

John — Appendix
Notes (E. E. Whitfield.)

Table of Contents

NOTES ON THE INTRODUCTION	1
NOTES ON THE FIRST CHAPTER.....	7
NOTES ON THE SECOND CHAPTER.....	15
NOTES ON THE THIRD CHAPTER.....	18
NOTES ON THE FOURTH CHAPTER.....	23
NOTES ON THE FIFTH CHAPTER.....	25
NOTES ON THE SIXTH CHAPTER.....	27
NOTES ON THE SEVENTH CHAPTER.....	31
NOTES ON THE EIGHTH CHAPTER.....	33
NOTES ON THE NINTH CHAPTER.....	35
NOTES ON THE TENTH CHAPTER.....	37
NOTES ON THE ELEVENTH CHAPTER.....	39
NOTES ON THE TWELFTH CHAPTER.....	42
NOTES ON THE THIRTEENTH CHAPTER.....	44
NOTES ON THE FOURTEENTH CHAPTER.....	46
NOTES ON THE FIFTEENTH CHAPTER.....	48
NOTES ON THE SIXTEENTH CHAPTER.....	50
NOTES ON THE SEVENTEENTH CHAPTER.....	52
NOTES ON THE EIGHTEENTH CHAPTER.....	54
NOTES ON THE NINETEENTH CHAPTER.....	56
NOTES ON THE TWENTIETH CHAPTER.....	59
NOTES ON THE TWENTY-FIRST CHAPTER.....	62

NOTES ON THE INTRODUCTION

1 THE traditional writer of the fourth Gospel was John the Apostle. Of the two oldest manuscripts of the original text, the *Vatican* (B) has simply "According to John" as both columnar title and subscription, whilst the *Sinaitic* (C) shows this as subscription (so also the Old Latin copies). "Gospel according to John" is found in ACEFGL, etc. Manuscripts of the Apocalypse bear the superscription of "John the divine (θεόλογος)," which refers to his λόγος doctrine (Reuse, p. 21), but, Weiss and Zahn think, was not so used before the third century. Dr. Barry has described him as "last of Apostles and first of divines" (p. 264).

Most manuscripts assign to it the last place among the Gospels, but in D it is placed next to Matthew's, as being both by Apostles.

This John was, it would seem, the younger of the two sons of Zebedee and Salome (*cf.* Matt. 28: 56 with Mark 15: 40). The Gospels "according to" Matthew and Mark both always name James first; and so Luke generally, but twice the third Evangelist writes "John and James" (Luke 8: 51, Luke 9: 28).

The Synoptic Gospels would lead us to suppose that theirs was a Galilean family, and probably of Bethsaida (*Cf.* John 1: 45 with Luke 5: 9), in easy circumstances (Mark 1: 20). Until the brothers became permanently attached to JESUS they followed the calling of fishermen (see, further, notes on John 1: 35 and John 18: 15).

John's definite call to discipleship is recorded in Matt. 4: 21 *f.* and Luke 5: 1- 11. The Lord gave to him and his brother the joint name of "Boanerges" (Mark 3: 17); so that writers concerned with the question of the authorship of the Apocalypse have to consider the fitness of the designation of a son "of thunder" in that connection, as also when investigating the authorship of the Epistles which go under John's name.

The "disciple whom Jesus loved," spoken of in the Gospel attributed to John the Apostle, is generally supposed to be a designation of himself (see, further, note on John 13: 23). To the disciple so described our Lord when dying bequeathed the care of His mother (John 19: 26). This Apostle is, besides, spoken of as one of the "pillars" of the Church at Jerusalem (Gal. 2: 19; *cf.* Acts 15, A.D. 51). The last glimpse we have of him in the New Testament is as an exile in the island of Patmos during the reign, Eusebius (ii. 18) states, of Domitian. Before that time, according to Tertullian (*Præscr. Hæret.*), while the Apostle was in Rome, he was cast into a cauldron of boiling oil, from which he emerged unhurt. Ecclesiastical tradition carries on the story of his life, when released from Patmos, by representing him as prominently connected with the churches of Asia Minor, with Ephesus in particular (Irenæus). Zahn supposes that he removed from Palestine during the fatal Jewish war of the year 69, whilst Blass, comparing Acts 15 with John 21 there, considers that he must have finally left Jerusalem by at least the year 54. His residence in Asia Minor has been questioned, on insufficient grounds, by Keim, Scholten, H. Holtzmann, Harnack, Bousset, and Schmiedel, from its not suiting their theory as to the authorship. Amongst other familiar incidents related of that period of his life are the stories of his reclaiming a notable backslider (Eusebius iii. 33), and of his meeting a Gnostic in a public bath, when he at once rushed out of the place. Irenæus's account (iii. 3, 4) gives Cerinthus as the name, but Epiphanius (xxx. 24) says that it was Ebion. The last-named writer states that the Apostle remained unmarried. John is generally reported to have passed away in Ephesus by a natural death soon after the year 98 — i.e., after the accession of Trajan (so Irenæus, ii. 22, 5). Eusebius (vii. 25) states that his grave was shown there, another account is that two graves were shown at Ephesus connected with the name John (see, further, note on John 21: 22 *f.*).

1a Indications of authorship present themselves in the Gospel itself at John 1: 14, John 19: 35, John 21: 24. So much of the tradition as concerns the Apostle's connection with it is pieced together from the "Church History" of Eusebius (iii., chapter xxiv.), who has preserved the Preface to comments on *Logia* of the Lord, by Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis (see Col. 4: 13) about A.D. 130 or 140 (see Sanday, "Gospels in the Second Century," pp. 145-160, or Stanton, pp. 166-168), from the Muratorian Fragment, about A.D. 170 (see Westcott on the Canon), and from Irenæus in his treatise against heresies (A.D. 180), whose statement in iii. 11 Weizsäcker acknowledges as documentary evidence, not mere tradition. The language of Papias is too vague to be of any help as to this Gospel and its authorship. Justin Martyr came in between this Papias and Irenæus. He seems to quote from the Gospel in both his Apology and his Dialogue with Trypho, but does not name the author. The Muratorian Fragment, however, is distinct in its evidence, not only for the Apostolic authorship, but for the supreme value it attached to the fourth Gospel. By the time of Irenæus acceptance of the Johannine authorship is clear; of him Jülicher candidly says that "he was not the man to spin tradition out of his own brain" (p. 405). Indeed, the late Dr. Ezra Abbot, an American Unitarian, was convinced that we need not travel lower down for recognition of John's authorship than the time of Justin Martyr — i.e.,

in the middle of the second century (p. 80, *cf.* Stanton, pp. 181-191). Justin's adherent, Tatian (A.D. 160), seems to have used this Gospel for his "Diatessaron," which begins with "In the beginning was the Word" (*cf.* testimony of Theodoret, in Zahn). As far as is known, recognised opponents of Christianity, such as Celsus and Porphyry, did not attempt to disturb the received opinion. It is true that so-called *Alogi* (see note on John 1: 1) attributed the authorship to Cerinthus, and the acceptance of the Johannine claim in the second century was retarded by the circumstance that the Gnostic heretic did actually appeal to this Gospel (see notes on John 1: 3, 5, 14, etc.). So according to Origen, Heracleon in Italy (170-180), whilst the Alexandrian Basilides, "about the year 175," as wrote Matthew Arnold ("God and the Bible," p. 268 *f.*), "had before him the fourth Gospel." Zahn (ii. 459 note) gives ample references for such writers, as well as to Theophilus of Antioch, who died in 186, the first of the orthodox distinctly naming the author. Stanton well says: "That this Gospel, unlike as it is to the Synoptics, should have overborne the resistance offered to its acceptance is, humanly, only to be explained by its Apostolic authorship" (p. 277; *cf.* Sadler, Introduction to Commentary, xxv.).

In the early years of the third century we find Clement of Alexandria (according to Eusebius, vi. 14) affirming that he had heard from men of Asia Minor that John the Apostle wrote this Gospel after being "urged by his friends and divinely moved by the Spirit." Origen's acceptance, soon after Clement's, of the received opinion is no less clear; the great Christian scholar does not even hint at any diversity of opinion about it. All down the centuries such was the belief, until in 1792 an English clergyman named Evanson questioned it ("The Dissonance of the Evangelists"). In 1820 a German professor, Bretschneider, followed, and, again, Strauss in 1835, as Baur of Tübingen in 1844. But for some thirty years after the appearance of Strauss's famous "Life of Jesus" most German theologians, including independent workers like Neander, De Wette, and Ewald, followed the lead of Schleiermacher in adhering to the old view, and resisting the ideas of the "Tübingen school." So also Renan in his "Life of Jesus," belonging to the sixties; but by the time he wrote his "Évangiles" this famous French writer's opinion had changed (p. 428; *cf.* the "Life," etc., 13th ed., p. 10 *f.*).

In 1864 appeared a work by Weizsäcker (Baur's successor), entitled "Investigations respecting the Gospel History," and also the Dutch theologian Scholten's "The Gospel according to John," which may together be taken as marking increased academical acceptance of the "modern" view, now largely held in Protestant circles on the Continent, especially since the publication of Keim's "Jesus of Nazareth." Weizsäcker's position in his later work, "The Apostolic Age," is that the Apostle was the indirect, a confidential disciple of his the direct author (*cf.* Harnack's "The Gospel of John the Elder according to John the son of Zebedee"). Such, likewise, was essentially the view of the late Auguste Sabatier, of the French "Liberal" school, as it is of Loisy, his counterpart among French Romanists, to whom Nouvelle has replied. Schürer (see English edition of his pamphlet) is of the same opinion, which was adopted also by Matthew Arnold ("God and the Bible," p. 256 *f.*).

Amongst Germans the names of Lücke, Bleek, Meyer, Hengstenberg, Credner, Luthardt, Bunsen, Ritschl, B. Weiss, Schanz, Beyschlag, Zahn (as Haussleiter and Blass, regarding the "Elder" as none other than the Apostle), and Goebel stand for defence of the Johannine authorship; but those of the two Holtzmanns, Pfleiderer, Schürer, Jülicher, Bousset, Clemen, and the Swiss professors Wernle and Schmiedel, rank as opponents. In this country Dr. S. Davidson, Dr. Jas. Martineau, and Dr. E. A. Abbott, as, of course, the now disclosed author of "Supernatural Religion," support the negative position; whilst Bishops Lightfoot and Westcott, with Professors Sanday and Stanton, Dr. Plummer, Dr. Salmon and Dr. Gloag, besides Dr. Jas. Drummond among Unitarian scholars, uphold the older view. So also the Swiss scholar, Professor Barth, and the late F. Godet. French and American writers are likewise in different camps.

The literary question has been complicated by the fact that Eusebius (book iii.) evidently understood Papias as saying that there were two Johns of Ephesus — John the Apostle and John the Elder (see Stanton, pp. 168-171) the passage would be found in Routh's "Reliquiæ Sacræ," vol. i., p. 8. The tendency now is to discredit the existence of two such contemporaries at the same place: so Harnack ("Chronology," i., pp. 409, 662 note, 674), for whom it is merely "a third-century idea," with Schürer, Loisy, etc. The distinguished professor of Berlin holds that whilst the Apostle's influence lies behind (p. 677), the Evangelist was the Elder, to whom he ascribes all the Johannine writings (*op. cit.*, i., p. 659 *f.*). On the other hand, conservative scholars, by specially "critical" Germans called "Apologists," generally regard "the Elder" as identical with the Apostle (*cf.* 2 John 1, 3 John 1, with 1 Peter 5: 1). Even Hilgenfeld (of the Tübingen school) thought the existence of a distinct Elder (still held by H. J. Holtzmann and others) very shadowy; so also Drummond.

Wendt (reviving an idea of Weisse) takes a mediating position; he analyses the book into a "Source" (the Evangelist, John the Apostle) and an Editor ("redactor"). The American professor, Briggs, is of the same mind. His countryman, Bacon of Yale, sets up a triple authorship, although disclaiming classification with the writers last-named (for him the "redactor" was "Theologos," the teacher of Justin Martyr). But most scholars, as Pfleiderer (ii., p. 480 *f.*) and Martineau ("Seat of Authority," p. 189), decide for a single writer. There are, accordingly, three main views — that the writer was (a) the Apostle; (b) a distinct Elder; (c) a disciple, whether of the Apostle or of this Elder (as Bousset and von Soden think). The last takes the form in the hands of Dr. Salmon (see his posthumous work, p. 436) of a *hermeneutes*, or interpreter acting as amanuensis.

The third view is akin to the idea of a "Second (Third) Isaiah" in Old Testament criticism. "That the author of this Gospel," writes Sir R. Anderson, "should not have left even a tradition of his personality or name is a supposition which tries even a trained capacity for misbelief" (p. 142 of 2nd ed. of "Christianized Rationalism" in *Twentieth Century Papers*).

Opinion differs amongst the "advanced" writers as to whether the Evangelist was of Jewish or of Gentile descent. Keim and Scholten thought that he was a Gentile Christian; others, as O. Holtzmann and J. Réville, hold that he was a Hebrew Christian (see, further, notes on John 4: 27 and John 18: 15). With this goes, of course, the question of the linguistic style of the Gospel, from which the critics seek to determine the amount of "culture" (Acts iv. 13) at the Evangelist's command. Some, as O. Holtzmann and Jülicher (after F. W. Newman in this country), speak of "monotony" characterising the discourses, whilst von Soden complains of "the poverty of vocabulary," which seems ill to accord with the same writer's saying that the Evangelist's mind was "rooted in the Greek culture in which he grew up" (p. 440). The device is, accordingly, adopted of supposing him to be a Hebrew Christian with a Gentile education. Dr. Briggs holds strongly that this Gospel was first written in Hebrew (p. 147). There is a great unwillingness to own Ewald's demonstration of its Hebraising style, or the justice of Lightfoot's very competent opinion that "a scholarly Greek could not have written as John" (see his "Biblical Essays," pp. 16 *f.*, 128 *ff.*, 135 *ff.* for illustrations). Ewald supposed that the book was taken down by a friend from the Apostle's dictation; that the amanuensis had some control over the language used ("Johannine Writings," p. 50 *f.*), thus rendering the Apostle service like the aid that another is believed to have given to Paul in the literary form of the Epistle to the Hebrews (*cf.* Salmon. p. 206). Dr. Barry finds no difficulty in assuming that "St. John gave the substance, which his Hellenistic secretary put into shape" (p. 169).*

* Professor Gregory (p. 312, A.) states that Prochorus (*cf.* Acts 6: 5) is portrayed in several manuscripts as the amanuensis (*cf.* Zahn, "Exposition," p. 28).

2 A decision as to the date of the publication of this Gospel, of course, depends mainly on the view that one takes of the authorship. The old Tübingen opinion, now happily dead, was that it arose in the latter half of the second century. This has been brought back by H. Holtzmann to the years from 100 to 140 (Schmiedel, between 132 and 140). But Dr. Plummer inquires: "If the Gospel was published between these years, why did not the hundreds of Christians who had known St. John during his later years denounce it as a forgery?" (p. xxxvii.). Other dates are J. Réville's, 100-125, Julicher's, 100-110, until we reach O. Holtzmann's convenient "not before 100" (because of alleged dependence on Luke's Gospel). There remain the views of the two specially representative scholars, all of whose writings, from different points of view, command English respect — *Harnack*, who does not conceal his dissatisfaction with nineteenth-century results, and puts the date at between 80 and 110; and *Zahn*, whose date is from 75 to 90. Eusebius says that the Gospel was written in the Evangelist's old age, with which Harnack's and Zahn's respective dates would sufficiently agree. And so W. Kelly: "God directed that the truth should be held back from his pen for fifty years at least" ("Exposition of the Epistles of John," p. 6). "Repetition of phrases," as Barry says, "is characteristic of old age" (p. 161); see also note on v. 2.

The best short popular statement as to the authorship is that by Colonel Turton in his clearly written, sane, and, to opponents, markedly fair book (pp. 323-335).

3 See notes on John 1: 3-5, etc.

4 See note on John 1: 14.

5 See note introductory to John 3.

6 It is clear that the latest of the Gospels supposes acquaintance with those which preceded it (see John 2: 12, John 3: 24, John 11: 2, John 18: 24, 28).

Renan started the absurd notion that this Evangelist bore testimony against whatever he omitted. Thus, the second chapter of the "Vie de Jésus" begins with "Jesus was born at Nazareth," with footnote referring to John 1: 45 *f.* (see, further, in note 42 below).

O. Holtzmann enumerates certain omissions from this Gospel (as of any account of the Temptation), and says that such incidents were deemed derogatory to the Son of God. Nowhere, however, in the Synoptics is greater insistence placed on the Lord's humanity than in John's Gospel.

Dr. E. A. Abbott, in book 4 of his "From Letter to Spirit," has a chapter on "The Silence of John," but Dr. Drummond shows, by an illustration taken from old ecclesiastical literature, how little the argument drawn from silence serves the purpose for which it is used (p. 157).

Nine-tenths of this Gospel is peculiar to itself, and five-sixths is composed of discourses

On its relation in general to the Synoptic records, see Westcott, Introduction 78-80, or Salmon, Lecture 17, Mulligan, 29 *f.*, Reynolds, 88-128. Ewald and Godet suppose that John designedly gave his narrative a supplementary ohmmeter, whilst Weiss and Zahn consider that he did so without intending it, but Reuss rejects either view (see Introduction to the Exposition of Mark, 1: 7, and note 12 there). Pfeleiderer (as now Heitmüller) has differed from German critics in general with regard to the Johannine Christ; these two writers hold that the fourth Gospel exhibits the "historical Jesus" (see further, next note).

7 A very serious point is the claim of the fourth Gospel to be accounted *historical i.e.*, as setting forth what our Lord actually said and did. This is discussed in Westcott's Introduction, p. 53. *Cf.* the Advent Lectures (1907) of the Dean of Westminster. Many critics depreciate it relatively to the

Synoptic Gospels from the fancy that the "Jesus" of Paul (2 Cor. 2: 4) and John (1 John 4: 3) is "another" than the "historical" Jesus of the Synoptists. The followers of Renan criticize by the light of this. All careful readers may discern, alongside of parallel statements in the Synoptists (Reuss, p. 226 *f.*), the difference between the Gospels according to Matthew, Mark, and Luke, on the one hand, and that going under the name of John on the other, in regard of (1) the duration of the Lord's ministry (see note on John 2: 13); (2) the scene of it (*ibid.*); (3) the style of our Lord's teaching (see note on John 3: 1), (4) the assertion of His Messianic claim (see notes on John 1: 33, 41). The personality of the writers does seem to enter more largely into the last than that of the writers of the earlier narratives into their respective texture. And yet if John was to portray the *inwardness* of our Lord's life and mind, how could he do so without projection of his own soul into the task of setting forth the way in which he had "learned Christ" (Eph. 4: 20)? Such even as Schmiedel talk of the application of their "own intellect" to analysis of the mind of Christ ("Jesus in Modern Criticism," p. 36). Clement of Alexandria described the fourth Gospel as predominantly "spiritual" in contrast with the "bodily" Synoptic Gospels (Eusebius, vi. 7, 14), as to which see W. Kelly, "Elements of Prophecy," p. 82, or Bruce, "Kingdom of God," p. 346. This may have referred to the inner spirit in contrast with the facts of the Lord's life (Milligan, Introduction, 19). *Cf.* T. H. Green, "The Gospel at its Highest Potency and in its Finest Essence" (iii. 171). It may be said to set before us "heavenly" rather than "earthly" things (John 3: 12; *cf.* John 7: 46, John 16: 12). Nevertheless, as W. Kelly has written in his "Exposition of the Revelation," the "general bent" of this Gospel is to trace what He was on earth rather than what He is in heaven (p. 100).

There may be a difference between theological *veracity* and scientific *exactness* (see F. W. Robertson, sermon on "The Kingdom of the Truth," vol. i. of "Sermons") respectively expressed in Professor Kaftan's recent pamphlet ("Jesus and Paul," p. 66) by *Wahrheit* (veracity) and *Wirklichkeit* (reality); but can one safely apply that distinction to the discourses in the fourth Gospel? With Robertson it is easy to go when he says (sermon on "The Sanctification of Christ," vol. ii., No. 17): "Feel a truth: that is the only way of comprehending it. St. John felt out truth. He understood his Lord by loving Him." So already Origen (Inge, "Christian Mysticism," p. 45). However that may be, to use the words of Bishop Moule, "In the record as it stands I have a report revised by the ever-blessed Speaker" (p. 14). *Cf.* Bernard, "The Central Teaching of Jesus Christ" p. 179.

That the material accuracy of its statements should be questioned is soul-corrupting in the light of the express assurance conveyed by John 21: 24. But it is the centre of the position of those who uphold New Testament revelation in general (*cf.* Lightfoot, "B. E.," p. 47), and so must be attacked. Dr. Salmon, moreover, has remarked that "critics nowadays trust far more to their own power of divination than to historical testimony" (p. 256). Intellectual honesty is incumbent on all of us. As says Bishop Gore: "We must all train ourselves in the very rare quality of submission to good evidence. This quality is as rare among sceptics as among believers" ("First Sermon on the Permanent Creed," etc., p. 17). It may be added, indeed, that the "free science" upon which some German professors flatter themselves belongs rather to the mythology of the nineteenth century. It is the duty of historians to hold the balance between the "objective" and "subjective"; but Kaftan, in his pamphlet already mentioned, remarks that those of the "Liberal" school "wish to know history not as it was, but as it ought to be — that is, according to their presuppositions, governed by the modern view of the world" (p. 56).

8 The various foregoing aspects of this Gospel will receive detailed consideration in the following notes on passages specially used by the "critical school" for the statement of their respective views, and, it is hoped, some aid will be given towards discrimination of that which is true from what is false in current theories. For example, the writer of "Supernatural Religion" has: "If the doctrines preached

in the fourth Gospel represent Christianity, then the Synoptic Gospels do not teach it" (vol. ii., p. 463). There is an element of truth in these words. The three first Gospels supply us only with "the word of the beginning of Christ" (Heb. 6: 1). The late W. Kelly ("God's Inspiration of the Bible," p. 524 note) would have associated himself entirely with the following extract from Sir R. Anderson's Reply to Harnack: "The *distinctive* doctrines of Christianity are not to be found in the teaching of the *Synoptic*, as they are called. The first two Gospels belong as much to the Old Testament as to the New. . . . The Synoptical Gospels are divinely described as the records of what Christ *began* to do and teach, of what *began* to be spoken by the Lord. And His voice, like that of Moses and the prophets then Spoke *on earth*. But to us He speaketh from heaven" (*Twentieth Century Papers*, p. 189). Cf. Professor Kaftan: "To proclaim the *Jesus religion* as the proper and true Christianity is contrary to history (p. 50)." Cf. Seeley "Ecce Homo," p. 78 f. (edn. of 1908). The position taken up by Baur, later German professors, with Mr. W. R. Cassels, have but plagiarised. As the late Professor Schlottmann has said: "It is the right and duty of the Church to reject the popularising of crude hypotheses put forth with the semblance of scientific results" ("Compendium of Biblical Theology," p. 137).

Without any reservation, the view, expressed towards the end of his life by W. Kelly, of the authorship of the Gospels and the Epistles going under the name of John, was that the Apostle so-called was the instrument of the Holy Spirit for furnishing the Church with these writings in succession, and that the Apocalypse was that which appeared last ("Exposition of the Epistles," pp. 3- 7).

This Gospel begins with a Preface ("Prologue"), which most writers regard as extending to John 1: 18 (so Tischendorf's Synopsis), and ends with an "Epilogue" (John 21). It is variously divided, as into seven parts (Milligan), or three parts (H. Holtzmann, Zahn). Some look upon the "Prologue" as the key to the whole, whilst Harnack thinks that it was intended only to engage the interest of Greek readers (p. 235).

NOTES ON THE FIRST CHAPTER

9 John 1: 1. — "In the beginning . . . WORD . . . GOD." Cf., of course, Gen. 1: 1, where, "to begin with" (as to absence of the article, cf. W. Kelly's "In the Beginning," p. 14), God is at once introduced, without the writer's pausing to prove His existence. That was supposed to flow from Creation, attributed to Him (cf. Rom. 1: 20), which is spoken of here also. Some evidential treatises have probably helped on unbelief as much as they have confirmed belief in GOD. Of recent books appealing to a wide circle of readers, mention may be made of Turton (chapters 1 to 3), Kinnear (chapter 1) both of which are really helpful, as also Lotze's work, of which there is an English edition

As far back as research goes there has been RELIGION, however we may choose to define it, as with Bousset, "personal relation to God" (p. 23, cf. Liddon, "Elements," p. 19). As to the discussion whether it lies in conduct (Kant), or knowledge (Fichte), or feeling (Schleiermacher), see Achelis, "Sketch," pp. 98-100. Surely it extends to the whole man (Mark 12: 30 and parallels).

For "Agnostics" (whose high priest was Herbert Spencer: see his "First Principles," chapters 3, 5), not denying the existence of God, but saying that He is unknowable (cf. Exposition, p. 429), DUTY takes the place of God, and so Ethical Societies have sprung up with their "Ethical Religion" (Mill's "Religion of Humanity"), a protagonist of which is Dr. Stanton Coit.* As to the relation of morality to religion, see Wentscher, pp. 146 f., and Achelis, "Ethics," p. 42 ff

{*Has there ever been any *moral* revival without some *religious* impulse?

asks Principal T. M. Lindsay ("The Reformation").}

For the Christian, as for the Jew, belief in God goes without saying (Heb. 6: 1, Heb. 11: 6), it is experienced through His Word (*ibid.*, 4: 12 *f.*). A man like F. W. Newman, who affected to believe in God apart from this, is by such pure rationalists as Mr. Benn deemed a "mystic." Even those who proclaim themselves without God feel the need of some equivalent, so ingrained in the human breast (as Comte knew) is the religious instinct, taking in the Far East the form of veneration of dead ancestors, as in the West of the memory of a wife (J. S. Mill), or of notable personages in the Positivist calendar. Scripture predicts general acquiescence in this last principle.

A momentous question still remains. Is JESUS, who is accounted to have revealed Him, Himself GOD? The fourth Evangelist affirms this, and some who are not conventional Trinitarians, such as Mr. Boyd Kinnear (chapter 7), sustain his declaration. But it will be seen that this Gospel has much to say of the FATHER and also of the SPIRIT, the conjoint deity of whom is affirmed by the Nicene Creed so-called. The doctrines of the Godhead and of Redemption are closely knit together. See, further, note on 17: 3.

The WORD, *Logos*. Some moderns have identified the Evangelist's thought with that of his contemporary, Philo of Alexandria, a mystical Jewish philosopher. So Weizsäcker, Pfeleiderer, O. Holtzmann, Wernle, Scott. It may be readily granted that such as Apollos (Acts 18: 24) would carry the Alexandrian phraseology with them to Ephesus. But Harnack and Drummond have abandoned the theory that the writer of the Gospel was indebted to Philo for his doctrine, one holding that "the Logos of John has little more in common with the Logos of Philo than the name" ("History of Dogma," i., p. 97), while the other says that "nothing can be more unlike than Philo and John" ("Inquiry," p. 24). Our English writer has shown that, as far as his writings go, Philo never came to regard the Logos — an intermediate agent between God and man — as a *personal* agent. Meyer and others (including Bishop Gore, "Bampton Lectures," p. 69) have traced the Logos to the *Memra* of the Targum, which is Philo's ῥῆμα (*cf.* Heb. 11: 2), used for God's mouth, voice, spirit, and face — all His relations with the world made and maintained by means of this. But, as Luthardt says, these Aramaic paraphrases of the Hebrew Scriptures (see note 22) in their present form belong to the third or fourth century of the Christian era. Some information about them could be derived from Edersheim "Life of Jesus the Messiah," i., p. 476, and ii. 659-664 (Appendix on "Philo of Alexandria and Rabbinic Theology"). The only satisfactory view is that of looking for the roots of the idea in the Wisdom books of the Old Testament. so Luthardt, Godet, Liddon (Lecture II.), Weiss ("Theology of the New Testament," ii. 325-347). The Evangelist's Preface no more witnesses to his having received a philosophical education than does use of such a word as "evolution" tell us anything about the intellectual antecedents of any person of the present day in whose mouth it is (Drummond, "Inquiry," p. 23 *f.*). Nowhere does the Evangelist put "Logos" onto the Lord's mouth, as any romancer or literary dreamer would certainly have done. Archdeacon Watkins, in a Bampton Lecture, has well remarked that the strain of the Prologue was as appropriate to an Ephesian as it would have been inappropriate to a Galilean circle of readers. Neither of these wanted nor would have eared for that which suited the other.

In the latter half of the second, or early part of the third, century certain people whom Epiphanius (Hær., LI., 3, 4) called Alogi (irrationalists), represented by one Caius of Rome, resisted the doctrine of the Logos, and "from the Evangelist's use of the term" they held that he must have been, not an Apostle, but Cerinthus or other Gnostic. Reference might be made to Stanton (pp. 198-212). Lightfoot remarks that their questioning the Johannine authorship of the Gospel is "just one of those exceptions which strengthen the rule" (p. 61). Large use was, of course, made of John's Preface in the Arian controversy; as to which see Dorner's standard work on "The History of the Person of Christ," or Pullan's small but valuable book, "Early Christian Doctrine." That Christianity itself was at stake

Thomas Carlyle owned in his later life, stating to Froude that he had come to see that if the Arians had won it would have dwindled away to a legend ("Life in London," ii., p. 462). Harnack adds his testimony: "The opponents were right: thus doctrine leads back to heathenism."

See, further, Lightfoot's note on Col. 1: 15, Jowett, essay on "St. Paul and Philo" (p. 272 of reprint), and Inge, essay in "Contentio Veritatis," p. 67 *f.*, which is a sequel to his Bampton Lectures, where the Logos is described as "the basis of Christian mysticism" (*cf.* note 278b.).

9a John 1: 1 *f.* — "With God." The force of the preposition *Optis* is well brought out by Sanday: "face to face with" ("Outlines," p. 41).

For the correspondence of the three great arguments for the existence of GOD to the three "Persons" of the Godhead, see Turton, p. 261,

For the Biblical cosmogony, see, of course, Gen. 1. The *geological accuracy* of the first chapter of the Bible has been impeached of late, in the columns of the *Guardian*, by the clerical Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford, and his attitude upheld by another learned clergyman of the same University, who has written of "the utterly unscientific conception of the world presented in Gen. 1." *Contra*, a well-known German Ideologist, Professor Quenstedt, who does not pretend to any familiarity with Hebrew, but takes the Genesaic record according to its "plain meaning," in a lecture has been describing Moses as "a great geologist" (*einen grosser Geologen*), whose statements have "not yet been confuted" (*noch nicht widerlegt*). Will "conspicuous honesty" in Biblical interpretation, which Dr. Driver's henchman, Mr. F. H. Woods, claims that they represent, accept as an "ascertained fact" that *algæ* (see "Encyclopaedia Britannica") — the marine plants used by Quenstedt as his illustration — were the primary organisms? That is, learn from Germans when these can really put English clergy right? Or are Germans to be followed only when they serve the cause of unbelieving criticism?

Again, *Darwinism*, some twenty years ago, might have served these English Hebraists as a refuge, but at a German Natural History Congress of the present year (1907), the English scientist's characteristic doctrine (struggle for existence and sexual selection) was declared, without a single dissentient voice, to be *im Begriff abzusterben*.

May not the "Westminster Commentary" on Genesis within a few years' time be obsolete, so far as regards its physical science? An Oxford First Classman in Science, holder of the University Scholarship in Geology, and at the same time a Hall-Houghton Greek Testament Prize, who was a firm believer in the accuracy of Genesis, thirty years ago to the present writer described Huxley's "Elementary Lessons in Physiology" as "written in gold." The same friend's brother, himself a biologist, as the present century came in, spoke of that book as "entirely superseded." We have now a Senior Wrangler publicly declaring that he declines to take his science from Canon Driver. The "ordinary man," besides, as the *Athenæum* has just said, "believes the Mosaic incidents to be facts." Apart from reasons other than these it is no wonder that churches are depleted of men. "*Knowledge comes*," indeed, but what if "*wisdom lingers*"?

As to alleged connection of evil with creation (Exposition, p. 10, note), *cf.* Rashdall in "Contentio Veritatis," pp. 43 *ff.* In Isa. 45: 7, it should be observed, "evil" means *adversity*.

9b John 1: 3. — The preposition *διὰ* is commonly taken as instrumental, and yet in 1 Cor. 1: 9 it certainly is used of the original source (Kenrick).

On the concurrence of Aorist and Perfect (*ἐγένετο, γέγονεν*), see Lightfoot on Col. 1: 15.

The punctuation by which *γέγονεν* is taken as part of this verse has had the approval of Meyer (as

Alford), Luthardt, Godet and Zahn. Moulton went with Westcott and Hort.

10 John 1: 4. — On the general question of the text of the Fourth Gospel, see Blass, "Philology of the Gospels," chapter 12. This scholar, in his edition, has favoured more than most the "Western" text so-called, whilst Weiss differs from Westcott and Hort in always regarding the internal evidence.

11 Gnostics ascribed a distinct personality to both Life and Light. On such errors the standard English work is Mansel's "Gnostic Heresies," but reference might be made also to Green, "Handbook of Church History," pp. 171-176. Mr. E. F. Scott, adopting the theory that the Evangelist made incursions into philosophy (p. 266), imagines that the Life and Light are "related to the Platonic doctrine of Ideas" or archetypes (p. 253). That could only be by way of contrast. Why travel outside Biblical passages, such as Ps. 36: 9?

God as Creator (Power or Force: *cf.* Mark 14: 62) is the Hebrew *EL*, Semitic idea, whilst the new revelation exhibits Him also as Light, establishing the Aryan notion (see note 90 on θεός). These are combined by the Evangelist in his Preface.

12 John 1: 6. — "John." In this Gospel we have to distinguish (α) the Baptist, never so described by the Evangelist, to whom it does not occur that there could be any confusion of the son of Zacharias with himself; (β) the father of Andrew and Peter (verse 42).

12a John 1: 7. — "All." For the universalism of this Gospel, *cf.* John 3: 16 and John 12: 32, also note on verse 14 with regard to grace.

"Believe." In the fourth Gospel the verb only is used, not the noun "belief" or "faith." On the various constructions employed of the verb, see Abbott, "Johannine Grammar," § 1480 *ff.*, in particular. On Faith as set forth by this Evangelist, see notes on John 5: 46 *f.*, John 6: 69, and John 17: 3. Reference may also be made to Sir R. Anderson's "The Gospel and its Ministry," chap. 4, and to Illingworth's "Christian Character," chapter 4.

13 John 1: 9. - ὅ . . . ἐρχόμενον. This connection of the words, followed in the Exposition, agrees with the opinion of Grotius, and seems to have the approval of Plummer. Luther adopted it for the first edition of his version. "Come into the world" was a Messianic phrase: *cf.* John 2: 27 and John the Baptist's "He that should come" from which Govett renders "was to come." The English Authorised Version has the support of Meyer, Ryle, and McRory, whilst "the true light was coming" represents the construction favoured by Weiss, H. Holtzmann, Godet, Westcott (see also Revised Version) and Zahn (p. 66*f.*). That "the light lighteneth every man" remains certain. The words were quoted by the Gnostic Basilides exactly as they stand in this Gospel.

Mr. Carr refers to the ancient use of "enlightened" for the baptised; but only the Fathers, never Scripture, so spoke of them.

14 John 1: 10. — "He was in the world." Origen, Chrysostom, Augustine, Cyril, and Theodoret agreed that these words speak of Christ pre-incarnate, or as Jehovah, so Milligan, Inge, etc. But *cf.* Zahn, pp. 57 *f.*, 66-68. As to the specially Johannine sense of the world, see "Exposition of the Epistles of John," pp. 137-142, and note on John 15: 19 below. This verse bears on the philosophical doctrine of the *Transcendence* of God, exaggerated by Deists, and the scientific doctrine of His *Immanence*, exaggerated by Pantheists. As to the latter, see Wentscher, pp. 150-152, Mr. J. R. Illingworth's book, s. tit., and Bishop Gore's Third Lecture on "The New Theology." God is morally transcendent. And so Stevens: "The world is separate from God because of its sinfulness" ("Johannine Theology," p. 97). *Cf.* T. H. Green, iii. p. 248. The immanence of God should rather be described as that of nature in Him (Acts 7: 28; Col. 1: 17). The two notions find their reconciliation in the person of Christ, and in Him

alone.

With this and the following verse, *cf.* 1 Cor. 1: 22 *f.*, and, of course, 16: 8 of this Gospel. "He convicts them, not of mere unbelief in Messiah (as in Matthew), but of the common atheism of man" (Bellett, p. 10).

As to difference between Apprehension and Comprehension of the Infinite, see I. Taylor, "The World of Mind," p. 822, and *Cf.* Schofield, "The Knowledge of God," p. 62.

15 John 1: 11. — τὰ ἴδια, "His own door." Segond's French version (*chez les siens* for this as for οἱ ἴδιοι) falls short of the conventional idiom of that language, *chez soi*, used in the "Version Nouvelle" by Mr. J. N. Darby.

16 John 1: 12. — The vexed question as to universal "Fatherhood of God" comes in here (see F. W. Robertson, "First Sermon on Baptism," vol. ii., p. 59 *ff.*, and Bishop Gore, "Creed of the Christian," p. 9 i.). God is, of course, "Father of spirits" (Heb. 12: 9; *cf.* Acts 17: 29). But Rom. 8: 16 is very clear, for all not hampered by reluctance to own the Evangelist's independence of Pauline doctrine (see general note on John 3) as a parallel to this passage, where "authority" (title) to become is so pronounced. "What is usually meant by the *Fatherhood* of God is really His Godhood (Sir B. Anderson, "The Gospel and its Ministry," p. 182).

Harnack writes ("The Essence of Christianity"): "God's Fatherhood is the main article in Jesus' message" (meaning the joint Synoptic record), as to which, however, see the English reply entitled "Christianized Rationalism": "There was nothing new in the conception of the Divine Fatherhood so conceived" (p. 147). See, further, on John 3: 16 and on John 16: 27.

17 "Believe on (trust to) His name." Origen, on 3: 18, regards "trusting to the name" as the initial form of faith (Abbott, *op. cit.*, § 1,486. *Cf.* note below on John 2: 23 *ff.*, and see John 8: 30-32). As to believing "His name" (without εἰς) in 1 John 3: 23, see "Exposition of the Epistles," p. 340 *f.* Salvation by His name alone, as set forth by the Evangelist's fellow-witness Peter in Acts 4: 12, shatters the idea lately broached that an men are "potential Christs."

18 John 1: 14. — "Became flesh." On the Incarnation, see such works as Bishop Gore's "Bampton Lectures," Professor Orr's "Kerr Lectures," No. 6, and Turton, p. 262 *ff.* It was either denied or undermined by Gnosticism, in its earliest form known as "Docetism," one of the representatives of which was *Cerinthus*, contemporary with the Apostle John. His errors Irenæus (III., 11, 7) attributed to misuse of the Gospel of Mark. Cerinthus held that JESUS would rise again with the rest of mankind in the day of judgment, for which Ronan compares Qoran, iv. 156 (see Hansel, Lecture VIII.). The "Docetæ" derived their name from holding that our Lord had only an *apparent* body (see 1 John 1: 1, 4: 2 *f.*, 2 John 7). They made use of the Apostle's own writings, as of the Gospel (3: 5 *f.*), in support of the evil of matter. The Apocryphal "Gospel of Peter" issued from this school (see "Exposition of the Epistles," p. 251). *Basilides* (Mansel, Lecture 10) was an Alexandrian active between 117-138 A.D.; *Valentinus* (Lectures 11, 12) was doing his mischief from 140-155 A.D. He, too, quoted this Gospel. The error of *Nicolas* is referred to in Rev. 2: 15 (see "Exposition of Revelation," p. 51).

18a "Dwelt." See below under "glory" (note 20).

19 "We beheld." The writer was an eye-witness. There are many indications of this in the fourth Gospel. His use of the materials of others must not be mistaken for *dependence*, as by H. Holtzmann ("Manual Commentary," p. 3). *Cf.* Von Soden: "What could have led him, the foremost of eye-witnesses, to depend upon an account second-hand such as the Gospel of Mark?" (p. 442). It were wiser to say that in all cases of such supposed reliance on existing written material the Apostle is

confirming the narrative from his own knowledge (Heb. 2: 3).

20 "His glory" (*cf.* 12: 41). The Targumic *Shekina*, as at Ex. 25: 8, where "dwell" (Hebrew: shaken) is represented by σκηνοῦν (John's, ἐσκήνωσεν) in the Palestinian Greek version by Aquila. *See* also references to LXX. in Zahn, p. 79. *Cf.* the Targum at Isa. 53: 3, etc., and note 8 above. An allusion seems to be made to the Transfiguration.

21 "Only begotten from beside a father." This striking form of expression is the Evangelist's way of alluding to the Virgin Birth (see Zahn, ii. 505, and p. 72 of his "Exposition"; also Blass, p. xii *f.* of Preface to critical edition, showing that Tertullian's text had "was born" (*cf.* old Lat. codex of Verona) without "who." Blass attaches importance to the first and of v. 14. *Cf.* papers of Mr. Carr in the *Expositor* and the *Expository Times*, 1907).

22 "Grace." It is only in the fourth of the Gospels that we meet with the revelation of grace. "It is not to be found in Mark or Matthew, although foreshadowed in Luke" (Sir R. Anderson, *Twentieth Century Papers*, p. 189). *Cf.* note 8 above, and, of course, Titus 2: 11, one of the passages in Paul's writings by which some writers now imagine the Evangelist was influenced. *See*, further, general note on John 3; also John 2 of Sir R. Anderson's "The Gospel and its Ministry."

23 John 1: 16. — On Gnosticism, see note 18 above. and for references in the Pauline epistles to the system in the hands of Jews. see Col. 1: 19, Col. 2: 9, 1 Tim. 6: 20. The distinction made between "Jesus" and "Christ" has reappeared in the recent work entitled "Science and Health," text book of "Christian Science" (110th edition, p. 229). The same work reasserts the evil of matter (p. 258, etc.).

24 "Grace upon grace." That is, grace taking the place of (ἀντὶ) old grace. The expositor here takes the same view as Bengel, Winer, Olshausen, Alford, Weiss and Zahn. The other view referred to in the text is that of Calvin which is followed by Govett.

25 John 1: 17. — "Jesus Christ" (*cf.* 1 John 1: 3; Rev. 1: 1). "Christ" had now become a personal name, in distinction from "the Christ" (see also on John 17: 3).

26 John 1: 18. — There are four readings: (α) "The only begotten Son," to which Luthardt, as Kelly, adheres; (β) "The only begotten" (Latin copy followed by Blass) (γ) "God only begotten" (Westcott and Hort, Weiss Zahn), (δ) "the only begotten God." Westcott and Hort have in additional note: "The best attested reading has the advantage of combining the two great predicates of the word which have been previously indicated" (verses 1, 14) But the omission of the article before "God" tells against their reading. Carr (*Expositor*, April, 1907) avails himself of Dr. Hort's reading, but what he says on John 1: 14 needs no such questionable support. Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen all quote "God" (see Tischendorf, 8th edition, or Tregelles), so that the alteration must have been made early, and would secure some recognition when seen to lend itself to Arian views. But it was probably, as Paley says, "an error of transcription" (Confusion of υσ and θσ). A recent commentator (Heitmüller) thinks υἱὸς the more probable reading.

26a Thus Mr. Ernest Scott writes: "Truth becomes another name for the Divine nature . . . God the only true" (p. 254). But in John 17: 3 the word for true is ἀληθινός, "genuine." Besides the remarks of Mr. Kelly on the present passage of John, reference should be made to his comment on John 14: 6, and to his "Exposition of the Epistles," p. 365 *f.*

26b John 1: 16-18. — Origen, Athanasius, Augustine, Calvin, etc., suppose that these verses were spoken by the Baptist; but Cyril, Chrysostom, Grotius, Alford, Wordsworth and Zahn take them to be the Evangelist's. John 1: 19 clearly marks a resumption of the Baptist's testimony. Moreover, "who is in the bosom" would be said of the ascended Christ (Zahn, p. 96).

27 Much has been made by recent writers of the different way in which the unfolding of the claims of JESUS to be Messiah is treated in the fourth from its presentation in the other Gospels. Thus H. Holtzmann represents that, according to the Synoptists, it dawns on John the Baptist only when he is in prison that JESUS is the Christ! ("Manual Commentary," p. 4). So also for the reserve of our Lord on this subject characteristic of the second Gospel, as to which see note on Mark 8: 29 (No. 82). But already, according to that Evangelist's account in his first chapter (verse 44), the leper was told by the Lord to show himself to the priest "for a testimony to them." See now Garvie, "Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus," chapter 6: "Early self-disclosure."

28 John 1: 19. — "The Jews." In verse 24 it is said that the Pharisees sent them. One of the fancies current criticism is that when "Pharisees" are spoken of in this Gospel you have an earlier, when "Jews," as usually (John 2: 6, 13, etc.) a later, recension. Apart from a special application of the name "Jews" to the Lord's opponents — those who were such only in name (Rev. 3: 9) — distance of time and scene called for the designation even on the part of a writer himself a Jew by birth.

29 John 1: 28. — "Bethany." Perhaps the Betonim of Joshua 13: 26. The writer of "Supernatural Religion" impeached the Evangelist of ignorance of Palestinian topography, as though he confused the place here spoken of with the village by himself said to be near Jerusalem (2: 18). There are other place-names, each of which is applied to more than one position in the country (*cf.* note in G. A. Smith's "Historical Geography of Palestine," p. 496). For example, Emmaus in Luke 24: 13 could not be the same as that spoken of in 1 Macc. 3: 40 (*cf.* note on Cana in John 2: 1 here). Moreover, places are liable to change of name. Drummond gives several instances of such variation in the British Isles. And so this Bethany may have become "Bethabara."

30 John 1: 23. — One test of authorship of a New Testament book is the way in which the Old Testament is quoted by the writer. None of John's citations are from the LXX. against the Hebrew, whilst some are from the Hebrew against the LXX. Such are John 12: 14 *f.*, 40, John 13: 18 to John 19: 37. In this last, as Bishop Lightfoot notes, "the LXX. has not a single word in common with St. John's text." This bears on the question of whether a Gentile Christian could have been the writer of the Gospel (*cf.* notes 18, 92 on Mark).

31 John 1: 25. — The Greek article, here as in verse 21, excludes the idea some have had that behind the Jew's inquiry was the superstitious notion (alluded to in Luke 9: 19) that the old prophets would rise from the dead when Messiah came.

32 John 1: 26. — "Standeth." Not that the Lord was just then in the crowd before the Baptist (*cf.* verse 29). It is, literally, "there hath stood." Bengel: "hath taken his stand."

33 John 1: 29. — "Taketh away." So Meyer, Godet, Westcott, Weiss and Zahn. The word ἀίρων was taken by Lücke and De Wette in the sense of "bearing" as the margin of A.V. With his exposition of the present passage of. Mr. Kelly's treatment of 1 John 2: 2 (p. 65 i.).

34 John 1: 31. — "Knew Him not." Comparison with Matt. 3: 14, which is cited as contradicting this, seems to show that οὐκ ᾔδειν here can scarcely mean absolutely unacquainted with our Lord, which in itself is very improbable although allowance has to be made for the fact that they were brought up in different parts of the land. John did not previously know Him as Messiah So Luthardt, Westcott, Milligan, Dods and Zahn, and see note 136 on Mark *Cf.* also Carr's note. May we not also compare the last words of verse 26 in the Greek with the present passage? The Evangelist seems to speak of the same kind of knowledge here as there.

35 John 1: 32 *ff.* — Several modern critics (e.g., Schmiedel, col. 2,538) treat this section of the first

chapter as inconsistent with the Synoptists' representation of the Baptist's recognition of the Messiahship of JESUS. Such regard Matt. 11: 2-6 (Luke 7: 18-23) as indicating quite a different state of mind about this in John from what ordinary readers gather from those Gospels. The "critical" view is that the Baptist's belief in our Lord as the Christ was then not retrograde but hopeful. It is only by assuming that Matthew's account of the first official relations of the Baptist and JESUS was "doctored" that they can use the first Gospel in support of their theory (see last previous note).

John 1: 32 contradicts the Gnostic theory that the Being who descended on JESUS was "the Christ," and declares that it was the "Spirit."

36 John 1: 40. — "Simon Peter." The Evangelist assumes knowledge of this disciple from previous records (*cf.* his parenthetical note in John 3: 24).

37 John 1: 41. — "Messiah." Peculiar to this Gospel (see also John 4: 25). As to the bearing of this passage on Mark 8: 29, see note 82 on that Gospel.

"First" is taken with "he" by Tischendorf (eighth edition), Meyer, Godet and Zahn (πρῶτος); with "brother" by Tregelles, Alford, W. and H. (prw'ton; R.V.: "findeth first"). The Evangelist here intimates indirectly that he followed Andrew's example in bringing his own brother to JESUS (Zahn, p. 9).

38 John 1: 42. — Simon. Those bearing the name who come before us in the Gospels are (α) Simon Peter, (β) Simon the Cananæan, also described as Zealot (γ) Simon Iscariot, father of Judas the Betrayer, as here (δ) Simon one of the brethren of the Lord; (ε) Simon the leper; (ζ) Simon the Pharisee.

39 "Kephas." This, his Aramaic surname, is peculiar to the fourth Gospel.

40 John 1: 44. — "Bethsaida." There is a question as to whether there were two places of this name, as Trench thought (so now Staerk), one on the western shore of the lake, in Galilee, another on the eastern shore, in Gaulonitis. Thomson considered that there was but one ("The Land and the Book," p. 373 *f.*). We have the name again in John 12: 21, where "Galilee" is added as if by way of distinction (*cf.* note 232).

41 John 1: 45. — "Nathanael." Nathanael is mentioned again in John 21: 2, where he is said to have been of Cana, to which the Lord here proceeds. To imagine, as Mr. E. F. Scott does, that his name was used by the Evangelist symbolically, as a counterpart of Paul, is to carry the theory of the unhistorical character of the Gospel as far as the wildest of the Continental writers (see further in note 61). Others have, with no more reason, supposed that he was the disciple whom Jesus loved.

42 "Joseph." Under this name we have to distinguish (α) the husband of Mary, mother of the Lord, (β) one of the brethren of the Lord, introduced under the Greek form "Joses", (γ) a brother of James the Little; (δ) the disciple from Arimathea. Trench notes "John's veracity in recording Philip's imperfect knowledge" ("Studies," p. 68 *f.*). The Evangelist's admission to his record of such descriptions of our Lord (*cf.* 6: 42) falls under what the late Dr. Salmon called John's "irony," as against the German suggestion that the Evangelist did not know of the Virgin Birth, or discredited it. This many-sidedness of John's narrative does but confirm the conviction of its never departing from, still less correcting, the common "historical" setting of the Synoptic Gospels. O. Holtzmann, whilst one of those lightly esteeming the historical value of the fourth Gospel (p. 108), hesitates not to appraise it highly, as occasion serves, like the present passage, for the belittling of the Synoptic narrative; here to support the idea of a human paternity of the Lord (see, further, on John 6: 42).

43 John 1: 49. — "Son of God, King of Israel." With Ps. 2 *cf.* Isa. 44: 16 Zeph. 3: 13-20. For many

Christians the Son of God's Kingship over Israel is a dead-letter. "To such Israel is a broken vessel never more to be used" (Govett, p. 50 *f.*). so they speak of His "reigning in the hearts of His spiritual people." But His death was to attest that He is "the King of the Jews," not "the King of the Church"; Scripture never so describes Him (Exposition, p. 405 *f.*)

44 John 1: 50. — "Verily, verily." This form of asseveration, characteristic of John's Gospel, regularly introduces a statement of special solemnity — we may say revelation (see John 3: 3, 11, John 6: 26, 32, 47, 53, John 8: 34, 51, 58, John 10: 1, 7, John 13: 16, 20, 21, 38, John 14: 12, John 21: 18).

45 John 1: 51. — "Son of man." In this first chapter of John's Gospel we have had the Lord designated in about twenty different ways. For his title "Son of man," see note 30 on Mark 2: 10, and in this Gospel, John 3: 13 *f.*, John 6: 27, 53, 62, John 8: 28 (John 9: 35, doubtful reading), John 12: 23, 34. To the references in the note on Mark may here be added Bousset, "Religion of Judaism," pp. 248-251, which introduces the reader to the Jewish literary sources belonging to the period between the Old and the New Testament, an early English authority on which was Prideaux, and by general readers chiefly but imperfectly known from the "Apocrypha." Staerk's little work is the most recent.

NOTES ON THE SECOND CHAPTER

46 John 2: 1. — "The third day." *Cf.* with the remarks in exposition here the last paragraph but one of comment on John 20. The prevalence of the number *three* in this Gospel is noteworthy. Besides the three days here, we have the Lord going thrice into Galilee, thrice to Judæa. there are generally supposed to be three Passovers actually mentioned (but see on verse 1), and three other festivals, the discourse on the last day of the Feast of Tabernacles is divisible into three parts; Judas is thrice designated traitor; the Lord undergoes three judicial trials, and Pilate thrice tries to save Him from crucifixion; the Evangelist records three of the sayings from the cross; and the book may be divided into three parts (Holtzmann, "Introduction," p. 438 *f.*). But "triads" are to be found also in the Gospel of Matthew. The number *seven*, in like manner (as in chapters 8-10), finds illustration in the fourth Gospel — "the seven signs", "these things have I spoken unto you" occurs seven times, there is sevenfold witness; "I am" has seven predicates if Resurrection and Life be taken as one, and likewise Way, Truth, Life (Abbott, E. B., § 52 col. 1,799). There is, however, nothing peculiar or unduly "artificial" in this, in the light of numerical arrangement running through other parts of the Bible. See an excellent pamphlet by R. Govett on "The Septenary Arrangement of Scripture."

47 "Cana of Galilee." There was also a Cana in the tribe of Asher (Josephus, "Antiquities," John 15: 5,1; *cf.* Joshua 19: 28). Comparing John 1: 43, we may suppose that the Lord reached Cana from Peræan territory in one day's journey, its position on maps admitting of this.

48 "The mother of Jesus." Our Lord's humanity was not heavenly in the Gnostic sense, He did really take of His mother's substance. This Evangelist never mentions her name, although he gives that of His father (John 21); all the others name her. It is one of the indications of John the Apostle's authorship. The name Mary was borne also by (α) the wife of Cleophas (Alphæus), (see note on John 19: 25); (β) the Magdalene; (γ) a sister of Lazarus.

49 John 2: 4. — "What is there (in common) to Me and thee?" Blass remarks that this was "frequent in colloquial Greek of the time, quite in the meaning of our *let me alone*" ("Philology of the Gospels," p. 238).

50 John 2: 6. — "Purifying of the Jews." *Cf.* Mark 7: 4.

51 John 2: 8 *f.* — Edersheim notes the absence of "friends of the bridegroom" in the custom of

Galilee ("Life of Jesus the Messiah," p. 155). Another indication of exact knowledge on the part of the writer.

52 John 2: 11. — Trench has happily recalled the first miracle of Moses (Ex. 7: 20), a turning of water into blood as a ministration of death, in contrast with this ministration of life ("Miracles," p. 121 *f.*). It is significant that nearly all Christ's works of power reported in the canonical Gospels are those of benevolence. For the manifestation of Christ's glory, *cf.* Isa. 40: 5, and the version of the LXX. there with the Greek here, also note 99.

σημεῖα, "signs." This word is regularly used by the Evangelist in his comments, whilst the Lord is recorded as always using ἔργα, "works." A strenuous endeavour has been made by writer of the negative tendency to set the fourth Gospel in an unfavourable light as compared with the Synoptists on the question of *miracles*. A difference has been set up, as by Harnack (see note 27 on Mark), between the way in which the Lord Himself regarded His works of power and the estimate of the writer of this Gospel. And so, as a recent British writer would have it, in the Synoptic records you have (1) belief, (2) miracles, with that order reversed in the fourth Gospel, the Evangelist's own point of view being distinguished from the Master's (Scott, p. 268). *Cf.* John 14: 11. How, then, are we to explain in the Synoptics the evidential value attached to His works, as in Matt. 9: 4? Is not Luke 11: 29 in exact agreement with the usual Johannine representation of miracles as performed to confirm the real, or raise the superficial, faith of those already disciples, as in the present passage? Again, how can "critics" explain the testimony of Christ's *word* being presented in John 8 and that of His *works* being postponed to John 9? According to the analysis in fashion, the arrangement of chapters in the fourth Gospel results from the Evangelist's arbitrary fancy. Although rearrangement of other parts of this Gospel has been proposed. the traditional order of those two chapters seems to remain unquestioned.

That in the Gospel "according to John" there are superficially apparent contradictions is recognised, but it is the critical interpretations of these which are at fault. Some, taken from H. Holtzmann's "Introduction," will be examined in these notes.

On the general question of miracles, see J. N. Darby, "Collected Writings," vol. 32, pp. 272 *17*; Green, 3, pp. 254 *f.*; Sir R. Anderson, "Silence of God," chapter 3; Nash, p. 141; Turton, chapter 18; Bishop Gore, Sixth Lecture on "The New Theology," etc.; and Von Gerdell, "Burning Questions," etc., Nos. 2, 3 (published by Kielmann, Stuttgart). The last-named writer, like the lamented Count Andreas v. Bernstorff, having had both a juristic and a theological education, has preferred to remain a "layman," in order to "get the ear" of young men who, in Germany as in Britain, care not to listen to "pastors," either orthodox or heterodox, and, to use Count Bernstorff's words to the present writer, distrust the "professional mind." See, further, note 99.

53 John 2: 13 *ff.* — It may be desirable here to consider the question of the length and the scene of our Lord's ministry as contemplated by the Synoptists and John respectively. Eusebius records an ancient observation that the Synoptists seem to tell us of only one Passover — i.e., of but one year's ministry — whilst the fourth Gospel speaks of several Passovers, at least three (*cf.* John 6: 4, John 12: 1). Some, as W. Kelly (see note on v. 1), find four Passovers in this Gospel. Again, the earlier Gospels take us almost entirely to Galilee (and Persia), but John's mainly to Judæa (*cf.* v. 1, John 7: 14, John 10: 22, John 12: 12). A great deal is made by "the critical school" of each of these admitted facts. It has been suggested by Blass (*Expository Times*, July, 1907) that, whilst the Church had its headquarters at Jerusalem, it was an account of the Galilean and of the Peræan ministry that Christians of Judæa in particular would require, the incidents of the Lord's work in Judæa being sufficiently familiar there, but that, precisely when the Christian communities of Judæa were dispersed by political events, the need

would arise of a record of the Judæan ministry, which John was able to supply. And, again, Briggs' recent book, "Fresh Light," has earned the title adopted by the writer. He gives good ground for supposing that John's special fitness for his task came of his having companied with the Lord during the whole of an early Judæan ministry. Not only so, but that there was an early Galilean ministry of a less pronounced public character than that introduced by Matt. 4: 12 and Mark 1: 14. We shall recur to this in notes on the third Gospel, which seems to confirm Briggs' view. But Luthardt, Lightfoot, and othem, had previously shown that Matt. 23: 37 (as Luke 13: 34) had already indicated by the πυσάκις ("how often") that the Lord's visits to Judæa were more frequent than might appear from the Synoptic records. Julicher as to this caustically remarks: "To reconstruct several visits of Jesus to Jerusalem out of the Synoptists solely on account of the one prophetic utterance is childish" (p. 419). The "obvious intention" of the Synoptists supposed by him is very questionably obvious. A *tu quoque* might well be employed against such writers with regard to the use made of Luke 4: 19 to establish a *single* year's ministry: nowhere do the Synoptists say that the ministry lasted only one year. Blass rightly observes: "It is John who first clears up the passage" (common to Matt. 23 and Luke 13) "and justifies it." There is no inconsistency, such as A. Réville sets up (John 2: 20), between the Synoptists' account and John's representing that JESUS and the Baptist were at work for some time simultaneously. Moreover, as so the Galilean ministry is concerned, John distinctly recognises it, whatever H. Holtzmann may say about such visits being "merely episodes" (John 2: 1-12; John 4: 43-54, John 6: 1-7, 10). Logy (p. 64) asks: "How could Jesus have preached at Jerusalem several years, declaring Himself Messiah, without being arrested?" The wordy underlined do but savour of romance. At first no idea of a "permanent miracle," such as Loisy attributes to the Evangelist, is needed. the attitude of the "Jews" for some time was one of sceptical inquiry, of unwillingness to believe, rather than hostility. The incident in the Temple (John 2) will be discussed below. It is not until we reach John 8 that the "Jews'" threatening demeanour towards the Lord personally becomes acute. Even so, between the first (John 8: 59) and second attempt to stone Him (John 10: 31), we still find them asking Him, "How long dost Thou keep us in suspense?" (John 10: 24). If He was to be arrested, it would be by the servants of the high-priest, but they served for protection, evidently sympathising with and giving effect to the feelings of many in the Judæan crowds, who had their spokesman in the Sanhedrin itself (John 7: 40-52).

The second distinctly named Passover comes at John 6: 4, the third at John 11: 55 which speaks, in any case, of the last. According to this, the length of the whole ministry would be about two years (Irenæus, 2, 22-3). So Delitzsch's article, "Passover," in Riehm's Handbook. Briggs, however, is of opinion that the scheme of the fourth Gospel in this respect coincides with that of the Synoptists, and that there were no other distinct Passovers than the one spoken of in the present passage and that mentioned in John 11: 55 (p. 54). *Cf.* Milligan's view.

54 John 2: 13. — "The Jews' Passover." Critics use this as an indication that the writer was a Gentile. It seems, however, to mean no more than either that, as it in the first time the festival is mentioned by John, he so describes it for the information of his first readers — Gentiles — in Asia Minor, or that it is used in distinction from the Christian Passover, which we know formed subject of controversy between East and West after his death. And yet, pace the neo-critics Matthew (Matt. 28: 15), too, makes use of the word (*cf.* Luke 23: 51).

Cf. Paul's way of speaking of Mount Sinai (not as "the mount of God") in Gal. 4: 25.

55 John 2: 14 *ff.* — See note 117 on Mark 11: 15, parallel with Matt. 21: 12 *f.* and Luke 19: 45 *f.*, and W. Kelly's "Lectures on Matthew." Wendt says: "Such an act can only once be morally justified" Yet he recognises the differences in verses 16, 18-20 from the Synoptic accounts of the occasion with which the other Evangelists are concerned. Thus, comparing verse 18 with Matt. 20: 23 *ff.*, anyone may

see that while the leaders there also demand the authority of JESUS, He refers to the baptism of John, not, as here, to death and resurrection, as supplying it. Surprise has been expressed (*cf.* note 53) that there was no resistance offered, as to which, without resorting to the supposition that the Lord's supernatural manner overawed the traffickers, Carr says that it may be sufficiently explained by "the popular dislike to these bazaars, which were suppressed not long afterwards." So great was the odium which the family of Annas, in whose interest they were held, really earned. To this the Talmud witnesses. Horton ("Teaching of Jesus," p. 215) well compares Mark 1: 27 for "that air of authority observable from the outset" of the Lord's career.

56 John 2: 16. — "My Father." This contradicts the Gnostics' idea that the God (Creator) of the Old Testament was not "the Father" spoken of by our Lord. Observe that in the cleansing of the Temple described by the Synoptists, instead of "My Father's house," we find "your house," because then the Jews had fully rejected Christ. For thy designation of His opponents, here especially the leaders, *cf.* John 7: 15, 35, John 8: 22, John 13: 33, etc.

57 John 2: 20. — The restoration of Zerubbabel's temple was completed only A.D. 64. Reckoning the forty-six years from Herod's commencement of the work B.C. 20 (Josephus, "B. J.," 1: 21), we reach the year 26 of the new era — i.e., the first of the Lord's ministry. For the force of the aorist οἰκοδομήθη here, Field aptly compares Ezra 5: 16. The A.V., to which Mr. J. N. Darby's version adheres, is singularly close: the temple was not yet finished. Schmiedel, for once, supports Lightfoot on John's precision. For the use made of the Lord's words against Him judicially, see Mark 14: 58.

58 John 2: 21. — The minister of the Hampstead Congregational Church, Dr. Horton (following Reuss, Wendt, etc.), alleges against the Evangelist misinterpretation of the Master's mind ("Teaching of Jesus," p. 164). As to such wanton treatment of this Gospel, the late Dr. Friedrich Blass, a happy representative of learned German "laymen," has sententiously remarked "that it becomes us moderns to query whether any can now know better than a contemporary," See also note on 12: 32 *f.*

58a John 2: 22. — "The Scripture" seems to be Ps. 16: 10.

59 John 2: 23 *f.* — As to πιστεύειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, see note 17 above. It is a long cry from a miracle wrought to confirm those already believers (see verse 14) to another designed to impress sceptics. Ostensible discipleship, acceptance of instruction, is independent of living faith (6: 60, 64; Matt. 28: 19; Mark 16: 16). The present passage shows that such faith may be superficial (*cf.* John 7: 31, John 8: 31 [proof of discipleship must be given], John 10: 38), which takes its character from the Lord's leaving them without excuse (John 11: 45 *f.*). In the last, real fidelity to Him is in question. See also John 6: 68 and John 17: 21, 23, where, for disciples and the world alike, moral transcend physical impressions.

60 John 2: 25. — This should be considered in connection with the Lord's choice of Judas and probable difficulties raised at the time this Gospel was written by unbelievers questioning His deity. *Cf.* Mark 2: 8, where the same faultless insight is attributed already to the "historical Jesus."

Such as believe without confession of Christ appear again in John 12: 42 *f.* They had not yet learnt what discipleship was. Nicodemus, in the next chapter, was one of the better examples in that day.

NOTES ON THE THIRD CHAPTER

61 The beginning, with this chapter, of a series of discourses characteristic of the Gospel of John calls for some development of what has been said in note 7 upon the treatment these have received at the hands of critics. Westcott, in his conservative "Introduction to the Study of the Gospels," has remarked that, as compared with the Synoptists, in the fourth Gospel there is a "transition from one

world of thought to another . . . a contrast in form and spirit between the earlier and later narratives" (p. 249). As the leading conservative scholar in Germany says, the Johannine teaching is "esoteric" (Zahn, 2: 528). It is, however, with the statement of the narrowly "scientific" writers that we have to deal.

One of the objections of F. W. Newman (following Strauss) was that the Evangelist makes our Lord and the Baptist speak in the same, his own manner (p. 153 *f.*). As to this, reference might be made to the Reply to the younger Newman made in "The Irrationalism of Infidelity" by J. N. Darby, whom Mr. Benn (in a footnote of his second volume) describes as "fanatical." The present writer, from twelve years' acquaintance with the "Irish clergyman" towards the close of his life, found him the very opposite of what one may suppose Tertullian as a Montanist or George Fox to have been, and singularly characterised by the Pauline *σωφρονισμός* (2 Tim. 1: 7). For a balanced objective appreciation, see Cheetham, "History of the Christian Church since the formation" (1907), p. 306 *f.*

See, further, an interesting letter by the elder Newman in Plummer, p. 100, on the difference between the ancient and the modern mind with regard to the use of direct for indirect speech.

Renan, while accepting the historical character of the narrative portion of the Gospel, treated the speeches as romance. So Jülicher: a "philosophical fiction," "prose poem," and much to the same purpose you find in Weizsäcker, Pfleiderer, and the Holtzmanns. Wendt, on the other hand, attaches restore credit to the discourses than to the incidents reported, and seeks to show the harmony between the Synoptic and Johannine teaching. But, asks Wernle, is it psychologically possible that Jesus preached alternately in the manner of the Sermon on the Mount and of John 14-16? (p. 421; *cf.* Gardner, p. 165). Goethe does not seem to have felt any such difficulty; *cf.* the great difference between the second part of his "Faust" from the first. Contrast the late Dr. Hort's "Dissertations," etc., with his "Village Sermons." We have to remember the very different audiences our Lord would have in Jerusalem from those in Galilee or Peræa. Of course, much depends for us on the way in which we regard the mystery of His Person.

Again, German writers raise a difficulty over the "eyewitness" of the Evangelist impeaching this in respect of the conversations with Nicodemus, the Samaritan woman, and Pilate. Briggs' scheme of the ministry would get Over this so far as regards Nicodemus, especially if we suppose (although the wind in the trees may suggest Olivet) that the Lord lodged in John's house at Jerusalem (*cf.* John 19: 27). The record in the fourth chapter is not prejudiced by the statement that "His disciples had gone away to the city," which are the Evangelist's own parenthetical words, besides being in accordance with his manner; and if he himself stayed behind, he would be reticent about it, whilst the propriety of language admits of exception from the *whole* number of the disciples. As for Pilate's judgment-hall, the fourth Evangelist records how "the beloved disciple" hovered about the scenes of this chapter of our Lord's sorrows, and the words exchanged between Him and Pilate may accordingly have well been within John's hearing.

The question of possible *interpolation* is discussed. Delff ("Fourth Gospel," p. 11) has suggested that a considerable amount of matter has been added by a later hand, which H. Holtzmann and Jülicher will not allow, for they insist on the unity of the book, but Wellhausen, in his lately published monograph, supports the idea. Some of his supposed "interpolations" are taken seriatim in notes below. This idea of interpolation is a favourite resource of critics when stumbling on passages which contradict their theories.

The Evangelist's own comments are for the most part easily discerned. Such are John 2: 21 *f.*, John 7: 39, John 8: 6, John 11: 31, 51 *f.*, John 12: 6, 16, 33, John 13: 11, John 18: 2. Other alleged cases are uncertain, as John 1: 16-18, John 3: 13, 16-21, 31-36, where commentators differ as to who is the

speaker.

Much is made of this Evangelist's supposed dependence on Paul's writings, the publication of all of which is generally supposed to have been intermediate between the appearance of the last of the Synoptic Gospels and that of the fourth. H. Holtzmann attributes the authorship of this to a John who was an Ephesian disciple of Paul, and quotes the Epistle to the Ephesians, as Jülicher that to the Romans, in support of this position. Holtzmann supposes that the "critical" John was afterwards confounded with the son of Zebedee, so that a later generation ascribed the writing of the Gospel to "the beloved disciple" ("Introduction," p. 170). This notion is reflected in the American Professor Bacon's book ("Deutero-Pauline Christianity of *Theologos*," etc.). Weiss ("New Testament Theology," ii., p. 228), on the conservative side, sees the influence of the Epistle to the Hebrews on John's thought. There is a useful note in Salmon (p. 265) on the parallels gathered between the Pauline writings and the Johannine. See also Stevens, chapter 15, Bernard, p. 12 *f*. The recent English and American writers generally show scarcely more balance than the German and French (as Loisy). There is little to choose between Professor Wernle's saying that John is a mere plagiarist of Paul ("Beginnings," ii., pp. 262, 264, 274) and Mr. Scott's committal to the statement, "The Evangelist is everywhere indebted to Paul" (p. 46) "for almost all his larger doctrines" (p. 49). Of course, no one could deny that, as far as we can judge from *writings*, "it was Paul who first conceived of the glorified Christ as the real object of faith" the manner of his conversion determined that. That the basis of the life of each of these two Apostles was "profoundly mystical" (Illingworth, chapter 9) all would allow. But whilst Paul sets the believer in Christ before God, John sets God in Christ before the believer; in other words, the one instructs us in the Divine counsels, the other in the Divine nature. Scott speaks of John's advancing on Paul (p. 51), but this is gratuitous: the types of doctrine are throughout really distinct. The Church had already received the Pauline scheme, the Johannine, assuming the Synoptic accounts, was needed to complete the doctrine, not of the *Church*, but of the *Person of Christ*.

Even as regards the truths of redemption, Mr. Scott is at sea. A writer must be infatuated who can say that "sin has a subordinate place" in John's Gospel (p. 51 *f*.). The Evangelist's sense of the acuteness of it is evidenced by John 16: 8, 9. Paul's writings had sufficiently emphasised it in respect of man's *need*. On p. 52 we are told that Paul's doctrine of atonement has disappeared, in the sense of being transcended; and that John takes exclusive account of the Life as possessing the significance which Paul attached to the Cross. But this writer must have forgotten Rom. 5: 10: "Much more . . . we shall be saved by His life." That John 8: 33-39 flows from Rom. 6: 16-23 (*cf.* Gal. 4: 30) there is no more ground for Mr. Scott's saying than any other writer's alleging the converse. Indeed, it is open to so-called "apologists" to suggest that, when in the company of this "pillar" during his stay in Judæa. Paul had opportunity of learning from him as to the Lord's ministry, for "imparted nothing to me" (Gal. 2: 6) has reference to authority and capacity rather than to information.

62 John 3: 1. — "Nicodemus." As to Abbott's identification of him with Nicodemon, son of Gorion, who was employer of the water-carriers in Jerusalem during the Passover, see Westcott, *contra*.

63 John 3: 2. — "By night." See note 61 above. For Nicodemus' subsequent history, see John 7: 50 and John 19: 39. What we may learn from this state of mind in the present passage is that "it is not *learning*, but *life*, that man needs" (Govett). For the function of signs, see note 52, and *cf.* John 5: 36, John 10: 25, John 15: 24.

64 John 3: 3 *f*. — "Anew." So most commentators, as Godet, Westcott Luthardt, Weiss and Zahn here and in verse 7, after the Peschito-Syriac, etc. Origen followed, amongst others, by Bengel, Meyer and Pfleiderer, prefers the meaning "from above", "from heaven" is the interpretation put upon ἄνωθεν

by most of the Greek writers. *Cf.* Abbott, "Johannine Vocabulary," § 1,707e, referring to verse 31 and John 19: 11.

65 "The kingdom of God." This phrase is used only here in the fourth Gospel. For the connection between the Kingdom and Life *cf.* Mark 9: 43, 45, 47, and Luke 18: 18, 24. As to other links between the second (critical first) and fourth Gospels, see notes 18, 94, 122, 130, 146 on Mark, and note on verse 5 below; and in particular the exposition at p. 366.

66 John 3: 5 *ff.* — "Born of water and Spirit." Advanced critics oddly support the "Catholic" tradition that Christian Baptism is here spoken of (verse 22 *f.*), to this theory Scott adheres (p. 40). If Paul's doctrine is to control the interpretation of this Gospel, why do such writers ignore a passage like Eph. 5: 26? That the words bear some relation to the Baptism of John which Nicodemus may have shirked one may well believe (*cf.* Luke 7: 30) As to ἐκ, "out of," and the one article in the Greek, see R. Govett's exposition of the passage. A reference to the Jewish baptism of proselytes owes its plausibility to that practice, which originated in part from the interpretation put on Ezek. 36 cited in the Exposition. *Cf.* Seeley, "Ecce Homo," p. 98.

66a "Enter into the kingdom." See note 99 on Mark. "Enter" seems to be always used of the time of recompense. *Cf.* Matt. 25: 21, Luke 24: 26, with, of course, Matt. 18: 3, which links itself specially with this passage of John. The Messianic bearing of the first Gospel must always be kept in mind. Readers of Mr. Scott's book might derive from it an impression that the fourth Evangelist discards that point of view, which would be a mistake.

67 John 3: 11. — The Lord takes up the "We know" of Nicodemus. "We" here seems used by Christ of Himself, as in Mark 4: 30. So Theophylact of old, Ryle and McRory among moderns. If it mean John the Baptist as well as Himself (so Zahn), then there is a reference to the law's requirement of two witnesses (Govett). Luthardt, Godet and Westcott understand it of the disciples associated by the Lord with Himself.

68 John 3: 13. — "That is in heaven." Words actually spoken by the Lord on earth, not supposing the Ascension accomplished, as Weiss thinks, apparently with John 6: 62 in mind (*cf.* Arnold, "God and the Bible," chapter 6, § 5). It is probably the later passage that induces some to take verse 13 here as parenthetical, and as words of the Evangelist himself (note 61).

As to the note on ὧν (p. 60 of the Exposition), see Winer, p. 429. Bengel has been followed by Hofmann, Luthardt, Weiss, Barth and Zahn, some founding it on the passage in John 6, whilst the last-named writer refers to John 9: 25. Moulton is amongst those who reject these words.

69 John 3: 15. — "Life eternal." Oosterzee, comparing this with John 6: 35, says that it expresses established personal communion with Christ ("Theology of the New Testament," p. 170). *Cf.* notes 106, 110 on Mark. The rendering in R.V. results from acceptance of en (see critical note), whilst Mr. Kelly has followed it, etc.

70 John 3: 16-18. — Tholuck, Luthardt, Godet, Westcott, Sadler, and Plummer, after Erasmus and others, take this and the following verses to 21 as words of the Evangelist himself (note 61). That, however, the third person is used does not tell against the Lord's speaking the words may be seen from John 4: 10, John 5: 19, 29. If they are His (Zahn), Christ speaks of Himself definitely as Son of God (*cf.* Sanday, *s. tit.* in Hastings, "D. B.," p. 572). He used the third person when speaking of Himself as Son of man also (Mark, as John).

On the significance of verse 16 for the *Biblical* doctrine of Atonement, see essay on that subject by Von Gerdell, pp. 42, 77. He pulverises the theological travesty of it, to which unbelievers have rightly

shown no mercy.

For the sentiment *cf.*, of course, Rom. 8: 32, 2, Cor. 9: 15. As to the scope of salvation here conflicting with the narrower outlook of the Synoptists (Matt. 10: 5 *f.*, etc.), observe that it is precisely when the Lord is speaking in Judæa that He strikes the universalistic note, and when away from there that He speaks of His mission having been to the "lost sheep of the house of Israel." In verse 16 we have the compassion of the love of God as such (*cf.* note on John 16: 2).

John 3: 17 is on the same lines as John 12: 47. As to John 9: 39, see note there.

71 John 3: 19. — "Loved." Ryle, comparing John 15: 8 and also Rom. 8: 30 would take the aorist here as "proleptic" — that is, in a present sense. See however, Mr. Kelly's footnote on John 13: 31, where reference is made to John 15: 6.

72 John 3: 20 *f.* — *Cf.* v. 29, where the same distinction obtains between ποιεῖν, said of good, and πράσσειν, of evil.

73 John 3: 22-30. — This passage Briggs regards as synchronising with Mark 3: 18 *ff.*

74 John 3: 22. — "He . . . baptised." *Cf.* verse 26. Schmiedel (col. 2,538) sets against this John 4: 2. But what about Pilate's scourging JESUS, and his writing the superscription for the Cross?

75 John 3: 24. — Wernle ("Sources," p. 27 *f.*) treats this parenthetical note as "correcting" the Synoptists, as though they stated that the Lord's work in Galilee, with which His ministry opens in their Gospels, was the beginning of His public activity! Briars, in his last book, raps the knuckles of a good many answerable for such "historical" criticism (*cf.* note on Mark 1: 13 *f.*).

76 John 3: 26. — Schmiedel (col. 2,538), after H. Holtzmann, finds a contradiction here to verse 32. That is, the people say to the Baptist something, to be taken for what it is worth, to which he (or Matthew Arnold's "theological lecturer") takes exception. In any case, where is the self-contradiction on the part of the Evangelist? It is in connection with such cases, of course that suggestions of dual authorship arise; but many are the cobwebs spun.

77 John 3: 31-36. — The words are taken as the Baptist's by Luthardt, Godet, Plummer and Zahn. See, again, note 61, as for the last preceding note. Erasmus's view, that they are the Evangelist's, has been followed by Bengel, Tholuck, Westcott, Sadler, and Milligan. Nothing seems to be gained by the suggestion, nothing to need amendment in the older view, followed by the expositor. The words may have been suggested to the Baptist by those contained in Matt. 9: 15.

John 3: 32. — "No one receiveth His testimony." This has been set in conflict with verse 26, where, however, we meet with exaggeration of fervour: so Weiss and Westcott. The latter notes the singular darkness and hopelessness of the close of the Apostolic age (*cf.* 1 John 5: 19).

78 John 3: 32 *f.* — See J. H. Newman ("Apologia," p. 199): "In religious inquiry we arrive at certitude by accumulated probabilities." *Cf.* the examination of that book by J. N. Darby. We have in verse 33 the touchstone of the quality of a man's "faith."

79 John 3: 36. — Mr. Darby, in his version, has rendered ἀπειθῶν, "not subject," as supporting the view that the Baptist was the speaker (*cf.* Luke 3: 7).

The words of this verse expose the delusion of a modern idea that, because God is love, He forgives as such, not because of the death of His Son.

NOTES ON THE FOURTH CHAPTER

80 Comparing Luke 9: 51-56 with the contents of this chapter, Von Soden discredits the success among the Samaritans here recorded. That is, when one Evangelist speaks of the resistance shown to His ministry by Samaritans when the Lord is going in the direction of Jerusalem southwards, and another records a journey from Jerusalem northwards. which has a different result, the two accounts are held to clash. There is a good deal of the same superficial criticism in such literature. The writer named is silent upon the words of verse 9.

80a John 4: 1. — Observe "the Lord" of the Evangelist, and "Jesus" of the Pharisees, and for "the Lord," *cf.* John 6: 23, John 11: 2, John 20: 20. "Knew," supernaturally (Milligan). *Cf.* 2: 24.

81 John 4: 2 *f.* — Wellhausen treats this as an editorial interpolation made to remove apparent discrepancy between the fourth Evangelist (*cf.* John 3: 22) and the Synoptists. If that, however, had been really felt, would not the course likely to be taken by any editor be to leave out the words "and baptizeth," which he found in the autograph? Here the Evangelist reverts to "Jesus," because he seems to be quoting a report. So Moffatt.

82 John 4: 5. — "Sychar." Doubt was at one time felt as to the Evangelists accuracy in this name. It was supposed to stand for Sichem, which is given by the Sinaitic Syriac, whilst the Harclensian recension has "Sychar." Eusebius, settled at Cæsarea, distinguished them. Thomson's identification of the place with the modern Askar was questioned by Grove, but it has been upheld by G. A. Smith in his "Historical Geography of Palestine": "The author knew the place about which he was writing" (p. 368 *ff.*). That was not Shechem, the modern Nablûs.

83 John 4: 6. — οὕτως, "thus." Field, apparently following Chrysostom — "as it changed" — for which see also 5: 30, 8: 40. That is, just as He was (*cf.* Mark 4: 36). The "wearied," as Zahn says (ii. 539), emphasises His humanity.

84 "Sixth hour." As to John's way of reckoning hours, see note on John 19: 14.

85 John 4: 7 *ff.* — Dr. Abbott, on the ground alleged that "no disciple was present," says that "it is practically certain that the dialogue did not occur in the exact words recorded" ("Encycl. Bibl.," col. 1,801). As to the absence of all disciples, see in note 61 above, to which may be added here the consideration that we are not to suppose all persons with whom Christ spoke kept the knowledge of such conversations to themselves. It is practically certain that they would reproduce at least the substance of Christ's words to them. For this *cf.* what the expositor has said in the volume on Mark (p. 10, foot).

86 John 4: 9. — "A Jew." She knew Him to be such by His dress. See Schor "Palestine and the Bible." Here used in the broadest sense. So in verse 22, unlike John 7: 1, etc.

87 "For Jews have no intercourse with Samaritans." These words are treated as parenthetical in the R.V. — that is, as an explanatory comment of the Evangelist. Calvin considered them to be spoken by the woman.

88 "The gift of God." Luthardt, Govett and Zahn take this in the same way as the expositor. Godet, Westcott (referring to John 3: 16), and Carr follow Stier, who explains it of Christ. But Jeremy Taylor rightly described that as "too vague." "Christ, the smitten rock, was the source" (Govett).

88a John 4: 14. — "Shall not thirst for ever." So Govett, referring to Rev. 21: 6.

89 John 4: 20. — Οἱ προσκυνεῖν, see Abbott, "Johannine Vocabulary," §§ 1,640-1,651.

90 John 4: 22. — Olshausen, followed by Ryle, takes σωτηρία as equivalent to "the Saviour." Cf. Luke 19: 9.

90a John 4: 21-24. — "The hour." This present dispensation, which is only for a while: it will give place to the millennial. As to the character of worship on earth then, see Govett, pp. 145 f.

"God (θεός) is a Spirit (πνεῦμα)." The word θεός in latest philological research has been connected with "breath," "spirit." See article GOD in Hauck's "Encyclopædia," vol. 6, p. 780.

91 John 4: 25. — "That is called Christ." Here, again, brackets have been used in the R.V. to indicate a parenthesis, the Revisers understanding the words to be the Evangelist's addition, not used by the woman. "The woman expected a teacher, not a liberator" (Horton, p. 191).

92 John 4: 26 f. — The first direct assertion by our Lord that He is "the Christ," and outside the Jewish territory. On the disclosure of this to a woman, Quesnel has remarked: "It is a great mistake to suppose that the knowledge of the mysteries of religion ought not to be imparted to women.... The abuse of the Scriptures and the sin of heresies did not proceed from the simplicity of women, but from the conceited learning of men."

92a "Wondered," etc. The rabbinical rule, much quoted (from Dr. John Lightfoot), was that a man should not speak even to his wife in the street. See "Jewish Prayer-Book" (Eyre and Spottiswoode), p. 185. The knowledge of this prejudice shown by the Evangelist is one of the indications of his Jewish nationality. Others occur in v. 1 ff., John 7: 22, 27, 49, John 12: 34, etc. (see note 1, ad fin.)

93 John 4: 28 f. — Origen calls her the "apostle of the Samaritans," whilst Cyril notes that after Christ had first bidden her call her husband, she finally of her own behest called all the men to Him, and receiving the talent of the glad tidings, she at once put it out to interest.

The R V. has, "Can this be the Christ?" according to the form used in verse 33, but the older rendering practically comes to the same thing.

94 John 4: 34. — Augustine here remarks that we should not be surprised by the woman's not understanding about the *water* of which Christ spoke to her when His disciples misunderstood what He said about food. This verse (cf. John 9: 4) explains the "must" of verse 4 above.

95 John 4: 38. — Origen: "Did not Moses and Elias the sowers rejoice with the reapers, Peter, James, and John, when they saw the glory of the Son of God at the Transfiguration?"

96 John 4: 43 f. — "His own country." It is difficult to determine whether this means Galilee or Judæa. Meyer, Hofmann, Luthardt, Govett and Zahn say Galilee, suggested by the like expression in the Synoptic Gospels (see note on Mark 1: 21), whilst Origen, Maldonatus, the approved Roman Catholic commentator (whom Kenrick follows), Westcott, Sadler, Milligan, Plummer, Norris, Reynolds, Wendt, Schmiedel and Carr (see his note) take it of Judæa. If the second view be right, we have here, of course, a recognition by the fourth Evangelist of the birth at Bethlehem, of which critics represent him as "knowing nothing."

Cyril; Calvin, H. Holtzmann, Field, and Briggs decide for Nazareth; Chrysostom and Euthymius, Capernaum. Cf. also Mark 6: 4 for its bearing on the question.

97 John 4: 48. — Cf. Mark 8: 12 and note 27 on that Gospel; also Matt. 12: 39. It is not a question so much of the Lord's own attitude or that of the disciples (which fluctuated) towards miracles as that of the mass of the people, which none of the Evangelists adopt, although critical works might lead one to suppose such was the case.

98 John 4: 54. — This incident is not to be confused with that in Luke 7.

99 The working of "a sign" by way of display ("epideictic"), apart from some groundwork of antecedent faith (*cf.* John 11: 26 *f.* with verse 40 there), can no more be charged against the Johannine than the Synoptic miracles (*cf.* John 2: 11 and note 52).

NOTES ON THE FIFTH CHAPTER

100 John 5: 1. — Most commentators (including the Reformers) follow Irenæus, Eusebius, and Theodoret, etc., in taking the feast here spoken of as a Passover Jerome, followed by Norris, thought that it was Pentecost; Neander, Meyer, Weiss, M'Clellan and Milligan, *Purim*; Zahn (reading the article), *Tabernacles*. As to the number of Passovers during the ministry, see note 52.

101 John 5: 2. — "There is." Blass (*Expository Times*, July, 1907) followed Bengel in accepting this as an indication of the date of the writing of the Gospel, as earlier than that of the Roman devastation.

102 John 5: 8. — "Took up his couch." The simplicity of the process has been brought home to those visiting the recent Palestine Exhibitions. See Schor. "Palestine and the Bible," p. 38. As to its taking place on the Sabbath day, (verse 10), *cf.* Jer. 17: 21.

103 John 5: 13. — For the apparently miraculous withdrawal here, *cf.* John 10: 39, as well as Luke 4: 30. The word used in this place is a solecism. See Westcott or Govett, in *loc.*

104 John 5: 14. — "Sin no more": a note of our Lord's omniscience.

105 John 5: 18. — "Broke." Lit., "was loosing." *Cf.* Matt. 18: 18, and see also John 10: 33.

105a 22. — As to alleged inconsistency with 15: 2, see note there. The ascription of "judgment" to the Son (*cf.* v. 27) is by no means peculiar to the fourth Gospel. See Matt. 7: 22 and other references in Turton, p. 448.

106 John 5: 24 *f.* — De Wette, Olshausen, Meyer and Plummer explain this resurrection similarly to the expositor. The passage has been misused by such as those spoken of in 2 Tim. 2: 18.

"Cometh." For this present tense, *Cf.* John 4: 36, John 6: 46 *f.*, 64, and John 12: 25. In the last passage the future is used co-ordinately.

Observe that the Lord speaks of Himself a second time definitely as "Son of God" (see note 70 above, and *cf.* 9: 35, 10: 36, 11: 4). It is a favourite notion of critics that such is language merely of the Evangelist.

107 John 5: 26. — The all-important words are "in Himself" (*cf.* John 6: 67). Athanasius ("Orations against Arians," iii.) says: "The word *gave* shows us that the Son is a distinct Person from the Father, but the use of the word "so" is a clear proof of His being the natural Son, equal to, co-essential with the Father.... As the Father hath, so hath the Son from the Father, self-existence" (*cf.* note 8, *ad fin.*). Observe the aorist ἔδωκεν, "gave," not the perfect δέδωκεν, "hath given," for it transcends time.

108 John 5: 28 *f.* — The difference of time in the two judgments is recognised by Meyer and Beyschlag. An objection made that the two resurrections take place in the same hour is rebutted by verse 26, where the spiritual resurrection which has gone on for nearly two millenniums is also called an "hour." A resurrection of the wicked does not emerge so clearly from the Synoptic accounts. That there is to be no general contemporaneous resurrection was foreshadowed by Ps. 1: 6: "The wicked shall not *arise* in the judgment, nor sinners in the assembly of the righteous." See LXX. and Vulgate

(*resurgent*). The German critics no more apprehend the sense of *qum* there than English translators, who alike adhere to "stand." But *cf.* Matt. 12: 41, where all assign to ἀναστήσονται, in the same form of words, its natural meaning. The usual idea is that the Old Testament uniformly predicates resurrection of the righteous *alone*, but the point is that they who have done good and those that have done evil will *not* rise *together*. *Cf.* Simcox on Rev. 20: 6. The Pharisees supposed that only the righteous would live again (Josephus, "Antiquities," xviii. 14; 2 Macc. 6: 26; and other references in Bousset, "Religion of Judaism," p. 259).

The present passage was so inconvenient to the Tübingen school that Scholten resorted to the usual makeshift — suggestion of interpolation — which feeble resource has had to do duty for several others since (see, *e.g.*, amongst recent writers, Briggs, p. 145).

109 John 5: 30. — See note on John 4: 6.

109a John 5: 31. — As to supposed conflict of this verse with John 8: 14, see note there. Observe the use of the word "witness" throughout verses 31-39. It occurs, in one form or other, some fifty times in this Gospel; "believe" about one hundred times.

110 John 5: 35. — *Cf.* Sirach, 48: 1.

110a John 5: 36. — "Witness greater" representing μείζω, accepted by Blass, who understands "witness in greater measure." μείζων would mean "I the witness, a greater," etc. (see Zahn).

As to the evidence of "works" or "signs," see John 3: 2 and references there.

111 John 5: 37. — The distinction of this witness from that of the Scriptures (verse 38) is maintained by Chrysostom, Bengel, and others, who refer it to the Lord's baptism, etc. Ryle (following Calvin, Tholuck, Alford, and Burgon) preferred to regard it as coalescing with the testimony borne by the Old Testament writings.

112 John 5: 39. — The word ἐπιανῶτε is taken as *indicative* by Cyril, Erasmus, Beza, Bengel, Meyer, Olshausen, Tholuck, De Wette, Burgon, Kenrick, Godet, Westcott (citing Hillel), Plummer, Govett, Kennedy, Manning, McRory, and Carr; as *imperative* by Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euthymius, Augustine, Luther, Calvin, Grotius, a Lapide, Stier, Luthardt, Alford, Wordsworth, Ryle M'Clellan, and Field. The last-named very judicious scholar remarks that we should not stop short at "eternal life," as if the ὅτι had no influence beyond those words. The revisers, however, having decided to give up the A.V. their rendering will probably establish itself. J. N. Darby, in his versions had adopted the indicative. Certainly the words "ye think" suggest it.

"Life eternal." This was a later development accepted by the Pharisees (Watson, "Inspiration," p. 142).

113 John 5: 43. — "Another." Bousset has rightly taken this of *Antichrist*, not of Bar Kochba (A.D. 132), as Pfleiderer, followed by Schmiedel (col. 2,551). The absurdity, again, of applying these words to the *Popedom* is clear from several New Testament passages, commencing with 2 Thess. 2. The Popes have never come in their own name, but in that of Peter they own the Father and the Son (1 John 2: 18-23), and Jesus Christ coming in the flesh (1 John 4: 2). Bousset, in the "Encyclopaedia Britannica" (vol. i., col. 177), following his work on Antichrist, takes 2 Thess. 2: 1-12 as his starting-point, he sees that the Antichrist must be a Jew, and that any "preterist or historical interpretation is out of the question" (col. 181). Swete, in like manner, thinks that the "second beast" of Rev. 13 is in some sense Antichrist ("Commentary on Apocalypse," *ad loc.*).

114 John 5: 44. — The force of the aorist πιστεῦσαι is well brought out by Abbott: "to reach the

threshold of belief" (§ 2,496 *f.*; *cf.* note on 12: 39).

115 John 5: 46 *f.* — In connection with the supremacy attached to Holy Scripture by our Lord, it may be helpful to consider what has been said by a few recent writers of repute on FAITH in general, and, in particular, its relation to SCRIPTURE. In the valuable Note 2 appended to Westcott's "Historic Faith" (pp. 73-77) he discriminates "a conviction of truth [knowledge], a quickening of love [feeling], a readiness for action [will]," which last is represented by "an advance into the unseen . . . wholly different from a belief in past facts which rests on testimony [intellectual assent]." The present Bishop of Birmingham, in his "Creed of the Christian" (p. 33), has said: "In order to act decisively, we must believe decisively," which is a repetition, in other words, of the prophet's teaching: "If ye do not hold fast, ye will not stand fast" (Isa. 7: 9). Dr. Gore, inquiring as to the essence of faith, answers that it is "the open hand or open mouth of the human soul" (p. 53). Next, where does Scripture come in? Dr. J. H. Newman shall reply. In a letter printed in Miss Mozley's "Letters and Correspondence" of this eminent man (vol. ii., p. 113), which he wrote to Hurrell Froude in 1835, we find: "The more I read of Athanasius, Theodoret, etc., the more I see that the ancients did make the Scriptures the basis of belief . . . The Fathers do certainly rest on Scripture, as upon two tables of stone." There is, happily, no reason for supposing that when he went over to Rome Newman had to abandon this conviction. And so we are prepared for what Professor Herrmann (a Ritzachlian) says in his "Faith and Morals" (p. 18): "The common idea [of Faith] is an acknowledgment of the whole Bible as God's Word and true, coupled with firm trust in its narratives and doctrines." He adds, critically: "That is no more than the Catholic idea of Faith." but then, as he says. Tradition is annexed to it by "Catholics." This it is which makes all the difference, for Superstition, which is purely carnal tends to swamp Faith. "For the writer of this Gospel," says Inge, "Faith is not an acceptance of a proposition upon evidence. It is the resolution to follow Christ wherever He may lead us" ("Christian Mysticism," p. 50). See, further, note on vi. 69, also Green, iii., pp. 253-276; and chapter iv. of Sir R. Anderson's "The Gospel and its Ministry."

NOTES ON THE SIXTH CHAPTER

116 John 6: 5-9. — As to the close connection of Philip and Andrew with John, see Lightfoot on Colossians, p. 45 *f.*

"A lad." On the baker's "boy," see Schor, "Palestine and the Bible," pp. 32, 58.

117 John 6: 11. — One miserable attempt to get rid of this miracle has been to suggest that Jesus and His disciples shared their provisions with some of the crowd, others following their example. From those who indulge in such explanations one may well ask for a reason why the people thought our Lord the Messiah, and wished to make Him King? That is significantly forgotten.

117a John 6: 12*f.* — "Fragments." Or "broken pieces," as R.V. The command is peculiar to this Gospel.

118 John 6: 14. — "The prophet." See Deut. 18: 15, and *cf.* John 11: 27 (Matt. 11: 3, Luke 7: 19), John 12: 13. There the testimony is that of His works (*cf.* chapter 9), as in John 7: 40 of His teaching.

118a John 6: 15. — As to kingship of JESUS, predicted in the Old Testament, see, further, Micah 5: 2, Jer. 23, 5, Ps. 89, etc., and *cf.* note on Luke 1: 32 *f.* When our Lord did offer Himself us King, the Jews refused Him (Matt. 21: 15). Godet would explain the "compelled" of Mark 6: 45 (Matt. 14: 22) by what we are told here.

119 John 6: 16 *ff.* — H. Holtzmann criticises "withdrew again to the mountain," because the Lord is not said previously to have left the mountain. And so Schmiedel and Heitmüller after him. One might

well suppose that such writers are devoid entirely of imagination. A tract of hilly country is in question, into which Christ further penetrated. (So Weiss; *cf.* note 39 on Mark.) The "again" may suggest difficulty; but, as the critical note shows, that, to say no more, is a doubtful reading.

120 John 6: 17 *ff.* — *Cf.* note 65 on Mark. For such power over sea and waves, *cf.* Ps. 107: 23-31. Matthew's parallel (Matt. 14: 33) shows that the disciples worshipped Him as Son of God. Are we to be told of an interpolation there?

120a John 6: 19. — "On the sea." The same Greek in John 21: 1 has been quoted for the meaning "at" (beside, on the bank of) the sea. But even there it may mean "on." In either case it expresses loose connection. As to attempts made, as by Paulus, to explain it away, see Turton, p. 412. Taking the miracle and the discourse which follows it in connection with the Lord's Supper (as do Catholics), certain critics have this notion so much on the brain that one of them — Schmiedel — will have it that the walking on the water was "intended to signify that exaltation of Jesus above the limitations of space necessary to render possible the presence of His glorified body at every celebration of the Eucharist!" (col. 2,521). Where "progress" — for it is imagination — beyond ecclesiastical tradition comes in it is indeed difficult to discover.

121 John 6: 22-24. — Unbelievers of today are not seldom at issue with sceptics in the time of the Evangelist, those of old could not understand the Lord's walking along the shore within that short interval (verse 25). Some now, doubtless, would gladly discover differences in manuscripts here, so us to be able to suggest "accretions."

122 John 6: 27 *ff.* — "Son of man." Not Christ, the Son of God, as Gnostics would have said: their Christ was not "Son of man" at all. Observe that, to meet their error, the Evangelist constantly speaks of our Lord as Jesus, and that here is the Son of man Whom the Father has sealed, attested, as His Son.

The Rabbins said that the seal of God was קדש , the three letters of which are respectively the first, the middle, and the last of the alphabet (Edersheim, ii. 29). Comparing verse 29 with Rom. 1: 5, may we not say that Paul's words are an echo of our Lord's here?

123 John 6: 35. — The Lord here, for the first time, speaks of Himself as "the Bread," so that some, as Alford and Govett, would in verse 33 render by "that which" rather than by "He who," verse 34 indicating ambiguity. As to hunger and thirst, see on verses 51-56. For "ye believe not," *cf.* John 16: 9. Above all else, faith is due to God (*cf.* Mark 16: 14 *ff.*). No quarter is given here to hyper-Calvinism.

124 John 6: 42. — Forcible words of Von Hartmann should lead some to pause "If one sees in Jesus only the son of the carpenter Joseph and his wife Mary; this Jesus and His death can as little redeem me from my sins as, say, Bismarck can do it" ("Dissolution of Christianity," p. 92). Critics would have had the Lord here disclose His supernatural birth. But with what propriety to men in the state of mind that these were? It could but have excited their derision.

125 John 6: 47. — For the "verily, verily," *cf.* 1 John. 5: 11-13.

126 John 6: 51. — As to "living bread," see Carson, "On Interpretation," p. 81. Much use has been made of the passage in the interests of a theory of the Incarnation, by which Christ, as the Word made flesh, is supposed to be "joined to universal humanity." Words of Irenæus ("Against Heresies," v. 1) about "Christ's raising humanity into God" by His incarnation, or of Athanasius, in his treatise "On the Incarnation," where he speaks of our Lord's having "become man that we might be made God" (*liv.*), seem to have originated this notion. And so, on the one hand, Bishop Gore ("Sermon on Sin," p. 21), as, on the other, Mr. Scott (p. 208, etc.). But the Lord does not speak here of His *taking*, but of His *giving* His flesh for us (so H. Holtzmann, but misapplying it); and such passages as Eph. 5: 30 and 2

Peter 1: 4, which have been used in support of the theory, have nothing to do with the solidarity of the human race, but concern Christian believers only. The last words of verse 51 — "for the life of the world" — are said, not of Christ's life, but His death, and "Unless ye shall have eaten the flesh of the Son of man, and drunk His blood, ye have no life in yourselves" (verse 53) means that we cannot be so associated with the "historical Christ" as the theory requires. Redemption is needed for it; whilst *bona fide* children of God alone are united to Him, and that in resurrection. Out of the Patristic theory has, beyond all doubt, arisen the whole remedial system of ordinances developed in the "historical" Church. The comradeship of sacerdotalists and critics in this matter tells its own tale: different poles of error unite for mutual aid. As to the use made of this text by Annihilationists, see Turton, p. 525; and on the Incarnation in general, Green iii., pp. 207-220.

127 John 6: 52-59. — The Patristic application (as by Chrysostom and Cyril, etc.) of this passage to the Eucharist for the doctrine adopted by Wordsworth, Burgon, Williams, Sadler and Gore, as already stated. has the unwonted and by no means edifying support of some critics, as E. Holtzmann, Pfleiderer and Harnack, followed by Burkitt (p. 224 ff.) etc., from the difficulty which they experience of understanding it in its present context. But, lone ago Augustine took a healthier view of it, as, in recent times, Meyer, Hofmann Weiss ("Life of Christ," iii. 71), Godet, and Westcott. Dr. John Lightfoot (*cf.* Bishop Boyd Carpenter, "Introduction to Scripture") showed that "eating" and "drinking" were used by Jesus metaphorically, a certain rabbi is recorded to have spoken of "devouring Messiah" ("Hor. Hebr.," iii. 307 ff. Oxford edition). One will tell you that the Evangelist aimed at checking sacramental theory (so Scott); another that he himself held "high sacramental doctrine" (Burkitt); whilst a third would have it that the Lord observed the Eucharist from the beginning of His ministry (Wright)! Horton agrees with none of these (p. 298).

127a That the words were spoken to the Jews (verse 58) is, amongst others, recognised by Heitmüller, one of the latest writers on this Gospel. The lesson which they had to learn (that of Egypt and the wilderness: Bellett, p. 57) is the primary thing.

128 The reference is to Cardinal Wiseman, in his "Lectures on Doctrines and Practices," No. XIV.; also in his "Lectures on the Real Presence," p. 40 f.

Cardinal Manning's note on verse 54 says: "is here promised to the worthy receiver." There is not a word of qualification in the verse.

129 John 6: 56 f. — "Abideth in Me, and I in him." One of the passages turned to account by those who make much of John's supposed dependence on Pauline doctrine ("in Christ," "Christ in us"). Again, let it be said, it is a *dead* Christ who gives to the believer life, as it is a *risen* Christ in whom he abides. See, further, on John 15: 4 ff. Observe the use of the *present participle* here, as in verse 54, and compare the *present tense* (πιστεύετε) in verse 29: "live the life of faith" (Horton, p. 257).

"Shall live by reason of Me." See foot of p. 150, and *cf.* Rom. 5: 10; also note 192. For both the Apostles it is the resurrection life, not that of the Lord on earth.

130 John 6: 62. — *Cf.* note 68 above. This refutes Swedenborg, who held that the Lord was always casting off His manhood, so that at last only the Father remained, there was neither Son of God nor Son of man who could ascend! We are here told that Christ called Himself "Son of man," in view of *resurrection*. Swedenborg, in keeping with his theory of the Lord's earthly life, denied His *bodily* return from heaven — a negation which the Evangelist, in his Second Epistle, brands as a mark of Antichrist (verse 7; see R.V., and *cf.* John 4: 2). For further reference to the Ascension in this Gospel see John 20: 17. It is such passages as these that Wendt attributes to an "editor" (see note 2 on Introduction).

131 John 6: 67 *ff.* — "The twelve." The first time that, in this Gospel, the apostolic band is so described.

131a Paley: "slanderer" — *i.e.*, to the rulers (verse 70).

132 John 6: 68. — "To whom shall we go away?" Govett: "Before we leave what we hold, we should see what better can replace it" (p. 290). *Cf.* note 59, and see John 17: 8.

133 John 6: 69. — *Cf.* note on v. 466 above. Note the force of the *perfect*: "We have been believing" — *i.e.*, they had acquired the habit in their hearts of thinking so of Him. For the disciples it was not a question of mere opinion, for which there is no assured permanence. *Cf.* Browning's "Bishop Blougram's Apology": "With me faith means perpetual unbelief." A necessary element in it is knowledge of the truth, to which the Apostle Paul says some ever learning never attain (2 Tim. 3: 7).

Martineau has well said: "Nothing so marks the degradation of our modern Christianity as the notion that faith is only opinion — that a man may have it or not without affecting his moral worth, that it is the result of intellectual accident or opportunity, for which God will never call him to account.... Want of faith is the hypothesis of a coward, unambitious heart.... This presumption in favour of sanctity in human life is *faith*" ("Hours of Thought," vol. ii., p. 90). See also Bishop Gore's "Creed of the Christian," p. 53, and "Sermon on Sin," p. 7. It should be remembered that in Lessing's 'Nathan,' referred to by him, none of the three characters was a really typical representative of his own greed.

Weiss has written ("New Testament Theology," ii. 364) that the doctrine of John on Faith in this connection is in distinction from the Pauline view, as that in the Epistle to the Hebrews, means the conviction of the truth of the fact that Jesus is the Christ, and not a trust in the love of God in Christ (*cf.* McGiffert, p. 498). This has, happily, been pronounced by Beyschlag ("New Testament Theology," ii. 455-95.) as "the greatest possible mistake". for the Halle theologian, passages such as 14: 1 set before us "a personal surrender to Christ leading to personal communion of life with Him" (*cf.* note on verse 46 above). Again, as he says: "The confident apprehension with the heart has to precede the deliberative apprehension with the mind." Scott's view (p. 52, etc.) is very much that of Weiss, for the British writer at one time treats faith and knowledge as identical (an intellectual assent: "acceptance of a given dogma," p. 267, as to which see note 374); but also because of passages in the First Epistle in particular (*e.g.*, John 4: 16) he treats knowledge as emphatically antecedent to faith, in which he seems to confound one element of faith which precedes knowledge with another which gives place to knowledge. Acquaintance with God and Christ certainly grows out of continued trust, for John as for Paul ("I know in whom I have believed"). The "act of belief" which, Scott says, "comes at the end of a religious experience" (p. 268), is the same with each Apostle. When this writer says, "The original demand for a simple childlike faith was no longer sufficient in a theology which had allied Christianity with a metaphysical doctrine" (p. 274), one wonders how he would attempt to make this tally with the classical passage in the First Epistle of this Evangelist (1 John 2: 12-14), written subsequently to the Gospel, a knowledge of which is supposed throughout the Epistle. In singular, satisfactory contrariety to Scott's view is that of the late Dr. Martineau: "Religious faith is rather the first root of life than the last blossom of thought" (*op. cit.*). "As to what faith is psychologically," says Dr. McCosh, "no two metaphysicians explain alike" ("Gospel Sermons," p. 73). This need cause no surprise.

133a "The Holy One of God." The waiter referred to in the Exposition is Hengstenberg.

134 John 6: 70. — "Chosen." Here, again, the Evangelist supposes knowledge of the earlier Gospels. The choice referred to is different from that spoken of in John 13: 18. In the present passage it is the appointment to apostleship (Mark 3: 13 *f.*; Luke 6: 13 *f.*). We have here an early disclosure of the character of Judas, but the rest of the Apostles seem not to have apprehended it at the time.

"Devil." See note 131a.

135 John 6: 71. — "Judas, son of Simon Iscariot." This seems to mean, *of Kerioth* (Joshua 15: 25), in Judæa. He probably became a follower of the Lord during the early Judæan ministry. The question of his fate has been discussed lately in the Interpreter in his favour; but whatever may have been the belief of Judas as to the Lord's extrication of Himself, such a notion could only be fruit of unbelief in Christ's own words.

Besides the betrayer, we meet in the Gospels with (a) Judas, the Apostle otherwise called Lebbæus, or Thaddæus, and (b) Judas, brother of the Lord.

NOTES ON THE SEVENTH CHAPTER

136 John 7: 1-5. — There is further recognition here of the Galilean ministry.

136a John 7: 1. — "After these things." That is, about six months after the discourse of John 6.

"The Jews." *Cf.* John 2: 8, 54.

137 John 7: 3. — As to the Lord's "brethren being uterine" — that is, His mother's children — see Ps. 69: 8, and *cf.* Acts 1: 14, 1 Cor. 9: 5. This belief is maintained, after Tertullian, by M'Clellan, Farrar ("Early Days of Christianity" chapter 19), Mayor (Introduction to "Commentary on Epistle of James"), and by Professor Swete (Commentary on Mark). For the theory that Joseph was married previously, see Lightfoot ("Dissertation" in his edition of the Epistle to the Galatians) and salmon. It must be borne in mind that Origen and Jerome, who supported the idea of Mary's continued virginity, were influenced by Apocryphal Gospels. Mr. Card seems to have changed his opinion since he wrote the note in his Cambridge edition of Matthew's Gospel (see his note on present passage).

On what we are told in verse 5, Kinnear remarks: "His divinity was hidden in the absolute perfection of His humanity" (p. 71).

138 John 7: 8. — The reading "not yet" seems to have arisen from a desire to meet Porphyry's imputation to Jesus of inconstancy. But the Lord's not going up then was but an illustration of what this Evangelist speaks of elsewhere — His dependence on the Father, by whose direction He was governed day by day, in respect both of speech (verse 16) and action (v. 19). Any real difficulty is removed by the natural explanation of Westcott and Plummer — that the Lord meant, not to keep the feast.

139 John 7: 12. — "Good": in the sense of "benevolent."

139a "The Jews." Here the special meaning that the title acquires in this Gospel is very clear.

140 John 7: 15. — "Letters" — i.e., rabbinical learning (Acts 16: 24: πολλὰ γράμματα, "much learning"). In the Gospel records we are told of the Lord Jesus' writing (John 8: 6), and of His reading (Luke 4: 16). The one reading book of the synagogue school was the Bible. *Cf.* notes 23, 56 on Mark.

141 John 7: 21 *f.* — "One." Heitmüller treats this as inconsistent with John 7: 21. But the Lord is not Himself the speaker there. The expositor takes "because of this" as part of verse 21, but Govett, as the revisers, with "Moses," as beginning of verse 22.

141a John 7: 23. — The ὅλον goes with ἄνθρωπον rather than (as A.V. and R.V.) with ὕγιῃ — "a whole man" (so Wetstein).

142 John 7: 26. — Observe that it is the rulers ("the Jews") who fail to recognise the Lord's Messiahship, and only those of the crowd influenced by them (verse 41).

143 John 7: 27. — See note at John 9: 29.

144 John 7: 28. — "Cried." For the Lord's exceptional uplifting of His voice (Matt. 12: 19), *cf.* verse 37 and John 12: 44.

"He allows that they have spoken rightly of His human origin" (Barth "Chief Problems," p. 162). We may suppose, however, that our Lord is but reminding them of their own words recorded in John 6: 42 — *i.e.*, taking them on their own ground.

145 John 7: 31. — See Micah 5: 2.

145a "I am." *Cf.* John 3: 13.

146 John 7: 37. — "The great." According to Num. 29: 12, the feast was to last seven days; another day had been added by custom, but on this day no water was drunk from the pool of Siloam, to be poured on the altar. Jesus was the true Shiloh ("sent"). But *cf.* Jer. 2: 13. This statement shows exact knowledge on the part of the writer.

147 "Stood . . . thirst." His attitude now, as well as His manner, emphasized His words. Connect with this, "I will stand upon the rock in Horeb" (Ex. 17: 6; *cf.* Num. 20: 11).

148 John 7: 38. — "As the Scripture said." Reference may be made to such passages as Isa. 12: 3; Isa. 35: 6 (*cf.* Matt. 11: 4-6); Isa. 44: 3, Isa. 55: 1, Isa. 58: 11; Joel 3: 13; Ezek. 47: 1.

149 John 7: 39. — "Spirit was not yet." On this Schmiedel, who is followed by Burkitt (p. 248) and Scott (p. 336), has the following remark: "The Holy Spirit had no existence before the exaltation of Christ," and cites 2 Cor. 3: 17 (col. 2,530). One might fairly expect a writer of such pretension (he has edited Winer's "Grammar") to be acquainted with a use of the negative which appears in other passages of this Gospel, such as John 9: 3 and John 11: 4, and also in 2 Cor. 3: 10. From there being no article before "Spirit," some (as Norris and Govett) would explain it of spiritual gift (1 Cor. 12, 14), which now represents the gifts of the Spirit predicted of the days of Messiah. See, however, the Exposition, p. 450, note. As to misunderstanding by the Evangelist of the Lord's utterances (alleged by Reuss and others), see note at John 2: 21.

150 John 7: 40. — *Cf.* verse 46 for Christ's words being evidential. As to "the prophet," see note 118. For the connection of this verse with verse 52, see Carr, "Horæ Biblicæ," p. 76 *ff.* He considers that "the" should be understood before "prophet" in the Pharisee's question (p. 83). This suggestion, which commends itself, is reproduced in the same writer's annotated edition of the R.V. of this Gospel. *Cf.* Abbott, "Johannine Grammar," p. 358.

151 John 7: 42. — "Bethlehem." Critics wonder why John (Wendt and others would say his "editor"), if he knew of the Bethlehem birth, did not here mention it. Perhaps we have in this an instance of what Dr. Salmon described as the Evangelist's "irony," as in John 6: 42. We have examples of something of the kind in the Pauline Epistles. The important point is that the Jews, as Govett remarks, "in this the chief of questions had not interest enough to push their inquiries."

152 John 7: 43. — "Division." This illustrates Luke 12: 51. So, again, in John 9: 16, John 10: 19. The word in each passage is "schism."

153 John 7: 45 *f.* — "The chief priests." These represent the Synoptic "Sadducees," who, together with the Pharisees, made up the Sanhedrin.

"Never man" — *i.e.*, a mere man (ἄνθρωπος).

NOTES ON THE EIGHTH CHAPTER

154 John 7: 53 — John 8: 11. — Some of those rejecting this passage are influenced by the feeling that there is no clear connection with what comes before or follows it. As to this, see the Exposition. Difficulty over the connection has, however, not weighed so much as judgment formed on the diplomatic evidence. The expositor shows that the impeachment on that side of the case is not so formidable as is usually supposed. Eusebius says that he found the passage, not merely in the Gospel of the Hebrews, but in Papias, from whom Lightfoot supposes it was derived. It is markedly in harmony with i. 17, and was not likely to be inserted by a later hand. Whilst the early Reformers (Calvin, Beza, etc.) discredited it, Augustine before them, as Bengel afterwards, upheld it. The agreement of textual critics of such different schools as Tregelles and Scrivener, of course, is unfavourable to its being read in John; whilst some, acknowledging it as "Scripture," would place it at the end of Luke 21, as in the Ferrer group of manuscripts (but in these only), so Blass, the latest editor. Lightfoot's judgment was that "it is an interpolation where it stands" ("Biblical Essays," p. 69). He regarded it as a marginal note to verse 15. We may, however, be morally certain that the Evangelist, if he did not actually put the incident in writing, told the story in his oral ministry. "Advanced" critics go with others in commendation of its spirit and teaching, Julicher describing it as "the noblest of Agrapha" (p. 393). Its *Divine* wisdom is attested on all sides. See, further, notes 157, 159.

155 John 8: 3. — Here only in this Gospel are the *scribes* spoken of. Instead of being against the genuineness, the word tells the other way; for, as some one has said, "it is in exact keeping with any attempt — the only one described in this Gospel — to entrap Him subtly, in which the expertness of such men was needed."

156 John 8: 5. — The Old Testament texts are Lev. 22: 10, Deut. 22: 22. Observe that "Moses in the law" is solely Johannine (John 1: 45), not being found in the Synoptic Gospels. What about the absence in these Jews of concern as to the treatment to be dealt out to the *adulterer*? Cf. Seeley, "Ecce Homo," pp. 117- 120.

156a John 8: 7. — See Deut. 13: 6-11.

157 John 8: 11. — "Neither do I condemn," or, command execution of the law. Had early Christians discerned that these words have regard to the distinction between the Church and the world in its sentences, they could not have hesitated, as they did, to admit the passage into lectionaries. There is no "Go in peace," or "Thy sins are forgiven thee" here: the woman is governmentally respited (cf. the case of John 5). The Lord gave effect to the law which required two witnesses (Deut. 17: 2-7, 19: 15). Of. verse 17 of this chapter which bears singularly on the authenticity of the passage, but seems to have been uniformly neglected by those who have questioned it.

158 Reference should here be made to "Lectures on the Gospel," p. 462 f.

159 John 8: 12. — The "again" marks resumption of the interrupted discourse (verse 2). To whom could "them" refer but the angry Pharisees? If a passage like this (cf. 12: 32) were editorial, might we not say that the interpolator was a prophet? Moreover, would not this verse be awkward if 7: 53 to 8: 11 were omitted?

159a John 8: 12 If. — "The light," referring probably to the elm, beaming out as He spoke (Bishop Andrewes and others), rather than to the golden lamp (Stier, etc.), or to the pillar of cloud and fire (Cyril, etc.).

160 "True." Here ἀληθής, but in John 19: 35 ἀληθινός: both words occur together there. Schmiedel,

as others before him, pits verse 13 against verse 31, in which they have been anticipated by these very Jews here! The answer to the critical, as to the Pharisaic, objection turns on His Godhead, shown by what follows. Westcott puts it: "The I in the earlier passage marked the separate individuality; here it marks the fulness of the whole Person."

160a "Ye know not." This, again, has been set against John 7: 28: "Ye know." But there He says, "whence I am"; here, "whence I come." The objection is a mere quibble; the Lord was speaking previously of His earthly origin.

Burkitt (p. 227) characterises His attitude towards the Jews here as "mystifying, repellent," from not weighing the moral bearing of the words. See the Exposition.

161 John 8: 17. — See Deut. 17: 6, Deut. 19: 15. For "law of the Jews" ("your law"), *cf.* John 10: 34, John 15: 25. It is a case of argumentum ad hominem. So Stevens (p. 35), whilst his countryman Bacon follows captious German criticism. *Cf.* note 157 above.

161a John 8: 18. — As to testimony to the two natures of the Lord, see Exposition (p. 178 *f.*), Mark. 12: 35-37, where, as Lord of David, we get His Deity, as in Son of David His humanity (*cf.* Rom. 1: 3).

162 John 8: 19. — May not John 7: 28 have been slightly ironical, as Ryle suggests? See above as to the irony, also ascribed to the Evangelist by Salmon.

163 John 8: 20. — *cf.* Luke 22: 53. The Lord taught in the outer courts only, being, according to the flesh, of the tribe of Judah, not Levi (Heb. 7: 14).

164 John 8: 24. — "I Am": Deut. 32: 39-41; Ps. 102: 25-27; Isa. 12: 4, Isa. 48: 10.

164a The American Revisers discredited the British marginal rendering, "How is it that I speak to you at all?" which was derived from Cyril and Chrysostom, and is approved by Zahn. *Cf.* Blass, "Grammar," § 50. 5 (E.T., p. 176), who would render "(Do you reproach Me) that I speak to you at all?" Those taking it as "altogether" include Winer, Grimm, Stier, H. Holtzmann, Alford, Godet, Plummer, and Reynolds.

165 John 8: 29. — This controverts Swedenborg's doctrine that there is only one "Person" in the Godhead, that the body taken was the Son, and that the Father, in His resistance to evil, put it off altogether! (*Cf.* note 130.)

165a John 8: 30-32. — "Believed on Him . . . believed Him." See note 17.

166 John 8: 37. — "Maketh no way." So Westcott, who compares Wisd. 7: 23 and Weiss, referring to 2 Macc. 13: 26; as Zahn also to John 3: 40, John 15: 37 there.

167 John 8: 40. — "A man" ἄνθρωπος. Gnosticism denied (α) the Deity of Jesus, (β) the humanity of the Christ. It was the predicted parent of the apostasy spoken of in 1 Tim. 4: 1-3,

167a John 8: 41. — *Cf.* Mal. 2: 10.

168 John 8: 43. — *Cf.* Prov. 8: 9. What Alexander Carson, fifty years ago, remarked is true still: if men "are erroneous in their doctrines, they must be erroneous in their philology" ("On Interpretation," p. 91).

169 John 8: 44. — "Standeth" (ἔστηκεν), as the American revisers. The British committee adopted the imperfect of στήκω — i.e., ἔστηκεν (ÅBpm, DL, etc.); and so Blass. Horton criticises the first part of the verse in the light of verse 30. But the Lord is speaking to the Jews referred to in verse 33. *Cf.* verses 40 and 45. Polycarp, in his "Letter to the Philippians," echoed the words "of the devil."

170 John 8: 46. — It is on the Lord's conscious sinlessness that Weiss would base His Messianic consciousness ("Life of Christ," i. 290).

Professor Du Bose has revived the execrable doctrine of Edward Irving. Note the following terrible statements taken from the American writer: "There was that in His flesh which actively He had to put to death" ("Soteriology," p. 320), "His lifelong death to sin created and constituted His sinlessness" ("The Gospel in the Gospels," p. 159); "He had as much to hunger and thirst after righteousness which was not His own as we have" (*ibid.*, p. 164); "Jesus Himself, in His humanity, needed the salvation which all humanity needs" ("The Gospel according to St. Paul," p. 127); "There was that in Him which He needed to deny, to mortify, to crucify" (*ibid.*, p. 173); "As man, our Lord was subject with us all to sin and death" (p. 228). To found such execrable language on anything from Paul or Peter (*e.g.*, Rom. 8: 3; 2 Cor. 5: 21; 1 Peter 4: 1) is, as one of them has written, to wrest the Scriptures to your own destruction. *Cf.* v. 23 of this Gospel. What a mercy that the Saviour (*pace* Schmiedel) has spoken of forgiveness extended to those blaspheming the "Son of man"! (Matt. 12: 32).

With verse 47 *cf.* 1 John 4: 6.

171 John 8: 48 *f.* — Schmiedel (col. 2,541): "Had Jesus really possessed that exalted consciousness of His pre-existence and Divine dignity which is attributed to Him in the fourth Gospel, the declaration that blasphemy against Him was incapable of forgiveness (Matt. 12: 31 *f.*; Luke 12: 10) could never have been attributed to Him." But it is to His character of Son of man that the Synoptic words as to forgiveness attach; and it is precisely in the earlier Gospels that the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost is said not to admit of forgiveness, attributing Christ's works to Beelzebub, as here His words to a demon. There is not a particle of such difference in the accounts: the Synoptists record nothing that detracts from the words "ye dishonour Me" given by John.

As to the Jews' insinuation, see Schofield, "Christian Sanity," p. 14. *Cf.* John 7: 20 of this Gospel.

172 John 8: 57. — "Fifty years old." What is one to think of Loisy, who follows Ireneus, saying that, "according to the Evangelist, the Christ was about fifty years old when He died" (p. 13)? as to which Schmiedel sensibly remarks that Irenæus was not trustworthy in respect of traditions of that kind. The "fifty" might be explained from Num. 4: 3, 39, Num. 8: 34, but probably means, what is generally supposed, that the blessed Saviour was prematurely old. *Cf.* Zahn, *ad loc.*

173 John 8: 58. — "I am." See note 164, and *cf.* Ps. 90: 2, Ps. 102: 27. The Unitarian explanation is that "Jesus only meant that He existed as Messiah in God's counsels before Abraham." There would, however, be nothing peculiar in that, as true also of Adam and the Jews themselves, whom He was addressing. *They* understood His words very differently. The "wrangling, little in the style of Jesus," which is said to characterise this chapter (Horton, p. 164; *cf.* Burkitt) is, of course, primarily an utterance of German oracles.

NOTES ON THE NINTH CHAPTER

174 John 9: 1 — "Blind from birth." Symbolical of Israel as a people (Deut. 29: 4). D'Alma imagines that the Evangelist had Paul in his mind; but the Apostle of the Gentiles, instead of being "a proselyte of the gate," was "a Hebrew of the Hebrews."

175 John 9: 2. — The Pharisees supposed that the souls of good men passed from one body to another (Josephus, "Antiquities," xviii. 1, 3; "B.J.," ii. 8, 14). So Herod, of John the Baptist. By the "pious and learned author" referred to in the Exposition Tholuck would seem to be meant, for such is the view that he propounds.

176 John 9: 6. — As to this Jewish remedy for eye disease, see Edersheim ("Life," ii. 48). The next verse seems to show that it stands here for Jewish ordinances, which the people refused to give up for the word of Christ. Their "Sabbath" was their hindrance (*cf.* Isa. 28: 9-12).

177 John 9: 7. — "Siloam." The Shiloah of Isa. 8: 6 (*cf.* Ps. 46: 4). That the name meant "sent" has been questioned in "Supernatural Religion," (p. 419), but not by Schmiedel, Mr. Cassels' German counterpart. Reference should here be made to John 8: 16-18, 26-29, besides verse 4 of this chapter. For the use of clay as eye salve, *cf.* that made of the brazen serpent, and for the water here, *cf.* Acts 2: 33, 38 *f.*, of the Holy Spirit sent down to dispel Jewish blindness.

178 John 9: 16. — "How can," etc. See John 3: 2, the "we" of which finds further illustration here. There were some who agreed with Nicodemus. *Cf.* verse 33 of the present chapter.

179 John 9: 22. — The opposition to our Lord's Messianic claim had now become acute, at an advanced stage of His ministry. As to exclusion from the fellowship of the synagogue, see Edersheim, ii. 184.

180 John 9: 24. — "Give glory to God." This formula takes us back to the time of Joshua (John 7: 19).

181 John 9: 29. — "We know not whence He is." Schmiedel (following Holtzmann, etc.) says that the Evangelist "sometimes contradicts his own precise statements" (col. 2,537). The reference here is, of course, to John 7: 27. Westcott explains that here it is a question of His prophetic function of the commission, the authority by which JESUS comes. So the healed man's "the wonderful thing." Is it not simply a question of "the Jews," learned and acute as the man knew them to be, stultifying themselves? Govett's comment is: "Unbelievers will at last be condemned out of their own mouths and by their own principles." The "common sense" which governs men in ordinary concerns has a way of forsaking them in religious matters; the soundness of the head is here regulated so much by the state of the heart. Weiss notes the emphatic ἡμεῖς, "we." *Cf.* the man's οὐμεῖς, "ye" — "they, the people's spiritual leaders, who alone have to judge in such matters"! Have we not their analogues in our own day?

182 John 9: 31 *f.* — The man's statement is supported by Ps. 66: 18, Prov. 15: 29; Isa. 1: 15. *Cf.* the history of Elijah and Elisha. Observe that the knowledge of the constancy of Nature had already in the Apostolic Age filtered through to the people (Gerdell, "Primitive Miracles," etc., p. 30).

182a John 9: 34. — This was the sole attempt the Jews made to disprove any of the Lord's miracles. *Cf.* John 3: 2, John 11: 47.

183 John 9: 35. — "The Son of God." See John 3: 18, John 5: 25, John 10: 36, John 11: 4. For "Son of man," see John 3: 15, John 6: 27 (and Exposition), 34-36 (the same). It may be said, on the one hand, that any alteration would be more likely made from "man" to "God" than vice versa, because of the frequency of "Son of God" in this Gospel (so Zahn), but, on the other, that a copyist, from the fact that the "Son of man" was Christ's usual mode of designating Himself, would be very likely to alter "Son of God" into "Son of man." In support of "Son of God," see "Irrationalism of Infidelity," p. 293. Godet, too, adheres to this reading, because of the worship rendered by the man. Indeed, John 6: 27, 29 seems to the present writer to settle the whole point. The "Son of man" is there said to be sealed (attested) as "Son of God" (*cf.* note 122). Before He could be Son of man He must have been sent as Son of God. By acknowledgment of the truth of this, the object of the miracle became the first "martyr" confessor of the new community (Carr). See also note 238.

184 John 9: 39. — The Lord here fulfils Isa. 28: 9-13. The judgment is a sifting process. *Cf.* Luke 2: 34: "for the falling and rising up of many in Israel," leaving men either better or worse, with "they that

see not" also John 3: 19, *ff.* Carr aptly compares the words of John 7: 49. "They that see" of course calls up Isa. 13: 19. Only those who fail to see the different bearing of John 3: 17 and the present passage "as to judgment" could, with H. Holtzmann, find a contradiction. *Cf.* McRory, *ad loc.*

185 John 9: 41. — *Cf.* John 15: 22. "Remaineth," attacheth, is unforgiven. "Forgiveness" is not a term of this Gospel, which, however, expresses the idea in various ways, as in 8: 32, "the truth shall make you free." For the attitude of unbelief towards the Christian doctrine of forgiveness, see Greg, "Creed of Christendom," or "Essays" of Miss Edith Simcox in the same strain, and on the believing side Sir R. Anderson, "Christianized Rationalism," p. 193.

Heitmüller: "Sin reposes essentially on ignorance if a man have proper insight, he will act rightly" (p. 174). Such is Tolstoy's doctrine. See record of interview between him and the late Dr. F. W. Baedeker, in "Memoir" of the latter. The Russian Count had not reckoned with Luke 11: 21 *f.* *Cf.* note 49 on Mark, as to Humanitarianism.

NOTES ON THE TENTH CHAPTER

186 John 10: 1-18. — The Scriptures for reference are, in particular, Ps. 23. Isa. 40. Zech. 11. To be understood rightly, the close connection of this passage with John 8 and John 9 must be seen, which the division of chapters tends to obscure.

187 John 10: 1-3. — "The fold." ". . . leadeth them out." One of the "realistic scenes" given at the Palestine Exhibitions brings out those characteristics of an Eastern sheepfold stated in Carr's note, *ad loc.* — the high wall entrance closed at night and guarded by "porter", the mixture of flocks and their separation each morning through the different voice of each shepherd *Cf.* Isa. 43: 1 and Acts 2: 39. By "the porter" it will be seen the expositor understands the Holy Spirit (so Stier, Alford, and MoRory); Godet, the Baptist.

For the New Testament add, in particular, Luke 15: 11-32. As to the relation of allegory to metaphor, see Carson on "Figurative Language of Scripture," or "Encyclopædia Britannica," vol. i., under "Allegory."

188 John 10: 4-7. — "He goeth before them." The Lord severed His connection with the Temple before the disciples separated from it; their break with it was very gradual.

With verse 6 *cf.* John 16: 25, *ff.* and Mark 4: 13; and with 5: 7, Heb. 10: 20 (Norris).

189 John 10: 8. — "Before me." These words seem to have been omitted in some leading, manuscripts from the difficulty that attaches to the verse when they are read. The Manichees used them in support of their theories. If the words $\pi\rho\delta\ \acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\upsilon$ are retained, one way of taking $\pi\rho\delta$ is in the sense of "instead," "in place of," but then it will be necessary to take the statement prophetically, as none such presented themselves until *after* the Lord's first coming. Isaiah has used the past tense in this way (10: 28-31). Other explanations are recorded in Alford's note, *ad loc.* Zahn combines the idea of both past and immediate future by supposing that the Asmonæan rulers and Herodian princes are meant.

190 John 10: 9. — "Shall go in and shall go out." This is a Hebraism. See Num. 27: 17. *Cf.* Maclaren's remarks on Communion and Service in his Exposition, vol. ii., pp. 28 *ff.*

An Eastern shepherd acts as a door.

191 John 10: 10. — "Abundantly." *Cf.* 2 Peter 1: 11.

192 John 10: 11. — The view of Pfleiderer (ii. 480), that Paul's doctrine of salvation resting on the

death and resurrection of Christ was supplanted by John's emphasizing the whole redemptive activity of His earthly life, is reproduced by Scott. As to this theory, see the Exposition at p. 367.

"The *good* Shepherd" *cf.* (Heb. 13: 20). "the *great* Shepherd," and (in 1 Peter 5: 4) "the *chief* Shepherd." Pss. 22, 23, 24 seem to answer respectively to these designations.

"Layeth down His life," or *soul* (*cf.* Isa. 53: 10). The word for "life" here is altogether different from that in verse 10 (life in contrast with death). The following "for," as Meyer says, indicates *substitution*, not only benefit, as in 1 John 3: 16, with which *cf.* Rom. 16: 4 (decisive). It comes out strikingly in this Gospel (John 18: 8), where see note.

Govett, on the present passage, well remarks: "He showed He had power to enforce that exchange." How can Scott get over the five-times repeated mention by Christ of His *death* in this short discourse? It carries as much emphasis as, *e.g.*, in Acts 20: 28 or Heb. 13: 20, 1 Peter 1: 19.

193 John 10: 12. — See Ezek. 34: 11-23, etc. For the "wolf," *cf.* Matt. 10: 16 and Acts 20: 29. The "hireling" is exemplified in the conduct of the blind man's parents in John 9 here.

193a See the "Lycidas" of Milton.

194 John 10: 14-16. — Here we have a link with the first Gospel: our Lord "in the days of His flesh" was "Minister of the circumcision" (*cf.* John 21: 23-32 and note 8 above). Again, there is connection with the third Gospel. It would be nearer the truth to say that John was influenced by Isaiah (Isa. 49) than by Paul.

With verse 14 *cf.* John 17: 20-22. The passage should correct the strangely serious notion that to doubt one's acceptance is the best proof of being a child of God!

As one has said. "To insist on the one *flock* (v. 16) and yet form a sacramental *fold* which is exclusive, instead of inclusive, is suicidal: always has been and ever will be."

195 John 10: 17 *f.* — On the relation of these words of Christ to those of Paul in Gal. 3: 13. see Gerdell on "Substitution," p. 44 *f.* Criticism, has been bestowed on J. N. Darby's writing that the Lord gave up His first human life, "to which sin attached," to take up in resurrection another life, in which the sin of mankind, reckoned to Him on the cross (2 Cor. 5: 21), has no voice. But it is of the ζῶν that the writer of "Synopsis of the Books of the Bible" speaks — from no neglect of the Greek word used here — with reference to such passages as 1 Peter 4: 1. Reference to Mr. Darby's treatment of Scriptures outside this Gospel, like those just referred to, should remove any misapprehension of his meaning. The words of these verses entirely meet the unholy view of the Atonement, according to which the Father is regarded as exposing Himself to the imputation of injustice. He and the Son combine.

195a Contrast the present passage with Ps. 89: 48. "No *one* taketh it away from Me." This, of course, at the same time as human, excludes Satanic power, it is equivalent to "No one can," etc. And so for Heb. 5: 7 as bearing on the agony in Gethsemane (Luke 22: 43 *f.*).

In Heb. 9: 14, "an eternal spirit" speaks of Christ's own (Westcott). His own Deity was engaged in the work.

195b *Cf.* Horton, "Teaching of Jesus," pp. 200 *f.*

196 John 10: 19-21. — *Cf.* Ps. 146: 7 *f.* From these verses of the Gospel we may learn that truth separates as a preliminary to uniting.

Observe how the Lord's works were seen to reinforce His words, which stand or fall together.

Jülicher admits that they are inseparable.

With v. 20, *cf.* Schofield, "Christian Sanity," p. 15.

197 John 10: 22. — The "Feast of Dedication," also called the "Feast of Lights." was instituted by the Maccabean Jews to commemorate the rededication of the Temple after the victories of Judas over Antiochus Epiphanes, who had desecrated it. See "Jewish Prayer Book," p. 274. The *Chanuka* generally falls in the month of *Chisleu*, or December, and so the mention of "winter." Observe that the Evangelist does not speak of it as a "feast" — *i.e.*, as if it had Divine sanction.

198 John 10: 24 *f.* — "Dost thou hold our soul in suspense?" These words serve to show that the progress of the Messianic claim is not really represented differently in the fourth from what it is in the earlier Gospels (*cf.* Horton pp. 190 *f.*).

John takes us more "behind the scenes," emphasizing more their responsibility; nevertheless, the Jews can still talk thus at this advanced stage of the ministry. Having regard to John 9: 22, their sincerity may well be questioned. It is much the same with the antecedent rejection of "the miraculous" in our day. "Openness of mind" alone will do in religious as in all other search after truth. *Cf.* Matt. 11: 4 *f.*; Luke 11: 3 *ff.*

198a John 10: 26 *f.* — See verse 3 *f.*

199 John 10: 28-30. — See note 110 on Mark, and *cf.* Deut. 32: 39, Isa. 43: 13 Hengstenberg: "Jesus assumes to Himself the possession of the power which belongs to Jehovah." See Hooker's notable sermon on the "Perpetuity of Faith in the Elect," which might suffice for "Anglicans."

"We are One," *Ěv*, neuter. It is not one in will or purpose only, for this in the case of Jesus might still be frustrated, but that will and *power* coalesce in the person of the Speaker. In these verses the distinction of Persons and unity of Nature alike come out. See, further, John 12: 45, John 14: 9 *f.*, John 17: 21, and *cf.* Heb. 1: 3. The Sabellian and Patripassian (Swedenborgian) theory breaks down when faced with the words: the Father and JESUS are not one "Person", whilst the one *nature* contradicts Arians (Socinians). The contemporary Jews understood the Lord's statement, whilst their descendants and "Unitarians" miss its meaning.

200 John 10: 31. — *Cf.* Lev. 24: 10, and see note on John 19: 7 below.

201 John 10: 32. — *Cf.* Ps 78: 11 *f.*

201a John 10: 33. — This may be regarded as the *locus classicus* on the way in which the Lord's claims were understood *at the time*.

202 John 10: 35. — "The word of God came." *Cf.* Ezek. 1: 3; Luke 3: 2.

203 John 10: 36. — See note 30 on Mark (p. 248).

204 John 10: 40 §. — "Again." As to the Peræan ministry, see 1: 28. As to John's performing no miracles, see Gerdtehl, p. 70.

NOTES ON THE ELEVENTH CHAPTER

205 *The Resuscitation of Lazarus*. — This, the third and most notable case of Christ's raising the dead, has always excited sharp criticism by sceptics. Spinoza is said to have declared that if he could be satisfied that the miracle was actually performed he would become a Christian. But, of course, such an intellectual times spoken of in this Gospel, has never permanently profited anyone. At the present day

the main objection taken to the incident is that John alone records it, which circumstance is considered to invest the story with suspicion, because it is alleged an incident represented to have brought about the death of the Lord (see note on verse 63) must have been known to one or other of the Synoptists if it really took place. So Cassels, Abbott, Burkitt, etc., after Strauss, Keim, and their Continental followers. It affords prominent illustration of a favourite "critical" canon — that if a biblical historian knows of an event he is bound to record it. The author of "Supernatural Religion" goes so far as to say that "each of the Synoptic Gospels professes to be complete in itself" — a principle that can only yield an absurd result. Not even does the preface of Luke lend itself to such an idea. That Evangelist's "all" is said of his resources, not of the things in which Theophilus had been instructed, for the accuracy of which Luke is prepared to vouch.

If there were any sound basis in the principle, it would, of course, apply all round. Matt. 27: 52, for example, would fall under it; there alone are we told of the dead saints who left their graves and appeared in Jerusalem after the Lord's own resurrection. In respect of the present Gospel we should have to assume that, in the face of Synoptic declarations to the contrary, John himself knew nothing of the raising of Jairus's daughter, of the Transfiguration, of the agony in Gethsemane, or the forsaking on the Cross, all recorded by Mark, who was a witness of none of these! Two of such incidents are indirectly attested by John (see notes 20 above, and that on John 12: 27); and other such incidents as the Temptation (Matthew, Luke) some (as Reynolds) believe have parallels in his Gospel (chapters 1-4).

Keim treated the resuscitation of Lazarus as a fiction, O. Holtzmann ("Life of Jesus," p. 275), followed by Burkitt, cannot fit it into the framework of Mark's, conceived to be the fundamentally historic, narrative. Schmiedel (col 2,521), as Abbott in the same work (col 1,805), after Bruno Bauer and Schenkel, regards it as a development of the parable of Lazarus in Luke 16: 19-31, and so Wernle ("Sources," pp. 42 *f.*). As to all this, see note 5 in the volume on Mark, and *cf.* Turton, p. 413. Remarks will be made below on individual features of the narrative, to show how worthless are such insinuations against its credibility. See, further, Weiss, "Life of Christ," Bk. vi., § 6, or Westcott, "Study of the Gospels," p. 164, who says: "It did not fall in with the common plan of the Synoptists, which excluded all working at Jerusalem until the final entry."

206 John 11: 2. — The Evangelist assumes that an incident is already known from the earlier accounts which he will himself describe later (John 12: 2). *Cf.* Luke's manner of writing in 4: 23, 31 of his Gospel.

207 John 11: 15. — "Let us go unto him." These words negative the idea of Swedenborgians and spiritualists that the disembodied is the final state of man, as if after death the body is no more resumed.

208 John 11: 16. — "That we may die with him." As in the first edition, "him" has been printed with small initial letter, because of the uncertainty which attaches to its exact meaning. Zahn, as did Grotius, takes it of Lazarus; most commentators, however, understand JESUS. See verse 9 *f.*

209 John 11: 18. — "Was." For the imperfect sense here, instead of the present, as in v. 2, Lightfoot compares Luke 4: 29 ("Biblical Essays," p. 175). See also Blass in Expository Times, July, 1907.

210 John 11: 24-26. — "The resurrection at the last day." Martha's belief was doubtless that propounded by the Pharisees from Isa. 25: 8, Isa. 26: 19; Dan. 12: 2, Hosea 13: 14. For the novelty that the Evangelist was a "Christianized Sadducee," see Burkitt, p. 250.

With v. 26 *cf.* 6: 40; Luke 20: 35 *f.*; Phil. 3: 11.

211 John 11: 27. — "That should come into the world." See note on John 1: 9.

212 John 11: 33. — "Where have ye laid Him?" If the Lord had not asked this question, would not unbelievers have said that He was only acting a part or that there was collusion? As to the Lord being "moved in spirit" see Maclaren, ii. 99.

212a John 11: 35. — "Jesus wept" — i.e., shed tears simply, not "sobbed," as the word means which is used in verses 31, 33. The word employed in the present verse appears here only in the New Testament. For other occasions of the Lord's weeping, see Luke 19: 41; Matt. 26: 39. Chrysostom remarks that this Evangelist emphasizes His affections whilst making higher statements as to His nature than the other Evangelists.

Cassels has described our Lord's tears here as "the theatrical adjuncts of a dramatic scene" ("Supernatural Religion," p. 461). Such writers have not profited by the lesson of Mark 9: 13, 16 and parallels. The propriety of those tears has been questioned because of the early removal of the cause of sorrow. But surely, as Christ thought of the vast area of misery brought in by Satan with sin, the sorrow shown here was natural and becoming. Indeed, had the Lord not wept, would not sceptics have suggested that it was not a representation of any true humanity?

213 John 11: 38. — "A cave" — that is, a rock-hewn tomb (Schor, "Palestine and the Bible," p. 34), as shown at the Palestine Exhibitions.

214 "Take away the stone." Had the Lord removed it miraculously, objectors would have insinuated that it evinced fraud; that Lazarus had done it from inside.

214a John 11: 39. — "The sister of the deceased." Does not the Evangelist say this in order to remove the least shred of suspicion of imposture?

215 John 11: 41 *f.* — Cassels: "Evidently artificial." But although no prayer by Christ is mentioned in previous cases of resurrection, the fourth Gospel aims at exhibiting Him as the SON submissive in all things to the Father's will, not an independent Deity. Hence its propriety, which, of course, only a believer can appreciate.

215a John 11: 43 *f.* — "Lazarus . . . the dead." *The dead* is strictly applicable to the *body*, and so that attaches to man *risen*. Resurrection, therefore, is not, as some represent, emancipation of the soul from the body at death. But that notion, doubtless, is widely prevalent.

215b John 11: 46. — Origen's view that the information was conveyed to the Pharisees with a friendly intention is, as Carr says, unlikely.

216 John 11: 47 *f.* — Bengel: "Death more easily yields to Christ's power than unbelief" (*cf.* note 219). Observe that "many" miracles are spoken of.

217 John 11: 49, 51. — "Being high priest of that year." Instead of election for life, the office was held at the whim of the Romans, according to Josephus, "Antiq.," 18: 2. Eleazar and Simon (appointed in succession by Valerius Gratus, after the deposition of Annas) each held the office for only one year.

The Evangelist, neither here nor in John 18: 12, uses the article before "high priest." It is, perhaps, another illustration of his "irony" (Salmon). "Twenty-eight held the position from the time of Herod's accession to the destruction of Jerusalem" (*cf.* Acts 23: 5). Keim gave up the critical objection founded on the words. Holtzmann supposes a circle of readers accustomed to the naming of a year after the "Asiarch" (Acts 19: 31) in office at the time being.

217a The decision as to the death of JESUS must rest with the high priest for the time being

(Weiss).

217b "One of them." This may indicate that Caiaphas was not acting as president of the Sanhedrin (Godet). The brusqueness here of this Sadducean illustrates what Josephus tells of his party (Bell. Jud., ii. 8, 14). Here it was a case of "Sadducee *versus* Pharisee."

218 John 11: 50. — "For the nation." This is clearly substitutionary, not "in behalf of", ὑπέρ, "instead of." Our Lord died as Saviour or Redeemer of Israel (Isa. 45, 49), as well as of the Church. "For the transgression of My people was He stricken." Not that He was made a curse for Israel alone, as Kaftan supposes ("Dogmatics," pp. 461 *f.*). See Gal. 3: 13, and *cf.* Orr, p. 73.

219 John 11: 53. *Cf.* note 216. Use has been made of this verse for the supposition that it is to the raising of Lazarus we must attribute the Crucifixion, so as to heighten any difficulty about the silence of the other Evangelists. The Lord's death, however, had been determined on long before (see John 7: 1, 25 *f.*, 44; again in John 8: 39, and John 10: 31, John 11: 8, 16). This incident did not bring matters to a crisis and lead the rulers to give definite shape to their plans, because the characteristic tenet of the high-priestly family had been shaken to its foundations, so as to discredit them to the utmost.

220 John 11: 54. — This place is identified with the modern *El-Taiyibeh*, about twenty miles from Jerusalem, on the road from Jericho north-westwards. It was from here, probably, that the Lord went to Jericho, and thence to Bethany (John 12: 1; *cf.* Mark 10: 46; Luke 18: 31, 35).

NOTES ON THE TWELFTH CHAPTER

220a John 12: 1. — Matt. 20: 17-24; Mark 10: 32-52; Luke 18: 31 — Luke 19: 20 will immediately precede this section of the Gospel (see Carr's note).

The Lord's arrival at Bethany would be on the evening of the Friday — i.e., technically, on Saturday, the 9th Nisan. "Six days before the Passover" is terminology characteristic of the *Roman* calendar.

221 John 12: 2. — "They." Indefinite. *Cf.* Matt. 5: 15, Matt. 10: 10, Matt. 13: 48, and John 15: 6.

222 John 12: 3. — *Cf.* Ps. 23: 5. Origen and Chrysostom considered that there were three anointings: (α) in house of Simon the Pharisee (Luke 7); (β) in house of Simon the leper (Mark 14); (γ) in Martha's house (John 12). Some find but two, regarding Martha as wife of Simon the leper. There seem to be six Simons mentioned in the Gospels.

223 John 12: 4-6. — For the words of Judas here, *cf.* Ps. 55: 21. The Lord was not bound to keep temptation out of the way of the traitors, who must have forgotten the petition which he had been taught: "Bring us not into temptation." Judas, it may be observed, betrayed his Master for one-tenth the value of that which Mary lavished upon Him.

224 The word γλωσσόκομον does not mean "bag," but a chest (R.V., margin "box"); and ἐβάσταζεν may be rendered "used to take away" (steal). The papyri inscriptions recently discovered throw light on the Evangelist's statement.

225 John 12: 7. — The word τηρήσῃ seems to mean that Mary had reserved it from the ointment used for Lazarus's funeral. See Field, who does not follow Alford. Had we not Martha here, this alone would tell against the identification of Mary with the Magdalene.

226 John 12: 9. — Abbott ("Johannine Grammar," §1,739) contrasts the ὁ ὄχλος πολὺς used here and in verse 12 with the better Greek of Mark (12: 37), ὁ πολὺς ὄχλος. This militates against the idea

(see first note on Introduction) that the Greek of this Gospel was not such as a Galilean fisherman would have had at his command.

227 John 12: 12. — "On the morrow." This brings us to the first day of the last week — the 10th Nisan (*cf.* Ex. 12: 3, Zech. 11: 12, Mark 11: 15). With respect to the "palms," is it not striking, as regards the question of the authorship of the Gospel and of the Apocalypse, that these two books alone in the New Testament speak of them? (see Rev. 7: 9-17). Leaves of the palm-tree are associated with the Feast of Tabernacles, type of the Kingdom. *Cf.* Zech. 14.

228 John 12: 14. — Besides verse 9 of Zech. 9, *cf.* also Zeph. 3: 13-20. The disciples were *not* taught by the Holy Spirit that Zion stands for the Church (according to the Patristic interpretation, which was Pusey's).

229 John 12: 17. — The reading ὄτι, adopted by the Revisers, as by Mr. Kelly may have sprung from the difficulty felt over the multitude ("crowd") present when the Lord performed the miracle. *Cf.*, of course, John 11: 42: a crowd was gathered by Him on His journey from Ephraim to Bethany.

230 John 12: 19. — The same doubt attends θεωρεῖτε here as ἐραυνᾶτε in v. 39. Ryle takes the word here as imperative.

231 John 12: 20. — "Of." This is surely preferable to the "among" of the R.V., which would imply inclusion of Jews. It means, of the Greeks that came up. For such devout Gentiles, *cf.* Acts 17: 4.

232 John 12: 21. — "Bethsaida of Galilee." G. A. Smith: "This need not mean that it lay west of the Jordan, for the province of Galilee was right round the lake" ("Historical Geography of the Holy Land," p. 458). The existence of two Bethsaidas is however, a question likely to remain uncertain. The present writer inclines to Trench's view. *Cf.* note 65 on Mark. Professor Smith's "need not" is significant. Why should "of Galilee" be added by the Evangelist, unless there were two or more places of the same name?

232a John 12: 24. — We have here the antitype of the sheaf of firstfruits (Delitzsch). The way in which the Lord expressed Himself seems to have been adapted to the system of thought familiar to Greeks of that day. See J. G. Frazer, "The Golden Bough," iii. 130 *ff.*, for "dying God" and "corn spirit." *Cf.* Achelis, "Sketch," p. 32. Researches such as Prof. Frazer's do but by illustration confirm rather than, as he supposes, impair revealed truth. The fourth Gospel was the divinely suited vehicle for the record of such words of Christ. As to protest from Germany against such interpretation as Frazer's of the play of heathen conception in primitive Christianity, see Knowling, p. 86.

233 John 12: 23. — "Son of man." See note on verse 34. In 11: 4 it was glorification of the Son of God.

234 John 12: 25. — *Cf.* Matt. 10: 39, Matt. 16: 25; Mark 8: 35; Luke 9: 24, Luke 14: 26, Luke 17: 33. "In this world." For κόσμος the Synoptists use αἰῶν, which connects itself with the Kingdom, a term that the fourth Evangelist uses only in John 3: 3-5, because, as here, he regards eternal life in its future aspect as beginning with that. He is concerned characteristically with its present significance.

235 John 12: 27. — Milligan, for the ἔκ, "out of," compares Heb. 5: 7. See also Reynolds, *ad loc.* Many critics make use of what they conceive to be the fourth Evangelist's omission of the Synoptic agony in Gethsemane, of which John should have had some special knowledge, for their argument against his authorship of the book. We seem, however, in these words to have an allusion to it. The vicious principle that governs such writers has been already considered. See the Exposition at p. 393.

236 John 12: 31. — "This world." See John 1: 5-10. "Shall be cast out." Bishop Gore speaks of

Satan's "hiding his face in hell" ("The Christian Creed," p. 68). But see Rev. 2: 13 ("earth"), 12: 10 ("heaven").

237 John 12: 32 *f.* — The expositor, it will be seen, explains by "crucified" (see verse 33). "Out of." After some Fathers, Meyer, Milligan, and Dods (*cf.* Zahn, in loc.) regard it as covering the Ascension. *Cf.* Gen. 40: 13, 19.

Wendt (p. 69) refers to verse 23. See also Carr's note. Reuss and others, as Horton in England, make use of verse 33 for the wretched theory of the Evangelist's imperfect understanding of our Lord's meaning (see note on John 2: 21). John is evidently emphasizing the world's side of this greatest of tragedies.

238 John 12: 34. — See Luke 24: 26 and note 30 on Mark (p. 247) as to Son of man. From this passage we learn that the title was not familiar to the Jews, and that it was not used for "Messiah." The present passage seems to support the reading "God" in John 9: 35.

"Abideth for ever." See 1 Chr. 17: 12, Ps. 89: 24, 29, Ps. 110: 4; Isa. 9: 7, Isa. 53: 8; Ezek. 37: 25; Dan. 7: 14; Micah 4: 7.

239 John 12: 36. — "The light." JESUS meant Himself (1 John 1: 5) — that is, that He is GOD. See Deut. 32: 20, Ps. 78: 11 *f.*, for "hid Himself from them."

240 John 12: 37 *ff.* — "So many signs" — four in Galilee, three in Judæa — with tacit reference to the earlier Gospels.

"Could not believe." The present infinitive (πιστεῦειν), "to form a habit of belief" (Abbott, §2,496). *Cf.* note 114 (v. 44), and see Milligan's remarks on the judicial blinding of these Jews. Observe that "Isaiah" is named as source, and no critical "Second Isaiah."

241 John 12: 40. — Isa. 6: 9 *f.* is quoted in all four Gospels. It is given here (*cf.* John 9: 39) in the same form as in Mark and Luke. See volume on Mark, note 45.

242 John 12: 42 *f.* — Amongst such, probably, was Joseph of Arimathæa, as well as Nicodemus. *Cf.* note 59 above. The Evangelist's words in verse 43 carry us back to those of the Lord in v. 44.

243 John 12: 44. — For "cried" (ἔκραζεν), *cf.* Matt, 27: 50 (Mark 15: 39), and John 7: 28-37.

244 John 12: 46. — See verse 9 of the Preface (chapter 1), and *cf.* Eph. 5: 14.

245 John 12: 48. — "Slighteth" is in the Greek (ἄθετῶν) peculiar to this passage of John. It is used also in Luke 10: 16.

"The last day." This term is peculiar to the fourth Gospel (John 6: 39 *f.*, 44, 54 and John 11: 24). It is one of the "interpolations" alleged by Wendt, etc.

246 John 12: 50. — *Cf.* 1 John 3: 22 *f.*

NOTES ON THE THIRTEENTH CHAPTER

247 John 13: 1. — "Before the Feast of the Passover." The question, by many always considered so difficult, here presents itself of the agreement or otherwise of the fourth Gospel with the preceding records in regard to the character of the last meal of which our Lord partook with His disciples. The subject has already been discussed in note 142 on Mark (Mark 14: 12 *f.*). Here may be added reference to Dalman, "Aramaic Grammar," p. 248 *f.*, for $\overline{\text{ܡܘܨܝܐ}}$ being used in post-Biblical Jewish literature for the

whole feast; also to Andrews, pp. 542-581. The general question can be dealt with most conveniently in the present volume, in connection with the expositor's own note on John 19: 14 below.

248 John 13: 2. — Field and Govett adhere to the reading of A.V.: γενομένου. Alford renders "supper being prepared" (or, going on), and compares Matt. 26: 6. Mr. Kelly, as the Dean and the Revisers: γινομένου. It affords a good instance of the different ways in which copyists, writing from dictation, heard a word uttered by the reader.

249 John 13: 4, 5. — This is manifestly the narrative of an eye-witness. There are seven steps, all engraven on the Evangelist's memory. Note the graphic ἐγείρεται . . . βάλλει. As to the "girding," *cf.* Luke 12: 37.

Those who deny that it was a strictly *paschal* supper make use of the fact of the "rising": "standing" had been prescribed for that, but it would seem for the first occasion alone.

250 For "washing from iniquity," *cf.* Ps. 51: 2, and 1 Cor. 6: 11.

251 See on verse 12 below.

252 John 13: 10. Calvin's idea of continued reconciliation was doubtless in the minds of King James's New Testament company concerned with the rendering "to make reconciliation" in Heb. 2: 17. It has reappeared in teaching of recent years, based on an interpretation of 2 Cor. 5: 20, which the expositor combated.

253 John 13: 12. — The "know" means understand (γινώσκετε). *Cf.* verse 7, where οἶδας and γνώση occur together.

254 John 13: 13. — See Luke 5: 8.

255 John 13: 17. — Schmiedel remarks: "If read in the Synoptic Gospels, would cause no difficulty." What, then, about Matt. 7: 21, which is to the same effect?

255a varies.

256 John 13: 19. — *Cf.* Isa. 43: 11-13 and John 8: 24, 28, 58 of this Gospel.

John 13: 18. — The quotation is from the Hebrew, from which the Septuagint

257 John 13: 21. — It is supposed that this is the point at which the Lord's Supper would come in. For "troubled in His spirit," *cf.* 11: 33, 12: 27.

258a John 13: 22. — "Doubting," perplexed (ἀπορούμενοι)

259 John 13: 23. — "At table." The posture was that of reclining. Leonardo da Vinci's picture, which represents the guests as sitting, represents quite a wrong idea.

260 Here is the first mention by the Evangelist of the disciple understood to mean himself. Westcott, Drummond, Loisy and others concur, at any rate, in this opinion. Scholten started the notion, which Bacon advocates, that an ideal disciple is meant. Imagination may employ itself ad infinitum, but fruitlessly.

261 John 13: 24-27. — A critical canon, as to the shorter readings being preferable, here favours the T.R.

262 As to the morsel, or "sop," given and received in token of a covenant of peace, see pamphlet of Mr. Khodadad (London Jews' Society), pp. 32 *f.*

263 John 13: 29. — "For the feast." It is used here for the whole feast, as in John 2: 13, 23, John 6: 4, 11: 55, 12: 1, and the first verse of this chapter. See, further at John 18: 28.

263a John 13: 30. — "Having received the morsel." Cf. Luke 22: 21. "It was night." Cf. Ex. 12: 42.

264 John 13: 31-34. — See note 62 on Mark. For love as element of Christian character, see Illingworth, chapter 5.

265 John 13: 31 *f.* - "Is [was] glorified." For the aorist, cf. John 15: 6, 8, and John 17: 4; also at John 3: 19, in purpose, if not in reality.

266 John 13: 33. — "Little children": a solecism in the Gospel. Judas is by this time excluded. "The Jews": the only time in which the Lord uses the term *to His disciples*.

267 John 13: 35. — The Christian is not to be known by his wearing a cross, as the South Sea Islander a tattoo, or the Brahmin a blue thread.

268 As to discrepancies alleged by Strauss and others in respect of Peter's denials, see McClellan, pp. 494-503.

NOTES ON THE FOURTEENTH CHAPTER

269 John 14: 1. — "Let not your heart be troubled." Hengstenberg finds *seven* encouragements in this chapter: verses 2*f.*, 4-11, 12-14, 15-17, 18-24, 25 *f.*, 27.

270 "Ye believe," as in A.V., supported by Erasmus, Grotius, Olshausen etc. The Syriac of Sinai treats the verb as in the imperative the first time also, so Cyril, Augustine, Stier, Alford, Revisers' Margin, Norris. Bernard and Zahn (comparing John 1: 46, John 7: 52, John 11: 34).

271 John 14: 3. — "I am coming." This is understood by Meyer, Ewald, Luthardt, Hofman, Westcott, H. Holtzmann, Weiss and Zahn, of the παρουσία (personal "Second Advent," note 134 on Mark): one happy instance of representative agreement. So Cyril in the past, and Bishop Hall. Neither by the Paraclete nor other "spiritual" coming (De Wette, Stier, Wendt), nor, as supposed by many ordinary readers, inspired by Tholuck, etc., of a coming at death. Cf. John 21: 22.

The Tübingen idea was that the fourth Evangelist was "so spiritual that he did not believe in a visible Second Coming of Christ." The reader would find this reflected *ad nauseam* in Mr. E. F. Scott's recent book (chapter 10). Some remarks will be made on his version of German views when commenting on chapters 17 and 20 of this Gospel. How melancholy the words of Bishop Westcott: "A few enthusiasts from time to time bring the thought of Christ's return into prominence, but for the most part it has little influence upon our hearts and minds" ("The Historic Faith," p. 38).

On the παρουσία (the word itself does not occur in the Johannine writings), see also Mr. Kelly's "Exposition of the Epistles," p. 163, and his books specially devoted to the "Second Coming" in its various aspects. There is a very instructive treatise on the "Rapture" in particular by the late R. Govett, where the sense of the word παρουσία by that writer always translated "Presence" (as R.V., margin), and of cognate terms, is skilfully determined from Scripture. See also "The Lord's Coming," etc., by the late T. B. Baines of Leeds (6th edition, 1890).

The terms ἡ πρώτη παρουσία and ἡ δευτέρα παρουσία seem to have been first used by Justin Martyr in his "Dialogue with Trypho." In his "Apology" also he often speaks of the "First Coming." Cf. note 88 on Mark (9: 1).

272 John 14: 4. — Field defends the T.R. (and so A.V.), supposing that an οἴδατε ("ye know") was omitted through homoeoteleuton.

273 John 14: 8 if. — As to Philip and his "son of Joseph," see John 1: 45. Christ must have been GOD to speak as He does here.

274 John 14: 11. — "If not . . . for the very works' sake." Here, it must be borne in mind, our Lord is addressing *His disciples*. It is His works, not as Messiah (Matt. 12: 23), but as Son of God.

275 John 14: 12 I. — "Greater things than these." See, for example, Acts 2: 41. Because of verses 17 *f.* of Mark 16 there is the greater readiness on the part of those with loose views of Scripture to get rid of the last twelve verses of that Gospel. See last note under Mark. The second Evangelist goes even beyond the fourth in this particular, only that, according to John, as we see here, it was promised to believers in general. To say, as do some critics, that the portion questioned does but proceed from Church experience, aggravates the unbelief concerned. As to the effect of prayer, see Kinnear, pp. 176 *f.*

276 John 14: 15. — For the Lordship of Christ, which has been described as "the first principle of the Christian faith," *cf.* 1 John 2: 4 and Rom. 10: 9.

277 John 14: 16. — English scholars (Afford, Chr. Wordsworth, Westcott and Lightfoot, etc.) have generally accepted, as did the expositor, the distinction made between these synonyms by Trench. It has been questioned, not only by the American scholar Ezra Abbot in his "Critical Essays," but also by

Field, *ad loc.*, referring to Luke 14: 32, Acts 3: 2 *f.*, 1 John 3: 16 *f.*, for their equivalence. The two words occur together in the Gospel at 16: 26 *f.* Abbott is of opinion that ἐρωτᾶν implies inquiry whether accomplishment of the wish is possible. A good example would be found in 12: 21 of this Gospel. The word is one of the examples used by Deissmann (art. "Hellenistic Greek" in Hauck's Encyclopedia, vol. 7, p. 638) of the widespread colloquial language of the period.

277a The three Persons of the Holy Trinity are clearly distinguished in this verse. Scott is one of those who, questioning the personality of the Holy Spirit, acknowledge only an influence (p. 343). But the terms in which the Evangelist speaks of the "Comforter" scarcely need, for the support they give to the language of the Creeds, the aid of Paul's doctrine — *e.g.*, his words as to not *grieving* the Spirit (*cf.* Eph. 4: 30).

The idea of the personality of the Holy Spirit was already making itself felt among the Jews when the Psalms of Solomon appeared (see John 17: 42 there). Pflleiderer conceives that "Paraclete" came from Philo (p. 488). This fancy also is worked out in E. F. Scott's book.

On the Spirit as "the truth" (1 John 5: 7), see Godet, 2: 177, Bernard, 164 *f.*

278 John 14: 18. — This "coming" is also taken of the Holy Spirit by Tholuck, Meyer, Luthardt, Godet, Plummer and Charles. Zahn, after Augustine, understands it as that spoken of in verse 3; whilst Ewald and Weiss take it here of the appearance of the Lord to His disciples after His resurrection.

278a John 14: 20. — *Cf.* "Exposition of the Epistles," p. 87 *f.*

278b John 14: 23. — As to Mysticism (variously represented by Bernard, Tauler, Teresa, Law, etc.), of which this Gospel has been described as "the charter," see the art. "Mystical Theology" in Hauck's Encyclopedia; the two books of Inge and chapter in Illingworth, "Christian Character"; also James, "Varieties of Religious Experience," Lect. xvi. *f.*, Cheetham, "History of the Christian Church, etc.," pp. 132-134 249. Mrs. Bevan's "Three Friends of God" and "The Quiet in the Land"; and Schofield,

"Christian Sanity," ch. vii. Professor Inge prefers the shortest definition of all, "the love of God", Mr. Illingworth has described it as the belief that the human spirit is capable of an immediate apprehension of God and His truth; whilst, from the "rationalist" side, Benn speaks of it as "inward illumination caught straight from the central heart of things." Ritschl rightly held that there is no *immediate* "communion" with God without the mediation of His word ("Theology and Metaphysics," p. 476). Many need ever to be reminded of this.

The system of thought designated after the Last-named writer regards Christianity, in the words of Inge, as a primitive Puritanism spoiled by the Greeks who brought into it their intellectualism and their sacramental mysteries. "True Christianity," on the other hand, "is faith in the *historical* Christ" ("Christian Mysticism," p. 346). But for Kaftan, one of this school, "the centre of gravity is the glorified Christ, the Christian's life being *a life hid with Christ in God*" (Orr, "Essays," p. 66). The Berlin professor here, accordingly, forsakes the general trend of Ritschl's followers.

On Divine immanence, see note 14, and *cf.* F. B. Meyer, pp. 76-82.

279 John 14: 26. — *Cf.* 16: 13. Mahomet, his English followers tell us, claimed to be the predicted Paraclete (Qoran, chapter 61, "Ahmed"). See the Rewritings of Mr. Quilliam of Liverpool.

In the last words of this verse we have the *rationale* of the fourth Gospel.

280 John 14: 28. — "The Father is greater than I." *Cf.*, of course, the words of the Athanasian Creed so-called: "inferior to the Father as touching His manhood." Men of intellectual pretension — Unitarians and their followers — sometimes read Scripture very superficially. These words in the fourth Gospel are constantly used by such in support of their theory that our Lord was inferior in essence (nature) to the Father. But He is here speaking of *station*. "I go unto the Father." The reference is plainly to His exaltation on Ascension, after that He had first humbled Himself in becoming Son of man. He is then given a name above every name (Phil. 2: 9). It has nothing whatever to do with His nature. *Cf.* Bernard, p. 171. The alleged repudiation of Ascension in the Johannine record (*cf.* note on 20: 17) is part of current rubbish of "critical exposition" popularised in such books as the last of Wernle.

281 John 14: 30. — "Hath nothing *in* Me." These words meet the blasphemous doctrine of Irvingites, Christadelphians, etc., which represents that the Lord had evil propensities, but that these were never allowed to break out. We have to remember that "the *thought* of evil is sin." Not only were the Jews unable to convict JESUS of overt evil, but Satan, He affirms, could find no vulnerable point within Him.

282 John 14: 31. — "Let us go hence." The Saviour here associates His disciples with Him in His conflict: Satan is their foe as well as His. *Cf.* Mark 14: 42.

NOTES ON THE FIFTEENTH CHAPTER

283 John 15: 1 *f.* — "I am the true [genuine] Vine." *Cf.* Ps. 80: 8-16; Jer. 2: 21. As to the difference between ἄληθής and ἄληθινός used here (as in 17: 3 of God), see Trench, "Studies," p. 274, or his work on "Synonyms of the New Testament." So of Christ as the genuine Bread in vi. 32. It speaks of what is original, archetypal, the Vine of heaven. Alford's idea that we here have the "Visible Church" is, as Ryle, in his excellent "Expository Thoughts," has said, altogether unsatisfactory. For "Husbandman" *cf.* Luke 13: 7, only that there the word used is ἀμπελουογός, as to which, and the use made by Arians of it, see Trench, *op. cit.*, p. 276, note. The "vine of the earth" John sets before us in the Apocalypse: a terrible ending it will have. Many do not clearly distinguish between the harvest and the

vintage there (John 14: 18).

284 *Cf.* Paul's doctrine of "in Christ," upon which Alford touches at the end of his note.

Use of this verse has been prominent in the "Arminian" controversy.

If H. Holtzmann could but apprehend the distinct bearing of v. 22, he would not venture to pit that passage against this, as if they were inconsistent.

285 John 15: 3. — Observe the emphatic "ye," the ὑμεῖς being expressed for the disciples' comfort. *Cf.* John 13: 10. The expositor's remarks here call for special attention.

"I have spoken." *Cf.* John 5: 24, John 8: 31 *f.* Man is not to judge ("criticise") God's word, but to let it search his conscience (John 12: 48). What was then the spoken is now for us the *written* word. When justified, the Christian needs *practical*, following on *positional*, sanctification, which detaches from much that would otherwise hinder "advance in grace" (2 Peter 3: 18). Few things can be more blighting than what passes as "Higher Criticism," putting Scripture into man's mortar and applying his pestle to it. Is there not pride, self satisfaction, which is "of the world" (1 John 2: 16) behind it all? God forbid that, in writing so, one should even seem to assume a "superior tone." All by nature alike are tarred with the same brush.

286 John 15: 4 *ff.* — "Abide in Me . . . much fruit." *Cf.* Col. 1: 27; 2 Peter 1: 5-11. It is manifestly a question of "laying up in store" against "the time to come," the "day of Christ," the time of recompense (1 Tim. 6: 19 — τὸ μέλλον — and 2 Tim. 4: 8). McGiffert would have it that the Evangelist here represents the Lord as saying that He dwelt in His followers even during His earthly life (p. 493).

287 John 15: 6. — ἐβλήθη. *Cf.* ἐδοξάσθη in verse 8. Winer: "immediate result." Abbott would regard this use of the Greek tense as a "Hebraic instantaneous aorist" ("Johannine Grammar," § 2,445: he compares Isa. 40: 6-8). "They gather . . . cast." *Cf.* Matt. 5: 16; Mark 1: 30; Luke 16: 9.

Alford follows Meyer, who refers it to the "day of judgment."

288 *Cf.* "Exposition of the Epistles," p. 229 *ff.*

289 John 15: 7 *f.* — For the bearer of our Lord's words here on the "Higher Criticism," see *ibid.*, pp. 144-147; and as to "Development," p. 154. See, in particular, 2 John 9, and observe that in the present passage Christ's words are inseparable from Himself (verse 4).

290 John 15: 11. — Ryle (p. 122) quotes a happy remark of Cyril, *ad loc.*: "Christians find their joy in that over which Christ rejoices."

290a John 15: 12. — This is developed in 1 John 4: 14. Illingworth: "The essence of the life is love" (chapter 5).

290b John 15: 13. — This would be the highest reach of what is now called "Altruism." But *cf.* Matt. 5: 44. The present writer has heard Dr. Coit admit that "ethical religion" has in this a hard task in rivalry with Christianity.

291 John 15: 15. — *Cf.* Luke 12: 4 for a previous occasion when the Lord called the disciples His "friends." A striking illustration of the difference between "friend" and "servant," as regards communications made, presents itself in the incident recorded of Jonathan in contrast with his attendant (1 Sam. 20).

291a From here to John 16: 20, *cf.* Matt. 10: 17-22.

291b John 15: 19. - "The world." This, in the words of Westcott, stands for "the organisation of

society alien from, and opposed to, God" (*cf.* 1 John 2: 15). "Chosen you out": here is the idea of the Church (ἐκκλησία).

292 John 15: 22-24, — In verse 22 note the *words*; in verse 24, the *works*.

John 15: 22. — *Cf.* John 16: 9. Scott writes: "To the mind of John sin in itself involves no moral culpability; sin is in itself a mere privation" (p. 220), The "City Temple" homilies have offered the same withering sentiment for the delectation of "the man in the street." In his First Epistle the Evangelist lays down, "Sin is lawlessness," which should be read in connection with the words immediately preceding (1 John 3: 3 *f.*). Such ministers are at direct issue with both Paul and John. One of these Apostles uses language in that same letter (1 John 4: 6) which might warn them to reconsider their position in view of the βῆμα of Christ. The Epistle supposes throughout acquaintance with the Gospel.

292a The Lord avoided needless irritation of the Jews. How could the words of the Psalm quoted be made to agree with Burkitt's remarks on the discussion in Chapter 8?

293 John 15: 26. — For this "*procession*" the Gnostics substituted their "emanation." Norris has a good note on the Catholic doctrine.

The witness that the Holy Spirit bears is another evidence of personality. Observe that the Lord has sent, not merely, as an influence, imparted the Spirit. For later Scriptural designations of the third "Person" of the Trinity, *cf.* Acts 16: 7; Gal. 4: 6; Phil. 1: 9.

NOTES ON THE SIXTEENTH CHAPTER

294 John 16: 2. — Those acquainted with the history of the "Inquisition" will remember that the slaughter of "heretics," so-called, was described as an "act of faith" (*auto da fé*).

294a As to persecution, see note on the last verse of this chapter.

295 John 16: 5. — H. Holtzmann, with others, finds in this a contradiction of 13: 36. To this there is no need of any English, for his countryman B. Weiss has an adequate, reply: "No one any longer asks, because it had become only too clear to them that the 'I go back to the Father,' of which He was constantly speaking, concerned His definite departure from the earth." There is no reproach in the Lord's words. Nevertheless, as the expositor puts it, desire for some further communication would have been the expression of simpler faith.

296 John 16: 7. — *Cf.* note 134 on Mark.

297 John 16: 8 *ff.* — "Afford proof." ἐλέγχειν (verse 9) may here be rendered by "indict," "charge." For the crowning sinfulness of unbelief, see John 15: 22 and note 292. Blindness of soul comes out also in Matt. 6: 23 (Luke 11: 34 *f.*).

298 John 16: 10. — "Righteousness." Stevens (p. 214 *f.*), after Chrysostom, with most (Luthardt, Zahn, and H. Holtzmann alike), takes this of the Saviour's righteousness, H. Holtzmann, referring to John 9: 24, John 18: 30. And certainly, as one spiritual writer has said: "Righteousness comes in graciously between sin and judgment" (Govett). Mr. Kelly, it will be seen, understands by it the Pauline "righteousness of God," as Mr. J. N. Darby before him. As to this, *cf.* Liddon, "Analysis of the Epistle to the Romans," p. 71, and also Reynolds, *ad loc.*, for Augustine it was "The Righteousness of Faith." The present passage alone should be enough to meet Du Bose's assertion that "God raised Him from the dead by His grace" ("The Gospel in the Gospels," p. 184).

299 John 16: 12 *f.* — "From Himself." Here again comes out the distinct *personality* of the Holy Spirit. *Cf.* the same form of expression by Christ of Himself in *v.* 19. For spoken words of the Spirit, *cf.* 1 Tim. 4: 1 (λέγειν); 1 Peter 4: 11 (λαλεῖν), "His instruments." The Scriptures have to suffice us now (2 Tim. 3:16). *Cf.* Note 13 on Mark. "All bodies of Christians have tended to imagine that they are in the same stage of religious development as the first believers" (Jowett, "Essays," p. 484). Whether this be true or not, we may well echo the words of F. B. Meyer: "The cry should be, 'Up to Christ' rather than 'Back to Him'" (p. 125). The exposition should correct Westcott's interpretation of τὰ ἐρχόμενα, "the constitution of the Christian Church," for see Rev. 1: 19.

300 John 16: 16. — "Behold" (θεωρεῖν) and "see" (ὄραν), the one relating to "things external" (as Matt. 27: 55), the other to "things spiritual." The word for vision (ὄψις) is connected with the latter (Carr).

300a The difficulty which seems to have produced the omission of the last clause (retained by Govett) is easily appreciated. How could the Lord's departure be the cause of their seeing Him? For *spiritual* sight, see Eph. 1: 18. That Epistle is charged with mention of the Holy Spirit.

300b That which the expositor describes as "the enigma" of "the little while" is resolved in the same way by Luther, Hengstenberg, Ewald, Luthardt, and Weiss. It does not set before us the παρουσία, as Augustine, followed by Hofmann, supposed. See also the helpful remarks of Maclaren, p. 120 *ff.*

301 John 16: 20. — "Grieved." *Cf.* Luke 23: 27, and for their joy Luke 24: 41, 52, as also John 20: 20 here.

302 John 16: 23. — The word ἐρωτᾶν is here taken as "to question" by Meyer, Trench, Alford, Godet, Westcott, H. Holtzmann, Plummer, and Carr, but "to make request" by Weizsäcker, Weiss, O. Holtzmann, and Abbott. *Cf.* note on John 14: 16.

As to prayer in Christ's name, see Martensen, "Christian Dogmatics," p. 415 *f.*

302a See last footnote on p. 303, and notes 275, 277 of Appendix.

303 John 16: 25. — The use of "hour" in this verse bears on the interpretation of *v.* 28 *f.* See note there.

304 John 16: 26. — *Cf.* John 8: 42, and observe how these Scriptures discredit the modern theory of "the Fatherhood of God" and the cognate "Union in Incarnation." The difference between John 3: 14-17 and the present passage is that between love of compassion and of complacency (delight). That which was true of "the Jews" then, according to John 7: 7-19, John 15: 24 *f.*, has been true of "the world" in general since the Ascension (Luke 19: 14).

305 John 16: 27. — "Came forth from (beside) God." Already the disciples not only believed, but had come to know this (*cf.* John 6: 69, John 17: 8).

306 John 16: 29 *f.* — These verses should be read with reference to "the little while" which had perplexed the disciples, but which they now supposed they understood. It is clear, however, that, as the expositor says, they felt that He read their hearts, and Divinely.

307 John 16: 31. — Those (as Afford) who take "believe" affirmatively regard it as indicating the Lord's own glad appreciation of progress in their thoughts (*cf.* John 17: 8). The Revisers, however, seem to have acted wisely in retaining the interrogation in A.V., as do the critically revised texts.

308 John 16: 32. — "His own." For the sense, see margin of R.V., comparing John 19: 27.

"Should leave Me alone." See John 18. Critics question how the words following tally with the

Synoptic, "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" (Matt. 27: 46, Mark 15: 34). Such people talk of "psychological" difficulties, if not impossibilities: so arbitrary are they, but their psychology sits easily upon them. English readers of our national history need only be reminded of King Henry IV.'s state of mind when informed of his son's delinquency before one of the royal judges. He was a prince as well as a father. Here, in the fourth Gospel, it is of God as His Father that our Lord speaks.

308a See notes 205, 235.

309 John 16: 33. — Compare 1 Cor. 15: 5-7. There must be tribulation for the people of God until the time comes predicted in Isa. 25. There can be no real truce in the meantime between the "World" and the "Church," as pictured to us in Scripture. One of Luther's fine sayings was: "The World's enmity is the court-dress of Christians."

NOTES ON THE SEVENTEENTH CHAPTER

310 Modern critics are very ready to speak of that which they deem impossible where Scripture is concerned, yet some of these display rank perversion of their own "psychology" by conceiving it possible that some unknown writer of Greek education, whether aided by Pauline teaching at Ephesus or not, composed that which, among *bona fide* Christians, goes by the name of the Lord's "High priestly Prayer." The credulity of such people is amazing. Moreover, if to any unsophisticated reader it seem, at any rate, improbable that even a highly educated Hellenist or Hellenistic Jew could have put together such a prayer, how much more unlikely that the critics' Galilean provincial, John, son of Zebedee, could have indulged in a reverie of his own to manufacture such a composition or idealise the Lord's utterances!

310a The prayer divides itself into three parts: (1) Of the Lord for Himself; (2) for those in whose hearing it was spoken; (3) for those who should believe on Him through their word.

Milligan well says: "It would be as difficult to account for it from the pen of the Evangelist as from the lips of Jesus."

Bishop Chase, in his book on the Lord's Prayer (so called) in the early Church, has very suggestively compared the petitions of that formula with the prayer of this chapter as follows:

"Our Father who art in Heaven" with "Father" in verses 1, 5, 21, 24 with "Holy Father" in verse 11; and with "Righteous Father" in verse 25.

"Hallowed be Thy Name" with verses 6, 11, 12, 26. [We might add, "that Thy Son may glorify Thee" in verse 1.]

"Thy kingdom come" with verses 1 *f.*

"Thy will be done" with verses 4 *f.* 11, 21.

"Bring us not into temptation" with verses 12, 15.

Cf., passim, Bishop Moule's volume on this chapter, recently published, which is in his best style.

311 John 17: 1. — "Glorify Thy Son." How could this have been said, or put into the mouth of one no more than man?

"That Thy Son," etc. Govett: "That He may expend what is given in the glorifying of the Father Himself."

312 John 17: 3. — "This is the eternal life." Weiss and Westcott suppose that we have here a definition, but Beyschlag rightly says that it would be incongruous in such utterances ("New Testament Theology," i. 263 *f.*). Theosophy seeks to turn to account our Lord's words here in the service of its theory. Thus Mrs. Besant: "The heavenly root [of all religions] is the Wisdom, the knowledge of God, which is Eternal Life... From any one of its branches a man may pluck a leaf for the healing of the nations" (*Theosophist*, July, 1907). And yet, even "many Christians do not know God" (Schofield, "The Knowledge of God," p. 32): see 1 Cor. 16: 34; Titus 1: 16.

312a The knowledge which, as Westcott points out from the present tense used, is eternally progressive, is the knowledge of intimate communion, or fellowship, as said Luther. It is realised in the present, according to v. 24 *f.* and John 6: 47, 54, but only by foretaste (*cf.* Mark 10: 30; Luke 18: 30). See Note 110 on Mark. It is not that faith (*cf.* John 20: 31) and knowledge are coextensive (Scott), for faith is temporal, knowledge eternal. As Professor Inge puts it: "Eternal life is not γνῶσις, knowledge and possession, but the state of acquiring knowledge." The knowledge is dependent on the life, rather than the life on the knowledge. *Cf.* Walpole's "Vital Religion," ninth edition, 1907, chapter 1. As to difference between apprehension and comprehension of the Infinite, see Isaac Taylor, "The World of Mind," p. 822, and *cf.* Job 36: 26.

312b "True" (ἀληθινός), in contrast with what is imperfect, rather than the false, which would require ἀληθής, as in Rom. 3: 4.

312c "Jesus Christ." This is the only place in the Gospels where our Lord speaks thus of Himself, so that it has been a quarry for critics. H. Holtzmann says, "The historic Christ cannot have spoken so," and refers it to the same influence on the text as that alleged for Matt. 28: 19 *f.* So Horton.

Godet, happily, adheres to the unimpeachable credibility of the Evangelist's "These words spoke Jesus", as does also Bernard (p. 345 *ff.*). Not so Westcott and Plummer, who bow to German ruling. Those who love the Scriptures may hold fast the assurance that our Lord's own self-designation here was the source of that so often afterwards used by the Holy Spirit in the New Testament. And so, to begin with, Matt. 1: 1; Mark 1: 1. For the Lord's naming Himself, *cf.* the Synoptic self-designation as "Son of man." On the verge of the close of His life He called Himself by the name JESUS, given to Him by the angel at its outset; and that He did call Himself "the CHRIST" is vouched for by Matt. 23: 10. It is not, therefore, correct to say, as Carr, on the present passage of John, "Here only does our Lord apply the term 'CHRIST' to Himself," for in Matthew's Gospel the Lord does more than "accept" the title, as in Matt. 16: 17 there, also Mark 14: 61 *f.*

Finally, by what philosophy or romance could knowledge of a creature, as Unitarians and their critical allies regard Christ, be needful for life eternal? A like question is, of course, applicable to the words "glorify Thy Son" in verse 1, as to verses 10 *f.*, etc.

313 See note 232a.

313a The Exposition here meets a point raised by Pfleiderer and, in English guise, Scott (note 192).

313b John 17: 5. — "The glory which I had," etc. If this, as Unitarians suggest, had meant merely the glory that Christ had in the counsels of the Father before living in this world. how could such a being have known of glory destined for him? *Cf.*, of course, John 1: 3.

314 John 17: 6. — "I manifested Thy Name." *Cf.* Ps. 22: 22.

314a John 17: 8. — "Knew" — i.e., learned. Not conscious knowledge, as εἰδῆτε in 1 John 5: 13, etc. However closely "believe" may approach "know" in this way, they are not interchangeable words.

315 John 17: 9. — "I request for them." The preposition is περί, not ὑπέρ, "in behalf of" (*cf.* the Greek, both verb and preposition, at John 18: 19), which occurs in verse 19. It is not intercession, but the Lord putting forth a claim.

316 John 17: 11. — "We." Christ puts Himself on a perfect level with the Father.

"One." "Not manifested ecclesiastical oneness, but in the spirit of their minds" (Bellett, p. 124). *Cf.* note on verse 21.

317 John 17: 12. — Alford. Wordsworth and Burgon use this verse for the idea that Judas had at one time been a true believer (verse 6). This is not only to hazard their reputation as commentators. but to bring "divinity" into contempt. See John 18: 9.

317a John 17: 15. — Milligan and Bernard would render "out of the Evil One" (*cf.* 1 John 5: 18 *f.*). This rendering Mr. Kelly preferred for Matt. 6: 13.

318 John 17: 17. — As to "disunion of the Church" being an incentive to unbelief. see T. Pearson on "Infidelity," Part II., chapter 6; also Isaac Taylor "Spiritual Christianity," p. 149. *Cf.* notes 316, 319a.

318a John 17: 18. — "I also sent." This may be proleptic.

319 John 17: 19. — Our Lord does not speak of "consecration of humanity" as such, but of His setting Himself apart for the sake of disciples. *Cf.* John 10: 36, of which this is correlative.

319a John 17: 21. — "One." *Cf.* note on verse 11. Bishop Moule (p. 177) happily compares Rom. 14: 19. The still continuing tendency is unfavourable to this, indeed, ecclesiastical dissension might seem to retard the Second Coming of the Church's Head. As to "believe," see note on verse 23.

320 John 17: 22. — "The glory," as future (*cf.* Rom. 8: 18).

321 John 17: 23. — "Perfected into one." *Cf.* Eph. 4: 13

"Know." Here is an advance on verse 21, "believe." *Cf.* note 314a Heitmüller treats the words as "almost identical." Such a notion breaks down when applied to their context. Indeed. the critical reading of John 10: 38, as of 1 John 5: 13, shakes it severely.

322 John 17: 24. — Scott: "He is not thinking primarily of a future meeting with His disciples in heaven" (p. 305 *f.*). How does that comport with the preceding verse, which does not yield to the German view (see last preceding note) that the Johannine "know" and "believe" are practically equivalent. To hark back to verse 15 is a long cry. Again: "He has taken them to dwell in heavenly places with Himself" (p. 306). But this only introduces Paul's doctrine (Eph. 2: 6), of which John's is independent, although the writer labours to prove the contrary. With reference to the notion that Paul's belief had undergone material change since he wrote his First Letter to the Thessalonians (Charles, "Eschatology," p. 385 *ff.*), we have but to compare 2 Thess. 2: 8 with 2 Tim. 4: 8. The word ἐπιφάνεια is common to both of these letters, and in the earlier letter the Apostle has combined παρουσία with it. John has in no sense "corrected" Paul,

NOTES ON THE EIGHTEENTH CHAPTER

323 John 18: 2. — We have here manifestly the comment of an eye-witness. All attempts to forge a weapon against such testimony must come to nought.

324 John 18: 6. — "Went away backward" (*cf.* Ps. 40: 14). These words, as others elsewhere, may well have been directed against the Gnostic theory (Iren., bk. iii.) that "the Christ" forsook "Jesus" in

the hour of need.

325 John 18: 7 *f.* — Deut. 22: 6 here finds its spiritual counterpart. The Lord seems to say: "Take either Me or them; you cannot have both" (Govett). How Frederick Robertson's unhappy words, "He drew too near to a whirling wheel," etc., witness against a preacher whose utterances have been much in vogue! Conspicuous is the truth of substitution, assailed like so much else in the words of Christ Himself.

326 John 18: 10. — The fourth Evangelist alone supplies the names. *Cf.* note above on verse 2.

327 John 18: 11. — "The cup," etc. Whilst these words are peculiar to John's narrative, they afresh illustrate his way of subdued reference to Synoptic accounts. *Cf.* Matt. 26: 39.

328 John 18: 12. — "To Annas first." How, in the light of the Synoptic account could any but an eye-witness, the Evangelist himself, have recorded this without contradiction?

329 John 18: 13. — "Who was high priest of that year." See note on John 11: 49.

330 John 18: 15. — "Known to the high priest." Bleek and Ewald ("History of Israel," 6, p. 118; "Johannine Writings," 1, p. 400) supposed that the Evangelist was related to the high-priestly family. This idea has been used by Delff for his theory that the writer had himself been a priest, as by Burkitt (p. 250) for the notion that he had been a Sadducee. Such fancies have been generated by a statement (in Eusebius) of Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus A.D. 190, that John of Ephesus wore a *πέταλον* — *i.e.*, plate, coronet, or mitre (*cf.* Ex. 39: 30). This may, however, have referred to one of the same name who, we know, was "of the kindred of the high priest" (Acts 4: 6). Whilst Chrysostom and Cyril regard the disciple "known to the high priest" as the Evangelist, Augustine and others have questioned the identity, Bengel supposed Nicodemus to be meant; Zahn thinks, James. "The" before "other" is doubtful: it is not in *ÅBD*, the Syriac, and Memphitic. Anyhow, *γνωστὸς* must be distinguished from *συγγενής* (verse 26). If it be the Evangelist, any trade-connection he may have had with the high priest would sufficiently explain the word here used.

331 John 18: 19. — "The high priest." Augustine, Chrysostom, Alford, Ellicott and Luthardt understand Annas (*cf.* verses 13, 24); but Zahn, as most, takes it of Caiaphas. See note on verse 24.

333 John 18: 20. — "In secret I spoke nothing." See Isa. 45: 17-19, Isa. 48: 12-18. It will be observed that the Lord is silent as to His disciples.

333 John 18: 22. — The record of this is peculiar to John.

334 John 18: 24. — Most commentators are of opinion that this should come in between verses 13 and 14, as in some Greek and Syriac manuscripts, and as it was read by Cyril of Alexandria; and that the questioning and smiting took place before Caiaphas and the Sanhedrin. Some writers, however, suppose that John describes only the informal hearing before Annas, and accordingly passes over the trial by Caiaphas. *Cf.* Zahn, *ad loc.*

The verse comes twice in Cod. A. of the Syriac of Jerusalem lectionary, the first time after verse 13, and again after verse 23: this, of course, represents the work of harmonists. Luther's Bible contains a marginal note by himself at the earlier verse that it "has been misplaced in turning the page, as often happens," and at verse 24: "This verse ought to follow immediately after verse 14." John 18: 19-24 are absent from the Syrsin. See Mrs. Lewis's remarks in *Expositor*, vol. 12, p. 519 ("John 18: 18, 24, and 14 are really one"). *Cf.* Blass, "Philology of the Gospels," p. 59, on "blundering scribes." In his text this last of recent editors has placed verse 24 between verses 13 and 14.

335 John 18: 28ff. — The seven stages in the trial before Pilate, according as it was conducted outside or inside the "prætorium," are verses 28-32 of this chapter, outside; verses 33-37 inside; verses 38-40 outside; 19: 1-3 inside verses 4-7 outside; verses 8-11 inside; verses 12-16 outside (Westcott).

336 John 18: 28. — "That they might eat the Passover." The difficulty about the last Passover, already discussed in a note on Mark 14: 12, and touched on here in connection with the opening words of chapter 13, is dealt with by the expositor in a long note on John 19: 14, where the view is taken that it was allowable to partake of the paschal meal within the twenty-four hours of the same technical day. And so Milligan, who supposes that the Jews' celebration was interrupted. Cf. Bernard, pp. 49-54. It may have been to secure strict compliance with primitive usage that the rubric in the Talmudic treatise *Zebbach* (verse 2) was afterwards framed. Delitzsch (in Riehm) questions the explanation given by Dr. John Lightfoot, the learned Rabbinic scholar of the seventeenth century, who says that the Evangelist here adopts the popular language — *i.e.*, speaks of the *Chagigah*, or peace-offering ("Works," ii. 670). Zahn, however, is of opinion that Lightfoot was probably right, and that the day here intended was the fifteenth of Nisan ("Introduction," ii., p. 514; Exposition, p. 622 *f.*). The learned Erlangen professor remarks that φαγεῖν is used for celebration, and that the standing expression for the fourteenth day of Nisan was ποιεῖν. Cf. "This do in remembrance of Me"; Ex. 12: 48, Num. 9: 2, Deut. 16: 1; Matt. 26: 18; Heb. 11: 28. Note that Num. 28: 16-18 (as Lev., see note on Mark) distinguishes between the paschal meal and "the Feast." See, further, Khodadad, p. 20 *f.*, and note 346 below (*ad Irk.*).

337 John 18: 32. — "It is not lawful for us," etc. According to the Talmud, it was in the year immediately preceding this that the Romans had deprived the Jews of execution of capital punishment — *i.e.*, exactly "forty years" before the Fall of Jerusalem.

338 John 18: 37. — "King." See Luke 23: 2, and *cf.* 1 Tim. 6: 13, the "good confession."

"Of the truth": *cf.* 1 John 3: 19 and 1 John 4: 6, 1 John 5: 19. "Of God," in the last references does not justify its being said that the terms are practically equivalent, as by Heitmüller (so Scott). See Exposition, p. 20.

339 John 18: 38 *ff.* — "I find no fault in Him at all." *cf.* Ex. 12: 5; Deut. 17: 1; 1 Peter 1: 19.

339a One of the latest crazes is to drag in here the Feast of Purim, so that Barabbas should represent Mordecai, and the role of Haman be taken by our Lord (Frazer, "Golden Bough," 3: 188-198). Even Benn hesitates to accept such a suggestion. Conjuring with the name of the Jewish anarchist cannot be a self-satisfying, to say nothing of a creditable, service to society, for either an authority on folk-lore or a writer of romance.

NOTES ON THE NINETEENTH CHAPTER

340 John 19: 2. — For the "robe" Herod's men put on our Lord, in which He was sent back to Pilate, see Luke 23: 11. Evidently Pilate's soldiers, in the first instance, combined with Herod's in this indignity, and readjusted the same garment on returning to their own guard-room. It was not merely Herod's men who engaged in that horseplay, as Frazer represents (*op. cit.*, 3, p. 1901).

341 John 19: 5. — *Cf.* John 11: 50. He was so portrayed by Correggio in the picture exhibited at the National Gallery, and in the later famous picture in the Doré Gallery.

342 John 19: 6. — The Jews disguised from Pilate that the punishment prescribed in Lev. 24: 16 was "stoning," which they had already several times attempted.

343 John 19: 7. — As to the alleged blasphemy, *Cf.* John 5: 18, John 8: 59, John 10: 33. Here is

their final deliberate judgment of His claims (*Cf.* Matt. 26: 65; Mark 14: 64; Luke 22: 71).

344 John 19: 11. — By "he" Caiaphas is meant (John 11: 49 *ff.*).

345 John 19: 13. — Pilate now took his seat, it would seem for the first time. Some would treat ἐκάθισεν as "seated" — i.e., "Jesus" — but the verb is nowhere else used transitively (Westcott, Zahn).

"Gabbatha." Bishop Lightfoot (p. 143) follows Ewald in taking this, not of a "raised" place, but as connected with a root yielding the idea of *mosaic*.

346 John 19: 14. — "The preparation . . . the *sixth* hour." The expositor, in his note attached to this verse, leaves really very little to add beyond recording that Alford, as Bengel, has followed Eusebius's idea that the text was altered. The present writer, accordingly, whilst referring the reader to note 142 in the volume on Mark's Gospel, and that on John 18: 28 of this Gospel, may confine his remarks here pretty much to the question of the hours, Sir William Ramsay's treatment of which seems not to have come under Mr. Kelly's notice.

To begin with, it should be noticed in Luke 22: 7-13 that John was one of the two concerned in making the actual Passover "preparation." Schmiedel writes: "John corrected by insertion what Mark and Luke corrected by omission" (col. 1,773). To this the present remarks shall be directed. The leading passage referred to by Mr. Kelly may be transcribed in an English rendering.

Pliny (2: 79): "The days have been computed by different peoples in different ways. The Babylonians reckoned from one sunrise to the next; the Athenians from one sunset to the next; the Umbrians from noon to noon; the multitude universally from dawn to darkness; while the Roman priests and those who presided over the Civil Day (as also did the Egyptians and Hipparchus) from midnight to midnight." Aulus Gellius ("Noctes Atticæ") refers to a work of Varro, whose statement is to the same effect.

Sir W. Ramsay (Expositor, 1893, fourth series, vol. 7, pp. 216-223, and 1896, fifth series, vol. 3, pp. 457 *ff.*; *Cf.* art. in Hastings, D.B., extra vol. p. 475 *ff.*) holds that *sixth hour* indicated *mid-day* at all seasons of the year so that "about the sixth hour" would be "somewhere between 11 a.m. and 1 p.m.", and that the Roman civil day "was not divided into hours." Further that "there is no justification for the theory that the ancients reckoned the hours in two ways — (1) beginning from sunrise; (2) beginning from midnight." Accordingly, he gives up the usual reconciliation. He believes that the numbering of hours began invariably from daybreak or sunrise." Zahn is like-minded.

If the Roman reckoning differed in Italy and the Roman province of Asia Minor, the third hour of Mark living in Italy would be identical with "about the sixth hour" of John living at Ephesus in his old age. *Cf.* Plummer (*ad loc.*).

Besides Nonnus, spoken of in the original note, Theophylact conjectured the true reading to be "third," and so Bengel, Usher, Alford and McRory, but the textual evidence is strongly against it. *Cf.* Zahn, p. 718.

Wordsworth and Burgon's belief, as that of Tholuck, Ewald, Westcott and Milligan, that John followed the Roman computation of time (in some form or other), so that "sixth hour" would be our 6 a.m., whilst Mark's was the Jewish (for this purpose reckoned from sunrise), and the same as modern 9 a.m., might seem to be sustained by the fourth Gospel itself. As Ryle says, there would remain three hours to account for. These would be taken up with the preliminaries of crucifixion. That excellent writer himself inclines to the view of Calvin, Hammond, Hengstenberg, Ellicott, etc., that, from the Jews' division of their day into twelve hours of four parts (Maimonides), Mark's "third hour" would

work out at about 9 a.m., and John's "sixth" at between 9 and 12.

According to old Jewish modes of thought, the day spoken of in John 20: 19 would have to be a "Monday," but everyone knows that John is speaking of the first day of a week. On the whole, the present writer cannot but think that resort to a recondite explanation, of which none of the ancients seems ever to have dreamed, is best avoided.

To what has been said on the general question of alleged discrepancy in note on Mark 14: 12 may be added that Chwolson, a Hebrew Christian, in his "Last Passover of Christ" (1892), maintains that the Pharisees ate their Passover on the 13th, the Sadducees on the 14th Nisan.

Zahn holds that John says substantially the same as the Synoptists (Introduction, 2, pp. 523-526; Exposition, pp. 637-640). As to the "Paschal Controversy" (A.D. 165-170), see Eusebius, v. 24; Stanton, 173-197; Zahn, 2: 522 *f.*, with his notes 16-18.

The date of the lord's death seems to have been April 7 in the year 30 of our era.

347 John 19: 15. — Here probably Matt. 27: 24 comes in. Some, however, put the incident there between John 18: 40 and John 19: 1.

348 John 19: 17. — "Went out." See Lev. 6: 12-21, Lev. 16: 27; Heb. 13: 12.

349 John 19: 19. — Of the four forms of inscription, John's is the fullest, and is most like Matthew's, so that probably these were both in Hebrew. Pilate would perhaps employ different scribes to write the several inscriptions

Observe that no part of any of them is excluded by or inconsistent with any part of the other three. Its being put in different languages is in keeping with the glory of the "Son of man" (Bellett, p. 148).

350 John 19: 23. — A coat of one piece only is still worn by Northern peasants (Schor, p. 48).

351 John 19: 26. — Most commentators take Mary, wife of Cleopas, as sister of the Lord's mother, but Bengel, Meyer, Alford, Norris, Weiss, Mayor and Zahn regard Salome as sister of the Lord's mother (*Cl.* Matt. 27: 56 and Mark 15: 40), so making four women. According to their view, the Evangelist and his brother James would be cousins of our Lord.

351a John 19: 26. — Bishop Lightfoot, in his second Dissertation appended to edition of the Epistle to the Galatians, regards the Lord's committal of His mother to the care of John as "fatal" to the "Helvidian" theory that His kinsmen were His *uterine* brethren. But surely His marking their unbelief in this way may be accepted in explanation.

The statement of Origen, cited by this learned writer, is certainly wrong that Scripture nowhere speaks of them as Mary's children: see Ps. 69: 8, the Messianic character of which, presumably, neither of these truly great scholars would have denied (*cf.* note 137).

352 John 19: 31. — The day was "great" because on it were offered the firstfruits (Lev. 23: 10-14; *cf.* Deut. 21: 23).

Paraskeue, the Christian name of Friday, "could to Greek Christians suggest nothing else" (Milligan).

353 John 19: 35 *f.* — "He knoweth." This has been taken by Weizsäcker of a confirmatory witness, and Schmiedel, a complacent follower, questions how the witness already spoken of could be sufficiently authoritative, Although Luthardt has cited John 9: 37 as closely parallel, Abbott, Zahn, etc., follow Erasmus's paraphrase in taking ἔκεῖνος of our Lord. On the other side, reference may be made

to Buttmann (against Hilgenfeld). As usually taken, the pronoun illustrates the characteristically redundant style of this Evangelist.

See "Not a bone of Him shall be crushed." *Cf.* Ps. 139: 16 (Bellett).

354 John 19: 37. — The Evangelist here follows the present Hebrew text of Zech. 12: 10 (which has "on Me") nor the Septuagint. If we regard the matter from the merely literary point of view, he may have been acquainted with some Aramaic paraphrase.

354a John alone says that this Joseph was "a disciple of Jesus, but secretly for fear of the Jews." *Cf.* notes on Mark 15: 43; Luke 23: 50; Matt. 27: 51. It will be found that each of the Evangelists furnishes some statement peculiar to himself.

354b *Cf.* Luke 23: 53.

355 John 19: 42. — "They put Jesus." This, again, controverts such views of human destiny as Swedenborg's, which represent the body as for ever abandoned at death. The Lord's body is spoken of as Himself.

NOTES ON THE TWENTIETH CHAPTER

356 The RESURRECTION. — For the order of appearances (see Table in Turton, p. 357) of the risen Lord. see West on the Resurrection, Birks's "Horæ Apologeticæ," Ryle's valuable note, and a pamphlet by R. Govett, "The Saviour's Resurrection: Events of the First Day," as also a powerful book by the same, published by Maclehose, Glasgow. Colonel Turton's chapter (17) on the whole subject is excellent, see in particular p. 362 as to St. Paul's reference to the various occasions in groups. Reference should also be made to Swete, "The Appearances of the Lord after the Passion," p. 51 *ff.*

357 John 20: 1 *f.* — See note 167 on Mark 16: 1-8. Here is John's first mention of the stone.

"Dearly loved," ἐφίλει, for which ἡγάπα is used elsewhere, as in 13: 23.

358 "We know not." This assumes knowledge of the earlier Gospels. The fourth Evangelist, like each of the rest, knew more than he has recorded. *Cf.* note on verse 30.

359 John 20: 3. — *Cf.* Luke 24: 12, where sceptical writers, as is their wont in such cases, find a contradiction. There (α) Peter is alone, (β) does not enter the tomb (see verse 6 here). But the earlier Evangelist is speaking of a second visit of Peter, on returning from which he met the Lord Himself (verse 34 there).

360 John 20: 5. — "Stooping down" — i.e., sideways (παρακύψας). Had he not done so, he would have stood in his own light. As to such a tomb, see Schor, p. 34.

361 John 20: 7. — The word ἐντετυλιγμένον speaks volumes. It means "folded inwards" — i.e., turban-shaped (Govett), or twirled (Latham). What was it that entranced him? The remarkable appearance that the vesture presented in the position of the various parts towards each other. The Lord had detached Himself from the napkin and the shroud without dishevelled them, to say nothing of handling them. A miracle alone could explain the phenomenon. The common notion (as of Dr. Torrey, "Talks with Men") that He had just calmly folded up the napkin afresh in a different place, so as to indicate that there had been no haste, no removal of the body by friend or foe, is feeble in comparison with the full reality. "A place apart" refers to the different position consistent with the unity, which had not been disturbed. *Cf.* Carr: "The napkin perhaps rested on a stone which had served as a pillow." So apparently, Bishop Gore understands it ("New Theology," 3, p. 123), as does Prof. Swete. Further

reference may be made to Govett or Latham ("The Risen Master," p. 43, *ff.*, ed. of 1901).

362 John 20: 8. — A question has been raised as to the Lord's vesture as risen. A change must take place if Lev. 16: 23 was to be fulfilled,

362a "Saw" (εἶδεν). This time with intelligence.

362b As suggested by Lake ("Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ," p. 133).

363 John 20: 9. — "From" — *i.e.*, from among (ἐκ).

363a See note on John 6: 69, and as to Divine faith founded on Scripture giving infallible certainty, Bishop Pearson on the words of the Creed, "I believe."

363b *Cf.* 17: 8, 1 John 5: 13.

364 John 20: 11-16. — These and the two following verses are peculiar to John. *Cf.*, again, note 167 on Mark. Some have carped at the absence of any record of fright on Mary's part. But, writes Bellett, "What was such splendour to her?" (p. 155).

365 John 20: 13. — "I know not." In verse 2 it was "We know." She had spoken with the other women in the meantime. John's account supposes knowledge of Matt. 28: 1, 5 *f.*; Mark 16: 1-5; Luke 24: 1-10 (Zahn, 2: 509). One may see that the fourth Evangelist attaches himself especially to the account given by the second.

366 John 20: 14. — Athanasius, Chrysostom and Bishop Andrewes suppose that Mary thought, from the altered manner of the angels, that there was another on the scene, and that, accordingly, she turned to see the new-comer.

367 John 20: 17. — "The Christ" had not yet ascended. The Gnostics alleged that He did so when "Jesus" was arrested (note 324). Scott supposes that he reproduces the Evangelist's own interpretation when he represents the Lord's ascension as "accomplished from the time of His meeting with Mary", that for John "there was no room for what is described by the writer of the Acts" and that "the παρουσία was taken out of its Apocalyptic setting." Such writers evidently should leave John 21: 22 alone, for their system "has no room" for it. Observe that the words "till I come" (or, "while I am coming") are independent of any theory as to the three closing verses of the Gospel. See notes 394 *ff.*

"Do not go on touching Me." For denial of historical support to the bodily resurrection of the Lord, see Lake, *op. cit.* For St. Paul's position, *cf.* Col. 2: 9, Phil. 3: 21.

"My God." The Lord is "Son of man" still. *cf.* notes on John 3: 13, John 6: 62.

368 John 20: 19. — "When it was evening." See note on John 19: 14 (*ad fin.*).

"The doors were shut," etc. The question as to the properties of the Lord's body in resurrection leads to the suggestion of a "four-dimensional world," of which Mr. R. J. Campbell has availed himself for a system of ideas very different from the views of the propounder of it (Dr. A. T. Schofield).

369 John 20: 20. — "The disciples." Luke shows that others were present besides the Apostles. As to his saying that they were "terrified" whilst John speaks of their being "glad," see sensible remarks of Turton, p. 359.

370 John 20: 23. — See note on John 7: 39. It would be found that each form of the commission in the Gospels illustrates the design of the respective record (Bellett, p. 162 *f.*).

371 This act of administrative forgiveness, Augustine said, holds of all believers everywhere. So

even Pusey on "Absolution," p. 32. The Second Book of Homilies: "The priests are as much bound to confess to the lay people as the lay people to the priests." After such *dicta*, who could call the late Dean Stanley revolutionary when he wrote: "The clergyman needs the advice and pardon of the gifted layman quite as much as the layman needs the advice and pardon of the gifted clergyman"? ("Christian Institutions," p. 179).

Observe that Thomas was absent on this occasion. This lends support to the view of Augustine and others, to which reference has been made; otherwise that Apostle's commission must have been defective.

Instances such retention of sin are Ananias and Sapphira, the incestuous person at Corinth, Hymenæus and Alexander.

For power conferred on the ἐκκλησία as such, see Matt. 18.

372 "Didymus." This is not a surname: Thomas in Syriac means "twin."

373 John 20: 29. — Cf. 1 Peter 1: 8.

374 John 20: 30 *f.* — "Signs." The great question of controversy between the Church and the Jewish rulers had been as to the Messianic claims of JESUS, and in the first period miracles played the chief part in establishing them. It was to the interest of Jewish opponents to upset the reality of these. Why, it may be asked, if truth was on their side, did they not put the Apostles to open shame? (Gerdell, "On the Miracles," etc., p. 53). Martineau thought that these verses indicate that the writer did not intend his work to be taken as strictly "historical" ("Seat of Authority in Religion," p. 435). In them, however, we have inspired expression to the difference between merely human and Scripture biography. Contrast Boswell's "Johnson," Lockhart's "Scott," Morley's "Gladstone," with the very limited scope of the fourth Gospel. Such a statement as that contained in these verses, of course, discredits theories like those of Wellhausen, who, accordingly, in his recent monograph, treats them as from a later hand (p. 27).

The last words afford us a pre-eminent instance of what is meant by "dogma." "A truth which every one who would be a Christian is bound to believe" (Gore, "The Creed of the Christian" p. 16). But Creeds are, after all, "only human expositions" (Kinnear, p. 163). As to Dogma, see Green, iii. 165-185, Lotze, § 94 *ff.*

There were two departments of error with which the Apostles had to deal: (α) Jewish, to which the Gospel of Matthew is directed, (β) that of *Gentile* speculation, rife around John at Ephesus, which treated matter as evil, and questioned the omniscience and goodness of the Creator. The fourth Evangelist has shown that sin is a matter of man's heart, and that the Lord Jesus was the Creator's accredited agent and witness. Again, reason as man may about the character of the Lord's body in resurrection, that this was not merely phenomenal is patent to all but bigots.

The Lord has been shown to be Son of God and Son of man in one (see verses 14-18). Cf., again, John 3: 13 and 16 with John 11: 27 and John 17: 3. In John 1: 32 the Dove was not "the Christ," but the Spirit.

As for Eternal Life, Christ's word was saturated with mention of it (John 6: 68, John 10: 27 *f.*). He is Himself that Life (John 5: 26, John 11: 25 *f.*).

With verse 31 here *cf.*, of course, 1 John 5: 9, 13, which in like manner informs us of the object the Apostle had in writing that letter.

375 Grotius thought that the last chapter was written by John the Presbyter, as do Harnack and others now. The opinion that the Gospel originally ended with John 20 seems to go back to Tertullian ("Ad Prax," 25). It is that of Germans in general, including Zahn (§ 66 *ad init.*).

375a Ewald's opinion was that it was John's own composition, dating some ten years after the rest of the Gospel, but added before its publication, the uncompleted part in the meanwhile having a sort of private circulation. It is rather a summary, like that at the close of John 12 (Reynolds).

NOTES ON THE TWENTY-FIRST CHAPTER

376 As far as we know, writes Zahn, the Gospel has never circulated without this chapter (ii., p. 484). Tatian's "Diatessaron" used the essential parts of it down to verse 25. Some think that the closing verses proceeded from those around the Apostle, with his sanction (Zahn, p. 493).

Scarcely any German writer now follows Hengstenberg's defence. Even Luthardt regards it as an Epilogue, although probably from John's own hand. So Meyer and Godet. Weiss is one of those who think that it was by another hand (see note 394a). Happily, most reject the view of Baur, Strauss and Keim, that it represents a vindication of John as a rival of Peter.

Mr. Kelly, it will be seen, defends every verse of the chapter as an integral portion of the Gospel written by John himself, reprobating the idea that it is a supplement.

377 John 21: 1. — "Manifested Himself." Cf. John 2: 11, John 7: 4.

"At the sea of Tiberias." It was so called already in the time of Josephus. Observe John's combination of the Lucan and Matthæan different scenes of the appearances.

378 John 21: 2. — The sons of Zebedee. The only distinct mention in the Gospel of James and John, and, of course, not by name. Zahn regards it as indication of editorship (2, p. 485).

379 Godet suggests that these may have been Papias's John the Elder and Aristion, whom the ancient writer speaks of as "disciples of the Lord." Observe that there are seven disciples in the scene (see note 46). Germans are embarrassed in accounting for the number.

379a John 21: 3. — Bacon: "Unconscious of the Resurrection" (H.J., October, 1907, p. 141). How, then, explain the readiness of the words of the disciple to Peter in verse 7?

380 John 21: 4 *ff.* — There seems to be a designed comparison with Luke 5: 1-9 whilst verse 7 reminds of Matt. 14: 28-31, and verses 9-12 recall 6: 9-11 of this Gospel.

John's account is different from that of the incident described in Luke 5, from the very fact that they were distinct occasions. Thus, in the earlier Gospel Peter says, "Depart from me," etc., whilst here he girds his fisher's smock about him and strikes out for the shore to go to the Lord. On the previous occasion his confession of sinfulness was superficial; experience acquired of what he is has now the rather moved him to be silent about it. On that first occasion the net was being rent and the fish not secured; here all is tranquilly brought to land. See, further, in Harnack, "Luke the Physician," English translation, p. 227, where dissent is expressed from the view taken by Wellhausen in commentary on Luke.

381 John 21: 7. — This verse makes it certain that the Evangelist John was intended by "the disciple whom Jesus loved."

382 "One hundred and fifty-three." No better explanation has ever been found for this number than

Hengstenberg's, that it was the number of nations of the world known at the time.

383 John 21: 13 *f.* — The Gnostic condemnation of animal food is here disposed of.

384 "The third time." That is, to the Apostles as a company.

385 John 21: 15-17. — Who but John could have written these verses? *Cf.* John 13: 37.

386 John 21: 15 *f.* — Adolphe Monod: "Give me thine observances, says the God of Pharisaism, give me thy personality, says the God of Hegel; give me thy reason, says the God of Kant. It remains for the God of Jesus Christ to say, Give Me thy heart . . . the unmistakable feature of a genuine conversion" (from sermon on "Dieu demandant le Coeur a l'Homme," cited by Bishop Moule in his devotional book on Jesus and the Resurrection).

The difference between ἀγαπᾶν and φιλεῖν is that "φ. is so far lower than ἀ. that it indicates less of insight and more of emotion" (Moule, p. 181, aptly comparing 1 Peter 1: 8). Reference may be to Trench, Westcott, Abbott. Augustine calls attention to "My" (not "thy").

"Feed . . . tend." The difference between βόσκειν and ποιμαίνειν being one of sustenance, as compared with guidance.

387 John 21: 18 *f.* — *Cf.* 2 Peter 1: 14. The words here are from the same hand as John 12: 13 (Lightfoot, p. 194).

388 John 21: 18. — "When thou wast young." There is a prolepsis in these words. The Lord is speaking of "Peter's life then present" (Moule, pp. 190 *f.*). *Cf.* 1 Cor. 13: 12.

389 John 21: 19. — *Cf.* 13: 36.

390 John 21: 20-23. — John was still alive when these verses were written (Zahn, 2, p. 488).

Drummond, from these words, vindicates the Evangelist against the Tübingen charge (note 376) of depreciation of Peter (p. 395 *f.*).

391 John 21: 21. — *Cf.* Mark 10: 39.

392 John 21: 22. — Bengel: "Peter, the foundation; John, the crown."

393 "Come." At death, say Augustine, Grotius, Ewald, Olshausen, etc., at destruction of Jerusalem, Luthardt, Alford, Godet, Westcott, etc., but De Wette, Meyer, Weiss, H. Holtzmann, Gloag and Zahn, at the "Second Coming."

Instead of negating Paul's distinction of two classes, those who shall have fallen asleep and those who remain, these verses rather confirm it.

A question has been raised whether John the Apostle died a natural death as generally supposed, or was, like his brother, martyred by Jews (*cf.* Matt. 20: 23; Mark 10: 38*f.*), as alleged in a Fragment of Philip of Side of the fifth century. See English edition of Schürer (p. 59), and a Chronicle of George the Sinner of the ninth or tenth century. *Cf.* Stanton, p. 167; Burkitt, p. 252. The statement of George the Sinner, which had already been given in Harnack's "Apostolic Fathers" (p. 87 *ff.*), that distinguished scholar himself discredits ("Chronology," p. 665 *f.*), because of the silence of Eusebius and Irenæus. Heitmüller, one of the latest writers, joins Schmiedel and others in crediting this mythology. Drummond (p. 223) had remarked, with reference to the Syrian martyrology in Burkitt (p. 254), that it does not imply that the brothers came by their deaths at the same time and place.

394 John 21: 23-25. — Harnack supposes that the Evangelist was already dead when verse 23 was

added (p. 676), and (as Ewald) that the writer is expressly distinguished from the disciple that "beareth witness and wrote." From verse 23 a curious notion has been derived by Pfeleiderer (Scott follows suit) that the Evangelist gave up the chiliastic expectation (Rev. 20: 4).

394a THE EPILOGUE (verse 24 *f.*). — Weiss and many other students of Scripture regard verses 24 and 25 as alone written after the Apostle's death. But how could a third person, or even a company of John's friends or followers, attest the truth of his record, whether personally acquainted with him or not? As Dr. B. G. Moulton sensibly remarks, "endorsement is of no value without names" ("The Modern Reader's Bible," p. 1706). Bacon's quotation of Rom. 8: 16 is not in the least to the point. *Cf.* John 19: 35 and note. The difficulty, moreover, that some raise over "we know" (verse 24) is not felt by those who compare the same form of expression in chapter i. of the First Epistle (see also 2 Cor. 1: 13). Observe that there is no emphatic pronoun (ἡμεῖς) used, which would have given colour to the "critical" argument. Again, the transition from the third person we meet with in 3 John 1 of the "elder" — it becomes the first plural in verses 9,12- whilst the final use of the first singular is paralleled by 1 Thess. 2: 18; Heb. 13: 8*f.* So that there is no need whatever to take "we know" of Ephesian elders or friends (as Westcott, from comparison of John 19: 35), or "I suppose" of an amanuensis. Even if such were necessary the direct association by the Apostle of others with himself would be paralleled by joint-writers of Pauline epistles. One need do no more than just record the ingenious proposal of Chrysostom and Theophylact to read, instead of οἴδαμεν, οἴδα μὲν, so as to preserve the first person singular.

Weizsäcker (vol. iii., p. 209 95.) and some others regard the whole of the Gospel as written after the Apostle's death. This, it is hoped, has been sufficiently dealt with in note 1a on the Introduction.

395 "Contain." See Matt. 19: 11 in the Greek. As to the Oriental hyperbolism of Scripture, reference might be made to Ryle, vol. 3, p. 629. Amongst other passages, that writer refers to our Lord's own language as to Capernaum, and reproduces a helpful remark of Calvin.

Tregelles upheld the verse as written by the first hand in the Sinaitic manuscript.

EDITIONS OF AUTHORS USED

N.B.-Foreign works existing in English translations are recorded under the titles of such; all are cited in the notes by English titles. An asterisk is attached to the name of any Roman Catholic writer, a dagger to that of any professed Unitarian.

BRITISH.

ABBOTT, Dr. E. A.: Art. "Gospels" in Encyclopaedia Britannica, 9th ed., vol. x. (1879).

Art. "Gospels" in Encyclopædia Biblica, §§ 8-107.

From Letter to Spirit (1903).

Johannine Vocabulary (1905).

Johannine Grammar (1906).

ANGUS, J.: Bible Handbook, revised by S. G. Green (second impression, 1907).

ARNOLD, M.: Literature and Dogma (1873, cheap reprint, 1903).

God and the Bible (1875, cheap reprint, 1906)

*BARRY, DR. W.: The Tradition of Scripture (1906)

BELLETT, J. G.: The Evangelists: On the Gospel according to St. John (ed. of 1900)

BENN, A. W.: The History of English Rationalism in the Nineteenth Century (1906).

BERNARD, T. D.: The Central Teaching of Jesus Christ (1892).

BRUCE, A. B.: The Kingdom of God (1899).

BURKITT, PROFESSOR: The Gospel History and its Transmission (1906).

CARPENTER, BISHOP: Introduction to the Scriptures (1903).

†CARPENTER, PROFESSOR: The Bible in the Nineteenth Century (1903).

CASSELS, W. R.: Supernatural Religion, 7th ed. (1889).

*CLARKE, R. F.: The Pope and the Bible (1889)

DARBY, J. N.: Irrationalism of Infidelity (1853; reissued, abridged, 1890).

DODS, Dr. M.: The Expositor's Greek Testament: The Gospel of St. John (1897)

†DRUMMOND, PRINCIPAL: Inquiry into the Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel (1903).

EDERSHEIM, DR.: Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah (eleventh impression, 1901).

FIELD, Dr. F.: Notes on the Translation of the New Testament (1899).

GARDNER, PROFESSOR: Exploratio Evangelica (1899).

GARVIE, PRINCIPAL: Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus (1907).

GLOAG, Dr. P.: Introduction to the Johannine Writings (1891).

GORE, BISHOP: Bampton Lectures-On the Incarnation (1903).

The Creed of the Christian (1905).

GOVETT, R.: Exposition of the Gospel of St. John (1884).

GREEN, T. E.: Works, ed. by Nettleship (1885-1888).

HORTON, Dr. R. F.: The Teaching of Jesus (1895).

Inspiration and the Bible (1888)

The Commandments of Jesus (1898)

ILLINGWORTH, J. R.: Christian Character (1904, cheap reprint, 1907).

Doctrine of the Trinity (1907).

INGE, PROFESSOR: Bampton Lectures-Christian Mysticism (1899).

Studies of Christian Mystics (1906).

KINNEAR, J. B.: The Foundations of Religion (1905).

KNOWLING, PROFESSOR: Literary Criticism and the New Testament (1907)

LATHAM, H.: The Risen Master (1901).

LIDDON, DR. H. P.: Bampton Lectures-On the Divinity of Our Lord (1867)

Elements of Religion, 7th ed. (1890).

LIGHTFOOT, BISHOP: *Biblical Essays* (1893).

LOCK, DR. W.: *History and Character of the Fourth Gospel* (*Interpreter*, July, 1907).

MACLAREN, DR. A.: *Exposition of the Gospel of St. John* (1907).

McCLELLAN, J. B.: *The New Testament-vol. i., The Gospels* (1875).

McRORY, PROFESSOR: *The Gospel of St. John, with Notes* (1897).

MANSEL, DEAN: *The Gnostic Heresies of the First and Second Centuries*

†MARTINEAU, DR. J.: *The Seat of Authority in Religion* (1890).

MEYER, F. B.: *Exposition of John: Love to the Uttermost* (1898).

MILLIGAN, DR. W., and MOULTON, DR. W. F.: *Commentary on the Gospel of John* (reprint, 1898).

MOULE, BISHOP: *The High-priestly Prayer* (1907)

NEWMAN, F. W.: *Phases of Faith* (1850)

NORRIS, ARCHDEACON: *The New Testament, with Notes* (1880).

ORR, PROFESSOR: *The Christian View of God and the World* (Kerr Lectures,

*PALEY, F. A.: *The Gospel of St. John, from the Vatican MS., with Notes*

PLUMMER, DR. A.: *The Gospel according to St. John* (ed. of 1900).

REYNOLDS, DR. H. R.: *Exposition of Gospel of St. John* (Pulpit Commentary,

ROBINSON, DEAN: *Advent Lectures on the Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel, reported in Guardian* (December, 1907)

RYLE, BISHOP J. C.: *Expository Thoughts on the Gospel of St. John* (1873).

SADLER, M. F.: *The Gospel according to St. John, with Notes* (1883).

SALMON, DR. G.: *Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament* (1885)

The Human Element in the Gospels (1907).

SANDAY, PROFESSOR: *The Gospels in the Second Century* (1876).

Criticism of the Fourth Gospel (1905).

Art. "Son of God" in *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*.

SCOTT, E. F.: *The Fourth Gospel: its Purpose and Theology* (1906).

STANTON, PROFESSOR: *The Gospels as Historical Documents* (1903).

STRONG, DEAN: Art. "John the Apostle" in *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*.

TRENCH, ARCHBISHOP: *On the Miracles*, 13th ed. (1886).

Synonyms of the New Testament, 7th ed. (1871).

Studies in the Gospels (1867).

TURTON, COLONEL: *The Truth of Christianity*, 6th ed. (1907).

WATKINS, ARCHDEACON: Bampton Lectures-On Modern Criticism in its Relation to the Fourth Gospel (1890).

WATSON, DR. F.: Inspiration (1906).

WESTCOTT, BISHOP: Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, 6th ed. (1872).

Commentary on the Gospel of St. John (1882).

The Historic Faith (1883, cheap reprint, 1904)

WILLIAMS, I.: The Gospel Narrative of our Lord's Ministry (second year, 1848),

AMERICAN.

ABBOT, DR. E.: Authorship of the Fourth Gospel (1880).

ANDREWS, S. J.: The Life of Our Lord upon Earth (1892).

BACON, PROFESSOR: Introduction to the New Testament (1900).

The Johannine Problem (*Hibbert Journal*, 1903-1905).

The Defence of the Fourth Gospel (*Hibbert Journal*, 1907).

The Beloved Disciple (*Expositor*, October, 1907).

BRIGGS, PROFESSOR: New Light on the Life of Jesus (1904).

DU BOSE, PROFESSOR: The Soteriology of the New Testament (1892).

The Gospel in the Gospels (1906).

GREGORY, PROFESSOR (at Leipzig): Canon and Text of the New Testament (1907).

JAMES, PROFESSOR: The Varieties of Religious Experience (1902).

*KENRICK, ARCHBISHOP: The New Testament, with Notes, 2nd ed. (1862).

McGIFFERT, PROFESSOR: A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age (1897).

NASH, PROFESSOR: A History of the Higher Criticism (1901).

STEVENS, PROFESSOR: Johannine Theology (1894).

GERMAN.

ACHELIS, DR. T.: Sketch of Science of Comparative Religion (1904). Ethics (1904).

BEYSCHLAG, W.: The Johannine Question (1876).

Theology of the New Testament, 2nd ed. (1895).

BLASS, F.: The Gospel according to John (1902).

Grammar of New Testament Greek (1905).

Philology of the Gospels (1898).

Paper in *Expository Times*, "St. John" (July, 1907).

Papias in Eusebius (1907).

BOUSSET, PROFESSOR: Commentary (Meyer's) on the Apocalypse (1896).

Art. "Anti-Christ" in *Encyclopædia Biblica*.
The Jewish Religion, etc. (1903).
 Clemen, PROFESSOR: *The Origin of the New Testament* (1906).
 DELFF, H.: *Rabbi Jesus of Nazareth* (1889).
The Fourth Gospel (1890).
 DELITZSCH, FRANZ: Art. "Passover" in *Riehm's Handbook of Biblical Antiquities*,
 2nd ed. (1893).
 EWALD, H.: *The Johannine Writings* (1861).
 GERDTELL. VON: *Is the Doctrine of Christ's Atonement still Tenable?* 2nd ed. (1905).
Are the Miracles of Primitive Christianity sufficiently Attested 2nd ed. (1907).
The Christian Miracles before the Forum of Modern Thought, 2nd ed. (1907).
 HARNACK, PROFESSOR: *History of Dogma*, 3rd ed. (1894); (English trans., 1899).
History of Old Christian Literature. Two Parts (1893-1904).
 HEITMÜLLER, W.: *Exposition of the Gospel of John* (1907).
 HERMANN, PROFESSOR: *Faith and Morals* (1904).
 HOLTZMANN, PROFESSOR H.: *Manual Commentary on the New Testament*,
 2nd ed. (1893).
 HOLTZMANN, PROFESSOR O.: *The Gospel of John* (1887).
Life of Jesus (English trans., 1904).
 JÜLICHER, PROFESSOR: *Introduction to the New Testament*
 (English trans., 1904; 6th German ed., 1906).
 LOTZE, H: *Outlines of a Philosophy of Religion* (English trans., 1892).
 LUTHARDT, PROFESSOR: *The Johannine Origin of the Fourth Gospel* (1874).
Exposition of the Gospel of John (1886).
 NEANDER, A.: *Life of Christ* (American trans., 1871).
 PFLEIDERER PROFESSOR: *Primitive Christianity* (2nd German ea., 1902)
 REUSS E.: *History of the Sacred Scriptures of the New Testament*
 (English trans. of 5th ed., 1884).
 *SCHANZ, PROFESSOR: *Commentary on the Gospel of St. John* (1885).
 SCHÜRER, PROFESSOR: *The Fourth Gospel* (*Contemporary Review*, 1891)
 STAERK, DR. W.: *The New Testament Period* (1907).
 VON SODEN, PROFESSOR THE BARON: *History of Early Christian Literature*
 (English trans., 1906).

WEISS, PROFESSOR B.: Introduction to the New Testament (English trans. 1887, 1888).
Ninth Edition of Meyer's Commentary on the New Testament (1902),
Manual Commentary on the New Testament (1902, American trans., 1906).

Life of Christ (English trans., 1885).

Theology of the New Testament (English trans. of 3rd ea., 1882,

WEIZSÄCKER, C.: Investigations respecting the Gospel History
(2nd German ea., 1901, English trans., 1905).

The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church (from 2nd ea., 1894)

WELLHAUSEN, PROFESSOR: Interpolations and Alterations in the Fourth Gospel (1907).

WENDT, PROFESSOR: The Gospel of John (ea. of 1900, English trans., 1902).

WENTSCHER, PROFESSOR: Introduction to Philosophy (1907).

ZAHN, PROFESSOR: Introduction to the New Testament (1899).

Art. "John the Apostle" in Hauck's Encyclopædia for Protestant Theology, etc. (1901).

The Gospel of John Expounded (1908).

DUTCH.

SCHOLTEN, PROFESSOR: The Gospel according to John (1864-1866).

FRENCH.

D'ALMA: The Fourth Gospel Controversy (1907).

*LEPIN: Origin of the Fourth Gospel (1907).

*LOISY, A.: The Fourth Gospel (1903).

RENAN, E.: Life of Jesus (1863). The Gospels (1877).

REVILLE, PROFESSOR A.: Jesus of Nazareth, 2nd ed. (1906).

REVILLE, PROFESSOR J.: The Fourth Gospel (1901).

SABATIER, A.: Art. in Lichtenberger's Encyclopædia of Religious Knowledge, vol. vii., pp. 181-193
(1880).

SWISS.

BARTH, PROFESSOR: The Chief Problems of the Life of Jesus, 2nd ed. (1903).

The Gospel of John and the Synoptic Gospels (1905).

GODET, F.: Commentary on the Gospel of John

(English trans., 1886; 4th ed. of French, 1905).

SCHMEIDEL, PROFESSOR: Art. "Son of Zebedee" in Encyclopædia Biblical Jesus in Modern
Criticism (English trans., 1907).

WERNLE, PROFESSOR: Sources of the Gospels (English trans., 1907).

