

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

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

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



*Buy me a coffee*

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



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

**NOTES ON ST JOHN  
AND THE APOCALYPSE**

**By ALEX. PALLIS**

**HUMPHREY MILFORD  
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS**

*Printed in England*  
*At the OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS*  
*By John Johnson*  
*Printer to the University*

ST JOHN'S GOSPEL differs from the Synoptics in two special features. The first is a uniformly homely diction, reproducing in thirty-one instances demotic Modern Greek; whereas the Synoptical language is tainted in the case of St Mark and St Matthew with the inconsistencies inherent in all compilations, and in the case of St Luke with would-be classicisms and Septuagint peculiarities. Its second feature is an acquaintance with some historical facts, as is indicated in my comments on 3-25. 10-7. 12-15. 14-2. 17-15. 18-8. 18-10. 18-15. 19-24. 19-34. 20-2. 21-20.

These Notes will be followed soon, I hope, by others dealing with St Luke and the Acts.

Nobis et ratio et res ipsa centum codicibus potiores sunt.

BENTLEY

La critique ne connaît pas de textes infallibles; son premier principe est d'admettre dans le texte qu'elle étudie la possibilité d'une erreur. RENAN

## ST JOHN

1-1. ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν. *The word abode near, or by the side, of God.* Practically the same as 1-18 ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς and Rom.8-34 ὅς ἐστιν ἐν δεξιῷ τοῦ πατρὸς. For πρὸς with accusative = *by the side of* cf. Acts 5-10 ἔθαιψαν (αὐτὴν) πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς. Also 4 Kings 10-15 ἀνεβίβασεν αὐτὸν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ ἄρμα, etc.

1-4. ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν. That Christ was the eternal light of mankind formed of course the foundation of a Christian's belief; and what could have prompted our Evangelist in addressing other Christians to affirm that darkness—the darkness of sin—did not overtake Christ, as if such an eventuality were conceivable? That is, however, what our text does by saying αὐτό. It was men who walked in the darkness of sin, and by his advent Christ enlightened them and prevented their being overwhelmed thereby. The correct reading is therefore not αὐτό, but αὐτοὺς, namely τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, as corroborated by 12-35 περιπατεῖτε ὡς τὸ φῶς ἔχετε ἵνα μὴ σκοτία ὑμᾶς καταλάβῃ and 12-46 φῶς εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐλήλυθα ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ μὴ μείνῃ. It is possible that 1 Jn 1-5 ὁ θεὸς φῶς ἐστὶ καὶ σκοτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἐστὶν has been inspired by our passage, and that ἐν αὐτῷ represents αὐτό; but its absurdity is there eliminated to some extent by not saying ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν, but σκοτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἐστὶν, which merely reaffirms that ὁ θεὸς φῶς ἐστὶν.

1-6. ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ θεοῦ, ὄνομα αὐτῷ Ἰωάννης. Burney looks upon this construction as an Aramaism. But Pernot has disproved this view by directing to Odys.I,366 Οὐτίς ἐμοί γε ὄνομα. Add Herod.1-179 ἐστὶ δὲ ἄλλη πόλις ἀπέχουσα ὀκτῶ ἡμερῶν ὁδὸν ἀπὸ Βαβυλῶνος, \*Ἰς οὖνομα αὐτῆ. \*Ἐνθα ἐστὶ ποταμὸς οὐ μέγας, \*Ἰς καὶ τῷ ποταμῷ τὸ οὖνομα. 205 γυνὴ τῶν Μασσαγατέων βασιλεία, Τόμυρις οἱ ἦν οὖνομα. Euseb. EH.2-23 τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰησοῦ, Ἰάκωβος ὄνομα αὐτῷ. 3-4

Ἄρεοπαγίτην ἐκείνον, Διονύσιος ὄνομα αὐτῷ. 4-11 ἄλλον τινα, Μάρκος αὐτῷ ὄνομα. The variant ᾧ ὄνομα αὐτῷ Ἰωάννης is a more frequent construction, but here less probable.

1-13. οἱ οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων, οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος σαρκὸς οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρὸς, ἀλλ' ἐκ θεοῦ ἐγεννήθησαν. The statement that believers were not born in a carnal way is false, nor do I find such a peculiar theory advanced anywhere else in the Gospels; it was after they believed in, and by their baptism acknowledged, Jesus as the Messiah that men became God's adopted children. The true position is represented by the variant ὅς . . . ἐγενήθη, by which in accordance with sense it is to Jesus alone that an immaculate birth is attributed. The relative ὅς refers to τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, which is a periphrastic equivalent of αὐτόν; cf. 2-23 ἐπίστευσαν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ = εἰς αὐτόν, etc.

ἐξ αἱμάτων. The plural instead of the singular as referring to a statement repeatedly mentioned. I have dealt with this idiom in my note on Rom.13-13.

ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρὸς. Practically a repetition of ἐκ θελήματος σαρκὸς. But in Nativ.Mar.4-1 we have *sine virili commixione virgo generabit*, which possibly was borrowed from here. If so, its author must have found ἐκ μίγματος ἀνδρὸς.

1-16. ὅτι—αὐτοῦ. Equal to the genitive of a relative pronoun. Charles, in the Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, p. lv, and Burney, in the Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel, p. 76, misconceive this idiom as a Semitism, and assume it as one of the proofs of both these works being but translations from the Aramaic; it is a proof of no value. Pernot, in reviewing Burney's book in the *Revue des Études grecques*, Janvier-Mars 1924, p. 128, writes very much to the point as follows: 'Après tout ce qu'on a écrit sur la construction οὗ οὐκ εἰμι ἰκανὸς κύψας λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ (Mk 1-7), on est surpris de la voir encore qualifiée d'hébraïsme. Le gr.mod. coïncide ici d'une façon frappante avec l'hébreu: ποῦ est l'équivalent de *asher*; l'homme à qui j'ai dit = l'homme que (*asher* ou ποῦ) je lui ai dit; la femme que (*asher* ou ποῦ) j'ai vu l'enfant d'elle, etc. Il s'agit là d'un phénomène linguistique bien connu, et courant en français populaire par exemple [cf. Daudet, *Lettres de mon moulin*, Le Curé de Cucugnan; *Les*

*gens de Cucugnan, que c'est moi qui suis leur prieur*].’ This idiom is a legitimate one of the Greek language both in Hellenistic times and at present, and I have fully illustrated it myself in my note on Rom.8-29. I have explained there that ὅτι represents an indeclinable conjunction which replaces relative pronouns in all their forms.

ἐλάβομεν χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος. It is possible to render *we have received grace in succession to* (another) *grace*, and expositors have produced a sufficient number of instances in support. But χάρις must mean *reprieve* or *redemption* from sin, and it is against the whole Christian theory that anything before the advent of Christ redeemed us from sin. According to that theory men were in hopeless sin and doomed to condemnation and punishment, and Christ came to rescue them by substituting grace or reprieve for condemnation. I read therefore ἐλάβομεν χάριν ἀντὶ κρίματος. For κρίμα = *condemnation* see Dictionaries.

1-21. ὁ προφήτης εἶ σύ; No doubt, as pointed out by previous critics, the prophet meant is the one predicted by Moses and referred to in the 18th chapter of Deuteronomy. In full it would be ὁ προφήτης ὁ ἐρχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον; cf. 6-14.

2-9. ὡς δὲ ἐγεύσατο ὁ ἀρχιτρίκλιος τὸ ὕδωρ οἶνον γεγενημένον καὶ οὐκ ἤδει πόθεν ἔστιν, οἱ δὲ διάκονοι ἤδειςαν οἱ ἠτληκότες τὸ ὕδωρ. As the text stands it states that, although the ἀρχιτρίκλιος was at a loss to account for the presence of the good wine, the servants knew whence it came. If so, it is strange that they kept silent and left their chief in his bewilderment. An old translation, however, records *et videntes factum mirabantur*; this comports with the spirit of the passage, which is that everybody was puzzled, especially the servants who had actually just filled the vessels with water. Accordingly read ἠποροῦσαν for ἤδειςαν. The suffix -οῦσαν as in Nehem.4-18 ψκοδομοῦσαν, etc.; see Jannaris § 789. Probably also in Mk 11-14 instead of ἤκουον οἱ μαθηταὶ we should read ἠπόρουν οἱ μαθηταί.

2-10. ἐλάσσω. *Inferior*. Commentators aptly compare Hebr.7-7 τὸ ἔλαττον ὑπὸ τοῦ κρείττονος εὐλογεῖται. In the same sense HermP. 3Vis. 7-6 τόπῳ πολὺ ἐλάττονι, badly interpreted in the old Latin version by *minore*. Cf. Wisd.9-5 ἐλάσσω ἐν συνέσει, etc.

2-11. ταύτην ἐποίησεν ἀρχήν. A variant, which is strongly attested,



gives τὴν ἀρχήν. What does the article represent? It is probably a remnant of πρώτην, the text originally reading πρώτην ἀρχήν. Such a reading is actually recorded in the old Latin versions as *primum initium*, and the Sinaiticus likewise adds πρώτην, though placed after Γαλιλαίας. And similarly Epiphanius (see Tischendorf) πρώτον σημείον. This combination is preserved in MGk in the verb πρωταρχίζω, registered by Vlákhos.

2-21. περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ. This is against normal usage, which would omit the first article; see Cobet, Var. Lect., pp. 164 and 532. The same peculiarity in 8-44 ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστὲ, but a variant drops the article before πατρὸς, and Origen (see Tischendorf) remarks ‘ἀμφίβολον εἶπερ εἴρητο τὸ πρότερον ἄβρον.’

2-23. πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ θεωροῦντες αὐτοῦ τὰ σημεῖα ἃ ἐποίησεν· αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἐπίστευεν αὐτὸν (read with several Mss αὐτὸν) αὐτοῖς διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν γινώσκειν πάντας, καὶ ὅτι οὐ χρεῖαν εἶχεν ἵνα τις μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. The force of διὰ having been misunderstood has led to the corruption of the text. It is here a preposition of purpose. Sophocles v. διὰ § 6 ‘διὰ τὸ with the infinitive = ἵνα with its appropriate mood. Jos. Ant. 9-4-5, p. 482 διὰ τὸ κοῦφοι πρὸς τὸ φεύγειν εἶναι = ἵνα ᾧσι. Epiph. 1-956 c διὰ τὸ εἶναι = ἵνα ἦ. Apophth. 292 c διὰ τὸ εὐλογηθῆναι με = ἵνα εὐλογηθείην. Leont. Cyr. 1741 a διὰ τὸ κοιμᾶσθαι. Anast. Sin. 709 d. Mal. 388 διὰ τὸ τοὺς ἀέρας φησὶν ἀλλάξαι, *for a change of air, says he*. Epiph. Antec. 3-7-3, p. 580 διὰ τὸ πᾶσιν εἶναι πρόδηλον = ἵνα εἶη.’ The last example is identical in sense with our διὰ τὸ γινώσκειν πάντας. This usage is also illustrated by Jannaris § 1522.<sup>1</sup> The context further demands ἐπίστου instead of ἐπίστευεν, cf. 2 Mac. 7-24 δι’ ὄρκων ἐπίστου. The drift of the whole passage now is that many believed on Jesus on the strength of his miracles and urged him in his own interest to reveal his divinity to the general public also by the performance of further miracles; cf. 7-3 ἔπαγε εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν ἵνα καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ σου (?) θεωρήσωσι τὰ ἔργα σου ἃ ποιεῖς. But he refused to comply and would not explicitly assert himself, for (καθότι) indeed he needed no one’s testimony and cared (see my note on Apoc. 3-17) not if none understood who he was.

<sup>1</sup> See also my note on Rom. 3-25.

2-25. καὶ οὕτως. Read καθότι, as emended by Holwerda. I had myself made the same guess independently.

3-4. πῶς δύναται ἄνθρωπος γεννηθῆναι γέρον ὢν; So far as I am aware, no scholar has taken exception to γέρον ὢν; but its absurdity ought to be clear. Jesus had just said that to see the kingdom of God, i. e. to secure communion with God, one must be reborn, the point insisted upon being a rebirth, meaning a spiritual birth. To this it is a rational answer on the part of Nicodemus, who did not understand the point of the spiritual birth, to ask: What dost thou mean by saying that a man must be born anew? how is that possible? But as the text stands Nicodemus makes the mad retort that, so far as an old man is concerned, he cannot be born at all. The primitive reading, however, was not γέρον ὢν but ἄνωθεν. It is preserved in an old Latin version, which gives *denovo* (= ἄνωθεν, *anew*, cf. Gal. 4-9 πάλιν ἄνωθεν δουλεύειν θέλετε), and in the conflate reading of two Greek Mss, which give ἄνωθεν γέρον ὢν.

3-5. ἐὰν μὴ τις γεννηθῆ ἔξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος. A regeneration by water or baptism is beside the point here. Nicodemus was arguing concerning a material birth as though such a birth had been suggested, and Jesus corrects him by pointing out that he had not referred to a material but a spiritual birth. Had our Lord's thought been that a regeneration by water was equally indispensable, he would have repeated it in v. 8 (where ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος of some Mss is an evident intrusion). Baptism in course of time became a rite of such supreme importance as a proof of conversion, that ὕδατος was interpolated here—as it also was in vv. 6 and 8—so that baptism might appear an injunction of the Lord; see my note on 6-51.

3-21. ποιῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν. As explained in my note on 3-33 (see also on 14-17), ἀλήθεια is a synonym of δικαιοσύνη, ἁγιοσύνη, *righteousness, holiness*. So that ποιῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν = ἐργάτης τῆς δικαιοσύνης =, *δικαίος ἐργάτης*; the reverse of 8-34 ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν and Lk 13-27 ἐργάται ἀδικίας.

3-25. ἐγένετο οὖν ζήτησις ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν Ἰωάννου μετὰ Ἰουδαίου. Bentley's emendation μετὰ τῶν Ἰησοῦ is certain. This was one of the disputes so prevalent between rival Rabbinic schools. The point in dispute was as to which was the Prophet predicted (see my note on

1-21), who possessed the right to baptize and consequently to remit sins. The Baptist's disciples had maintained that this was their master's privilege, and they probably went so far as to claim in his favour Messiahship; cf. v. 28, where the Baptist vehemently protests that all along he had been making it clear that he was not the Messiah, and this protest must have been in answer to the claim advanced by his disciples. Our Gospel by appealing to this, the Baptist's own, testimony, as well as to that in 1-20 *ὠμολόγησε καὶ οὐκ ἠρνήσατο, καὶ ὠμολόγησεν ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ὁ Χριστὸς*, repudiates the pretensions of his school, and in 4-1 *ἤκουσαν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ὅτι Ἰησοῦς πλείονας μαθητὰς ποιεῖ καὶ βαπτίζει ἢ Ἰωάννης* further supports its own version by pointing out that the public favoured Jesus in this matter; cf. also 10-41 *πολλοὶ ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν (τὸν Ἰησοῦν) καὶ ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἰωάννης μὲν σημεῖον ἐποίησεν οὐδὲν, πάντα δὲ ὅσα εἶπεν Ἰωάννης περὶ τούτου (τοῦ Ἰησοῦ) ἀληθὴ ἦν, καὶ πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν*. This version, being supported with a certain amount of heat in 10-41 by *Ἰωάννης μὲν σημεῖον ἐποίησεν οὐδὲν*, and still more emphatically in 1-20 by *ὠμολόγησε καὶ οὐκ ἠρνήσατο, καὶ ὠμολόγησεν ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ὁ Χριστὸς*, indicates that the altercation had not yet subsided by the time of the composition of this Gospel. That the two schools ran concurrently for some considerable time is proved by the case of Apollos, who, when according to Acts 18-24 ff. and 19-3 ff. he was at Ephesus and Corinth, referred to John's baptism as if it were still practised. Their antagonism is passed over in silence by Luke in the Acts, but is probably disclosed in 1 Cor. 1-12 *ἕκαστος ὑμῶν λέγει Ἐγὼ μὲν εἰμὶ Παύλου, ἐγὼ δὲ Ἀπολλώ*. Our Evangelist in saying (in 4-22) that Jesus himself was not baptizing confirms, as we should have expected, that our Lord himself kept aloof from these wrangles.

The alteration of the text must have been effected when Christians came to absorb the Baptist as one of their saints and were loath to let it appear that there ever existed anything but cordial relations between him and Jesus; to this points the Baptist's exaltation in Mt 11-7 ff. The original change was *μετὰ Ἰουδαίων*, a reading which is very strongly attested, to the extent that Tischendorf says 'pari antiquitate praestat lectio Ἰουδαίων;' but I suppose the singular number was finally adopted from a desire to show that it was but a single casual individual who presumed to question the rights of Jesus.

καθαρισμοῦ. A synonym of *baptism*.

3-29. ὁ ἑστηκώς καὶ ἀκούων αὐτοῦ. Exactly as in MGk πῶδ (= ὁς) στέκει καὶ τὸν ἀκούει, where στέκει does not denote that the listener is actually standing, but it is added to show that the listening is done attentively and patiently, i. e. without any sign of the listener withdrawing or even moving.

3-31. ὁ ὢν ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐστί. An extraordinary truism. But the Sinaiticus and Latin versions give ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐστί, and this no doubt is the original reading, effecting a contrast between him who, originating from heaven and being spiritual, stands high above all and him who, originating from the earth and being γῆϊνος or χοϊκός, lingers below upon the earth. The sentiments and utterances of this χοϊκός are conformably χοϊκά; or *terrena*, as Tertullian interprets, his text further on probably giving τὰ τῆς γῆς λαλεῖ and not ἐκ τῆς γῆς λαλεῖ.

3-33. ὁ λαβὼν αὐτοῦ τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἐσφράγισεν ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἀληθῆς ἐστίν. This is surely absurd; how could possibly a man be imagined whose endorsement is necessary to prove the righteousness of God? The text is corrupt, and we should read ἐσφράγισεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεὸς ὅτι ἀληθῆς ἐστίν. Jesus means that whoever does not repudiate him or his word receives God's seal or affirmation that he is a righteous man. To the same effect in 6-27 Jesus says that whoever accepts his meat or gospel receives God's seal or approval. Probably it was the unusual syntax of ὁ λαβὼν instead of τὸν λαβόντα that brought about the corruption. Such a syntax, however, is not uncommon; cf. Apoc. 3-12 ὁ νικῶν ποιῶσω αὐτόν. 3-21 ὁ νικῶν δώσω αὐτῷ. 6-8 ὁ καθήμενος ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ ὄνομα αὐτῷ ὁ θάνατος. Lk 12-36 ἵνα ἐλθόντος ἀνοίξωσιν αὐτῷ, etc.

3-33. ἀληθῆς. A synonym of δίκαιος, ἅγιος, *righteous, holy*. In my note on Rom. 3-7 I have stated 'ἀλήθεια. From the context it is clear that ἀλήθεια is here employed in the same sense as δικαιοσύνην in v. 5. Apparently a Hebraism; cf. Ps. 24-10 ἔλεος καὶ ἀλήθεια. See also my notes on 3-21. 14-17. 15-26. Cf. Lk 16-11. Also 2 Kings 2-6 ποιῆσαι κύριος μεθ' ὑμῶν ἔλεος καὶ ἀλήθειαν. Tob. 13-6 ποιῆσαι ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ (τοῦ κυρίου) ἀλήθειαν, etc.'

3-34. οὐ γὰρ ἐκ μέτρου δίδωσι τὸ πνεῦμα. For Christ, God's messenger, does not mete out the Holy Spirit in short or bad measure, but in a measure στάθμιον καὶ δίκαιον (Prov. 16-11); he receives God's words, in

which the divine spirit is embodied, and retails them to mankind in their exact form.

ἐκ μέτρου. I. e. ἐν κακομετρίᾳ; cf. Oxyr. Pap. No. 1447.

4-6. ἐκαθέζετο οὕτως ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ. C. S. Jerram in the 'Guardian' of 2nd Sept. 1900 writes as follows: 'As regards the sense of οὕτως in Mk 2-7, noted in your review of Pallis's book, allow me to mention a similar use of the word in John 4-6 ἐκαθέζετο οὕτως ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ, *he sat thus or as he was* (R.V. margin) *at the well*. The idea conveyed is that of an easy unrestrained attitude, such as a tired traveller might assume. This usage of οὕτως is also classical; for instances see Liddell and Scott. In Latin *sic* is similarly used, especially in the phrase *sic temere*, as in Hor. Od.2-11-14. I think that in the account of St Paul's shipwreck in the Acts, in the verse translated *strake sail and so were driven*, οὕτως might well be rendered *at random*. If so, this may serve as another instance of the same usage.' Cf. also Lucian. Scyth.5 ὄψει γέροντα οὕτως δημοτικῶς ἐσταλμένον. Asin.20 διὰ τί οὕτω καθέζῃ καὶ οὐ παρασκευάζεις ἄριστον; The same usage obtains in MGk. πηγῇ. *A well*. So in MGk πηγᾶδι(ον).

4-7. πειῖν. Some of our earliest witnesses give πειῖν, a form adopted by Tischendorf, who shows from Herodianus its genuineness; it occurs also in Oxyr. Pap. No. 1353. It probably represents πειῖν with the vowels in synizesis.

4-11. οὔτε ἀντλημα ἔχεις καὶ τὸ φρέαρ ἐστὶ βαθύ· πόθεν οὖν ἔχεις τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ζῶν; The emphasis falls upon τὸ ζῶν, the woman arguing that Jesus could not supply water so superior to that from the well, since that well and that water were given by the patriarch Jacob himself, a superior man to Jesus. But D and the Sinaiticus, as well as other witnesses, do not record οὖν, thus making the woman's question a direct answer to the foregoing ἔδωκεν ἄν σοι ὕδωρ ζῶν. It would then appear that the words οὔτε ἀντλημα ἔχεις καὶ τὸ φρέαρ ἐστὶ βαθύ were originally absent. When added, it is these words that are emphasized, and the emphasis is then quite pointless.

4-35. ἔτι τετράμηνος ἔστι καὶ ὁ θερισμὸς ἔρχεται. Read ἄρτι for ἔτι. *Now is the fourth month of the year* (counting from springtime), *and the harvest therefore is at hand*. No satisfactory sense can be elicited with ἔτι.

4-36. ὁ θερίζων μισθὸν λαμβάνει. The reaper μισθοῦται (passively, see Liddell and Scott), *takes up a job*, is engaged to reap.

4-38. εἰς τὸν κόπον αὐτῶν εἰσεληλύθατε. Probably εἰς τὸν τόπον. You have taken, or usurped, their place. Cf. Acts 1-25 λαβεῖν τὸν τόπον τῆς διακονίας. 1 Cor. 14-16 ἀναπληρῶν τὸν τόπον τοῦ ἰδιώτου. In Gal. 6-2 ἀναπληρώσετε τὸν νόμον τοῦ Χριστοῦ read probably τὸν τόπον.

4-44. αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐμαρτύρησεν ὅτι προφήτης ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ πατρίδι τιμὴν οὐκ ἔχει. The difficulty of this passage has been noticed by both ancient and modern expositors, and several expedients have been resorted to in endeavouring to overcome it; all of them exceedingly far-fetched. The verse was originally a marginal comment meant to apply to v. 42. The Samaritans believed in Christ, though least expected to do so, and the commentator remarks that Jesus himself had already affirmed, as recorded in the Synoptics, that a prophet would not be received in his own country, implying that, if he were received anywhere, it would be among aliens, such as the Samaritans. Both αὐτὸς and ἐμαρτύρησεν add point to this explanation.

5-2. ἐστὶ δὲ ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐπὶ τῇ προβατικῇ κολυμβήθρα, ἣ ἐπιλεγομένη Ἑβραϊστὶ Βηθεσδὰ, πέντε στοᾶς ἔχουσα. We should surely write with Theodore ἐπὶ τῇ προβατικῇ κολυμβήθρα. Cf. Oxyg. Pap. No. 1151 ὁ θεὸς τῆς προβατικῆς κολυμβήθρας. Similarly Josep. mentions κολυμβήθραν ὄψεων, στρουθίου, ἀμυγδάλου, etc. Βηθεσδὰ was not the name of the κολυμβήθρα, since it means a house of mercy. It must have been the name of a shed divided into five compartments, and the compartments having no walls in front, as is often the case in the East, would appear as porches. This name Βηθεσδὰ, owing to its ending in -ὰ, was taken for a feminine noun; hence the dependent participle is in the feminine gender. The meaning is: *Now in Jerusalem by the Bath of the Sheep there is what in Hebrew is called Βηθεσδὰ (i. e. a house of mercy which in Hebrew is called Bethesda), and this house has five porches.*

5-3. κατέκειτο πλῆθος τῶν ἀσθενοῦντων, τυφλῶν, χωλῶν, ξηρῶν, ἐκδεχομένων τὴν τοῦ ὕδατος κίνησιν. . . ἄνθρωπον οὐκ ἔχω, ἵνα ὅταν παραχθῆ τὸ ὕδωρ βάλῃ με εἰς τὴν κολυμβήθραν ἐν ᾧ δὲ ἔρχομαι ἐγὼ, ἄλλος πρὸ ἐμοῦ καταβαίνει. In this passage we have to deal with two corruptions. The first corruption is κίνησιν, a misreading of κένωσιν, pouring out. The afflicted were lying about in the shed waiting for fresh water to be poured out into the bath, for the water of the previous day, being contaminated by leprous and other diseased bathers, would be renewed

every morning. Sophocles records several instances of *κενόω* and *κένωσις* as applied to contents emptied or poured out. Cf. also Cant. 1-3 *μύρον ἐκκενωθὲν ὄνομά σου*. This is an analogous usage to that of the English verb *to empty*. The second corruption is *παραχθῆ*, a misreading of *παραχυθῆ*. Cf. Herod. 4-75 *αἱ γυναῖκες ὕδωρ παραχέουσαι* (for the purpose of bathing). In Oxyr. Pap. No. 1499 occurs the noun *παραχύτης*, meaning an *attendant* at the public *baths*, as Grenfell and Hunt explain, and another instance is recorded in Liddell and Scott from Athenaeus. So that *ὅταν παραχυθῆ τὸ ὕδωρ* means *when the water is poured out* into the bath, *παραχυθῆ* being thus a synonym of *κενωθῆ*.

Now, when these two corruptions were committed, a miracle was imagined, and so the legend about an angel agitating the water was formed and interpolated into the text; but the legend is absent from several most important Mss. Some Mss omit also the words *ἐκδεχομένων τὴν τοῦ ὕδατος κίνησιν*, but these are indispensable, first because some reason had to be assigned for the presence of the diseased crowd at the bath, and secondly because the word *κίνησιν* formed the foundation of the legend. On the other hand, the clause in v. 7 *ἐν ᾧ δὲ ἔρχομαι ἐγὼ*, ἄλλος πρὸ ἐμοῦ καταβαίνει evidently belongs to the legend.

5-5. *τριακότα ὀκτῶ ἔτη ἔχων*. *Who had been thirty-eight years*. Cf. Mart. Polyc. 9 *ὀγδοήκοντα καὶ ἐξ ἑτη ἔχω δουλεύων*, *I have been serving these eighty-six years*.<sup>1</sup> This idiom is still current. Vlákhoš in v. *ἔχω* 'πόσον καιρὸν ἔχετε εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας; *depuis quand êtes-vous à Athènes?*'

5-17. *ὁ πατήρ μου ἕως ἄρτι ἐργάζεται, καὶ γὰρ ἐργάζομαι*. *My father works until now* (i. e. all the week inclusive of the Sabbath) by making the sun rise, by raining, etc. Since he works incessantly not resting even on the Sabbath, so do I also work incessantly, following his lead.

5-19. *οὐ δύναται ὁ υἱὸς ποιεῖν ἄφ' ἑαυτοῦ οὐδὲν, ἐὰν μὴ τι βλέπῃ τὸν πατέρα ποιῶντα*. The meaning required is exactly what the English version gives, *the son can do nothing of himself but what he seeth the father doing*; but this presupposes *ὃ τι* instead of *τι*, and *ὃ τι* no doubt was the original reading. As it stands the text says that *the son can do nothing of himself unless he sees the father doing something*, which is out of the question. At Rom. 14-14 I have shown that *ἐὰν μὴ = εἰ μὴ = ἀλλά*; cf. Gal. 2-16.

<sup>1</sup> Several other examples in Sophocles v. *ἔχω*.

5-30. καθὼς ἀκούω κρίνω. *As I am instructed I judge.* For ἀκούω as equivalent to διδάσκομαι, *I am instructed*, I learn as from an instructor cf. Mk 4-24. Mt 5-21. Heb.2-1, and my notes on Jn 6-45. 8-38. Rom.10-17. On the last place I have commented as follows: ‘ἀκροαταὶ = *disciples* or pupils in Rom.2-13. Philo.6-5-42, etc. See Sophocles in νν. ἄκουσμα (= *a lesson, discourse*), ἀκουστής, ἀκρόασις. Thomas Robinson, *The Evangelists and the Mishna*, p. 27: “The expression *to hear* was used by the Jews as equivalent to receiving as a tradition.” In Greek, however, ἀκούω, being a synonym of ἀκροῶμαι, could simply be equivalent to *receiving instruction* without necessarily involving a reference to tradition. Cf. Jn 6-45 ἀκούσας παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μαθὼν.’

5-35. ἠθέλησατε. Peerlkamp in v. Manen’s *Conjecturaal Critiek* οὐκ (see my note on 5-46) ἠθέλησατε.

5-39. δοκεῖτε ἐν αὐταῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἔχειν. *You think that by them you will obtain eternal life.* I have pointed out in my note on Rom.1-13 by numerous instances extending to classical times that ἔχειν is often equivalent to σχεῖν, λαβεῖν (e. g. Mt 27-65 ἔχετε κουστωδῖαν = λάβετε κουστωδῖαν). So is it in this passage; the study of the Scriptures by the Jews had as its object the attainment of future life in heaven. For δοκῶ (= ἐλπίζω) with the aorist infinitive instead of with the future cf. Lk 6-34 ἐλπίζετε λαβεῖν, etc.

5-39. ἐκεῖναί εἰσιν αἱ μαρτυροῦσαι περὶ ἐμοῦ, καὶ οὐ θέλετε ἐλθεῖν πρὸς με ἵνα ζωὴν ἔχητε. A query should be marked after ἔχητε. The Scriptures bear witness that I am the Messiah; and since you are acquainted with this fact by your familiarity with the Scriptures, how is it that you are so ill-advised as not to come to me?

5-44. πῶς δύνασθε ὑμεῖς πιστεῦσαι δόξαν παρὰ ἀλλήλων λαμβάνοντες, καὶ τὴν δόξαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ μόνου θεοῦ οὐ ζητεῖτε; There is something wrong in this sentence, for there is no logical connection between the two clauses. Perhaps πῶς δύνασθε ὑμεῖς δόξαν παρὰ ἀλλήλων λαμβάνειν καὶ τὴν δόξαν κτλ. How is it possible for you, or any sane person, to prefer glory bestowed by another man, and not rather seek that glory which comes from God? I cannot, however, account for the intrusion of πιστεῦσαι.

5-46. εἰ γὰρ ἐπιστεύετε Μωσῆ, ἐπιστεύετε ἂν ἐμοί, περὶ γὰρ ἐμοῦ ἐκεῖνος ἔγραψεν· εἰ δὲ τοῖς ἐκείνου γράμμασιν οὐ πιστεύετε, πῶς τοῖς ἐμοῖς ῥήμασι



**πιστεύετε;** The sense required seems to me to be : I accuse you of not believing Moses, for if you did, you would believe me, whose advent he has foretold ; if, however, you affirm that you believe his prophecies, how is it that you reject me and my words? Accordingly I should write *εἰ δὲ τοῖς ἐκείνου γράμμασι πιστεύετε, πῶς τοῖς ἐμοῖς ῥήμασιν οὐ πιστεύετε;* The negative is lost, as it also seems to have been in 5-35. 15 20. 21-12. Acts 18-25. 24-22. In my note on Rom.1-19 I have fully commented upon its very frequent loss.

6-22. *τῇ ἐπαύριον ὁ ὄχλος ὁ ἐστηκὼς πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης εἶδον ὅτι πλοῦριον ἄλλο οὐκ ἦν ἐκεῖ εἰ μὴ ἓν, καὶ ὅτι οὐ συνεισῆλθε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, ἀλλὰ μόνοι οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἀπῆλθον κτλ.* The passage is very intricate and somewhat disturbed, but the import is clear. What is meant is that, though the multitude had noticed that the disciples alone left on the previous day in the only boat then available, and Jesus therefore, they thought, ought to be on their own side by the lake, still, not finding him and thinking perhaps of another possible miracle, they went across to search for him whither they knew that his disciples had gone. The difficulty of the passage is increased by the article *οἱ* having dropped out before *εἶδον* ; without its addition the text reads as if it were on the morrow that the disciples saw that there had not been another boat.

6-26. *ζητεῖτέ με οὐχ ὅτι εἶδετε σημεῖα, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἐφάγετε.* The multitude is taunted with having searched out the Lord in the hope of being fed over again. That is why he tells them not to concern themselves with material feeding.

6-27. *ἐργάζεσθε μὴ τὴν βρῶσιν τὴν ἀπολλυμένην, ἀλλὰ τὴν βρῶσιν τὴν μένουσαν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, ἣν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑμῖν δώσει· τοῦτον γὰρ ὁ πατήρ ἐσφράγισεν, ὁ θεός.* Owing to its proximity to *υἱὸς, τοῦτον* by a misapprehension has been supposed by previous commentators to mean the son. But it seems to me that we have to deduce its force from *ἐργάζεσθε τὴν βρῶσιν τὴν μένουσαν* ; *τοῦτον* is the man who works for meat that abideth unto eternal life, and thus receives from God the seal of righteousness. See my note on 3-33.

6-32. *οὐ Μωσῆς ἔδωκεν ὑμῖν τὸν ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἀλλ' ὁ πατήρ μου δίδωσιν ὑμῖν τὸν ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὸν ἀληθινόν.* There is something amiss in this passage. It is an answer to v. 31 *οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν τὸ*

μάννα ἔφαγον ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, and by saying οὐ Μωσῆς ἔδωκεν that fact is denied, though it is admittedly true. Besides, if the intention of the Evangelist was to say that the bread in the desert was not supplied by Moses but by God, we should have had not δίδωσιν but ἔδωκεν; nor was there any occasion for objecting that Moses did not give the bread, since the multitude had not mentioned Moses at all. The error lies in οὐ, which originally was εἰ, and this occurring so often as an equivalent of οὐ (cf. Mk 8-12 εἰ δοθήσεται where Origen 'εἰ, τουτέστιν οὐ,' etc.) gave place to οὐ. By substituting εἰ we get this meaning, that, though you have once received bread from above as you have just mentioned (that bread which according to the Scriptures Moses gave you) still the real and true bread from heaven is that given by my father. For εἰ—ἀλλὰ = εἰ καὶ—ἀλλὰ cf. Plat. Soph. 254 c εἰ μὴ πάση σαφηνείᾳ δυνάμεθα λαβεῖν, ἀλλ' οὖν λόγου γε ἐνδεεῖς μηδὲν γιγνώμεθα, etc. See Stallbaum, Plat. Phaed. 91 b.

6-39. πᾶν ὃ δέδωκε = πάντας οὓς δέδωκε. So also in 17-24.

6-45. πᾶς ὁ ἀκούσας παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μαθὼν. *Every one who, having received instruction from the father, has learnt.* For the sense of ἀκούειν = *to be instructed* see my note on 5-30. The proof that this is the meaning lies in the preceding διδακτοί.

6-51 to 58. ἐάν τις φάγη ἐκ τούτου τοῦ ἄρτου, ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα· καὶ ὁ ἄρτος δὲ ἐν ἐγὼ δώσω ἡ σὰρξ μου ἐστὶν ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς. 52 Ἐμάχοντο οὖν πρὸς ἀλλήλους οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι λέγοντες Πῶς δύναται οὗτος ἡμῖν δοῦναι τὴν σάρκα φαγεῖν; 53 Εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς Ἄμην ἀμην λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐὰν μὴ φάγητε τὴν σάρκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ πῖητε αὐτοῦ τὸ αἷμα, οὐκ ἔχετε ζωὴν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς. 54 Ὁ τρώγων μου τὴν σάρκα καὶ πίνων μου τὸ αἷμα ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον, καὶ ἐγὼ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ. 55 Ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ μου ἀληθὴς ἐστὶ βρώσις καὶ τὸ αἷμά μου ἀληθὴς ἐστὶ πόσις. 56 Ὁ τρώγων μου τὴν σάρκα καὶ πίνων μου τὸ αἷμα ἐν ἐμοὶ μένει, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ. 57 Καθὼς ἀπέστειλέ με ὁ ζῶν πατήρ, καὶ ἐγὼ ζῶ διὰ τὸν πατέρα. Καὶ ὁ τρώγων με, κἀκεῖνος ζήσεται δι' ἐμέ· 58 οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς. The sentiments embodied in these verses are similar to those expressed by Luke in his account of the Last Supper. But at that place there was an intelligible occasion for referring to the blood, that of the wine at the supper; here no such occasion exists. It is remarkable moreover that up to v. 51 Jesus, in

speaking of himself, confines his remarks to the heavenly bread only and no mention is made of the blood; the point of the blood only appears at v. 53, but disappears again at v. 58. So that I have no doubt that vv. 53 to 56 are an interpolation intruded by a theologian after the Eucharist had become established as a most momentous rite of the liturgy (see my note on 3-5). But the interpolation starts from καὶ ὁ ἄρτος of v. 51, for the words which follow that verse hang with vv. 53 ff.; and it extends to ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς of v. 58, whose writer has missed the theme, which does not concern merely the bread but the living bread. From οὐ καθὼς ἔφαγον of v. 58 the text links up quite naturally with ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα of v. 51.

6-61. εἰδὼς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν ἑαυτῷ ὅτι γογγύζουσι περὶ τούτου οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ. D gives εἰδὼς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἐν ἑαυτοῖς γογγύζουσι περὶ τούτου οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, which is a better reading. The disciples were discussing the matter ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, i. e. *among themselves* and apart from Jesus, not wishing their master to hear that any doubts of his word had crossed their minds; had they not been discussing apart, the Evangelist would not have said that Jesus *understood* (εἰδὼς) their murmurs, but that he *heard* (ἀκούσας) them. Similarly Mt 9-3 τινὲς τῶν γραμματέων εἶπον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς Οὗτος βλασφημεῖ. Καὶ εἰδὼς ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὰς ἐνθυμήσεις αὐτῶν εἶπεν. Mk 2-8 ἐπιγνοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι οὕτως διαλογίζονται ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, λέγει αὐτοῖς.

6-63. οὐκ ὠφελεῖ. *Is no good.* This signification of ὠφελεῖ is preserved in MGk in the form φελᾶ or φελάει. Vlákhos v. φελῶ 'αὐτὸ δὲν φελᾶ τίποτε, cela ne vaut rien.' So in Mt 27-24 ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Πιλάτος ὅτι οὐδὲν ὠφελεῖ = *and when Pilate saw that it was no good*, that it was useless. Similarly Lucian. Somn.3 οὐδὲν ὄφελος.

7-3. ὕπαγε εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν ἵνα καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ σου θεωρήσωσι τὰ ἔργα σου. The words καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ σου cannot be genuine. As shown in v. 4, Jesus was not urged to show his works or miracles to his disciples, who naturally knew them, since it was on the strength of the miracles that he had secured their adherence; he was urged to make his works known to the world, namely, to the general public of Judaea. In fact, v. 7 shows that the people among whom he was to appear were such as would hate him, consequently not his disciples. The third person plural θεωρήσωσι has an impersonal subject; but

this not having been understood, theologians sought to complete the sentence by the addition of a personal subject. Hence the original reading *καὶ ἐκεῖ θεωρήσωσι* was altered into *καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ σου θεωρήσωσι*.

7-19. οὐ Μωσῆς ἔδωκεν ὑμῖν τὸν Νόμον ; Καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐξ ὑμῶν ποιεῖ τὸν Νόμον. An anachronism. It was in later times, when the controversy with regard to circumcision was raging and the Jews were insisting upon conformity to the Mosaic Law, that the argument was devised of the Jews themselves not conforming to the Law, since by the destruction of Jerusalem they could no longer continue the prescribed sacrifices which according to the Law should be performed exclusively there. This point is touched upon in Gal. 5-3, equally an anachronism, and constituted one of the favourite arguments of the Apologists with which they imagined they could confound the Jews. It will also be noticed that the above words have no connection either with what precedes them or with what comes after ; whereas *τί με ζητεῖτε ἀποκτεῖναι* naturally follows the protest of Jesus that he had done no wrong.

7-21. ἐν ἔργον ἐποίησα καὶ πάντες θαυμάζετε. The work meant must naturally be the miraculous cure of the paralytic as told in ch. 5, at which the Jews were astonished and indignant because it had been performed on a sabbath ; and here also in vv. 22 and 23 the argument runs upon the Jewish objection to a performance on the sabbath. But in the above sentence this essential point is ignored, and Jesus speaks as if the Jews objected to his ever doing any work at all. The Syr. Sin., however, adds *in your sight* after *ἐποίησα*, and possibly in the place of *in your sight* there once occurred a lacuna, which originally was occupied by *ἐν σαββάτῳ*, but which the scribe of the Sinaiticus or of one of its archetypes filled in by what he regarded as plausibly fitting the context.

7-23. ὅλον ἄνθρωπον ὑγιῆ ἐποίησα. Battier in v. Manen's Conjecturaal Kritik conjectures *χωλὸν* for *ὅλον*.

7-24. μὴ κρίνετε κατ' ὄψιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν δικαίαν κρίσιν κρίνατε. *Judge not by appearances, but render a fair judgment.* Wetstein had already very aptly compared from Lysias *οὐκ ἀξίον ἀπ' ὄψεως, ᾧ βουλή, οὔτε φιλεῖν οὔτε μισεῖν οὐδένα, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν ἔργων σκοπεῖν*. Cf. also Prov. 24-38 *αἰδεῖσθαι πρόσωπον ἐν κρίσει οὐ καλόν*. A comparison of these two examples makes the synonymity of *πρόσωπον* and *ὄψιν* safe. But we

might further compare 1Kings 16-7 *μη ἐπιβλέψῃς ἐπὶ τὴν ὄψιν αὐτοῦ, οἷ ἄνθρωπος ὄψεται εἰς πρόσωπον, ὁ δὲ θεὸς ὄψεται εἰς καρδίαν*. So that the above sentence is similar to Mt 22-16 *ἀληθῆς εἶ, οὐ γὰρ βλέπεις εἰς πρόσωπον ἀνθρώπων*, and Lk 20-21 *ὀρθῶς λέγεις καὶ διδάσκεις καὶ οὐ λαμβάνεις πρόσωπον*. Jesus asks his objectors to judge him fairly and not to be guided by his modest social position. Akin to this is Gal. 2-6, where Paul writes to the effect that in his sight the authority of the Apostles stood high in spite of the fact that once they were fishermen and socially humble people.

Apparently this injunction of treating humble people not with disregard but fairly had become proverbial. Cf. Deut.1-16 *κρίνατε δικαίως, οὐκ ἐπιγνώσῃ πρόσωπον ἐν κρίσει κατὰ τὸν μικρὸν καὶ κατὰ τὸν μέγαν*. Isa.11-3 *οὐ κατὰ τὴν δόξαν κρινεῖ οὐδὲ κατὰ τὴν λαλιὰν ἐλέγξει, ἀλλὰ κρινεῖ ταπεινῶ κρίσιν*. These two last examples quoted by Wetstein.

7-28. *κἀμὲ οἴδατε καὶ οἴδατε πόθεν εἰμί*. In 8-19 Jesus declares the contrary by saying *οὔτε ἐμὲ οἴδατε οὔτε τὸν πατέρα μου*. The correct reading therefore must have been *κἀμὲ ἤδαιτε, εἰ ἤδαιτε πόθεν εἰμί*, in accordance with what follows in 8-19 *εἰ ἐμὲ ἤδαιτε, καὶ τὸν πατέρα μου ἤδαιτε ἂν*. For the omission of *ἂν* in the apodosis cf. 8-39 *εἰ τέκνα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ ἐστε (ἦστε?)*, τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ ἐποιεῖτε. 9-33, etc. In my note on Rom.9-3 I have referred to Blaydes, Arist. Ran.866, where it is seen that the omission of *ἂν* dates back to classical times.

*ἀπ' ἐμαντοῦ οὐκ ἐλήλυθα, ἀλλ' ἔστιν ἀληθινὸς ὁ πέμψας με*. Probably *ἐλήλυθα* is a misreading of *ἐλάλησα*. Cf. 7-17 *ἀπ' ἐμαντοῦ λαλῶ*. 8-44 *ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων λαλεῖ*. The sentence *ἀλλ' ἔστιν ἀληθινὸς ὁ πέμψας με* is a concise equivalent (see my note on Rom.1-8) to *ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ πέμψαντός με, ὅς ἐστιν ἀληθινός*; so that the whole clause, if my suggestion were introduced, would be the same as 12-49 *ἐξ ἐμαντοῦ οὐκ ἐλάλησα, ἀλλ' ὁ πέμψας με πατήρ, αὐτός μοι ἐντολὴν δέδωκε τί λαλήσω*. Similarly in 16-13 it is said of the Holy Ghost that *οὐ λαλήσει ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ, ἀλλ' ὅσα ἀκούσει λαλήσει*. Cf. also 8-26 *πολλὰ ἔχω περὶ ὑμῶν λαλεῖν, ἀλλ' ὁ πέμψας με ἀληθῆς ἐστιν, κἀγὼ ἃ ἤκουσα παρ' αὐτοῦ, ταῦτα λαλῶ εἰς τὸν κόσμον*. Possibly *ἐλήλυθα* was introduced as forming an antithesis to *πέμψας*.

7-29. *παρ' αὐτοῦ εἰμί*. The Sinaiticus gives *παρ' αὐτῷ εἰμί*, and the Syriac Sinaiticus *παρ' αὐτῷ ἤμην*, which is a much better reading. Cf.

1-1 ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν. 17-5 τῇ δόξῃ ἣ εἶχον παρὰ σοί. The Syr. Sin. variant is not recorded by v. Soden, and Baljon goes so far as not even to mention παρ' αὐτῷ. I am at a loss to understand what purpose their masses of material serves, more especially v. Soden's ponderous accumulation, if readings which, to say the least, are plausible or possible are thus arbitrarily ignored. Tischendorf's is still our best register of variations, being not only accurate and objective but also lucid.

7-38. ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ, καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή, ποταμοὶ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ βρέουσιν ὕδατος ζώντος. It is wonderful that ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ, which verges on the grotesque, should have been calmly accepted as rational for so long. It has been defended by various expedients; one is that κοιλίας stands for καρδίας. It certainly does in the Septuagint (cf. Prov.20-27. Sir.19-12, etc.), that is, in a translation made hurriedly by incompetent hands, and therefore made literally; its occurrence in such a work does establish its use in Hebrew, but an author writing in original Greek, however poor he might be, could never have employed κοιλία for καρδία. What could have tempted him to do so? Would a sane person speaking or writing in English, where *belly* and *heart* are terms designating two distinct common organs, as is equally the case in Greek, say *belly* and mean *heart*?

The allusion evidently is to Ps.77-16 διέρρηξε πέτραν ἐν ἐρήμῳ καὶ ἐπότισεν αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐν ἀβύσσῳ πολλῇ, καὶ ἐξήγαγεν ὕδωρ ἐκ πέτρας καὶ κατήγαγεν ὡς ποταμοὺς ὕδατα, combined with Isa.48-21 ὕδωρ ἐκ πέτρας ἐξάξει αὐτοῖς, σχισθήσεται πέτρα καὶ ῥήσεται ὕδωρ. Our Evangelist has taken ποταμοὶ from ποταμοὺς of the Psalmist and βρέουσιν from ῥήσεται of Isaiah. Further, in these passages the chief marvel is that the flow of water emerged ἐκ πέτρας, as likewise in Exod.17-6 πατάξεις τὴν πέτραν καὶ ἐξελεύσεται ἐξ αὐτῆς ὕδωρ. Neh.9-15 ὕδωρ ἐκ πέτρας ἐξήνεγκας αὐτοῖς. Ps.113-8 τοῦ στρέψαντος τὴν πέτραν εἰς λίμνας ὑδάτων καὶ τὴν ἀκρότομον εἰς πηγὰς ὑδάτων. Wis.11-4 ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς ἐκ πέτρας ἀκροτόμου ὕδωρ καὶ ἴαμα δάψης ἐκ λίθου σκληροῦ. Thus, the quotation in our passage would be deficient in point if it did not include ἐκ πέτρας, of which however ἐκ τῆς is probably a remnant. As regards κοιλίας, the only word in the above passages which might be so misread is σκληροῦ of Wis.11-4. I correct therefore ποταμοὶ ἐκ πέτρας σκληρῶς αὐτῷ (the dative as in Isa.48-21. Neh.9-15. Wis.11-4 above quoted)

ρεύουσιν. I would paraphrase thus: *To him who believes in me, (in the words of the Scriptures) rivers of living water will flow out.* The quotation was from memory, and therefore should not be taken literally, but applied in a form so altered as to suit the sentence which it illustrates; of this peculiarity I have cited several examples in my note on Rom. 3-4.

7-39. *τοῦτο δὲ εἶπε περὶ τοῦ πνεύματος κτλ.* A comment upon *ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ ρεύουσιν* in its corrupt state. The verse therefore is spurious.

7-41. *Μὴ γὰρ ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ὁ Χριστὸς ἔρχεται; Μὴ γὰρ* is still alive in MGk as *μηγάρι* or *μηγάρις*. Vlákhos '*μηγάρι τὸν εἶδα; est-ce que je l'ai vu? comme si je l'avais vu.*' It is registered by Sophocles in *v. μὴ*, who explains 'the answer expected being *no.*' In English it would be expressed as nearly as possible by *But has anybody ever heard of such a thing as that Christ comes from Galilee?*

7-53. The beautiful story of the adulteress, one of the gems of the New Testament, is absent from a great many documents. It is not hard to discover the reason why. The answer of our Lord *οὐδὲ ἐγὼ σε κατακρίνω* must have appeared monstrous to hypocrites and sticklers for propriety.

8-25. *εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὴν ἀρχὴν ὅτι (οἱ δὲ τι) καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν.* The meaning of *τὴν ἀρχὴν* is still a puzzle; the interpretations so far given are unconvincing. The next words *ὅ τι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν* are probably the prototype of the MGk current phrase *αὐτὸ ποῦ σὰς λέω = what I tell you (it is what I tell you and nothing else)*, which often disputants in Greece employ when they wish to reassert their opinions without further discussion.

8-33. *ἀπεκρίθησαν.* As the text stands the subject must be the men who had believed Jesus. But the language of the following verses, in which a charge is preferred of enslavement to sin, is so severe that it could not possibly be addressed to believers. I suspect therefore that before *ἀπεκρίθησαν* a section has been lost, where hostile Jews were brought into the discourse, vehemently dissenting from, and possibly threatening, our Lord.

8-37. *ἀλλὰ ζητεῖτέ με ἀποκτεῖναι.* *Nevertheless you seek to murder me.* You may be descendants of Abraham, but that does not prevent you

from seeking to murder me, i. e. but all the same you are murderers. For ἀλλὰ = *nevertheless, it is a fact however that*, see my notes on Rom.5-14 and 7-7.

ὁ λόγος ὁ ἐμὸς οὐ χωρεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν. *My word cannot be taken in by you*, it passes the capacity of your head and intelligence. The phrase is still alive in MGk, though turned the other way about. Vlákhos v. χωρῶ 'αὐτὸ δὲν τὸ χωρεῖ ὁ νοῦς μου, *cela me passe ; c'est au delà de ma portée.*' And so likewise Hellenistically; cf. Mt 19-11 οὐ πάντες χωροῦσι τὸν λόγον. Philosoph.5-4-26 διὰ τὸ μὴ πάντας χωρεῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν. Pseud. Phocyl.83 (from Liddell and Scott) οὐ χωρεῖ μεγάλην διδαχὴν.

8-38. ἃ ἐγὼ ἐώρακα παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ λαλῶ, καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν ἃ ἠκούσατε παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ποιεῖτε. *In the same way as I speak of what I have seen at my father's, so are you doing what your own father has instructed* (see my note on 5-30) *you to do.* The father imputed to the disputants is Satan, as he also is in vv. 41 and (twice) 44; so Alford, Meyer, and others. Similarly in Mart.Petr.7 it is said of Ἀγρίππας that διάκονός ἐστιν τῆς πατρικῆς αὐτοῦ ἐνεργείας.

8-39. εἰ τέκνα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ ἐστε, τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ ἐποιεῖτε. Holwerda ἦστε instead of ἐστε (see my note on 7-28) in accordance with sense and the variant ἦτε.

8-43. Διὰ τί τὴν λαλιὰν τὴν ἐμὴν οὐ γινώσκετε; Ὅτι οὐ δύνασθε ἀκοῦειν τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐμὸν. There is an evident tautology between τὴν λαλιὰν τὴν ἐμὴν and τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐμὸν; in fact, between the whole of the first and the whole of the second clause. I read τοῦ θεοῦ<sup>1</sup> for τὸν ἐμὸν, for there is a contrast between obedience to God our heavenly father and to Satan the father of the wicked. The change must have been consciously effected so as to bring the second clause into conformity with v. 51 ἐάν τις τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐμὸν τηρήσῃ. Translate: *Why cannot you acknowledge* (cf. 8-54 λέγετε ὅτι θεὸς ὑμῶν ἐστι, καὶ οὐκ ἐγνώκατε αὐτόν. 1Cor.8-3 εἰ δέ τις ἀπαρᾶ τὸν θεόν, οὗτος ἐγνωσται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ) *what I say? Because you cannot obey God's word.* For ἀκοῦειν = *to obey* cf. v. 47 τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ θεοῦ ἀκούει. Isa.30-9 ὁ λαὸς ἀπειθής ἐστιν, υἱοὶ ψευδεῖς, οἱ οὐκ ἠβούλοντο ἀκοῦειν τὸν νόμον τοῦ θεοῦ, etc.

8-44. ψεύστης ἐστὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ. This habit of including one's

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Rom. 8-7 (where see my note) τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς ἐχθρα εἰς θεόν, τῷ γὰρ νόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐχ ὑποτάσσεται, οὐδὲ γὰρ δύναται.



father in an abuse is very prevalent in the Levant. So in Greece the vulgar invariably curse one's father and occasionally mother. I understand that in Arabic all one's forbears are thrown in. In the Arabian Nights (Madrus' translation, vol. 2, p. 118) I find *Le barbier ne partit qu'en maudissant le marchand, le père et le grand-père du marchand*. Our Gospel in this part is manifestly fanciful.

8-48. οὐ καλῶς λέγομεν ἡμεῖς; So exactly in MGk καλὰ δὲ λέμε ἑμεῖς, *are we not right in saying?* And similarly Mk 7-6 καλῶς προεφήτευσεν Ἡσαίας περὶ ὑμῶν, *Isaiah was right in prophesying about you*.

δαιμόνιον ἔχεις. In MGk εἶσαι δαιμονισμένος, thou art mad. It was believed in the Levant that insane people had a devil in their belly; and they were often subjected to daily whipping in the belief that the whipping did not hurt the patient but the devil within, who to avoid further annoyance would eventually come out. This must have been the reason why E. H. Jones was severely belaboured by the Turks at Mardeen when he feigned madness (*The Road to En-Dor*, p. 266).

8-50. ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ ζητῶ τὴν δόξαν μου· ἔστιν ὁ ζητῶν καὶ κρίνων. *But I do not seek my own glory; there is One who seeks it and decides*, in whose hands it is whether to bestow upon me glory or not. For this sense of κρίνειν cf. Acts 3-13 κρίναντος ἐκείνου ἀπολύειν. 20-16 κεκρίκει γὰρ ὁ Παῦλος παραπλεύσαι, etc. Weiss has come very close to the right interpretation by rendering *der sie sucht und danach richtet, ob sie ihm ertheilt wird*.

8-53. Ἄβρααμ ὅστις ἀπέθανε. D instead of ὅστις gives ὅτι, which may be the original reading; see my note on 1-16.

8-56. Ἄβρααμ ἠγαλλιάσατο ἵνα ἴδῃ τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐμήν. For the causal force of ἵνα see my note on 9-39.

9-2. τίς ἤμαρτεν ἵνα τυφλὸς γεννηθῆ; *Who has sinned that he should be born blind?* See my note on 10-17.

9-6. ἐπέχρισεν αὐτοῦ τὸν πηλὸν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς. Respecting αὐτοῦ Bloomfield remarks with reason that it is in opposition to *usus linguae*, since ἐπιχρίω is never construed with the genitive. Nor can it be construed with ὀφθαλμούς; where it stands it must be construed either with ἐπέχρισεν or with πηλόν. D gives αὐτῷ, which makes the syntax unobjectionable. But in some old Latins we have *superunxit eum luto*, ἐπέχρισεν αὐτὸν τῷ πηλῷ, and this probably is the original reading. Cf. 11-2 ἀλείψασα τὸν κύριον μύρω. Mk 6-13 ἤλειφον ἐλαίῳ πολλούς.

Acts 10-38 ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν πνεύματι. Num.35-25 ἔχρισαν αὐτὸν τῷ ἐλαίῳ. Jud.10-3 ἐχρίσατο μύρω. Ps.88-21 ἐν ἐλέει ἔχρισα αὐτόν. Jer.22-14 κεχρισμένα ἐν μίλτῳ. Lucian.Luct.11 μύρω χρίσαντες τὸ σῶμα. Arist. Rhet.3-2 τῷ σιάλῳ τὰ παιδία παραλείφουσι, etc. The following in v. 11 ἐπέχρισέν μου τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς is not different.

9-17. τί σὺ λέγεις περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἤνοιξέ σου τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς; *What dost thou say of him, (thou) whose eyes he opened?* For ὅτι—σου = *whose* see my note on 1-16. All commentators, at any rate as many as I have consulted, have gone astray over this sentence.

9-24. δὸς δόξαν τῷ θεῷ· ἡμεῖς οἶδαμεν ὅτι ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος ἀμαρτωλὸς ἐστίν. *Pray to God that you be forgiven, for this man with whom you have come into contact is, as we know, a sinner, who has sinned by curing you on the sabbath.* So in Acts 12-23 ἀνθ' ὧν οὐκ ἔδωκε τὴν δόξαν τῷ θεῷ, *for he did not pray to God for forgiveness when he heard the blasphemy and did not deprecate it.* For διδόναι δόξαν τῷ θεῷ = *to pray to God* cf. 1 Kings 6-5 δώσετε τῷ κυρίῳ δόξαν ὅπως κουφίσῃ τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ, etc.

9-27. εἶπον ὑμῖν ἤδη καὶ οὐκ ἠκούσατε. Meyer rightly marks a query. *I told you already, and did you not hear?* Namely, you have heard, what need is there to repeat what I have clearly told you already?

9-29. τοῦτον δὲ οὐκ οἶδαμεν πόθεν ἐστί. Exactly as in MGK αὐτὸν δὲν τὸν ξέρομε ἀπὸ ποῦ εἶναι, namely, he is unknown, a nobody. An expression of contempt. That is how the man understood the Pharisees, for his answer is: That is where the marvel comes in; you say that he is a nobody, but yet this nobody of yours is good enough to open men's eyes.

9-39. εἰς κρῖμα ἐγὼ εἰς τὸν κόσμον τοῦτον ἦλθον ἵνα οἱ μὴ βλέποντες βλέπωσι καὶ οἱ βλέποντες τυφλοὶ γένωνται. A sentence obscurely phrased, but its import is perfectly clear. The ignorant (οἱ μὴ βλέποντες) have understood that I have come into the world as the Messiah, but the Pharisees (οἱ βλέποντες), who are versed in the Prophets, have become callous and indifferent to the prophetic voices which indicate my Messiahship; the result of my advent therefore must result in their condemnation.

κρῖμα. *Condemnation*, as often; see Grimm and Zorell. In appearance κρῖμα applies to both the ignorant and the learned, but that it means *condemnation* and in reality applies to the learned Pharisees alone is clear from v. 41, where Jesus deals with them ex-

clusively, and by charging them with sin foretells their condemnation, since condemnation is the consequence of sin.

ἴνα. Not telic but causal; cf. 8-56 Ἐβραῖμ ἡγαλλιάσατο ἵνα ἴδῃ τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐμήν. See Jannaris § 1741 (though all his examples are not applicable).

10-3. τούτῳ ὁ θυρωρὸς ἀνοίγει, καὶ τὰ πρόβατα τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούει, καὶ τὰ ἴδια πρόβατα φωνεῖ κατ' ὄνομα. I suspect that the first τὰ πρόβατα is an interpolation, and that it is not the sheep that attend to the shepherd's voice but the θυρωρὸς. Cf. Apoc.3-20 ἔστηκα ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν καὶ κρούω· ἐάν τις ἀκούσῃ τῆς φωνῆς μου καὶ ἀνοίξῃ τὴν θύραν, εἰσελεύσομαι. The text as it stands says that the sheep obey the voice of the θυρωρὸς and he calls them one by one; but the natural thing is not for the θυρωρὸς but for the shepherd to call the sheep and then for the sheep, recognizing his voice, to follow. This is what the elimination of the first τὰ πρόβατα accomplishes.

φωνεῖ. For the change of subject see my note on 18-16.

10-4. ἐκβάλλῃ. Leads out to graze; in sense an aorist to the preceding ἐξάγει. So exactly in MGk βγάζει, takes out; for example, βγάζω τὸ παιδί στον περίπατο, I take out the child for a walk.

10-7. ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ θύρα τῶν προβάτων· πάντες ὅσοι ἦλθον πρὸ ἐμοῦ κλέπται εἰσὶ καὶ λησταί, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἤκουσαν αὐτῶν τὰ πρόβατα. By a stretch one can take ἡ θύρα τῶν προβάτων for ἡ θύρα τῆς ἀλλῆς τῶν προβάτων, but how can we reconcile ὅσοι ἦλθον πρὸ ἐμοῦ with ἡ θύρα? Πρὸ ἐμοῦ must mean πρὸ τῆς θύρας, and therefore ὅσοι ἦλθον must mean ὅσαι θύραι ἦλθον, which is utterly absurd and could not have been written by an even moderately rational author. I have no doubt that instead of ἡ θύρα τῶν προβάτων we should read ὁ κύριος τῶν προβάτων, the master of the sheep, cf. Mk 12-9 ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελώνος. Palaeographically between θύρα and κύριος there is sufficient similarity to have caused the mistake under the influence of θύρα in vv. 1 and 9. The words ἀλλ' οὐκ ἤκουσαν αὐτῶν τὰ πρόβατα in v. 8 I surmise were a marginal note by an enthusiast, who declared that Christians had not heeded the commands of previous false prophets.

Who are the men alluded to as κλέπται and λησταί? Cerinthus and the Gnostics, to whom probably reference is made in Acts 20-29 εἰσελεύσονται μετὰ τὴν ἀφίξίν μου λύκοι βαρεῖς εἰς ὑμᾶς μὴ φειδόμενοι τοῦ ποιμνίου, are precluded by πρὸ ἐμοῦ; nor can the Pharisees be meant,

for ἤλθον points to Prophets. However strong the language is, either Moses is alluded to, or more probably the Baptist and his disciples, those discussed in my note on 3-25.

10-10. ἵνα ζῶν ἔχωσι καὶ περισσὸν ἔχωσιν. *That they may have food and have even more food than is sufficient.* An expression current in MGk γὰρ νὰ ἔχουν τὴ θροφή τους καὶ μὲ τὸ παραπάνω. For ζῶν = τροφή cf. Judg.17-10 τὰ πρὸς ζῶν σου. Sir.4-1 τὴν ζῶν τοῦ πτωχοῦ μὴ ἀποστερήσης, both these examples being quoted by Sophocles. In v. 9 ζῶν is expressed by νομὴν. The Vulg. *vitam* is wrong.

10-17. διὰ τοῦτό με ὁ πατήρ ἀγαπᾷ, ὅτι ἐγὼ τίθημι τὴν ψυχὴν μου, ἵνα πάλιν λάβω αὐτήν. If ἵνα is given a telic sense, then this passage reads as though the Father's love came from the fact that Jesus would receive back his soul; in other words, that Jesus was making no sacrifice, a strange notion of merit. But ἵνα here has a metabatic force, the clause ἵνα πάλιν λάβω αὐτήν being equal to ἀλλὰ λήψομαι πάλιν αὐτήν. It is a favourite idiom with our Evangelist. Cf. v. 38. 9-2. 17-2. But also 1 Cor. 3-18 μωρὸς γενέσθω, ἵνα γένηται σοφός. 2 Cor.1-17. 7-9. At Rom.5.21 ὑπερεπερίσσευσεν ἡ χάρις, ἵνα, ὡς περ ἐβασίλευσεν ἡ ἁμαρτία, οὕτως καὶ ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσῃ I have noted 'And so grace shall reign. Cf. TheodM. at Gal.5-17 "τὸ ἵνα οὐκ ἐπὶ αἰτίας εἶπεν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀκόλουθον." So in 11-11. Jn 10-38, and often.' Thus the Father's love comes solely from the sacrifice, and ἵνα πάλιν λάβω αὐτήν is merely an encouraging remark to the disciples that the soul will not be lost for ever.

10-24. Pernot writes (see *Mededeelingen der Koninklijken Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeeling Letterkunde Deel 57, Serie A, No. 5*) as follows: 'ἕως πότε τὴν ψυχὴν ἡμῶν αἶρεις; Vulg. *quousque animam nostram tollis?* Les traductions donnent *jusqu'à quand tiendras-tu notre esprit en suspens?* Il s'agit en réalité d'une expression très familière, qui s'est conservée en grec moderne, comme Pallis n'a pas manqué de l'apercevoir, et qui signifie littéralement *jusqu'à quand vas-tu nous arracher l'âme?* c.-a.-d. *jusqu'à quand vas-tu nous tracasser de la sorte?* [Cf. Clem. Hom.6-2 μὴ με ἀναβαλλόμενος βασανίσῃς].

Ces trois derniers exemples<sup>1</sup> s'expliquent, on le voit, par le grec

<sup>1</sup> Pernot comments also on Lk 14-23 ἀνάγκασον εἰσελθεῖν. 'Non pas *force-les* mais *invite-les* à entrer, comme le prouvent les emplois de ce verbe dans le grec du moyen âge.' And on Mk 14-8 προέλαβε μυρίσαι μου τὸ σῶμα εἰς τὸν ἐνταφιασμόν. 'Le verbe a ici le même sens qu'en grec moderne, *elle a juste à temps oint mon corps pour la sépulture.*'

byzantin et moderne. Le grec actuel est, dans cette question, un élément important, peut-être ne serait-il pas exagéré de dire capital. Peu de personnes se doutent des liens très étroits qui unissent la langue du N.T. et celle qu'on emploie aujourd'hui à Athènes. Le grec du N.T. est certainement plus proche, à beaucoup d'égards, du grec moderne que de celui du 7<sup>e</sup> siècle avant notre ère. Il serait aisé de citer dans les Évangiles plus d'un passage, dont seuls ceux qui connaissent bien le grec moderne peuvent sentir la finesse et goûter toute la saveur. Quand on n'a sur ceci que des connaissances livresques, ce qui est fatalement le cas de la plupart des savants occidentaux, on ne peut s'imaginer à quel point cette langue du N.T. est encore une langue vivante.'

10-25. εἶπον ὑμῖν καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε. A query should be marked. See my note on 9-27.

10-29. ὁ πατήρ μου ὃς δέδωκέ μοι μείζων πάντων ἐστί. This is the reading for which the context evidently calls, and the variant ὁ πατήρ μου ὃ δέδωκέ μοι πάντων μείζων ἐστί is worthless. Cf. 14-28 ὁ πατήρ μείζων μου ἐστί. But how has so unsuitable a reading as ὁ—μείζων arisen? Perhaps we had originally ὅτι in the sense of ὃς (see my note on 1-16), and its sense being missed, it was disfigured to ὃ, and then the predicate naturally followed in the neuter.

10-38. ἵνα γνῶτε = καὶ τότε γνώσεσθε. See my note on 9-2.

11-5. ἡγάπα δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὴν Μάρθαν. A variant *Μαρίαν* instead of *Μάρθαν* I suspect represents the original reading, prominence being thus given to Mary, as is also given in v. 1, where the order of the names is *Μαρίας καὶ Μάρθας*. In v. 19 the order is reversed, and one document omits *Μαρίαν* altogether, both of which changes I imagine are due to the fact that the woman who anointed Jesus and who according to this Gospel in chap. 12 is Mary, was branded in Lk 7-37 as ἐν τῇ πόλει ἀμαρτωλὸς, i. e. as a prostitute. But in v. 2 the reminder that Mary was she who anointed the Lord prepares us for her activities in the following narrative; and the narrative in v. 45 is wound up by saying that the believing Jews who were present at the miracle had come to Mary. But not only has Mary's name been tampered with, but the whole episode seems to have been amplified in favour of Martha, who in later times became glorified as a saint specially in-

terested in charity; cf. Acts Phil.94 ἡ δὲ Μάρθα ἐστὶν ἡ διακονοῦσα τοῖς πλήθεσιν καὶ κοπιῶσα σφόδρα.

The amplification starts in v. 20 with ἐπήντησεν and runs down to ἐκείνη δὲ ὡς ἤκουσεν of v. 29. Originally the text must have run ἡ οὖν Μάρθα, ὡς ἤκουσεν ὅτι ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἔρχεται, ἠγέρθη ταχὺ καὶ ἤρξατο πρὸς αὐτόν· οἱ οὖν Ἰουδαῖοι (v. 30 being eliminated) οἱ ὄντες κτλ. For it is curious that, whereas according to v. 29 Mary shows eagerness to rush forward and meet Jesus, in v. 20 for no special reason she lingers inactively at home, leaving to Martha the office of welcome. As usual in amplifications (see my note on 18-16 to 27), some of the wording in the genuine part is taken up in the accretion. So we have in v. 20 ἡ οὖν Μάρθα ὡς ἤκουσεν and in the amplified part of v. 29 ἐκείνη δὲ ὡς ἤκουσεν; again, κύριε, εἰ ἦς ὧδε, οὐκ ἂν ἀπέθανέ μου ὁ ἀδελφός of v. 32 is repeated in v. 21. These repetitions generally occur at the beginnings of amplifications as is the case here. The amplifier was unskilful, for in v. 22 by καὶ νῦν οἶδα ὅτι ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσῃ τὸν θεὸν δώσει σοι ὁ θεός he has represented Martha as though she expected a miracle, and this miracle could be no other but the resurrection of her brother; but by οἶδα ὅτι ἀναστήσεται ἐν τῇ ἑσχατῇ ἡμέρᾳ she is represented as not now expecting a resurrection or any miracle, going so far in v. 39 as to deprecate the reopening of the grave. Also the section λέγει αὐτῷ ἡ ἀδελφῆ of v. 39 to τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ is due to the amplifier.

If what I say further on respecting the part 12-1 to 11 is justified, it follows that the above amplifications were introduced subsequently to the interpolation of that part.

11-9. οὐχὶ δώδεκά εἰσιν ὥραι τῆς ἡμέρας; Ἐάν τις περιπατῇ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, οὐ προσκόπτει, ὅτι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου τούτου βλέπει· ἐὰν δὲ τις περιπατῇ ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ, προσκόπτει, ὅτι τὸ φῶς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῷ. There is plenty of time, as much as twelve hours, of light in the course of a day, and a sensible man, by taking advantage of any one of those hours, may go about his work without fear of coming to grief; not so an ill-advised person who, by preferring the night, risks stumbling. Cf. 12-35 περιπατεῖτε ὡς τὸ φῶς ἔχετε ἵνα μὴ σκοτία ὑμᾶς καταλάβῃ, καὶ ὁ περιπατῶν ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ οὐκ οἶδε ποῦ ὑπάγει. As regards myself, Jesus says, I walk in the light of day and have nothing to fear. The disciples had just told their master to beware, and he answers that, proceeding righteously and doing no wrong, he is afraid of nothing.

11-10. τὸ φῶς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῷ. Bloomfield 'τὸ φῶς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῷ seems to be a popular expression for τὸ φῶς οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτῷ, *he is destitute of the light*, as in 12-35.' Respecting ἐν αὐτῷ = αὐτῷ I have noted on Rom.1-19 'ἐν αὐτοῖς = αὐτοῖς. See note on v. 9. 6-2. Cf. 8-3 ἐν ᾧ (= ᾧ) ἡσθένει (read ἡσθένου). Apoc.14-2 καθαριζόντων ἐν ταῖς κιθάραις. Mt 17-12. 1 Cor.7-15. Gal.1-16, and often.' The expression ἔστι μοί τι for *I have something* is very good and current classical Greek.

11-12. εἰ κεκοίμηται, σωθήσεται. *If he has fallen asleep, it (i. e. his sleep) will come to an end.* This meaning of σωθῆναι = *to come to an end* is still alive in MGk. Coraes in his note on Plut. Aem. Paul. p. 416 says 'παθητικῶς ἢ μέσως, οἷον ἐσώθη ἡ οἰκοδομή.' Sophocles v. σώζω 'Pass. σωθῆναι = λήγω. 1Thom. Evag. 8-2 ἐσώθησαν οἱ ὑπὸ τὴν κατάραν αὐτοῦ πεσόντες, *came to an end.*' The translations *he will recover* or *he will be saved* are against the context.

11-31. δόξαντες. The variant λέγοντες is rather better attested and perfectly suitable. It means δοκοῦντες, *thinking*, as it does also in MGk. Vlákhos v. λέγω 'λέγεις νὰ τὸ κάμη; croyez-vous qu'il le fera?' So 3 Kings 5-5 λέγω οἰκοδομήσαι = *I am thinking of building.* Judg. 15-2 εἶπα ὅτι μισῶν ἐμίσησας = *I thought you hated.* Ps. 105-23 εἶπε τοῦ ἐξολοθρεῦσαι = *he thought of exterminating*, etc. The same is the force of λέγω in Rom. 10-18. 10-19. 11-1. 11-11. It dates from as far back as Homer; cf. Γ 366 ἦ τ' ἐφάμην τίσεσθαι. α 194 δὴ γάρ μιν ἔφαντ' (κεν ἔφην?) ἐπιδήμιον εἶναι. Similarly Jn 7-44 a variant ἔλεγον for ἤθελον, and 11-13 ἔλεγον for ἔδοξαν.

11-33. ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι καὶ ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν. The words ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν, i. e. ἐταράχθη ἐν ἑαυτῷ, are probably a glossa, for they mean nothing different to ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι, i. e. ἐνεβριμήσατο ἐν ἑαυτῷ (cf. v. 38 ἐμβριμώμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ), *was agitated within himself.*

11-41. Πάτερ, εὐχαριστῶ σοι ὅτι ἤκουσάς μου. Ἐγὼ δὲ ᾔδειν ὅτι πάντοτέ μου ἀκούεις, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὄχλον τὸν περιστώτα εἶπον, ἵνα πιστεύσωσιν ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας. I am not quite sure that the import of this passage has been thoroughly grasped by previous commentators. The words Πάτερ, εὐχαριστῶ σοι ὅτι ἤκουσάς μου were spoken aloud in the hearing of the bystanders, whom Jesus wished to understand that for the resuscitation of Lazarus which was about to be performed he had prayed to God, as all pious people would do who beseech for a divine

favour, and that he had prayed to him as to his father, God granting his prayer as to his son and deputy upon earth. The following words, however, are addressed to God in an aside, and explain the reason why he uttered *Πάτερ, εὐχαριστῶ σοι ὅτι ἤκουσάς μου*. After this aside he bids Lazarus loudly to come out of the grave.

11-47. *τί ποιούμεν; ὅτι οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος πολλὰ σημεῖα ποιεῖ*. *What are we about?* We are acting futilely in the way we proceed, allowing this man to perform his miracles. Cf. Acts 21-13 *τί ποιεῖτε κλαίοντες; what is the good of your weeping?* 1 Cor. 15-29 *τί ποιήσουσιν οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι* (read *βασανιζόμενοι*) *ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν; what good is there in toiling so hard for the sake of men who are dead for good and all?* The phrase *τί ποιούμεν* survives exactly in MGk in the form *τί κάνουμε* (= *κάμνομεν* = *ποιούμεν*), and it implies a negative, i. e. there is no sense in the way we are acting. Often it takes an affirmative form, namely, *δὲν κάνουμε τίποτα, we do no good*.

11-48. *ἀρῶσιν ἡμῶν καὶ τὸν τόπον καὶ τὸ ἔθνος*. *Will destroy both our country and our nation*. Cf. Act. Paul. Thecl. 32 *ἀρθήτω ἡ πόλις ἐπὶ τῇ ἀνομίᾳ ταύτῃ*.

*τὸν τόπον*. *Our country, our native land*. So in MGk.

12-6. *τὸ γλωσσόκομον ἔχων τὰ βαλλόμενα ἐβάσταζεν*. The versions *took away* or *carried* are not exact. The meaning of *βαστῶ* in MGk is often *to keep* (for oneself) in an unfavourable sense of *embezzling*. Reversely, *having* for *ἔχων* is too literal; we do not say of a cashier that he has the cash or of a clerk that he has the books, but that they *keep* the cash or the books. I should suggest that the best rendering would be *keeping the money-bag he misappropriated the contributions*.

12-1 to 11. A passage awkwardly splitting the narrative concerned with Jesus' entry into Jerusalem. It is an accretion made up from the Synoptics. The interpolator was unskilful; for by saying that *Δάζαρος εἰς ἦν ἐκ τῶν ἀνακειμένων* he has represented him as a guest whereas he was the host. Nor did he understand his text; Mark and Matthew quite intelligibly state that Jesus was anointed in view of his impending burial, but, though according to v. 5 the ointment had already been used up for that purpose, the interpolator says that Mary was to keep it for subsequent application. The section *ἤλειψε τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ ἐξέμαξε ταῖς θριξίν αὐτῆς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ* is from



Luke. The interpolator took ἤλειψε τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ from Lk 7-46 ἤλειψέ μου τοὺς πόδας, and he took ἐξέμαξε ταῖς θριξίν αὐτῆς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ from Lk 7-38 ταῖς θριξί τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῆς ἐξέμαξε (τοὺς πόδας). That is the reason for the repetition of τοὺς πόδας; an original writer would of course have written ἤλειψε τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ ἐξέμαξεν αὐτοὺς ταῖς θριξίν αὐτῆς.

12-10. ἐβουλεύσαντο δὲ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ἵνα καὶ τὸν Λάζαρον ἀποκτείνωσιν, ὅτι πολλοὶ δι' αὐτὸν ὑπῆγον τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ ἐπίστευον εἰς τὸν Ἰησοῦν. In MGk, when reference is made to a man's action with disapproval or astonishment, to the verb denoting that action the verb *πηγαίνει* (= *ὑπάγει, πορεύεται*) is often added without any notion of going. So is it here. By *ὑπῆγον* being added to *ἐπίστευον* the indignation of the chief priests is indicated at so many Jews believing in Christ. The rendering therefore *went away and believed*, as well as the marking of a comma after τῶν Ἰουδαίων, are wrong. This MGk peculiarity goes back to Hellenistic times. Cf. Mt 18-30 ἀπελθὼν ἔβαλεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν φυλακὴν. 22-15 πορευθέντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι συμβούλιον ἔλαβον ὅπως αὐτὸν παγιδεύσωσιν (where it is wrong in the English version to split the clause by marking a comma after Pharisees). Lk 8-14 πορευόμενοι συμπνίγονται (where *go forth and are choked* in the A.V. is likewise wrong, whilst *as they go on their way they are choked* of the R.V. is even absurd). Several examples of this kind occurring in the Septuagint point to a similar usage in Hebrew. Cf. Gen. 35-21 ἐπορεύθη Ῥουβὴν καὶ ἐκοιμήθη μετὰ Βαλλᾶς. Deut. 11-28 εἰς πλανηθήτε ἀπὸ τῆς ὁδοῦ ἧς ἐνετειλάμην ὑμῖν πορευθέντες λατρεύει θεοῖς ἑτέροις. 29-18 πορευθέντες λατρεύει τοῖς θεοῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν. 29-26 πορευθέντες ἐλάτρευσαν θεοῖς ἑτέροις. Jos. 23-16 πορευθέντες λατρεύσητε θεοῖς ἑτέροις. Judg. 14-3 πορεύη λαβεῖν γυναικα ἀπὸ τῶν ἀλλοφύλων. Jer. 3-8 ἐπορεύθη καὶ ἐπόρνευσε. Occasionally, however, no disapproval is meant, as for instance in Jn 15-16 ἵνα ὑμεῖς ὑπάγητε καὶ καρπὸν φέρητε. I may add that in πάντα εἰπείν of Mart. Petr. 2 the word πάντα should not be eliminated as Lipsius suggested, but emended into βάντα (= πορευθέντα).

12-15. καθήμενος ἐπὶ πῶλον ὄνου. Zach. 9-9, whence this was taken, gives πῶλον νέον, and not πῶλον ὄνου. One might account for the divergence by ascribing it to a lapse of memory but that in v. 14 the text says ὄναριον, which is the same as πῶλον νέον. It was essential that

Jesus should be represented as having sat upon an animal which had not been polluted (see my note on 19-34) by the touch of mortal man ; cf. Mk 11-2 πῶλον ἐφ' ὃν οὐδεὶς οὐπω ἀνθρώπων ἐκάθισε. Hence πῶλον νέον seems indispensable.

12-16. ὅτε ἐδοξάσθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς. *When Jesus was beatified or died.* See my notes on 17-19 and 21-19.

12-27. τί εἶπω; Πάτερ, σῶσόν με ἐκ τῆς ὥρας ταύτης; Ἄλλὰ διὰ τοῦτο ἦλθον εἰς τὴν ὥραν ταύτην. Πάτερ, δόξασόν σου τὸ ὄνομα. Ἦλθεν οὖν φωνὴ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἐδόξασα καὶ πάλιν δοξάσω. The reading with τὸ ὄνομα has nothing to recommend it. It is not apparent what prompts our Lord's prayer as it stands in the text; it is only by surmises unwarranted by the words that commentators, who desperately hold fast to their predilections for certain manuscripts, strive to explain it. But a variant gives τὸν υἱὸν instead of τὸ ὄνομα, and this is what the context demands. Both in what precedes and what follows Jesus speaks of himself. He does not deprecate his passion, since for that very purpose he was incarnated, but he prays for his prompt deliverance and glorification, i. e. for his prompt return to heaven. The heavenly voice answers that as he was glorified before (by being enthroned on the right hand of God), so shall he be glorified again by being received up into heaven. That δοξάσω designates this ἀνάληψις is clear from ἐὰν ὑψωθῶ ἐκ τῆς γῆς of v. 32.

13-32. καὶ ὁ θεὸς δοξάσει αὐτὸν ἐν αὐτῷ. In my note on Rom.1-19 φανερόν ἐστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς I wrote as follows: 'Jannaris § 1562 says: "The metaphorical (instrumental) use of ἐν becomes considerably frequent in Hellenistic times, notably among biblical writers and their imitators, who often go so far as to place it before any dative, a phenomenon which points to Hebrew influence and moreover indicates the retreat of the loose dative." The partiality to this idiom in consequence of its frequent appearance in the LXX eventually led to its being employed instead of the dative with ὑπό. Cf. Rom.8-4 τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου πληρωθῆ ἐν ὑμῖν (= ἐφ' ὑμῶν). 1 Cor.6-2 ἐν ὑμῖν κρίνεται ὁ κόσμος. Col.1-16 ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα. This led to a further most absurd abuse in that ἐν αὐτῷ was occasionally foisted upon active verbs by writers affecting a sacred style as a sort of repetition of the subject. So Eph.1-4 ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ. 1-9 ἦν προέθετο ἐν αὐτῷ (= ἡ προε-

τέθη ὑπ' αὐτοῦ). 2-15 ἵνα τοὺς δύο κτίσῃ ἐν αὐτῷ. 2-16 ἀποκτείνας τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν αὐτῷ. Rom.1-24 ἀτιμάζεσθαι τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς (Mss ἑαυτοῖς). 1-27 ἐν αὐτοῖς (some Mss ἐν ἑαυτοῖς) ἀντιλαμβάνοντες. Col. 2-15 θριαμβεύσας αὐτοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ. Mart.Petr.7 θεμελιώσει ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ κρινεῖ ἐν αὐτῷ. XII Patr.Sim.6 ἤξει ὡς ἄνθρωπος καὶ σώζων ἐν αὐτῷ τὸν Ἀδάμ. Similarly 1 Thes.1-5 ἐγενήθημεν ἐν ὑμῖν (read ἡμῖν).<sup>7</sup> The same is the case in this passage; ἐν αὐτῷ is a sort of repetition of ὁ θεός. This idiom, however, is too learned and artificial for St John's style, and therefore I suspect that καὶ ὁ θεός δοξάσει αὐτὸν ἐν αὐτῷ along with καὶ εὐθὺς δοξάσει αὐτὸν are not genuine.

13-38. οὐ μὴ ἀλέκτωρ φωνήσῃ ἕως οὐ ἀπαρνήσῃ με τρίς. Nay, it will not be long before thou deniest me; *thou wilt deny me before* even this very night is spent and *the cock crows thrice*. But I suspect that τρίς is spurious, being intruded with the object of bringing John's story into harmony with that in the Synoptics. It seems to me that Peter only denied his master once, for there was only one occasion on which he was asked whether he was with Jesus, that recorded in 18-25; the denial in v. 27 is only in appearance a second denial, for it is but an affirmation of the previous one. For the denial to the maid see my note on 18-16 to 27.

14-2. ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς μου μοναὶ πολλαὶ εἰσὶν· εἰ δὲ μὴ, εἶπον ἂν ὑμῖν ὅτι πορεύομαι ἐτοιμάσαι τόπον ὑμῖν. This is a positive riddle unsolved so far. But I may venture a suggestion that possibly instead of εἰ δὲ μὴ εἶπον ἂν ὑμῖν ὅτι the original reading was ἥδη εἶπον ὑμῖν ὅτι, *as I have already told you, I am going to prepare your abode* among the numerous heavenly resting-places. I should say that this alteration meets the context. At that time the adherents to Christianity, who had expected an advent of the kingdom of God in their lifetime, were bitterly disappointed to see the deaths of the faithful; and as a consolation to them, Jesus is represented as having clearly foretold that all would die, as even himself and the Apostles had died, but that such deaths only meant a transition from this world to bliss in heaven. An explanation of the awkward fact of the deaths had also to be given to the Thessalonians; see 2 Thes.2-1 ff. My suggestion, however, presupposes a previous conversation respecting πορεύομαι ἐτοιμάσαι τόπον ὑμῖν, but no such conversation is recorded in our Gospel.

The idea of this consolation may have been suggested by Isa. 56-4 τὰδε λέγει κύριος Ὅσοι ἂν φυλάξωται τὰ σάββατά μου καὶ ἐκλέξωται ἃ ἐγὼ θέλω καὶ ἀντέχωμαι τῆς διαθήκης μου, δώσω αὐτοῖς ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ μου καὶ ἐν τῷ τείχει μου τόπον ὀνομαστόν.

εἶπον ἂν ὑμῖν ὅτι πορεύομαι. Usually a semicolon is marked between ὑμῖν and ὅτι, and the English Version translates accordingly. But Ch. Bruston in the Revue des Études grecques, Janvier-Mars 1925, p. 16, points out that the correct rendering is *je vous aurais dit que je vais*. That is what my own translation of the Gospels gives.

14-16. παράκλητον. Taylor in Pirgḗ Aboth, p. 69, says : ' We have here in a Hebrew form the word παράκλητος, or *advocate* (1 Jn 2-1), one who is called to a person's aid, which is rendered, perhaps wrongly, COMFORTER in Jn 14-16 and 26.15-26.16-7.' But παράκλητος must have a meaning analogous to one of the meanings of παρακαλεῖν, and that of *comforting* suits the spirit of the passage admirably. I, says Jesus, was sent to you by my father to cheer you in this miserable world with the assurance of a better life hereafter ; when I am gone, my father will send you the Holy Ghost as a continuator of my office. Παράκλητος certainly signifies an *advocate* or *mediator* in 1Jn 2-1 ; but how does an advocate come into this passage ?

14-17. τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας. A periphrasis both here and in 15-26 for τὸ ἀληθές or ἀληθινὸν πνεῦμα, the Holy (see my note on 3-21) Ghost, ἀληθές being a synonym of ἅγιον, as explained in my note on 3-21. The same combination twice occurs in XII Patr. Jud.20 in contrast to τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πλάνης, the context there showing that πλάνης means *of sin*, and therefore that ἀληθείας means *of holiness*, as it does in this passage.

14-20. γνῶσεσθε ὑμεῖς. The pronoun added with emphasis ; *it is you who will know* and not ὁ κόσμος (cf. vv. 17 and 22), the wicked and infidel world.

14-21. ὁ ἔχων τὰς ἐντολάς μου καὶ τηρῶν αὐτάς. In my note on Rom. 1-13 I have suggested that ἔχων stands here for σχῶν, as it often does (see my note on 5-39), for otherwise there would be a tautology, ἔχων as a present and τηρῶν being practically synonymous. Or perhaps the true reading is ποιῶν and not τηρῶν. Cf. Neh.1-9 εἰν φυλάξητε τὰς ἐντολάς μου καὶ ποιήσητε αὐτάς. 10-29 φυλάσσεσθαι καὶ ποιεῖν τὰς ἐντολάς. Ξεν.26-3 τὰς ἐντολάς μου φυλάσσησθε καὶ ποιήσητε. Josh.23-6 φυλάσσειν καὶ ποιεῖν πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα, etc.

14-22. τί γέγονεν; *How is it possible?* The same is the sense in 2Act.Pil.11-3.

τί γέγονεν ὅτι ἡμῖν μέλλεις ἐμφανίζειν σεαυτὸν καὶ οὐχὶ τῷ κόσμῳ; Ἀπεκρίθη δ' Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἐάν τις ἀγαπᾷ με, τὸν λόγον μου τηρήσει καὶ ὁ πατήρ μου ἀγαπήσει αὐτὸν καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐλευσόμεθα καὶ μονὴν παρ' αὐτῷ ποιησόμεθα. *How is it possible that thou shouldst manifest thyself to us and not to (all) the world?* If we see thee, all the world equally will. Jesus' answer is not direct, but its meaning is clear: Nay, all will not see me; *the one whom my father and I shall visit* and to whom thus we shall manifest ourselves *is he alone who loves me* as you do *and keeps my commandments.*

14-30. ἔρχεται γὰρ ὁ τοῦ κόσμου ἄρχων. Καὶ ἐν ἐμοὶ οὐκ ἔχει οὐδέν, ἀλλ' ἵνα γνῶ ὁ κόσμος ὅτι ἀγαπῶ τὸν πατέρα, καὶ καθὼς ἐνετείλατό μοι ὁ πατήρ, οὕτω ποιῶ. *For the ruler of this world—namely, death identified with Satan—is coming; he has no power over me, and if I temporarily submit to him, I do so to obey my father's desire that I should sacrifice myself for the sake of the redemption of all men.* This is evidently the import of this passage, and it demands ἐπ' ἐμοὶ and not ἐν ἐμοί.

15-1. ἡ ἄμπελος. Paspatis<sup>1</sup> contends, and I agree with him, that ἄμπελος here means *vineyard*, and not *vine*. It is the κλήμα further on that is the vine, erroneously interpreted *the branch*. Both these errors are due to the Vulgate. Liddell and Scott register one instance of ἄμπελος in the sense of *vineyard*. In MGk ἀμπέλι(ον) and κλήμα are specific terms for *vineyard* and *vine* respectively.

15-8. ἐν τούτῳ ἐδοξάσθη (read δοξασθήσεται) ὁ πατήρ μου, ἵνα καρπὸν πολὺν φέρητε καὶ γενήσεσθε ἐμοὶ μαθηταί. *By this fact shall my father be glorified and you shall prove yourselves* in the eyes of the world *my true disciples, namely by the fact of producing much good* as a consequence of your adherence to my precepts. It seems to me that δοξασθήσεται is indispensable, for in his whole discourse Jesus speaks of the future; besides, were ἐδοξάσθη correct, instead of φέρητε we should have had a past tense.

ἵνα καρπὸν φέρητε. The same as an ἔναρθρον infinitive. Cf. 6-29 τοῦτό

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Ἀλέξανδρος Πασπάτης delivered a lecture at Constantinople on the occasion of the publication of the Revised Version. This lecture was afterwards published in a pamphlet form and contains some valuable suggestions.

ἔστι τὸ ἔργον τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα πιστεύητε (= τὸ πιστεύειν) εἰς ὃν ἀπέστειλεν. 17-3 αὕτη δέ ἐστιν ἡ αἰώνιος ζωὴ, ἵνα γινώσκωσί (τὸ γινώσκειν αὐτοὺς) σε τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεόν. Lk 1-43 πόθεν μοι τοῦτο, ἵνα ἔλθῃ ἡ μήτηρ (τὸ ἐλθεῖν τὴνμητέρα) τοῦ κυρίου μου; 2 Jn 6 αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγάπη, ἵνα περιπατῶμεν (= τὸ περιπατεῖν ἡμᾶς) κατὰ τὰς ἐντολάς. Jn 4-34 ἐμὸν βρῶμά ἐστιν ἵνα ποιήσω (= τὸ ποιῆσαί με) τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με.

καὶ γενήσεσθε ἐμοὶ μαθηταί. The import would have been clearer if this sentence stood after ἐν τούτῳ δοξασθήσεται ὁ πατήρ μου; indeed, that may have been its position originally.

15-20. εἰ τὸν λόγον μου ἐτήρησαν, καὶ τὸν ὑμέτερον τηρήσουσιν. The context requires a negative before both ἐτήρησαν and τηρήσουσιν (for its loss see my note on 5-46), for ταῦτα πάντα ποιήσουσιν εἰς ὑμᾶς διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου, ὅτι οὐκ οἶδασιν τὸν πέμψαντά με of the following verse, as well as μισεῖ ὑμᾶς ὁ κόσμος of v. 19, assert that this blind and malignant world has ever hated the Apostles, and therefore nothing but violence, and not conformity with their teaching, was to be expected therefrom.

15-26. ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ὁ παράκλητος, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ἐκεῖνος μαρτυρήσει περὶ ἐμοῦ, καὶ ὑμεῖς δὲ μαρτυρεῖτε, ὅτι ἀπ' ἀρχῆς μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐστέ. After saying that the Holy Ghost shall bear witness of him, it is strange that Jesus should invoke the testimony of the disciples, who after all were but mere men. I read καὶ ὑμῖν δὲ μαρτυρήσει. *Not only shall the Holy Ghost testify of me, but of you also*, who from the beginning have been cleaving to me through all my vicissitudes. John mostly says μαρτυρῶ περὶ τινος, but also in 3-26 and 5-33 μαρτυρῶ τινι.

τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας. *The Holy Ghost*; see my note on 14-17.

16-2. ἀποσυναγώγους ποιήσουσιν ὑμᾶς, ἀλλ' ἔρχεται ὥρα ἵνα πᾶς ὁ ἀποκτείνῃς ὑμᾶς δόξῃ λατρείαν προσφέρειν. You shall be excommunicated; indeed, the world shall come to hate you so intensely that, were you even murdered, your murder would be applauded as though a sacrifice on the altar were performed. Such ought to be the sense of this passage; but from the use of ἀλλὰ an anticlimax ensues, and the murder is made to appear as a milder instead of a stronger sort of persecution. Ἄλλὰ therefore is a corruption of a word denoting *indeed, in fact, nay*; perhaps of ἀμὴν, which may have been misunderstood as ἄν μὴ = ἀλλὰ, see my note on 5-19.

ἔρχεται ὥρα ἵνα δόξῃ. The same as ἔρχεται ὥρα τοῦ δόξαι. We have here, as often, a resolved infinitive. As Alford places no comma before ἵνα, I presume that such was also his opinion, though his note is not clear. Similarly v. 32 ἔρχεται ὥρα ἵνα σκορπιωθῆτε. The sentence could be equally well expressed by ἔρχεται ὥρα ὅτε δόξει; cf. v. 25 ἔρχεται ὥρα ὅτε οὐκέτι ἐν παροιμίαις λαλήσω. See also my note on 15-8.

δόξῃ. *Will appear*; in this sense Acts 17-18 ξένων δαιμονίων δοκεῖ καταγγελεὺς εἶναι. 2 Cor. 10-9 ἵνα μὴ δόξω ὡς ἂν ἐκφοβεῖν ὑμᾶς, etc.

16-8. ἔλθων ἐκεῖνος (the Paraclete) ἐλέγξει τὸν κόσμον περὶ ἁμαρτίας καὶ περὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ περὶ κρίσεως· περὶ ἁμαρτίας μὲν ὅτι οὐ πιστεύουσιν εἰς ἐμὲ, περὶ δικαιοσύνης δὲ ὅτι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ὑπάγω καὶ οὐκέτι θεωρεῖτέ με, περὶ δὲ κρίσεως ὅτι ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου κέκριται. The words in v. 10, which explain that Jesus will go to heaven as a consequence of δικαιοσύνη, show that this word signifies departure from this world combined with beatification; see my note on 17-19. The import of the whole passage is that when the Paraclete descends as a messenger from above, he will instruct all men respecting three things; first, in respect of sin that it consists in unbelief; secondly, in respect of beatification that Jesus has been beatified by joining his father in his abode, where sinners are not destined (I read θεωροῦσί με for θεωρεῖτέ με) to meet him; thirdly, in respect of condemnation that Satan, the prince of this world and continuator of evil, has been definitely condemned and his power for ever broken by Jesus' advent. Thus ὅτι is declarative and not causal.

ἐλέγξει. The same as μαρτυρήσει, διδάξει with a shade of reproof as from a master to pupils of slow intelligence.

16-12. ἔτι πολλὰ ἔχω λέγειν ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' οὐ δύνασθε βαστάζειν ἄρτι. *I have much else to tell you, but you cannot at present comprehend.* The disciples were not yet enlightened enough to grasp all the true facts; they would grasp them when the Holy Ghost came and revealed them. This inability of the disciples to understand is also referred to in Mk 9-32 οἱ δὲ ἡγγρόουν τὸ ῥῆμα and in Lk 18-34 κοὶ αὐτοὶ οὐδὲν τούτων συνήκαν; also in Mk 9-10, if we read, as I think we should καὶ τὸν λόγον οὐκ ἐκράτησαν.

βαστάζειν. In my notes on St Mark and St Matthew I have commented as follows: 'Mk 9-10 καὶ τὸν λόγον ἐκράτησαν. Κρατεῖν in the

sense of *to understand* is a Latinism reproducing *tenere*, a similar Latinism occurring in connection with *βαστάζειν*, a synonym of *κρατεῖν* [compare Acts 9-15 *βαστάσαι τὸ ὄνομά μου* with Apoc.2-13 *κρατεῖς τὸ ὄνομά μου*] in Jn 16-12. Compare also *χωρεῖν* in Mt 19-11 (where see Weiss's note) as a translation of *capere*.<sup>7</sup> In MGk *κρατῶ* and *βαστῶ* (= *βαστάζω*) are synonymous throughout all their meanings.

16-22. *οὐδεὶς αἶρει*. A present as an emphatic and vivid form of the future. So exactly in MGk *κανεῖς δὲ* (= *δὲν, not*) *σᾶς τὴν παίρνει*.

16-24. *λήψεσθε ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν ᾗ πεπληρωμένη*. *You will receive complete joy*. No comma should be marked after *λήψεσθε*, for *ἵνα κτλ.* is its object. Cf. 9-22 *συνετέθειντο ἵνα ἀποσυνάγωγος γένηται*, and often.

17-1. *δοξάσον σου τὸν υἱὸν ἵνα ὁ υἱὸς δοξάσῃ σε*. *Glorify thy son, and thus the son will glorify thee*. This idiom illustrated in my note on 10-17.

17-8. *τὰ ῥήματα ἃ ἔδωκάς μοι δέδωκα αὐτοῖς, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔλαβον*. I have explained in my note on Rom.6-17 that *ἔδωκας* here is employed in the sense of *παρέδωκας, thou hast taught*; such is the case also of *δέδωκα* in v. 14. In that same note I have dealt with *ἔλαβον* as equivalent to *παρέλαβον, they have learnt*.

17-12. *ἐτήρουν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι, καὶ ἐφύλαξα καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀπώλετο*. The sentence *ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι* evidently refers to the Apostles; cf. v. 6 *ἐφανερώσά σου τὸ ὄνομα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις οὓς δέδωκάς μοι*. 18-9 *οὓς δέδωκάς μοι οὐκ ἀπώλεσα ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐδένα*. Jesus pleaded for his disciples in v. 9 *ἔρωτῶ περὶ ὧν δέδωκάς μοι*, and the fact that he did so a second time in this passage was perceived by that student who substituted the variant *οὓς* for *ᾧ*. But a second variant *ὅ* in the form *ὅτι* is the one probably which represents the true reading, it being the undeclinable relative particle explained in my note on 1-16. This remark applies equally to v. 11, where we find the same variations, and to v. 24, where the reading varies between *ὅ* and *οὓς*.

17-15. *οὐκ ἔρωτῶ ἵνα ἄρῃς αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου*. When I said that my disciples are not of the world, I did not mean to go so far as to pray that they should be taken from the world or die. This probably has reference to John, and I surmise that it is a hint that our Lord never prayed for this disciple's death, a modest way of saying that he prayed for his immortality; see my note on 21-20. In his unusually advanced years John must have come to persuade himself



that he was not destined to die before the reappearance of Christ. I can fancy a crowd of interested sycophants about his person comforting him, when he was infirm and tottering, by constantly dinging in his ears a gradually evolved promise of immortality.

17-19. ἀγιαζώ ἑαυτόν. *I saint myself, I die.* So ἡγιασθη in Hebr. 10-29. How ἀγιαζεσθαι came to denote *to die* I have sketched in my note on Rom.6-7, as follows: 'Among the Greeks a dead man is referred to as ὁ συχωρεμένος [ὁ μακαρίτης], *the forgiven one*, and this idea dates from old times, as proved by the customary proclamation at funeral rites ὁ ἀποθανὼν δεδικαίωται. As a development a dead man so forgiven became in the popular imagination a δίκαιος, *a sinless man, a saint.*' Thus by saying that a man ἡγιασθη people often would only mean that *he died.*

17-21. ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ᾤσιν. Probably ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ᾤσιν, an exhortation to concord, for at the time when this Gospel was written discords had already infected the Church; see my note on Rom.10-14 and 15. So here Jesus prays that all believers speak and act with one mind; if they did so, the world would be impressed and believe them to be Apostles of a Messiah.

18-5. Λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς Ἐγὼ εἰμί. Εἰσπήκει δὲ καὶ Ἰούδας ὁ παραδιδούς αὐτὸν μετ' αὐτῶν. Ὡς οὖν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Ἐγὼ εἰμί, ἀπήλθον εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω καὶ ἔπεσον χαμαί. What was the object of adding that Judas stood there with the guard? After leading the guard to the spot he takes no part in the proceedings, and the addition is otiose. But it is intelligible if we read ἀπήλθεν and ἔπεσεν, variants which stand as corrections in G; they prepare us for what afterwards happens to Judas. He did not leave the guard after leading them to the garden, but was still by them when Jesus addressed them; and hearing the voice of the master whom during a long association he had learnt to revere and obey, he was suddenly awestruck, and retreating a few paces he fell on his face (see following note) to the ground.<sup>1</sup> The narrative in this way gains enormously in logic as well as vividness. On

<sup>1</sup> A similar story is told by Clement of Alexandria (Div. Serv. 42) respecting a youth who had been befriended by John, but who during John's absence turned a brigand. When the Apostle returned and hastened to find him, he, though by now a hardened criminal, was abashed when he sighted his benefactor, and forthwith fled.

the other hand, there was no occasion for the soldiers to be at all impressed, let alone to prostrate themselves before Jesus, who in their eyes was a mere outlaw; what they did was simply to seize him after a momentary pause, caused probably by Judas' strange action, and bind him. Meantime the readings ἀπῆλθεν and ἔπεσεν have been treated with contempt by Baljon, v. Soden, and Souter; on the other hand, both Baljon and v. Soden record faithfully the variants ἀπῆλθαν and ἔπεσαν, which make no difference whatever to the sense. So much for profound theories.

18-6. ἔπεσαν χαμαί. *He fell down on his face*, as the effect of awe or fear. Cf. Mt 17-6 ἔπεσον ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν. Acts 9-3 ἐξαίφνης περιήστραψεν αὐτὸν φῶς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ πεσὼν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἤκουσε φωνήν. Apoc. 1-17 ὅτε εἶδον αὐτὸν, ἔπεσα πρὸς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ ὡς νεκρός. Tob. 12-16 ἔπεσον ἐπὶ πρόσωπον, ὅτι ἐφοβήθησαν. Dan. 8-17 ἦλθε (Γαβριήλ) καὶ ἔστη ἐχόμενος τῆς στάσεώς μου, καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐλθεῖν αὐτὸν ἐθαμβήθη καὶ πίπτω ἐπὶ πρόσωπόν μου. 18 ἐν τῷ λαλεῖν αὐτὸν μετ' ἐμοῦ πίπτω ἐπὶ πρόσωπόν μου. It is perhaps by these passages from Daniel that John's episode was inspired.

18-8. Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπον ὑμῖν ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμί· εἰ οὖν ἐμὲ ζητεῖτε, ἄφετε τούτους ὑπάγειν. Ἴνα πληρωθῇ ὁ λόγος ὃν εἶπεν, ὅτι οὓς δέδωκάς μοι οὐκ ἀπόλεσα ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐδένα. We have here to understand that the disciples scattered. This must have been thought pusillanimous, and probably some feeling still lingered in Christian circles against them for having fled, instead of making some effort to rescue the beloved master. So probably with a view to calming that feeling the matter is here represented as though the disciples did not abandon Jesus of their own accord but were sent away at his request, and as though this happened of necessity so that his promise that he would suffer no disciple to perish might be fulfilled. If my surmise be well founded, this representation of the matter shows acquaintance with actual historical events.

18-10. Πέτρος οὖν ἔχων μάχαιραν εἵλκυσε αὐτὴν καὶ ἔπαισε τὸν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως δούλον καὶ ἀπέκοψεν αὐτοῦ τὸ ὠτάριον τὸ δεξιόν· ἦν δὲ ὄνομα τῷ δούλῳ Μάλχος. This is another episode which I believe shows knowledge of an historical fact. This fact is a wrangle which was still proceeding at the time of the composition of this Gospel. It must

have been common ground among all Christians that a sympathizer of Jesus did wound the servant of the high priest, thereby aggravating the position of the master, who thus appeared in the eyes of the Roman authorities as the leader of a lawless gang. But the disputants disagreed as to who that sympathizer was. The one party, whose position is represented by our Gospel, maintained that Peter was the aggressor, asserting in support of their claim that they were the sole possessors of all the facts down to minute details; and it is in support of this claim that such particulars as the name of the servant and the side of the ear, which would otherwise be mere verbiage, were inserted in our narrative. The opposite or Synoptical party, desiring to exculpate Peter from the grave consequences of his impetuous action, imputed it to a different sympathizer but left his name unspecified.

On another point. Which of the two versions is the more plausible? The answer must be that the Synoptical party are out of court. The aggressor could be no other than one of the disciples, and if the Synoptics were at all familiar with the facts, they would needs have known and recorded his name.

18-15. ἠκολούθει δὲ τῷ Ἰησοῦ Σίμων Πέτρος καὶ ἄλλος (a variant καὶ ὁ ἄλλος) μαθητής. Ὁ δὲ μαθητής ἐκεῖνος ἦν γνωστός τῷ ἀρχιερεὶ καὶ συνεισηγήθη τῷ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὴν αὐλήν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, ὁ δὲ Πέτρος εἰστήκει πρὸς τῆ θύρα ἔξω. Ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ μαθητής ὁ ἄλλος ὃς ἦν γνωστός τῷ ἀρχιερεὶ, καὶ εἶπε τῇ θυρωρῷ καὶ εἰσήγαγεν τὸν Πέτρον. Who was this other disciple that is associated with Peter and so vaguely alluded to? It is generally supposed that he was John himself; but this is inadmissible. For, in the first place, what was the object of specially suppressing this Apostle's name? And, secondly, John was a humble fisherman who could not possibly have any influence with an arrogant Sadducee, as he is here represented to have had, much less approach him at a time when as a high priest he was engaged in important judicial business; a Sadducee would not even so much as be conscious of John's existence.

There was, however, another disciple, a recent recruit, who was wealthy enough to enjoy some degree of influence, and that was Mark. His wealth is proved by the fact that, according to Acts 12-12, his house had the means of gathering and extending hospitality to

numerous adherents. It was probably also in his house that according to the Synoptical legend Jesus and the disciples foregathered for the Last Supper (Mk 14-17, etc.). Two further allusions in the New Testament to a person unnamed show that this person was a well-to-do man. One is in Mk 14-51, where a young man is robbed of a valuable coat made of Egyptian or fine linen (I correct ἐπὶ γυμνοῦ by ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου, see my notes on St Mark and St Matthew); the other is in Mk 11-3, where it is said that Jesus sent to an unspecified friend for an ass when he stood in need of a special one upon which no one had sat before. Assuming then that the unnamed disciple was really Mark, why has his name been withheld? The explanation probably is that at one time a good deal of animus was developed against Mark either because he became estranged from Paul or because on some point or points he did not see eye to eye with the other Apostles; and so it was sought to misrepresent him as having never risen to the dignity of an authoritative disciple like the eleven (see also note on 19-26). This sentiment first discloses itself in the disparaging remark of Papias (see Euseb. *EH*.3-39) that Mark οὔτε ἤκουσε τοῦ κυρίου οὔτε παρηκολούθησεν αὐτῷ, ὕστερον δὲ Πέτρῳ. Jn 20-8 also appears to be an insinuation that the unnamed disciple, namely Mark (see my note on 20-2), at one time perversely hesitated to accede to the story propagated by the disciples or other believers as to Jesus having left the grave. Finally, I would point out the fact that the association of the mysterious disciple with Peter tallies with that of Mark with Peter in Papias, an association which reappears in 1 Pet.5-13 ἀσπάζεταιται ὑμᾶς ἢ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτῇ καὶ Μάρκος ὁ υἱὸς μου.

Nor do I think that ἄλλος is sound. The original reading must have been εἰς νέος, i. e. ANEOΣ, which being palaeographically not much dissimilar, became ΑΛΛΟΣ under the influence of ἄλλος of v. 16, the corruption further extending to 20-2 and 8. The reading νέος has been preserved in Nonnus (see Tischendorf), who says καὶ νέος ἄλλος ἐταῖρος, one of his copies probably giving νέος and another ἄλλος.

18-16. εἶπε τῇ θυρωρῷ καὶ εἰσήγαγε τὸν Πέτρον. *He told the maid, the door-keeper, and she admitted Peter.* Erasmus was right in taking the θυρωρὸς as the subject of εἰσήγαγε. It is an idiomatic syntax fully illustrated by Jannaris in § 1712, whence I borrow the following

clear instances: Nehem. 13-9 εἶπα καὶ ἐκαθάρισαν. 19 εἶπα καὶ ἔκλεισαν. Chron. 74-2 ἐκέλευσε καὶ ἐκαύθη. Such instances, according to Jannaris, are in reality condensed sentences, i. e. εἶπα ἵνα κλείσωσι καὶ ἔκλεισαν. So in our passage, εἶπε τῇ θυρωρῶ ἵνα εἰσαγάγῃ τὸν Πέτρον, καὶ ἡ θυρωρὸς εἰσῆγαγεν αὐτόν. The idiom is still current; Vlákhos v. καὶ 'τὸν ἄφησαν καὶ ἀπέθανε, ὅν ἡ αὐτὸς ἔλασσε mourir.' I. e. τὸν ἄφησαν ἵνα πεθάνῃ καὶ πέθανε.

18-16 to 27. We have probably here the original story of Peter's denials, from which the Synoptics drew. But it is somewhat confused, having been tampered with from a desire to adapt it to the three denials recorded in the Synoptics, for the Church had finally adopted the story in that form; see also my note on 13-38. The repetitions in v. 25 in almost identically the same terms of vv. 17 and 18 μὴ καὶ σὺ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν εἶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τούτου and ἦν δὲ καὶ ὁ Πέτρος μετ' αὐτῶν ἐστὼς καὶ θερμαινόμενος point, as is often the case, to an accretion; see my note on 11-5. Then εἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ of v. 25 must have as its subject οἱ δοῦλοι καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται of v. 18, and this subject would not have been left out had not εἶπον originally followed οἱ δοῦλοι καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται. Then it is strange that the maid asks Peter whether he was a disciple and nothing further happens; in fact, it is exceedingly strange that she presumed at all to put to Peter such an insulting question as whether he was a disciple of a public malefactor, when Peter was befriended by a gentleman who must have been highly important in her eyes as an acquaintance of the high priest. The maid and her question, it seems to me, were merely intruded from Mk 14-66 with the design of completing the three denials. The suspicion of a manipulation is strengthened by the fact that in the Syr. Sinaiticus the examination by the high priest precedes instead of following the introduction of Peter, and that the denial to the maid is not detached from the other denials. Lastly, both traditions are faulty, considering that they separate the examination from its result, i. e. from the carrying off of Jesus to the Roman authorities.

What has happened seems to me to be this. When it was decided to effect the three denials by the inclusion of the episode of the maid, vv. 25 and 26 were removed to where they now stand with the addition of the introductory words ἦν δὲ Πέτρος ἐστὼς καὶ θερμαινόμενος and their place was filled in by that episode.

18-24. ἀπέστειλεν οὖν αὐτὸν ὁ Ἄνας δεδεμένον πρὸς Καϊάφαν τὸν ἀρχιερέα. Meyer: 'In order to assign the hearing of vv. 19 to 21 to Caiaphas, some have taken critical liberties and placed v. 24 after v. 14. So Cyril.' There can be no question of a liberty at all in this transference. It possesses evidence of the highest value in its favour, that of the Syr. Sinaiticus, which however—more plausibly still—places the transference after v. 13. By such a transference we are saved all sorts of far-fetched explanations.

18-28. ἄγουσιν οὖν. When this verse is connected with v. 23, it is easily seen that the conjunction required is one of continuation and not a syllogistic one. The variant δὲ therefore is preferable to οὖν.

Herford, Christianity in Talmud, p. 88: 'It is stated there [in Gemara] that Jesus was put to death on the eve of the Passover; the Florence codex adds that it was also the eve of the Sabbath. This is probably dependent on the Gospel story, and it is interesting to note that it agrees more with the Gospel of John than with the Synoptics.'

18-38. τί ἐστιν ἀλήθεια; *What is the meaning of truth?* For this force of ἐστίν as equivalent to *the meaning of* cf. 7-36 τίς ἐστιν οὗτος ὁ λόγος ὃν εἶπε, *what did he mean by what he said?* 16-17 τί ἐστι τοῦτο ὃ λέγει; Gal.4-24 ἀτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα, *the meaning of which is allegorical.* Eph.4-9 τὸ δὲ ἀνέβη τί ἐστιν; *and what is the meaning of ἀνέβη?* ClemA. Protr.8-80 ἡ σοφία, ἣ ἐστιν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ, *the wisdom which means his word.* Mk 9-10 συζητοῦντες τί ἐστι τὸ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆναι. Mt 1-23. 9-13. 12-7. 27-33. 27-62. Lk 2-11. 12-1. Gal.1-7. 3-16. Pilate did not follow what Jesus meant by ἀλήθεια and answers petulantly *What is this nonsense of yours about truth?* and then he breaks off further examination as hopeless and goes out. In MGk, in answering impatiently, one would use exactly the same expression Τί θὰ πῆ (= τί ἐστι) ἀλήθεια; So Vlákhos v. λέγω 'τί θὰ εἶπη αὐτό; *qu'est-ce que cela veut dire? que signifie cela?*' See also note on 20-16. Expositors, by taking ἐστίν as equivalent to *is*, make the conversation incomplete. The ancient readers were equally led astray, and thinking that something was missing, sought to complete the passage by adding what has been preserved in 1Act.Pilat.ch.3 Λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Ἄλήθεια ἐξ οὐρανοῦ. Λέγει ὁ Πιλάτος Ἐπὶ γῆς ἀλήθεια οὐκ ἔστιν; Λέγει ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ Πιλάτῳ Ὁρᾶς οἱ τὴν ἀλήθειαν λέγοντες πῶς κρίνονται ἀπὸ τῶν ἐχόντων τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ γῆς.

19-5. Ἴδε ὁ ἄνθρωπος. Pernot, Revue des Études grecques, no. 172, p. 366 : 'La phrase célèbre ne me semble pas avoir été bien entendue. Elle signifie simplement *Voici l'homme en question*: Linguistiquement elle a pour équivalent le grec moderne courant *νά ὁ ἄνθρωπος*; comp. 19-4 Ἴδε ἄγω ὑμῖν αὐτὸν ἔξω. C'est un cas où l'article a gardé quelque chose du démonstratif, ce qui se présente assez fréquemment en grec, comme en français et ailleurs.'

19-15. ἄρον. *Execute, destroy*. So in Acts 21-36. Josep. Ant. 16-1-1, both examples quoted by Bloomfield at Lk 23-18. Add Mart. Andr. 13 αἶρε κὰν ἡμᾶς τοὺς πολλὰ ἁμαρτήσαντας. Act. Paul. Thec. 32, and often. Originally the expression perhaps was αἶρω τὴν κεφαλὴν; so Act. Andr. Matth. 25 ἐὰν ἄρωμεν αὐτοῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν, *if we behead him*.

19-17. βαστάζων ἑαυτῷ τὸν σταυρὸν ἐξῆλθεν. This sounds as though the initiative in the carrying of the cross rested with Jesus. Noris ἐξῆλθεν appropriate to a criminal who was led out to execution; it should be ἀπήχθη. But there is a variant βαστάζων αὐτοῦ, from which I conjecture βαστάζοντος αὐτοῦ τὸν σταυρὸν ἐξῆλθεν, *they went out, he (Jesus) carrying the cross*.

19-21. οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων. Such a combination is not instanced elsewhere; nor could it be, since the ἀρχιερεῖς were but those of the Jews. Some documents, both Greek and versions, very properly omit τῶν Ἰουδαίων. Only a few lines higher up the chief priests are called simply ἀρχιερεῖς, and there is no special reason why at this place they should need any qualification.

19-23. ἄραφος, ἄνωθεν ὑφαντὸς δι' ὄλου. To the instances quoted by previous commentators regarding the meaning of δι' ὄλου add Paus. 3-17-6 δι' ὄλου οὐκ ἔστιν εἰργασμένον. 8-14-5 τὰ ἀγάλματα διὰ παντὸς ἠπίσταντο ἐργάζεσθαι καθάπερ ἐσθῆτα ἐξυφαίνοντες. Orig. Cels. 2-69 ἐν μᾶ καὶ δι' ὄλων (read δι' ὄλου) ἠνωμένη πέτρα. Oxyr. Pap. 1277 στρωμάτων λιπῶν ποικιλτῶν δι' ὄλου. Narr. Joseph. 5 ἦν διὰ παντὸς (ὁ Ἰησοῦς) φῶς.

19-24. μὴ σχίσωμεν αὐτὸν ἀλλὰ λάχωμεν περὶ αὐτοῦ. The Synoptics did not understand that the reason why no lots were cast for the χιτῶν was that it was a garment woven in one piece, which it would have been a pity to cut up; so they made the casting of the lots to apply to all the garments, although it would not matter if these were divided. In this particular also John's account represents the original

legend. Meyer: 'The account of John is more exact and complete than that of the Synoptics.'

19-26. Ἰησοῦς οὖν, ἰδὼν τὴν μητέρα καὶ τὸν μαθητὴν παρεστῶτα ὄν ἡγάπα, λέγει τῇ μητρὶ Γύναι, ἰδοὺ ὁ υἱός σου· εἶτα λέγει τῷ μαθητῇ Ἴδου ἡ μήτηρ σου. Καὶ ἄπ' ἐκείνης τῆς ὥρας ἔλαβεν αὐτὴν ὁ μαθητὴς εἰς τὰ ἴδια. In my note on 18-8 (see also Mk 14-49 and Mt 26-56) I explain that the disciples deserted their master in the garden and scattered; and after the crucifixion they were so apprehensive that, as related in 20-19, they kept their door fastened during their gatherings for fear of molestation on the part of the mob. Peter too, when asked in the yard of the chief priest whether he was a disciple, had not the pluck to own it. How then could any disciple have dared to stand devoutly before the cross? Therefore I distrust the genuineness of these verses. But if they are genuine, the disciple meant cannot be John; nothing being said to the contrary, the Gospels must mean that he left the garden along with his fellows. Perhaps Mark was meant, the reason why his name has been suppressed being that explained in my note on 18-15.

19-31. ἵνα μὴ μείνῃ ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ τὰ σώματα ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ. This very skilfully by unforced steps leads to the lance thrust, which by the outflow of blood proved the continued vitality of the body. But the skill stops at this outflow, for when the vitality was ascertained one would have thought that the soldiers would have proceeded to the breaking of the legs.

19-34. ἐξῆλθεν εὐθὺς αἷμα καὶ ὕδωρ. Modern critics, with the exception of Hoffmann, Baumgärten, and Godet (see Meyer, p. 357, footnote), have failed to grasp the significance of the outflow of blood; hence countless physiological and other more or less fanciful explanations. But Origen saw it, for in Cels. 2-69 he says 'τὸν μὴ τοῖς λοιποῖς νεκροῖς ὁμοῖον, ἀλλὰ ζωτικὰ σημεῖα καὶ ἐν τῇ νεκρότητι δείξαντα, τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ τὸ αἷμα.' The persistency of the blood was to show that no dissolution or corruption had been suffered by the body, in accordance with the prophecy of Ps. 15-10 οὐδὲ δώσεις τὸν ὄσιόν σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν. This incorruptibility of Christ's body became a frequent argument in early Christianity. In his speech reported in Acts 13-35 Paul dwells upon it, concluding that ὄν δὲ ὁ θεὸς ἤγειρεν οὐκ εἶδε διαφθοράν. Peter also in



one of his speeches repeats that οὕτε ἡ σὰρξ αὐτοῦ εἶδε διαφθοράν; see Acts 2-31.

The following are the points of the belief held by early Apologists.

(1) That Christ's body did not suffer corruption, as explained above.  
 (2) That the body was never polluted; it was shrouded ἐν συνδόκι καθαρά with an enormous quantity of the aromatic spices prescribed by Jewish custom, and then deposited in a rock excavation newly made, in which no corpse had previously been interred. No hand of living man even touched the interior of this grave; cf. Orig. Cels. 2-69 εἶδε ἐν καινῷ καὶ καθαρῷ γενέσθαι μνημεῖον, ἵνα ἡ ταφὴ ἔχη τὴν καθαρότητα, διὰ τοῦ συμβολικοῦ δηλουμένην ἐν τῷ ἀποτεθεῖσθαι αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα ἐν μνημεῖον καινῷ ὑφειστώπι, οὐκ ἐκ λογάδων λίθων οἰκοδομηθέντι καὶ τὴν ἔνωσιν οὐ φυσικὴν ἔχοντι, ἀλλ' ἐν μιᾷ καὶ δι' ὄλων (read δι' ὄλου) ἡνωμένη πέτρα, λατομητῇ καὶ λαξευτῇ. This anxiety to prove Christ's perfect freedom from physical pollution out of deference to Jewish susceptibilities goes back to his entry into Jerusalem, when, we are told, the ass upon which he sat had not been ridden before. (3) That Christ did not linger in the grave but left it at once, the interval between interment and his reappearance being occupied by his *descensus ad inferos* for the purpose of conquering death and hell and preaching to the dead; cf. 1 Pet. 3-19 τοῖς πνεύμασι ἐκήρυξεν. 4-6 νεκροῖς ἐηγγελίσθη. According to Peter's Gospel the preaching was completed before the dawn of the sabbath.

ὄδωρ. Showing that the body had not dried up.

19-35. καὶ ὁ ἑωρακὼς μεμαρτύρηκε—καὶ ἀληθινὴ ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ ἡ μαρτυρία, κἀκείνος οἶδεν ὅτι ἀληθὴ λέγει—ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς πιστεύσητε. If what I argue in my note on 19-26 is convincing, this verse cannot be genuine. Were it genuine, it would here refer to John, but in that case we should have had not the perfect, but the present μαρτυρεῖ, as in 21-24 οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ μαθητὴς ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ τούτων. I have no doubt that it is an interpolation framed on the lines of 21-24 οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ μαθητὴς ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ τούτων καὶ γράψας ταῦτα, καὶ οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἀληθὴς ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία αὐτοῦ. The interpolator probably replies to an antagonist who had argued that the outflow of blood from a dead body was impossible.

κἀκείνος οἶδεν ὅτι ἀληθὴ λέγει. A pointless remark. Read ὁ κύριος for κἀκείνος. *And the Lord knows that what the eye-witness says is true.*

ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς πιστεύσητε. This depends from *μεμαρτύρηκε*, the intervening words being a parenthesis.

19-39. ἦλθε δὲ καὶ Νικόδημος φέρων μίγμα σμύρνης καὶ ἀλόης ὡς λίτρας ἑκατόν. Bloomfield : 'Immense quantities of spices were burnt [at funerals], especially when great respect was meant to be shown to the dead. So Jos. Ant.15-3-4 notices the great quantity of *θυμιάματα* at the funeral of Aristobulus. And so, speaking of Herod's funeral (Ant.17-10), he says that there were fifty *ἀρωματοφόροι*.' Add Plut. Sull.38 λέγεται δὲ τοσοῦτον πλήθος ἀρωμάτων εἰσενεγκεῖν αὐτῷ, ὥστε, ἄνευ τῶν ἐν φορήμασι δέκα καὶ διακοσίοις διακομιζομένων, πλασθῆναι μὲν εἶδωλον εὐμέγεθες αὐτοῦ Σύλλα, πλασθῆναι δὲ καὶ ῥαβδούχον ἕκ τε λιβανωτοῦ πολυτελοῦς καὶ κιναμώμου. 2 Mac.4-49 τὰ πρὸς τὴν κηδείαν αὐτῶν μεγαλοπρεπῶς ἐχορήγησαν. 2 Paral.16-14 ἔθαψαν αὐτὸν καὶ ἐκοίμισαν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῆς κλίνης, καὶ ἔπλησαν ἀρωμάτων καὶ γένη μύρων μυρεψῶν καὶ ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ ἐκφορὰν μεγάλην ἕως σφόδρα. As is the case to-day with the quantity of flowers offered, so in those times the greater the weight of spices the more important the dead friend would appear in the eyes of the public; that is why such an enormous weight as 100 litres is mentioned.

20-2. ἔρχεται πρὸς Σίμωνα Πέτρον καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἄλλον μαθητὴν ὃν ἐφίλει ὁ Ἰησοῦς. Here also I suspect that the original reading was πρὸς τὸν νέον μαθητὴν (see my note on 18-15), and that by the substitution of τὸν ἄλλον for τὸν νέον and the addition of ὃν ἐφίλει ὁ Ἰησοῦς, taken from 21-7, the passage was altered so that it might fit John. The remark in v. 8 that eventually the disciples in question saw and believed presupposes a previous disbelief; and such a disbelief cannot possibly be attributed to John. In v. 5 it is related that the disciple looked into the grave and saw the shroud but did not enter, and one does not understand why this detail; but the reason for its addition is clear if the disciple was Mark and if at some time his version was that he did see the body in the grave, a statement which the other disciples sought to refute by maintaining that Mark, distinguishing but imperfectly from outside, was deceived and took the shroud for the body. The difficulty attached to disbelief on the part of John must have been felt by others, for at v. 8 three minus-cules and twice Eusebius (see Tischendorf) give εἶδον καὶ ἐπίστευσαν

instead of εἶδε καὶ ἐπίστευσε. At v. 9 we have οὐδέ πω γὰρ ᾗδεισαν τὴν γραφήν; who were the persons represented by the plural? They could not be the eleven. But  $\aleph$  and old Latins read the singular, most probably meaning Mark.

οὐκ οἶδαμεν. Throughout this chapter it is Magdalen alone who speaks and acts. So οἶδαμεν must stand for οἶδα. In my note on Rom.1-5 I have commented 'ἐλάβομεν = ἔλαβον. So Gal.1-8 εὐηγγελισθήμεθα. 2 Pet.1-1 ἡμῖν (= ἐμοὶ) etc. In post-classical times the employment of the plural in the first person instead of the singular spread extensively, so that it occurs in demotic private letters. Cf. Oxyg.Pap.1479 Φιλομούσῳ εἰρήκαμεν. 1481 ἡμῖν. 1491 ἡμῶν. For the plural, though a singular precedes, and vice versa, cf. Lk 23-14 and 15 εἶρον—ἡμᾶς etc. Probably also Eph.3-13 ταῖς θλίψεσί μου ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν (Mss ὑμῶν).' Add Gal.4-14 τὸν πειρασμὸν ἡμῶν (Mss ὑμῶν) ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου.

20-7. θεωρεῖ τὰ θρόνια κείμενα, καὶ τὸ σουδάριον, ὃ ἦν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ, οὐ μετὰ τῶν θρόνιων κείμενον ἀλλὰ χωρὶς ἐντετυλιγμένον εἰς ἓνα τόπον. There must have been some reason for giving this detail of the napkin of the head not lying together with the shroud, but apart in a place by itself and rolled up; but not knowing all the objections raised at the time, we shall probably never guess that reason.

20-9. οὐδέ πω γὰρ ᾗδεισαν τὴν γραφήν. Well translated by *for as yet they knew not the Scripture*, for οὐδέ πω = a simple οὐ πω, as οὐδὲν often = οὐ; cf. Lk 23-40. Acts 4-21, etc. Jannaris §§ 1798 and 1799: 'We very often find οὐδὲν as mere equivalent of οὐ. Οὐδὲν was reduced by aphaeresis to δὲν, a form ever since universally current in MGk.' This evolution of οὐ into οὐδὲν or μὴ into μηδὲν goes back to classical times; cf. Plat. Soph.254c λόγου ἐνδεεὶς μηδὲν γινώμεθα. For οὐδέ πω or μηδέ πω = οὐ πω or μὴ πω cf. Luc.1VH.8 ὅσον οὐδέ πω καρποφορήσειν ἔμελλον. Aelian.VH.12-57 προσημαίνοντες τὰς ὅσον οὐδέ πω τύχας. Oxyg. Pap. Nos. 1424 and 1527, etc.

20-15. κύριε. Qu. κηπουρέ.

21-5. παιδία. The same as παῖδες, *lads, boys, mates*. Sophocles registers one example in this sense from the tenth century. So in MGk παιδιὰ and in French *enfants*. The diminutive addition very early after the classical period became a mere suffix without any diminutive force; Coraes has treated of this phenomenon in his *Plu-*

tarch. See my note on 21-8 and cf. Acts 5-6. The English translation *children* is incorrect.

μή τι προσφάγιον ἔχετε; Here also the A.V. rendering *have ye any meat* is incorrect, and the R.V. *have ye aught to eat* has made things worse. Προσφάγιον is a synonym of ὄψον, anything eaten with bread to give it flavour and relish, as Liddell and Scott interpret ὄψον. Hesychius 'ὄψον, προσφάγιον.' That is why Clemens Alex. reproduces this sentence as μή τι ὄψον ἔχετε. And here, προσφάγιον means ὄψον in its signification of *fish*, of which Sophocles cites several instances. Liddell and Scott quote from Plut.2-667 f πολλῶν ὄντων ὄψων ἐκκενέκην ὁ ἰχθύς μόνος ἢ μάλιστα γε ὄψον καλεῖσθαι. And ὄψον eventually became [ὄ]ψάρι[ον] (see Sophocles), which now is the only term for *fish* in use. That προσφάγιον here means *fish* is clear from Jesus telling the disciples that by casting the net again they would find προσφάγιον.

21-7. Πέτρος, ἀκούσας ὅτι ὁ κύριός ἐστι, ἔβαλεν ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν. Οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι μαθηταὶ τῷ πλοιαρίῳ ἦλθον (οὐ γὰρ ἦσαν μακρὰν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἀλλ' ὡς ἀπὸ πτηχῶν διακοσίων) σύροντες τὸ δίκτυον τῶν ἰχθύων. The reason given for the other disciples returning in the boat, namely that it was lying but at a short distance from the shore, is surely meaningless. In what other way could they have returned whether the distance was short or long? But the reason is rational if it was meant to explain how Peter was able to swim to the shore; he could do so because of the short distance. The parenthesis therefore should be removed to after ἔβαλεν ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, and that is its place in the Syr. Sinaiticus. Baljon, however, v. Soden and Souter have ignored this variation.

Πέτρος τὸν ἐπερδύτην διεζώσατο (ἦν γὰρ γυμνός) καὶ ἔβαλεν ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν. Overcoats are not put on when people are about to swim; they are taken off. Instead therefore of the words διεζώσατο (ἦν γὰρ γυμνός) the genuine reading was merely ἀπέζώσατο, *took off*. When this was misread as διεζώσατο, a comment on the margin explaining the reason why Peter put on his coat was transferred by another commentator into the text.

ἔβαλεν ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν. Peter, in his impatience to join Jesus, would not wait a minute until the boat was made ready to return, but preferred to swim out at once.

21-8. τῷ πλοιαρίῳ. The same as τῷ πλοίῳ. For the diminutive suffix see my note on 21-5.

21-9. βλέπουσιν ἀθρακιὰν κειμένην καὶ ὀψάριον ἐπικείμενον καὶ ἄρτον. The old Latin versions found *καιομένην*, *carbones incensos*, and not *κειμένην*, and so did the Syr. Sinaiticus; and there ought to be no question that this reading, when considered on its own merits and apart from any preconceived notions as to the relative value of documents, is much preferable. Baljon, however, and Souter neglect *καιομένην*. Further, it seems to me that *καὶ ὀψάριον ἐπικείμενον* must be an intrusion, for, in accordance with v. 10 *ἐνέγκατε ἀπὸ τῶν ὀψαρίων ὧν ἐπιάσατε νῦν*, the fish was yet to come from the catch in the net dragged out by Peter. The intrusion was probably made with an object, that of reconciling this text with *ὀψάριον* of v. 13 (see my note on that verse), which was misunderstood to mean one fish. But in placing his words where he did, the interpolator did not perceive that he made the text read as though the bread also was lying upon the fire. Lastly, Syr. Sinaiticus adds *κείμενον* to *ἄρτον*; the addition makes the meaning clearer, but is not indispensable.

21-11. Ἀνέβη οὖν Σίμων Πέτρος καὶ εἴλκυσε τὸ δίκτυον εἰς τὴν γῆν. A variant *ἐνέβη* is preferable to *ἀνέβη*, if we supply *εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν*. It would state that Peter waded in and dragged the net out, as fishermen do. On the other hand, *ἀνέβη* means either *he landed* or *he went aboard*. The former interpretation would make Peter reach the shore after the arrival of the boat, and not before as was his intention; the latter would make him take unnecessary extra trouble by dragging the net out into the boat and thence upon the shore. The same variation in 6-17. 6-24. Mt 14-32. 15-39.

21-12. οὐδεὶς δὲ ἐτόλμα τῶν μαθητῶν ἔξετάσαι αὐτὸν σὺ τίς εἶ, εἰδότες ὅτι ὁ κύριος ἐστίν. Words devoid of all sense where they stand; the explanations so far given are purely imaginative. But they would fit if the text was *οὐκ εἰδότες* instead of *εἰδότες* (for the loss of the negative see my note on 5-46) and they followed v. 6 in that form. Thus, when the disciples saw so much fish caught where there was none before, they would wonder as to who it was that could perform such a miracle, in the same way as when Jesus calmed the waters (Mt 8-27); but, being awed by the miracle, they were loath to put a dis-

respectful question; for *τίς εἶ σὺ*, as is evident from MGk, is another way of saying *thou art nobody*. It was John only who recognized the Lord.

21-13. τὸ ὀψάριον. Not one fish, but fish collectively, as in MGk and I presume in all languages. Cf. Nehem.13-16 φέροντες ἰχθῖν (similarly σταφυλῆν in v. 15) καὶ πᾶσαν πρᾶσιν πωλοῦντες. Ezech.47-9 ἔσται ἐκεῖ ἰχθὺς πολὺς. Num.11-22 πᾶν τὸ ὄψος (= ὀψάριον, see my note on 21-9) τῆς θαλάσσης.

21-19. ποίῳ θανάτῳ δοξάσει τὸν θεόν. An old Latin variant *eum* (meant probably for *εαυτὸν*) instead of τὸν θεόν may represent the original reading. If so, *δοξάσει εαυτὸν* would be the same as *δοξασθήσεται*, *he will die*; see my notes on 12-16 *ὅτε ἐδοξάσθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς* and 17-19 *ἀγιάζω ἐμαυτόν*. But 1Pet.4-16 *δοξαζέτω τὸν θεὸν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ*, to which commentators refer as a parallel, is different; it means *let him render thanks to God for being a Christian*. Phil.1-20 *μεγαλυνθήσεται Χριστὸς ἐν τῷ σώματί μου* would be an imitation of our passage after *εαυτὸν* became τὸν θεόν.

21-20. ἐπιστραφεῖς ὁ Πέτρος βλέπει τὸν μαθητὴν ὃν ἠγάπα ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀκολουθοῦντα. When Jesus bade Peter follow him, he meant that Peter was to die as he himself had died. If now John was also following, it would mean that he was also to die. But thus the point of this episode is ruined, for, as the context shows, an idea prevailed, born of his old age, that John would live on until the revelation. Therefore *ἀκολουθοῦντα* is not right. It is another case of the loss of the negative (see my note on 5-46), *οὐκ* having dropped out before *ἀκ[ολουθοῦντα]*.<sup>1</sup> After this loss some students must have felt the unsuitability of *ἀκολουθοῦντα*, for N and an old Latin Ms do not record it; of this variation Baljon takes no notice.

<sup>1</sup> I now see in v. Manen's *Conjecturaal Kritiek* that in this conjecture I have been anticipated by Venema.

## THE APOCALYPSE

1-5. **πρωτότοκος τῶν νεκρῶν.** This should be *πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν*, as it stands in Col.1-18, for Jesus was not the firstborn of the dead, but the first to emerge from the dead at the rebirth. Cf. also Acts 26-23 *πρῶτος ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν.*

1-9. **ἐν τῇ θλίψει καὶ βασιλείᾳ καὶ ὑπομονῇ.** The reading *βασιλείᾳ*, placed as it is between the words *θλίψει* and *ὑπομονῇ*, should express, as they do, some kind of suffering, whereas it expresses the contrary. The right reading is supplied in 2-9 *τὴν θλίψιν καὶ τὴν πτωχείαν καὶ τὴν βλασφημίαν*, in accordance with which we should read *βλασφημία*. Cf. also Eph.4-31 *πικρία καὶ θυμὸς καὶ ὀργὴ καὶ κραυγὴ καὶ βλασφημία*. It means a *curse* in the sense of *woe*.

**ἐν Ἰησοῦ.** *By the help of Jesus.*

1-15. **καμίνῳ πεπυρωμένης.** A genitival solecism. Cf. Rom.4-17 *θεῶ τοῦ ζωοποιούντος*. 2 Mac.1-2 *πρὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ τῶν δούλων*. 1 Act. Pil. 16-5 *καθεζόμενον διδάσκοντος*. Mart. Petr. ch. 3 *καταπεσόντος αὐτοῦ ἐκλυθεὶς συστῆ*. Act. Phil. 139 *κατέφυγον γινώσκοντος*. Act. Ioan. 10 *τὸν μάγον ὡς μὴ σκενάσαντος*. Gen. 24-30 *ἄνθρωπον ἐστηκότος*. Just. 341c *φθεγγόμενον αὐτοὺς ὡς γνομένων*.

2-3. **ἐβάστασας.** The version *thou didst bear* is not accurate; the exact rendering is *thou didst keep firm*, thou didst not give in; so in MGk, cf. *Vlákhos v. βασιτῶ 'βάστα! [φρ.], courage! βάστα καλά! tenez ferme! tenez bon!*'

**καὶ οὐ κεκοπίακας.** The English version *and hast not grown weary* and Arethas's *καὶ οὐκ ἀπηγόρευσας* are both due to a happy surmise as to what the context requires. But the text means *and thou hast not laboured*. In order to render the correct sense in accordance with the English version we must correct *καὶ οὐκ ἐκκεκοπίακας*. I have not met with *ἐκκοπιάζειν* elsewhere, but *ἐκκάμνειν* (*to grow weary*), of which it is a synonym, is pretty frequent. Besides Sophocles registers *ἀποκοπῶ* (= *ἐκκοπῶ*) from Dionysios of Alexandria. A similar error in

Hebr.12-3 *ἵνα μὴ κάμητε ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν ἐκλυόμενοι*, where we must read *ἐκκάμητε*, the sense being *that you may not grow weary of your souls becoming exhausted* (by suffering). Cf. Nicol.Damas. (Coraes's edition, p. 232) *μαστεύων Παρσώνδην ἐξέκαμε*, *he grew weary of searching for Parsondes*. In Lk 18-1 also the right word probably is *ἐκκακεῖν* and not *ἐγκακεῖν*. Cf. also *ἀποκάμειν*.

2-22. *βάλλω αὐτήν εἰς κλίνην καὶ τοὺς μοιχεύοντας μετ' αὐτῆς εἰς θλίψιν*. It is clear from the context that *κλίνην* conceals a kind of punishment, and from the Armenian version *κάμινον*, recorded by Tischendorf, combined with *κλίην*, I had guessed that the original reading was *κλίβανον*, and I have since seen in Souter that this is the word that the Armenians give, both the Old and the Vulgate. Jezebel was to be cast into an oven as worthless sticks unfit for any other purpose than for fuel to heat an oven with. Cf. Mt 6-30 *τὸν χόρτον τοῦ ἀγροῦ σήμερον ὄντα καὶ αὔριον εἰς κλίβανον βαλλόμενον*.

2-24. *τὰ βαθέα τοῦ Σατανᾶ, ὡς λέγουσιν*. A sneer at the Gnostics who claimed that *ἔγνωσαν τὰ βαθέα*. The author retorts to them that their recondite (as they call it) wisdom is that derived by them from Satan.

2-27. *ποιμανεῖ αὐτοὺς ἐν ῥάβδῳ σιδηρᾷ, ὡς τὰ σκευῆ τὰ κεραμικὰ συντριβεται*. The passage is not sound, nor is it remedied by adopting the variant *συντριβήσεται*, as Wordsworth and other scholars have done. The future would fit if it were in the plural in accordance with *αὐτούς*. I think originally the text ran *καὶ συντρίψει αὐτοὺς ὡς τὰ σκευῆ τὰ κεραμικὰ συντριβεται*, and (*the victor*) *shall shatter them as earthen pots are shattered*. My addition harmonizes the sentence with its prototype in Ps.2-9 *ποιμανεῖς αὐτοὺς ἐν ῥάβδῳ σιδηρᾷ, ὡς σκευὸς κεραμῆος συντρίψεις αὐτούς*. Cf. also Jer.19-11 *οὕτως συντρίψω τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον καθὼς συντριβεται ἄγγος ὀστράκινον*. Judg.14-6 *συνέτριψεν αὐτὸν ὡσεὶ συντρίψει ἔριφον αἰγῶν*.

3-9. *ἰδοὺ, διδώ ἔκ τῆς συναγωγῆς*. No sense. In the preceding verse there is an allusion to a persecution of the Philadelphian Church, and by the above words the Son of Man promises to humble the persecuting Jews before that Church, avenging her on their synagogue. Thus I think the above sentence originally read *ἰδοὺ, ἐκδικῶ σε ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς*, *Behold, I avenge thee on the synagogue*. For the syntax, which apparently is a Latinism *vindico te ab synagoga*, cf. 6-10 *ἐκδι-*



καὶς τὸ αἷμα ἡμῶν ἐκ τῶν κατοικούντων. 19-2 ἐξεδίκησε τὸ αἷμα ἐκ χειρὸς αὐτῆς. Lk 18-3 ἐκδίκησόν με ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀντιδίκου μου. Deut. 18-19 ἐκδικήσω ἐξ αὐτοῦ.

3-17. οὐδὲν (= οὐ, see my note on Jn 20-9) χρεῖαν ἔχω. Exactly what is preserved in MGk in the phrase δὲν ἔχω ἀνάγκη, which in a feeling of independence or contempt is quite currently employed, meaning *I care not, I am indifferent whatever people may do to, or say or think of, me*. This phrase recurs in 1 Cor. 7-37 μὴ ἔχων ἀνάγκη, *caring nothing, fearing nothing*. 1 Thes. 4-12 ἵνα μηδενὸς χρεῖαν ἔχητε. Sir. 11-23 μὴ εἴπῃς τίς ἔστι μου χρεῖα; A similar phrase is Mt 22-16 οὐ μέλει σοι περὶ οὐδενός. 1 Pet. 3-6 μὴ φοβούμεναι μηδεμίαν πτόησιν. Lucian. Paras. 52 οὐδὲν αὐτῷ μέλον ὦν οἱ ἄνθρωποι οἴονται περὶ αὐτοῦ. Jn 2-25 οὐ χρεῖαν εἶχε ἵνα τις μαρτυρήσῃ.

3-19. ζήλευε οὖν καὶ μετανόησον. Evidently ζήλευε is unsound, for it means *be jealous*, which is quite unsuitable, and not *be zealous* which might perhaps do; the variant ζήλωσον would give this meaning, but it looks like a correction of ζήλευε by some scribe who felt its unfitness. A better reading is recorded by Primasius (6th century), i. e. *crede,πίστευε*. But I think that the right word is *νήστευε*, for some sort of self-infliction as a sign of repentance for past sins, as is enjoined by the Spirit, seems best to fit the context. Repentance would of course be accompanied by fervent prayers, and it was customary to fast whilst such prayers lasted. For instance, 2 Kings 12-16 ἐζήτησε (= *prayed*) Δαυὶδ τὸν θεὸν περὶ τοῦ παιδαρίου καὶ ἐνήστευσε. 2 Esdr. 8-21 ἐκάλεσα νηστεῖαν τοῦ ταπεινωθῆναι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ζητήσαι (= *pray*) παρ' αὐτοῦ ὁδὸν εὐθειᾶν. Cf. also Nehem. 1-4 ἐπένηθσα ἡμέρας καὶ ἡμην νηστεύων καὶ προσευχόμενος. Joel 2-12 ἐπιστράφητε (= *metanoήσατε*) πρὸς με ἐν νηστεία. 1 Kings 7-6 ἐνήστευσαν καὶ εἶπαν ἡμαρτήκαμεν. Sir. 31-31 νηστεύων ἐπὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν. Just. 1 Apol. 61 εὐχεσθαί τε καὶ αἰτεῖν νηστεύοντας παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν ἁμαρτημένων ἄφεσιν. So Esther, when she wishes her people to pray for success in her venture, bids them fast.

5-4. οὐδεὶς ἄξιος εὐρέθῃ ἀνοῖξαι τὸ βιβλίον. Paspatis points out that ἄξιος here does not signify *worthy*, as the English version translates, but *ικανὸς, able, capable*. It is so currently employed in MGk. Vlákchos v. ἄξιος 'capable; propre à; bon à.'

6-6. χοίρις σίτου δηναρίου καὶ τρεῖς χοίρικες κριθῶν δηναρίου, καὶ τὸ

ἐλαιον καὶ τὸν οἶνον μὴ ἀδικήσης. Bloomfield 'the price subjoined (which has been proved to be enormous, nearly twenty times the usual one) is meant to intimate the excessive scarcity and dearness of the articles.' Some such allusion ought also to be expressed to the oil and wine, which ἀδικήσης does not express. The original reading, it seems to me, was οὐ μὴ δοκιμάσεις, *thou wilt not taste*, thou wilt not so much as get a taste of, so expensive will oil and wine become. I have not traced any passages where δοκιμάζειν is equivalent to *to taste*, but in MGk δοκιμάζω is a specific term for this sense. Vlákhos 'δοκιμάζω, *gôûter*; δοκιμάσατε ἀπ' αὐτὸ τὸ γλύκυσμα, *gôûtez de ce pâté*.' But even if we took δοκιμάζειν in its more usual signification of *to sample*, it will suit the context quite well. A similar allusion to dearness in a time of scarcity we have in 4 Kings 6-25 ἐγενήθη κεφαλὴ ὄνου πεντήκοντα ἀργυρίου καὶ τέταρτον τοῦ κάβου κόπρου περιστερῶν πέντε ἀργυρίου.

6-17. ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ μεγάλη τῆς ὀργῆς αὐτῶν. The version *the great day of their wrath* is too literal and obscure; in fact, I am not sure that it is not due to a misunderstanding of the sense. The meaning is *the great day of their curse* (passively) or *woe*, the day when the curse (of God) will fall upon them. Cf. Lk 21-23 ἔσται γὰρ ὀργὴ τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ. In MGk it is a current curse to say νὰ σὲ πάρῃ ἡ ὀργή, the original form of which must have been νὰ σὲ πάρῃ ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ. Vlákhos v. ὀργή 'νὰ τὸν πάρῃ ἡ ὀργή! *que le diable l'emporte!*' The sentence therefore is the same as ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ μεγάλη τοῦ ὀργισθῆναι αὐτοῦς, the verb being passive; see my note on 11-18.

7-10. φοίνικες ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτῶν καὶ κράζουσι φωνῇ μεγάλῃ λέγοντες 'Ὡ σωτηρία τῷ θεῷ. A reminiscence of Jn 12-13 ἔλαβον τὰ βῆλα τῶν φοινίκων καὶ ἐξήλθον εἰς ὑπάντησιν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐκραύγαζον 'Ὡσαννά. The words σωτηρία τῷ θεῷ means *the blessing to God*, or *God be blessed*. For σωτηρία represents *salaam*, the usual Oriental salutation or blessing, which I was told literally signifies *salvation*, σωτηρία. Cf. Ps. 68-30 ἡ σωτηρία τοῦ προσώπου σου ἀντελάβετό μου, *thy blessing has succoured me*. 1 Paral. 16-23 ἄσατε τῷ κυρίῳ, ἀναγγεῖλατε σωτηρίαν αὐτοῦ, *voice blessings to him*. 2 Kings 19-2 ἐγένετο ἡ σωτηρία εἰς πένθος, *the blessing or happiness turned to mourning*. This blessing or *salaam* is more frequently expressed by εἰρήνη. Cf. Hebr. 7-3 βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ (= Σαλαῶμ), ὁ ἐστὶ βασιλεὺς εἰρήνης, etc.

10-7. χρόνος οὐκέτι ἔσται, ἀλλὰ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ ἑβδόμου ἀγγέλου ὅταν μέλλῃ σαλπίζειν καὶ ἐτελέσθῃ τὸ μυστήριον. The variants ἔστι for ἔσται and τελεσθῆ for ἐτελέσθῃ are perfectly in keeping with the context. The angel swore that it is not yet time (for the end of the world), but (that it will be brought about) in the days when the seventh angel will sound his trumpet and the divine mystery will be accomplished. The readings ἔσται and ἐτελέσθῃ have nothing to recommend them except the preconceived notions as to the absolute authority of certain Mss. Such notions have been disastrous to the establishment of a rational text.

11-18. τὰ ἔθνη ὠργίσθησαν = τὰ ἔθνη κατελήφθησαν ὑπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς (τοῦ θεοῦ), *the nations were overtaken by (God's) curse*, were punished. The version *the nations were wroth* misses the sense altogether and is due to not realizing the passive force of ὠργίσθησαν. So ἐμνήσθη passively in 16-19. At Hyper.Epit.35 Kenyon observes 'διηγῆσθαι fortasse passive usurpatum ut apud Platonem περιηγῆσθαι.' In my note upon Rom.3-9 I have produced several examples of passives formed from deponents. For the sense of ὀργῆ see my note on 6-17.

12-11. διὰ τὸ αἷμα. The same as διὰ τοῦ αἵματος. Cf. 13-14 διὰ τὰ σημεῖα = διὰ τῶν σημείων. Rom.15-15 ἐπαναμμνήσκων διὰ τὴν χάριν, whereas 12-3 λέγω διὰ τῆς χάριτος. Jannaris § 1534: 'When with the opening of the transitional period [A. D. 300-600] the construction of all prepositions became uniform by substituting the accusative for the other oblique cases, the various meanings of διὰ with genitive were naturally transferred to its accusative construction.' The Revisers have spoilt the meaning by substituting *because of the blood* for the A.V. *by the blood*, being too much influenced by Attic usage. A notable example of the adverse influence of Attic upon the understanding of a N.T. text is Lk 6-35 μηδὲν ἀπελπίζοντες, which the A.V. correctly renders *hoping for nothing again* (better *in return*) in accordance with the context, but which the Revisers ruined by substituting *never despairing* in spite of v. 34 εἰς δανείζετε παρ' ὧν ἐλπίζετε λαβεῖν.

14-2. ἐν ταῖς κιθάραις. The same as a simple dative; see my note on Jn 11-10.

14-6. εὐαγγέλιον αἰώνιον. The English versions translate *an everlasting or eternal gospel*. The real sense is *a gospel fixed from times*

*immemorial*. So according to Eph.3-11 the Church was formed *κατὰ πρόθεσιν τῶν αἰώνων* = *κατὰ αἰώνιον πρόθεσιν*, *according to a purpose fixed from times immemorial*.

14-8. οἴνου τοῦ θυμοῦ. The same as *θυμώδους οἴνου*, *hot-tempered wine*, a well-known periphrasis; cf. Col.1-13 *οἶνός τῆς ἀγάπης* = *ἀγαπητοῦ οἴνου*. Hebr.1-3 *ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως* = *ῥήματι δυνατῶ*, etc. For *θυμὸς* as applied to wine cf. Deut.32-33 *θυμὸς δρακόντων ὁ οἶνος αὐτῶν καὶ θυμὸς ἀσπίδων ἀνάτος*. Hos.7-5 *ἤρξαντο οἱ ἄρχοντες θυμοῦσθαι ἐξ οἴνου*.

*ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου τοῦ θυμοῦ τῆς πορνείας αὐτῆς*. *From the hot-tempered or passionate wine of her fornication*, from her passionate lewdness.

14-13. *ναὶ, λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα, ἵνα ἀναπαύσονται ἐκ τῶν κόπων αὐτῶν*. *Yea, says the spirit, let them rest from their labours*. The subjunctive with *ἵνα* as equivalent to an imperative is a well-known idiom, of which I have cited several instances at Rom.16-2, tracing it back to classical times by referring to Plato, Gorg.454b *ἀλλ' ἵνα μὴ θανάμῳζης* = *ἀλλὰ μὴ θαύμαζε*. The voice had said that those dying now are *μακάριοι*, and the spirit answers *Yea, they are μακάριοι*, let them now rest and enjoy their *μακαριότης*.

*ἀκολουθεῖ μετ' αὐτῶν*. The same as *ἀκολουθεῖ αὐτοῖς*. For in Hellenistic times *μετὰ* with the genitive often replaced the dative. Cf. Mk 6-50 *ἐλάλησε μετ' αὐτῶν*. Lk 10-36 *ποιήσας τὸ ἔλεος μετ' αὐτοῦ*. Acts 9-39 *ὅσα ἐποίησε μετ' αὐτῶν*. Tob.12-6 *ἐποίησε μεθ' ὑμῶν*. 2 Esdr.6-8 *μὴ ποτέ τι ποιήσητε μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων* (= *τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις, κατὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων*), etc. See also Jannaris § 1607, 3. *Ἀκολουθεῖν μετὰ* is used in a different sense, see Cobet, Var. Lec. page 22. The A.V. correctly *follow them*, spoilt by the Revisers into *follow with them*.

17-5. *ὄνομα γεγραμμένον μυστήριον βαβυλῶν ἡ μεγάλη*. No satisfactory explanation of *μυστήριον* has so far been forthcoming. As suggested in my note on Rom.2-29, it may be a play upon *μύσος* or *μυσαρός*. Cf. Euseb. EH.4-7 *μυσταγωγίαις ἢ καὶ μάλλον μυσαροποιίας*. Or perhaps it is a corruption of *μυσαρόν*, due to the proximity of *μυστήριον* in v. 7.

17-16. *ἡρημωμένην ποιήσουσιν αὐτήν*. *They will work havoc upon her*, as indicated by the MGK *ῥημάζω*, *I work havoc upon*. Vlákhos 'ῥημάζω, *dévaster*'. Similarly 18-16 *ἡρημώθη ὁ τοσοῦτος πλοῦτος*, *so much opulence has suffered havoc*. In an analogous sense *ἐρήμωσις* in Dan.(LXX) 11-31 and Lk 21-20.

18-5. ἐκολλήθησαν αὐτῆς αἱ ἀμαρτίαι ἄχρι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. Probably a reminiscence of 2 Esdr.9-6 αἱ πλημμύλαι ἡμῶν ἐμεγαλύνθησαν ἕως εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. If so, is ἐκολλήθησαν sound, or has it taken the place of another verb denoting ἐμεγαλύνθησαν? If sound, it must have been used as an equivalent of ἤγγισαν. Cf. Jer.28-9 ἤγγικεν εἰς οὐρανὸν τὸ κρίμα αὐτῆς. Dan (LXX) 4-5 ἡ κορυφή αὐτοῦ ἤγγισεν ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. But I have not encountered another example of such a usage except perhaps Zach.14-5 ἐγκολληθήσεται φάρογξ ὀρέων ἕως Ἰασόδ.

21-17. ἐμέτρησε τὸ τεῖχος αὐτῆς ἑκατὸν τεσσαράκοντα τεσσάρων πηχῶν. As the dimensions of length, width, and height were already given in the foregoing, the measurement of 144 cubits must refer to another particular, and there is none left unspecified except that of thickness, a particular no less essential than those of length, width, and height. Substitute therefore πάχος for τεῖχος.

μέτρον ἀνθρώπου, ὃ ἐστὶν ἀγγέλου. The scribe, who found τεῖχος in his text and applied it to the perimeter of the wall, must have felt bewildered by the excessively meagre measurement of 144 cubits as compared with the other dimensions. He got out of his difficulty by assuming that the measure of a man really meant the measure of an angel, and as such an immense measure.