apprehended by His hearers, we cannot believe that He would have imported, or that they would have accepted, an idea which is not found in any O.T. passage which speaks of the water of life.

The difficulty may at once be solved upon the hypothesis that the passage has been translated from Aramaic. As we have seen, Joel speaks of 'a fountain', Hebrew מַעְיָן *ma'yān**; and the word is the same in Aramaic (employed, e.g., in the Targum of Ps. 104¹⁰, Prov. 5¹⁶, 8²³). The Aramaic for 'belly' or 'bowels' is מַעֵין *mē'in* (Hebrew מַעֵים); it is used, e.g., of the belly of the image in Dan. 2³². It will at once be seen that, in an unvocalized text, מַעֵין 'belly' and מַעְיָן 'fountain', would be absolutely identical. Adopting the word for 'fountain' our Lord's words would run in Aramaic, מִן דְּצַחֵי יֵיתִי לְתֵי וְיִשְׁתִּי מִן דְּמַהֲיָיִן בִּי הֵיךְ דְּאָמַר דְּתַבְּרָא נְחֻלִין כּוֹד־מַעְיָן דְּמִיִּין נְבָעִין יְהֵא נְגִדִין. If 'fountain' is correct, however, how can we connect 'He that believeth in Me' with 'rivers from the fountain'? There can be little doubt that, as was recognized by the most ancient western interpreters, the clause really belongs to the offer preceding it. On this view the Aramaic yields the sense—

'He that thirsteth, let him come unto Me;
And let him drink that believeth in Me.

As the Scripture hath said, Rivers shall flow forth from the fountain of living waters'.

* It is worthy of note that the Joel-passages with its allusion to the fountain is directly applied to the Messiah in Midrash Rabba on Ecclesiastes, par. i. 28: מִה גּוֹאֵל רֵאשִׁיִן הָעֵלָה אֶת הַבָּאֵר אֵף גּוֹאֵל אַחֲרָיו יַעֲלֶה אֶת הַמִּים שְׁנֵא' וּמַעֵין. 'Just as the first Redeemer (Moses) caused the well to spring up, so also shall the second Redeemer cause the waters to spring up, as it is said, "And a fountain shall come forth from the House of the Lord, &c."''. This passage follows directly upon a similar Midrashic deduction which was clearly in the minds of the people who witnessed our Lord's miracle

Our Lord, we are told, 'stood forth and cried aloud', like one of the prophets of old; and His words, like theirs, fall naturally into grand and impressive parallelism. The reference to Scripture which follows the parallel couplet summarizes the main conceptions of Ezekiel, Joel, and Zechariah. When the passage was translated from Aramaic into Greek, מן מען was taken to mean, 'from the belly'; and this was connected with 'he that believeth in Me', and was therefore rendered, 'from *his* belly'.

8⁵⁶. Ἀβραὰμ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ἡγαλλιάσατο ἵνα ἴδῃ τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐμὴν, καὶ εἶδεν καὶ ἐχάρη. This passage can hardly be preserved in its original form. No extension of the use of ἵνα seems adequate to explain ἡγαλλιάσατο ἵνα ἴδῃ, and moreover, if we grant that 'rejoiced to see' is the sense intended, the following clause καὶ εἶδεν καὶ ἐχάρη, instead of forming a climax, makes mere tautology. What we expect the first clause to say is, not that Abraham rejoiced to see the day, but that he *longed* to see it, and that the satisfaction of this longing was the cause of his gladness. After a verb meaning 'longed' the construction with ἵνα (Aramaic ܝܢܐ) would be natural; and this meaning is expressed both by Pal. Syr. ܝܢܐ and by Pesh. ܝܢܐ. In Syriac ܝܢܐ in Pe'al and Pa'el (the form used in Pesh.) means both 'wished, longed' and also 'exulted' (cf. Payne Smith, *s. v.*). The verb is not known to occur in W. Aramaic, but there is no reason why it should not have been in use; and the assumption that a wrong meaning has been given to it by the translator ('exulted' instead of 'longed') at once removes the difficulty.*

of the loaves and fishes, and, in asking a further sign, recalled the miracle of the Manna (6^{14, 30, 31}): מן השמים אף גואל אחרון יוריד את המן שנאמר הנני ממטיר לכם לחם: Just as the first Redeemer brought down the Manna, as it is said, "Behold, I am about to rain bread from heaven for you", so also the second Redeemer shall bring down the Manna, as it is said, "There shall be a handful of corn in the earth"¹.

* (1) What is the basis of the statement that Abraham saw the day of our Lord, and (2) what precisely is to be understood by 'My day'? There is nothing in the text of Genesis, or elsewhere in the O.T., which seems adequately to answer these questions; yet we must suppose that our Lord's words, so far from being similarly obscure to His hearers, were in fact calculated to appeal to their knowledge of current Biblical exegesis. Perusal of the Rabbinic interpretation of the Covenant-scene in Gen. 15, as we find it set forth in the Jerusalem Targum, appears at once to shed a flood of light upon both questions; and lends, moreover,

9²⁵. $\epsilon\nu \sigma\iota\delta\alpha$, i.e. הָדָא יָדַע אֲנִי , may well be an error for הָדָא יָדַע אֲנִי 'This I know'; and this is actually the reading of Pal. Syr. ܗܕܐܝܕܥܐܢܝ . The difference between הָדָא *hādā* 'one' and הָדָא *hādā* 'this' in an unvocalized text is merely the difference between ח and ה , which are very easily confused. It cannot be urged, however, that $\epsilon\nu \sigma\iota\delta\alpha$ yields an unsuitable sense.

20². The strange use of $\sigma\upsilon\lambda\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu$ *αὐτὸς ὁλῶμαι* in the mouth of Mary Magdalen, where we should expect $\sigma\upsilon\lambda\alpha$ *αὐτὸς ὁλῶ*, may be due to a strong support to the reading 'longed to see My day', which we have adopted above.

The Targum of this chapter opens by picturing Abraham in despondent frame of mind after his victory over the kings narrated in *ch.* 14;—'The righteous Abraham pondered in his heart and said, "Woe is me! perchance I have received the recompense of the commandment in this world, and there shall be for me no part in the world to come; or perchance the brethren and neighbours of those slain ones who fell before me shall come and be established in their cities and provinces, and there shall be associated with them many legions whom they will lead out against me: perchance the commands imposed upon me were but light in the former times when they fell before me, and they are spared as my opponents; or perchance merit was found in me in the former times when they fell before me, but perchance it shall not be found in me the second time, and the name of Heaven shall be profaned in me." Therefore there came a word of prophecy from before the Lord to righteous Abraham, saying, "Fear not, Abraham; although many legions shall be gathered together and shall come against thee, My *Mēmvrā* shall be a protecting buckler to thee in this world, and a shield over thee continually in the world to come."' Coming to *v.* 12, we find the following paraphrase:—'And the sun was inclining towards setting, and a deep sweet sleep fell upon Abraham. And lo, Abraham saw four kingdoms which were to arise to enslave his sons, $\text{אֵימָה חֹשֶׁכַּה גְּדֻלָּה נִפְלְאָה עָלָיו}$ "Terror Darkness Great Falling upon him". אֵימָה *Terror*, which is Babylon; חֹשֶׁכַּה *Darkness*, which is Media; גְּדֻלָּה *Great*, which is Greece; נִפְלְאָה *Falling*, which is Edom (i.e. Rome), that is the fourth kingdom which is destined to fall, and shall not rise again for ever and ever. *v.* 17 And lo, the sun had set and it was dark; and lo, Abraham beheld until seats were ranged in order and thrones set; and lo, Gehenna which is prepared for the wicked in the world to come like an oven with glowing sparks surrounding it and flames of fire, into the midst of which the wicked fell because they had rebelled against the Law in their lifetime; but the righteous who kept it shall be delivered from affliction'.

The reference is to the four kingdoms of Dan. 7¹⁻¹⁴ (cf. the same interpretation of 'Terror, &c.' in Midrash Bereshith Rabba, par. xliv. 20), whose career is terminated by the great world-judgement which ushers in the coming of the Son of Man (*v.* 13). If, then, this Rabbinic exegesis lies behind Jn. 8⁵⁶, 'My day' is 'the day of the Son of Man', a vision of which was granted to Abraham in response to his heart-searching and longing. This is in entire accordance with the eschatological background which we find to the conception of the Son of Man in the Synoptic Gospels.

misreading ܠܐ ܝܕܥܢܐ *lā yēda'nā* (1st plur. Perfect) of an original ܠܐ ܝܕܥܢܐ *lā yāda'anā* (fem. sing. Participle combined with 1st pers. pronoun). Cf., for this latter form, Dalman, *Gramm.* p. 235. The same mistake, *yēda'nā* for *yāda'nā* (masc. sing. Participle combined with 1st pers. pronoun), is made in the vocalization of ܝܕܥܢܐ Num. 22⁶ in Walton's Polyglot. Possibly οἶδαμεν in the opening words of Nicodemus (3²) may likewise represent ܠܐ ܝܕܥܢܐ 'I know'.

20¹⁸. ἔρχεται Μαριάμ ἡ Μαгдаληνὴ ἀγγέλλονσα . . . ὅτι Ἐώρακα τὸν κύριον καὶ ταῦτα εἶπεν αὐτῇ. The change from direct to oblique oration is strange and awkward. Ἐώρακα = ܠܐ ܝܕܥܢܐ *hāmēlli*, ἔώρακε = ܠܐ ܝܕܥܢܐ *hāmīth*.^{*} The two forms are identical in the unvocalized text, and the latter may easily have been taken for the former by the translator under the influence of the ordinary construction with ὅτι *recitativum*. Thus we may conjecture that the original ran, 'announcing that she had seen the Lord, and that He had spoken, &c.'

* We have assigned the Galilaean verb ܠܐ ܝܕܥܢܐ to a native of Magdala. If ܠܐ ܝܕܥܢܐ was used in the narrative there might be a precisely similar confusion—1st pers. ܠܐ ܝܕܥܢܐ, 3rd pers. ܠܐ ܝܕܥܢܐ.

CHAPTER VIII

OLD TESTAMENT QUOTATIONS IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

THE question whether the writer of the Fourth Gospel cited the O. T. from the Hebrew Bible or the LXX is important in its bearing on the question of the original language of the Gospel. If the author was a Hellenist he would naturally have employed the LXX. If he was a Palestinian he would be more likely to make his citations from the Hebrew; and if he actually wrote in Aramaic he could hardly have done otherwise. Thus, though the question of the Johannine quotations has frequently received discussion, a fresh examination may possibly bring to light certain points which have hitherto passed unnoticed. This section of our examination gives therefore a tabulation of all O. T. citations and references, together with the Hebrew text of each passage and its translation compared with the LXX rendering.

1. 1²³ Ἐγὼ φωνῇ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ Εὐθύνετε τὴν ὁδὸν Κυρίου, καθὼς εἶπεν Ἡσαίας ὁ προφήτης.

Isa. 40³ יְהוָה יְרָךְ פְּנֵי כֹרֵא בְּמִדְבָּר קוֹל קוֹרֵא 'The voice of one crying, In the wilderness prepare ye the way of the Lord'.

LXX Φωνῇ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, Ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν Κυρίου.

Jn. quotes from memory, and substitutes the verb of the parallel clause, יִשְׁרֵ בְּעֶרְבָה מִסְלָה לְאַלְהֵינוּ 'make straight in the desert a highway for our God', for the verb פְּנֵי 'prepare ye'. In doing this, he seems to be thinking, however, of the Hebrew and not of the LXX, since the latter renders יִשְׁרֵ not by Εὐθύνετε, but by εὐθείας ποιεῖτε. The fact that the words 'in the wilderness' properly form in the Hebrew the opening of the proclamation (synonymous with 'in the desert' of the parallel clause), whereas LXX and Jn., as

the text of these versions is punctuated, treat them as descriptive of the speaker's situation, is unimportant, since the punctuation is a secondary matter.

2. I⁵¹ Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὁψεσθε τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεφύοντα, καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀναβαίνοντας καὶ καταβαίνοντας ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

Gen. 28¹² וַיַּחְלֶם וַיְהִי כִּלְמָם כִּמְצָב אֲרָצָה וְרֹאשָׁהּ מִיָּעַ נִשְׁיָמָה וַיְהִי מִלְאָכֶי וַיֵּלְכוּ עָלָיו וַיֵּרְדּוּ בּוֹ 'And he dreamed, and lo, a ladder set up on the earth, and its top reaching to the heaven; and lo, the angels of God ascending and descending upon it'.

LXX καὶ ἐνυπνιάσθη· καὶ ἰδοὺ κλίμαξ ἐστηρικμένη ἐν τῇ γῇ, ἧς ἡ κεφαλὴ ἀφικνέιτο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀνέβαινον καὶ κατέβαινον ἐπ' αὐτῆς.

The quotation takes the form of a free reminiscence. It seems clear, however, that in the words, 'ascending and descending upon the Son of man', we have an interpretation of the final **בּוֹ** different from that which is generally accepted. **בּוֹ** is regularly taken to mean 'on it' (the ladder); but there is also the possibility of the interpretation 'on him' (Jacob), and this appears to be adopted in Jn.'s citation.* Jacob, as the ancestor of the nation of Israel, summarizes in his person the ideal Israel in *posse*, just as our Lord, at the other end of the line, summarizes it in *esse* as the Son of man. The Genesis-passage, in which 'the ladder is an image of the invisible, but actual and unceasing connexion in which God, by the ministry of His angels, stands with the earth, in this instance with Jacob' (Delitzsch), points forward to 'the constant and living intercourse ever maintained between Christ and the Father' (Driver). The point which concerns us here is that the interpretation put upon the passage depends on the Hebrew, in which, since מִלְאָךְ 'ladder' is masculine, the force of **בּוֹ** is ambiguous. In LXX, ἐπ' αὐτῆς can refer only to κλίμαξ. It may be added that Jn.'s ἀναβαίνοντας καὶ καταβαίνοντας literally

* We should of course expect עָלָיו in this sense, as in the following verse וַיַּעֲבֹד עָלָיו 'standing over him' (not 'standing upon it'—the ladder). We are not, however, concerned to argue the legitimacy of the interpretation, but merely its origin; though it may be remarked that this interpretation of **בּוֹ** might be justified by the use of the preposition to denote *proximity* (see *Oxford Hebrew Lexicon*, **בּוֹ** § 11).

represents the Hebrew participial construction עֲלִים וְיָרִים, which is obscured in ἀνέβαινον καὶ κατέβαινον of LXX.*

3. 2¹⁷ Ἐμνήσθησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι γεγραμμένον ἐστὶν Ὁ ζῆλος τοῦ οἴκου σου καταφάγεται με.

Ps. 69¹⁰ קִנְאָת בֵּיתְךָ אָכְלָתִי 'The zeal of Thine house hath eaten me'.

LXX ὁ ζῆλος τοῦ οἴκου σου καταφάγεται με.

Here Jn. and LXX are in verbal agreement against the Heb. 'hath eaten me'.

There is a *v. l.* κατέφαγεν which is found in LXX in B^b A^{ca} R, and in Jn. in (13) & c. 8 (vt.^s vg.) 8 (boh) Eus Epiph.

4. 6³¹ οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν τὸ μάννα ἔφαγον ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, καθὼς ἐστὶν γεγραμμένον Ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν.

Ex. 16⁴ הִנְנִי מְבַטֵּר לָכֶם לֶחֶם מִן־הַשָּׁמַיִם 'Behold, I will rain for

* This note stands as worked out by the writer before it occurred to him to consult the Midrash Bereshith Rabba for traces of the interpretation of בָּן which he has suggested as inherent in the Johannine reference. He now finds that such an interpretation was actually put forward and debated in early times in Rabbinic circles; cf. Bereshith Rabba, par. lxviii. 18: ר' חייא ור' ינאי ח"א עולים ויורדים 18: וח"א עולים ויורדים ביעקב. מ"ד עולים ויורדים בסלם נחא. ומ"ד עולים ויורדים ביעקב. מעלים ומורידים בו. אפויים בו קפזים בו סונמים בו. שנא ישראל אשר נך אתפאר את הוא שאיקונין שלך חקוקה למעלה. עולים למעלה (Interpretations of) Rabbi Hiya and Rabbi Yannai. The one scholar says, "Ascending and descending upon the ladder", and the other says, "Ascending and descending upon Jacob". The explanation, "Ascending and descending upon the ladder", is to be preferred. The explanation, "Ascending and descending upon Jacob", implies that they were taking up and bringing down upon him. They were leaping and skipping over him, and rallying him, as it is said, "Israel in whom I glory" (Isa. 49³). "Thou art he whose *είκων* is engraved on high." They were ascending on high and looking at his *είκων*, and then descending below and finding him sleeping'. The words translated 'they were taking up and bringing down upon him' are very obscure in meaning; but the following note by Dr. Ball offers an elucidation. 'I would ask why the Genesis text does not say *were coming down and going up thereon*? It seems rather strange that the Angels of God should start from the earth. But leaving that on one side, I am inclined to think that the Midrashic בו מעלים ומורידים is a sort of general reply to the unasked question, *Why were the angels going up and coming down?* the answer being, *They were taking up and bringing down*—acting as carriers between Earth and Heaven. In this case, apparently, they were taking up to Heaven the *είκων* of the sleeping Jacob (which

you bread from heaven'. LXX Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ὧ ὑμῖν ἄρτους ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

Ex. 16¹⁵ הַיּוֹהָה לָקַח לָכֶם לֶאֱכֹלָה 'That is the bread which the Lord hath given you to eat'. LXX Οὗτος ὁ ἄρτος ὃν ἔδωκεν Κύριος ὑμῖν φαγεῖν.

Ps. 78²⁴ יָרַן שְׁמַיִם נָתַן לָמוֹ 'And corn of heaven He gave them'. LXX καὶ ἄρτον οὐρανοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς.

In Ps. 78²⁴ LXX's rendering of רִגַן 'corn' by ἄρτον (only so rendered here) is dictated by recollection of Ex. 16¹. Jn.'s quotation is a free reminiscence of Ex. 16^{1,15}, probably uninfluenced by recollection of the Ps. passage. In rendering ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ it is nearer to the Heb. of Ex. 16¹ than is LXX plur. ἄρτους.

5. 6¹⁵ ἔστιν γεγραμμένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις Καὶ ἔσονται πάντες διδασκτοὶ Θεοῦ.

is "fastened to the Throne of Glory"; Targ. Jon. *ad loc.*). As Jacob was in deep sleep, was this *εἰκὼν* his wraith or spirit—supposed to be separated from the body under conditions of trance? The case would then be parallel to that of St. Paul "caught up to the third Heaven" (2 Cor. 12^{1ff.}) where he "heard" ἄρρητα, much as Jacob became conscious of Yahweh "standing by him", and heard His voice.

It is difficult to resist the conclusion that the remarkable explanation of this Midrash throws further light upon the Johannine passage. Jacob's *εἰκὼν* (the Hebrew simply reproduces the Greek term) is already existent in Heaven (cf. also Targ. Jerus. and Targ. Jon. *ad loc.*); this *εἰκὼν*—inasmuch as Jacob embodies the national hope and ideal—represents the heavenly Man (cf. 1 Cor. 15⁴⁷⁻⁴⁹ ὁ δεύτερος ἀνθρώπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, whose *εἰκὼν* we are in the future to bear) who is to come on the clouds of Heaven; if the heavens were opened Nathaniel might behold the angels exulting over him.

The same interpretation of בו as referring to Jacob is given a little further on (B.R. par. lxix. 1) in a comment on והנה י"י נצב עליו 'And, behold, the Lord stood over him' (Gen. 28¹³): א"ר אבהו משל לבן מלכים שהיה ישן על נבי עריסה והיו זכובים שכנים עליו. וביון שבא מינקתו שחה עליו מינקתו וברחו מעליו. כך בתחלה והנה מלאכי אלהים עולים ויורדים בו. בין שנתגלה עליו. Rabbi Abbahu said, It is like a royal child who was sleeping in a cradle and flies were settling on him; but when his nurse came, his nurse bent over him, and they flew away from off him. So at first, "And, behold, the angels of God ascending and descending upon him". When the Holy One (blessed be He) revealed Himself over him they flew away from off him'. We may note that Rabbi Hiyā and Rabbi Yannai also differed as to the interpretation of the suffix עליו, the one explaining that the Lord stood *on the ladder*, the other that He stood *over Jacob*.

Isa. 54¹³ וְלִבְנֵיךָ לִמּוּדֵי יְהוָה 'And all thy sons shall be taught of the Lord'.

LXX (in connexion with v. 12 καὶ θήσω τὰς ἐπάλξεις σου ἱασπιν, κτλ.) καὶ πάντας τοὺς υἱούς σου διδακτοὺς Θεοῦ.

Clearly Jn., in treating the statement as an independent sentence, is dependent upon Heb. and not on LXX. Nevertheless, it is probable that the use of Θεοῦ—'taught of *God*' in place of 'taught of the Lord'—is due to LXX influence. If this is so, the natural inference is that the quotation was originally made directly from the Heb., and was afterwards modified by a copyist under LXX influence—possibly by the translator from Aramaic into Greek.

6. 7³⁸ καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή, ποταμοὶ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ ρέουσιν ὕδατος ζῶντος.

This passage has already been discussed, and has been shown to involve a misunderstanding of an Aramaic original (cf. p. 109).

7. 7⁴² οὐχ ἡ γραφή εἶπεν ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος Δαυείδ, καὶ ἀπὸ Βηθλεὲμ τῆς κώμης ὅπου ἦν Δαυείδ, ἔρχεται ὁ Χριστός;

Based on Isa. 11¹, Jer. 23⁵, &c. (Davidic descent), Mic. 5² (5¹ in Heb.; from Bethlehem). The references are general merely.

8. 8¹⁷ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ δὲ τῷ ὑμετέρῳ γέγραπται ὅτι δύο ἀνθρώπων ἡ μαρτυρία ἀληθὴς ἐστίν.

Deut. 19¹⁵ עַל-פִּי שְׁנֵי עֲדָיִם א֠וְ עַל-פִּי שְׁלֹשָׁה יָקֻם דְּבָרִי 'At the mouth of two witnesses or at the mouth of three shall a word be established'.

LXX ἐπὶ στόματος δύο μαρτύρων καὶ ἐπὶ στόματος τριῶν μαρτύρων στήσεται πᾶν ῥῆμα.

A vague reference.

9. 10³⁴ Οὐκ ἔστιν γεγραμμένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ὑμῶν ὅτι Ἐγὼ εἶπα Θεοὶ ἐστε;

Ps. 82⁶ אֵלֹהִים אָמַרְתִּי יְהוָה 'I have said, Ye are gods'.

LXX Ἐγὼ εἶπα Θεοὶ ἐστε.

Heb. and LXX agree exactly, and the verbal agreement between Jn. and LXX has therefore no special significance, since Heb. could hardly be otherwise rendered.

10. 12¹³ καὶ ἐκραύγαζον Ὡσαννά, εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου.

Ps. 118^{25,26}

אָנָה יְהוָה הוֹשִׁיעָה נָא

בְּרִיךְ הַבָּא בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה

'O Lord, save now!

Blessed be he that cometh in the name of the Lord!

LXX

ὦ Κύριε, σῶσον δὴ,

εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου.

Heb. and LXX agree exactly. 'Ωσαννά represents the Heb. *hōšā-nā* 'Save now!' which, by substitution of the short form of the imperative for that with the cohortative termination, becomes *hōšā'-na*. εὐλογημένος κτλ. is verbally identical with LXX; but the Heb. could hardly be otherwise translated.

11. 12^{14,15} εὐρὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὄναριον ἐκάθισεν ἐπ' αὐτό, καθὼς ἔστιν γεγραμμένον

Μὴ φοβοῦ, θυγάτηρ Σιών
 ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἔρχεται,
 καθήμενος ἐπὶ πῶλον ὄνου.

Zech. 9⁹

נִילִי מְאֹד בַּת־צִיּוֹן
 הִרְיֵעִי בַת־יְרוּשָׁלַם
 הִנֵּה מֶלֶכְךָ יָבוֹא לָךְ
 צַדִּיק וְנוֹשֵׁעַ הוּא
 עָנִי וְיָכַב עַל־חֲמֹר
 וְעַל־עֵר בֶּן־אֲתָנָח

'Exult greatly, O daughter of Zion;
 Shout, O daughter of Jerusalem.
 Behold, thy king cometh unto thee;
 Righteous and victorious is he;
 Lowly, and riding upon an ass,
 And upon a colt, an ass's foal'.

LXX

Χαῖρε σφόδρα, θυγάτερ Σειών·
 κήρυσσε, θυγάτερ Ἱερουσαλήμ·
 ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἔρχεται σοι
 δίκαιος καὶ σώζων,
 αὐτὸς πραὺς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὑποζύγιον
 καὶ πῶλον νέον.

The quotation is abbreviated and somewhat free. It is clear, however, that *πῶλον ὄνου* is derived from Heb. and not from LXX.

12. 12³⁴ Ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου ὅτι ὁ Χριστὸς μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

Ezek. 37³⁵ לְעוֹלָם לְעוֹלָם נָשִׂיא עַבְדִּי דָוִד וְדָוִד עַבְדִּי נָשִׂיא עַבְדִּי 'And David my servant shall be their prince for ever'.

LXX καὶ Δαυεὶδ ὁ δοῦλός μου ἄρχων εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

Cf. also Isa. 9⁷ (9⁶ in Heb.), 2 Sam. 7¹³, Ps. 89^{4f}, 110⁴.

The reference is vague and general.

13. 12³⁸ ἵνα ὁ λόγος Ἡσαίου τοῦ προφήτου πληρωθῇ ὃν εἶπεν

Κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν ;

καὶ ὁ βραχίων Κυρίου τίς ἀπεκαλύφθη ;

Isa. 53¹ מִי הֶאֱמִין לְשִׁמְעִתִּי
וְיָרֹעַ יְהוָה עַל-מִי גָלְתָה

'Who hath believed our report ;

And the arm of the Lord, to whom hath it been revealed'.

LXX Κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν ;
καὶ ὁ βραχίων Κυρίου τίς ἀπεκαλύφθη ;

Heb. and LXX agree exactly, except that LXX has added the opening *Κύριε*, which is also found in Jn.'s quotation which agrees verbally with LXX. It is clear that the text of Jn. is influenced by LXX.

14. 12^{39,40} ὅτι πάλιν εἶπεν Ἡσαίας

Τετύφλωκεν αὐτῶν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς

καὶ ἐπώρωσεν αὐτῶν τὴν καρδίαν,

ἵνα μὴ ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς

καὶ νοήσωσιν τῇ καρδίᾳ καὶ στραφῶσιν, καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς.

Isa. 6¹⁰ הַשְׁמֹן לְכַהֲעֵם הָזֶה
וְאָזְנוֹ הַכֶּבֶד וְעֵינָיו הַשֶּׁעַ
פֶּן-יִרְאֶה בְּעֵינָיו וּבְאָזְנוֹ יִשְׁמַע
וְלִבָּבוּ יִבִּין וְשָׁב וְרָפָא לוֹ

'Make the heart of this people gross,

And make their ears heavy, and blind their eyes ;

Lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears,

And understand with their heart, and repent, and be healed'.

LXX ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου,
καὶ τοῖς ὥσιν αὐτῶν βαρέως ἤκουσαν καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς
ἐκάμμυσαν,
μή ποτε ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ τοῖς ὥσιν ἀκούσωσιν,
καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσιν καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσιν, καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς.

Here Jn. is clearly independent of LXX; contrast *Τετύφλωκεν* αὐτῶν τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς with καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐκάμμυσαν: ἵνα μή with μή ποτε: καὶ νοήσωσιν τῇ καρδίᾳ with καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσιν: στραφῶσιν with ἐπιστρέψωσιν. Jn. is not, however, merely a free reminiscence of the Hebrew, as might be supposed from the fact that the writer uses past tenses *τετύφλωκεν*, *ἐπώρωσεν*, while the Hebrew appears to use Imperatives (R.V. 'shut', 'make fat'). *יָכַח*, *עָשָׂה* are either treated as Infinitives Absolute in place of Perfects—'blinding' (lit. 'smearing over'), 'making gross', standing for 'He hath blinded', 'hath made gross' (a normal and idiomatic usage); or the forms are read as Perfects, *יָכַח*, *עָשָׂה*, as they might naturally be read in the unvocalized text.* Thus (allowing for omission of the reference to ears, and the transposition of a clause) Jn.'s reading is a reasonably accurate rendering of Heb., and is nearer to it than LXX in reading sing. *τετύφλωκεν* in place of plur. *ἐκάμμυσαν* which makes the people the subject.

15. 13¹⁸ ἀλλ' ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ 'Ο τρώγων μου τὸν ἄρτον ἐπῆρεν ἐπ' ἐμέ τὴν πτέρναν αὐτοῦ.

Ps. 41¹⁰ כָּרַץ עָלַי לִבִּי הָיָה לִי כֶּסֶל 'He that eateth my bread hath lifted up his heel against me'.

LXX ὁ ἐσθίων ἄρτους μου, ἐμεγάλυνεν ἐπ' ἐμέ πτερνισμὸν.

Jn. renders Heb. accurately, and is independent of LXX.

16. 15²⁵ ἀλλ' ἵνα πληρωθῇ ὁ λόγος ὁ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτῶν γεγραμμένος ὅτι 'Εμίσησάν με δωρεάν.

Ps. 35¹⁹ and 69⁴ (5 in Heb.) מִשְׂנְאֵי אֵינִי 'my haters without cause'.

LXX in both passages, οἱ μισοῦντές με δωρεάν.

A free reminiscence.

* Symmachus took the Imperatives *יָכַח*, *עָשָׂה* as Perfects *יָכַח*, *עָשָׂה*, but, unlike Jn., made the people (not Yahweh) the subject—ὁ λαὸς οὗτος τὰ ὦτα ἰβάρυνε, καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ ἔμυσε.

17. 19²⁴ ἵνα ἡ γραφή πληρωθῇ

Διμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτιά μου ἑαυτοῖς
καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμόν μου ἔβαλον κλῆρον.

Ps. 22¹⁸ (19 in Heb.) חֶלְקִי בְּנִדִי לָהֶם
וְעַל-לְבוּשִׁי יַפִּילוּ גִזְרֵם

'They part (or parted) my garments among them,
And upon my vesture do (or did) they cast lots'.

LXX διμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτιά μου ἑαυτοῖς
καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμόν μου ἔβαλον κλῆρον.

Heb. and LXX agree closely. The verbal agreement between Jn. and LXX points to LXX influence.

18. 19^{28,29} Μετὰ ταῦτα εἰδὼς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἤδη πάντα τετέλεσται ἵνα τελειωθῇ ἡ γραφή λέγει Διψῶ. σκευὸς ἔκειτο ὄξους μεστόν· σπόγγον οὖν μεστόν τοῦ ὄξους ὑσσώπῳ περιθέντες προσήνεγκαν αὐτοῦ τῷ στόματι.

Ps. 69²¹ (22 in Heb.) יִשְׁקֶנִי יְיָ אֶלְצָנִים 'and for my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink'.

LXX καὶ εἰς τὴν δίψαν μου ἐπότισάν με ὄξος.

The reference is general merely.

19. 19³⁶ ἐγένετο γὰρ ταῦτα ἵνα ἡ γραφή πληρωθῇ 'Ὅστούν οὐ συντριβήσεται αὐτοῦ.

Ex. 12⁴⁶ וְלֹא יִשְׁבְּרֶתֶּם אֶת-עַצְמוֹתָיו 'and ye shall break no bone of it'.

LXX καὶ ὅστούν οὐ συντρίψετε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.

Num. 9¹² וְלֹא יִשְׁבְּרֶתֶּם אֶת-עַצְמוֹתָיו 'and they shall break no bone of it'.

LXX καὶ ὅστούν οὐ συντρίψουσιν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.

Ps. 34⁵⁰ (21 in Heb.) שָׁמַר כָּל-עַצְמוֹתַי
אֶת מִתְהַפְּכָתָם לֹא נִשְׁבְּרָה

'He keepeth all his bones;
Not one of them is broken'.

LXX [Κύριος] φυλάσσει πάντα τὰ ὀστᾶ αὐτῶν,
ἐν ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐ συντριβήσεται.

The quotation is a free reminiscence.

20. 19³⁷ καὶ πάλιν ἑτέρα γραφή λέγει 'Ὁψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν.

Zech. 12¹⁰ וְהָבִיטוּ אֵלַי אֶת-רִגְלֵי-קָרְקָרִי 'and they shall look on me whom they have pierced'.

LXX καὶ ἐπιβλέψονται πρὸς με ἄνθ' ὧν κατωρχήσαντο.

Some fifty Heb. MSS. read וְעָלָיו 'on him', and it is this text upon which Jn. is dependent; or—since $\text{וְעָלָיו} \text{לְאִלֵּים}$ (וְעָלָיו) is scarcely possible as a Hebrew construction—he may presuppose the more natural reading $\text{וְעָלָיו} \text{לְאִלֵּים}$. The strange LXX rendering is based on a reading וְרָקְרָק 'they danced', an erroneous transposition of the letters of וְרָקְרָק 'they pierced'.

Several LXX MSS., representing the Lucianic recension, read $\text{καὶ ἐπιβλέψονται πρὸς μὲ εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν}$, which is the rendering of Theodotion. Aquila . . . σὺν ᾧ ἐξεκέντησαν , Symmachus . . . $\text{ἐμπροσθεν ἐπεξεκέντησαν}$.

It is obvious that Jn. is independent of LXX, whose rendering destroys the point of the quotation. The connexion with Theodotion in the rendering $\text{εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν}$ appears to be fortuitous merely, and does not imply that Jn. and Theodotion were dependent upon an earlier non-Septuagintal rendering (as suggested by Swete, *Introd. to the O. T. in Greek*, p. 398). Ἐκκεντεῖν is the natural rendering of רָקַק (used by LXX in Judg. 9⁵⁴, 1 Chr. 10⁴, Jer. 44 (37)¹⁰, Lam. 4⁹, and by Aquila and Symmachus in Isa. 13¹³); and the variation between Jn.'s ὁψονται εἰς ὃν and Theodotion's $\text{ἐπιβλέψονται πρὸς μὲ εἰς ὃν}$ is decisive against common borrowing from an earlier Greek source. In the LXX MS. 240 we find the rendering $\text{ὁψονται πρὸς μὲ εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν}$ as a doublet, and this no doubt is a Christian marginal variant influenced by Jn. The Apocalypse, which is thoroughly Hebraic, has an echo of the O. T. passage in $\text{ἡ καὶ ὁψεται αὐτὸν πᾶς ὁφθαλμὸς καὶ οἷτινες αὐτὸν ἐξεκέντησαν}$. Here we notice that the two verbs are the same as those employed in Jn.

Thus the following classification of Jn.'s O. T. quotations may be made:

- (a) Quotations dependent on the Hebrew; Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, 11, 14, 15, 20.
- (b) Quotations agreeing with LXX where this is an accurate rendering of the Hebrew; 9, 10, 17.
- (c) Quotations agreeing with LXX where this differs from the Hebrew; 3, (5), 13.
- (d) Free reminiscences; 4, 7, 8, 12, 16, 18, 19.
- (e) Misreading of an Aramaic original; 6.

Under (a) we notice that, while in 4 and 11 the points of agreement with Heb. against LXX are slight, all the other cases are weighty and preclude any other theory than a first-hand knowledge of the Heb. text.

Under (b) the agreement with LXX in 9 and 10 might be accidental, since the Heb. could scarcely be translated in other words. This, however, is a point not to be pressed, since 17 and the three cases under (c) show a connexion with LXX which cannot be accidental.

Under (c) we observe that the variations of Jn. and LXX from Heb. are very slight, and that the point of the quotations in no way depends upon them. In 3 (2¹⁷) the Heb. reading 'hath eaten me' is represented by Jn.'s *v. l. κατέφαγεν* which has considerable attestation. In 5 the variation from Heb. consists only in the substitution of Θεοῦ for 'the Lord', and in 13 only in the prefixing of Κύριε.

We have now to seek an explanation of the fact that, while a considerable number of the quotations in Jn. presuppose direct use of the Hebrew Bible, certain others are as clearly conformed to LXX. We may rule out the possibilities that the writer was familiar with both Heb. and LXX, and quoted from both indiscriminately; or that the Gospel is composite, the use of Heb. and LXX marking different strands of authorship. There remains the theory that the writer used either Heb. or LXX solely, and that the variations from his regular usage are the work of a later hand. Now it is obvious that the agreements with Heb. cannot be due to alteration, since e. g. 2 and 20 exhibit points of connexion vital to the quotation which are absent from LXX. On the other hand, all the quotations which now agree verbally with LXX might very well have been quoted from Heb. and subsequently modified so as to agree with LXX, since the variation between Heb. and LXX is in every case slight and unimportant. This inference, which emerges from a consideration of the quotations as a whole, seems to be raised to a certainty by the fact that 5 has points of connexion with both Heb. and LXX. The words 'And they shall be all taught of God' agree with Heb. as being an independent sentence, and can hardly depend upon LXX, 'And I will make . . . all thy sons to be taught of God'; while the point of connexion

with LXX—‘taught of *God*’ instead of Heb. ‘taught of *the Lord*’—is just the kind of alteration which might subsequently be made under LXX influence. If this be granted, the fact that the writer of the Gospel was a Palestinian Jew employing the Heb., and not a Hellenist dependent on LXX, is proved. Further, it must surely be admitted that slight modifications of passages originally quoted from Heb. into verbal agreement with LXX, though they might very possibly be made by a reviser or copyist of the Greek text, would be far more likely to arise in process of translation into Greek from another language, such as Aramaic. And in 6 (7³⁸) we have very striking evidence that the language in which the O.T. reference was originally cast *was* Aramaic.

CHAPTER IX

EPILOGUE

AT the close of this discussion the writer may be expected to offer some remarks as to the influence which his theory should, if it gains acceptance, exercise upon current historical criticism of the Fourth Gospel. This is a task which for two reasons he feels somewhat loth to essay. Firstly, the question has been mainly if not wholly linguistic, and ought at the outset to be presented for consideration uncomplicated by ulterior issues. And secondly, the writer is conscious that in attempting to touch upon such larger issues he is in danger of getting outside his province; for, while to the best of his ability he has made a minute study of the Gospel itself, and can claim some knowledge of the external criteria bearing upon the question of authorship, he cannot claim conversance with more than a small portion of the gigantic mass of modern literature which has been directed towards the solution of the Johannine problem.

Still, it goes without saying that in the course of the linguistic investigation the question of its bearing upon the authorship of the Gospel has been constantly in his mind. If the theory is soundly based, it must surely affect something like a revolution in current Johannine criticism; for, while cutting at the roots of the fashionable assumptions of a particular school of critics, it may be held to go even farther, and to demand a re-examination, if not a reconstruction, of certain fundamental postulates which have hitherto been accepted by all schools of criticism. Thus it may be thought fitting that the author of the theory should indicate in brief the results to which he believes that it points.

In the first place, it should establish beyond question the fact that the Gospel is a product of Palestinian thought. This is a conclusion which emerges with no less clearness even if it be held that the evidence which has been offered is insufficient to prove

actual translation from Aramaic; for at least it cannot be disputed that the case for virtual translation is irrefragable. The author's language is cast throughout in the Aramaic mould. He is thoroughly familiar with Rabbinic speculation. He knows his Old Testament, not through the medium of the LXX, but in the original language.

If this be granted, the figment of Alexandrine influence upon the author must be held finally to be disproved. His Logos-doctrine is the development of conceptions enshrined in the Targums, and is not derived from Philo. This can hardly be disputed in face of the evidence adduced on pp. 35 ff. Could New Testament scholars ever have arrived at any other conclusion if they had approached the subject with an adequate Semitic, as well as a Greek, equipment? Not, indeed, that Palestinian Rabbinism was wholly uninfluenced by Greek thought; the Midrashim prove the contrary. Yet, when this is admitted, Palestinian Jewish thought is one thing, Alexandrine Hellenistic thought another. It may be true that there is an ultimate connexion between the Logos-conception of Philo and that of the Gospel-prologue; but this connexion is no closer than is implied by a common parentage. Philo's doctrine was in no sense the moulding influence of our author's thought.

It may be observed that the theory that the Gospel was written in Aramaic fits in admirably with other well-ascertained results of internal evidence—the author's intimate knowledge of Palestinian topography, of Jewish festivals and customs, and of the current Messianic expectations at the time of our Lord. On all these questions, in which in time past his accuracy has in one way or another been impugned, he has been triumphantly vindicated. If, in addition, it is proved that he actually wrote in Aramaic, we have added the coping-stone which harmoniously completes the building.

Here, however, we find that our theory seems to call for the re-opening of a question which is generally supposed to be settled. If the Gospel was written in Aramaic, it must surely have been written in Palestine or Syria; it could hardly have been written at Ephesus. This conclusion is by no means necessarily at variance with the tradition that the author spent the latter part of his life at

Ephesus ; for obviously we have the possibility that he may have written the Gospel at an earlier period. It may be observed that, while tradition generally assigns the writing of the Gospel to Ephesus, there are traces of a different opinion. The Muratorian Canon seems to state that the Gospel was written before the breaking up of the Apostolic circle,* therefore, presumably, in Palestine.

The assignment of a Palestinian or Syrian origin to the Gospel would seem to carry with it an earlier date for its composition than that which is commonly accepted (A.D. 95 or somewhat later); possibly even a considerably earlier one. But this is by no means at variance with the facts of internal evidence. Even apart from a full acceptance of the theory propounded in the present volume, it must surely be admitted that the facts which have been brought together greatly strengthen the case for holding that the Gospel is the work of an eye-witness. The view that it represents the mature Christian experience of that witness is doubtless sound ; but if we are to assume that he was a man of eighty or more when he took up his pen, we are postulating for him a mental vigour quite exceptional in one so old. Opinions may differ as to the impression of the author's personality conveyed by the Gospel ; but the present writer feels that, while the First Epistle might fairly be regarded as the product of extreme old age, the planning and execution of the Gospel is hardly consistent with such a theory. The age of sixty-five or seventy would at any rate be more normal for the composition of a work which exhibits so markedly a maturity which is as yet unimpaired. Assuming that the author was about twenty at the Crucifixion, this would lead us to date the Gospel A.D. 75-80. The question whether it would be reasonable to place it even earlier demands an expert knowledge of its relation to the Synoptic Gospels and a first-hand conclusion as to the dates of these latter ; and on these points the writer does

* The Fourth Gospel is said to be the work of 'Ioannis ex discipulis'. The occasion of its composition is given as follows : 'Cohortantibus condiscipulis et episcopis suis dixit, Conieunate mihi hodie triduo et quid cuique fuerit revelatum alterutrum nobis enarremus. Eadem nocte revelatum Andreae ex apostolis ut recognoscentibus cunctis Ioannes suo nomine cuncta describeret.' Since John himself is named 'one of the disciples', it seems to follow that 'his fellow-disciples' (one of whom is Andrew) are the other Apostles.

not feel qualified to venture an opinion. We may note, however, that there seem to be no indications pointing to a date prior to the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70; the evidence of 5², *Ἔστιν δὲ ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐπὶ τῇ προβατικῇ κολυμβήθρα . . . πέντε στοὰς ἔχουσα, which has been thought to imply that the city was still standing intact, being of doubtful validity if the Greek is regarded as a translation from Aramaic.*

On the other hand, there *are* a number of indications which suggest a certain remoteness, both in time and place, from the scenes described, and also seem to imply that the author was not writing, at least primarily, *for Jews*, but for a larger circle of Christians. What Jew, or indeed what Gentile inhabitant of *Palestine*, would need to be informed that the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans, that Tabernacles was the feast of the Jews, or that the festival of the Dedication took place in winter?† Of course it might be maintained that the author, writing not merely for his contemporaries but for posterity to whom such details would not be obvious, took care to insert them; but such a theory can hardly claim probability.

We arrive, then, at the impression that the Gospel was not written at an earlier date than A.D. 75-80, nor from Palestine; yet on the other hand our theory of an Aramaic original seems to demand that it should have originated in an Aramaic-speaking country. Thus Syria is indicated, and if Syria, then Antioch.

* The meaning 'was' or 'is' might be left in Aramaic to be inferred from the context, or at any rate expressed in such a way that confusion would be easy in translation. For Ἔστιν . . . ἔχουσα Cur. has ܐܕ ܠܐܝܬܐ . . . ܝܘܢ ܠܐ, lit. 'Existing was . . . and existing in it'; Pesh. ܐܕ ܝܘܢ ܠܐܝܬܐ . . . ܝܘܢ ܠܐ 'Existing was . . . and existing was in it'; while in Pal. Syr. we find ܐܕ ܝܘܢܐ . . . ܝܘܢܐ 'Existing is . . . and is in it'. Here, however, the only time-determining factor is the dot above ܝܘܢܐ, which marks it as the Participle *hāwē*, not the Perfect *hāwā*. In W. Aramaic there would probably have been no mark of distinction.

† Instances of such touches may be seen in 2^{6,13,23}, 4^{5,9}, 5², 6^{1,4}, 7^{2,37}, 10²², 11¹⁸, 19^{31,40}. Two of these passages, viz. 2²³ ἐν τῷ πάσχα ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, 6¹ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης τῆς Γαλιλαίας τῆς Τιβεριάδος, convey the impression of conflation. Of course it must be assumed, on the hypothesis of translation, that in 4²⁵ (ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός), 5² (Ἑβραϊστί), 19¹³ (Λιθόστρωτον, Ἑβρ. δέ), 19¹⁷ (Κρανίου Τόπον, ὃ λέγεται Ἑβρ.), 20¹⁶ (Ἑβρ. . . ὃ λέγεται Διδάσκαλε) the translator has glossed the text for the benefit of his readers. It is possible that some of the touches in the first set of passages given in this note may be translator's glosses.

Though Antioch was a Greek city, it stood not far from the heart of the district whence from the earliest times the Aramaic speech was diffused, eastward into Mesopotamia and southward through Syria and Palestine. The city must have been bilingual, and though Greek was doubtless the language of the upper classes, there must have been a large substratum of population to whom Aramaic was the more familiar language. This follows necessarily from the exigencies of trade—both the regularly organized caravan-trade from beyond the Euphrates, and the local trade which brought the country people into the metropolis to sell their food-stuffs, and to add new blood to the population. As we learn from Acts, the natural line of expansion for the infant-Church at Jerusalem was northward to Antioch. If the writer of the Fourth Gospel really spent the last part of his life at Ephesus, then we have in Antioch a half-way house between this and Jerusalem; and if the line of his missionary activity was Jerusalem—Antioch—Ephesus he was following in the footsteps of St. Paul.

It is interesting to note that we are not entirely without external indication that St. John was at Antioch and wrote the Gospel there. Mr. F. C. Conybeare has quoted a statement translated from a Syriac fragment appended to the Armenian translation to the commentary of St. Ephrem on Tatian's Diatessaron: 'Iohannes scripsit illud [evangelium] graece Antiochiae, nam permansit in terra usque ad tempus Traiani'.* There exists a wide-spread (though not very early) tradition that St. Ignatius was a disciple of St. John. The *Ματρίκιον Ἰγνατίου* (5th or 6th century A.D.) so describes him at its opening, and adds later on the scarcely credible statement that he and Polycarp (born A.D. 69) had together been disciples of the Apostle.†

The facts which lead the present writer to suggest the theory that the Fourth Gospel may have been written at Antioch are as follows:

1. The Epistles of St. Ignatius (c. A.D. 110) are full of Johannine Theology. It is true that there is only one passage in them which approximates to an actual verbal quotation, but reminiscences of the teaching of the Gospel are more numerous than is generally

* *ZNTW*, 1902, p. 193.

† Cf. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II. ii, pp. 473 f., who argues against the historical value of the statement and seeks to explain how it may have arisen.

recognized. Dr. Inge's conclusion is that 'Ignatius' use of the Fourth Gospel is highly probable, but falls some way short of certainty'.* One of his reasons for this doubtful verdict is 'our ignorance how far some of the Logia of Christ recorded by John may have been current in Asia Minor before the publication of the Gospel'. This is met if it can be shown that Ignatius was probably also acquainted with the First Epistle of St. John; and this seems to be the case.† The Ignatian expressions, ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου and τέκνα φωτὸς ἀληθείας may actually imply acquaintance with the original Aramaic of the Gospel.

2. Drs. Rendel Harris and Mingana, in their recent edition of the Odes and Psalms of Solomon (1920), have made a case for a connexion between the Odes and the Letters of Ignatius, and have shown that the dependence is almost certainly on Ignatius's side. There is a tradition recorded by the historian Socrates that Ignatius instructed the Antiochenes in the composition and singing of hymns.‡ Theophilus of Antioch was also familiar with the

* *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, by a committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology, p. 83.

† Cf. especially the group of passages reflecting the teaching of 1 Jn. quoted from the letter to the Ephesians on p. 154.

‡ 'We must also tell whence the custom of the Church of singing antiphonal hymns had its origin. Ignatius, the third bishop after Peter of the Syrian Antioch, who also had personal intercourse with the Apostles themselves, saw a vision of angels praising the Trinity in antiphonal hymns, and delivered the fashion of the vision to the church in Antioch: from whence also the same tradition was transmitted to other churches.'—Socrates, *HE.* vi. 8, quoted by Harris and Mingana, p. 43. These editors also aptly call attention (p. 47) to two passages in Ignatius's letters in which he uses chorus-singing as a metaphor for Christian harmony; Ephes. 4, '*In your concord and harmonious love Jesus Christ is sung. And do ye, each and all, form yourselves into a chorus, that, being harmonious in concord, and taking the key-note of God, ye may in oneness sing with one voice through Jesus Christ unto the Father, that He may both hear you and acknowledge you by your good deeds to be the members of His Son*' (i. e. *His children*); Rom. 2, '*Forming yourselves into a chorus, in love sing to the Father in Jesus Christ.*' These passages find a striking parallel in Ode 41, which begins as follows:

'Let *all of us* who are the Lord's bairns, praise Him :
And let us appropriate the truth of His faith :
And His children shall be acknowledged by Him :
Therefore *let us sing in His love.*

Let us, therefore, *all of us unite together* in the name of the Lord.'

The italics draw attention to the parallelism in thought.

Odes.* It seems clear that they were originally composed in Syriac.† The conclusion of these editors is that they were probably written at Antioch in the first century.‡

Now the fact that the writer of the Odes was acquainted with the Fourth Gospel can be proved fairly clearly; though here again the evidence takes the form of reminiscence of the teaching rather than actual verbal quotation. Surprising as this may seem in view of the very early date which is assigned to the Odes, it is the less surprising if, as on our theory, the date of the Gospel is earlier than is commonly supposed; and it becomes quite comprehensible if the Gospel was actually composed at Antioch and first circulated there in Aramaic. It is noteworthy that a great part of the connexions with the thought of the Gospel, both in Ignatius's Letters and in the Odes, are with the Last Discourses, Jn. 13—17.

The evidence for all this appears so highly important that it is given in detail in an Appendix.

The supposed influence of Pauline Theology upon the Fourth Gospel in no way conflicts with our new theory as to the date and place of the Gospel. A period of twenty years or so allows ample time for the principal epistles of St. Paul to have become well known at Antioch. The present writer has, however, put forward suggestions (pp. 45 ff.) which may indicate a somewhat different conclusion, viz. that both St. Paul and the author of the Gospel may have been influenced by a common earlier source of teaching. Both of them were Rabbinists; and the course of the present discussion has revealed several instances of a knowledge of Rabbinic speculation on the part of the Gospel-author which is independent of St. Paul. Both again were mystics; but there is no reason for assuming that the mysticism of the Gospel was a development of Pauline teaching. Mysticism is one of the characteristics of the Rabbinic method of treating Scripture; and the question how far this trait in the two Christian writers is based on Jewish Haggada is one which calls for further investigation. The inclusion within the early Church at Jerusalem of a large contingent from the priestly class (Acts 6ⁱ) must almost

* *op. cit.* ch. iii.

† *op. cit.* ch. xiii.

‡ *op. cit.* ch. iv.

certainly have resulted in the application of Rabbinic speculation to the service of the new Faith.

As to the author of the Gospel—while the conclusion that he wrote his Gospel in Aramaic strongly confirms the opinion that he was an actual eye-witness of the events which he describes, it must be admitted that the clear traces which we have noticed of his acquaintance with Rabbinic learning* seem to diminish the probability that he was St. John the Apostle. St. Peter and St. John impressed the priestly authorities at Jerusalem as *ἄνθρωποι ἀγράμματοι καὶ ἰδιῶται* (Acts 4¹³); and though the phrase is used in connexion with their unexpected eloquence, the paradox consisted, not in the fact that having previously been *ἀγράμματοι*—i.e. untrained in Rabbinic methods of exegesis—they now appeared so to be trained; but in the fact that, though still *ἀγράμματοι*, they were able to speak and argue eloquently and convincingly. It is of course conceivable that the Galilaean fisherman, especially if a young man, may have had a natural aptitude for assimilating the Rabbinic methods of argument; and that, his interest being whetted through listening to our Lord's discussions with the Rabbinites at Jerusalem, he may subsequently have carried his studies farther in this direction, e.g. through intercourse with the Christian members of the Jewish priesthood. It is clear, however, that if we had reason to think that, like St. Paul, he had actually undergone a thorough Rabbinic training, much light would be thrown upon the Gospel. We should then understand how it was that the author was able to retain the substance of our Lord's arguments with his former teachers, and why these arguments appealed to him more than the simple parabolic teaching which was adapted to the Galilaean peasantry. His first-hand use of the Hebrew Bible would be explained; and, supposing that he may also have been the author of the Apocalypse, we should understand how he was able to construct this work upon a Biblical Hebrew model.

Now, as Prof. Delff was the first to remark,† there are details in

* Cf. especially pp. 35 ff., 43 ff., 110 n., 111 n., 116 n.

† *Gesch. d. Rabbi Jesus v. Nazareth* (1899). pp. 67 ff.; *Das vierte Evangelium* (1890), pp. 1 ff. Delff's theory was followed by Bousset in the 1st ed. of his *Offenbarung Johannis* (1896), but dropped by him in the 2nd ed. (1906); cf. p. 46, n. 2. It is regarded with considerable favour by Dr. Sanday, *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 17 f., 90, 99 ff.

the Gospel which, taken together, strongly suggest that the author had some connexion with priestly circles. He (on the assumption that he is the unnamed disciple) was known to the high priest and gained ready admission to his house, which was denied to Peter until he intervened (18^{15,16}). He alone of the Evangelists mentions the name of the high priest's servant, Malchus, whose ear Peter cut off (18¹⁰), and also the fact that one of those who questioned Peter was a kinsman of Malchus (18²⁶). He has special knowledge of persons like Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathaea, who were both members of the Sanhedrin (3^{1ff.}, 7⁵⁰, 19^{38ff.}), and seems to have gained inside information as to what went on at meetings of the Sanhedrin (7¹⁵⁻⁵², 11⁴⁷⁻⁵³, 12¹⁰), which may have come to him through Nicodemus. The fact that, when our Lord commended His Mother to his care, he took her *eis τὰ ἴδια* 'from that hour' suggests that he had a house at or near Jerusalem (19²⁷).

The deduction based on these internal indications serves further to explain the remarkable statement of Polycrates of Ephesus that John, who reclined on the breast of the Lord, was a priest wearing the sacerdotal frontlet (*ὃς ἐγενήθη ἱερεὺς τὸ πέταλον πεφορεκώς*), which otherwise is an insoluble enigma. Moreover, if Polycrates supposed that John the author of the Gospel was the Apostle St. John, it is in the highest degree anomalous that he should mention him subsequently to Philip, whom he defines as *τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων*, and the daughters of Philip, and should then describe him, not as an Apostle, but as *μάρτυς καὶ διδάσκαλος* simply—this too in spite of the fact that 'he sleeps at Ephesus' where Polycrates himself was bishop, while Philip 'sleeps at Hierapolis' (Eusebius, *HE.* v. 24). If one of the most famous members of the original Apostolic band had actually preceded him in his own see, he would surely have named him first of all.

The familiar quotation from Papias (Eusebius, *HE.* iii. 39) seems likewise to indicate that the celebrated John of Ephesus was not the Apostle. Papias tells us that 'if any one chanced to come my way who had been a follower of the presbyters, I would inquire as to the sayings of the presbyters—what Andrew or Peter said (*εἶπεν*), or Philip or Thomas or James or John or Matthew, or any other of the Lord's disciples; and also what

Aristion and John the presbyter, the Lord's disciples, say (λέγουσιν)'. Unless we adopt the view that the Apostles mentioned are termed 'the presbyters'* (a view both improbable in itself and also apparently excluded by the distinctive application of the term to the second John), it is clear from this passage that Papias only claims to have learned the Apostles' sayings *at third hand*, i.e. he learned from his informants what the presbyters said that the Apostles said. On the other hand, the obvious deduction from the statement 'also what Aristion and John the presbyter, the Lord's disciples, say', is that Papias learned the sayings of these disciples *at second hand*; and since the change of tense from εἶπεν to λέγουσιν is clearly intentional, it is natural to infer that Aristion and the second John were still living, and that Papias might have heard them *at first hand* if he had had the opportunity.†

If this conclusion is sound, and if the title 'the Lord's disciples' implies—as in the first occurrence, where it is applied to the Apostles—actual knowledge of our Lord during His earthly life, then the date at which Papias collected his materials cannot be later than A.D. 100—a conclusion which fits in with the statement of Irenaeus that he was a companion of Polycarp (A.D. 69-155) and 'one of the ancients' (ἀρχαῖος ἀνὴρ).‡ It follows that c. A.D. 100 Papias knew of a John whom he termed 'the presbyter' (apparently in distinction from John the Apostle before mentioned), who, though an actual disciple of our Lord, was still living at that date, and must therefore have been of a very advanced age. On the other hand, all that he claims to have learned (or to have

* This is the view of Eusebius (see foot-note following), and it is taken e.g. by Lightfoot, *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, p. 145, and by Westcott, *Canon of the N.T.* p. 70, n. 1. On the contrary, see Moffatt, *Introd. to Literature of N.T.* p. 599.

† Papias does not state in this passage that he was an actual hearer of Aristion and John the presbyter, as is unwarrantably assumed by Eusebius; Καὶ ὁ νῦν δὲ ἡμῖν δηλούμενος Πάπιας τοὺς μὲν τῶν ἀποστόλων λόγους παρὰ τῶν παρηκολουθήκτων ὁμολογεῖ παρεληφέναι, Ἀριστίωνος δὲ καὶ τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου Ἰωάννου αὐτήκοον ἑαυτὸν φησι γενέσθαι. Why Dr. Lightfoot (*Essays on Supern. Rel.* p. 146) should accept Eusebius's opinion on this point against the plain sense of the passage is incomprehensible.

‡ *Haer.* V. xxxiii. 4; Eusebius, *HE.* iii. 39. A.D. 100 is adopted by Dr. Sanday (*Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 250 f.), as against the extreme date adopted by Harnack (c. A.D. 145-60). Eusebius (*HE.* iii. 36) states that his episcopate was contemporary not only with Polycarp's, but also with Ignatius's (d. A.D. 110).

endeavoured to learn) by word of mouth about the Apostolic son of Zebedee is what others said that the presbyters said that he said; and so far is he from attaching any special prominence to him that he mentions him only sixth in a list of seven of the Apostles.

Now Irenaeus tells us that John, 'the disciple of the Lord', who wrote the Gospel, survived at Ephesus until the times of Trajan,* i.e. until after A.D. 98. If this John was the son of Zebedee, would Papias—who must certainly have been born long before his death, and who was probably collecting his information, if not before, at any rate not long after that event, and who was bishop of a Church which was close to Ephesus—have been reduced to learning at third hand as to his teaching? And since, for one man who could give him authentic information as to what Andrew or Peter had said, there must (on this hypothesis) have been ten who could give him fuller and more recent information as to what John the son of Zebedee had said, is it at all likely that the vastly superior importance to Papias of John as a witness to our Lord's acts and teaching, involved in the fact of his nearness to him both in time and in place, should be ignored to such an extent that he only mentions the Apostle sixth in a list of seven?

The inference is clear that Papias did not claim to have any better knowledge of John the son of Zebedee than he possessed of Andrew, Peter, and the rest who had died years before he began to collect his materials. The absence of such a claim fits in with the statement attributed to him by Philippus Sidetes (5th cent.) and Georgius Hamartolus (9th cent.) that John and James his brother were slain by the Jews, which certainly seems to imply that John the son of Zebedee did not survive to a ripe old age in Asia, but lost his life through Jewish persecution, and therefore probably in Palestine and prior to the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70.† There exists, however, yet another statement attributed to Papias in an argument prefixed to a Vatican MS. of the Fourth Gospel (9th cent.):—'Evangelium Iohannis manifestatum et datum est ecclesiis ab Iohanne adhuc in corpore constituto, sicut Papias

* *Haer.* II, xxii. 5; III. i. 1; III. iii. 4.

† On further evidence as to the martyrdom cf. Moffatt, *Introd. to Lit. of N.T.* 3 pp. 601 ff.; and most recently, Charles, *Revelation*, i, pp. xlv ff.

nomine Hierapolitanus, discipulus Iohannis carus, in exotericis, id est in extremis [externis] quinque libris retulit. Descripsit vero evangelium dictante Iohanne recte'.* Confused and improbable as this statement seems in detail, we have no grounds for questioning the main facts, viz. that Papias may have stated that the author of the Gospel was John of Asia who survived into his own times.

If, however, the other statement referred to Papias means that John the son of Zebedee suffered martyrdom in Palestine prior to A.D. 70, the statement as to the writing of the Gospel can only be squared with it on the assumption that the references are to two different Johns—in the first case to the Apostle, in the second to John of Asia, i.e. the presbyter.

Now the writer of the Second and Third Epistles of St. John actually describes himself as *ὁ πρεσβύτερος*, and the inference from the contents of the Epistles is that they were not intended to be anonymous, but that this title was sufficient to mark the writer's identity. If they are rightly ascribed to John, the inference that this is the *Ἰωάννης ὁ πρεσβύτερος* of Papias is obvious.† Dr. Charles in his *Commentary on Revelation* (i, pp. xxxiv ff.) has argued from a careful linguistic study that the Fourth Gospel and the three Epistles of St. John are by the same author. It follows that the Gospel is the work of John the presbyter, and that the tradition that it was composed at Ephesus is wrapped up with the fact of his authorship. Thus the earliest Asian tradition, as represented by Papias and Polycrates and confirmed by the testimony of the Second and Third Epistles, points to the presbyter and not the son of Zebedee as the author of the Gospel.

* Cf. Lightfoot, *Essays on Supern. Rel.* pp. 210 ff.; Westcott, *Canon of N.T.* p. 77, n. 1. Lightfoot (p. 214) has an ingenious suggestion as to the way in which the statement may have arisen that Papias was actually the amanuensis of John. 'Papias may have quoted the Gospel "delivered by John to the Churches, which they wrote down from his lips" (*ὁ ἀπέγραφον ἀπὸ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ*); and some later writer, mistaking the ambiguous *ἀπέγραφον*, interpreted it "I wrote down", thus making Papias himself the amanuensis.'

† This seems to be hinted by Eusebius, *HE.* iii. 25: *Τῶν δ' ἀντιλεγόμενων, γνωρίμων δ' οὖν ὁμοῦ τοῖς πολλοῖς . . . ἡ ὀνομαζομένη δευτέρα καὶ τρίτη Ἰωάννου, εἴτε τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ τυγχάνουσαι, εἴτε καὶ ἐτέρου ὁμωνύμου ἐκείνῳ.* The view is definitely taken by Jerome, *de viris illust.* cc. 9 and 18.

Our evidence, however, is incomplete without examination of the testimony of St. Irenaeus, which is important because, in the well-known passage from his letter to Florinus (Eusebius, *HE.* v. 20), he states that in his boyhood (παῖς ἔτι ὢν) he was a hearer of Polycarp and could remember his description of 'his intercourse with John and with the rest who had seen the Lord'. Irenaeus appears unjustly to have suffered considerable misrepresentation. While claimed on the one hand as a conclusive witness to the fact that the John of Ephesus was the Apostle St. John, he is commonly accused, on the other hand, by the opponents of this theory of having mistaken the meaning of his teacher Polycarp, and supposed that he was referring to the Apostle when all the time he was speaking of the presbyter. Similarly, he is taken to task by Eusebius (*HE.* iii. 39) because he describes Papias as ὁ Ἰωάννου μὲν ἀκουστής, Πολυκάρπου δὲ ἑταῖρος γεγονώς. Eusebius's comment on this statement is Αὐτός γε μὴν ὁ Παπίας κατὰ τὸ προοίμιον τῶν αὐτοῦ λόγων, ἀκροατὴν μὲν καὶ αὐτόπτην οὐδαμῶς ἐαντὸν γενέσθαι τῶν ἱερῶν ἀποστόλων ἐμφαίνει, παρεληφέναι δὲ τὰ τῆς πίστεως παρὰ τῶν ἐκείνοις γνωρίμων. The error of which he is accused by Eusebius is cited by modern critics as enhancing the probability that he made the additional error of mistaking Polycarp's reminiscences of the presbyter as referring to the Apostle.

In reality, it is doubtful whether Irenaeus makes any mistake at all. The true state of affairs may best be gathered by tabulating all his references to the author of the Fourth Gospel, whom he also regarded as author of the Apocalypse.*

	<i>Occurrences.</i>
'John the disciple of the Lord'	
In references to the Gospel	9
In references to the Apocalypse	3
In references to incidents at Ephesus	2
	<hr/>
Total	14

* These computations are as complete as the writer could make them; but he cannot claim that they are more than approximately so. They cover the fragments as well as the *Contra Haer.* Under 'John' a few Gospel references referring to the son of Zebedee have not been reckoned.

'The disciple of the Lord'	1
'His disciple John'	1
'John'	
In references to the Gospel	20
In references to the Apocalypse	10
In references to incidents at Ephesus	1
	<hr/>
Total	31
 'The Apostle'	 2

With these references we may compare Irenaeus's references to other Evangelists and Apostles :

'Matthew the Apostle'	1
'Matthew' elsewhere.	
 'Mark the interpreter and disciple of Peter'	 1
'Mark the disciple and interpreter of Peter'	1
'Mark' elsewhere.	
 'Luke the follower and disciple of the Apostles'	 1
'Luke the disciple and attendant of the Apostles'	1
'Luke the attendant of Paul'	1
'Luke' elsewhere.	
 'Peter the Apostle'	 1
'Peter' elsewhere.	
 'Paul the Apostle'	 17
'Paul, being the Apostle of the Gentiles'	1
'Paul His Apostle'	1
'Paul'	64
'The Apostle'	74

Here we notice the extraordinary care which Irenaeus takes accurately to define the position and authority of his witnesses. This comes out especially in his description of Mark and Luke ; while Matthew alone of the Synoptists is correctly given the title of Apostle.

We notice again that, while Matthew, Peter, and Paul are defined as Apostles, John *is never so defined by name*. It is true that in two passages which come near together (*Haer.* I. ix. 2, 3) he is mentioned as 'the Apostle' simply, having just previously been cited as 'John' ; but this is different from the direct attachment of

the title to his name. Irenaeus, when not specially defining the rank of his witnesses, uses the term 'Apostle' in a wider sense. Thus in *Haer.* III. xi. 9, after a summary of the teaching and scope of the four Gospels, he remarks, 'Having thus ascertained the opinion of those who delivered the Gospel to us . . . let us proceed to the remaining Apostles'; and again in IV. *pref.* 1, 'Accordingly, in the book before this we have set forth the sentence of the Apostles upon them all'. There are several passages in which John is included by inference among the Apostles; II. xxii. 5, 'And all the elders testify, who in Asia conferred with John the disciple of the Lord, that John had handed down these facts; for he abode with them until the times of Trajan. And some of them saw not only John, but also other Apostles'; III. iii. 4, 'And Polycarp too, who had not only been trained by the Apostles, and had conversed with many of those who had seen Christ, but also had been constituted by the Apostles bishop over Asia in the church of Smyrna . . . having always taught these things, which he had learned from the Apostles'; 'And there are some who have been told by him (Polycarp) that John the disciple of the Lord, when he had gone to have a bath at Ephesus . . . and Polycarp too himself. . . Such pious care had the Apostles and their disciples, &c.'; 'Yea, and the church at Ephesus, having had both Paul for its founder, and John to abide among them until the times of Trajan, is a true witness of the tradition of the Apostles'; Letter to Victor (Eusebius, *HE.* v. 24), 'For neither could Anicetus persuade Polycarp not to observe (the Quarta-deciman practice), inasmuch as he had always observed it with John the disciple of our Lord and the rest of the Apostles with whom he had associated'.

Let us attach full weight to these passages (which the writer believes are all which come into question), and we are still brought to a standstill by the fact that, if Irenaeus believed John of Ephesus to have been *one of the Twelve Apostles*, it is most remarkable that he never styles him 'John the Apostle', but always 'John the disciple of the Lord'. We note specially the fact that even where the four Evangelists are most carefully described in III. ix. 1; x. 1, 6; xi. 1, and the first of them figures as 'Matthew the Apostle', John is still simply 'John the disciple of the Lord'. Had Irenaeus taken

him for the Apostle John, it would have been so natural in this case to have added 'who was one of the twelve Apostles'. We are bound also to contrast the way in which he is only twice referred to unnamed as 'the Apostle', with the 74 occasions on which St. Paul is so styled.

Now arises the question—Whence did Irenaeus obtain this distinctive title, 'the disciple of the Lord'? It is not derived from the Fourth Gospel; for, had this been so, we should have expected 'the disciple whom Jesus loved'. Looking at the titles of other witnesses, we observe that 'Mark the interpreter and disciple of Peter' seems clearly to depend upon Papias's statement, *Μάρκος μὲν ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου γενόμενος . . . Οὐτε γὰρ ἤκουσε τοῦ Κυρίου, οὔτε παρηκολούθησεν αὐτῷ· ὕστερον δέ, ὡς ἔφην, Πέτρῳ* (Eusebius, *HE.* iii. 39). In the same way, we observe that Papias styles Arision and John the presbyter *οἱ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθηταί*. It is true that in the same paragraph he subjoins *ἢ τις ἕτερος τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητῶν* to the names of the seven Apostles whom he mentions, and so may be taken to include them as *μαθηταί*. Here, however, we mark a difference; since the sense obviously is that Papias was anxious to gain information coming from any (presumably deceased) *μαθητῆς Κυρίου* (i.e. direct associate of the Lord), whether Apostle or otherwise. But in the cases of Arision and John the presbyter *οἱ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθηταί* is *their distinctive title*, i.e. they were not Apostles, but they were (presumably) associates of our Lord who fell into a class by themselves as still living when Papias was collecting his information.

On the basis of these facts we conclude without hesitation that by 'John the disciple of the Lord' Irenaeus means John the presbyter, and that when he refers to Papias as *ὁ Ἰωάννου μὲν ἀκουστής*, he is at any rate as correct as Eusebius when he says *ὁ νῦν δὲ ἡμῖν δηλούμενος Παπίας . . . τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου Ἰωάννου αὐτήκοον ἑαυτὸν φησι γενέσθαι*. It is Eusebius who, jumping to the conclusion that John the Apostle (mentioned sixth by Papias in his list of seven Apostles) must be the Evangelist (*σαφῶς δηλῶν τὸν εὐαγγελιστήν*), attaches to Irenaeus the charge of misconstruing Papias's evidence which has stuck to him ever since. In reality Irenaeus appears to be an impeccable witness as to the early Asian tradition in regard to John; and he completes our evidence that John the Evangelist

and disciple of the Lord, who survived to old age at Ephesus, was not the son of Zebedee, but the presbyter.

Thus all the early Asiatic evidence, i. e. all the external evidence that matters, unites in indicating that the only John of Ephesus was John the presbyter, and that he wrote the Fourth Gospel. This, as we have seen, fits in wonderfully well with the internal evidence which favours the view that the author was not John the son of Zebedee, but a Jerusalemite of priestly family. There are, however, other internal considerations which may seem to tell against this view. If there were not, then surely there would be no problem of authorship remaining.

The first difficulty is the finding of a place among the companions of our Lord for a young man of priestly family who was not one of the twelve Apostles. This is largely based, it seems, upon the presupposition that the Apostles were our Lord's only openly-confessed adherents and regular companions. This of course is not the case. There were others from whom the seventy (or, according to the alternative reading of WH., seventy-two) missionaries were drawn, who must, we may conjecture, have accompanied with Him not a little before they were fit to be entrusted with their mission. Yet of these we should know nothing apart from Lk. 10^{1ff}. There were, again, the women who accompanied Him during a part at least of His evangelistic tours, and ministered to Him and His Apostles out of their substance. Of this fact too we should have been ignorant but for Lk. 8^{1ff}. According to St. Paul in 1 Cor. 15⁶, one of our Lord's Resurrection-appearances was 'to above five hundred brethren at once'. After the Ascension the number of 'the brethren' at Jerusalem is given in Acts 1¹⁵ as about one hundred and twenty, all of whom, apparently (perhaps with the addition of other disciples who had come up to Jerusalem for the Feast), received the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost.

Thus, if it were necessary to suppose that the young priestly disciple regularly accompanied our Lord upon His travels, this would not constitute an insuperable difficulty. But it is not so necessary; and indeed the probability is against such a theory.

Let us ask ourselves—How is it probable that our Lord would have dealt with a young man of good family and priestly con-

nexions whom we may assume to have been a mere youth (perhaps not more than sixteen), who was keenly desirous of joining Him and becoming His disciple? Is it not likely that, while reading his heart and recognizing the great sincerity of his desire, He would—just because of his youth and the great renunciation of home and prospects which He knew that the step would entail—have refused with all tenderness to allow him at once to throw in his lot with the Apostolic band, and commanded him for the time to remain at home at Jerusalem? Meanwhile, whenever our Lord came up to Jerusalem and engaged in discussion with the Rabbinites, the young disciple would be there, making as much as he could of the great Teacher's temporary presence, keenly following the debates which his scholastic training so well enabled him to appreciate, drinking in every word of the subtle arguments of which the Galilaean Apostles could make nothing.*

Thus may well be explained the fact that the great bulk of the Gospel has to do with scenes and discourses at or near Jerusalem, the Galilaean episodes taking a comparatively subordinate part. And, in assessing the qualities in the young disciple which made him pre-eminently 'the disciple whom Jesus loved', shall we be wrong in attaching full weight to the *intellectual bond*—the fact that the youth's upbringing enabled him, in a far fuller measure than the untrained and more slow-witted Galilaean Apostles (at least before Pentecost), to enter into our Lord's point of view, to follow

* It is important to notice that the opinion of Jewish scholars distinctly favours the general historical character of the discourses in the Fourth Gospel, as representing one aspect of our Lord's teaching. Cf. the words of Dr. Abrahams in his essay 'Rabbinic aids to exegesis', *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, p. 181. 'One of the most remarkable facts about the writings of recent Jewish critics of the New Testament has been that they have tended on the whole to confirm the Gospel picture of external Jewish life, and where there is discrepancy, these critics tend to prove that the blame lies not with the New Testament originals but with their interpreters. Dr. Güdemann, Dr. Büchler, Dr. Schechter, Dr. Chwolson, Dr. Marmorstein, have all shown that the Talmud makes credible details which many Christian expositors have been rather inclined to dispute. Most remarkable of all has been the cumulative strength of the arguments adduced by Jewish writers favourable to the authenticity of the discourses in the Fourth Gospel, especially in relation to the circumstances under which they are reported to have been spoken. Much more may be expected in this direction, for Jewish scholars have only of late turned themselves to the close investigation of the New Testament.'

His expositions of the inner meaning of the Old Testament, and to grasp the fact that He was in the highest sense the embodiment of its ideals?

It is only natural that such a disciple should have been present at the Last Supper, and that the Apostles should not have grudged him a place next his Lord to which his deep affection and high gifts entitled him.* Nor is it surprising, even apart from his

* It would, however, not be strange if the position of privilege granted by our Lord to the young disciple should have excited the disapproval of some members at least of the Apostolic Twelve. Lk. 22²¹⁻²⁴—a passage of extraordinary interest as appearing to offer a summary of the events of the fuller narrative contained in Jn. 13—states in v. 24, 'Ἐγένετο δὲ καὶ φιλονεικία ἐν αὐτοῖς, τὸ τίς αὐτῶν δοκεῖ εἶναι μείζων. This is met by our Lord's words of reproof, in which ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν εἰμὶ ὡς ὁ διακονῶν is the verbal summary with which the foot-washing of Jn. 13 corresponds as the acted parable. Occasion for the Apostles' strife as to precedence may, as Dr. Plummer suggests, have arisen respecting the places at the Last Supper; but when we consider that the Twelve must presumably have sat at meals alone with their Master on many other occasions, the reason why the strife should have arisen on *this* occasion of all others is not apparent. Supposing, however, that this time the circle was enlarged by admission of the young disciple, and that he was placed by our Lord next to Himself, it may be that we have found the cause of this outbreak of φιλονεικία. Adopting this hypothesis, we seem to read our Lord's words of reproof with a new understanding. In the injunction ἀλλ' ὁ μείζων ἐν ὑμῖν γινέσθω ὡς ὁ νεώτερος the young disciple John becomes the concrete example of ὁ νεώτερος, which seems almost to acquire the meaning, 'this youth' (cf. Mk. 9³⁸⁻⁴¹ and parallels). Again, the point of v. 28 appears to stand out more clearly: 'But ye (Apostles, in contrast to this young disciple) are they which have continued with Me in My temptations; and I appoint unto you a kingdom, even as My Father hath appointed unto Me, that ye may eat and drink at My table in My kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel'. These words, with all the fullness of promise which they undoubtedly contain, seem to be cast—with something like a touch of irony—in language adapted to appeal to the then-condition of the Apostles' ideals.

If our theory be true, the relation of the Twelve to St. John presents a close analogy to that of Martha to Mary (Lk. 10³⁸⁻⁴²). Like Martha they were eager to spend and be spent in the service of their Master; but they were not, at that stage, endowed with the religious insight and spiritual (as distinct from practical) devotion possessed by Mary and the young disciple John. John, like Mary, had chosen the good part, which was not to be taken away from him.

If such was the occasion which led to the sublime example of the foot-washing, we see at once why the Fourth Evangelist gives no hint of the special circumstances which led up to it. As elsewhere, he suppresses his own personality as far as possible; and would, we may think, be the more careful to do so if it was his own position at the Supper which excited the envy of the Twelve. It may be added that the words μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα Mk. 14¹⁷, μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα [μαθητῶν] Mt. 26²⁰, καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι σὺν αὐτῷ Lk. 22¹⁴, by no means exclude the presence of a non-Apostolic guest at the Supper. The presence of John (as we picture him) might well have

devotion, that when the Galilaeans fled in panic at the arrest, he should have followed on and entered boldly into the high priest's house.

We have now, it may be observed, further explained the bond of union between St. John and St. Paul to which allusion has already been made. Similarity of social position, a common Rabbinic training, common ideals and pride of race and enthusiasm for Judaism in its higher developments, account for much. We seem here to find explained the remarkable double attitude towards the Jews which characterizes both the Christian converts. If from one point of view the unbelieving Jews excite St. Paul's keenest antipathy, as those 'who both killed the Lord Jesus and the prophets, and drove out us, and please not God, and are contrary to all men; forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they may be saved; to fill up their sins alway: but the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost' (1 Thess. 2^{15,16}); from another he can assert with all earnestness, 'I could wish myself anathema from Christ for my brethren's sake, my kinsmen according to the flesh: who are Israelites; whose is the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the cultus, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom is Christ after the flesh' (Rom. 9³⁻⁵), and can speak not without satisfaction of the privileges which he inherited as 'a Hebrew of Hebrew parents' and the recipient of a thorough training in the strictest principles of Judaism (Phil. 3⁴⁻⁶). So to St. John 'the Jews' from one point of view stand as the embodiment of unbelief and hardened opposition to the Embodiment of Light and Truth; yet from another he can record (with certainly a strong touch of national feeling) our Lord's words to the Samaritan woman, 'Ye worship that which ye know not: we worship that which we know: for salvation is from the Jews' (Jn. 4²²), and can refer, with a glow of enthusiasm, to 'the last day, the great day of the feast' of Tabernacles (Jn. 7³⁷).

It was precisely the grasp of Judaism from the inside only

seemed not to call for record. He may have counted for no more to the Apostles *at that time* than would nowadays a young scholar and thinker in the minds of men of practical ability holding high official positions in the Church.

possible to a trained Rabbinic scholar which emphasized the sense of its privileges and opened out the vista of its lofty possibilities in the light of the teaching of Him who was seen to be both its supreme exponent and its ultimate goal; while at the same time strengthening the recoil from those its professed teachers and practitioners who resolutely shut their ears to and resisted the Truth, and would not come to Him that they might have life. Such scholars were St. Paul and the Fourth Evangelist.

The other difficulty which may be urged against our view lies in the fact that there are indications in the Gospel which undoubtedly may be taken to point to John the son of Zebedee as the author. This conclusion, however, is largely bound up with the line of reasoning with which Dr. Westcott has familiarized us, in which we first take our stand upon the indubitable indications that the author of the Gospel was an eye-witness, and then argue—if an eye-witness, then an Apostle; if an Apostle, then John the son of Zebedee. If, however, the inference from eye-witness to Apostle may be questioned (as the present writer has questioned it in the preceding argument), and if the grounds upon which it is questioned be held to be valid, then the case for the authorship of John the son of Zebedee is clearly weakened. The fact that John the son of Zebedee is not mentioned by name is weighty if the author must needs be an Apostle. If there are grounds for holding that he was not an Apostle, then this omission falls into the same category as the omission of the names of James the son of Zebedee, Matthew, James the son of Alphaeus, Simon Zelotes, and possibly Bartholomew, i.e. it may be due to accident. We may feel surprise that two of the Apostles who so frequently in the Synoptic Gospels accompany Peter as special attendants of our Lord should not receive mention; but we should hardly be justified in arguing from this that one of these unnamed Apostles must be the author, even in the absence of strong indications to the contrary. From the opening of *ch.* 21 it is clear that the disciple whom Jesus loved is included under οἱ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου on the ordinary view, but under ἄλλοι ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ δύο upon the view which we are maintaining; and it is legitimate to argue that, since the author always elsewhere deliberately conceals his

identity, the latter conclusion is (apart from evidence to the contrary) more probable than the former.*

The argument from the fact that the disciple whom Jesus loved is brought into connexion with Peter three times in rather special circumstances (13^{23ff.}, 20^{2ff.}, 21^{20ff.}) is weakened when we reflect that Peter stood in a special relation to our Lord as leader of the Apostolic band, and therefore any one else who for any reason likewise stood in a special relation was bound to come into close connexion with Peter. In 13^{23ff.} all that the connexion amounts to is that a privileged Apostle of greater boldness than the others suggested a question to a disciple whom he recognized as still more intimate with our Lord than himself; in 21^{20ff.} that, having heard a prediction as to his own future, he inquired as to the fate of that other who was similarly united to his Master by a special tie of devotion. The remaining passage, 20^{2ff.}, suggests indeed that the two disciples were lodging together—or it may have been, keeping vigil—in the same abode; but this is natural in the circumstances. The very facts that the younger disciple had witnessed Peter's denial, and at the same time was animated by a kindred affection for our Lord which would make him understand the better the dreadful grief of the repentant Apostle, would undoubtedly draw him close to him in the hour of need.

We are left, then, with the account in Jn. 1^{25ff.} of the first meeting with Jesus of the two disciples of St. John Baptist, one of whom we are told was Andrew the brother of Simon Peter, and the other, we infer, was the author of the Gospel. In v. ¹¹ it is said of Andrew, εὕρισκει οὗτος πρῶτον τὸν ἀδελφὸν τὸν ἴδιον Σίμωνα, and from this Dr. Westcott draws the deduction—'The words imply that some one else was afterwards found; and from the form of the sentence we may conclude that this is James the brother of John'.

This narrative is not a duplicate of the account of the call of the two pairs of Apostles in Mk. 1¹⁶⁻²⁰=Mt. 4¹⁸⁻²², for (not to speak of the difference in detail) the scene is different—in Jn. Bethabara (or Bethany) beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing; in the Synoptists, the sea of Galilee. The two accounts may quite well

* Notice the similarity of the phrase to ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ δύο 1³⁵, ὁ ἄλλος μαθητὴς 20^{2,3,4,8}.

be harmonized if we suppose that the definite call (Δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου) of the Synoptic narrative came subsequently to the virtual call described by Jn.; and on this view the readiness of the disciples at once to leave their occupations and follow Christ receives considerable elucidation—they came at once without question because they had already been prepared for the call by the meeting described in Jn.

It must be remarked, however, that while this conclusion is clear as regards Andrew and Peter, the question as to the second disciple mentioned in Jn. 1³⁵ ff. is involved in considerable obscurity. In the first place, we cannot be quite sure that the author of the Gospel is referring to himself; though this assumption is natural, and explains the author's detailed knowledge of the circumstances, both here and in the preceding vv. 29 ff. Secondly, Dr. Westcott's deduction from the statement εὗρίσκει οὗτος πρῶτον κτλ. is surely much too categorical. Why should πρῶτον imply that some one else was afterwards found? Comparing the use of the adverb in Mt. 6³³ ζητεῖτε δὲ πρῶτον τὴν βασιλείαν καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ, we may say rather that it implies that Andrew *made it his first business* to find his brother—'found him *then and there*'. If, then, the author of the Gospel is describing his own first interview with our Lord, there is nothing in the narrative which really conflicts with the theory that he was not the son of Zebedee but a member of a priestly family from Jerusalem. It is quite likely that such a one may have joined the multitudes who flocked to hear the Baptist, may have attached himself to him as a disciple and so have formed a friendship with Andrew, from whom incidentally he may at a later time have learned the details of the feeding of the five thousand (cf. 6⁸), if, as on our view, he was not permitted to become a constant follower of our Lord, but was an actual eye-witness of the Jerusalem-scenes only.

In endeavouring thus to strike a balance between the two views of authorship which we have been discussing—Apostle or young priestly disciple—we find that, while there is much both in internal and external evidence which is difficult to harmonize with the former view, the latter view seems wholly to be supported by the earliest external evidence, and to have the preponderant support of internal evidence; such internal indications as may

seem, at first sight, to tell against it, being amenable to a reasonable solution.

A last point to which reference must briefly be made is the bearing of our theory of an Aramaic original for the Fourth Gospel upon the question of the authorship of the Apocalypse. In making the few remarks which he has to offer on this subject, the writer would guard against the impression that he has come to a fixed opinion. He has not studied the Apocalypse sufficiently thoroughly to do this. All that he has to put forward are certain obvious considerations which seem necessarily to arise out of his new theory as to the Gospel.

The case against the view that the Gospel and Apocalypse are by the same author has always been based chiefly upon the difference in Greek style. It is held that the extraordinary solecisms of the Apocalypse find no parallel in the Gospel, in which the language 'flows along smoothly from the prologue to the end; there is no startling phrase, no defiance of syntax; if it is obviously the work of one who was more familiar with the construction of the Semitic than of the Greek sentence, yet the author seldom or never offends against definite laws. In these respects he not only differs from the Apocalypticist, but stands at the opposite pole to the eccentricities, the roughnesses, the audacities of the latter'.*

It is obvious that, if the Gospel is a translation from Aramaic, the criterion of Greek style as differentiating the two books at once falls to the ground. On the other hand, if the Gospel was written in Aramaic prior to the author's arrival in Ephesus somewhat late in his life, and he then adopted Greek owing to the exigencies of his new surroundings, such Greek as we find in the Apocalypse would not be surprising.†

* Swete, *Apocalypse*², p. cxxviii. It may be remarked that this estimate of the smoothness of the Greek of the Gospel is perhaps somewhat exaggerated in face e.g. of the group of passages which the present writer has brought together on pp. 101 ff.

† It may be urged that, if the Gospel is a translation, the Epistles still remain; and they, though presumably written in Greek, do not display the solecisms of the Apocalypse. But the Epistles may well have been dictated to an amanuensis, who was in some degree responsible for the correctness of the Greek; and possibly this amanuensis may have been the translator of the Gospel.

Again, we have to notice that, as Dr. Charles has ably pointed out, the author of the Apocalypse frames his style upon a Biblical Hebrew model. Such a knowledge of Biblical Hebrew, though unexpected in a Galilaean fisherman, would be natural in a trained Rabbinic scholar. We have found reason to believe that the author of the Gospel was such a scholar; and it seems necessary to hold that the author of the Apocalypse, who must likewise have been a Palestinian, was similarly equipped.*

It is a remarkable fact that, though Dr. Charles holds that the author of the Apocalypse was not the author of the Gospel, the description which he gives (i, p. xlv) of the characteristics of the former is applicable, in its main details, to the latter according to the conclusions which we have formed in the present discussion. Thus we are told that the author of the Apocalypse 'was a Palestinian Jew. He was a great spiritual genius, a man of profound insight and the widest sympathies'. He had an 'intimate acquaintance with the Hebrew text of the O.T.' 'The fact that he thought in Hebrew and translated its idioms literally into Greek, points to Palestine as his original home.' 'His extraordinary use of Greek appears to prove not only that he never mastered the ordinary Greek of his own times, but that he came to acquire whatever knowledge he had of this language when somewhat advanced in years.' All these characteristics are precisely those which we should expect that the author of the Fourth Gospel would display if he turned himself to the composition of a book like the Apocalypse. Is this coincidence merely accidental?

The following is a rough list of Semitisms common to the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse:

Asyndeton (cf. p. 49), which is an Aramaic characteristic, is naturally not to be expected in a work which conforms itself to Biblical Hebrew style. The author of Apoc. slips into it, however,

* Dr. Charles is hardly accurate in speaking (i, p. xlv) of 'his use of Hebrew practically as his mother tongue (for Hebrew was still the language of learned discussions in Palestine)'. The language of learned discussion in Palestine was New Hebrew, which is in many respects more closely akin to Aramaic than to the classical Hebrew in which this writer correctly finds the author's model (cf. p. 17, foot-note). Rabbinic scholars were, however, naturally skilled in their knowledge of the O.T. in the original; and the author is deliberately modelling his style upon the O.T. and not upon New Hebrew.

not infrequently towards the end of his book, possibly owing to the fact that Aramaic was his mother-tongue. It may be noted that Aramaic has influenced New Hebrew in this respect (cf. p. 50). Cf. Apoc. 16⁶, 19²⁰, 20^{3.5.6.14}, 21⁴, 22^{15.17}.

Parataxis (cf. p. 56). The co-ordination of sentences by *καί* . . . *καί* is so frequent in Apoc. that it needs no illustration.

Non-use of Aorist Participle describing action anterior to Finite verb. There seems to be only one instance, viz. ἐπιστρέψας εἶδον 1¹². In Jn. the usage is far less frequent than in the Synoptists (cf. p. 56).

Avoidance of the Genitive absolute construction. This construction is totally absent from Apoc. Though used occasionally in Jn., it is far less frequent than in the Synoptists (cf. p. 57).*

Use of Casus pendens (cf. p. 63). See Swete, p. cxviii; Charles, i, pp. cxlix, 53. This construction is more frequent in Jn. than in Apoc.

καί linking contrasted statements (cf. p. 66). Cf. Apoc. 2^{13.21}, 3^{1.5.8}.

Great rarity of δέ. There seem to be 5 occurrences only in Apoc., viz. 1¹⁴, 2²⁴, 10², 19¹², 21⁸. δέ in Jn. is proportionately slightly less frequent than in Mk., and less than half as frequent as in Mt. and Lk. (cf. p. 69).

Infrequency of γάρ (cf. p. 69). Only about 17 occurrences.

ὥστε frequent, μήποτε never. There are 11 occurrences of ὥστε in Apoc., and none of μήποτε. μήποτε never occurs in Jn. in sense 'that . . . not', 'lest', its place being regularly taken by ὥστε (cf. pp. 69 f., 100).

The Relative completed by a Pronoun (cf. p. 84). Cf. Apoc. 3⁸, 7^{2.9}, 12^{6.14}, 13^{8.12}, 17⁹, 20⁸.

ὄνομα αὐτοῦ = 'Whose name was'. Jn. 1⁶, 3¹, Apoc. 6³, 9¹¹. Never elsewhere in N.T. (cf. p. 30).

ἔρχεται *Present used as Futurum instans* (cf. p. 94). Cf. Apoc. 1^{4.7.8}, 2^{6.16}, 3¹¹, 4⁸, 9¹², 11¹⁴, 16¹⁶, 22^{7.12.20}. The same usage is seen with other verbs in 11⁵ (ἐκπορεύεται, κατεσθῆναι), 11^{9.10} (βλέπουσιν, ἀφίονυσιν, χαίρουσιν, εὐφραίνονται), 14⁹ (προσκυνεῖ, λαμβάνει).

* Dr. Charles (i, p. xxxv) states that the Genitive absolute 'occurs often' in Jn. As a matter of fact the occurrences are 17, as against Mt. 48, Mk. 36, Lk. 59, i.e. it is proportionately about 2½ times as frequent in the Synoptists as in Jn.

Change of construction after Participle (cf. p. 96, where the cases in Apoc. are noted).

παῖς (παῖν) . . . οὐ = 'none' (p. 98). Cf. Apoc. 7¹⁶, 28²³, 21²⁷, 22³.

Thus it appears that the case against identity of authorship of the Gospel and Apocalypse can certainly not be maintained upon the ground of style. The evidence is all in the other direction.

A few words may be added as to the claim to authorship made by the Apocalyptist. He describes himself as 'John' simply in 1¹⁴, 22⁸; in 1⁹ with the addition of 'your brother and companion in the tribulation and kingdom and endurance (which is) in Jesus'. In 18²⁰, 21¹⁴ he seems to distinguish himself from the Twelve Apostles. In 22⁹ he is ranked among the prophets. Though the tone of authority in which he delivers his message is bound up with the fact that he is the mouthpiece of the glorified Christ, it is clear that he recognizes that his name carries the authority of a *true* mouthpiece, i.e. he is a man well known and of important standing in the churches of Asia. His work, though apparently utilizing older sources, must almost certainly be dated towards the end of the reign of Domitian, i.e. shortly before A.D. 96.

Now the evidence which we have already reviewed points to the conclusion that there was but *one* John of great note in Asia at this period, viz. John the presbyter, who was known as 'the disciple of the Lord'. Evidence also indicates that this John was the author of the Fourth Gospel. Unless, therefore, the Apocalypse is pseudonymous (against which see Dr. Charles, i, pp. xxxviii f.), the conclusion is certainly cogent that the author who signs himself 'John' is John the presbyter.

Thus the evidence of claim to authorship combines with that of Semitic style in suggesting that the author of the Apocalypse is one with the author of the Fourth Gospel and Epistles. Whether there exist criteria of Theological thought or other internal characteristics which are sufficient to disprove this inference is a question which the writer must leave to others to decide.

APPENDIX

1. *Reminiscences of the teaching of the Fourth Gospel (and 1 Jn.) in the Epistles of St. Ignatius.*

To the Ephesians.

2. πρέπον οὖν ἐστὶν κατὰ πάντα τρόπον δοξάζειν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν δοξάσαντα ὑμᾶς· ἵνα ἐν μιᾷ ὑποταγῇ κατηρτισμένοι . . . κατὰ πάντα ἦτε ἡγιασμένοι. Jn. 17²² καὶ γὰρ τὴν δόξαν ἣν δέδωκάς μοι δέδωκα αὐτοῖς, ἵνα ᾧσιν ἐν καθῶς ἡμεῖς ἔν. Jn. 17¹⁹ ἵνα ᾧσιν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἡγιασμένοι ἐν ἀληθείᾳ.
4. διὰ τοῦτο ἐν τῇ ὁμονοίᾳ ὑμῶν καὶ συμφώνῳ ἀγάπῃ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ᾧδεταί. Jn. 13³⁵ ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκονται πάντες ὅτι ἐμοὶ μαθηταί ἐστε, ἐὰν ἀγάπην ἔχητε ἐν ἀλλήλοις.
5. πόσῳ μᾶλλον ὑμᾶς μακαρίζω τοὺς ἀνακεκραμένους οὕτως, ὡς ἡ ἐκκλησία Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ὡς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τῷ πατρὶ, ἵνα πάντα ἐν ἐνότητι σύμφωνα ᾦ. Jn. 17²¹ ἵνα πάντες ἐν ᾧσιν, καθὼς σύ, πατήρ, ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ γὰρ ἐν σοί, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν [ἐν] ᾧσιν.
7. Christ is ἐν θανάτῳ ζωὴ ἀληθινή. Cf. 11. μόνον ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ εὐρεθῆναι εἰς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ζῆν. Trall. 9. ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, οὗ χωρὶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ζῆν οὐκ ἔχομεν. Jn. 11^{25,26} Ἐγὼ εἰμι . . . ἡ ζωὴ ἡ οὐ πτωχύνειν εἰς ἐμὲ καὶ ἀποθάνει ζήσεται· κτλ. Cf. also 1 Jn. 5²¹.

We may note that the adj. ἀληθινός is specially characteristic of Jn. (9 times), 1 Jn. (4 times), and Apoc. (10 times), occurring but 5 times besides in the whole remainder of the N.T.

11. Ἐσχατοὶ καιροί.

1 Jn. 2¹⁸ ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἐστίν.

14. Ὡς οὐδὲν λανθάνει ὑμᾶς, ἐὰν
τελείως εἰς Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἔχητε τὴν
πίστιν καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην· ἥτις ἐστὶν
ἀρχὴ ζωῆς καὶ τέλος· ἀρχὴ μὲν πίστις,
τέλος δὲ ἀγάπη· τὰ δὲ δύο ἐν ἐνότητι
γενόμενα Θεός ἐστιν.

1 Jn. 4^{8,16} ὁ Θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν.

1 Jn. 2⁵ ἀληθῶς ἐν τούτῳ ἡ ἀγάπη
τοῦ Θεοῦ τετελείωται. Cf. 4^{12,17,18}.

The Johannine teaching is here combined with that of St. Paul
in 1 Cor. 13.

14. οὐδεὶς πίστιν ἐπαγγελλόμενος
ἁμαρτάνει οὐδὲ ἀγάπην κεκτημένος
μισεῖ.

1 Jn. 3⁶ πᾶς ὁ ἐν αὐτῷ μένων οὐχ
ἁμαρτάνει.

1 Jn. 4²⁰ ἐάν τις εἴπῃ ὅτι Ἀγαπῶ
τὸν Θεόν, καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ μισῇ,
ψεύστης ἐστίν. Cf. also 2^{9,11}.

15. πάντα οὖν ποιῶμεν, ὡς αὐτοῦ ἐν
ἡμῶν κατοικοῦντος, ἵνα ὦμεν αὐτοῦ
ναοὶ καὶ αὐτὸς ἡ ἐν ἡμῶν Θεός.

1 Jn. 3²⁴ καὶ ὁ τηρῶν τὰς ἐντολὰς
αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ μένει καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν
αὐτῷ.

17. Διὰ τοῦτο μύρον ἔλαβεν ἐπὶ
τῆς κεφαλῆς [αὐτοῦ] ὁ Κύριος, ἵνα
πνέῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀφθαρσίαν.

Jn. 12³ ἡ δὲ οἰκία ἐπληρώθη ἐκ τῆς
ὁσμῆς τοῦ μύρου.

The words ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ prove that St. Ignatius has in
mind the narrative of the anointing as recorded in Mk. 14³⁻⁹ =
Mt. 26⁶⁻¹³. According to Jn. 12^{1ff.} our Lord's *feet* were anointed;
yet it is difficult to resist the conclusion that Ignatius's words
ἵνα πνέῃ κτλ. are based on recollection of the passage from Jn.
which we have placed as a parallel, 'the house' being allegorized
as referring to the Church.

17, 19. The phrase ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου occurs six times
in St. Ignatius's letters (the other occurrences are Magn. 1; Trall.
4; Rom. 7; Phil. 6). In the Syriac version the equivalent is
ܐܪܚܘܢ ܕܗܝܘܢܐ ܕܗܝܘܢܐ (Eph. 19). In Jn. 12³¹, 16¹¹ we have the
phrase ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, which is rendered by Sin.
ܐܪܚܘܢ ܕܗܝܘܢܐ ܕܗܝܘܢܐ (12³¹) ܐܪܚܘܢ ܕܗܝܘܢܐ;
in 14³⁰ ὁ τοῦ κόσμου [τούτου] ἄρχων is rendered by Sin. and Pesh.
ܐܪܚܘܢ ܕܗܝܘܢܐ. In Jn., as in Ignatius, the thought is of the
spiritual ruler of the *present age* or *world-period* (properly τοῦ αἰῶνος
τούτου), just as in 1 Cor. 2^{6,8} τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου denotes

the earthly rulers of the present age. Aramaic has but one term ܡܠܟܐ (Syr. ܡܠܟܐ) to denote $\alpha\iota\omega\acute{\nu}$ and $\kappa\acute{o}\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$, and the Johannine rendering $\tau\omicron\upsilon \kappa\acute{o}\sigma\mu\omicron\upsilon \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ is less accurate than $\tau\omicron\upsilon \alpha\iota\omega\acute{\nu}\omicron\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$, and mistranslates the original which must have been $\text{ܡܠܟܐ ܕܗܝܠܐ ܡܝܢ ܕܝܠܕܐ ܕܝܠܕܐ}$. It can hardly be doubted, then, that Ignatius drew his phrase from Jn., and the form in which he gives it suggests that he may have known the Aramaic original of the Gospel.

To the Magnesians.

1. $\epsilon\acute{\nu} \alpha\iota\varsigma$ [ἐκκλησίαις] $\epsilon\acute{\nu}\omega\sigma\iota\upsilon$ $\epsilon\ddot{\upsilon}\chi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ $\sigma\alpha\rho\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\pi\acute{\nu}\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\delta\iota\alpha$ $\pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\eta\acute{\mu}\omega\upsilon$ $\zeta\eta\acute{\nu}$, $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ $\tau\epsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta\varsigma$ $\eta\varsigma$ $\omicron\ddot{\upsilon}\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\pi\rho\omicron\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\rho\iota\tau\alpha\iota$, $\tau\omicron$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omega\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon$, Ἰησοῦ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\pi\alpha\tau\rho\acute{\varsigma}$.

Jn. 17²¹ (quoted above on Eph. 5).

5. $\omega\varsigma\pi\epsilon\rho$ $\gamma\acute{\alpha\rho}$ $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\upsilon$ $\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\iota}\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ $\delta\acute{\nu}\omicron$, δ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ δ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ $\kappa\acute{o}\sigma\mu\omicron\upsilon$, $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\acute{\nu}$ ἴδιον $\chi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\tau\eta\acute{\rho}\alpha$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\mu\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\upsilon$ $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota$, $\omicron\acute{\iota}$ $\acute{\alpha}\pi\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\iota$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\kappa\acute{o}\sigma\mu\omicron\upsilon$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$, $\omicron\acute{\iota}$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\acute{\iota}$ $\epsilon\acute{\nu}$ $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta$ $\chi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\tau\eta\acute{\rho}\alpha$ $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ $\pi\alpha\tau\rho\acute{\varsigma}$ $\delta\iota\alpha$ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ . . .

Jn. 15¹⁹ $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\kappa\acute{o}\sigma\mu\omicron\upsilon$ $\eta\gamma\epsilon$, δ $\kappa\acute{o}\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ $\tau\omicron$ ἴδιον $\acute{\epsilon}\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\epsilon\iota$. $\omicron\tau\iota$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\kappa\acute{o}\sigma\mu\omicron\upsilon$ $\omicron\acute{\iota}\kappa$ $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}$, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda$ $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$ $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\text{-}$ $\lambda\epsilon\acute{\xi}\acute{\alpha}\mu\eta\eta$ $\acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\kappa\acute{o}\sigma\mu\omicron\upsilon$, $\delta\iota\alpha$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$ $\mu\iota\sigma\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ $\acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ δ $\kappa\acute{o}\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$.

5. $\tau\omicron$ $\zeta\eta\acute{\nu}$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\omicron\acute{\iota}\kappa$ $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\upsilon$ $\epsilon\acute{\nu}$ $\eta\acute{\mu}\acute{\iota}\nu$.

1 Jn. 1⁸ $\acute{\eta}$ $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha$ $\omicron\acute{\iota}\kappa$ $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\upsilon$ $\epsilon\acute{\nu}$ $\eta\acute{\mu}\acute{\iota}\nu$.
1 Jn. 1¹⁰ δ $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\omicron\acute{\iota}\kappa$ $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\upsilon$ $\epsilon\acute{\nu}$ $\eta\acute{\mu}\acute{\iota}\nu$.

Jn. 8³⁷ δ $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ δ $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\varsigma$ $\omicron\acute{\upsilon}$ $\chi\omega\rho\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}$ $\epsilon\acute{\nu}$ $\acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$.

1 Jn. 3¹⁵ $\omicron\acute{\iota}\kappa$ $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota$ $\zeta\omega\eta\eta$ $\alpha\iota\omega\acute{\nu}\iota\omicron\upsilon$ $\epsilon\acute{\nu}$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha\upsilon$.

6. $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ $\omicron\ddot{\upsilon}\nu$ $\delta\omicron\mu\omicron\sigma\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha\upsilon$ $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ $\lambda\alpha\beta\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\eta}\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$. . . $\epsilon\acute{\nu}$ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\eta}\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\delta\iota\alpha$ $\pi\alpha\upsilon\text{-}$ $\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\pi\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon$.

Jn. 13³⁵ (quoted above on Eph. 4).

7. Ὡςπερ $\omicron\ddot{\upsilon}\nu$ δ Κύριος $\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\upsilon$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\pi\alpha\tau\rho\acute{\varsigma}$ $\omicron\ddot{\upsilon}\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\omicron\acute{\iota}\eta\sigma\epsilon\upsilon$ [$\eta\gamma\omega\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ $\omega\acute{\nu}$], . . .

Jn. 5¹⁹ $\omicron\acute{\upsilon}$ $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$ δ $\nu\acute{\iota}\delta\varsigma$ $\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ $\acute{\alpha}\phi$ $\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\omicron\ddot{\upsilon}\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ $\mu\acute{\eta}$ $\tau\iota$ $\beta\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\pi\eta$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\pi\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha$ $\pi\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\acute{\nu}\tau\alpha$.

Jn. 8²⁸ $\acute{\alpha}\pi$ $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\pi\omicron\iota\omega$ $\omicron\ddot{\upsilon}\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu$,

ἀλλὰ καθὼς ἐδίδαξέν με ὁ πατήρ
ταῦτα λαλῶ.

Jn. 10³⁰ ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἓν ἐσμεν.

Cf. also 10^{23,37,38}.

7. ἐπὶ ἓνα Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν ἀφ'
ἐνὸς πατρὸς προελθόντα καὶ εἰς ἓνα
ὄντα καὶ χωρήσαντα.

εἰς ἓνα ὄντα.

καὶ χωρήσαντα.

8. ὅτι εἷς Θεὸς ἐστὶν ὁ φανερώσας
ἐαυτὸν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ
αὐτοῦ,

ὃς ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ λόγος ἀπὸ σιγῆς
προελθών,

ὃς κατὰ πάντα εὐηρέστησεν τῷ πέμ-
ψαντι αὐτόν.

Jn. 16²⁸ ἐξῆλθον ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ
ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον· πάλιν ἀφίημι
τὸν κόσμον καὶ πορεύομαι πρὸς τὸν
πατέρα. Cf. 8⁴², 13³.

Jn. 1¹⁸ ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ
πατρὸς. Cf. 14^{10,11,20}.

Cf. 14^{12,18}, 16^{10,17}.

Jn. 17⁶ Ἐφανερώσά σου τὸ ὄνομα.

Jn. 1^{1ff.}

Jn. 8²⁹ καὶ ὁ πέμψας με μετ' ἐμοῦ
ἐστίν· . . . ὅτι ἐγὼ τὰ ἀρεστὰ αὐτῷ
ποιῶ πάντοτε. Cf. also with τῷ
πέμψαντι αὐτόν, Jn. 4³⁴, 5^{23,24,30,37},
6^{38,39,44}, 7^{16,18,28,33}, 8^{16,18,26}, 9⁴, 12^{44,45,49},
13²⁰, 14²⁴, 15²¹, 16⁵, 20²¹.

9. πῶς ἡμεῖς δυνησόμεθα ζῆσαι
χωρὶς αὐτοῦ; cf. Trall. 9. οὐ χωρὶς
τὸ ἀληθινὸν ζῆν οὐκ ἔχομεν.

Jn. 15^{1ff.} Cf. especially v. 5
χωρὶς ἐμοῦ.

To the Trallians.

11. Φεύγετε οὖν τὰς κακὰς παρα-
φυάδας τὰς γεννώσας καρπὸν θανατη-
φόρον, οὗ ἔαν γεύσηταί τις, παραντὰ
ἀποθνήσκει. οὗτοι γὰρ οὐκ εἰσιν
φυτεία πατρὸς.

Jn. 15^{1,2,6} The Father is the
husbandman who tends the vine
and removes the worthless
shoots.

Lightfoot compares Clement Alex. *Paed.* i. 8 καθυλομανεῖ γὰρ μὴ
κλαδευομένη ἢ ἄμπελος, οὕτως δὲ καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος· καθαίρει δὲ αὐτοῦ τὰς
ἐξυβριζούσας παραφυάδας ὁ λόγος, κτλ. The word παραφυάς denotes
a side-growth or worthless sucker which detracts from the fertility

of the plant. According to Aristotle, *Plant.* i. 4 παραφυάδες δέ εἰσι τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς ῥίζης τοῦ δένδρου βλαστάνοντα. Thus the thought of Ignatius is allied to that of Jn., with the difference that the μὴ φέρον καρπὸν of the latter becomes τὰς γεννώσας καρπὸν θανατηφόρον.

In the last clause there is allusion to Mt. 15¹³, Πᾶσα φυτεία ἣν οὐκ ἐφύτευσεν ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ οὐράνιος ἐκριζωθήσεται.

II. καὶ ἦν ἂν ὁ καρπὸς αὐτῶν Jn. 15¹⁶ ἵνα . . . ὁ καρπὸς ὑμῶν ἄφθαρτος. μένη.

To the Romans.

3. μεγέθους ἐστὶν ὁ χριστιανισμός, Jn. 15¹⁹ εἰ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἦτε, ὁ κόσμος ἂν τὸ ἴδιον ἐφίλει· ὅτι δὲ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου οὐκ ἐστέ, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ ἐξε-

λεξάμην ὑμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, διὰ τοῦτο μισεῖ ὑμᾶς ὁ κόσμος.

7. μὴ λαλεῖτε Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν I Jn. 2¹⁵ εἰ τις ἀγαπᾷ τὸν κόσμον, οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ πατρὸς ἐν αὐτῷ.

7. ὕδωρ δὲ ζῶν καὶ λαλοῦν ἐν ἐμοί, Jn. 4¹⁰ ἔδωκεν ἂν σοι ὕδωρ ζῶν.
ἔσωθέν μοι λέγον κτλ.. Jn. 4¹⁴ τὸ ὕδωρ ὃ δώσω αὐτῷ γενήσεται ἐν αὐτῷ πηγὴ ὕδατος ἀλλομένου εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. Cf. also Jn. 7³⁸.

7. ἄρτον Θεοῦ θέλω, ὃ ἐστὶν σὰρξ τοῦ Χριστοῦ . . . καὶ πόμα θέλω τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ, ὃ ἐστὶν ἀγάπη ἄφθαρτος. Jn. 6^{32,33} ὁ πατήρ μου δίδωσιν ὑμῖν τὸν ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὸν ἀληθινόν· ὁ γὰρ ἄρτος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστὶν ὁ καταβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ζωὴν διδοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ.

Jn. 6⁵⁵ ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ μου ἀληθὴς ἐστι βρώσις, καὶ τὸ αἷμά μου ἀληθὴς ἐστι πόσις.

To the Philadelphians.

2. Τέκνα οὖν φωτὸς ἀληθείας,* Jn. 12³⁶ ὥς τὸ φῶς ἔχετε πιστεύετε φεύγετε τὸν μερισμὸν καὶ τὰς κακο- εἰς τὸ φῶς, ἵνα υἱοὶ φωτὸς γένησθε.

* Lightfoot's verdict is, 'The reading of the Greek MSS. φωτὸς ἀληθείας "of the light of truth", cannot stand; for definite articles would almost certainly be

διδασκαλίας· ὅπου δὲ ὁ ποιμὴν ἐστίν, ἐκεῖ ὅς τις ἐκ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν πολλοὶ γὰρ λύκοι . . . αἰχμαλωτίζουσιν τοὺς θεοδόμους.

3. Ἀπέχεσθε τῶν κακῶν βοτανῶν, ἄστινας οὐ γεωργεῖ Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, διὰ τὸ μὴ εἶναι αὐτοὺς φυτεῖαν πατρός. Cf. on Trall. 11.

7. τὸ πνεῦμα οὐ πλανᾶται, ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ὄν· οἶδεν γὰρ πόθεν ἔρχεται καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγει, καὶ τὰ κρυπτὰ ἐλέγχει.

8. πιστεύω τῇ χάριτι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃς λύσει ἀφ' ὑμῶν πάντα δεσμόν.

9. αὐτὸς ὢν θύρα τοῦ πατρός, δι' ἧς εἰσέρχονται Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ καὶ οἱ προφῆται καὶ οἱ ἀποστολοὶ καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησία.

Jn. 10⁴ ὅταν τὰ ἴδια πάντα ἐκβάλῃ, ἐμπροσθεν αὐτῶν πορεύεται, καὶ τὰ πρόβατα αὐτῷ ἀκολουθεῖ.
v.¹² καὶ ὁ λύκος ἀρπάζει αὐτὰ καὶ σκορπίζει.

Jn. 15^{1ff.}

Jn. 3⁸ τὸ πνεῦμα ὅπου θέλει πνεῖ, καὶ τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ ἀκούεις, ἀλλ' οὐκ οἶδας πόθεν ἔρχεται καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγει· οὕτως ἐστὶν πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος.

Jn. 3¹⁰ καὶ οὐκ ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸ φῶς, ἵνα μὴ ἐλεγχθῇ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ.

Jn. 8^{32,36} καὶ γνώσεσθε τὴν ἀλήθειαν, καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια ἐλευθερώσει ὑμᾶς. . . . ἐὰν οὖν ὁ υἱὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλευθερώσῃ, ὅντως ἐλεύθεροι ἔσεσθε.

Jn. 10^{7,9} ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ θύρα τῶν προβάτων. . . . ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ θύρα· δι' ἐμοῦ ἐάν τις εἰσέλθῃ σωθήσεται.


required. The text might be mended by inserting a *καί*, as the Armenian Version gives "light and truth". On such a point however a version has little weight, since this would be a very obvious expedient for a translator. I am disposed to think that *τέκνα ἀληθείας* was the original reading of Ignatius; and that *φωτός* was first intended as a substitution or a gloss or a parallel, suggested by the familiar scriptural phrase *τέκνα (υἱοὶ) φωτός*. It may be remarked, however, that the Aramaic method of expressing 'the true light' is ܢܘܪܐ ܬܪܝܢܐ, Syr. ܢܘܪܐ ܬܪܝܢܐ 'light of truth', this latter being used e.g. to translate τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν in Jn. 1⁹. Thus *φωτὸς ἀληθείας*, which, according to Lightfoot 'is older than any existing authorities', may well be an Aramaism, possibly pointing (like δ ἄρχων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου noted on p. 154) to an acquaintance with the original Aramaic Gospel. For omission of the definite article in rendering such a Semitic phrase into Greek cf. Gen. 24⁴⁸ ܡܕܢܐ ܗܝܬܝܬ ܐܝܢ ܕܝܕܝ 'in the true (right) way' (lit. 'in way of truth') = LXX ἐν ὁδῷ ἀληθείας, Ps. 118 (119)⁸⁰ ὁδὸν ἀληθείας ἡρετισάμην.

To the Smyrnaeans.

Ι. πεπληροφορημένους εἰς τὸν
 Κύριον ἡμῶν . . . ἀληθῶς ἐπὶ Ποντίου
 Πιλάτου καὶ Ἑρώδου τετραράρχου
 καθηλωμένον ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐν σαρκί.
 . . . ἵνα ἄρῃ σύσσημον εἰς τοὺς
 αἰῶνας διὰ τῆς ἀναστάσεως εἰς τοὺς
 ἀγίους καὶ πιστοὺς αὐτοῦ, εἴτε ἐν
 Ἰουδαίοις εἴτε ἐν ἔθνεσιν, ἐν ἐνὶ
 σώματι τῆς ἐκκλησίας αὐτοῦ.

Jn. 3^{14,15} καὶ καθὼς Μωυσὴς ὕψωσεν
 τὸν ὄφιν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, οὕτως ὕψω-
 θῆναι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἵνα
 πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ἐν αὐτῷ ἔχῃ ζωὴν
 αἰώνιον.

Jn. 12³² ἀλλὰ ἂν ὕψωθῶ ἐκ τῆς γῆς,
 πάντας ἐλκύσω πρὸς ἑμαυτόν.

Cf. also Jn. 

The allusion of *σύσσημον* seems to be to the Δ 'standard' or 'signal-post' on which the brazen serpent was set, Num. 21.^{8,9} LXX καὶ θῆς αὐτὸν ἐπὶ σημείον. Δ is rendered *σύσσημον* by LXX in Isa. 5²⁶, 49²², 62¹⁰. It is so rendered by Aquila in Ps. 60 (59)⁶, Isa. 11¹⁰, 33²³; by Symmachus in Isa. 11¹⁰, 33²³; and by Theodotion in Isa. 33²³.

2. *Reminiscences of the Odes of Solomon in the Epistles of St. Ignatius.*

The principal passages from which Drs. Rendel Harris and Mingana argue that the Odes were familiar to Ignatius are as follows :

Ode 38^{7.8}[illegible]

‘But Truth proceeds in the right path,
And whatever I did not know it made clear to me;
Even all the drugs of error,
And the plagues of death which men think to be sweetness.’*

* In the last line the Syriac construction is somewhat harsh; lit. 'And the plagues which they think to be sweetness, of death'. The separation of 'of death' from 'the plagues' (if not merely an accidental misplacement) may have been dictated by desire to bring it into sharp contrast to 'sweetness', the sense being, 'And the plagues which they think to be sweetness, (though they be the plagues) of death'.

In Trall. 6 Ignatius warns his readers against the teaching of heretics in the following terms: 'For these men do even mingle poison with Jesus Christ, imposing upon others by a show of honesty, like persons administering a deadly drug with honied wine, so that one who knoweth not, fearing nothing, drinketh in death with a baneful delight' (ὥσπερ θανάσιμον φάρμακον διδόντες μετὰ οἶνομέλιτος, ὅπερ ὁ ἀγνοῶν ἀδεῶς λαμβάνει ἐν ἡδονῇ κακῇ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν).

In the view of the editors 'ܚܠܝܘܬܗ *halyūthā* is not merely "sweetness", but something with which the poison is taken, i.e. a sweet drink'. This is substantiated by a passage in which Ephrem states that Bardaisan, in composing his Psalter in imitation of David, 'was administering to the simple bitters in *halyūthā*'. It is a fair inference, then, that the οἶνόμελι of Ignatius corresponds to the Syr. *halyūthā*. Thus both the Ode and Ignatius compare heretical teaching to a poisonous drug concealed in a sweet drink, so that men imbibe it unwittingly. The coincidence in thought can hardly be accidental.

Ode 11⁶

وقدسا متكلا منحه لاهقلا
جمع فجعده؟ مندا؟ لا سحر.

'And speaking waters drew near my lips
From the fountain of the Lord, without stint.'

Ignatius, Rom. 7; 'My lust hath been crucified, and there is no fire of material longing in me, but only water living and speaking in me, saying within me, Come to the Father' (ὕδωρ δὲ ζῶν καὶ λαλοῦν ἐν ἐμοί, ἔσωθέν μοι λέγον· Δεῦρο πρὸς τὸν πατέρα).

In explanation of λαλοῦν, Lightfoot cites Jortin (*Eccles. Hist.* 1, pp. 356 f.) as finding an allusion to the heathen superstition that certain waters communicated a prophetic power to the people drinking them. As there was one of these 'speaking' fountains at Daphne (Sozomen, *HE.* v. 19; Evagrius i. 16), the famous suburb of Antioch, Jortin supposes that the image could readily suggest itself to Ignatius. Lightfoot himself is inclined to question the text, and to prefer the interpolator's text ἀλλόμενον (cf. Jn. 4¹⁴); but the correctness of λαλοῦν is now confirmed by the passage in the Ode, with which we can hardly fail to trace a connexion.

In assessing the character of that connexion, in this and the former passage, Drs. Harris and Mingana remark with justice that 'it is far more likely that Ignatius, writing letters rapidly on his western journey, should quote the Hymn-book of the time, than that the early Hymn-book should have picked up an obscure passage in a letter which had hardly got into circulation at a very early date'.*

Ode 17^{10,11}

ولا صبر لاسباب حب في اسب
 صبر لاسباب حب في اسب
 صبر لاسباب حب في اسب

'And nothing appeared closed to me;
 Because I was the door of everything:
 And I went towards all my bondmen to loose them'.

Cf. Ignatius, Phil. 8, 'Christ Jesus shall loose you from every bond'. This is followed by the statement (9) that 'He is the door of the Father, by which enter Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and the Prophets and the Apostles and the Church'; i.e. Jesus Christ is the door of *everybody*, which is an explanation of 'the door of everything' in the Ode.

Ode 41^{1 ff.}

The connexion of this passage with Ignatius, Rom. 2, has already been noticed on p. 131, n. ‡.

These are the principal parallels between the Odes and the letters of Ignatius which Drs. Harris and Mingana have collected. The few others which they cite are of but slight importance. The case for Ignatius's knowledge of the Odes is, however, considerably strengthened when it is noticed that in Eph. 19 he actually seems to be quoting at length an ode of a similar character. The passage runs as follows:

Καὶ ἔλαθεν τὸν ἄρχοντα τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἡ παρθενία Μαρίας καὶ ὁ τοκετὸς αὐτῆς, ὁμοίως καὶ ὁ θάνατος τοῦ Κυρίου· τρία μυστήρια κραυγῆς, αἵτινα ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ Θεοῦ ἐπράχθη. πῶς οὖν ἐφανερῶθη τοῖς αἰῶσιν; ἀστὴρ ἐν οὐρανῷ ἔλαμψεν ὑπὲρ πάντας τοὺς ἀστέρας, καὶ τὸ φῶς αὐτοῦ ἀνεκκλήτων ἦν, καὶ ξενισμὸν παρέειχεν ἡ καινότης αὐτοῦ· τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ πάντα ἄστρα ἅμα ἡλίῳ

* *op. cit.* ii, p. 43.

1000 מן הַשָּׁמַיִם
 וְהַלְלוּ אֶת הַשֵּׁם
 וְהַלְלוּ אֶת הַשֵּׁם
 וְהַלְלוּ אֶת הַשֵּׁם

1. A star shone forth in the heaven,
 Surpassing all the stars;
 And its light was not to be uttered,
 And its newness caused amaze.
2. Then all the rest of the stars,
 Together with sun and moon,
 Joined in concourse round the star;
 But its light outshone them all.
 Bewildered, they questioned whence came
 The new thing, unlike to themselves.
3. Thenceforth was magic annulled,
 And bonds of evil dissolved;
 Error was swept away,
 And the ancient kingdom passed;
 When God appeared in the flesh
 Unto newness of life without end.
4. Thus was begun the scheme
 Perfected in God's design:
 Hence all things were perturbed
 For that death's destruction was planned.

In this ode the following points of connexion with the thought of the Odes of Solomon may be noticed:

1. Conception of the star shining in the world.
 Ode 8⁶ 'Let not the Luminary be conquered by darkness;
 Nor let Truth flee away from falsehood'.
 Ode 41¹⁴ 'And Light dawned from the Word
 That was beforetime in Him'.
2. The stars gather round the new star, and express their wonder.
 Ode 12¹ 'And the Most High hath given Him to His worlds,
 (Worlds) which are the interpreters of His own beauty,
 And the repeaters of His praise'.

3. 'And bonds of evil dissolved'.

Ode 17³ 'My choking bonds were cut off by His hand'.

Ode 21² 'Because He hath cast off my bonds from me'.

Ode 25¹ 'I was rescued from my bonds'.

Ode 42¹⁶ 'And bring me out from the bonds of darkness'.

Ode 17¹¹ (Christ speaks)

'And I went towards all my bondsmen to loose them,
That I might not leave any man bound and binding'.

'Error was swept away'.

Ode 7²¹ 'For ignorance hath been destroyed,

Because the knowledge of the Lord hath arrived'.

We have adopted ܐܬܠܐܡܐ 'error' in our rendering, following the Syriac text. The Greek, however, has *ἀγνοια*, which is exactly ܐܬܠܐܡܐ ܐܠܐ (lit. 'not-knowledge') of the Ode. We have both terms in the following passage:

Ode 18^{10,11} 'And error (ܐܬܠܐܡܐ) Thou knowest not,
For neither doth it know Thee.
And ignorance (ܐܬܠܐܡܐ ܐܠܐ) appeared like dust,
And like the scum of the sea'.

Ode 38⁶ 'And error fled away before Him,
And would not meet Him'.

With the whole passage cf. Ode 22^{3f.} (where Christ is represented as speaking):

'He who scattered My enemies
And My adversaries;
He who gave Me authority over bonds,
That I might loose them;
He that overthrew by My hand the dragon with seven heads,
And set Me at his roots that I might destroy his seed—
Thou wast there and didst help Me;
And in every place Thy name was round about Me'.

Later on in the same Ode we read—

'Thou *didst bring Thy world to corruption,*
That everything might be dissolved and *renewed,*
And on it Thou didst build *Thy kingdom;*
And it became the dwelling-place of the saints'.

For they travailed from the beginning,
 And the end of their travail was life.
 And every one of them that was defective perished ;
 For it was not permitted to them to make a defence for
 themselves that they might remain'.

Drs. Harris and Mingana compare a somewhat similar passage
 at the beginning of Ode 31 :

'The abysses were dissolved before the Lord ;
 And darkness was destroyed by His appearance.
 Error went astray
 And disappeared from Him,
 And (as for) Falsehood, I gave it no path,
 And it was submerged by the Truth of the Lord'.
 'For that death's destruction was planned'.

Ode 15^o 'Death hath been destroyed before my face ;
 And Sheol hath been abolished by my word.
 And there hath gone up deathless life in the Lord's
 land'.

Thus our Ignatian ode appears throughout to be thoroughly in
 keeping with conceptions contained in the Odes of Solomon.

3. *Reminiscences of the Johannine literature in the Odes of Solomon.*

The list includes some points of connexion with the Apocalypse.

Ode 1³ 'For I should not have known how to love the Lord, if
 He had not loved me'. 1 Jn. 4¹⁹ 'We love (Him) be-
 cause He first loved us'.

Ode 1⁵ 'And where His rest is, there also am I'. Jn. 14³ 'That where I am, there
 ye may be also'.

Ode 1⁸ 'For he that is joined to Him that is immortal, will
 himself also become immortal ;
 and he that hath pleasure in the
 Living One, will become living'. Jn. 14¹⁹ 'Because I live, ye shall
 live also'.

- Ode 1¹⁰ 'This is the Spirit of the Lord, that doth not lie'. Cf. 1 Jn. 4¹⁻⁶.
- Ode 7⁴ 'He became like me, that I might receive Him; in fashion was he reckoned like me, that I might put Him on'. Jn. 1¹⁴ 'And the Word became flesh, and tabernacled among us'. Jn. 1¹² 'But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God'. Jn. 15⁹ 'Continue ye in My love'. Jn. 15⁹ 'As the Father hath loved Me, so have I loved you'. Jn. 17¹¹ 'Keep them in Thy name'. v. 12 'I have kept them in Thy name'. v. 15 'That Thou shouldest keep them from the evil (one)'. Jn. 14¹⁹ 'Because I live'. Apoc. 3⁵ 'He that overcometh . . . I will in no wise blot his name out of the book of life'. 1 Jn. 5⁴ 'And this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith'. Jn. 16³³ 'I have overcome the world'. Jn. 11⁵² 'That He might gather together into one the children of God that are scattered abroad'. Apoc. 21²⁴ (Pesh.) 'And the nations that are saved shall walk by the light thereof'. Apoc. 21³ 'And they shall be His peoples' (Pesh. 'people'). Apoc. 11¹⁵ 'The kingdom of the world has become our Lord's
- Ode 8²² 'Pray, and continue in the love of the Lord; Ye beloved ones, in the Beloved; And ye that are kept, in Him that lived (again)'.
- Ode 9¹¹ 'And all those that have overcome shall be written in His book'. Ode 9¹² 'For their inscription is the victory, which is yours'.
- Ode 10⁴ 'I (Christ) took the world captive'. Ode 10⁵ 'And the nations were gathered together as one that were scattered abroad'. Ode 10⁶ 'And the traces of the light were set upon their heart; and they walked in My life and were saved; and they became My people for ever and ever'.

Ode 17¹⁰ 'And nothing appeared closed to Me, because I was the door of everything'.

Ode 18^{4,6} 'O Lord, for the sake of them that are deficient, do not deprive me of the Word . . . Let not the luminary be conquered by the darkness, nor let Truth flee away from falsehood'.

Ode 22⁶ (Christ speaks) 'He that overthrew by My hands the dragon with seven heads, and set Me at his roots that I might destroy his seed'.

Ode 30^{1,2} 'Fill ye water for yourselves from the living fountain of the Lord; for it hath been opened to you:

And come, all ye thirsty, and take a drink, and rest by the fountain of the Lord'.

Ode 36³ (Christ speaks) 'And although a Son of Man, I was named the Luminary, the Son of God'.

Ode 41¹¹ 'And His Word was with us in all our way, even the Saviour who giveth life and doth not reject our souls'.

Ode 41¹⁴ 'And light dawned

and His Christ's, and He shall reign for ever and ever'.

Jn. 10⁹ 'I am the door; by Me if any enter in, he shall be saved'.

Jn. 1^{1ff.} 'The Word'.

v. 5 'And the Light shineth in the darkness, and the darkness obscured it not'.

Apoc. 12³ 'And there was seen another sign in heaven: and, behold, a great red dragon, having seven heads, &c.' Cf. the whole chapter.

Jn. 4¹⁰ 'Thou wouldest have asked of Him, and He would have given thee living water'.

v. 14 'The water that I shall give him shall become in him a fount of water for life eternal'.* Cf.

Jn. 7³⁸ as emended on p. 110.

Jn. 7³⁷ 'If any man thirst, let him come unto Me and drink'.

Jn. 1⁹ 'That was the true Light'.

Jn. 1^{1ff.} 'The Word'.

Jn. 6²³ 'That giveth life to the world'.

v. 37 'Him that cometh to Me I will in no wise cast out'.

Jn. 1^{4,5} 'In Him was light, and

* So Sin. and Cur., omitting 'springing up'.

from the Word, that was before- the light was the life of men.
time in Him'. And the light shineth in dark-
ness'.

Ode 41¹⁸ 'The Messiah is truly Jn. 17²⁴ 'For Thou lovedst Me
One; and He was known before the foundation of the
before the foundation of the world'.
world'.

From the poetical character of the Odes it is obvious that more or less exact quotations could hardly be expected; yet even so, some of the above-noticed coincidences are very remarkable. Ode 8²² is entirely built up upon thoughts derived from the Last Discourses of Jn. Ode 9¹¹ is a fairly close representation of Apoc. 3⁵. Ode 10^{5.6} is a passage which illustrates very remarkably the poet's use of the Johannine writings. His theme is the gathering of the Gentile nations into the Church; and he seems deliberately to have selected outstanding passages on this subject from Jn. and Apoc., and worked them up in a manner which utilizes their most striking phrases. This appears very clearly through comparison of the Syriac text with the corresponding phrases of Pesh. in Jn. and Apoc.

'And were gathered together as one ܐܠܠܗܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܒܥܝܢ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ	the nations ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ	that were scattered abroad; ܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ
'He might gather together into one' Jn. 11 ⁵²	'the nations', Apoc. 21 ²⁴	'that were scattered abroad' Jn. 11 ⁵²

and were set the traces ܐܠܠܗܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ	of light ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ 'by the light' Apoc. 21 ²⁴	upon their heart, ܕܡܫܝܚܐ 'and they shall walk' Apoc. 21 ²⁴	and they walked in My life ܐܠܠܗܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܐܠܠܗܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ 'and they shall walk' Apoc. 21 ²⁴
--	--	--	---

and were saved ;	and they became My people	for ever and ever'.
ܐܡܪܝܢܐ	ܐܡܪܝܢܐ ܐܡܪܝܢܐ	ܠܕܠܐܡܝܢܐ
ܐܡܪܝܢܐ	ܐܡܪܝܢܐ ܐܡܪܝܢܐ ܐܡܪܝܢܐ	ܠܕܠܐܡܝܢܐ
'that are saved'	'and they shall be His people'	'for ever and ever'.
Apoc. 21 ²⁴	Apoc. 21 ³	Apoc. 11 ¹⁵

We notice incidentally that the text of Pesh. appears to be presupposed in Apoc. 21²⁴ (ܐܡܪܝܢܐ) = τῶν σωζομένων. WH. om.) and Apoc. 21³ (ܐܡܪܝܢܐ) = λαὸς αὐτοῦ. WH. λαοὶ αὐτοῦ).

These three lines of evidence taken together form an argument for the early date of the Fourth Gospel which is exceedingly weighty. St. Ignatius, writing in A.D. 110, was thoroughly familiar with the Theology of Jn. and 1 Jn., and therefore (we must surely infer) with the documents themselves. He also appears to have known the Odes of Solomon, and at any rate quotes an ode which is marked by the same lines of thought. Lastly, the Odes of Solomon appear unmistakably to have known not merely Jn. and 1 Jn., but also the Apocalypse. The knowledge of the Apocalypse shown in the Odes is perhaps the most surprising fact of all. If Ignatius knew the Odes, they are carried back, if not to the first century, at any rate to the very beginning of the second. But if the Apocalypse is, as is commonly thought, not earlier than the last years of Domitian's reign, i.e. c. A.D. 95, there scarcely seems sufficient time for the book to have influenced the Odes; even when we make full allowance for the facts that intercourse between Ephesus and Antioch was easy, and that the Apocalypse was precisely the kind of work which was likely to gain ready circulation in the east, and to be speedily utilized in time of persecution. This difficulty seems, however, to be resolved by the consideration that the book, if as late as Domitian, is generally admitted to embody much earlier elements; and it may be from these that the reminiscences in the Odes are drawn.

The weakest strand in our threefold cord is undoubtedly that which postulates Ignatius's knowledge of the Odes of Solomon. Though it will probably be admitted, upon the evidence adduced, that Ignatius quotes a hymn like the Odes, and though the evidence that he was interested in hymnology and actually knew some of

the Odes is sufficiently striking, it has not been proved that he knew *all* the Odes, or that they are all by one hand, and not (like a modern hymn-book) the work of different authors at various dates. At present, however, the fact which principally concerns us is Ignatius's knowledge of the Fourth Gospel, which seems to be proved to demonstration. The manner in which he utilizes its teaching shows further that his acquaintance with it was not merely superficial, but that he had assimilated it through a familiarity extending over many years. This thoroughly favours the theory of the Antiochene origin of the Gospel.*

* The peculiar character of Ignatius's indebtedness to the thought of the Fourth Gospel is emphasized by Freiherr von der Goltz (*Ignatius von Antiochien als Christ und Theologe*, in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, Band xii), and by Dr. Sanday (*Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 242 ff.). The former scholar concludes (p. 130) that 'Ignatius must have come under the prolonged influence of a community itself influenced by Johannean thought'. Dr. Sanday says, 'I do not think there can be any doubt that Ignatius had digested and assimilated to an extraordinary degree the teaching which we associate with the name of St. John . . . I had occasion a few years ago to study rather closely the Ignatian letters, and I was so much impressed by it as even to doubt whether there is any other instance of resemblance between a biblical and patristic book, that is really so close. Allowing for a certain crudity of expression in the later writer and remembering that he is a perfervid Syrian and not a Greek, he seems to me to reflect the Johannean teaching with extraordinary fidelity.' The writer concludes by expressing his belief that, to explain the connexion in thought, the alternative lies between falling back upon the tradition that Ignatius was an actual disciple of St. John, or 'had actually had access to the Johannean writings years before the date of his journey to Rome, and that he had devoted to them no mere cursory reading but a close and careful study which had the deepest effect upon his mind'. Elsewhere in the same work (p. 199) Dr. Sanday remarks, 'I have long thought that it would facilitate our reconstruction of the history of early Christian thought, if we could assume an anticipatory stage of Johannean teaching, localized somewhere in Syria, before the Apostle reached his final home at Ephesus. This would account more easily than any other hypothesis for the traces of this kind of teaching in the *Didaché*, and in Ignatius, as well as in some of the early Gnostic systems.'

INDEX

- Abbahu, R., 117
 Abbott, Dr. E. A., 57, 65, 66, 68
 Abraham sees the day of the Son of Man, 111 f.
 Abrahams, Dr. I., 143
Acta Thomae, 27, 55, 67, 95
 Adam, first and second, 45, 47
 Akiba, R., 23
 Alexandrine influence on Fourth Gospel, theory of, 39, 127
 Allen, Canon W. C., 2, 7, 16, 17, 18, 19, 77, 86, 90, 106
 Ammi, R., 22
 Amoraim, 22
 Andrew, 147, 148
 Anna, 107
 Antioch, as home of Fourth Gospel, 129 ff., 171
 Aorist Participle describing action anterior to finite verb, 56 f., 151
 Apocalypse, Greek of, 15, 149 ff.; authorship of, 149 ff.; date of, 170
 'Apostle', wider usage of term, 140
 Aquila, 23, 123, 159
 Aramaic, Palestinian, 20 ff.; rise of use of, among the Jews, 21
 Aramaic constructions and usages contrasted with Hebrew, 7 ff., 12 f., 13, 14, 15, 16 f., 49 f., 53, 61 ff., 96, 99
 Aramaisms, 7 ff.
 Aristion, 135
 Asyndeton, in Aramaic, 49 f., 52 f., 54 f.; in Fourth Gospel, 18, 50 ff.; in Mark, 18, 54; in Apocalypse, 150 f.
 Bacher, Dr. W., 22, 23, 24
 Ball, Dr. C. J., 2, 29 f., 103, 104, 107, 116
 Barnabas, Epistle of, 47
 Bertholdt, L., 2
 Berliner, Dr. A., 21, 22, 23
 Bertholet, Prof. A., 21
 Blass, Prof. F., 39
 Bolten, I. A., 2
 Bousset, Prof. W., 133
 Box, Prof. G. H., 48
 Brazen serpent, 159
 Brockelmann, Dr. C., 86
 Büchler, Dr., 143
 Burkitt, Prof. F. C., 26, 27, 28, 68, 89
Casus pendens, 6, 34, 63 ff., 151.
 Charles, Dr. R. H., 15, 96, 136, 137, 150, 151, 152
 Chwolson, Dr., 143
 Conybeare, Mr. F. C., 130
 Creation, the Incarnation regarded as a new, 43 ff.
 Cureton, Dr. W., 26, 77
 Dalman, Prof. G. H., 7, 13, 20, 23, 24, 25, 39, 40, 55
 Daniel, Aramaic section in Book of, 20; asyndeton in, 49 f.
 Daphne, speaking fountain of, 160
 Deissmann, Prof. A., 4, 5, 39
 Delff, Prof. H., 133
 Delitzsch, Prof. Franz, 115
 Demonstrative Pronouns, 82 ff.
 Diatessaron, 25 f., 77, 130
 Discourses in Fourth Gospel, authenticity of, 143
 Driver, Prof. S. R., 20, 24, 25, 42, 61, 63, 96, 115
 Duval, R., 27
 Egypt, Jews in, 4 f.
 Ellipse, 32
 Enforcement of verbal idea, 13
 Ephesus, supposed writing of Fourth Gospel at, 127; John of, 130, 134 ff., 149
 Eusebius, 77, 78, 134, 135, 137, 138, 140, 141
 Evagrius, 160
Evangelion da-M^ehall'te, 26
Evangelion da-M^epharr^eshc, 26
 Ewald, Prof. H., 2, 68
 Ezra, Aramaic sections in Book of, 20
 Florinus, 138
 Gamaliel the elder, 22, 46; Gamaliel II., 22
 Gemara, 22
 Genitive absolute, 57 ff., 151
 Genitive anticipated by Possessive Pronoun, 19, 85
 Georgius Hamartolus, 136
 'Glory of the Lord, the', 36 ff.
 Golz, Freiherr von der, 171
 Gore, Dr. C., 109
 Grabe, J. E., 77
 Greek, character of Biblical, 3 ff.

Greek words and phrases :

ἀκολουθεῖν ὀπίσω, 8
 ἀληθινός, 153
 ἀμνός = *alṃā*, 107 f.
 ἄνθρωπος = *tiś*, 99
 ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ὁ δεύτερος, 117
 ἀπεκρίθη, ἀπεκρίθησαν as asyndeton
 opening of sentence, 52 ff.
 ἀπὸ προσώπου, 15
 ἀρχὴν τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, ὁ, 154
 γάρ, 69, 151
 γέγραπται, 46
 δέ, sparse use of, in Fourth Gospel and
 Mark, 18, 69; extreme rarity of, in
 Apocalypse, 151
 δίδωμι in wide range of senses, 15
 δόξα, 36 ff.
 ἐγένετο introducing time-determina-
 tion, 11 f.
 εἰλεγειν, εἰλεγον, frequency of Imper-
 fect, 18, 92, 93
 ἐναντι, ἐναντίον, 14
 ἐνώπιον, 14
 ἐπὶ πρόσωπον (προσώπου), 15
 ἐσκήνωσεν, 35 ff.
 εὐθύς in Mark, 68
 ἦρξατο auxiliary, 19
 ἵνα, frequency of, in Fourth Gospel, 69,
 70; Mark's ἵνα avoided by the other
 Synoptists, 70 ff.; Aramaic character
 of ἵνα construction, 70, 72 ff.; ἵνα =
 conjunctive 'that', 18, 19, 70 ff.;
 mistranslation of Aramaic relative,
 18, 19, 32, 75 f., 101; mistranslation
 of ܐܝܢ = 'when', 19, 78.
 ἵνα μή, 19, 69, 70, 100, 151.
 καὶ linking co-ordinate sentences, 5 f.,
 56; linking contrasted statements, 18,
 33, 66 f., 151; introducing apodosis
 after time-determination, 11 f.
 λαμβάνειν πρόσωπον, 15
 λέγει, λέγουσιν, asyndeton, 54 ff.;
 Historic Presents, 87, 89.
 μαγδαλοφύλαξ, 5
 μέν, 68
 ὁμολογεῖν ἐν, 8
 ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, 30 f., 151
 ὅτε introducing temporal clause, 58 ff.
 ὅτι mistranslation of Aramaic relative,
 18, 76 f.; mistranslation of ܐܝܢ =
 'when', 78
 οὐ . . . ἄνθρωπος = 'no one', 19, 99
 οὐ μή . . . εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, 18, 99
 οὖν, 66, 68
 πᾶς (πάν) . . . οὐ (μή), 98
 πιστεύειν εἰς, 18, 34
 πλήρης, 39
 πνεῦμα ζωοποιεῖν, 45 f.
 πολλά, adverbial, 19
 πορεύεσθαι (ὑπάγειν) εἰς εἰρήνην, 14
 πρὸ προσώπου, 15

πρός = 'with', 18, 28 f.
 προστίθην in place of ἅλιν or similar
 adverb, 14
 προσωπολήμψης, προσωπολήμψία, 15
 ῥῆμα = 'thing', 108 f.
 σὰρξ and πνεῦμα, 45
 στηρίζειν τὸ πρόσωπον, 15
 τέκνα φωτὸς ἀληθείας, 157 f.
 φοβεῖσθαι ἀπὸ, 8
 Χριστός not employed as title by the
 Baptist, 106
 ὥς introducing temporal clause, 58
 Grotius, H., 2
 Gudemann, Dr., 143
 Haggādā, 23, 132
 Hālākhā, 23
 Harnack, Prof. A., 135
 Harris, Dr. J. Rendel, 29, 131, 159 ff.
 Hawkins, Sir J. C. (*HS.*²), 8, 16, 69, 70,
 87, 88, 92
 Hebraisms, 7 ff.
 Hebrew, New, contrasted with Biblical
 Hebrew, 17, 150
 Hebrew Bible employed by writer of
 Fourth Gospel, 114 ff.; by writer of
 Apocalypse, 150
 Hegesippus, 77
 Hillel, R., 22, 24
 Historic Present in Fourth Gospel, 18,
 54 ff., 87 ff.; in Mark, 16, 18, 88, 89;
 in LXX, 16
 Hiya, R., 116, 117
 Hoshaiah, R., 45
 Ignatius, Epistles of, 130 f.; reminis-
 cences of Fourth Gospel and First
 Epistle of St. John in, 153 ff., 170,
 171; Syriac ode quoted in, 161 ff.
 Imperfect in Fourth Gospel, 90 ff.
 Inge, Dr. W. R., 131
 Irenaeus, 135, 136, 138 ff.
 Jacob, 115 ff.
 Jerome, 137
 Jerusalem, predominance of scenes at or
 near, in Fourth Gospel, 143, 148
 John, Epistles of, 137, 149; First Epistle
 of, 131, 153 ff., 166 f.; Second and
 Third Epistles of, 137
 John, Gospel of, style of, 5 ff., 149; a
 product of Palestinian thought, 39,
 126 f.; written in Palestine or Syria,
 127 ff.; date of, 128; glosses in, 129;
 author of, 133 ff.; discourses in, 143
 John the Baptist, 104 ff.; the disciples
 of, 147
 John the presbyter, 135 ff., 152; author
 of the Fourth Gospel, 137
 John the son of Zebedee, 133, 134, 135 f.,
 138, 141, 146 ff.; tradition of martyr-
 dom of, 136, 137

- Jonathan ben Uzziel, 24
 Joseph of Arimathea, 134
 Joseph of Pumbeditha, R., 24
 Joshua ben Levi, R., 22
- Koiné* dialect, 4 ff., 57, 65, 70
- Last Supper, 144
 Lewis, Mrs., 26
 Lightfoot, Dr. John, 33
 Lightfoot, Dr. J. B., 1, 11, 130, 135, 137, 156, 157, 160, 162
 Logos-conception, origin of, 37 ff.
 Luke, nationality of, 10 f.; Gospel of, style of, 8 ff.; Hebraisms in, 11 ff.; Birth-narrative of, 16, 44, 47 f.
 Luthardt, Prof. C. E., 2
- Malchus, 134
 Mark, Gospel of, Aramaic style of, 2, 7 f., 16 ff., 29; comparison of style with that of Fourth Gospel, 18 f.
 Marmorstein, Dr., 143
 Martin, Raymund, 46
 Matthew, Gospel of. *See* Q document.
 Mechilta, 3, 33, 64
Mēmā, 38 f.
 Messiah in Rabbinic Literature, 44, 110 f.
 Midrashim, 17, 25
 Midrash Rabba, 3, 9, 33, 44, 45, 46, 56, 110, 112, 116 f.
 Milligan, Prof. G., 4, 5
 Mingana, Dr., 131, 159 ff.
 Mishna, 17, 22, 50
 Mistranslation of an Aramaic original, in Q, 9 f.; in Fourth Gospel, 18, 19, 29, 30, 32, 34, 39, 40, 75 ff., 101 ff.; in Mark, 76, 77
 Moffatt, Dr. J., 135, 136
 Moses had-Darshan, 46
 Moulton, Prof. J. H., 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 39, 57, 65
 Muratorian Canon, 128
 Mysticism in Fourth Gospel and St. Paul, 132
- Negatives, 98 ff.
 Nestle, Dr. E., 25
Nōwē shālōm, 45
 Nicodemus, 134
 Noldeke, Prof. T., 23, 24
- Old Testament quotations in Fourth Gospel, 114 ff.
 Onkelos, origin of name, 23
- Palestinian Syriac Lectionary, 25, 26
 Papias, 134 ff., 141
 Papyri, modern discoveries of Greek, 3 ff.
- Parataxis, in papyri, 5 f.; in Semitic literature, 6; in Fourth Gospel, 5 f., 18, 56 ff.; in Mark, 18; in Apocalypse, 151
 Participle, change of construction after, 19, 96, 152
 Participle in Aramaic, 88 f.; with Substantive verb, 92 f.; as *Futurum instans*, 94
 Paul, St., Aramaic influence upon style of, 29; Theological conceptions of, 43 ff.; Rabbinic influence upon, 45 f., 132; relation of writer of Fourth Gospel to, 45, 47, 132, 145 f.
 Payne Smith, Dr. R., 10, 30, 111
 'Perez, the son of', 46
 Personal Pronouns, frequency of, in Fourth Gospel, 79 ff.; in Semitic, 80 f.
 Peshittā, O.T., 25; N.T., 26
 Peter, St., association of, with writer of Fourth Gospel, 146 f.
 Pfannkuche, H. F., 2
 Philip the Apostle, 134
 Philippus Sidetes, 136
 Plummer, Dr. A., 11, 144
 Polycarp, 130, 135, 138
 Polycrates, 134
 Present as *Futurum instans*, 19, 94 f., 151
 'Prince of this world, the', 154 f.
 Prologue of Fourth Gospel, 28 ff.; poetical form of, 40 ff.; climactic parallelism of, 42 f.
 Pronoun anticipating direct object of verb, 19, 86; marking subject of Participle in Semitic, 80
- Q document, original language of, 8 ff.; Mark's knowledge of, 9
- Rabbinic influence on Fourth Gospel, 35 ff., 43 ff., 110, 111, 116, 132, 133, 145 f., 150; on Apocalypse, 150
 Rabbula, bishop of Edessa, 26
 Relative completed by a Pronoun, 18, 70, 84, 151
 Relative particle invariable in Aramaic, 70, 84, 101 ff.
 Richards, Mr. G. C., 4
 Robertson, Dr. A. T., 5
- Salmasius, C., 2
 Samuel ben Isaac, R., 22
 Sanday, Prof. W., 46, 133, 135, 171
 Schlechter, Dr., 143
 Schlatter, Prof. A., 2 f., 33, 56, 64
 Schmiedel, Prof. P. W., 7, 8, 9, 16
 Semitic Influence on Biblical Greek, 4 ff.
 Semitic Studies, importance of, to N.T. research, 1 ff.
 Semitisms, 4, 17

- Septuagint, influence of, on Luke, 8 ff.
 Servant of Yahweh, the ideal, 104 ff.
Sh'kīnā, Sh'kīnūtā, 35 ff.
 Simeon, 106
 Siphre, 3, 33
 Socrates, 131
 Solomon, Odes of, 131; reminiscences
 of, in Epistles of Ignatius, 159 ff.;
 Johannine literature known to, 132,
 166 ff.
 Son of Man, the, 112, 115 ff.
 Sozomen, 160
 Stenning, Mr. J. F., 26
 Swete, Prof. H. B., 4, 123, 149
 Symmachus, 121, 123, 159
 Syriac version of the Gospels, Old, 26

 Tannaim, 22, 23
 Talmud, 22, 46; Palestinian, 3, 25
 Targums, 20 ff.; Hebraizing renderings
 of, 13, 14, 24, 61; conceptions derived
 from, 35 ff.
 Targum, Jerusalem, 23, 24, 111
 Targum of Jonathan on the Prophets, 24

 Targum of Onkelos, 22, 23
 Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan on the
 Pentateuch, 23
 Tatian, 25, 130
 Temporal clauses, 58 ff.
Testimonia, early Christian, 46
 Thackeray, Dr. H. St. J., 12, 45
 Theodotion, 53 f., 81, 82, 88, 92, 123, 159
 Theophilus of Antioch, 131
 Thumb, Prof. A., 4
 Turner, Prof. C. H., 39

 Verbal sequences in Fourth Gospel, 95 f.
 Virgin-Birth, the, 34 f., 43 ff.

Wāw consecutive in Hebrew, 68
 Wellhausen, Prof. J., 2, 9, 19, 76, 77, 85, 90
 Westcott, Dr. B. F., 28, 32, 33, 78, 102,
 110, 135, 146, 147, 148
 'Word of the Lord, the', 38

 Yannai, R., 44, 46, 116, 117
Yēkārā, 36 ff.
Yinnōn as Messianic title, 46

PRINTED IN ENGLAND

AT THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS