

CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL
COMMENTARY
ON
THE NEW TESTAMENT.

BY
HEINRICH AUGUST WILHELM MEYER, TH.D.,
CONSISTORIALRATH, HANNOVER.

From the German, with the Sanction of the Author.

THE TRANSLATION REVISED AND EDITED BY
WILLIAM P. DICKSON, D.D.,
AND
FREDERICK CROMBIE, D.D.

PART II.
THE GOSPEL OF JOHN.
VOL. I.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
1893.

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON : SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED.

NEW YORK : CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

TORONTO : THE PRESBYTERIAN NEWS CO.

CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL
HANDBOOK
TO
THE GOSPEL OF JOHN.

BY
HEINRICH AUGUST WILHELM MEYER, TH.D.,
CONSISTORIALRATH, HANNOVER.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FIFTH EDITION OF THE GERMAN BY
REV. WILLIAM URWICK, M.A.

THE TRANSLATION REVISED AND EDITED BY
FREDERICK CROMBIE, D.D.,
PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM, ST. MARY'S COLLEGE, ST. ANDREW.

SECOND EDITION.

VOL. I.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
1893.

PREFATORY NOTE BY THE EDITOR.



THE translation of this first part of Dr. Meyer's *Commentary on John* has been executed from the fifth edition of the original by the Rev. William Urwick, already known as the translator of several works published by the Messrs. Clark. It has, however, been revised and carried through the press by myself at the request of Dr. Dickson, who, with the assent of the publisher, had asked me to join him in the editorship of the series. In order to secure as great uniformity as possible between this volume and the two already edited by Dr. Dickson, that gentleman was kind enough to read the proofs of the first few sheets, and I also had the benefit of his judgment and experience upon some points of difficulty that occurred in the earlier pages. References have been made not only to Dr. Moulton's translation of Winer's *Grammar of New Testament Greek* (published by Messrs. Clark), but also to the translation of Alex. Buttmann's *Grammar* (New Testament Greek), by Professor Thayer, of the Theological Seminary, Andover, which has recently appeared. These references, it is hoped, will be useful to students of the original. A list of exegetical works upon the Gospel of John will be prefixed to the second volume, which will complete the Commentary upon the Gospel.

F. CROMBIE.

P R E F A C E.



THE Gospel of John, on which I have now for the fifth time to present the result of my labours, still at the present day continues to be the subject—recently, indeed, brought once more into the very foreground—of so much doubt and dissension, and to some extent, of such passionate party controversy, as to increase the grave sense of responsibility, which already attaches to the task of an unprejudiced and thorough exposition of so sublime a production. The strong tendency now prevalent towards explaining on natural grounds the history of our Lord, ever calling forth new efforts, and pressing into its service all the aids of modern erudition, with an analytic power as acute as it is bold in its free-thinking, meets with an impassable barrier in this Gospel, if it really proceeds from that disciple whom the Lord loved, and consequently is the only one that is entirely and fully apostolic. For it is now an admitted fact, and a significant proof of the advances which have been gradually achieved by exegesis, that the pervading supernaturalism—clearly stamped on it in all the simplicity of truth—cannot be set aside by any artifices of exposition. This, however, does not prevent the work of a criticism, which obeys the conviction that it is *able*, and that for the sake of the right knowledge of the Gospel history it *ought*, to establish the non-apostolic origin of the fourth Gospel. Accordingly, in pursuance of the programme which was traced for it fifty years ago by Bretschneider, and of the ampler investigations subsequently added by the criticism of Baur, unwearied efforts have been made with augmented and more penetrating powers,

and to some extent also with a cordial appreciation of the lofty ideas which the Gospel presents, to carry out this project to completion. Such critical labour submits itself to be tried by the judgment of scholars, and has its scientific warrant. Nay, should it succeed in demonstrating that the declaration of the Gospel's apostolic birth, as written by all the Christian centuries, is erroneous, we would have to do honour to the truth, which in this case also, though painful at first, could not fail to approve itself that which maketh free. There is, however, adequate reason to entertain very grave doubts of the attainment of this result, and to refuse assent to the prognostication of universal victory, which has been too hastily associated with these efforts of criticism. Whoever is acquainted with the most recent investigations, will, indeed, gladly leave to themselves the clumsy attempts to establish a parallelism between the Gospel of John and ancient fabrications concocted with a special aim, which carry their own impress on their face; but he will still be unable to avoid the immediate and general duty of considering whether those modern investigators who deny that it is the work of the apostle have at least discovered a *time* in which—putting aside in the meanwhile all the substantive elements of their proof—the origin of the writing would be historically conceivable. For it is a remarkable circumstance in itself, that of the two most recent controversialists, who have treated the subject with the greatest scientific independence, the one assumes the latest, the other the earliest possible, date. If now, with the first, I place its composition not sooner than from 150 to 160, I see myself driven to the bold assertion of Volkmar, who makes the evangelist sit at the feet of Justin—a piece of daring which lands me in a historical absurdity. If I rightly shrink from so preposterous a view, and prefer to follow the thoughtful Keim in his more judicious estimate of the ecclesiastical testimonies and the relations of the time, then I obtain the very beginning of the second century as the period in which the work sprang up on the fruitful soil of the church of Asia Minor, as a plant Johannine indeed in spirit, but post-Johannine in origin. But from this position also I feel myself at once irresistibly driven. For I am now

brought into such immediate contact with the days in which the aged apostolic pillar was still amongst the living, and see myself transported so entirely into the living presence of his numerous Asiatic disciples and admirers, that it cannot but appear to me an absolutely insoluble enigma how precisely *then and there* a non-Johannine work—one, moreover, so great and so divergent from the older Gospels—could have been issued and have passed into circulation under the name of the highly honoured apostle. Those disciples and admirers, amongst whom he, as the high priest, had worn the *πέταλον*, could not but know whether he had written a Gospel, and if so, of what kind; and with the sure tact of sympathy and of knowledge, based upon experience, they could not but have rejected what was not a genuine legacy from their apostle. Keim, indeed, ventures upon the bold attempt of calling altogether in question the fact that John had his sphere of labour in Asia Minor; but is not this denial, in face of the traditions of the church, in fact an impossibility? It is, and must remain so, as long as the truth of historical facts is determined by the criterion of historical testimony. Turning, then, from Volkmar to Keim, I see before my eyes the fate indicated by the old proverb: *τὸν καπνὸν φεύγοντα εἰς τὸ πῦρ ἐκπίπτειν*.

The necessary references have been made in the Introduction to the substantive grounds on which in recent years the assaults have been renewed against the authenticity of the Gospel, and there also the most recent apologetic literature upon the subject has been noticed. After all that has been said for and against up to the present time, I can have no hesitation in once more expressing my delight in the testimony of Luther—quoted now and again with an ironical smile—that “*John’s Gospel is the only tender, right, chief Gospel, and is to be far preferred before the other three, and to be more highly esteemed.*”¹ In order to make the confession one’s own, it is not necessary to be either a servile follower of

¹ So Luther, in that section of his Preface to the New Testament containing the superscription, “Which are the right and noblest books of the New Testament?” This section, however, is wanting in the editions of the New Testament subsequent to 1539, as also in the edition of the whole Bible of 1534.

Luther or a special adherent of the immortal Schleiermacher. I am neither the one nor the other, and in particular I do not share the individual, peculiar motive, as such, which underlies the judgment of the former.

Since the publication of the fourth edition of my Commentary (1862), many expository works upon John and his system of doctrine, and among these several of marked importance, have seen the light, along with many other writings and disquisitions,¹ which serve, directly or indirectly, the purpose of exposition. I may venture to hope that the consideration which I have bestowed throughout upon these literary accessions, in which the one aim is followed with very varying gifts and powers, has not been without profit for the further development of my work, probably more by way of antagonism (especially towards Hengstenberg and Godet) than of agreement of opinion. In our like conscientious efforts after truth we learn from each other, even when our ways diverge.

The statement of the readings of Tischendorf's text I was obliged to borrow from the second edition of his *Synopsis*, for the reasons already mentioned in the preface to the fifth edition of my Commentary on Mark and Luke. The latest part of his *editio octava*, now in course of appearance, was published last September, and extends only to John vi. 23, while the printing of my book had already advanced far

¹ The essay of Riggenbach, "*Johannes der Apostel und der Presbyter*," in the *Jahrb. f. D. Theologie*, 1868, p. 319 ff., came too late for me to be able to notice it. It will never be possible, I believe, to establish the identity of the apostle with the presbyter, and I entertain no doubt that Eusebius quite correctly understood the fragment of Papias in reference to this point.—To my regret, I was unable, also, to take into consideration Wittichen's work, *Ueber den geschichtlichen Charakter des Evang. Joh.* The same remark applies to the third edition of Ebrard's *Kritik der evangel. Geschichte*, which appeared in 1868, and in which I regret to observe a renewed display of the old vehemence of passion. Renan's *Life of Jesus*, even as it has now appeared in its thirteenth edition, I have, as formerly, left out of consideration.—The first part of Holtzmann's dissertation upon "The Literary Relation of John to the Synoptics" (*Hilgenfeld's Zeitschrift*, 1869, p. 62 ff.) has just been published, and the conclusion is still to follow. Of course, before the latter appears, no well-founded judgment can be passed upon this essay of this acute theologian; but I have doubts whether it will ever be successfully shown that in the case of the fourth Gospel there is any dependence of a literary kind upon the Synoptics, especially upon the Gospel of Luke.

beyond that point. I may add that the deviations in the text of this *editio octava* from that of the *Synopsis* in reference to the various readings noticed in my critical annotations down to vi. 23, are not numerous, and scarcely any of them are of importance exegetically. Of such a nature are those, in particular, in which this highly meritorious critic had in his *Synopsis* too hastily abandoned the *Recepta*,¹ and has now returned to it. I would fain think that this may also be the case in future with many other of the readings which he has now adopted, where apparently the *Cod. Sinait.* has possessed for him too great a power of attraction.²

In conclusion, I have to ask for this renewed labour of mine the goodwill of my readers,—I mean such a disposition and tone in judging of it as shall not prejudice the rights of critical truth, but shall yet with kind consideration weigh the difficulties which are connected with the solution of the task, either in itself, or amidst the rugged antagonisms of a time so vexed with controversy as the present. So long as God will preserve to me in my old age the necessary measure of strength, I shall continue my quiet co-operation, however small it may be, in the service of biblical exegesis. This science has in fact, amid the dark tempests of our theological and ecclesiastical crisis, in face of all the agitations and extravagances to the right and left, the clear and lofty vocation gradually, by means of its results,—which are only to be obtained with certainty through a purely historical method, and which are not to be settled by any human confession of faith,—to make such contributions to the tumult of

¹ I. 18, where the *Synopsis* has *μονογενὴς θεός*, the *editio octava* has restored *ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός*: iii. 13, where *ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ* was deleted in the *Synopsis*, these words have again been received into the text.

² *E.g.* with the reading *θαυμάζετε* in v. 20; in the same way with *φύγει*, which is found *only* in *Σ* of all the *Codd.* In the great predominance of testimonies against it, I regard the former as the error of an ancient copyist, while the latter appears to me as a marginal gloss, quite inappropriate to the strain of tender feeling in which John speaks of Jesus, which perhaps originated in a similar manner, as Chrysostom, while reading in the text *ἀνεχώρησεν*, says by way of explanation, *ὁ δὲ Χριστὸς φύγει*. Had *φύγει* been the original reading, and had it been desired to replace it by a more becoming expression, then probably *ἰξίυσεν* from v. 13, or *ἀνῆλθεν* in vi. 3, to which passage *παλιν* in *ver.* 15 points back, would have most naturally suggested themselves.

strife as must determine the course of a sound development, and finally form the standard of its settlement and the regulative basis of peace. And what writing of the New Testament can in such a relation stand higher, or be destined to produce a more effective union of spirits, than the wondrous Gospel of John, with its fulness of grace, truth, peace, light, and life? Our Lutheran Church, which was born with a declaration of war and had its confession completed amid controversy from without and within, has raised itself far too little to the serene height and tranquil perfection of this Gospel.

DR. MEYER.

HANOVER, *1st December 1868.*

THE GOSPEL OF JOHN.



INTRODUCTION.

SEC. I.—BIOGRAPHICAL NOTICE OF JOHN.



JOHN'S parents were Zebedee, a fisherman on the Sea of Galilee, probably not of the poorer class (Mark i. 20; Luke v. 10), and Salome (Mark xv. 40; comp. Matt. xxvii. 56). To his father the evangelists ascribe no special religious character or personal participation in the events of the Gospel history; but his mother was one of the women who followed Jesus even up to His crucifixion (comp. on xix. 25). To her piety, therefore, it is justly attributable that John's deeply receptive spirit was early fostered and trained to surrender itself to the sacredly cherished, and at that time vividly excited expectation of the Messiah, with its moral claims, so far at least as such a result might be produced by a training which was certainly not of a learned character. (Acts iv. 13.) If, too, as we may infer from xix. 25, Salome was a sister of the mother of Jesus, his near relationship to Jesus would enable us better to understand the close fellowship of spirit between them, though the evangelists are quite silent as to any early intimacy between the families; and in any case, higher inward sympathy was the essential source out of which that fellowship of spirit unfolded itself. The entrance of the Baptist on his public ministry—to whom John had attached himself, and whose prophetic character and labours he has described most clearly and fully—was the occasion of his becoming one of the followers of Jesus, of whom he and Andrew were the first disciples (i. 35 f.). Among these, again, he and Peter, and his own brother James

the elder, brought by himself to Jesus (see on i. 42), formed the select company of the Lord's more intimate friends; he himself being the most trusted of all,¹ the one whom Jesus pre-eminently loved, and to whose filial care He on the cross entrusted Mary (xix. 26). Hence the ardent, impetuous disposition, which led the Lord Himself to give to him and his brother the name *Boanerges*, and which he exhibited on more than one occasion (Mark iii. 17, ix. 38 ff.; Luke ix. 49 f., 54),—connected even though it was with an ambition which his mother had fostered by her sensuous Messianic notions, Matt. xx. 20 ff.; Mark x. 35 ff.),—is by no means to be deemed of such a character as to be incapable of gradually subjecting itself to the mind of Jesus, and becoming serviceable to its highest aims. After the ascension he abode, save perhaps when engaged on some minor apostolical journey (such as that to Samaria, Acts viii. 14), at Jerusalem, where Paul met with him as one of the three pillars of the Christian church (Gal. ii. 1 ff.). How long he remained in this city cannot, amid the uncertainty of tradition, be determined; and, indeed, it is not even certain whether he had already left the city when Paul was last there. He is certainly not mentioned in Acts xxi. 18, but neither is he in Acts xv., though we know from Gal. ii. 1 ff. that he nevertheless was present; and therefore, as on the occasion of Gal. i. 19, so on that of Acts xxi, he may have been temporarily absent. In after years he took up his abode at Ephesus (Iren. *Haer.* iii. 3. 4; Euseb. iii. 1. 23),² probably only after the

¹ On account of his devoted love to the person of the Lord, on which Grotius finely remarks: "Quod olim Alexandrum de amicis suis dixisse memorant, alium esse φιλαλίζανδρον, alium φιλοβασιλία, putem ad duos Domini Jesu apostolos posse aptari, ut Petrum dicamus maxime φιλόχριστον, Johannem maxime φιλοειρηνοῦν, . . . quod et Dominus respiciens illi quidem ecclesiam praecepto quodam modo, huic autem matrem commendavit."

² It is no argument at all against this, that Ignat. *ad Ephes.* 12 mentions Paul, but not John; for Paul is mentioned there as the *founder of the church* at Ephesus, and as *martyr*,—neither of which holds good of John. Besides, this silence is far outweighed by the testimonies of Polycarp in Irenaeus, Polycrates in Euseb., Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, etc. To account for these, as Keim in particular now attempts to do (*Gesch. J. I.* p. 161 ff.), by supposing some confusion of John the *Presbyter* with the *Apostle* John, is in my opinion futile, simply because the silence of Papias as to the apostle's residence in Asia proves nothing (he does not mention the residence of *any* of the Lord's apostles and disciples, to whom he makes reference), and

destruction of Jerusalem; not by any means, however, before Paul had laboured in Ephesus (Rom. xv. 20; 2 Cor. x. 16; Gal. ii. 7 f.), although it cannot be maintained with certainty that he had not even been there before Paul wrote his letter to the Ephesians: for, in the enigmatic silence of this epistle as to all personal references, such a conclusion from the non-mention of his name is doubtful.

The distinguished official authority with which he was invested at Ephesus, the spiritual elevation and sanctity ascribed to him, cannot be better indicated than by the fact that Polycrates (Euseb. iii. 31, v. 24) not only reckons him among the *μεγάλα στοιχεία* (great fundamental elements of the church; comp. Gal. ii. 9), but also calls him *ἱερεὺς τὸ πέταλον*¹ *πεφορηκώς*. Of his subsequent fortunes we have only untrustworthy and sometimes manifestly false traditions, amongst the latter of which is one based on Rev. i. 9,² but unknown even to Hegesippus (ap. Euseb. iii. 20), of his banishment to Patmos under Domitian (first mentioned by Irenaeus and Clem. Alex.),—an event said to have been preceded by others of a marvellous kind, such as his drinking poison at Rome without injury (see especially the *Acta Johannis* in Tischendorf's *Acta Apocr.* p. 266 ff.), and his being thrown into boiling oil, from which, however, he came out "nihil passus" (Tertullian), nay, even "purior et vegetior" (Jerome). The legend is also untrustworthy of his encounter with Cerinthus in a bath, the falling in of which he is said to have foreseen and avoided in time (Iren. *Haer.* iii. 3. 28; Euseb. iii. 28, iv. 14); it is only indirectly traceable to Polycarp, and betrays

because it seems scarcely conceivable that Irenaeus should have so misinterpreted what Polycarp said to him in his youth regarding his intimacy with John, as to suppose he spoke of the *Apostle*, when in fact he only spoke of the *Presbyter* of that name. It is pure caprice to assume that Eusebius "lacked the courage" to correct Irenaeus. Why so? See, on the other hand, Steitz in the *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1868, p. 502 ff.

¹ The plate of gold worn by the high priest on his forehead. See Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 393 f., ed. 3; Knobel on Ex. xxviii. 36. The phrase used by Polycrates is not to be taken as signifying relationship to a priestly family (xviii. 15; Luke i. 36), but as *symbolic* of high *spiritual* position in the church, just as it is also used of James the Lord's brother in Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxix. 4. Compare now also Ewald, *Johann. Schriften*, II. p. 401 f.

² See especially Dürstiedick on the *Revelation*, *Introduction*, p. 92 ff.

a purpose of glorifying the apostle at the expense of the heretic, although there may be little ground for the assertion that it is only what we should expect from the author of the Apocalypse (Baur, *Kanon. Evang.* p. 371). The great age to which John attained, which is variously stated,—according to Irenaeus, Eusebius, and others, about a hundred years, reaching down to Trajan's time,—gave some countenance to the saying (xxi. 23) that he should not see death; and this again led to the report that his death, which at last took place at Ephesus, was only a slumber, his breath still moving the earth on his grave (Augustine). In harmony, however, with a true idea of his character, though historically uncertain, and first vouched for by Jerome on Gal. vi. 10,¹ is the statement that, in the weakness of old age, he used merely to say in the Christian assemblies, *Filioli, diligite alterutrum*. For love was the most potent element of his nature, which had been sustained by the truest, deepest, and most affectionate communion in heart and life with Christ. In this communion John, nurtured in the heart of Jesus, discloses, as no other evangelist, the Lord's innermost life, in a contemplative but yet practical manner, with a profound idealizing mysticism, though far removed from all mere fiction and visionary enthusiasm; like a bright mirror, faithfully reflecting the most delicate features of the full glory of the Incarnate One (i. 14; 1 John i. 1); tender and humble, yet without sentimentalism, and with the full and resolute earnestness of apostolical energy. In the centre of the church life of Asia he shone with the splendour of a spiritual high-priesthood, the representative of all true Christian Gnosis, and personally a very *παρθένος* ("virgo mente et corpore," Augustine) in all moral purity. From the starting-point of an apostle of the Jews, on which he stands in contrast

¹ Earlier attested (Clemens, *Quis div. salv.* 42) is the equally characteristic legend (Clement calls it *μῦθον οὐ μῦθον, ἀλλὰ ὄντα λόγον*) of a young man, formerly converted by the apostle's labours, who lapsed and became a leader of robbers, by whose band John, after his return from Patmos, voluntarily allowed himself to be taken prisoner in order to bring their captain back to Christ, which he succeeded in doing by the mere power of his presence. The robber chief, as Clement says, was baptized a second time by his tears of penitence. Comp. Herder's legend "*der gerettete Jüngling*" in his *Werke z. schön. Lit.* vi. p. 31, ed. 1827.

(Gal. ii. 9) with the apostle of the Gentiles, he rose to the purest universalism, such as we meet with only in Paul, but with a clear, calm elevation above strife and conflict; as the last of the apostles, going beyond not only Judaism, but even Paul himself, and interpreting most completely out of his own lengthened, pure, and rich experience, the life and the light made manifest in Christ. He it is who connects Christianity in its fullest development with the person of Christ,—a legacy to the church for all time, of peace, union, and ever advancing moral perfection; among the apostles the true Gnostic, in opposition to all false Gnosticism of the age; the prophet among the evangelists, although not the seer of the Apocalypse. “The personality of John,” says Thiersch (*die Kirche im apostol. Zeitalt.* p. 273), “left far deeper traces of itself in the church than that of any other of Christ’s disciples. Paul laboured more than they all, but John stamped his image most profoundly upon her;” the former in the mighty *struggle* for the victory, which *overcometh* the world; the latter in the sublime and, for the whole future of the gospel, decisive celebration of the victory which *has overcome* it.

SEC. II.—GENUINENESS OF THE GOSPEL.

With regard to the *external testimonies*, we remark the following:—

1. Chap. xxi. could only serve as a testimony, if it proceeded altogether from another hand, or if the obviously spurious conclusion should be made to include ver. 24. See, however, on chap. xxi.—2 Pet. i. 14 also, and the Gospel of Mark, cannot be adduced as testimonies; since the former passage cannot be shown to refer to John xxi. 18 f., while the second Gospel was certainly written much earlier than the fourth.

2. In the apostolical Fathers¹ we meet with no express

¹ It is true that Barnabas, 4, quotes, with the formula *sicut scriptum est* (which is confirmed, against Credner, by the Greek text of the Codex Sinaiticus), a passage from Matthew (xx. 16, xxii. 14; not 2 Esdr. viii. 3, as Volkmar maintains). To find, however, in this alone canonical confirmation of the *fourth* Gospel (Tischendorf) is too rash a conclusion, since the close joint relation of the four, as composing one fourfold Gospel, cannot be proved so early as the apostolical

quotation from, or sure trace of any use of, the Gospel. Barnabas 5, 6, 12 (comp. John iii. 14), and other echoes of John in this confused anti-Judaizing epistle, to which too great importance is attached by Keim, as well as Herm. *Past. Simil.* 9, 12 (comp. John x. 7, 9, xiv. 6), Ignat. *ad Philad.* (comp. John iii. 8) 9 (comp. John x. 9), *ad Trall.* 8 (comp. John vi. 51), *ad Magnes.* 8 (comp. John x. 30, xii. 49, xiv. 11), *ad Rom.* 7 (John vi. 32 ff., vii. 38 f.), are so adequately explained by tradition, and the common types of view and terminology of the apostolical age, that it is very unsafe to attribute them to some definite written source. Nor does what is said in Ignat. *ad Rom.* 7, and *ad Trall.* 8, of Christ's flesh and blood, furnish any valid exception to this view, since the *origin* of the mystical conception of the *σάρξ* of Christ is not necessarily due to its dissemination through this Gospel, although it does not occur in the Synoptics (in opposition to Rothe, *Anfänge d. Chr. Kirch.* p. 715 ff.; Huther, in *Illgen's Zeitschr.* 1841, iv. p. 1 ff.; Ebrard, *Evang. Joh.* p. 102; *Kritik d. evang. Gesch.* ed. 2, p. 840 ff.; Tischend. Ewald *Jahrb.* V. p. 188, etc.). Hence the question as to the genuineness of the several epistles of Ignatius, and their texts, may here be altogether left out of consideration. Just as little from the testimony of Irenaeus *ad Florin.* (ap. Eus. v. 20) to Polycarp, that in all the latter said of Christ he spoke *σύμφωνα ταῖς γραφαῖς*, may we infer any use of our Gospel on Polycarp's part, considering the generality of this expression, which, moreover, merely sets forth Irenaeus' opinion, and does not necessarily mean *New Testament* writings. When, again, Irenaeus (*Hær.* v. 36. 1 f.) quotes an interpretation given by the "*presbyteri apostolorum discipuli*" of the saying in John xiv. 2 ("*In my Father's house,*" etc.), it must remain doubtful whether these *presbyteri* knew that saying from our Gospel or from apos-

Fathers; nor do even Justin's citations exhibit any *such corpus evangelicum*. Besides, that very remarkable *ὡς γέγραπται* makes it probable that the passage in Matthew may have erroneously appeared to the writer of the epistle as taken from the *Old Testament*.—Again, it is incorrect to say (with Volkmar) that the citation in Barnabas 5 of Ps. xxii. 21 tells *against* our Gospel, since that citation has no bearing on the spear-thrust spoken of in xix. 34, but simply refers to death on the *cross* as such, in contrast with death by the *sword*.

tolical tradition, since Irenaeus quotes their opinion simply with the general words: *καὶ διὰ τοῦτο εἰρηκέναι τὸν κύριον*.

3. Of indirect but decided importance, on the other hand, —assuming, that is, what in spite of the doubts still raised by Scholten must be regarded as certain, that the Gospel and First Epistle of John are from one author,—is the use which, according to Euseb. iii. 39, Papias¹ made of the First Epistle. That in the fragment of Papias no mention is made of our *Gospel*, should not be still continually urged (Baur, Zeller, Hilgenf., Volkmar, Scholten) as a proof, either that he did not know it, or at least did not acknowledge its authority (see below, No. 8). Decisive stress may also be laid on Polycarp, *ad Phil.* 7 (*πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἂν μὴ ὁμολογῇ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθέναι ἀντίχριστός ἐστι*), as a quotation from 1 John iv. 3; Polycarp's chapter containing it being unquestionably genuine, and free from the interpolations occurring elsewhere in the Epistle. It is true that it may be said, "What can such general sentences, which may have circulated anonymously, prove?" (Baur, *Kanon. Evangel.* p. 350); but it may be answered that that characteristic type of this fundamental article of the Christian system, which in the above form is quite peculiar to the First Epistle of John, points to the evangelist in the case of no one more naturally than of Polycarp, who was for so many years his disciple (comp. Ewald, *Johann. Schriften*, II. p. 395). It is nothing less than an unhistorical inversion of the relations between them, when some (Bretschneider, and again Volkmar) represent John's Epistle as dependent on Polycarp's, while Scholten tries to make out a difference in the application and sense of the respective passages.

4. It is true that Justin Martyr, in his citations from the *ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων* ("ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια,"

¹ A disciple of the *Presbyter* John. From the fragments of Papias in Eusebius, it is abundantly clear that he mentions *two different* disciples of the Lord called John,—John the *Apostle*, and John the *Presbyter*, who was not one of the twelve, but simply a disciple, like Aristion. The attempt to make the Presbyter, in the quotation from Papias, no other than the Apostle, leads only to useless controversy. See especially Overbeck in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr.* 1867, p. 35 ff.; Steitz in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1868, p. 63 ff., in opposition to Zahn in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1866, pp. 649 ff.

Apol. I. 66), which also served as church lessons,¹ has not used our canonical Gospels *exclusively* (the older view, and still substantially held by Bindemann in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1842, p. 355 ff., and Semisch, *d. apost. Denkw. Justins*, 1848; also by Luthardt, Tischendorf, and Riegenbach); but neither has he used *merely* an "uncanonical" Gospel (Schwegler), or *chiefly* such a one (Credner, Volkmar, Hilgenfeld), as was "a special recension of that Gospel to the Hebrews which assumed so many forms" (Credner, *Gesch. d. Kanon*, p. 9). For he used *not only* our canonical Gospels, but also in addition other evangelic writings *now lost*, which—rightly or wrongly—he must have looked upon as proceeding from the apostles, or from disciples of theirs (comp. *Tryph.* 103: ἐν γὰρ τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ φημι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκείνοις παρακολουθησάντων συντετάχθαι); and hence his variations from our canonical Gospels hardly agree more than once or twice with the Clementines. His *Apologies* certainly belong (see *Apol.* i. 46) to somewhere about the middle of the second century.² His citations, even when they can be referred to our canonical Gospels, are generally free, so that it is often doubtful where he got them. (See Credner, *Beitr.* I. p. 151 ff.; Frank, in the *Würtemb. Stud.* XVIII. p. 61 ff.; Hilgenf. *Krit. Untersuch. üb. die Evang. Justins*, etc., 1850; Volkmar *ueber Justin.*) From Matthew and Luke only five are verbally exact. He has also borrowed from John,³ and indeed so evidently, that those who would deny

¹ For the course of the discussions upon Justin's quotations, and the literature of the subject, see Volkmar, *Ueb. Justin d. M. u. s. Verh. z. uns. Evangelien*, 1853; Hilgenfeld, *Evangelien*, 1855; Volkmar, *Urspr. d. Evang.* 1866, p. 92 ff. See also in particular, Luthardt, *Justin d. M. u. d. Joh. Evang.*, in the *Erlanger Zeitschr. f. Protest. u. K.* 1856, xxxi. parts 4-6, xxxii. parts 1 and 2; Ewald, *Jahrb.* VI. 59 ff.; Riegenbach, *Zeugn. f. d. Ev. Joh.* p. 139 ff.

² The controversy as to the date of the first Apology (Semisch, A.D. 138-139; Volkmar, about 147; Keim, 155-160) need not here be discussed, since in any case our Gospel is in the same position as the Synoptics, so far as Justin's use and estimate of it are concerned.

³ He has made most use of Matthew, and then of the Pauline Luke, but also of Mark. That he has taken very little comparatively from John, seems to be due to the same reason as his silence in respect of Paul, which is not tantamount to an exclusion of the apostle of the Gentiles; for he is rich in Pauline ideas, and there can be no mistake as to his knowledge of Paul's epistles (Semisch, p. 123 ff.). It is probably to be explained by prudential consideration for the antagonism of

this are in consistency obliged, with Volkmar, to represent John as making use of Justin, which is an absurdity. See Keim, *Gesch. J. I.* p. 137 ff. It is true that some have found in too many passages references to this Gospel, or quotations from it (see against this, Zeller, *Theol. Jahrb.* 1845, p. 600 ff.); still we may assume it as certain, that as, in general, Justin's whole style of thought and expression implies the existence of John's writings (comp. Ewald, *Jahrb.* V. p. 186 f.), so, in the same way, must the mass of *those* passages in particular be estimated, which, in spite of all variations arising from his Alexandrine recasting of the dogma, correspond with *John's doctrine of the Logos*.¹ For Justin was conscious that his doctrine, especially that of the Logos, which was the central point in his Christology, had an *apostolic basis*,² just as the ancient church in the Jewish Christians to Paul's (and John's) anti-Judaism. In the obvious possibility of this circumstance, it is too rash to conclude that this Gospel had not yet won the high authority which it could not have failed to have, *had it really been a work of the apostle* (Weisse, *d. Evangelienfr.* p. 129); or even, that "had Justin known the fourth Gospel, he would have made, not only repeated and ready, but even preferential use of it. To assume, therefore, the use of only one passage from it on Justin's part, is really to concede the point" (Volkmar, *üb. Justin*, p. 50 f.; Zeller, p. 650). The Clementine Homilies (see hereafter under 5) furnish an analogous phenomenon, in that they certainly knew and used our Gospel, while yet borrowing very little from it. The synoptic evangelic literature was the older and more widely diffused; it had already become familiar to the most diverse Christian circles (comp. Luke i. 1), when John's Gospel, which was so very dissimilar and peculiar, and if not *esoteric* (Weizsäcker), certainly *antichilastic* (Keim), made its appearance. How conceivable that the latter, though the work of an apostle, should only very gradually have obtained general recognition and equal authority with the Synoptics among the Jewish Christians? how conceivable, therefore, also, that a man like Justin, though no Judaizer, should have hesitated to quote from it in the same degree as he did from the Synoptics, and the other writings connected with the Synoptic cycle of narratives? The assumption that *he had no occasion* to refer frequently and expressly to John (Luthardt, *op. cit.* p. 398) is inadmissible. He might often enough, where he has other quotations, have quoted quite as appropriately from John.

¹ See Duncker, *d. Logoslehre Justins d. M.*, Göttingen 1848, and Luthardt as above, xxxii. pp. 69 ff., 75 ff.; Weizsäcker in the *Jahrb. f. D. Theol.* 1862, p. 703 ff.; Tischendorf, *wann wurden uns. Ev. verf.* p. 31 ff., ed. 4; Weizsäcker, *d. Theol. d. M. Just.*, in the *Jahrb. f. D. Theol.* 1867, p. 78 ff. Great weight is due to Justin's doctrine of the *incarnation* of the Logos (*Apol.* i. 32, 66; *c. Tryph.* 100), which is foreign to the system of Philo, etc., and is specially Johannean.

² Hence his frequent reference to the ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων. On one occasion led to do so casually, because he is speaking directly of Peter, he refers definitely to the ἀπομνημονεύματα τοῦ Πέτροῦ (*c. Tryph.* 106:

general, either expressly or as a matter of course, traced the origin of its doctrine of the Logos to John. It is therefore unhistorical, in the special case of Justin, merely to point to an acquaintance with Philo, and to the Logos-speculations and Gnostic ideas of the age generally (against Zeller, Baur, Hilgenf., Scholten, and many others), or to satisfy oneself possibly with the assumption that Paul furnished him with the premisses for his doctrine (Grimm in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1851, p. 687 ff.), or even to make the fourth evangelist a pupil of Justin (Volkmar). It seems, moreover, certain that *Apol.* i. 61, καὶ γὰρ Χριστὸς εἶπεν ἅν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃτε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. Ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἀδύνατον εἰς τὰς μήτρας τῶν τεκουσῶν τοὺς ἅπαξ γεννωμένους ἐμβῆναι, φανερὸν πᾶσιν ἐστι, is derived from John iii. 3–5. See especially Semisch, p. 189 ff.; Luthardt, *l.c.* XXXII. p. 93 ff.; Riggenb. p. 166 ff. It is true, some have assigned this quotation, through the medium of Matt. xviii. 3, to the Gospel to the Hebrews, or some other uncanonical evangelic writing (Credner, Schwegler, Baur, Zeller, Hilgenfeld, Volkmar, Scholten), or have treated it as a more original form of the mere oral tradition (see Baur, against Luthardt, in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1857, p. 232). But in the face of Justin's free manner of quoting, to which we must attribute the ἀναγενν. instead of γενν. ἄνωθεν,—ἄνωθεν being taken, according to the common ancient view, in the sense of *denuo* (comp. also Clem. *Recogn.* vi. 9),—this is most arbitrary, especi-

μετανομαζέσθαι αὐτὸν Πίτρον ἵνα τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ γιγράσθαι ἰν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν αὐτοῦ, κ.τ.λ.). Here Credner (*Beitr.* I. p. 132; *Gesch. d. Kanon*, p. 17) quite correctly referred αὐτοῦ to Πίτρον (Lücke conjectures that αὐτοῦ is spurious, or that τῶν ἀποστόλων is to be inserted, so that αὐτοῦ would refer to Jesus), but he understood these ἄπομν. to be the apocryphal Gospel of Peter,—the more groundlessly, that the substance of Justin's quotation is from Mark iii. 17; Justin understood by ἀπομν. τοῦ Πιτροῦ the *Gospel of Mark*. So also Luthardt, *op. cit.* xxxi. p. 316 ff.; Weiss, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1861, p. 677; Riggenb. and others; comp. Volkmar, *Urspr. d. Evang.* p. 154. According to Tertullian, *c. Marc.* iv. 5, "Marcus quod edidit evangelium, Petri adfirmatur, cujus interpres Marcus." Comp. Irenaeus also, iii. 10. 6, iii. 1. 1. According to this, compared with what Papias says of Mark, Justin might have expressed himself exactly as he has done. With respect to the controversy on the subject, see Hilgenfeld, *Krit. Unters.* p. 23 ff., and Luthardt, *l.c.*; comp. on Mark, Introduction. Notice also how unfavourable the passage seems to the notion that Justin's *Memorials* are a compilation (Ewald and others).

ally when Justin himself gives prominence to the impossibility of a second natural birth. Moreover, in the second half of the quotation (οὐ μὴ εἰσελθ. εἰς τ. βασιλ. τῶν οὐρ.), some reminiscence of Matt. xviii. 3 might easily occur; just as, in fact, several very ancient witnesses (among the Codices, κ^*) read in John *l.c.* βασιλεῖαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, the Pseudo-Clemens (*Homil.* xi. 26), by quoting the second half exactly in this way, and in the first half adding after ἀναγενν. the words ὕδατι ζῶντι εἰς ὄνομα πατρὸς, υἱοῦ, ἁγίου πνεύματος, exhibits a free combination of Matt. xxviii. 19 and xviii. 3. Other passages of Justin, which some have regarded as allusions to or quotations from John, may just as fitly be derived from evangelic tradition to be found elsewhere, and from Christian views generally; and this must even be conceded of such passages as *c. Tryph.* 88 (John i. 20 ff.), *de res.* 9 (John v. 27), *Apol.* I. 6 (John iv. 24), *Apol.* I. 22 and *c. Tryph.* 69 (John ix. 1), *c. Tryph.* 17 (John i. 4). However, it is most natural, when once we have been obliged to assume in Justin's case the knowledge and use of our Gospel, to attribute to it other expressions also which exhibit Johannean peculiarities, and not to stop at *Apol.* I. 61 merely (against Frank). On the other hand, the remarkable resemblance of the quotation from Zech. xii. 10 in John xix. 37 and *Apol.* I. 52, leaves it doubtful whether Justin derived it from John's Gospel (Semisch, Luthardt, Tisch., Riggenb.), or from one of the variations of the LXX. already existing at that time (Grimm, *l.c.* p. 692 f.), or again, as is most probable, from the original Hebrew, as is the case in Rev. i. 7. It is true that the Epistle to Diognetus, which, though not composed by Justin, was certainly contemporary with and probably even prior to him, implies the existence of John's Gospel in certain passages of the concluding portion, which very distinctly re-echo John's Logos-doctrine (see especially Zeller, *l.c.* p. 618, and Credner, *Gesch. d. neut. Kanon*, p. 58 ff.); but this conclusion (chapp. 11, 12) is a later appendix, probably belonging to the third century at the earliest. Other references to our Gospel in the Epistle are uncertain.

5. To the testimonies of the second century, within the church, the *Clavis* of Melito of Sardis certainly does not belong (in Pitra, *Spicileg. Solesmense*, Paris 1852), since this

pretended κλεις, wherein the passages John xv. 5, vi. 54, xii. 24, are quoted as contained "in *Evangelio*," is a much later compilation (see Steitz, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1857, p. 584 ff.), but they include the *Epistle of the Churches at Vienne and Lyons* (Eus. v. 1), where John xvi. 2 is quoted as a saying of the Lord's, and the Spirit is designated the Paraclete: Tatian, Justin's disciple, *ad Graec.* 13, where John i. 5 is cited as τὸ εἰρημένον; chap. 19, where we have indications of an acquaintance with John's prologue (comp. chap. 5); and chap. 4, πνεῦμα ὁ θεός, compared with John iv. 24; also the *Diatessaron* of this Tatian,¹ which is based on the canon of the four Gospels, certainly including that of John: Athenagoras, *Leg. pro Christ.* 10, which is based

¹ According to Theodoret (*Haeret. fab.* i. 20), who from his account must have known it accurately, and who removed it from his diocese as dangerous, it was nothing else than a brief summary by way of extract of our four Gospels, in which the genealogies, and all that referred to Christ as a descendant of the seed of David, were left out. This account must (see also Semisch, *Tatiani Diatess.*, Vratisl. 1856) prevail against modern views of an opposite kind; it agrees also with what is said by Euseb. iv. 29, who, however, did not himself exactly know the peculiar way in which Tatian had combined the four. The statement of Epiphanius, *Haer.* xlvi. 1, "Many called it καὶ Ἑβραίων," is, on the other hand, simply an historical remark, which decides nothing as to the fact itself. According to the Jacobite bishop of the thirteenth century, Dionysius Bar-Salibi (in Assemani *Bibl. Orient.* i. p. 57 f., ii. p. 159), the *Diatessaron* of Tatian, who therefore must have laid chief stress on John, began with the words, *In the beginning was the Word*; he also reports that Ephraem Syrus wrote a commentary on the *Diatessaron*. Credner (*Beitr.* I. p. 446 ff.; *Gesch. d. neut. Kanon.*, p. 19 ff.), whom Scholten follows, combats these statements by showing that the Syrians had confounded Tatian and Ammonius and their writings with one another. But Bar-Salibi certainly keeps them strictly apart. Further, the orthodox Ephraem could write a commentary on Tatian's *Diatessaron* the more fitly, if it was a grouping together of the canonical Gospels. Lastly, the statement that it began with John i. 1 agrees thoroughly with Theodoret's account of the rejection of the genealogies and the descent from David, whereas the work of Ammonius cannot have begun with John i. 1, since, according to Eusebius (see Wetstein, *Proleg.* p. 68), its basis was the Gospel of Matthew, by the side of which Ammonius placed the parallel sections of the other evangelists in the form of a synopsis. The testimony of Bar-Salibi above quoted ought not to have been surrendered by Lücke, De Wette, and various others, on the ground of Credner's opposition. What Credner quotes in his *Gesch. d. neut. Kanon.*, p. 20, from Ebed-Jesu (in Maii *Script. vet. nova collect.* x. p. 191), rests merely on a confusion of Tatian with Ammonius on the part of the Syrians; which confusion, however, is not to be charged upon Dionysius Bar-Salibi. Further, there is the less ground for excluding the fourth Gospel from the *Diatessaron*, seeing that Tatian has made use of it in his *Oratio ad Graecos*.

upon a knowledge of John's prologue and of xvii. 21-23: Apollinaris, Bishop of Hierapolis, in a Fragment in the *Paschal Chronicle*, ed. Dindorf, p. 14 (ὁ τὴν ἀγίαν πλευρὰν ἐκκεντηθεὶς ὁ ἐκχέας ἐκ τῆς πλευρᾶς αὐτοῦ τὰ δύο πάλιν καθύρσια ὕδωρ καὶ αἷμα· λόγον κ. πνεῦμα, comp. John xix. 34), where Baur, of course, takes refuge in a tradition older than our Gospel; also in another Fragment in the same work (ὅθεν ἄσυμφῶνως τὲ νόμῳ ἢ νόησις αὐτῶν καὶ στασιάζειν δοκεῖ κατ' αὐτοὺς τὰ εὐαγγέλια), where, if we rightly interpret it,¹ John's Gospel is meant to be included among the εὐαγγέλια: Polycrates of Ephesus, in Euseb. v. 24, where, with a reference to John xiii. 23 f., xxi. 20, he designates the Apostle John as ὁ ἐπὶ τὸ στήθος τοῦ κυρίου ἀναπεσών. The Clementine Homilies (ed. Dressel, Götting. 1853) contain in xix. 22 an undeniable quotation from John ix. 2, 3;² as also, in iii. 52, a citation

¹ The correct explanation is the usual one, adopted by Wieseler, Ebrard, Weitzel, Schneider, Luthardt, Bleek, Weizsäcker, Riggenbach, and many others, also by Hilgenfeld, Volkmar, Scholten: "and the Gospels, according to them (in consequence of their asserting that Jesus, according to Matthew, died on the 15th Nisan), appear to be at variance" (namely, with one another). This ground of refutation rests on the assumption (which, however, is really erroneous) that there could be no disagreement among the Gospels as to the day when Jesus died, while there would be such a disagreement if it were correct that, according to Matthew, Jesus died on the 15th Nisan. Now it is true that Matthew really has this statement; only Apollinaris does not admit it, but assumes that both the Synoptics and John record the 14th Nisan as the day of Christ's death, so that on this point harmony reigns among the Gospels, as in fact, generally, the real disagreement among them had not come to be consciously observed. Comp. Clem. Al. in the *Chron. Pasch.*: ταύτη τῶν ἡμερῶν τῇ ἀκριβείᾳ . . . καὶ τὰ εὐαγγέλια συμφῶν. According to Schwegler (*Montanism*, p. 194 f.), Baur, Zeller, the sense must be: "According to their view, the Gospels are in conflict with the Law." This, however, is incorrect, because, after having given prominence to the irreconcilability with the Law, a new point is introduced with στασιάζειν, bearing on the necessary harmony of the Gospels. Moreover, there is no need whatever, in the case of στασιάζειν, of some such addition as ἐν ἑαυτοῖς or the like, since τὰ εὐαγγέλια represents a collective totality supposed to be well known. Comp. Xen. *Cyrop.* viii. 8. 2, ἵπαι μίντοι Κῦρος ἐπιλιούσης, ἐνός μὲν αὐτοῦ οἱ παῖδες ἰστασιάζον. Often so in Greek; comp. also Hilgenfeld, *Paschastreit*, p. 258.

² See Uhlhorn in the *Gött. gel. Anz.* 1853, p. 1810; Volkmar, *ein neu entdeckt. Zeugn. über d. Joh. Evang.*, in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1854, p. 446 ff. In spite of this clear testimony, however, Volkmar places the date of John's Gospel and of the Homilies so near each other (150-160 A.D.), that the former must have been used by the author of the Homilies directly after its origination "as an interesting but unapostolic Novum" (*Urspr. d. Evang.* p. 63). This

occurs from John x. 9, 27 (see, against Zeller and Hilgent, especially Uhlhorn, *d. Homil. u. Recogn. des Clem.* p. 223); and after these undoubted quotations, there is no longer any reason to question a reference also in xi. 26 (compare above, under 4) to John iii. 3. On the other hand, no great stress must be laid on the citations in the *Recognitions*, since this work is to be placed (in opposition to Hilgenfeld, Merx, Volkmar) somewhat later, though still in the second century, and now only exists in the obviously free Latin translation of Rufinus (*Recogn.* vi. 9, comp. John iii. 3-5; *Recogn.* ii. 48, comp. John v. 23; *Recogn.* v. 12, comp. John viii. 34). The first Father who quotes our Gospel *by name* is Theophilus, *ad Autolyc.* ii. 31 (ii. 22): "Οθεν διδάσκουσι ἡμᾶς αἱ ἄγλαι γραφαὶ καὶ πάντες οἱ πνευματοφόροι, ἐξ ὧν Ἰωάννης λέγει ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, κ.τ.λ. Besides this, according to Jerome (*Ep.* 151, *ad Aglas.*), he composed a work comparing the four Gospels together, which, like Tatian's Diatessaron, implies the recognition of John by the church. Of importance also here is the testimony of Irenaeus, *Haer.* iii. 1 (ἔπειτα Ἰωάννης ὁ μαθητὴς τοῦ κυρίου, ὁ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος αὐτοῦ ἀναπεσὼν, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐξέδωκε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τῆς Ἀσίας διατρίβων), comp. iii. 11. 1, 7, 8, 9, v. 10. 3, and especially ap. Eus. v. 8; partly because in his youth Polycarp was his teacher, and partly because he was an opponent of Gnosticism, which, however, could easily find, and did actually find, nutriment in this very Gospel. Hence the assumption is all the more natural, that the Gospel so emphatically acknowledged and frequently quoted by Irenaeus had Polycarp's communications in its favour, either *directly*, in that Polycarp made Irenaeus acquainted with John's Gospel, or at any rate *indirectly*, in that he found confirmed by that Gospel what had been delivered to him by Polycarp as coming from the apostle's own mouth respecting the words and works of Jesus,

use manifestly implies dissemination and admitted apostolic authority such as Matthew and Luke, and a Gospel of Peter, possibly used by him, must have possessed in the opinion of the author. Comp. Luthardt as above, XXXI. p. 368 ff. This also tells against Baur, who, in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1857, p. 240, strangely enough thinks to weaken this testimony as a "casual and external" use of the Gospel; while Scholten (*die ältesten Zeug.* p. 60 ff.), in a precarious and artificial fashion, raises doubts as to the use itself.

and which had remained vividly impressed in his recollection (*Epist. ad Florin.* in Eus. v. 20).—Finally, here belong, because we may take it for granted they are not later than the second century, the Canon of Muratori,¹ and the Canon of the Syrian church in the Peschito, and in the Fragments of the Curetonian text. The Itala also, if its origin really falls within the second century (Lachmann, *N. T. Praef.* p. x. f.), may be quoted among the testimonies of this century.

6. Among the heretics of the second century, besides the Tatian already referred to, we must name Marcion as a witness for our Gospel. He rejected, according to Tertullian (*c. Marc.* iv. 3), Matthew and John, and, according to the same writer, *de carne Christi* 3, John,—a fact which implies their apostolic authority, and that Marcion knew them to be apostolic,² although Hilgenfeld, Volkmar, and Scholten, following Zeller and Schwegler, assume the contrary. But he rejected the non-Pauline Gospels, not on critical grounds, but as a one-sided adherent of Paul, and, as such, in Tertullian's judgment (*"videtur"*), chose Luke's Gospel, in order to shape it anew for the purpose of restoring the pure gospel of Christ, and in such a way, in fact, that he now "*evangelio scilicet suo nullum adscribit auctorem*," Tertull. *c. Marc.* iv. 2, by which he deprived Luke of his canonical position (*"Lucam videtur elegisse, quem caederet"*). To question Tertullian's credibility in the above passages (Zeller, Baur, Volkmar), though he too frequently judged with the hostility of a partisan those whom he opposed, is yet without sufficient warrant, since he states particularly (*c. Marc.* iv. 3) how Marcion came to reject the other canonical Gospels; that is, namely, that he strove, on the ground of the Epistle to the Galatians (chap. ii.), to subvert the position of those Gospels—"quae propria et sub apostolorum nomine eduntur vel etiam apostolicorum, ut scilicet fidem, quam illis adimit, suo conferat." Comp. Weizsäcker, p.

¹ Credner erroneously maintains in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1857, p. 297, and *Gesch. d. neut. Kanon*, p. 158 f., that the Canon Murat. distinguishes John the Evangelist as a simple *discipulus* Christi from the *Apostle*. See, on the other hand, Ewald, *Jahrb.* IX. p. 96; Weiss in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1863, p. 597.

² Which certainly can be least of all doubted in the case of John's Gospel, of which *Asia* was the native country. The rejection of John as one of the *twelve* apostles is easily enough explained by Marcion's anti-Judaizing temper.

230 ff. (who, however, misunderstands *videtur* in the above passage), and Riggenb. p. 130 ff. Marcion, therefore, must in consistency have renounced the gain to Gnosticism with which John could have furnished him. The opposite course would have been inconsistent with his Paulinism. Again, that Tertullian understood, by the "Gospels peculiarly and specially apostolical," those of Matthew and John (against Zeller, who, with Volkmar, understands the apocryphal Gospels of the Jewish Christians), is clear from *c. Marc. iv. 2*: "Nobis fidem ex apostolis *Johannes et Matthaeus* insinuant, ex apostolicis *Lucas et Marcus*." Further, the Valentinians used our Gospel fully and in many ways, in support of their fine-spun fancies (Iren. *Haer. iii. 11. 7*); indeed, Heracleon, who is not to be rejuvenated into a contemporary of Origen,¹ wrote a commentary on it (see the Fragments from Origen in Grabe, *Spicil. Patr. ii. p. 85 ff.*); and Ptolemaeus (in Epiphan. *Haer. xxxiii. 3 ff.*) cites John i. 3 as an apostolical sentence, and according to Irenaeus, i. 8. 5, expressly described John's prologue as proceeding from the apostle; and Theodotus also (according to the extracts from his writings appended to the works of Clem. Alex.) often quotes the Gospel of John. Whether *Valentinus himself* used it, is a question on which also, apart from other less evident proofs, we are not without very distinct testimony since the publication of the *Philosophumena Origenis*, which were probably composed by Hippolytus; for in the *Philos. vi. 35*, among the proof-texts used by Valentinus, John x. 8 is cited: so that the subterfuge, "*The author likes to transfer the doctrines of the disciple to the Master*" (Zeller, Hilgenfeld, Volkmar, comp. Scholten), can be of no avail here, where we have an instance to the contrary lying clearly before us (see Jacobi in the *Deutsch. Zeitschrift*, 1851, No. 28 f., 1853, No. 24 f.; Ewald, *Jahrb. V. p. 200 f.*). When, therefore, Tertullian says, *Praescr. Haer. 38*, "*Valentinus integro instrumento uti videtur*," we may find this *videtur* in respect of John's Gospel simply confirmed by the *Philosophumena*² (see

¹ Origen himself (in *Joann. ii. c. 8*) alleges that Heracleon was esteemed a trusty disciple (*γράμματος*) of Valentinus.

² When Baur and Zeller, on the other hand, lay stress on the fact that among the texts adduced by the Valentinians in proof of their doctrine of the Aeons,

further, Bleek, *Beitr.* I. p. 214 ff.; Schneider, p. 27 ff.; Luthardt, *l.c.* p. 100 ff.; Tisch. *l.c.* p. 45 ff.; Riggenbach, p. 118 ff.).—That, again, even Basilides, who is not, however, to be looked upon as a disciple of the Apostle Matthias (Hofstede de Groot), used our Gospel,—a point which Baur even, with unsatisfactory opposition on the part of Hilgenfeld, Volkmar, and others, concedes,—and that he has employed as proof-texts in particular John i. 9, ii. 4, is likewise proved by the *Phil. Orig.* vii. 22, 27, with which many of the author's errors in *other* things are quite unconnected.—The Gospel also was in use among the *Naassenes* (*Philos. Or.* v. 6 ff.) and *Peratae* (v. 12 ff.), who belong to the close of the second century.—It is true that Montanism had not its original root in the Gospel of John, but in the doctrine of the Parousia; still, in its entire relation to the church and its doctrine (see especially Ritschl, *Altkathol. Kirche*, p. 477 ff.), and particularly in its ideas of prophecy, its asceticism, and its eschatology, it had no occasion to *reject* our Gospel, though some have erroneously found some evidence to this effect in Irenaeus,¹ though at the same time *dependence* on this Gospel cannot in its case be proved. There was a rejection of the

none occur from John, and hence conclude that the Valentinian system which Irenaeus there describes does not imply the existence of our Gospel at that time, it is still adverse to their view that Irenaeus immediately, i. 8. 5, adduces quotations from John out of Ptolemaeus, and in iii. 11. 7 testifies to the most ample use of our Gospel ("*plenissime utentes*") on the part of the Valentinians. So, also, the fact that Irenaeus, i. 20. 2, cites among the proof-texts of the Marcosians none from John, cannot serve to prove that the "Valentinian system originally stood in no connection with the fourth Gospel." Zeller, 1845, p. 635. Assuredly the whole theosophy of Valentinus was intertwined with, and grew upon, the ground and soil of John's distinctive theology. "Valentinus . . . *non ad materiam scripturas* (as Marcion), *sed materiam ad scripturas excogitavit*, et tamen plus abstulit et plus adjecit, auferens proprietates singulorum quoque verborum et adjiciens dispositiones non comparantium rerum." Tertullian, *de praescr. haer.* 38. The Valentinian Gnosis, with its Aeons, Syzygies, and so on, stands related to John's prologue as a product of art and fancy to what is simple and creative. Attempts to weaken the testimonies of the *Philosoph. Orig.* as to a use of John's Gospel on the part of Valentinus and Basilides, have been very unsuccessfully made: Zeller, in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1853, p. 144 ff.; Volkmar, *ibidem*, 1854, p. 125 f.; Baur, *ib.* p. 269 f.; Hilgenf. in his *Zeitschrift*, 1862, p. 452 ff.; Scholten, *d. alt. Zeug.* p. 67 ff.; and Volkmar, *Urspr. uns. Evang.* p. 70 ff.

¹ This is in answer to Bretschneider, *Probab.* p. 210 ff. The passage in Irenaeus, iii. 2. 9, reads thus: "Alii vero, ut donum Spiritus frustrentur, quod in

Gospel on the part of the Alogi, consequently on that of the *opponents* of Montanism (Epiph. *Haer.* li. 3 f.), in the interests, indeed, of *dogmatic* Antimontaniam, though they also adduced harmonistic reasons; but by this very rejection they furnish an indirect testimony to the recognition in their day of our Gospel as an *apostolic* work, both in the church and among the Montanists. They ascribed it to Cerinthus, who was yet a contemporary of John,—a proof how ancient they thought it, in spite of their rejection of it.

7. Celsus, whom we must certainly not assign, with Volkmar, to so late a date as the third century, has been cited as a witness of the second century standing *outside* the church,—all the more important, indeed, because her *enemy*,—and, from the Fragments of his work as cited in Origen, we may certainly infer that he was to some extent acquainted with the evangelic tradition and the evangelic writings, for he even alludes to the designation of the Logos and other peculiar points which are found in John, especially *c. Cels.* ii. 36, comp. John xx. 27; *c. Cels.* i. 67, comp. John ii. 18. He assures us that he drew his objections chiefly from the writings of the Christians (*c. Cels.* ii. 74). Now it is highly probable that the Gospel of John was also among them, since he (*c. Cels.* ii. 13) expressly

novissimis temporibus secundum placitum patris effusum est in humanum genus, illam speciem non admittunt, quae est secundum Johannis evangelium, in qua Paracletum se missurum Dominus promisit; sed simul et evangelium et propheticum repellunt Spiritum, infelices vere, qui pseudoprophetae quidem esse volunt, prophetiae vero gratiam ab ecclesia repellunt." He is here speaking of the *opponents* of Montanism, who for a polemical purpose did not acknowledge the characteristic Johannine nature of this Gospel, recognisable by the promise of the Paraclete; by which course Irenaeus thinks they reject equally both the Gospel (of John) and the prophetic Spirit also (who, in fact, was to be sent precisely as the *Paraclete*),—"truly unhappy men, who indeed ascribe it (the Gospel) to a false prophet, while they are repelling the grace of prophecy from the church."—The passage is not to be regarded, with Neander, as a Montanist interpolation; nor must we admit in the last words the conjecture "*pseudoprophetas*" (so Merkel, *Aufklärung d. Streitigk. der Aloger*, p. 13; also Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* I. i. p. 200, and Tischendorf), or *pseudoprophetae esse nolunt* (so Lücke), or *pseudoprophetas esse nolunt* (so Ritschl). Rather is *pseudoprophetae* to be taken as genitive: that "*it is the work of a false prophet.*" Accordingly the "*pseudoprophetae esse volunt*" answers to the preceding "*evangelium . . . repellunt*," while the "*prophetiae vero gratiam*" answers to the "*propheticum repellunt Spiritum.*" Hence also we must decline Volkmar's conjecture, that in Greek ψιδως προφηται stood instead of ψιδωπροφηται.

distinguishes the writings of the *disciples* of Jesus from *other* works treating of Him, which he proposes to pass over.—A weighty testimony from the oldest *apocryphal* literature might be furnished by the *Acta Pilati*, which are quoted even by Justin and Tertullian (see Tischendorf, *Evang. apocr. Prolegg.* p. liv. ff.), if their original form were satisfactorily determined, which, however, cannot be successfully done. Just as little do other apocryphal Gospels furnish anything which we may lay hold of as certain. The labour expended by Tischendorf therefore leads to no results.

8. By the end of the second century, and from the beginning of the third, tradition in the church testifies so clearly and uniformly in favour of the Gospel, that there is no need of additional vouchers (Clem. AL, Tertull., Hippolyt Orig., Dionys. AL, etc.). Euseb. iii. 25 places it among the Homologumena.

From this examination of witnesses, it is clear¹ that our Gospel was not merely in use in the church, and recognised by her as apostolical, from about 170 A.D. (Hilgenfeld, A.D. 150), and composed somewhere about 150 A.D. (Hilgenfeld, 120–140), but that the continuity of the attestations to it, and their growing extent in connection with the literature of the church, are as evident as we ever can and do require for the external confirmation of any New Testament writing. The continuity in particular goes back, by means of Irenaeus through Polycarp, and by means of Papias, so far as he testifies to the use of John's first *Epistle*, even if not directly (Iren., Hieron.), yet indirectly (Euseb., Dionys.),—that is, through the *Presbyter* John,—to the *Apostle himself*. That

¹ Comp. the acknowledgment of Keim, *Gesch. J.* i. p. 137: "It is used in the extant literature as early as the Synoptics." In opposition both to the usual determination of the date, which fixes on the last quarter of the first century, and to the criticism of Baur, Hilgenfeld, and Volkmar, Keim (pp. 146, 155) assigns the *origin* of the Gospel to Trajan's time, between A.D. 100 and 117. The difficulty here is, that, according to Keim, the Epistle of Barnabas necessarily implies the use of our Gospel in its time. This epistle, however, he places in Hadrian's day, about 120 A.D. In this case, the interval during which the Gospel had to become known and recognised is much too narrow; and besides, the date he assigns to Barnabas is by no means so certain as Keim is disposed to infer from chap. 4 and 16. Hilgenfeld places it under Nerva; Ewald and Weizsäcker even in that of Vespasian. The question is, in any case, still uncertain.

the *Fragment of Papias* in Euseb. iii. 39 does not mention John's *Gospel*, cannot be of any consequence, since it does not quote any written sources at all from which the author drew his accounts, but rather describes his procedure as that of an inquirer after sayings of the apostles and other of the Lord's disciples (such as Aristion and John the Presbyter), and expressly enunciates the principle: οὐ γὰρ τὰ ἐκ τῶν βιβλίων τοσοῦτόν με ὠφελεῖν ὑπελάμβανον, ὅσον τὰ παρὰ ζώσης φωνῆς καὶ μενούσης. Papias here throws together the then existing evangelic writings (τῶν βιβλίων), of which there was a multitude (Luke i. 1), all without distinction, not probably some merely apocryphal ones (Tischendorf; Riggenbach, p. 115); and as he included among them the Gospel of Matthew and that of Mark, both of which he specially mentions subsequently, so he also may have intended to include the Gospel of John among τῶν βιβλίων, since he manifestly does not indicate that he has any conception of *canonical* Gospels as such (comp. Credner, *Beitr.* I. p. 25), and has no occasion to note the distinction. When, further on, Eusebius quotes two statements of Papias on the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, this does not indicate that our Gospel did not exist in his day (Baur), or was at any rate not recognised by him (Hilgen., Credner, and Volkmar); but these two statements are simply made prominent, because they contain something specially noteworthy as to the *origin*¹ of those Gospels, just as Eusebius refers to it as specially worthy of remark that Papias makes use of proofs from two *epistolary* writings² (1 John

¹ When, in this statement, Papias intimates in regard to Mark: οὗτοι γὰρ ἤκουσι τοῦ κυρίου οὗτοι παρεκολούθησεν αὐτῷ, we may observe here a contrast to other evangelists who had heard the Lord and followed Him; which was not the case with Mark, whose credibility depended rather on Peter. Such other evangelists were Matthew and John.

² Why Eusebius makes this prominent, we cannot tell, since we do not know on what occasions Papias used these epistolary testimonies. We can hardly connect this prominent reference with the question of the genuineness of the epistles, to which the subsequent mention of the Gospel to the Hebrews would not at all be appropriate. Probably Eusebius mentions the reference to the two epistles only as an *exceptional* procedure on the part of Papias, who elsewhere dispenses with the citation of *written* testimonies. Comp. the passage previously adduced from the *Fragment*.—Scholten (*d. ältest. Zeugn.* p. 17) very arbitrarily, and without any reason, doubts whether Papias held the epistle to be a work of the apostle.

and 1 Peter), and has a narrative which occurs in the Gospel to the Hebrews.¹ Further, in opposition to the weighty testimony of Justin Martyr, it is incorrectly urged that, if he had known of John as *evangelist*, he would not have referred to him as the author of the Apocalypse with the bare words (*c. Tryph.* 81), ἀνὴρ τις, ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰωάννης, εἰς τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Justin had, in fact, no occasion at all, in the context of this passage, to describe John as evangelist, and all the less that to himself it was self-evident that in εἰς τῶν ἀποστόλων were included the authors of the ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων.

A historical argument specially adduced by some against our Gospel is derived from the history of the *Easter Controversy*. See, on the one side, Bretschneider, *Prob.* 109 f.; Schwegler, *Montanism*, p. 191 f.; Baur, p. 343 ff., and in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1844, p. 638 ff., 1847, p. 89 ff., 1848, p. 264 ff. On the opposite side, Weitzel, *d. christl. Passafest der drei ersten Jahrb.*, Pforzheim 1848, and in the *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1848, p. 806;—in answer to which, again, Hilgenfeld, in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1849, p. 209 ff., and in his *Galaterbrief*, p. 78 f.; Baur, *d. Christenth. d. drei ersten Jahrb.* p. 141 ff.; Scholten, *d. Evang. nach Joh. krit. hist. Untersuch.* p. 385 ff., and *d. ältest. Zeugnisse*, p. 139 ff. See further, for the genuineness of John: Ewald, *Jahrb.* V. p. 203 ff.; Schneider, p. 43 ff.; Bleek, *Beitr.* p. 156 ff., and *Einkl.* p. 187 ff.; Steitz, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1856, p. 721 ff., 1857, p. 741 ff., 1859, p. 717 ff., and in the *Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theologie*, 1861, p. 102 ff.;—against whom, Baur, in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1857, p. 242 ff., and in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr.* 1858, p. 298; Hilgenf. *Theol. Jahrb.* 1857, p. 523 ff.,

¹ Besides, it is not to be overlooked that Papias may somewhere else in his book have mentioned the fourth Gospel, which he does not name in the Fragment in Eusebius. We do not know, since the book is lost. See also Steitz, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1868, p. 493. It is true, a Latin Codex of the ninth century, in the Vatican, expressly testifies to such a mention (see Aberle in the *Tüb. Quartalschr.* 1864, p. 1 ff.; Tisch. as above, p. 118 f.; Zahn, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1867, p. 539 ff.); but less importance is to be attached to it, since the testimony is connected with the statement that Papias put together what was dictated by the apostle,—a late and worthless legend (occurring also in Corder. *Caten. Prooem.*), which might easily enough have originated from Irenaeus' speaking of Papias as Ἰωάννου ἀποστολῆς. See, moreover, Hilgenf. in his *Zeitschr.* 1865, p. 75 ff.; Overbeck, *ibidem*, 1867, p. 63 ff.

and in his *Zeitschr.* 1858, p. 151 ff., 1862, p. 285 ff., 1867, p. 187 ff. On the whole course of the investigations, Hilgenf., *d. Paschastreit d. alt. Kirche*, 1860, p. 29 ff.; *Kanon u. Krit. d. N. T.* 1863, p. 220 ff. Comp. also the apologetic discussion by Riggenbach, *d. Zeugnisse f. d. Ev. Joh.* p. 50 ff. The reasons derived from the Easter controversy against the genuineness of the Gospel are obviated, not by forcing the fourth Gospel into agreement with the Synoptics in their statements as to the day on which Jesus died (see on xviii. 28), which is not possible, but by a correct apprehension of the point of view from which the Catholic Quartodecimani in Asia Minor, who appealed for their observance of their festival on the 14th Nisan to apostolic custom, and especially to the example of John (Polycarp in Eusebius v. 24; and Polycrates, *ibidem*), regarded the observance of this particular day of the month. The opponents of the Gospel, it is true, say, If the custom of those in Asia Minor to celebrate the Lord's last supper on the 14th Nisan, contemporaneously with the Jewish passover, mainly originated with and proceeded from the Apostle John, then this apostle could not have written the fourth Gospel, because that custom agrees exactly with the Synoptic account of the last supper and the day of Jesus' death, while the fourth Gospel states the exact opposite,—namely, that Jesus kept His last supper, and therefore no true passover, on the 13th Nisan, and was crucified on the 14th Nisan. But the men of Asia Minor celebrated the 14th Nisan,—and that, too, by terminating the fast kept upon this day in remembrance of Christ's passion, down to the hour of His death, and by a joyous celebration of the Lord's supper immediately after, in gratitude for the accomplishment of His work of redemption,—not because Jesus ate the *passover* on that day, but because He *died* on that day, and by His death became the *real* and *true* Paschal Lamb of whom the Mosaic paschal lamb was the *type* (1 Cor. v. 7; John xix. 36); comp. also Ritschl, *Altkath. Kirche*, p. 269. Accordingly, they might justly maintain (see Polycrates in Euseb. *l.c.*) that their festival on the 14th Nisan was *κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον* (for any disagreement in the Gospels in reference to the day of Jesus' death was not yet perceived, and the passover meal of Jesus in the Synoptics was looked upon as an anticipation),

and κατὰ τὸν κανόνα τῆς πίστεως,—this latter, namely, because Jesus, by the observance of the passover on another day, would not have appeared as the antitype of the slaughtered paschal lamb. Also πᾶσα ἀγία γραφή might be rightly quoted in proof by Polycrates, since in no part of the Old Testament does any other day occur as that on which the paschal lamb was slaughtered, except the 14th Nisan, and Jesus was in fact the true Paschal Lamb. It is self-evident that John's example, which the Catholics of Asia Minor urged in favour of their "Quartodecima," perfectly agrees with the account of the fourth Gospel, and that the κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον of Polycrates, though by it no single Gospel, but the written evangelic history collectively, is meant, does not exclude, but includes John's Gospel, since its existence and recognition at that time is perfectly clear from other proofs. True, there was also a party of Quartodecimans in Asia Minor¹ who formed their judgments from a Judaistic (Ebi-onite) stand-point, whose celebration of the 14th Nisan did not rest on the assumption that Jesus, as the true Paschal Lamb, died on this day, but on the legal injunction that the passover was to be eaten on this day, and on the assumption that Jesus Himself ate it on the very same day, and did not suffer till the 15th Nisan (comp. Steitz, 1856, p. 776 ff.). These² men stirred up the so-called *Laodicean* controversy, and

¹ Characteristically referred to thus by Apollinaris in the *Chron. Pasch.* p. 14: ἔνιοι τοίνυν οἱ δι' ἄγνοίαν φιλονεικοῦσι περὶ τούτων, συγγνωστὸν πρᾶγμα πειονότις· ἄγνοια γὰρ οὐ κατηγορίαν ἀναδέχεται, ἀλλὰ διδαχῆς προσδίται. Comp. Hippolyt. *ibid.* p. 13: ὁρῶ μὲν οὖν, ὅτι φιλονικίας τὸ ἔργον, κ.τ.λ. With the mild description of these people in Apollinaris agrees also *Philos. Orig.* viii. 18, where they are simply distinguished as ἑτεροί τινες, and indeed as φιλονεικοὶ τῆς φύσει and ἰδιῶται τὴν γνώσει, while it is said of them that in other points they agree with the doctrine of the apostles. Against Baur and Hilgenfeld, by whom the distinction between Catholic and Judaic Quartodecimani is alleged to be pure fancy, see Steitz, 1856, p. 782 ff., 1857, p. 764; also in Herzog's *Encyclop.* xi. p. 156 ff. Even the ἔνιοι of Apollinaris and the ἑτεροί τινες of Hippolytus should have precluded them from thinking of the Asiatic church. On the other hand, Hilgenfeld, in his *Paschastreit*, pp. 256, 282, 404, is evasive.

² Whose observance is not to be regarded as a mere Jewish simultaneous celebration of the passover, which John assented to, as a custom which he found in existence in Ephesus (Bleek; De Wette, following Lücke). See, on the other hand, Hilgenfeld, *Kanon u. Krit. d. N. T.* p. 224 ff. The difference rests on a fundamental opposition. Comp. Ritschl, *Altth. Kirche*, pp. 123 f., 269 f.

had as opponents, first Melito of Sardis and Apollinaris of Hierapolis, and afterwards Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Clement, and others (Eus. iv. 26. 3). They were attacked partly by their own weapon — *the law* — according to which Christ could not have been put to death, that is, slain as the true Paschal Lamb, on the first day of the feast; partly by an appeal to the *Gospels*, in respect of which it was assumed that they agree in reporting the 14th Nisan as the day of Jesus' death (Apollinaris, in the *Chron. Pasch.* p. 14: ἀσυμφώνως τε νόμῳ ἢ νόησις αὐτῶν καὶ στασιάζειν δοκεῖ κατ' αὐτοὺς τὰ εὐαγγέλια. See above, under 5, the note on this passage). Moreover, it was urged by some who appealed to Matthew (Apollinaris, *i.e.* διηγούνται Ματθαῖον οὕτω λέγειν), that according to the words of Jesus, οὐκέτι φάγομαι τὸ πάσχα (comp. Luke xxii. 16), He did not eat of the legal passover, but died as the perfect Paschal Lamb on this day, and indeed before the time of eating the meal appointed by the law. See Hippolytus, in the *Chron. Pasch.* p. 13: ὁ πάλαι προειπὼν, ὅτι οὐκέτι φάγομαι τὸ πάσχα, εἰκότως τὸ μὲν δείπνον ἐδείπνησεν πρὸ τοῦ πάσχα, τὸ δὲ πάσχα οὐκ ἔφαγεν, ἀλλ' ἔπαθεν, οὐδὲ γὰρ καιρὸς ἦν τῆς βρώσεως αὐτοῦ (*i.e.* "because the legal period for eating the passover had not even come,"—it only came several hours after the death of Jesus); and just before: πεπλάνηται μὴ γινώσκων, ὅτι ὃ καιρῷ ἔπασχεν ὁ Χριστὸς, οὐκ ἔφαγε τὸ κατὰ νόμον πάσχα, οὗτος γὰρ ἦν τὸ πάσχα τὸ προκεκηρυγμένον καὶ τὸ τελειούμενον τῇ ὀρισμένῃ ἡμέρᾳ (on the 14th Nisan). That, however, Justin Martyr himself regarded the first day of the feast as the day on which Jesus died (so Baur and Hilgenfeld), is an erroneous assumption. For when he says (*c. Tryph.* 111, p. 338), καὶ ὅτι ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ πάσχα συνελάβετε αὐτὸν καὶ ὁμοίως ἐν τῷ πάσχα ἐσταυρώσατε, γέγραπται, he plainly means by ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ πάσχα, and by ἐν τῷ πάσχα, the day on which the paschal lamb was eaten — the 14th Nisan; since he shows immediately before that Christ was the true Paschal Lamb, and immediately after continues: ὥς δὲ τοὺς ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἔσωσε τὸ αἷμα τοῦ πάσχα, οὕτως καὶ τοὺς πιστεύσαντας ῥύσεται ἐκ θανάτου τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Comp. chap. 40, p. 259. He *might* therefore have regarded Christ not as dying on the 15th Nisan, but simply on the

14th, as this is expressed in the second fragment of Apollinaris,¹ without our needing to understand “ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τοῦ πάσχα” of the 15th Nisan.² Thus it is also said in the *Chron. Pasch.* p. 12: ἐν αὐτῇ δὲ τῇ τοῦ πάσχα ἡμέρᾳ, ἥτοι τῇ ιδ' τοῦ πρώτου μηνὸς, παράσκευῆς οὔσης ἐσταύρωσαν τὸν κύριον οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ τότε τὸ πάσχα ἔφαγον. Comp. p. 415: ἐν ἡμέρᾳ δὲ παρασκευῇ σταυρωθῆναι τὸν κύριον διδάσκουσιν τὰ θεόπνευστα λόγια, ἐν τῇ τοῦ πάσχα ἑορτῇ. On this fourteenth day the passover was celebrated according to the practice prevailing in Asia Minor, because on that day the true Paschal Lamb, Christ, was slain. Thus had Philip, John, Polycarp, and other μεγάλα στοιχεῖα, whom Polycrates mentions, already acted, and so John's example in this particular agrees with his own Gospel.

If some have also argued (see Hilgenfeld, Baur, Volkmar) against the early existence of our Gospel, from the antiquity and fixedness of the tradition which represented the ministry of Jesus as lasting for *one year* only (see *Homil. Clem.* xvii. 19), it is, on the other hand, certain that this tradition occurs in many writers who recognised the Gospel as the genuine work of John (Clem. Al., Orig., Ptolemaeus; and see generally Semisch, *Denkw. Justin's*, p. 199 f.); whence it is clear that it does not imply the non-existence of the Gospel, but seemed just as reconcilable with John as with the Synoptics. It may have originated from the Synoptic history (see on Luke iv. 19); but the counter statement of John, even if it actually existed, did not disturb it. It is the same also with the antiquity and

¹ To the same effect is p. 14: ἡ ιδ' τὸ ἀληθινὸν τοῦ κυρίου πάσχα, ἡ θυσία ἡ μεγάλη, ὁ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἁμνοῦ παῖς θεοῦ, ὁ δῆσις, ὁ δῆσας τὸν ἰσχυρόν, καὶ ὁ κριθεὶς κριτῆς ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν, καὶ ὁ παραδοθεὶς εἰς χεῖρας ἁμαρτωλῶν, ἵνα σταυρωθῇ, ὁ ὑψωθείς ἐπὶ κεράτων μονοκίρως, καὶ ὁ τὴν ἀγίαν πλευρὰν ἐκκεντηθεὶς . . . καὶ ὁ ταφθεὶς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τοῦ πάσχα, ἀνιτιθέμενος τῷ μνήματι τοῦ λίθου.

² Recently Steitz also (in Herzog's *Encyklop.* xi. 1859, p. 151), who formerly agreed with Baur, has admitted that Justin, agreeing with the other Fathers of the second and third centuries, did not in the above passage, c. *Tr.* p. 338, mean the 15th, but the 14th Nisan. Comp. Lev. xxiii. 5, 6; Num. xxviii. 16 f.; Ezek. xlv. 21. The 15th Nisan is called *postridie paschatis*, Num. xxxiii. 3, Josh. v. 11. Hilgenfeld's objection (*d. Paschastr. d. alten Kirche*, p. 206), that the *arrest* mentioned by Justin as taking place likewise on the ἡμέρα τοῦ πάσχα does not suit the 14th Nisan, is altogether futile. Justin correctly includes the arrest in the day of crucifixion, as, c. *Tryph.* 99, the agony in Gethsemane is already put by him τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ἧς περὶ ἱμελλεῖ σταυροῦσθαι.

fixedness of the tradition of the 14th Nisan as the day of Jesus' death, which nevertheless does not imply non-acquaintance with the synoptic Gospels.—If, further, the reasons which are alleged for a Johannean origin of the *Apocalypse* are likewise urged, especially by the Tübingen critics, as evidence against a similar origin for the *Gospel*, yet, on the other hand, an opposite procedure is equally justifiable; and, apart from the utter futility of those reasons in other respects, the testimonies for the *Apocalypse*, which was excluded even from the *Peschito*, do not attain to any such general recognition as those for this *Gospel*. The attribution by the unanimous judgment of the church (alleged to be erroneous) of the latter work to the apostle, would, if it only originated in the first half of the second century, be the result of a few decenniums, brought about as by a stroke of magic; and would be, historically, the more enigmatical and incomprehensible, in proportion as the contents and character of our book are the more peculiar, compared with the other Gospels, and the more divergent from the *Apocalypse*, which existed long before our *Gospel*, and was reputed to be apostolic. For in this book it is not a spiritualized apocalypse that is exhibited,¹ but simply an independent *Gospel*, set forth in profound spiritual perfection, is to be recognised, whose linguistic and other characteristics, and whose doctrinal contents, spirit, and aim, are, on the whole, so specifically different from those of the *Apocalypse*, in spite of various Christological points of connection, that it can only have come from a totally different author (against Hengsten., Godet, Riegenb., and others). The Gnostic tendency of the time, in which some have sought for the solution of that incomprehensible enigma, does not solve it, since the strong reaction in the church against Gnosticism would certainly rather have condemned a *Gospel* furnishing the Gnostics with so much apparent support, and with materials so liable to be misused, than have left to opponents so rich a mine, to be worked out for their designs, if its apostolic origin had not been known and acknowledged as an established fact.

¹ Against Baur, Schweigler, Köstlin, Hilgenf., and others. How some have represented even the *Synoptics* as dependent on the *Apocalypse*, see especially in Volkmar, *zur Apok. u. Urspr. uns. Evang.* p. 158 f. Nothing can be more futile.

SEC. III.—GENUINENESS CONTINUED.

As an *internal testimony* to its apostolic origin, we have, above all, the whole grand ideal peculiarity of the book, wherein the *πνευματικὸν εὐαγγέλιον* (Clem. Al.) is delineated with so much character and spirit, with such simplicity, vividness, depth, and truth, that a later fabricator or composer—who, moreover, could have occupied no other standing-point than that of his own time—becomes an impossibility, when we compare with it any production of Christian authorship of the second century. The Gospel of John, especially through the unity and completeness of its *Christological idea*, is no artificial antithesis (Keim, *Gesch. J.* p. 129), but the *πλήρωσις* of the previous evangelic literature, to which the Pauline Christology appears as the historical middle term. But such a creation, which constitutes such a *πλήρωσις*, without any imitation of the older Gospels, is not the work of some later forger, but of an immediate eye-witness and recipient.¹ In it there beats the *heart* of Christ,—as the book itself has been justly named (Ernesti). But, say some (Lützel, Baur and his

¹ In order to make the unique peculiarities of the Gospel agree with a non-apostolic author, neither the Epistle to the Hebrews nor the Apostle Paul ought to be brought into comparison. Both of them belong to the apostolic age, and the latter was called in an extraordinary manner by Christ, as a true apostle, and furnished with a revelation. To suppose that the author of this Gospel also received a revelation in a *similar way*, and yet to make him compose his Gospel no earlier than the second century, is unhistorical; and to attribute to any one deemed worthy of such a revelation the design of passing off his work as John's, is unpsychological, and morally opposed to the spirit of truth which pervades and underlies it. The originating creative energy of the Spirit had no longer, in the second century, its season ordained by God, as is clearly shown by the entire literature of that later period, not excepting even the most distinguished (such as the Epistle to Diognetus). And the assumption of the apostolic guise would have been, in the case of that creative energy, as unworthy as unnecessary. The pseudonymous post-apostolic literature of the early church may be sufficiently accounted for by the custom—excusable, considering the defective conception at that time of literary property—of assuming the name of any one according to whose ideas one intended to write (see Köstlin in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1851, p. 149 ff.); but the deliberate purpose on which this custom was founded, would, in the case especially of a book so sublime, and in an intellectual point of view, so thoroughly independent as our Gospel, have been *utterly incongruous*—a paradox of the Holy Ghost.

school), it is precisely this tender, fervent, harmonious, spiritual character of the Gospel, which is as little in keeping with those traits of the *Apostle John himself* exhibited in the other Gospels (Mark iii. 17; Luke ix. 49, 54; Mark ix. 38, x. 35), as the testimony borne to his anti-Pauline Judaism (Gal. ii.) is to the ideal universalism which pervades his Gospel (see especially iv. 24, x. 16, xii. 20). Yet the Judaizing partisanship which is said to be chargeable on John, is first simply imported into Gal. ii., and cannot without utter arbitrariness be inferred from the conflicts with Judaism in Paul's subsequent epistles. And as to the destination of an apostle of the Jews, a position which John certainly, in common with Peter and James, still adopted at the time of the Apostolical Council, might it not afterwards (though even Keim discovers in this assumption a mockery of history and psychology) expand gradually into that universalism which appears in the Gospel? Might not, in particular, the fuller insight into Paul's work which John attained (Gal. ii.), and the bond of fellowship which he formed with that apostle (Gal. ii.), as well as his entrance subsequently into the sphere of Paul's labours in Asia Minor, have contributed powerfully to that expansion and transformation which went beyond that of Paul himself; for the perfecting of which, down to the time when our Gospel¹ was composed, so long a period of church history and of personal experience had been vouchsafed? Moreover, like Paul, he still retained his Israelitish theocratic consciousness as an inalienable inheritance (iv. 22; his use of the Old Test.). With regard to the traits of character indicated in the Synoptics, is

¹ The well-known words of Polycrates, τὸ τίταλον πειφορηκώς, ought not to have been used as a proof that, in his later ministry in Asia, John was still the representative of Judaism, for they describe high-priestly dignity (see sec. 1) in a Christian, *spiritual* sense. Again, the words which John is said to have uttered, according to Irenaeus, iii. 3, when he encountered Cerinthus at the bath: φύγωμιν μὴ καὶ τὸ βαλανίον συμπύση ἵνδον ὄντος Κηρίνου, τοῦ τῆς ἀληθείας ἰχθύος, are alleged to be inappropriate to our evangelist. Why so? The very designation of Cerinthus as τῆς ἀληθείας ἰχθύος in the legend points to the evangelist, with whom ἀλήθεια was one of the great fundamental conceptions, whereas the author of the Apocalypse never once uses the word. The allegation that the latter, again, in Rev. xxi. 14, compared with ii. 4, testifies to the anti-Pauline sentiments of the Twelve, and hence of the Apostle John also, is simply foisted into the passage by a criticism on the look-out for it.

not the holy fervour of spirit which everywhere pervades his Gospel, and still marks his First Epistle, to be conceived as the glorified transfiguration of his former fiery zeal? And as to this transfiguration itself,¹ who may define the limits in the sphere of what is morally possible to man, beyond which, in a life and labours so long continued, the development of the new birth could not extend under influences so mighty as the apostles experienced by means of the Spirit's training in the school of the holiest calling? What purification and growth did not Peter, for example, experience between the time of his smiting with the sword and denial on the one hand, and his martyrdom on the other? Both his labours and his Epistle bear witness on this point. Similarly must we judge of the objection, that the higher, nay, philosophical (or rather Christian speculative) Hellenistic culture of the evangelist, especially his doctrine of the Logos, cannot be made to suit (Bretschneider, Baur, and others) the Galilean fisherman John (comp. also Acts iv. 13), for whom the fathomless hardihood of modern criticism has substituted some highly cultured *Gentile* Christian (so even Schenkel), who, wishing to lead *heathen* readers (xix. 35, xx. 31) to Christian faith, exhibited the remarkable phenomenon "of historical evangelic authorship turning away from the existing Christian communities, for whom there were already Gospels enough in existence, to appeal to the educated conscience of the heathen world" (Hilgenfeld, *d. Evangelien*, p. 349). Even the fact that John was, according to xviii. 15, an acquaintance of the high priest, is said to be unsuited to the circumstances of the Galilean fisherman (see Scholten, p. 379),—a statement wholly without adequate ground.

It is true the author does not give his *name*, just as the other historical works of the N. T. do not designate their authors. But he shows himself to have been an eye-witness in the plainest possible way, both at i. 14 (comp. 1 John i. 1, iv. 14) and at xix. 35 (comp. xxi. 24); while the

¹ Keim (p. 160) says, inappositely, of Mark and Luke: "Since they clearly imply the death of the apostles (of all?), they have not even allowed a *possibility* of further developments." Neither Mark nor Luke undertook to write in their Gospels any history at all of the *apostles*, but of *Jesus*.

vividness and directness of so many descriptions and individual details, in which no other Gospel equals ours, as well as its necessarily conscious variation from the synoptic representation as a whole and in particular points of great importance, can only confirm the truth of that personal testimony, which is not to be set aside either by interpreting *ἐθεασάμεθα*, i. 14, of the Christian consciousness in general, or by the pretext that *ἐκεῖνος* in xix. 35 distinguishes the evangelist from such as were eye-witnesses (Köstlin, Hilgenfeld, Keim, and several others). See the exegetical remarks on those passages. And as a proof that the eye-witness was, in fact, no other than John, the significant *concealment of the name John* is rightly urged against Bretschneider, Baur, and others. Though allowed to be one of the most intimate friends of Jesus, and though the Gospel describes so many of his peculiar and delicate traits of character, this disciple is never referred to by name, but only in a certain masked, sometimes very delicate and thoughtful way, so that the nameless author betrays himself at once as the individual who modestly suppresses his name in i. 35 ff. The true feeling of the church, too, has always perceived this; while it was reserved only for a criticism which handles delicate points so roughly,¹ to lend to the circumstance this explanation: "The author speaks of his identity with the apostle, as one, simply, to whom the point was of no consequence: his Gospel was meant to be Johannean, without bearing the apostle's name on its front; at least the author had no intention of once mentioning the name in order to make it his own, but the reader was merely to be led to make this combination, so as to place the Apostle John's name in the closest and most direct connection with a Gospel written in his spirit" (Baur, p. 379). In fact, a fraud so deliberately planned, and, in spite of its attempting no imitation of the Apocalypse, so unexampled in its success, a striving after apparent self-renunciation so crafty, that the lofty, true, transparent, and

¹ See, besides the Tübingen critics and Scholten, also Weisse, *d. Evangelienfr.* p. 61, according to whom, if John could have designated himself the disciple beloved by Christ, there would be in this an offensive and impudent self-exaltation: comp. also Keim, *Gesch. J.* i. p. 157 f. See for the opposite and correct view, Ewald, *Johann. Schrif.* i. p. 48 ff.

holy spirit of which the whole bears the impress, would stand in the most marked contradiction to it! Moreover, the instances of other non-apostolic works which were intended to go forth as apostolic, and therefore do not at all conceal the lofty names of their pretended authors, would be opposed to it. On the other hand, the universal recognition which this *nameless* author as the Apostle John obtained in the church is the more striking, since a later production of *this* kind, which had been anticipated by so well-known a work of a *totally different* character, passing for Johannean,—that is, the Apocalypse,—in contrast to the latter recognised as apostolic, while not once mentioning the name of that disciple, would be an historical phenomenon hardly conceivable. At least it is far more intelligible that the Apocalypse, bearing John's name on its very face, and solemnly repeating it to the end more than once, should, in an uncritical age, make good its claim to be an apostolic work, though not permanently (comp. Ewald, *Jahrb.* v. p. 182 f.; Düsterd. *on the Apocalypse*, Introduction). Further, the circumstance that in our Gospel John the *Baptist* is always mentioned simply as Ἰωάννης, never as ὁ βαπτιστής, is not so weighty (in opposition to Credner, Bleek, Ebrard) as to prove that the writer was the *apostle*, who, as its author, would have had no occasion to point out the other John distinctly by that appellation, for the name ὁ βαπτιστής was by no means designed to mark any such distinction. But we may probably be of opinion that a writer who had simply to appropriate the evangelic materials in the Gospels already existing, and develope them further in a peculiar way, would hardly have failed to employ the surname of the Baptist so commonly and formally used in the Gospels. It is, however, possible that our apostle, having been a personal disciple of the Baptist, and having a *lively recollection* of his former close relation to him, mentions him by his bare name, as he had been wont to do when he was his disciple, and not with the designation ὁ βαπτιστής, which had come down to him through the medium of *history*.

In the extended *discourses* of Jesus, in the chronological *arrangement* of the historical materials, in the prominence given to the Lord's *ministry out of Galilee*, in the *significant*

and *peculiar narratives* omitted by the Synoptics (among which the most noteworthy is that of the raising of Lazarus), in the *important variations from the Synoptics* in parallel narratives (the chief of which are in the history of the last supper, and in the date of the day when Jesus died), in the noticeable *omissions* of evangelic matter (the most remarkable being the silence as to the institution of the supper, and the agony in Gethsemane) which our Gospel exhibits, we recognise just so many indications of an *independence*, which renders the general *recognition* of its apostolic authorship in the church only explicable on the ground of the indubitable *certainly* of that fact. It was this certainty, and the high general reputation of the beloved disciple, which far outweighed all variations from the form and contents of the older Gospels, nay, even subordinated the credit and independence of the Synoptics (for instance, in the history of the last supper, which even in them was placed on the 13th Nisan). All these points of difference have therefore been wrongly urged against the apostolic authorship; they make the external attestation all the stronger, far too strong to be traceable to the aims and fictions of a writer of the second century (comp. Bleek, *Beitr.* p. 66 ff.; Brückner on De Wette, p. xxviii. f.). With regard especially to the *discourses and conversations* of Jesus (which, according to Baur's school, are wanting in appropriateness of exposition and naturalness of circumstances, and are connected with unhistorical facts, and intended to form an explication of the Logos-Idea), they certainly imply¹ a free reproduction and combination on the part of an intelligent writer, who draws out what is historically given beyond its first concrete and immediate form, by further developing and explaining it. Often the originality is certainly not that of purely objective *history*, but savours of *John's* spirit (compare the First Epistle of John), which was most closely related with that of *Jesus*. This *Johannean* method was such that, in its undoubted right to reproduce

¹ It cannot be shown that he records the experiences of the later apostolic age, and makes Jesus speak accordingly (see Weizsäcker, p. 285 f.). The passages adduced in proof (xvii. 20, xx. 29, xiv. 22, xvii. 9, xvii. 3, iii. 13, vi. 57, 62 f., iv. 36-38) are fully explained exegetically without the assumption of any such ὑστέρων πρῶτον.

and to clothe in a new dress, which it exercised many decenniums after, it could not carry the mingling of the objective and subjective, unavoidable as it was to the author's idiosyncrasy, so far as to merge what constituted its original essence in the mere view of the individual. Thus the λόγος, especially in the distinct *form* which it assumes in the *prologue*, does not reappear in the *discourses*¹ of Jesus, however frequently the λόγος of God or of Christ, as the *verbum vocale* (not *essentiale*²), occurs in them. All the less, therefore, in these discourses can the form be externally separated from the matter to such an extent as to treat the one as the subjective, the other as the objective (Reuss in the *Strassb. Denkschr.* p. 37 ff.),—a view which is inconceivable, especially when we consider the intellectual Johannean unity of mould, unless the substance of the matter is to be assigned to the sphere of the subjective along with the form. The Jesus of John, indeed, appears in His discourses as in general more sublime, more solemn, frequently more hard to understand, nay, more enigmatical, more mysterious, and, upon the whole, more ideal, than the Jesus of the Synoptics, especially as the latter is seen in His pithy proverbs and parables. Still, we must bear in mind that the manifestation of Jesus as the divine human life was intrinsically too rich, grand, and manifold, not to be represented variously, according to the varying individualities by

¹ Although the *essential conception of the Logos*, as regards its *substance*, is everywhere with John a prominent feature in the consciousness of Jesus, and is re-echoed throughout the Gospel. (Comp. iii. 11, 13, 31, vi. 33 ff., vi. 62, vii. 29, viii. 12, 23, xvi. 28, xvii. 5, 24, and other places.) To deny that John exhibits Jesus as having this superhuman self-consciousness, is exegetically baseless, and would imply that (in his prologue) the evangelist had, from the public life of the Lord, and from His words and works, formed an abstract idea as to His nature, which was not sustained, but rather refuted, by his own representation of the history,—a thing inconceivable. This, in general, against Weizsäcker in *d. Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theologie*, 1857, p. 154 ff., 1862, p. 634 ff.; Weiss, *Lehrbegr.* p. 244. See my comments on the particular passages (also against Beyschlag).—The idea of the Logos, moreover, is related to that of the ζῶν, not as something accidental, but in such a way that the Logos is conceived as the original and personally conscious substratum of the latter. Thus was it *given* to the author by the history itself, and by his profoundly vivid realization of that history through communion with Him in whom the ζῶν dwells. The Logos is the same fundamental conception (only in a more definite speculative form) as the *ὁὶς τοῦ θεοῦ*.

² Comp. Weizsäcker. *Evangel. Gesch.* p. 257.

which its rays were caught, and according to the more or less ideal points of view from which those rays were reflected,—variously, amid all that resemblance of essential character, and peculiar fundamental type, in which it allowed itself to be recognised by manifold receptivities, and under dissimilar circumstances. It was on the soul of this very apostle that the image of that wonderful life, with which his inspired recollections were connected, was, without a single discordant feature, most *perfectly* delineated, and in all the deep fulness of its nature: it *lives* in him; and his own thinking and feeling, with its profound contemplativeness, is so thoroughly intertwined with and transfigured by this life and the ideal it contains, that each *individual* recollection and representation becomes the more easily blended by him into harmony with the *whole*. His very language must needs ever retain that inalienable stamp which he once involuntarily received from the heart and living word of Christ, and appropriated and preserved in all its depth and transparency in the profoundly spiritual laboratory of his own long regenerate life. (Comp. Ewald, *Jahrb.* III. p. 163, X. p. 90 f., and his *Johan. Schriften*, I. p. 32 ff.; also Brückner on De Wette, p. 25 ff.) Some have assigned to the Gospel the honour rather of a well-devised work of art, than of a truly earnest and real history (Keim, *Gesch. J.* I. p. 123). It is both, in the inseparable unity and truth of the art of the Holy Ghost.—If, again, some have urged that the author of the fourth Gospel appears as one *standing apart* from any personal participation in the history he was writing, and from Judaism (compare the frequent *οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι*, v. 16, vii. 1, 19, 25, viii. 17, x. 34, etc.¹), still we should bear in mind, that if John wrote his Gospel at a later time, and among a community moulded by Hellenistic culture, after the liberation of his Christian nature from the Judaism by which it had long been penetrated, and when he had long been familiar with the purest spiritual Christianity and its universalism, as well as raised through the medium of specula-

¹ See Fischer in the *Tüb. Zeitschr.* 1840, II. p. 96 ff.; Baur, *Neut. Theol.* p. 390 f.; Scholten and others. On the other side, Bleek, p. 246 ff.; Luthardt, I. p. 143 ff. Compare notes on i. 19, viii. 17; also Ewald, *Johann. Schriften*, I. p. 10 f.

tion to a higher standpoint in his view of the Gospel history, he certainly did stand much further apart than the earlier evangelists, not indeed from his history strictly speaking, but from its former surroundings and from Judaism. This, however, does not warrant the substitution in his place of a non-Jewish author, who out of elements but slightly historical and correlative myths wove a semblance of history. On the contrary, many peculiar traits marked by the greatest vividness and originality, revealing a personal participation in the history (see i. 35 ff., v. 10 ff., vii. 1 ff.; chap. ix. 11, 12, xiii. 22 ff., xviii. 15 ff., xix. 4 ff., xxi.), rise up in proof, to bridge over the gulf between the remoteness of the author and the proximity of a former eye-witness, in whose view the history throughout is not developed from the doctrine, but the doctrine from the history.¹ Hence, also, he it is who, while he rose much higher above Judaism than Paul, yet, like Matthew in his Gospel, though with more individuality and independence, took pains to exhibit the connection between the events of the Gospel history and Old Testament prophecy. In this way, as well as by the explanations of Jewish facts, views, appellations, and so on, which are interspersed, he shows himself to belong to the ancient people of God, as far as his spiritual renewal was, and necessarily must have been, compatible with this connection. (Comp. Weizsäcker, *Evang. Gesch.* p. 263.) Lastly, the historical *contradictions* with the Synoptics are either only apparent (for instance, a ministration on several occasions at Jerusalem is implied, Matt. xxiii. 37, Luke xiii. 34), or such as cannot fairly lead to the conclusion of a non-apostolic authorship, since we do not possess Matthew in its original form, and therefore are not prevented by the counterweight of equally apostolic evidence from assigning to John a preponderating authority, which especially must be done in regard to such very striking variations as the date of the day on which Jesus died, and the

¹ Compare Weizsäcker in the *Jahrb. f. D. Th.* 1859, p. 690 ff. See the opposite view in Keim, p. 127. Scholten comes even to the melancholy conclusion: "The contents of the fourth Gospel cannot be of use as historical authority in any single point." The author threw into the form of an *historical drama* what was subjective truth to himself, unconcerned as to its historical accuracy.

account of the last supper. Besides, if what was erroneous and unhistorical might, after the lapse of so long a time, have affected even the memory of an apostle, yet matters of this sort, wherever found in particular passages of our Gospel, are rather chargeable on commentators than on the author, especially in the exceptions taken to the names of such places as Bethany, i. 28, and Sychar, iv. 5. On the whole, the work is a phenomenon so sublime and unique among productions of the Christian spirit,¹ that if it were the creation of an unknown author of the second century, it would be beyond the range of all that is historically conceivable. In its contents and tone, as well as in its style, which is unlike that of the earlier Gospels, it is so entirely without any internal connection with the development and literary conditions of that age, that had the church, instead of *witnessing* to its apostolic origin, raised a *doubt* on that point, historical criticism would see assigned to it the inevitable task of proving and vindicating such an origin from the book itself. In this case, to violate the authority of the church *for the sake* of the Gospel, would necessarily have a more happily and permanently successful result than could follow from opposing the Gospel. After having stood the critical tests originated by Bretschneider and Baur, this Gospel continues to shine with its own calm inner superiority and undisturbed transparency, issuing forth victorious from never-ceasing conflicts; the last star, as it were, of evangelic history and teaching, yet beaming with the purest and highest light, which could never have arisen amid the scorching heat of Gnosticism, or have emerged from the fermentation of some catholicizing

¹ Gfrörer, of course, makes it a product of dotage and fancy. Origen, on the other hand, calls it τῶν εὐαγγελίων ἀπαρχήν, and says of it, οὗ τὸν νοῦν οὐδὲς δύναται λαβεῖν μὴ ἀναπιστῶν ἐπὶ τὸ στήθεος Ἰησοῦ, and, τηλικούτων δὲ γενέσθαι διὰ τὸν ἐσόμενον ἄλλον Ἰωάννην, ὥστε οἰοῖ τὸν Ἰωάννην διυχθῆναι ὄντα Ἰησοῦν ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ. Hence, also, we can understand the constant recurrence, so as to make them regulate the presentation of the history, both of the ideas lying at the basis of Christ's whole work, and of the fundamental views which John, beyond any other evangelist, had derived from the history itself, in which he had borne a part on the breast of Jesus. Thus, with him, the grand simple theme of his book is through all its variations in harmonious and necessary concord, a lively monotone of the one spirit, not a "leadén" one. (Keim, *Gesch. J.* p. 117.)

process, but which rose rather on the horizon of the apostolic age, from the spirit of the disciple most intimate with his Lord, and which is destined never again to set,¹—the guide to a true catholicity, differing wholly from the ecclesiastical development of the second century,² and still remaining as the unattained goal of the future.

Nor can the attempt be successful to treat only a certain *nucleus* of our Gospel as genuinely apostolical, and to assign the rest to disciples of John or other later hands. The reasons for this procedure are inadequate, while it is itself so destitute of all historical evidence and warrant, and runs so entirely into caprice and diversity of subjective judgment, and hence also presents such a variety of results in the several attempts which have been made, that it would be in any case critically more becoming to leave still unsolved the difficulties in the matter and connection of particular passages, rather than to get rid of them by striking them out according to an arbitrary standard. This remark applies not merely to some of the older attempts of this kind by Eckermann, Vogel, Ammon (*Progr. quo docetur, Johannem evang. auctorem ab editore huj. libri fuisse diversum*, 1811), and Paulus, but also to Rettig's opinion (*Ephemer. exeg.* I. p. 83 ff.): "Compositum esse et digestum a seriori Christiano, Johannis auditore forsitan gnosticae dedito philosophiae, qui, quum in ecclesiae Ephesinae scriniis ecclesiasticis vel alio loco privato plura Jesu vitae capita per Johannem descripta reperisset, vel a Johanne ipso accepisset, iis compositis et ordinatis suam de λόγῳ philosophiam prae-fixit;"—and even to the more thorough attempts made by Weisse (both in his *Evang. Gesch.* I. p. 96 ff., II. p. 184 ff., 486 ff., 520 ff.; as also in his *Evangelienfrage*, 1856, p. 111 ff.) and Alex. Schweizer (*d. Ev. Joh. nach s. innern Werthe kritisch untersucht*, 1841). According to Weisse (compare, however, his partial retractation in

¹ If the apostle, in composing his work, employed an amanuensis, which is not improbable, judging from similar cases in the New Testament Epp. (see especially Ewald, *Jahrb.* X. p. 87 ff.), though it is not proved by xix. 35, still the writer must be regarded only as simply drawing up what the apostle *dictated*,—a conclusion arising out of the peculiar character, tenderness, and profundity of the book, and its entire resemblance to the First Epistle of John.

² Comp. Holtzm. *Judenth. u. Christenth.* 1867, p. 713.

his *Philos. Dogmat.* 1855, I. p. 153), John, for the purpose of setting forth his own idea of Christ and doctrinal system in discourses of Jesus, selected such discourses, adding those of the Baptist and the prologue. After his death, one of his adherents and disciples (xix. 35), by further adding what he had learnt from the apostle's own mouth, and from the evangelic tradition, but without any knowledge of the Synoptics, worked up these "*Johannean Studies*" into a Gospel history, the plan of which was, of course, very imperfect; so that the apostle's communications consequently form only the *groundwork* of the Gospel, though among them must be reckoned all the strictly didactic and contemplative portions, in determining which the First Epistle of John serves as a test. According to Schweizer (comp. also Schenkel, previously in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1840, p. 753 ff., who resolves the apostolical portion into two sets of discourses), such sections are to be excluded from the apostle's original work, as are "quite disconnected and abrupt, interwoven with no discourses, are altogether without any important word of Jesus, permeated by an essentially different estimate and idea of miracle, without vividness of narration, and moreover are divergent in style, and agree, besides, in recounting Galilean incidents." These excluded sections, along with which especially fall to the ground the turning of the water into wine at Cana, the healing of the nobleman's son, the miraculous feeding (ii. 1 ff., iv. 44 ff., vi. 1 ff.), are said to have originated with the author of chap. xxi., who also, according to Scholten, is said to have added a cycle of interpolated remarks, such as ii. 21 f., vii. 39, xii. 33, xviii. 32. All such attempts at critical dismemberment, especially in the case of a work so thoroughly of one mould, must undoubtedly fail. Even Weizsäcker's view (*Untersuch. üb. d. evang. Gesch.* 1864, p. 298 ff.), that our Gospel was derived from the apostle's own communications, though not composed by his own hands, but by those of his trusted disciples in Ephesus, is based on insufficient grounds, which are set aside by an unprejudiced exegesis (see also Ewald, *Jahrb.* XII. p. 212 ff.). This hypothesis is all the more doubtful, if the Gospel (with the exception of chap. xxi.) be allowed to have been composed while the apostle was still living; it is not supported by the

testimony of Clem. Alex. and the Canon of Muratori,¹ and in fact antiquity furnishes no evidence in its favour.

Literature:—(1.) *Against the Genuineness*: Evanson, *Dissonance of the Four* — — *Evangelists*, Ipswich 1792. (Vogel), *d. Evangelist Joh. u. s. Ausleger vor d. jüngsten Gericht*, I. Lpz. 1801, II. 1804. Horst, in Henke's *Mus.* I. 1, pp. 20 ff., 47 ff., 1803. Cludius, *Uransichten des Christenth.*, Altona 1808, p. 40 ff. Ballenstedt, *Philo u. Joh.*, Gött. 1812. The most important among the older works: Bretschneider, *Probabilia de evangelii et epistolarum Joh. apost. indole et origine*, Lpz. 1820, who makes the Gospel originate in the first half of the second century, in the interest of Christ's divinity. Later opponents: Rettig, *Ephem. exeg.* I. p. 62 ff. Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, despite a half retractation in the third edition (1838), the more decidedly against in the fourth (1840). Weisse, *Evang. Gesch.* 1838, and *d. Evangelienfrage*, 1856. Lützelberger, *die kirchliche Tradition üb. d. Apostel Joh.* 1840. B. Bauer, *Krit. d. evang. Gesch. d. Joh.* 1840, and *Kritik d. Evangelien*, I. 1850. Schwegler, *Montanism*, 1841, and *nachapost. Zeitalter*, 1846. Baur,² *Krit. Untersuchungen üb. d. kanonischen Evang.*, Tüb. 1847,

¹ Clement of Alexandria, in Euseb. vi. 14, says John composed the spiritual Gospel *προτραπίντα ὑπὸ τῶν γυνάριμων πνεύματι θεωροῦντα*. How different is this statement from the above view! Just as much at variance with it is the similar testimony of Muratori's Fragment, which lays special stress upon the composition by the apostle himself, and indeed supports it by 1 John i. 1-4. Moreover, see on xviii. 15, xix. 35, xxi. 23 f.

² According to Baur's school, the Gospel, the existence of which is only conceivable at the time of the church's transition into Catholicism, originated about the middle of the second century (according to Volkmar, only towards 150-160; according to Hilgenfeld, as soon as 120-140, contemporaneously with the second Jewish war, or soon after). The author, who, it is said, appropriated to himself the authority of the Apostle John, the author of the Apocalypse, transfigured in a higher unity into the Christian Gnosis the interests of Jewish and Pauline Christianity, while going beyond both, so that the historical materials taken from the Synoptics, and wrought up according to the ideas of the prologue, form merely the basis of the dogmatic portions, and are the reflex of the idea. To bring the new form of the Christian consciousness to a genuine apostolic expression, the author, whose Gospel stands upon the boundary line of Gnosticism, and "now and then goes beyond the limits," made an ingenious and artistic use of the relative points of connection with the Apocalypse, in order to spiritualize the Apocalypse into a Gospel. The relation of the Gospel to the parties of the time (whose exciting questions it touches), especially to Gnosticism, Montanism, Ebionism, the Easter controversy, is indeed very variously defined by Baur's school, yet always in such a way that the historical character of the contents is given up. In exchange for this loss, the consolation is offered us, that "the Christianity thus fashioned into a perfect theory was simply a development of that which,

p. 79 ff. (previously in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1844). Zeller, in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1845, p. 579 ff., and 1847, p. 136 ff. Baur, *ibidem*, 1848, p. 264 ff., 1854, p. 196 ff., 1857, p. 209 ff.; and in his *Christenth. d. drei ersten Jahrh.* p. 131 ff.; also in his controversial work, *An Herrn Dr. Karl Hase*, Tüb. 1855; and in his treatise, "*die Tübinger Schule*," 1859. Hilgenfeld, *d. Evang. u. die Briefe Joh. nach ihrem Lehrbegr. dargestellt*, Halle 1849, and in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1849, p. 209 ff.: also in his works, *die Evangelien nach ihrer Entstehung u. s. w.*, Lpz. 1854, p. 227 ff.; and in his controversial treatise, *das Urchristenth. in d. Hauptwendepunkten seines Entwicklungsganges*, Jena 1855; also in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1857, p. 498 ff., and in the *Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1859, p. 281 ff., 383 ff.; similarly in the *Kanon u. Krit. d. N. T.* 1863, p. 218 ff., and in his *Zeitschr.* 1863, 1 and 2, 1867, p. 180 ff. Köstlin, in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1851, p. 183 ff. Tobler, *die Evangelienfrage*, Zürich 1858 (anonymously), and in the *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* 1860, p. 169 ff. Schenkel¹ in his *Charakterbild Jesu*, chap. 2. Volkmar, most recently in his work against Tischendorf, "*d. Ursprung uns. Evangel.*" 1866. Scholten, *d. ältest. Zeug. betr. d. Schriften d. N. T.*, translated from the Dutch by Manchot, 1867 (compare his *Evang. according to John*, translated by Lang). Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, 1867, I. p. 103 ff. (2.) *For the Genuineness*, and especially against Bretschneider (comp. the latter's later confession in his *Dogmat.* ed. 3, I. p. 268: "The design which my *Probabilia* had—namely, to raise a fresh and further investigation into the authenticity of John's writings—has been attained, and the doubts raised may perhaps be now regarded as removed"): Stein, *Authentia ev. Joh. contra Bretschn. dubia vindicat.*, Brandenb.

according to its most primitive and credible representation, the religious consciousness of Jesus contained in creative fulness,"—Hilgenfeld (*d. Evangelien*, p. 349), who even makes John's theology stand in the same relation to the religious consciousness of Jesus, "as, according to the promise in John xvi. 12, the work of the Paraclete, as the Spirit leading the church into all truth, was to stand to the teachings of its Founder." The most extravagant judgment is that of Volkmar: the Evangelist "*starts from the Gospel of the dualistic anti-Judaical Gnosis of Marcion, and overcomes it by the help of Justin's doctrine of the Logos with its Monism.*"—Tobler, though attributing the first Epistle to the apostle, makes the author of our Gospel to be *Apollos*, whom he also regards as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and of First and Second John. See against this error, which makes the Gospel to have been intended for the Corinthians, Hilgenf. in the *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* 1859, p. 411 ff. Moreover, what Tobler has subsequently advanced in the *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* 1860, p. 169 ff., cannot support his hypothesis.

¹ According to this modern notion of Schenkel, our Gospel originated about 110-120 A.D., under the influence of the Christian doctrine of wisdom prevail-

1822. Calmberg, *Diss. de antiquiss. patrum pro ev. Joh. authentia testim.*, Hamb. 1822. Hensen, *die Authent. der Schriften des Ev. Joh.*, Schleswig 1823. Usteri, *Comment. crit., in qua ev. Joh. genuinum esse ex comparatis quatuor evangelior. narrationib. de coena ultima et passione J. Ch. ostenditur*, Turici 1823. Crome, *Probabilia haud probabilia, or Widerlegung der von Dr. Bretschneider gegen die Aechtheit des Ev. u. d. Briefe Joh. erhobenen Zweifel*, Lpz. 1824. Rettberg, *an Joh. in exhibenda Jesu natura reliquis canonicis scriptis vere repugnet*, Gött. 1826. Hauff, *die Authent. u. der hohe Werth des Ev. Joh.*, Nürnberg 1831.—Against Weisse: Frommann, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1840, p. 853 ff.; Hilgenfeld, in the *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* 1859, p. 397 ff.—Against Schweizer: Luthardt, i. p. 6 ff.—Against Baur and his school: Merz, in the *Würtemb. Stud.* 1844, ii. Ebrard, *d. Ev. Joh. u. die neueste Hypothese üb. s. Entstehung*, Zürich 1845; and in his *Kritik d. evang. Gesch.* ed. 2, 1850, p. 874 ff. Hauff, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1846, p. 550 ff. Bleek, *Beiträge z. Ev. Krit.* 1846, p. 92 ff., u. *Einl.* p. 177 ff. Weitzel, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1848, p. 806 ff., 1849, p. 578; also De Wette, *Einl.*, whose final judgment, however (§ 110 g.), only declares against the view which would deny to the apostle *any* share in the composition of the Gospel. See, besides, Niermeyer, *Verhandeling over de echtheid d. Johanneischen Schriften*, s' Gravenhage 1852. Mayer (Catholic), *Aechtheit d. Ev. nach Joh.*, Schaffh. 1854. Schneider, *Aechth. des Joh. Ev. nach den äusseren Zeugen*, Berl. 1854. Kahnis, *Dogmat.* I. p. 416 ff. Ritschl, *Altkath. K.* p. 48. Tischendorf, *wann wurden uns. Ev. verfasst?* 1865; 4th enlarged edition, 1866. Riggenbach, *d. Zeug. f. d. Ev. Joh. neu unters.* 1866. Dr. Pressensé, *Jes. Christus, son Temps*, etc., 1866. Oosterzee, *d.*

ing in Asia Minor. The author, he says, certainly did not write a work of fiction or fancy, but separated a cycle of evangelic traditions from their historical framework, and forced them up into the region of eternal thought, etc. Thus, Jesus was such, as the author depicts Him, not always in *reality*, but in *truth*. At this result Keim also substantially arrives: he attributes the Gospel to a Jewish Christian of liberal opinions and friendly to the Gentiles, probably one of the Diaspora in Asia Minor about the beginning of the second century, who published it under the name of the Apostle John. He wrote with the just conviction that the apostles and John would have so written, had they been living in his time, and did not aim at establishing an external history, but at exhibiting the spirit which sits enthroned in every history of the life of Jesus. According to Scholten, the Gospel was written about 150 A.D., by a philosophically enlightened Gentile Christian, assuming the guise of an ideal apostle, setting aside what was untrue in the various tendencies of the day (Gnosticism, Antinomianism, Montanism, Quartodecimanism), but recognising the correlated truths, and expressing them in appropriate forms, though it was recognised as apostolic only towards the close of the second century.

Johannes-evang., vier Vorträge, 1867 [Eng. trans.]; also Hofstede de Groot (against also the previously mentioned work of Scholten), *Basilides als erster Zeuge für Alter und Auctorität*, *neutest. Schr.*, German edition, 1868. Jonker, *het evang. v. Joh.* 1867. Compare generally, besides the Commentaries, Ewald, *Jahrb.* III. p. 146 ff., V. p. 178 ff., X. p. 83 ff., XII. p. 212 ff. Grimm, in the *Hall. Encykl.* ii. 22, p. 5 ff.

SEC. IV.—DESIGN OF THE GOSPEL.

John himself, xx. 31, tells us very distinctly the purpose of the Gospel which he wrote for the Christians of his own day. It was nothing else than to impart the conviction that Jesus was the Messiah, by describing the history of His appearance and of His work; and through faith in this, to communicate the Messianic life which was revealed in Jesus when on earth. While it has this general purpose in common with the other Gospels, it has as its special and definite task to exhibit in Jesus the Messiah, as *in the highest sense the Son of God*, that is, *the Incarnate Divine Logos*; and hence John places the section on the Logos at the very beginning as his distinctive programme, therewith furnishing the key for the understanding of the whole. In the existing name and conception of the Logos, he recognises a perfectly befitting expression for his own sublime view of Christ, the humanly manifested divine source of life; and accordingly, he has delineated the human manifestation and the historical life of the divine in Christ with creative spirit and vividness, in order that the eternal and highest power of life, which had thus entered bodily into the world, might be appropriated by faith. Even the Gospel of Matthew (and of Luke) grasps the idea of the Son of God metaphysically, and explains it by the divine generation. John, however, apprehends and explains it by raising it into the premundane and eternal relation of the Son to the Father, who sent the Son; just as Paul also earnestly teaches this pre-existence, though he does not conceive of it under the form of the Logos, and therefore has nothing about a beginning of divine Sonship by a divine generation in time. John therefore occupies a far higher standing-point than Matthew; but, like the other evangelists, he develops his proof *historically*,

not sacrificing historic reality and tradition to idealism (against Baur and his school), but now selecting from the materials furnished by the extant tradition and already presented in the older evangelic writings, now leaving these, and carefully selecting solely from the rich stores of his own memory and experience. In this way, it is quite obvious how important the discourses of Jesus, especially upon His divine Messianic dignity in opposition to the unbelief of the Jews, were as elements of John's plan; and further, how necessary it was that the testimonies of the Baptist, the prophetic predictions, and the select miraculous proofs,—the latter forming at the same time the bases of the more important discourses,—should co-operate towards his purpose. The general similarity of his aim with that of the current Galilean tradition on the one side, and on the other hand its special distinctiveness, which is due to his own more sublime and spiritual intuition and his purpose to delineate Jesus as the Incarnate Logos, the possessor and imparter of divine and eternal life, as well as his independence in both these respects, as a most intimate eye and ear witness, of all the previous labours of others, and his original peculiar arrangement and reproduction of the doctrines of Jesus as from a centre, determining every detail and binding them into one,—this, and the primary destination of the work for readers who must have been acquainted with Graeco-Judaic speculations, gave the book the characteristic form which it possesses. The intellectual unity, which thus runs through it, is the reflection of the author's peculiar view of the whole, which was not formed *à priori*, but as the result of experience (i. 14; comp. Hauff, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1846, p. 574 ff.), the fruit of a long life in Christ, and of a fulness and depth of recollection such as he only, among the living, could possess. Written after the destruction of Jerusalem, and by *that* disciple who had long advanced beyond Jewish Christianity, and in the centre of Asiatic culture was still labouring amidst the highest esteem, as probably the only aged apostle remaining, this Gospel could not have an eye to Palestinian readers,¹ as had been formerly the case with

¹ Hence the interpretations and explanations which presuppose the readers to be *non-Palestinian*, i. 38, 41 f., iv. 25, v. 2, *al.*

Matthew's Collection of Logia, and the Gospel which originated from it. It was very naturally destined, first of all, for those Christian circles among which the apostle lived and laboured, consequently for readers belonging to churches originally founded by Paul, and who had grown up out of Jewish and Gentile Christian elements, and had been carried on by John himself to that higher unity for which Paul could work only amidst continual conflict with yet unconquered Judaism. The Gospel of John, therefore, is not a Pauline one, but one more transfigured and spiritual, plainly rising more sublimely above Judaism than Paul, more tender and thoughtful than his, and also more original, but agreeing as to its main ideas with the doctrine dialectically wrought out by Paul, though exhibiting these ideas at a calmer height above the strife of opposing principles, and in harmony with the full perfection of fundamental Christian doctrine; and thus communicating for all time the essence, light, and life of the eminently *catholic* tendency and destination of Christianity. It represents the true and pure Christian Gnosis, though by this we are not to suppose its design was a *polemical one against the heretical Gnostics*, as even Irenaeus in his day (iii. 11. 1) indicates the errors of *Cerinthus* and of the *Nicolaitans* as those controverted by John, to which Epiphanius (*Haer.* li. 12, lxix. 23) and Jerome (*de vir. illustr.*) added also those of the *Ebionites*, while even modern writers have thought that it controverted more or less directly and definitely the Gnostic doctrine, especially of *Cerinthus* (Erasmus, Melanchthon, Grotius, Michaelis, Storr, Hug, Kleucker, Schneckenburger, Ebrard, Hengstenberg, and several others). It is decisive against the assumption of any such polemical purpose, that, in general, John nowhere in his Gospel allows any direct reference to the perverted tendencies of his day to appear; while to search for indirect and hidden allusions of the kind, as if they were intentional, would be as arbitrary as it would be repugnant to the decided character of the apostolic standpoint which he took up when in conscious opposition to heresies. In his First *Epistle* the apostle controverts the vagaries of Gnosticism, and it is improbable that these came in his way only after he had already written his Gospel (as Ewald, *Jahrb.* III. p. 157, assumes);

but the task of meeting this opposition, to which the apostle set himself in his Epistle, cannot have been the task of his Gospel, which in its whole character keeps far *above* such controversies. At any rate, we see from his Epistle how John would have carried on a controversy, had he *wished* to do so in his Gospel. The development of Gnosticism, as it was in itself a movement which could not have failed to appear, lay brooding then, and for some time previously, in the whole atmosphere of that age and place; it appears in John pure, and in sententious simplicity and clearness, but ran off, in the heresies of the partly contemporaneous and partly later formed Gnosticism, into all its varied aberrations, amid which it seemed even to derive support by what it drew from John. That it has been possible to explain many passages as *opposed* to the Gnostics, as little justifies the assumption of a set purpose of this kind, as the interpretation *favourable* to Gnosticism, which is possible in other passages, would justify the inference of an *irenical* purpose (Lücke) in respect of this heresy, since any *express* and *precise indication* of such tendencies does not appear. Similarly must we judge the assumption of a polemical purpose against the *Docetæ* (Semler, Bertholdt, Eckermann; Niemeyer, *de Docetis*, Hal. 1823; Schneckenburger, Schott, Ebrard), for which some have adduced i. 14, xix. 34, xx. 20, 27; or an opposition to *Ebionism* and *Judaism* (Jerome, Grotius; Lange, *die Judenchristen, Ebioniten und Nikolaiten d. apost. Zeit.*, Lpz. 1828; Ebrard, and many others); or to the plots of the Jews who had been restored after the destruction of Jerusalem (Aberle in the *Tüb. Quartalschr.* 1864, p. 1 ff.). At the same time, it seems quite arbitrary, nay, injurious to John's historical fidelity and truth, to set down his omissions of evangelic circumstances to the account of a polemical purpose; as, for example, Schneckenburger, *Beitr.* p. 60 ff., who regards the omission of the agony as based on an anti-Gnostic, and the silence as to the transfiguration on the mount on an anti-Docetic interest. A controversial reference to the *disciples of John* (Grotius, Schlichting, Wolzogen; Overbeck, *über d. Ev. Joh.* 1784; Michael, Storr, Lützelberger, and others, even Ewald) is not supported by such passages as i. 6–8. 15. 19–41. iii. 22 ff.,

v. 33-36, x. 40 f., since the unique sublimity of Jesus, even when contrasted with *John* who was sent by God, must have been vindicated by the apostle in the necessary course of his history and of his work; but in these passages no such *special* purpose can be proved, and we must assume that, with any such tendency, expressions like that in Matt. xi. 11 would not have been overlooked. Besides, those disciples of John who *rejected* Christ (*Recogn. Clem.* i. 54, 60), and the *Zabaeans* or *Mendicans* (Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* I. 1, p. 76, Eng. trans. vol. I. p. 58), who became known in the seventeenth century, were of later origin, while those who appear in Acts xviii. 25, xix. 1 ff., were simply not yet accurately acquainted with Christ, and therefore as regards them we should have to think only of a tendency to gain these over (Herder, *vom Sohne Gottes*, p. 24; also De Wette); but we cannot assume even this, considering the utter want of any more precise reference to them in our Gospel.

Moreover, in general, as to the development of heresy, so far as it was conspicuous in that age, and especially in Asia (comp. the Epistles to the Galatians and Colossians), we must assume as an internal necessity that John, in opposition to its errors, especially those of a Gnostic and Judaizing character (according to Hengstenberg, to the inundation of *Gentile* errors into the church), must have been conscious that his Gospel ought to set forth the original *truth*, unobscured by those errors. We must therefore admit generally, that the influence of the existing forms of opposition to the truth, for which he had to testify, practically contributed to determine the shape of his treatise, but only to the extent that, while abiding solely by his thesis, he provided therein, by its very simplicity, the weightiest counterpoise against errors (comp. Reuss, *Denkschr.* p. 27), without stooping to *combat* them, or even undertaking the *defence* of the Gospel against them (Seyffarth, *Specialcharakterist.* p. 39 f.; Schott, *Isag.* § 40; De Wette, Hengstenberg, and many others), his task being elevated far *above* the then existing conflicts of opinion.¹ This must be maintained, lest

¹ Even Baur, p. 373, acknowledges that "John's Gospel stands amid all the oppositions of the age, without anywhere exhibiting the definite colour of a temporary or local opposition." But this is really only conceivable if the Gospel belongs to

on the one hand we degrade the Gospel, in the face of its whole character, into a controversial treatise, or on the other hand withdraw it, as a product of mere speculation, from its necessary and concrete relations to the historical development of the church of that age.

Seeing that our Gospel serves in manifold ways not only to *confirm*, but moreover, on a large scale (as especially by relating the extra-Galilean journeys, acts, discourses) as well as in particulars, to *complete* the synoptic accounts, nay, even sometimes (as in determining the day of the crucifixion) in important places to *correct* them, it has been assumed very often, from Jerome (comp. already Euseb. iii. 24) downwards, and with various modifications even at the present day (Ebrard, Ewald, Weizsäcker, Godet, and many others), that this relation to the Synoptics *was the designed object of the work*. So regarded, however, this view cannot be supported; for there is not the slightest hint in the Gospel itself of any such purpose; and further, there would thus be attributed to it an historico-critical character totally at variance with its real nature and its design, as expressly stated, xx. 30, 31, and which even as a collateral purpose would be quite foreign to the high spiritual tone, sublime unity, and unbroken compactness of the book. Moreover, in the repetition of synoptical passages which John gives, there are not always any material additions or corrections leading us to suppose a confirmatory design, in view of the non-repetition of a great many other and more important synoptical narrations. Again, where John diverges from parallel synoptical accounts, in the absence of contradictory references (in iii. 24 only does there occur a passing note of *time* of this kind), his independence of the Galilean tradition fully suffices to explain the divergence. Finally, in very much that John has not borrowed from the synoptical history, and against the truth of which no well-founded doubt can be urged, to suppose in such passages any intentional

the apostolic age, and its author stands upon an apostolic elevation; it is inconceivable if it originated in the second century, when those oppositions were developing, and had already developed into open and deep-seated divisions, and where the conditions necessary for the production of *such a Formula Concordiæ* were utterly wanting in the bosom of the time.

though silent purpose on his part to correct, would be equivalent to his rejection of the statements. In short, had the design in question exercised any determining influence upon the apostle in the planning and composition of his work, he would have accomplished his task in a very strange, thoroughly imperfect, and illogical manner. We may, on the contrary, take it for granted that he was well acquainted with the Galilean tradition,¹ and that the written accounts drawn from the cycle of that tradition, numbers of which were already in circulation, and which were especially represented in our Synoptics, were likewise sufficiently known to him; for he presupposes as known the historical existence of this tradition in all its essential parts.² But it is just his perfect independence of this tradition and its records—keeping in view his aim to bring fully out the higher Messianic proof, and the abundant material from which his own recollection could so fully draw—which enables us to understand the partial coincidence, and still greater divergence, between him and the Synoptics, and his entire relation to them generally, which is not determined by any special design on his part; so that the confirmation, correction, and enlargement of their narratives often appear as a *result* of which he is conscious, but never as the *object* which he had sought to accomplish in his treatise. As to any design, so understood, of *correcting* the Synoptics, the *silence* of John upon many portions of the cycle of synoptic narrative is undoubtedly very significant, in so far as the historical truth of these in their traditional form would have been of special value for the apostle's purpose. This holds true particularly of the account of the temptation, the transfiguration, and the ascension as actual occurrences, as well as of the cure of demoniacs as such. As criticism, however,

¹ According to Ewald, John only compared and made use of what is assumed by Ewald to be the "oldest Gospel," "the collection of discourses," and "the original Mark." But a limitation to these three books, considering the number already existing (Luke i. 1), is in itself improbable, and is all the less demonstrable, that the first and third treatises named by Ewald have themselves only a very problematical existence.

² See Weizsäcker in the *Jahrb. für Deutsche Theol.* 1859, p. 691 ff. He goes, however, too far, when (*Evang. Gesch.* p. 270) he calls the fourth Gospel, without enlargement from other sources, "a misty picture without reality." Taken *all in all*, it contains even more concrete history than the Gospels whose range is limited to Galilee.

is here pledged to special caution, so the opposite conclusion—viz. that facts which would have been of great importance even for the synoptical Messianic proof, but which are recorded only in John, cannot be regarded as originally historical in the form in which he gives them—is everywhere inadmissible, especially where he speaks as an eye-witness, in which capacity he must be ranked above Matthew: for Matthew did indeed compose the collection of discourses which is worked up into the Gospel that bears his name, but not the Gospel itself as it lies before us in its gradually settled canonical form. It, while taking all into account, the complete, unbiassed independence of John in relation to the Synoptics, above whom he stands distinguished by his exact determination of the succession of time, must be preserved intact; we must at the same time bear in mind that, as the last evangelist and apostle, he had to satisfy the higher needs of Christian knowledge, called forth by the development of the church in this later stage, and thus had boldly to go beyond the range of the whole previous Gospel literature.¹ This higher need had reference to that deeper and uniform insight into the peculiar eternal essence of Christianity and its Founder, which John, as no other of his contemporaries, by his richly stored experience was fitted and called to impart. He had thus, indeed, as a matter of fact, supplemented and partly corrected the earlier evangelists, though not to such an extent as to warrant the supposition that this was his deliberate object. For, by giving to the entire written history its *fullest completion*, he took rank far above all who had worked before him; not doctrinally making an advance from *πίστις* to *γνώσις* (Lücke), but, in common with the Synoptics, pursuing the same goal of *πίστις* (xx. 31), yet bringing the subject-matter of this common faith to a higher, more uniform, and universal stage of the original *γνώσις* of its essence than was possible in the earlier Gospel histories, composed under diverse relations, which had now passed away, and with different and (measured by the standard of John's fellowship with Jesus) very inferior resources.

John prosecutes his design, which is to prove that Jesus is the Messiah in the sense of the incarnate Logos, by first of

¹ Comp. Keim, *Gesch. Jesu*, p. 106 f.

all stating this leading idea in the prologue, and then exhibiting in well-selected¹ historical facts its historical realization in Jesus. This idea, which belongs to the very highest Christological view of the world, guided his choice and treatment of facts, and brought out more clearly the opposition—which the author had constantly in view—with unbelieving and hostile Judaism; but so far from detracting from the historical character of the Gospel, it appears rather only to be derived from the actual experience of the history, and is in turn confirmed thereby. To defend the Gospel against the suspicion of its being a free compilation from synoptical materials, used merely to subserve some main idea, is, on the one hand, as unnecessary for him who recognises it as of necessity apostolic, and as a phenomenon conceivable *only* upon this supposition; as it is, on the other hand, impossible, as experience shows, to do so successfully, considering the total difference of presuppositions, in the face of the man who can place it in the second century, and ascribe to so late a period so great a creative power of Christian thought.

SEC. V.—SOURCES, TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

The main source is John himself (1 John i. 1 f.), his own inalienable recollection, his experience, his life of fellowship with Christ, continued, increased, and preserved in its freshness by the Spirit of truth, together with the constant impulse to preach and otherwise orally communicate that sublime view of the nature and life of Jesus, which determined the essential

¹ In connection with this, the selection made of the *miracles* of Jesus is specially noteworthy. Only one of each kind is chosen, viz. one of transformation, ii. 1 ff.; one fever cure, iv. 47 ff.; one cure of lameness, v. 1 ff.; one feeding, vi. 4 ff.; one walking on the sea, vi. 16 ff.; one opening the eyes of the blind, ix. 1 ff.; one raising from the dead, xi. 1 ff. The number seven is hardly accidental, nor yet the exclusion of any instance of the casting out of demons. That a paragraph containing an account of an instance of casting out has fallen out after chap. v. (Ewald), finds no support in the connection of chap. v. and vi. or elsewhere, and has left no trace appreciable by criticism in evidence of its existence; while that completed number seven, to which an eighth miracle would thus be added, is against it. This number seven is evidently based upon 3 + 3 + 1,—viz. three miracles of *nature*, three of *healing*, and one of *raising the dead*. An eighth miracle was only added in the appendix, chap. xxi., after the book was finished.

contents of his work, as a whole and in details. Accordingly, the credibility of the work asserts itself as being relatively the highest of all, so that it ought to have the deciding voice in case of discrepancies in all essential portions, where the author speaks as an eye and ear witness. This also applies to the discourses of Jesus, in so far as their truthfulness is to be recognised, not indeed to all their details and form,—for they were freely reproduced and resuscitated by his after recollection, and under the influence of a definite and determining point of view, after the Lord's thoughts and expressions had by a lengthened process of elaboration been blended with his own, which thus underwent a transfiguration,—but as to the subject-matter and its characteristic clothing and thoughtful changes and variations, in all their simplicity and dignity. Their truthfulness is, I say, all the more to be recognised, the more inwardly and vividly the apostle in particular stood in harmony with his Lord's mind and heart. So familiar was he with the character and nature of Christ's discourses, and so imbued with His spirit, that even the reflections of his own which he intertwines, as well as his Epistle, nay, even the discourses of the Baptist, bear one and the same stamp; a fact, however, which only places the essential originality of the Johannean discourses so much the more above suspicion.¹

In those portions in which we have no vouchers for personal testimony, the omission is sufficiently supplied, by the author's connection with Christ and his fellow-apostles (as well as with Mary), and by the investigations which we may assume he made, because of his profound interest in the subject; and by the living, harmonious, and comprehensive view of Christ's life and work with which he was inspired, and

¹ Ewald, *Jahrb.* III. p. 163 f.: "As, under the Old Covenant, it is just the earliest prophets who are the strictest and purest interpreters of Him who, though never visible in bodily form, yet moves, lives, and speaks in them as if He were; so at the very close of the New Testament a similar phenomenon reappears, when the Logos comes on the scene in bright and clear manifestation. The Spirit of the historical Christ was concentrated in His former familiar disciple in the most compact strength and transparent clearness, and now streams forth from him over this later world, which had never yet so understood Him. The mouth of John is for this world the mouth of the glorified Christ, and the full historical resuscitation of that Logos who will not reappear till the end of all things."

which of itself must have led to the exclusion of any strange and interpolated features.

The supposition that in his own behoof he made use of *notes taken by himself* (so Bertholdt, Wegscheider, Schott, and others), does not, indeed, contradict the requirements of a living apostolic call, but must be subordinated so as to be compatible with the unity of spirit and mould of the whole work; a unity which is the gradually ripened and perfected fruit of a long life of recollection, blending all particulars in one true and bright collective picture, under the guidance of the Divine Spirit as promised by Christ Himself (xiv. 26).

The synoptical tradition was known to John, and his Gospel presupposes it. He was also certainly acquainted with the evangelic writings which embodied it—those at least that were already widely spread and held in esteem; but all this was not his *source* properly so called: his book itself is proof enough that, in writing it, he was independent of this, and stood *above* all the then existing written and traditional authorities. He has preserved this independence even in the face of Matthew's collection of discourses and Mark's Gospel, both of which doubtless he had read, and which may have suggested to him, unintentionally and unsought for on his part, many expressions in his own independent narrative, but which can in no way interfere with its apostolic originality. Comp. Ewald, *Gesch. Christi*, p. 127 ff. We cannot determine whether he likewise knew the somewhat more recent Gospel of *Luke* (Keim and others); for the points of contact between the two are conceivable upon the supposition of their writing independently side by side, especially as Luke had a rich range of sources, which are to us for the most part unknown. That John likewise knew the *Gospel of the Hebrews* is not made probable by the saying which he records concerning "the birth from above." The combination, on that account, of this saying with the corresponding quotation made by Justin and the Clementines (see above, sec. ii.) rests upon the very precarious premiss that both of these cite from the Gospel of the Hebrews.

As to the question whence John derived his representation of the divine element in Christ as the *Logos*, see on chap. i. 1.

As to the PLACE where the Gospel, which was certainly written in Greek, not in Aramaic (against Salmasius, Bolten, and partly Bertholdt), was composed, the earliest tradition (already in Iren. iii. 1, Clement of Alex., Origen, Eusebius, etc.) distinctly names *Ephesus*; and the original document is said to have been preserved there to a late period, and to have been the object of believing veneration (*Chron. Pasch.* p. xi. 411, ed. Dind.). By this decision as to the place we must abide, because the Gospel itself bears upon its very face proofs of its author's remoteness from Palestine, and from the circle of Jewish life, along with references to cultured Greek readers; and because the life of the apostle himself, as attested by the history of the church, speaks decidedly for Ephesus. The tradition that he wrote at *Patmos* (Pseudo-Hippolytus, Theophylact, and many others, also Hug) is a later one, and owes its origin to the statement that the Apocalypse was written on that island. With this, the tradition which tries to reconcile both, by supposing that John dictated his Gospel in Patmos and published it at Ephesus (Pseudo-Athanasius, Dorotheus), loses all its value.—The assumption that a long time elapsed before it gained any wide circulation, and that it remained within the circle of the apostle's friends in Ephesus, at whose request, according to a very ancient tradition (Canon Muratori, Clement of Alexandria, in Euseb. vi. 14), he is said to have written it, is not indeed sanctioned by the silence of Papias concerning it (Credner), but receives confirmation by the fact that the appendix, chap. xxi., is found in all the oldest testimonies,—leading us to conclude that its publication in more distant circles, and dissemination through multiplication of copies, did not take place till after this addition.

As to the TIME of its composition, the earliest testimonies (Irenaeus, Clement of Alex., Origen) go to prove that John wrote subsequently to the Synoptics, and (Irenaeus) not till after the deaths of Peter and Paul. A later and more precise determination of the time (Epiphanius, *Haer.* li. 12),¹ in the

¹ Διὸ ὕστερον ἀναγκάζει τὸ ὅτι οὐκ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰωάννην παραιτούμενον εὐαγγελίσασθαι δι' ἐνθάδε καὶ ταπεινοφροσύνην, ἐπὶ τῇ γῆρα αὐτοῦ ἡλικίᾳ, μετὰ ἱερῶν ἐκείνων τῆς αὐτοῦ ζωῆς, μετὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς Πάτμου ἐπάνοδον τὴν ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου γινο-

advanced old age of the apostle, is connected with the desire to ascribe to the Gospel an anti-heretical design, and therefore loses its critical weight. The following points may perhaps be regarded as certain, resulting as they do from a comparison of this tradition with historical circumstances and with the Gospel itself. As John certainly did not settle in Ephesus until after St. Paul's removal from his Asiatic sphere of labour, nor indeed, doubtless, until after the destruction of Jerusalem, where until then John resided; as, further, the distance from Palestinian circumstances, so evident in the Gospel, implies an already prolonged residence away from Palestine; as the elaborate view of the Logos is a post-Pauline phase of the apprehension and exposition of Christ's higher nature, and suggests a longer familiarity with philosophical influences; as the entire character and nature of the book, its clearness and depth, its calmness and completeness, most probably indicate the matured culture and clarifying influence of riper years, without, however, in the least degree suggesting to us the weakness of old age,—we must put the composition not *before* the destruction of Jerusalem (Lampe, Wegscheider), but a considerable time *after*; for if that catastrophe had been still fresh in the recollection of the writer, in the depths of its first impression, it could hardly, on psychological grounds, have escaped express mention in the book. No such express reference to it occurs; but if, notwithstanding, Jerusalem and its environs are to be regarded, and that rightly, as in ruins, and in the distant background of the apostle's view, the *ἦν* in xi. 18, xviii. 1, xix. 41, reads more naturally than if accounted for from the mere context of historical narration, while on the other hand the *ἔστι* in v. 2 may retain its full appropriateness. If a *year* is to be definitely

μὲν Kaiσάρου, καὶ μετὰ ἱκανὰ ἔτη τοῦ διατρίψαι αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας ἀναγκάζεται ἐκθίσει τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. These last words are not corrupt, nor is *ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας* to be joined with *ἀναγκάζεται* as if it meant *ab Asiae episcopis* (Lücke); but we must render them, "and many years afterwards, after he had lived far from Asia, he was obliged," etc.,—thus taking the words in their necessary sense, "many years after his extra-Asiatic sojourn," many years after his return from Patmos. The genitive, *τοῦ διατρίψαι αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τ. Ἀσίας*, denotes that the time spent is the point of departure from which the *ἱκανὰ ἔτη* begin to run. See Kühner, II. pp. 164, 514. Comp. Bernhardt, p. 138.

named, A.D. 80¹ may be suggested as neither too far back nor too far on.²

Note.—As to PLAN, the Gospel divides itself into the following sections:—After the prologue, i. 1–18, which at once sets before the reader the lofty point of view of the most sacred history, the revelation of the glory of the only-begotten Son of the Father (which constitutes the theme of the Gospel, i. 14) begins, first through John the Baptist, and its self-revelation onwards to the first miracle, and as yet without any opposition of unbelief, down to ii. 11. Then (2) this self-revelation passes on to publicity, and progresses in action and teaching amid the antithesis of belief and unbelief, onwards to another and greater miracle, ii. 12–iv. 54. Further, (3) new miracles of the Lord's in Judea and Galilee, with the discourses occasioned thereby, heighten that antithesis, so that there arises among the Jews a desire to persecute and even to kill Him, while among His disciples many fall away, v.–vi. 71. After this, (4) unbelief shows itself even among the brothers of Jesus; the self-revelation of the Only-begotten of the Father advances in words and deeds to the greatest miracle of all, that of the raising of the dead, by which, however, while many believe upon Him, the hostility of unbelief is urged on to the decisive determination to put Him to death, vii.–ix. 57. There ensues, (5) in and upon the carrying out of this determination, the highest self-revelation of Christ's divine glory, which finally gains its completed victory in the resurrection, xii.–xx. Chap. xxi. is an appendix. Many other attempts have been made to exhibit the plan of the

¹ There therefore lies between the Apocalypse and the Gospel a space of from ten to twelve years. Considering the maturity of mind which the apostle, who was already aged in the year 70, must have attained, this space was too short to effect such a change of view and of language as we must suppose if the apocalypticist was also the evangelist. This also against Tholuck, p. 11.

² It is evident from the distinctive and internal characteristics of the Gospel, and especially from the form of its ideas, that it was written after the downfall of the Jewish state and the labours of St. Paul; but we cannot go so far as to find reflected in it the beginning of the second century (i.e. a time only 20 or 30 years later), nor to argue *therefrom* the non-apostolic origin of the Gospel (and of the Epistle). The interval is too short, and our knowledge of church movements, especially of Gnosticism, is not direct and precise enough, so far as they may be said to belong, at least in their stages of impulse and development, to the beginning only of the new century, and not to the two or three preceding decades of years. This tells, at the same time, against Keim, *Gesch. J. I.* p. 147 ff. How can it be said, on any reliable grounds, that "the Gospel discloses the state of the church just about the year 100, but not the state of the church about the year 80"?

book; on which see Luthardt, I. p. 255 ff., who (comp. also his treatise, *De composit. ev. Joh.*, Norimb. 1852; before this Köstlin, in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1851, p. 194 ff., and afterwards Keim, *Gesch. J. I.* p. 115 f.) endeavours on his part to carry out a *threefold* division of the whole and of the several parts; and in Godet, *Comment.* I. p. 111. The arrangement which approaches most nearly to the above is that of Ewald, *Jahrb.* III. p. 168, comp. VIII. 109, and *Johann. Schr.* I. p. 18 ff. In every method of division, the opposition of the world's ever-increasing unbelief and hatred to the revelation of the divine glory in Christ, and to faith in Him, must ever be held fast, as the thread which runs systematically through the whole. Comp. Godet,¹ as before.

¹ Who (p. 121) gives what he calls the "*photographie de l'histoire*" as follows: "La foi naît, i.-iv.; l'incrédulité domine, v.-xii.; la foi atteint sa perfection relative, xiii.-xvii.; l'incrédulité se consomme, xviii., xix.; la foi triomphe, xx. (xxi.)." Such special abstract designations of place give too varied play to the subjectivities, still more so the subdivision of the several main parts, as by Ewald especially, and Keim, with different degrees of skill; but the latter considers that his threefold division and subdivision of the two halves (i.-xii., xiii.-xx.) "has its root in the *absolute ground of the divine mystery of the number three*,"—*a lusum ingenii*.

Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ἰωάννην.

B. & have merely κατὰ Ἰωάνν. Others: τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάνν. (ἄγιον) εὐαγγ. Others: ἐκ τοῦ κ. Ἰωάνν. Others: εὐαγγ. ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ Ἰωάνν. See on Matthew.

CHAPTER I.

Ver. 4. ζῶῃ ἦν] D. & Codd. in Origen and Augustine, It. (Germ. Foss. excepted), Sahidic, Syr.^{ca} Clem. Valentt. in Ir. Hilary, Ambrose, Vigil.: ζῶῃ ἐστίν. So Lachm. and Tisch. Generalization in connection with the words: ὁ γέγ. ἐν αὐτῷ, ζῶῃ ἦν, and perhaps in comparison with 1 John v. 11. — Ver. 16. καὶ ἐκ] B. C.* D. L. X. & 33. Copt. Aeth. Arm. Ver. Verc. Corb. Or. and many Fathers and Schol.: ὅτι ἐκ. So Griesb., Lachm., Tisch.; ὅτι is to be preferred on account of the preponderating evidence in its favour, and because ver. 16 was very early (Heracl. and Origen) regarded as a continuation of the Baptist's discourse, and the directly continuous καὶ naturally suggested itself, and was inserted instead of the less simple ὅτι. — Ver. 18. υἱός] B. C.* L. & 33. Copt. Syr. Aeth. and many Fathers: θεός. Dogmatic gloss in imitation of ver. 1, whereby not only υἱός, but the article before μονογ. (which Tisch. deletes), was also (in the Codd. named) suppressed. The omission of υἱός (Origen, *Opp.* IV. 102; Ambrose, *ep.* 10) is not sufficiently supported, and might easily have been occasioned by ver. 14. — Ver. 19. After ἀπέστειλαν, B. C.* Min. Chrys. and Verss. have πρὸς αὐτόν. So Lachm., an addition which other Codd. and Verss. insert after Λευίτας. — Ver. 20. οὐκ εἰμι ἐγώ] A. B. C.* L. X. Δ. & 33. Verss. and Fathers have: ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμι. So Lachm., Tisch. Rightly, on account of the preponderating evidence. Comp. iii. 28, where οὐκ εἰμι ἐγώ is attested by decisive evidence. — Ver. 22. The οὖν after εἶπον (Lachm. Tisch. read εἶπαν) is deleted by Lachm., following B. C. Syr.^{ca},—testimonies which are all the less adequate, considering how easily the οὖν, which is not in itself necessary, might have been overlooked after the final syllable of εἶπον.¹—

¹ Matthaei, ed. min. ad x. 39, well says: "In nullo libro scribae ita vexarunt particulas καί, δέ, οὖν, πάλιν . . . quam in hoc evangelio. Modo temere incul-

Ver. 24. The article before ἀπεσταλμ. is wanting in A.* B. C.* L. s.* Origen (once), Nonn. Perhaps a mere omission on the part of the transcriber, if ἀπεστ. ἦσαν were taken together; but perhaps intentional, for some (Origen and Nonn.) have here supposed a second deputation. The omission is therefore doubly suspicious, though Tisch. also now omits the art. — Ver. 25. Instead of the repeated οὕτως, we must, with Lachm., Tisch., following A. B. C. L. X. s. Min. Origen, read οὐδέ. — Ver. 26. δέ after μέσος must, with Tisch., on weighty testimony (B. C. L. s. etc.), be deleted, having been added as a connecting particle. — Ver. 27. Against the words αὐτός ἐστιν (for which G. Min. Chrys. read οὗτός ἐστιν) and ὅς ἐμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν the testimonies are so ancient, important, and unanimous, that they must be rejected together. Lachm. has bracketed them, Tisch. deletes them. αὐτός ἐστιν is an unnecessary aid to the construction, and ὅς ἐμπρ. μου γέγονεν (though defended by Ewald) is a completion borrowed from vv. 15, 30. — Ver. 28. Βηθανία.] Elz.: Βηθαβαρᾶ (adopted of late by Hengstenberg), against conclusive testimony, but following Syr.^{cu} and Origen (*Opp.* II. 130), who himself avows that σχεδὸν ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις is found Βηθανία, yet upon geographical grounds decides in favour of Βηθαβαρᾶ,—a consideration by which criticism cannot be bound. See the exegetical notes. — Ver. 29. After βλέπει Elz. has ὁ Ἰωάνν., against the best testimonies. Beginning of a church lesson. — Ver. 32. ὡς] Elz.: ὡσεί, against the oldest and most numerous Codd. See Matt. iii. 16; Luke iii. 22. — Ver. 37. ἤκουσ. αὐτοῦ] Tisch., following B. s., puts αὐτοῦ after μαθητ.; C.* L. X. T.^b have it after δύο. The Verss. also have this variation of position, which must, however, be regarded as the removal of the αὐτοῦ, made more or less mechanically, in imitation of ver. 35. — Ver. 40. ἴδετε] B. C.* L. T.^b Min. Syr. utr. Origen, Tisch.: ὁψεσθε. Correctly; the words which immediately follow and ver. 47 (comp. xi. 34) make it much more likely that the transcriber would write ἴδετε for ὁψεσθε, than *vice versa*. After ὥρα Elz. has δέ, against which are the weightiest witnesses, and which has been interpolated as a connecting link. — Ver. 43. Ἰωνᾶ] Lachm.: Ἰωάννου, after B.; the same variation in xxi. 15–17. We must, with Tisch., after B.* L. s. 33, read Ἰωάννου. Comp. Nonnus: υἱὸς Ἰωάννου. The Textus Receptus has arisen from Matt. xvi. 17. — Ver. 44. After ἠθέλησεν Elz. has ὁ Ἰησοῦς, which the best authorities place after αὐτῷ. Beginning of a church lesson. — Ver. 52. ἀπάρτι] wanting in B. L. s. Copt. Aeth. Arm. Vulg.

carunt, modo permutarunt, modo omiserunt, modo transposuerunt. Accedunt interpretes, qui cum demum locum aliquem tractant, illas particulas in principio modo addunt, modo omittunt."

It. and some Fathers, also in Origen. Deleted by Lachm. Tisch. Omitted, because it seemed inappropriate to the following words, which were taken to refer to actual angelic appearances.

Ver. 1. 'Εν ἀρχῇ] John makes the beginning of his Gospel parallel with that of Genesis;¹ but he rises above the historical conception of בְּרֵאשִׁית, which (Gen. i. 1) includes the beginning of time itself, to the absolute conception of *anteriority to time*: the creation is something subsequent, ver. 3. Prov. viii. 23, ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸ τοῦ τὴν γῆν ποιῆσαι, is parallel; likewise, πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι, John xvii. 5; πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, Eph. i. 4. Comp. Nezach Israel, f. 48, 1: *Messias erat* מֵפְנֵי תוֹהוּ (*ante Tohu*). The same idea we find already in the book of Enoch, xlvi. 3 f., 6 f., lxii. 7,—a book which (against Hilgenfeld and others) dates back into the second century B.C. (Dilm., Ewald, and others). The notion, in itself *negative*, of anteriority to time (ἄχρονος ἦν, ἀκρίχτος, ἐν ἀρρήτῳ λόγος ἀρχῇ, Nonnus), is in a popular way *affirmatively* designated by the ἐν ἀρχῇ as "*primeval*;" the more exact dogmatic definition of the ἀρχή as "*eternity*" (Theodor. Mopsuest., Euthym. Zig.; comp. Theophylact) is a correct development of John's meaning, but not strictly what he himself says. Comp. 1 John i. 1; Rev. iii. 14. The *Valentinian* notion, that ἀρχή was a *divine Hypostasis* distinct from the Father and the λόγος (Iren. *Haer.* i. 8. 5), and the Patristic view, that it was the divine σοφία (Origen) or the everlasting Father (Cyril. Al.), rest upon speculations altogether unjustified by correct exegesis.²—ἦν] *was present, existed*. John writes *historically*, looking *back* from the later time of the incarnation of the λόγος (ver. 14). But he does not say, "In the beginning the λόγος *came into existence*," for he does not conceive the generation (comp. μονογενής) according to the Arian view of creation, but according to that of Paul, Col. i. 15. — ὁ λόγος] *the Word*; for the reference

¹ See Hoelemann, *de evangelii Joh. introitu introitus Geneseos augustiore effigie*, Lipsic 1855, p. 26 ff.

² Quite opposed to correct exegesis, although in a totally different direction, is the rendering of the Socinians (see *Catech. Racov.* p. 135, ed. Oeder), that is ἀρχή signifies *in initio evangelii*.

to the history of the creation leaves room for no other meaning (therefore not *Reason*). John assumes that his readers understand the term, and, notwithstanding its great importance, regards every additional explanation of it as superfluous. Hence those interpretations fall of themselves to the ground, which are unhistorical, and imply anything of a *quid pro quo*, such as (1) that ὁ λόγος is the same as ὁ λεγόμενος, "*the promised one*" (Valla, Beza, Ernesti, Tittm., etc.); (2) that it stands for ὁ λέγων, "*the speaker*" (Storr, Eckerm., Justi, and others). Not less incorrect (3) is Hofmann's interpretation (*Schriftbeweis*, I. 1, p. 109 f.): "ὁ λόγος is the word of God, the *Gospel*, the personal subject of which however, namely *Christ*, is here meant:" against which view it is decisive, first, that neither in Rev. xix. 13, nor elsewhere in the N. T., is Christ called ὁ λόγος merely as the *subject-matter of the word*; secondly, that in John, ὁ λόγος, without some additional definition, never once occurs as the designation of the *Gospel*, though it is often so used by Mark (ii. 2, iv. 14, *al.*), Luke (i. 2; Acts xi. 19, *al.*), and Paul (Gal. vi. 6; 1 Thess. i. 6); thirdly, that in the context, neither here (see especially ver. 14) nor in 1 John i. 1 (see especially ὁ ἐωράκαμεν . . . καὶ αἱ χεῖρες ἡμῶν ἐψηλάφησαν) does it seem allowable to depart in ὁ λόγος from the *immediate* designation of the *personal* subject,¹ while this immediate designation, *i.e.* of the creative Word, is in our passage, from the obvious parallelism with the history of the creation, as clear and definite as it was appropriate it should be at the very commencement of the work. These reasons also tell substantially against the turn which Luthardt has given to Hofmann's explanation: "ὁ λόγος is the *word of God, which in Christ*, Heb. i. 1, *has gone forth into the world, and the theme of which was His own person.*" See, on the other hand, Baur in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1854, p. 206 ff.; Lechler, *apost. u. nachapost. Zeit.* p. 215; Gess, *v. d. Person Chr.* p. 116; Kahnis, *Dogmat.* I. p. 466. The investigation of the Logos idea can only lead to a true result when pursued by the path of *history*. But here, above all, history points us

¹ See, with reference to 1 John i. 1 (in opposition to Beyschlag's impersonal interpretation), besides Düsterdieck and Huther, Johansson, *de aeterna Christi praeexist. sec. ev. Joh.*, Lundae 1866, p. 29 f.

to the O. T.,¹ and most directly to Gen. i., where the act of creation is effected by *God speaking*. The reality contained in this representation, anthropomorphic as to its form, of the revelation of Himself made in creation by God, who is in His own nature hidden, became the root of the Logos idea. The Word as creative, and embodying generally the divine will, is *personified* in Hebrew poetry (Ps. xxxiii. 6, cvii. 20, cxlvii. 15; Isa. lv. 10, 11); and consequent upon this concrete and independent representation, divine attributes are predicated of it (Ps. xxxiv. 4; Isa. xl. 8; Ps. cxix. 105), so far as it was at the same time the continuous revelation of God in law and prophecy. A way was thus paved for the *hypostatizing* of the λόγος as a further step in the knowledge of the relations in the divine essence; but this advance took place gradually, and only after the captivity, so that probably the oriental doctrine of emanations, and subsequently the Pythagorean-platonic philosophy, were not without influence upon what was already given in germ in Gen. i. Another *form* of the conception, however, appears,—not the original one of the *Word*, but one which was connected with the advanced development of ethical and teleological reflection and the needs of the Theodicy, —that of *wisdom* (חֵכֶם), of which the creative word was an expression, and which in the book of Job (xxviii. 12 ff.) and Proverbs (viii., ix.), in Ecclus. i. 1–10, xxiv. 8, and Baruch iii. 37–iv. 4, is still set forth and depicted under the form of a *personification*, yet to such a degree that the portrayal more closely approaches that of the *Hypostasis*, and all the more closely the less it is able to preserve the elevation and boldness characteristic of the ancient poetry. The actual transition of the σοφία into the Hypostasis occurs in the book of Wisdom vii. 7–xi., where wisdom (manifestly under the influence of the idea of the Platonic soul of the world, perhaps also of the Stoic conception of an all-pervading world-spirit) appears as a being of light proceeding essentially from God, —the true image of God, co-occupant of the divine throne, —a real and independent principle revealing God in the world (especially in Israel), and mediating between it and Him, after it has, as His organ, created the world, in asso-

¹ See Röhricht in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1868, p. 299 ff.

ciation with a spirit among whose many predicates *μονογενής*¹ also is named, vii. 22. The divine *λόγος* also appears again in the book of Wisdom, ix. 1, comp. ver. 2, but only in the O. T. sense of a poetically personified declaration of God's will, either in blessing (xvi. 12, comp. Ps. cvii. 20) or in punishing (xviii. 15). See especially Grimm, *in locc.*; Bruch, *Weisheitslehre d. Hebr.* p. 347 ff. Comp. also Eccus. xliii. 46. While, then, in the Apocrypha the Logos representation retires before the development of the idea of wisdom,² it makes itself the more distinctly prominent in the *Chaldee Paraphrasts*, especially Onkelos: see Gfrörer, *Gesch. d. Urchristenth.* I. 1, p. 301 ff.; Winer, *De Onkel.* p. 44 f.; Anger, *De Onkel.* II. 1846. The Targums, the peculiarities of which rest on older traditions, exhibit the Word of God, *מִימְרָא* or *דְּבִירָא*, as the divinely revealing Hypostasis, identical with the *שְׂכִינָה* which was to be revealed in the Messiah. Comp. Schoettg. *Hor.* II. p. 5; Bertholdt, *Christol.* p. 121. Thus there runs through the whole of Judaism, and represented under various forms (comp. especially the *מְלֵאךְ יְהוָה* in the O. T. from Gen. xvi., Ex. xxiii. downwards, frequently named, especially in Hosea, Zechariah, and Malachi, as the representative of the self-revealing God), the idea that God never reveals Himself directly, but mediately, that is, does not reveal His hidden invisible essence, but only a manifestation of Himself (comp. especially Ex. xxxiii. 12–23); and this idea, modified however by Greek and particularly Platonic and Stoic speculation, became a main feature in the Judæo-Alexandrine philosophy, as this is set forth in PHILO, one of the older contemporaries of Jesus. See especially Gfrörer, I. 243 ff.; Dähne, *Jüdisch-Alex. Religionsphil.* I. 114 ff.; Grossmann, *Quaestion. Philon.*, Lpz. 1829; Scheffer, *Quaest. Phil. Marb.* 1829, 1831; Keferstein, *Philo's Lehre von dem göttl. Mittelwesen*, Lpz. 1846; Ritter, *Gesch. d. Philos.* IV.

¹ Comp. vii. 25, where it is said of wisdom, *ἀπρόβητα τῆς τοῦ παντοκράτορος δόξης εἰλικρινής*. *Μονογενής* should not have been rendered *single* (Bauerm., Lücke, Bruch, after the early writers), which it neither is nor is required to be by the merely formal contrast to *πολυμυρίς*. This idea *single*, as answering to the following *πολυμυρίς*, would have been expressed by *μονομυρίς* (Luc. Column. 6). Even Grimm (*exeget. Handb.* p. 152) has now rightly abandoned this interpretation.

² Wisdom as appearing in *Christ* is mentioned in N. T. also, in Luke xi. 49, comp. Matt. xi. 19.

418 ff.; Zeller, *Philos. d. Griechen*, III. 2; Lutterb. *neut. Lehrbegr.* I. 418 ff.; Müller in *Herzog's Encykl.* XI. 484; Ewald, *apost. Zeit.* 257; Delitzsch in *d. Luther. Zeitschr.* 1863, ii. 219; Riehm, *Hebr. Brief*, p. 249; Keim, *Gesch. J.* I. 212. Comp. also Langen, *d. Judenth. z. Zeit Christi*, 1867; Röhricht as formerly quoted. According to the intellectual development, so rich in its results, which Philo gave to the received Jewish doctrine of Wisdom, the Logos is the comprehension or sum-total of all the divine energies, so far as these are either hidden in the Godhead itself, or have come forth and been disseminated in the world (λόγος σπερματικός). As immanent in God, containing within itself the archetypal world, which is conceived as the real world-ideal (νοητός κόσμος), it is, while not yet outwardly existing, like the immanent reason in men, the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος; but when in creating the world it has issued forth from God, it answers to the λόγος προφορικός, just as among men the word when spoken is the manifestation of thought. Now the λόγος προφορικός is the comprehension or sum-total of God's active relations to the world; so that creation, providence, the communication of all physical and moral power and gifts, of all life, light, and wisdom from God, are its work, not being essentially different in its attributes and workings from σοφία and the Divine Spirit itself. Hence it is the image of the Godhead, the eldest and first-begotten (πρεσβύτατος, πρωτόγονος) Son of God, the possessor of the entire divine fulness, the Mediator between God and the world, the λόγος τομεύς, δημιουργός, ἀρχιερεύς, ἱκέτης, πρεσβευτής, the ἀρχάγγελος, the δεύτερος θεός, the substratum of all Theophanies, also the Messiah, though ideally apprehended only as a Theophany, not as a concrete humanized personality; for an incarnation of the Logos is foreign to Philo's system (see Ewald, p. 284 ff.; Dorner, *Entwicklungsgesch.* I. 50). There is no doubt that Philo has often designated and described the Logos as a *Person*, although, where he views it rather as immanent in God, he applies himself more to describe a power, and to present it as an attribute. There is, however, no real ground for inferring, with some (Keferst., Zeller), from this variation in his representation, that Philo's opinion wavered between

personality and impersonality; rather, as regards the question of subsistence in its bearing upon Philo's Logos (see especially Dorner, *Entwicklungsgesch.* I. 21; Niedner, *de subsistentia τῷ θεῷ λόγῳ apud Philon. tributa*, in the *Zeitsch. f. histor. Theol.* 1849, p. 337 ff.; and Hölemann, *de evang. Joh. introitu*, etc., p. 39 ff.), must we attribute to him no separation between the subsistence of God and the Logos, as if there came forth a Person *distinct from God*, whenever the Logos is described as a Person; but, "ea duo, in quibus cernitur τοῦ ὄντος καὶ ζῶντος θεοῦ essentia s. deitas plenum esse per suam ipsius essentiam et implere cuncta hac sua essentia, primo diserte *uni substantiæ tribuuntur*, deinde *distribuuntur*, sed tantum inter *essentiam* et hujus *actionem*, quemadmodum nomina τοῦ θεοῦ et τοῦ λόγου hujus ipsius dei" (Niedner). Accordingly, Philo's conception of the Logos resolves itself into the sum-total and full exercise of the divine energies; so that God, so far as He reveals Himself, is called Logos, while the Logos, so far as he reveals God, is called God. That John owed his doctrine of the Logos—in which he represents the divine Messianic being as pre-existent, and entering into humanity in a human form—*solely* to the Alexandrine philosophy, is an assertion utterly arbitrary, especially considering the difference between Philo's doctrine and that of John, not only in general (comp. also Godet, I. 233), but also in respect to the subsistence of the Logos in particular.¹ The form which John gave to his doctrine is understood much more naturally and historically thus, without by any means excluding the influence of the Alexandrine Gnosis upon the apostle;—that while the ancient popular wisdom of the Word of God, which (as we have above shown) carries us back to Gen. i. 1, is acknowledged to be that through which the idea of the Logos, as manifested in human form in Christ, was immediately suggested to him, and to which he appended and unfolded his own peculiar development of this idea with all clearness and spiritual depth, according to the measure of those personal testimonies of his Lord which his memory

¹ It tells also against it, that in John the name λόγος is undoubtedly derived from the divine *speaking* (Word); in Philo, on the other hand, from the divine *thinking* (Reason). See Hoelemann as before, p. 43 ff.

vividly retained, he at the same time allowed the widespread Alexandrine speculations, so similar in their origin and theme, to have due influence upon him, and used¹ them in an independent manner to assist his exposition of the nature and working of the divine in Christ, fully conscious of their points of difference (among which must be reckoned the cosmological dualism of Philo, which excluded any real incarnation, and made God to have created the world out of the *ὑλη*). Whether he adopted these speculations for the first time while dwelling in Asia Minor, need not be determined, although it is in itself very conceivable that the longer he lived in Asia, the more deeply did he penetrate into the Alexandrine theologoumenon which prevailed there, without any intermediate agency on the part of Apollos being required for that end (Tobler). The doctrine is not, however, on account of this connection with speculations beyond the pale of Christendom, by any means to be traced back to a mere fancy of the day. The main truth in it (the idea of the Son of God and His incarnation) had, long before he gave it its peculiar form, been in John's mind the sole foundation of his faith, and the highest object of his knowledge; and this was no less the case with Paul and all the other apostles, though they did not *formally* adopt the Logos doctrine, because their idiosyncrasies and the conditions of their after development were different. That main truth in it is to be referred simply to Christ Himself, whose communications to His disciples, and direct influence upon them (i. 14), as well as His further revelations and leadings by means of the Spirit of truth, furnished them with the material which was afterwards made use of in their various

¹ Comp. Delitzsch, *l.c.*, and *Psychol.* p. 178 [E. T. pp. 210, 211]; Beyschlag, *Christol. d. N. T.* p. 156; Keim, *Gesch. J.* I. p. 112 ff. If some attempt to deny the influence of the Judæo-Alexandrine Gnosis on the Logos doctrine of John (Hoelemann, Weiss, J. Köstlin, Hengstenberg), they at the same time sever, though in the interests of apostolic dignity, its historical credibility from its connection with the circumstances of the time, as well as the necessary presumption of its intelligibility on the part of the readers of the Gospel. But it is exactly the noble simplicity and clearness of the Prologue which shows with what truly apostolic certainty John had *experienced* the influence of the speculations of his day, and was *master* of them, modifying, correcting, and utilizing them according to his own ideas. This is also in answer to Luthardt, p. 200, and Röhricht, *l.c.*

modes of representation. This procedure is specially apparent also in John, whose doctrine of the divine and pre-existent nature of Christ, far removed from the influences of later Gnosticism, breaks away in essential points from the Alexandrine type of doctrine, and moulds itself in a different shape, especially rejecting, in the most decided manner, all dualistic and docetic elements, and in general treating the form once chosen with the independence of an apostle. That idea of a revelation by God of His own essence, which took its rise from Gen. i., which lived and grew under various forms and names among the Hebrews and later Jews, but was moulded in a peculiar fashion by the Alexandrine philosophy, was adopted by John for the purpose of setting forth the abstract divinity of the Son,—thus bringing to light the reality which lies at the foundation of the Logos idea. Hence, according to John,¹ by ὁ λόγος, which is throughout viewed by him (as is clear from the entire Prologue down to ver. 18)² under the conception of a *personal*³ subsistence, we must understand nothing else than *the self-revelation of the divine essence, before all time immanent in God* (comp. Paul, Col. i. 15 ff.), *but for the accomplishment of the act of creation proceeding hypostatically from Him, and ever after operating even in the spiritual world as a creating, quickening, and illuminating personal principle, equal to God Himself in nature and glory* (comp. Paul, Phil. ii. 6); *which divine self-revelation appeared*

¹ In the Apocalypse also, chap. xix. 13, Christ is called the λόγος, but (not so in the Gospel) ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ. The writer of the Apocalypse speaks of the whole Person of the God-man in a different way from the evangelist,—in fact, as in His state of exaltation. (See Düsterdieck, *z. Apok. Einl.* p. 75 ff.) But the passage is important against all interpretations which depart from the metaphysical view of the Logos above referred to. Comp. Gess, *v. d. Person Chr.* p. 115 ff.

² Comp. Wörner, *d. Verhältn. d. Geistes zum Sohne Gottes*, 1862, p. 24; also Baur, *neutest. Theol.* 352; Godet, *l.c.*

³ That is, the subsistence as a conscious intelligent Ego, endued with volition. Against the denial of this *personal* transcendency in John (De Wette, Beyschlag, and others), see in particular Köstlin, *Lehrbegr.* 90; Brückn. 7 f.; Liebner, *Christol.* 155 f.; Weiss, *Lehrbegr.* 242 f. When Dörner (*Gesch. d. prot. Theol.* 875 ff.) claims for the Son, indeed, a special divine mode of existence as His eternal characteristic, but at the same time denies Him any direct participation in the absolute divine personality, his limitation is exegetically opposed to the view of John and of the Apostle Paul.

bodily in the man Jesus, and accomplished the work of the redemption of the world. John fashions and determines his Gospel from beginning to end with this highest christological idea in his eye; this it is which constitutes the distinctive character of its doctrine. Comp. Weizsäcker, *üb. d. evang. Gesch.* pp. 241 ff., 297; also his *Abh. über d. Joh. Logoslehre*, in *d. Jahrb. f. D. Th.* 1862, pp. 619 ff., 701 f. The Synoptics contain the fragments and materials, the organic combination and ideal formation of which into one complete whole is the pre-eminent excellence of this last and highest Gospel. Paul has the Logos, only not in name. — The second and third ἦν is the *copula*; but καὶ ὁ λόγος, as the repetition of the great subject, has a *solemnity* about it. — πρὸς τὸν θεόν] not simply equivalent to παρὰ τῷ θεῷ, xvii. 5, but expressing, as in 1 John i. 2, the *existence* of the Logos in God in respect of *intercourse* (Bernhardy, p. 265). So also in all other passages where it appears to mean simply *with*, Mark vi. 3, ix. 19; Matt. xiii. 56, xxvi. 55; 1 Cor. xvi. 6, 7; Gal. i. 18, iv. 18; and in the texts cited in Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 202.¹ Upon the thing itself, comp. concerning Wisdom, Prov. viii. 30, Wisd. ix. 4. The *moral* essence of this essential fellowship is *love* (xvii. 24; Col. i. 13), with which, at the same time, any merely *modalistic* conception is excluded. — καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος] *and the Logos was God.* This θεός can only be the *predicate*, not the subject (as Röhricht takes it), which would contradict the preceding ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν, because the conception of the λόγος would be only a periphrasis for God. The predicate is *placed before* the subject emphatically (comp. iv. 24), because the progress of the thought, “He was *with* God, and (not at all a Person of an inferior nature, but) possessed of a *divine nature*,” makes this latter—the new element to be introduced—the naturally and logically *emphasized* member of the new clause, on account of its relation to πρὸς

¹ The expressions, in the language of the common people, in many districts are quite analogous: “he was with me,” “he stays with you” (bei mich, bei dich), and the like. Comp. for the Greek, Krüger, § 68. 39. 4. — As against all impersonal conceptions of the Logos, observe it is never said ἰ, τῷ θεῷ. Röhricht (p. 312), however, arrives at the meaning ἰ, τῷ θεῷ, and by unwarrantably comparing the very different usage of πρὸς, takes exception to our explanation of πρὸς τὸν θεόν.

τὸν θεόν.¹ The omission of the article was necessary, because ὁ θεός after the preceding πρὸς τὸν θεόν would have assigned to the Logos identity of Person (as, in fact, Beyschlag, p. 162, construes θεός without the art.). But so long as the question of God's self-mediation objectively remains out of consideration, ὁ θεός would have been out of place here, where πρὸς τὸν θεόν had laid down the distinction of Person; whereas θεός without the article makes the unity of essence and nature to follow the distinction of Person.² As, therefore, by θεός without the article, John neither desires to indicate, on the one hand, identity of Person with the Father; nor yet, on the other, any lower nature than that which God Himself possesses: so his doctrine of the Logos is definitely distinguished from that of Philo, which predicates θεός without the article of the Logos in the sense of subordination in nature, nay, as he himself says, ἐν καταχρήσει (I. 655, ed. Mang.); see Hoelemann, I. 1, p. 34. Moreover, the name ὁ δεύτερος θεός, which Philo gives to the Logos, must, according to II. 625 (Euseb. *praep. ev.* vii. 13), expressly designate an intermediate nature between God and man, after whose image God created man. This subordinationism, according to which the Logos is indeed μεθ' ὁρίως τις θεοῦ φύσις, but τοῦ μὲν ἐλάττων, ἀνθρώπου δὲ κρείττων (I. 683), is not that of the N. T., which rather assumes (comp. Phil. ii. 6, Col. i. 15, 16) the eternal unity of being of the Father and the Son, and places the subordination of the latter in His dependence on the Father, as it does the subordination of the Spirit in His dependence on the Father and the Son. Θεός, therefore, is not to be explained by help of Philo, nor is it to be converted into a general qualitative idea—"divine," "God-like" (B. Crusius),—which deprives the expression of the precision which, especially considering the strict monotheism of the N. T. (in John, see in particular xvii. 3), it must possess, owing

¹ There is something majestic in the way in which the description of the Logos, in the three brief but great propositions of ver. 1, is unfolded with increasing fulness.

² "The last clause, *the Word was God*, is against Arius; the other, *the Word was with God*, against Sabellius."—LUTHER. See also Thomasius, *Chr. Pers. v. Werk*, I. 83 ff.

to the conception of the personal Logos as a divine being. Comp. Schmid, *bibl. Theol.* II. 370. On Sam. Crell's conjecture (*Artemonii initium ev. Joh. ex antiquitate eccl. restitut.* 1726) that $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ is a mere anti-trinitarian invention, see Bengel, *Appar. crit.* p. 214 ff.

Ver. 2 again emphatically combines the first and second clauses of ver. 1, in order to connect with them the work of creation, which was wrought by the $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$.¹ In this way, however, the subject also of the *third* clause of ver. 1 is included in and expressed by $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$. On this $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ —to which, then, $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$ standing at the beginning of ver. 3 significantly corresponds—lies the emphasis in the continuation of the discourse. In ver. 2 is given the necessary premiss to ver. 3; for if it was *this same Logos*, and no *other* than He, who *Himself* was God, who lived in the beginning in fellowship with God, and consequently when creation began, the *whole* creation, *nothing excepted*, must have come into existence *through Him*. Thus it is assumed, as a self-evident middle term, that God created the world not immediately, but, according to Gen. i., through the medium of the Word.

Ver. 3. $\Pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$] “grande verbum, quo *mundus*, i.e. universitas rerum factarum denotatur, ver. 10,” Bengel. Comp. Gen. i.; Col. i. 16; Heb. i. 2. Quite opposed to the context is the view of the Socinians: “the *moral* creation is meant.” Comp. rather Philo, *de Cherub.* I. 162, where the $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ appears as the $\delta\omicron\rho\gamma\alpha\upsilon\omicron\nu\ \delta\iota'\ \omicron\upsilon$ (comp. 1 Cor. viii. 6) $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\sigma\kappa\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\sigma\theta\eta$ ($\acute{o}\ \kappa\acute{o}\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$). The further speculations of Philo concerning the relation of the $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ to the creation, which however are not to be imputed to John, see in Hoelemann, *l.c.* p. 36 ff. John *might* have written $\tau\grave{\alpha}\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$ (with the article), as in 1 Cor. viii. 6 and Col. i. 16, but he was not *obliged* to do so. Comp. Col. i. 17, John iii. 35. For his thought is “*all*” (unlimited), whereas $\tau\grave{\alpha}\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$ would express “the whole of what actually exists.” — $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \chi\omega\rho\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$, $\kappa\tau.\lambda.$] an emphatic *parallelismus antitheticus*, often occurring in the classics (Dissen, *ad Dem. de Cor.* p. 228; Maetzner, *ad Antiph.* p. 157), in the N. T. throughout, and especially in John (ver. 20, x. 28; 1 John ii. 4, 27, *al.*). We are not to suppose

¹ Who accordingly now worked as $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma\ \pi\rho\omicron\varphi\omicron\rho\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$.

that by this negative reference John meant to exclude (so Lücke, Olshausen, De Wette, Frommann, Maier, Baeumlein) the doctrine of a *ἔλῃ* having an extra-temporal existence (Philo, *l.c.*), because *ἐγένετο* and *γέγονεν* describe that which exists only *since the creation*, as *having come* into existence, and therefore *ἔλῃ* would not be included in the conception. John neither held nor desired to oppose the idea of the *ἔλῃ*; the antithesis has no polemical design—not even of an anti-gnostic kind—to point out that the Logos is raised above the series of Aeons (Tholuck); for though the world of spirits is certainly included in the *πάντα* and the *οὐδὲ ἔν*, it is not specially designated (comp. Col. i. 16). How the Valentinians had already referred it to the *Aeons*, see in Iren. *Haer.* i. 8. 5; Hilgenfeld, *d. Ev. u. d. Briefe Joh.* p. 32 ff. — *οὐδὲ ἔν*] *ne unum quidem, i.e. prorsus nihil*, more strongly emphatic than *οὐδέν*. Comp. 1 Cor. vi. 5; see Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Sympos.* p. 214 D; Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 6. 2. As to the thing itself, comp. Philo, II. p. 225: *δι' οὗ σύμπας ὁ κόσμος ἐδημιουργεῖτο. — ὃ γέγονεν*] Perfect: *what has come into being, and now is*. Comp. *ἐκτισται*, Col. i. 16. This belongs to the emphatic *fulness* of the statement (Bornemann, *Schol. in Luc.* p. xxxvii.), and connects itself with what *precedes*. The very ancient connection of it with what *follows* (C. D. L. Verss., Clem. Al., Origen, and other Greeks, Heraclion, Ptolemaeus, *Philos. Orig.* v. 8, Latin Fathers, also Augustine, Wetst., Lachm., Weisse), by putting the comma after either *γέγ.* or *αὐτῷ* (so already the Valentinians),¹ is to be rejected, although it would harmonize with John's manner of carrying forward the members of his sentences, whereby "*ex proximo membro sumitur gradus sequentis*" (Erasmus); but in other respects it would only be Johannean if the comma

¹ "*Whatever originated in Him (self) is life.*" The latter is said to be the *Zoë*, which with the Logos formed one Syzygy. Hilgenfeld regards this view as correct, in connection with the assumption of the later Gnostic origin of the Gospel. But the construction is false as regards the *words*, because neither *ιστί* nor *ἰγένετο* stands in the passage; and false also as regards the *thought*, because, according to vv. 1-3, a principle of life cannot have first originated in the Logos, but must *have existed* from the very beginning. Even Bunsen (*Hypol.* II. 291, 357) erroneously preferred the punctuation of the Alexandrines and Gnostics.

were placed after γέγ. (so also Lachm.). The ground of rejection lies not in the ambiguity of ζωή, which cannot surprise us in John, but in this, that the *perfect* γέγονεν, as implying continuance, would have logically required ἐστὶ instead of ἦν after ζωή; to ἦν not γέγονεν but ἐγένετο would have been appropriate, so that the sense would have been: "what came into existence had in Him its ground or source of life."

Ver. 4. An advance to the nature of the Logos¹ as *life*, and thereby as *light*. — ἐν αὐτῷ ζωή ἦν] *in Him was life*, He was πηγὴ ζωῆς (Philo). *Life* was that which existed in Him, of which He was full. This must be taken in the most comprehensive sense, nothing that is life being excluded, *physical, moral, eternal* life (so already Chrysostom),—all life was contained in the Logos, as in its principle and source. No limitation of the conception, especially as ζωή is without the article (comp. v. 26), has any warrant from the context; hence it is not to be understood either merely of *physical* life, so far as it may be the sustaining power (B. Crusius, comp. Chrysostom, Euthymius Zigabenus, Calvin), or of *spiritual* and *eternal* life,—of the Johannean ζωή αἰώνιος (Origen, Maldonatus, Lampe, Kuinoel, Köstlin, Hengstenberg, Weiss), where Hengstenberg drags in the negative notion that the creature was excluded from life until Christ was manifested in the flesh, and that down to the time of His incarnation He had only been virtually life and light. — καὶ ἡ ζωή, κ.τ.λ.] *and the life*, of which the Logos was the possessor, *was the light of men*. The exposition then passes over from the universal to the relation of the Logos to *mankind*; for, being Himself the universal source of *life* to the world made by Him, He was as such unable to remain inactive, least of all with respect to men, but shows Himself as operating upon them conformably to their rational and moral nature, especially as *the light*, according to the necessary connection of life and light

¹ The Logos must necessarily be taken as in vv. 1-3, but not from ver. 4 onwards in Hofmann's sense, as no longer a person but a thing, viz. the Gospel, as Röhricht (p. 315) maintains, as if the *verbum vocale* were now a designation of Christ, who is the bearer of it. No such change of meaning is indicated in the text, and it only brings confusion into the clear advance of the thought.

in opposition to death and darkness. (Comp. viii. 12; Ps. xxxvi. 10; Eph. v. 14; Luke i. 78, 79.) The *light* is *truth pure and divine*, theoretical and moral (both combined by an inner necessity, and not simply the former, as Weiss maintains), the reception and appropriation of which *enlightens* the man (*υἱὸς φωτός*, xii. 36), whose non-appropriation and non-acceptance into the consciousness determines the condition of *darkness*. The Life *was* the Light of men, because in its working upon them it was the necessary *determining power of their illumination*. Comp. such expressions as those in xi. 25, xiv. 6, xvii. 3. Nothing as yet is said of the working of the Logos *after His incarnation* (xiv. 6), but (observe the ἦν) that the divine truth in that primeval time came to man from the Logos as the source of life; life in Him was for mankind the actively communicating principle of the divine ἀλήθεια, in the possession of which they lived in that fair morning of creation, before through sin darkness had broken in upon them. This reference to the time when man, created after God's image, remained in a state of innocency, is necessarily required by the ἦν, which, like the preceding ἦν, must refer to the creation-period indicated in ver. 3. But we are thus at the same time debarred from understanding, as here belonging to the enlightening action of the Logos, God's revelations to the Hebrews and later Jews (comp. Isa. ii. 5), by the prophets, etc. (Ewald), or even from thinking of the elements of moral and religious truth to be found in heathendom (λόγος σπερματικός). In that fresh, untroubled primeval age, when the Logos as the source of *life* was the *Light* of men, the antithesis of light and darkness did not yet exist; this tragic antithesis, however, as John's readers knew, originated with the fall, and had continued ever after. There follows, therefore, after a fond recalling of that fair bygone time (ver. 4), the painful and mournful declaration of the later and still enduring relation (ver. 5), where the light still *shines* indeed, but in *darkness*,—a darkness which had not received it. If that reference, however, which is to be kept closely in view, of ἦν to the time of the world's creation, and also this representation of the onward movement of our narrative, be correct, it cannot also be explained of the *continuous* (ver. 17) creative activity

of the Logos, through which a consciousness and recognition of the highest truth have been developed among men (De Wette); and just as little may we find in τὸ φῶς τ. ἀνθρ. what *belongs to the Logos in His essence only*, in which case the reading ἐστὶ would (against Brückner) be more appropriate; comp. φωτίζει, ver. 9. As in ἐν αὐτῷ ζῶν ἦν, so also by ἦν τὸ φῶς τ. ἀνθρ. must be expressed what the Logos was in His *historical activity*, and not merely what He was *virtually* (Hengstenberg). Comp. Godet, who, however, without any hint from the text, or any historical appropriateness whatever, finds in “*life and light*” a reminiscence of the trees of life and of knowledge in Paradise.

Ver. 5. Relation of the light to the darkness. — καὶ τὸ φῶς] *and the light shineth*; ¹ not “*and thus, as the light, the Logos shineth*” (Lücke). The discourse steadily progresses link by link, so that the preceding predicate becomes the subject. — φαίνει] *Present, i.e. uninterruptedly from the beginning until now*; it embraces, therefore, the illuminating activity of the λόγος ἄσαρκος² and ἑσαρκος. As it is arbitrary to supply the idea of “*still present*” (Weiss), so also is its limitation to the revelations by the *prophets of the O. T.*, which would make φαίνει merely the descriptive *praesens historicum* (De Wette). For the assumption of this, however, in connection with pure preterites there is no warrant; comp. rather φωτίζει, ver. 9. According to Ewald, *Jahrb.* V. 194 (see his *Johann. Schr.* I. 121), φαίνει represents as present the time in which the Light, which since the creation had enlightened men only from afar, had now suddenly come down into the world, which without it is darkness, and was shining in the midst of this darkness. An antithetic relation is thus assumed (“*only from afar,—but now suddenly in the midst*”) which has no support

¹ φαίνει, *lucet*, not interchangeable with φαίνεται, which means *apparet*. See on Phil. ii. 15. Godet's criticism of the distinction is erroneous.

² Godet thinks that the *law written in the heart, the light of conscience*, is meant (Rom. ii. 14), which the Logos makes use of; and this His relation to all mankind is essential and permanent. But this would be utterly inadequate to the fulness of meaning expressed by φῶς, especially in its antithesis to σκοτία. The φῶς shines as *divine light before Christ* (by revelation and prophecy), and *after Him*. It is *supernatural, heavenly*. Comp. 1 John ii. 8. There is no mention here of the λόγος σπиритικός.

in the present tense alone, without some more distinct intimation in the text. The stress, moreover, is not on φαίνει, but the (tragic) emphasis is laid on the ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ, which with this object precedes it. It is the continuation of the discourse, ver. 7 ff., which first leads *especially* to the action of the *Incar-nate One* (this also against Hengstenb.). — The σκοτία is the negation and opposite of the φῶς, the condition and order of things in which man does not possess the divine ἀλήθεια, but has become the prey of folly, falsehood, and sin, as a godless ruling power, with all its misery. Here the abstract term “darkness,” as the *element in which* the light shines, denotes not the *individual subject* of darkness (Eph. v. 8), but, as the context requires, that same totality which had been previously described by τῶν ἀνθρώπων, consequently *mankind in general, in so far as* in and for themselves they have since the fall been destitute of divine truth, and have become corrupt in understanding and will. Melancthon well says, “genus humanum oppressum peccato vocat tenebras.” Frommann is altogether mistaken in holding that σκοτία differs in the two clauses, and means (1) humanity so far as it yet lay *beyond* the influence of the light, and (2) humanity so far as it was *opposed* thereto. But Hilgenfeld is likewise in error, when, out of a different circle of ideas, he imports the notion that “light and darkness are *primeval* opposites, which did not first originate with the fall;” see on viii. 44. — οὐ κατέλαβεν] *apprehended it not, took not possession of it*; it was not *appropriated* by the darkness, so that thereby the latter might have become light, but remained aloof and alien to it. Comp. Phil. iii. 12, 13, 1 Cor. ix. 24, and especially Rom. ix. 30; also expressions like καταλαμβ. σοφίαν, Eccus. xv. 1, 7. The explanation *apprehended, i.e. ἔγνω*, ver. 10 (Eph. iii. 18; Acts x. 34, iv. 13; Plato, *Phaedr.* p. 250 D; Phil. p. 16 D; Polyb. viii. 4. 6), is on one side arbitrarily narrowing, on another anticipatory, since it foists in the individual *subjects* of the σκοτία, which is conceived of as a *realm*. It is erroneous to interpret, as Origen, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, Bos., Schulthess, Hoelemann, p. 60, also Lange: “The darkness did not hem it in, oppress it; it was invincible before it.” Linguistically this is allowable (see Schweighäuser;

Lex. Herod. II. p. 18), but it nowhere so occurs in the N. T., and is here opposed to the parallels, vv. 10, 11. — Observe that οὐ κατέλαβεν, which presupposes no Gnostic absolutism, but freedom of moral self-determination (comp. vv. 11, 12), reflects the phenomenon *as a whole*, and indeed as it presented itself to John in *history and experience*; hence the *aorist*. Comp. iii. 19.

Ver. 6. In the painful antithesis of ver. 5 which pervades the entire Gospel, was included not merely the pre-human relation of the Logos to mankind, but His relation thereto *after His incarnation* likewise (see on φαίνειν). This latter is now *more minutely unfolded* as far as ver. 11, and indeed in such a way that John, to strengthen the antithesis, adduces first the *testimony of the Baptist* (vv. 6–8) to the Light, on the ground of which he then designates the Logos *as the true Light* (ver. 9); and finally, thus prefaced, makes the *antithesis* (vv. 10, 11) follow with all the more tragic effect. The *mention of John's testimony* here in the Prologue is not therefore a mere confirmation of the reality of the appearance of the Logos (Brückner), which the statements of vv. 9, 10 did not require; still less is it a pressing forwards of the thought to the beginning of the Gospel history (De Wette), nor even the representation of the idea of the first intervention in the antithesis between light and darkness (Baur), nor “an illustrious exception” (Ewald) to the preceding ἡ σκοτία, κ.τ.λ.; but introducing a new paragraph, and therefore beginning without a particle, it forms a historical *preparation*, answering to what was actually the fact, for that *non-recognition and rejection* (vv. 10, 11) which, in spite of that testimony of the Baptist, the light shining in the darkness had experienced. Ver. 15 stands to ver. 7 in the relation of a particular definite statement to the general testimony of which it is a part. — ἐγένετο] not *there was* (ἦν, iii. 1), but denoting the *appearing*, the historical *manifestation*. See on Mark i. 4; Luke i. 5; Phil. ii. 7. Hence not with Chrys.: ἐγένετο ἀπεσταλμένος ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀπεστάλη; which Hengstenberg repeats. — Observe in what follows the noble simplicity of the narrative: we need not look out for any antithetical reference (ἐγένετο — ἀνθρώπος — ἀπεστ. π. θεοῦ) to ver. 1 (B. Crusius, Luthardt,

and older expositors). With ἀπεσταλμ. π. θεοῦ, comp. iii. 28; Mal. iii. 1, 23. Description of the true prophet; comp. also Luke iii. 2, 3.

Ver. 7. Εἰς μαρτυρίαν] *to bear witness*; for John testified what had been prophetically *made known* to him by divine revelation respecting the Light which had come in human form. Comp. ver. 33. — ἵνα πάντες, κ.τ.λ.] Purpose of the μαρτυρήσῃ, final end of the ἦλθεν. — πιστεύσ.] *i.e.* in the light; comp. vv. 8, 9, xii. 36. — δι' αὐτοῦ] by means of John, so far as he by his witness-bearing *was the medium of producing* faith: "and thus John is a *servant* and *guide* to the Light, which is Christ" (Luther); not by means of *the light* (Grotius, Lampe, Semler), for here it is not faith in God (1 Pet. i. 21) that is spoken of.

Ver. 8. ἦν is *emphatic*, and is therefore placed in the front: he *was* not the Light, but he was to *bear witness* of the Light; and hence, in the second clause, μαρτυρήσῃ *emphatically* takes the lead. The object of making this antithesis prominent is not controversy, nor has it the slightest reference to the disciples of John (see the Introduction), but to point out¹ the true position of the Baptist in face of the historical fact, that when he first appeared, men took him for the Messiah Himself (comp. ver. 20; Luke iii. 15), so that his witness shall appear in its proper *historical* aspect. Comp. Cyril. — ἀλλ' ἵνα, κ.τ.λ.] From what precedes, we must understand ἦλθεν before ἵνα; a rapid hastening away to the main thought (comp. ix. 3, xiii. 18, xv. 25; 1 John ii. 19; Fritzsche, *ad Matt.* 840 f; Winer, p. 297 [E. T. p. 398]); not imperative (De Wette), nor dependent upon ἦν (Lücke, Lange, Godet): not the latter, because εἶναι, ἵνα (instead of εἰς τό), even if it were linguistically possible, is here untenable on account of the emphasis placed upon the ἦν; while to take ἦν in the sense of *aderat*, as again understood before ἵνα (Godet), would be more forced and arbitrary than to supply ἦλθεν from ver. 7.

Ver. 9. For the correct apprehension of this verse, we must

¹ Not: to bring more fully to light the greatness of Christ, through the subordination to Him of the greatest men and prophets, as Hengstenb. asserts. In this case John ought to have been described according to his own greatness and rank, and not simply as in ver. 6.

observe, (1) that ἦν has the main emphasis, and therefore is placed at the beginning: (2) that τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθ. cannot be the predicate, but must be the subject, because in ver. 8 another was the subject; consequently without a τοῦτο, or some such word, there are no grounds for supposing a subject not expressed: (3) that ἐρχόμ. εἰς τὸν κόσμον (with Origen, Syr., Copt., Euseb., Chrys., Cyril., Epiph., Nonnus, Theophyl., Euth. Zig., It., Vulg., Augustine, Erasmus, Luther, Beza, Calvin, Aret., and most of the early expositors¹) can only be connected with πάντα ἄνθρωπον, not with ἦν; because when John was bearing witness the Logos *was* already in the world (ver. 26), not simply then *came* into the world, or was *about* to come, or *had* to come. We should thus be obliged arbitrarily to restrict ἐρχ. εἰς τ. κόσμ. to His *entrance upon His public ministry*, as Grotius already did (from whom Calovius differs), and because the order of the words does not suggest the connecting of ἦν with ἐρχόμ.; rather would the prominence given to ἦν, and its wide separation from ἐρχόμ., be without any reason. Hence the connection by the early church of ἐρχόμ. with π. ἄνθρ. is by no means to be regarded, with Hilgenfeld, as obsolete, but is to be retained,—to be explained, however, thus: “*The true Light was existing, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.*” This, together with the following ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἦν onwards to ἐγένετο, serves, by preparing the way, to strengthen the portentous and melancholy antithesis, καὶ ὁ κόσμ. αὐτὸν οὐκ ἔγνω. The usual objection that ἐρχόμ. εἰς τ. κ., when referred to πάντα ἄνθρ., is a superfluous by-clause, is inept. There is such a thing as a *solemn* redundancy, and that we have here, an *epic fulness of words*. Hence we must reject (1) the usual interpretation by the older writers (before Grotius), with whom even Kaeuffer sides: “*He* (or even *that*, namely τὸ φῶς) *was the true Light which lighteth all men who come into this world*” (Luther), against which we have already remarked under (1) and (2) above; again, (2) the construction which connects ἐρχόμ. with φῶς as an accompanying definition (so probably Theod. Mopsu.; some in Augustine, *de pecc. mer. et rem.* i. 25; Castalio,

¹ So of late Paulus also, and Klee, Kaeuffer in the *Sächs. Stud.* 1844, p. 116, Hoelemann, and Godet.

Vatablus, Grotius; Schott, *Opusc.* I. p. 14; Maier): "He was the true Light, *which was at that time to come into the world*;"¹ also, (3) the connecting of ἦν with ἐρχόμενον, so as to interpret it either in a purely historical sense (Bleek, Köstlin, B. Crusius, Lange, Hengstenberg: "*He came*," with reference to Mal. iii. 1; and so already Bengel); or relatively, as De Wette, Lücke: "when John had appeared to bear witness of Him, *even then came the true Light into the world*," comp. Hauff in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1846, p. 575; or as future, of Him who was soon to appear: *venturum erat* (Rinck, Tholuck), according to Luthardt (comp. Baeuml.): "it had been *determined* of God that He should come;" or more exactly, of an unfulfilled state of things, still present at that present time: "*It was coming*" (Hilgenfeld, *Lehrbegr.* p. 51²); and according to Ewald, who attaches it to vv. 4, 5: "*It was at that time always coming into the world*, so that every human being, if he had so wished, might have let himself be guided by Him;" comp. Keim: "He was *continually coming* into the world." As to details, we have further to remark: ἦν] *aderat*, as in vii. 39 and often; its more minute definition follows in ver. 10: ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἦν. The Light *was* already *there* (in Jesus) when John bore witness of Him, ver. 26. The reference of vv. 9-13 to the working of the Logos before His incarnation (Tholuck, Olshausen, Baur, also Lange, *Leben J.* III. p. 1806 ff.) entirely breaks down before vv. 11-13, as well as before the comparison of the Baptist with the Logos, which presupposes the personal manifestation of the latter (comp. also ver. 15); and therefore Baur erroneously denies that there is any distinction made in the Prologue between the working of the Logos *before* Christ and *in* Christ. Comp. Bleek in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1833,

¹ The interpretation of Schoettgen, Semler, Morus, Rosenmüller, as if instead of ἐρχόμεν. we had ἦλθεν, is quite erroneous. Luther's explanation down to 1527 was better: "through His advent into this world."

² That is, during the time before His baptism; the man Jesus (according to the Valentinian Gnosis) did not become the organ of the Logos until His baptism, and accordingly through that rite the Logos first came into the world. The birth of Jesus was only introductory to that coming. Brückner, while rejecting this importation of Gnosticism, agrees in other respects with Hilgenfeld. — Philippi (*der Eingang d. Joh. Ev.* p. 89): "He was to come, according to the promises of the O. T.;" and ver. 10: "These promises had now received their fulfilment."

p. 414 ff. — τὸ ἀληθινόν] Because it was neither John nor any other, but the *true, genuine*, archetypal Light, which corresponds to the idea—the *idea* of the light realized.¹ Comp. iv. 23, 37, vi. 32, vii. 28, xv. 1. See, generally, Schott, *Opusc.* I. p. 7 ff.; Frommann, *Lehrbegr.* p. 130 ff.; Kluge in the *Jahrb. f. D. Th.* 1866, p. 333 ff.; also Hoelemann, *l.c.*, p. 63, who, however, supposes an antithesis, which is without any support from the connection, to the *cosmic* light (Gen. i.). — ὁ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρ.] a characteristic of the true light; it illumines *every one*. This remains true, even though, as a matter of fact, the illumination is not received by many (see on Rom. ii. 4), so that every one does not really *become* what he *could* become, a child of light, φῶς ἐν κυρίῳ, Eph. v. 8. The relation, as a *matter of experience*, resolves itself into this: “quisquis illuminatur, ab hac luce illuminatur,” Bengel; comp. Luthardt. It is not this, however, that is expressed, but the *essential* relation as it exists on the part of the Logos.² Bengel well says: “numerus *singularis* magnam hic vim habet.” Comp. Col. i. 15; Rom. iii. 4. — ἐρχόμενον εἰς τ. κόσμον] every man *coming into the world*; rightly without the article; comp. 2 John 7. The addition of the predicative clause gives emphatic prominence to the conception of πάντα. There is no need to compare it with the Rabbinic עוֹלָם כְּסוּפָה (see Lightfoot and Schoettgen). Comp. xvi. 21, and see on xviii. 37.

Ver. 10. What here follows is linked on to the preceding by ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἦν, following upon εἰς τ. κόσμ. This is a fuller definition of the emphatic ἦν of ver. 9: “*It was in the world*,” viz. in the person of Jesus, when John was bearing witness. There is no mention here of its *continual* presence in humanity (B. Crusius, Lange), nor of the “*lumière innée*” (Godet) of every man; see on ver. 5. The *repetition* of κόσμος three times, where, on the last occasion, the word has the

¹ In the classics, see Plato, *Pol.* i. p. 347 D (τῶ ὄντι ἀληθινός), vi. p. 499 C; Xen. *Anab.* i. 9. 17; *Oec.* x. 3; Dem. 113. 27, 1248. 22; Theocrit. 16 (*Anthol.*); Pindar, *Ol.* ii. 201; Polyb. i. 6. 6, *et al.* Rück., *Abendm.* p. 266, erroneously says, “the word *seldom* occurs in the classics.” It is especially common in Plato, and among later writers in Polybius.

² Luther: “Of what avail is it that the clear sun shines and lightens, if I shut my eyes and will not see his light, or creep away from it beneath the earth?” Comp. also Delitzsch, *Psychol.* p. 348 [E. T. p. 410].

narrower sense of the world of *mankind*, gives prominence to the mournful antithesis; Buttm. *neut. Gr.* p. 341 [E. T. p. 398]. — ἦν] not pluperfect ("It had been already always in the world, but was not recognised by it"), as Herder, Tholuck, Olshausen, and Klee maintain, but like ἦν in ver. 9. — καὶ ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένε. Further preparation, by way of climax, for the antithesis with reference to ver. 3. If the Light was *in the world*, and the world was *made* by it, the latter could and ought all the more to have recognised the former: it *could*, because it needed only not to close the inner eye against the Light, and to follow the impulse of its original necessary moral affinity with the creative Light; it *ought*, because the Light, shining within the world, and having even given existence to the world, could demand that recognition, the non-bestowal of which was ingratitude, originating in culpable delusion and moral obduracy. Comp. Rom. i. 19 ff. We need not attach to the καί, which is simply conjunctive, either the signification *although* (Kuinoel, Schott), nor the force of the relative (*which* was made by it, Bleek). — αὐτόν] *the Logos*, which is identified with the Light, which is being spoken of as its possessor, according to vv. 4 ff.; αὐτοῦ was still *neuter*, but the antithesis passes over into the *masculine*, because the object which was not recognised was this very *personal manifestation* of the Logos.—With regard to the last καί, observe: "cum vi pronuntiandum est, ut saepe in sententiis oppositionem continentibus, ubi frustra fuere qui καίτοι requirerent," Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Apol.* p. 29 B. Comp. Hartung, *Partikell.* p. 147. Very often in John.

Ver. 11. More particular statement of the contrast. Observe the gradual ascent to still greater definiteness: ἦν, ver. 9; ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἦν, ver. 10; εἰς τὰ ἴδια ἦλθε, ver. 11.—εἰς τὰ ἴδια] *to His own possession*, is, with Erasmus, Luther, Beza, Calvin, Bengel, Lampe, and many expositors, also Lücke, Tholuck, Bleek, Olshausen, De Wette, B. Crusius, Maier, Frommann, Köstlin, Hilgenfeld, Luthardt, Ewald, Hengstenberg, Godet, and most interpreters, to be explained of the *Jewish people* as specially belonging to the *Messiah* (Ecclus. xxiv. 7 ff.), as they are called in Ex. xix. 5, Deut. vii. 6, Ps. cxxxv. 4, Isa. xxxi. 9, *Jehovah's* possession; from Israel salvation was to spread

over all the world (iv. 22; Matt. viii. 12; Rom. i. 16). This interpretation is required by the *onward progress* of the discourse, which by the use of ἦλθε excludes any reference to the *world* (Corn. a Lapide, Kuinoel, Schott, Reuss, Keim), as was proposed along with this by Chrysostom, Ammonius, Theophylact, Euth. Zig., and conjoined with it by Augustine and many others. "He *was* in the *world*;" and now follows His *historical advent*, "He *came* to His *own possession*." Therefore the sympathy of God's people, who were *His own* people, should have led them to reach out the hand to Him.—οἱ Ἰδίου] the *Jews*. παρέλαβον] they *received Him not*, i.e. not as Him to whom they peculiarly belonged. Comp. Matt. i. 20, xxiv. 40, 41; Herod. i. 154, vii. 106; Plato, *Soph.* p. 218 B. Observe that the special guilt of Israel appears still greater (οὐ παρέλαβον, they despised Him) than the general guilt of mankind (οὐκ ἔγνω). Comp. the οὐκ ἠθέλησατε of Matt. xxiii. 37; Rom. x. 21. In the negative form of expression (vv. 10, 11) we trace a deeply elegiac and mournful strain.

Ver. 12. The mass of the Jews rejected Him, but still *not all* of them. Hence, in this fuller description of the relation of the manifested Logos to the world, the refreshing light is now (it is otherwise in ver. 5) joyfully recognised and placed over against the shadow.—ἔλαβον] He *came*, they *received Him*, did not reject Him. Comp. v. 43; Soph. *Phil.* 667, ἰδὼν τε καὶ λαβὼν φίλον.—The nominative ὅσοι is emphatic, and continues independent of the construction that follows. See on Matt. vii. 24, x. 14, xiii. 12, xxiii. 16; Acts vii. 40.—ἐξουσίαν] neither *dignity*, nor *advantage* (Erasmus, Beza, Flacius, Rosenmüller, Semler, Kuinoel, Schott), nor even *possibility* (De Wette, Tholuck), nor *capability* (Hengstenberg, Brückner), fully comes up to the force of the word,¹ but *He gave them full power* (comp. v. 27, xvii. 2). The rejection of the Logos when He came in person, excluded from the attainment of that sacred condition of fitness—received through Him—for entering into the relationship of children of God, they only who received Him in faith obtained through Him this *warrant*, this *title* (ἐπιτροπή νόμου, Plato, *Defin.* p. 415 B).

¹ Comp. Godet: "il les a mis en position."

It is, however, an arrangement *in the gracious decree of God*; neither a claim of right on man's part, nor any *internal* ability (Lücke, who compares 1 John v. 20; also Lange),—a meaning which is not in the word itself, nor even in the connection, since the commencement of that filial relationship, which is the consummation of that highest theocratic *ἐξουσία*, is conceived as a *being born*, ver. 13, and therefore as passive (against B. Crusius). — *τέκνα θεοῦ*] Christ alone *is* the Son of God, manifested as such *from His birth*, the *μονογενής*. Believers, from their knowledge of God in Christ (xvii. 3), *become* children of God, by being *born of God* (comp. iii. 3; 1 John iii. 9), *i.e.* through the moral transformation and renewal of their entire spiritual nature by the Holy Ghost; so that now the divine element of life rules in them, excludes all that is ungodly, and permanently determines the development of this moral fellowship of nature with God, onwards to its future glorious consummation (1 John iii. 2; John xvii. 24). See also 1 John iii. 9 and 1 Pet. i. 23. It is thus that *John* represents the idea of filial relationship to God, for which he *always* uses *τέκνα* from the point of view of a *spiritual genesis*; ¹ while *Paul* apprehends it from the *legal* side (as adoption, Rom. viii. 15; Gal. iv. 5), regarding the spiritual renewal connected therewith (regeneration), the *καινότης ζωῆς* (Rom. vi. 4), as a new creation (2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. vi. 15), a moral resurrection (Rom. vi.), and the like; while the *Synoptics* (comp. also Rom. viii. 23) make the *νόθεσία* appear as first commencing with the kingdom of the Messiah (see on Matt. v. 9, 45; Luke vi. 35), as conditioned, however, by the moral character. There is no

¹ Hilgenfeld, indeed, will have it that those spoken of are already regarded as *originally τέκνα θεοῦ* (comp. iii. 6, viii. 44, xi. 52), and attempts to escape the dilemma into which *γινίσθαι* brings him, by help of the interpretation: "the power by which the man who is born of God realizes this, and actually becomes what he is *in himself* according to his nature!" Thus we should have here the Gnostic *semen arcanum electorum et spiritualium*. See Hilgenfeld, *Evangelien*, p. 233. The reproach of tautology which he also brings against the ordinary explanation (in his *Zeitschr.* 1863, p. 110) is quite futile. The great conception of the *τέκνα θεοῦ*, which appears here for the first time, was in John's eye important enough to be accompanied by a more detailed elucidation. Generally, against the anthropological dualism discovered in John by Hilgenfeld (also by Scholten), see Weiss, *Lehrbegr.* p. 128 ff.; also Weizsäcker in the *Jahrb. f. D. Th.* 1862, p. 680 f.; and even Baur, *neutest. Theol.* p. 359 ff.

difference as to the thing itself, only in the manner of apprehending its various sides and stages. — τοῖς πιστεύουσιν, κ.τ.λ.] *quippe qui credunt*, is conceived as *assigning the reason*; for it is as believers that they have fulfilled the subjective condition of arriving at sonship, not only negatively, since they are no longer under the wrath of God and the condemnation of the law (iii. 36, 16, 17, v. 45), but also positively, inasmuch as they now possess a capacity and susceptibility for the operation of the Spirit (vii. 38, 39). John does not say πιστεύσασιν, but πιστεύουσιν, for the faith, the *entrance* of which brought about the ἔλαβον, is thenceforth their *enduring habitus*. — εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ] not essentially different from εἰς αὐτόν, but characterizing it more fully; for the entire *subject-matter* of faith lies in the *name* of the person on whom we believe; the *uttered* name contains the whole *confession* of faith. Comp. ii. 23, iii. 18, 1 John iii. 23, v. 13. The name itself, moreover, is no other than that of the historically manifested Logos—*Jesus Christ*, as is self-evident to the consciousness of the reader. Comp. ver. 17; 1 John v. 1, ii. 22.

Ver. 13. Οἱ] refers to τέκνα θεοῦ (the *masculine* in the well-known *constructio κατά σύνεσιν*, 2 John 1, Philem. 10 Gal. iv. 19; comp. Eurip. *Suppl.* 12, *Androm.* 571), not to τοῖς πιστεύουσιν, because the latter, according to ver. 12, are said to *become* God's children, so that ἐγεννήθησαν would not be appropriate. The conception "*children of God*" is more precisely defined as denoting those who came into existence not after the manner of natural human generation, but who were begotten of God. The negative statement exhibits them as those in whose coming into existence human generation (and consequently also Abrahamic descent) has no part whatever. *This latter* brings about no *divine* sonship, iii. 6. — οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων] *not of blood*, the blood being regarded as the seat and basis of the physical life (comp. on Acts xv. 20), which is transmitted by generation.¹ Comp. Acts xvii. 26; Hom. *Il.* vi. 211, xx. 241; Soph. *Aj.* 1284, *El.* 1114; Plato, *Soph.* p. 268 D; Liv. xxxviii. 28. Kypke and Loesner on the passage, *Interpp. ad Virg. Aen.* vi. 836; Horace, *Od.* ii. 20. 6; Tib. i.

¹ ὡς τοῦ σπέρματος ὕλην τοῦ αἵματος ἔχοντος, Eustath. *ad Hom. Il.* vi. 211. Comp. Delitzsch, *Psychol.* p. 246 [E. T. p. 290, and note].

6. 66. The plural is not to be explained of the commingling of the *two sexes* ("ex sanguinibus enim homines nascuntur maris et feminae," Augustine; comp. Ewald), because what follows (*ἀνδρός* and the corresponding *ἐκ θεοῦ*) points simply to generation on the *man's* side; nor even of the *multiplicity of the children of God* (B. Crusius), to which there is no reference in what follows; quite as little does it refer to the *continuous propagationum ordines* from Adam, and afterwards from Abraham downwards (Hoelemann, p. 70), which must necessarily have been more distinctly indicated. Rather is the plural used in a sense not really different from the singular, and founded only on this, that the material blood is represented as the sum-total of all its parts (Kühner, II. p. 28). Comp. Eur. *Ion.* 705, ἄλλων τραπεῖς ἀφ' αἱμάτων; Soph. *Ant.* 121, and many places in the Tragedians where αἵματα is used in the sense of *murder* (Aesch. *Eum.* 163, 248; Eur. *El.* 137; *Or.* 1547, *al.*); Monk, ad Eur. *Alc.* 512; Blomf. *Gloss. Choeph.* 60. Comp. Eccus. xxii. 22, xxxi. 21; 2 Macc. xiv. 18; also Plato, *Legg.* x. p. 887 D, ἔτι ἐν γάλαξιν τρεφόμενοι.—The negation of human origination is so important to John (comp. iii. 6), that he adds *two further parallel definitions* of it by οὐδέ—οὐδέ (which he arranges co-ordinately); *nor even—nor even*, where *σαρκός* designates the flesh as the substratum of the *generative impulse*, not "*the woman*" (Augustine, Theophylact, Rupertus, Zeger, Schott, Olshausen),—an interpretation which is most inappropriately supported by a reference to Gen. ii. 22, Eph. v. 28, 29, Jude 7, while it is excluded by the context (*ἀνδρός*, and indeed by what follows). The *man's* generative will is meant, and this is more exactly, *i.e.* personally, defined by *ἐκ θελ. ἀνδρός*, to which the contrasted *ἐκ θεοῦ* is correlative; and hence *ἀνὴρ* must not be generalized and taken as equivalent to *ἄνθρωπος* (Lücke), which never occurs—even in the Homeric *πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε* only *apparently*—but here least of all, because the act of *generation* is the very thing spoken of. The following are merely arbitrary glosses upon the points which are here only rhetorically accumulated to produce an ever increasing distinctness of description; *e.g.* Baumgarten Crusius: "There is an advance here from the most sensual to the most noble" (nature, inclination, will—in spite of the

twice repeated *θελήματος* !); Lange (*L. J.* III. p. 558): "There is an onward progress from natural generation to that which is caused by the will, and then to that consummated in theocratic faith;" Hoelemann: "*σάρξ*, meant of both sexes, stands midway between the *universalis humani generis propagatio* (*αἵματα*) and the *proprius singularis propagationis auctor* (*ἀνὴρ*)." Even Delitzsch refines upon the words, finding in *θελήμ. σαρκός* the *unholy* side of generation, though John has only in view the antithesis between the *human* and the *divine* viewed in and by themselves.—*ἐκ θεοῦ ἐγεννήθ.*] *were begotten of God*, containing the *real* relation of sonship to God, and *thus explaining* the former *τέκνα θεοῦ*, in so far as these were begotten by no human being, but by God, who through the Holy Spirit has restored their moral being and life, iii. 5. Hence *ἐκ θεοῦ ἐγενν.* is not tautological. *Ἐκ* indicates the issuing forth from God as cause, where the relation of immediateness (in the first and last points) and of mediateness (in the second and third) lies in the very *thing*, and is self-evident without being distinctively indicated in the simple representation of John.

Ver. 14. *Καὶ*] *and*; not *assigning a reason* for the sonship just mentioned (Chrys., Theophyl., Jansen, Grotius, Lampe, and several others); nor even = *οὖν* (Bleek), nor in the sense of *namely* (Frommann), nor *yea* (Godet), but simply *carrying forward the discourse*, like every *καὶ* in the Prologue; and not therefore pointing back to ver. 4 (Maldonatus) or to ver. 9 (De Wette), nor joining on to ver. 11 (Lücke: "The Logos came not only to His own possession, but appeared *visibly*;" so, substantially, also Baur and Hilgenfeld), which would be a merely *apparent* advance in the exposition, because the visible manifestation is already intimated by *φαίνει* in ver. 5 and in vv. 9–13. No; after having in vv. 4–13 spoken of the Logos as the light, of the melancholy opposition of the darkness of unbelief to that true light which had been attested by the Baptist as divine, and of the exceedingly blessed effects which He exercised on believers through the bestowal of the gift of sonship, the evangelist, on arriving at this last point, which expresses his own deepest and most blessed experience, can no longer hesitate formally and solemnly again to proclaim *the*

great event by which the visible manifestation of the Logos—previously so frequently presupposed and referred to—had, with all its saving power, been brought about; and thus by an outpouring of speech, which, prompted by the holiest recollections, soars involuntarily upwards until it reaches the highest height, to set forth and celebrate the *How* of that manifestation of the Logos which was attended with such blessed results (vv. 12, 13), and which he had himself experienced. The *transition*, therefore, is from what is said in vv. 12, 13 of the efficacy of the manifested Logos, to the *nature and manner of that manifestation itself*, i.e. consequently to the *incarnation*, as a result of which He, as Jesus Christ, exhibited the glory of the Only-begotten, and imparted the fulness of grace and truth,—that *incarnation* which historically determined what is recorded of Him in vv. 12, 13. Accordingly καὶ is not definitive, “under such circumstances, with such consequences” (Brückner, who inappropriately compares Heb. iii. 19, where καὶ connects the answer with the question as in continuous narration), but it carries the discourse onwards, leading up to the highest summit, which even from ver. 5 showed itself as in the distance. We must interpret it: *and*—to advance now to the most momentous fact in the work of redemption, namely, *how* He who had come and wrought so much blessing was manifested and was able to accomplish such a work—the *Word was made flesh*, etc. — ὁ λόγος] John does not simply say καὶ σὰρξ ἐγένετο, but he names the great subject as he had done in ver. 1, to complete the solemnity of the weighty statement, which he now felt himself constrained still to subjoin and to carry onwards, as if in joyful triumph, to the close of the Prologue. — σὰρξ ἐγένετο] The word σὰρξ is carefully chosen, not indeed in any sort of opposition to the divine idea of humanity, which in this place is very remote,¹ but as opposed to the purely divine, and hence also to the purely immaterial nature² of the

¹ Against Beyschlag in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1860, p. 459.

² Hence also σὰρξ is selected for the purpose of expressing the full antithesis, and not σῶμα, because there might be a σῶμα without σὰρξ (1 Cor. xv. 40, 44); and besides, the expression ὁ λόγος σῶμα ἰγίνετο would not necessarily include the possession of a human soul. John might also have written ἄνθρωπος ἰγί-

Logos (Clem. *ad Cor.* II. 9, ὃν μὲν τὸ πρῶτον πνεῦμα ἐγένετο σὰρξ; comp. Hahn, *Theol. d. N. T.* I. 197), whose transition, however, into this other form of existence necessarily presupposes that He is conceived of as a *personality*, not as a *principle* (Beyschlag, *Christol.* p. 169); as is, besides, required by the whole Prologue. The actual incarnation of a principle would be for John an unrealizable notion. Just as decidedly is ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο opposed to the representation that the Logos always became *more and more completely σὰρξ* (Beyschlag) during the whole *unfolding* of His *earthly life*. The ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο is a definite *act* in the consummation of His history. He became *flesh*, *i.e.* a corporeal material being, visible and tangible (1 John i. 2), which He was not before,¹ and by which it is self-evident that the human mode of existence in which He appeared, which we have in the person of *Jesus*, and which was known to the reader, is intended. Ἐν σαρκὶ ἐλήλυθεν (1 John iv. 2; 2 John 7; comp. 1 Tim. iii. 16) is, in fact, the same thing, though expressed from the point of view of that *modality* of His *coming* which is conditioned by the σὰρξ ἐγένετο. As, however, ἐγένετο points out that He *became* what He *was* not before, the incarnation cannot be a mere *accident* of His substantial being (against Baur), but is the assumption of another real existence, whereby out of the purely divine Logos-Person, whose specific nature at the same time remained unaltered, and in order to accomplish the work of redemption (chap. vi.; Rom. viii. 3; Heb. ii. 14, 15), a really corporeal personality, *i.e.* the God-man Jesus Christ (ver. 17), came into existence. Comp. on the point, 1 John iv. 2; Phil. ii. 7; 1 Tim. iii. 16; Heb. ii. 14, v. 7. Since σὰρξ necessarily carries with it the idea only of the ψυχή (see Schulz, *Abendm.* p. 94 ff.; Weiss, *Lehrbegr.* p. 256), it might seem as if John held the Apollinarian notion,

(v. 27, viii. 40), but σὰρξ presented the antithesis of both forms of existence most sharply and strikingly, and yet at the same time unquestionably designates the human personality (xvii. 2). According to Baur, indeed, it is said to be *impossible* to understand by the incarnation any proper assumption of humanity.

¹ Comp. the well-known "*Sum quod eram, nec eram quod sum, nunc dicor utrumque.*" In Jesus Christ we have the absolute synthesis of the divine and the human.

that in Christ there was no human νοῦς, but that the λόγος took its place.¹ But it is not really so (see, on the other side, Mau, *Progr. de Christolog. N. T.*, Kiel 1843, p. 13 ff.), because the human ψυχή does not exist by itself, but in necessary connection with the πνεῦμα (Beck, *bibl. Seelenl.* § 13; Hahn, *Theol. d. N. T.* I. § 154), and because the N. T. (comp. viii. 40) knows Jesus only as *perfect man*.² In fact, John in particular expressly speaks of the ψυχή (xii. 27) and πνεῦμα of Christ (xi. 33, xiii. 21, xix. 30), which he does not identify with the Logos, but designates as the substratum of the human self-consciousness (xi. 38).³ The *transcendental* character, however, of this self-consciousness, as necessarily given in the incarnation of the Logos, Weizsäcker has not succeeded, as is plain from his interpretation of the passages referred to, in explaining away by anything Jesus Himself says in this Gospel. The conception of *weakness and susceptibility of suffering* (see on Acts ii. 17), which Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, Olshausen, Tholuck, Hengstenberg, Philippi, and others

¹ Of late, Zeller in particular (in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1842, I. 74) has limited the Johannine doctrine of the human element in the person of Jesus simply to His *corporeity*, excluding any special human *anima rationalis*. Comp. also Köstlin, p. 148 ff., and Baur, *neutest. Theol.* p. 362. That σάρξ was the merely *formal non-personal clothing* of the Logos-subject (Pfleiderer, in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr.* 1866, p. 260), does not correspond with the conception of ἄνθρωπος, under which Christ represents Himself (viii. 40). This is also in answer to Scholten, who in like manner comes to the conclusion that, in John's view, Jesus was man as to His body only, but the Logos as to His spirit.

² So John in particular. See Hilgenfeld, *Lehrbegr.* p. 234 ff., who, however, explains the σὰρξ ἐγένετο from the Valentinian system, and attributes to the evangelist the notion of a corporeity, real indeed, but not fettered by the limitation of a material body, appealing to vi. 16 ff., vii. 10, 15, viii. 59, ii. 19 ff. Baur's view is similar, though he does not go so far. Baur, p. 367.

³ Rightly has the church held firmly to the *perfection* (perfectio) of the divine and human natures in Christ in the Athanasian sense. No change and no defect of nature on the one side or the other can be justified on exegetical grounds, and especially no such doctrine as that of Gess, that by the incarnation the Logos became a human soul or a human spirit (comp. also Hahn, *Theol. d. N. T.* I. 198 f.). This modification, which some apply to the κίνησις, is unscriptural, and is particularly opposed to John's testimony throughout his Gospel and First Epistle. How little does Gess succeed in reconciling his view with John v. 26, for example,—a passage which is always an obstacle in his way! Further, according to Wörner, *Verhältn. d. Geistes zum Sohne Gott.* p. 27, the Logos became a *soul*. Against Hahn, see Dorner in the *Jahrb. f. D. Theol.* 1856, p. 393 ff.

find in *σάρξ*, is quite remote from this verse (comp. 1 John iv. 2), where the point in question is simply the change in the divine mode of existence, while the *σάρξ* is that which bears the *δόξα*; and so also is any anti-Docetic reference, such as Frommann and others, and even De Wette and Lechler, imagine. — The *supernatural generation* of Jesus is neither presupposed nor included (as even Godet maintains), nor excluded,¹ in John's representation *ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο*, for the expression contains nothing as to the *manner* of the incarnation; it is an *addition* to the primitive apostolical Christology, of which we have no certain trace either in the oldest Gospel (Mark), or in the only one which is fully apostolic (John), or even anywhere in Paul: see on Matt. i. 18; comp. John v. 27, Rom. i. 3, 4. — *καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν*] *and tabernacled, i.e. took up His abode, among us*: *ἐσκήνωσεν* here is *chosen* merely to draw our attention to the manifestation of the incarnate Logos, whose holy *σκήνωμα* (2 Pet. i. 13) was in fact His human substance,² as the fulfilment of the promise of God's dwelling with His people (Ex. xxv. 8, xix. 45; Lev. xxvi. 11; Joel iii. 21; Ezek. xxxvii. 27; Hagg. ii. 8: comp. Ecclus. xxiv. 8; Rev. xxi. 3), and therefore as the *Shekinah* which formerly revealed itself in the tabernacle and in the temple (see on Rom. ix. 4); an assumption which the context justifies by the words: *ἐθεασ. τ. δόξαν αὐτοῦ*. The Targums, in like manner, represent the Word (מִימְרָא) as the מִיכִנָּה, and the Messiah as the manifestation of this. — *ἐν ἡμῖν*] refers to the *ὅσοι ἔλαβον αὐτόν*, vv. 12, 13, to whom John belongs, not simply to the Twelve (Tholuck), nor to the Christian consciousness (Hilgenfeld), nor to mankind generally; comp. ver. 16. The *believers* whom Jesus found are the *fellowship* who, as the holy people, surrounded the incarnate Word, and by

¹ For assuredly the same Subject, which in His divine essence was *pre-existent* as the eternal Logos, may as a temporal human manifestation *come into existence* and begin to be, so that in and by itself the manner of this origination, natural or supernatural, makes no difference in the conceivableness of the fact (against Baur in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1854, p. 222).

² In this He tabernacled among us not merely as a divine principle (Bey-schlag), but as *πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος* (Col. ii. 9), *i.e.* exactly what He was as the personal Logos. Thus His *body* was the *temple* of God (ii. 19), the true special dwelling of God's gracious presence.

whom His glory was beheld (comp. 1 John i. 1). — *καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα, κ.τ.λ.*] We must not (as most expositors, even Lücke, Frommann, Maier, De Wette) take this clause as far as *πατρός* to be a lively *insertion*, interrupting the narrative; for the having beheld the *δόξα* is the essential element in the progress of the discourse. It is an *independent part in the connection*; so that *πλήρης χάρ. κ. ἀλ.*, which is usually joined grammatically with *ὁ λόγος*, is to be referred to *αὐτοῦ* in an irregular combination of cases, determined by the logical subject (B. Crusius, Brückner, Weiss, comp. Grotius), by which the nominative instead of the dependent case (Augustine *read πλήρους*) sets forth the statement more emphatically without any governing word. See especially Bernhardt, p. 68; Heind. *ad Plat. Theæt.* 89, *Soph.* 7; Winer, p. 524 [E. T. p. 705]. — *τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ*] *the Majesty* (כבוד) of the Logos, *i.e.* of necessity the *divine* glory (in the O. T. symbolically revealing itself as the brilliant light which surrounded the manifestation of Deity, Ex. xxiv. 17, xl. 34 ff.; Acts vii. 2), so far as the Logos from His nature (see what follows) essentially participated therein, and possessed it in His pre-human state and onwards.¹ It presented itself to the recognition of believers as a reality, in the entire manifestation, work, and history of Him who became man; so that they (not unbelievers) *beheld* it² (*intuebantur*), because its rays shone forth, so as to be recognised by them, through the veil of the manhood, and thus it revealed itself visibly to them (1 John i. 1; comp. chap. ii. 11). The idea of an *inner* contemplation is opposed to the context (against Baur). The *δόξα τοῦ λόγου*, which before the incarnation could be represented to the prophet's eye alone (xii. 41), but which otherwise was, in its essence, incapable of being beheld by man, became by means of the incarnation an object of external observation by those who were eye-witnesses (Luke i. 2; 1 John iv. 14) of His actual self-manifestation. We must, however, bear in mind that the manifestation of this divine glory of the Logos in His human state is conceived of *relatively*, though revealing

¹ Comp. Gess, *Person Chr.* p. 123.

² All limitations to individual points, as *e.g.* to the miracles, or even specially to the history of the transfiguration (Luke ix. 32; Wetstein, Tittmann), are arbitrary.

beyond doubt the divine nature of the Logos, and nothing else than that, yet as limited and conditioned on the one hand by the imperfection of human intuition and knowledge, and on the other by the state of humiliation (Phil. ii. 6 ff.) which was entered upon with the *σὰρξ ἐγένετο*. For the *δόξα* absolutely, which as such is also the adequate *μορφή θεοῦ*, was possessed by Him who became man—the Logos, who entered upon life in its human form—only in His *pre-existent* state (xvii. 5), and was resumed only after His exaltation (xii. 41, xvii. 5, xxii. 24); while during His earthly life His *δόξα* as the manifestation of the *ἴσα εἶναι θεῷ* was not the *simply divine*, but that of the *God-man*.¹ See on Phil. ii. 8, note, and chap. xvii. 5. No distinction is hereby made between God's *δόξα* and the *δόξα* of the God-man (as objected by Weiss); the difference is simply in the degrees of manifestation and appearance. Still Weiss is quite right in refusing, as against Köstlin and Reuss, to say that there is in John no idea whatever of humiliation (comp. xii. 32, 34, xvii. 5). — *δόξαν*] more animated without δέ. Comp. Hom. *Od. a*, 22 f.; Dem. *de. cor.* 143 (p. 275, Reisk.): πόλεμον εἰς τ. Ἀττικὴν εἰσάγεις . . . πόλεμον Ἀμφικτυονικόν. See Krüger, § 59, 1. 3, 4. — ὡς μονογενοῦς] *as of an only-begotten*, i.e. as belongs to such an one,² corresponds to the nature of one who is *μονογενὴς παρὰ πατρός*; Chrysostom: οἶαν ἔπρεπε καὶ εἰκὸς ἔχειν μονογενῇ καὶ γνήσιον υἱὸν ὄντα, κ.τ.λ. The idea of *reality* (Euthymius Zigabenus: ὄντως) lies as little in ὡς as in the erroneously so-called *veritatis* (against Olshausen, Klee, and earlier writers); there is rather the supposition of a comparison, which approaches the meaning of *quippe* (Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 1002); see Kühner, § 330. 5. — *μονογενής*] of Christ, and regarded, indeed, in His divine nature, is Johannean, expressing the apostle's own idea of Christ's unique

¹ Which indeed, even after His exaltation, is and ever continues to be that of the *God-man*, though without limitation and perfect.—According to Weiss (*Lehrbegr.* p. 261), the *δόξα* of the Logos cannot be that of the originally divine essence itself, but one vouchsafed to Christ for the purpose of His works. This, however, is contrary to the express meaning of the word here, where by the *τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ*, κ.τ.λ., we can only understand His proper glory brought with Him by the Logos into His incarnate life. As to xvii. 22, see on that passage.

² Therefore *μονογ.* is *without the article*. The expression is *qualitative*.

relationship as the Son of God, i. 18, iii. 16, 18, 1 John iv. 9, though it is put into the mouth of Christ Himself in iii. 16, 18. Comp. the Pauline *πρωτοτόκος*, Col. i. 15, Heb. i. 6, which as to the *thing* certainly corresponds with the Johannean *μονογενής*, but presents the idea in the relation of time to the creation, and in Rom. viii. 29 to Christendom. *Μονογ.* designates the Logos as the *only* Son (Luke vii. 12, viii. 42, ix. 38; Heb. xi. 17; Tob. viii. 17; Herod. vii. 221; Plato, *Legg.* III. p. 691 D; Aesch. *Ag.* 898; Hes. *ἔργ.* 378), besides whom the Father has none, who moreover did not become such by any moral generation, as in the case of the τέκνα θεοῦ, vv. 12, 13, nor by adoption, but by the metaphysical relation of existence arising out of the divine essence, whereby He was ἐν ἀρχῇ with God, being Himself divine in nature and person, vv. 1, 2. He did not first *become* this by His incarnation, but He *is* this before all time as the Logos, and He *manifests* Himself as the *μονογ.* by means of the incarnation, so that consequently the *μονογ. υἱὸς* is not *identical* (Beyschlag, p. 151 ff.) with the historical person Jesus Christ, but *presents* Himself in that person to believers; and therefore we are not to think of any interchange of the predicates of the Logos and the Son, "who may be also conceived of retrospectively" (Weizsäcker, 1862, p. 699). In other respects the designation corresponds to *human* relations, and is anthropomorphic, as is υἱὸς θεοῦ itself,—a circumstance which, however, necessarily limited its applicability as an expression of the metaphysical relation, in apprehending which we must also leave out of view the conception of *birth* as such, so far as it implies the idea of the maternal function. Origen well remarks: τὸ δὲ ὡς μονογ. παρὰ πατρ. νοεῖν ὑποβάλλει, ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς εἶναι τὸν υἱόν . . . εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἄλλα παρὰ πατρὸς ἔχει τὴν ὑπαρξιν, ματαιῶς ἢ τοῦ μονογενοῦς ἔκειτο φωνή.—πατρὸς] without the article (Winer, p. 116 [E. Tr. p. 151]). Παρὰ πατρ. must be joined to *μονογ.*, to which it adds the definite idea of *having gone forth*, i.e. of *having come* from the Father (vi. 46, vii. 29, xvi. 27). Correlative with this is ver. 18, ὁ ὢν εἰς τ. κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς, where the only-begotten Son who *came forth* from the Father is viewed as having again *returned* to the Father. The conception of *having been be-*

gotten, consequently of *derivation from the essence*, would be expressed by the simple genitive (πατρός) or by the dative, or by ἐκ or ἀπό, but lies in the word μονογενοῦς itself; since this expresses the very *generation*, and therefore the ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς εἶναι (Origen). Its connection with δόξαν (Erasmus, Grotius, Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* I. 120, Weiss; already Theophyl. ?) is in itself grammatically admissible (Plut. *Agis*, 2; Plato, *Phaedr.* p. 232 A; Acts xxvi. 12), but is not favoured here either by the position of the words or by the connection, from which the idea of the *origin* of the δόξα lay far remote, the object being to designate the *nature* of the δόξα; moreover, the anarthrous μονογ. requires a more precise definition, which is exactly what it has in παρὰ πατρός. — πλήρης χάρις κ. ἀληθ.] To be referred to the subject, though that (αὐτοῦ) stands in the genitive. See above. It explains *how* the Logos, having become incarnate, manifested Himself to those who beheld His glory. *Grace and truth*¹ are the two efficaciously saving and inseparable factors of His whole manifestation and ministry, not *constituting* His δόξα (Luthardt),—a notion opposed to ii. 11 and xvii.,—but displaying it and making it known to those who beheld that glory. Through God's *grace* to sinful man He became man; and by His whole work on earth up to the time of His return to His Father, He has been the instrument of obtaining for believers the blessing of becoming the children of God. *Truth*, again, was what He revealed in the whole of His work, especially by His preaching, the theme of which was furnished by His intuition of God (ver. 18), and which therefore must necessarily reveal in an adequate manner God's nature and counsel, and be the opposite of σκοτία and ψεῦδος. Comp. Matt. xi. 27. The ἀλήθεια corresponds formally to the nature of the Logos as light (φῶς); the χάρις, which bestows everlasting life (iii. 15), to His nature as life (ζωή), vv. 4, 5. That the χάρις κ. ἀλήθεια with which He was filled are *divine* grace and truth, of which He was the

¹ Where, according to Hilgenfeld, the author must have had in view the female Aeons of the two first Syzygies of the Valentinian system. John undoubtedly has the word χάρις only in the Prologue, but Matthew and Mark also do not use it; while Luke does not employ it in the sense of saving Christian grace, in which sense it first occurs in the Acts and in Paul.

possessor and bearer, so that in Him they attained their complete manifestation (comp. xiv. 6), is self-evident from what has preceded, but is not specially indicated, as would necessarily have been done by the use of the article, which would have expressed the grace and truth (simply) κατ' ἐξοχήν. Ver. 16 f. is decisive against the construction of πληρῆς with what follows (Erasmus, Paulus). Whether John, moreover, used the words πλήρ. χάριτος κ. ἀληθ. with any reference to Ex. xxxiv. 6 (Hengstenberg) is very doubtful, for Πῶς in that passage has a different meaning (truthfulness, fidelity). John is speaking independently, from his own full experience and authority as a witness. Through a profound living experience, he had come to feel, and here declares his conviction, that all salvation depends on the *incarnation* of the Logos.

Ver. 15. It is to this great fact of salvation to which the Baptist bears testimony, and his testimony was confirmed by the gracious experience of us all (ver. 16). — μαρτυρεῖ] Representation of it as present, as if the testimony were still sounding forth. — κέκραγε] “clamat Joh. cum fiducia et gaudio, uti magnum praeconem decet,” Bengel. He *crieth*, comp. vii. 28, 37, xii. 44; Rom. ix. 27. The *Perfect* in the usual classical sense as a present (βοῶν . . . καὶ κεκραγώς, Dem. 271, 11; Soph. *Aj.* 1136; Arist. *Plut.* 722, *Vesp.* 415). Not so elsewhere in the N. T. Observe, too, the *solemn circumstantial* manner in which the testimony is introduced: “*John bears witness of Him, and cries while he says.*” — οὗτος ἦν] ἦν is used, because John is conceived as speaking *at the present time*, and therefore as pointing back to a testimony *historically past*: “This was He whom I meant at the time when I said.” With εἰπεῖν τινα, “to speak of any one,” comp. x. 36; Xen. *Cyr.* vii. 3. 5; Plato, *Crat.* p. 432 C; Hom. *Il.* ζ. 479. See on viii. 27. — ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμεν. ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν] “*He who cometh after me is come before me;*”—in how far is stated in the clause ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν, which assigns the reason. The meaning of the sentence and the point of the expression depend upon this,—namely, that Christ in His human manifestation appeared *after* John, but yet, as the pre-mundane Logos, *preceded* him, because He existed before John. On γίνεσθαι with an adverb, especially of place, in the sense of

coming as in vi. 25, see Krüger on Xen. *Anab.* i. 2. 7; Kühner, II. p. 39; Nägelsbach, note on *Iliad*, ed. 3, p. 295. Comp. Xen. *Cyrop.* vii. 1. 22, ἐγένετο ὀπίσθεν τῶν ἄρμαμαξῶν; *Anab.* vii. 1. 10; i. 8. 24. Both are adverbs of place, so that, however, the time is represented as local, not the rank (ἐντιμότερός μου ἔστι, Chrysostom; so most critics, even Lücke, Tholuck, Olshausen, Maier, De Wette),¹ which would involve a diversity in the manner of construing the two particles (the first being taken as relating to time), and the sentence then becomes trivial, and loses its enigmatical character, since, indeed, the one who appears later need not possess on that account any lower dignity. Origen long ago rightly understood both clauses as relating to time, though the second is not therefore to be rendered "He was before me" (Luther and many, also Brückner, Baeumlein), since ἦν is not the word;² nor yet: "He came into being before me," which would not be referable "to the O. T. advent of Christ" (Lange), but, in harmony with the idea of μονογενής, to His having come forth from God prior to all time. It is decisive against both, that ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν would be tautological,—an argument which is not to be set aside by any fanciful rendering of πρῶτος (see below). Nonnus well remarks: πρῶτος ἐμεῖο βέβηκεν, ὀπίσ-τερος ὅστις ἰκάνει. Comp. Godet and Hengstenberg; also in his *Christol.* III. 1, p. 675, "my successor is my predecessor," where, however, his assumption of a reference to Mal. iii. 1 is without any hint to that effect in the words. According to Luthardt (comp Hofmann, *Weissag. u. Erf.* II. 256), what is meant to be said is: "He who at first walked behind me, as if he were my disciple, has taken precedence of me, i.e. He has become my master." But the enigma of the sentence lies just in this, that ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμ. expresses something still future, as this also answers to the formal ἐρχεσθαι used of the Messiah's advent. Hofmann's view, therefore, is more correct, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 10 ff.,—namely, that the meaning of the

¹ This rendering is not ungrammatical (in opposition to Hengstenberg), if it only be maintained that, even while adopting it, the local meaning of ὑμπροσθεν is not changed. (Comp. Gen. xlviii. 20; Baruch ii. 5.)

² So, too, in Matt. xix. 8 and John ια' 27, γίνεσθαι does not mean *esse*, but *feri* (against Baeumlein); so also in passages such as Luke i. 5, 2 Pet. ii. 1.

Baptist is, "while Jesus is coming after him, He is already before him." But even thus *ἐμπρ. μου γέγ.* amounts to a figurative designation of *rank*, which is not appropriate to the clause *ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν*, which assigns the reason, and manifestly refers to time. — *ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν*] is a direct portion of the Baptist's testimony which has just been adduced (against Hengstenberg), as ver. 30 shows, presenting the key to the preceding Oxymoron: *for before me He was in existence*. The reference to *rank* (Chrysostom, Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, Grotius, and most comm., also B. Crusius and Hofmann), according to which we should construe, "*He was more than I*," is at once overthrown by *ἦν*, instead of which we ought to have *ἐστίν*. Comp. Matt. iii. 11. Only a rendering which refers to *time* (i.e. only the pre-existence of the Logos) solves the apparent opposition between subject and predicate in the preceding declaration. — *πρῶτος* in the sense of *πρότερος*, answering to the representation, "*first in comparison with me*."¹ See Herm. *ad Viger.* p. 718; Dorvill. *ad Charit.* p. 478; Bernhardt, *Eratosth.* 42, p. 122. We must not, with Winer and Baur, force in the idea of *absolute* priority.² Comp. xv. 18; and Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 74 [E. T. p. 84]. This also against Ewald ("far earlier"), Hengstenberg, Brückner, Godet ("the principle of my existence"). To refuse to the Baptist all *idea of the pre-existence of the Messiah*, and to represent his statement merely as one put into his mouth by the evangelist (Strauss, Weisse, B. Bauer, De Wette, Scholten, and many others), is the more baseless, the more pointed and peculiar is the testimony; the greater the weight the evangelist attaches to it, the less it can be questioned that deep-seeing men were able, by means of such O. T. passages as Mal. iii. 1, Isa. vi. 1 ff., Dan. vii. 13 ff., to attain to that idea, which has even Rabbinical testimony in its support (Bertholdt, *Christol.* p. 131), and the more resolutely the pioneer of the Messiah, under the influence of divine revelation, took his stand as the last of the prophets, the Elias who had come.

¹ Comp. the genitive relation in *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*, Col. i. 15.

² Philippi, *d. Eingang d. Joh. Ev.* p. 179: "He is the *unconditioned first* (i.e. the eternal), in relation to me." The comparison of *Α* and *Ω* in the Revelation is inapplicable here, because we have not the absolute *ἰ πρῶτος*, but *πρῶτός μου*.

Ver. 16. Not the language of the Baptist (Heracleon, Origen, Rupertus, Erasmus, Luther, Melancthon, Lange), against which ἡμεῖς πάντες is decisive, but that of the *evangelist* continued. — ὅτι (see critical notes) introduces *the personal and superabounding gracious experience of believers*, with a retrospective reference indeed to the πλήρ. χάριτος κ. ἀληθ., ver. 14, and in the form of a confirmation of John's testimony in ver. 15: this testimony is justified by what was imparted to u all out of the fulness of Him who was borne witness to. — ἐκ τοῦ πληρώμ. αὐτοῦ] *out of that whereof He was full*, ver. 14; πλήρωμα in a *passive* sense; see on Col. i. 19. The phrase and idea were here so naturally furnished by the immediate context, that it is quite far-fetched to find their source in Gnosticism, especially in that of the Valentinians (Schwegler, Hilgenfeld). — ἡμεῖς] *we on our part*, giving prominence to the personal experience of the believers (which had remained unknown to unbelievers), vv. 10, 11. — πάντες] None went empty away. *Inexhaustibleness* of the πλήρωμα. — ἐλάβομεν] *absolute: we have received.* — καὶ] *and indeed.* See Winer, p. 407 [E. T. p. 546]; Hartung, *Partikell.* I. 145. — χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος] *grace for grace*, is not to be explained (with Chrysostom, Cyril, Severus, Nonnus, Theophylact, Erasmus, Beza, Aretius, Calovius, Jansen, Wolf, Lampe, and many others, even Paulus), *N. T. instead of O. T. grace* (Euthymius Zigabenus: τὴν καινὴν διαθήκην ἀντὶ τῆς παλαιᾶς), or instead of the *original* grace lost in Adam (see especially Calovius), since in ver. 17 ὁ νόμος and ἡ χάρις are opposed to each other, and since in the N. T. generally χάρις is the distinctive essence of *Christian* salvation (comp. especially Rom. vi. 14, 15); but, as Beza suggested, and with most modern expositors,¹ “*so that ever and anon fresh grace appears in place of that already received.*” “Proximam quamque gratiam satis quidem magnam gratia subsequens cumulo et plenitudine sua quasi obruit,” Bengel. So superabundant was the λαμβάνειν! This rendering is sufficiently justified linguistically by Theogn. *Sent.* 344,

¹ Among whom, however, Godet regards the phrase with ἀντὶ as a *play upon words*, referring to the O. T. law of retaliation, according to which “*chaque grâce était la récompense d'un mérite acquis.*” But such an allusion would be inappropriate, since χάρις in ἀντὶ χάριτος is not something human, but divine.

ἀντὶ ἀνιῶν ἀνίας; Philo, *de poster. Caini*, I. p. 254; Chrys. *de sac.* vi. 13,—as it is generally by the primary meaning of ἀντὶ (grace interchanging with grace); and it corresponds, agreeably to the context, with the idea of the πλήρωμα, from which it is derived, and is supported further by the increasingly blessed condition of those individually experiencing it (justification, peace with God, consolation, joy, illumination, love, hope, and so on: see on Rom. v. 1 ff.; Gal. v. 22; Eph. v. 9). John might have written χάριν ἐπὶ χάριτι or χάριν ἐπὶ χάριν (Phil. ii. 27), but his *conception* of it was different. Still, any special reference to the fulness of the *special* χαρίσματα, 1 Cor. xii.–xiv. (Ewald), lies remote from the context here (ver. 17); though at the same time they, as in general *no εὐλογία πνευματική* (Eph. i. 3), wherewith God in Christ has blessed believers, are not *excluded*.

Ver. 17. Antithetical confirmation of χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος; “for how high above what was formerly given by Moses, does that stand which came through Jesus Christ!” Comp. Rom. iv. 15, x. 4; Gal. iii. 10 ff., *al.* The former is the *law*, viewed by Paul as the *antithesis* of grace (Rom. vi. 14, vii. 3; Gal. iv. 4, and many other passages), in so far as it only lays us under obligation, condemns us, and in fact arouses and intensifies the need of grace, but does not bestow peace, which latter gift has been realized for us through Christ. The antithesis without μὲν—δέ has rhetorical force (iv. 22, vi. 63); Buttm. *N. T. Gk.* p. 344 [E. T. p. 364].—ἡ χάρις] in the *definite* and *formal* sense of redemption, *saving grace*, *i.e.* the grace of the *Father* in the *Son*. Hence also καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια is added with a *pragmatical* reference to ver. 14; this, like all Christ’s gifts of grace, was regarded as included in the universal χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος of ver. 16. Moreover, the ἀλήθεια was not given in the law, in so far as its substance, which was not indeed untrue, but an outflow of the divine will for salvation (Rom. vii. 10 sqq.; Acts vii. 38), was yet related only as type and preparation to the absolute revelation of truth in Christ; and hence through its very fulfilment (Matt. v. 17) it had come to be done away (Rom. x. 4; Col. ii. 14; Heb. x. 1 ff., vii. 18). Comp. Gal. iii. 24. *Grace* was still wanting to the law, and with it *truth* also in the *full* meaning of the word.

See also 2 Cor. iii. 13 ff. — ἐγένετο] The non-repetition of ἐδόθη is not to point out the *independent* work of the Logos (Clemens, *Paedag.* i. 7), to which διὰ would be opposed, or of God (Origen), whose work the law also was; but the change of thought, though not recognised by Lücke, lies in this, that each clause sets forth the historical phenomenon *as it actually occurred*. In the case of the law, this took place in the historical form of *being given*, whereas grace and truth *originated, came into being*, not absolutely, but in relation to mankind, for whom they had not before existed as a matter of experience, but which now, in the manifestation and work of Christ, unfolded their historical origin. Comp. 1 Cor. i. 30. — Observe how appropriately, in harmony with the creative skilful plan of the Prologue, after the incarnation of the Logos, and the revelation of His glory which was therewith connected, have been already set forth with glowing animation, there is now announced for the first time the great historical NAME, *Jesus Christ*, which designates the incarnate Logos as the complete concrete embodiment of His manifestation. Comp. 1 John i. 1–3. Only now is the Prologue so fully developed, that Jesus Christ, the historical person of the λόγος ἑνσαρκος (who therefore is all the less to be understood throughout, with Hofmann and Luthardt, under the title λόγος), comes before the eye of the reader, who now, however, knows how to gather up in this name the full glory of the God-man.

Ver. 18 furnishes an explanation of what had just been said, that ἡ ἀλήθεια διὰ 'Ι. Χ. ἐγένετο;¹ for that there was required direct knowledge of God, the result of experience, which His only-begotten Son alone possessed. — οὐδεὶς] no man, not even Moses. “Besides is no doctor, master, or preacher, than the only Teacher, Christ, who is in the Godhead inwardly,” Luther; comp. Matt. xi. 27. — ἑώρακε] *has seen, beheld* (comp. iii. 11), of the intuition of God's *essence* (Ex. xxxiii. 20), to the exclusion of visions, theophanies, and the like. Comp. 1 John iv. 12; also Rom. i. 20; Col. i. 15; 1 Tim. i. 17. Agreeably to the context, the reference is to

¹ Not including any explanation of ἡ χάρις also (Luthardt), because ἑώρακε and ἐπηγήσατο answer only to the conception of the *truth* in which the vision of God is interpreted.

the direct vision of God's essential glory, which no man could have (Ex. *l.c.*), but which Christ possessed in His pre-human condition as λόγος (comp. vi. 46), and possesses again ever since His exaltation. — ὁ ὦν εἰς τὸν κόλπ. τοῦ πατρός] As ἐξήγησ. refers to the state *on earth* of the Only-begotten, ὦν consequently, taken as an imperfect, cannot refer to the *pre-human* state (against Luthardt, Gess, pp. 123, 236, and others); yet it cannot coincide with ἐξήγη. in respect of time (Beyschlag), because the εἶναι εἰς τὸν κόλ. τ. π. was not true of Christ during His earthly life (comp. especially i. 52).¹ The right explanation therefore is, that John, when he wrote ὁ ὦν εἰς τ. κ. τ. π., expressed himself from *his own* present standing-point, and conceived of Christ as in His state of *exaltation*, as having returned to the bosom of the Father, and therefore into the state of the εἶναι πρὸς τὸν θεόν. So Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* I. 120, II. 23; Weiss, *Lehrbegr.* 239. Thus also must we explain the statement of direction towards, εἰς τὸν κόλπ., which would be otherwise without any explanation (Mark ii. 1, xiii. 16; Luke xi. 7); so that we recognise in εἰς as the prominent element the idea of *having arrived at* (Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 537; Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* XIII. p. 71; Buttm. *N. T. Gr.* p. 286 [E. T. p. 333]), not the notion of *leaning upon* (Godet, after Winer, Lücke, Tholuck, Maier, Gess, and most others), nor of *moving towards*, which is warranted neither by the simple ὦν (in favour of which such analogies as *in aurem dormire* are inappropriate) nor by εἰς, instead of which πρὸς (Hom. *Il.* vi. 467) or ἐπὶ with the accusative ought rather to be expected.² This forced interpretation of εἰς would never have been attempted, had not ὦν been construed as a *timeless*

¹ Hence we must not say, with Brückner, comp. Tholuck and Hengstenberg, that a relation of the *μονογενής* is portrayed which was neither interrupted nor modified by the incarnation. The communion of the Incarnate One with God remained, He in God, and God in Him, but not in the same manner metaphysically as before His incarnation and after His exaltation. He while on earth was still in *heaven* (iii. 13), yet not *de facto*, but *de jure*, because heaven was His home, His ancestral seat.

² Philippi's objections (*Glaubensl.* IV. 1, p. 409 f.) to my rendering are quite baseless. For an explanation of the ὦν εἰς τὸν κόλπ. which occurs to every unprejudiced expositor as coming directly from the words themselves cannot be "arbitrary." And it is not *contrary to the connection*, as both Godet and Beyschlag hold, because what the words, as usually interpreted, say, is already con-

Present, expressing an *inherent* relation, and in this sense applied (Lücke, Tholuck, De Wette, Lange, Brückner, Hengstenberg, Philippi, and most expositors) also to the earthly condition of the Son; comp. Beyschlag, pp. 100, 150. So far as the *thing* itself is concerned, the *εἶναι εἰς τὸν κόλπ.* does not differ from the *εἶναι πρὸς τὸν θεόν* of ver. 1; only it expresses the fullest fellowship with God, not before the incarnation, but after the exaltation, and at the same time exhibits the relation of *love* under a sensuous form (*κόλπον*); not derived, however, from the custom (xiii. 23) of reclining at table (thus usually, but not appropriately in respect of fellowship with *God*), but rather from the analogy of a father's embrace (Luke xvi. 22). In its *pragmatic* bearing, *ὁ ὦν* is the historical *seal* of the *ἐξηγήσατο*; but we must not explain it, with Hilgenfeld, from the Gnostic idea of the *πλήρωμα*. — *ἐκεῖνος*] strongly emphatic, and pointing heavenwards.¹ — *ἐξηγήσατο*] namely, the substance of His intuition of God; comp. viii. 38. The word is the usual one for denoting the *exposition*, interpretation of *divine* things, and intuitions. Plato, *Pol.* iv. p. 427 C; Schneid. *Theag.* p. 131; Xen. *Cyr.* viii. 3. 11; Soph. *El.* 417; comp. the *ἐξηγηταί* in Athens: Ruhnken, *ad Tim.* p. 109 ff.; Hermann, *gottesd. Alterth.* § 1, 12. It does not occur elsewhere in John, and hence a *special* reference in its *selection* here is all the more to be presumed, the more strikingly appropriate it is to the context (against Lücke, Maier, Godet). Comp. LXX. Lev. xiv. 57.

Note.—The Prologue, which we must not with Reuss restrict to vv. 1–5, is not “*A History of the Logos*,” describing Him

tained in the *ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός*, whereupon *ὁ ὦν*, π. τ. λ. sets forth the exaltation of the Only-begotten—just as in *ὁ μονογ. υἱός* were given the *ground* and *source* of the *ἐξηγήσατο*—as the infallible *confirmation* hereof. This also against Gess, p. 124. My interpretation is quite as compatible with *earnest dealing in regard to the deity of Christ* (Hengstenberg) as the usual one, while both are open to abuse. Besides, we have nothing at all to do here with the *earnestness* referred to, but simply with the *correctness* or *incorrectness* of the interpretation. Further, I have not through fear of spiritualism (as Beyschlag imagines) deviated from the usual meaning, which would quite agree with iii. 13.

¹ As with Homer (see Nitzsch, p. 37, note 1), so in the N. T. John pre-eminently requires not merely to be *read*, but to be *spoken*. His work is the epic among the Gospels.

down to ver. 13 as He was *before* His incarnation, and from ver. 14 ff. as *incarnate* (Olshausen). Against this it is decisive that vv. 6-13 already refer to the period of His *human* existence, and that, in particular, the sonship of believers, vv. 12, 13, cannot be understood in any other than a specifically *Christian* sense. For this reason, too, we must not adopt the division of Ewald: (1) The pre-mundane history of the Logos, vv. 1-3; (2) The history of His first purely spiritual working up to the time of His incarnation, vv. 4-13; (3) The history of His human manifestation and ministry, vv. 14-18. John is intent rather on securing, in grand and condensed outline, a profound *comprehensive view of the nature and work* of the Logos; which latter, the work, was in respect of the world *creative*, in respect of mankind *illuminative* (the *Light*). As this working of the Logos *was* historical, the *description* must necessarily also bear an historical character; not in such a way, however, that a formal history was to be given, first of the λόγος ἄσαρκος (which *could* not have been given), and then of the λόγος ἑνσαρκος (which forms the substance of the *Gospel itself*), but in such a way that the whole forms a *historical picture*, in which we see, in the world which came into existence by the creative power of the Logos, His *light* shining before, after, and by means of His incarnation. This at the same time tells against Hilgenfeld, p. 60 ff., according to whom, in the Prologue, "the Gnosis of the absolute religion, from its immediate foundation to its highest perfection, runs through the series of its historical interventions." According to Köstlin, p. 102 ff., there is a brief triple description of all Christianity from the beginning onwards to the present; and this, too, (1) from the standing-point of God and His relation to the world, vv. 1-8; then (2) from the relations of the Logos to mankind, vv. 9-13; and lastly, (3) in the individual, vv. 14-18, by which the end returns to the beginning, ver. 1. But a triple beginning (which Kaeuffer too assumes in the *Sächs. Stud.* 1844, p. 103 ff.) is neither formally hinted at nor really made: for, in ver. 9, ὁ λόγος is not the subject to ἦν, and this ἦν must, agreeably to the context, refer to the time of the Baptist, while Köstlin's construction and explanation of ἦν—ἔρχόμενον is quite untenable; and because in the last part, from ver. 14 onwards, the antithesis between receiving and not receiving, so essential in the first two parts, does not at all recur again. The simple explanation, in harmony with the text, is as follows: The Prologue consists of three parts,—namely, (1) John gives a description (*a*) of the primeval *existence* of the Logos, vv. 1, 2, and (*b*) of His *creative* work, ver. 3 (with the addition of the first part of ver.

4, which is the transition to what follows). Next, (2) he represents Him in whom was life as the *Light of mankind*, ver. 4 ff., and this indeed (a) as He once had been, when still without the antithesis of darkness, ver. 4, and (b) as He was in this antithesis, ver. 5. This shining in the darkness is continuous (hence *φαίνει*, ver. 5), and the tragic opposition occasioned thereby now unfolds itself before our eyes onwards to ver. 13, in the following manner: "Though *John* came forward and testified of the Light, not being himself the Light, but a witness of the Light (vv. 6-8),—though He, the true Light, was already *existing* (ver. 9),—though He was *in the world*, and the world was made by Him, still men acknowledged Him not; though He came to *His own*, His own received Him not (vv. 10, 11); whereas those who did receive Him obtained from Him power to become the spiritual sons of God (vv. 12, 13)." Lastly, (3) this blessedness of believers, due to the Logos who had historically come, now constrains the apostle to make still more prominent the *mode and fashion* in which *He was manifested in history* (His incarnation), and *had revealed His glory*, vv. 14-18. Thus the Prologue certainly does not (against Baur) *lift* the historical *out of* its own proper soil, and transfer it to the sphere of metaphysics, but rather unveils its metaphysical side, which was essentially contained in and connected with it, as existing prior to its manifestation, and in the light of this its metaphysical connection sums it up according to its *essence and antithesis*, its actual development and the proof of its historical truth being furnished by the subsequent detailed narrative in the Gospel. We may distinguish the three parts thus: (1) The *pre-mundane existence and creative work of the Logos*, vv. 1-4a; (2) *His work as the Light of men*, and the opposition to this, vv. 4-13; (3) The *revelation of His glory which took place through the incarnation*, vv. 14-18. Or, in the briefest way: the Logos (1) as the *creator*; (2) as the *source of light*; (3) as the *manifestation of the God-man*. This third part shows us the Incarnate One again, ver. 18, where as *ἄσαρκος* He was in the beginning—*ὁ ὢν εἰς τ. κόλπ. τοῦ πατρὸς*; and the cycle is complete.

Vv. 19, 20. The *historical narrative*, properly so called, now begins, and quite in the style of the primitive Gospels (comp. Mark i; Acts x. 36, 37, xiii. 23-25), with the testimony of the Baptist. — *καὶ*] and, now first of all to narrate the testimony already mentioned in ver. 15; for *this*, and not another borne before the baptism, is meant; see note foll. ver. 28. — *αὕτη*] "The following is the testimony of John,

which he bore when," etc.¹ Instead of *ὅτι*, the evangelist puts *ὅτε*, because the idea of time was with him the predominant one. Comp. Pflugk, *ad Hec.* 107; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 393. Had he written *ὅτι*, his thought would have been: "Herein did his testimony consist, that the Jews sent to him, and he confessed," etc. — *οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι*] means, even in such passages as this, where it is no merely indifferent designation of the people (as in ii. 6, 13, iii. 1, iv. 22, v. 1, xviii. 33 ff., and often), nothing else than *the Jews*; yet John, writing when he had long severed himself from Judaism, makes *the body of the Jews*, as the old religious community from which the Christian Church had already completely separated itself, thus constantly appear in a *hostile* sense in face of the Lord and His work, as the ancient theocratic people in corporate opposition to the new community of God (which had entered into their promised inheritance) and to its Head. How little may be deduced from this as ground of argument against the age and genuineness of the Gospel, see my *Introd.* § 3. For the rest, in individual passages, the *context* must always show *who*, considered more minutely as matter of history, the persons in question were by whom *οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι* are represented, as in this place, where it was plainly the *Sanhedrim*² who represented the people of the old religion. Comp. v. 15, ix. 22, xviii. 12, 31, etc. — *καὶ Λευῖται*] priests, consequently, with their *subordinates*, who had, however, a position as teachers, and aspired to priestly authority (see Ewald and Hengstenberg). The mention of these together is a trait illustrative of John's *precision of statement*, differing from the manner of the Synoptics, but for that very reason, so far from raising doubts as to the genuineness, attesting rather the independence and originality of John (against Weisse), who no longer uses the phrase so often repeated in the Synoptics, "the scribes and elders," because it had to him already become strange and out of date. — *σὺ τίς εἶ*] for John *baptized* (ver. 25), and this baptism had reference to Messiah's kingdom (Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 26,

¹ Following Origen and Cyril, Paulus and B. Crusius suppose that *ὅτι* begins a new sentence, of which *καὶ ἀπολόγησι*, etc., is to be taken as the apodosis—contrary to the simplicity of John's style.

² Comp. *Ἀχαιοί* in Homer, which often means the *proceres* of the Greeks.

xxxiii. 23 ; Zech. xiii. 1). He had, generally, made a great sensation as a prophet, and had even given rise to the opinion that he was the Messiah (Luke iii. 15 ; comp. Acts xiii. 25) ; hence the question of the supreme spiritual court was *justified*, Deut. xviii. 21, 22, Matt. xxi. 23. The question itself is not at all framed in a captious spirit. We must not, with Chrysostom and most others, regard it as prompted by any *malicious* motive, but must explain it by the authoritative position of the supreme court. Nevertheless it implies the assumption that John regarded himself as the Messiah ; and hence his answer in ver. 20, hence also the emphatic precedence given to the *σύ* ; comp. viii. 25. Luthardt too hastily concludes from the form of the question, that the main thing with them was the *person*, not the call and purpose of God. But they would have inferred the call and purpose of God from the *person*, as the question which they ask in ver. 25 shows. — ἐξ [Ἱεροσ.] belongs to ἀπέστειλαν. — καὶ ὁμολογ.] still dependent on the ὅτε. — ὁμολ. καὶ οὐκ ἡρνήσ.] emphatic prominence given to his straightforward confession ; ὡς ἀληθῆς καὶ στεῆρός, Euthymius Zigabenus ; comp. Eur. *El.* 1057 : Φημι καὶ οὐκ ἀπαρνοῦμαι ; Soph. *Ant.* 443 ; Dem. *de Chers.* 108. 73 : λέξω πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ οὐκ ἀποκρύψομαι. See Bremi *in loc.* ; Valcken. *Schol. ad Act.* xiii. 11. — καὶ ὁμολ.] The first κ. ὁμολ. was absolute (*Add. ad Esth.* i. 15, and in the classics) ; this second has for subject the following sentence (ὅτι recitative). Moreover, “vehementer auditorem commovet ejusdem redintegratio verbi,” *ad Herenn.* iv. 28. There is, however, no side glance here at the disciples of John (comp. the *Introd.*). To the evangelist, who had himself been the pupil of the Baptist, the testimony of the latter was weighty enough in itself to lead him to give it emphatic prominence. — According to the right order of the words (see crit. notes), ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ ὁ Χ., the emphasis lies upon ἐγώ ; *I on my part*, which implies that he knew *another* who was the Messiah.

Ver. 21. In consequence of this denial, the next point was to inquire whether he was the *Elias* who, according to Mal. iv. 5, was expected (back from heaven) as the immediate *forerunner* of the Messiah. — τί οὖν] not, *quid ergo es* (Beza *et al.*), but as τίς does not again occur (vers. 19, 22) : *what*

then is the case, if thou art not the Messiah? what is the real state of the matter? — Art thou Elias? So put, the question assumes it as certain that John must give himself out to be *Elias*, after he had denied that he was the Messiah. — οὐκ εἰμι.] He *could* give this answer, notwithstanding what is said in Luke i. 17, Matt. xi. 14, xvii. 10 (against Hilgenfeld), since he could only suppose his interrogators were thinking of the *literal*, not of the *antitypical* Elijah. Bengel well says: “omnia a se amolitur, ut Christum confiteatur et ad Christum redigat quaerentes.” He was conscious, nevertheless, according to ver. 23, in what sense he was *Elias*; but taking the question as *literally* meant, there was no occasion for him to go beyond that meaning, and to ascribe to himself in a special manner the character of an antitypical *Elias*, which would have been neither prudent nor profitable. The οὐκ εἰμι is too *definite* an answer to the definite question, to be taken as a denial in general of *every externally defined position* (Brückner); he would have had to answer evasively. — ὁ προφήτης εἶ σύ;] The absence of any connecting link in the narrative shows the rapid, hasty manner of the interrogation. ὁ προφήτης is marked out by the article as the *well-known promised* prophet, and considering the previous question Ἡλίας εἶ σύ, can only be a *nameless* one, and therefore not *Jeremias*, according to Matt. xvi. 14 (Grotius, Kuinoel, Olshausen, Klee, Lange), but the one *intended* in Deut. xviii. 15, the reference of whom to the Messiah Himself (Acts iii. 22, vii. 37; John i. 46, vi. 14) was at least not universal (comp. vii. 40), and was not adopted by the interrogators here. Judging from the descending climax of the points of these questions, they must rather have thought of some one inferior to *Elias*, or, in general, of an individual undefined, owing to the fluctuation of view regarding Him who was expected as “*the prophet*.”¹ Nonnus well expresses the namelessness and yet eminence of this ὁ προφήτης: μὴ σύ μοι, ὃν καλέουσι, θεηγόρος ἐσσι προφήτης, ἄγγελος ἐσσομένων;

¹ Luthardt thinks of the prophet in the second portion of Isaiah. Comp. Hofmann, *Weissag u. Erf.* II. p. 69. It would agree with this, that John immediately gives an answer taken from Isa. xl. But if his interrogators had had in mind Isa. xl ff., they would probably have designated him whom they meant more characteristically, viz. as the *servant of Jehovah*.

Observe how the rigid denials become shortened at last to the bare οὐ. Here also we have a *no* on the Baptist's lips, because in his view *Jesus* was the prophet of Deut. xviii.

Vv. 22, 23. Now comes the question which *cannot* be met by a bare negative; *ἵνα* as in ix. 36. — The *positive* answer to this is from Isa. xl. 3 according to the LXX., with the variation εὐθύνετε instead of ἐτοιμάσατε, in unison with the second half of the words in the LXX. For the rest, see on Matt. iii. 3. The designation of himself, the herald of the coming Messiah calling men to repentance, as a *voice*, was *given* in the words of the prophet, and the accompanying βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ excludes the idea which Baur entertains, that John here intended to *divest* himself, as it were, of every *personal* characteristic. According to Hilgenfeld, *Evang.* p. 236, the evangelist has put the passage of Scripture *applied* to the Baptist by the Synoptics (who, however, have not *this* account at all) "at last into the Baptist's own mouth."

Ver. 24 ff. The inquiry, which proceeds still further, finds a pragmatic issue in *pharisaic* style (for the Sanhedrim had chosen their deputies from this learned, orthodox, and crafty party). From their strict scholastic standing-point, they could allow (οὐν) so thoroughly reformatory an innovation as that of baptism (see on Matt. iii. 5), considering its connection with Messiah's kingdom, only to the definite personalities of the Messiah, Elias, or the promised prophet, and not to a man with so vague a call as that which the Baptist from Isa. xl. 3 ascribed to himself,—a passage which the Pharisees had not thought of explaining in a Messianic sense, and were not accustomed so to apply it in their schools. Hence the parenthetical remark just here inserted: "*And they that were sent belonged to the Pharisees,*"—a statement, therefore, which points *forwards*, and does not serve as a *supplementary* explanation of the hostile spirit of the question (Euthymius Zigabenus, Lücke, and most others). — The *reply* corresponds to what the Baptist had said of himself in ver. 23, that he was appointed to *prepare* the way for the Messiah. His baptism, consequently, was not the baptism of the Spirit, which was reserved for the *Messiah* (ver. 33), but a *baptism* of water, yet without the *elementum coeleste*; there was already standing, however, in their midst the

far greater One, to whom this preparatory baptism pointed. The *first* clause of the verse, ἐγὼ βαπτ. ἐν ὕδατι, implies, therefore, that by *his* baptism he does not lay claim to anything that belongs to the *Messiah* (the baptism of the *Spirit*); and this portion refers to the εἰ σὺ οὐκ εἶ ὁ Χριστός of ver. 25. The *second* clause, however, μέσος, etc., implies that this preliminary baptism of his had now the justification, owing to his relation to the Messiah, of a divinely ordained necessity (ver. 23); since the Messiah, unknown indeed to them, already stood in their midst, and consequently what they allowed to Elias, or the prophet, dare not be left unperformed on his part; and this part of his answer refers to the οὐδὲ Ἑλίας οὐδὲ ὁ προφήτης in ver. 25. Thus the question τί οὖν βαπτίζεις is answered by a *twofold* reason. There is much that is inappropriate in the remarks of expositors, who have not sufficiently attended to the connection: *e.g.*, De Wette overlooks the appropriateness of the answer to the Elias question; Tholuck contents himself with an appeal to the "laconic-comma style" of the Baptist; and Brückner thinks that "John wished to give no definite answer, but yet to indicate his relation to the Messiah, and the fact of his pointing to Him;" while Bäumlein holds that the antithetical clause, ὅς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύμ. ἁγ., which was already intended to be here inserted, was *forgotten*, owing to the intervening sentences; and finally, Hilgenfeld, after comparing together Matthew and Luke, deduces the unhistorical character of the narrative. Heracleon already was even of opinion that John did not answer according to the question asked of him, but as he αὐτὸς ἐβούλετο. In answer to him, Origen. — ἐγὼ] has the emphasis of an *antithesis* to the higher Baptizer (μέσος δὲ, etc.), not to ὑμεῖς (Godet). Next to this, the stress lies on ἐν ὕδατι. This is the *element* (see on Matt. iii. 11) in which his baptism was performed. This otherwise superfluous addition has a *limiting* force, and hence is *important*. — μέσος] without the spurious δὲ is all the more emphatic; see on ver. 17. The emphasizing of the *antithesis*, however, has brought this μέσος to the front, because it was the *manifestation of the Messiah*, already taking place *in the very midst of the Jews*, which justified John in baptizing. Had the Messiah been still far off, that baptism

would have lacked its divine necessity; He was, however, standing in their midst, *i.e.* ἀναμεμυγμένος τότε τῷ λαῷ (Euthymius Zigabenus). — ὃν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε] reveals the reason why they could question as they had done in ver. 25. The emphasis is on ὑμεῖς, as always (against Tholuck); here in contrast with the knowledge which he himself had (see on ver. 28, note) of the manifested Messiah: *you on your part, you people*, have the Messiah among you, and know Him not (that is, as the Messiah). In ver. 27, after rejecting the words αὐτός ἐστιν and ὃς ἔμπροσ. μου γέγονεν (see the critical notes), there remains only ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος (ver. 15), and that in fact as the subject of μέσος ἔστηκεν, which subject then receives the designation of its superiority over the Baptist in the οὐ ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἄξιος, κ.τ.λ. Concerning this designation, see on Matt. iii. 11. — ἐγὼ] *I for my part*. — ἄξιος ἵνα] *worthy that I should loose*; ἵνα introduces the *purpose* of the ἀξιώτης. Comp. ἰκανὸς ἵνα, Matt. viii. 8, Luke vii. 6. — αὐτοῦ] placed *first* for emphasis, and corresponding to the ἐγὼ. On αὐτοῦ after οὐ, see Winer, p. 140 [E. T. p. 184]. Τούτου would have been still more emphatic.

Ver. 28. On account of the importance of His public appearance, a definite statement of its locality is again given. — A place so exactly described by John himself (xi. 18), according to its situation, as *Bethany on the Mount of Olives*, cannot be meant here; there must also have been another Bethany situated in Peraea, probably only a village, of which nothing further is known from history. Origen, investigating both the locality and the text, did not find indeed any Bethany, but a Bethabara instead¹ (comp. Judg. vii. 24?), which the legends of his day described as the place of

¹ To suppose, with Possinus, *Spicil. Evang.* p. 32 (in the Catena in Marc. p. 382 f.), that both names have the same signification (בֵּית עֶבְרָה, *domus transitus*, ford-house; בֵּית אֲנִיָּה, *domus navis*, ferry-house),—a view to which even Lange inclines, *L. J.* II. 461,—is all the more untenable, seeing that this etymology is not at all appropriate to the position of Bethany on the Mount of Olives. Origen himself explains the name Bethabara with an evident intention to allegorize: ὁ δὲ κατασκευῆς (בְּרָא). The derivation of the name Bethany (Lightfoot: בֵּית הַיְּנִי, house of dates; Simon: בֵּית עֲנִיָּה, *locus depressionis*; others: בֵּית עֲנִיָּה, *domus miseri*) is doubtful.

baptism; the legend, however, misled him. For Bethany in Peraea could not have been situated at all in the same latitude with Jericho, as the tradition represents, but must have lain much farther north; for Jesus occupied about three days in travelling thence to the Judæan Bethany for the raising of Lazarus (see on xi. 17). Yet Paulus (following Bolten) understood the place to be Bethany on the Mount of Olives, and puts a period after ἐγένετο, in spite of the facts that τῇ ἐπαύριον (comp. ver. 35) must begin the new narration, and that ὅπου ἦν Ἰωάνν. βαπτ. must clearly refer to ver. 25 ff. Baur, however, makes the name, which according to Schenkel must be attributed to an error of a non-Jewish author, to have been *invented*, in order to represent Jesus (?) as *beginning* His public ministry at a *Bethany*, seeing that He came out of a *Bethany* at its close. Against the objection still taken to this name even by Weizsäcker (a name which a third person was certainly least of all likely to venture to insert, seeing that Bethany on the Mount of Olives was so well known), see Ewald, *Jahrb.* XII. p. 214 ff. As to the *historic truth of the whole account* in vv. 19–28, which, especially by the reality of the situation, by the idiosyncrasy of the questions and answers, and their appropriateness in relation to the characters and circumstances of the time, as well as by their connection with the reckoning of the day in the following verses, reveals the recollections and interest of an eye-witness, see Schweizer, p. 100 ff.; Bleek, *Beitr.* p. 256. — ὅπου ἦν Ἰωάνν. βαπτ.] where John was employed in baptizing.

Note.—(1.) Seeing that, according to vv. 26, 27 (comp. especially ὃν ὑμεῖς οὐκ ὄδατε, which implies his own personal acquaintance), the Baptist already knows the Messiah, while according to vv. 31–33 he first learned to recognise Him at His baptism by means of a divine σημεῖον, it certainly follows that the occurrences related in vv. 19–28 took place *after the baptism of Jesus*; and consequently this baptism could not have occurred on the same or the following day (Hengstenberg), nor in the time between vv. 31 and 32 (Ewald). Wieseler, Ebrard, Luthardt, Godet, and most expositors, as already Lücke, Tholuck, De Wette, following the older expositors, rightly regard the events of ver. 19 ff. as *subsequent* to the baptism. It is futile to appeal, as against this (Brückner), to the “*inde-*

finiteness" of the words *ὁν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε*, for there is really no indefiniteness in them; while to refer them to a merely preliminary knowledge, in opposition to the *definite* acquaintance which began at the baptism, is (against Hengstenberg) a mere subterfuge. That even after the baptism, which had already taken place, John could say, "Ye know Him not," is sufficiently conceivable, if we adhere to the purely historical account of the baptism, as given in vv. 31–34. See on Matt p. 111 ff. (2.) Although, according to Matt. iii. 14, John already knows Jesus as the Messiah when He came to be baptized of him, there is in this only an apparent discrepancy between the two evangelists; see on ver. 31. (3.) Mark i. 7, 8, and Luke iii. 16 ff., are not at variance with John; for those passages only speak of the Messiah as being in Himself near at hand, and do not already presuppose any personal acquaintance with Jesus as the Messiah. (4.) The testimonies borne by the Baptist, as recorded in the Synoptics, are, both as to time (*before* the baptism) and occasion, very different from that recorded in John i. 19 ff., which was given before a deputation from the high court; and therefore the historic truth of both accounts is to be retained side by side,¹ though in details John (against Weisse, who attributes the narrative in John to another hand; so Baur and others) must be taken as the standard. (5.) To deny any reference in ver. 19 ff. to the baptism of Jesus (Baur), is quite irreconcilable with vv. 31 and 33; for the evangelist could not but take it for granted that the baptism of Jesus (which indeed Weisse, upon the whole, questions) was a well-known fact. (6.) Definite as is the reference to the baptism of Jesus, there is not to be found any allusion whatever in John's account to the history of the temptation with its forty days, which can be brought in only before ver. 19, and even then involving a contradiction with the Synoptics. The total absence of any mention of this—important as it would have been in connection with the baptism, and with John's design generally in view of his idea of the Logos (against B. Crusius)—does not certainly favour the reality of its historic truth as an actual and outward event. Comp. Schleiermacher, *L. J.* p. 154. If the baptism of

¹ Keim, *Gesch. J. I.* p. 522, sees in John's account *not so much an historical narrative*, as rather (?) a "very significant literary introduction to the Baptist, who to a certain extent (?) is officially declaring himself. According to Scholten, the Baptist, during his ministry, did not at all recognise Jesus as Messiah, and Matt. iii. 14, 15 is said to be an addition to the text of Mark;" while the fourth Gospel does not relate the baptism of Jesus, but only mentions the revelation from heaven then made, because to narrate the former would not be appropriate to the Gnosis of the Logos.

Jesus be placed between the two testimonies of ver. 19 ff. and ver. 29 ff. (so Hilgenfeld and Brückner, following Olshausen, B. Crusius, and others), which would oblige us still to place it on the day of the first testimony (see Brückner), though Bäumlein (in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1846, p. 389) would leave this uncertain; then the history of the temptation is as good as *expressly* excluded by John, because it must find its place (Mark i. 12; Matt. iv. 1; Luke iv. 1) immediately after the baptism. In opposition to this view, Hengstenberg puts it in the period after iii. 22, which is only an unavailing makeshift.

Ver. 29. *Τῇ ἐπαύριον*] *on the following day*, the next after the events narrated in vv. 19–28. Comp. vv. 35, 44 (ii. 1), vi. 22, xii. 12. — *ἐρχόμε. πρὸς αὐτ.*] *coming towards him*, not *coming to him*, i.e. only so near that he could *point to Him* (Baur). He came, however, neither to take leave of the Baptist before His temptation (Kuinoel, against which is ver. 35), nor to be baptized of him (Ewald, Hengstenberg; see the foregoing note); but with a purpose not more fully known to us, which John has not stated, because he was not concerned about that, but about the *testimony of the Baptist*. If we were to take into account the narrative of the temptation,—which, however, is not the case,—Jesus might be regarded as here *returning* from the temptation (see Euthymius Zigabenus, Lücke, Luthardt, Riggenbach, Godet). — *ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, κ.τ.λ.*] These words are not addressed to Jesus, but to those who are around the Baptist, and they are suggested by the sight of Jesus; comp. ver. 36. As to the use of the singular *ἴδε*, when nevertheless several are addressed, see on Matt. x. 16. The *article* denotes the *appointed* Lamb of God, which, according to the prophetic utterance presupposed as well known, was *expected* in the *person* of the Messiah. This characteristic form of Messianic expectation is based upon Isa. liii. 7. Comp. Matt. viii. 17; Luke xxii. 37; Acts viii. 32; 1 Pet. ii. 22 ff.; and the *ἀρνίον* in the Apocalypse. On the force of the article, see ver. 21, *ὁ προφήτης*; also *ἡ ῥίζα τοῦ Ἰεσσαί*, Rom. xv. 12; *ὁ λέων ὁ ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Ἰούδα*, Rev. v. 5. The *genitive* is that of possession, that which *belongs to God*, i.e. the lamb appointed as a sacrifice by God Himself. This interpretation follows from the entire contents of Isa. liii., and from the idea of *sacrifice* which is contained in *ὁ αἵρων*,

κ.τ.λ. We must not therefore render: "the Lamb *given* by God" (Hofmann, Luthardt). But while, according to this view, the lamb, designated and appointed by God, is meant,—the lamb already spoken of in holy prophecies of old, whose fulfilment in Jesus was already recognised by the Baptist,—it is erroneous to assume any reference to the *paschal* lamb (Luther, Grotius, Bengel, Lampe, Olshausen, Maier, Reuss, Luthardt, Hofmann, Hengstenberg; comp. Godet). Such an assumption derives no support from the more precise definition in ὁ ἀγνός, κ.τ.λ., and would produce a ὑστερον πρότερον; for the view which regarded Christ as the *paschal* lamb first arose *ex eventu*, because He was crucified upon the same day on which the paschal lamb was slain (see on xviii. 28; 1 Cor. v. 7). He certainly thus *became* the antitype of the paschal lamb, but, according to the whole tenor of the passage in Isaiah, He was not regarded by the Baptist in this *special* aspect, nor could He be so conceived of by his hearers. The *conception of sacrifice* which, according to the prophecy in Isaiah and the immediate connection in John, is contained in ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, is that of the trespass-offering, ذبيحة, Isa. liii. 10;¹ 1 John ii. 2, iv. 10, i. 7. It by no means militates against this, that, according to the law, lambs were not as a rule employed for trespass-offerings (Lev. xiv. 2, Num. vi. 12, relate to exceptional cases only; and the daily morning and evening sacrifices, Ex. xxix. 38 ff., Num. xxviii., which Wetstein here introduces, were prayer- and thank-offerings), but for sacrifices of purification (Lev. v. 1–6, xiv. 12; Num. vi. 12):² for in Isaiah the Servant of Jehovah, who *makes atonement* for the people by His vicarious sufferings, is represented as a lamb; and it is this *prophetic* view, not the *legal* prescription, which is the ruling thought here. Christ was, as the Baptist here prophetically recognises Him, the antitype of the O. T. sacrifices: He must therefore, as such, be represented in the form of some animal appointed for sacrifice; and the appropriate figure was given not in the law, but by the *prophet*, who,

¹ As to the distinction between trespass or guilt and sin offerings, חטאת, see Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 76 ff.; and for the various opinions on this distinction, especially Keil, *Arch.* I. § 46; Oehler in Herzog's *Encykl.* X. p. 462 ff.; Saalschütz, *M. R.* p. 321 ff.

² Concerning ذبيحة, Lev. v. 6, see Knobel *in loc.*

contemplating Him in His gentleness and meekness, represents Him as a sacrificial *lamb*, and from this was derived the form which came to be the *normal* one in the Christian manner of view. The apostolic church consequently could apprehend Him as the Christian *Passover*; though legally the passover lamb, as a trespass-offering, which it certainly was, differed from the ordinary trespass-offerings (Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 467 f.; Hengstenberg takes a different view, *Opfer. d. h. Schr.* p. 24 ff.). This Christian method of view accordingly had a *prophetical*, and not a legal foundation. To exclude the idea of sacrifice altogether, and to find in the expression Lamb of God the representation merely of a divinely consecrated, innocent, and gentle *sufferer* (Gabler, *Melet. in Joh.* i. 29, Jen. 1808–1811, in his *Opusc.* p. 514 ff.; Paulus, Kuinoel), is opposed to the context both in Isaiah and in John, as well as to the view of the work of redemption which pervades the whole of the N. T. Weiss, *Lehrbegr.* p. 159 ff. — ὁ αἵρων τ. ἁμαρτ. τ. κόσμου] may either signify, “who *takes away* the sin of the world,” or, “who *takes upon himself*,” etc., *i.e.* in order to bear it. Both renderings (which Flacius, Melancthon, and most others, even Bäumlein, combine) must, according to Isa. liii., express the idea of *atonement*; so that in the first the cancelling of the guilt is conceived of as a *removing*, a doing away with sin (an abolition of it); in the second, as a *bearing* (an expiation) of it. The latter interpretation is *usually* preferred (so Lücke, B. Crusius, De Wette, Hengstenberg, Brückner, Ewald, Weber, v. Zorne Gottes, p. 250), because in Isa. liii. the idea is certainly that of *bearing* by way of expiation (נָשָׂא: LXX. φέρει, ἀνένεγκε, ἀνοίσει). But since the LXX. never use αἵρειν to express the *bearing* of sin, but always φέρειν, etc., while on the other hand they express the *taking away* of sin by αἵρειν (1 Sam. xv. 25, xxv. 28; Aq. Ps. xxxi. 5, where Symm. has ἀφέλης and the LXX. ἀφῆκας); and as the context of 1 John iii. 5, in like manner, requires us to take τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἄρῃ, there used to denote the act of expiation (comp. ii. 2), as signifying the *taking away* of sins; so ὁ αἵρων, etc., here is to be explained in this sense,—not, indeed, that the Baptist expresses an idea different from Isa. liii., but the expiation there described as a *bearing* of sins is represented, according to its

necessary and immediate result, as the *abolition* of sins by virtue of the vicarious sacrificial suffering and death of the victim, as the ἀθέτησις ἁμαρτίας, Heb. ix. 26. Comp. already Cyril: ἵνα τοῦ κόσμου τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἀνέλῃ; Vulgate: qui tollit; Goth.: *afnimith*. John himself expresses this idea in 1 John i. 7, when referring to the sin-cleansing power of Christ's blood, which operates also on those who are already regenerate (see Düsterdieck *in loc.*, p. 99 ff.), by καθαρίζει ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας. The taking away of sins by the Lamb presupposes His taking them upon Himself. The interpretation "to take away," in itself correct, is (after Grotius) misused by Kuinoel: "*removebit* peccata hominum, *i.e.* *pravitatem e terra*;"¹ and Gabler has misinterpreted the rendering "to bear:" "*qui pravitatem hominum . . . i.e.* *mala sibi inflicta*, *patienti et mansueto animo sustinebit*." Both are opposed to the necessary relation of the word to ὁ ἄμνος τ. θεοῦ, as well as to the real meaning of Isa. liii.; although even Gabler's explanation would not in itself be linguistically erroneous, but would have to be referred back to the signification, to *take upon oneself, to take over* (Æsch. *Pers.* 544; *Soph. Tr.* 70; *Xen. Mem.* iv. 4. 14; 1 Macc. xiii. 17; *Matt.* xi. 29, *al.*). — The *Present* ὁ αἰψὼν arises from the fact that the Baptist prophetically views the act of atonement accomplished by the Lamb of God as *present*. This act is *ever-enduring*, not in itself, but in its *effects* (against Hengstenberg). Luthardt holds that the words are not to be understood of the future, and that the Baptist had not Christ's death in view, but only regarded and designated Him in a general way, as one who was manifested in a body of weakness, and with liability to suffering, in order to the salvation of men. But this is far too general for the concrete representation of Christ as the *Lamb* of God, and for the express reference herein made to *sin*, especially from the lips of a man belonging to the old theocracy, who was himself the son of a sacrificing priest, a Nazarite and a prophet. — τὴν ἁμαρτίαν] the sins of the world conceived of as a collective unity;

¹ Comp. Baur, *N. T. Theol.* p. 396: "In a general sense, He bears away and removes sin by His personal manifestation and ministry throughout." This is connected with the error that we do not find in John the same significance attached to Christ's death which we find in Paul.

“una pestis, quæ omnes corripuit,” Bengel. Comp. Rom. v. 20. — τοῦ κόσμου] an extension of the earlier prophetic representation of atonement for the *people*, Isa. liii., to all *mankind*, the reconciliation of whom has been *objectively* accomplished by the ἱλαστήριον of the Lamb of God, but is accomplished *subjectively* in all who believe (iii. 15, 16). Comp. Rom. v. 18.

Note.—That the Baptist describes Jesus as the Messiah, who by His *sufferings makes expiation* for the world's sin, is to be explained by considering his apocalyptic position, by which his prophecies, which had immediate reference to the person and work of Jesus, were conditioned; comp. vv. 31 ff. It was not that he had obtained a sudden glimpse of light in a natural manner (Hofmann, Schweizer, Lange), or a growing presentiment (De Wette), or a certitude arrived at by reason and deep reflection (Ewald); but a *revelation* had been made to him (comp. ver. 33). This was necessary in order to announce the idea of a suffering Messiah with such decision and distinctness, even according to its historical realization in Jesus;—an idea which, though it had been discovered by a few deep-seeing minds through prophetic hints or divine enlightenment (Luke ii. 25, 34, 35), nevertheless undoubtedly encountered in general expectations of a kind diametrically opposite (xii. 34; Luke xxiv. 26),—and in order likewise to give to that idea the impress of world-embracing universality, although the way was already prepared for this by the promise made to Abraham. The more foreign the idea of a suffering Messiah was to the people in general, the more disinclined the disciples of Jesus showed themselves to accept such a view (Matt. xvi. 21; Luke xxiv. 25); the more certain that its dissemination was effected by the development of the history, while even thus remaining a constant σκάνδαλον to the Jews, the more necessary and justifiable does it appear to suppose a special divine revelation, with which the expression borrowed from Isa. liii. may very well be consistent. And the more certain it is that the Baptist really was the subject of divine revelations as the forerunner of the Messiah (comp. Matt. iii. 14), all the more unhistorical is the assumption that the evangelist divests the idea of the Messiah of its historical form (Keim) by putting *his own* knowledge into the Baptist's mouth (Strauss, Weisse, Baur, Hilgenfeld, Scholten; comp. De Wette's doubt, but against this latter, Brückner). This view receives no support from the subsequent vacillation of the Baptist (Matt. xi. 3), because the revelation which he had received, as well as that made to him at the baptism (ver. 32), would not exclude a subsequent and tempo-

rary falling into error, and because this was not caused by any sufferings which Jesus underwent, but by his own sufferings in face of the Messianic works of Jesus, whereby the divine light previously received was dimmed through human weakness and impatience. It is only by surrendering the true interpretation (see *ὁ αἴρων* above) that Luthardt avoids such a supposition as this. The notion of a spiritualizing legend (Schenkcl) is of itself excluded by the genuineness of the Gospel, whose author had been a disciple of the Baptist. Moreover, Jesus Himself, according even to the testimony of the Synoptics (Mark ii. 20; Matt. xii. 39, etc.), was sufficiently acquainted from the very first with the certainty of His final sufferings.

Ver. 30 does not refer to vv. 26, 27, where John bears his witness before the deputies from the Sanhedrim, but to an earlier testimony borne by him before his disciples and hearers, and in this definite enigmatic form, to which ver. 15 likewise refers. So essential is this characteristic form, that of itself it excludes the reference to vv. 26, 27 (De Wette, Hengstenberg, Ewald, Godet, and others). The *general* testimony which John had previously borne to the *coming Messiah*, here receives its definite application to the *concrete personality* there standing before him, *i.e.* to *Jesus*. — ἐστὶ] not ἦν again, as in ver. 15, for Jesus is now *present*. — ἐγώ] possesses the emphasis of a certain inward feeling of prophetic certitude. — ἀνὴρ] as coming from the Baptist, more reverential and honourable than ἄνθρωπος. Acts xvii. 31; Zech. vi. 12; Dem. 426. 6; Herod. vii. 210; Xen. *Hier.* vii. 3.

Ver. 31. καὶ γάρ] not *I also*, like all others, but *and I*, resuming and carrying forward the ἐγώ of ver. 30. Though the Baptist had borne witness in a general way concerning the Messiah, as ver. 30 affirms, Jesus was, at the time when he bare that witness, still unknown to him as in His own person the historic Messiah. Ver. 34 shows that καὶ in καὶ γάρ is the simple *and*; for the thrice repeated καὶ γάρ, vv. 31-34, can only be arbitrarily interpreted in different senses. The emphasis of the ἐγώ, however (*I on my part*), consists in his ignorance of the special individuality, in the face of the divine revelation which he had received. — οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτόν] that is, *as the Messiah*, see ver. 33; not "as the manifestation of a pre-existent personality" (Hilgenfeld); still not denying, in

general, every kind of previous acquaintance with Jesus (Lücke, Godet), which the following *ἵνα φανερωθῇ* and *ὅν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἶδατε* in ver. 26 forbid. This *οὐκ ᾔδειν* leaves it quite uncertain whether the Baptist had any personal acquaintance *generally* with Jesus (and this is by no means placed beyond doubt by the legendary prefatory history in Luke i. 36 ff., which is quite irreconcilable with the text before us). *That Jesus was the Messiah* became known to the Baptist only at the baptism itself, by the sign of the descending dove; and this sign was immediately preceded only by the prophetic presentiment of which Matt. iii. 14 is the impress (see on that passage). Accordingly, we are not to assume any contradiction between our text and Matt. *l.c.* (Strauss, Baur, and most others), nor leave the *οὐκ ᾔδειν* with its meaning unexplained (Brückner); nor, again, are we to interpret it only comparatively as a denial of *clear* and *certain* knowledge (Neander, Maier, Riggenbach, Hengstenberg, Ewald). — *ἀλλ' ἵνα φανερωθῇ, κ.τ.λ.*] occupying an emphatic position at the beginning of the clause, and stating the purpose of the Baptist's manifestation as referring to Messiah, and as still applying notwithstanding the *καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ᾔδειν*, and being thus quite independent of his own intention and choice, and purely a matter of *divine* ordination. — *ἵνα φανερωθῇ*] This *special* purpose, in the expression of which, moreover, no reference can be traced to Isa. xl. 5 (against Hengstenberg), does not exclude the more generally and equally divine ordinance in ver. 23, but is included in it. Comp. the tradition in Justin, *c. Tryph.* 8, according to which the Messiah remained unknown to Himself and others, until Elias anointed Him and made Him manifest to all (*φανερόν πασι ποιήσῃ*). — *ἐν τῷ ὕδατι βαπτίζων*] a humble description of his own baptism as compared with that of Him who baptizes with the Spirit, ver. 33; comp. ver. 26. Hence also the *ἐγώ, I* on my part. For the rest, we must understand *ἐν τ. ὕδ. βαπτ.* of John's call to baptize *in general*, in which was also *included the conception* of the baptizing of *Jesus*, to which ver. 32 refers.¹

¹ For *ἐν τῷ ὕδατι*, Lachmann (now also Tischendorf), following B. C. G. L. P. A. N., cursives, and some of the Fathers, reads *ἐν ὕδατι*; but the article after ver. 26, comp. ver. 33, would be more easily omitted than inserted. It is *demonstrative*, for John as he speaks is standing by the *Jordan*.

Ver. 32. What John had said in ver. 31, viz. that though Jesus was unknown to him as the Messiah, yet his commission was to make Him known to the people, needed *explanation*; and that as *to the way in which he himself had come to recognise Him as the Messiah*. This was, indeed, a necessary condition before he could make the *φανερώσις* to the people. This explanation he now gives in the following testimony (not first spoken upon another occasion, Ewald) concerning the divine *σημεῖον*, which he beheld. And the evangelist considers this testimony so weighty, that he does not simply continue the words of the Baptist, but solemnly and emphatically introduces the testimony as such: *καὶ ἐμαρτύρησεν, κ.τ.λ.*, words which are not therefore parenthetical (Bengel, Lücke, and most), but from an impressive part of the record: "And a testimony did John bear, when he said." The following *ὅτι* is simply *recitative*. — *τεθέαμαι*] *I have seen*; Perfect, like *έώρακα* in ver. 34, which see. The phenomenon itself took place at the baptism, which is assumed as known through the Gospel tradition, and is referred to in ver. 33 by *ὁ πέμψας με βαπτίζειν ἐν ὕδατι*, which implies that the *σημεῖον* was to take place at the *baptism* of the person spoken of. This is in answer to Baur, p. 104 ff., according to whom there is no room here for the supposition that Jesus was baptized by John,—an assertion all the more groundless, because if we insert the baptism of Jesus before ver. 19, there is no place in the plan of this Gospel for the narration of a fact which is assumed as universally known.—The *sight itself* here spoken of was no mere production of the imagination, but a *real sight*; it indicates an actual *event* divinely brought about, which was traditionally worked up by the Synoptics into a visible occurrence more or less objective (most unhesitatingly by Luke), but which can be the subject of *testimony* only by virtue of a *θεωρία νοητική* (Origen). See on Matt. iii. 17, note. — *ὡς περιστεράν*] *i.e. shaped like a dove*: *ἀντίτυπον μίμημα πελειάδος*, Nonnus. See on Matt. iii. 16. According to Ewald, "the sudden downward flight of a bird, coming near to Him at the moment, confirmed the Baptist's presentiment," etc. Conjectures of this kind are additions quite alien to the prophetic mode of view. — *καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐπ' αὐτόν*] The

transition here to the finite verb is owing to the importance of the fact stated. Bernhardy, p. 473; Buttmann, *N. T. Gk.* p. 327 [E. T. p. 382]. ἐπ' αὐτόν, however, is not synonymous with ἐπ' αὐτοῦ (xix. 31); the idea is, "it remained ('fluttered not away,' Luther) directed towards Him." We are to suppose the appearance of a dove coming down, and poising itself for a considerable time over the head of the person. See on ἐπὶ with the accusative (iii. 36; 1 Pet. iv. 14), seemingly on the question "where?" Schaef. *ad Long.* p. 427; Matthiae, p. 1375; Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* i. 2. 2.

Ver. 33. John's recognition of Jesus as the Messiah (whom he had not before known as such) rested upon a revelation previously made to him with this intent; and this he now states, solemnly repeating, however, the declaration of his own ignorance (καγὼ οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτόν). — ἐκεῖνος] in emphatic contrast with his own reflection. — εἰπεν] i.e. by express revelation. We cannot tell the precise time or manner of this prior revelation. By it John was referred to some outwardly visible σημεῖον (ἰδης) of the Spirit, in a general way, without any definition of its form. He was to see it descending, and this descent took place in the form of a dove, and after that divine intimation there was no room for doubt. Comp. on Matt. iii. 17, note. — ἐφ' ὃν ἂν ἴδης] that is, when thou baptizest Him with water. This is not expressly stated in the divine declaration, but John could not fail so to understand it, because, being sent to baptize, he would naturally expect the appearance of the promised sign while fulfilling his mission; comp. ver. 31. He therefore describes the giver of the revelation as ὁ πέμψας με, κ.τ.λ., and the evangelist puts the statement in the conditional form: ἐφ' ὃν ἂν, κ.τ.λ., i.e., according to the connection of the narrative: "When, in the fulfilment of this your mission, you shall see the Spirit descending upon one of those whom thou baptizest, this is He," etc. — ἐν πνεύμ. ἁγίῳ] by communicating it to those who believe upon Him. See on Matt. iii. 11. The designation of this communication as a baptism very naturally arose from its close relation to the work of the Baptist's mission (comp. Matt. iii. 11; Mark i. 8; Luke iii. 16; Acts i. 5, xi. 16), because the gift of the Spirit, according to the prophetic figure (Joel iii. 1; Isa.

xliv. 3), had been promised under the form of an *outpouring* (comp. Acts ii. 33). The contrast itself distinctly sets before us the difference between the two baptisms: the one was a preparation for the Messianic salvation by *μετάνοια*; the other, an introduction thereto by the divine principle of life and salvation, the communication of which presupposes the forgiveness of sins (see on Mark i. 4).

Ver. 34. A still more distinct and emphatic conclusion of what John had to adduce from ver. 31 onwards, in explanation of the *οὗτός ἐστιν* mentioned in ver. 30. — *καὶ γώ*] and I on my part, answering triumphantly to the double *καὶ γώ* in vv. 31, 33. — *έώρακα*] i.e. as the divine declaration in ver. 33 had promised (*ἰδης*). This *having seen* is to the speaker, as he makes the declaration, an accomplished fact. Hence the *Perfect*, like *τεθέαμαι* in ver. 32. Nor can the *μεμαρτύρηκα* be differently understood unless by some arbitrary rendering; it does not mean: "*I shall have borne witness*" (De Wette, Tholuck, Maier), as the aorist is used in the classics (see on vi. 36); or, "*I have borne witness, and do so still*" (Grotius, Lücke), or "*testis sum factus*" (Bengel, comp. Bernhardt, p. 378 ff.); but, *I have borne witness*, that is, since I saw that sight; so that, accordingly, John, *immediately after the baptism of Jesus*, uttered the testimony which he here refers to as an accomplished fact, and by referring to which he ratifies and confirms what he *now* has testified (ver. 30). Comp. also Winer, p. 256 [E. T. p. 341]. — *ὅτι οὗτος, κ.τ.λ.*] the subject-matter of the *μεμαρτ.* — *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*] the *Messiah*, whose divine Sonship, however, had already been apprehended by the Baptist in the *metaphysical sense* (against Beyschlag, p. 67), agreeably to the testimony borne to His pre-existence in vv. 30, 15: *ὅτι θεοῦ γόνος οὗτος, αἰζώοιο τοκῆς*, Nonnus. The heavenly voice in Matt. iii. 17, in the synoptic account of the baptism, corresponds to this testimony. All the less on this account are the statements of the Baptist concerning Jesus to be regarded as unhistorical, and only as an echo of the position assigned to the former in the Prologue (Weizsäcker). The position of the Baptist in the Prologue is the result of the history itself. That the meaning attaching to *υἱὸς τ. θεοῦ* in the fourth Gospel generally is quite different

from that which it has in the Synoptics (Baur), is a view which the passages Matt. xi. 27, xxviii. 19, should have prevented from being entertained.

Note.—On vv. 32–34 we may observe in general: (1.) The λόγος and the πνεῦμα ἅγιον are not to be regarded as identical in John's view (against Baur, *bibl. Theol. d. N. T.* II. 268; J. E. Chr. Schmidt, in *d. Bibl. f. Krit. u. Exeg.* I. 3, p. 361 ff.; Eichhorn, *Einl.* II. 158 ff.; Winzer, *Progr.*, Lps. 1819), against which the ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο in ver. 14 is itself conclusive, in view of which the πνεῦμα in our passage appears as an hypostasis distinct from the λόγος, an hypostasis of which the σὰρξ ἐγένετο could not have been predicated. The λόγος was the substratum of the divine side in Christ, which having become incarnate, entered upon a human development, in which the divine-human subject needed the power and incitement of the πνεῦμα. (2.) He was of necessity under this influence of the Spirit from the very outset of the development of His divine-human consciousness (comp. Luke ii. 40, 52, and the visit when twelve years old to the temple), and long before the moment of His baptism, so that the πνεῦμα was the awakening and mediating principle of the consciousness which Jesus possessed of His oneness with God; see on x. 36. Accordingly, we are not to suppose that the Holy Ghost was given to Him now for the first time, and was added consciously to His divine-human life as a new and third element; the text speaks not of a *receiving*, but of a *manifestation* of the Spirit, as seen by John, which in this form visibly came down and remained over Him, in order to point Him out to the Baptist as the Messiah who, according to O. T. prophecy (Isa. xi. 2, xlii. 1), was to possess the fulness of the Spirit. The purpose of this divine σημεῖον was not, therefore (as Matthew and Mark indeed represent it), to *impart* the Spirit to Jesus (which is not implied even in iii. 34), but simply for the sake of the Baptist, to divinely *indicate* to him who was to make Him known in Israel, that individuality who, as the incarnate Logos, must long before then have possessed the powers of the Spirit in all their fulness (comp. iii. 34). The πνεῦμα in the symbolic form of a dove hovered over Jesus, remained over Him for a while, and then again vanished (comp. Schleiermacher, *L. J.* p. 150). This the Baptist saw; and he now knows, through a previously received revelation made to him for the purpose *who* it is that he has to make known as the Messiah who baptizes with the Spirit. To find in this passage a special stimulus imparted through the Spirit to Jesus Himself, and perceived by the Baptist, tending to the development or opening up of

His divine-human consciousness and life (Lücke, Neander, Tholuck, Osiander, Ebrard, De Wette, Riggenbach, and others; comp. Lange, and Beyschlag, p. 103), or the equipment of the Logos for a coming forth out of a state of *immanence* (Frommann), or the communication of *official* power (Gess, *Pers. Chr.* p. 374; comp. Wörner, *Verhältn. d. Geistes*, p. 44), as the principle of which the Spirit was now given in order to render the *σάρξ* fit to become the instrument of His self-manifestation (Luthardt, after Kahnis, *vom heiligen Geiste*, p. 44; comp. also Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* I. 191, II. 1, 166; Godet; and Weisse, *Lehrbegr.* p. 268, who connects with ver. 52),—as in a similar way B. Crusius already explained the communication of the Spirit as if the *πνεῦμα* (in distinction from the *λόγος*) were now received by Jesus, as that which was *to be* further communicated to mankind;—these and all such theories find no justification from our Gospel at least, which simply records a *manifestation* made to the *Baptist*, not a communication to *Jesus*; and to it must be accorded decisive weight when brought face to face with those other diverging accounts. Thus, at the same time, this whole manifestation must not be regarded as an empty, objectless play of the imagination (Lücke): it was an objective and real *σημεῖον* divinely presented to the Baptist's spiritual vision, the design of which (*ἵνα φανερωθῇ τῷ Ἰσραήλ*, ver. 31, that is, through the Baptist's testimony) was sufficiently important as the *γνώρισμα* of the Messiah (Justin. *c. Tryph.* 88), and the result of which (ver. 34) corresponded to its design; whereas, upon the supposition that we have here a record of the *receiving* of the Spirit, there is imported into the exposition something quite foreign to the text. If this supposition be surrendered, then the opinion loses all support that the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus at His baptism is a mythical inference of Ebionitism (Strauss), as well as the assertion that here too our Gospel stands upon the boundary line of Gnosticism (Baur); while the boldness of view which goes still further, and (in the face of the *βαπτίζων ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ*) takes the *πνεῦμα* to be, not the Holy Spirit, but the *Logos* (in spite of i. 14), which as a heavenly Aeon was for the first time united at the baptism with Jesus the earthly man (so Hilgenfeld, following the Valentinian Gnosis), does not even retain its claim to be considered a later historical analogy. There remains, however, in any case, the great fact of which the Baptist witnesses—"the true birth-hour of Christendom" (Ewald): for, on the one hand, the divinely sent forerunner of the Messiah now received the divinely revealed certainty as to *whom* his work as Elias pointed; and, on the other hand, by the divinely

assured testimony which he now bore to Jesus before the people, the Messianic consciousness of Jesus Himself received not only the consecration of a heavenly ratification, but the warrant of the Father's will, that now *the hour was come for the holy ἀρχή* of His ministry in word and work. It was not that now for the first time the Messiah's *resolve* was formed; rather was it the *entrance* (comp. Acts xiii. 23) upon His great work, the commencement of its realization, which was the great event in the world's history that marked this hour, when the fulness of time was come for the accomplishment of the counsel of God.

Vv. 35, 36. Πάλιν εἰστήκει] pointing back to ver. 29. — δύο] One was Andrew, ver. 41. The other? Certainly *John* himself,¹ partly on account of that peculiarity of his which leads him to refrain from naming himself, and partly on account of the special vividness of the details in the following account, which had remained indelibly impressed upon his memory ever since this first and decisive meeting with his Lord. — ἐμβλέψας] denoting *fixed attention*. Comp. ver. 43; Mark x. 21, 27, xiv. 67; Luke xx. 17, xxii. 61. The profoundest interest led him to fix his gaze upon Him. — ἶδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τ. θεοῦ] These few words were quite sufficient to direct the undivided attention of both to Him who was passing that way; for, beyond a doubt (against De Wette, Ewald,—because the fact that nothing is now added to the ὁ ἀμνὸς τ. θεοῦ gives the words quite a *retrospective* character), they had been witnesses the day before of what is recorded in vv. 29–34. The assumption of a further conversation not here recorded (Kuinoel, Lücke, and most) is unnecessary, overlooks the emphasis of the one short yet weighty word on which hangs their recollection of all that occurred the day before, and moreover is not required by ver. 37. — We need not even ask why Jesus, who was now walking along (περιπατ.) in the same place,

¹ Already Chrysostom (according to Corderius, *Cat.*; Theodore of Mopsuestia) mentions the same view, but along with it the other: ὅτι ἐκείνος οὐχὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐστίν, which he seems to approve of. — But if *John* is here already (and see on ver. 42) indicated, though not by name, and afterwards (ver. 46) *Bartholomew* under the name *Nathanael*; if, again, ver. 42 implies that *James* is brought to Jesus by his brother *John*, and that he therefore has his place *after John*; then we certainly cannot say, with Steitz (in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1868, p. 497): “The order in which Papias, in Euseb. iii. 39, quotes the six apostles, Andrew, Peter, Philip, Thomas, James, John, exactly corresponds with that in which these names occur in succession in the fourth Gospel.”

had not been with John, because the text says nothing about it. Answers have been devised; *e.g.* Bengel: "Jesus had sufficiently humbled Himself by once joining Himself with John;" Lampe: "He wished to avoid the suspicion of any private understanding with the Baptist." Equally without warrant in the text, B. Crusius and Luthardt: "Jesus had already separated Himself from the Baptist to begin His own proper ministry, while the Baptist desired indirectly to command his disciples to join themselves with Jesus;" as Hengstenberg also supposes, judging from the result, and because he at the same time regards the two as representatives of all John's disciples.

Vv. 37-40. *And the two disciples heard (observed) him speak.* For he had not addressed the words ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τ. θεοῦ directly to them, but in general (comp. ver. 29) to those round about him. — ἠκολούθησαν] not the following of discipleship, nor in a "sens profondément symbolique" (Godet), but simply: "they went after Him" (ὁπίστέροι ἦλθον ὁδίται Χριστοῦ νεισσομένοιο, Nonnus), in order to know Him more intimately (πεῖραν λαβεῖν αὐτοῦ, Euthymius Zigabenus). Nevertheless Bengel rightly says: *primæ origines ecclesiae Christianae.* — στραφεῖς] for He heard the footsteps of those following Him. — τί ζητεῖτε] *what do you desire?* He anticipates them by engaging in conversation with them, not exactly because they were shy and timid (Euthymius Zigabenus). But no doubt the significant θεασάμενος, κ.τ.λ. (*intuitus*), was accompanied by a glance into their hearts, ii. 25. — ποῦ μένεις] correlative to the περιπατοῦντι, ver. 36; therefore: "*where dost thou sojourn?*" Polyb. xxx. 4. 10; Strabo, iii. p. 147. They regarded Him as a travelling Rabbi, who was lodging in the neighbourhood at the house of some friend. — ἔρχεσθε κ. ὄψεσθε (see the critical notes); a friendly invitation to accompany Him at once.¹ They had sought only to know where the place was, so that they might afterwards seek Him out, and converse with Him undisturbed. We have not here the Rabbinical form of calling attention, בא וראה (Buxt. *Lxx. Talm.* p. 248; Lightfoot, p. 968), nor an imitation of Rev.

¹ There is nothing to indicate whether the place where He was lodging was near or at a distance, although Ewald would infer the latter from the reading ἴψαυθι.

vi. 1 (Weisse), nor yet an allusion to Ps. lxvi. 5, 9, and a gentle reference on the part of Jesus to His Godhead (Hengstenberg), for which there was no occasion, and which He could not expect to be understood. — ἡλθον, κ.τ.λ.] shows the simplicity of the narrative. — μένει] instance of insertion of the direct address, common in dependent clauses. Kühner, II. 594; Winer, p. 251 [E. T. p. 335]. — τὴν ἡμέρ. ἐκ.] *i.e.* the remaining part of that day, not at once from that day onwards (Credner, against whom is Ebrard). — δεκάτῃ] that is, at the beginning of their stay with Him. We have no reason to suppose in John, as Rettig does in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1830, p. 106, as also Tholuck, Ebrard, Ewald, the *Roman* mode of counting the hours (from midnight to midnight, therefore ten o'clock in the morning) instead of the *Jewish*, which is followed elsewhere in the N. T. and by Josephus (even *Vit.* 54), *i.e.* four o'clock in the afternoon; because there is time enough from 4 P.M. till late in the evening to justify the popular expression τὴν ἡμέρ. ἐκ.; because, moreover, in xi. 9 it is plainly the Jewish method which is followed; and because even in iv. 6 the same method best suits the context, and is not excluded in iv. 52, while in xix. 14 it is with a harmonistic view that the Roman method of reckoning is resorted to. The Romans themselves, moreover, frequently measured the day after the Babylonian computation of the hours, according to the twelve hours from sunrise to sunset; and the *tenth* hour especially is often named, as in our text, as the hour of return from walking, and mention of it occurs as a *late* hour in the day, when *e.g.* the soldiers were allowed to rest (Liv. ix. 37), or when they went to table (Martial, vii. 1), etc. See Wetstein. — The great significance of this hour for John (it was *the first of his Christian life*) had indelibly impressed it on his grateful recollection, and hence the express mention of it here. This consideration forbids our giving, with Hilgenfeld and Lichtenstein, to the statement of time an onward reference to the incident next mentioned, the finding by Andrew of his brother Simon. Brückner, too, imports something that is foreign into this statement of time, when he says that it indicates, in close connection with ver. 41 ff., how rapidly faith developed itself in these disciples.

Vv. 41-43. Still on the same day (not on the following, as, after the early expositors, De Wette, Baur, Luthardt, Ewald, and most others suppose; see, on the contrary, the *ἐπαύριον* which again appears, but not till ver. 44), Andrew first meets his brother Simon. — *πρῶτος*] We must understand the matter thus: Both disciples go out from the lodging-place (at the same time, or perhaps Andrew first), still in the first fresh glow of joy at having found the Messiah,¹ in order that each of them may seek his own brother (we must assume that both brothers were known to be in the neighbourhood), in order to inform him of the new joy, and to bring him to Christ. Andrew is *the first* (*πρῶτος*, not *πρῶτον*, an inelegant change adopted by Lachmann, after A. B. M. X. 8**) who finds his brother. John, however, does not say that he also sought *his* brother *James*, found him, and brought him to Jesus; and this is in keeping with the delicate reserve which prevents him from naming either himself or those belonging to him (even the name of James does not occur in the Gospel). Still this may be clearly seen from the *πρῶτος*, and is confirmed by the narrative of the Synoptics, in so far that both James and John are represented as being called at the same time by Jesus (Mark i. 19 and parallels). Bengel, Tholuck, De Wette, Hengstenberg, wrongly say that Andrew and John had *both* sought out *Simon*. The *τὸν ἴδιον* is against this; as it neither here nor elsewhere (comp. v. 18) occurs as a mere possessive (against Lücke, Maier, De Wette, and others), but in opposition to that which is foreign. Any antithetic relation to the *spiritual* brotherhood in which John as well as Andrew stood to Simon (Hengstenberg), is quite remote from the passage. — *εὐρήκαμεν*] placed emphatically at the beginning of the clause, and presupposing the feeling of *anxious desire* excited by the Baptist. The *plural* is used because Andrew had in mind the other disciple also. — *ἐμβλέψας, κ.τ.λ.*] This fixed look (ver. 36) on the countenance of Simon pierces his inner soul.

¹ John's use here and in iv. 25 of *τὸν Μεσσίαν* (משיח) is accounted for by the depicting of the scene exactly as it occurred; whereas in i. 20, 25, when he simply writes historically, he uses the ordinary translation *Χριστός*. The *genre* picture is specially minute; so here. According to Baur, *N. T. Theol.* p. 393, the author has given an *antiquarian* notice, as it were, of this Hebrew name, which occurs nowhere else in the N. T.

Jesus, as the Searcher of hearts (ii. 25 ; Weiss, *Lehrbegr.* p. 263), sees in him one who should hereafter be called to be the *rock* of the church, and calls him by the *name* which he was henceforth to bear as His disciple (not first in Matt. xvi. 18, as Luthardt thinks). A *rock* is the emblem of firmness as early as Homer (*Od.* xvii. 463) ; comp. Ezek. iii. 9. There is no contradiction here with Matt. xvi. 18 (it is otherwise with Mark iii. 16), as if John had transferred the giving of the name to this place (Hilgenfeld, comp. Baur and Scholten), for in Matt. xvi. 18 the earlier giving of the name is really *presupposed, confirmed, and applied*. See on Matt. — σὺ εἶ Σίμων, κ.τ.λ.] This belongs to the circumstantiality of the solemn ceremony of the name-giving ; it is first said *who he is*, and what in future he should be *called*. Comp. Gen. xxxii. 28, xxxv. 10, xvii. 5. Σὺ εἶ Σίμων is not, as Ewald thinks, a question ; and there is no ground whatever for supposing that Jesus *immediately* recognised him (Cyril, Chrysostom, Augustine, Aretius, Maldonatus, Cornelius a Lapide, Bengel, Luthardt, and many, comp. Strauss), for Andrew introduced his brother to Jesus. Grotius and Paulus¹ give arbitrary explanations of the reading Ἰωνᾶ, but see the critical notes. For the rest, we must not say, with Hilgenfeld, “ Peter here *attains* the pre-eminence of the first called disciple ;” but Peter is first *given* this pre-eminence in the synoptical accounts (Matt. iv. 18 and parallels) ; the personal recollection of John, however, must take precedence of these. See especially the note following ver. 52.

Vv. 44, 45. Τῇ ἐπαύρ.] *i.e.* after the last-mentioned day, ver. 39, which is the same with the τῇ ἐπαύρ. of ver. 35, consequently the *fourth* day from i. 19. — ἡθέλησεν, κ.τ.λ.] He was *just desiring to go forth, and findeth*, etc. ; therefore still at the lodging-place, ver. 40, for ἐξελεθεῖν refers to the stay there (μένει, ver. 40). — εὐρίσκει] as if accidentally, but see xvii. 5 ff. — The statement, instead of being hypotactic in form

¹ The fantastic play upon the words in Lange's *L. J.* II. 469, is of this sort. He renders : “ Now thou art the son of the timid dove of the rock ; in future shalt thou be called the sheltering rock of the dove (the church).” According to the true reading of the passage, the name of Peter's father contained in Βαριωνά which occurs in Matthew, must be regarded as an abbreviation for *John*, and has nothing whatever to do with *dove*. See on Matt. xvi. 17.

("when he would go out, he findeth"), is *paratactic*, as often in Greek from Homer downwards (Nägelsbach, *z. Ilias*, p. 65, ed. 3; Kuhner, II. p. 416), and in the N. T.; Buttmann, *N.T. Gr.* p. 249 [E. T. p. 196]. We must place the scene at the commencement of the journey homeward, not *on the road* during the journey (Lücke). — ἀκολου μοι] of following *as disciples*. Comp. Matt. iv. 19, 20, ix. 9; see also ver. 46, ii. 2. The invitation to do this (not merely to go with Him) is explained by ver. 45, as brought about by the communications of Andrew and Peter, though certainly the heart-piercing look of Jesus Himself, and the impression produced by His whole bearing, must be regarded as the causes which mainly led Philip to come to a decision. John does not record the further conversations which of course ensued upon the ἀκολου μοι, and the obedience which followed, because his aim was to narrate the *call*. — ἐκ τ. πόλεως, κ.τ.λ.] see on Matt. viii. 14.

Ver. 46. Εὐρίσκει] *when and where* in the course of the journey we are not told,—perhaps at some distance from the road, so that Philip, observing him, quitted the road, and went towards him. According to Ewald, "not till after their arrival in the village of Cana, which nevertheless is named for the first time in ii. 1, and to which Nathanael belonged" (xxi. 2). The supposition, however, that Nathanael was on his way to John's baptism (Godet) is quite groundless. — Ναθαναήλ, ὁ βαπτιστής, *i.e.* *Theodorus* (Num. i. 8; 1 Chron. ii. 14), is identical with Bartholomaeus. For, according to this passage, in the midst of calls to the *apostleship*, comp. xxi. 2, he appears as one of the twelve; while in the lists of the apostles (Matt. x. 3; Luke vi. 14; Mark i. 18; Acts i. 13), where his name is wanting, we find *Bartholomaeus*, and placed, moreover, side by side with Philip (only in Acts i. 13 with Matthew;¹ comp. *Constitt. Apol.*

¹ Hilgenfeld regarded him as identical with *Matthew*; but how much opposed is this view to the history of Matthew's call! though the *meaning* of his name is not different from that of Matthew's. Very recently, however, Hilgenfeld has supposed that the name answers to the Matthias who was appointed in the place of Judas (*N. T. extra canon.* IV. p. 105). Schleiermacher, *L. J.* p. 368, considers it very doubtful whether Nathanael belonged to the twelve at all. Chrysostom, Augustine, and others, long ago denied that he did, but this is already assumed in the "*duae viae*" (Hilgenfeld, *N. T. extra canon.* IV.). According to Spaeth, in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift*, 1868, p. 168 ff., Nathanael is to be taken

vi. 14. 1). This identity is all the more probable, because *Bartholomew* is only a patronymic, and must have become the ordinary name of the individual, and that in most frequent use; and thus it came to pass that his own distinctive name does not appear in the synoptic narrative. — *ὃν ἔγραψε*] *of whom*, etc. See on Rom. x. 5. — *Μωϋσῆς*] Deut. xviii. 15, and generally in his Messianic references and types. See on ver. 46. — *τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ*] for *Nazareth*, where Jesus had *lived* with His parents from infancy upwards, passed for His birth-place. Philip may have obtained his knowledge from Andrew and Peter, or even from Jesus Himself, who had no occasion at this time to state more fully and minutely his relation to Nazareth; while the *τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Ἰωσήφ*, which must rest upon a communication from Jesus, leaves His divine Sonship undisturbed. To attribute to Philip knowledge of the facts of the case with regard to both points (Hengstenberg) is in itself improbable, and is not in keeping with the simplicity of his words. But it is a groundless assumption to suppose that *John knew* nothing of the birth at Bethlehem; for it is *Philip's own* words that he records (against Strauss, De Wette). See on vii. 41.

Ver. 47. *Can anything good come out of Nazareth?* A question of astonishment that the Messiah should come *out of Nazareth*. But Nathanael asks thus doubtingly, not because Nazareth lay in *Galilee*, vii. 52 (the Fathers, Luther, Melancthon, Ebrard, and many), nor because of its *smallness*, as too *insignificant* to be the birth-place of the Messiah (Lücke, De Wette, Hug, Krabbe, Ewald, Lange, Brückner, and others), nor from both reasons together (Hengstenberg); nor, again, because the prophecy did not speak of Nazareth as the Messiah's birth-place (Godet); but, as the general expression *τὸ ἀγαθόν* proves (it is not the more special *ὁ Χριστός*), because Nathanael, and probably public opinion likewise, looked upon the little town as morally degenerate: it must have been so regarded at least in the narrow circle of the

as a *symbolical* name, invented by the writer, under which the *Apostle John himself* is said to be represented. The author of the Appendix, chap. xxi. 2, where Nathanael is expressly *distinguished* from the sons of Zebedee, is said to have made a *mistake*.

surrounding villages (Nathanael belonged to Cana). We have no historical proof that this was so; outside the N. T. the place is not mentioned, not even in Josephus; nevertheless Mark vi. 6, and the occurrence recorded Luke iv. 15 ff., well correspond with Nathanael's judgment as to its disrepute in a moral point of view. — ἀγαθόν] which yet must above all be the case if the Messiah were to come therefrom,—He whose coming must be a signally holy and sublime manifestation. — ἔρχου κ. ἴδε] “*optimum remedium contra opinioniones praeconceptas*,” Bengel.

Ver. 48. Περὶ αὐτοῦ] therefore to those journeying with Him, but so that the approaching Nathanael hears it, ver. 49. — ἀληθῶς] *truly* an Israelite, not merely according to outward descent and appearance, but in the moral nature which really corresponds to that of an upright Israelite. Comp. Rom. ix. 6, ii. 29. Ἐν ᾧ δόλος οὐκ ἐστὶ tells *by what means* he is so. Thus sincere and honest, thus inwardly true, *should* every Israelite be (not simply free from self-righteousness, but possessing what essentially belongs to truth); and Nathanael *was* all this. This virtue of guilelessness, as the characteristic of the true Israelite, is not named as belonging generally to the ancient *ideal* of the nation (Lücke, De Wette; this view arbitrarily passes by the reference to the nation *historically* which lay much nearer); but in view of the venerable and honourable testimonies which had been uttered concerning the people of Israel (*e.g.* Num. xxiii. 10), whose father was himself already designated ⲙⲉ ⲡⲓⲛ, LXX. ἀπλαστος,¹ Gen. xxv. 27; Aq. ἀπλοῦς,² Symm. ἄμωμος.—Jesus here also, as in vv. 43, 44, appears as the *searcher of hearts*.

Ver. 49. The approaching Nathanael heard the testimony of Jesus, and does not decline His commendation,—itself a proof of his guileless honesty; but he asks in amazement *how Jesus knew him*. — ὅντα ὑπὸ τ. συκῆν] belongs, as ver. 51 shows, not to φωνῆσαι, but to εἰδόν σε. Therefore, before Philip, vv. 46, 47, met and called (φωνῆσαι, comp. ii. 9, iv. 16, xi. 28, xviii. 33), Nathanael had been under a fig-tree;

¹ Comp. Plato, *Legg.* I. p. 642 D: ἀληθῶς καὶ οὕτως πλαστωὶς εἰσὶν ἀγαθοί. Soph. 216 C: οἱ μὴ πλαστωὶς, ἀλλ' ὄντως φιλόσοφοι.

² Comp. Aristoph. *Plut.* 1159: οὐ γὰρ δόλου οὐν ἴργον, ἀλλ' ἀπλῶν τρέπων.

whether the fig-tree of his own house (Mic. iv. 4; Zech. iii. 10), whether *meditating* (possibly upon the Messianic hope of the people), praying, reading,—which, according to Rabbinical statements (see in Lightfoot, Schoettgen, Wetstein), were employments performed beneath such trees,—we are not informed. He had just come from the tree to the place where Philip met him.¹ — εἰδόν σε] is usually taken as referring to a *glance into the depth of his soul*,² but contrary to the simple meaning of the words, which affirm nothing else than: *I saw thee*, not ἔγνων σε, or the like. Comp. also Hengstenberg. The miraculous element in the εἰδόν σε, which made it a σημεῖον to Nathanael, and which led to his confession which follows in ver. 50, must have consisted in the fact that the fig-tree either was situated out of sight of the place, or so far off that no one with ordinary powers of sight could have discerned a person under it. Εἰδόν σε thus simply interpreted gives the true *solution* to Nathanael's question, because there could not have been this *rapprochment* of miraculous *far-seeing* on the part of Jesus, had it not just been brought about by the immediate *recognition* of the true Israelite when he was at that distance. This spiritual elective affinity was the *medium* of the supernatural εἰδόν σε. Nonnus well says: ὁμμασι καὶ πραπίδεσσι τὸν οὐ παρόντα δοκεῖν. Jesus would not have seen an *ordinary* Jew, who, being therefore without this spiritual affinity, was beyond the limits of sight. — ὑπὸ τὴν συκ.] with the article: “under that *well-known* fig-tree, beneath which you were,” or, if the tree was within the range of vision, *pointing towards it*. De Wette also rightly abides by the simple meaning, *I saw thee*, but thinks that what caused the astonishment of Nathanael was the fact that Jesus saw him *when he believed himself to be unobserved* (though John regarded this seeing as supernatural). But this does not give an adequate motive psychologically for the confession of ver. 50; and we must further assume, with Ewald, that the words

¹ The reference of the εἰδόν σε to the same place where Philip called him (so, after the Greek Fathers, B. Crusius) must be rejected, because neither the ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐ—φωτῆσαι nor the ὄντα ὑπὸ τὴν συκῇν would thus have their appropriate and necessary point.

² Where it is imagined, though without the slightest hint to that effect in the text, that Jesus had a short time before *passed by the fig-tree unobserved*.

of Jesus reminded Nathanael of the deep and weighty thoughts which he was revolving when alone under the fig-tree, and he thus perceived that the depths of his soul were laid open before the spiritual eye of Jesus, though this is not indicated in the text.

Ver. 50. The double designation is uttered in the excitement of joyful certainty. The simple faith in the Messiah, expressed in ver. 41, is here intensified, not as to its subject-matter, but in its outward expression. Comp. Luthardt, p. 344. The second designation is the more definite of the two; and therefore the first, in the sense in which Nathanael used it, is not as yet to be apprehended metaphysically (against Hengstenberg) in John's sense, but is simply theocratic, presupposing the national view (Ps. ii. 7; John xi. 27) of the promised and expected theocratic King (comp. Riehm in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1865, p. 63 ff.), and not perhaps implying the teaching of the Baptist (Olshausen). The early occurrence of such confessions therefore conflicts the less with that later one of Peter's in Matt. xvi. 3, which implies, however, a consciousness of the higher import of the words (against Strauss).

Ver. 51. *Πιστεύεις* is, with Chrysostom and most others (even Lachmann and Tischendorf, not Godet), to be taken *interrogatively*; see on xx. 29.¹ But the question is not uttered in a tone of *censure*, which would only destroy the fresh bloom of this first meeting (Theophylact: "he had not yet rightly believed in Christ's Godhead"); nor is it even the expression of slight disapproval of a faith which was not yet based upon adequate grounds (De Wette, comp. Ewald); but, on the contrary, it is an expression of *surprise*, whereby Jesus joyfully *recognises* a faith in Nathanael which could hardly have been expected so soon. And to this faith, so surprisingly *ready* in its beginning, He promises something *greater* (ἐς ἐλπίδα φέρτερον ἔλκων, Nonnus) by way of further *confirmation*. — τοῦ-των] Plural of the category: "*than this* which you now have

¹ As to the *paratactic protasis*, which may be read interrogatively or not according to the character of the discourse, see C. F. Hermann, *Progr.* 1849, p. 18; Scheibe in Schneidew. *Philolog.* 1850, p. 362 ff. Comp. also Nägelsbach's note on the *Iliad*, p. 350, ed. 3.

met with, and which has become the ground of your faith." — *καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ*] specially introduces the further *statement* of the *μείζω τούτων* as a most significant word. — *ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν*] The double *ἀμὴν* does not occur in other parts of the N. T., but we find it twenty-five times in John, and only in the mouth of Jesus,—therefore all the more certainly original. — *ὑμῖν*] to thee and Andrew, John, Peter (James, see in ver. 42), and Philip. — *ἀπάρτι*] *from now onwards*, for Jesus was about to begin His Messianic work. See chap. ii. Thus, in this weighty word He furnishes His disciples with the key for the only correct understanding of that work. — *ᾧ ὁψέσθῃ, κ.τ.λ.*] The "opened heaven" is not intended to be taken in its literal sense, as if it stood *alone*, but is part of the figurative moulding of the sentence in keeping with the following metaphor. Observe here the *perfect* participle: *heaven stands open*; comp. Acts vii. 56. The *ascending and descending angels* are, according to Gen. xxviii. 12, a symbolical representation of the *uninterrupted and living intercourse subsisting between the Messiah and God*,—an intercommunion which the disciples would *clearly* and vividly recognise, or, according to the symbolic form of the thought, would *see* as a matter of experience throughout the ministry of Jesus which was to follow.¹ The angels are not therefore to be regarded as personified divine *powers* (Olshausen, De Wette, and several), or as personal energies of God's Spirit (Luthardt and Hofmann), but as always God's *messengers*, who brought to the Messiah God's commands, or executed them on Him (comp. Matt. iv. 11, xxvi. 53; Luke xxii. 43), and return to God again (*ἀναβαίνοντας*), while others with new commissions came down (*καταβαίν.*), and so on. We are not told whether, and if so, to what extent, Nathanael and his companions now already perceived the *symbolic* meaning of the declaration. It certainly is not to be understood as having reference to the *actual appearances of angels* in the course of the Gospel history (Chrysostom, Cyril, Euthymius Zigabenus,

¹ This expression tells us nothing concerning the origin of Christ's knowledge of God, which ver. 18 clearly declares, and which cannot therefore be attributed to a series of progressive revelations (Weizsäcker); the expression rather presupposes that origin. Comp. also Weiss, *Lehrbegr.* p. 236 ff.

and most of the early expositors), against which ἀπάρτι is conclusive; nor merely to *the working of miracles* (Storr, Godet), which is in keeping neither with the expression itself, nor with the necessary reference to the Messiah's ministry *as a whole*, which must be described by ἀπάρτι ὁψεσθε, etc. — ἀναβαίν.] is placed *first*, in remembrance of Gen. xxviii. 12, without any special purpose, but not inappropriately, because when the ὁψεσθε takes place, the intercourse between heaven and earth does not then begin, but is already going on. We may supply ἀπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρ. after ἀναβαίν. from the analogy of what follows. See Kühner, II. p. 603. — Concerning ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρ., see on Matt. viii. 20; Mark ii. 8, note. In John likewise it is the standing Messianic designation of Jesus as used by Himself; here, where angelic powers are represented as waiting upon Him who bears the Messianic authority, it corresponds rather with the prophetic vision of the Son of man (Dan. vii. 14), and forms the impressive conclusion of the whole section, confirming and ratifying the joyous faith and confession of the first disciples, as the first solemn self-avowal on the part of Jesus in their presence. It *thus* retained a deep and indelible hold upon the recollection of John, and therefore it stands as the utterance of the clear Messianic consciousness of Jesus unveiled before us at the outset of His work. It is exactly in John that the Messiahship of Jesus comes out with the greatest precision, not as the consequence and result, but as already, from the beginning onwards, the subject-matter of our Lord's self-consciousness.¹

Note.—The synoptical account of the call of the two pairs of brothers, Matt. iv. 18 ff. and parallels, is utterly *irreconcilable* with that of John as to place, time, and circumstances; and the usual explanations resorted to—that what is here recorded was only a *preliminary* call,² or only a *social union* with Christ (Luther, Lücke, Ebrard, Tholuck; comp. also Ewald and Godet), or only

¹ The historic accuracy of this relation, as testified by John, stands with the apostolic origin of the Gospel, against which even the objections of Holtzmann in his investigation, which are excellent in a historical point of view (*Jahrb. f. D. Theol.* 1867, p. 389), can have no effect.

² So, most recently, Märcker, *Uebereinstimm. der Evang. d. Matt. u. Joh.*, Meiningen 1868, p. 10 ff. The τὸν λεγόμενον Πέτρον, Matt. iv. 18, furnishes no

the *gathering together of the first believers* (Luthardt), but not their call—fall to the ground at once when we see how the narrative proceeds; for according to it the *μαθηταί*, ii. 2, are with Jesus, and remain with Him. See on Matt. iv. 19, 20. The harmony of the two accounts consists in this simply, that the two pairs of brothers are the earliest apostles. To recognise in John's account not an actual history, but a picture of the author's own, drawn by himself for the sake of illustrating his idea (Baur, Hilgenfeld, Schenkel),—that, viz., the knowledge of the disciples and that of Jesus Himself as to His Messianic call might appear perfect from the outset,—is only one of the numerous self-deceptions in criticism which form the premisses of the unhistorical conclusion that the fourth Gospel is not the work of the apostle, but of some writer of much later date, who has *moulded* the history into the form of his own ideal. On the contrary, we must here specially observe that the author, if he wished to antedate the time and place of the call, certainly did not need, for the carrying out of his idea, to invent a totally different *situation* from that which was before his eyes in the Synoptics. Over and above this, the assumption that, by previously receiving John's baptism, Jesus renounced any independent action (Schenkel), is pure imagination. Weizsäcker (p. 404) reduces John's account to this: "The first acquaintance between Jesus and these followers of His was brought about by His meeting with the Baptist; and on that occasion, amid the excitement which the Baptist created, Messianic hopes, however transitory, were kindled in this circle of friends." But this rests upon a treatment of the fourth Gospel, according to which it can no longer claim the authority of an independent witness; instead of this witness, we have merely the poet of a thoughtful Idyll. And when Keim (I. p. 553) finds here only the narration of an age that could no longer endure the humble and human beginnings of Jesus, but would transplant into the time of His first appearance that glory which, as a matter of history, first distinguished His departure and His exaltation, this is all the more daring a speculation, the more closely, according to Keim, the origin of the Gospel verges upon the lifetime of the apostle, and must therefore present the most vivid recollections of His disciples.

proof, as is plain from the parallel in Mark i. 16, which is the source of Matthew's account, but has not those words. They are simply a personal notice added from the standing-point of the writer, as in Matt. x. 2.

CHAPTER II

Ver. 10. *τότε* is wanting in B. L. *κ*.^{*} Min. Verss.; deleted by Tisch. But how easily might it, in itself superfluous, have been passed over before *τὸν*!—Ver. 11. The *τὴν* before *ἀρχὴν* we must delete, with Lachm. and Tisch., following A. B. L. *Δ*. Min., Origen, and other Fathers.—Ver. 12. *ἔμειναν*. A. F. G. *Δ*. Min. Copt. Arm. Pers. p. Ver. Nonn.: *ἔμεινεν*. In keeping with the preceding *κατέβη* and the following *ἀνέβη*.—Ver. 15. For *τὸ κέρμα*, B. L. T^b. X. 33. Copt. Arm. Ver. Origen: *τὰ κέρματα* (explanatory).—Ver. 17. *δέ* is wanting in B. L. X. *κ*. Copt.; bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch. Added for connection sake. For *καταφάγεσαι* Elz. has *κατέφαγε*, against all the Uncials, from the LXX.—Ver. 22. After *ἔλεγε* Elz. has *αὐτοῖς*, an addition feebly supported.

Ver. 1. *Τρίτῃ*] is, with Origen, *c. Cels.* vi. 30, to be reckoned from the last-named day, i. 44, not from the coming to Cana (Ewald), which has not yet been alluded to. Thus we have in all *six* days from i. 19, not *seven* (see on i. 41), in which number Luthardt would find this symbolic meaning: "It is a Sabbath, as it were, which Jesus here is keeping."—By *τῆς Γαλιλαίας* the village of Cana (now not *Kafar kenna*, as Hengstenberg and Godet still think, but *Kana el-Jelil*: see Robinson, III. p. 443; Ritter, XVI. 753 ff.), about three hours N.W. from Nazareth, is distinguished from *another* Cana; for in ver. 11, iv. 46, xxi. 2, *τῆς Γαλιλαίας* is also added, and hence it must be taken as a *standing* descriptive addition, as if belonging to the name (like our "Freiburg im Breisgau" and the like), and not here as a mere allusion to the *arrival* in Galilee (B. Crusius). The *other* Cana lay in the tribe of *Asher*, Josh. xix. 28 (S.E. from Tyre; comp. Robinson, III. 657), and though also to be considered as belonging to Galilee, was yet so near to *Phoenicia*, that the designation of our Cana as *K. τῆς Γαλιλαίας*, in distinction from the other, is justified on geographical grounds. Ewald distinguishes our Cana from the

Kanath lying east of the river district, but the name (קנא, Num. xxxii. 42, 1 Chron. ii. 23; and Bertheau on the word; *Kanáth* LXX., *Kanátha* Josephus) does not correspond. — *καὶ ἦν ἡ μήτηρ, κ.τ.λ.*] Mary was already there when Jesus and His disciples arrived in Cana, no doubt arranging and helping (see vv. 3, 5) in the friend's house where the wedding was to take place. That shortly before the baptism of Jesus she had *come to live* at Cana (Ewald), but soon after removed thence to Capernaum (ii. 12), is without specific intimation both here and in iv. 46. That Joseph was not there with her, is in keeping with his entire disappearance (equally unaccountable as it is) from the Gospel narrative after Luke ii. 41 ff. It is usually assumed, though without proof (see vi. 42), that he was already *dead*.

Ver. 2. *Jesus also and His disciples* (those won in chap. i.) *were invited, i.e.* when, in the meanwhile, He had come to Cana.¹ To take *ἐκλήθη* as *pluperfect* is objectionable both in itself (see on xviii. 24), and also because the disciples had been first won by Jesus on the way. But there is nothing against the supposition that Jesus had journeyed not to Nazareth, but to *Cana*, on account of the wedding; for He may have known (through Nathanael, Godet thinks) that His mother was there, and because, considering the friendly relations with the family, He did not need a *previous* invitation. This is at the same time in answer to Weisse, II. 203, who finds an invitation inconceivable; to Lange, who holds that Jesus found the invitation awaiting Him at Nazareth(?); also to Schleiermacher, who makes the invitation to have preceded even His baptism. Of the disciples, Nathanael, moreover, was himself a native of Cana (xxi. 2). But even apart from this, the friendly invitation of the disciples along with Jesus by no means implies a previous extended ministry of Jesus in Galilee (Schenkel), or even such a ministry at all before His baptism (Schleiermacher).—As to the sing. *ἐκλήθη*, see Kühner, § 433, 1; Buttmann, *N. T. Gk.* 110 [E. T. p. 126 ff.].

Ver. 3. *ῥοπήσ. οἴνου*] *because a scarcity of wine had occurred*,—on what day of the marriage feast (it usually lasted

¹ Schenkel thoughtlessly says, that, "according to our Gospel, Jesus was to all appearance transported to Cana by a *miracle of almighty power*."

seven, Gen. xxix. 27; Judg. xiv. 14; Tob. ix. 12, x. 1) we are not told.¹ The expression ὅστερ' εἶ τι, *something fails or runs short*, belongs to later Greek (Mark x. 21; Isa. li. 14; Neh. ix. 21; Dios. v. 86). — οἶνον οὐκ ἔχουσι] *they are short of wine, they, i.e. the family of the bridegroom, who provided the feast.* They might be *disgraced* by the failure of the wine. The words, however, are not only an expression of interest, which was all the more reasonable, as the deficiency was accelerated by the invitation of her Son and His disciples; but they also contain, as Jesus Himself understood (ver. 4), an indirect *appeal for help*, as is confirmed by ver. 5, which was prompted by thoughtful consideration for the credit of the house providing the feast. Some find herein a call to *work a miracle*. But wrongly, because this would imply either that Mary had inferred from the conception, birth, etc., of her Son, His power of working miracles, which she now expected Him to display, or that Jesus had already, on some previous occasion, though in a narrower circle, done some wonderful works (the former hypothesis in Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, Baumgarten, Maier, Godet, Hengstenberg, and many more; the latter in Lücke and others),—assumptions which are equally incapable of proof. Wrongly too, because the supply of *this* want of itself so little suggested the need of a miracle, that the thought of so disproportionate a means occurring to Mary's mind without any adequate reason, even by the recollection of such traits as are related in Luke ii. 49 ff. (Brückner), or by the miracle at His baptism, or by the call of the disciples, or by the declaration of i. 52, of which she would be informed at the marriage (Godet), is quite inexplicable, even supposing that she had observed more clearly than any others the change which had taken place in her Son, and had therefore with fuller expectation looked up to Him as the Messiah (Ewald's view, comp. Tholuck). Far rather did she wish to prompt Jesus in a *general*

¹ The text does not say that it lasted only one day, as Hengstenberg finds expressed in ver. 1, where we are simply told that the marriage *began* on the third day,—which has nothing to do with its *duration*. Nor is there any hint in the text of "*poor circumstances*," for it speaks of the master of the feast and of servants. Least of all does the inviting of Jesus' *disciples* along with Himself imply poverty. This also in answer to Godet.

way to render help; and this she would suppose He would do in the most natural manner (by furnishing wine), which must have appeared as obvious a way as that of miracle was remote. But Jesus, in the feeling of His divine call (ver. 4), *intended* to render help in a special and *miraculous* manner; and accordingly, with this design of His *own* in view, returns the answer contained in ver. 4. In this way the *obscurity* of the words is removed (which Lampe and De Wette dwell upon), and at the same time the objection raised from ver. 11 (by Strauss, B. Bauer, Schweizer, Scholten) against the entire narrative, upon the assumption that Mary (from the Logos standing-point of the evangelist, it is supposed!) expected a miracle. Lastly, it is purely gratuitous to suppose that Mary wished to *give a hint* to Jesus and His disciples *to go away* (Bengel, Paulus); yet Ebrard (on Olshausen) has brought this view forward again, explaining afterwards "mine hour" of the time of His death, when Jesus would have to leave the marriage (the marriage figuratively representing the period of His earthly ministry). This is not profundity, but a mere playing with exegesis.

Ver. 4. Jesus understands His mother's wish, but He has in His mind a method of help altogether *different* from what she meant. He therefore repels her interference, in the consciousness of the call which here is given Him to begin His Messianic ministry of miracles, and holds out the prospect of rendering help at a *later* period.—*τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί;*] a rejection of fellowship (וְלִי וְלָךְ, Josh. xxii. 24; Judg. xi. 12, *al.*; Matt. viii. 29, xxvii. 19; Mark i. 24; Luke viii. 28; also in the classics; see Bernhardt, p. 98), here with reference to the help to be rendered, which He Himself, without His mother's assistance, and independently of her, would accomplish, according to His own divinely determined call and will, and in a miraculous manner. Godet well says: "Sa devise sera désormais: *mon père et moi.*" Comp. Dorner, *Jesu sündlose Vollkommenh.* p. 11. The appellation *γύναι* added to the *τί—σοί* (which Hofmann thinks should be joined to what follows; but why?) does not contain anything unfriendly ("*duriter respondet*," Melancthon), as is clear already from xix. 21; see also Wetstein. Comp. xx. 15. But His not saying *μήτερ*

followed involuntarily from the consciousness of His higher wonder-working capacity and will, by virtue of which, as an *ἀμήτωρ*, He rejected any interference proceeding from feminine weakness, even such as was presented here before Him in His mother. The remark of Euthymius Zigabenus is not happy (comp. Augustine): "He spoke thus *as God*;" while that of Epiphanius, Beza, Calvin, and many others, is singular: "His aim was to oppose that future *Mariolatry* which He foresaw." Still, the passage tells against that worship. Schenkel says erroneously, quoting Mark iii. 21, "He was at *variance* with the members of His family." — *ἡ ὥρα μου*] can only mean, *the moment when it will be for me to help*.¹ So also Hengstenberg, in keeping with the context. Jesus, conscious of His close communion with the Father, sees clearly that this His first manifestation of Himself as Messiah in the working of miracles stands, even with reference to the time when it is to begin, in close connection with the divine appointment; and He feels that the moment (*ἡ ὥρα* = *ὁ καιρός*, as in xvi. 21, and often in the N. T. and the classics) for this first Messianic display of power is not yet present when His mother refers to the want of wine. *How* He was conscious of the exact *horas et moras* for working, cannot be more precisely determined. Euthymius Zigabenus is substantially right: *ἡ τοῦ θαυματουργήσαι*; and Ewald: "the hour of full Messianic sense of power." Strangely attributing to Mary thoughts of that kind, Baumgarten Crusius remarks, "the moment of my *public appearance* as Messiah;" and Godet: "*l'heure de l'avénement royal*." Anticipating ver. 11, Lücke, Tholuck, Brückner, Maier, Baur, Baumgarten render: "the moment of the *revelation of my glory*." Comp. Luthardt: "This miracle, as the figurative *prolepsis* of Christ's subsequent full revelation of Himself before the eyes of men,

¹ It is an error to suppose that *ἡ ὥρα μου* in John always signifies *the hour of Christ's death*. Its reference depends entirely upon the *context*, as in vii. 30, viii. 20, where it means the hour of Christ's seizure; and xiii. 1, where the more precise definition is expressly given. Already *τινὲς* in Chrysostom, Ebrard, and many, take it here as meaning the hour of Christ's death. Hilgenfeld understands it of the hour of the *glorification* of Jesus, the culminating point of which was certainly the crucifixion; and that Jesus, according to John, gives expression to the full consciousness of the Logos, and its superhuman independence of all human counsel.

was of significance only for that narrow circle, and was intended to lead Jesus on from it into public life,"—of which, however, the text contains no hint either in ver. 5 or elsewhere.

Ver. 5. The words of Jesus last spoken implied that He intended to help, though not immediately. Hence Mary's direction to the servants, whose service she supposed Jesus would require (perhaps to go and fetch wine). Any allusion to Gen. xli. 55 (Hengstenberg) is remote from the text. Ebrard finds it implied in the passage, that Jesus, after He had spoken, ver. 4, rose and turned towards the servants.

Ver. 6. *Ἑκεῖ*] Whether in the feast chamber, or possibly in the vestibule, we are not told. — *ὑδρίαι*] *water-pitchers* for carrying water, iv. 28; often in the LXX.; Dem. 1155. 6; Arist. *Vesp.* 926; *Lysistr.* 327, 358; Lucian, *Dem. enc.* 29. — *ἕξ*] Not stated as explanatory of the Jewish custom, but as vividly describing the exact circumstances, yet not with any symbolic significance (six, Lange thinks, was the number of poverty and labour). — *κείμεναι*] *positae, set down, placed there*. Comp. xix. 29; Jer. xxiv. 1; Xen. *Oec.* viii. 19: *χύτρας . . . εὐκρινῶς κείμενας*. — *κατὰ τὸν καθαρ. τῶν Ἰουδ.*] *i.e. for the sake of cleansing* (the hands and vessels, Matt. xv. 2; Mark vii. 3 ff.; Luke xi. 39; Lightfoot, p. 974), which the Jews practised before and after meals. On *κατὰ*, in which, as in 2 Tim. i. 1, "notio secundum facile transit in notionem propter" (Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 3. 12). Comp. Winer, p. 376 [E. T. p. 602]. — *μετρητάς*] In conformity with his Hellenic tendency, John gives the *Attic* measure, which, however, is equal to the Hebrew *הא* (Josephus, *Antt.* viii. 2. 9). The *Attic metretes* contained 12 *χόες* or 144 *κοτύλαι*, $1\frac{1}{2}$ Roman *amphorae*, *i.e.* about 21 Würtemberg measures (see Wurm, *de ponderum etc. rationib.* 126), and about 33 Berlin quarts, in weight eighty pounds of water [about $8\frac{7}{8}$ gallons] (Bertheau, *Gesch. d. Israel*, p. 77). Comp. Böckh, *Staatshaush.* I. 127; Hermann, *Privatalterth.* § 46. 10. Each pitcher contained two or three *metretae* (which are not, with Ammon, to be referred to a smaller measure, nor even, with Ebrard, to that of an *amphora*); for as a row of six pitchers is named, *ἀνά* can, consistently with the context, only be taken in a *distributive* sense, not in the signification—which is, besides, lin-

guistically untenable (see Winer, p. 372 [E. T. pp. 496-7])—of *circiter*, according to which all six must have held only about two or three *metretæ* (Paulus, Hug). The *great* quantity of water thus turned into wine (252-378 Würtemberg measures, 106-160 gallons) seems out of all proportion, and is used by Strauss and Schweizer to impugn the historic character of the narrative; but it is conceivable if we consider the character of the miracle as one of *blessing* (compare the miraculous Feedings), and that we are to suppose that what was left over may have been intended by Jesus as a present for the married pair, while the possible abuse of it during the feast itself was prevented by the presence of the Giver. We must also bear in mind that the quantity was suggested to Him by the six pitchers standing there; and therefore, if the blessed Wonder-worker had not merely to measure the amount of the *need*, He had occasion all the more not to keep within the exact quantity which the circumstances demanded, by changing the contents of only one or two pitchers into wine, and omitting the rest. The blessing conferred by the Wonder-worker has also, considering the circumstances, its appropriateness and *decorum*, in keeping with which He was not to act in a spirit of calculation, but, on the contrary, to give plentifully, especially when, as was here the case, this abundance was suggested by the vessels which were standing there.

Vv. 7, 8. The transformation is accomplished in the time between ver. 7 and ver. 8.¹ — *αὐτοῖς*] the servants, who obeyed Him according to the direction of Mary, ver. 5; not, as Lange's imagination suggests, "under the influence of a miraculously excited feeling pervading the household." — *γέμισατε*] The most natural supposition from this and ver. 6 is that the pitchers had been *empty*, the water in them having been used up before the feast began, and were to be filled afresh for use after meat. Observe, moreover, that Christ

¹ The commencement of the transformation might indeed be also placed after the drawing out, and consequently after ver. 8, so that only that portion of water which was drawn was converted into wine. But the minute statement of the number and large size of the vessels in ver. 6, by which it is manifestly intended to draw attention to the greatness in a quantitative point of view of the miracle of transformation, presupposes rather that *all* the water in the pitchers was converted into wine.

does not proceed *creatively* in His miracles, neither here nor in the feedings. — *ἕως ἄνω*] This is stated for no other purpose than to give prominence to the *quantity* of the wine which Jesus miraculously produced. — *ἀντλήσατε*] Altogether general, without specifying any particular pitcher,—showing that as *all* were filled, the water in *all* was turned into wine (in answer to Semler and Olshausen). From the nature of the case, *no object* is appended, and we therefore can only understand the general word *it*. The drawing out was done by means of a vessel (a tankard, *πρόχοος*, Hom. *Od.* xviii. 397), out of which the master of the feast would fill the cups upon the table (comp. Nitzsch on Hom. *Od.* η. 183). — The *ἀρχιτρίκλινος*, *table-master* (Heliod. vii. 27), in Petron. 27 *triclinarches*, elsewhere also called *τραπεζοποιός* (Athen. iv. p. 170 D E; Beck. *Char.* II. 252), is the chief of the waiters at table, upon whom devolved the charge of the meats and drinks, and the entire arrangement of the repast. See Walch, *De architriclino*, Jena 1753. Comp. Fritzsche on Ecclus. xxxv. 1, where he is designated as *ἡγούμενος*. He was at the same time the taster of the meats and drinks, and is not to be confounded with the *συμποσίαρχος*, *modimperator*, *arbitrator bibendi*, who was chosen by the guests themselves from among their own number (Xen. *Anab.* vi. 1. 30; Herm. *Privat-alterth.* § 28, 29; Mitscherlich, *ad Hor.* *Od.* i. 4. 18).

Vv. 9, 10. The parenthesis, usually made to begin with *κ. οὐκ ἦδει*, must be limited to *οἱ δὲ διάκονοι* — *ὑδωρ*, because not only does the construction run on with *καὶ οὐκ ἦδει*, but a reason is also assigned for the *φωνεῖ τὸν νυμφίον*, *κ.τ.λ.*, which follows; for had the man known whence the new wine had come, he would not in surprise have called the bridegroom, etc. — *τὸ ὑδωρ οἶν. γεγεν.*] not *the wine which had been water* (Luther), but *the water which had become wine* (and now was wine). Observe the force of the perfect. If the *τό* had been repeated, this water, as that which had been made wine, would have been distinguished from *other* water (*aquam, eam dico quae*, etc.). See Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* iv. 6. 1. The *τό* not being repeated, the *ὑδωρ οἶν. γεγεν.* expresses one complete conception. — *πόθεν ἐστίν*] *whence it comes*, i.e. that it had been drawn out of the water-pitchers. This is evident

from the following οἱ ἡγκληκότες τὸ ὕδωρ. The table-master, therefore, cannot have been present at the drawing out of the water, ver. 8. Concerning the present ἐστίν, see i. 40. — The insertion of the words οἱ δὲ διάκονοι, κ.τ.λ., serves to give prominence *to the reality of the miracle*. — ἤδρυσαν] *i.e.* πόθεν ἐστίν, but they did not know that it was *wine* which they brought. — φωνεῖ] *He called him to him* (comp. i. 49), and said to him. Whether the bridegroom was just outside at the time (as Nonnus represents), or was reclining at the table, or is to be supposed as employed in the chamber, does not appear. — ὁ ἀρχιτρίκλ.] a superfluous repetition, but suggested by the parenthesis, as is often the case in Greek. — πᾶς ἄνθρωπος, κ.τ.λ.] spoken under the impression that the bridegroom had kept the good wine in reserve, and had not allowed it to be put forth (τίθησι), but now was regaling them with it. We may suppose the words to have been spoken jocularly, in joyous surprise after tasting the wine. The general custom, however, to which the table-master refers, is not elsewhere with any certainty confirmed (the proof in Wetstein is doubtful); nor, indeed, considering the playful way in which it was spoken, does it need any voucher. — ὅταν μεθυσθῶσι] *when they have become intoxicated*, so that they can no longer appreciate the goodness of the wine. The word does not mean anything else; not *when they have well drunk* (Tholuck, De Wette, and several, *e.g.* Beza, Cornelius a Lapide, and others), because *intoxication* is the essential though relative conception (see also Gen. xliii. 34; Hag. i. 6; Rev. xvii. 2). The man says only in joke, as if it were a *general experience*, what he certainly may often have observed, and no inference can therefore be drawn from his words that the guests at Cana were already intoxicated; especially as ὥς ἄρτι simply means *till now*, after they had been drinking so long at the table, in antithesis with the πρῶτον.

Ver. 11. The τὴν before ἀρχὴν being spurious (see critical notes), we must translate: *This, as beginning of His miracles, did Jesus at Cana*. See on iv. 54, and Bernhardt, p. 319; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Gorg.* p. 510 D. From this it is clear that it is the first miracle *in general*, and not merely the first of those that were wrought in *Cana* (iv. 46 sqq.), that is

meant (so already *τινές* in Chrysostom and Paulus). This concluding remark of John's simply serves to express, on occasion of the first of them, the *teleological* nature of the miracles of Jesus generally. — *τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ*] not "His excellent humanity" (Paulus), but *His divine Messianic majesty*, as in i. 14. The miracles of Jesus, as He Himself testified, had for their object not only the *δόξα* of the *Father*, but also *His own*, xi. 4 (in opposition to Weizsäcker, *Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol.* 1857, p. 165). The former is really the latter, and the latter the former. Observe how in John (as well as in the Synoptics) Jesus begins His Messianic ministry in *Galilee*, even in this His first miracle. — *καὶ ἐπίστευσαν, κ.τ.λ.*] *and His disciples became believers in Him*. The faith which they already had (i. 35–52) was only introductory, belonging to the commencement of their connection with Jesus; now, upon the basis of this manifestation of His glory (i. 14), came the more advanced and fuller decision, a new epoch in their faith, which, moreover, still continued susceptible of and requiring fresh additions even to the end (xi. 15, xiv. 11). There is no hint here of any contrast with the unbelief afterwards manifested by the people (Brückner), nor can this be inferred from ver. 12 ff. Comp. Weiss, *Lehrbegriff*, p. 102.

Note.—This turning of the water into wine must be regarded as an *actual miracle*, for John as an eye-witness (see on i. 41, 42), in the most simple and definite manner (comp. iv. 46), represents it as such, and as the first manifestation of the divine glory dwelling in Christ in the direction of miraculous working (not as portraying beforehand the heavenly marriage supper, Rev. xix. 8, Matt. xxvi. 29, as Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, II. 2, p. 407, and Baumgarten, p. 99, take it). Every exposition which explains away the miraculous element contradicts the words and the purpose of St. John, infringes on his credibility and capacity for simple observation, and places even the character of Jesus in an ambiguous light. The *physical inconceivability*, which nevertheless is not identical with absolute impossibility (against Scholten, p. 215), pertains to this work in common only with every miracle;¹ and hence the appeal made

¹ It does not become more conceivable by Lange's fiction (*L. J.* II. p. 479), which is quite unsupported by the text, viz. that the company were elevated to a higher tone of feeling, as the disciples were at a later time upon the mount of

to a supposed *accelerated process of nature* (Olshausen, comp. already Augustine and Chrysostom), which must have been at the same time an artificial process, is only a superfluous crutch on which the representation is made to lean, inapplicable to the other miracles, and as arbitrary as it is (in the absence of a vine) inadequate. Its *inconceivableness* in a *telic* point of view John himself removes in ver. 11; and remembering its design as there stated, the miracle was not an act of luxury (De Wette), but of abounding human kindness in blessing (see on ver. 6). To suppose another design, viz. that Jesus wished to show how opposed He was to the strict asceticism of the Baptist (Flatt, Olshausen), is pure and arbitrary invention, in opposition to ver. 11. Further, the fact that the *Synoptics* have not the narrative really amounts to nothing, because John selected and wrote independently of the synoptical series of narrations; and as they have not the first, so neither have they the last and greatest miracle. We must, after all, abide by the simple statement that there was a *change of substance* (ver. 9), effected by the power of Jesus over the sphere of nature, in conformity with a higher law of causation. Granting this power, which the whole range of the Gospel miracles demands, there is no ground whatever for contenting oneself (against ver. 9) with the assumption of a *change of attributes* merely in the water, whereby (after the analogy of mineral waters) it may have received the colour and taste of wine (Neander). It is levity of an equally objectionable kind, and a wronging of a writer so serious as John, to explain what occurred as a *wedding joke*, as Paulus (Jesus had a quantity of wine brought into the house, and had it mixed with water out of the pitchers and put upon the tables, ver. 4 having been spoken jestingly) and Gfrörer (Mary brought the wine with her as a wedding present, and during the feast, at the right moment, she gave her son a sign to bring out and distribute the gift) have agreed to do. Thus, instead of the transmutation of the water, we have a frivolous transmutation of the history.¹ Lastly, the *mythical* explanation contradicts the trustworthiness and genuineness of the Gospel. According to it, *fact* is resolved into *legend*—a legend derived from the

transfiguration, and that Christ, from the full spring of His highest life-power, made them drink creatively "in the element of the higher feeling."

¹ Ammon also, *L. J. I.*, falls back upon an erroneous idea and representation on the part of John: "What took place in the intervening time, when the water-pitchers were empty, and soon after were filled to the brim, is unknown to us." The miracle is thus reduced into a natural event behind the scenes. Schenkel simply enough removes every miraculous element from the history, as being legendary adornments.

analogies of the histories of Moses (Ex. xv. 23 sqq.) and Elisha (2 Kings ii. 19), as Strauss will have it, or from a misunderstood parable, as Weisse thinks; while De Wette—without, however, adopting the mythical view, but not fully recognising the historic character of the narrative—regards the dispensing of the wine as an act corresponding with the dispensing of the bread, and both as answering to the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper. This he holds to be the most appropriate explanation; but it is all the more inept, because there is not the least hint of it in the narrative, and because the Lord's Supper is not once mentioned in John. According to Schweizer and Weisse, the paragraph is to be reckoned among certain interpolations which have been added to the genuine Johannean nucleus,—an arbitrary assertion; whereas Baur, whose criticism rejects the whole Gospel, transforms the narrative into an allegory, wherein water is the symbol of the Baptist, wine of the Messiah's dignity (*i.e.* the bridegroom's), and the transformation typifies the transition from the preparatory stage of the Baptist to the epoch of Messianic activity and glory (comp. Baumgarten Crusius, p. 82); while Hilgenfeld (*Evang.* p. 248) looks upon the turning of the water into wine as intended as a counterpart to the synoptical narrative of the temptation, and to illustrate how Jesus was raised above all narrow asceticism. Thus, too, some of the Fathers (Cyril, Augustine, and many others) allegorize the miracle, without, however, surrendering its objective and historical character as a fact; whereas Ewald, while renouncing any investigation into the historic probability of the narrative, regards it as the gilding of the idea of the beneficent power of the Messianic spirit, whereby even now water ought to become wine. Luthardt holds, indeed, the objective historical reality, but regards the manifestation of the *δόξα* to have been *in contrast with that given in the O. T.*,—the gift of God occupying the place of the command, and the higher life, which Jesus the bridegroom makes known in this miracle, the place of outward purification. Similarly Scholten, p. 164. But while the representation of Christ as bridegroom is quite remote from the narrative, John gives no support or sanction to the idea that the miracle was symbolical, either in the remark of ver. 6 (*κατὰ τ. καθ'αυτ. τ. Ἰουδ.*) or in that of ver. 11 (*ἐφ'αυέρ. τ. δόξ. αὐτοῦ*).—The miracle at Cana is, finally, the only one to which the Synoptics have *no* one that corresponds. Therefore the miracles in John are all the less to be used in support of the assertion that, in John, Christ, after the manner of the Gnostics, announces another and higher God than the God of the O. T. (Hilgenfeld, *Lehrbegr.* 281). According to Keim, the marriage in Cana, the first great

beaming forth of the divine glory, stands in John as "a loving portrait" of Christ, and designedly in place of the painful temptation in the wilderness. But this glory beamed forth still more grandly and more significantly in its bearing upon the Saviour's whole ministry in the threefold triumph over Satan.

Ver. 12. *Μετὰ τοῦτο κατέβη, κ.τ.λ.*] Direct from Cana? or from Nazareth (i. 46), whither Mary, Jesus, and the disciples had returned? The latter must be assumed as the correct view, because the *brothers* of Jesus (His brothers *literally*, not His *cousins*, as Hengstenberg again maintains; see vii. 3, 5, and on Matt. i. 25, xii. 46, 1 Cor. ix. 5) had not been with Him at the wedding. It is quite arbitrary to suggest that they were accidentally omitted to be mentioned in ver. 2 (Baumgarten Crusius, following earlier commentators). — *κατέβη*] *down*, for *Καφαρναούμ* (to be written thus, with Lachmann and Tischendorf, in John likewise) lay on the shore of the *lake of Tiberias*. — *αὐτὸς κ. ἡ μήτηρ, κ.τ.λ.*] A common *ἐπανόρθωσις* (correction). See Fritzsche, *Conject.* p. 25; *ad Matt.* p. 420; *ad Marc.* p. 70; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Crit.* p. 50 E. John does not tell us *why* they went down to Capernaum¹ (Matt. iv. 13 is in a totally different connection). The *settlement* of the family at Capernaum is left uncertain by John; the fact had but little interest for the Judaistic standing-point of his history, and is neither *recorded* here, as Ewald maintains (the *κ. ἰκεῖ ἔμειναν οὐ πολλ. ἡμ.* which follows is against this), nor even *presupposed* (Wieseler, De Wette, Tholuck), for the mention of the brothers who were not with Him at the marriage forbids this. Nor is the settlement attested either by iv. 3, 43, or by vi. 17, 59. — *οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας*] because the Passover was at hand, ver. 13, which Jesus (and the disciples, iii. 22) attended; not, therefore, on account of misconstruction and hostility (Ewald).

Vv. 13-16. *Καὶ*] Simply the continuative *and*, *i.e.* during this short stay at Capernaum. — For vv. 14-16, see on Matt.

¹ Hengstenberg supposes that John mentions this only from a feeling of personal interest; that he himself had belonged to Capernaum, and Jesus had stayed at his father's house. An utterly groundless conjecture, made for the sake of harmonizing (i. 45; comp. Luke iv. 38, Mark i. 29), according to which we should have to regard Bethsaida as a suburb of Capernaum; see, on the contrary, Matt. xi. 21, 23.

xxi. 12, 13. — *πάντας*] refer not to the *persons*, but to the *animals* named immediately afterwards with the *τε*—*καί*, *i.e.* *not only, but also* (see Bäuml. *in loc.*, and *Partik.* 225). Thus the unseemliness which some have found in the *use* of the scourge,—certainly intimated by the connection of *ποιήσας* and *ἐξέβαλεν*,—and along with it every *typical* explanation of the scourge (Grotius, Godet, and others regard it as the symbol of God's wrath), disappear. — *Ἐξέχεε*] uncontracted form, to be taken as the *aor.* Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 222. — *τὸ κέρμα*] *coin*, especially small coin. Mostly in the plural in Greek. The singular here is *collective*. — *καὶ τοῖς τὰς περιστράς, κ.τ.λ.*] He *could* not of course *drive out* the doves like the other animals, and He therefore says to those who sold them, *ἄρατε ταῦτα ἐντεῦθεν*. John is here more *minute* than the Synoptics; but we must not regard the words as indicating greater *mildness* towards the sellers of the doves, because these were used by the *poor* (Rupertius, De Wette). The command *μὴ ποιεῖτε, κ.τ.λ.*, addressed to *them* applied to *all*. — *τοῦ πατρός μου*] *Admiranda auctoritas*, Bengel; the full *consciousness of the Son* manifested itself already (as in Luke ii. 49) in the temple. — *οἶκ. ἐμπορίου*] *a house of, a place of, merchandise*. The holy temple house had, in the Lord's view, become this, while the temple court had been made a place of buying and marketing (*ἐμπόριον*, Thuc. i. 13. 3; Dem. 957, 27; Xen. *de red.* iii. 3; Herodian. viii. 2. 6; Ezek. xxvii. 3; Isa. xxiii. 17, not the same as *ἐμπορία*). Possibly Zech. xiv. 21 was in His thoughts.

Ver. 17. *Ἐμνήσθησαν*] At the very time of the occurrence, and not (as Olshausen asserts) after the resurrection, a circumstance which has to be *stated* in ver. 22 (comp. xii. 16). — The text quoted is Ps. lxi. 10; the theocratic sufferer in this psalm, a psalm written during the exile, is a *type of the Messiah*; see xv. 25, xix. 28 ff. Comp. Rom. xv. 3, xi. 9; Acts i. 20. — *καταφάγεται με*] *will devour or consume me*, is to be understood of a power which wears one out *internally*, Ps. cxix. 139, not to be referred to the *death* of Jesus (Bengel, Olshausen, Hofmann, *Weissag. u. Erf.* p. 111; Luthardt, comp. Brückner), for the disciples could at that time have thought of anything but His death; comp. ver. 22. In this wrathful zeal,

which they saw had taken hold of Jesus, they thought they saw the Messianic fulfilment of that word in the psalm, wherein the speaker declares his great zeal for God's house, which was yet to wear him out. The fulfilment relates to the *ὁ ζῆλος τοῦ οἴκου σου*, whereof the *καταφάγεται* indicates only the violence and permanence; and there is therefore no ground for imagining already any gloomy forebodings on the part of the disciples (Lange). For *ἐσθίειν* and *ἔδειν*, used of consuming emotions (as in Aristophanes, *Vesp.* 287), see Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* VI. 280; *Del. epigr.* p. 257. As to the *future φάγομαι*, which belongs to the LXX. and Apocrypha, see Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 327; like the classical *ἔδομαι*, it never stands as present (against Tholuck, Hengstenberg, Godet, and others).

Note.—If there was but *one* cleansing of the temple, then either John or the Synoptics have given an erroneous narrative. But if it happened *twice*,¹ first at the beginning, and then at the end of the Messianic ministry of Jesus,—a supposition which in itself corresponds too well to the significance of the act (in so far as its repetition was occasioned by the state of disorder remaining unchanged after so long an interval had elapsed) to be inconceivable (as has been asserted by some), or even merely to pass the limits of probability,—it is then, on the one hand, conceivable that the Synoptics do not contain the first cleansing, because Christ's early labours in Jerusalem do not belong to the range of events which they generally narrate; and, on the other hand, that John passes over the second cleansing, because he had already recorded the Messianic *σημεῖον* of the same kind. We are not therefore to suppose that the one account is true, and the other false, but to assume that the act was *repeated*. See on Matt. xxi. 12, 13. So the Fathers and most subsequent writers; also Schleiermacher, Tholuck, Olshausen, B. Crusius, Maier, Ebrard, Luthardt, Riggenbach, Lange, Baumgarten, Hengstenberg, Godet, etc. *Others*, on the contrary, *admitting* only one temple-cleansing, decide in favour, some of the synoptical account (Strauss, Weisse, Baur, Hilgenfeld, Scholten, Schenkel²), and some in favour of John's (Lücke, De Wette,

¹ "Whether it took place before or after, once or twice, it takes nothing from our faith."—LUTHER.

² Comp. also Luther: "It seems to me that John here *skips over* the three first years."

Ammon, Krabbe, Brückner, Ewald, Weizsäcker, and many others; Baumlein hesitatingly). The latter would be the correct view, because John was an eye-witness; although we are not to suppose, as Baur, in keeping with his view of the fourth Gospel, thinks, that John derived the facts from the Synoptics, but fixed the time of the transaction independently, in consistency with the idea of reformatory procedure. See also Hilgenfeld, who traces here the "idiosyncrasy of John," who, with reference at least to the knowledge of the disciples and the relations of Jesus to the Jews, begins where the Synoptics leave off; and thus his narrative is merely a peculiar development of synoptical materials. Besides, upon the supposition of two distinct cleansings of the temple, any essential difference between the two acts themselves is not to be discovered. Luthardt, indeed, following Hofmann (comp. Lichtenstein, p. 156), thinks that, in the synoptical account, Jesus as prophet protects the place of *divine worship*, but that in John's He as Son exercises His *authority over the house*; but the *ὁ οἶκος μου* of the Synoptics, as the declaration of God, exactly corresponds with *τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρὸς μου* in John as the word of Christ. The distinction, moreover, that the first cleansing was the announcement of *reformation*, and the second that of *judgment* (Hengstenberg), cannot be made good, separates what is clearly connected, and attaches too much importance to collateral minutiae. This remark in answer to Goulet, who regards the first cleansing as "*un appel*," the second as "*une protestation*." The essential element of difference in John's account lies in the very striking declaration of Jesus about the temple of His body, ver. 19, of which the Synoptics have not a word, and which possesses great prophetic significance as uttered at the very outset of His Messianic ministry, but has no special fitness at the end of it. Jesus accordingly did not utter it again at the second cleansing, but only at the first, though upon that second cleansing also, occasion was given for so doing (Matt. xxi. 23). It is this very declaration, however, which marks unmistakeably the *Messianic* character of the appearance of Jesus in Jerusalem from the very first (against Weizsäcker, *Evangel. Gesch.* p. 260). Chap. vii. 3 is not the first place which treats of that Messianic appearance.

Vv. 18, 19. The same question as in Matt. xxi. 23, but how totally different an *answer*! It cannot therefore be used to confirm the supposed *identity* of the two events. — ἀπεκρίθ.] As in Matt. xi. 25 (which see), and often, denoting what is said *upon occasion* of Christ's act, and *with reference*

thcreto. — τὸ σημεῖον] If what He had done was to be recognised as appropriate to Him, it must be based upon a really prophetic ἐξουσία, and consequently upon divine authorization; in proof of this, they desired a special *miraculous sign or act, accrediting Him as a divine messenger*, and which was to be wrought by Him before their eyes, οὐκ, σημεῖον τῆς αὐθεντίας, Euthymius Zigabenus; comp. vi. 30. — δεικνύεις] *dost thou bring before us, lettest us see*; comp. Hom. *Il.* v. 244: Κρονίων—δεικνύς σῆμα βροτοῖσιν. *Od.* γ. 174. — ὅτι] εἰς ἐκεῖνο, ὅτι, ix. 17, xi. 51, xvi. 9; Mark xvi. 14; 2 Cor. i. 18, xi. 10. See Fritzsche *ad Matt.* p. 248. Consequently in the sense of *quatenus*, see Ast, *Lex. Plat.* II. 485. — ποιεῖς] The *present* denotes the act just performed, but which is still *regarded as present*. — Ver. 19. λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον, κ.τ.λ.] refers, according to the apostle's explanation in ver. 21, to the *death and resurrection of Jesus*, so that he consequently means His body as the dwelling-place of God, who was *in Christ* (x. 38, xiv. 10, 11, 20, xvii. 21, i. 14), *i.e.* as the antitype of the temple,¹ and, in conformity with this, His violent death as *the pulling down*, and His resurrection as *the rebuilding* of it. We must therefore, according to John, suppose that Jesus, with the temple buildings before Him, to which He points (*this temple here*), sees in them the sacred type of His body, and with that directness of expression characteristic of the old prophets (such as we often see, *e.g.*, in Isaiah), straightway substitutes the image for that which it represented, so that these sharp, vivid strokes, dashed down without any explanation, contain, as in a pictorial riddle, a symbolic and prophetic announcement of His resurrection,² as

¹ Considering the oft-recurring representation of the indwelling of God in Christ, it is very far-fetched to derive the temple comparison here from the Valentinian Christology concerning a higher body of the Messiah appropriate for union with the Logos (in answer to Hilgenfeld, *Lehrbegr.* 247). Seeing, further, that Christ (ver. 16) calls the literal temple "*His Father's house*," how can the *Demiurge* be conceived of as the God of the Jews? How can we reconcile with that expression even "a milder Gnosticism" (Hilgenfeld, in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1857, p. 516)? Simply to admit that "a weak reference to the highest God was not wanting even in Judaism," is both incorrect in itself, and altogether unsuited to solve the palpable contradiction.

² It is assumed (with Bengel) still in my 4th edition, that Jesus indicated the reference to His body "*nutu gestu*," but that the Jews did not notice it.

in Matt. xii. 39, xvi. 4, and in keeping with what we are to assume throughout, viz. that He never foretold His resurrection in so many words, but only by figures and in obscure terms. The thought accordingly, divested of this figurative envelope, is, according to John, no other than this: *kill me, and within three days* (ἐν, see Bernhardt, p. 209; Winer, p. 361 [E. T. p. 482]) *I will rise again*. The imperative in the protasis is not *permissive* merely, which weakens the emotion, but *contains a challenge*; it springs from painfully excited feeling, as He looks with heart-searching gaze upon that implacable opposition which was already beginning to show itself, and which would not be satisfied till it had put Him to death. Comp. *πληρώσατε*, Matt. xxiii. 32. John's explanation is adopted by the ancients, and among modern expositors by Kuinoel, Tholuck, Hildebrand (in Hüffell's *Zeitschr.* II. 1), Kling (in *d. Stud. u. Krit.* 1836, p. 127), Krabbe, Klee, Olshausen (at least as to their *inner* meaning, while the words, he thinks, were *apparently* simply a repelling paradox), Maier, Hasert (*Ueb. d. Vorhersagungen Jesu von seinem Tode*, Berlin 1839, p. 81), Hauff in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1849, p. 106 ff.; Brückner (against De Wette), Laurillard, *de locis ev. Joh. in quibus ipse auctor verba J. interpretat. est*, Lugd. B. 1853, p. 1 ff.; Baumgarten, Maier, Baeumlein, Godet, even Luthardt (though bringing in a double meaning; by putting Jesus to death, Israel destroyed itself as the house of God, while the resurrection was the setting up of God's spiritual house; comp. Ebrard, Lange, Riggenbach, Hengstenberg); similarly Baur, p. 137 ff., who, however (and with him Hilgenfeld), traces the expression to synoptic elements much later in point of time. But John's explanation is abandoned, since the time of Herder (*vom Sohne Gottes*) and Henke (*Programm* 1798, in Pott, *Sylloge*, I. p. 8 ff.), by Eckermann, Paulus, Lücke, Schweizer, Bleek, B. Crusius, Ammon, Strauss, Gfrörer, De Wette, Ewald, Weizsäcker, Schenkel, Scholten,

This is inadmissible, because thus the *ταῦτα* would have no reference whatever to the temple of stone, whereas the entire scene in the temple court shows that this reference is contained in it. Besides, such a gesture would be inappropriate while using an *enigmatical* word, for it would at once give the key to its solution. The intellectual point would be quite lost.

and many others, who, with various modifications, explain the pulling down of the temple of the *decay of the old temple religion*, and the setting up in three days of the *new spiritual theocracy* so soon to be established; thus the imperative is taken by some as a challenge (as above) (Herder, Henke, Ewald), by some again as a concession (Schenkel), and by some as an hypothesis (Lücke, B. Crusius, De Wette: "Granted that ye destroy")—according to De Wette, with allusion perhaps to the late partial pulling down of the temple by Herod. But (1) before we can assume that John of all men, who yet elsewhere was so deeply imbued with the mind of Jesus, wholly misunderstood Him, and that too at the time when he wrote his Gospel, when, consequently, the old degenerate religion had been long ago overthrown, and the new spiritual sanctuary long ago set up,—the most decisive evidence of such a misunderstanding is requisite. If this be not forthcoming, we are bound to seek the *true* interpretation of any saying of Jesus from *him*, and especially *in this case*, where he distinctly gives his own explanation *in opposition* to the misconception of the Jews, and gives it not only as *his own*, but as that of *the rest of the disciples* likewise. (2) The accusation in Matt. xxvi. 61, Mark xiv. 58 (comp. Acts vi. 13) is no argument in favour of the modern interpretation, for it is based only upon the Jewish misunderstanding of the saying. (3) The place and occasion alike suggested the temple as an *illustration*, but they determined nothing as to the *subject-matter* of the comparison; a *σημεῖον* in general was asked for, not one *bearing specially upon the temple*. (4) The setting up of the spiritual temple was an event not at all dependent upon a *previous* λύειν of the old economy; on the contrary, a beginning had already been made, the further development of which was not the effect but the cause (the fermenting element) of the dissolution of the old theocracy: hence the relation of the protasis to the apodosis of the sentence would be neither logically nor historically correct. (5) This spiritual building up was so far from being a momentary act, and was to so great a degree a gradual development, that neither the conception of a *σημεῖον* in general, nor the words ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις, which belong essen-

tially to this conception, have any corresponding relation thereto; the latter expression, even if taken in a proverbial sense (Hos. vi. 2, not Luke xiii. 32; but see Dissen *ad Dem. de cor.* p. 362), could only mean "*in a few days*," and therefore would be quite unsuited to the comparison, and would even have the appearance of grandiloquence. Moreover, as the *three days* joined to the *ἐγερῶ* were always the *fixed* correlative of Christ's *resurrection*, this ought itself to have excluded the modern explanation. (6) A new temple would of necessity have been spoken of as *another* (comp. Mark xiv. 58), but *ἐγερῶ αὐτόν* can only mean the *same*; and thus the Jews as well as John rightly understood it, for Jesus did not say *ἐγερῶ ἄλλον* or *ἕτερον*, or the like.¹ (7) It is only a seeming objection to John's explanation, that according to N. T. theology Christ did not raise Himself from the dead, but was raised by the Father; comp. ver. 22; Acts ii. 24, 31 ff., iii. 15, iv. 10, v. 30, *al.*; Rom. iv. 24, viii. 11; 1 Cor. vi. 14; 2 Cor. iv. 14; Gal. i. 1; Eph. i. 21; Col. ii. 12; 1 Thess. i. 10; 1 Pet. i. 21. Any such contradiction to the Christian mode of view, if real, must have prevented John himself above every one from referring the words to the resurrection. But the objection disappears if we simply give due weight to the figurative nature of the expression, which rests upon that visible contemplation of the *resurrection*, according to which the *Subject* that arises, whose resurrection is described as the re-erecting of the destroyed temple, must also be the Subject that erects the temple,—without affecting the further doctrine, which, moreover, does not come under consideration, that the *causa efficiens*, *i.e.* the actual revivifying power, is the Father. Christ receiving His life again from the Father (x. 17) and rising again, Himself raises up by His very resurrection the destroyed temple. See, moreover, Brückner, p. 57, and Godet. Comp. Ignat. *Smyrn.* 2: ἀληθῶς ἀνέστησεν ἑαυτόν. — For *ἐγείρειν* as used of erecting buildings, see Ecclus. xlix. 11; 3 Esdras

¹ Appeal is wrongly made to Matt. x. 39, where *ψυχὴν* denotes *earthly* life merely, and then *αἰώνην* life *eternal*. *ψυχὴν* as well as *αἰώνην* there means nothing but the *soul*; and the enigma of the expression lies not in a different sense being applied to these two words, but in the different meaning as respects duration of *εὐρών* and *ἀπολίσσει*.

v. 44, viii. 81; Ael. V. H. 12, 23; Herodianus, 3, 15. 6; Jacobs *ad Anthol.* XII. p. 75

Note.—It cannot perplex us in John's explanation, that the answer which Jesus gave was rightly understood neither by the Jews nor by the disciples at the time. It was the manner of Jesus, as especially appears in John, to throw out seeds of thought for the *future* which could not take root *at the time*. Comp. Chrysostom: πολλά τοιαῦτα φέγγεται τοῖς μὲν τότε ἀκούουσιν οὐκ ὄντα δὴλα, τοῖς δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐσόμενα. Τίνος δὲ ἕνεκεν τοῦτο ποιεῖ; ἵνα δειχθῇ προειδώς ἀνῶθεν τὰ μετὰ ταῦτα, ὅταν ἐξέλθῃ καὶ τῆς προφῆσεως τὸ τέλος ὃ δὴ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς προφητείας ταύτης γέγονεν. And that from His very first public appearance He foresaw the development of the opposition of this seemingly guileless party, onwards to its goal in the destruction of the temple of His body, can be regarded as an unhistorical presupposition of the Logos doctrine only by one who, on the one hand, can by critical doubts¹ get rid of the early references of Jesus to His death which are contained in the Synoptics (e.g. Matt. x. 38, xii. 39, x. 23), and, on the other hand, does not sufficiently estimate Christ's higher knowledge, and especially His acquaintance with the heart which John unfolds, by virtue of which He apprehends the full intent (vi. 64) of this seemingly justifiable requirement of a sign.

Ver. 20. An intended *deductio ad absurdum*. Τεσσαράκ. κ. ἑξ ἔτεσιν] length of time named without ἐν. Bernhardy, p. 81; Winer, p. 205 [E. T. p. 273]. The great number of years stands emphatically first. — ὥκοδομήθη] i.e. so far as it was already complete. The proposed enlargement and renewal of the temple of Zerubbabel was begun in the 18th year of Herod the Great's reign (autumn of 734–5; see Joseph. *Antt.* xv. 11. 1), and was first completed, according to Josephus, *Antt.* xx. 9. 7, under Herod Agrippa II., A.D. 64. How the 46 years named here prove that the passover then being held was that of the year 782 (A.D. 29), corresponding with the year of the Baptist's appearance according to Luke iii. 1 (August 781–2), see on Acts, Introd. § 4. Wieseler, p. 166, reckoning onwards from Nisan 735, places the end of the 46th year exactly in Nisan 781;² comp. also Wieseler in Herzog's *Encykl.* XXI. 546.

¹ Comp. Keim, *Geschichtl. Christus*, pp. 35, 36, ed. 3.

² Ewald reckons from B.C. 20 to A.D. 28, and, counting only the *full* inter-

Vv. 21, 22. Τοῦ σώματος]¹ Genitive of apposition; see Winer, p. 494 [E. T. p. 666]. — Ver. 22. οὖν] represents the recollection as answering to the true meaning of that declaration. — ἐμνήσθησαν] *they became mindful of*, ver. 17, xii. 16. The saying came afresh to their remembrance when it was explained as a fact by the resurrection; previously, because not understood, it had been forgotten. With ἡγέρθη comp. ἐγερῶ, ver. 19. — καὶ ἐπίστευσαν, κ.τ.λ.] As the result of this recollection, *they believed the Scripture* (felt convinced of the truth of its statements),—observing, that is, the harmony of its prophecies concerning the resurrection of Jesus (Ps. xvi. 10; Isa. liii.; cf. Luke xxiv. 26; Acts xiii. 33 ff.; 1 Cor. xv. 4; Matt. xii. 40) with that saying of Christ's,—*and the word which Jesus had* (then, ver. 19) *spoken*, which now, as fulfilled in the resurrection, presented itself to them in its full prophetic truth. Upon πιστεύειν τινι in St. John, comp. Weiss, *Lehrbegr.* p. 20. — Schweizer (whom Scholten follows) regards vv. 21, 22 as spurious, quite groundlessly. The statement is the exact outcome of St. John's inmost personal experience.

Ver. 23. Δέ] introducing a characteristic summary statement (to ver. 25) regarding this stay of Jesus at the feast, in order next to give prominence to a special scene, the story of Nicodemus in iii. 1 ff. — ἐν τ. Ἱεροσ. ἐν τ. πάσχα ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ] The latter clause is not added as an *explanation* for Greek readers (that should have been done at ver. 13), but “He was at Jerusalem during the passover in the feast (engaged in celebrating the feast);” thus the first ἐν is local, the second refers to time, and the third joins on with ἦν, and expresses

vening years, he gets the 46, thus omitting B.C. 20, the year in which the rebuilding began, and A.D. 28, the year of the passover named in our text. — For the rest, it must be remembered (in opposition to Keim's doubts in his *Gesch. J. I.* p. 615) that the statement in the text does not necessarily oblige us to suppose an αἰνοδομῆσθαι *without any interruptions*. The building had been going on now for 46 years.

¹ John explains the saying so *simply* and definitely, that there is no room for the double meaning which Luthardt, Hengstenberg, and others import into it. With equal simplicity and definiteness does he represent the meaning given as that of *Jesus Himself* (against Weizsäcker, p. 266). In like manner vii. 38, xii. 32, xxi. 19. In none of these passages is any distinction drawn between the sense given and the meaning intended by Jesus Himself.

the surroundings, that in which a person is engaged (*versari in aliqua re*). See, concerning εἶναι ἐν here, Bernhardy, p. 210; Ast, *Lex. Plat.* I. 623. — θεωροῦντες, κ.τ.λ.] *while they beheld His miracles*, etc. On αὐτοῦ, comp. *Iycurg.* 28: ταῦτα ἐμοῦ ἐθεωρήσατε, and Kühner, § 528, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 1. 11. Euthymius Zigabenus rightly says: ἐκείνοι γὰρ ἀκριβέστερον ἐπίστευον, ὅσοι μὴ διὰ τὰ σημεῖα μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τὴν διδασκαλίαν αὐτοῦ ἐπίστευον. Their faith in His name (as that of the Messiah) did not yet amount to any decision of their inner life for Jesus, but was only an opinion, produced by the sight of His miracles, that He was the Messiah; comp. viii. 30, vi. 26. Luther calls it "*milk faith*." Comp. Matt. xiii. 20. On τὰ σημεῖα, comp. iii. 2. None of the miracles of this period has been recorded; xx. 30, comp. iv. 45. Consequently, not only the Synoptics, but John also speaks summarily of *multitudes* of miracles, without relating any of them individually (against Schleiermacher, *L. J.* p. 201).

Vv. 24, 25. Αὐτὸς δὲ, κ.τ.λ.] *But He on His part*, though they on their part, on account of His miracles, believed on Him. — οὐκ ἐπίστ. ἐαυτόν] an intentional antithesis to the preceding ἐπίστ. εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ. Observe the emphatic ἐαυτόν: it must not be taken as meaning "He kept back *His doctrine* from them" (Chrysostom, Kuinoel, and many), or "*His work*" (Ebrard); but He did not trust *Himself*, i.e. *His own person*, to them; He refrained from any closer personal intercourse with them. Without any such reserve on His part, rather with confident self-surrender, had He given Himself to His intimate Galilean friends. Towards the Jews in Jerusalem, on whom, from His knowledge of the human heart, He could not bestow this self-devotion, because there were wanting in them the inward moral conditions necessary thereto, His bearing was more strange and distant. Observe the *imperfects* ἐπίστευεν and ἐγίνωσκε. — διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν γινώσκ. πάντ.] *because He Himself* (as in the following αὐτός) *knew all men*, universal. Respecting *none* did His personal knowledge fail Him with regard to the state of his moral feeling. — καὶ ὅτι, κ.τ.λ.] negative expression of the same thought in the popular form of a still *further* reason. — ἵνα] not instead of the infinitive construction (Matt. iii. 14 *al.*), but the object of the need is

conceived of in the form of a *purpose* which the person needing guidance entertains. Comp. xvi. 30; 1 John ii. 27. — *περὶ τοῦ ἀνθρ.*] does not apply to Jesus Himself ("concerning Him as man," Ewald), but concerning any man with whom He had at any time to do. See Bernhardy, p. 315; Winer, p. 109 [E. T. p. 143]. — *αὐτός*] of *Himself*, i.e. *αὐτοδίδακτος*, Nonnus. See Herm. *ad Viger.* p. 733; Krüger, *Anab.* ii. 3. 7; comp. *Clementine Homil.* iii. 13: *ἀπείρω ψυχῆς ὀφθαλμῶ.* — *τί ἦν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρ.*] the inward, though not outwardly indicated capacity, character, disposition, and so on; *τὸ κρυπτὸν τοῦ νοῦς*, Origen. Comp. Nonnus: *ὅσα φρενὸς ἔνδοθεν ἀνὴρ εἶχεν ἀκηρύκτῳ κεκαλυμμένα φάρεϊ σιγῆς.* To this supernatural and *immediate discernment*, as possessed by Jesus, special prominence is often given by John. Comp. i. 49, 50, iv. 19, 29, vi. 61, 64, xi. 4, 15, xiii. 11, xvi. 19, xxi. 17. It is the life expression of His *divine* essence (Ps. vii. 10, cxxxix. 2; Acts xv. 8), like the working of miracles.

CHAPTER III.

Ver. 2. Instead of αὐτόν, the Elzevir has τὸν Ἰησοῦν, in the face of decisive testimonies. The beginning of a new section and of a church lesson. — Ver. 2. The position of δύναιται immediately after γάρ (Lachm. Tisch.) is supported by preponderating testimony. — Ver. 5. For τ. θεοῦ Tisch. reads τῶν οὐρανῶν, upon ancient but yet inadequate testimony (κ* Inst. Hippol. etc.). — Ver. 13. ὁ ὢν ἐν τ. οὐρ.] wanting in B. L. T^b. κ. 33. Eus. Naz. Origen; deleted by Tisch. But these mysterious words may easily have been regarded as objectionable or superfluous, because not understood or misunderstood; and there was nothing to suggest the addition of them. — Ver. 15. μὴ ἀπόληται, ἀλλ'] is deleted by Tisch. after B. L. T^b. κ. Min. Verss. Fathers. Rightly so; it is an addition borrowed from ver. 16. — The readings ἐπ' αὐτόν (Lachm.), ἐπ' αὐτῷ and ἐν αὐτῷ (Tisch.), have indeed less support than the received εἰς αὐτόν, but this latter forced itself in as the most current form of expression, and ἐν αὐτῷ is, following B. T^b. Codd. It., to be preferred. — Ver. 19. The order αὐτῶν πονηρά has preponderating evidence in its favour. — Ver. 25. The Elzevir has Ἰουδαίων instead of Ἰουδαίου, in the face of decisive testimony. The plural evidently was inserted mechanically. — Ver. 31 f. The second ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστὶ has against it very weak testimony, viz. D. κ. Min. and some Verss. and Fathers. But the following καὶ (bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch.) is omitted not only by the same testimonies, but also by B. L. Min. Copt. Pers., and must be regarded as an interpolation, the absence of which originally led more easily to the omission of ἐπάνω π. ἐ. — Ver. 34. ὁ θεός after δίδωσιν is wanting in B. C.* L. T^b. κ. Min. Ver. Brix. Cyr.; bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch. A supplying of the subject, which seemed uncertain.

Vv. 1, 2. Prominence is now given to a specially important narrative, connected by the δέ which continues the discourse, — a narrative belonging to that first sojourn in Jerusalem, — viz. *the conversation with Nicodemus*, wherein Jesus more fully

explains His person and work. No intimation is given of any inner connection with what precedes (Lücke: "now comes an instance of that higher knowledge possessed by Jesus;," De Wette, Lange, Hengstenberg: "an illustration of the entire statement in ii. 23-25;," Tholuck: "an instance of the beginnings of faith just named;," Luthardt: "from the *people* collectively, to whom Jesus had addressed Himself, a transition is now made to His dealing with an *individual*;" Ewald: "Nicodemus appears desirous to make an *exception* to the general standing aloof of men of weight in Jerusalem"). — *ἄνθρωπος*] in its most ordinary use, simply equivalent to *τὸς*; not "un exemplaire de ce type humain que Jésus connaissait si bien" (Godet). It is quite independent of ii. 25, introducing a *new* narrative. — *Νικόδημος*, a frequent name as well among the Greeks (Demosth. 549. 23, and later writers) as among the Jews (נִקְדֵּם or נִקְדִּים, see Lightfoot and Wetstein). We know nothing certain of this man beyond the statements concerning him in St. John (comp. vii. 50, xix. 39).¹ The Nicodemus of the Talmud was also called *Bunai*, must have survived the destruction of Jerusalem, and was known under this latter name as a disciple of Jesus. See Delitzsch in the *Zeitschr. f. Luther. Theol.* 1854, p. 643. The identity of the two is possible, but uncertain. The so-called *Evangelium Nicodemi* embraces, though in a doubtful form, two different treatises, viz. the *Acta Pilati* and the *Descensus Christi ad inferos*. See Tischendorf, *Evang. Apocr.* p. 203 ff. — *ἄρχων*] He was a member of the Sanhedrim, vii. 50;

¹ According to Baur, p. 173, he is a *typical* person, representing the believing and yet really unbelieving Judaism, just as the Samaritan woman (chap. iv.) represents believing heathendom; thus leaving it uncertain how far the narrative is to be taken as fact. According to Strauss, the whole owes its origin to the reproach that Christianity made way only among the common people (notwithstanding 1 Cor. i. 26, 27). Weisse rejects at least the truth of the *account*, which De Wette designates "a poetical, free, and highly spiritualized reproduction." See on the other hand Brückner. According to Hilgenfeld, the whole conversation cannot be understood "unless we view it from the evangelist's standing-point;" according to which, we see that the design is simply and solely to explain how Christianity essentially distinguished itself from Judaism. According to Scholten, we have here set forth the power of Christianity triumphing over the slowness of heart and prejudices of the learned,—this merely, without any historical basis of fact in the story.

Luke xxiii. 13, xxiv. 20. — He came to Jesus *by night*,¹ being still undecided, in order to avoid the suspicion and hostility of his colleagues. He was not a *hypocrite* (as Koppe in Pott, *Sylloge*, IV. p. 31 ff., holds), who pretended to be simple in order to elicit from Jesus some ground of accusation; a circumstance which, if true, John would not have failed to state, especially considering what he says of him in vii. 50 and xix. 39: he was, on the contrary, though of a somewhat slow temperament, a man of *honourable* character, who, together with others (*οἶδαμεν*, comp. *ὑμᾶς*, ver. 7), was in a general way convinced by the miracles of Jesus that He must be a divinely commissioned and divinely supported Teacher, and he therefore sought, by a confidential interview, to determine more exactly his to that extent half-believing judgment, and especially to find out whether Jesus perhaps was the very Messiah. His position as a Pharisee and a member of the Sanhedrim shows how strongly and honestly he must have felt this need. Comp. xii. 42. — For the entire section see Knapp, *Scripta var. arg.* I. 183; Fabricius, *Commentat. Gott.* 1825; Scholl in Klaiber's *Studien*, V. 1, p. 71; Jacobi in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1835, 1; Hengstenberg in the *Evang. K. Z.* 1860, 49; Steinfass in the *Meklenb. Zeitschr.* 1864, p. 913. — That the disciples, and John in particular, were with Jesus during the interview, has nothing against it (as De Wette and most others think), for Nicodemus came to Jesus by night only through fear of the *Jews*; and the vivid and peculiar features, with the harmonious characteristics of the narrative, even if touched up by the pen of John, confirm the supposition that he was a witness. If not, he must have received what he relates from the Lord Himself, as it impressed itself deeply and indelibly upon his recollection. As to the *result* of the interview, nothing historically to be relied upon has come down to us, simply because there was no immediate effect apparent in Nicodemus. But see vii. 50, xix. 39. — *ὅτι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἐλήλ. διδάσκαλος*] *that thou art come from God as teacher.* The expression implies the thought of one divinely *sent*, but not the *idea of the Logos* (as Bretschneider holds). — *ταῦτα τὰ*

¹ A symbolical reference to "the still benighted mind" must not be attributed to this simple historical statement (against Hengstenberg).

σημεῖα] emphatic, *hacce tanta signa*. — εἰ μὴ ἡ ὁ θεὸς μετ' αὐτοῦ] ὅτι οὐκ ἐξ οἰκείας δυνάμεως ταῦτα ποιεῖ, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ, Euthymius Zigabenus. From the miracles (ii. 23) Nicodemus thus infers the *assistance* of God, and from this again that the worker of them is one *sent* from God.

Ver. 3. In ver. 2 Nicodemus had only uttered the preface to what he had it in his mind to ask; the question itself was to have followed. But Jesus interrupts him, and gives him the answer by anticipation. This question, which was not (as Lange thinks, in contradiction of the procedure of Nicodemus on other occasions) kept back with remarkable prudence and caution, is to be inferred solely from the answer of Jesus; and it was accordingly no other than the general inquiry, "*What must a man do in order to enter the Messiah's kingdom?*" not the special one, "Is the baptism of John sufficient for this?" (Baeumlein), for there is no mention of John the Baptist in what follows; comp. rather Matt. xix. 16. The first is the question which the Lord *reads* in the heart of Nicodemus, and to which He gives an *answer*,—an answer in which He at once lays hold of the anxiety of the questioner in its deepest foundation, and overturns all Pharisaic, Judaistic, and merely human patchwork and pretence. To suppose that *part of the conversation* is here omitted (Maldonatus, Kuinoel, and others), is as arbitrary as to refer the answer of Jesus to the *words* of Nicodemus. Such a reference must be rejected, because Jesus had not given him time to tell the purpose of his coming. We must not therefore assume, either that Jesus wished to lead him on from *faith in His miracles* to that faith which effects a moral transformation (Augustine, De Wette, comp. also Luthardt and Ebrard); or that "He wished to convince Nicodemus, who imagined he had made a *great* confession in his first words, that he had not yet so much as made his way into the porticoes of true knowledge" (Chrysostom); or that "He wished to intimate that He had not come merely as a *Teacher*, but in order to the moral renewal of the world" (Baumgarten Crusius, comp. already Cyril, and Theophylact); or, "*Videris tibi, O Nicodeme, videre aliquod signum apparentis jam regni coelorum in hisce miraculis, quae ego edo; amen dico tibi: nemo potest videre regnum*

Dei, *sicut oportet*, si non, etc.” (Lightfoot, approved by Lücke, and substantially by Godet also). — ἐὰν μὴ τις γενν. ἄνωθεν] *except a man be born from above, i.e. except a man be transformed by God into a new moral life.* See on i. 13. What is here required answers to the μετανοεῖτε, etc., with which Jesus usually began His preaching, Mark i. 15. ἄνωθεν, the opposite of κάτωθεν, may be taken with reference to *place* (here equivalent to ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ; comp. Xen. *Mem.* iv. 3. 14; *Symp.* vi. 7; Thuc. iv. 75. 3; Soph. *El.* 1047; Eur. *Cycl.* 322; Baruch vi. 63; James i. 17, iii. 15), or with reference to *time* (equivalent to ἐξ ἀρχῆς); Chrysostom gives both renderings. The latter is the ordinary interpretation—Syriac, Augustine, Vulgate, Nonnus, Luther, Castalio, Calvin, Beza, Maldonatus, etc. (so likewise Tholuck, Olshausen, Neander, and substantially Luthardt, Hengstenberg, Godet)—because Nicodemus himself (ver. 4) thus understood it. Accordingly, ἄνωθεν would be equivalent to *iterum, again, anew*, as Grimm (on *Wisd.* xix. 6) also thinks. But this is already unjustifiable upon linguistic grounds, because ἄνωθεν when used of time does not signify *iterum* or *denuo*, but *throughout, from the beginning onwards*¹ (and so Ewald and Weiss interpret it), Luke i. 3; Acts xxvi. 5; Gal. iv. 9; *Wisd.* xix. 6; Dem. 539, 22. 1082, 7. 13; Plat. *Phil.* 44 D; and, conformably with Johannean usage, the only right rendering is the *local*, not only linguistically (ver. 31, xix. 11, 23), but, considering the manner of representation, because John apprehends regeneration, not according to the element of *repetition*, a being born

¹ This, and not “again from the beginning,” as Hofmann (*Schriftbeweis*, II. 11) arbitrarily renders it, is the meaning of ἀνωθεν. It is self-evident that the conception *from the beginning* does not harmonize with that of being *born*. Nor, indeed, would “again from the beginning,” but simply “again,” be appropriate. *Again from the beginning* would be πάλιν ἀνωθεν, as in *Wisd.* xix. 6; Gal. iv. 9. The passage, moreover, from Josephus, *Antt.* i. 18. 3, which Hofmann and Godet (following Krebs and others) quote as sanctioning their rendering, is inconclusive. For there we read φιλίαν ἀνωθεν ποιῶνται: “he makes friendship *from the beginning onwards*,” not implying the continuance of a friendship before unused, nor an entering again upon it. Artemidorus also, *Oneirocr.* i. 14, p. 18 (cited by Tholuck after Wetstein), where mention is made of a dream of a corporeal birth, uses ἀνωθεν in the sense not of *again*, but as equivalent to *coelitus* with the idea of a divine agency in the dream (Herm. *Gottesd. Allerth.* § 37. 7. 19).

again, but as a *divine* birth, a being born of God; see i. 13; 1 John ii. 29, iii. 9, iv. 7, v. 1. The representation of it as a *repeated*, a *renewed* birth is *Pauline* (Tit. iii. 5, comp. Rom. xii. 2; Gal. vi. 15; Eph. iv. 23, 24; Col. iii. 9) and *Petrine* (1 Pet. iii. 23). Ἄνωθεν, therefore, is rightly taken as equivalent to ἐκ θεοῦ by Origen, Gothic Vers. (*iupathrō*), Cyril, Theophylact, Arethas, Bengel, etc.; also Lücke, B. Crusius, Maier, De Wette, Baur, Lange, Hilgenfeld, Baeumlein, Weizsäcker (who, however, adopts a double sense), Steinfass. — ἰδεῖν] *i.e.* as a *partaker* thereof. Comp. εἰσελθεῖν, ver. 5, and see ver. 36, also ἰδεῖν θάνατον (Luke ii. 26; Heb. xi. 5), διαφθοράν (Acts ii. 27), ἡμέρας ἀγαθάς (1 Pet. iii. 10), πένθος (Rev. xviii. 7). From the classics, see Jacobs *ad Del. epigr.* p. 387 ff.; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. 343. Not therefore: “simply to see, to say nothing of entering,” Lange; comp. Ewald on ver. 5. It is to be observed that the expression βασ. τοῦ θεοῦ does not occur in John, save here and in ver. 5;¹ and this is a proof of the accuracy with which he has recorded this weighty utterance of the Lord in its original shape. In xviii. 36 Christ, on an extraordinary occasion, speaks of *His* kingdom. The *conception* of “the kingdom” in John does not differ from its meaning elsewhere in the N. T. (see on Matt. iii. 2). Moreover, the necessary correlative thereto, the Parousia, is not wanting in John (see on xiv. 3).

Ver. 4. The question does not mean: “If the repetition of a corporeal birth is so utterly impossible, how am I to understand thy word, ἄνωθεν γεννηθῆναι?” (Lücke); nor: “How can this ἄνωθεν γενν. take place, save by a second corporeal birth?” as if Nicodemus could not conceive of the beginning of a new personal life without a recommencement of natural life (Luthardt, comp. Hofmann); nor: “How comes it that a Jew must be born anew like a proselyte?” (Knapp, Neander, comp. Wetstein; for the Rabbins liken proselytes to new-born babes, *Jevamoth*, f. 62. 1; 92. 1); nor again: “This requirement is as impossible in the case of a man already old as for one to enter again, etc.” (Schweizer, B. Crusius, Tholuck, comp. Baumgarten and Hengstenberg). These meanings are not in

¹ The expression, moreover, βασ. τῶν οὐρανῶν (comp. the Critical Notes) is not found in John.

the words, they are simply *imported* into them. But the opinion that Nicodemus here wished to "*entangle Jesus in His words*" (Luther), or that, under excited feelings, he intentionally took the requirement in a literal sense in order to reduce it *ad absurdum* (Riggenbach), or "by a stroke of Rabbinical cleverness in argumentation" to declare it to be too strongly put (Lange, *Life of Jesus* p. 495), is opposed to the honourable bearing of this straightforward man. According to the text, what Nicodemus really asks is *something preposterous*. And this is of such a nature, that it is only reconcilable with the even scanty culture of a Jewish theologian (ver. 10), who could not, however, be ignorant of the O. T. ideas of circumcision of heart (Deut. xxx. 6; Jer. iv. 4), of a new heart and a new spirit (Ex. xi. 19, 20, xxxvi. 26, 27; Ps. li. 12, lxxxvi. 4 ff.), as well as of the outpouring of the Spirit in the time of the Messiah (Joel ii.; Jer. xxxi.), upon the assumption that, being a somewhat narrow-minded man, and somewhat entangled by his faith in the miracles, he was taken aback, confused and really *perplexed*, partly by the powerful impression which Jesus produced upon him generally, partly by the feeling of surprise at seeing his thoughts known to Him, partly by the unexpected and incomprehensible *ἀνωθεν γεννηθῆναι*, in which, however, he has an anticipation that something miraculous is contained. In this his *perplexity*, and not "in an *ironical humour*" (as Godet thinks, although out of keeping with the entire manifestation), he asks this foolish question, as if Jesus had spoken of a *corporeal* birth and not of a birth of one's *moral* personality. Still less can there be any suspicion of this question being an *invention*, as if John merely wished to represent Nicodemus as a very foolish man (Strauss; comp. De Wette and Reuss),—a notion which, even on the supposition of a desire to spin out the conversation by misapprehensions on the part of the hearers, would be too clumsy to be entertained. — γέρων ὧν] *when he is an old man*; Nicodemus added this to represent the impossibility *with reference to himself* in a stronger light. — δεύτερον] *with reference to being for a time in the mother's womb before birth*. He did not take the ἀνωθεν to mean δεύτερον, he simply *did not understand it at all*.

Ver. 5. Jesus now explains more fully the *ἄνωθεν γεννηθῆναι* onwards to ver. 8. — *ἐξ ὕδατος κ. πνεύματος*] *water*, inasmuch as the man is *baptized* therewith (1 John v. 7, 8; Eph. v. 26) for the forgiveness of sins (Acts ii. 33, xxii. 16; 2 Cor. vi. 11), and *spirit*, inasmuch as the *Holy* Ghost is given to the person baptized in order to his spiritual renewal and sanctification; both *together*¹—the former as *causa medians*, the latter as *causa efficiens*—constitute the objective and causative *element*, *out of which* (comp. i. 13) the birth from above is produced (*ἐκ*), and therefore baptism is the *λουτρὸν παλιγγενεσίας* (Tit. iii. 5; comp. Tertullian *c. Marc.* i. 28). But that *Christian* baptism (ver. 22, iv. 2), and not that of *John* (B. Crusius; Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, II. 2. 12; Lange, who, however, generalizes ideally; and earlier comm.), is to be thought of in *ὕδατος*, is clear from the *κ. πνεύματος* joined with it, and from the fact that He who had already appeared as Messiah could no longer make the baptism of His forerunner the condition, not even the preparatory condition, of His Messianic grace; for in that case He must have said *οὐκ ἐξ ὕδατος μόνον, ἀλλὰ καί*. If Nicodemus was not yet able to understand *ὕδατος* as having this definite reference, but simply took the word in general as a symbolical designation of Messianic expiation of sin and of purification, according to O. T. allusions (Ezek. xxxvi. 25; Isa. i. 16; Mal. iii. 3; Zech. xiii. 1; Jer. xxxiii. 8), and to what he knew of John's baptism, still it remained for him to look to the *immediate* future for more definite knowledge, when the true explanation could not escape him (iv. 2, iii. 22). We are not therefore to conclude from this reference to baptism, that the narrative is "a *proleptic fiction*" (Strauss, Bruno Bauer), and, besides Matt. xviii. 3, to suppose in Justin and the Clementines uncanonical developments (Hilgenfeld and others; see Introduction, § 2). Neither must we explain it as if Jesus were referring Nicodemus not to baptism as such, but only by way of allusion to the *symbolic*

¹ Weisse, who does not regard the rite of baptism by water as having originated in the institution of Christ, but considers that it arose from a misapplication of His words concerning the baptism of the Spirit, greatly errs when he declares that to make regeneration depend upon baptism by water "*is little better than blasphemy*" (*Evangelienfrage*, p. 194).

import of the water in baptism (Lücke; Neander, p. 910). This latter view does not satisfy the definite γεννηθῆ ἐξ, upon which, on the other side, Theodore of Mopsuestia and others, in modern times Olshausen in particular, lay undue stress, taking the water to be the *female* principle in regeneration (the Spirit as the *male*)—water being, according to Olshausen, “the element of the soul purified by true repentance.” All explanations, moreover, must be rejected which, in order to do away with the reference to baptism,¹ adopt the principle of an ἐν διὰ δυοῖν, for water and Spirit are two quite separate conceptions. This is especially in answer to Calvin, who says: “of water, *which is the Spirit*,” and Grotius: “*spiritus aqueus*, i.e. *aquae instar emundans*.” It is further to be observed, (1) that both the words being without the article, they must be taken *generically*, so far as the water of baptism and the Holy Spirit are included in the general categories of *water* and *Spirit*; not till we reach ver. 6 is the concrete term used;—(2) that ὕδατος is put first, because the gift of the Spirit as a rule (Acts ii. 38) *followed* upon baptism (Acts x. 47 is an exceptional case);—(3) that believing in Jesus as the Messiah is presupposed as the condition of baptism (Mark xvi. 16);—(4) that the necessity of baptism in order to participation in the Messianic kingdom (a doctrine against which Calvin in particular, and other expositors of the Reformed Church, contend) has certainly its basis in this passage, but with reference to the convert to Christianity, and not extending in the same way to the children of Christians, for these by virtue of their Christian parentage are already ἄγιοι (see on 1 Cor. vii. 14). Attempts to explain away this necessity—e.g. by the comparative rendering: “*not only* by water, *but also* by the Spirit” (B. Crusius; comp. Schweizer, who refers to the baptism of proselytes, and Ewald)—are meanings *imported into* the words.

Ver. 6. A more minute antithetic definition of this birth, in order further to elucidate it. — We have not in what follows two originally different *classes* of persons designated

¹ Krummacher, recently, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1859, p. 509, understands by the water the working of the Holy Spirit. How untenable! for the Spirit is named as a *distinct* factor *side by side* with water.

(Hilgenfeld), for the new birth is needed by *all* (see ver. 7 comp. also Weiss, *Lehrbegriff*, p. 128), but two different and successive *epochs of life*. — τὸ γεγεννημ.] *neuter*, though designating persons, to give prominence to the statement as *general and categorical*. See Winer, p. 167 [E. T. p. 222]. — ἐκ τῆς σαρκός] The *σάρξ* is that *human nature*, consisting of body and soul, which is alien and hostile to the divine, influenced morally by impulses springing from the power of sin, whose seat it is, living and operating with the principle of sensible life, the *ψυχή*. See on Rom. iv. 1. “*What is born of human nature thus sinfully constituted* (and, therefore, not in the way of spiritual birth from God), *is a being of the same sinfully conditioned nature*,¹ without the higher spiritual moral life which springs only from the working of the divine Spirit. Comp. i. 12, 13. Destitute of this divine working, man is merely *σαρκικός, ψυχικός* (1 Cor. ii. 14), *πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν* (Rom. vii. 14), and, despite his natural moral consciousness and will in the *νοῦς*, is wholly under the sway of the sinful power that is in the *σάρξ* (Rom. vii. 14–25). The *σάρξ*, as the moral antithesis of the *πνεῦμα*, stands in the same relation to the *human πνεῦμα* with the *νοῦς*, as the prevailingly sinful and morally powerless life of our lower nature does to the higher moral principle of life (Matt. xxvi. 41) with the will converted to God; while it stands in the same relation to the *divine πνεῦμα*, as that which is determinately opposed to God stands to that which determines the new life in obedience to God (Rom. viii. 1–3). In both relations, *σάρξ* and *πνεῦμα* are *antitheses* to each other, Matt. xxvi. 41; Gal. v. 17 ff.; accordingly in the unregenerate we have the *lucta carnis et MENTIS* (Rom. vii. 14 ff.), in the regenerate we have the *lucta carnis et SPIRITUS* (Gal. v. 17). — ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος] *that which is born of the Spirit, i.e. that whose moral nature and life have proceeded from the*

¹ The *sinful* constitution of the *σάρξ* in itself implies the *necessity* of a being born of the Spirit (vv. 3, 7); comp. 1 John ii. 16. The above exposition cannot therefore be considered as attributing to John a Pauline view which is strange to him. This is in answer to Weiss, according to whom Jesus here merely says, “as the corporeal birth only produces the corporeal sensual part.” Similarly J. Müller on *Sin*, vol. I. p. 449, II. 382. See on the other hand, Luthardt, *v. freien Willen*, p. 393.

operation of the Holy Spirit,¹ *is a being of a spiritual nature*, free from the dominion of the σάρξ, and entirely filled and governed by a spiritual principle, namely by the Holy Spirit (Rom. viii. 2 ff.), walking ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος (Rom. vii. 6). — The general nature of the statement forbids its limitation to the *Jews* as descendants of Abraham according to the flesh (Kuinoel and others), but they are of course included in the general declaration; comp. ver. 7, ὑμᾶς. — In the apodosis the substantives σάρξ and πνεῦμα represent, though with stronger emphasis (comp. vi. 63, xi. 25, xii. 50; 1 John iv. 8; Rom. viii. 10), the adjectives σαρκικός and πνευματικός, and are to be taken *qualitatively*.

Vv. 7, 8. To allay still more the astonishment of Nicodemus (ver. 4) at the requirement of ver. 3, Jesus subjoins an analogy drawn from *nature*, illustrating the operation of the Holy Spirit of which He is speaking. The man is seized by the humanly indefinable Spirit, but knows not whence He cometh to him, and whither He leadeth him. — ὑμᾶς] individualizing the general statement: "*te et eos, quorum nomine locutus es*," Bengel. Jesus could *not* have expressed Himself in the *first* person. — τὸ πνεῦμα] This, as is evident from πνεῖ, means *the wind* (Gen. viii. 1; Job xxx. 15; Wisd. xiii. 2; Heb. i. 7; often in the classics), not the *Spirit* (Steinfass). It is the double sense of the word (comp. πνι) which gave rise to *this* very analogy from nature. For a similar comparison, but between the *human* soul, so far as it participates in the divine nature, and the well-known but inexplicable agency of wind, see, *e.g.*, Xen. *Mem.* 4. 3. 14. Comp. also Eccles. xi. 5; Ps. cxxxv. 7. On the expression τὸ πνεῦμα πνεῖ, see Lobeck, *Paral.* 503. — ὅπου θέλει] The wind blowing now here, now there, is *personified* as a free agent, in keeping with the comparison of the personal Holy Spirit (1 Cor. xii. 2).² — ποῦ] with a verb of motion. Comp. Hom. *Il.* 13. 219; Soph. *Trach.* 40: κείνος δ' ὅπου βέβηκεν, οὐδείς οἶδε; and see

¹ The ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος, implying the ἐκ τοῦ πνύματος (after ver. 5), and the meaning of which is clear in itself, is not repeated by Jesus, because His aim now is simply to let the contrast between the σάρξ and the πνεῦμα stand out clearly.

² Concerning the personality of the Holy Spirit as taught in John, see especially xiv.-xvi.

Lobeck *ad Phryn.* 45; Mätzner *ad Antiph.* 169, § 8. Expressing by anticipation the state of rest following upon the movement. Often in the N. T. as in John (vii. 35, viii. 14, xii. 35) and Heb. xi. 8. — οὕτως ἐστὶ πᾶς, κ.τ.λ.] A popular and concrete mode of expression (Matt. xiii. 19, etc.): *so is it*, i.e. with reference experimentally to the course of his higher birth, *with every one who has been born* (perfect) *of the Spirit*. The points of resemblance summed up in the οὕτως are: (1) *the free self-determining action* of the Holy Spirit (ἔπου θέλει, comp. 1 Cor. xii. 11; John v. 21), not merely the greatness of this power, Tholuck; (2) *the felt experience* of His operations by the subject of them (τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ ἀκ.); and (3) yet their *incomprehensibleness* as to their origin and their end (ἀλλ' οὐκ οἶδας, κ.τ.λ.), the latter pertaining to the moral sphere and reaching unto eternal life, the former proceeding from God, and requiring, in order to understand it, the previously experienced workings of divine grace, and faith ensuing thereupon. The man feels the working of grace within, coming to him as a birth from above, but he knows not whence it comes; he feels its attraction, but he knows not whither it leads. These several elements in the delineation are so distinctly indicated by Jesus, that we cannot be satisfied with the mere general point of incomprehensibleness in the comparison (Hengstenberg), upon the basis of Eccles. xi. 5.

Vv. 9, 10. The entire nature of this birth from above (ταῦτα) is still a puzzle to Nicodemus as regarded its *possibility* (the emphasis being on δύναται); and we can easily understand how it should be so to a learned Pharisee bound to the mere form and letter. He asks the question in this state of *ignorance* (*haesitantis est*, Grotius), not in *pride* (Olshausen). Still, as one acquainted with the Scriptures, he *might* and *ought* to have recognised the possibility; for the power of the divine Spirit, the need of renewal in heart and mind, and the fact that this renewal is a divine work, are often mentioned in the O. T. Jesus therefore might well ask in wonder: *Art thou the teacher*, etc.? The article ὁ διδάσκ. and the τοῦ Ἰσρ. following designate the man not merely in an *official* capacity (Ewald), which would not mark him out *individually* from others, but as *the well-known* and *acknowledged*

teacher of the people. See Bernhardt, p. 315; Winer, p. 110 [E. T. p. 143]. Hengstenberg puts it too strongly: "the concrete embodiment of the *ideal* teacher of Israel;" comp. Godet. But Nicodemus must have held a position of influence as a teacher quite inconsistent with this proved ignorance; there is in the *article* a touch of *irony*, as in the question a certain degree of *indignation* (Nägelsbach on the *Iliad*, ed. 3, p. 424).

Ver. 11. Jesus now discloses to the henceforth silent Nicodemus, in growing excitement of feeling, the *source* of his ignorance, namely, his *unbelief* in what He testifies, and which yet is derived from His own knowledge and intuition. — The plurals *οἶδαμεν*, etc., are, as is clear from the singulars immediately following in ver. 12, simply rhetorical (plurals of *category*; see Sauppe and Kühner *ad Xen. Mem.* 1. 2. 46), and refer only to Jesus Himself. Comp. iv. 38, and its frequent use by St. Paul when he speaks of himself in the plural. To include the disciples (Hengstenberg, Godet), or to explain them as referring to *general Christian consciousness* as contrasted with the *Jewish* (Hilgenfeld), would be quite inappropriate to what has been stated (see especially *ὁ ἑωράκ. μαρτ.*). To understand them as including *John the Baptist* (Knapp, Hofmann, Luthardt, Weizsäcker, Weiss, Steinfass), or *him along with the prophets* (Luther, Beza, Calvin, Tholuck), or even *God* (Chrysostom, Euthymius Zigabenus, Rupertus, Calovius, etc.), or the *Holy Ghost* (Bengel), is quite arbitrary, and without a trace of support in the text, nay, on account of the *ἑωράκ.*, opposed to it, for the Baptist especially did not by i. 34 occupy the same stage of *ἑωρακέναί* with Christ. It is, moreover, quite against the context when B. Crusius says: "*men generally* are the subject of the verbs *οἶδαμεν* and *ἑωράκ.*," so that *human things*—what one sees and knows (*τὰ ἐπίγεια*, ver. 12)—are meant. — Observe the gradual *ascent* in the parallelism, in which *ἑωράκαμεν* does not refer to the knowledge attained in this earthly life (Weizsäcker), but to the vision of God enjoyed by Christ in His pre-existent state. Comp. ver. 32, i. 18, vi. 46, viii. 38, xvii. 5.—*οὐ λαμβάνετε*] ye Jews: comp. *τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ*, ver. 10; and for the fact itself, i. 11, 12. The reproach, like the *οὐ πιστεύετε* of ver. 12, refers to

the nation as a whole, with a reference also to Nicodemus himself. To render this as a *question* (Ewald) only *weakens* the tragic relation of the second half of the verse to the first.

Ver. 12. How grievous the prospect which your unbelief regarding the instructions I have already given opens up as to the future! — τὰ ἐπίγεια] *what is on earth*, things which take place on earth (not in heaven). We must strictly adhere to this meaning of the word in this as in all other passages (1 Cor. xv. 40; 2 Cor. v. 1; Phil. ii. 10, iii. 19; Jas. iii. 15. Comp. Wisd. ix. 16, and Grimm, *Handbuch*, p. 189). To the *category* of these *earthly things* belonged also the birth from above (against Baeumlein), because, though brought about by a power from heaven, *it is accomplished on earth*; and because, proceeding in repentance and faith, it is a change taking place on earth within the earthly realm of our moral life; and because it is historically certain that Christ everywhere began His work with this very preaching of μετάνοια. The Lord has in His mind not *only* the doctrine of regeneration just declared to Nicodemus, but, as the plural shows, *all* which thus far He had taught the Jews (εἶπον ὑμῖν); and this had been hitherto only ἐπίγεια, and not ἐπουράνια, of which He still designs to speak.¹ It is therefore wrong to refer the expression to the comparison of the *wind* (Beza) or of corporeal *birth* (Grotius), as prefiguring higher doctrine; for the relation to the faith spoken of did not lie in these symbols, but in the truths they symbolized. The meaning of the words is quite altered, moreover, if we change the word ἐπίγεια into "*human and moral*" (B. Crusius), or take it as meaning only what is stated in the *immediate context* (Lücke), or, with De Wette, make the point of difference to be nothing more than the antithesis between man's susceptibility of regeneration as a work within him and his susceptibility of merely *believing*. — The counterpart of the ἐπίγεια are the ἐπουράνια, of which Jesus intends to

¹ εἶπον is *dixi*, not *dixerunt*, as Ewald thinks, who regards the *ancients* in the O. T. as the subject, and upon too feeble evidence reads πιστεύετε instead of πιστεύετε. This new subject must have been expressed, and an ἰγώ should have stood over against it in the apodosis. Comp. Matt. v. 21, 22. The *earthly* might be appropriate to the *law* (following Col. ii. 17; Heb. ix. 5, x. 1), but not to the prophets.

speak to them in future, *things which are in heaven* (so in all places, Matt. xviii. 35; 1 Cor. xv. 40, 48, 49; Eph. i. 3; Phil. ii. 10, etc.). To this category belong especially the *Messianic mysteries*, i.e. the *divine decrees for man's redemption and final blessedness*. These are *ἐπουράνια*, because they have their foundation (Wisd. ix. 16, 17) in *the divine will*, though their realization commences in the present *αἰών*, through the entire work, and in particular through the death of Jesus and the faith of mankind; but while still unaccomplished, belongs to the divine counsel, and shall be first consummated and fully revealed in the kingdom of the Messiah by the exalted Christ, when the *ζωὴ αἰώνιος* will reveal itself at the goal of perfection (Col. iii. 4), and "it will appear what we shall be." To the *ἐπουράνιους*, therefore, does not first belong what is to be said of His exaltation, Matt. xxvi. 64 (Steinfass); but that very statement, and indeed as the first and main thing, which Jesus immediately after delivers in ver. 14 ff., where the *heavenly element*, i.e. *what is in the counsels of God* (vv. 15, 16), is clearly contained. According to the connection, it is to be inferred that what is heavenly is *difficult to be understood*; but this difficulty has nothing to do with the word itself, as Lücke holds.

Ver. 13. "And no other than I can reveal to you heavenly things." This is what Jesus means, if we rightly take His words, not an assertion of His *divinity* as the first of the heavenly things (Hengstenberg), which would make the negative form of expression quite inexplicable. Comp. i. 18, vi. 46. — The *καὶ* is simply *continuative* in its force, not *antithetic* (Knapp, Olshausen), nor *furnishing a basis*, or *explanatory of the motive* (Beza, Tholuck; Lücke, Lange). — *οὐδεὶς ἀναβέβηκεν, κ.τ.λ.*] which, on account of the perfect tense, obviously cannot refer to the actual *ascension of Christ*¹ (against Augustine, Beda, Theophylact, Rupertus, Calovius, Bengel, etc.); nor does it give any support to the unscriptural *raptus in coelum* of the Socinians (see Oeder *ad Catech. Racov.* p. 348 ff.); nor is it to be explained by the *unio hypostatica* of Christ's *human nature* with the *divine*, by virtue of which the former may be

¹ So also Weizsäcker, who assumes that we have here an experience belonging to the apostolic age, carried back and placed in the mouth of Christ. An anachronism which would amount to literary carelessness.

said to have entered into heaven (Calovius, Maldonatus, Steinfass, and others). It is *usually* understood in a *figurative* sense, as meaning a *spiritual elevation of the soul to God* in order to knowledge of divine things, a coming to the perception of divine mysteries, which thus were brought down, as it were, by Christ from heaven (see of late especially Beyschlag); to support which, reference is made to Deut. xxx. 12, Prov. xxx. 4, Baruch iii. 29, Rom. x. 6, 7. But this is incorrect, because Christ brought along with Him out of His *pre-existent state* His immediate knowledge of divine things (ver. 11, i. 18, viii. 26, *al.*), and possesses it in uninterrupted fellowship with the Father; consequently the figurative method of representation, that *during His earthly life* He brought down this knowledge through having been raised up into heaven, would be inappropriate and strange. 'Ο ἐκ τοῦ οὐρ. καταβ. also must be taken literally, of an *actual* descent; and there is therefore nothing in the context to warrant our taking ἀναβ. εἰς τ. οὐρ. *symbolically*. Hengstenberg rightly renders the words literally, but at the end of the verse he would *complete* the sense by adding, "*who will ascend up into heaven.*" This in itself is arbitrary, and not at all what we should look for in John; it is not in keeping with the connection, and would certainly not have been understood as a matter of course by a person like Nicodemus, though it were the point of the declaration: consequently it could not fitly be suppressed, and least of all as a saying concerning the *future*. Godet does not get beyond the explanation of essential communion with God on the part of Jesus *from the time of His birth*. The only rendering true to the words is simply this: Instead of saying, "No one has *been* in heaven except," etc., Jesus says, as this could only have happened to any other by his *ascending* thither, "No one *has ascended* into heaven except," etc.; and thus the εἰ μὴ refers to an *actual existence* in heaven, which is implied in the ἀναβέβηκεν. And thus Jansenius rightly renders: Nullus hominum in coelo fuit, quod ascendendo fieri solet, ut ibi coelestia contempleretur, nisi, etc.; and of late Fritzsche the elder in his *Novis opusc.* p. 230; and now also Tholuck, and likewise Holtzmann in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr.* 1865, p. 222.

—ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρ. καταβάς] which took place by means of the *incarnation*. These words, like ὁ ὦν ἐν τ. οὐρ., are *argumentative*, for they necessarily imply the fact of *existence in heaven*; but ὁ ὦν, which must be taken as an attributive definition of ὁ υἱὸς τ. ἀνθρ., and not as belonging to καταβάς, and therefore taking the article, cannot be equivalent to ὃς ἦν (Luthardt; Hofmman, I. 134; Weiss, etc.), as if ποτε, τὸ πρότερον or the like were there, but is equivalent to ὃς ἐστι, *whose existence is in heaven*, who has there His proper abode, His home.¹—ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρ.] a Messianic designation which Christ applies to Himself, in harmony with the fulfilment of the prophetic representation in Dan. vii. 13, which began with the καταβάς (comp. on i. 52). *Nicodemus* could understand this only by means of a fuller development of faith and knowledge.

Note.—According to Beyschlag, p. 99 ff., this verse is utterly opposed to the derivation of Christ's higher knowledge from the recollection of a pre-existent life in heaven. But we must bear in mind, (1) that the notion of an *ascent* to God to attain a knowledge of His mysteries (which Beyschlag considers the only right explanation) never occurs in the N. T. with reference to Jesus—a circumstance which would surprise us, especially in John, if it had been declared by Jesus Himself. But it was *not* declared by Him, because He *has* it not, but knows His knowledge to be the gift of His Father which accompanied Him in His mission (x. 36). (2) He could not have claimed such an ascent to heaven for Himself *alone*, for a like ascent, though not in equal degree, must belong to other men of God. He must, therefore, at least have expressed Himself *comparatively*: οὐδεὶς οὕτως ἀναβέβηκεν ἐ. τ. οὐρ. ὡς ὁ, κ.τ.λ. Even the church now sings:

“ Rise, rise, my soul, and stretch Thy wings
Towards heaven, Thy native place.”

But something distinct and *more* than this was the case with Christ, viz. as to the past, that He had His existence in heaven, and had *come down* therefrom; and as to His earthly presence, that He *is* in heaven.

¹ Nonnus: ἀσπερίεντι μιλάθρῳ πάτριον οὐδας ἔχων.—IX. 25 is similar: τυφλὸς ἄν: blind from one's birth. Schleiermacher refers the coming down from heaven to the conception of His *mission*, and the being in heaven to the *continuity of His God-consciousness*. See e.g. his *Leben Jesu*, p. 287 ff.

Vv. 14, 15. Jesus, having in ver. 13 stated the *ground* of faith in Him, now proceeds to show the *blessedness* of the believer—which was the design of His redemptive work—in order the more to incite those whom He is addressing to fulfil the fundamental condition, contained in faith, of participating in His kingdom. That this is the logical advance in the discourse, is clear from the fact that in what follows it is the *blessedness* of faith which is *dwelt upon*; see vv. 15, 16, 18. We have not here a transition from the *possibility* to the *necessity* of communicating heavenly things, ver. 13 (Lücke); nor from the *ideal* unveilings of divine things to the *chief mystery* of the doctrine of salvation which was manifested in historical reality (De Wette, comp. Tholuck and Brückner); nor from the first of divine things, Christ's *divinity*, to the second, the *atonement* which He was to establish (Hengstenberg, comp. Godet); nor from the *Word* to His *manifestation* (Olshausen); nor from the work of *enlightenment* to that of *blessing* (Scholl); nor from the present *want* of faith to its future *rise* (Jacobi: "faith will first begin to spring up when my *ἔψωσις* is begun"); nor from Christ's *work* to His *person* (B. Crusius); nor from His *person* to His *work* (Lange).—The event recorded in Num. xxi. 8 is made use of by Jesus as a type of the divinely appointed manner and efficacy of His coming death,¹ to confirm a prophecy still enigmatical to Nicodemus, by attaching it to a well-known historical illustration. The points of comparison are: (1) *the being lifted up* (the well-known brazen serpent on the pole, and Jesus on the cross); (2) *the being saved* (restored to health by looking at the serpent, to eternal ζωή by believing on the crucified One). Comp. Wisd. xvi. 6, and, in the earliest Christian literature, *Epist. of Barnabas*, c. 12; *Ignatius ad Smyrn.* 2, *interpol.*; *Justin, Apol.* 1. 60, *Dial. c. Tr.* 94. Any further drawing out of the illustration is arbitrary, as, for instance, that of Bengel: "ut serpens ille fuit serpens sine veneno contra serpentes venenatos, sic Christus homo sine peccato contra serpentem antiquum," comp. Luther and others, approved by Lechler in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1854, p. 826. Lange goes

¹ Which, consequently, He had clearly foreseen not for the first time in vi. 51 (Weizsäcker); comp. on ii. 19.

furthest in this direction; comp. Ebrard on Olshausen, p. 104. There is, further, no typical element in the fact that the brazen serpent of Moses was a *dead representative* ("as the sign of its conquering through the healing power of the Lord," Hengstenberg). For, apart from the fact that Christ was lifted up *alive* upon the cross, the circumstance of the brazen serpent being a *lifeless* thing is not made prominent either in Num. xxi. or here. — ὑψωθήναι] not *glorified*, acknowledged in His exaltation (Paulus), which, following ὑψωσε, would be opposed to the context, but (comp. viii. 28, xii. 32, 33) *shall be lifted up*, that is, *on the cross*,¹—answering to the Aramaean ܚܕܝܐ (comp. the Heb. ָרָא, Ps. cxlv. 14, cxlvi. 8), a word used of the hanging up of the malefactor upon the beam. See Ezra vi. 11; Gesenius, *Theol.* I. 428; Heydenreich in Höffel's *Zeitschr.* II. 1, p. 72 ff.; Brückner, 68, 69. Comp. *Test. XII. patr.* p. 739: κύριος ὑβρισθήσεται καὶ ἐπὶ ξύλου ὑψωθήσεται. The express comparison with the raising up of the brazen serpent, a story which must have been well known to Nicodemus, does not allow of our explaining ὑψωθήσ., as = ָרָא, of the exaltation of Jesus to glory (Bleek, *Beitr.* 231), or as *including* this, so that the cross is the stepping-stone to glory (Lechler, Godet); or of referring it to the *near coming of the kingdom*, by which God will show Him in His greatness (Weizsäcker); or of our abiding simply by the idea of an *exhibition* (Hofmann, *Weissag. u. Erf.* II. 143), which Christ underwent in His public sufferings and death; or of leaving wholly out of account the *form* of the exaltation (which was certainly accomplished on the cross and then in heaven), (Luthardt), and conceiving of an exaltation for the purpose of being visible to all men (Holtzmann), as Schleiermacher also held (*Leben Jesu*, 345); or of assuming, as the meaning which was intelligible for Nicodemus, only that of *removing*, where Jesus, moreover, was conscious of His being lifted up on

¹ The higher significance imparted to Christ's person and work by His death (Baur, *Neutest. Theol.* 379) is not implied in the word ὑψωθήναι, but in the comparison with the *serpent*, and in the sentence following, which expresses the *object* of the lifting up. This passage (comp. i. 29) should have prevented Baur from asserting (p. 400) that the Pauline doctrine concerning such a significance in Christ's death is wholly wanting in St. John's doctrinal view. See also vi. 51, 53, 54.

the cross and up to God (Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, 301). — $\delta\epsilon\iota$] according to the divine decree, Matt. xvi. 21, Luke xxiv. 26, does not refer to the type, but only to the anti-type (against Olshausen), especially as between the *person* of Christ and the brazen serpent *as such* no typical relation could exist. — Lastly, that Jesus should thus early make, though at the time an enigmatic, allusion to His death by crucifixion, is conceivable both on the ground of the doctrinal peculiarity of the event, and of the extraordinary importance of His death as the fact of redemption. See on ii. 19. And in the case of Nicodemus, the enigmatic germ then sown bore fruit, xix. 39. — Adopting the reading $\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$ (see Critical Notes), we cannot refer it to $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\omega\nu$, but, as $\mu\eta\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{o}\lambda\eta\tau\alpha\iota$, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda'$ is spurious (see Critical Notes), to $\epsilon\chi\eta$: "every believer shall *in Him* (i.e. resting upon Him as the cause) have eternal life." Comp. xx. 31, v. 39, xvi. 33, xiii. 31. — $\zeta\omega\eta\nu\ \alpha\iota\omega\mu\iota\omicron\nu$] eternal *Messianic life*, which, however, the believer already has ($\epsilon\chi\eta$) as an internal possession in $\alpha\iota\omega\nu\ \omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$, viz. the present self-conscious development of the only true moral and blissful $\zeta\omega\eta$, which is independent of death, and whose consummation and full glory begin with the second advent. (Comp. vi. 40, 44, 45, 54, 58, xiv. 3, xvii. 24; 1 John iii. 14, iv. 9.)

Ver. 16. *Continuation of the address of Jesus to Nicodemus*, onwards to ver. 21,¹ not, as Erasmus, Rosenmüller, Kuinoel, Paulus, Neander, Tholuck, Olshausen, Maier think (see also Bäumlein), an explanatory meditation of the evangelist's own; an assumption justified neither by anything in the text nor by the word $\mu\omicron\nu\nu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\varsigma$, a word which must have been transferred from the language of John to the mouth of Jesus (not *vice versa*, as Hengstenberg thinks), for it is never elsewhere used by Christ, often as He speaks of His divine sonship. See on i. 14. The reflective character of the following discourse is so fully compatible with the design of Christ to instruct, and the preterites $\eta\gamma\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ and $\eta\nu$ so little require to be explained from the standing-point of a later time, that there does not

¹ Luther rightly praised "the majesty, simplicity, clearness, expressiveness, truth, charm" of this discourse. He "exceedingly and beyond measure loved" this text.

seem any sufficient basis for the *intermediate* view (of Lücke, De Wette, Brückner), that in this continued account of the discourse of Jesus, vv. 16 ff., John inserts more explanations and reflections of his own than in the preceding part, how little soever such a supposition would (as Kling and Hengstenberg think) militate against the trustworthiness of John, who, in recording the longer discourses, has exactly in his own living recollection the abundant guarantee of *substantial certainty*. — οὕτω] *so much*; see on Gal. iii. 3. — γάρ] reason of the purpose stated in ver. 15. — ἡγάπησεν] *loved*, with reference to the time of the ἔδωκεν. — τὸν κόσμον] *i.e. mankind at large*,¹ comp. πᾶς, ver. 15, xvii. 2; 1 John ii. 2. — τὸν μονογ.] to make the proof of His love the *stronger*, 1 John iv. 9; Heb. xi. 17; Rom. viii. 32. — ἔδωκεν] He did not reserve Him for Himself, but *gave* Him, *i.e. to the world*. The word means more than ἀπέστειλεν (ver. 17), which expresses² the manner of the ἔδωκεν, though it does not specially denote the giving up to *death*, but the state of humiliation as a whole, upon which God caused His Son to enter when He left His pre-existent glory (xvii. 5), and the final act of which *was to be* His death (1 John iv. 10). The Indicative following, ὥστε, describes the act objectively as something actually done. See on Gal. ii. 13; and Klotz *ad Devar.* 772. — μὴ ἀπόληται, κ.τ.λ.] Concerning the subjunctive, representing an object as present, see Winer, 271 [E. T. p. 377]. The change from the Aorist to the Present is to be noted, whereby the being utterly ruined (by banishment to hell in the Messianic judgment) is spoken of as an act in process of accomplishment; while the possession of the Messianic ζωή is described as now already

¹ This declaration is the rock upon which the absolute predestination doctrine goes to pieces, and the supposed (by Baur and Hilgenfeld) metaphysical dualism of the anthropology of St. John. Calovius well unfolds our text thus: (1) *salutis principium* (ἡγάπ.); (2) *dilectionis objectum* (the κόσμος, not the electi); (3) *donum amplissimum* (His only-begotten Son); (4) *pactum gratiosissimum* (faith, not works); (5) *finem missionis Christi saluberrimum*.

² Weizsäcker in the *Zeitschr. f. Deutsche Theol.* 1857, p. 176, erroneously finds wanting in John an intimation on the part of Christ that He is the Logos who came *voluntarily* to the world. He is, however, the Logos *sent* of God, who undertook this mission in the feeling of obedience. Thus the matter is presented throughout the N. T., and the thought that Christ came αὐτοθιλή is quite foreign thereto.

existing (commencing with regeneration), and as abiding for ever. Comp. on ver. 15.

Ver. 17. Confirmation of ver. 16, in which ἀπέστειλεν answers to the ἔδωκεν, κρίνῃ to the ἀπόληται, and σωθῇ to the ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον of ver. 16. Considering this exact correspondence, it is very arbitrary with modern critics (even Lücke, B. Crusius) to understand the second τὸν κόσμον differently from the first, and from the τ. κόσμον of ver. 16, as denoting in the narrow Jewish sense the *Gentile* world, for whose judgment, *i.e.* condemnation, the Messiah, according to the Jewish doctrine, was to come (see Bertholdt, *Christol.* pp. 203, 223). Throughout the whole context it is to be uniformly understood of the *world of mankind as a whole*. Of it Jesus says, that He was not sent to judge it,—a judgment which, as all have sinned, must have been a judgment of *condemnation*,—but to procure for it by His work of redemption the Messianic σωτηρία. “Deus saepe ultor describitur in veteri pagina; itaque consilii peccatorum merito expectare poterant, filium venire ad poenas patris nomine exigendas,” Grotius. It is to be remembered that He speaks of His coming in the state of humiliation, in which He was not to accomplish judgment, but was to be the medium of obtaining the σώζεσθαι through His work and His death. Judgment upon the finally unbelieving was reserved to Him upon His Second Advent (comp. v. 22, 27), but the κρίμα which was to accompany His works upon earth is different from this (see on ix. 39).—The thrice-repeated κόσμος has a tone of solemnity about it. Comp. i. 10, xv. 19.

Ver. 18. More exact explanation of the negative part of ver. 17. Mankind are either *believing*, and are thus delivered from condemnation (comp. v. 24), because if the Messiah had come to judge the world, He would only have had to condemn sin; but sin is forgiven to the believer, and he already has everlasting ζωή;—or they are *unbelieving*, so that condemnation has already been passed upon them in idea (as an internal fact),¹ because they reject the Only-begotten of God, and there

¹ Hence it is clear that the signification of κρίνεν as meaning *condemnatory* judgment is correct, and not the explanation of Weiss, *Lehrbegriff*, p. 184, according to whom the “judgment” here means in general only a decision either

is no need of a special act of judgment to be passed on them on the part of the Messiah; their own unbelief has already passed upon them the sentence of condemnation. "He who does not believe, already has hell on his neck," Luther; he is *αὐτοκατάκριτος*, Tit. iii. 11. Ver. 18 does not speak of the *last* judgment which shall be the solemn and ultimate completion of this temporal judgment,¹ but it does not call it *in question*, in opposition to the Jewish Messianic belief (Hilgenfeld). See on v. 28-30, xii. 31. Well says Euthymius Zigabenus: *ἡ ἀπιστία κατέκρινε πρὸ τῆς κατακρίσεως*. Comp. ver. 36. — *πεπίστευκεν*] *has become a believer* (and remains so); the *subjective* negation in the causal clause (contrary to the older classical usage), as often in Lucian, etc., denoting the relation as one *presupposed* in the view of the speaker. See Herm. *ad Viger*. p. 806; Winer, p. 442 [E. T. p. 602]. Otherwise in 1 John v. 10. — *τοῦ μονογ. υἱοῦ τ. θεοῦ*] very impressively throwing light upon the *ἤδη κέκριται*, because bringing clearly into view *the greatness of the guilt*.

Ver. 19. The *ἤδη κέκριται* is now more minutely set forth, and this as to its moral character, as rejection of the light, *i.e.* of God's saving truth,—the possessor and bringer in of which was Christ, who had come into the world,—and as love of darkness. "*But herein consists the condemnation* (as an inner moral fact which, according to ver. 18, had already occurred), *that,*" etc. *ἡ κρίσις* is the judgment in question, to be understood here also, agreeably to the whole connection, of *condemnatory* judgment. But in *αὕτη . . . ὅτι* (comp. 1 John v. 11) we have not the *reason* (Chrysostom and his followers), but the characteristic *nature* of the judgment stated. — *ὅτι τὸ φῶς*,

for life or death. In that case, not *οὐ κρίνεται*, but *ἤδη κρίνεται*, must apply also to the *believer*. But this very distinction, the *οὐ κρίνεται* used of the believer and the *ἤδη κρίνεται* of the unbeliever, places the explanation of a *condemnatory κρίσις* beyond doubt. This is also against Godet, who with reference to the believer hits upon the expedient of supposing that the Lord here *anticipates* the judgment (*viz.* the "constater l'état moral"). But according to the words of Jesus, this suggestion would apply rather to the case of the *unbeliever*.

¹ This *temporal* judgment of the world is the world's history, the conclusion of which is the *last* judgment (v. 27), which, however, must not (as Schleiermacher, *L. J.* 355) be dissipated by means of this text into a merely natural issue of the mission of Jesus. See on v. 28. See also Croos in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1863, p. 251.

etc., καὶ ἡγάπησαν] The first clause is not expressed in the dependent form (ὅτι ὅτε τὸ φῶς, etc., or with Gen. abs.), but as an independent statement, in order to give emphatic prominence to the contrast setting forth the guilt. See Kühner, II. 416; Winer, p. 585 [E. T. pp. 785-6]. — ἡγάπησαν] after it had come. Jesus could *now* thus speak already from experience regarding His relations to mankind *as a whole*; the *Aor.* does not presuppose the consciousness of a later time. See ii. 23, 24. For the rest, ἡγάπ. is put first with tragic emphasis, which object is also served by the simple καί (not *and yet*). The expression itself: *they loved the darkness rather* (*potius*, not *magis*, comp. xii. 43; 2 Tim. iii. 4) *than the light*, — μᾶλλον belonging not to the verb, but to the noun, and ἡ comparing the two *conceptions* (Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 51; Bäuml *Partik.* p. 136), — is a mournful *meiosis*; for they did not love the light at all, but *hated* it, ver. 20. The ground of this hatred, however, does not lie (comp. ver. 6, i. 12) in a metaphysical opposition of principles (Baur, Hilgenfeld, Colani), but in the light-shunning demoralization into which men had sunk through their own free act (for they might also have done ἀλήθεια, ver. 21). The source of unbelief is immorality. — ἦν γὰρ αὐτῶν, κ.τ.λ.] The *reason* why "they loved the darkness rather," etc. (see on i. 5), was *their immoral manner of life*, in consequence of which they must shun the light, nay, even hate it (ver. 20). We may observe the growing emphasis from αὐτῶν onwards to πονηρά, *for the works which they* (in opposition to the individual lovers of the light) *did were evil*; which πονηρά does not in popular usage denote a higher degree of evil than φαῦλα, ver. 20 (Bengel), but answers to this as *evil* does to *bad* (*worthless*); Fritzsche *ad Rom.* p. 297. Comp. v. 29; Rom. ix. 11; 2 Cor. v. 10; Jas. iii. 16; φαῦλα ἔργα in Plat. *Crat.* p. 429 A.; 3 Macc. iii. 22.

Ver. 20. Γάρ] If by the previous γάρ the historical *basis* for the statement ἡγάπησαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, κ.τ.λ., was *laid*, then this second γάρ is related to the same statement as *explanatory* thereof (see on Matt. vi. 32, xviii. 11; Rom. viii. 6), introducing a general elucidation, and this from the psychological and perfectly natural relation of evil-doers to the light which was manifested (in Christ) (τὸ φῶς not different from ver. 19),

which they hated as the principle opposed to them, and to which they would not come, because they wished to avoid the ἔλεγχος which they must experience from it. This “coming to the light” is the believing adherence to Jesus, which, however, would have to be brought about through the μετάνοια.¹ — ἵνα μὴ ἐλεγχθῇ] Intention. This ἔλεγχος is the *chastening censure*, which they shunned both on account of their being put to shame before the world, and because of the threatening feeling of repentance and sorrow in their self-consciousness. Comp. Luke iii. 19; John viii. 8; Eph. v. 11, 13. “Gravis malae conscientiae lux est,” Senec. *ep.* 122. 14. This dread is both moral pride and moral effeminacy. According to Luthardt (comp. B. Crusius), the ἐλέγχεσθαι refers only to the psychological fact of an *inner* condemnation. But against this is the parallel φανερωθῇ, ver. 21.—Observe, on the one hand, the participle *present* (for the πράξας might turn to the light), and, on the other, the distinction between πρᾶσσων (he who *presses on, agit*, pursues as the goal of his activity) and ποιῶν, ver. 21 (he who *does, facit*, realizes as a fact). Comp. Xen. *Mem.* iii. 9. 4: ἐπισταμένος μὲν ἃ δεῖ πράττειν, ποιῶντες δὲ τάναντία, also iv. 5. 4, *al.*; Rom. i. 31, ii. 3, vii. 15, xiii. 4. See generally, Franke, *ad Dem. Ol.* iii. 15.

Ver. 21. Ὁ δὲ ποιῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν.] The opposite of ὁ φαῦλα πρᾶσσων, ver. 20, and therefore ἀλήθεια is to be taken in the *ethical* sense: he who does what is *morally true*, so that his conduct is in harmony with the divine moral standard. Comp. Isa. xxvi. 10; Ps. cxix. 30; Neh. ix. 33; Job iv. 6, xiii. 6; 1 John i. 6; 1 Cor. v. 8; Eph. v. 9; Phil. iv. 8. Moral truth was *revealed* before Christ, not only in the law (Weiss), but also (see Matt. v. 17) in the prophets, and, outside Scripture, in creation and in conscience (Rom. i. 19 ff., ii. 14 ff.). Comp. Groos, p. 255. — ἵνα φανερ. αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα] φανερ. is the opposite of the μὴ ἐλεγχθῇ of ver. 20. While the wicked wishes his actions not to be reproved, but to remain in darkness, the good man wishes *his* actions to come to the light and to be made manifest, and he therefore ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸ φῶς; for Christ, as the personally manifested *Light*, the bearer of

¹ In opposition to Colani, who finds a circle in the reasoning of vv. 19, 20. See Godot.

divine truth, cannot fail through His working to make these good deeds be recognised in this their true nature. The manifestation of true morality through Christ must necessarily throw the true light on the moral conduct of those who come to Him, and make it manifest and show it forth in its true nature and form. The purpose *ἵνα φανερ., κ.τ.λ.*, does not spring from self-seeking, but arises from the requirements, originating in a moral necessity, of moral satisfaction in itself, and of the triumph of good over the world. — *αὐτοῦ*] thus put before, for emphasis' sake, in opposition to the evil-doer, who has altogether a different design with reference to his acts. — *ὅτι ἐν θεῷ, κ.τ.λ.*] the reason of the before-named purpose. How should he not cherish this purpose, and desire the *φανέρωσις*, seeing that his works are wrought *in God*! Thus, so far from *shunning*, he has really to *strive after* the manifestation of them, as the revelation of all that is divine. We must take this *ἐν θεῷ*, like the frequent *ἐν Χριστῷ*, as denoting the *element* in which the *ἐργάζεσθαι* moves; not without and apart from God, but living and moving in Him, has the good man acted. Thus the *κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ*, 1 John v. 14, and the *κατὰ θεόν*, Rom. viii. 27, 2 Cor. vii. 10, also the *εἰς θεόν*, Luke xii. 21, constitute the necessary *character* of the *ἐν θεῷ*, but are not the *ἐν θεῷ itself*. — *ἔργα εἰργασμένα*] as in vi. 28, ix. 4, Matt. xxvi. 10, *et al.*, and often in the classics.—Observe from ver. 21, that Christ, who here expresses Himself generally, yet conformably to experience, encountered, at the time of His entering upon His ministry of enlightenment, not only the *φαῦλα πράσσοντες*, but also those who practised what is right, and who were living in God. To this class belonged a Nathanael, and the disciples generally, certainly also many who repented at the preaching of the Baptist, together with other O. T. saints, and perhaps Nicodemus himself. They were drawn by the Father to come to Christ, and were given to Him (vi. 37); they were of God, and had ears to hear His word (viii. 47, comp. xviii. 37); they were desirous to do the Father's will (vii. 17); they were *His* (xvii. 6). But according to ver. 19, these were exceptions only amid the multitude of the opposite kind, and even their piety needed purifying and transfiguring into true

δικαιοσύνη, which could be attained only by fellowship with Christ; and hence even in their case the way of Christian penitence, by the *φανέρωσις* of their works wrought in God, brought about by the light of Christ, was not excluded, but was exhibited, and its commencement brought about, because, in view of this complete and highest light, the sincere Old Testament saint must first rightly feel the need of that repentance, and of the lack of moral satisfaction. Consequently the statement of vv. 3, 5, still holds true.

Vv. 22, 23. After this interview with Nicodemus¹ (μετὰ ταῦτα) Jesus betook Himself with His disciples from the capital into the *country* of Judea, in a north-easterly direction towards Jordan. Ἰουδαίαν is, as in Mark i. 5, Acts xvi. 1, 1 Macc. ii. 23, xiv. 33, 37, 2 Macc. v. 23, 3 Esr. v. 47, *Anthol.* vii. 645, an *adjective*. — ἐβάπτισεν] during His stay there (*Imperf.*), not Himself, however, but through His disciples, iv. 2. Baur, indeed, thinks that the writer had a definite purpose in view in this mode of expression; that he wished to bring Jesus and the Baptist as closely as possible together in the same work. But if so, the remark of iv. 2 would be strangely illogical; see also Schweizer, p. 194. The baptism of Jesus, besides, was certainly a continuation of that of John, and did not yet possess the new characteristic of Matt. xxviii. 19 (for see vii. 39); but that it already included that higher element, which John's baptism did not possess (comp. Acts xix. 2, 3),—namely, the operation of the Spirit, of which Christ was the bearer (ver. 34), for the accomplishment of the birth from above,—is manifest from ver. 5, a statement which cannot be a prolepsis or a prophecy merely. — ἦν δὲ καὶ Ἰωάνν., κ.τ.λ.] *but John was also employed in baptizing, namely in Aenon*, etc. This name, usually taken as the intensive or adjectival form of ἰψ, is rather = ἰψ ἰψ, *dove spring*; the place itself is otherwise unknown, as is also the situation of Salim, though placed by Eusebius and Jerome eight Roman miles south of Scythopolis. This is all the more uncertain, because Aenon, according to the mention of it here (comp. iv. 3), must have been in Judaea, and not in Samaria, and *could not* therefore have

¹ To interpose a longer interval, *e.g.* a return to and sojourn in Galilee, is quite gratuitous. Not before iv. 3 does Jesus return to Galilee.

been the Ainun discovered by Robinson (*Later Explorations*, p. 400). Ewald thinks of the two places יְנִיחַ in Josh. xv. 32. So also Wieseler, p. 247. In no case could the towns have been situated on the Jordan, for in that case the statement ὅτι ὕδατα πολλὰ would have been quite out of place. Comp. Hengstenberg, who likewise refers to Josh. xv. 32, while Pressel (in Herzog's *Encykl.* XIII. 326) prefers the statement of Eusebius and Jerome. For the rest, the narrative of the temptation, which Hengstenberg places in the period after ver. 22, has nothing to do with the locality in this verse; it does not belong to this at all.—The question why John, after the public appearance of Jesus, still *continued to baptize*, without baptizing *in His name*, is answered simply by the fact (against Bretschneider, Weisse, Baur) that Jesus *had not yet come forth as* John expected that the Messiah would, and that consequently the Baptist could not have supposed that his work in preparing the way for the Messiah's kingdom by his baptism of repentance was already accomplished, but had to await for that the divine decision. This perseverance of John, therefore, in his vocation to baptize, was by no means in conflict with his divinely received certainty of the Messiahship of Jesus (as Weizsäcker, p. 320, thinks), and the ministry of both of them side by side must not be looked upon as improbable, as "in itself a splitting in sunder of the Messianic movement" (Keim).

Ver. 24 corrects, in passing, the synoptic tradition,¹ which John knew as being widely spread, and the discrepancy in which is not to be explained either by placing the imprisonment between John iv. 2 and 3, and by taking the journey of Jesus to Galilee there related as the same with that mentioned in Matt. iv. 12 (Lücke, Tholuck, Olshausen, B. Crusius, Ebrard, Hengstenberg, and many others), or by making the journey of Matt. iv. 12 to coincide with that named in John vi. 1 (Wieseler). See on Matt. iv. 12. Apart from that purpose of correction, which is specially apparent if we compare Matt. iv. 17 (subtleties to the contrary in Ebrard), the remark, which was quite intelligible of itself, would be,

¹ It is supposed, indeed, that John simply wishes to intimate that what he records, vv. 22-36, must be placed *before* Matt. iv. 12 (Hengstenberg). But in the connection of Matthew, there is no place for it before iv. 12.

to say the least, superfluous,—unnecessary even to gain space for bringing Jesus and the Baptist again alongside each other (Keim), even if we were to venture to propose the suggestion, of which the text says nothing, that Jesus felt himself obliged, as the time of the Baptist was not yet expired, to bring the kingdom of God near, in keeping with the form which the Baptist had adopted (Luthardt, p. 79).

Vv. 25, 26. Οὕν] in consequence of the narration of ver. 23 (ver. 24 being a parenthetical remark). Nothing is known more particularly as to this question (ζητήσις) which arose among John's disciples (ἐγένετο ἐκ τῶν μαθ. Ἰωάνν., comp. Lucian. *Alex.* 40; Herod. v. 21). The theme of it was "*concerning purification*" (περὶ καθαρισμοῦ), and, according to the context, it did not refer to the usual prescriptions and customs in general (Weizsäcker), but had a closer reference to the baptism of John and of Jesus, and was discussed *with a Jew*, who probably placed the baptism of Jesus, as being of higher and greater efficacy with regard to the power of purifying (from the guilt of sin), above that of John. Comp. ver. 26. Possibly the prophetic idea of a consecration by purification preceding the Messiah's kingdom (Ezek. xxxvi. 25; Zech. xiii. 1; Hofm. *Weissag. u. Erf.* II. 87) was spoken of. Who the Ἰουδαῖος was (Hofmann, Tholuck, a Pharisee) cannot be determined. A Jewish *Christian* (Chrysostom, Euthymius Zigabenus, and others; also Ewald) would have been more exactly designated. According to Luthardt, it was an *unfriendly Jew* who declared that the baptism of John might now at length be dispensed with, and who wished thus to beguile the Baptist to become unfaithful to his calling, by which means he hoped the better to work against Jesus. An artificial combination unsupported by the text, or even by ᾧ σὺ μεμαρτύρηκας, ver. 26. For that this indicated a *perplexity on the part of the disciples as to the calling of their master* finds no support in the words of the Baptist which follow. There is rather expressed in that ᾧ σὺ μεμαρτ., and in all that John's disciples advance,—who therefore do not name Jesus, but only indicate Him,—a *jealous irritation* on the point, that a man, who himself had just gone forth from the fellowship of the Baptist, and who owed his standing to the testimony borne

by the latter in his favour (ὧ), should have opened such a competition with him as to throw him into the shade. Through the statements of the Jew, with whom they had been discussing the question of purification, there was awakened in them a certain feeling of envy that Jesus, the former pupil (as they thought), the receiver of a testimony at the hand of their master, should now presume to put himself forward as his superior rival. They saw in this a usurpation, which they could not reconcile with the previous position of Jesus in relation to the Baptist. But he, on the contrary, vindicates Jesus, ver. 27, and in ver. 28 brings into view His far higher position, which excluded all jealousy. — *ὃς ἦν μετὰ σοῦ, κ.τ.λ.*] i. 28, 29. — *ἴδε* and *οὗτος* have the emphasis of something unexpected; namely, that this very individual should (according to their view) interfere with their master in his vocation, and with such results! — *καὶ πάντες*, an exaggeration of excited feeling. Comp. xii. 19. Not: "all who submit to be baptized by Him" (Hengstenberg).

Vv. 27, 28. The Baptist at first answers them, putting his reply in the form of a general truth, *that the greater activity and success of Jesus was given Him of God*, and next reminds them of the subordinate position which he held in relation to Jesus. The reference of the general affirmation to *the Baptist himself*, who would mean by it: "non possum mihi arrogare et rapere, quae Deus non dedit," Wetstein (so Cyril, Rupertus, Beza, Clarius, Jansen, Bengel, Lücke, Maier, Hengstenberg, Godet, and others), is not in keeping with the context; for the petty, jealous complaint of the disciples, ver. 26, has merely prepared the way for a vindication of *Jesus* on the part of the Baptist; and as in what follows with *this* intent, the comparison between the two, as they, in vv. 27, 28, according to our interpretation, stand face to face with each other, is thoroughly carried out; see vv. 29, 30, 31; so that Jesus is always *first* characterized, and *then* John. We must not therefore take ver. 27 as referring to *both* (Kuinoel, Tholuck, Lange, Brückner, Ewald, Luthardt¹). — *οὐ δύναται*] relatively, *i.e.* according to divine ordination. — *ἄνθρωπος*] quite general,

¹ Who, in keeping with his view of ver. 26, takes ver. 27 to mean: "The work of both of us is divinely ordained, and therefore I, for my own part, am

a man, any one; not as Hengstenberg, referring it to John, renders it: "*because I am merely a man.*" — λαμβάνειν] not arrogate to himself (ἐαυτῷ λαμβ., Heb. v. 4), but simply to receive, answering to *be given*. — αὐτοὶ ὑμεῖς] though you are so irritated about him. — μαρτυρ.] Indic: *ye are yourselves my witnesses*, see i. 19–28, the substance of which John sums up in the words οὐκ εἰμὶ, etc. They had themselves appealed (ver. 26) to his μαρτυρία concerning Jesus, but he περιτρέπει ταύτην καθ' αὐτῶν, Euthymius Zigabenus. — ἀλλ' ὅτι] Transition to dependent speech. Winer, p. 539 [E. T. p. 679 f.]. — ἐκείνου] referring not to the appellative ὁ Χριστός, but to *Jesus* as the Χριστός.

Vv. 29, 30. Symbolical setting forth of his subordinate relation to Jesus. The bridegroom is Jesus, John is the friend who waits upon Him; the bride is the community of the Messianic kingdom; the wedding is the setting up of that kingdom, now nigh at hand, as represented in the picture which the Baptist draws (comp. Matt. ix. 15, xxv. 1 ff.). The O. T. figure of God's union with His people as a marriage (Isa. liv. 5; Hos. ii. 18, 19; Eph. v. 32; Rev. xix. 7, xxi. 2, 9) forms the basis of this comparison. It may reasonably be doubted whether Solomon's Song (especially v. 1, 6) was likewise in the Baptist's thoughts when employing this illustration (Bengel, Luthardt, Hengstenberg); for no quotation is made from that book in the N. T., and therefore any allegorical interpretation of this Song with Messianic references cannot with certainty be presupposed in the N. T. Comp. Luke xiii. 31, note.—*He to whom the bride* (the bride-elect of the marriage feast) *belongs is the bridegroom*,—therefore it is not I.—*The friend* of the bridegroom (κατ' ἐξοχήν: the appointed friend, who serves at the wedding) is the παρανύμφιος, who is also, Sanhedr. f. 27, 2, called אורח, but usually ששן. Lightfoot, p. 980; Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm. s.v.*; Schoettgen, p. 335 ff.; and see on 2 Cor. xi. 2. — ὁ ἐστηκὼς κ. ἀκούων αὐτοῦ] *who standeth* (tanquam apparitor, Bengel) *and attentively heareth him*, i.e. in order to do his bidding.¹

justified in continuing my work after the appearance of Jesus, so long at least as the self-witness of Jesus is not believed."

¹ The working of Jesus was so *manifest*, and now so *near* to the Baptist, that

Contrary to the construction (*καὶ*), and far-fetched, is the rendering of B. Crusius: "who is waiting for him (*ἑστήκει*), and *when he hears him*, viz. the voice of the *approaching* bridegroom. (?)” Tholuck also, following Chrysostom, brings in what is not there when he renders: "who standeth, *having finished his work as forerunner*." The Baptist had still to work on, and went on working. The *ἑστήκει* must be regarded as taking place at the marriage feast, and not before that, during the bridal procession (Ewald, who refers to the frequent stoppages which took place in it); but it does not mean standing *at the door of the wedding chamber*, nor *ἀκ. αὐτοῦ* the audible pleasure of the newly married pair. An indelicate sensualizing (still to be found in Kuinoel) unwarranted by the text. — *χαρὰ χαίρει*] *he rejoiceth greatly*; see Lobeck, *Paralip.* p. 524; Winer, p. 424 [E. T. p. 584]. Comp. 1 Thess. iii. 9, where, in like manner, *διὰ* stands instead of the classical *ἐπί*, *ἐν*, or the dative. — *διὰ τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ νυμφ.*] This is not to be understood of his loud caresses and protestations of love (Grotius, Olshausen, Lange), nor of the command of the bridegroom to take away the cloth with the signum virgin-tatis (thus debasing the beautiful figure, Michaelis, Paulus), nor of the conversing of the bridegroom with the bride (Tholuck and older expositors),—all of which are quite out of keeping with the general expression; the reference is merely to the *conversation and joy of the bridegroom amid the marriage mirth*. Comp. Jer. vii. 34, xvi. 9, xxv. 10. The explanation, also, which makes it the voice of the *approaching* bridegroom who calls the bride to *fetch her home*, would need to be more precisely indicated (against B. Crusius and Luthardt), and is not in keeping with *ὁ ἑστηκώς*;¹ the acti-

this feature of the comparison is fully explained by it. Neither in this place nor elsewhere is there any answer to the question, whether and what personal intercourse the Baptist had already had with Him (Hengstenberg thinks "through intermediate persons, especially through the Apostle John"). In particular, the assumption that the interview with Nicodemus became known to the Baptist (through the disciples of Jesus who had previously been the Baptist's disciples) is quite unnecessary for the understanding of the words which here follow (against Godet).

¹ For the *παρανύμφιος* does not stand there *waiting* for the bridegroom, but accompanies him on his way to the bride's house. The standing and waiting pertain to the female attendants on the bride, Matt. xxv. 1 ff.

vity of Jesus, moreover, was already *more* than a call to the bringing home, which might have symbolized His *first* appearing. Comp. Matt. ix. 15.—Note, besides, how the ardent expression of *joy* stands contrasted with the envious feelings of John's disciples.—*αὕτη οὖν ἡ χαρὰ, κ.τ.λ.*] οὖν infers the *αὕτη* from the application of the figure: *this* joy, therefore, which is mine, viz. at the bridegroom's voice.—*πεπλήρωται*] *has been fulfilled* completely, so that nothing more is wanting to it. The Baptist, with prophetic anticipation, sees, in the successful activity of Jesus, and in the flocking of the people to Him, the already rising dawn of the Messiah's kingdom (the beginning of the marriage). On *πεπλήρ.* comp. xv. 11, xvi. 24, xvii. 13; 1 John i. 4.—*δεῖ*] as in ver. 14. This noble self-renunciation was based upon the clear certainty which he had of the *divine purpose*.—*αὐξάνειν*] in influence and efficiency.—*ἐλαττοῦσθαι*] the counterpart of increase: *to become less*, Jer. xxx. 16; Symm.; 2 Sam. iii. 1; Ecclus. xxxv. 23, *al.*; Thuc. ii. 62. 4; Theophr. *H. pl.* vi. 8. 5; Josephus, *Antt.* vii. 1. 5. Comp. Plat. *Leg.* iii. p. 681 A: *αὐξανόμενων ἐκ τῶν ἐλαττόνων*.

Vv. 31, 32, down to ver. 35, is not the comment of the *evangelist* (so Wetstein, Bengel, Kuinoel, Paulus, Olshausen, Tholuck, Klee, Maier, Baumlein). Ver. 32, comp. with vv. 29, 30, seems to sanction the notion that it is; but as no intimation to this effect is given in the text, and as the thread of discourse proceeds uninterruptedly, and nothing in the subject-matter is opposed to it, we may regard it as the *continued discourse of the Baptist*, though elaborated in its whole style and colouring by John,—not, however, to such an extent that the evangelist's record passes almost entirely *into a comment of his own* (Lücke, De Wette, comp. also Ewald). We perceive how the Baptist, as if with the mind of Jesus Himself, unveils before his disciples, in the narrower circle of whom he speaks, with the growing inspiration of the last prophet, the full majesty of Jesus; and therewith, as if with his swanlike song, *completes* his testimony before he vanishes from the history.¹ Even the subsequent momentary perplexity (Matt. xi.) is

¹ It is self-evident, that all that is said in ver. 31 f. was intended to incite the disciples of John to believe in Jesus, and to scare them from unbelief.

psychologically not irreconcilable with this (see on i. 29), simply because John was ἐκ τῆς γῆς. But the Baptist, notwithstanding his witness concerning Jesus, has not gone over to Him, because the calling of *forerunner* had been once divinely committed to him, and he felt that he must continue to fulfil it so long as the Messianic kingdom was not yet established. These remarks tell, at the same time, against the use which is made of this passage to prove that the entire scene is unhistorical (Strauss, Weisse, Reuss, Scholten, following Bretschneider). — ὁ ἄνωθεν ἐρχόμεν.] *He who cometh from above, i.e. Christ* (comp. ver. 13, viii. 23), whose *coming, i.e. whose coming forth* from the divine glory in human form as Messiah, is here regarded as still in the course of its actual self-manifestation (cf. viii. 14), and consequently as a *present* phenomenon, and as not ended until it has been consummated in the establishment of the kingdom. — πάντων] *Masc.* John means the category as a whole to which Jesus belonged—all *interpreters of God*, as is clear from what follows, vv. 31, 32. — ὁ ὧν ἐκ τῆς γῆς] *i.e. the Baptist, who, as an ordinary man, springs from earth, not heaven.* — ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐστίν] as predicate denotes the *nature* conditioned by such an origin. He is of no other kind or nature than that of one who springs from earth; though withal his divine mission (i. 6), in common with all prophets, and specially his divinely conferred baptismal vocation (Matt. xxi. 25, 26), remain intact. — καὶ ἐκ τ. γῆς λαλεῖ] *and he speaketh of the earth.* His speech has not heaven as its point of departure, like that of the Messiah, who declares what He has seen in heaven (see ver. 32); but it proceeds from the earth, so that he utters what has come to his knowledge upon earth, and therefore under the limitation of earthly conditions,—a limitation, however, which as little excluded the reception of a revelation (i. 33; Luke iii. 2), as it did in the case of the saints of the O. T., who likewise were of earthly origin, nature, and speech, and afterwards *e.g.* in that of the Apostle Paul.¹ The *contents* of the discourse

¹ The Fathers rightly perceived the *relative* character of this self-assertion. Euthymius Zigabenus: πρὸς σύγκρισιν τῶν ὑπερφῶν λόγων τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 14, misapprehends this, supposing that this ver. 31 has no reference to the Baptist.

need not therefore relate merely to τὰ ἐπιγεια (iii. 12), as Weisse thinks, but may also have reference to ἐπουράνια, the knowledge and promulgation of which, however, do not get beyond the ἐκ μέρους (1 Cor. xiii. 9 ff.). The expression ἐκ τῆς γῆς λαλ. must not be confounded with ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου λαλεῖν, 1 John iv. 5. — ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρ. ἐρχ., κ.τ.λ.] A solemn repetition of the first clause, linking on what follows, viz. the antithesis still to be brought out, of the ἐκ τῆς γῆς λαλεῖ. — ὁ ἑώρακε, καὶ ἤκουσε] i.e. during His pre-existence with God, i. 15, 18, iii. 11. From it He possesses *immediate knowledge* of divine truth,¹ whose witness (μαρτυρεῖ) He accordingly is. Note the *interchange of tenses* (Kühner, II. p. 75). — τοῦτο] this and nothing else. — κ. τ. μαρτ. αὐτοῦ οὐδεὶς λαμβ.] tragically related to what preceded, and introduced all the more strikingly by the bare καί. Comp. i. 10, iii. 11. The expression οὐδεὶς λαμβ. is the hyperbole of deep sorrow on account of the *small number* of those—small in comparison of the vast multitude of unbelievers—who receive His witness, and whose fellowship accordingly constitutes the bride of the marriage. John himself limits the οὐδεὶς by the following ὁ λαβὼν, κ.τ.λ. Comp. i. 10, 11, 12. The concourse of hearers who came to Jesus (ver. 26), and the Baptist's joy on account of His progress (vv. 29, 30), could not dim his deep insight into the world's unbelief. Accordingly, his joy (ver. 29) and grief (ver. 32) both forming a noble contrast to the jealousy of his disciples (ver. 26).

Ver. 33. Αὐτοῦ] placed before for emphasis: *His* witness, correlative with the following ὁ θεός. — ἐσφράγισεν] has, by this receiving, *sealed, i.e. confirmed, ratified* as an act. For this figurative usage, see vi. 27; Rom. iv. 11, xv. 28; 1 Cor. ix. 2; 2 Cor. i. 22; Eph. i. 13; Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* ix. pp. 22, 144, 172. — ὅτι ὁ θεός ἀληθ. ἐστίν] In the reception of the witness of *Jesus* there is manifested on man's part the practical ratification of the truthfulness of *God*, the human "*yea verily*"

¹ Decisive against Beyschlag, p. 96, who understands the words only of a *prophetic* sight and hearing through the Spirit, is the antithesis with the Baptist (who was yet himself a prophet), running through the whole context, as also the ἰσάνω πάντων ἰστί, which ranks Jesus *above* the prophets. Comp. also Heb. xii. 25.

in answer to the proposition "God is true," because Jesus (see ver. 34) is the ambassador and interpreter of God. The non-reception of that witness, whereby it is declared untrue, would be a rejection of the *divine* truthfulness, the "*nay*" to that proposition. Comp. 1 John v. 10. Reference to O. T. *promises* (Luthardt) is remote from the context.

Ver. 34. The first γάρ serves to state the reason for the ἐσφράγισεν, ὅτι, etc.; the second, for the τὰ ῥήματα τ. θεοῦ λαλεῖ, so far, that is, as it would be doubtful, if God gave the Spirit ἐκ μέτρου, whether what God's ambassador spoke was a divine revelation or not; it might in this case be wholly or in part the word of man — ὃν γὰρ ἀπέστ. ὁ θεός] not a general statement merely, appropriate to every prophet, but, following ver. 31, to be taken more precisely as a definition of a *heavenly* (ἄνωθεν, ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ) *mission*, and referring strictly to *Jesus*. This the context demands. But the following οὐ γὰρ ἐκ μέτρου, κ.τ.λ., must be taken as a *general statement*, because there is no αὐτῷ. Commentators would quite arbitrarily supply αὐτῷ,¹ so as to render it, not by measure or limitation, but without measure and in complete fulness, God gives the Holy Spirit to Christ. This supplement, unsuitable in itself, should have been excluded by the present διδωσιν, because we must regard Christ as *possessing* the Spirit long before. The meaning of this *general statement* is rather: "*He does not give the Spirit according to measure*" (as if it consequently were out of His power, or He were unwilling to give the Spirit beyond a certain quantitative degree, determined by a definite measure); He proceeds herein *independently of any μέτρον*, confined and limited by no restricting standard. The way in which this is to be *applied* to *Jesus* thus becomes plain, viz. that God must have endowed Him² when He sent Him from heaven (ver. 31), in keeping with His nature and destination, with the richest spiritual gifts, namely, *with the entire fulness of the Spirit* (πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα, Col. i. 19), more richly, therefore, than prophets or any others; —which He could not have done had He been fettered by a

¹ The subterfuge of Hengstenberg is no better: "we must supply, in the case before us." See also Lange.

² οὐ γὰρ μέτρον λόγισ [or rather πνύματος] φέρι λόγος.—Nonnus.

measure in the giving of the Spirit.¹ — ἐκ μέτρου] ἐκ used of the *rule*. See Bernhardt, p. 230; comp. on 1 Cor. xii. 27. Finally, the οὐ γὰρ ἐκ μέτρου must not be regarded as presenting a different view to ver. 32 (comp. Weiss, p. 269); for the Spirit was in Christ the principle whereby He *communicated* (the λαλεῖν) to men that which He had beheld with God. See on vi. 63, 64; Acts i. 2.

Ver. 35. A further description of the dignity of Christ. The Father hath given *unlimited power* to His beloved Son. — ἀγαπ.] the ground of the δέδωκε. — πάντα] neut. and without limitation. Falsely Kuinoel: *omnes doctrinae suae partes* (comp. Grotius: "omnia mysteria regni")! Nothing is exempted from the Messianic 'ξουσία, by virtue of which Christ is κεφαλὴ ὑπὲρ πάντα, Eph. i. 22, and πάντων κύριος, Acts x. 36; comp. xiii. 3, xvii. 2; Matt. xi. 27; 1 Cor. xv. 27; Heb. ii. 8. — ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ] Result of the direction of the gift, a well-known *constructio praeagnans*. Winer, p. 385 (E. T. p. 454).

Ver. 36. All the more weighty in their results are faith in the Son and unbelief! Genuine prophetic conclusion to life or death. — ἔχει ζ. αἰ.] "he has eternal life," i.e. the Messianic ζωή, which, in its temporal development, is already a *present* possession of the believer; see on vv. 15, 16. At the Second Advent it will be completed and glorified; and therefore the antithesis οὐκ ὀψεται ζωήν, referring to the future αἰών, is justified, because it presupposes the οὐκ ἔχει ζ. — ἀπειθῶν] not: "he who does *not believe* on the Son" (Luther and the Fathers), but: "he who *is disobedient* to the Son;" yet, according to the context, so far as the Son *requires faith*. Comp.

¹ Hitzig, in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr.* 1859, p. 152 ff., taking the first half of the verse as a general statement, applicable to every prophet, would read the relative οὗ instead of οὐ, "according to the measure, that is, in which He gives the Spirit." Considering the γὰρ, this rendering is impossible.—Ewald and Brückner come nearest to our interpretation. B. Crusius and Ebrard (on Olshausen) erroneously make οὐν ἀπίστ. κ.τ.λ. the subject of διδωσιν (ὁ θς; is spurious, see the critical notes); but this yields a thought neither true in itself, nor in keeping with the context. Godet puts an antithetical but purely imported emphasis upon διδωσιν: to other messengers of God the Spirit is not *given*, but only *lent* by a "visite momentanée;" but when God *gives* the Spirit, He does so without measure, and this took place on the first occasion at the baptism of Jesus. This is exegetical poetizing.

Acts xiv. 2, xix. 9; Rom. xi. 30; Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* I. p. 17. Contrasted herewith is the ὑπακοὴ πίστεως, Rom. i. 5. — ἡ ὀργή] not *punishment*, but *wrath*, as the necessary emotion of holiness; see on Rom. i. 18; Eph. ii. 3; Matt. iii. 7. — μένει] because unreconciled, inasmuch as that which appropriates reconciliation, *i.e.* faith (iii. 16), is rejected; comp. ix. 41. This μένει (it is not termed ἔρχεται) implies that the person who rejects faith is still in a moral condition which is subject to the divine wrath,—a state of subjection to wrath, which, instead of being removed by faith, *abides* upon him through his unbelief. The wrath, therefore, is not first awakened by the refusal to believe (Ritschl, *de ira Dei*, pp. 18, 19; Godet), but is already there, and through that refusal remains.¹ Whether or not this wrath rests upon the man *from his birth* (Augustine; Thomasius, *Chr. Pers. u. Werk*, I. p. 289), this text gives no information. See on Eph. ii. 3. — That *the Baptist* could already speak after this manner, is evident from chap. i. 29. — ἐπ' αὐτόν] as in i. 32, 33.

¹ This is also against Hengstenberg. But certainly the μένει must, according to the context, be an *eternal* abiding, if the ὑπακοὴ πίστεως never occurs.

CHAPTER IV.

Ver. 3. *πάλιν*] wanting in A. and many other Uncials and Cursives, Syr. p. Pers. p. Or. Chrys. It is found, indeed, in B. (in the margin) C. D. L. M. T^b. *κ*., but was probably added to denote the *return*. — Ver. 5. *οὐ*] Elz. Tisch. *δ*, against C.* D. L. M. S. Curss. Chrys., an inelegant correction. — Ver. 6. *ώσει*] Lach. Tisch. read *ώς*, for which the testimonies are decisive. — Vv. 7–10. For *πειν*, Tisch. foll. B.* C.* D. *κ*.* reads *πειν*, for which also *πιν* occurs. *πειν* is to be adopted on account of the preponderating testimony. — Ver. 14. The words *οὐ μή—δῶσω αὐτῷ* are wanting in C.* Curss. and some Verss. and Fathers, even Or.; bracketed by Lach. The testimonies are too weak to warrant our striking them out, and how easily might their omission have occurred through *ὁμοιοτέλευτ.*! — For *διψήσῃ* Lach. and Tisch. read *διψήσει*, following preponderating evidence. But the Future seems to be connected with an early omission of *μή* (which we still find in D.). — Ver. 15. *ἔρχομαι*] the *Indicative* *ἔρχομαι* or *διέρχομαι* (so Tisch.) is bad Gk., and has witnesses enough against it (A. C. D. U. V. Δ.; even *κ*.*, which has *διέρχομαι*) to be regarded as a transcriber's error; comp. xvii. 3. — Ver. 16. *ὁ Ἰησοῦς* is wanting in B. C.* Heracl. Or.; an addition. The position *σου τὸν ἄνδρα* (Tisch.) is too weakly attested by B. Curss. Or. (three times) Chrys. — Ver. 21. *γύναι, πίστευσόν μοι*] Lach.: *γ. πίστευέ μ.*; Tisch.: *πίστευέ μ. γ.* Amid manifold diversities of testimony the last must be adopted as the best authenticated, by B. C.* L. *κ*. Ver. Sahid. Heracl. Or. Ath. Cyr. Chrys. Hilar. — Ver. 27. For *ἰθαύμαζον* Elz. has *ἰθαύμασαν*, against decisive testimony. — Ver. 30. After *ἔξηλθον* Elz. has *οὖν*, against decisive testimony. Added for the purpose of connection, instead of which *δὲ* also occurs, and C. D. Verss. have *καὶ* before *ἔξηλθον*, and accordingly Lachm. puts this *καὶ* in brackets. — Ver. 34. *ποιῶ*] B. C. D. K. L. T^b. II. Cursives, Clem. Heracl. Or. Cyr. Chrys.: *ποιήσω*; recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm.; a co-ordination with what follows. — Ver. 35. For *τετράμηνος* Elz. has *τετράμηνον*, against almost all the Uncials. A clumsy emendation. Comp. Heb. xi. 23. — Ver. 36. Before *ὁ θερίζ.* Elz. has *καὶ* (bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch.), condemned by B. C.* D. L. T^b. *κ*. Cursives, Verss. and Fathers. Through

the very ancient variation, which joins *ἡδὴ* either with what follows (A. C. D. Cyr.) or with what precedes (Or.), the insertion of *καὶ* is the result of the latter mode of connection. If *καὶ* were genuine, neither of the two constructions would have prompted its omission. — Ver. 42. After *κόσμου* Elz. has *ὁ Χριστός*, which Lachm. Tisch., following important witnesses, have deleted as an exegetical addition. — Ver. 43. *καὶ ἀπελήθειν*] wanting in B. C. D. T^b. *κ*. Cursives, Codd. It. Copt. Or. Cyr. Bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch.; supplementing addition after ver. 3, not in keeping with John's mode of expression. — Ver. 45. Instead of *ᾧ* we must adopt *ὅσα*, with Lachm. Tisch., following A. B. C. L. Cursives, Or. Cyr. Chrys. As the conception expressed by *ὅσα* is already in *πάντα*, *ᾧ* would seem more appropriate, which therefore we find in vv. 29, 39, in Codd. — Ver. 46. After *οὖν* Elz. has *ὁ Ἰησοῦς*, which is altogether wanting in important witnesses, and in others stands after *πάντων* (so Scholz). A common addition. — Ver. 47. *αὐτόν* after *ἡρ.* is wanting in B. C. D. L. T^b. *κ*. Cursives, Verss. Or. Aug. Bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch. Supplementary. — Ver. 50. *ᾧ*] Lachm. Tisch., following A. B. C. L. *κ***, read *ὅν*. An unskillful emendation. — Ver. 51. *ἀπήγγευσαν*] B. C. D. K. L. *κ*. Cursives: *ὑπήγγευσαν*. So Lachm. and Tisch.; rightly, for John elsewhere always has *ὑπαντ.* (xi. 20, 30, xii. 18). — *ὁ παῖς σου*] Lachm. Tisch.: *ὁ π. αὐτοῦ*, upon such weighty evidence that the received reading must be regarded as a mechanical alteration in imitation of ver. 50. — Ver. 52. Instead of *χθές*, we must, with Lachm. and Tisch., following the majority of Codd., adopt *ἐχθές*.

Vv. 1–3. *Ὡς οὖν ἔγνων, κ.τ.λ.*] *οὖν, igitur*, namely, in consequence of the concourse of people who flocked to Him, and which had been previously mentioned. Considering this concourse, He could not fail to come to know (*ἔγνων*, not supernatural knowledge, but comp. ver. 53, v. 6, xi. 57, xii. 9) that it had reached the ears of the Pharisees, how He, etc. This prompted Him, however, to withdraw to Galilee, *where their hostility would not be so directly aroused and cherished as in Judaea, the headquarters of the hierarchy.* To surrender Himself to them before the time, before His hour arrived, and the vocation of which He was conscious had been fulfilled, was opposed to His consciousness of the divine arrangements and the object of His mission. *He contented himself, therefore, for the present with the interest which He had already excited in Judaea on behalf of His work, and withdrew, for the time being,*

to His own less esteemed country.¹ As to the date of this return, see ver. 35; it is an arbitrary invention to say (Lange, *L. J.* II. p. 515), that upon leaving Judaea *He gave up baptizing* because John's imprisonment (?) brought a ban of uncleanness upon Israel (515 sq.). The performance of baptism must be supposed as taking place subsequent to this, when conversions are spoken of (*e.g.* ver. 53), comp. iii. 5; and Matt. xxviii. 19 does not contain a wholly *new* command to baptize, but its completion and extension to all times and nations. — οἱ Φαρισαί.] It is only *this* party, the most powerful and most dangerous of the Jewish sects, that is still named by John, the evangelist who had become furthest removed from Judaism. — ὅτι Ἰησοῦς, κ.τ.λ.] a *verbatim* repetition of the report; hence the *name* (1 Cor. xi. 23), and the *present tenses*. Comp. Gal. i. 23. — ἡ Ἰωάννης] whom they had moreover less to fear, on account of his legal standpoint, and his declarations in i. 19 ff., than Jesus, whose appearance was in Jerusalem at once so reformatory, miraculous, and rich in results, and who was so ominously attested by John. — Ver. 2 is *not* to be put in a parenthesis, for the construction is not interrupted. — καίτοι γε] *quonquam quidem, and yet*; see Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 245 ff.; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 654 f. The thing is thus expressed, because “semper is dicitur facere, cui praemini-

¹ According to Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. I, p. 168 f., whom Lichtenstein follows, Jesus withdrew, because He was apprehensive lest what had come to the Pharisees' ears should be made use of by them to throw *suspicion on the Baptist*. But this is all the less credible, when we remember that Jesus certainly, as well as John himself (iii. 30), knew it to be a divine necessity that He should increase and the Baptist decrease, and therefore would hardly determine his movements by considerations of the kind supposed. He could more effectually have met any such suspicions, by testifying on behalf of the noble Baptist in the neighbourhood where he was, than by withdrawing from the scene. No; Jesus went out of the way of the danger that threatened Himself, and which He knew it was not yet time for Him to expose Himself to; comp. vii. 1, x. 40, xi. 54. Nonnus: φιύγων λύσσαν ἄπιστον ἀπηλύτων Φαρισαίων. Still, however, we must not, with Hengstenberg and most others, suppose that this retirement to Galilee arose from the fact that John *had already fallen a prey to pharisaic persecution*, and that Jesus had all the more reason to apprehend this persecution. There is no hint whatever of the supposed fact that the *Pharisees* had delivered John over to Herod. This explanation is based merely upon an attempt at harmonizing, in order to make this journey back to Galilee the same with that named in Matt. iv. 12. See on iii. 24.

stratur," Tertullian. A pretext for this lay in the fact that *John* did himself baptize. *But why did not Jesus Himself baptize?* Not because it was incumbent on Him only to preach (1 Cor. i. 17); there must have been a *principle* underlying His not baptizing, seeing that John, without limitation, made it so prominent (against Thomas, Lyra, Maldonatus, and most); not, again, because He *must have baptized unto Himself* (so already Tertull. *de bapt.* 11), for He could have done this; not even for the clear preservation of the truth: "that it is He who baptizes *all* down to the present day" (Hengstenberg), an arbitrarily invented abstraction, and quite foreign even to the N. T. Nonnus hits upon the true reason: οὐ γὰρ ἀναξ βάπτιζεν ἐν ὕδατι. Bengel well says: "baptizare actio *ministralis*, Acts x. 48, 1 Cor. i. 17; Johannes minister sua manu baptizavit, discipuli ejus ut videtur neminem, at Christus baptizat *Spiritu sancto*," which the disciples had not power to do until afterwards (vii. 39). Comp. Ewald. For the rest, ver. 2 does not contain a correction of himself by the evangelist (Hengstenberg and early expositors),—for we must not omit to ask why he should not *at once* have expressed himself correctly,—but, on the contrary, a correction of *the form of the rumour* mentioned in ver. 1. Comp. iii. 26. Nonnus: ἐτήτυμος οὐ πέλε φήμη. In this consists the historical interest of the observation (against Baur and Hilgenfeld), which we are not to regard as an unhistorical consequence of transporting Christian baptism back to the time of Jesus.

Vv. 4, 5. Ἔδει] *from the geographical position*; and hence the usual way for Galilaean travellers lay through Samaria (Josephus, *Antt.* xx. 6. 1), unless one chose to pass through Perea to avoid the hated land, which Jesus has at present no occasion to do. Comp. Luke ix. 52. — εἰς πόλιν] *towards a city* (not *into*, ver. 28 ff.). Comp. Matt. xxi. 1; see Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 81. — Συχάρ] (not Σιχάρ, as Elz. has, against the best witnesses) is, according to the usual opinion,—though, indeed, the λεγομένην, comp. xi. 54, pointing to an unknown place, does not tally with it,—the same town as that called ܡܫܚܐ (LXX. Συχέμ, comp. Acts vii. 16; also Σίκιμα, comp. Josephus) in Gen. xxxiii. 18, Josh. xx. 7, Judg. ix. 7, *et al.*; after the

time of Christ, however, called *Neapolis* (Joseph. *Bell.* iv. 8. 1), and now *Nablus*. See Crome, *Beschreib. von Pal.* I. p. 102 ff.; Robinson, III. 336; Rosen, in the *Zeitschr. d. morgenl. Gesellsch.* 1860, p. 634 ff. Upon the remnant of the Samaritans still in this town, see Rogers on the *Modern Samaritans*, London 1855; Barges, *les Samaritains de Naplouse*, Paris 1855. The name Συχάρ,¹ which Credner quite arbitrarily tries to refer to a mere error in transcription, was accordingly a *corruption* of the old name, perhaps *intentional*, though it had come into ordinary use, and signifying *drunken town* (according to Isa. xxviii. 1), or *town of lies*, or *heathen town*, after Hab. iii. 18 (שָׁרָה). Reland takes the former view, Lightfoot and Hengstenberg the latter, Hengstenberg supposing that *John himself* made the alteration in order to describe the *lying character of the Samaritans*—quite against the simplicity of the narrative in general, and the express λεγομένην in particular. This λεγομ., and the difference in the name, as well as the following πλησίον, etc., and ver. 7, suggest the opinion that Sychar was a *distinct* town in the *neighbourhood* of Sychem (Hug, Luthardt, Lichtenstein, Ewald, Brückner, Baeumlein). See especially Delitzsch, in Guericke's *Luth. Zeitschr.* 1856, p. 244 ff.; Ewald, *Jahrb.* VIII. 255 ff., and in his *Johann. Schr.* I. 181. The name may still be discovered in the modern *al Askar*, east of Nablus. Schenkel still sees here an error of a Gentile-Christian author.—The χωρίον belonged to Sychem (Gen. xxxiii. 19, xlviii. 22, LXX. Josh. xxiv. 32),² but must have lain in the *direction of* Sychar.—πλησίον] the town lay in the *neighbourhood* of the field, etc. Here only in the N. T., very often in the classics, as a *simple* adverb.

Ver. 6. Πηγή τοῦ Ἰακώβ] a *spring-well* (ver. 11), the making of which tradition ascribed to *Jacob*. It is still in existence, and regarded with reverence, though there is no spring-water in it. See Robinson, III. p. 330; Ritter, XVI. 634. The ancient sacredness of the spot made it all the more worthy of being specially noted by John.—οὕτως] *thus, without*

¹ Concerning the Talmudic name סוכר, see Wieseler, *Synopse*, p. 256 ff.

² The LXX. in Gen. xlviii. 22 render שִׁכֶם by Σίμαμα, the error being that they took the Hebrew word directly as a *name*, whereas it is only an *allusion* to the town Sichem.

further ado, just as He was, without any ceremony or preparation, “*ut locus se obtulerat*,” Grotius; ἀπλῶς ὡς ἔτυχε, Chrysostom. See Ast, *Lex. Plat.* II. p. 495; Nägelsbach, *z. Ilias*, p. 63, ed. 3. The rendering “*tired as He was*” (Erasmus, Beza, Winer, Hengstenberg), so that the preceding participle is repeated in meaning (see Bornemann in *Rosenmüller’s Rep.* II. p. 246 ff., Ast, *l.c.*; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Protag.* p. 314 C), would require the οὕτως to be *placed before*, as in Acts xxvii. 17, xx. 11. — ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ] *at the well*, denoting immediate proximity to it, ver. 2; Mark xiii. 29; Ex. ii. 15. See Bernhardt, p. 249; Reisig, *ad Oed. Col.* 281; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. 541. — ὥρα . . . ἔκτε] *noon, mid-day*; δίχιος ὥρη, Nonnus. Here again we have not the Roman reckoning (see on i. 40), though the evening¹ was the more usual time for drawing water. Still we must not suppose that, because the time was unusual, it was intended thereby that Jesus might know, in connection therewith, “that the woman was given Him of the Father” (Luthardt, p. 80). Jesus knew that, independently of the hour. But *John* could *never forget* the hour, so important in its issues, of this first preaching to the Samaritan woman, and *therefore* he names it. Comp. i. 40.

Vv. 7-9. Γυνὴ ἐκ τ. Σαμαρ.] to be taken as one designation, *a Samaritan-woman*. John gives prominence to the country to which she belonged, to prepare the way for the characteristic features of the following interview. It is not the *town* two miles distant (*Sebaste*) that is meant, but the *country*. — ἀντλήσαι ὕδωρ] The modern Nablus lies half an hour distant from the southern well, and has many wells of its own close by; see Robinson, III. 333. It is therefore all the more probable that Sychar, out of which the woman came,² was a separate town. As to the forms πεῖν and πῖν (so Jacobs, *Del. epigr.* vi. 78), see Herm. *Herodian.* § 47; Buttmann, *N.*

¹ If it had been six o'clock in the evening (as even Isenberg in the *Luther. Zeitschr.* 1868, p. 454 ff., maintains, for the sake of xix. 14), how much too short would the remainder of the day be for all that follows down to ver. 40! We must allow a much longer time, in particular, for vv. 28-30, and yet ver. 35 still presupposes bright daylight.

² That, considering the *sacred character* of the water, she did not hesitate about the distance of the well from Sychem (Hengstenberg), is without any hint in the *text*.

T. Gr. p. 58 [*E. T.* p. 66], who prefers $\pi\acute{\iota}\nu$, though this is regarded by Fritzsche (*de conform. Lachm.* p. 27) as the mistake of a copyist. As to the phrase $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\mu\iota\ \pi\acute{\iota}\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$, without any object expressed, see Krüger, § 55. 3. 21. It is an arbitrary supposition in itself, to imagine, as Hengstenberg does, that this "Give me to drink" had underlying it "a spiritual sense," "Give me spiritual refreshment (by thy conversion)," and is opposed to ver. 8, which by no means gives a general reason why Jesus entered into conversation with the woman; for He might have done this in the apostles' presence, though, according to Hengstenberg, He must have sent them away (all excepting John¹), on purpose to have an undisturbed interview with the woman. All this is mere imagination. — Ver. 8. $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$] The reason why he asked the services of the woman; the disciples, whose services he would otherwise have claimed, were absent. — ἵνα τροφὰς ἀγορ.] According to later tradition ("Samaritanis panem comedere aut vinum bibere prohibitum est," Raschi, *ad Sota*, 515), this would not have been allowed. But the separation could not have been so distinctly marked at that time, especially as to commercial dealings and intercourse with the Galileans, since their road lay through Samaria. Jesus, moreover, was raised above these hostile divisions which existed among the people (Luke ix. 52). — Ver. 9. The woman recognised that Jesus was a Jew by His language, and not by His accent merely. — $\pi\acute{\omega}\varsigma$] *qui fit ut.* The words of the woman indicate the pert feminine caprice of national feeling. There is no ground whatever for supposing (Hengstenberg) that the woman had at this stage any presentiment that He who addressed her was any other than an ordinary Jew. — οὐ γὰρ, κ.τ.λ.] not a parenthesis, but the words of the evangelist. — *Jews with Samaritans*, without the article.

Ver. 10. Jesus certainly recognised at once the susceptibility of the woman; allowing, therefore, His own need to stand in abeyance, He began the conversation, which was sufficiently striking to excite at once the full interest of her sanguine temperament, though at the outset this interest was nothing

¹ Who must, according to Godet also, have remained with Him. A gratuitous addition, made for the purpose of securing a guarantee for the accuracy of the narrative.

but feminine curiosity. — τὴν δωρ. τ. θεοῦ] *the gift of God*, which you may now partake of by conversation with me. Not certainly the person of *Jesus Himself* (the Greek Fathers, Erasmus, Beza, and most others, even Hengstenberg and Godet), to which he refers only as the discourse advances with the καί of closer definition. — σὺ ἂν ᾔτησας] *thou wouldst have prayed Him* (i.e. to give you to drink), and *He would have*, etc. Observe the emphatic σύ (the request would have come from you). — ὕδωρ ζῶν] The woman takes this to mean *spring-water*, מֵי חַיִּים, Gen. xxvi. 19, Lev. xiv. 5, Jer. ii. 13, as opposed to water in a cistern. Comp. *vivi fontes* and the like among the Romans; see Wetstein. Christ does indeed mean *spring-water*, but, as in vii. 38, in a *spiritual* sense (comp. ver. 14), namely, *God's grace and truth* (i. 14), which He, who is the possessor of them, communicates by His word out of His fulness, and which in its living, regenerating, and, for the satisfying of spiritual need, ever freshly efficacious power, is typified by water from the spring. Comp. analogous passages, Ecclus. xv. 3, xxiv. 21; Baruch iii. 12; Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* p. 2298. He does not mean *Himself*, His own life (Olshausen, Godet, following Epiphanius and most others), in the same manner as He speaks of Himself as the bread of life, vi. 35, for this is not indicated in any part of the present colloquy; nor does He mean *faith* (iii. 15), as Lücke thinks, nor the *Spirit* (Calovius, Baumgarten Crusius, Luthardt, Hofmann), the gift of which *follows* the communication of the living water. Any reference to *baptism* (Justin, Cyprian, Ambrose, and most others) is quite remote from the text. Calvin is substantially right when he sees typified *totam renovationis gratiam*.

V. 11, 12. "Thou canst not mean the spring-water here in this well; you could not give this to me, for thou hast no bucket,¹ which is needed on account of the depth of the well; whence hast thou, therefore, the spring-water you speak of?" —

¹ ἄντλημα, elsewhere *the drawing of water*, is used in the sense of *haustrum*. Nonnus explains it κάδον ἰλκυστῆρα (*a bucket to draw water*).—The woman had with her a ὕδρια, ver. 28 (comp. ii. 6), but she must also have had an ἄντλημα, provided with a long handle or rope to draw the water *up*, or at least some contrivance for letting down the ὕδρια itself.

κύριε] The τίς ἐστὶν ὁ λέγων σοι, etc., ver. 10, has given the woman a momentary feeling of *respect*, not unmixed with irony.—οὕτε followed by καὶ is rare, 3 John 10; see Winer, p. 460 [E. T. p. 619]; Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 222; Klotz, *ad Devar.* 714.—μὴ σὺ μείζων, κ.τ.λ.] Notice the emphatic σὺ coming first: “*thou* surely art not greater,” etc.; “*thou* dost not look like that!” Comp. viii. 53.—μέιζων] *i.e.* more able, in a position to give what is better. By *him* was the well given us, and for *him* it was good enough for him and his to drink from; yet thou speakest as if thou hadst another and a better spring of water! The woman dwells upon the enigmatical word of Christ at first, just as Nicodemus did, iii. 4, but with more cleverness and vivacity, at the same time more pertly, and with feminine loquacity.—τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν] for the Samaritans traced their descent back to *Joseph*. Josephus, *Antt.* vii. 7. 3, viii. 14. 3, xi. 8. 6. They certainly were not of purely heathen origin (Hengstenberg); see Keil on 2 Kings xvii. 24; Petermann in *Herzog's Encykl.* XIII. 367.—ὃς ἔδωκεν, κ.τ.λ.] a Samaritan tradition, not derived from the O. T.—καὶ αὐτὸς, κ.τ.λ.] καὶ is simply *and*, neither for καὶ ὅς, nor *and indeed*. The θρέμματα are the *cattle* (Plato, *Polit.* p. 261 A; Xen. *Oec.* xx. 23; *Ages.* ix. 6; Herodian. iii. 9. 17; Josephus, *Antt.* vii. 7. 3), not *servants* (Majus, Kypke),¹ whom there was no need specially to name; the mention of the *herds* completes the picture of their *nomadic* progenitor.—τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ζῶν] which thou hast to give; ver. 10.

Vv. 13, 14. Not an explanation, but (comp. iii. 5) a carrying out of the metaphor, to lead the woman nearer to its higher import.—τούτου] referring to the well.—οὐ μὴ διψῇ εἰς τ. αἰῶνα] “*will certainly not thirst for ever*,” antithesis to fleeting bodily refreshment, ver. 13. Comp. vi. 34. *That heavenly grace and truth which Christ communicates, when received by faith into the inner life, for ever supplies what we need in order to salvation, so that the lack of this*

¹ The word, the general meaning of which is *quicquid enutritur*, is found on inscriptions as applied to *slaves*; it is used of *children* likewise in the classics (Valck. *Diatr.* p. 249), as in Soph. *Phil.* 243; comp. *Oed. Rex*, 1143. It does not occur in the LXX. or Apocrypha.

satisfaction is never felt, because the supply is always there. Bengel admirably remarks: "Sane aqua illa, quantum in se est, perennem habet virtutem; et ubi sitis recurrit, hominis non aquae defectus est." The expression in Eccles. xxiv. 20: οἱ πίνοντές με (Wisdom) ἔτι διψήσουσι, rests upon a different view of the continuity of enjoyment, namely, that of the individual moments passing in the continual alternation of desire and satisfaction, and not of the unity which they make up, and of their condition as a whole. — γενήσεται ἐν αὐτῷ, κ.τ.λ.] the *positive* effect following the *negative* (and hence τὸ ὕδωρ ὃ δώσω αὐτῷ is emphatically repeated): *divine grace and truth appropriated by faith will so energetically develop their life in him in inexhaustible fulness, that its full impelling power endures unto eternal Messianic life.* Upon his entrance into the Messiah's kingdom (comp. iii. 3, 5), the man takes along with him this inner living power of divine χάρις καὶ ἀλήθεια, vi. 27. — ἄλλεσθαι εἰς, *to spring up into*, often also in the classics (Hom. *Il.* a. 537; Xen. *Mem.* i. 3. 9), but with reference to *water* here only. A Greek would say προρεῖν εἰς; still the word in the text is stronger and more vivid. The ζωὴ αἰών. is conceived of *locally*, in keeping with the comparison of a widespreading spring; to render εἰς "*reaching to everlasting life*" (B. Crusius, Luthardt, Brückner, Ewald), arbitrarily lets go the concrete comparison, one of the main features in which is endless power of springing up. This description of the well *springing up* into everlasting life is the *finishing touch* of the picture. On εἰς ζ. αἰ., see ver. 36.

Vv. 15, 16. The woman as yet having no apprehension of the higher meaning of the water spoken of (against B. Crusius, Lange), yet being in some degree perplexed, asks, not in irony, as Lightfoot and Tholuck think, but sincerely, for this wonderful water, which at any rate must be of great use to her.— Jesus breaks off suddenly, and commences, by a seemingly unimportant request, "Call thy husband," to lay hold of the woman *in her inner life, so that the beginnings of faith in Him might be connected with His supernatural knowledge of her peculiar moral relations.* This process must be accompanied with the *awakening* in her of a *sense of guilt* (see ver. 29), and thus pave the way for μετάνοια; and who dare deny

that, besides the *immediate* object, this may have been included in the *purposes* of Jesus? though He does not directly rebuke, but leaves the feeling to operate of itself (against Strauss and most others). — *φώνησ. τ. ἄνδρα σου*] We are not to ask here what the husband *was to do* (Chrysostom, Euthymius Zigabenus: "that he might partake with her of the gift of salvation that was before her;" so also Lücke); because the command was only an *apparent* one, not *seriously* intended, for Jesus *knew* the relations of the woman, and did not merely discover His prophetic gift by the answer she gave, as Lücke and Godet quite gratuitously assume. The *τ. ἄνδρα σου* was the *sore spot* where the healing was to begin. According to Lange, *L. J.* II. p. 530 f., it would have been unseemly if Jesus, now that the woman showed a willingness to become His disciple (?), had continued to converse longer with her in her husband's absence; His desire, therefore, was in keeping "with the highest and finest sense of social propriety." But the husband was nothing more than a *paramour*! — *ἐλθέ]* in the sense of *come back*, as the context shows. See Hom. *Od. a.* 408, *β.* 30; Xen. *Anab.* ii. 1. 1, v. 1. 4; Baruch iv. 37; Tobit i. 18; Heind. *ad Plat. Prot.* p. 310 C. Comp. xiv. 18; Luke xix. 13.

Vv. 17, 18. The woman is *taken aback*; her light, naive, bantering manner is now completely gone, and she quickly seeks to shun the sensitive point with the answer, true only in words, *οὐκ ἔχω ἄνδρα*; but Jesus goes deeper still. — *καλῶς]* *rightly, truly*; viii. 48; Matt. xv. 7; Luke xx. 39. *How far* truly, what follows shows,—namely, only relatively, and therefore the approval is only apparent, and in some degree ironical. — *ἄνδρα οὐκ ἔχω]* "a husband I have not;" as it is the *conception* of *ἀνὴρ* which Jesus has to emphasize, it stands first. — *πέντε γὰρ, κ.τ.λ.]* It is doubtful whether she *really* had five successive husbands, from whom she had been separated either by death or by divorce, or whether Jesus included *paramours*, using *ἄνδρας* in a varying sense according to the varying subjects; or whether, again, He meant that *all five* were *scortatores* (Chrysostom, Maldonatus, and most others). The first supposition is to be adopted, because the *present* man, who is not her husband, stands in contrast

with the former husbands. She had been therefore five times married (*such* a history had already seared her conscience, ver. 29; how? is not stated), and now she was either a widow or a divorced wife, and had a paramour (νόθον ἀκοίτην, Nonnus), who lived with her as a husband, but really *was not* her husband (hence the οὐκ ἔστι is emphatically put first). To interpret the story of the five husbands as a whole as a *symbolical history of the Samaritan nation* (according to 2 Kings xvii. 24 ff.; Josephus, *Antt.* ix. 14. 3: πέντε ἔθνη . . . ἕκαστον ἰδίου θεοῦ εἰς Σαμαρ. κομίσαντες), either as a divinely intended coincidence (Hengstenberg, Köstlin, comp. Baumgarten and Scholten), or as a type in the mind of the evangelist (Weizsäcker, p. 387), so that the symbolic meaning excludes any actual fact (Keim, *Gesch. J.* p. 116), or again as fiction (B. Bauer), whose mythical basis was that history (Strauss), is totally destitute of any historical warrant. For the man whom the woman *now* had must, symbolically understood, represent Jehovah; and He had been the God of the Samaritans before the introduction of false gods, and therefore it would have been more correct to speak of *six* husbands (Heracleon actually read ἕξ). But how incredible is it, that Jesus would represent Jehovah under the similitude of a *paramour* (for the woman was now living in *concubinage*), and the "fivefold heathenism" of the nation under the type of *real* marriages!—For the rest, the *knowledge which Jesus had* of the woman's circumstances was *immediate* and *supernatural*. To assume that He had ascertained her history from others (Paulus, Ammon), is opposed to the Johannean view; while the notion that the disciples introduced into the history what they afterwards discovered (Schweizer, p. 139) is psychologically groundless, if once we admit that Jesus possessed a knowledge of the moral state of others (and here we have not merely a knowledge of outward circumstances,—against De Wette) beyond that attainable by ordinary means.¹ Lange invents the strange and unnecessary (ii. 24 f.) addition, that "the psychical effects produced by the five husbands upon the woman were traceable in her manner and mien, and

¹ We must not therefore suppose, as Ewald does, that Jesus named simply a *round* number of husbands, which in a wonderful manner turned out to be right.

these were recognised by Jesus." — ἀληθές] *as something true*. See Winer, p. 433 [E. T. p. 582]. Comp. Plato, *Gorg.* p. 493 D: τοῦτ' ἀληθέστερον εἶρηκας; Soph. *Phil.* 909; Lucian, *D. M.* vi. 3; *Tim.* 20.

Vv. 19, 20. The woman now discerns in Jesus the man of God endowed with higher knowledge, a *prophet*,¹ and puts to Him accordingly—perhaps also to leave no further room for the unpleasant mention of the circumstances of her life which had been thus unveiled—the national religious question ever in dispute; a question which does not, indeed, imply a presentiment of the superiority of the Jews' religion (Ewald), but one, the decision of which might be expected from such a *prophet* as she now deemed Him to be. The great *national* interest in this question (see Josephus, *Antt.* xiii. 3. 4) is sufficient to remove any apparent improbability attaching to it as coming from the lips of this morally frivolous woman (against Strauss, B. Bauer). Luthardt thinks that she now wished to go in prayer for the forgiveness of her sins to the holy place appointed, and only desires to know where? on Gerizim or in Jerusalem. But she has not arrived at this stage yet; she does not give any intimation of this, she does not call the place a place of *expiation* (this also against Lange); and Jesus, in His answer, gives no hint to that effect. Her seeking after religious information is still theoretical merely, laying hold upon a matter of popular controversy, naive, without any depth of personal anxiety, as also without any thought about the fundamental difference between the two nations, which Hengstenberg attributes to her as a representative of the Samaritans, one who first wished to remove the stumbling-block between the nations; see ver. 25. — θεωρῶ] περισκοπεῖται καὶ θαυμάζει, Chrysostom. — οἱ πατέρες ἡμ.] As ὑμεῖς stands opposed, we must not go back to *Abraham* and *Jacob* (according to a tradition based upon Gen. xii. 6 ff., xiii. 4, xxxiii. 20), as Chrysostom, Euthymius Zigabenus, and many others, even Kuinoel and Baumgarten Crusius, do; we must simply take the reference to be to the ancestors of the *Samaritans* as far back as the building of the temple on Mount Gerizim in the

¹ Comp. 1 Sam. ix. 9; in Greek and Latin writers: Hom. *Il.* i. 70; Hesiod, *Theog.* 38; Virgil, *Georg.* iv. 392; Macrobius, *Sat.* i. 20. 5.

time of Nehemiah. — ἐν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ] pointing to Gerizim, between which and Ebal the town of Sychem (and Sychar) lay. The temple there had already been destroyed by *John Hyrcanus*; but the site itself, which Moses had already fixed as that wherein the blessings of the law were to be spoken (Deut. xi. 29, xxvii. 12, 13), was still held sacred by the people (comp. Josephus, *Antt.* xviii. 4. 1; *Bell.* iii. 7. 32), especially also on account of Deut. xxvii. 4 (where the Samaritan text has גִּרְזִים instead of עֵיבָל), and is so even at the present day. See Robinson, III. p. 319 ff.; Ritter, *Erdk.* XVI. p. 638 ff.; Abulfathi, *Annab. Samar. arab. ed.*, ed. Vilmar, 1865, Proleg. 4. Concerning the ruins on the top of the mountain, see especially Bargès, as before, p. 107 ff.

Ver. 21. Jesus decides neither for the one place nor for the other; nor, on the other hand, does He pronounce both wrong (B. Crusius); but now that His aim is to give her the living water, divine grace and truth, He rises to the *higher point of view of the future*, whence both the local centres and limitations of God's true worship *disappear*; and the question itself no longer arises, because with the triumph of His work all outward localizing of God's worship comes to an end, not indeed absolutely, but as fettering the freedom of the outward service. — προσκυνήσ.] As spoken to the woman, this refers not to mankind generally (Godet), nor to the Israelites of *both* forms of religion (Hilgenfeld, comp. Hengstenberg), but to the future conversion of the *Samaritans*, who thus would be freed from the ritual on Mount Gerizim (which is therefore named *first*), but were not to be brought to the ritual in Jerusalem, and therefore ἐν Ἱεροσολ. has its warrant with reference to the Samaritans (against Hilgenfeld in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1857, p. 517; and in his *Zeitschr.* 1863, p. 103). The divine ordainment of the temple service was *educational*. Christ was its *aim* and *end*, its πληρώσις; the modern doctrine of the re-establishing of Jerusalem in its grandeur is a chiliastic dream (see Rom. xi. 27, note). — τῷ πατρί] spoken from the standing-point of the future converts, to whom God, through their faith in the Reconciler, would be *Father*: "Tacite novi foederis suavitatem innuit," Grotius.

Ver. 22. Jesus has answered the question as to the *where*

of worship; He now turns, unasked, to the *object* of worship, and in this He pronounces in favour of the Jews. The chain of thought is not: "as matters *now* stand," and so on (Lücke and most others); such a change of *time* must have been indicated. — $\delta \text{ οὐκ οἶδατε}$] *ye worship what ye know not.* God is meant, who is named not personally, but by the neuter, according to His essence and character, not as *He* who is worshipped, but as *that* which is worshipped (comp. the neuter, Acts xvii. 23, according to the more correct reading); and this is simply *God Himself*, not $\tauὰ \text{ τοῦ θεοῦ}$ or $\tauὰ \text{ πρὸς τὸν θεόν}$ (Lücke), which would not be in keeping with the conception expressed in προσκυνεῖν ; for what is worshipped is not what *pertains to God*, but *God* (comp. vv. 21, 23, 24). The οὐκ οἶδατε is to be understood *relatively*; comp. vii. 28. As the Samaritans received the Pentateuch only, they were without the developed revelation of God contained in the subsequent books of the O. T., particularly in the Prophets, especially the steadfast, pure, and living development of Messianic hope, which the Jews possessed, so also they had lost, with the temple and its sacred shrines, the abiding presence of the Deity (Rom. iii. 2, ix. 4, 5). Jesus, therefore, might well speak of their knowledge of God, *in comparison with that of the Jews* ($\eta\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$), who possessed the full revelation and promise, *as ignorance*; and He could regard this great superiority of the Jews as unaffected by the monotheism, however spiritual, of the Samaritans. According to de Wette, whom Ebrard follows, the meaning is: "ye worship, and *in so doing*, ye do what ye know not,"—which is said to refer to the arbitrary and unhistorical manner in which the Samaritan worship originated. According to this, the δ would have to be taken as in $\delta \text{ δὲ νῦν ζῶ}$, Gal. ii. 20 (comp. Bengel), so that it would denote the προσκύνησις itself, which is accomplished in the προσκυνεῖν (see Bernhardt, p. 106). But in that case it would have been more logical to write $\delta \text{ ὑμεῖς προσκυνεῖτε, οὐκ οἶδατε}$. Tittmann, Morus, Kuinoel, also erroneously say that δ stands for $\kappa\alpha\theta' \delta$, *pro vestra ignorantia*. It is the accusative of the object, in which is included the dative, or even the accusative of the demonstrative (for προσκύν. is construed in both ways; see Lobeck, *ad Phrym.* p. 463). — $\eta\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$] *i.e.*

Jews, without a conjunction, and hence all the more emphatic. According to the whole connection, it must mean *we Jews*, not *Christians*, as if *ἡμεῖς* were intended in the Gnostic sense to denote, as something altogether new, the distinctively Christian consciousness, as contrasted with the unconscious worship of the Israelitish race in its Samaritan and Jewish branches (Hilgenfeld, comp. his *Zeitschr.* 1863, p. 213 ff.). That Jesus, being Himself a Jew (Gal. iv. 4; John i. 11), should reckon Himself among the Jews, cannot be thought strange in the antithesis of such a passage as this. But in what follows, the Lord rises so high above this antithesis between Samaritan and Jew, that in the future which He opens up to view (vv. 23, 24), this national distinctiveness ceases to have any significance. Still, in answer to the woman's question, He could simply and definitely assign to the Jews that superiority which historically belonged to them before the manifestation of that higher future; but He could not intend "to set her free from the unreality of her national existence" (Luthardt), but rather, considering the occasion which presented itself, could make no concession to the injury of the rights of His patriotism as Messiah, based as this was upon historical fact and upon the divine purpose (Rom. i. 16). — *ὅτι ἡ σωτ., κ.τ.λ.*] *because salvation* (of course, not without the *σωτήρ*, though this is not *named*) proceeds from the Jews (not from the Samaritans),—a general doctrinal statement, incontestably true, based upon the promise to Abraham, Gen. xii. (comp. Isa. ii. 3; Mic. iv. 2), concerning the *σωτηρία* of the Messiah's kingdom, whose *future* establishment is *represented as present*, as is natural in such an axiomatic statement of historic fact. As salvation is of the *Jews*, this design of their existence in the economy of grace constitutes the reason (*ὅτι*) why *they*, as a nation, possessed the true and pure revelation of God, whose highest culmination and consummation is that very *σωτηρία*; comp. Rom. ix. 4, 5. It must not, indeed, be overlooked that *ἡμεῖς . . . οἶδαμεν* was not true of every *individual* of the *ἡμεῖς* (not of those who rejected the *σωτηρία*), but refers to the nation as a whole in its ideal existence as the *people of God*, whose prerogative as such could not be destroyed by empirical exceptions. Thus the invisible church is hidden in the visible.

Vv. 23, 24. But¹ this antithesis will also disappear (comp. ver. 21) by the προσκυνεῖν of the true (*i.e.* answering to the ideal of such, comp. i. 19) worshippers of God, whose time is coming, yea, already is present (inasmuch as Jesus had already gathered round Him a small band of such worshippers). He could *not* add καὶ νῦν ἐστὶν to the ἔρχ. ὥρα of ver. 21. — ἐν πνεύματι κ. ἀληθ.] expresses the *element wherein* the προσκυνεῖν is carried on in its two closely connected parts, viz.: (1) *In spirit*; *i.e.* the worship does not consist in outward acts, gestures, ceremonies, limitations of time and place, or in anything pertaining to the sphere of sense; it has to do with that higher spiritual nature in man which is the substratum of his moral self-consciousness, and the seat of his true moral life, manifesting itself in thoughts, feelings, efforts of will, moods of elevation, excitements, etc.; otherwise the προσκύνησις would belong to the sphere of the σάρξ merely, which is the opposite of true worship. Comp. Rom. i 9: ὃ λατρεύω ἐν τῷ πνεύματί μου. It is self-evident, from both the O. T. and N. T. view, that the πνεῦμα in which this takes place is influenced by the divine πνεῦμα (comp. Rom. viii. 14–16, 26); but we must not take ἐν πνεύματι (ver. 24) to denote objectively the Divine Spirit (Luthardt, Brückner, Bäumlein, following the early expositors). The προσκύνησις ἐν πνεύμ. is λογική, Rom. xii. 1; it does not in itself exclude the *ritus externos*, but it does exclude all *mechanical* ritualism, and all *opus operatum*. (2) *In truth*, not “in sincerity, honesty,” which would be greatly too weak a meaning after οἱ ἀληθινοί, but, so that the worship harmonizes with its object, not contradicting but corresponding with God’s nature and attributes. Otherwise it belongs to the sphere of the ψεῦδος, either conscious or unconscious; *this* ψεῦδος, and not σκιά or τύποι, is the antithesis of ἀληθεία. — προσκυνητής, save only in Eustathius and Hesychius, occurs only in *Inscript. Chandl.* p. 91. — καὶ γὰρ, κ.τ.λ.] *for the Father*

¹ ἀλλὰ, *yet*, as contrasted, not with the ἡ σωτηρία ἐν τ. Ἰουδαίων ἰστίς (Hilgenfeld, as if μὴ . . . δι were there), but, as is clear from what follows (the true προσκύνειν), with the ὑμῖς . . . σὶδαμιν. Bäumlein regards it as an intensified addition to ver. 21, “*yea, the hour is coming.*” But thus ver. 22 would be arbitrarily overleaped.

also, etc. The *καὶ* denotes that what the *προσκυνηταὶ* do *on their part* is also what the Father Himself desires. Luther, B. Crusius, Tholuck, Hengstenberg, and most others, erroneously render it as if it were *καὶ γὰρ τοιούτους* or *καὶ γὰρ ζητεῖ*. The emphasis given by *καὶ* in *καὶ γὰρ* always rests upon the word immediately following (even in 1 Cor. xiv. 8); Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Gorg.* p. 467 B. It does not elsewhere occur in John. Usually the *καὶ* has been overlooked; but the Vulgate rightly renders: "nam et pater." — *ζητεῖ*] *accordingly He desires*. Comp. Herod. i. 94; John i. 39, iv. 27, *al. τοιούτους* is with marked emphasis put first: *of this character* He desires His worshippers to be. — *πνεῦμα ὁ θεός, κ.τ.λ.*] The predicate emphatically stands first (comp. i. 1: *θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος*): *a Spirit is God*, etc. Here God's *nature* is added to His *will* (ver. 23), as a further motive for true worship,¹ to which the nature and manner of the *προσκύνησις* on man's part must correspond. How utterly *heterogeneous* would be a carnal and spurious worship with the perfectly pure and holy nature of God, completely raised above every limit of sense, of place, of particularism, and of all need of gifts, simply because He is *Spirit*! whereas a spiritual and true worship is *θεοπρεπὴς κ. κατὰλληλος*, Euthymius Zigabenus, and is *homogeneous* with the idea of God as Spirit.

Vv. 25, 26. The woman is *struck* by Christ's answer, but she does not yet *understand* it, and she *appeals to the Messiah*; *Χριστῶ Χριστὸν ἔλεξεν*, Nonnus. Well says Chrysostom: *εἰλιγγίασεν ἡ γυνή* (she grew dizzy) *πρὸς τὰ λεχθέντα, καὶ ἀπηγόρευσε πρὸς τὸ ὕψος τῶν εἰρημένων, καὶ καμουσα ἄκουσον τί φησιν, κ.τ.λ.* The presentiment that Jesus Himself was

¹ *Πνεῦμα ὁ θεός* is not to be conjoined with the assumption of a *corporeity* belonging to God (in answer to the concessions of Hamberger in the *Jahrb. f. D. Th.* 1867, p. 421). Jesus might take it for granted that *every one* who belonged to the O. T. monotheism *understood* that God is a Spirit, according to Ex. xx. 4, Jer. xxxi. 3; and it is by no means necessary to refer to the traces of Samaritan spiritualism, in order to make the expression more intelligible as addressed to the woman (Gesenius, *de Theol. Sam.* p. 12; *de Pentat. Sam. orig.* p. 58 ff.). *Πνεῦμα* must not be regarded as indicating something *new* in comparison with the O. T. (Lutz, *bibl. Dogm.* p. 45; Köstlin, *Lehrbegr.* p. 79), but as something known, and emphasized with corresponding impressiveness on account of its importance. Comp. Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* I. 68 ff.; Weiss, *Lehrbegr.* pp. 54, 55.

the Messiah is not to be recognised in her words (against Luthardt); yet these are neither evasive nor abrupt (Lücke, de Wette), but the expression of the need of the manifestation of the Messiah, which was deeply felt in this moment of profound impression,—a need which Jesus perceived, and immediately satisfied by the declaration that followed. The Samaritans, sharing the national hope of the Jews, and taking their stand upon the Messianic passages in the Pentateuch (such as Gen. xv., xlix. 10, Num. xxiv., and especially Deut. xviii. 15), were expecting the Messiah,¹ whom they called מְשִׁיחַ or מְחִיבָה (now *el Muhdy*; see Robinson, III. 320), whose mission they apprehended less in a political aspect, though also as the restoration of the kingdom of Israel, and the re-establishment of the Gerizim-worship, yet merely as the result of human working. See Gesen. *de theol. Sam.* p. 41 ff., and *ad carmina Sam.* p. 75 f.; Bargès, *passim*; Vilmar, *passim*. Against B. Bauer's unhistorical assertion, that at that time the Samaritans had no Messianic belief (*Evang. Gesch. Joh. Beil.* p. 415 ff.), see B. Crusius. *Μεσσίας* (without the article, as in i. 42) is uttered by the woman as a *proper name*, and thus she adopted the Jewish title, which was doubtless well known in Samaria, and the use of which might be so closely connected with a feeling of respect for the highly gifted Jew with whom she was conversing, that there is no adequate ground for the assumption that the evangelist puts the word into her mouth (Ammon). — πάντα] used in a popular indefinite sense. — ἐγώ εἰμι] *I am He*, i.e. the Messiah, ver. 25, the simple usual Greek expression, and not in imitation of Deut. xxxii. 39. Observe the plain and direct avowal, in answer to the *guilelessness of the Samaritan woman, whose faith was now ready to acknowledge Him* (comp. Chrysostom). The consideration of the special circumstances, and of the fact that here there was no danger of a political abuse of the avowal (vi. 15), obviates the seeming contradiction between this early confession and Matt. viii. 4, xvi. 20.

¹ The Samaritan name מְשִׁיחַ or מְחִיבָה is by some rendered *the converter* (so Gesenius and Ewald), and by others the *returning one* (Moses), as Sacy, Juynboll (*Commentar. in hist. gentis Sam. L. B.* 1846), Hengstenberg. Both are linguistically admissible; the latter, considering Deut. xviii. 15, is the most probable.

Ver. 27. Ἐπὶ τοῦτῳ] *Hereupon*, while this was going on. See Bernhardt, p. 250; Winer, p. 367 [E. T. p. 489]. Often in Plato. — ἐθαύμαζον] the descriptive imperfect alternates with the simply narrative Aor. See Kühner, II. 74. — μετὰ γυναικὸς] *with a woman*; for they had yet to learn the fact that Jesus rose above the Rabbinical precepts, teaching that it was beneath the dignity of man to hold converse with women, and the directions of the law upon the subject (see Lightfoot, Schoettgen, and Wetstein). — οὐδεὶς μέντοι, κ.τ.λ.] reverential fear. — τί ζητεῖς] *what desirest thou?* i.e. what was it that led you to this strange conversation? (i. 39). There is no reason to warrant our taking μετ' αὐτῆς as referring by ζεύγμα (παρ' αὐτῆς) also to ζητεῖς (Lücke, de Wette); and just as little to render ζητεῖν, contrary to its ordinary meaning, to *contend*, as if the disciples thought there was a discussion prompted by national hostility going on (Ewald). — ἢ] *or*, i.e. if you *want* nothing.

Vv. 28-30. Οὖν] in consequence of the disciples' coming, which interrupted the interview with Jesus. — ἀφῆκεν, κ.τ.λ.] οὕτως ἀνήφθη τῷ πυρὶ τῶν πνευματικῶν ναμάτων, ὡς καὶ τὸ ἄγγος ἀφεῖναι καὶ τὴν χρεῖαν, δι' ἣν παρεγένετο, Euthymius Zigabenus. How great the power of the decisive awakening of the new life in this woman! — πάντα ὅσα] often thus used together in the classics; Xen. *Anab.* ii. 1. 2; Soph. *El.* 370, 880, 884; Bornem. *ad Anab.* i. 10. 3. — ἐποίησα] thus from *a sense of guilt* she described what Jesus had said to her. His words were therefore the summary of her moral history. — μήτι οὗτος, κ.τ.λ.] *not must he not be really the Messiah?* as if the question implied an *affirmation*. So Lücke, but against the constant use of μήτι as simply interrogative, in keeping with which we should rather render the words, *yet is not perhaps this man the Messiah?* which supposes a *negative* answer; to be explained, however, as arising psychologically from the fear and bashfulness of surprise at the newly discovered fact, too great for belief. The woman believes it; but startled at the greatness of the discovery, she does not trust herself, and ventures modestly only to ask as one in doubt. See on Matt. xii. 23; Baeumlein, *Partik.* 302. Observe in ver. 30 the change from ἐξῆλθον to the vividly

descriptive ἤρχοντο (see on ver. 27, xx. 3). In the latter word the reader *sees* the crowd coming. Comp. ver. 40, where they arrive.

Vv. 31-34. Ἐν τῷ μεταξύ] *in the meantime* (Xen. *Symp.* i. 14; Lucian, *V. H.* i. 22, *D. D.* x. 1), after the woman had gone, and before the Samaritans came.—Ver. 32. Jesus, making the sensuous the clothing of the supersensuous (the *pastus animi*), speaks from a feeling of inner quickening and satisfaction, which He had just experienced from the change He had wrought in the Samaritan woman,—a feeling which He was to experience still more strongly throughout His divinely appointed work onwards until its completion. This inner satisfaction now prompts Him to refuse bodily sustenance. Observe the emphatic antithesis of ἐγώ and ὑμεῖς.—As to βρώσις, and βρῶμα, ver. 34, see on Col. ii. 16.—Ver. 33. In the question μήτις, κ.τ.λ., prompted by a misunderstanding of His words, the emphasis is upon ἥνεγκεν, “surely no one has brought Him,” etc.—Ver. 34. ἐμὸν βρῶμα] *i.e.* without a figure, “*what gives me satisfaction and enjoyment is this*: I have to do what God desires of me, and to accomplish *that* work of redemption which He (αὐτοῦ emphatically placed first) has committed to me” (xvii. 4). Observe (1) that ἵνα is not the same as ὅτι, which would express objectively the actual subject-matter of ἐμὸν βρ.; it rather indicates the nature of the βρῶμα viewed as to its *end*, and points to the *aim* and *purpose* which Jesus pursues,—a very frequent use of it in John. (2) The present ποιῶ denotes *continuous* action, the *Aor.* τελειῶσα the *act of completion*, the future goal of the ποιῶ. Comp. xvii. 4.

Ver. 35. The approaching townspeople now showed how greatly already the ἵνα ποιῶ was in process of accomplishment. They were coming through the corn-field, now tinged with green; and thus they make the fields, which for four months would not yield the harvest, in a higher sense already white harvest-fields. Jesus directs the attention of His disciples to this; and with the beautiful picture thus presented in nature, He connects further appropriate instructions, onwards to ver. 38.—οὐχ ὑμεῖς λέγετε] that is, at the present season of the year (ἐπι). The ὑμεῖς stands contrasted with *what Jesus*

was about to say, though the antithesis is not expressed in what follows by ἐγώ, because the antithesis of the *time* stands in the foreground.¹ The supposition that the disciples had, during their walk, made an observation of this kind to each other (and this in a theological sense with reference to hoping and waiting), as Hengstenberg suggests, is neither hinted at, nor is in harmony with the *Præsens* λέγετε. — ὅτι ἔτι . . . ἔρχεται] Harvest began in the middle of Nisan (Lightfoot, v. 101), i.e. in April. Consequently the words must have been spoken in December, when Jesus, as the seed-time fell in Marchesvan (the beginning of November), might be surrounded by sown fields already showing tints of green, the harvest of which, however, could not be expected for four months to come. We render therefore: *there are still four months* (to wait, until) *the harvest comes*. As to the paratactic expression with καὶ instead of a particle of time, see Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Symp.* p. 220 C; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. 881. Concerning the bearing of the passage upon the chronology, see Wieseler, *Synopse*, p. 214 ff. The taking of the words as *proverbial* (Lightfoot, Grotius, Tittmann, etc., even Lücke, Tholuck, de Wette, Krafft, *Chronol.* p. 73), as if the saying were a *general* one: "*from seed-time to harvest is four months*" (seed-time would thus be made to extend into December; comp. *Bava Mezia*, f. 106, 2), is forbidden, not only by the fact that such a proverb occurs nowhere else, but by the fact that seed-time is not here mentioned, so that ἔτι (comp. the following ἤδη) does not refer to a point of time to be understood, but to the time then present, and by the fact, likewise, that the emphasized ὑμεῖς would be inexplicable and strange in an ordinary proverb (comp. rather Matt. xvi. 2).² It is worth while to notice *how long* Jesus had been in Judæa (since April). — τετράμηνος] sc. χρόνος; see Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 549. — τὰς χώρας] *regiones*. They had just been sown, and the young seed was now springing up, and yet in

¹ The versatility of thought often in Greek changes the things contrasted as the sentence proceeds. See Dissen, *ad Dem. de cor.* 163; Schaef. *ad Timocr.* p. 763, 13.

² This also is in answer to Hilgenfeld, who takes ἔτι with reference to the present, and not the future, and interprets it: four months are *not yet gone*, and yet the harvest is *already here*. This strange rendering derives no support whatever from xi. 39.

another sense *they were white for being reaped*; for, by the spectacle of the townspeople who were now coming out to Christ across these fields, it appeared in concrete manifestation before the eyes of the disciples (hence ἐπάρατε τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, κ.τ.λ.), that now for men the time of conversion (of ripeness) was come in the near establishment of the Messiah's kingdom, into which, like the harvest produce, they might be gathered (comp. Matt. iii. 12). Jesus, therefore, here gives a prophetic view, not only of the near conversion of the *Samaritans* (Acts viii. 5 ff.); but, rising above the concrete fact now before them, consequently from the people of Sychar who were flocking through the fields of springing green, His prophetic eye takes in *all mankind*, whose conversion, begun by Him, would be fully accomplished by His disciples. See especially ver. 38. Godet wrongly denies this wider prophetic reference, and confines the words to the immediate occurrence, as an improvised harvest feast. Such an explanation does not suffice for what follows, vv. 36–38, which was suggested, indeed, by the phenomenon before them, but embraces the whole range of service on the part of Christ's disciples in their relation to their Lord. If we do not allow this wider reference, ver. 38 especially will be of very strange import. — ὅτι] not *for*, but according to common *attraction* (Winer, p. 581 [E. T. p. 781 f.]), *that* they are, etc. — ἤδη] *even now, at this moment*, and not after four months; put at the end for emphasis (Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Phaedr.* p. 256 E; *ad Menex.* p. 235 A). Comp. 1 John iv. 3; Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* i. 8. 16. Not, therefore, to be joined with what follows (A. C.* D. E. L. κ. Codd. It. *al.*, Schulz, Tisch., Ewald, Ebrard, Godet), which would make the correlation with ἔτι inappropriate. For the rest, comp. Ovid, *Fast.* v. 357: “maturis albescit messis aristis.”

Ver. 36. This harvest—*how full of recompense for the reapers* (i.e. for you, my disciples)! The *wages* for the reaper's labour consist in this, that (καὶ *explicative*) he *gathers fruit into life eternal* (this is spoken *locally*, as denoting the granary, as is clear from συνάγει, against Luthardt, who takes εἰς to denote the result); comp. ver. 14, without any figure: “He converts men, and thus secures for them an entrance into the Messiah's

kingdom." *Thereupon, as well the sower (Christ) as the reaper rejoice together*, according to God's ordinance (*ἵνα*). Chrysostom and many others wrongly take *σπείρων* to denote the prophets. For *όμοῦ*, with one verb in the singular and two subjects, comp. Hom. *Il.* α. 61: *εἰ δὲ ὁμοῦ πόλεμος τε δαμῶ καὶ λοιμὸς Ἀχαιοῦς*; Soph. *Aj.* 1058. Here, however, it certainly signifies the *simultaneousness* of the joy, not simply joy *in common* (B. Crusius, Luthardt); for it is the *joy of harvest*, which the Sower also shares in time of harvest, on account of the blessing with which His toil in sowing is now crowned.

Vv. 37, 38. "As well the sower as the reaper, I say, for in this case they are different persons." — *ἐν γὰρ τούτῳ, κ.τ.λ.] for herein, in this relation of sowing and reaping, the saying* (the proverb of ordinary life, *τὸ λεγόμενον*, Plato, *Gorg.* p. 447 A; *Phaed.* p. 101 D; *Pol.* x p. 621 C; comp. *ὁ παλαιὸς λόγος*, *Phaed.* p. 240 C; *Gorg.* p. 499 C; Soph. *Trach.* i.) has its essential truth, i.e. its proper realization, setting forth its idea. Comp. Plat. *Tim.* p. 26 E: *μὴ πλασθέντα μῦθον, ἀλλ' ἀληθινόν* (i.e. a real) *λόγον*. The reference of the *λόγος* to the words of the servant, Matt. xxv. 24, which Weizsäcker considers probable,¹ would be very far-fetched; the rendering of *ἀληθινός*, however, as equivalent to *ἀληθής*, 2 Pet. ii. 22 (de Wette and many others), is quite opposed to the idiosyncrasy of John (so also xix. 35). The *article* before *ἀληθ.*, which through want of attention might easily have been omitted (B. C.* K. L. T.^b Δ. Or.), marks off the predicate with exclusive definiteness. Comp. Bernhardt, p. 322; Kühner, II. 140. With respect to other relations (not *ἐν τούτῳ*), the proverb does not express its proper idea.—As to the proverb itself, and its various applications, see Wetstein. The *ἀληθινόν* of it is explained in ver. 38.—*ἐγώ]* with emphasis: *I*, consequently the sower in the proverb.—The *preterites ἀπέστειλα* and *εἰσεληλ.* are not *prophetic* (de Wette, Tholuck), but

¹ Weizsäcker, in his harmony of the words of John with those of the Synoptics, in which the latter are dealt with very freely (p. 282 ff.), brings in general much that is far-fetched into parallelisms which cannot be demonstrated. The intellectual independence of personal recollection and reproduction in John raises him above any such search after supposed borrowings.

the mission and calling of the disciples were already practically involved in their reception into the apostolate.¹ Comp. xvii. 8. — ἄλλοι and αὐτῶν refer to *Jesus* (whom Olshausen, indeed, according to Matt. xxiii. 34, even excludes!), not to the *prophets* and *the Baptist*, nor to them together with Christ (so the *Fathers* and most of the *early* writers, also Lange, Luthardt, Ewald, and most others), nor in a general way to all who were instrumental in advancing the preparatory economy (Tholuck). They are plurals of *category* (see on Matt. ii. 20; John iii. 11), representing the work of Christ, into which the disciples entered, as not *theirs*, but *others'* work, *i.e.* a distinct and *different* labour. But the fact that *Jesus* was the labourer, while self-evident from the connection, is not directly expressed, but with intentional self-renunciation, half concealed beneath the plural ἄλλοι. He it was who introduced the conversion of mankind; the disciples were to complete it. He prepared and sowed the field; they were called upon to do what was still further necessary, and to reap. The great toil of the apostles in fulfilling their call is not denied; but, when compared with the work of Jesus Himself, it was the easier, because it was only the carrying on of that work, and was *encouragingly* represented under the cheerful image of harvesting (comp. Isa. ix. 3; Ps. cxxvi. 6). If ἄλλοι is to be taken as referring to Philip's work in converting the Samaritans, Acts viii. 52, upon which Peter and John entered (Baur), or to Paul's labour among the heathen, the fruit of which is to be attributed to the first apostles (Hilgenfeld), *any* and *every* exegetical impossibility may be with equal right allowed by a ὑστερον πρότερον of critical arbitrariness.

Ver. 39 ff. Resumption of the historical narrative of ver. 30, which here receives its elucidation, to which then the con-

¹ According to Godet, ἀπίστ. is to be taken as referring to a summons, discovered by him in ver. 36, to the work of reaping among the approaching Sycharites. He then takes ἄλλοι κίκοι. to refer to the labour of Jesus in His interview with the woman. The latter words are said to have been spoken to the disciples, who thought He had been resting during their absence, with a "finesse qu'on oserait presque appeller légèrement malicieuse," and with an "aimable sourire." Such weighty thoughts as ἀποστολή and κόπας represent are utterly incompatible with such side hints and passing references. And it is a pure invention to find in ver. 36 an "invitation à prendre la faucille."

tinuation of the history attaches itself, vv. 40-42. As to the position of the words πολλοὶ ἐπ. εἰς αὐτ. τῶν Σαμ., see Buttmann, *N. T. Gr.* p. 332 [E. T. p. 388]. — ὅτι εἰπέ μοι πάντα, κ.τ.λ.] Indication of *conscience* ratifying ver. 18. — διὰ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ] *on account of His own word* (teaching). No mention is made of *miracles*, but we must not infer from this that there was no need of miracles among the Samaritans; see, on the other hand, Acts viii. 6 ff. Jesus found that in this case His *word* sufficed, and therefore upon principle (see ver. 48) He forbore to work miracles, and His mighty word was all the mightier among the unprejudiced people. — διὰ τὴν σήν λαλιὰν] *on account of thy discourse*. This is the meaning of *λαλιά* invariably in classical Greek. The term is *purposely chosen*, as from the standing-point of the *speaker*; whereas John, as an impartial *narrator*, with equal appropriateness, writes τὸν λόγον in ver. 39. As to *λαλιά* in viii. 43, where Jesus thus designates *His own* discourse, see *in loc.* Observe, besides, the emphatic σήν as contrasted with the λόγος of Jesus which they themselves (αὐτοί) have now heard. — ἀκηκόαμεν] the following ὅτι refers to both verbs. They have *heard* that Jesus was the Messiah, for this became *evident* to them from His words. — ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου] not due to the *individuality of John* (1 John iv. 14), and put into the mouths of the people, as Lücke and Tholuck are inclined to suppose, but a confession quite conceivable as the result of the two days' ministry of Jesus; universalism, moreover, being more akin to the Messianic faith of the Samaritans (see Gesenius, *de Samar. theol.* p. 41 ff.) than to that of the Jews, with their definite and energetic feeling of nationality.

Note. — The prohibition in Matt. x. 5 militates neither against this narrative of John iv. in general, nor in particular against the promise of ver. 35 ff. It had merely a *temporary* force, and was abrogated again by Matt. xxviii. 19, 20, and Acts i. 8; and, moreover, it presented no insuperable barrier to restrict Jesus in *His* work (for He did not wholly exclude even Gentiles from His teaching). Acts viii. 5 ff. is no proof whatever that this history in John is of mythical origin; it is, on the contrary, the fulfilment of the promise given here. Its several features are so original, and so psychologically true, and the words of Jesus (see especially vv. 21-24) come so directly

from the living depths of His soul, that the exceptions taken against certain particulars (as, for instance, against the misunderstandings on the part of the woman; against the words concerning the food, ver. 32; against the command of Jesus, "Go, call thy husband;" against the woman's question concerning the place of worship; against the faith of the Samaritans, which is said to contradict Luke ix. 53) are of no real weight, and are explicable only by the very authenticity of the narrative, not by the supposition of an intentional poetizing. This is in answer to Strauss, B. Bauer, and partly Weisse; also to Scholten, who considers that the author's object was to describe in a non-historical picture the *spirit* which actuated Jesus even towards the Samaritans. As a full guarantee for that part of the narrative, which the disciples, being absent, could not have witnessed, we may, considering the vivid impress of genuineness which marks it, fairly assume that Jesus Himself communicated it to the evangelist, and there is no need for the unfounded supposition that (ver. 8) John was left behind with Jesus (Hengstenberg, Godet). When, finally, Baur (p. 145 ff.; comp. also Hilgenfeld) resolves our history into a *typus*,—"the Samaritan woman being a figure of *heathendom*, susceptible, readily opening itself to faith, and presenting a wide harvest field," a contrast to Nicodemus, the type of unsusceptible Judaism,—with all this arbitrariness on the part of the inventor, it is passing strange, if this were his object, that he did not bring Jesus into contact with a real *heathen* woman, for this would have been quite as easy to invent; and that he should keep the words of the woman so free from the least tinge of anything of a *heathen* nature (ver. 20 ff.), and have put into her mouth so clear an expression of Messianic hope (vv. 25, 42),—this bungling is quite out of character on the part of such an inventor.

Vv. 43, 44.¹ Τὰς δύο ἡμέρας] The article is to be explained by ver. 40.—αὐτός] *ipse*, not merely others with reference to Him, but "*He Himself* did not hesitate to testify," etc. As to the fact itself, see Matt. xiii. 57; Mark vi. 4;

¹ See Ewald, *Jahrb.* X. 1860, p. 108 ff. He agrees for the most part with my rendering; comp. also his *Johann. Schr.* I. p. 194; in like manner Godet, who, however, without the slightest hint of it in the text, supposes a purpose on the writer's part, in connection with iii. 24, to correct the synoptical tradition. John wishes "constater l'intervalle considérable qui sépara du baptême de Jésus son retour définitif et son établissement permanent en Galilée." In iii. 24 he states the fact, and here he gives the motive. Scholten puts the emphasis which prompts the following γὰρ upon *ἐκείνη*, a word which is quite unessential, and might just as well have been omitted.

Luke iv. 24. When Schenkel concludes from *προφήτης* that Jesus did not yet regard Himself as the *Messiah*, this is a misuse of the general term within the category of which the conception of Messiah is embraced. — *ἐμαρτύρ.*] not in the sense of the *Pluperfect* (Tholuck, Godet; see on xviii. 24), but *then*, when He returned to Galilee. — *γάρ* is the ordinary *for*; and *πατρίδι* is not the native *town*, but, as is clear from *Γαλιλαίαν*, vv. 43, 45, the native *country*. So also usually in Greek writers, from Homer downwards. The words give the *reason* why He did not hesitate to return to Galilee. The gist of the reason lies in the antithetical reference of *ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ πατρίδι*. If, as Jesus Himself testified, a prophet had no honour *in his own country*, he must seek it *abroad*. And this Jesus had done. Abroad, in Jerusalem, He had by His mighty works inspired the Galilaeans who were there with that respect which they were accustomed to deny to a prophet at home. Thus He brought the prophet's honour with Him *from abroad*.¹ Accordingly (ver. 45) He found a reception among the Galilaeans also, because they had seen His miracles in *Jerusalem* (ii. 23). It is therefore obviously incorrect to understand *Γαλιλαίαν* specially of *Upper Galilee*, as distinct from *Lower Galilee*, where Nazareth was situated. So Lange, in spite of the fact that *Γαλιλ.* here must be the universal and popular name for the whole province, as distinct from Samaria (*ἐκεῖθεν*), whether we retain *καὶ ἀπῆλθεν* as in the Elzevir or not. It is further incorrect, and an utterly arbitrary gloss, to interpret *πατρίς* as meaning *Nazareth*, and *γάρ* as referring to the *fact* that He had gone, indeed, to Galilee, *but not to Nazareth* (Chrysostom and even Euthymius Zigabenus: to Capernaum). So Cyril, Nonnus, Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, Aretius, Grotius, Jansen, Bengel, and many; also Kypke, Rosenmüller, Olshausen, Klee, Gemberg in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1845, I.; Hengstenberg, Baumlein. It is also incorrect, because not in keeping with the context, nor with the general view, which is also that of John, which regards Galilee as Christ's home (i. 46, ii. 1, vii. 3, 41, 52), to take *πατρίς* as denoting *Judea*, and *γάρ* as

¹ Baumlein urges, against my explanation: "We cannot believe that, after the words 'He betook Himself to Galilee,' there should follow the reason why He had before *left Galilee*." This, however, is not the logical connection at all.

stating the reason (in the face of the quite different reason already given, vv. 1-3) why Jesus had *left* Judea (Origen, Maldonatus, B. Bauer, Schwegler, Wieseler, B. Crusius, Schweizer, Köstlin, Baur, Hilgenfeld, and formerly also Ebrard); whence some, *e.g.* Origen and Baur, take *πατρίς* in a higher sense, as signifying the native land of the *prophets*,¹ and therefore of the Messiah also, and most, like Hilgenfeld, as having reference to the *birth at Bethlehem*. Lücke has rightly, in his 3d ed., abandoned this interpretation; but, on the other hand, he takes *γὰρ* as equivalent to *namely*, and explains it as referring not to what precedes, but to *what follows* (so substantially also Tholuck, Olshausen, Maier, de Wette), so that ver. 44 gives an explanation in passing on the point: "that the Galilaeans on this occasion received Jesus well, but only on account of the miracles which they had seen in Jerusalem" (de Wette). It is against this, however, that though in the classics *γὰρ* explicative often precedes the sentence to be explained (see Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 467; Bäumlein, *Partik.* p. 75 ff.), especially in parenthesis (see Bremi, *ad Lys.* p. 66; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. 338), yet this form of expression is quite without precedent in the N. T. (Rom. xiv. 10, Heb. ii. 8, are not instances in point), and especially would be quite foreign to John's simple progressive style of narration; moreover, the "*indeed,—but only*," put into ver. 45, is quite obtruded on the words, inasmuch as John wrote neither *μέν* after *ἐδέξ.*, nor thereafter a *μόνον* *δέ*, nor any such expression.² According to

¹ So also B. Crusius, who compares vii. 52. Quite erroneously, when the general and proverbial character of the statement is considered. After iv. 3, however, the reader can expect no further explanation of the reason why Jesus did not remain in Judea. Schwegler and B. Bauer suppose that here Judea is meant as the native land of Jesus, and make use of this as an argument against the genuineness and historical truth of the Gospel. Comp. also Köstlin in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1851, p. 186. Hilgenfeld, *Evang.* p. 266: "a remarkable inversion of the synoptical statement, wherein the Gospel appears as a free compilation by a post-apostolic author" (*Zeitschr.* 1862, p. 17). Schweizer also finds it such a stumbling-block, that he regards it as proving the following narrative to be a Galilean interpolation. Gfrörer, *heil. Sage*, II. 289, rightly indeed understands the words as referring to *Galilee*, but considers that we should supply the following: "*save very slowly and reluctantly, for*," etc.

² Weizsäcker also, in the *Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol.* 1859, p. 695, regards *γὰρ* not as introducing a reason, but as demonstrative. John intimates that he

Brückner, Jesus came to Galilee *because* (but see vv. 1–3) He had supposed that He would find no honour there, and consequently with the intention of *undertaking the conflict* for the recognition of His person and dignity. According to Luthardt, whom Ebrard now follows (comp. Hofmann, *Weissag. u. Erf.* II. 88, also *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 171), the words imply the hope entertained by Jesus of *being able to remain in rest and silence in Galilee* more easily than anywhere else. But both explanations are incompatible with the following *ὅτε οὖν, κ.τ.λ.*, which certainly means that the Galileans received Him with honour, as He was called immediately thereafter to perform a miracle. We should certainly expect *δέ* or *ἀλλά* (comp. Nonnus) to introduce the statement, and not *οὖν*. In what follows, moreover, regarding the residence in Galilee, we are told neither about conflict nor about the repose of Jesus, but simply of the healing at a distance of the nobleman's son. Lastly, it is contrary to the words (because *ὅτε οὖν ἦλθεν* in ver. 45 directly resumes the *εἰς τ. Γαλ.* of ver. 43, and admits of no interval), when Hauff, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1849, p. 117 ff., makes the train of thought to terminate with ver. 44, and takes ver. 44 itself as a general description of the result of Christ's Galilean ministry. Thus *ἐδέξαντο* is said to indicate *that He did and taught much there*; which is clearly a gloss foisted into the text.

Vv. 45, 46. *Ἐδέξαντο αὐτόν*] The reception which He found among them was one of faith, for He now brought with Him from Jerusalem the honour which the prophet had not in his own country; therefore *πάντα ἑώρακότες, κ.τ.λ.*, *because they had seen, etc.*, and in this we have the key to the right understanding of ver. 44. — Ver. 46. *οὖν*] in consequence of this reception, which encouraged Him to go farther into the

will not narrate much of Christ's ministry in Galilee; he refers to that saying as if shrinking from unpleasant recollections. But this is not in the text, nor is it compatible with the connection in ver. 45, and the history that follows. Weizsäcker, indeed, thinks (comp. his *Unters. üb. d. ev. Gesch.* p. 276) that in this synoptic saying John refers to the synoptic account of that Galilean ministry, *which he would not himself describe*. Who ever could imagine that? especially when John at once goes on to narrate the good reception given to Jesus in Galilee, and His miracle of blessing there. Did the Lord betake Himself to "*voluntary obscurity*," concerning which John wishes to be silent?

country. He goes again straight to *Cana*, because here He had relatives, and might hope in consequence of His first miracle to find the soil prepared for further labour on His part. — κ. ἡν τις βασιλικός, κ.τ.λ.] ἐν Καφαρναούμ should be joined to ἡν. Βασιλικός, a *royal person*, is, according to the frequent use of the word in Josephus (see Krebs, p. 144) and other writers (Plutarch, Polyb., etc.; see Wetstein), not a *relation* of the king (so Baronius, Bos, and many, also allowed by Chrysostom), but one in the *service* of the king (Herod Antipas); whether a military man (thus very often in Josephus; Nonnus: ἰθύνων στρατήν), or civilian, or court retainer, is uncertain. — ὁ υἱός] according to ver. 49, still young. The *article* indicates, perhaps, that he was the only one.

Vv. 47, 48. Ἀπῆλθε πρὸς αὐτόν] from Capernaum to Cana. — ἵνα] the subject of the request is its *purpose*. — ἤμελλε] *in eo erat, ut*. Comp. Luke vii. 2; Hemsterhuis, *ad Lucian. D. M.* II. p. 546. — The man's prayer is conceivable partly from the first miracle at Cana, and partly from the fame of Jesus which had followed Him from Jerusalem. — "If ye are not witnesses of signs and wonders, ye will certainly not believe," is spoken in displeasure against the *Galileans generally* (ver. 45), but *including the suppliant*; Jesus foreseeing that the healing of his son would make him believe, but at the same time that his faith would *not* be brought about *without* a miracle. The Lord's *teaching* was in His own view the weightiest ground of faith, especially according to John (comp. ver. 41), though faith based on the *miracles* was not rejected, but under certain circumstances was even required by Him (x. 38, xiv. 11, xv. 24), though not as the *highest*, but as of *secondary* rank, according to the purpose of the miracles, which were intended as a divine *confirmation* of the teaching. It is incorrect to put the emphasis upon ἵδητε, unless ye see *with your own eyes*, etc., condemning the prayer following. According to this, not only would ἵδητε have to be put first (against Bengel and Storr), but τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς or the like must be supplied; yet the man *saw* the miracle, and a greater one than if Jesus had gone with him. — σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα] see on Matt. xxiv. 24; Rom. xv. 19. As to the reproach itself, comp. 1 Cor. i. 22.

Vv. 49, 50. Then follows a still more urgent entreaty of the father's love, tried by the answer of Jesus; the *τὸ παιδίον μου*, *my child*, being in keeping with the father's tender affection. Comp. Mark v. 23. — Jesus rewards his confidence with the short answer, *Go thy way, thy son liveth*; thus announcing the deliverance from death accomplished at that very moment by an act of His will through miraculous power operating at a distance (not by magnetic healing power, against Olshausen, Krabbe, Kern, thus resorting to a sphere as foreign to the miracles of healing as it is inadequate by way of an explanation). As little can Christ's word be regarded as a *medical prognosticon* (Paulus, comp. Ammon). No more is there any trace in the text of an effect resulting from faith in general, and the spiritual movement of the masses (Weizsäcker). According to the text, Jesus speaks from a conscious knowledge of the crisis of the sickness, effected that moment at a distance by Himself: "*Thy son is not dead, but liveth!*" — ἐπιστ. τῷ λόγῳ] Thus he now overleaps the limit of faith which supposed Christ's presence necessary to the working of the cure; *he believed the word*, i.e. had confidence in its realization.

Vv. 51-54. Αὐτοῦ καταβ. . . αὐτῷ] see Buttmann, *N. T. Gr.* p. 270 [E. T. p. 315]. — ἤδη] belongs to καταβ., not to ὑπῆντ. (B. Crusius): *when he was already going down*, and now was no longer in Cana, but upon his journey back. — οἱ δοῦλοι, κ.τ.λ.] to reassure the father, and to prevent the now unnecessary coming of Jesus. — ζῇ] he is not dead, but the sickness has the opposite issue: *he lives!* — κομψότερον] *finer, prettier*, as in common life we are wont to say, "he is pretty well." Exactly so in Arrian. *Epict.* iii. 10 of the sick: κομψῶς ἔχεις, and its opposite κακῶς ἔχεις. Comp. the Latin *belle habere*. Here it is an "amoenum verbum" (Bengel) of the father's heart, which apprehends its good fortune still with feelings of tenderness and anxiety. — ἐχθές] see Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 323. — ὥραν ἐβδόμην] He had therefore been on the way since one o'clock the day before, because we must suppose from ver. 50 that he set out immediately after the assurance of Jesus. This also seems strange to us, considering the distance from Cana to Capernaum, not exactly known to us

indeed, but hardly three geographical miles. That in his firm faith he travelled "*non festinans*" (Lampe) is unnatural; the impulse of parental love would hurry him home; and so is also the idea that he *stayed the night* somewhere on the way, or at Cana (Ewald assumes the latter, making the seventh hour seven in the evening, according to the Roman reckoning). We may suppose some delay not named, on the journey back, or (with Hengstenberg, Brückner, and others) take the *to-day* in the mind of the Jewish servants as denoting the day which began at six P.M. (sunset). According to Baur and Hilgenfeld, this noting of the time is to be attributed, not to the genuineness and originality of the account, but to the subjective aim of the writer, which was to make the miracle as great and pointed as possible (comp. ver. 54, note). — ἐν ἑκ. τ. ὥρᾳ] sc. ἀφῆκεν αὐτὸν ὁ πυρετός. Observe, with reference to ἐκεῖνος, that it does not mean *idem*, but is the simple relative *ille*. — κ. ἐπίστευσεν, κ.τ.λ.] upon Jesus as the Messiah. Καλῶς οὖν καθήψατο αὐτοῦ ὁ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ γινώσκων Χριστός, εἰπὼν ὅτι ἐὰν μὴ σημεῖα, κ.τ.λ., Euthymius Zigabenus. Observe how faith here attains its realization as to its object, and further, the importance of this καὶ ἡ οἰκία αὐτοῦ (the first household), which now occurs for the first time. Comp. Acts xvi. 14, 15, 34, xviii. 8. — τοῦτο πάλιν δεύτερον, κ.τ.λ.] Referring back to ii. 11. Literally inaccurate, yet true as to its import, is the rendering of Luther: "*This is the second miracle that Jesus did*;" τοῦτο stands by itself, and the following δεύτ. σημ. supplies the place of the predicate (*this Jesus did as the second miracle*), hence no article follows τοῦτο. See on ii. 11, and Bremi, *ad Lys. Exc.* II. p. 436 f.; Ast, *Lex. Plat.* II. 406; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Apol.* pp. 18 A, 24 B. Πάλιν, however, must not be overlooked, nor is it to be joined with δεύτερον (so usually) as a current pleonasm (see on Matt. xxvi. 42; comp. John xxi. 15, Acts x. 15), for δεύτερον is not an adverb, but an adjective. It rather belongs to ἐποίησεν, thus affirming that Jesus *now again* did this as a *second* miracle (comp. Beza) *upon His return from Judea to Galilee* (as in ii. 1). Thus the idea that the miracle was a *second time* wrought upon His coming out of Judea into Galilee is certainly doubly expressed,—once *adverbially* with the verb

(παλιν ἐποίησεν), and then *adjectivally* with the noun (δεύτερον σημ.); both receive their more minute definition by ἐλθὼν, κ.τ.λ. Schweizer (p. 78) quite arbitrarily considers the reference to the first miracle at Cana unjohannean.

Note.—The βασιλικός is not the same with the *Centurion* of Matt. viii. 5 ff.; comp. Luke vii. 2 ff. (Origen, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, and most others). On the assumption of their *identity* (Irenaeus, Eusebius, Semler, Seyffarth, Strauss, Weisse, B. Bauer, Gfrörer, Schweizer, Ammon, Baumgarten Crusius, Baur, Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Weizsäcker), which thus attributes the greater originality on the one hand to Matthew and Luke (Strauss, B. Bauer, Weisse, Baur, Hilgenfeld), on the other to John (Gfrörer, Ewald), and to the latter an *adjusting* purpose (Weizsäcker), the discrepancies as to place, time, and even as regards the sick person, constitute lesser difficulties, as well as the entirely different character in which the suppliant appears in John and in the two Synoptics. In these latter he is still a heathen, which, according to John, he cannot be (against Cyril, Jerome, Baur, and Ewald); see ver. 48, which represents him as associated with Galileans, and therefore Jews; and this alone suffices to establish the difference of the two miracles, apart from the fact that there is no more objection against the supposition of two healings wrought at a distance than against one. This is at the same time against Schweizer's view, that the section in John is an interpolation. Indeed, a single example of healing at a distance, the historical truth of which, moreover, even Ewald maintains, might more easily be resolved by the arbitrariness of criticism into a *myth* borrowed from the history of Naaman, 2 Kings ix. 5, 9 ff. (Strauss), or be explained away as a misunderstanding of a *parable* (Weisse), or be dissolved into a *subjective transposition and development of the synoptical materials* on John's part for his own purpose, which would make the belief in miracles plainly pass beyond the Jewish range of view (Hilgenfeld), and appears in its highest form as a πιστεύειν διὰ τὸν λόγον (Baur, p. 152);¹ although πιστεύειν τῷ λόγῳ, ver. 41, is something quite different from πιστεύειν διὰ τὸν λόγον, and the ἐπίστευσεν in ver. 53 took place, not διὰ τὸν λόγον, but διὰ τὸ σημεῖον.

¹ If John had really derived his matter from the Synoptics, it would be quite inconceivable how, according to the design attributed to him by Baur, he could have left unused the statement of Matt. viii. 10, especially if the βασιλικός is taken to be a Gentile. See Hase, *Tübingen Schule*, pp. 32, 33.

CHAPTER V.

Ver. 1. ἑορτή] C. E. F. H. L. M. Δ. Π. Κ. Cursives, Copt. Sahid. Cyr. Theophyl.: ἡ ἑορτή. So Tisch. But the witnesses *against* the article are still stronger (A. B. D. etc. Or.); and how easily might the insertion have occurred through the ancient explanation of the feast as that of Easter! — Ver. 2. ἐπὶ τῇ προβατικῇ] ἐν τ. πρ. is more weakly attested (though sanctioned by A. D. G. L. Κ.**). Only Κ.* Cursives, some Verss. and Fathers have simply προβατική. A change following another construction (*sheep-pool*). Unnecessary, and unsupported on critical grounds, is the conjecture of Gersdorf: ἡ προβατικὴ κολυμβήθρα ἡ λεγόμενη Ἐβρ. Βηθ. Tisch. following Κ.* has τὸ λεγόμενον instead of ἡ ἐπιλεγομένη. — Ver. 3. πολὺ] wanting in B. C. D. L. Κ. Cursives, and some verss. Bracketed by Lachmann, deleted by Tisch. A strengthening addition that might easily present itself. — The words ἐκδεχομ. τὴν τοῦ ὕδατος κίνησιν, together with the whole of ver. 4, are wanting in B. C.* D. Κ. 157, 314, Copt. Ms. Sahid. Syr^{ca}. Those words are wanting only in A. L. 18; the fourth verse only in D. 33, Arm. Mss. Codd. It. Aug., Nonnus (who describes *the stirring*, but does not mention *the angel*), and is marked as doubtful in other witnesses by an obelus or asterisks. There is, moreover, great variation in particular words. For κατέβαινεν, A. K. Verss. have even ἐλούετο, which Grotius approves. The entire passage from ἐκδεχομ. to the end of ver. 4, though recognised by Tertullian (Origen is silent), is a legendary addition (so also Lücke, Olshausen, Baeumlein, and now even Brückner, reject it), though left in the text by Lachmann in conformity with his principles, but deleted by Tisch.; by de Wette not decidedly rejected; vindicated on various grounds by B. Crusius, Hahn, *Theol. N. T.* I. 303, Lange, Reuss, and Hengstenberg; left doubtful by Luthardt. Had the passage been genuine, its contents would have led more easily to its being retained than to its being omitted; moreover, the comparatively numerous ἀπαξ λεγόμενα in it make it suspicious, viz. κίνησιν, παραχῇ, δῆποτε (instead of ᾧ δῆποτε Lachmann has οἰφδηποτοῦν), ἰσημα. When it is judged (de Wette) that John would hardly have ended the sentence with ξηρῶν, and then have immediately

proceeded with *ἦν δὲ τις*, etc., this is really arbitrary, for we would miss nothing if nothing had been there; *ὅταν παραχρῆν τὸ ὕδωρ*, ver. 7, by no means makes a preceding explanation "almost necessary," but probably states the original form of the popular belief, out of which the legend soon developed itself and found its way into the text. This also against Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, I. 327 f., whose vindication of ver. 4 is approved by Hilgenfeld, *Evang.* p. 268. Ewald (so also Tholuck and Godet) rejects ver. 4, but defends the words *ἐκδεχομένων . . . κίνησιν* in ver. 3 for the sake of ver. 7; Hofmann, *in loc.*, follows an opposite course. But the critical witnesses do not sanction such a separation. — Ver. 5. *καὶ* is wanting in the Elz., and is bracketed by Lachmann, but adopted by Tisch., and this upon preponderating evidence. — *ἀσθεν.*] B. C.* D. L. *κ.* Cursives, Codd. It. Vulg. Copt. Sahid. Arm. Cyr. Chrys. append *αὐτοῦ*, which Lachmann puts in brackets, and Tisch. receives. Rightly; between *ἀσθενεῖα* and *τοῦτον* the superfluous *αὐτοῦ* might easily escape notice. — Ver. 7. For *βάλη* Elz. has *βάλλη*, against decisive evidence. — Ver. 8. *ἔγειρε*] Elz.: *ἐγειραι*, against the best Codd. See the critical notes on Mark ii. 2. — Ver. 12. *τὸν κράββ. σου* is wanting in B. C.* L. *κ.* Sahid. An addition from vv. 8, 11. Deleted by Tisch. — Ver. 13. *ἰαθεῖς*] Tisch., following D. and Codd. of the It., reads *ἀσθενῶν*, apparently original, but inappropriate after *τῷ τεθεραπευμένῳ* in ver. 10; to be regarded as a subject added to ver. 7, and besides this too weakly supported. — Ver. 15. *ἀνήγγειλε*] C. L. *κ.* Syr. Syr^{ca} Copt. Cyr. read *εἶπεν*; D. K. U. D. Cursives, Chrys.: *ἀπήγγ.* The latter reading might easily arise by joining *ἀνήγγ.* with *ἀπῆλθεν*; but this makes the testimonies against *εἶπεν*, which Tisch. adopts, still stronger. — Ver. 16. After *Ἰουδαῖοι*, Elz., Scholz (bracketed by Lachmann), read *καὶ ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν ἀποκτείνει*, against decisive witnesses. A supplement borrowed from ver. 18. — Ver. 20. Tisch.: *θαυμάζετε*, which is far too weakly supported by L. *κ.* — Ver. 25. *ζήσονται*] Lachmann and Tisch.: *ζήσουσιν*, following B. D. L. *κ.* Cursives, Chrys. Rightly; the more usual form crept in. — Ver. 30. After *με* Elz. has *πατρός*, an addition opposed by decisive witnesses. — Ver. 32. *οἶδα*] Tisch. *οἶδατε*, following only D. *κ.* Codd. It. Syr^{ca} Arm. — Ver. 35. The form *ἀγαλλιασθῆναι* (Elz., following B.: *ἀγαλλιασθῆναι*) has preponderating evidence in its favour.

Ver. 1. *Μετὰ ταῦτα*] after this stay of Jesus in Galilee; an approximate statement of time, within the range of which the harmonist has to bring much that is contained in the Synoptics. The distinction made by Lücke between this and *μετὰ τοῦτο*,

according to which the former denotes *indirect*, and the latter *immediate* sequence, is quite incapable of proof: *μετὰ ταῦτα* is the more usual in John; comp. ver. 14, iii. 22, vi. 1, vii. 1. — *ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων*] *a feast of the Jews*; John does not describe it more definitely. But *what* feast is meant appears with certainty from iv. 35; comp. vi. 4. For in iv. 35 Jesus spoke in *December*, and it is clear from vi. 4 that the Passover was still *approaching*; it must therefore¹ be a feast occurring in the interval between *December and the Passover*, and this is no other than the *feast of Purim* (יִּסְרָאֵל פִּרְיָה, Esth. ix. 24 ff., iii. 7), *the feast of lots*, celebrated on the 14th and 15th of Adar (Esth. ix. 21), consequently in March, in commemoration of the nation's deliverance from the bloody designs of Haman. So Keppler, d'Outrein, Hug, Olshausen, Wieseler, Krabbe, Anger, Lange, Maier, Baeumlein, Godet, and most others. So also Holtzmann (*Judenth. u. Christenth.* p. 374) and Märcker (*Uebereinst. d. Matth. u. Joh.* 1868, p. 11). In favour of this interpretation is the fact that, as this feast was by no means a great one, but of less importance and less known to Hellenistic readers, the indefinite mention of it on John's part is thoroughly appropriate; while he *names* the greater and well-known feasts,—not only the Passover, but the *σκηνοπηγία* in vii. 2, and the *ἐγκαίνια* in x. 22. To suppose, in explanation of the fact that he does not give the name, that he had forgotten what feast it was (Schweizer), is compatible neither with the accuracy of his recollection in other things, nor with the importance of the miracle wrought at this feast. It is arbitrary, however, to suppose that John did not wish to lay stress upon the *name* of the *ἑορτή*, but upon the fact that Jesus did not go up to Jerusalem *save on occasion of a feast* (Luthardt, Lichtenstein); indeed, the giving of the name *after Ἰουδαίων* (comp. vii. 2) would in no way have interfered with that imaginary design. It is objected

¹ If *this feast itself* is taken to be the Passover, we are obliged, with the most glaring arbitrariness, to put a *spatium vacuum* of a year between it and the Passover of vi. 4, of which, however, John (vi. 1-4) has not given the slightest hint. On the contrary, he lets his narrative present the most uninterrupted sequence. Hengstenberg judges, indeed, that the gap can appear strange only to those who do not rightly discern the relation in which John stands to the Synoptics. But this is nothing more than the dictum of harmonistic presuppositions.

that the feast of *Purim*, which was not a temple feast, required no journey to Jerusalem (see especially Hengstenberg, *Christol.* III. p. 187 f., Lücke, de Wette, Brückner); and the high esteem in which it is held in *Gem. Hier. Megill.* i. 8 cannot be shown to refer to the time of Jesus. But might not Jesus, even without any legal obligation, have availed Himself of this feast as an occasion for His further labours in Jerusalem? And are we to suppose that the character of the feast—a feast for eating and drinking merely—should *hinder Him from going* to Jerusalem? The *Sabbath* (ver. 9), on which apparently (but see Wieseler, p. 219) the feast could never occur, may have been before or after it; and, lastly, what is related of Jesus (vi. 1 ff.) between this festival and the Passover, only a month afterwards, may easily have occurred within the space of that month. In fine, it can neither have been the *Passover* (Cod. A., Irenaeus, Eusebius' *Chron.*, Rupertus, Luther, Calovius, Grotius, Jansen, Scaliger, Cornelius a Lapide, Lightfoot, Lampe, Paulus, Kuinoel, Süsskind, Klee, Neander, Ammon, Hengstenberg), nor *Pentecost* (Cyril, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, Erasmus, Melancthon, Beza, Calvin, Maldonatus, Bengel), nor *the feast of Tabernacles* (Cod. 131, Cocceius, Ebrard, Ewald, Hilgenfeld, Lichtenstein, Krafft, Riggenbach), nor *the feast of the Dedication* (a possible surmise of Keppler and Petavius); nor can we acquiesce in leaving the feast *undeterminable* (Lücke, de Wette, Luthardt, Tholuck, Brückner. Baumgarten Crusius hesitates between Purim and the Passover, yet inclines rather to the latter).

Vv. 2, 3. "Εστὶ] is all the less opposed to the composition of the Gospel *after* the destruction of Jerusalem, as what is mentioned is a *bath*, whose surroundings might very naturally be *represented* as still existing. According to Ewald, the charitable uses for which the building served might have *saved it* from destruction. Comp. Tobler, *Denkblätt.* p. 53 ff., who says that the porches were still pointed out in the fifth century. — ἐπὶ τῇ προβατικῇ] is usually explained by πύλη supplied: *hard by the sheep-gate*; see on iv. 6. Concerning the צֶמֶח הַצֵּיטֹן, Neh. iii. 1, 32, xii. 39, so called perhaps because sheep for sacrifice were sold there, or brought in there

at the Passover, nothing further is known. It lay north east of the city, and near the temple. Still the word supplied, "gate," cannot be shown to have been in use; nor could it have been self-evident, especially to Gentile Christian readers, not minutely acquainted with the localities. I prefer, therefore, following Theodore of Mopsuestia, Ammonius, Nonnus, to join *κολυμβ.* with *προβατικῇ*, and, with Elz. 1633 and Wetstein, to read *κολυμβήθρα* as a dative (comp. already Castalio): "*Now there is in Jerusalem, at the sheep-pool, [a place called] Bethesda, so called in the Hebrew tongue.*" According to Ammonius, the sheep used for sacrifice were washed in the sheep-pool.—*ἐπιλεγ.*] "*this additional name being given to it.*" On *ἐπιλέγειν*, elsewhere usually in the sense of selecting, see Plat. *Legg.* iii. p. 700 B. The pool was called *Bethesda*, a characteristic surname which had supplanted some other original name.—*Βηθεσδα*] *בִּתְּשָׁדָא*, *locus benignitatis*, variously written in Codd. (Tisch., following *κ.* 33, *Βεθζαθά*), not occurring elsewhere, not even in Josephus; not "*house of pillars*," as Delitzsch supposes. It is impossible to decide with certainty which of the present pools may have been that of Bethesda.¹ See Robinson, II. 136 f., 158 f. To derive the healing virtue of the (according to Eusebius) red-coloured water, which perhaps was *mineral*, as Eusebius does, from the blood of the sacrifices flowing down from the temple, and the name from *בִּתְּשָׁדָא*, *effusio* (Calvin, Aretius, Bochart, Michaelis), is unwarranted, and contrary to ver. 7. The *five porches* served

¹ *Probably* it was the present ebbing and flowing "*Fountain of the Virgin Mary*," an intermittent spring called by the inhabitants "*Mother of Steps*." See Robinson, II. 148 f. According to Wieseler, *Synopse*, p. 260, it may have been the pool *Ἀμύγδαλον* mentioned in Josephus, *Antt.* v. 11. 4, as was already supposed by Lampe and several others, against which, however, the difference of name is a difficulty; it has no claim to be received on the ground of etymology, but only of similarity of sound. Ritter, *Erdk.* XVI. pp. 329, 443 ff., describes the pool as now choked up, while Kraft, in his *Topogr.* p. 176, thinks it was the *Struthion* of Josephus. It certainly was not the ditch, now pointed out by tradition as Bethesda, at the north of the temple wall. See also Tobler as before, who doubts the possibility of discovering the pool. As to the meaning of the name (*House of Mercy*), it is possible that the arrangement for the purposes of a bath together with the porches was intended as a *charitable foundation* (Olshausen, Ewald), or that the divine favour, whose effects were here manifested, gave rise to the name. This latter is the more probable, and perhaps gave occasion to the legend of the Angel in the Received Text.

as a shelter for the sick, who are *specially* described as τυφλῶν, etc., and those afflicted with diseases of the nerves and muscles. On ξηρῶν, "persons with withered and emaciated limbs," comp. Matt. xii. 10; Mark iii. 1; Luke vi. 6, 8. Whether the sick man of ver. 5 was one of them or of the χωλοῖς is not stated.

Ver. 5. Τριάκοντα, κ.τ.λ.] *i.e.* "having passed thirty-eight years in his sickness," so that ἔχων belongs to τρ. κ. ὀκτὼ ἔτη (viii. 57, xi. 17; Josephus, *Arch.* vii. 11. 1; Krebs, p. 150), and ἐν τ. ἀσθ. αὐτ. denotes the state in which he spent the thirty-eight years. Against the connection of ἔχων with ἐν τ. ἀσθ. ἀ. (*being in his sickness* thirty-eight years; so Kuinoel and most others) ver. 6 is decisive, as also against the perversion of Paulus, who puts a comma after ἔχων ("thirty-eight years old"). The *duration* of the sickness makes the miracle all the more striking; comp. Luke viii. 43. There is no intimation of any reference to the sentence of death pronounced upon Israel in the wilderness (Baumgarten, p. 139 f.; comp. Hengstenberg).

Vv. 6, 7. Τοῦτον . . . ἔχει] two points which excited the compassion of Jesus, where γνούς, however (as in iv. 1), does not denote a *supernatural* knowledge of this external (otherwise in ver. 14) and easily known or ascertained fact (against Godet and the early expositors). — ἔχει] *i.e.* ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ, ver. 5. — θέλεις, κ.τ.λ.] *Wilt thou become whole?* The *self-evident* nature of this desire made the question an appropriate one to rouse the sufferer's *attention* and *expectation*, and this was the object Jesus had in view in order to the commencement of His miraculous work. *This* question was inappropriate for the purpose (de Wette thinks) of merely *beginning a conversation upon the subject*. Paulus falsely supposes that the man might have been a dishonest beggar, *feigning* sickness, and that Jesus asks him with reproving emphasis, "*Wilt thou be made whole? art thou in earnest?*" So, too, Ammon; while Lange regards him as simply *languid in will*, and that Christ again roused his *dormant* will; but there is nothing of this in the text, and just as little of Luthardt's notion, that the question was meant for all the people of whom the sick man is supposed to be the type. *This* miracle alone furnishes an example of an *unsolicited interrogation* upon Christ's part (a

feature which Weisse urges against it); but in the case of the man born blind, chap. ix., we have also an unsolicited *healing*. — ἀνθρώπον οὐκ ἔχω] *ad morbum accedebat inopia*, Grotius; ἄνθρ. emphatically takes the lead; the ἔρχομαι ἐγὼ that follows answers to it. — ὅταν ταραχθῇ τὸ ὕδωρ] The occasional and intermittent disturbance of the water is not to be understood as a *regular* occurrence, but as something *sudden* and *quickly passing away*. Hence the man's waiting and complaint. — βάλῃ] *throw*, denoting a *hasty* conveyance before the momentary bubbling was over. — ἔρχομαι] he therefore was obliged to help himself along, but slowly. — ἄλλος πρὸ ἐμοῦ] so that the place where the bubbling appeared was occupied by another. Observe the *sing.*; the short bubbling is to be regarded as occurring only in *one fixed springing-point* in the pool, so that *one* person only could let it exert its influence upon him. The apocryphal ver. 4 has perverted this circumstance, in conformity with a popular superstition, which probably reaches as far back as the time of Christ.

Vv. 8, 9. Comp. Matt. ix. 6; Mark ii. 9, 11. — περιπάτει] *walk, go*; hitherto he had lain down there, ver. 6. The command implies the man's *faith*, which had been recognised by Christ. — καὶ ἤρε] simply and emphatically told in the very words which Jesus had spoken.—Some (Strauss) quite arbitrarily regard this story as a legendary exaggeration of the healing of the paralytic in the Synoptics (Matt. ix.; Mark ii.); time, place, circumstances, and what ensues, especially its essential connection with the healing on the Sabbath-day, are all original and independent, as is also the whole account, so full of life and psychologically true, and very different from that in the Synoptics. Notwithstanding, Baur again (p. 243 ff.) would make the story in John a composition out of synoptical materials, appealing especially to Mark ii. 9, 10; and Hilgenfeld, *Evang.* 269 f., adopts the same course, finding the "inner peculiarity" of the narrative in the idea that the omnipotence of the Logos cannot be controlled by any earthly law or human custom; whilst Weisse (*Evangelienfr.* 268) sees in the man's lameness the helplessness of one *morally* sick, and attributes the origin of the entire narrative to what was originally a *parable*. Thus they *themselves* complete the

fiction, and then pass it off on the *evangelist*, while the simplest as well as the most distinctive and characteristic historical features are now interwoven into his supposed plans. See, on the contrary, Brückner, *in loc.*

Vv. 10-13. *Οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι*] The *Sanhedrim* are here meant; see vv. 15, 33. They never once mention the *healing*; with hostile coldness they only watch for their point of attack; "Quaerunt non quod mirentur, sed quod calumnientur," Grotius.—*ὁ ποιήσας*, etc., and *ἐκεῖνος* are in the mouth of the man who was healed an appeal to the *authority* which, as a matter of fact, his Saviour must possess; there is something *defiant* in the words, so natural in the first realization of his wonderful cure.—*ὁ ἄνθρωπος*] contemptuous. Ast, *Lex. Plat.* I. p. 178.—*ἐξένευσεν*] *He withdrew* (see Dorvill. *ad Char.* p. 273; Schleusner, *Thess.* II. 293), *i.e.* when this encounter with the Jews began. As He wished to avoid the scene which would occur with the crowd who were in the place, He conveyed Himself away (not *pluperfect*).

Vv. 14, 15. *Μετὰ ταῦτα*] whether or not on the same day does not appear. But it is psychologically probable that the new feeling of restored health led the man at once into the sanctuary.—*μηκέτι ἁμάρτ.*] Jesus therefore knew (by direct intuition) that the sickness of this sufferer had been brought about (see on Matt. ix. 2, 3) by special *sin* (of what *kind* does not appear); and this *particular* form of sin is what He refers to, not generally to the universal connection between sin and physical evil (Neander, following the early expositors), or between sin and sickness (Hengstenberg), which would not be in keeping with the character of this private interview, the design of which was the good of the man's soul. The man's own *conscience* would necessarily give an *individual* application to the *μηκέτι ἁμάρτ.* Comp. viii. 11.—*χεῖρον*] to be left indefinite; for if the *ἁμαρτάνειν* recurred, it might bring with it a worse sickness (so Nonnus), and other divine punishment, even the loss of eternal salvation. See generally Matt. xii. 45; 2 Pet. ii. 20.—Ver. 15. *ἀνήγγειλε, κ.τ.λ.*] The motive was neither *malice* (Schleiermacher, Paulus, comp. Ammon), nor *gratitude*, to bring Jesus into notice and recognition among the Jews (Cyril, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euthymius

Zigabenus, Grotius, and many early writers; also Maier and Hengstenberg), nor *obedience to the rulers* (Bengel, Lücke, de Wette, Luthardt), under the influence of stupidity (Tholuck) or fear (Lange), but, in keeping with ver. 11, and the designation $\delta \text{ ποιήσας αὐτὸν ὑγιῇ}$ (comp. ver. 11): the *supplementary vindication of the authority* in obedience to which he had acted, though it was the Sabbath (vv. 9, 10), and which he was unable to name to the Jews. This authority is with him decidedly higher than that of the Sanhedrim; and he not only employs it for his own acquittal, but even *defies* them with it. Comp. the man born blind, ix. 17, 31 ff. But for this purpose how easily could he ascertain the *name* of Jesus!

Vv. 16, 17. $\Delta\iota\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$] on account of this notice referring to Jesus, and then $\delta\tau\iota$, because *He* that is. See on x. 17. — $\acute{\epsilon}\delta\acute{\iota}\omega\kappa\epsilon$] not *judicially*, by means of the law (Lampe, Rosenmüller, Kuinoel), of which the sequel says nothing, but in a *general* way: they made Him the object of their persecutions. — $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$] *these things*, such as the healing of the paralytic. — $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\iota$] *he did*, not $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu$. — $\acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron$] The means by which He met the $\delta\acute{\iota}\omega\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$ of the Jews, whether that then showed itself in accusations, reproaches, machinations, or otherwise in overt acts of hostility. *This Aorist* occurs in John only here, ver. 19, and xii. 23. — $\delta\ \pi\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\ \mu\omicron\upsilon, \kappa\tau\lambda$] *My Father is working even to this moment; I also work*. This expression is not borrowed from *Philo* (Strauss); Jesus alludes to the unresting activity of God for human salvation¹ since the creation was finished, notwithstanding the divine rest of the Sabbath (Gen. ii. 1–3) observed after the six days'

¹ Jesus accordingly does not deny that God rested on the seventh day after the six days of creation (against Ammon); but He affirms that since then He is ever active, even on the Sabbath-days, for man's redemption. Nor does He speak of the law concerning the Sabbath as not of divine institution (Baur), as of no obligation, or as abrogated; but *He* as the *Son* stands *above* it, and is as little bound by it as the Father, who ever continues to work, even on the Sabbath. This against Hilgenfeld (*Lehrbegriff*, p. 81; *Evangelium*, p. 270; and in his *Zeitschrift* 1863, p. 218), who considers that, according to this Gospel, Jesus, passing by the O. T. representation of God, rises to the absolutely transcendental essence, exalted above all contact with the finite, and manifest only to the Son; and that the evangelist, following the Gnostics, refers the history of the creation to the Demiurge, as distinct from the most high God. This is not the "eagle height" of John's theology.

work. This distinct reference (not generally "to the sustaining and government of the world") is presented in the activity of Christ answering to that of God the Father. "As the *Father*," that is, says Jesus, has not ceased from the beginning to work for the world's salvation, but ever works on even to the present moment,¹ so of necessity and right, notwithstanding the law of the Sabbath, does *He* also, *the Son*, who as such (by virtue of His essentially divine relationship of equality with the Father) cannot in this His activity be subject to the sabbatical law, but is *Lord* of the Sabbath (comp. Matt. xii. 8; Mark ii. 28). Olshausen and de Wette import this in the words: "As in God rest and action are united, so in Christ are contemplation and activity." But there is no mention of rest and contemplation. According to Godet, Jesus says, "*Jusqu'à chaque dernier moment où mon père agit, j'agis aussi*;" the Son can only cease His work when He sees the Father cease. But in this case we should have simply *ἕως* (ix. 4), and not *ἕως ἄρτι*; *ἕως ἄρτι* means nothing more nor less than *usque adhuc* (ii. 10, xvi. 24; 1 John ii. 9), the *now* limiting it still more distinctly than *ἕως τοῦ νῦν* (Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* pp. 19, 20). — *καὶ γὰρ ἐργάζομαι*] is not to be again supplemented by *ἕως ἄρτι*. *I also* (do not rest, but) *work*. The relation of both sentences is not that of *imitation* (Grotius), nor of *example* (Ewald), but of *necessary equality* of will and procedure. The *asyndeton* (instead of "because my Father," etc.) makes the statement all the more striking. See on 1 Cor. x. 17.

Ver. 18. *Διὰ τοῦτο*] because He said this, and *ὅτι* as in ver. 16. "Apologiam ipsam in majus crimen vertunt," Bengel. — *μᾶλλον*] neither *potius* nor *amplius* (Bengel: "modo per-

¹ *ἕως ἄρτι* carries our view of God's working, which began with the creation, onwards to the present moment, the moment wherein Jesus has to defend Himself on account of Sabbath-breaking. In conformity with this redemptive work of God the Father onwards until now, and which was interrupted by no rest, *He* also works. The inference that herein is implied a divine *rest* at a *future* period, as Luthardt thinks,—who regards the day of Christ's resurrection as the then approaching Sabbath of God's redemptive work,—is quite remote from the text. "*ἕως ἄρτι*" includes the survey of the entire past down to the moment then present, without any intimation of a change in the future, which, if intended, should appear in the context, as in xvi. 24.

sequebantur, nunc amplius quaerunt occidere"); but, as according to its position it necessarily belongs to ἐξήτ., *magis*, "*they redoubled their endeavours.*" It has a reference to ἐδίωκον in ver. 16, so far as this general expression includes the desire to kill. Comp. for the ζητεῖν ἀποκτεῖναι, vii. 1, 19, 25, viii. 37, 40, xi. 53. — πατέρα ἰδίου, κ.τ.λ.] *patrem proprium*. Comp. Rom. viii. 32. They *rightly* interpreted ὁ πατήρ μου as signifying *peculiar* and *personal* fatherhood, and not what is true also with reference to others, "*sed id misere pro blasphemia habuerunt,*" Bengel. Comp. x. 33. — ἴσον ἑαυτὸν, κ.τ.λ.] not an explanation, nor exactly (B. Crusius) a proof of what precedes, which the words themselves of Jesus, ὁ πατήρ μου, supply; but what Jesus says of *God's* relation to *Him* (πατέρα ἰδίου), declares at the same time, as to the other side of the relationship, what He makes *Himself out to be* in *His* relation to God. We must translate: "*since He* (at the same time) *puts Himself on the same level with God,*" i.e. by that κἀγὼ ἐργάζομαι of ver. 17, wherein He, as the Son, claims for Himself equality of right and freedom with the Father. Comp. also Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, I. p. 133. The thought of claiming equality of *essence* (Phil. ii. 6), however, lies in the background as an indistinct notion in the minds of His opponents.

Ver. 19 ff. Jesus does not deny what the Jews attributed to Him as the capital offence of blasphemous presumption, namely, *that He made Himself equal with God*; but He puts the whole matter in its true light, and this from a consideration of His whole present and future work, onward to ver. 30; whereupon, onwards to ver. 47, He gives vent to an earnest denunciation of the unbelief of the Jews in the divine witness to Himself.

Ver. 19. Οὐ δύναται] denies the possibility, on account of an *inner* necessity, involved in the relationship of the Son to the Father, by virtue of which it would be *impossible* for Him to act with an individual *self-assertion* independent of the Father, which He could then only do if He were not the Son. Comp. Bengel, *in loc.*, and Fritzsche, *nova opusc.* p. 297 f. In ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ, as the subject of the reflexive is the Son in His relation to the Father, there does not lie any opposition between the human and divine wills (Beyschlag), nor an indistinct and onesided reference to the human element in Christ

(de Wette); but it is *the whole subject, the God-man, the incarnate Logos*, in whom the *Aseitas agendi*, the self-determination of action independently of the Father, cannot find place; because otherwise He must either be divine only, and therefore without the subordination involved in the economy of redemption (which is the case also with the πνεῦμα, xvi. 13), or else simply human; therefore there is no contradiction between what is here said and the prologue (Reuss; comp. on the other side, Godet). — ἐὰν μὴ τι, κ.τ.λ.] refers simply to ποιεῖν οὐδέν, and not also to ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ. See on Matt. xii. 4; Gal. ii. 16. — βλέπῃ τ. πατ. ποιοῦντα] a familiar description, borrowed from the attention which children give to the conduct of their father—of the inner and immediate intuition which the Son perpetually has of the Father's work, in the perfect consciousness of fellowship of life with Him. This relation, which is not only religious and moral, but founded on a transcendental basis, is the necessary and immediate standard of the Son's working. See on ver. 20. — ἀ γὰρ ἀν ἐκεῖνος, κ.τ.λ.] Proof of the negative assertion by means of the *positive* relationship subsisting. — ὁμοίως] *equally, proportionately*, qualifying ποιεῖ, indicating again the reciprocity or sameness of action already expressed by ταῦτα, and thus more strongly confirming the perfect equality of the relationship. It is, logically speaking, the *pariter* (Mark iv. 16; John xxi. 13; 1 Pet. iii. 1) of the *category mentioned*.

Ver. 20. Moral necessity in God for the aforesaid ἀ γὰρ ἀν ἐκεῖνος, etc. Comp. iii. 35. — γὰρ refers to the whole of what follows down to ποιεῖ, of which καὶ μέλζονα, etc., gives the result. — φιλεῖ] “*qui amat, nil celat*,” Bengel. The distinction between this and ἀγαπᾷ (which D., Origen, Chrysostom here read), *diligit* (see Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 50), is to be retained even in John, though he uses both to denote the same relationship, but with varying definiteness of representation. Comp. iii. 35, xxi. 15. Φιλεῖν is always the proper *affection* of love. Comp. xi. 3, 36, xvi. 27, xx. 2, *et al.* But this love has its basis in the metaphysical and eternal relation of the Father to the Son, as His μονογενὴς υἱός (i. 14, 18), and does not first begin in time. Comp. Luthardt. — πάντα δείκνυσιν] *He shows Him all*, permits Him to see in imme-

diate self-revelation all *that He Himself doeth*, that the Son also may do these things after the pattern of the Father. Description of the inner and essential *intimacy* of the Father with the Son, according to which, and indeed by virtue of His love to the Son, He makes all His own working an object of intuition to the Son for His like working (comp. ver. 17),—the humanly conditioned continuation of what He had seen in His pre-human existence, iii. 11, vi. 46.¹—*καὶ μείζονα, κ.τ.λ.*] a new sentence, and an advance in the discourse, the theme of all that follows down to ver. 30: *and greater works than these* (the healings of the sick spoken of) *will He show Him*; He will give Him His example to do them also.—*ἵνα*] the divine purpose of this,—not in the sense of *ὥστε* (Baeumlein).—*ὑμῖν*] *ye unbelievers*. Jesus does not say *πιστεύητε*; He means the *surprise of shame*, viz. at the sight² of His works.

Ver. 21. Jesus now specifies these *μείζονα ἔργα*, namely, the quickening of the dead, and judgment (vv. 21–30); *ἔργα* accordingly is a broader conception than miracle, which, however, is included in the category of the Messianic *ἔργα*. See especially ver. 36.

Ver. 21. He speaks of the operation of His power in judging and raising the dead, first *in an ethical sense* down to ver. 27, and then, vv. 28, 29, subjoins the *actual and universal* awakening of the dead as the completion of His entire life-giving and judicial work as the Messiah. Augustine anticipated this view (though illogically apprehending ver. 21 in a moral sense, and ver. 22 in a physical), and it is adopted among the older writers, especially by Rupertius, Calvin, Jansen, Calovius, Lampe, and more recently by Lücke, Tholuck, Olshausen, Maier, de Wette, Lange, Hilgenfeld, Lechler, *Apost. Zeitalt.* p. 225 f., Weiss, Godet. Others have

¹ This intimate relationship is to be regarded as one of *uninterrupted continuity*, and not to be limited merely to occasional crises in the life of Jesus (Gess, *Pers. Chr.* p. 237), of which there is not the slightest indication in John's Gospel. Comp. i. 52. This very *continuous* consciousness depends upon the continuance of the *Logos* consciousness (viii. 29, 59, xvii. 5, xvi. 32),—a view which is to be maintained against Weizsäcker, who introduces even *visions* (*evang. Gesch.* p. 435) in explanation of this passage, in the face of the known history of Jesus.

² For the astonishment connected with the *θεῖα δόξα*, is implied in the context. See Nägelsbach, *z. Ilias*, p. 200, ed. 3.

extended the ethical interpretation even as far as vv. 28, 29 (so Deysing in the *Bibl. Brem.* i. 6, Eckermann, Ammon, and many others; recently, Schweizer, B. Crusius, Reuss), which, however, is forbidden by the language and contents of vv. 28, 29; see on vv. 28, 29. Further, when Luthardt (comp. Tholuck on vv. 21-23, and Hengstenberg on vv. 21-24, also Brückner on ver. 21) understands ζωοποιεῖν generally of the impartation of life, he must take *both* kinds of quickening as the two *sides* of the ζωή, which appears quite irreconcilable with the right understanding of οὗς θέλει, and with the distinct separation between the present and the future (the latter from ver. 28 onwards). The ζωοποιεῖν of the Messiah during His *temporal* working concerns the *morally* dead, of whom He morally quickens whom He will; but *at a future day*, at the end of all things, He will call forth the *physically* dead from their graves, etc., vv. 28, 29. The carrying out of the double meaning of ζωοποιεῖν onwards to ver. 28 (for vv. 28, 29 even Luthardt himself takes as referring only to the *final* future) leads to confusion and forced interpretation (see on οἱ ἀκούσαντες, ver. 25). Further, most of the Fathers (Tertullian, Chrysostom and his followers, Nonnus, and others), most of the older expositors (Erasmus, Beza, Grotius, Bengel, and many others), and recently Schott in particular (*Opusc.* i. p. 197), Kuinoel, Baumeister (in the *Würtemb. Stud.* II. 1), Weizel (in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1836, p. 636), Kaeuffer, *de ζωῆς αἰών not.* p. 115 ff., also Baeumlein and Ewald, have taken the entire passage vv. 21-29 in a *literal* sense, as referring to the resurrection and the final judgment. Against this it is decisive: (a) that ἵνα ὑμεῖς θαυμάζητε in ver. 20 represents the hearers as continuous witnesses of the works referred to, and these works, therefore, as successive developments which they will see along with others; (b) that οὗς θέλει is in keeping only with the ethical reference; (c) that ἵνα πάντες τιμῶσι, etc., ver. 23, expresses a continuing result, taking place in the present (in the αἰὼν οὗτος), and as divinely intended; (d) that in ver. 24, ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου cannot be explained of physical death; (e) that in ver. 25, καὶ νῦν ἐστὶν and οἱ ἀκούσαντες are compatible only with reference to spiritual awakening. To this may be added, (f) that Jesus, where He speaks (vv. 28.

29) of the literally dead, very distinctly marks out the resurrection of these latter from that of the preceding as something greater and as still future, and designates the dead not merely with great definiteness *as such* (πάντες οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις), but also makes their ἀνάστασις ζωῆς conditional, not, as in ver. 24, upon *faith*, but, probably seeing that they for the most part would never have heard the gospel, upon *having done good*,—thus characteristically distinguishing *this* quickening of the dead from that spoken of immediately before. — ὥσπερ . . . ζωοποιεῖ] The awakening and reviving of the dead is represented as the essential and peculiar business of the Father (Deut. xxxii. 39; 1 Sam. ii. 6; Tobit xiii. 2; Wisd. xvi. 13); accordingly the *Present* tense is used, because the statement is *general*. Comp. Rom. iv. 17. Observe, however, that Jesus here speaks of the awakening of the dead, which is peculiar to the *Father*, without making any distinction between the spiritual and literal dead; this separation first appears in the following reference to the *Son*. The awakening of *both* springs from the same divine source and basis of life. — ἐγείρει and ζωοποιεῖ we might expect in reverse order (as in Eph. ii. 5, 6); but the ζωοποιεῖν is the key-note, which resounds through all that follows, and accordingly the matter is regarded in accordance with the popular view, so that the making alive begins with the awakening, which therefore appears as the immediate antecedent of the ζωοποιεῖν, and is not again specially named in the apodosis. — οὗς θέλει] for He will *not* quicken others because they *believe* not (ver. 24); this, and not an absolute decree (Calvin, Reuss), is the *moral* condition of His self-determination, just as also His κρίσις (ver. 22) is in like manner morally determined. That this spiritual resurrection is *independent of the descent from Abraham*, is self-evident from the fact of its being spiritual; but this must not be taken as actually *stated* in the οὗς θέλει. Many, who take ζωοποιεῖ *literally*, resort to the historical accounts of the raising of individuals from the dead (Lazarus, etc.), for which few cases the οὗς θέλει is neither appropriate nor adequate. See, besides, ver. 25. Ewald takes *God* as the subject of θέλει, which is neither logical (on account of the καὶ, which places

both subjects in the same line), nor possible according to the plain words, though it is self-evident that the Son acts only in the harmony of His will with that of the Father; comp. ver. 30, vi. 40. — ζωοποιεῖ] ethically, of the spiritual quickening to the higher moral ζωή, instead of that moral death in which they were held captive when in the unconverted state of darkness and sin. See on Luke xv. 24; Matt. iv. 16; Eph. v. 14; Rom. vi. 13; Isa. xxvi. 19. Without this ζωοποίησις, their life would remain ethically a ζωὴ ἄβιος (Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* VII. p. 152), βίος ἀβίωτος (Xen. *Mem.* iv. 8. 8). The *Present*, for He does it *now*, and is *occupied* with this ζωοποιεῖν, that is, by means of His *word*, which is the life-giving call (vv. 24, 25). The *Future* follows in ver. 28.

Ver. 22 does not state the ground of the Son's call to bestow life (Luthardt, comp. Tholuck and Hengstenberg), but is a justification of the οὗς θέλει,—because the κρίσις refers only to those whom He will not raise to life,—in so far as it is implied that the *others*, whom the Son will *not* make alive, will experience in themselves the *judgment of rejection* (the anticipatory analogon of the decisive judgment at the second advent, ver. 29). It is given to no other than the *Son* to execute this final judgment. The κρίνει οὐδένα should have prevented the substitution of the idea of *separation* for that of *judgment* (comp. iii. 17, 18). — οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁ π.] *for not even the Father*, to whom, however, by universal acknowledgment, judgment belongs.¹ Consequently it depends only upon the *Son*, and the οὗς θέλει has its vindication. Concerning οὐδέ, which is for the most part neglected by commentators, comp. vii. 5, viii. 42, xxi. 25. The antithesis ἀλλὰ, κ.τ.λ., tells *how far*, though God is the world's Judge, the Father does not judge, etc. — κρίνει] *the judgment of condemnation* (iii. 17, 18, v. 24, 27, 29), whose sentence is the opposite of ζωοποιεῖν, the sentence of spiritual death. — τὴν κρίσιν πᾶσαν] *judgment altogether* (here also to be understood on its *condemnatory* side), therefore not only of the last act on the day of judgment (ver. 27), but of its *entirety* (see on xvi. 13), and consequently in its progress in time, whereby the οὗς θέλει is decided.

¹ Weiss, *Lehrbegr.* p. 185, explains it as if it ran : οὐδὲ γὰρ κρίνει ὁ πατήρ, etc.

Ver. 23. The *divine purpose* which is to be attained in the relation of mankind to this judicial action of the Son. Observe the *Present Subjunctive*. — *καθώς*] for in the Son, who judges, we have the appointed *representative* of the Father, and *thus far* (therefore always relatively, xiv. 23) He is to be honoured *as* the Father. Comp. what follows. How utterly opposed to this divine intention was the procedure of the Jews, ver. 18! It is incorrect, however, to take *καθώς*, as Baeumlein does, as *causal* (see on xiii. 34, xvii. 2), because the whole context turns upon *the equality* of the Father and the Son. — *οὐ τιμᾷ τὸν πατέρα*] *i.e.* in this very respect, that he does not honour the Son, who is the Sent of the Father.

Ver. 24. The οὖς θέλει ζωοποιεῖ now receives—and that, too, with increasing solemnity of discourse—its more minute explanation, both as to the subjects whom it specifies (ὁ τὸν λόγον μου ἀκούων, κ.τ.λ.), and as to the ζωοποίησις itself (ἔχει ζωὴν). — ἀκούων is simply *heareth*, but is closely connected with the following καὶ πιστεύων (comp. Matt. xiii. 19 ff.), and thereby receives its definite reference. For the opposite, see xii. 47. — ἔχει ζ. αἰ.] The ζωοποιεῖν is accomplished in him; he *has* eternal life (iii. 15), *i.e.* the higher spiritual ζωή, which, upon his entrance into the Messiah's kingdom, reaches its consummation in glorious Messianic ζωή. He *has*, in that he is become a believer, *passed from* the spiritual death (see on ver. 21) *into the eternal life* (the ζωὴ κατ' ἐξοχήν), and *cometh not into* (condemnatory, comp. iii. 18) *judgment*, because he has already attained unto that *life*.¹ The result of this is: θάνατον οὐ μὴ θεωρήσῃ, viii. 51. On the Perfect μεταβέβ., see iii. 18; 1 John iii. 14.

Ver. 25. Jesus re-affirms what He had already asserted in ver. 24, but in the more concrete form of allegorical expression. — καὶ νῦν ἐστιν] *i.e.* in its beginning, since Christ's entrance upon His life-giving ministry. Comp. iv. 23. The duration of this ὥρα, however, continues till the second advent;

¹ Melancthon: "Postquam illuxit fides seu fiducia Christi in corde, qua agnoscimus nos vere a Deo recipi, exaudiri, regi, defendi, sequitur pax et laetitia, quae est inchoatio vitae aeternae et tegit peccata, quae adhuc in imbecillitate nostra haerent." Baur is wrong in concluding from such passages (comp. viii. 51, xi. 26) that our evangelist verges closely on the doctrine of the Gnostics, 2 Tim. ii. 18.

already had it begun to be present, but, viewed in its completeness, it still belonged to the future. The expositors who take the words to denote the *literal* resurrection (see ver. 25, even Hengstenberg), refer καὶ νῦν ἐστὶν to the *individual* instances of raising from the dead which Jesus wrought (John xi; Mark v. 41; Luke vii. 14; Matt. xi. 5); but this is as inappropriate in general as it is out of keeping with John's Gospel, for those individuals were not at all awaked to ζωὴ in the sense of the context, but only to the earthly life, which was still liable to death. Olshausen, who illogically explains ver. 25 as referring to the resurrection of the body, appeals to Matt. xxvii. 52, 53. — οἱ νεκροί] the *spiritually* dead; Matt. viii. 22; Rev. iii. 1; and see on ver. 21. — τῆς φωνῆς] according to the context, *the resurrection summons* (ver. 28), which is here *really*, in the connection of the allegory, the morally life-giving *preaching* of Christ. The spiritually dead, *generally*, according to the category οἱ νεκροί, will hear this voice, but all will not *awake* to its call; only οἱ ἀκούσαντες, which therefore cannot be taken in the same sense as ἀκούσονται, but must signify: *those who will have given ear thereto*. Comp. viii. 43, 47. In Latin: "Mortui audient . . . et qui audientes fuerint," etc. It is the ἀκούειν καλοῦντος, Plut. *Sert.* 11, *al.*, ἀκούειν παραγγέλλοντος, and the like, ἀκούειν τοῦ προστάγματος (Polyb. xi. 19. 5). If we understand the words of *bodily* awakening, οἱ ἀκούσαντες with the article is quite *inexplicable*. Chrysostom: φωνῆς ἀκούσαντες ἐπιταττούσης; Grotius: "simul atque audierint." All such renderings, as also the vague explanation of Hengstenberg,¹ would require ἀκούσαντες *merely without* the article;² and ζήσουσιν would, in opposition to the entire context, signify "*to live*" generally, in an indifferent sense. Olshausen, indeed, supplements ἀκούσαντες—which, nevertheless, must of necessity refer to τῆς φωνῆς—by τὸν λόγον from ver. 24: "they who in this life hear the word of God." It is just as impossible to hold, with Luthardt (so far as he would include

¹ The article is said to indicate the inseparable connection between *hearing* and *life*.

² See Eurip. *Hec.* 25, 26, and Pflugk thereon. But οἱ ἀκούσαντες with the article is: *quicunque audiverunt*.

the literal resurrection), that οἱ ἀκούσαντες refers to those "who hear the last call of Jesus differently from others, *i.e.* joyfully receiving it, and therefore attain to life." This is an *imported* meaning, for there is no such modal limitation in the text; but οἱ ἀκούσαντες *alone*, which, so far as it must differ from the general ἀκούσονται, can only designate those who *give ear*, and by this the literal resurrection is *excluded*. For this double meaning of ἀκούειν in one sentence, see Plat. *Legg.* p. 712 B: θεὸν . . . ἐπικαλώμεθα ὁ δὲ ἀκούσειέ τε καὶ ἀκούσας (cum exaudiverit) . . . ἔλθοι, and also the proverbial expression ἀκούοντα μὴ ἀκούειν.

Vv. 26, 27. The life denoted by the aforesaid ζήσουσιν, seeing the subjects of it were *dead*, must be something which is in process of being *imparted* to them,—a life which comes from the Son, the quickener. But He could not impart it if He had not in Himself a divine and independent fountain of life, like the Father, which the Father, the absolutely living One (vi. 57), gave Him when He *sent* Him into the world to accomplish His Messianic work; comp. x. 36. The following ἔδωκεν (ver. 27) should itself have prevented the reference to the eternal generation (Augustine and many others, even Gess). Besides (therefore ver. 27), if only the ἀκούσαντες (comp. οὗς θέλει, ver. 21) are to live, and the other νεκροί not, the Son must have received from the Father the warrant and power of judging and of deciding who are to live and who not. This power is given Him by the Father *because He is the Son of man*; for in His *incarnation*, *i.e.* in the fact that the Son of God (incarnate) is a child of *man* (comp. Phil. ii. 7; Gal. iv. 4; Rom. i. 3, viii. 3), the *essence* of His nature as Redeemer consists, and this consequently is the *reason in the history of redemption* why the Father has equipped Him for the Messianic function of judgment. Had the Son of God not become a child of *man*, He could not have been the fulfiller of the Father's decree of redemption, nor have been entrusted with judicial power. Luthardt (comp. Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 78) says incorrectly: "for God desired to judge the world by means of a *man*," which is a thought much too vague for *this* passage, and is borrowed from Acts xvii. 31. De Wette, with whom Brückner concurs (comp. also Reuss), more

correctly says: "It denotes the *Logos* as a *human manifestation*,¹ and in this lies the reason why He judges, *for the hidden God could not be judge*." But this negative and refined definition of the reason given, "because He is the Son of man," can all the less appropriately be read between the lines, the more it savours of Philonic speculation, and the more current the view of the Deity as a Judge was among the Jews. So, following Augustine, Luther, Castalio, Jansen, and most others, B. Crusius (comp. also Wetstein, who adduces Heb. iv. 15): "because executing judgment requires direct operation upon mankind."² Others (Grotius, Lampe, Kuinoel, Lücke, Olshausen, Maier, Baumlein, Ewald, and most others, now also Tholuck): "*υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* is He who is *announced* in Dan. vii. and in the book of Enoch as *the Messiah*" (see on Matt. viii. 20), where the thought has been set forth successively in various ways; Lücke (so also Baumlein): "because He is the *Messiah*, and judgment essentially belongs to the work of the Messiah" (comp. Ewald). Tholuck comes nearest to the right sense: "because He is become man, *i.e.* is the *Redeemer*, but with this redemption itself the *κρίσις* also is given." Hengstenberg: "as a *reward for taking humanity upon Him*." Against the whole explanation from Dan. vii. 13, however, to which Beyschlag, *Christol.* p. 29, with his explanation of the *ideal* man (the personal standard of divine judgment), adheres, it is decisive that in the N. T. throughout, wherever "Son of man" is used to designate the Messiah, both words *have the article*: *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* (in John i. 52, iii. 13, 14, vi. 27, 52, 62, viii. 28, xii. 23, 34, xiii. 31):

¹ Or the *relative humanity* of Him who is *God's Son*. The expression is therefore different from: "*because He is man*."

² Comp. also Baur in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* 1860, p. 276 ff., and *N. T. Theol.* p. 79 ff.; Holtzmann in the same, 1865, p. 234 f. Akin to this interpretation is that of Weiss, p. 224: "so far as He is a son of man, and can in human form bring near to men the life-giving revelation of God." Even thus, however, what is said to be the point of the reason given has to be supplied. This holds also against Godet, who confounds things that differ: "On one side judgment must proceed from the womb of humanity as an 'homage à Dieu,' and on the other it is entrusted by God's love as a purification of humanity to Him who voluntarily became man." Groos (in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1868, p. 260) substantially agrees with Beyschlag.

υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου without the article¹ occurs in Rev. i. 13, xiv. 14, but it does not express the idea of the Messiah. Thus the prophecy in Daniel does *not* enter into consideration here; but "*son of a human being*" is correlative to "*son of God*" (of the *Father*, vv. 25, 26), although it must frankly be acknowledged that the expression does not necessarily presuppose *birth from a virgin*.² The Peshito, Armenian version, Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, Paulus, connect the words—rightly taking υἱὸς ἀνθρ. to mean *man*—with what follows: "*Marvel not that He is a man.*" This is not in keeping with the context, while τοῦτο witnesses for the ordinary connection. — ζῶν ἑαυτῷ] *in Himself*. "Est emphasis in hoc dicto: vitam habere in sese, i. e. alio modo quam creaturae, angeli et homines," Melancthon. Comp. i. 4, xiv. 6.³ The words καὶ νῦν ἐστιν are certainly decisive against Gess (*Pers. Chr.* p. 301), who ascribes the gift of life by the Father to the Son as referring only to His pre-existent glory and His state of exaltation, which he considers to have been "*suspended*" during the period of His earthly life. The prayer at the grave of Lazarus only proves that Christ exercised the power of life, which was bestowed upon Him as His own, in accordance with the Father's will. See on ver. 21.

Vv. 28-30. *Marvel not at this* (comp. iii. 7), viz. at what I have asserted concerning my life-giving and judicial power;

¹ Weizsäcker (*Unters. üb. d. evang. Gesch.* p. 431) cuts away this objection by the statement, without proof, that υἱὸς ἀνθρ. without the article belongs to the explanatory exposition of the fourth Gospel. Baeumlein and Beyschlag, to account for the absence of the article, content themselves with saying that υἱὸς ἀνθρ. is the predicate, and therefore (comp. Holtzmann) the point would turn on the meaning of the conception. But the *formal* and *unchanging* title, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρ., would not agree with that; and, moreover, in this way the omission only of the first article, and not of the second (τοῦ), would be explained; υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου can only mean *son of a man*. Comp. Barnabas, *Ep.* xii. (Dressel.)

² He who is Son of God is son of a *man*—the latter κατὰ σάρκα, i. 14; the former κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιοσύνης, Rom. ix. 5, i. 3.

³ Quite in opposition to the ἑαυτῷ, Weizsäcker, in the *Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol.* 1857, p. 179, understands the possession of life as brought about "*by transference or communication from the Father.*" Chap. vi. 57 likewise indicates life as an *essential* possession, brought with Him (i. 4) from His pre-existent state in His mission from the Father, and according to the Father's will and appointment, Col. i. 19, ii. 10.

for¹ the last and greatest stage of this my Messianic quickening work (not the work of the λόγος as the absolute ζωή, to whom Baur refers the whole passage, vv. 20 ff.; see, on the contrary, Brückner) is yet to come, namely, the raising of the actually dead out of their graves, and the final judgment.² Against the interpretation of this verse (see on ver. 21) in a *figurative* sense (comp. Isa. xxvi. 19; Ex. xxxvii. 12; Dan. xii. 2), it is decisive that οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις would have to mean *merely* the spiritually dead, which would be quite out of keeping with οἱ τὰ ἀγαθὰ ποιήσαντες. Jesus Himself intimates by the words οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις that He here is passing from the spiritually dead, who thus far have been spoken of, to the *actual* dead. — ὅτι] *argumentum a majori*; the wonder at the *less* disappears before the *greater*, which is declared to be that which is *one day* to be accomplished. We are not to supply, as Luthardt does, the condition of faithful meditation on the latter, for the auditors were unbelieving and hostile; but the far more wonderful fact that is told does away with the wonder which the lesser had aroused, goes beyond it, and, as it were, causes it to disappear. — ἔρχεται ὥρα] Observe that no καὶ νῦν ἐστίν, as in ver. 25, *could* be added here. — πάντες] Here it is as little said that all shall be raised *at the same time*, as in ver. 25 that all the spiritually dead shall be quickened simultaneously. The τῶντα, which Paul distinguishes at the resurrection, 1 Cor. xv. 23, 24, and which are in harmony with the teaching of Judaism and of Christ Himself regarding a twofold resurrection (Bertholdt, *Christol.* pp. 176 ff., 203 ff.; and see on Luke xiv. 14), find room likewise in the ὥρα, which is capable of prophetic extension. — οἱ τὰ ἀγαθὰ ποιήσαντες, κ.τ.λ.] that is, the first resurrection, that of the *just*, who are regarded by Jesus in a purely ethical

¹ Ewald renders ὅτι that: "Marvel not at this, that (as I said in ver. 1) *an hour is coming*," etc. But in ver. 25 the thought and expression are different from our text.

² It is not right, as is already plain from the text and ver. 27, to say that in John the judgment is *always* represented as an *inner* fact (so even Holtzmann, *Judenth. u. Christenth.* p. 422). The saying, "The world's history is the world's judgment," only partially represents John's view; in John the last *day* is not without the last *judgment*, and *this* last judgment is with him the *world-judgment*. See on iii. 18.

aspect, and apart from all national particularism. See on Luke xiv. 14, and comp. John vi. 39. It was far from His object here to dwell upon the necessity of His redemption being appropriated by faith on the part of the dead here spoken of; He gives expression simply to the abstract moral normal condition (comp. Rom. ii. 7, 13; Matt. vii. 21). This necessity, however, whereby they must belong to the οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ (1 Cor. xv. 23; comp. Matt. xxv. 31 sqq.), implies the *descensus Christi ad inferos*. — εἰς ἀνάστ. ζωῆς] they will come forth (from their graves) *into a resurrection of life* (represented as local), *i.e.* to a resurrection, the necessary result of which (comp. Winer, p. 177 [E. T. p. 235]) is *life*, life in the Messiah's kingdom. Comp. 2 Macc. vii. 14: ἀνάστασις εἰς ζωὴν; Dan. xii. 2; Rom. v. 18: δικαίωσις ζωῆς. — κρ[ί]σεως] to which *judgment* pertains, and judgment, according to the context, in a *condemnatory* sense (to eternal death in Gehenna); and accordingly ἀνάστασις ζωῆς does not exclude an act of judgment, which awards the ζωή. — As to the distinction between ποιεῖν and πράττειν, see on iii. 20, 21. Ver. 30 further adds the *guarantee of the rectitude* of this κρίσις, and this expressed in a *general* way, so that Jesus describes His judgment *generally*; hence the *Present*, denoting *continuous* action, and the general introductory statement of ver. 19, οὐ δύναμαι, etc. — καθὼς ἀκούω] *i.e.* from God, who, by virtue of the continual communion and confidence subsisting between Him and Christ, always makes *His* judgment directly and consciously known to Him, in accordance with which Christ gives His verdict. Christ's sentence is simply the declaration of God's judgment consequent upon the continuous self-revelation of God in His consciousness, whereby the ἀκούειν from the Father, which He possessed in His pre-existent state, is continued in time. — ὅτι οὐ ζητῶ, κ.τ.λ.] "I cannot therefore *deviate* from the κρίνειν καθὼς ἀκούω; and my judgment, seeing it is not that of an individual, but divine, *must* be just." — τοῦ πέμψ. με, κ.τ.λ.] as it consequently accords with this my dependence upon God.

Ver. 31. Justification of His witness to Himself from ver. 19 ff., intermingled with denunciation of Jewish unbelief (vv. 31-40), which Jesus continues down to ver. 47. — The

connection is not that Jesus now passes on to the *τιμή* which is due to Him (ver. 23), and demands faith as its true form (Luthardt), for the conception of *τιμή* does not again become prominent; but ἐπειδὴ τοιαῦτα περὶ ἑαυτοῦ μαρτυρήσας ἔγνω τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἐνθυμουμένους ἀντιθεῖναι καὶ εἰπεῖν ὅτι ἐὰν σὺ μαρτυρεῖς περὶ σεαυτοῦ, ἡ μαρτυρία σου οὐκ ἔστιν ἀληθής· οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἑαυτῷ μαρτυρῶν ἀξιόπιστος ἐν ἀνθρώποις δι' ὑποψίαν φιλαυτίας· προέλαβε καὶ εἶπεν ὁ ἐμελλὼν εἰπεῖν ἐκείνοι, Euthymius Zigabenus. Comp. Chrysostom. Thus at the same time is solved the seeming contradiction with viii. 14. — ἐγώ] emphatic: if a *personal witness concerning myself* only, and therefore not an attestation *from another* quarter. Comp. ἄλλος, ver. 32. — οὐκ ἔστιν ἀληθ.] i.e. *formally* speaking, according to the ordinary rule of law (Chetub. f. 23. 2: "testibus de se ipsis non credunt," and see Wetstein). In reality, the relation is different in Christ's case, see viii. 13–16; but He does not insist upon this here, and we must not therefore understand His words, with Baeumlein, as if He said: εἰ ἐγὼ ἐμαρτύρουν . . . οὐκ ἂν ᾔην ἀληθής ἡ μαρτυρία μου. Chap. viii. 54, 55 also, and 1 Cor iv. 15, xiii. 1, Gal. i. 8, are not conceived of in this way.

Ver. 32. *Another is He who bears witness of me.* This is understood either of *John the Baptist* (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Nonnus, Euthymius Zigabenus, Erasmus, Grotius, Paulus, Baumgarten Crusius, de Wette, Ewald) or of *God* (Cyril, Augustine, Bede, Rupertius, Beza, Aretius, Cornelius a Lapide, Calovius, Bengel, Kuinoel, Lücke, Tholuck, Olshausen, Maier, Luthardt, Lange, Hengstenberg, Brückner, Baeumlein, Godet). The latter is the right reference; for Jesus Himself, ver. 34, does not attach importance to John's witness, but rather lays claim, vv. 36, 37, only to the higher, the *divine* witness. — καὶ οἶδα, ὅτι, κ.τ.λ.] not a *feeble* assurance concerning God (de Wette's objection), but all the weightier from its simplicity, to which the very *form* of the expression is adapted (ἡ μαρτυρία, ᾗν μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ), and, moreover, far too solemn for the *Baptist's* testimony. On μαρτυρίαν μαρτυρεῖν, comp. Isa. iii. 11, xii. 25; Plato, *Eryx.* p. 399 B; Dem. 1131. 4.

Vv. 33, 34. "That witness, whose testimony you have

yourselves elicited, *John the Baptist*, I do not accept, because it is a human testimony; I mention him for *your* salvation (not for *my* advantage), because ye have not appreciated him according to his high calling (ver. 35); the witness which I have is *greater*," etc. Ver. 36. — ὑμεῖς] *you, on your part*. — μεμαρτ. τῇ ἀληθ.] i. 19 ff. "All that he said was testimony in favour of the truth; for the state of the case (with reference particularly to what he said of the Messiah) was as he testified." — ἐγὼ δὲ] *but I on my part*. — τὴν μαρτυρίαν] the witness in question, which is to tell for me. This I cannot receive *from any man*. Jesus will not avail Himself of any human witness in this matter; He puts it away from Him. Accordingly, λαμβ. τ. μαρτυρίαν, just as in iii. 11, 32, is to be taken of the *acceptance*, not indeed believing acceptance, but acceptance as *proof*, conformably with the context. Others, unnecessarily deviating from John's usage, "I borrow" (Lücke), "I strive after, or lay hold of" (B. Crusius, comp. Beza, Grotius), "I snatch" (de Wette). — ἵνα ὑμεῖς σωθῇτε] *for your advantage, that you on your part* (in opposition to any personal interest) *may attain to salvation*. They should take to heart the remembrance of the Baptist's testimony (ταῦτα λέγω), and thus be roused to faith, and become partakers of the Messiah's redemption; "*vestra res agitur*," Bengel.

Ver. 35. What a manifestation he was, yet how lightly ye esteemed him! — ἦν and ἦθελ point to a manifestation already past. — ὁ λύχνος] not τὸ φῶς, i. 8, but less; hence φῶς in the second clause is used only predicatively. The *article* denotes the *appointed* lamp which, according to O. T. promise, was to appear, and had appeared in John as the forerunner of the Messiah, whose vocation it was to inform the people of the Messianic salvation (Luke i. 76, 77). The figure of the man who lights the way for the approaching bridegroom (Luthardt) is very remote. Comp. rather the similar image, though not referred to here, of the mission of Elias, Ecclus. xlviii. 1. The comparison with a lamp in similar references was very common (2 Sam. xxi. 17; Rev. xxi. 23; 2 Pet. i. 19). Comp. also Strabo, xiv. p. 642, where Alexander the rhetorician bears the surname ὁ λύχνος. — καιόμενος καὶ φαίνων] is not to be interpreted of two

different properties (burning zeal and light-giving); in the nature of things they go together. A lamp *burns and shines*; this it does of necessity, and thus it is represented. Comp. Luke xii. 35; Rev. iv. 5. — ὑμεῖς δὲ, κ.τ.λ.] striking description of the frivolous worldliness which would gratify its own short-lived excitement and pleasure in this new and grand manifestation, instead of making use of it to obtain saving knowledge, and allowing its full solemnity to operate upon them. The Jews flocked in great crowds to the Baptist (Matt. iii. 5, xi. 7 ff.), as to the messenger of the approaching glorious kingdom of the Messiah; but instead of finding what they *desired* (ἡθελής.), they found all the severity of the spirit of Elias calling to repentance, and how soon was the concourse over! In like manner, the Athenians hoped to find a new and passing *divertissement* when the Apostle Paul came among them. “Johanne utendum erat, non fruendum,” Bengel. — πρὸς ὧραν] τοῦ εὐκολίαν αὐτῶν δεικνύντος ἐστὶ καὶ ὅτι ταχέως αὐτοῦ ἀπεπήδησαν, Chrysostom. Comp. Gal. ii. 5; Philem. 15. The main feature of the perverted desire does not lie in πρὸς ὧραν, which more accurately describes the ἀγαλλ. according to its frivolity, so soon changing into satiety and disgust, but in ἀγαλλ. itself, instead of which μετάνοια should have been the object of their pursuit. — ἐν τῷ φωτὶ αὐτοῦ] *in*, i.e. encompassed by *his light*, the radiance which shone forth from him. Comp. 1 Pet. i. 6; and for χαίρειν ἐν, see on Phil. i. 18.

Ver. 36. Ἐγὼ δὲ] Formal antithesis to ὑμεῖς in ver. 35, and referring back to the ἐγὼ δὲ of ver. 34. — *I have the witness which is greater* (not “the greater witness;” see Kühner, II. § 493. 1) *than John*. τοῦ Ἰωάννου in the sense of τῆς τοῦ Ἰωάν., according to a well-known *comparatio compendiaria*.¹ See on Matt. v. 20. On μείζω, i.e. “*of weightier evidence*,” comp. Isoc. *Archid.* § 32: μαρτυρίαν μείζω καὶ σαφεστέραν. — τὰ ἔργα] not *simply* the *miracles* strictly so called, but *the Messianic works generally*, the several acts of the Messiah’s entire work, the ἔργον of Jesus (iv. 34, xvii. 4). Ἔργα are always *deeds*, not word and teachings (*word* and *work* are distinct conceptions, not only in Scripture, but elsewhere like-

¹ The reading adopted by Lachmann, μίζω (A. B. F. G. M. Δ., Cursives), is nothing else than an error of transcription.

wise; see Lobeck, *Paralip.* pp. 64, 65; Ellendt, *Lcx. Soph.* I. p. 672; Pflugk, *ad Eur. Hec.* 373); but what the word of Jesus effected, spiritual quickening (ver. 20), separation, enlightenment, and so on, and in like manner the resurrection of the dead and judgment (vv. 28, 29), are included in the ἔργα, and constitute His ἔργον as a whole. When *miracles* properly so called are designated by the more general term ἔργα, it is indicated in the context, as in iii. 2, vii. 3, 21, and often. — ἔδωκε] *hath given*, expressing the divine appointment, and bestowment of power. Comp. Homer, *Il.* ε. 428: οὐ τοι, τέκνον ἐμόν, δέδοται πολεμήϊα ἔργα. Comp. ν. 727. — ἵνα τελ. αὐτὰ] Intention of the Father in committing to Him the works: *He was to accomplish them* (comp. iv. 34, xvii. 4), not to leave them undone or only partially accomplished, but fully to carry out the entire task which the works divinely entrusted to Him involved for the attainment of the goal of Messianic salvation. — αὐτὰ τὰ ἔργα] *those very works*, emphatic repetition (Kühner, II. § 632), where, moreover, the homoeoteleuton (the recurrence of the α five times running) must not be regarded as a dissonance (Lobeck, *Paralip.* p. 53). — ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ] ἐγὼ with august self-consciousness. As to *how* they witness, see xiv. 11.

Ver. 37. From the works which testified that He was the Sent of God, He now passes to the *witness of the Sender Himself*; therefore from the *indirect* divine testimony, presented in the works, to the *direct* testimony in the Scriptures. *And the Father Himself, who hath sent me, hath borne witness of me.* The subject, which is placed at the beginning of the sentence, the independence (immediateness) expressed by αὐτός, together with the Perfect μεμαρτ., unite to prove that there is no longer any reference here to the previous testimony, that of the *works*, by which God had borne testimony (against Augustine, Grotius, Maldonatus, Olshausen, Baur, and most others). Quite arbitrary, and in opposition to the account of the baptism given by John, is the view which *others* take, that the divine witness given in *the voice at the baptism*, Matt. iii. 17 (but see rather John i. 33), is here meant (Chrysostom, Rupertius, Jansen, Bengel, Lampe, Paulus, Godet). While Ewald (*Johann. Schr.* I. 216) includes together both the

baptism *and* the works, Hengstenberg adds to these two the witness of *Scripture* likewise; others, again, "*the immediate divine witness in the believer's heart*, by means of which the indirect testimony of the works is first apprehended" (De Wette, B. Crusius, Tholuck), the "drawing" of the Father, vi. 14, comp. vi. 45, viii. 47. But there is not the slightest indication in the text that an outward, perceptible, concrete, and objective witness is meant; nay more, in the face of the following connection (*φωνήν . . . εἶδος*). The only true interpretation in harmony with the context is that which takes it to mean *the witness which God Himself has given in His word, in the Scriptures of the O. T.* (Cyril, Nonnus, Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, Beda, Calvin, Kuinoel, Lücke, Lange, Maier, Luthardt). In the O. T. prophecies, God Himself has lifted up His voice and revealed His form. — οὐτε φωνήν, κ.τ.λ.] Reproach of *want of susceptibility* for this testimony, all the *more emphatic* through the absence of any antithetic particle. *Neither a voice of His have ye ever heard, nor a form of His have ye ever seen.* With respect to what God had *spoken* in the O. T. as a testimony to Christ (*μεμαρτύρ. περὶ ἐμοῦ*), or as to the manner in which, with a like purpose, He had therein given His *self-manifestation* to the spiritual contemplation (He had made known his *δόξα*; comp. *μορφὴ θεοῦ*, Phil. ii. 6),—to the one ye were spiritually *deaf*, to the other ye were spiritually *blind*. As the first cannot, conformably with the context, be taken to mean the revealing voice of God within, vouchsafed to the prophets (De Wette), so neither can the second refer merely to the *Theophanies* (in particular, to the appearances of the *Angel of the Lord*, Hengstenberg) and prophetic *visions*,¹ but to the entire *self-revelation of God in the O. T. generally*, by virtue of which He lets Himself be seen by him who has eyes to see;—a general and broad interpretation, which corresponds with the general nature of the expression, and with its logical relation to *μεμαρτ. π. ἐμοῦ*. The Jews *could* not have heard the *voice at the baptism*, nor *could* they have seen the form of God as the Logos had seen it, i. 18, iii. 13; and for this

¹ Jesus could not reproach His opponents with not having received prophetic revelations, such as Theophanies and Visions, for these were marks of distinction bestowed only on individuals. This also against Weiss, *Lehrbegr.* pp. 104, 105.

reason neither the one meaning nor the other can be found in the words (Ewald). Every interpretation, moreover, is incorrect which finds in them anything but a reproach, because Jesus speaks in the second person, and continues to do so in ver. 38, where the tone of censure is still obvious. We must therefore reject the explanation of B. Crusius: "never hitherto has this immediate revelation of God taken place;" and that of Tholuck: "ye have not received a more direct revelation than did Moses and his coteremporaries (Num. xii. 8; Deut. iv. 15, v. 24), but ye have not received within you the witness of the revelation in the word,"—an artificial connecting of ver. 37 with ver. 38, which the words forbid. Paulus and Kuinoel (comp. Euthymius Zigabenus) likewise erroneously say that "Jesus here *concedes*, in some degree, to the Jews what they had themselves wished to urge *in objection*, viz. that they had heard no divine voice, etc. Comp. Ebrard (in Olshausen), who imports the idea of irony into the passage.

Ver. 38. At the end of ver. 37 we must place only a comma. John might have continued: οὐτε τὸν λόγον, κ.τ.λ.; instead of which he attaches the negation not to the particle, but to the verb (οὐτε . . . καὶ, see on iv. 11), and thus the new thought comes in more independently: *And ye have not His word abiding in you*; ye lack an inner and permanent appropriation of it; comp. 1 John ii. 14. The λόγος θεοῦ is not "the inner revelation of God in the conscience" (Olshausen, Frommann), but, conformably with the context (vv. 37, 39), *what God has spoken in the O. T.*, and this according to its *purport*. Had they given ear to this as, what it is in truth, the word of God (but they had no ear for God's voice, ver. 37), had they discerned therein God's manifestation of Himself (but they had no eye for God's form, ver. 37), what God had spoken would have penetrated through the spiritual ear and eye into the heart, and *would have become the abiding power of their inner life*. — ὅτι ὃν ἀπέστειλεν, κ.τ.λ.] demonstration of the fact. He who rejects the *sent* of God cannot have that *word* abiding in him, which witnesses to Him who is sent (ver. 37). "Quomodo mandata regis discet qui legatum excludit?" Grotius. — τούτῳ ὑμεῖς] observe the emphasis in the position of the words here.

Vv. 39, 40 bring out to view the complete *perversity* of *this unbelief*. "The Scriptures testify of me, as the Mediator of eternal life; he, therefore, who searches the Scriptures, because in them he thinks he has eternal life, will by that witness be referred to me; ye search the Scriptures, because, etc., and yet refuse to follow me according to their guidance." How inconsistent and self-contradictory is this! That ἐρευνᾶτε is *Indicative* (Cyril, Erasmus, Casaubon, Beza, Bengel, and many moderns, also Kuinoel, Lücke, Olshausen, Klee, De Wette, Maier, Hilgenfeld, Brückner, Godet), and not *Imperative* (Chrysostom, Augustine, Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, Luther, Calvin, Aretius, Maldonatus, Cornelius a Lapide, Grotius, Calovius, Wolf, Wetstein, Paulus, B. Crusius, Tholuck, Hofmann, Luthardt, Baeumlein, Ewald, Hengstenberg, arguing from Isa. xxxiv. 16), is thus clear from the context, in which the Imperative would introduce a foreign element, especially out of keeping with the correlative καὶ οὐ θέλετε. Comp. also Lechler in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1854, p. 795. The *searching of the Scriptures* might certainly be attributed to the Jews, comp. vii. 52 (against B. Crusius and Tholuck); but a special significance is wrongly attached to ἐρευνᾶτε (a study which penetrates into the subject itself, and attains a truly inward possession of the word, Luthardt); and the contradiction of ver. 40, which forms such a difficulty, is really nothing but the inconsistency which Jesus wishes to *bring out to view*. — ὑμεῖς] emphatic, *for you, ye on your part*, are the people who think this. Still there lies in δοκεῖτε neither blame,¹ nor (as Ewald maintains, though ver. 45 is different) a delicate sarcastic reference to their exaggerated and scholastic reverence for the letter of Scripture, but certainly a contrast to the actual ἔχειν, which Jesus *could* not affirm concerning them, because they did not believe in Him who was testified

¹ According to Hilgenfeld, *Lehrbegr.* p. 213 (comp. his *Evang.* p. 272, and *Zeitschr.* 1863, p. 217), directed against the *delusion* of the Jews, that they possessed the perfect source of blessedness in the literal sense of the O. T. which proceeded from the Demiurge, and was intended by him. Even Rothe, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1860, p. 67, takes *δοκῆσις* in the sense of a *delusion*, viz. that they possessed eternal life in a *book*. Such explanations are opposed to the high veneration manifested by Jesus towards the Holy Scriptures, especially apparent in John, though here even Weiss, p. 106, approves of the interpretation of an *erroneous doxism*.

of in the Scriptures as the Mediator of eternal life. Comp. Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, I. 671. Theoretically considered, they were right in their *δοκεῖν*, but practically they were wrong, because Christ remained hidden from them in the Scriptures. Comp. as to the thing itself, 2 Cor. iii. 15, 16; and on *ἔχειν ζωὴν αἰ.*, iii. 15. — *ἐν αὐταῖς*] The possession of Messianic life is regarded as *contained* in the Scriptures, in so far as they contain that by which this possession is brought about, that which is not given *outside* the Scriptures, but only *in* them. — *καὶ ἐκείναι, κ.τ.λ.*] Prominence assigned to the identity of the subject, in order to bring out the contrast more fully: *and they*, those very Scriptures which ye search, *are they which*, etc. — *καὶ οὐ θέλετε*] *καὶ* does not mean *and yet*, but simply *and*. This simplicity is all the more *striking*, more striking and tragic even than the interrogative interpretation (Ewald). On *ἐλθεῖν πρὸς με*, denoting a believing adherence to Christ, comp. vi. 35. They stood aloof from Him, and this depended on their *will*, Matt. xxiii. 37. — *ἵνα ζωὴν ἔχ.*] “in order that that *δοκεῖν* of yours might become a reality.”

Vers. 41-44. “I do not utter these reproaches against you from (disappointed) ambition, but because I have perceived what a want of all right feeling towards God lies at the root of your unbelief.” — *δόξαν παρὰ ἀνθρ.*] These words go together, and stand emphatically at the beginning of the sentence, because there is presupposed the possibility of an accusation *on this very point*. Comp. Plato, *Phaedr.* p. 232 A; see also 1 Thess. ii. 6. — *οὐ λαμβ.*] *i.e.* “I reject it,” as in ver. 34. — *ἔγνωκα ὑμᾶς*] “*cognitos vos habeo*; hoc radio penetrat corda auditorum,” Bengel. — *τ. ἀγάπ. τ. θεοῦ*] If they *had love to God* in their hearts (this being the summary of their law!), they would have felt sympathy towards the Son, whom the Father (ver. 43) sent, and would have received and recognised Him. The *article* is *generic*; what they lacked was *love to God*. — *ἐν ἑαυτοῖς*] *in your own hearts*; it was an excellence *foreign* to them, of which *they themselves* were destitute—a mere theory, *existing outside the range of their inner life*. — Ver. 43. Actual result of this deficiency with reference to their relation towards Jesus, who had come in His Father's name, *i.e.* as His appointed representative, and consequently as the true Christ

(comp. vii. 28, viii. 42), but who was unbelievably despised by them, whereas, on the other hand, they would receive a false Messiah. — ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τῷ ἰδίῳ] *in his own name*, i.e. in his own authority and self-representations, not as one commissioned of God (which He of course is *alleged* to be), consequently a *false Messiah*; ¹ ψευδώνυμος ἀνὴρ ἀντίθεος, Nonnus. *He* will be received, because he satisfies the opposite of the love of God, viz. *self-love* (by promising earthly glory, indulgence towards sin, etc.). For a definite prophecy of false Messiahs, see Matt. xxiv. 24. To suppose a special reference to *Barkochba* (Hilgenfeld), is arbitrarily to take for granted the uncritical assumption of the post-apostolic origin of this Gospel. According to Schudt, *Jüdische Merkwürdigkeit*. vi. 27–30 (in Bengel), sixty-four such deceivers have been counted since the time of Christ. — Ver. 44. The reproach of unbelief now rises to its highest point, for Jesus in a wrathful question denies to the Jews even the *ability* to believe. — ὑμεῖς] has a deeply emotional emphasis: How is it possible *for you* people to believe? And the ground of this impossibility is: *because ye receive honour one of another* (δόξαν παρὰ ἀλλ. are taken together), because ye reciprocally give and take honour of yourselves. This ungodly desire of honour (comp. xii. 43; Matt. xxiii. 5 sqq.), and the indifference, necessarily concomitant therewith, towards the true honour, which comes from God, must so utterly blight and estrange the heart from the divine element of life, that it is not even *capable* of faith. That divine δόξα is indeed the true *glory of Israel* (Luthardt), comp. Rom. ii. 29, but it is not here designated *as such*, as also the δόξαν παρὰ ἀλλ. λαμβ. does not appear as a designation of the "*spurious-Judaism*," which latter is in general a wider conception (Rom. ii. 17 ff.). — τὴν παρὰ, κ.τ.λ.] for it consists in this, that one knows himself to be recognised and esteemed of God. Comp. as to the thing itself, xii. 43; Rom. ii. 29, iii. 23. — παρὰ τοῦ μόνου θεοῦ] not "*from God alone*"

¹ This reference of the text to false Messiahs is not too narrow (Luthardt, Brückner), because ἰσθῆ corresponds to the ἰσθλυσθαι; and this, as the entire context shows, indicates that the appearance of the Messiah had taken place. This also tells against Tholuck's general reference to *false prophets*. Many of the Fathers have taken the words to refer to *Antichrist*.

(Grotius, De Wette, Godet, and most others, from an erroneous reference to Matt. iv. 4, 10), but *from the alone* (only) *God*. Cf. xvii. 3 ; Rom. xvi. 26 ; 1 Tim. vi. 15. The adj. shows the exclusive *value* of this honour. — οὐ ζητεῖτε] The transition from the participle to the finite tense gives greater independence and impressiveness to the second clause.

Vv. 45-47. In concluding, Jesus sweeps away from under their feet the entire ground and foundation upon which they based their hope, by representing Moses, their supposed saviour, as really their *accuser*, seeing that their unbelief implied unbelief in Moses, and this latter unbelief made it impossible for them to believe in Jesus. This last completely annihilating stroke at the unbelievers is not only in itself, but also in its implied reference to the cause of the hostility of the Jews (ver. 15), “maxime aptus ad conclusionem,” Bengel. — μὴ δοκεῖτε] as you might perhaps believe from my previous denunciation. — κατηγορήσω] not of the final judgment (Ewald and early writers), where certainly Christ is *Judge* ; but in general, Jesus, by virtue of His permanent intercourse with the Father, might *at any time* have accused them before Him. — ἔστιν ὁ κατηγο. ὅμ.] The emphatic ἔστιν : there *exists* your accuser Moses—he *as the representative of the law* (not of the whole of the O. T., as Ewald thinks) ; therefore not again the *future*, but the present participle used as a substantive, expressing *continuous* accusation. — ὁμεις] has tragic emphasis. — ἡλπικατε] *ye have set your hope, and do hope* ; comp. iii. 18, and see on 2 Cor. i. 10. As a reward for their zeal for the law, and their obedience (Rom. ii. 17 ff., ix. 31 f.), the Jews hoped for the salvation of the Messianic kingdom, towards the attainment of which Moses was accordingly their patron and mediator.

Ver. 46. Proof that Moses was their accuser. Moses wrote of *Christ*, referring to Deut. xviii. 15, and generally to all the Messianic types (comp. iii. 14) and promises of the Pentateuch, and to its general Messianic import (Luke xxiv. 44 ; Rom. x. 5) ; in this, that they did not believe *Christ* (i.e. that He spoke the truth), is implied that they rejected the truth of what *Moses* had written concerning Him. This unbelief is the subject-matter of Moses' accusation. Well says Bengel : “ Non juit

Judaeos illud: Credimus vera esse omnia, quae Moses scripsit. Fide *explicita* opus erat." — Ver. 47. δέ] Further conclusion from the unbelief with regard to Moses, pointed out in ver. 46. Thus the discourse ends with a question implying hopelessness. — The antithesis is not between γράμμασιν and ῥήμασι (as if the *writings* were easier of belief than the *words*), but between ἐκείνου and ἐμοῖς (faith in *him* being the necessary condition of faith in *Christ*); while the distinction of Moses having *written* (comp. ver. 46), and Christ *spoken*, simply presents the *historical* relation. Were the antithesis between γράμμ. and ῥήμ., these words would have taken the lead; were it between *both*, in γράμμ. and ῥήμ., and at the same time in ἐκείνου and ἐμοῖς likewise, this twofold relationship must have been shown, thus perhaps: τοῖς γράμμασιν τοῖς ἐκείνου . . . τοῖς ῥήμασι τοῖς ἐμοῖς.

Note. — The discourse, vv. 19–47, so fully embodies in its entire progress and contents, allowing for the necessary Johannine colouring in the mode of representation, those essential doctrines which Jesus had to advocate in the face of the unbelieving Jews, and exhibits, in expression and practical application, so much that is characteristic, great, thoughtful, and striking, that even Strauss himself does not venture to deny that it came substantially from the Lord, though as to its form he attaches suspicious importance to certain resemblances with the first Epistle; but such a suspicion is all the less weighty, the more we are warranted to regard the Johannine idiosyncrasy as developed and moulded by the vivid recollection of the Lord's words, and as under the guidance of His Spirit, which preserved and transfigured that recollection. The reasons which lead Weisse to see nothing in the discourse but synoptical matter, and B. Bauer to regard the whole as a reflection of the later consciousness of the Church, while Gfrörer supposes a real discourse, artificially shaped by additions and formal alterations, consist so much of arbitrary judgments and erroneous explanations and presuppositions, that sober criticism gains nothing by them, nor can the discourse which is attacked lose anything. Certainly we have in it "a genuine exposition of Johannine theology" (Hilgenfeld, *Evang.* p. 273), but in such a manner, that this is the theology of *Christ Himself*, the miracle of healing at Bethesda being historically the occasion of the utterance in this manner of its main elements. This miracle itself is indeed by Baur regarded as a fictitious pretext, invented for

the delivery of the discourse, so much so that "every feature in it seems to have been intended for this purpose" (p. 159); and this in the face of the fact that no reference whatever is made (in ver. 19 ff.) to the point in connection with the miracle at which the Jews took offence, viz. the *breaking of the Sabbath* (ver. 16). Nothing whatever is specially said concerning *miracles* (for *ἔργα* denotes a far wider conception), but the whole discourse turns upon that *Messianic faith* in the person of Jesus which the Jews refused to entertain. The fundamental truths, on this occasion so triumphantly expressed, "were never taught by Him so distinctly and definitely as now, when the right opportunity presented itself, at the very time when, after the Baptist's removal, He came fully forth as the Messiah, and was called upon, quietly and comprehensively, to explain those highest of all relations, the explanation of which was previously demanded." Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 298 f.; comp. his *Johann. Schr.* I. 206 ff. At this crisis of His great mission and work, the references in the discourse to the Baptist, and the apologetic statements concerning His life-giving work and the divine witness of Scripture, connect themselves so necessarily with His historical position, that it cannot even remotely suffice to suppose, with Weizsäcker, p. 282, that the discourse was composed simply with an eye to the synoptical statements of Matt. xi.

CHAPTER VI.

Ver. 2. *ἑώρων*] Lachm. and Tisch.: *ἑθεώρων*, after A. B. D. L. *κ*. Cursives, Cyr. The origin of this reading betrays itself through A., which has *ἑθεώρων*, judging from which *ἑώρων* must have been the original reading. The *ἑθεώρ.* was all the more easily received, however, because John invariably uses the Perfect only of *ὄρᾱν*.—After this Elz. has *αὐτοῦ*, against decisive testimonies.—Ver. 5. *ἀγοράσομεν*] Scholz, Lachm., Tisch., read *ἀγοράσωμεν*, in favour of which the great majority of the testimonies decide.—Ver. 9. *ἦν*] is wanting in B. D. L. *κ*. Cursives, Or. Cyr. Chrys. and some Verss. Rejected by Schulz after Gersd., bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch. But how easily might it have been overlooked, because superfluous, and coming after the syllable *ON*! For *ἰ* Lachm and Tisch. read *ῖς*, following decisive witnesses; transcribers were easily led to make changes according to the *grammatical* gender.—Ver. 11. After *διέδωκε* Elz. has *τοῖς μαθηταῖς, οἱ δὲ μαθηταί*, words which are wanting in A. B. L. *κ*.^{*} Cursives, Fathers, and almost all Versions. An enlargement in imitation of Matt. xiv. 19 and parallels.—Ver. 15. Lachm. and Tisch. have rightly deleted *αὐτόν* after *ποιήσ.*; an addition wanting in A. B. L. *κ*. Cursives, Or. Cyr.—Ver. 17. *οὐκ*] B. D. L. *κ*. Cursives, Versions (not Vulgate), and Fathers read *οὐπω*. So Lachm. and Tisch. A gloss introduced for the sake of more minute definition.—Ver. 22. *ιδών*] Lachm. reads *εἶδον*, after A. B. Chrys. Verss. (L. *ιδον*); D. *κ*. Verss. read *οἶδεν*. The finite tense was introduced to make the construction easier.—After *ἦν* Elz. Scholz have *ἐκεῖνο εἰς ὃ ἐνέβησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ*, against very important authorities. An explanatory addition, with many variations in detail.—*πλοῖον*] Elz.: *πλοῖάριον* against decisive witnesses. Mechanical and careless (vv: 17, 21) repetition borrowed from what precedes.—Ver. 24. *αὐτοί*] Elz. *καὶ αὐτοί*, against decisive witnesses.—Ver. 36. *με* is bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch. The authorities against it are insufficient (only A. *κ*. among the Codices), and it might easily have been left out after *ΤΕ*.—Ver. 39. After *με* Elz. has *πατρός*, the omission of which is overwhelmingly attested. An addition.—Ver. 40. *τοῦ πατρὸς μου*] So also Lachm. and Tisch. The Textus Receptus is *τοῦ πέμψαντός με*. Preponderance of testimony is in favour

of the former; the latter is a repetition from ver. 39, whence also, instead of γάρ, the received reading δέ was inserted. — τῇ ἐσχ. ἡμ.] According to A. D. K. L., etc., ἐν τ. ἐσχ. ἡμ. is to be restored, as in ver. 39, where ἐν, indeed, is wanting in many witnesses; but that it was the original reading is indicated by the reading αὐτόν (instead of αὐτό). In ver. 54, also, ἐν is sufficiently confirmed, and (against Tisch.) is to be in like manner restored. — Ver. 42. The second οὗτος has against it B. C. D. L. T. Cursives, Verss. Cyr. Chrys.; bracketed by Lachm. But it might easily have been overlooked as being unnecessary, and because the similar ΟΤΙ follows. — Ver. 45. ἀκούσα] ἀκούων, which Griesbach received and Scholz adopted, has important authority, but this is outweighed by the testimonies for the Received reading. It is nevertheless to be preferred; for, considering the following μαθών, the *Aorist* would easily occur to the transcribers who did not consider the difference of sense. οὖν before ὁ ἀκούων is to be struck out (with Lachm. and Tisch.) upon sufficient counter testimony, as being a connective addition. In vv. 51, 54, 57, 58, the form ζήσῃ is, upon strong evidence, to be uniformly restored. — Concerning the omission of the words ἦν ἐγὼ δώσω in ver. 51, see the exegetical notes. — Ver. 55. For ἀληθῶς Lachm. and Tisch. have both times ἀληθής, which is powerfully confirmed by B. C. K. L. T. Cursives, Versions (yet not the Vulgate), and Fathers (even Clement and Origen). The genuine ἀληθής, as seeming inappropriate, would be glossed and supplanted now by ἀληθῶς and now by ἀληθινή (already in Origen once). — Ver. 58. After πατέρες, Elz. Scholz have ὑμῶν τὸ μάννα, Lachm. simply τὸ μάννα, both against very important testimony. An enlargement. — Ver. 63. λελάληκα] Elz. λαλῶ, against decisive witnesses. Altered because the reference of the Perfect was not understood. Comp. xiv. 10. — Ver. 69. ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τ. θεοῦ] The reading ὁ ἅγιος τ. θεοῦ is confirmed by B. C.* D. L. s. Nonn. Cosm., and adopted by Griesb. Lachm. Tisch. The Received reading is from Matt. xvi. 16, whence also came the addition τοῦ ζῶντος in the Elz. — Ver. 71. Ἰσκαριώτην] Lachm. and Tisch. read Ἰσκαριώτου, after B. C. G. L. 33, and Verss. So, after the same witnesses in part, in xiii. 26. But as in xiv. 22 Ἰσκαριώτης occurs critically confirmed as the name of Judas himself (not of his father), and as the genitive might easily be introduced as explanatory of the name (ἀπὸ Καριώτου, as s. and many Cursives actually read here), the Received reading is to be retained. Had John regarded the name as designating the *father* of Judas, it would not be apparent why he did not use the genitive in xiv. 22 also. See, besides, the exegetical notes.

Ver. 1. The *account of the Feeding* is the same with that given in Matt. xiv. 13 ff., Mark vi. 30 ff., Luke ix. 10 ff., and serves as the basis of the discourse which follows, though Schweizer denies that vv. 1-26 proceed from John. The discrepancies in matters of detail are immaterial, and bear witness to the independence of John's account. The author of this narrative, according to Baur, must have appropriated synoptical material for the purpose of his own exposition, and of elevating into a higher sphere the miracle itself, which in the Synoptics did not go beyond the supply of temporal needs. The *historical connection* with what precedes is not the same in John and in the Synoptics, and this must be simply acknowledged. To introduce more or less synoptical history into the space implied in *μετὰ ταῦτα* (Ebrard, Lange, Lichtenstein, and many), is not requisite in John, and involves much uncertainty in detail, especially as Matthew does not agree with Mark and Luke; for he puts the mission of the disciples earlier, and does not connect their return with the Miraculous Feeding. To interpolate their mission and return into John's narrative, inserting the former at chap. v. 1, and the latter at vi. 1, so that the disciples rejoined Jesus at Tiberias, is very hazardous; for John gives no hint of it, and in their silence concerning it Matthew and John agree (against Wieseler and most expositors). According to Ewald, at a very early date, a section, "probably a whole sheet," between chap. v. and vi., was *altogether lost*. But there is no indication of this in the text, nor does it form a necessary pre-supposition for the succeeding portions of the narrative (as vii. 21). — *μετὰ ταῦτα*] after these transactions at the feast of Purim, chap. v. — *ἀπῆλθεν*] from Jerusalem; whither? *πέραν τ. θαλ., κ.τ.λ.*, tells us. Thuc. i. 111. 2, ii. 67. 1: *πορευθῆναι πέραν τοῦ Ἑλλησπόντου*; Plut. *Per.* 19; 1 Macc. ix. 34; and comp. ver. 17. To suppose some place in *Galilee*, of starting from which *ἀπῆλθεν* is meant (Brückner, Luthardt, Hengstenberg, Godet, and earlier critics),—Capernaum, for example,—is, after v. 1, quite arbitrary. *Ἀπῆλθε πέραν, κ.τ.λ.*, rather implies: *ἀπολιπὼν Ἱεροσόλυμα ἦλθε πέραν, κ.τ.λ.* Comp. x. 40, xviii. 1. — *τῆς Τιβερ.*] does not imply that He set sail from Tiberias (Paulus), as the genitive of itself

might indicate (Kühner, II. 160), though this use of it does not occur in the N. T.; it is the chorographical genitive (Krüger, xlvii. 5. 5-7), more closely describing τῆς θαλάσσης τῆς Γαλιλ. (comp. Vulg. and Beza: "mare Galilaeae, quod est Tiberiadis"). Therefore "*on the other side of the Galilaean lake of Tiberias*," thus denoting the southern half of the lake, on the western shore of which lay the town built by Antipas, and called after the emperor Tiberias. Comp. xxi. 1. In Pausan. v. 7. 3, the entire lake is called λίμνη Τιβερίς. In Matthew and Luke we find the name θάλασσα τῆς Γαλιλ. only; in Luke v. 1: λίμνη Γεννησαρέτ. Had John intended τῆς Τιβεριάδος not as a more exact description of the locality, but only for the *sake of foreign readers* (Lücke, Godet, Ewald, and others), it would have been sufficient to have omitted τῆς Γαλιλ. (comp. xxi. 1), which indeed is wanting in G. and a few other witnesses.

Vv. 2, 3. Ἡκολούθει] on this journey, continuously. — ἐώρων] not *had seen* (against Schweizer, B. Crusius), but *saw*. He performed them (ἐποίει) upon the way. — ἐπὶ τ. ἀσθ.] *among the sick*. Dem. 574. 3; Plat. Pol. iii. p. 399 A; Bernhardt, p. 246. — εἰς τὸ ὄρος] *upon the mountain which was there*. See on Matt. v. 1. The mountain was certainly on the *other* side of the lake, but we cannot determine the locality more nearly. The loneliness of the *mountain* does not contradict Matt. xiv. 13, nor does the *eastern* side of the lake contradict Luke ix. 10 ff. (see *in loc.*).

Ver. 4. Ἐγγύς] *close at hand*. See on v. 1. Paulus wrongly renders it *not long since past*. See, on the contrary, ii. 13, vii. 2, xi. 55. The statement is intended as introductory to ver. 5, explaining how it happened (comp. xi. 55) that Jesus, after He had withdrawn to the mountain, was again attended by a great multitude (ver. 5),—a thing which could not have happened had not the Passover been nigh. It was *another* crowd (not, as is *commonly* assumed, that named in ver. 2, which had followed Him in His progress towards the lake), composed of *pilgrims to the feast*, who therefore were going the opposite way, from the neighbourhood of the lake *in the direction of Jerusalem*. Thus ver. 4 is not a mere *chronological* note (B. Crusius, Maier, Brückner,

Ewald), against which the analogy of vii. 2 (with the οὖν following, ver. 3) is decisive; nor is it, because every more specific hint to that effect is wanting, to be looked upon as referring by anticipation¹ to the following discourse of Jesus concerning eating His flesh and blood as the antitype of the Passover (B. Bauer; comp. Baur, p. 262, Luthardt, Hengstenberg, and already Lampe). — ἡ ἑορτὴ τ. 'Ιουδαίων] κατ. ἑξοχὴν. There is no intimation that Jesus Himself went up to this feast (Lücke). See rather vii. 1.

Vv. 5, 6. According to the reading ἀγοράσωμεν, *whence are we to buy?* deliberative conjunctive. The fact that Jesus thus takes the *initiative* (as *host*, Ewald thinks, but this is not enough), and takes action without the prompting of any expressed need, however real, is not to be explained merely on the supposition that this is an abridgment (Lücke, Neander, Hengstenberg) of the synoptical account (Matt. xiv. 15); it is a *discrepancy*, which, however, does not destroy the fact that John was an eye-witness. It is purely arbitrary on Baur's part to assume the design to be that of directing attention more directly to the spiritual purpose of the miracle, or, with Hilgenfeld, to regard all here as *composed* out of synoptical materials to prove the omnipotence of the Logos. The most simple and obvious course is to explain the representation given as flowing from the preponderating idea of the *Messiah's autonomy*.² See on Matt. xiv. 15. It is an analogous case when Jesus *Himself gave occasion to* and introduced the miracle at Bethesda, v. 6. It is a *supplement* to the narrative in the Synoptics, that Jesus discussed with *Philip* (i. 44) the question of bread. Why with *him*? According to Bengel, because it fell to him to manage the

¹ Comp. also Godet: Jesus must have been in the position "*d'un proscrit*," and could not go to Jerusalem to the Passover; He therefore saw in the approaching multitudes a sign from the Father, and thought, "*Et moi aussi, je célébrerai une pâque*." This is pure invention.

² Amid such minor circumstances, the *idea* might certainly supplant the more exact *historical* recollection even in a John. We have no right, however, on that account, to compare Jesus, according to John's representation, to a housewife, who, when she sees the guests coming in the distance, thinks in the first place of what she can set before them, as Hase (*Tübing. Schule*, p. 4) very inappropriately has done.

res alimentaria, which is improbable, for *Judas* was treasurer, xiii. 29. Judging from ver. 6, we might say it was because Philip had to be tested according to his intellectual idiosyncrasy (xiv. 8 ff.), and convinced of his *inability to advise*. The *πειράζειν* does not signify the trial of *faith* (so usually, even Hengstenberg), but, as *αὐτὸς γὰρ ᾗδει* shows, was a *test whether he could here suggest any expedient*; and the *answer* of the disciple (ver. 7) conveys only the impression that he knew of *none*. This consciousness, however, was intended also to prepare the disciple, who so closely resembled Thomas, and for whom the question, therefore, had an *educative* purpose, the more readily to feel, by the new and coming miracle, how the power of faith in the divine agency of his Lord transcended all calculations of the intellect. This was too important a matter for Jesus with respect to that disciple, to allow us to suppose that *πειράζων αὐτόν* is a mere notion of John's own, which had its origin among the transfiguring recollections of a later time (Ewald). *Ἦϊδει τῶν μαθητῶν τοὺς μάλιστα δεομένους πλείονος διδασκαλίας*, Theodore of Mopsuestia; in which there is nothing to suggest our attributing to Philip a "*simplicité naïve*," Godet. — *αὐτός*] *Himself*, without having any need to resort to the advice of another.

Vers. 7-9. *For 200 denarii* (about 80 Rhenish Guildens, nearly £7) *we cannot get bread enough for them*, etc. This amount is not named as the *contents of the purse*, but generally as a *large sum*, which nevertheless was *inadequate* to meet the need. Different in Mark vi. 37. — Vv. 8, 9. A special trait of originality. — *εἰς ἐκ τ. μαθητ. αὐτοῦ*] may seem strange, for Philip was himself a disciple, and it is explained by Wassenbach as a *gloss*. It has, however, this significance; Philip had been specially asked, and after he had answered so helplessly, *another from the circle of the disciples*, viz. Andrew, directed a communication to the Lord, which, though made with a consciousness of helplessness, was made the instrument for the further procedure of Jesus. — *παιδάριον ἔν*] who had these victuals for sale as a market boy, not a servant of the company, B. Crusius. It may be read *one single lad* (Matt. xi. 16), or even *one single young slave* (see Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 240; Schleusner, *Thes.* III.

p. 160). Comp. the German *ein Bürschchen* (a lad), as also the manner in which *παιδίον* is used (Aristoph. *Ran.* 37; *Nub.* 131). In which of the two senses it stands here we cannot decide. In neither case can *ἐν* stand for *τῷ*, but *ἐν*, as well as the diminutive *παιδίον*, helps to describe the meagreness of the resource, the emphasis, however, being on the latter; and hence *ἐν* follows, which is not to be taken as an argument against its genuineness (Gersd. p. 420; Lücke, and most others), though in *all* other places, when John uses *εἰς* with a substantive (vii. 21, viii. 41, x. 16, xi. 50, xviii. 14, xx. 7), the numeral has the emphasis, and therefore takes the lead. But here: "one single lad," a mere boy, who can carry little enough! — *ἄρτους κριθίνους*] comp. Xen. *Anab.* iv. 5. 31; Luc. *Macrob.* 5. Barley bread was eaten mainly by the poorer classes; Judg. vii. 13, and Studer, *in loc.*; Liv. xxvii. 13; Sen. *ep.* xviii. 8; see also Wetstein and Kypke, I. p. 368. — *ὀψάριον*] denotes generally a small relish, but in particular used, as here (comp. xxi. 9, 13), of fish. It belongs to later Greek. See Wetstein. — *εἰς τοσούτους*] for so many. Comp. Xen. *Anab.* i. 1. 10: *εἰς δισχιλίους μισθόν*.

Vv. 10–13. *Οἱ ἄνδρες*] They were *men* only who formally sat down to the meal, as may be explained from the subordinate position of the women and children; but the feeding of these latter, whose presence we must assume from ver. 4, is not, as taking place indirectly, excluded. — *τὸν ἀριθμόν*] Accusative of closer definition. See Lobeck, *Paralip.* p. 528. — Ver. 11. *εὐχαρ.*] The grace before meat said by the host. See on Matt. xiv. 19. There is no indication that it contained a special petition ("that God would let this little portion feed so many," Luthardt, comp. Tholuck). — *διέδωκε*] He distributed the bread (by the disciples) collectively to those who were sitting; and of the fishes as much as they desired.¹ — Ver. 12. It is not given as a *command* of Jesus in the synoptical account. As to the miracle itself,² and the

¹ Luther's translation, "as much as *He would*," rests upon an unsupported reading in Erasmus, edd. 1 and 2.

² By Ewald (*Gesch. Chr.* p. 442 sq. ed. 3) apprehended *ideally*, like the turning of the water into wine at Cana, as a *legend*, upon the formation of which great influence was excited by the holy feeling of higher satisfaction,

methods of explaining it away, wholly or in part, see on Matt. xiv. 20, 21, note, and on Luke ix. 17, and observe besides on ver. 13, that according to John the twelve baskets were filled with fragments of *bread* only (otherwise in Mark vi. 43).—Luthardt, without any sanction from the text, assumes a *typical* reference in the baskets to the twelve tribes of Israel. Jesus will not have anything wasted, and each apostle fills his travelling wallet with the surplus. John indicates nothing further, not even that the Lord wished to provide *ἵνα μὴ δόξη φαντασία τις τὸ γινόμενον* (Euthymius Zigabenus, Erasmus, and most others).

Vv. 14, 15. *Ὁ προφήτης, κ.τ.λ.*] *the Prophet who* (according to the promise in Deut. xviii. 15) *cometh into the world, i.e. the Messiah.*—*ἀρπάξουσιν*] *come and carry Him away by force* (Acts viii. 39; 2 Cor. xii. 2; 1 Thess. iv. 17), *i.e.* to Jerusalem, as the seat of the theocracy, whither they were journeying to the feast.—*πάλιν*] *comp. ver. 3.* He had come down from the mountain on account of the feeding, ver. 11.—*αὐτὸς μόνος*] *as in xii. 24.* See Toup. *ad Longin.* p. 526; Weisk.; Heind. *ad Charm.* p. 62.—The *enthusiasm* of the people being of so *sensuous* a kind, does not contradict ver. 26.—The *solitude* which Jesus sought was, according to Matt. xiv. 23, Mark vi. 46, that of *prayer*, and this does not contradict John's account; both accounts *supplement* each other.

Vv. 16-21. *Comp. Matt. xiv. 22 ff., Mark vi. 45 ff.,* which do not refer to a *different* walking on the sea (Chrysostom, Lücke).—*ὥς δὲ ὀψία ἐγένετο*] According to ver. 17, the time meant is *late in the evening, i.e. the so-called second evening*, as in Matt. xiv. 24, from the twelfth hour until the *σκοτία*, ver. 17. See on Matt. xiv. 15.—*εἰς τὸ πλοῖον*]

which resulted from the participation in the bread of life partaken of by the disciples after Christ's resurrection. This is incompatible with the personal recollection and testimony of John, whom Hase, indeed, supposes by some accident to have been absent from the scene. With equally laboured and mistaken logic, Schleiermacher (*L. J.* 234) endeavours to show that ver. 26 excludes this event from the category of *σημεῖα*. Weizsäcker leaves the fact, which is here the symbol of the blessing of Jesus, in perfect uncertainty; but the description by an eye-witness of the work effected in its miraculous character, which only leaves the *how* unexplained, does not admit of such an evasion.

into the ship, in which they had crossed over (ver. 1). In it they now return to the western side of the lake. So Luthardt, rightly. But it does not follow that Jerusalem could not have been the place of departure in ver. 1; ver. 1 rather implies that they had travelled from Jerusalem to the western shore of the lake, and had crossed over from thence.—*ἤρχοντο*] They were *upon* their return journey, coming across, but the coming was not yet completed. Lampe and Paulus erroneously speak of their actual *arrival*, what follows being taken as *supplementary*. In Mark vi. 45 Bethsaida is named (on the western shore). An immaterial discrepancy. See on Matt. xiv. 22, 23.—*καὶ σκοτία . . . διηγείρετο*] describing how little they could have expected that Jesus would come after them.—Ver. 19. *ὡς σταδίους . . . τριάκοντα*] indicative of an eye-witness, and almost agreeing with *μέσον* in Matt. xiv. 24, for the lake was forty stadia or one geographical mile wide (Josephus, *Bell.* iii. 10. 7).—*θεωροῦσι* and *ἐφοβήθη*.] Correlatives; quite unfavourable to the naturalistic interpretation, according to which *ἐπὶ τ. θαλ.* is said to mean not *on the sea*, but *towards the sea* (so Paulus, Gfrörer, and many, even B. Crusius; but see, on the contrary, note on Matt. xiv. 25).—Ver. 21. *ἤθελον, κ.τ.λ.*] comp. i. 44; but observe the *Imperfect* here. After Jesus had reassured them by His call, *they wish to take Him into the ship, and straightway* (while entertaining this *ἐθέλειν*) *the ship is at the land*, i.e. by the wonder-working power of Jesus, both with respect to the distance from the shore, which was still far off, and the fury of the sea, which had just been raging, but was now suddenly calmed. The idea that Jesus, to whom the disciples had stretched out their hands, had just *come on board* the ship, introduces a foreign element (against Luthardt and Godet), for the sake of bringing the account into harmony with Matthew and Mark. The discrepancy with Matthew and Mark, according to whom Christ was actually received into the ship, must not be explained away, especially as in John a more wonderful point, peculiar to his account, is introduced by the *καὶ εὐθέως*, etc., which makes the actual reception *superfluous* (Hengstenberg, following Bengel, regards it as implied). An unhappy attempt at harmonizing renders it, “*they*

willingly received Him" (Beza, Grotius, Kuinoel, Ammon, etc.; see, on the contrary, Winer, p. 436 [E. T. p. 586]; Buttmann, *N. T. Gk.* p. 321 [E. T. p. 375]), which cannot be supported by a supposed antithesis of previous unwillingness (Ebrard, Tholuck), but would be admissible only if the text represented the will *and* the deed as undoubtedly simultaneous. See the passages given in Sturz, *Lex. Xen.*; Ast, *Lex. Plat.* I. 596. John would in that case have written ἐθέλοντες οὖν ἔλαβον. — εἰς ἣν ὑπῆγον] to which they were intending by this journey to remove.—The miracle itself cannot be resolved into a natural occurrence,¹ nor be regarded as a story invented to serve Docetic views (Hilgenfeld); see on Matt. xiv. 24, 25. The latter opinion appears most erroneous, especially in the case of John,² not only generally because his Gospel, from i. 14 onwards to its close, excludes all Docetism, but also because he only introduces, with all brevity, the narrative before us by way of transition to what follows, without taking pains to lay emphasis upon the miraculous, and without adding any remark or comment, and consequently without any special doctrinal purpose; and thus the attribution of the occurrence of any symbolical design, e.g. prophetically to shadow forth the meetings of the risen Lord with His disciples (Luthardt), or the restless sea of the world upon which Christ draws nigh to His people after long delay (Hengstenberg), is utterly remote from a true exegesis. Weizsäcker's narrowing of the event, moreover,—abstracting the miraculous element in the development of the history,—into an intervention of the Lord to render help, does such violence to the text, and to the plain meaning of the evangelist, that the main substance of the narrative would be thus explained away. The design, however, which Baur propounds, viz. that the greedy importunity of the people might be set forth, only to experience the cold hand of denial, and to bring out the spiritual side of the miracle of the feeding, would not

¹ Ewald probably comes to that conclusion, for he takes θεωρεῖν, ver. 19, to denote a mere vision (phantasiangoria?), and φοβεῖσθαι to signify *disquietude of conscience*: "He finds them not pure in spirit."

² Who, moreover, in the deviations from Matthew and Mark, possesses the deciding authority (against Märcker, p. 14).

have required this miraculous voyage in order to its realization.

Vv. 22-24. The complicated sentence (so seldom occurring in John; comp. xiii. 1 ff., 1 John i. 1 ff.) here proceeds in such a manner that the ὁ ὄχλος which, without further government, stands at the head as the subject of the whole, is again taken up¹ in ver. 24 by ὅτι οὖν εἶδεν ὁ ὄχλος, while ver. 23 is a parenthesis, preparing the way for the passing over of the people in the following clause. The participial clause, ἰδὼν ὅτι . . . ἀπῆλθον, is subordinate to the ἐστηκὼς πέραν τ. θαλ., and gives the explanation why the people expected Jesus on the next day still on the east side of the lake. John's narrative accordingly runs thus: "*The next day, the people who were on the other side of the lake, because (on the previous evening, ver. 16 f.) they had seen that no other ship was there save only the one, and that Jesus did not get into the ship with His disciples, but that His disciples only sailed away, [but other ships came from Tiberias near to the place, etc.],—when now the people saw that Jesus was not there, nor His disciples,*² finding themselves mistaken in their expectation of meeting with Him still on the eastern shore, *they themselves embarked in the ships,*" etc. As to details, observe further, (1) that πέραν τ. θαλ. in ver. 22 means the *eastern side* of the lake in ver. 1, but in ver. 25 the *western*; (2) that ἰδὼν is spoken with reference to the *previous* day, when the multitude had noticed the departure of the disciples in the evening, so that the conjecture of εἰδώς (Ewald) is unnecessary; that, on the contrary, ὅτι οὖν εἶδεν, ver. 24, indicates that they became aware *to-day*,—a difference which is the point in the cumbrously constructed sentence that most easily misleads the reader; (3) that the transit of the ships from Tiberias, ver. 23, occurred while the people were still on the eastern shore, and gave them an appropriate opportunity, when they were undeceived in their expectation, of looking for Jesus on the western shore; (4) that αὐτοί, *ipsi*,

¹ On the usual resumptive οὖν, see Winer, p. 414; Baumlein, *Partik.* p. 177.

² *Jesus* was not there, because, though they did not think of His going away, He did not show Himself anywhere; the *disciples* were not, because they could not have remained unobserved if they had come back again from the other side; and such a return could not have taken place in the ἄλλοις πλοιαρίοις, for these latter came not from Capernaum, but from Tiberias.

indicates that, instead of waiting longer for Jesus to come to them, they *themselves* set out, and availed themselves of the opportunity presented of looking for Jesus on the other side, by embarking in the ships that had arrived, and sailing across to Capernaum, the well-known place of our Lord's abode; (5) that the circumstantial character of the description of things throughout indicates the vivid communication of an eye-witness, which John had received, and does not permit of our taking the transit of the people (which, however, must not be pressed as including the whole 5000) as invented to confirm the story of the walking on the sea (Strauss).

Vv. 25, 26.¹ Πέραν τ. θαλάσσης.] in the synagogue at Capernaum, ver. 59. But πέραν τ. θαλ. has importance *pragmatically*, as showing that it formed a subject of *amazement* to them to find Him already on the *western* shore. — πότε] when? for it must have been, at the earliest, *after* the arrival of the *disciples* (ver. 22); and in this lay the incomprehensible *how?* no other boat having crossed, and the journey round by land being too far. They have a dim impression of something miraculous; “quaestio de *tempore* includit quaestionem de *modo*,” Bengel. Jesus does not enter upon their question, nor gratify their curiosity, but immediately charges them with the unspiritual motive that prompted them to seek Him, in order to point them to higher spiritual food. For γέγονας, *venisti*, see on i. 15. — οὐχ . . . ἀλλ.] not “*non tam . . . quam*” (Kuinoel, etc.); the ὅτι εἶδετε σημ. is *absolutely* denied. Comp. Fritzsche, *ad Marc. Exc.* II. p. 773. In the miraculous feeding they should have seen a divinely significant reference to the higher Messianic bread of life, and *this* ought to have led them to seek Jesus; but it was only the material satisfaction derived from the miraculous feeding that brought them to Him, as they hoped *that* He would further satisfy their carnal Messianic notions. — σημεῖα] They had seen the outward miracle, the mere event itself, but not the spiritual significance of it, — that wherein the real essence of the σημεῖον, in the true conception of it, consisted. The *plural* is not intended to include the healings of the sick, ver. 2

¹ See, concerning all the occurrences, ver. 26 fl., Harless, *Luther. Zeitschrift*, 1867, p. 116 fl.

(Bengel, Lücke, and most others), against which see ver. 4, but refers only to the feeding, as the antithesis ἀλλ' ὅτι shows, and it is therefore to be taken *generically*, as the plural of *category*.

Ver. 27. "*Strive to obtain, not the food which perisheth, but the food which endureth unto life eternal.*" The activity and labour of acquiring implied in ἐργάζεσθαι (*laborando sibi comparare*; comp. ἐργάζ. τὰ ἐπιτήδεια, Dem. 1358. 12; ἐργάζ. βρῶμα, Palaeph. xxi. 2; ἐργάζ. θησαυρούς, Theodot. Prov. xxi. 6; see especially Stephan. *Thes. Ed. Hase*, III. p. 1968) consists, when applied to the everlasting food, in striving and struggling after it, without which effort Jesus does not bestow it. We must come believingly to Him, must follow Him, must deny ourselves, and so on. Then we receive from Him, in ever-increasing measure, divine *grace and truth*, by a spiritual appropriation of *Himself*; and *this* is the abiding food, which for ever quickens and feeds the inner man; the thing itself not being really different from the *water*, which for ever quenches thirst (iv. 14). See on βρῶσις, iv. 32, also, and the οὐράνιος τροφή in Philo, *de profug.* p. 749; *Allegor.* p. 92. According to this view, the thought conveyed in ἐργάζεσθαι, as thus contrasted with that of δώσει on the other side, cannot be regarded as strange (against De Wette); both conceptions rather are necessary correlatives. Phil. ii. 12, 13. — τὴν ἀπολλυμ.] not merely in its power, but in its very nature; it is digested and ceases to be (Matt. xv. 17; 1 Cor. vi. 13). On the contrast, τ. μένουσ. εἰς ζ. αἰ., comp. iv. 14, xii. 25. — ἐσφραγ.] *sealed*, i.e. authenticated (see on iii. 33), namely, as the appointed Giver of this food; in what way? see v. 36-39. — ὁ θεός] emphatically added at the end to give greater prominence to the highest authority.

Vv. 28, 29. The people perceive that a *moral* requirement is signified by τὴν βρῶσιν τ. μένουσαν, etc.; they do not understand *what*, but they think that Jesus means *works*, which God requires to be done (ἔργα τ. θεοῦ, comp. Matt. vi. 33; Rev. ii. 26; Baruch ii. 9; Jer. xlviii. 10). Therefore the question, "*What are we to do, to work the works required by God?*" (which thou seemest to mean). Ἐργάζεσθαι ἔργα, "*to perform works*," very common in all Greek

(see on iii. 21); ἐργάζ. here, therefore, is not to be taken as in ver. 27. — Ver. 29. See Luthardt in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1852, p. 333 ff. Instead of the many ἔργα θεοῦ which they, agreeably to their legal standing-point, had in view, Jesus mentions only one ἔργον, in which, however, all that God requires of them is contained—the work (the moral act) of *faith*. Of this one divinely appointed and all-embracing work—the fundamental *virtue* required by God—the manifold ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ are only different manifestations. — In the *purpose* expressed by τοῦτο . . . ἵνα there lies the idea: “This is the work which God wills, *ye must believe*.” Comp. v. 50, xv. 8, 12, xvii. 3; 1 John iv. 17, v. 3. See on Phil. i. 9. And this fundamental requirement repeatedly recurs in the following discourses, vv. 35, 36, 40, 47, etc.

Vv. 30, 31. Οὐν] *What dost thou, therefore, as a sign?* for they knew well enough that by ὃν ἀπέστ. ἐκεῖνος He meant *Himself*, and that, too, as Messiah. Hence also the emphatic σὺ, *thou, on thy part*. The *question itself* does not imply that it is asked by those who had not seen the miraculous feeding the day before (Grotius), or by prominent Jews in the synagogue (Kuinoel, Klee). Moreover, this demand for a sign after the miracle of the feeding must not be regarded as contradictory and unhistorical (Kern, B. Bauer, Weisse), nor as a proof of the non-Johannine origin (Schweizer), or non-miraculous procedure (Schenkel), in the account of the feeding. For the questioners, in their ἀναίσθησις (Chrysostom), indicate at once (ver. 31), that having been miraculously fed with *earthly* food, they, in their desire for miracles, require something *higher* to warrant their putting the required faith in Him, and expect a sign from *heaven, heavenly* bread, such as God had given by Moses. Thus they explain their own question, which would be strange only if ver. 31 *did not immediately follow*. Their eagerness for Messianic miraculous attestation (vv. 14, 15) had *grown* during the night. This also against De Wette, who, with Weisse, concludes that this discourse was not originally connected with the miraculous feeding; see, on the contrary, Brückner. — τί ἐργάζη] a sarcastic retorting of the *form* of the requirement given, vv. 27, 29. Not to be explained as if it were τί σὺ ἐργ. (De Wette),

but what dost thou perform (as *σημεῖον*)? — *γεγραμμ.*] a free quotation of Ps. lxxviii. 24; comp. cv. 40, Ex. xvi. 4, where the subject of *ἔδωκεν* is God, but by the medium of *Moses*, this being taken for granted as known (ver. 32). The Jews regarded the *dispensing of the manna* as the greatest miracle (see Lampe). As they now regarded Moses as in general a type of Christ (Schoettgen, *Hor.* II. p. 475), they also hoped in particular, “Redemptor prior descendere fecit pro iis manna; sic et redemptor posterior descendere faciet manna.” *Midrash Coheleth*, f. 86. 4.

Vv. 32, 33. Jesus does not mean to deny the miraculous and heavenly origin of the manna in itself (Paulus), nor to argue polemically concerning the O. T. manna (Schenkel), but He denies its origin as heavenly in the higher *ideal sense* (comp. τὸν ἀληθινόν). The antithesis is not between the *ἀήρ* and the *κυρίως οὐρανός* (Chrysostom, Euthymius Zigabenus, Grotius, and most others), but between the type and the anti-type in its full realization. — *ὑμῖν*] *your nation*. — *ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*] here and in the second half of the verse to be joined to *δέδωκεν* (and *δίδωσιν*): “It is not Moses who dispensed to you the bread from heaven, but it is my Father who dispenseth to you from heaven that bread which is the true bread.” In ver. 31, too, *ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* is to be joined with *ἔδωκεν*; and observe also, that in Ex. xvi. 4 מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם belongs not to מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם, but to מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם. The expression *ἐκ τοῦ οὐρ.* is taken from Ex. xvi. 4; for, if we follow Ps. lxxviii. 24, cv. 40 (where מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם is an attribute of *bread*), we should have *ἄρτον οὐρανοῦ*. Comp. Targ. Jonath. Deut. xxxiv. 6: “Deus fecit descendere filiis Israel panem de coelo.” — *δίδωσιν*] continuously; for Jesus means Himself and His work. — τὸν ἀληθινόν] corresponding in reality to the idea. See on i. 9. Ἐκεῖνος γὰρ ὁ ἄρτος τυπικὸς ἦν, προτυπῶν, φησὶν, ἐμὲ τὸν αὐτοαλήθειαν ὄντα, Euthymius Zigabenus. This defining word, placed emphatically at the end, explains at the same time the negative statement at the beginning of the verse. — Ver. 33. Proof that it is the *Father* who gives, etc. (ver. 32); for it is none other than the *bread which is being bestowed by God*, that *comes down from heaven and giveth life to the world*. The argument proceeds *ab effectu* (ὁ καταβ. . . κόσμῳ) *ad*

causam (ὁ ἄρτος τοῦ θεοῦ). — ὁ καταβαίνων, κ.τ.λ.] refers to ὁ ἄρτος, and states its *specific property*, both as to its origin and working, both being essentially connected; it does not refer to *Jesus* ("He who cometh down," etc.), though, in the personal application of the general affirmation, Jesus, by the bread, *represents*, and must represent, Himself; and hence the expression "*cometh down*" (against Grotius, Dav. Schulz, Olshausen, Fritzsche in his *Novis opusc.* p. 221, Godet, and others). The direct reference to Jesus would anticipate the subsequent advance of the discourse (ver. 35), and would require ὁ καταβάς (ver. 41; comp. ver. 48). See on ver. 50. — ζώην] *life*. Without this bread, humanity (ὁ κόσμος) is *dead* in the view of Jesus—dead spiritually (ver. 35) and eternally (vv. 39, 40).

Ver. 34 ff. Πάντοτε] emphatically takes the lead.—The request is like that in iv. 15, but here, too, without *irony* (against Calvin, Bengel, Lampe), which would have implied unbelief in His power to give *such* bread. To explain the words as prompted by a dim *presentiment concerning the higher gift* (Lücke, B. Crusius, and most other expositors), is not in keeping with the stiffnecked antagonism of the Jews in the course of the following conversation. There is no trace of a further development of the supposed presentiment, nor of any approval and encouragement of it on the part of Jesus. The Jews, on the contrary, with their carnal minds, are quite indifferent whether anything supersensuous, and if so, what, is meant by that bread. They neither thought of an *outward glory*, which they ask for (Luthardt),—for they could only understand, from the words of Jesus, something analogous to the *manna*, though of a higher kind, perhaps "a magic food or means of life from heaven" (Tholuck),—nor had their thoughts risen to the *spiritual* nature of this mysterious bread. But, at any rate, they think that the higher manna, of which He speaks, would be a welcome gift to them, which they could always use. And they could easily suppose that He was capable of a *still* more miraculous distribution, who had even now so miraculously fed them with ordinary bread. Their unbelief (ver. 36) referred to Jesus Himself as that personal bread of life, to whom, indeed, as such, their carnal nature

was closed. — Vv. 35, 36. Explanation and censure. — ἐγώ] with powerful emphasis. Comp. iv. 26. — ὁ ἄρτος τ. ζωῆς] ζῶν διδούς τῷ κόσμῳ, ver. 33. Comp. ver. 68. — ὁ ἐρχόμε. πρὸς με] of a *believing* coming (v. 40); comp. vv. 47, 44, 45, 65. For ἐρχόμε. and πιστεύων, as also their correlatives οὐ μὴ πειν. and οὐ μὴ διψ., do not differ as antecedent and consequent (Weiss), but are only *formally* kept apart by means of the *parallelism*. This parallelism of the discourse, now become more excited, occasioned the addition of the οὐ μὴ διψήσῃ, which is out of keeping with the metaphor hitherto employed, and anticipates the subsequent turn which the discourse takes to the eating of the flesh and drinking of the blood. We must not imagine that by this a superiority to the manna is intended to be expressed, the manna being able to satisfy *hunger* only (Lücke); for both οὐ μὴ πειν. and οὐ μὴ διψ. signify the *same* thing—the everlasting satisfaction of the higher spiritual need. Comp. Isa. xlix. 10. — ἀλλ' εἶπον ὑμῖν] *But I would have you told that*, etc. Notice, therefore, that ὅτι ἑώρακ., κ.τ.λ., does not refer to a *previous* declaration, as there is not such a one (Beza, Grotius, Bengel, Olshausen, B. Crusius, Luthardt, Hengstenberg, Baeumlein, Godet, and most others: to ver. 26; Lücke, De Wette: to vv. 37–40; Euthymius Zigabenus: to an *unwritten* statement; Ewald: to one in a supposed fragment, *now lost*, which preceded chap. vi; Brückner: to a reproof which runs through the whole Gospel); on the contrary, the statement is itself announced by εἶπον (*dictum velim*). See, for this use of the word, Bernhardt, p. 381; Kühner, II. § 443. 1. In like manner xi. 42. In classical Greek, very common in the Tragedians; see especially Herm. *ad Viger.* p. 746. — καὶ ἑώρακ. με κ. οὐ πιστ.] *ye have even seen me* (not simply heard of me, but even are eye-witnesses of my Messianic activity), *and believe not*. On the first καί, comp. ix. 37, and see generally Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 3. 1; Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 149 ff.

Vv. 37 ff. Through this culpable οὐ πιστεύετε, they were quite different from those whom the Father gave Him. How entirely different were all these latter; and how blessed through me, according to the Father's will, must their lot be!—

παῦν] Neuter, of persons as in iii. 6, xviii. 2; 1 Cor. i. 27. It designates them as a "*totam quasi massam*," Bengel. — ὁ δίδ. μοι ὁ πατ.] viz. by the efficacious influence of His grace (vv. 44, 45), whereby He inclines them to come, and draws them to me; οὐ τὸ τυχὸν πρᾶγμα ἢ πίστις ἢ εἰς ἐμέ. ἀλλὰ τῆς ἁνωθεν δεῖται ῥοπῆς, Chrysostom. Moral self-determination (v. 40, vii. 17; Matt. xxiii. 37) may obey this influence (ver. 40), and may withstand it; he who withstands it is *not* given Him by the Father, Phil. ii. 13. "There is implied here a *humble*, simple, hungry and thirsting soul," Luther. Explanations resting on dogmatic preconceptions are: of the absolute *election of grace* (Augustine, Beza, and most others¹), of the natural *pietatis studium* (Grotius), and others. — πρὸς ἐμέ] afterwards πρὸς με. But ἐμέ is emphatic. The ἤξει is not *more* (*arrivera jusqu'à moi*, Godet) than ἐλεύσεται, as ver. 35 already shows; comp. the following κ. τ. ἐρχόμενον, with which ἤξω is again resumed. — οὐ μὴ ἐκβάλω ἔξω] *I certainly will not cast him out, i.e.* will not exclude him from my kingdom on its establishment; comp. vv. 39, 40, xv. 6; also Matt. viii. 12, xxii. 13. The negative expression is a *litotes* full of love; Nonnus adds: ἀλλὰ νόφ χαίρουσι δεδέξομαι. — Vv. 38, 39. "How could I cast them out, seeing that I am come only to fulfil the *divine* will? and this requires of me, not the rejection of any one, but the blessed opposite." — οὐχ ἵνα, κ.τ.λ.] Comp. v. 30. — τοῦτο δὲ . . . πέμψ. με] impressive repetition of the same words. — παῦν ὁ δέδωκε, κ.τ.λ.] *Nominative absolute*, unconnected with the following, and significantly put first. Comp. viii. 38, xv. 2, xvii. 2; and see on Matt. vii. 24, x. 14,

¹ See, on the contrary, Weiss, *Lehrbegr.* p. 142 ff. — Schleiermacher rationalizes the divine gift and drawing into a divine *arrangement of circumstances*; see *L. J.* p. 302 ff. Thus it would be resolved into the general government of the world. — According to Beyschlag, p. 162, there would be in this action of the Father, preparing the way for a cleaving to Christ (comp. vv. 44, 45), an opposition to the light-giving action of the Logos (vv. 4, 5, 9), if the Logos be a personality identical with the Son. But the difference in person between the Father and the Son does not exclude the *harmonious* action of both for each other. Enlightening is not a monopoly of the Son, excluding the Father; but the Father draws men to the Son, and the Son is the way to the Father. Weiss has rightly rejected as unjohannean (p. 248 f.) the idea of a hidden God, as absolutely raised above the world, who has no immediate connection with the finite.

32, xii. 36; Buttmann, *N. T. Gr.* p. 325 [E. T. p. 379]. Here the *Perfect* δέδωκε, because spoken from the standing-point of the *future*.—μὴ ἀπολ. ἐξ αὐτοῦ] *sc.* τι; see Fritzsche, *Conject.* p. 36. The conception of *losing* (i.e. of letting fall down to eternal death; see the antithesis ἀλλὰ, etc.) is correlative to that of the δέδωκέ μοι. Comp. xvii. 12.—ἀναστήσω, κ.τ.λ.] of the actual resurrection at the last day (comp. v. 29, xi. 24, xii. 48), which, as a matter of course, includes the transformation of those still living. The designation of the thing is *a potiori*. It is the *first* resurrection that is meant (see on Luke xiv. 14, xx. 34; Phil. iii. 11; 1 Cor. xv. 23), that to the *everlasting life of the Messianic kingdom*. See on v. 29. Bengel well says: “hic finis est, ultra quem periculum nullum.” Comp. the recurrence of this blessed refrain, vv. 40, 44, 54, which, in the face of this solemn recurrence, Scholten regards as a gloss.

Ver. 40. Explanation, and consequently an assigning of the reason for the statement of God's will, ver. 39; the words τοῦτο, etc., being an impressive *anaphora*, and τοῦ πατρός μου being spoken instead of τοῦ πέμψ. με, because at the close Jesus means to describe Himself, with still more specific definiteness, as the *Son*.—ὁ θεωρ. τὸν υἱὸν κ. πιστ. εἰς αὐτ.] characterizes those meant by the ὁ δέδωκέ μοι. There is implied in θεωρ. the *attenta contemplatio* (τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς τῆς ψυχῆς, Euthymius Zigabenus), the *result* of which is faith. Observe the *carefully chosen* word (Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 121; Grotius, *in loc.*). The Jews have *seen* Him, and have *not* believed, ver. 36. One must *contemplate* Him, and believe.—ἔχει and ἀναστήσω are both dependent upon ἵνα. There is nothing decisive against the rendering of καὶ ἀναστ. independently (Vulgate, Luther, Luthardt, Hengstenberg), but the analogy of ver. 39 does not favour it. Observe the change of tenses. The believer is said to have eternal Messianic life already in its development in time (see on iii. 15), but its perfect *completion*¹ at the last day by means of the resurrection; therefore ἀναστήσω *after* the ἔχειν of the ζωὴ αἰών.—ἐγώ] from the consciousness of Messianic power. Comp. vv. 44, 54.

¹ Nothing is further from John than the Gnostic opinion, 2 Tim. ii. 18, upon which, according to Baur, he is said very closely to border.

Vv. 41, 42. "*They murmured*, and this μετ' ἀλλήλων, ver. 43, *against Him with reference to what He had said, viz. that,*" etc. Upon all the rest they reflect no further, but *this* assertion of Jesus impresses them all the more offensively, and among themselves they give expression half aloud to their *dissatisfaction*. This last thought is not contained in the word itself (comp. vii. 32, 12; according to Pollux, v. 89, it was also used of the cooing of doves), but in the context (οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι). We are not therefore, as De Wette supposes, to think of it merely as a *whispering*. Comp. rather ver. 61; Matt. xx. 11; Luke v. 30; 1 Cor. x. 10; Num. xi. 1, xiv. 27; Eccclus. x. 24; Judith v. 22; Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 358. — οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι] The opposition party among the Jews were therefore among the ὄχλος (vv. 5, 22, 24). Even in the congregation of the synagogue itself (ver. 59), though it included many followers of Jesus (ver. 60), there may have been present members of the spiritual aristocracy (see on i. 19). The assumption that the ὄχλος itself is here called οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, on account of its refusal to recognise Jesus (De Wette, Tholuck, Baur, Brückner, Hengstenberg, Godet, and most others), is more far-fetched, for hitherto the ὄχλος had shown itself sensuously eager indeed after miracles, but not hostile. — ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος κ.τ.λ.] compiled from vv. 33, 35, 38. — οὗτος] on both occasions, contemptuously. — ἡμεῖς] we on our part. — οἶδαμεν τ. πατ. κ. τ. μητ.] This human descent which they knew (comp. Matt. xiii. 55) seemed to them in contradiction with that assertion, and to exclude the possibility of its truth. Heb. vii. 3 (ἀπάτωρ ἀμήτωρ) does not apply here, because it is not a question of the Messiahship of Jesus, but of His coming down from heaven. — τὸν πατέρα κ. τὴν μητ.] The words, on the face of them, convey the impression that *both* were still alive; the usual opinion that Joseph (whom subsequent tradition represents as already an old man at the time of his espousal with Mary; see Thilo, *ad Cod. Apocr.* I. p. 361) was already dead, cannot, to say the least, be certainly proved (comp. also Keim, *Gesch. J.* I. 426), though in John also he is entirely withdrawn from the history.

Vv. 43, 44. Jesus does not enter upon a *solution* of this difficulty, but admonishes them not to trouble themselves

with it; they should not dwell upon such questions, but upon something far higher; the "drawing" of the Father is the condition of participation in His salvation.—The ἐλκύειν is not simply a strengthening of the διδόναι in vv. 37, 38, but specifies the *method* of it, an *inner drawing and leading to Christ through the working of divine grace* (comp. LXX. Jer. xxxi. 3), which, however, does not *annul* human freedom, but which, by means of the enlightening, animating, and impelling influence, and of the instruction appropriated by the man, wins him over. Comp. xii. 32. Ἐλκύειν (ver. 45) *includes* the Father's *teaching* by His witness to Christ (Weiss), but this is not all that it comprehends; it denotes rather the whole of that divine influence whereby hearts are won to the Son. In the consciousness of those who are thus won, this represents itself as a holy *necessity*, to which they have yielded. Comp. Wisd. xix. 4, where the opposite, the attraction of evil, appears as a necessity which draws them along, yet without destroying freedom. See Grimm, *Handb.* p. 292 f. Comp. also the classical ἔλκομαι ἦτορ (Pind. *Nem.* iv. 56), ἔλκει τὸ τῆς φύσεως βάρβαρον (Dem. 563, 14), and the like. Augustine already compares from the Latin the "*trahit sua quemque voluptas*" of Virgil. The word¹ *in itself* may denote what *involves force*, and is involuntary (Acts xvi. 19; 3 Macc. iv. 7; 4 Macc. xi. 9; Homer, *Il.* xi. 258; xxiv. 52, 417; Soph. *O. C.* 932; Aristoph. *Eq.* 710; Plato, *Rep.* iv. p. 539 B, and often; see Ast, *Lex. Plat.* I. p. 682), which is *always* expressed by σύρειν (comp. Tittm. *Syn.* p. 56 ff.); but the context itself shows that this is *not* meant *here* (in the classics it may even stand for *invitare*; see Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* IX. 142). Accordingly it is not, as Calvin judges, false and impious to say: "*non nisi volentes trahi*;" and Beza's "*Volumus, quia datum est, ut velimus*," is true and pious only in the sense of Phil. ii. 13. Comp. Augustine: "*non ut homines, quod fieri non potest, nolentes credant, sed ut volentes ex nolentibus fiant.*" — ὁ πέμψ. με] a specific relationship with which the saving act of the ἐλκύειν essentially corresponds. — καὶ ἐγὼ ἀναστήσω, κ.τ.λ.] the same solemn promise which we have already, vv.

¹ The Attics also prefer the Aorist form of ἔλκω to that of ἔλκω, but they form the future ἔλξω rather than ἔλκυσω (xii. 32). See Lobeck, *Paral.* p. 35 f.

39, 40, but with the ἐγώ of Messianic authority and power, as in ver. 54.

Vv. 45, 46 serve more fully to explain ἐλκύνειν. — ἐν τοῖς προφ.] *in volumine prophetarum*, Acts vii. 42, xiii. 40; Rom. ix. 24. The passage is Isa. liv. 13 (a free quotation from the LXX.), which treats of the divine and universal enlightenment of Israel in the time of the Messiah (comp. Joel iii. 1 ff.; Jer. xxxi. 33, 34): "and they shall be wholly taught of God." The main idea does not lie in πάντες, which, moreover, in the connection of the passage refers to all *believers*, but in διδασκτοὶ θεοῦ (*a Deo edocti*; as to the genitive, see on 1 Cor. ii. 13, and Kühner, II. § 516, *b*), which denotes the divine drawing viewed as *enlightening* and influencing. The διδασκτὸν θεοῦ εἶναι is the *state* of him who hears and has learned of the Father; see what follows. — πᾶς ὁ ἀκούων, κ.τ.λ.] The spurious οὖν rightly indicates the connection (against Olshausen); for it follows from that promise, that every one *who hears and is taught of the Father* comes to the Son, and no others; because, were it not so, the community of believers would not be unmixedly the διδασκτοὶ θεοῦ. Ἀκούειν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς is the spiritual perception of divine instruction; the subject-matter of which, as the whole context clearly shows, is the Son and His work. The communication of this revelation is, however, *continuous* (hence ἀκούων), and the "having learned" is its *actual result*, by the attainment of which through personal exertion the ἔρχεται πρὸς με is conditioned. One hears and has learned of the Father; in no other way is one in the condition which internally necessitates a believing union with the Son. Comp. Matt. xi. 25 ff.—Ver. 46. By this hearing and having learned of the Father, I do not mean an immediate and *intuitive* fellowship with Him, which, indeed, would render the coming to the Son unnecessary; no; no one save the Son only has had the *vision* of God (comp. i. 18, iii. 13, viii. 38), therefore all they who are διδασκτοὶ θεοῦ have to find in the Son alone all further initiation into God's grace and truth. — οὐκ ὅτι] οὐκ ἐρῶ, ὅτι. See Hartung, II. 154; Buttmann, *N. T. Gr.* p. 318 ff. [E. T. p. 372].— It serves to obviate a misunderstanding. — εἰ μὴ, κ.τ.λ.] *except He who is from God, He hath seen the Father* (that is, in His

pre-existent state).¹ Comp. Gal. i. 7. — ὁ ὦν παρὰ τ. θ.] for He is *come* from the Father, with whom He was (i. 1). See on i. 14, viii. 42, vii. 29, xvi. 27.

Vv. 47, 48. Jesus had given His answer to the murmurings of the Jews in vv. 43–46. He now returns to the subject which He had left, and first repeats in solemn asseveration what He had said in ver. 40; then He again brings forward the metaphor of the bread of life, which sets forth the same thought.

Vv. 49, 50. Οἱ πατέρες, κ.τ.λ.] “regeruntur Judaeis verba ipsorum ver. 31,” Bengel. — ἀπέθανον . . . ἀποθάνῃ] a diversity in the reference which is full of meaning: loss of *earthly* life, loss of *eternal* life, whose development, already begun in time (see on iii. 15), the death of the body does not interrupt (xi. 25). — οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἄρτος, κ.τ.λ.] of *this* nature is the bread which cometh down from heaven: *one* (τις) *must eat thereof*, and (in consequence of this eating) *not die*. This representation is contained in οὗτος . . . ἵνα; see on ver. 29. The expression, however, is not conditional (ἐάν τις), because the telic reference (ἵνα) does not belong to the last part merely. The *present participle* shows that Jesus does not mean by

¹ This clear and direct reference to His pre-human state in God (comp. vv. 41, 42), and consequently the agreement of Christ's witness to Himself with the view taken by the evangelist, should not have been regarded as doubtful by Weizsäcker. The divine life which was manifested in Christ upon earth was the personal life of His pre-existent state, as the prologue teaches, otherwise John had not given the original sense of the declaration of the Lord regarding Himself (to which conclusion Weizsäcker comes in the *Jahrb. f. D. Th.* 1862, p. 674), which, however, is inconceivable in so great and ever-recurring a leading point. It is the transcendent recollection in His temporal self-consciousness of that earlier divine condition, which makes itself known in such declarations (comp. iii. 11). See on viii. 38, xvii. 5. His certitude concerning the perfect revelation does not first begin with the baptism, but stretches back with its roots into His pre-human existence. See, against Weizsäcker, Beyschlag also, p. 79 ff., who, however (comp. p. 97 f.), in referring it to the sinless birth, and further to the pre-existent state of Jesus, *as the very image of God*, is not just to the Johannine view in the prologue, and in the first epistle, as well as here, and in the analogous testimonies of Jesus regarding Himself. See on ver. 62. Beyschlag renders: “because He is of God, He has seen God in His historical existence.” The far-fetched thought is here brought in, that only the pure in heart can see God. Comp. rather i. 18, iii. 13, 31, 32, viii. 26, 38. See, against this view of the continuous historical intimacy with God, Pfleiderer in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr.* 1866, p. 247 ff.; Scholten, p. 116 ff.

οὔτος His own concrete Personality, which is not named till ver. 51, but intends to set forth and exhibit the true bread from heaven generally, according to its real nature (comp. ver. 58). On τὶς, *one*, comp. Dem. *Phil.* i. 8, and Bremi, p. 118; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. 883; Nägelsbach on the *Iliad*, p. 299, ed. 3.

Ver. 51. Continuation of the exposition concerning the bread of life, which He is. "I am not only the life-giving bread (ὁ ἄρτος τ. ζωῆς, ver. 48); I am also the *living* bread; he who eats thereof shall live for ever," because the life of this bread is imparted to the partaker of it. Comp. v. 26, xiv. 19. Observe the threefold advance: (1) ὁ ἄρτος τ. ζωῆς, ver. 48, and ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ζῶν, ver. 51; (2) the universal καταβαίνων, ver. 50, and the historically concrete καταβάς, ver. 51; (3) the negative μὴ ἀποθάνη, ver. 50, and the positive ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ver. 51. — καὶ ὁ ἄρτος δὲ δὲ ἐγὼ δώσω] Christ is the bread, and He will also *give* it (consequently give *Himself*); how *this* is to take place, He now explains. The advance lies in δὲ ἐγὼ δώσω; hence also the καὶ δέ which carries on the discourse, and the emphatic repetition of the thought, ἦν ἐγὼ δώσω. Translate: "and *the* bread also *which* I (I on my part, ἐγὼ) *will give* [instead now of saying: *is myself*, He expresses what He means more definitely] *is my flesh*," etc. Concerning καὶ . . . δέ, *atque etiam*, καὶ being *and*, and δέ expressing the idea *on the other hand*, see in particular Krüger, and Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 1. 3; Baumlein, *Partik.* p. 149. It often introduces, as in this case, something that is specially important. See Bremi, *ad Dem. Ol.* II. p. 173. Observe, moreover, that what Christ promises to give is not *external to His own Person* (against Kling in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1836, p. 142 f.). — ἡ σὰρξ μου ἐστίν] He promises to give His *flesh*, *i.e.* by His bloody *death*, to which He here, as already in ii. 19, and to Nicodemus, iii. 14, 15, prophetically points. Σὰρξ is the *living* corporeal substance; this His living corporeity Christ will *give, give up, that it may be slain* (ἦν ἐγὼ δώσω), in order that thereby, as by the offering of the propitiatory sacrifice,¹ He may be the means of pro-

¹ Not that by the death of Jesus the barrier of the independent individuality existing between the Logos and the human being is destroyed. See against this explanation (Köstlin, Reuss), so foreign to John Weiss, *Lehrbegr.* p. 65 ff.

curing eternal life for mankind, *i.e.* ὑπὲρ (for the benefit of) τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς; comp. 1 John iv. 10, 14. But as the atoning efficacy which this giving up of His flesh has, must be inwardly *appropriated* by faith, Christ's σὰρξ, according to the figure of the bread of life, inasmuch as He means to give it up to death, appears as the *bread* which He will give to be *partaken of* (δὲν ἐγὼ δώσω). In the repeated δώσω there lies the ἐκούσιον of the surrender (Euthymius Zigabenus). But observe the difference of reference, that of the first δώσω to the giving up *for eating*, and that of the second to the giving up *to death*.¹ That eating is the *spiritual* manducatio,² the inward, real appropriation of Christ which, by means of an ever-continuing faith that brings about this appropriation, and makes our life the life of Christ within us (Gal. ii. 20; Eph. iii. 17), takes place with regard to all the benefits which Christ "carne sua pro nobis in mortem tradita et sanguine suo pro nobis effuso promeruit." *Forma Concordiae*, p. 744. On the idea of the life of Christ in believers, see on Phil i. 8. On σὰρξ, so far as it was put to death in Christ by His crucifixion, comp. 1 Pet. iii. 18; Eph. ii. 14; Col. i. 20 ff.; Heb. x. 20.

¹ The words ἢ ἰγὼ δώσω are wanting in B C D L T N, a few cursives, several versions (following Vulg. It.), and Fathers (even Origen twice), and are rejected by Lachm., Ewald, Tisch., Baeumlein, Harless. The preponderance of testimony is certainly against them; and in omitting them we should not, with Kling, take ἢ σὰρξ μου as in apposition with ὁ ἄρτος (see, on the contrary, Rückert, *Abendm.* p. 259), but simply render it: "the bread which I shall give is my flesh for the life of the world" (the former is the latter for the life of the world). But this short pregnant mode of expression is so little like John, and the repetition of ἢ ἰγὼ δώσω is so completely Johannian, that I feel compelled to retain the words as genuine, and to regard their omission as a very early error, occasioned by the occurrence of the same words a little before. Following N, Tischendorf now reads, after κ. ὁ ἄρτ. δι: δὲ ἰγὼ δώσω ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς, ἢ σὰρξ μου ἵστίιν. This is manifestly an arrangement resorted to in order to assign to the words ὑπ. τ. τ. κ. ζωῆς the place which, in the absence of ἢ ἰγὼ δώσω, seemed to belong to them. Baeumlein supposes that ὑπ. τ. τ. κ. ζωῆς is an ancient gloss.

² The expression "resurrection of the flesh" cannot be justified from John vi., as Delitzsch, *Psychol.* p. 460 [E. T. p. 541], supposes. If it cannot be justified by anything in St. Paul, which Delitzsch admits, it can least of all by anything in St. John. When, indeed, Delitzsch says (p. 339), "The flesh of Christ becomes in us a tincture of immortality, which, in spite of corruption, sustains the essence of our flesh, in order one day at the resurrection to assimilate also His manifestation to itself," we can only oppose to such fancies, "*Ne ultra quod scriptum est.*"

This explanation, which refers the words to Christ's *propitiatory death*, is that of Augustine, Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, Beza, Aretius, Grotius, Calovius, Wetstein, Lampe, and most others, also of Kuinoel, Lücke, Tholuck, Ammon, Neander, J. Müller (*Diss.* 1839), Lange, Ebrard, *Dogma v. Abendm.* I. p. 78 ff.; Keim, in the *Jahrb. f. d. Theol.* 1859, p. 109 ff.; Weiss; comp. also Ewald, Kahnis (*Dogmat.* I. p. 624), Godet.¹ Others, following Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Basil, have understood by *σάϕξ* the entire human manifestation of the *Logos*, which He offered up for the world's salvation, including therein His death (so in modern times, in particular, Paulus, D. Schulz, *Lehre vom Abendm.*, B. Crusius, Frommann, De Wette, Baeumlein; comp. Schleiermacher, *L. J.* p. 345, and Reuss). Not only is the future *δῶσω* opposed to this view, but the drinking of the blood in ver. 53 still more distinctly points to Christ's death as *exclusively* meant; because it would not be apparent why Jesus, had He intended generally that collective dedication of Himself, should have used expressions to describe the appropriation of it, which necessarily and directly point to and presuppose His death. That general consecration was already affirmed in *ἐγὼ εἶμι ὁ ἄρτος, κ.τ.λ.*; the advance from *being* and *giving* now demands something else, a concrete act, viz. His atoning death and the shedding of His blood. This tells also against the profounder development of the self-communication of Jesus which is said to be meant here, and is adopted by Hengstenberg and Hofmann (*Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 245 ff.), following Luther;² viz. that faith in the human nature of Jesus eats and drinks the life of God, or that His life-giving power is bound up in His flesh, i.e. in His actual human manifestation (Brückner). Others, again,

¹ Who, however, attaches great importance to the corporeal side of the real fellowship of believers with Christ, by virtue of which they will become at the resurrection the reproduction of the glorified Christ, referring to Eph. v. 30. The eating and drinking alone are figurative, while the not merely spiritual, but also bodily appropriation, must, according to him, be taken literally. This, however, is not required by the *ἀναστήσω αὐτὸν, κ.τ.λ.*, ver. 54, which we already had in ver. 39, and is not even admissible by ver. 63.

² "Therefore one eats and drinks the Godhead in His human nature.—This flesh does not carnalize, but will deify thee, i.e. give thee divine power, virtue, and work, and will take away sins," and so on (*Pred. Dom. Oculi*).

have explained it *of the Lord's Supper*; viz. Chrysostom, Cyril, Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, most of the Fathers (among the Latin Fathers, Cyprian, Hilary, perhaps also Augustine, etc.) and Catholic writers, also Klee and Maier, further, Calixtus too, strongly opposed by Calovius; and among moderns, Scheibel, Olshausen, Kling in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1836, p. 140 ff.; Lindner, Köstlin, Delitzsch in Rudelbach's *Zeitschrift*, 1845, ii. p. 29; Kaeuffer in the *Sächs. Stud.* 1846, p. 70 ff.; Kahnis, *Abendm.* p. 104 ff.; Luthardt; Richter in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1863, p. 250; further, while also calling in question the genuineness of the discourse, Bretschneider, Strauss, Weisse, Baur, Hilgenfeld, and many others. Thus, as iii. 5 refers to baptism, we have now, it is said, a reference to the second sacrament. This explanation¹ has already this against it, that the eating and drinking is regarded as *continuous* (ver. 56); and, moreover, it can be maintained only by *surrendering the authenticity* of John. But if this be assumed, and the discourse be regarded as historical, Jesus could not Himself speak in the manner in which He here does of the Lord's Supper. Had this been His reference, He would have spoken inappropriately, and in terms which differ essentially from His own mode of expression at the institution of the holy meal, irrespective of the fact that a discourse upon the *Lord's Supper* at this time would have been utterly incomprehensible to His hearers, especially to the *Ἰουδαῖοι* who were addressed. Moreover, there nowhere occurs in the Gospels a hint given *beforehand* of the Supper which was to be instituted; and therefore, that this institution was not now already in the thoughts of Jesus (as Godet, following Bengel and others, maintains), but was the product of the hour of the Supper itself, appears all the more likely, seeing how utterly groundless is the assumption based on ver. 4, that Jesus, in the feeding of the multitude, improvised a paschal feast. To this it must be added, that the promise of life which is attached to the eating and drinking could apply only to the case of

¹ A view which Luther decidedly opposed previous to the controversy regarding the Lord's Supper. In the heading or gloss he says: "This chapter does not speak of the sacrament of the bread and wine, but of spiritual eating, i.e. of the belief that Christ, both God and man, hath shed His blood for us."

those who worthily partake. We would therefore have to assume that the *reporter John* (see especially Kaeuffer, *l.c.*; comp. also Weisse, B. Crusius, Köstlin, etc.) *had put* this discourse concerning the Lord's Supper *into the mouth of Christ*; and against this it tells in general, that thus there would be on John's part a misconception, or rather an arbitrariness, which, granting the genuineness of the Gospel, cannot be attributed to this most trusted disciple and his vivid recollections; and in particular, that the drinking of the blood, if it were, as in the Lord's Supper, a special and essential part, would not have remained unmentioned at the very end of the discourse, vv. 57, 58; and that, again, the evangelist would make Jesus speak of the Lord's Supper in terms which lie quite beyond the range of the N. T., and which belong to the mode of representation and language of the apostolic Fathers and still later writers (see the passages in Kaeuffer, p. 77 ff.; Rückert, p. 274 f.; Hilgenfeld, *Evang.* p. 278).¹ This is specially true of the word *σάρξ*, for which all places in the N. T. referring to the Lord's Supper (Matt. xxvi. 26 ff.; Mark xiv. 22 ff.; Luke xxiv. 24 ff.; 1 Cor. xi. 23 ff.) have *σῶμα*; so that here accordingly there ought to have been stated the identity, not of the bread and the *flesh* (which Baur in particular urges), but of the bread and the *body*; while with reference to the blood, the element identified (the *wine*) ought also to have been mentioned. Further, the passage thus taken would speak of the literal "*eating and drinking*" of the flesh and blood, which is a much later materializing of the N. T. *κοινωνία* in the Lord's Supper; and lastly, the absolute necessity of this ordinance,² which ver. 53 ff. would thus assert, is not once mentioned thus directly by the Fathers of the first centuries; whereas the N. T., and John in particular, make *faith* alone the absolutely necessary condition of salvation. Had John been speaking of the Lord's Supper, he must have spoken in harmony with the N. T. view and mode of ex-

¹ Hilgenfeld calls the passages in Justin, *Apol.* i. 66; Ignatius, *ad Smyrn.* 7, *ad Rom.* 7, an admirable commentary upon our text. They would, indeed, be so if our evangelist himself were a post-apostolic writer belonging to the second century.

² Its limitation to the *Contemptus sacramenti* (Richter) is a dogmatic subterfuge which has no foundation in the text.

pression, and must have made Jesus speak of it in the same way. But the discourse, *as it lies before us*, if taken as referring to the Lord's Supper, would be an unexampled and utterly inconceivable ὑστερον πρότερον; and therefore even the assumption that at least the same *idea* which lay at the root of the Lord's Supper, and out of which it sprang, is here expressed (Olshausen, Kling, Lange, Tholuck, etc.; comp. Kahnis, Keim, Luthardt, Hengstenberg, Ewald, Godet), is only admissible so far as the appropriation of Christ's life, brought about by faith in His death, which here is enjoined with such concrete vividness as absolutely necessary,¹ likewise constitutes the sacred and fundamental basis presupposed in the institution of the Supper and forms the condition of its blessedness; and therefore the *application* of the passage to the Lord's Supper (but at the same time to baptism and to the efficacy of the word) justly, nay necessarily, arises. Comp. the admirable remarks of Harless, p. 130 ff.—According to Rückert (*Abendm.* p. 291 f.), the discourse is not intended by Jesus to refer to the Supper, but is so intended by John, through whose erroneous and crude method of apprehension the readers are supposed to be taught, whether they themselves believed in an actual eating of the flesh and drinking of the blood, or whether this was a stumbling-block to them. An interpretation this which is neither indicated by the text nor has any historical basis.—Upon the history of the interpretation of our text, see Lücke, ed. 2, App. 2; Lindner, *vom Abendm.* p. 241 ff.; Tischendorf, *De Christo pane vite*, 1839, p. 15 ff.; Mack, *Quartalschr.* 1832, I. p. 52 ff.; Kahnis, p. 114 ff.; Rückert, p. 273 ff. The exposition which takes it to refer to faith in the atoning death forms the basis of Zwingle's doctrine of the Eucharist. See Dieckhoff, *evangel. Abendmahlslehre*, I. p. 440.

Vv. 52, 53. The Jews rightly add φάγεῖν, borrowing it from the preceding context; but the meaning and reference of the expression, which they certainly recognised as somehow to be taken figuratively, are to them so indistinct, that they fall into a dispute with each other ("non jam solum

¹ "He makes it so that it could not be plainer, in order that they might not think that he was speaking of something else, or of anything that was not before their eyes; but that He was speaking of Himself."—LUTHER.

murmurabant uti ver. 41," Bengel) upon the question: "*How can this man give us his flesh* (τὴν σάρκα, also without the αὐτοῦ, a gloss in Lachm.) *to eat?*" Not as if they had *missed hearing* something (Luthardt: "the *futurity* implied in the expression, ver. 51"), but they did not *understand* the enigmatical statement. Instead now of explaining the *how* of their question, Jesus sets before them the absolute *necessity* of their partaking, and in still more extreme terms lays down the requirement, which seemed so paradoxical to them; for He now adds the *drinking of His blood*, in order thus to bring more prominently into view the reference to His *death*, and its life-giving power to be experienced by believing appropriation. — τοῦ υἱοῦ τ. ἀνθρ.] This prophetic and Messianic self-designation (i. 52, iii. 13, 14), which could now less easily escape the notice of His hearers than in ver. 27, serves as a still more solemn expression in place of μου, without, however, affecting the meaning of the eating and drinking. — οὐκ ἔχετε ζωὴν ἐν ἑαυτ.] "*ye have not life in yourselves*," "*life is foreign to and remote from your own inner nature*,"—*death* is the power that ye have in you, spiritual and eternal death; life must first, by that eating and drinking, be inwardly united with your own selves. In that appropriation of the flesh and blood of Jesus, this life flows forth from *His* life (vv. 56, 57, v. 26); and it is attached to faith only, not to the use of any outward element (comp. Harless, p. 124).

Vv. 54, 55. He now more fully explains Himself, onwards to ver. 58, with regard to the saving efficacy of this spiritual eating and drinking: "*He who eateth my flesh*," etc. — ὁ τρώγων] Previously the word was φάγητε, but there is in the change no special intention as if to use a stronger term (to chew, to crunch), as the repetition of πίνων shows. Comp. Dem. 402. 21: τρώγειν καὶ πίνειν. Plut. Mor. p. 613 B; Polyb. xxxii. 9. 9. Comp. also xiii. 18; Matt. xxiv. 38. — ζωὴν αἰών.] Fuller definition of the general ζωὴ which precedes; it signifies the *eternal Messianic life*, but the development of this in time as *spiritual* life is included in the thought; therefore ἔχει (iii. 15), and the result of the possession of this life: ἀναστήσω, κ.τ.λ. Comp. ver. 40. — Ver. 55. Proof of the assertion ἔχει . . . ἡμέρα; for if the flesh of Jesus were

not *true* food (something *which in very deed has nourishing power*), etc., the effect named in ver. 54 could not ensue. It is self-evident that food for the *inner* man is meant; but ἀληθής (see the critical notes) is not the same as ἀληθινή (this would mean *genuine* food, food that realizes its own ideal). It denotes the opposite of that which is merely apparent or so called, and therefore expresses the *actual fact* (1 John ii. 27; Acts xii. 9), which the Jews could not understand, since they asked πῶς δύναται, κ.τ.λ., ver. 52.

Vv. 56, 57. A statement parallel with what precedes, concerning him "who eats," etc., and explaining *how that comes to pass* which is said of him in ver. 54. — ἐν ἐμοὶ μένει καὶ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῷ] an expression distinctively Johannean of abiding, inner, and mutual fellowship (xv. 4 ff., xvii. 23; 1 John iii. 24, iv. 16), by virtue of which we live and move continually in Christ, and Christ works and rules in our minds, so that thus Christ's life is the centre and circumference, *i.e.* the all-determining power of our life. — Ver. 57. Consequence of this spiritual union: *life, i.e.* true imperishable life, as proceeding from the Father to the Son, so from the Son to believers. Observe (1) that the consequent clause does not begin with καὶ γὰρ (Chrysostom and his followers); but, as ver. 56 requires, with κ. ὁ τρώγων με, *so also he that eateth me*; (2) that in the antecedent clause the emphasis is on ζῶν and ζῶ (therefore ἀπέστειλε does not introduce any strange or unnatural thought, as Rückert supposes), while in the consequent it is upon the *subject*, which accordingly is made prominent by κακεῖνος, *he also*. — ὁ ζῶν πατήρ] the living Father (comp. ver. 26), the Living One absolutely, in whose nature there is no element of death, but all is life. — καὶ γὰρ ζῶ διὰ τ. πατ.] *and I—by virtue of my community of essence with the Father—am alive because of the Father.* διὰ with the accus. does not denote the cause (Castalio, Beza, De Wette, Gess, Rückert, and several), *per patrem*; nor *for* the Father (Paulus, Lange); but, according to the context, the *reason: because of* the Father, *i.e.* because my Father is the Living One. See on xv. 3; Plat. *Conv.* p. 203 E: ἀναβιώσκειται διὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς φύσιν; and see Nägelsbach, *Ilias*, p. 39 ff. ed. 3. — ὁ τρώγων με] This sufficed to denote the

relation, and is in keeping with the transition to ver. 58; whereas, if the discourse referred to the Lord's Supper, the eating and drinking of the flesh and blood should again have been mentioned, as in vv. 53-56. Note also that ὁ τρώγων με expresses a permanent, continuous relation, not one taking place from time to time, as in the Lord's Supper. — ζήσει] in contrast with spiritual and eternal death. — δι' ἐμέ] *on account of me*, because he thus takes up *my* life into himself.

Vv. 58, 59. A concluding summary, repeating *the* figure from which the whole discourse arose, ver. 32. — οὗτος] of *this* nature, as explained in vv. 32-57. Comp. ver. 50; not: "*this*, which gives life to him who partakes of it" (Lücke); nor: "*this*, i.e. *my flesh and blood*" (De Wette); what follows requires in οὗτος the idea of *modality*. — οὐ καθὼς, κ.τ.λ.] It is the bread that came down from heaven, but not in *the same* way and manner that the fathers did eat heavenly bread. It is quite *different* in the case of this bread. — Ver. 59 is simply an historical observation, without any further significance (Chrysostom: in order to impress us with the great *guilt* of the people of Capernaum). That ταῦτα means simply the discourse from ver. 41 onwards, and that what precedes down to ver. 40 was not spoken in the synagogue, but elsewhere, upon the first meeting with the people, vv. 24, 25 (Ewald), would need to have been more distinctly indicated. Taking John's words as they stand, ἐν συναγωγῇ, etc., is a more definite (according to Schenkel, indeed, mistaken) supplementary explanation of the vague πέραν τ. θαλάσσης of ver. 25. — ἐν συναγωγῇ, without the Art., as in xviii. 20: *in synagogue*; then follows the still more detailed designation of the locality, "*teaching in Capernaum*."

Ver. 60. Πολλοὶ οὖν] *Many therefore*, for in Capernaum He had many adherents (μαθηταί is here used in the wider sense, not of the apostles; see ver. 67). — σκληρός] *hard, harsh*, the opposite of μαλακός (Plat. *Legg.* x. p. 892 B; *Prot.* p. 331 D);—in a moral sense, Matt. xxv. 24; Ecclus. iii. 24; 3 Esdr. ii. 27; Soph. *Oed. R.* 36, *Aj.* 1340; Plat. *Loqr.* p. 104 C, and often;—of *speeches*, comp. Soph. *Oed. C.* 778: σκληρὰ μαλθακῶς λέγων; Gen. xlii. 7, xxi. 11, Aq.; Prov. xv. 1. It here denotes *what causes offence* (σκανδαλίζει, ver. 61), does not

comply with preconceived views, but is directly *antagonistic*, the relation in which the assurances and demands of Jesus from ver. 51 stood to the wishes and hopes of His disciples.¹ He had, indeed, from ver. 51 onwards, required that they should eat His flesh (which was to be slain), and drink His blood (which was to be shed), in order to have life. By this—whether they rightly understood it or not—they felt sorely perplexed and wounded. The *bloody* death, which was certainly the condition of the eating and drinking, was an offence to them, just as in that lay the lasting offence of the Jews afterwards, xii. 34; 1 Cor. i. 23; Gal. v. 11; comp. also Matt. xvi. 21 ff. The explanation "*difficult to be understood*" (Chrysostom, Euthymius Zigabenus, Grotius, Olshausen) lies neither in the word nor in the context, for *τίς δύναται, κ.τ.λ.* affirms: "*it is a thing not to be borne, to listen to the discourse,*" such insuperable offence does it excite. Tholuck, following early writers, finds the offence to be that Jesus seemed *arrogant* in making life dependent upon participation in His flesh and blood. But it was not the *arrogant*, it was the lowly and suffering, Messiah that was a *σκάνδαλον* to the Jew. As little did the offence consist in the requirement that Christ "*would be all, and they were to be nothing*" (Hengstenberg), which, indeed, is only an abstract inference subsequently drawn from His discourse.

Vv. 61, 62. *Ἐν ἑαυτῷ*] *In Himself*, without communication; *αὐτόματος*, Nonnus. — *γογγύζ.*] as in ver. 41. — *περὶ τούτου*] concerning this harshness of His discourse. — *τοῦτο ὑμ. σκανδ.*] Question of astonishment: *this*, namely, which you have found so hard in my discourse (Jesus *knew* what it was), *does this offend you?* Are you so mistaken in your opinion and feelings towards me? Comp. ver. 66. — *ἐὰν οὖν θεωρῇτε, κ.τ.λ.*] Aposiopesis, which, especially "in tam infausta re" (Dissen, *ad Dem. de cor.* p. 362), takes the place of the impassioned statement. See on Luke xix. 41; Acts xxiii.

¹ Not as if they had understood the eating and drinking of the flesh and blood in a literal and *material* sense (hence the expression "*manducatio Capernaïtica*"), and so nonsensical an affirmation had provoked them (Augustine, Grotius, Lücke, Keim, and many others). The speakers are *μαθηταί*; but not even the *Ἰουδαῖοι*, ver. 52, so grossly misunderstood Jesus.

9; Rom. ix. 22. The completion of it must be derived solely from the context, and therefore is not τί ἐρεῖτε or the like (Nonnus, Euthymius Zigabenus, Kuinoel, and many); but τοῦτο ὑμᾶς οὐ πολλῶ μᾶλλον σκανδαλίσει (comp. Winer, p. 558 [E. T. p. 750]; Fritzsche, *Conject.* pp. 22, 31): “Will not this impending sight serve to offend you still more?” By ἀναβαίνειν ὅπου ἦν τὸ πρότερον Jesus indicates His death; and, indeed, as *He*—in whom Daniel’s prophecy of the Son of man was to be fulfilled (comp. xii. 23; Matt. xxvi. 24)—contemplated it in the consciousness of His heavenly origin and descent (iii. 13), of which He had already spoken in ver. 58. His death, therefore, so far as it would be to Him, by means of the resurrection and ascension therewith connected, a return to the δόξα which He had before His incarnation. Comp. xvii. 5, and the ὑψωθῆναι ἐκ τῆς γῆς, xii. 32. To the spectators, who only saw the humiliating and shameful *outward spectacle* of His death, it served only to give the deepest *offence*. The concluding argument *a minori ad majus* which lies in οὖν, is like that in iii. 12. The interpretation of the ancient Church, which referred the words to the *corporeal ascension in and by itself* (so also Olshausen, Lindner, Maier, Ebrard, Kahnis, p. 120, Hilgenfeld, Hofmann, Hengstenberg, Baeumlein, Godet, Harless), would require us of logical necessity to supply, not the supposed *increase* of offence (Baeumlein), but a question expressing *doubt* or *denial*: “would ye still take offence then?” Comp. viii. 28. But this import of the aposiopesis, which even Ewald and Brückner adopt, though not explaining the words merely of the ascension, has the οὖν itself decidedly against it, instead of which ἀλλά would be logically required; and the reference to the ascension as such, *as an event by itself*, is totally without analogy in the discourses of Jesus, and quite un-Johannean.¹ So also the θεωρῆτε, in particular, is against this view; for, with the *Present* participle ἀναβαίνοντα, it would describe the ascension *expressly* as a *visible* event (in

¹ Appeal is made, but unreasonably, not only to iii. 13, but likewise to xx. 17 (see especially Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, 517, and Godet). Jesus there is speaking *after* His death, when that blessed *end* was still future, in reference to which *before* His death he was wont to describe that event as a departure and an ascension to the Father. There, accordingly, He could not avoid mentioning the ascension *alone*.

answer to Luthardt's observations, who explains it of the ascension, but with Tholuck regards its visibility as a matter of indifference, so far as the present passage is concerned) though its *visible* occurrence is attested by no apostle, while in the non-apostolic accounts (Mark xvi. 19; Luke xxiv. 51; Acts i. 9) only the disciples in the *narrower* sense, the twelve, who are just those not meant by the "ye" in our text, are represented as the eye-witnesses. On the other hand, the opinion that there lies in *θεωρ.* only the *possibility* of those present being eye-witnesses (Kahn, Hofmann)¹ is nothing more than a subtle evasion, unsupported by the *ἐάν* (comp. xii. 32, xiv. 3, xvi. 7), and no better than Hengstenberg's assertion (comp. Tholuck): "those who were present at the ascension were the *representatives* of the collective body of the disciples." Parallel with *ἀναβαλεῖν* is the designation of the death of Jesus as *a going to God*, vii. 33, xiii. 3, xiv. 12, 28, xvi. 5, 28, xvii. 11, 13. That He here describes His death not according to its low and painful phase, but according to the essence of its triumphant consummation as present to His own consciousness, is therefore quite Johannine; comp. also xvii. 5, xii. 23. The reference to *the gift of the Spirit*, the exaltation being intended as the *medium* of effecting this (Lange), is remote from the context, and is not indicated by any word in the sentence, for nothing is spoken of but the *seeing with the eyes* the future *departure*. — Upon τὸ πρότερον, see on Gal. iv. 13. It refers to the period preceding His present form of being, when as to the divine part of His nature, *i.e.* as the Logos, He was in heaven;² comp. xvii. 5, 24, viii. 58.

¹ "For they would certainly see Him die, but they would see Him ascend only if they remained His disciples," Hofmann. The former is as incorrect as the latter. For Jesus is speaking to His *Galilean* disciples, and, indeed, to His disciples in the *wider* sense (ver. 67), of whom therefore we cannot say that they would certainly be present at His death in Jerusalem; while the witnesses of the ascension were not those who remained faithful to Him generally, but the *apostles*. According to Harless, Christ means to say that they must not think of His flesh and blood in His state of humiliation, but of both in His state of glory. But flesh and blood is the contradictory of *δόξα*. The *glorified* body of Christ in the form of *flesh and blood* is *inconceivable* (1 Cor. xv. 49, 50).

² The meaning is not that "we immediately substitute another subject" (Bey-schlag, *Christol.* p. 29); but, in harmony with the witness of Jesus regarding Himself elsewhere in John, we have given us a *more definite* mention of the state

Vv. 63, 64. Instead of appending to the foregoing protasis its mournful *apodosis* (see on ver. 62), Jesus at once discovers to His disciples with lively emotion (hence also the asyndeton) the *groundlessness of the offence that was taken*. *It is not His bodily form*, the approaching surrender of which for spiritual food (ver. 51) was so offensive¹ to them, *but His spirit that gives life*; *His corporeal nature was of no use towards ζωοποιεῖν*. But it was just His *bodily* nature to which they ascribed all the value, and on which they built all their hope, instead of His life-giving Divine Spirit, *i.e.* the Holy Spirit given Him in all fulness by the Father (iii. 34), who works in believers the birth from above (iii. 6), and with it eternal life (comp. Rom. viii. 2; 2 Cor. iii. 6). Hence His death, through which His σάρξ as such would disappear, was to them so offensive a σκάνδαλον. Observe further, that He does not say τὸ πνεῦμά μου and ἡ σάρξ μου, but expresses the above thought in a *general* statement, the personal *application* of which is to be to Himself. Comp. Hofmann, II. 2, p. 252. Note once again that ἡ σάρξ οὐκ ὠφελεῖ οὐδέν does not contradict what was previously said of the life-giving participation in the flesh of Jesus; for this can take place only by the appropriating of the *spirit* of Christ by means of faith, and apart from this it cannot take place at all. Rom. viii. 2, 6, 9, 11; 1 Cor. vi. 17. Comp. 1 John iii. 24. The flesh, therefore, which “profiteth nothing,” is the flesh *without the Spirit*; the Spirit which “quickeneth” is the Spirit whose

wherein the Son of man had His pre-existence in heaven. That He had this *as the Son of man*, as Beyschlag, p. 85, explains (understanding it of the eternal divine image, whose temporal realization Jesus, by an intuition given Him on earth, knew Himself to be), the text does not say; it says: “the Son of man, *i.e.* the Messiah, will ascend up where He was before.” There can be no doubt, if we will follow John, in *what form of existence* He previously was in heaven. Neither is there any doubt if we ask Paul, who speaks of the pre-existence of Jesus *in μορφῇ θεοῦ*. See on Phil. ii. 6; comp. 2 Cor. viii. 8, 9. He does not there mean that He pre-existed *as Jesus*, but as the υἱὸς τ. θεοῦ. For the rest, comp. ver. 46, viii. 58, xvii. 5, i. 18. If it be true, as Keim says (*Geschichtl. Chr.* p. 102, ed. 3), that “not one particle of the self-consciousness of Jesus reaches back beyond His temporal existence,” the fundamental Christological view not only of the fourth Gospel, but of Paul also, is based upon a great illusion. As to the Synoptics, see on Matt. xi. 27, viii. 20.

¹ Godet, according to his rendering of ver. 62: “which you will see to vanish at my ascension.”

dwelling-place is the flesh, *i.e.* the corporeal manifestation of Christ, the corporeity which must be offered up in His atoning death (ver. 51), in order that believers might experience the full power of the quickening Spirit (vii. 39). When Harless, following Luther, understands by the flesh which profiteth nothing, the *σάρξ* of Christ in His *humiliation*, and by the quickening Spirit, "*the spirit which perfectly controls the flesh of the glorified Son of man*," he imports the essential point in his interpretation, and this, too, in opposition to the N. T., according to which the conception of *σάρξ* is quite alien to the *σῶμα τῆς δόξης* of the Lord, Phil. iii. 21; see 1 Cor. xv. 44-50; so that the *σῶμα πνευματικόν* cannot possibly be regarded as flesh pervaded by spirit (comp. 2 Cor. iii. 18). In no form is *σάρξ* ever ascribed to the *exalted* Lord. The antithesis here is not between carnal flesh and glorified flesh, but simply between flesh and spirit. According to others, *τὸ πνεῦμα* is the human *soul*, which makes the *body* to have life (Beza, Fritzsche in his *Nov. Opusc.* p. 239). But *ζωοποιεῖν* must, according to the import of the preceding discourse, be taken in a *Messianic* sense. Others say: *τὸ πνεῦμα* is the spiritual *participation*, *ἡ σάρξ* the material (Tertullian, Augustine, Rupertius, Calvin, Grotius, and most others; also Olshausen, comp. Kling and Richter); but thus again the peculiar element in the exposition, *viz.* the partaking of the *Lord's Supper*, is foisted in.¹ Others, interpolating in like manner, interpret *τὸ πνεῦμα* as the spiritual, and *ἡ σάρξ* as the unspiritual, sensuous *understanding* (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, Mosheim, Lampe, Klee, Ammon, etc.²); comp. Tholuck. Others differently still.³ "Quantopere sit

¹ Kahnis (*Abendm.* p. 122) has explained the passage in this sense seemingly in a manner most in keeping with the words: "What imparts the power of everlasting life to them who feed upon my flesh, is not the flesh as such, but the spirit which pervades it." According to this view, the glorified flesh of Christ, which is eaten in the Supper, would be described as the vehicle of the Holy Spirit, and the latter, not the flesh itself, as that which gives life. Comp. also Luthardt. But it is self-evident that the thought of glorified flesh has to be imported from without.

² So also Luther: "Ye must indeed have the Spirit likewise, or obtain a spiritual understanding, because it is too high and inconceivable for the flesh." See the striking remarks of Calovius against this interpretation.

³ Wieseler, on *Gal.* p. 446, takes *σάρξ* in the sense of original sin; sinful

hic locus variis expositionibus exagitatus, vix credibile est," Beza. — τὰ ῥήματα ἃ ἐγὼ, κ.τ.λ.] This does not mean that we are to hold to His *words* instead of to His corporeal *flesh* (Rückert, Keim), His words which remain as a compensation to us after His death (Lücke, De Wette, B. Crusius). It stands (seeing that σάρξ has already its full antithesis in what precedes) in close connection with the following ἀλλ' εἰσὶν ἐξ ὑμῶν τινες οἱ οὐ πιστ., and therefore a comma only is to be placed after ζωὴ ἐστιν. "The words which I have spoken unto you" (meaning the discourse in the synagogue just ended¹), "so far from containing any real ground for σκάνδαλον, are rather spirit and life, i.e. containing and revealing the divine spirit in me, and the Messianic life brought about by me; but the real guilt of the offence lies with you, for among you are many who believe not." He, namely, who does not believe in Him as the true Messiah, who secures by His death the life of the world, but expects Messianic salvation by His corporeal manifestation alone, which is not to die, but to triumph and reign—to him who is such a μαθητής of Jesus the discourse concerning feeding upon His flesh and blood can only be a stumbling-block and an offence. And of such τινές there were πολλοί, ver. 60. — ἐγὼ and ἐξ ὑμῶν stand in emphatic antithesis. — πνεῦμα ἐστὶ καὶ ζωὴ ἐστιν] The two predicates are thus impressively kept apart, and the designation by the *substantive* is fuller and more exhaustive (comp. iii. 6; Rom. viii. 10) than would be that by the adjective (πνευματικὰ καὶ ζωηρά, Euthymius Zigabenus). — ἦδει γάρ, κ.τ.λ.] an explanation added by John himself of the preceding words, ἀλλ' εἰσὶν, κ.τ.λ., which imply a further knowledge; comp. ii. 24, 25. — οἱ οὐ πιστεύουσιν] result of their wavering; for they are μαθηταί, who, from an imperfect and inconstant faith, have at last come to surrender faith

human nature can do nothing for man's salvation; the Spirit of God produces this. But σάρξ must take its stricter definition from the foregoing discourse, and if it were intended as in iii. 6, οὐκ ὀφείλει οὐδὲν would be far too little to say of it. This also tells against the similar interpretation of Hengstenberg: "The πνεῦμα is the Spirit represented through Christ, and incarnate in Him, and the σάρξ humanity destitute of the Spirit."

¹ The usual but arbitrarily general rendering brought with it the reading λαλῶ. Tholuck and Ebrard have the right reference. Comp. εἴρηκα, ver. 65.

altogether. They had been *πρόσκαιροι* (Matt. xiii. 21). Here we have *οὐ* with the relative, then *μή* with the participle accompanied by the article (iii. 18), both quite regular. — *ἐξ ἀρχῆς*] neither “from the *first beginning*” (Theophylact, Rupertius); nor “*before this discourse*, and not for the first time after the murmuring” (Chrysostom, Maldonatus, Jansenius, Bengel, etc.); nor even “*from the beginning of the acquaintance then existing*” (Grotius, De Wette, B. Crusius, Maier, Hengstenberg, etc.; comp. Tholuck, “from the very time of their call”); but, as the context shows (see especially *καὶ τίς ἐστίν, κ.τ.λ.*), *from the beginning, when He began to gather disciples around Him* (comp. i. 43, 48, ii. 24), consequently from the commencement of His Messianic ministry. Comp. xvi. 4, xv. 27. From His first coming forth in public, and onwards, He knew which of those who attached themselves to Him as *μαθηταί* did not believe, and in particular who should be His future betrayer. On this last point, see the note following ver. 70. Were we, with Lange and Weiss, to render: “*from the beginning of their unbelief*,” this would apply only to disciples in constant intercourse with Him, whom He always could observe with heart-searching eye,—a limitation, however, not justified by the text, which rather by the very example of Judas, as the sole unbeliever in the immediate circle of His disciples, indicates a range beyond that inner circle.

Ver. 65. See on vv. 37, 44. — *διὰ τοῦτο*] because many of you believe not, and therefore, though there is in them the outward appearance of discipleship, they lack the inward divine preparation. — *ἐκ τοῦ πατρ. μ.*] *from my Father*. See Bernhardy, p. 227 f; comp. Plat. *Lys.* p. 104 B: *τοῦτο δέ μοι πῶς ἐκ θεοῦ δέδοται*. Soph. *Philoct.* 1301: *τὰς μὲν ἐκ θεῶν τύχας δοθείσας*. Xen. *Anab.* i. 1. 6; *Hellen.* iii. 1. 6.

Vv. 66, 67. *Ἐκ τούτου*] not: “*from this time forwards*” (so usually even Lücke, De Wette, Hengstenberg), for a going away *by degrees* is not described; but (so Nonnus, Luthardt): *on this account*, because of these words of Jesus, ver. 61 ff., which so thoroughly undeceived them as regarded their earthly Messianic hopes. So also xix. 12; Xen. *Anab.* ii. 6. 4, iii. 3. 5, vii. 6. 13. Comp. *ἐξ οὗ, quapropter*, and see generally,

concerning the *ἐκ* of cause or occasion, Matthiae, II. 1334; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* i. 551, who justly remarks: "His etiam subest *fontis*, unde aliquid exoriatur, notio." — *εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω*] they went away, and went *back*, so that they no longer accompanied Him, but returned to the place whence they had come to Him. Comp. xviii. 6, xx. 14; 1 Macc. ix. 47; Prov. xxv. 9; Gen. xix. 17; Luke xvii. 31; Plato, *Phaedr.* p. 254 B; *Menex.* p. 246 B; Polyb. i. 51. 8. — *τοῖς δώδεκα*] who and what they were, John takes for granted as well known. — *μὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς, κ.τ.λ.*] *but ye too do not wish to go away?* Jesus knows His twelve too well (comp. xiii. 18) to put the question to them otherwise than with the presupposition of a *negative* answer (at the same time He knew that He must except one). But He wishes for their avowal, and therein lay His comfort. This rendering of the question with *μὴ* is no "pedanterie grammaticale" (Godet, who wrongly renders "*vous ne voulez pas?*"), but is alone linguistically correct (Baumlein, *Partik.* p. 302 f.). According to Godet, the thought underlying the question is, "*If you wish, you can,*" which is a pure invention.

Vv. 68, 69. *Peter*, according to the position, for which the foundation is already laid in i. 43, makes the confession, and with a resolution how deep and conscious! — *ἀπελευσόμεθα*] Future, at any time. "*Da nobis alterum Te,*" Augustine. — *ῥήματα ζωῆς, κ.τ.λ.*] Twofold reason for stedfastness: (1) *ῥήματα . . . ἔχεις*, and (2) *καὶ ἡμεῖς, κ.τ.λ.* Thou hast the words of everlasting life (*ζωὴν αἰώνιον προξενούντα*, Euthymius Zigabenus; more literally: "whose specific power it is to secure eternal life"); an echo of ver. 63. The *ῥήματα* which proceed from the Teacher are represented as *belonging to Him*, a possession which He has at His disposal. Comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 26. — *καὶ ἡμεῖς*] and we for our part, as contrasted with those who had fallen away. — *πεπιστ. κ. ἐγνώκ.*] "*the faith and the knowledge to which we have attained, and which we possess, is that,*" etc. (Perfect). Conversely, xvii. 8; 1 John iv. 16. Practical conviction may precede (Phil. iii. 10) and follow (comp. viii. 32) the insight which is the product of reason. The former quite corresponds to the immediate and overpowering impressions by which the apostles had been won

over to Jesus, chap. i. Both, therefore, are conformable with experience, and mutually include, and do not exclude, each other. — ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ (see the critical notes): *He who is consecrated of God* to be the Messiah through the fulness of the Spirit and salvation vouchsafed Him. See on x. 36; 1 John ii. 20; comp. Mark i. 24; Luke iv. 34; Acts iv. 27; Rev. iii. 7.—The similar confession, Matt. xvi. 16, is so different in its occasion, connection, and circumstances, that the assumption that our passage is only another version of the synoptical account (Weisse and others) is unwarrantable. Who can take exception to the repetition of a confession (of which the apostles' hearts were so full) upon every occasion which presented itself? Certainly, according to John (see already i. 42 ff., ii. 19), it is untenable to suppose that in our passage, according to the right reading (see the critical notes), we have *not yet a complete and unhesitating confession of the Messiah* (Ewald); or that the disciples had *only now* attained a full faith in Him (Weizsäcker). We would have to assume in the earlier passages of chap. i. a very awkward ὕστερον πρότερον on the part of the evangelist,—a view in which even Holtzmann acquiesces (*Judenth. u. Christenth.* p. 376).

Vv. 70, 71. Not a justification of the question in ver. 67, nor any utterance of reflection generally, but an outburst of grief at the sad catastrophe which He foresaw (ver. 64), in the face of that joyous confession which the fiery Peter thought himself warranted in giving in the name of them *all*.—The *question* extends only as far as ἐξελεξ.; then comes with the simple καὶ the mournful contrast which damps the ardour of the confessing disciple. Comp. vii. 19.—Observe the *arrangement of the words*, ἐγὼ and ἐξ ὑμῶν impressively taking the lead: *Have not I* (even *I*, and no other) *chosen you the twelve to myself?* *And of you* (this one chosen by myself) *one is devil!* not the devil, but of devilish kind and nature. Comp. θεός, i. 1. In what an awful contrast the two stand to each other! The addition of τοὺς δώδεκα to ὑμᾶς heightens the contrast, laying stress upon the great *significance* of the election, which nevertheless was to have in the case of one individual so contradictory a result.—διάβολος] not an *informer* (Theophylact, De Wette, Baeumlein), not an *adversary*

or *betray* (Kuinoel, Lücke, B. Crusius, and earlier writers), but, in keeping with the deep emotion (comp. Matt. xvi. 23), and the invariable usage of the N. T. in all places where *διάβ.* is a substantive (in John viii. 44, xiii. 2; 1 John iii. 8, 10): *devil*, whereby antagonism to Christ is set forth in its strongest manner, because in keeping with its demoniacal nature. That John would have written *υἱός*, or *τέκνον διαβόλου* (viii. 44; 1 John iii. 10), is an arbitrary objection, and does not adequately estimate the strength of the emotion, which the expression employed, never forgotten by John, fully does. — Ver. 71. ἔλεγε δὲ τὸν, κ.τ.λ.] *He spoke of*, like ix. 19; Mark xiv. 71; see Stallb. *ad Plat. Rep.* p. 363 B. As to the name *Ἰσκαρ.*,¹ *man of Karioth*, see on Matt. x. 4. Observe the sad and solemn emphasis of the full name *Ἰούδαν Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτην*, as in xiii. 22. *Ἰσκαριώτην* itself is used quite as a *name*, as forming with *Ἰούδ. Σίμωνος* one expression. Bengel, therefore, without reason desiderates the article *τόν* before *Ἰσκαρ.*, and prefers on that account the reading *Ἰσκαριώτου* (see the critical notes). — ἤμελλεν, κ.τ.λ.] *traditurus erat*, not as if he was already revolving it in his mind (see, on the contrary, xiii. 2), but according to the idea of *the divine destiny* (Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 72). Comp. vii. 39, xi. 51, xii. 4, 33, xviii. 32; Wisd. xviii. 4: *δι' ὧν ἤμελλε . . . δίδοσθαι*; Judith x. 12. Kern has erroneously lowered the expression to the idea of *possibility*. — εἰς ὧν, κ.τ.λ.] *although he*, etc. Still ὧν is critically doubtful (omitted by Lachmann), and without it the tragic contrast is all the stronger.

Note 1.—With respect to the psychological difficulty of Jesus having chosen and retained Judas as an apostle, we may remark: 1. That we cannot get rid of the difficulty by saying that Jesus did not make or intend a definite election of disciples (Schleiermacher, *L. J.* p. 370 ff.), for this would be at variance with all the Gospels, and in particular with ver. 70. 2. Jesus cannot have received Judas into the company of the apostles with the foreknowledge that He was choosing His betrayer (Hengstenberg; comp. Augustine in Ps. lv.: *electi undecim ad opus probationis, electus unus ad opus tentationis*); this

¹ Not equivalent to *איש שקר*, *man of lies*, as Hengstenberg maintains, after Prov. xix. 5; the Greek form itself already forbids this.

would be psychologically and morally inconceivable. He must have had confidence that each one of the twelve, when He selected them according to the variety of their gifts, temperaments, characters, etc., would become under His influence an effective supporter of His work; and, at any rate, the remark in ver. 64 is only a retrospective inference from the inconceivableness of so hideous an act in the case of one selected by the Lord Himself. The view in question also goes too far in this respect, that it attributes the crime not to the dangerous *disposition* of Judas, but to the knowledge of Christ from the outset, which would logically lead to the outrageous and inadmissible thought of Daub, that He *purposely* chose Judas, *in order that* he might betray Him. Comp. Neander, Lücke, Kern, Ullmann (*Sündlosigk.*), Tholuck, De Wette, Ewald, and many others. 3. Although the bent of the man, and his inclination towards an unhallowed development,—which, however, did not lead to a complete rupture until late (xiii. 2),—must have been known to Christ, the reader of all hearts, yet it may have been accompanied with the hope, that this tendency might be overcome by the presence of some other apostolic qualification possessed by Judas, perhaps a very special gift for external administration (xii. 6, xiii. 28). 4. As it became gradually evident that this hope was to be disappointed when the care of the money affairs became a special temptation to the unhappy man, it was the consciousness of the divine destiny herein manifesting itself (vv. 70, 71; Acts iv. 28) which prevented Jesus from dismissing Judas, and so disturbing the further progress of the divine purpose; while on the part of the Lord, we must, in conformity with His calling, suppose a continual moral influence bearing upon Judas, though this to the last remained without effect, and turned out to his condemnation,—*a tragic destiny* truly, whose details, besides, in the want of sufficient historical information concerning him before the commission of his bloody deed, are too far removed from the reach of critical judgment to enable them to lend any support to the difficulties arising therefrom as to the genuineness of vv. 70, 71 (Weisse, Strauss, B. Bauer), or to warrant the assumption of any modification of the statement, which John, in accordance with his later view, might have given to it (Lücke, Ullmann, and others).

Note 2.—The aim of Jesus in the discourse vv. 26 ff. was to set before the people, who came to Him under the influence of a carnal belief in His miracles, the duty of seeking a true and saving faith instead, which would secure a deep living recep-

tion of and fellowship with Christ's personal life, and that with a decision which, with an ever-advancing fulness, lays open this true work of faith in the appropriation of Himself to the innermost depth and the highest point of its contents and necessity. Baur's opinion, that the discourse sets forth the critical process of the self-dissolution of a merely apparent faith, so that the latter must acknowledge itself as unbelief, has no such confession in the text to support it, especially as the *ἐχλός* and the *ἰουδαῖοι* are not identical. See, besides, Brückner, p. 143 ff. Regarding the *difficulty of understanding* this discourse, which even Strauss urges, it may partly be attributed to the Johannean idiosyncrasy in reproducing and elaborating his abundant recollections of the words of Jesus. The difficulty, however, is partly exaggerated (see Hauff in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1846, p. 595 ff.); and partly it is overlooked that Jesus, in all references to His death and its design, had to reckon on the light which the *future* would impart to these utterances, and sowing, as He generally did, for the future in the bosom of the present, He was obliged to give expression to much that was mysterious, but which would furnish material for, and support to, the further development and purification of faith and knowledge. The wisdom thus displayed in His teaching is justified by the *history*.

CHAPTER VII.

Ver. 1. μετὰ ταῦτα] B. C. D. G. K. L. X. & Cursives, Verss. Cyr. Chrys. have these words before περιεπ. So Schulz, Lachm. Tisch. Considering the preponderance of testimonies, this arrangement is to be preferred. Were it an alteration in imitation of iii. 22, v. 1, vi. 1, the καὶ deleted by Tisch. would be omitted to a greater extent, but it is wanting only in C.** D. & and a few Cursives and Versions.—Ver. 8. The first ταύτην is wanting in B. D. K. L. T. X. & Cursives, Verss. Cyr. Chrys. Rejected by Schulz and Rinck, deleted by Lachm. and Tisch.; a mechanical addition, in imitation of what follows.—οὐκ] Elz. Lachm. read οὐπω, according to the preponderance of Codd. indeed (only D. K. M. & and three Cursives have οὐκ), but against the preponderance of Versions (even Vulg. It.), most of which have οὐκ. Of the Fathers, Epiph. Cyr. Chrys. Augustine, Jerome have οὐκ. Porphyry, in Jerome, *c. Pelag.* ii. 17, already found οὐκ, and inferred from it the accusation of vacillation. Just on account of this objection, οὐπω was introduced.—Ver. 9. αὐτοῦς] Tisch. αὐτός, following D.* K. L. T. X. & Cursives, Cyr. Augustine, and several Versions. Testimony preponderates in favour of the Received Text, and this all the more, that αὐτός might have been easily written on the margin as a gloss from ver. 10.—Ver. 12. After ἄλλοι, Elz. Lachm. have δέ, which has many important witnesses against it, and is an interpolation.—Ver. 15. Instead of καὶ ἐθαύμαζ, we must, with Lachm. and Tisch., read ἐθαύμ. οὖν, and still more decisively is οὖν confirmed after ἀπεκρ., ver. 16 (which Elz. has not).—Ver. 26. After ἐστίν Elz. has again ἀληθῶς, against decisive testimony. An interpolation (which displaced the first ἀληθ. in some witnesses); comp. iv. 42, vi. 14, vii. 40.—Ver. 31. The arrangement ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου δὲ πολλοὶ ἐπ. is, with Lachm., to be preferred. Tisch., following D. &, has πολλ. δὲ ἐπ. ἐκ τ. ὁ.—δτι] wanting indeed in B. D. L. T. U. X. & Cursives, Verss. Cyr., and deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. But it was greatly exposed to the danger of being overlooked between ON and O, as well as because it was unnecessary.—For μῆτι we must, with Lachm. Tisch., following decisive testimonies, read μῆ. In like manner, τούτων after σημ. is, with Lachm. Tisch., to be deleted. An addition to explain

the genitive ὧν. For ἐποίησεν, ποιῶ (Tisch.) is too weakly attested. — Ver. 33. After οὖν Elz. has αὐτοῖς, against decisive testimony. — Ver. 39. πιστεύοντες] Lachm. πιστεύσαντες, upon too weak and (in part) doubtful authority. — After πνεῦμα Elz. Scholz have ἅγιον, Lachm. δεδομένον (B. and a few Verss. and Fathers). Both additions are glosses; instead of δεδομ. there occur also δοθέν or *acceptum*, or ἐπ' αὐτούς or ἐπ' αὐτοῖς. — Ver. 40. πολλοὶ οὖν ἐκ τ. ὅχλου] Lachm. Tisch.: ἐκ τοῦ ὅχλου οὖν, following B. D. L. T. X. & Verss. Origen. Rightly; the Received reading is an interpretation. — τὸν λόγον] Lachm. Tisch.: τῶν λόγων τούτων, according to preponderating witnesses. The genitive and plural were certainly more strange to the transcribers. — Ver. 41. ἄλλοι δέ] Lachm. οἱ δέ, following B. L. T. X. Cursives, Verss. Origen, Cyril; Tisch. also, following weighty witnesses (even D. E. &): ἄλλοι. The original reading is οἱ δέ, instead of which ἄλλοι was mechanically repeated from what precedes, sometimes with, sometimes without δέ. — Ver. 46. οὕτως ἐλάλ. ἄνθρ. ὡς οὕτος ὁ ἄνθρ.] Lachm. has merely: ἐλάλ. οὕτως ἄνθρ., following B. L. T. two Cursives, Copt. Origen, Cyr. Chrys. Aug. But how superfluous would have been the addition, and how easily might their omission have occurred in looking from the first ἄνθρ. at once to the second! The *order*, however, ἐλάλ. οὕτως (Tisch.), is attested by preponderating evidence. — Ver. 49. ἐπικατάρτοι] Lachm. Tisch.: ἐπάρατοι, after B. T. & 1, 33, Or. Cyr. Chrys. Rightly; the Received text is from the familiar passage, Gal. iii. 10, 13. — Ver. 50. ὁ ἐλθ. νυκτὸς πρὸς αὐτ.] Lachm.: ὁ ἐλθ. π. α. πρότερον (after B. L. T. & al.). Νυκτὸς is certainly an explanatory addition (comp. xix. 39), which also has various positions in the Codd.; but πρότερον is so decisively attested, and so necessary, that Lachmann's reading is to be regarded as the original one, although the whole ὁ ἐλθ. . . . αὐτόν is not to be deleted, as Tisch. (so &*) thinks. — Ver. 52. ἐγὴγερται] Lachm. Tisch.: ἐγείρεται, following B. D. K. S. (in the margin) T. r. Δ. & Cursives, Vulg. It. Syr. Goth. Aeth. Or. An early emendation of the historical error. Copt. Sahid. have the *Future*. — Ver. 53, see on viii. 1.

Vv. 1, 2.¹ Μετὰ ταῦτα] after these transactions, chap. vi. — οὐ γὰρ ἤθελεν ἐν τ. Ἰουδ. περιπ.] whither He would already have gone for the approaching Passover (vi. 4), had He not had been influenced by this consideration (comp. v.

¹ As to Baur's assaults on the historical character of the contents of chap. vii., see Hauff in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1849, p. 124 ff. According to Baur, the object of chap. vii. is to show how the reasoning on which unbelief ventures to enter only becomes its own logical refutation.

16, 18). We must not assume from this, as B. Crusius does, that John regarded Judaea as the proper seat of the ministry of Jesus; nor, with Schweizer, make use of the passage to impugn the genuineness of vi. 1-26; nor say, with Brückner, that John here again takes up the theme of the hostility of the Jews, because this had not been dropped in what precedes (vi. 11, 52), where so late as in vv. 60, 61 even, a division among the disciples is mentioned, and does not immediately become prominent in what follows. — To this sojourn in Galilee, to describe which was beyond the plan of John's Gospel, most of the narrative in Matt. xiv. 34-xviii. belongs. It lasted from a little before the Passover (vi. 4), which Jesus did not attend in Jerusalem, onwards to the next feast of Tabernacles (ver. 2); hence also the *Imperfects*. — δέ] leading on to what, nevertheless, afterwards induced Him to go to Jerusalem. — ἡ σκηνοπηγία] פסחא דתני, beginning on the 15th Tisri (in October), and observed with special sacredness and rejoicing. Lev. xxiii. 33; Josephus, *Antt.* iii. 10. 4, *al.*; Plutarch, *Symp.* iv. 6. 2; Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 481 f.; Keil, *Archaeol.* I. § 85.

Ver. 3. The *brothers* (ii. 12; their names are given, Matt. xiii. 55, Mark vi. 3) were still *unbelievers* (ver. 5), because biassed by the prevailing Messianic views;¹ yet, allowing to themselves, because of the miracles, the possibility of His being the Messiah, they are anxious—partly, perhaps, for the sake of their own family—for the *decision* of the matter, which they thought might most appropriately take place at the great joyous feast of the nation, and which certainly must occur, if at all, in Jerusalem, the seat of the theocracy. A malicious and treacherous intention (ἵνα ἀναireθῇ παρὰ τῶν ζητούντων ἀποκτεῖναι αὐτόν, Euthymius Zigabenus, also Luther) is imputed to them without any foundation. They are of cold Jewish natures, and the higher nature belonging to their Brother is as yet hidden from them. The light of faith seems

¹ Hengstenberg is not deterred even by this passage from recognising in these *brothers* of Jesus His *cousins* (the sons, he thinks, of Cleopas and Mary; but see on xix. 25), and from maintaining, with all the arbitrariness and violence of exegetical impossibilities, that three of them, James, Simon, and Judas, were apostles, in spite of vv. 3, 5, 7 (conip. xv. 19). Against every attempt to explain away the literal brothers and sisters of Jesus, see on Matt. i. 25, xii. 46; 1 Cor. ix. 5; also Laurentius, *N. T. Stud.* p. 153 ff.; comp. Pressensé, *Jesus Chr.* p. 287.

not to have dawned upon them until after His resurrection, and by means of that event (1 Cor. xv. 7; Acts i. 14). This long-continued unbelief of His own earthly brothers (comp. Mark iii. 21) is important in estimating the genuineness of the accounts given in Matthew and Luke of the miraculous birth and early childhood of Jesus. — καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ σου] This expression entirely corresponds with the position of the brothers as *outside* the fellowship of Jesus. It does not say, "thy disciples *there* also" (so *usually*; even Baur, who takes it to refer to those who are first to be won over in Judaea), for the word *there* does not occur, nor "thy disciples *collectively*," but simply, "thy disciples also." They would be gathered together from all parts at the feast in Jerusalem, and He should let Himself and His works be seen *by them also*. It does not, indeed, clearly appear from this that coldness began to be exhibited towards Him within the circle of His disciples (Weizsäcker), but rather perhaps that Jesus had gone about in Galilee and worked miracles very much in secret, without attracting observation, and not attended by any great following, but perhaps only by the trusted twelve, which silent manner of working He was perhaps led to adopt by the lying in wait of the Jews (ver. 1). Comp. ver. 4: ἐν κρυπτῷ. According to B. Crusius, the brothers speak as if nothing miraculous had been done by Him in Galilee. Contrary to the narrative; and therefore ἀ ποιεῖς cannot mean "what you are *reported* to have done" (B. Crusius), but "*what thou doest*," i.e. during thy present sojourn in Galilee, although ἐν κρυπτῷ, ver. 4. According to Brückner (comp. Ebrard, and substantially also Godet), the brothers express themselves as if Jesus had made and retained no disciples in Galilee, and, indeed, with malicious and ironical allusion to the fact stated vi. 66, and to the report (iv. 1) which they did not believe. But, considering the long interval which elapsed between chap. vi. and vii. 2, such allusions, without more precise indication of them in the text, are all the less to be assumed. Luthardt attributes to the brothers the notion that in Galilee it was only the multitudes that followed Him, and that there was no such personal adherence to Him as had taken place in Judaea (in consequence of His baptizing). But it is incredible that

they should entertain a notion so obviously *erroneous*, because the events which they were continually witnessing in Galilee, as well as those which they witnessed in Judaea on occasion of their journeys to the feast, must have been better known to them.

Ver. 4. "*For no one does anything in secret, and is thereby personally striving to be of a frank, open-hearted nature;*" i.e. no one withdraws himself and his works also into quiet secrecy, and yet strives frankly to assert his *personal* position (as you must do if you are the Messiah). The two things are, indeed, contradictory! On ἐν παρρησίᾳ. comp. xi. 54; Wisd. v. 1; and Grimm, *Exeg. Handb.* p. 110 f.; Eph. vi. 19; Phil. i. 20; Col. ii. 15. The word does not signify "*manifest*" or "*known*" (De Wette, Godet, and most others), but it means the opposite of a *shy* and *timid* nature, which shrinks from playing the part of a fearless and frank character. — τὶ] is the simple *aliquid*, not *magnum quid* (Kuinoel and others); and καί does not stand for ὅς, so that αὐτός would be superfluous (Grotius, Kuinoel), but is the simple "*and*," while αὐτός¹ is *ipse*, thus putting the *person* attributively over-against the *work* (Herm. *ad Vig.* p. 735; Fritzsche *ad Rom.* II. p. 75), and not merely resuming the subject (Lücke, Tholuck), as also it must not be taken in Matt. xii. 50. — As to εἶναι ἐν, *versari in* (Bernhardy, p. 210), thus designating the adverbial predicate as *permanent*, see Buttmann, *N. T. Gr.* p. 284 [E. T. p. 330]. — εἰ ταῦτα ποιεῖς] answers to the τὰ ἔργα σου ἃ ποιεῖς, ver. 3, and to οὐδεὶς . . . ποιεῖ, ver. 4, and therefore, according to the context (comp. also the consequent clause, which corresponds with καὶ ζητεῖ αὐτός, κ.τ.λ.), refers to the *miracles* which Jesus did in Galilee. Ταῦτα has the emphasis: "*If thou doest these things, i.e. if thy work consists in such wonderful deeds* as thou art performing here in Galilee, do not act so foolishly as to confine thyself with such works within so narrow and obscure a range, but *present thyself openly before*

¹ The reading αὐτί (Lachm. following B. D.*) is only an error in transcription. Ebrard, who maintains its genuineness, yet marvellously renders: "*but* he strives, that it may take place openly." Καί, meaning "*but*," is said to be *Johannean*; it is really neither *Johannean* nor *Greek* at all, but simply *wrong*. The frequent Greek use of it in John in the sense of "*and yet*" is something quite different; see on ver. 29.

the world, as thou must do in *Judaea*, which during the feast is the *theatrum mundi*." Σεαυτόν, like the preceding αὐτός, gives prominence to His *person*, as opposed to His *work*. But the εἰ is not expressive of *doubt* (Euthymius Zigabenus: εἰ ταῦτα σημεῖα ποιεῖς καὶ οὐ φαντάξεις; Lücke, De Wette, and most: as if we were to supply, it it be really *as we hear*; comp. also Brückner, who considers that it is intended to intimate in a disagreeable manner that the fact was doubtful), it is *argumentative*; the brothers *know* that His works are of an extraordinary kind, as was evident to them in Galilee (ποιεῖς denotes a *permanent* course of action; Bernhardt, p. 370); and they consider it *absurd* that He should withdraw Himself personally from the place whither all the world was flocking.

Vv. 5, 6. *For not even His brothers*, whom we might have expected to have been foremost, etc.; otherwise they would not have urged Him to the test of a public appearance. They urged this upon Him all the more, because He had absented Himself from the previous Passover at Jerusalem,—a fact which could not have been unknown to them. — ἐπίστ. εἰς αὐτ.] in the ordinary sense; they did not believe in Him *as the Messiah*. To take the words to mean only the *perfect self-surrender* of faith, which they had not yet attained to (Lange, Hengstenberg), is an inference necessitated by the mistaken notion that these brothers were *not* literally brothers (see on Matt. xii. 46; Acts i. 14; Mark iii. 31; 1 Cor. ix. 5). Nonnus admirably says: ἀπειθέες οἵαπερ ἄλλοι, Χριστοῦ παμμεδέοντος ἀδελφείοι περ ἔοντες. See ver. 7. — ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐμός] cannot mean the *time to make the journey to the feast* (Luther, Jansen, Cornelius a Lapide, and most expositors); the antithesis ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ὑμ. demands a deeper reference. It is, according to the context, *the time to manifest myself to the world*, ver. 4, by which Jesus certainly understood the divinely appointed yet still expected moment of public *decision* concerning Him (comp. ii. 4), which did come *historically* at the very next Passover, but which He now felt in a general way was not yet come. Thus the explanation of Chrysostom, Euthymius Zigabenus, Lampe, and most others, who refer the words to the *time of His passion*, is not wrong, only that this is not

actually expressed, but was *historically the fulfilment* of what is here said. The corresponding ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ὑμέτερος in like manner means the time for showing themselves openly to the world, which the brothers might do at any time, because they stood in no opposition to the world (ver. 7, xv. 19).

Vv. 7, 8. Οὐ δύναται] "psychologically it cannot, because you are in perfect accord with it." "One knave agrees with another, for one crow does not scratch out the eye of another crow," Luther; τὸ ὅμοιον τῷ ὁμοίῳ ἀνάγκη αἰεὶ φίλον εἶναι, Plato, *Lys.* p. 214 B; comp. *Gorg.* p. 510 B.—ὁ κόσμος] not as in ver. 4, but with a moral significance (the unbelieving world). Comp. here 1 John v. 19.—ἐγὼ οὐκ ἀναβαίνω, κ.τ.λ.] not an indefinite answer, leaving the matter spoken of uncertain (Hengstenberg), but, as the *Present* shows, a direct and categorical refusal: I, for my part, *do not go up*. Afterward He changed (ver. 10) His intention *not* to go up to the feast, and went up to it after all, though as secretly as possible. Porphyry's reproach (in Jerome) of *inconstantia* is based upon a correct interpretation, but is not in itself just; for Jesus might alter His intention without being fickle, especially as the particular motive that prompted the change does not appear. In the case of the Canaanitish woman also, Matt. xv. 26 ff., He changed His intention. The result of this change was that once more, and for some length of time before the last decision, He prosecuted His work by way of opposition and instruction at the great capital of the theocracy. The attempt to put into οὐκ the sense of οὐπω, or to find this sense in the context, is as unnecessary as it is erroneous. Either the *Present ἀναβ.* has been emphasized, and αὐτὸν introduced (Chrysostom, Bengel, Storr, Lücke, Olshausen, Tholuck), or ἀναβ. has been taken to denote¹ the manner of travelling, viz. with the caravan of pilgrims, or the like; or the meaning of ἐορτήν has been narrowed (Apol.: οἱ μετὰ ἡλαρότητας; Cyril: οὐχ οὕτως ἐορτάζων), as, besides Hofmann, *Weissag. u. Erf.* II. p. 113, and Lange,² Ebrard's expedient of understanding the

¹ Comp. Bengel, Luthardt (who would supply "as ye think"), Baumgarten, p. 228; Baeumlein; in like manner Godet, who explains ἀναβαίνω, "I go not up as King Messiah." As if one had only to foist in such interpolations!

² See his *Leben Jesu*, II. 927: He did not actually visit the feast, but He

feast "*in the legally prescribed sense*" does ; or οὐκ has been regarded as limited by the following οὐπω (De Wette, Maier, and most), which is quite wrong, for οὐπω negatives generally the fulfilment of the καιρός in the present (*i.e.* during the *whole* time or the feast). So little does the true interpretation of the οὐκ justify the objection of modern criticism against the evangelist (B. Bauer : " Jesuitism ;" Baur : " the seeming independence of Jesus is supposed thus to be preserved ;" comp. also Hilgenfeld), that, on the contrary, it brings into view a striking trait of originality in the history. — Observe in the second half of the verse the simple and emphatic repetition of the same words, into which ταύτην, however, is introduced (see the critical notes), because Jesus has in view a visit to a future feast. Observe also the repetition of the reason already given in ver. 6, in which, instead of πάρεστιν, the weightier πεπλήρωται occurs.

Ver. 10. Ὡς δὲ ἀνέβ.] Aor. pluperfect ; Winer, p. 258 [E. T. p. 343]. — ὥς ἐν κρυπτῷ] *He went not openly* (φανερῶς ; comp. Xen. *Anab.* v. 4. 33 : ἐμφανῶς, instead of which ἐν ὄχλῳ follows), but *so to speak secretly (incognito)*, not in the company of a caravan of pilgrims, or in any other way with outward observation, but so that His journey to that feast is represented as made in secrecy, and consequently quite differently from His last entry at the feast of the Passover. On ὥς, comp. Bernhardt, p. 279 ; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 1004. Otherwise in i. 14 (against B. Crusius). The context does not intimate whether Jesus took a different *road* (through *Samaria*, for instance, as Hengstenberg with Wieseler, according to Luke ix. 51 ff., supposes), De Wette, Krabbe, and early writers, but shows only that He was without any *companions* (except His disciples, ix. 2). Baur (also Hilgenfeld) finds in οὐ φαν., ἀλλ' ὥς ἐν κρυπτῷ, something *Docetic*, or at least (*N. T. Theol.* p. 367) bordering upon *Gnosticism* (besides viii. 59, x. 39, vi. 16), which it is easy enough to find anywhere if *such* texts are supposed to be indications. See, on the contrary, Brückner. — This journey finally takes Jesus away from Galilee (*i.e.* until after His death), and *thus far* it is parallel with that in

went up in *the second half of the week of the feast*, and not before. Jesus never resorted to any such subtleties.

Matt. xix. 1, but *only* that far. In other respects it occurs in quite a different historical connection, and is undertaken with a different object (the Passover). The journey, again mentioned in Luke ix. 51 ff., is *in other respects quite different*. The assumption that Jesus returned to Galilee between the feast of Tabernacles and the feast of the Dedication (Ammon, Lange; see on x. 22), is the result of a forced attempt at harmonizing, which exceeds its limits in every attempt which it makes to reconcile the Johannean and the synoptic accounts of the last journey from Galilee to Judaea. Comp. also Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 491, ed. 3.

Vv. 11, 12. Οὐν] For He did not come with the Galilean travellers. — οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι] not all the people (Hengstenberg, Baeumlein), but the opposing hierarchy; vi. 41, 52, vii. 13, 15. Their *search* is prompted by *malice*, not by aimless curiosity (Luthardt); see vv. 1, 13. On ἐκεῖνος, which means the well-known absent one, Luther well remarks: "Thus *contemptuously* can they speak of the man, that they cannot almost name Him." The *people's* judgment of Him was a *divided* one, not frank and free, but timid, and uttered half in a whisper (γογγυσμός, murmuring, ver. 32). — Observe the change of number: ἐν τοῖς ὄχλοις: *among the multitudes* (the *plural* here only in John); τὸν ὄχλον: *the people*. — ἀγαθός] *upright*, a man of honour, no demagogue, seeking to make the people believe falsely that He was the Messiah. Comp. Matt. xxvii. 63.

Ver. 13 is usually, after Augustine, only referred to the party who judged favourably (so also Lücke, De Wette, Ewald, Baeumlein; not B. Crusius, Brückner, Tholuck, Hengstenberg, Godet). All the more arbitrarily, because this was first mentioned, and because the general expression ἐλάλει περὶ αὐτοῦ is quite against any such limitation; οὐδεὶς οὐν towards αὐτοῦ can only be taken as corresponding to the γογγυσμός ἐν τοῖς ὄχλοις, ver. 12, which refers to *both* parties. *Both* mistrusted the hierarchy; even those hostile in their judgment were afraid, so long as they had not given an *official* decision, that their verdict might be *reversed*. A true indication of an utterly jesuitical domination of the people. — διὰ τὸν φόβον] on account of the fear that *prevailed*.

Ver. 14. *Τῆς ἑορτ. μεσ.*] when the feast was half way advanced, ἤγουν τῇ τετάρτῃ ἡμέρᾳ (or thereby): ἐπτα γὰρ ἡμέρας (yet see on ver. 37), ἐώρταζον αὐτήν, Euthymius Zigabenus. Jesus was already, before this, in the city (ver. 10), but in concealment; now He goes up *into the temple*. The text does not say that He had only now *come into Jerusalem*. μεσοῦν (comp. Ex. xii. 29; Judith xii. 5; 3 Macc. v. 14) only here in the N. T., but very common in the classics. That the day was just the *Sabbath* of the feast (Harduin, Bengel, Kuinoel, Wieseler, *Synopse*, pp. 309, 329) is uncertain, as μεσοῦσης is only an *approximate* expression. For the rest, the discourses which follow, and the discussions onwards to chap. x., are not (with Weizsäcker) to be ranked as parallel with the synoptical accounts of proceedings in Jerusalem, but are wholly independent of them, and must be attributed to the vivid recollections of the evangelist himself regarding a time unnoticed by the Synoptics. Over and above this, we must, as an historical necessity, expect to find many points of resemblance in the several encounters of Jesus with His Jewish opponents.

Ver. 15. *Οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι*] as in vv. 11, 18. The teaching of Jesus produces a feeling of *astonishment* even in the hierarchy; but how? Not through the power of His truth, but because *He is learned without having studied*. And with a question *upon this point*, they engage in conversation with Him, without touching upon *what* He had taught. The *admission*, indeed, which is contained in their question, and that, too, face to face with the people, is only to be explained from the real impression produced upon their learned conceit, so that they ask not in the spirit of shrewd calculation, but from actual amazement. — *γράμματα*] not the *O. T. Scriptures* (Luther, Grotius, and many), but *litteras*, (theological) *knowledge*, which, however, consisted in *scriptural erudition*. Jesus had doubtless exhibited this knowledge in *His discourse by His interpretations of Scripture*. Comp. Acts xxvi. 24; Plato, *Apol.* p. 26 D: οἷε αὐτοὺς ἀπείρους γραμμάτων εἶναι, and the citations in Wetstein. Upon διδάσκειν γράμματα, used of teachers, see Dissen, *ad Dem. de cor.* p. 299. — *μὴ μεμαθ.*] *though he has not learned them* (Buttmann, *N. T. Gk.* p. 301 [E. T. p. 350 f.]), perhaps in a Rabbinical school as Paul did

from Gamaliel. The members of the Sanhedrim do not thus speak in conformity with the author's representation of the Logos (Scholten); they *know*, doubtless, from information obtained concerning the course of His life, that Jesus had not studied; He was reckoned by them among the ἀγράμματοι and ἰδιῶται, Acts iv. 13. This tells powerfully against all attempts, ancient and modern, to trace back the wisdom of Jesus to some school of human culture. Well says Bengel: "non usus erat schola; *character Messiae*." This *autodidactic* character does not necessarily exclude the supposition that during His childhood and youth He made use of the ordinary popular, and in particular of the synagogal instruction (Luke ii. 45). Comp. Schleiermacher, *L. J.* p. 120 f., and in particular Keim, *Gesch. J. I.* p. 427 ff.

Ver. 16. Jesus at once solves for them the riddle. "The contradictory relation: that of learning in the case of one who had been uninstructed, would be found in my teaching only if it were *mine*," etc. — ἡ ἐμή and οὐκ ἐ. ἐμή are used in different senses: "the teaching *which I give*," and "it is not *my possession*, but *God's*;" how far, see ver. 17, comp. v. 19, 30. — τοῦ πέμψ. με] a carefully-chosen designation, because the Sender has communicated to His messenger, and continually communicates what He is to say in His name.¹ — οὐκ . . . ἀλλὰ] here also not: *non tam . . . quam*, but simply excluding human individuality. Comp. viii. 28, xiv. 24.

Ver. 17. *The condition of knowing this* is that *one be willing* — have it as the moral aim of his self-determination — *to do the will of God*. He who is wanting in this, who lacks fundamentally the moral determination of his mind towards God, and to whom, therefore, Christ's teaching is something strange, for the recognition of which as divine there is in the ungodly bias of his will no point of contact or of sympathy; this knowledge is to him a moral impossibility. But, on the contrary, the bias towards the fulfilling of God's will is the sub-

¹ Bengel (in Wächter in the *Beitr. z. Beng. Schrifterklär.* 1865, p. 125). "If we may speak after the manner of men, the heavenly Father gives him a *collegium privatissimum*, and that upon *no author*." This relation, however, does not justify such one-sided exaggerations as those of Delitzsch, *Jesus u. Hillel*, 1866.

jective factor necessary to the recognition of divine doctrine as such; for this doctrine produces the immediate conviction that it is certainly divine by virtue of the moral *ὁμοιότης* and *ὁμοιοπάθεια* of its nature with the man's own nature. Comp. Aristotle, *Eth.* ix. 3, iii. 1: τὸ ὅμοιον τοῦ ὁμοίου ἐφίεται. See also on iii. 21 and xv. 19. It is only in form, not in reality, that the τὴν ἀγάπην τ. θεοῦ ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτῷ, v. 42, differs from the θέλειν τὸ θέλημα τ. θεοῦ ποιεῖν here, for this latter is the moral praxis of the love of God. Accordingly, we certainly have in this passage the *testimonium internum*, but not in the ordinary theological sense, as a thing for those who already believe, but for those who do not yet believe, and to whom the divine teaching of the Lord presents itself for the first time. — The θέλη is not superfluous (Wolf, Loesner, and most), but is the very *nerve* of the relation; note the “suavis harmonia” (Bengel) between θέλη and θέλημα. The θέλημα αὐτοῦ, however, must not be limited either to a definite form of the revelation of it (the O. T., Chrysostom, Euthymius Zigabenus, Bengel, Hengstenberg, Weiss, and most), or to any one particular requirement (that of faith in Christ, Augustine, Luther, Erasmus, Lampe, Ernesti, Storr, Tittmann, Weber, *Opusc.*, and most expositors; comp. the saying of Augustine, right in itself, *intellectus est merces fidei*), which would contradict the fact that the axiom is stated without any limitation; it must be taken in its full breadth and comprehensiveness—“that which God wills,” whatever, how, and wherever this will may require. Even the natural moral law within (Rom. i. 20 ff., ii. 14, 15) is not excluded, though those who heard the words spoken must have referred the general statement to the revelation given to *them* in the law and the prophets. Finally, it is clear from vi. 44, 45, viii. 47, that willingness to do God's will must be attributed to the gift and drawing of the Father as its source. — περὶ τῆς διδ.] concerning the teaching now in question, ver. 16. — ἐγὼ ἀπ' ἑμαυτοῦ] *I of myself*, thus strongly marking the opposite of ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ. Comp. v. 30. The classical expression πότερον . . . ἢ occurs only here in the N. T.

Ver. 18. Here is the *characteristic proof and token*, given almost in *sylogistic* form, that He spoke not of *Himself*. — τὴν

δόξ. τ. ἰδ. ζητ.] that is, among others. Comp. v. 41. — ὁ δὲ ζητῶν, κ.τ.λ.] *minor premiss* and (οὗτος, κ.τ.λ.) *conclusion*, in which, instead of the *negative*, "He speaks not of Himself," we have the *positive*, "the same is true," etc. But this positive conclusion is *logically* correct, both in itself, because ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ λαλεῖν is throughout the context regarded as something untrue and immoral (Grotius: "sua cogitata proferens, cum Dei mandatum prae se ferat"), and with reference to the hierarchy, and some of the people, who took Jesus to be a *deceiver*. Observe further, that ὁ δὲ ζητῶν, κ.τ.λ., is in the *form* of a *general* proposition, corresponding with the opposite proposition, ὁ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ λαλῶν, κ.τ.λ.; but it is derived exclusively from the relation of *Jesus*, and is descriptive therefore of *no other than He*. — ἀδικία] *improbitas, immorality of nature*, a stronger antithesis to ἀληθής than ψεῦδος, for which τινὲς in Euthymius Zigabenus, Grotius, Bengel, B. Crusius, Maier, and many take it,—a view which cannot be justified by the inexact LXX. translation of Job xxxvi. 4 (Ps. lii. 4; Theod. Mic. vi. 12). Ἀδικία is the inner (ἐν αὐτῷ) moral basis of the ψεῦδος. For the contrast between ἀλήθεια and ἀδικία, see Rom. i. 18, ii. 8; 1 Cor. xiii. 6; 2 Thess. ii. 12; see also on viii. 46. An allusion to the charge of breaking the Sabbath (Godet) is not indicated, and anticipates what follows, ver. 21.

Ver. 19. There is no ground for supposing that some unrecorded *words* on the part of the Jews (Kuinoel and many others), or some *act* (Olshausen), *intervened* between vv. 18 and 19. The chain of thought is this: Jesus in vv. 16–18 completely answered the question of the Jews, ver. 15. But now He Himself assumes the offensive, putting before them the real and malicious *ground* of all their assaults and oppression, *namely, their purpose to bring about His death*; and He shows them *how utterly unjustifiable*, on their part, this purpose is. — The note of interrogation ought to be placed (so also Lachm. Tisch.) after the first τὸν νόμον; and then the declaration of their contradictory behaviour is emphatically introduced by the simple καὶ. In like manner vi. 70. — οὐ Μωϋσῆς, κ.τ.λ.] The emphasis is upon Μωϋσ. as the great and highly esteemed authority, which had so strong a claim on their obedience. — τὸν νόμον] *without limitation*; therefore neither

the *commandment forbidding murder* merely (Nonnus, Storr, Paulus), nor that *against Sabbath-breaking* simply (Kuinoel, Klee. So once Luther also, but in his Commentary he refers to Rom. viii. : "what the law could not do," etc., which, indeed, has no bearing here), which, according to Godet, Jesus is said to have already in view. — *καὶ οὐδεὶς ὑμ. ποιεῖ τ. νόμον*] so that you, all of you, are liable to the condemnation of the law ; and instead of seeking to destroy me as a law-breaker, you must confess yourselves to be guilty. — *τί] why? i.e. with what right?* The emphasis cannot be upon the enclitic *με* (against Godet).

Ver. 20. This interruption, no notice of which, seemingly (but see on ver. 21), is taken by Jesus in His subsequent words, is a characteristic indication of the genuineness of the narrative. — *ὁ ὄχλος*] *the multitude* (not the same as the *Ἰουδαῖοι*, see ver. 12), unprejudiced, and unacquainted with the designs of the hierarchy, at least so far as they referred to the death of Christ, consisting for the most part, probably, of pilgrims to the feast. — *δαιμόνιον*] causing in you such perverted and wicked suspicions. Comp. viii. 48, x. 20. An expression not of ill-will (Hengstenberg and early writers), but of *amazement*, that a man who taught so admirably should imagine what they deem to be a moral impossibility and a dark delusion. It must, they thought, be a fixed idea put into his mind by some daemon, a *κακοδαίμων*.

Vv. 21, 22. *Ἀπεκρίθη*] The reply of Jesus, not to the *Ἰουδαῖοι* (Ebrard), but to the *ὄχλος* (for it is really addressed to them, not in appearance merely, and through an inaccurate account of the matter on John's part, as Tholuck unnecessarily assumes), contains, indeed, no direct answer to the question put, but is intended to make the people feel that *all* had a guilty part in the murderous designs against Him, and that none of them are excepted, because that one work which He had done among them was unacceptable to *them all*, and had excited their unjustifiable wrath. Thus He deprives the people of that assurance of their own innocence which had prompted them to put the question to Him ; "ostendit se profundius eos nōsse et hoc radio eos penetrat," Bengel. — *ἐν ἔργον*] *i.e.* the healing on the Sabbath, v. 2 ff., the only miraculous work

which *He had done in Jerusalem* (against Weisse¹) (not, indeed, the only work at all, see ii. 23, comp. also x. 32, but the only one during the last visit), for the remembrance of which the fact of its being so striking an instance of Sabbath-breaking would suffice. — καὶ πάντες θαυμάζετε] πάντες is correlative with εἰ, "and ye *all* wonder" (Acts iii. 12), i.e. how I could have done it as a *Sabbath work* (v. 16); it is the object of your *universal astonishment*! An exclamation; taken as a question (Ewald), the expression of disapprobation which it contains would be less emphatic. To put into θαυμάζετε the idea of *alarm* (Chrysostom), of *blame* (Nonnus), of *displeasure* (Grotius), or the like, would be to anticipate; the bitterness of tone does not appear till ver. 23. — διὰ τοῦτο] connected with θαυμάζετε by Theophylact, and most moderns (even Lücke, Tholuck, Olshausen, De Wette, B. Crusius, Maier, Lange, Lachmann, Hengstenberg, Ewald, Baumlein, Ebrard, Godet; among earlier expositors, Beza, Casaubon, Homberg, Maldonatus, Wolf, Mill, Kypke, etc.; see on Mark vi. 6); but Syr. Goth. Codd. It., Cyril, Chrysostom, Nonnus, Euthymius Zigabenus, Luther, Castalio, Erasmus, Aretius, Grotius, Cornelius a Lapide, Jansen, Bengel, Wetstein, and several others, also Luthardt, and already most of the Codices, with true perception, place the words at the beginning of ver. 22 (so also Elzevir); for, joined with θαυμάζετε, they are cumbersome and superfluous,² and contrary to John's method elsewhere of beginning, not ending, with διὰ τοῦτο (v. 16, 18, vi. 65, viii. 47, x. 17, *al.*; see Schulz on *Griesbach*, p. 543). Only we must not take them either as *superfluous* (Euthymius Zigabenus) or as *elliptical*: "therefore *hear*," or "*know*" (Grotius, Jansen, even Winer, p. 58 [E. T. p. 68]); the former is inadmissible, the latter is neither Johannine nor in keeping with what follows, which does not contain a declaration, but a deduction of a logical kind. We ought rather, with Bengel

¹ How does he make out the ἑ, ἵππος? It is the one miracle which Christ came to accomplish (Matt. xii. 38, xvi. 1 sqq.; Luke xi. 29 ff.), described by Him metaphorically as a Sabbath healing; this the evangelist has taken for a single miraculous act. See *Evangelienfr.* p. 249.

² This accounts for the omission of διὰ τοῦτο in N*. Tisch. deletes it, and with B* reads ὁ Μωϋσ. (with the article).

("propterea, hoc mox declaratur per οὐχ ὅτι, nempe non quia") and Luthardt, following Cyril, to regard them as standing in connection with the following οὐχ ὅτι. With this anticipatory διὰ τοῦτο, Jesus begins to diminish the astonishment which His healing on the Sabbath had awakened, showing it to be *unreasonable*, and this by the *analogy of circumcision*, which is performed also on the Sabbath. Instead of simply saying, "*because it comes from the fathers*," He puts the main statement, already introduced by διὰ τοῦτο, and so important in the argument, both *negatively* and *positively*, and says, "*Therefore Moses gave you circumcision, not because it originated with Moses, but (because it originated) with the fathers, and so ye circumcise*" (καὶ consecutive), etc.; that is, this οὐχ ὅτι, on to πατέρων, serves to show that circumcision, though divinely commanded by Moses in the law, and thus given to the Jews as a ritualistic observance, was not Mosaic in its origin, but was an *old patriarchal* institution dating back even from Abraham. The basis of its historic claim to validity lies in the fact that the law of circumcision *precedes* the law of the Sabbath, and consequently the enjoined rest of the Sabbath must *give way* to circumcision.¹ Even the Rabbins had this axiom: "*Circumcisio pellit sabbatum*," and based it upon the fact that it was "*traditio patrum*." See Wetstein on ver. 23. The anger of the people on account of the *healing* on the Sabbath rested on a false *estimate* of the Sabbath; comp. Matt. xii. 5. From this explanation it is at the same time clear that οὐχ ὅτι . . . πατέρων is not of the nature of a parenthesis (so usually, even Lachmann). Of those who so regard it, some rightly recognise in the words the authority of circumcision as *outweighing* that of the Sabbath; while others, against the context, infer from them its *lesser sanctity* as being a traditional

¹ The patriarchal period was indeed that of *promise*, but this is not *made prominent* here, and we cannot therefore say with Luthardt: "Jesus puts the law and the promise over-against one another, like Paul in Gal. iii. 17." There is no hint of this in the text. Judging from the text, there rather lies in οὐχ ὅτι, κ. τ. λ., the proof that, in the case of a collision between the two laws, that of circumcision and that of the Sabbath, the former must have the precedence, because, though enjoined by *Moses*, it already had a *patriarchal* origin, and on account of this older sanctity it must suffer no infringement through the law of the Sabbath. Nonnus well describes the argumentation by the words ἀρχιγόνῳ τινὶ δισουλῷ.

institution (Paulus, B. Crusius, Ewald, Godet). Others, again, take them as an (objectless) *correction* (De Wette, Baeumlein), or as an *historical* observation (equally superfluous) of Jesus (Tholuck, Hengstenberg, and earlier expositors) or of John (Lücke, cf. Ebrard). Above all, it would have been very strange and paltry to suppose (with Hengstenberg) that Jesus by this remark was endeavouring, with reference to ver. 15, to do away with the *appearance of ignorance*. — *Μωϋσῆς*] Lev. xii. 3. — *οὐχ ὅτι*] not as in vi. 46, but as in xii. 6. — *ἐκ τοῦ Μωϋσέως*] Instead of saying *ἐξ αὐτοῦ*, Jesus repeats the *name*, thus giving more emphasis to the thought. See Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 6. 1, *ad Anab.* i. 6. 11. — *ἐκ τῶν πατέρων*] Gen. xvii. 10, xxi. 4; Acts vii. 8; Rom. iv. 11. — *ἐν Σαββ.*] if it be the eighth day. Comp. the Rabbinical quotations in Lightfoot. Being emphatic, it takes the lead.

Ver. 23. *Περιτομήν*] *Circumcision*, without the article, but placed emphatically first, corresponding with *ὅλον ἄνθρωπον* in the apodosis. — *ἵνα μὴ λυθῇ, κ.τ.λ.*] in order *that so the law of Moses be not broken* (by the postponement of the rite), seeing that it prescribes circumcision upon the eighth day. Jansen, Bengel, Semler, Paulus, Kuinoel, Klee, Baeumlein, wrongly render *ἵνα μὴ* "*without*," and take *ὁ νόμος*. *Μωϋσ.* to mean the *law of the Sabbath*. — *ἐμοὶ χολᾶτε*] towards me how unjust! On *χολᾶν*, denoting *bitter*, violent anger (only here in the N. T.), comp. 3 Macc. iii. 1; Artemid. i. 4; Beck, *Anecd.* p. 116. — *ὅτι ὅλον ἄνθρ. ὑγ. ἐπ. ἐν σαββ.*] The emphasis of the antithesis is on *ὅλον ἄνθρ.*, in contrast with the *single member* in the case of circumcision. We must not, therefore, with Kling in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1836, p. 157 f., find here the antithesis between *wounding* and *making whole*; nor, with B. Crusius, that between an act for the *sake of the law*, on account of which circumcision was performed, and one for the sake of the *man himself*; similarly Grotius. In *ὑγ. ἐποίησα*, further, there must necessarily be expressed an analogy with what is done in circumcision, which is therefore equally regarded as a *cure* and a *healing*, not with reference to the subsequent *healing of the wound* (Cyril, Lampe), for *περιτ.* is circumcision itself, not its healing; nor with reference to the supposed *medical object* of circumcision (Rosenmüller, Kuinoel,

Lücke, Lange; comp. Philo, *de Circumcis.* II. 210 f.; see, on the contrary, Keil, *Archæol.* I. 309 f.), no trace of which was contained either in the law or in the religious ideas of the people; but with reference to the *purification* and sanctification wrought upon the member by the removal of the foreskin.¹ In this theocratic sense, a single *member* was made *whole* by circumcision; but Christ, by healing the paralytic, had made *an entire man* whole, i.e. *the whole body* of a man. The argument in justification, accordingly, is one *a minori ad majus*; if it was right not to omit the lesser work on the Sabbath, how much more the greater and more important! To take *ὅλον ἄνθρωπον*, with Euthymius Zigabenus 2, Beza, Cornelius a Lapide, Bengel, and Olshausen, as signifying *body and soul*, in contrast with the *σάρξ*, on which circumcision was performed, is alien to the connection, which shows that the Sabbath question had to do only with the *bodily* healing, and to the account of the miracle itself, according to which Jesus only *warned* the man who had been made whole, v. 14.

Ver. 24. This closing admonition is *general*, applicable to every case that might arise, but drawn by way of deduction from the special one in point. *According to the outward appearance*, that act was certainly, in the Jewish judgment, a breach of the Sabbath; but *the righteous judgment* was that to which Jesus had now conducted them. Upon *ὅψις*, *id quod sub visum cadit, res in conspicuo posita*, see Lobeck, *Paralip.* p. 512. It does not here mean *visage*, as in xi. 44, and as Hengstenberg makes it, who introduces the contrast between Christ "without form or comeliness," and the shining countenance of Moses. On *κρίνειν κρίσιν δικαίαν*, comp. Tobit iii. 2; Susannah 53; Zech. vii. 9.

Vv. 25-27. *Οὐν*] in consequence of this bold vindication. These *Ἱεροσολυμίται*, as distinct from the uninitiated *ὄχλος* of ver. 20, as inhabitants of the Holy City, have better knowledge of the mind of the hierarchical opposition; they wonder

¹ Comp. Bammidbar, R. xii. 1. 203. 2: "præputium est vitium in corpore." With this view, which regards the foreskin as impure,—a view which does not appear till a late date (Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 129 1.),—corresponds the idea of the circumcision of the *heart*, which we find in Lev. xxvi. 41, Deut. x. 16, xxx. 6, and often in the prophets and the N. T., Rom. ii. 29, Col. ii. 11, Acts vii. 51.

that the Sanhedrim should let Him speak so boldly and freely, and they ask, "*After all, do they not know in very deed that this,*" etc.? This, however, is only a momentary thought which strikes them, and they at once answer it themselves. — *πόθεν ἐστίν*] does not denote the *birth-place*, which was known both in the case of Jesus (ver. 41) and of the Messiah (ver. 42), but the *descent*; not, indeed, the *more remote*, which in the case of the Messiah was undoubted as being *Davidic*, but (comp. vi. 42) the *nearer*—father, mother, family (Matt. xiii. 55). Comp. xix. 9; Homer, *Od.* ρ. 373: *αὐτὸν δ' οὐ σάφα οἶδα, πόθεν γένος εὔχεται εἶναι*; Soph. *Trach.* 1006; Eur. *Rhes.* 702; Heliod. iv. 16, vii. 14. — *ὁ δὲ Χρ.*] is in antithesis with *τοῦτον*, and it therefore takes the lead. The popular belief that the immediate ancestry of the Messiah would be unknown when He came, cannot further be historically proved, but is credible, partly from the belief in His divine origin (Bertholdt, *Christol.* p. 86), and partly from the obscurity into which the Davidic family had sunk, and was supported, probably, by the import of many O. T. passages, such as Isa. liii. 2, 8, Mic. v. 2, and perhaps also by the sudden appearance of the Son of man related in Dan. vii. (Tholuck), and is strongly confirmed by the description in the book of Enoch of the heavenly Messiah appearing from heaven (Ewald). The passages which Lücke and De Wette quote from Justin (*c. Tryph.* pp. 226, 268, 336, ed. Col.) are inapplicable, as they do not speak of an unknown *descent* of the Messiah, but intimate that, previous to His anointing by Elias, His Messiahship was unknown to Himself and others. The beginning of Marcion's Gospel (see Thilo, p. 403), and the Rabbinical passages in Lightfoot and Wetstein, are equally inapplicable.

Vv. 28, 29. The statement in ver. 27, which showed how utterly Christ's higher nature and work were misunderstood by these people in consequence of the entirely outward character of their judgments, roused the emotion of Jesus, so that He raised His voice, *crying aloud* (*ἔκραζεν*, comp. i. 15, vii. 37, xii. 44, Rom. ix. 27; *κράζειν* never means anything but *to cry out*; "*clamores, quos edidit, magnas habuere causas,*" Bengel), and thus uttered the solemn conclusion of

this colloquy, while He taught in the temple, and said: *καὶ μὲ οἴδατε, κ.τ.λ.* The *ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων* is in itself superfluous (see ver. 14), but serves the *more vividly to describe* the solemn moment of the *ἐκραξεν*, and is an indication of the *original genuineness* of the narrative. — *καὶ μὲ οἴδατε, κ.τ.λ.*] i.e., “ye know not only my person, but ye also know my origin.” As the people really had this knowledge (vi. 42), and as the divine mission of Jesus was independent of His human nature and origin, while He Himself denies only their knowledge of His divine mission (see what follows; comp. viii. 19), there is nothing in the connection to sanction an *interrogatory* interpretation (Grotius, Lampe, Semler, Storr, Paulus, Kuinoel, Luthardt, Ewald), nor an *ironical* one (Luther, Calvin, Beza, and many others; likewise Lücke, Tholuck, Olshausen, B. Crusius, Lange, and Godet, who considers the words “*légèrement ironique*,” and that they have “*certainement* [?] *une tournure interrogative*”), nor the paraphrase: “Ye *think* that ye know” (Hengstenberg). Least of all can we read it as a *reproach*, that they knew His *divine* nature and origin, yet maliciously *concealed it* (Chrysostom, Nonnus, Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, Maldonatus, and most). No; Jesus *allows* that they have that outward knowledge of Him which they had avowed in ver. 27, but He further—in the words *καὶ ἀπ’ ἐμᾶυτοῦ, κ.τ.λ.*—sets before them the *higher* relationship, which is here the main point, and which was *unknown* to them. — *καὶ ἀπ’ ἐμ. οὐκ ἐλήλ.*] *and*—though ye think that, on account of this knowledge of yours, ye must conclude that I am not the Messiah, but have come by self-appointment merely—*of myself* (*αὐτοκέλευστος*, Nonnus) *am I not come*; comp. viii. 42. This *καί*, which must not be regarded as the same with the two preceding, as if it stood for *καὶ ὅτι* (Baeumlein), often in John connects, like *atque*, a *contrasted* thought, *and yet*. See Hartung, *Partikell.* I. 147. We may pronounce the *and* with emphasis, and imagine a pause after it. Comp. Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Apol.* p. 29 B; Wolf, *ad Leptin.* p. 238. — *ἀλλ’ ἔστιν ἀληθινὸς*] *but it is a real one who hath sent me, whom ye (ye people!) know not.*¹ *Ἀληθινὸς* is not *verax* (Chrysostom,

¹ Of course in a *relative* sense, as in iv. 22. If they had possessed the true and

Euthymius Zigabenus, Luther, Stolz, Kuinoel, Klee, B. Crusius, Ewald, and most), but, according to the invariable usage of John (see on i. 9), a real, genuine one, in whom *the idea is realized*. The substantive belonging to this adjective is not πατήρ, which Grotius gets out of πόθεν; but, according to the immediate context, it is to be inferred from ὁ πέμφας με, namely πέμπων, *a real sender, a sender in the highest and fullest sense* (comp. Matthiae, p. 1533; Kühner, II. 602). We cannot take ἀληθ. by itself as *absolutely* denoting the *true essential* God (Olshausen, Lange, Hengstenberg; comp. Kling: "one whose essence and action is pure truth"), because ἀληθινός in the Johannean sense is not an independent conception, but receives its definite meaning first from the substantive of which it is predicated. — Ver. 29. *I* (antithesis to ὑμεῖς) *know Him, for I am from Him, have come forth from Him* (as in vi. 46); *and no other than He* (from whom I am) *hath sent me*. This weighty, and therefore independent κακεῖνός με ἀπέστ., not to be taken as dependent upon ὅτι, comprehends the full explanation of the πόθεν εἰμί in its higher sense, which was not known to the Ἱεροσολυμιταῖς, and, with the ἐγὼ οἶδα . . . εἰμί, bears the seal of immediate certainty. Comp. viii. 14.

Ver. 30. Οὖν] Because He had so clearly asserted His divine origin and mission, His adversaries regarded this as blasphemy (comp. v. 18).—The *subject* of ἐξήτουν is Ἰουδαῖοι, the hierarchy, as is self-evident from the words and from the contrasted statement of ver. 31.—καί] as in ver. 28.—ὅτι οὐπω, κ.τ.λ.] *because the hour appointed for Him* (by God—the hour when He was to fall under the power of His enemies) *was not yet come*; comp. viii. 20. The reason here assigned is that higher religious apprehension of the history, which does not, however, contradict or exclude the immediate historical cause, viz. that through fear—not of conscience (Hengstenberg, Godet), but of the party who were favourably inclined to Christ, ver. 31—they dared not yet lay hands on Him. But John knows that the threads upon which the out-

full knowledge of God, they would then have recognised the Interpreter of God, and not have rejected Him for such a reason as that in ver. 27. Comp. viii. 54, 55; Matt. xi. 27.

ward history of Jesus runs, and by which it is guided, unite in the counsels of God. Comp. Luthardt, I. 160.

Ver. 31. According to the reading ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου δὲ πολλοί (see the critical notes), ὄχλος stands emphatically opposed to the subjects of ἐξήτουν in ver. 30. Δὲ after three words, on account of their close connection; see Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 378; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. 397. — ἐπίστ. εἰς αὐτ.] not only as a *prophet* (Tholuck), or as one *sent of God* (Grotius), but conformably with the fixed sense of the absolute expression (comp. ver. 5), as the *Messiah*. What follows does not contradict this, but rather sustains their avowal that they see realized in Jesus their ideal-miracle of the promised Messiah; and, accordingly, ὁ Χριστὸς ὅταν ἔλθῃ does not imply any doubt on *their* part as to the Messiahship of Jesus, but refers to the doubt of the *opposite party*. Comp. Euthymius Zigabenus 2: θῶμεν, ἕτερον εἶναι τὸν Χριστὸν, ὡς οἱ ἄρχοντες λέγουσιν, etc. — ὅτι] might be regarded as *giving the reason* for their faith (Nonnus: μὴ γὰρ Χριστὸς, κ.τ.λ.), but more simply as *recitative*. — μὴ] yet not more signs, etc.? To the one miracle wrought in Jerusalem (ver. 21) they added the numerous Galilaean miracles, which they, being in part perhaps pilgrims to the feast from Galilee, had seen and heard.

Vv. 32-34. The Pharisees present hear how favourable are the murmured remarks of the people concerning Jesus, and they straightway obtain an edict of the Sanhedrim (οἱ Φαρις. κ. οἱ ἄρχιερ.,—οἱ Φαρις. *first*, for they had been the first to moot the matter; otherwise in ver. 45), appointing officers to lay hands on Him. The Sanhedrim must have been immediately assembled. Thus rapidly did the ἐξήτουν of ver. 30 ripen into an actual decree of the council. The thing does not escape the notice of Jesus; He naturally recognises in the officers seeking Him, who were only waiting for a suitable opportunity to arrest Him, their designs against Him; and He therefore (οὖν) says what we have in vv. 33, 34 in clear and calm foresight of the nearness of His death,—a death which He describes as a going away to God (comp. on vi. 62). — μεθ' ὑμῶν] Jesus speaks to the whole assembly, but has here the hierarchy chiefly in his eye; comp. ver. 35. — πρὸς τὸν

πέμψαντά με] These words are, with Paulus, to be regarded not as original, but as a Johannean addition; because, according to vv. 35, 36, Jesus cannot have definitely indicated the *goal* of His going away, but must have left it enigmatical, as perhaps in viii. 22; comp. xiii. 33. Had He said πρ. τ. πέμψ., His enemies could not have failed, after vv. 16, 17, 28, 29, to recognise the words as referring to God, and could not have thought of an unknown ποῦ (against Lücke, De Wette, Godet). There is no room even for the *pretence* "that they acted as if they *could* not understand the words of Jesus," after so clear a statement as πρὸς τ. πέμψ. με (against Luthardt). — ζητήσετέ με, κ.τ.λ.] not of a *hostile* seeking, against which is xiii. 33; nor the seeking of the *penitent* (Augustine, Beza, Jansen, and most), which would not harmonize (against Olshausen) with the absolute denial of any finding, unless we brought in the doctrine of a peremptory limitation of grace, which has no foundation in Holy Scripture (not even in Heb. xii. 17; see Lünemann, *in loc.*), and which could only refer to individuals; but a *seeking for help and deliverance* (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, Erasmus, Calvin, Aretius, Hengstenberg; comp. Luthardt, Ewald, Brückner). This refers to the time of the divine judgments in the destruction of Jerusalem (Luke xx. 16 ff., xix. 43, *al.*), which were to ensue as the result of their rejection of Jesus. Then, Jesus means, the tables will be turned; after they had persecuted and killed Him who now was present, they then would anxiously long, but in vain, for Him, the absent One,¹ as the wonder-working helper, who alone could save them from the dire calamity. Comp. Prov. i. 28. The prophecy of misfortune involved in ζητήσετέ με, κ.τ.λ. is not expressly declared; but it lies in the thought of *retribution* which the words contain,—like an enigma which the history was to solve; comp. viii. 21. Theodoret, Heracleon (?), Maldonatus, Grotius, Lücke, De Wette, take the whole simply as descriptive of *entire separation*, so that nothing more is said than: "*Christum de*

¹ They would long for Him in His own person, for *Jesus* the rejected one, and not for the *Messiah generally* (Flacius, Lampe, Kuinoel, Neander, Ebrard), whom they had rejected in the person of Jesus (comp. also Tholuck and Godet),—an explanation which would empty the words of all their tragic nerve and force.

terris sublatum iri, ita ut inter viros reperiri non possit," Maldonatus. The poetical passages, Ps. x. 15, xxxvii. 10, Isa. xli. 12, are appealed to. But even in these the seeking and finding is not a mere figure of speech; and here such a weakening of the signification is all the more inadmissible, because it is not *annihilation*, as in those passages, which is here depicted, and because the following words, καὶ ὅπου εἰμι ἐγὼ, κ.τ.λ., describe a *longing* which was not to be satisfied. Luke xvii. 22 is analogous. — καὶ ὅπου εἰμι, κ.τ.λ.] still more clearly describes the tragic οὐχ εὐρήσ.: "and where *I* (then) am, thither *ye* cannot come," *i.e.* in order to find me as a deliverer, or to flee to me. Rightly says Euthymius Zigabenus: δηλοῖ δὲ τὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐν δεξιῇ τοῦ πατρὸς καθέδραν. The εἰμι (*I go*), not found in the N. T., is not the reading here (against Nonnus, H. Stephens, Casaubon, Pearson, Bengel, Wakefield, Michaelis, and most). Comp. xiv. 3, xvii. 24.

Vv. 35, 36. An insolent and scornful supposition, which they themselves, however, do not deem probable (therefore the question is asked with μή), regarding the meaning of words to them so utterly enigmatical. The bolder mode of teaching adopted by Jesus, His universalistic declarations, His partial non-observance of the law of the Sabbath, would lead them, perhaps, to associate with the unintelligible statement a mocking thought like this, and all the more because much interest was felt among the heathen, partly of an earnest kind, and partly (comp. St. Paul in Athens) arising from curiosity merely, regarding the oriental religions, especially Judaism; see Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 110 f. ed. 3. — πρὸς ἑαυτούς] the same as πρὸς ἀλλήλους, yet so that the conversation was confined to one party among the people, to the exclusion of the others. See Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* ii. 6. 20. — οὗτος] contemptuously, *that man!* — ὅτι] not to be arbitrarily supplemented by a supposed λέγων put before it, or in some other way (Buttmann, *N. T. Gr.* p. 305 [E. T. p. 358]); but the simple *because*: "Where will this man go, because, or seeing, that *we* are not (according to his words) to find him?" It thus states the *reason* why the ποῦ is *unknown*. — εἰς τ. διασπ. τ. Ἑλλ.] *to the dispersion among the Greeks.* Comp. Winer, p. 176 [E. T. p. 234]; and upon the thing referred to, Schneckenburger, *N. T.*

Zeitgesch. p. 94 ff. The subjects of the *διασπορά* are the Jews,¹ who lived beyond Palestine dispersed among the heathen, and these latter are denoted by the genitive τῶν Ἑλλήν. Comp. 1 Pet. i. 1, and Steiger and Huther thereon. Differently in 2 Macc. i. 27; LXX. Ps. cxlvi. 2. The abstract *διασπορά* is simply the sum-total of the concretes, like *περιτομή* and other words. See 2 Macc. i. 27. "Ἑλληνες in the N. T. invariably means the heathen, Gentiles, not the Hellenists (Graecian Jews), so even in xii. 20; and it is wrong, therefore, to understand τῶν Ἑλλήν. of the latter, and to take these words as the subject of the *διασπορά* (Scaliger, Lightfoot, Hammond, B. Crusius, Ammon), and render διδάσκ. τ. Ἑλλ. : "teach the Hellenists." The thought is rather: "Will Jesus go to the Jews scattered among the Gentiles, in order to unite there with the Gentiles, and to become their teacher?" This was really the course of the subsequent labours of the apostles. — Ver. 36. τίς ἐστίν] Their scornful conjecture does not even satisfy themselves; for that they should seek Him, and not be able to come to Him—they know not what the assertion can mean (τίς ἐστίν, κ.τ.λ.).

Ver. 37. As the eighth day (the 22d Tisri) was reckoned along with the seven feast days proper, according to Lev. xxiii. 35, 36, 39, Num. xxix. 35, Neh. viii. 18, as according to *Succah*, f. 48. 1, the last day of the feast is the eighth, it is clear that John meant this day, and not the seventh (Theophylact, Buxtorf, Bengel, Reland, Paulus, Ammon), especially as in later times it was usual generally to speak of the eight days' feast of Tabernacles (2 Macc. x. 6; Josephus, *Antt.* iii. 10. 4; *Gem. Eruvin.* 40. 2; *Midr. Cohel.* 118. 3). In keeping with this is the very free translation ἐξόδιον (*termination of the feast*), which the LXX. give for the name of the eighth day, עֲצָרָה (Lev. xxiii. 36; Num. xxix. 35; Neh. viii. 18), i.e. "assembly;" comp. Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 481. — τῇ μεγάλῃ] the (pre-eminently) great, solemn. Comp. xix. 31. The superlative is implied in the attribute thus given to this day above the other feast days. Wherein consisted the special distinction

¹ Not the heathen, as if ἡ διασπ. τ. Ἑλλ. were the same as *Dispersi Graeci* (Chrysostom and his followers, Rupertius, Maldonatus, Hengstenberg, and most). Against this Beza well says: "Vix conveniret ipsis indigenis populis nomen διασπορᾶς."

attaching to this day? It was simply the great closing day of the feast, appointed for the solemn return from the booths into the temple (Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 481), and, according to Lev. xxiii. 35, 36, was kept holy as a Sabbath. The explanation of ἐξόδιον in Philo, *de Septenario*, II. p. 298, that it denoted the end of the yearly feasts collectively, has as little to do with the matter (for τῇ μεγάλῃ has reference only to the feast of Tabernacles) as has the designation יום טוב in the Tr. *Succah*, for this means nothing more than “*feast day*.” If, indeed, this day had, according to Tr. *Succah* (see Lightfoot, p. 1032 f.), special services, sacrifices, songs, still *no more* was required than to honour it “*sicut reliquos dies festi*.” Its μεγαλότης consisted just in this, that it brought the great feast as a whole to a sacred termination. — The *express designation* of the day as τῇ μεγάλῃ is in keeping with the solemn coming forth of Jesus with the great word of invitation and promise, vv. 37, 38. The solemnity of this coming forth is also intimated in εἰστήκει (*He stood there*) and in ἔκραξε (see on ver. 28). — εἰάν τις διψᾷ, κ.τ.λ.] denoting spiritual need¹ and spiritual satisfaction, as in iv. 15, in the conversation with the Samaritan woman, and in vi. 35; Matt. v. 6. We are not told what led Jesus to adopt *this metaphorical expression here*. There was no need of anything special to prompt Him to do so, least of all at a feast so joyous, according to Plutarch, *Symp.* iv. 6. 2, even so bacchanalian in its banquetings. Usually, a reason for the expression has been found in the daily libations which were offered on the seven feast days (but also on the eighth, according to R. Juda, in *Succah* iv. 9), at the time of the morning sacrifice, when a priest fetched water in a golden pitcher containing three logs from the spring of Siloam, and poured this, together with wine, on the west side of the altar into two perforated vessels, amidst hymns of praise and music. See Dachs, *Succah*, p. 368. Some reference to this libation *may* be supposed, because it was one of the *peculiarities* of the feast, even on the hypothesis that it did *not* take place upon the eighth day, derived either from the old idea of pouring out water (1 Sam. vii. 6; Hom. *Od.* μ. 362, *al.*, so De Wette); or, according

¹ Luther: “a heartfelt longing, yea, a troubled, sad, awakened, stricken conscience, a despairing, trembling heart, that would know how it can be with God.”

to the Rabbis (so also Hengstenberg), from Isa. xii. 3, a passage which contains the words sung by the people during the libation. But any connection of the words of Jesus with this libation is all the more doubtful, because He is speaking of *drinking*, and this is the *essential* element of His declaration. Godet arbitrarily interpolates: "He compares Himself with the *water from the rock in the wilderness*, and represents Himself as *this true rock*" (comp. 1 Cor. x. 4).

Ver. 38. The *πίνειν* is brought about by faith; hence the statement *progresses*: *ὁ πιστεύων, κ.τ.λ. — καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γρ.*] is simply the formula of quotation, and cannot belong to *ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ*, as if it denoted a faith which is *conformable to Scripture* (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, Calovius, and most); *ὁ πιστ.*, on the contrary, is the nominative absolute (see on vi. 39), and *καθὼς εἶπεν, κ.τ.λ.*, belongs to the following *ποταμοί*, etc., the words which are described as a *declaration of Scripture*. There is no exactly corresponding passage, indeed, in Scripture; it is simply a free quotation harmonizing in thought with parts of various passages, especially Isa. xlv. 3, lv. 1, lviii. 11 (comp. also Ezek. xlvii. 1, 12; Zech. xiii. 1, xiv. 8; Joel iii. 1, 23; but not Cant. iv. 12, 15). Godet refers to the account of the rock in the wilderness, Ex. xvii. 6, Num. xx. 11; but this answers neither to the thing itself (for the subject is the person drinking) nor to the words. To think in particular of those passages in which mention is made of a stream flowing from the temple mount, the believer being represented as a living temple (Olshausen), is a gloss unwarranted by the context, and presents an inappropriate comparison (*κοιλίας*). This last is also in answer to Gieseler (in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1829, p. 138 f.), whom Lange, *L. J.* II. p. 945, follows. To imagine some *apocryphal* or lost canonical saying (Whiston, Semler, Paulus; comp. also Weizsäcker, p. 518; Bleek, p. 234, and in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1853, p. 331), or, as Ewald does, a fragment of Proverbs no longer extant, or of some such similar book, is too bold and unnecessary, considering the freedom with which passages of Scripture are quoted and combined, and the absence of any other certain trace in the discourses of Jesus of extra-canonical quotations, or of canonical quotations

not now to be found in the O. T.; although, indeed, the characteristic ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ itself occurs in none of the above-named places, which is certainly surprising, and not to be explained by an inappropriate reference to Cant. vii. 3 (Hengstenberg). But this expression, "*out of his body*," considering the connection of the metaphor, is very natural; the water which he drinks becomes in his body a spring from which streams of living water flow, *i.e. the divine grace and truth which the believer has received out of Christ's fulness into his inner life, does not remain shut up within, but will communicate itself in abundant measure as a life-giving stream to others*, and thus the new divine life overflows from one individual on to others. As represented in the metaphor, these ποταμοί take their rise from the water which has been drunk and is *in* the κοιλία, and flow forth *therefrom* in an oral effusion;¹ for the effect referred to takes place in an outward direction *by* an inspired oral communication of one's own experience of God's grace and truth (πιστεύομεν, διὸ καὶ λαλοῦμεν, 2 Cor. iv. 13). The mutual and inspired intercourse of Christians from Pentecost downwards, the speaking in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, the mutual edification in Christian assemblies by means of the charismata even to the speaking with tongues, the entire work of the apostles, of a Stephen and so on, furnish an abundant historical commentary upon this text. It is clear, accordingly, that κοιλία does not, as is *usually* supposed, denote the *inner* man, man's *heart* (Prov. xx. 27; Eccles. xix. 12, li. 21; LXX. Ps. xl. 9, following A.; comp. the Latin *viscera*), but must be left in its literal meaning "*belly*," in conformity with the *metaphor* which determines the expression.² The flowing forth of the

¹ Comp. ἰριζομαι, Matt. xiii. 35.

² Already Chrysostom and his followers took κοιλίας as equivalent to καρδίας; a confounding of the metaphor with its import. Hofmann's objection (*Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 13), "that the water here meant does not go into the belly at all," rests solely upon the same confusion of the figure with its meaning. According to the figure, it comes into the κοιλία because it is *drunk*, and this drinking is in like manner *figurative*. When Hofmann finds indicated in the word even a *springing place* of the Holy Spirit *within the body*, he cannot get rid of the idea of something within the *body* as being implied in κοιλία, because the text itself presents this figure as being in harmony with that of the *drinking*; unless, indeed, the concrete expression is to give way to an exegetical prudery foreign to the text

water, moreover, is not to be understood as something operating upon the *subject himself* only (B. Crusius : "his whole soul, from its very depth, shall have a continual quickening and satisfaction," comp. Maier), but as describing an efficacy *in an outward direction*, as ἐκ τ. κοιλ. shows, and therefore is not the same as the similar passage, chap. iv. 14. If we join ὁ πιστ. εἰς ἐμέ with πινέτω, αὐτοῦ must refer to Christ; and this is the meaning that we get: "He that thirsteth, let him come to me; and he that believeth in me, let him drink of me: for to me refers what the Scripture hath said concerning a river which shall flow forth from Jehovah in the time of the Messiah." So Hahn, *Theol. d. N. T.* I. p. 229 f., and Gess, *Pers. Chr.* p. 166. But against this it is decisive, first, that he who believes on Jesus *has* already drunk of Him (vi. 35), and the call to come and drink must apply not to the believer, but to the thirsty; and secondly, that the expression ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ would be unnecessary and unmeaning, if it referred to Jesus, and not to *him* who has performed the πινέτω (Nonnus, διὰ γαστρὸς ἐκείνου). — ὕδωρ ζῶν, as in iv. 10; ζῶντος δὲ, ἡγουν αἰεὶ ἐνεργούντος, ἀεικινήτου, Euthymius Zigabenus.—Observe further the ποταμοὶ emphatically taking the lead and standing apart; "not in spoonfuls, nor with a pipe and tap, but in full streams," Luther.

Ver. 39. Not an interpolated gloss (Scholten), but an observation by John in explanation of this saying. He shows that Jesus meant that the outward effect of which He spoke, the flowing forth, was not at once to occur, but was to commence upon the *reception of the Spirit after His glorification*. *He*,—self-evidently, and, according to the οὐ ἔμελλον, undoubtedly meaning the *Holy Spirit*,—He it was who would cause the streams of living water to flow forth from them. John's explanation, as proceeding from inmost experience, is

itself, and is to be blotted out at pleasure. Κοιλία in no passage of the N. T. means anything else than *body, belly*.—Strangely out of keeping with the unity of the figure, Lange, following Bengel (comp. also Weizsäcker), now finds in κοιλία an allusion to the *belly of the golden pitcher* (see on ver. 37), and Godet to the *inner hollow of the rock* whence the water flowed, so that in τ. κοιλ. αὐτοῦ corresponds with ἀρχὴ, Ex. xvii. 6. So inventive is the longing after types!

correct, because the principle of Christian activity in the church, especially in its outward workings, is none other than the Holy Spirit Himself; and He was not given until after the ascension, when through Him the believers spoke with tongues and prophesied, the apostles preached, and so on. Such overflowings of faith's power in its outward working did not take place before then. The objection urged against the accuracy of John's explanation, that *ρεύσουσιν* may be a relative future only, and is not to be taken as referring to that outpouring of the Spirit which was first to take place at a future time (De Wette), disappears if we consider the *strong* expression *ποταμοὶ, κ.τ.λ.*, ver. 38, to which John gives due weight, inasmuch as he takes it to refer not simply to the power of one's own individual faith upon others, so far as that was possible previous to the outpouring of the Spirit, but to something far greater and mightier—to those *streams* of new life which flowed forth from the lips of believers, and which were originated and drawn forth by the *Holy Ghost*. The strength and importance of the expression (*ποταμοὶ, κ.τ.λ.*) thus renders it quite unnecessary to supply *ποτέ* or the like after *ρεύσουσιν* (in answer to Lücke); and when Lücke calls John's explanation *exegetically* right, but *exegetically* incorrect, he overlooks the fact that John does not take *the living water itself* to be the Holy Ghost, but simply says, regarding Christ's declaration as a whole, that Jesus meant it of the Holy Spirit, leaving it to the Christian consciousness to think of the Spirit as the *Agens*, the divine charismatic *motive power* of the streams of living water. — It remains to be remarked that the libation at the feast of Tabernacles was interpreted by the Rabbis as a symbol of the outpouring of the Spirit (see Lightfoot); but this is all the less to be connected with the words of Jesus and their interpretation, the more uncertain it is that there is any reference in the words to that libation; see on ver. 37. — οὐπω γὰρ ἦν πνεῦμα] *non dum enim aderat* (i. 9), furnishing the reason for the οὐ ἔμελλον λαμβάνειν as the statement of what was still *future*. The ἦν, "*He was present*" (upon earth), is appropriately elucidated by δεδομένον (Lachmann; see on Acts xix. 2); Jesus alone possessed Him in His entire fulness (iii. 34). The absolute

expression οὐπω ἦν is not, therefore, to be weakened, as if it were relative (denoting merely an increase which put out of consideration all former outpourings), as Hengstenberg and Brückner take it, but "at the time when Christ preached He *promised* the Holy Spirit, and therefore the Holy Spirit was *not yet there*," Luther. Comp. Flacius, *Clav.* II. p. 326: "sc. *propalam datus*. Videtur negari substantia, cum tamen *accidens* negetur." See also Calvin. For the rest, the statement does not conflict with the action of the Spirit in the O. T. (Ps. li. 13; 1 Sam. xvi. 12, 13), or upon the prophets in particular (2 Pet. i. 21; Acts xxviii. 25, i. 16); for here the Spirit is spoken of as the principle of the *specifically Christian* life. In this *characteristic definiteness*, wherein He is distinctively the πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ, the πν. τῆς ἐπαγγελίας (Eph. i. 13), τῆς υἰοθεσίας (Rom. viii. 15), τῆς χάριτος (Heb. x. 29), the ἀρραβὼν τῆς κληρονομίας (Eph. i. 14), the Spirit of Him who raised Jesus from the dead (Rom. viii. 11), and according to promise was to be *given* after Christ's *exaltation* (Acts ii. 33), He was not yet present; just as also, according to i. 17, grace and truth first *came into existence* through Christ. The *reason* of the οὐπω ἦν is: "*because Jesus was not yet glorified*." He must through death return to *heaven*, and begin His *heavenly* rule, in order, as σύνθερος with the Father, and Lord over all (xvii. 5; 1 Cor. xv. 25), as Lord also of the Spirit (2 Cor. iii. 18), to *send* the Spirit from heaven, xvi. 7. This *sending* was the condition of the subsequent εἶναι (adesse). "The outpouring of the Spirit was the proof that He had entered upon His supra-mundane state" (Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, I. p. 196); and so also the office of the Spirit to glorify Christ (xvi. 14) presupposes, as the condition of its operation, the commencement of the δόξα of Christ. Till then believers were dependent upon the *personal* manifestation of Jesus; He was the possessor of that Spirit who, though given in His fulness to Christ Himself (iii. 34), and though operating through Him in His people (iii. 6, vi. 63; Luke ix. 55), was not, until after Christ's return to glory (Eph. iv. 7, 8), to be given to the faithful as the Paraclete and representative of Christ for the carrying on of His work. See chap. xiv.-xvi. Chap. xx. 21, 22 does not contradict

this; see *in loc.* The thought of an identity¹ of the glorified Christ with the Holy Spirit might easily present itself here (see on 2 Cor. iii. 17; and likewise Gess, *Pers. Chr.* p. 155). But we must not, with De Wette, seek for the reason of the statement in the *receptivity of the disciples*, who did not attain to a pure and independent development of the germ of spirit within them until the departure of Jesus; the text is against this. As little can we regard the *σάρξ* of Christ as a *limitation* of the Spirit (Luthardt), or introduce the *atonement wrought through His death* as an intervening event (Messner, *Lehre d. Ap.* p. 342; Hengstenberg and early writers); because the point lies in the *δόξα* of Christ (comp. Godet and Weiss, *Lehrbegr.* p. 286 f.), not in His previous death, nor in the subjective preparation secured by faith. This also tells against Baeumlein, who understands here not the Holy Spirit objectively, but the Spirit *formed* in believers by Him, which *τὸ πνεῦμα* never *denotes*, and on account of *λαμβάνειν* cannot be the meaning here.

Vv. 40-43. *Ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου οὖν ἀκούσαντες τῶν λόγων τούτων* (see the critical notes), *κ.τ.λ.* Now, at the close of all Christ's discourses delivered at the feast (vv. 14-39), these verses set before us the various impressions which they produced upon the people with reference to their estimate of Christ's person. "*From among the people, many, after they had heard these words, now said,*" etc. With *ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου* we must supply *τινές*, as in xvi. 17; Buttmann, *N. T. Gr.* p. 138 [E. T. p. 159]; Xen. *Mem.* iv. 5. 22; and Bornem. *in loc.* By *ὁ προφήτης*, as in i. 21, is meant the prophet promised Deut. xviii. 15, not as being himself the Messiah, but a *prophet* preceding Him, a more minute description of whom is not given. — *μὴ γὰρ ἐκ τ. Γαλ., κ.τ.λ.* "*and yet surely the Messiah does not come out of Galilee?*" *Γάρ* refers to the assertion of the *ἄλλοι*, and assigns the reason for the *contradiction*

¹ Tholuck. "*the Spirit communicated to the faithful, as the Son of man Himself glorified into Spirit.*" Phil. iii. 21 itself speaks decisively enough against such a view. Wörner, *Verhältn. d. Geistes*, p. 57, speaks in a similar way of "the elevation of Christ's flesh into the form of the Spirit itself," etc. Baur, on the contrary, *N. T. Theol.* p. 385, says: "Not until His death was the Spirit, hitherto identical with Him, separated from His person in order that it might operate as an independent principle."

of it which οἱ δὲ ἔλεγον indicates. See Hartung, *Partikell.* I. 475; Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 73. Christ's birth at *Bethlehem* was unknown to the multitude. John, however, records all the various opinions in a purely objective manner; and we must not suppose, from the absence of any correction on his part, that the birth at Bethlehem was unknown to the evangelist himself (De Wette, Weisse, Keim; comp. Scholten). Baur (p. 169) employs this passage and ver. 52 in order to deny to the author any *historical* interest in the composition of his work. This would be to conclude too much, for every reader could of himself and from his own knowledge supply the correction. — ἡ γραφή] Mic. v. 1; Isa. xi. 1; Jer. xxiii. 5. — ὅπου ἦν Δ.] *where David was.* He was born at Bethlehem, and passed his youth there as a shepherd, 1 Sam. xvi. — *A division therefore* (ἐκάστου μέρους φιλονεικοῦντος, Euthymius Zigabenus) *took place among the people concerning Him.* Comp. ix. 16, x. 19; 1 Cor. i. 10; Acts xiv. 4, xxiii. 7; Herod. vii. 219: καὶ σφεῶν ἐσχίζοντο οἱ γνώμαι. Xen. *Sympos.* iv. 59; Herod. vi. 109; Eur. *Hec.* 119; and Pflugk, *in loc.*

Ver. 44. Ἐξ αὐτῶν] Those, of course, who adopted the opinion last named. The contest had aroused them. Τινές, standing first and apart, has a special emphasis. "*Some* there were among the people, who were disposed," etc. — ἀλλ' οὐδεὶς, κ.τ.λ.] according to ver. 30, through divine prevention (ἐπεχόμενος ἀοράτως, Euthymius Zigabenus). On ἐπιβάλλ. τ. χεῖρ., see on Acts xii. 1. — According to De Wette (see also Luthardt), the meaning is said to be that they would have supported the *timid officers*, or would have acted for them. A gloss; according to John, they were inclined to an *act of popular justice*, independently of the officers, but it was not carried into effect.

Vv. 45, 46. Οὐν] *therefore*, seeing that no one, not even they themselves, had ventured to lay hands on Jesus. — οἱ ὑπηρέται] In accordance with the orders they had received (ver. 32), they had kept close to Jesus, in order to apprehend Him. But the divine power and majesty of His words, which doubtless hindered the τινές in ver. 44 from laying hands on Him, made it morally impossible for the officers of justice to

carry out their orders, or even to find any pretext or justification for so doing; they were *overpowered*. Schleiermacher, therefore, was wrong in inferring that they had received no *official* orders to take Him. — τοὺς ἀρχιερ. κ. Φαρ.] by the non-repetition of the article, construed as *one category*, i.e. as the Sanhedrim, who must be supposed to have been assembled in session. When first mentioned, ver. 32, both divisions are distinguished with logical emphasis. See Dissen, *ad Dem. de cor.* p. 373 f. — ἐκεῖνοι] the ἀρχιερ. κ. Φαρις.; of the nearest subject, though remote to the writer. Winer, p. 148 [E. T. p. 196], and Ast, *ad Plat. Polit.* p. 417; *Lex Plat.* pp. 658, 659. — Ver. 46. There is a solemnity in the words ὡς οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρ., in themselves unnecessary. "It is a *weighty* statement, a *strong* word, that they thus *meekly* use," Luther. "Character veritatis etiam idiotas convincentis prae dominis eorum," Bengel. It is self-evident that Jesus must have said *more* after ver. 32 than John has recorded.

Vv. 47-49. The answer comes from the *Pharisees* in the Sanhedrim, as from *that* section of the council who were most zealous in watching over the interests of orthodoxy and the hierarchy. — μὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς] *are ye also*—officers of sacred justice, who should act only in strict loyalty to your superiors. Hence the following questions: "*Have any of the Sanhedrim believed in him, or of the Pharisees?*" The latter are specially named as the class of *orthodox and most respected theologians*, who were supposed to be patterns of orthodoxy, apart from the fact that some of them were members of the Sanhedrim. — ἀλλά] *at*, breaking off and leading on hastily to the antithetical statement that follows; Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 15; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 78. — ὁ ὄχλος οὗτος] *those people there*, uttered with the greatest scorn. The people hanging upon Jesus, "this *mob*," as they regard them, are there before their eyes. It is self-evident, further, that the speakers do *not* include their own official servants in the ὄχλος, but, on the other hand, prudently separate them with their knowledge from the ὄχλος. — ὁ μὴ γινώσκ. τ. νόμον] because they regarded such a transgressor of the law as the Prophet, or the Messiah, vv. 40, 41. — ἐπάρατοί εἰσι] *they are cursed*, the divine wrath is upon them! The *plural* is justified by the collective ὁ ὄχλος, comp. ver. 44. The

exclamation is to be regarded merely as a blindly passionate statement¹ (Ewald); as a haughty outbreak of the *rabies theologica*, and by no means a *decree* (Kuinoel and others), as if the Sanhedrim had now *come to a resolution*, or at least had immediately, in keeping with the informal words, put *in regular form* (Luthardt) what is mentioned in ix. 22. Such an excommunication of the ὄχλος *en masse* would have been *preposterous*. Upon the unbounded scorn entertained by Jewish pride of learning towards the unlettered multitude (עם הארץ), see Wetstein and Lampe *in loc.*; Gfrörer in the *Tüb. Zeitschr.* 1838, I. p. 130, and *Jahrb. d. Heils*, I. p. 240 f. — ἐπάρατος] (see the critical notes), not elsewhere in the N. T., nor in the LXX and Apocrypha; it is, however, classical.

Vv. 50, 51. The Pharisees in the Sanhedrim had expressed themselves as decisively and angrily against Jesus, as if His guilt had already been established. But *Nicodemus*, who had secretly been inclined towards Jesus since his interview with Him by night, now raises a protest, in which he calmly, plainly, and rightly points the excited doctors to the law itself (see Ex. xxiii. 1; Deut. i. 16, 17, xix. 15). — πρὸς αὐτούς] to the Pharisees, ver. 47. — ὁ ἐλθὼν . . . αὐτῶν] *who had before come to Jesus, although he was one of them* (i.e. of the Pharisees), iii. 1. — μὴ ὁ νόμος, κ.τ.λ.] The emphasis is on ὁ νόμος: "our law itself does not," etc. They had just denied that the people knew the law, and yet they were themselves acting contrary to the law. — τὸν ἄνθρ.] *the man*; the article denotes the person referred to in any given case; see on ii. 25. We are not to supply ὁ κρίτης to ἀκούσῃ (Deut. i. 16, 17) and γνῶ, for the identity of the subject is essential to the thought; but the law itself is regarded and personified as (through the judge) examining and discerning the facts of the case. For a like personification, see Plato, *de Rep.* vii. p. 538 D. Comp. νόμος πάντων βασιλεύς from Pindar in Herod. iii. 38. — τί ποιεῖ] *what he doeth*, what the nature of his conduct is.

Ver. 52. *Thou art not surely* (like Jesus) *from Galilee*, so that your sympathy with Him is that of a fellow-countryman?

¹ Not of an *argumentative* character, as if they had inferred their disobedience from their unacquaintance with the law (Ewald). Their frame of mind was not so reflective.

— ὅτι προφήτης, κ.τ.λ.] *a prophet*; not: “no very distinguished prophet, nor any great number of prophets” (Hengstenberg); nor again: “a prophet has not appeared in Galilee in the person of Jesus” (Godet); but the appearance of any prophet out of Galilee is, in a general way, denied as a matter of history; hence also the *Perfect*. The plain words can have no other meaning. To Godet’s altogether groundless objection, that John must in this case have written οὐδεὶς προφ., the reference to iv. 44 is itself a sufficient answer. Inconsiderate zeal led the members of the Sanhedrim into historical error; for, apart from the unknown birth-places of many prophets, *Jonah* at least, according to 2 Kings xiv. 25, was of Galilee.¹ This error cannot be removed by any expedient either critical² or exegetical; still it cannot be used as an argument against the genuineness of the Gospel (Bretschneider), for there was all the less need to add a correction of it, seeing that it did not apply to Jesus, who was not out of Galilee. This also tells against Baur, p. 169. The argument in ὅτι προφ., κ.τ.λ., is from the general to the particular (“to say nothing of the Messiah!”), and is a conclusion from a negative induction.

Ver. 53. Belonging to the spurious section concerning the adulteress. “*And every one went*”—every one, that is, of those assembled in the temple—to his own house; so that the end of the scene described in ver. 37 f. is related. Chap. viii. 1 is against the view which understands it of the members of the *Sanhedrim*, who separated without attaining their object (against Grotius, Lampe, etc., even Maier and Lange). Chap. viii. 2 forbids our taking it as referring to the pilgrims at the feast returning to their homes (Paulus).

¹ Not *Elias* also, whose *Thisbe* lay in Gilead (see Thenius on 1 Kings xvii. 1; Fritzsche on Tobit i. 2; Kurtz, in *Herzog's Encykl.* III. p. 754). It is very doubtful, further, whether the *Elkosh*, whence *Nahum* came, was in Galilee or anywhere in Palestine, and not rather in Assyria (Michaelis, Eichhorn, Ewald, and most). *Hosea* came from the northern kingdom of Israel (Samaria); see Hos. vii. 1, 5.

² By giving preference, namely, to the reading *ἰγίριται*, according to which only the present appearance of a prophet in Galilee is denied (so also Tiele, *Spec. contin. annotationem in loc. nonnull. ev. Joh.*, Amsterdam 1853). This *ἰγίριται* would have its support and meaning only in the experience of history, because *προφήτης*, without the article, is quite general, and cannot mean the Messiah. This also in answer to Baumlein.