Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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

Buy me a coffee https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

PATREON https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

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

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

THE PRESENT POSITION OF THE JOHANNEAN QUESTION.

IV. The Author.

It has become almost a fixed custom with defenders of the Fourth Gospel to conduct their argument in a series of narrowing circles, proving (1) that the author must have been a Jew, (2) that he must have been a Jew of Palestine, (3) that he must have been a contemporary and eye-witness of the events, (4) that if a contemporary and eye-witness he was probably an Apostle, and (5) that if an Apostle he was probably St. John. The first and the (except on the theory of Dr. Delff) latest steps in this chain of reasoning are becoming more and more generally admitted; and the controversy is coming more and more to concentrate itself on the two intermediate points, the proposition that the author was a Jew of Palestine, and the proposition that he was a contemporary and eye-witness.

It was one of the axioms of Tübingen criticism that the author represented the Gentile branch of the Church. He was held to have had nothing to do with Palestine; and instances were quoted to show his ignorance not only of Palestinian geography but of Jewish customs. The first I believe to throw over these instances, though they would of course have made for his own conclusion, was Keim.

"Under this head," he wrote, "we do not reckon the list of errors, in general history, or in geography which it is the fashion to prove, over and above the Synoptics, from the Old Testament, from Josephus, and even from Eusebius and Jerome. There is the less need to accept these supposed errors about Bethany and Bethesda, Cana and Kidron, Salem

and Sychar, about the 'high priest of that year,' and about the distances of Cana and Capernaum, Bethany and Peræa, because in other respects the author shows a fairly good knowledge of the country, and even the most difficult cases can be explained by a special intention. The high priest of the 'Death-Year' (Todesjahres) is significant, and does not at all betray the opinion of a yearly change in the office; Sychar is a vernacular or mock name for Sichem; Salem and Ain are situated in Judæa, or rather in Samaria, to the borders of which the forerunner of him who sat by Jacob's well made his way; the exaggeration of distances is to enhance the miracle." [1]

Further on Keim admits a Hebrew colouring in the language, an understanding of the Old Testament in the original, acquaintance with Jewish customs and places, and even with particular features (Einzelmomente) in the Messianic idea.[2] And the ultimate conclusion to which he comes is that the author was "well acquainted with the Holy Land; a Jewish Christian, though liberal and friendly disposed towards the Gentiles, and probably belonging to the Jewish Diaspora in Asia Minor." [3]

Schürer himself takes up very much the same position.

"Among serious difficulties we need no longer reckon at the present day the supposed ignorance of Palestinian and Jewish matters from which Bretschneider and Baur inferred that the author was neither a Palestinian nor in any sense a Jew. The geographical errors and ignorance of things Jewish have more and more shrunk to a *minimum*. And the opposition no longer lays stress upon them. It is true that everything is not explained. In particular it remains questionable that the author seems to have assumed a yearly change in the high priesthood. But on the whole he has without doubt a good knowledge of things Jewish. And even by opponents of the genuineness, it is more and more pronounced probable that he was of Jewish origin, Hellenistic if not Palestinian." [4]

[1] *Gesch. Jesu v. Nazara*, i. 133. (There are several faults in the rendering of this passage in E. T., i. 181 f., ed. 2.)

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 156 (E. T., p. 212).

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 168 (E. T., p. 228).

[4] *Vortrag*, p. 67 f. This instalment was written before the appearance of Dr. Schürer's essay in English, and the quotations are left as they stood from the original as being in several respects a more satisfactory presentation of his views.

To this last point we shall return. In the meantime, in reference to the one lingering objection which is still taken by Schürer, it is enough to appeal to the answer already given by Keim. In view of the writer's sense of the solemnity of the crisis which he is describing, and in view of his fondness for casting emphasis by the use of the particular word ἐκεῖνος, in view too of the admission just made of his knowledge of Jewish customs, which includes many things far more minute and remote than those of the tenure of the high priesthood, it is surely strained on the part of Schürer, and unlike his usual judgment to leave even this one objection standing.[1]

We might leave the whole matter here, content only to claim that if so much is conceded as both Schürer and Keim are ready to concede, it shall be taken in earnest, and not merely remain as a concession in words, but be allowed to have the full weight in the mind which it deserves to have; we might be content with this, if it were not that a more sweeping objection has recently been raised by Mr. Cross. Mr. Cross calls in question not the minor premiss of the argument but the major. He does not dispute the local knowledge, but he disputes the inference that is drawn from it.

"We cannot but feel," he says, "as we read [the Fourth Gospel] that the writer is quite at home in Palestine. He knows the general lie of the country, the position of Samaria, the shores of the Sea of Galilee, and many such other places, with their special local features, and his narrative moves freely and without constraint through these scenes. Still this knowledge, or even his use of it in telling his story, does not prove that he was an eye-witness. It does not even prove that he was a native of Palestine."[2]

He quotes the cases of Origen and Jerome, both resident

[1] The two Holtzmanns account for what they think the mistake by confusion with the Asian high priesthood, which did change hands every year. (H. Holtzmann, *Einl.*, p. 469, ed. 2; O. Holtzmann, *Joh.-Ev.*, p. 115.)

[2] *Westminster Review*, Aug., 1890, p. 177.

for long periods in Palestine, and he desiderates a fuller examination of the literary habits of the time. In a later article he returns to the subject. He urges that

"Many examples might be cited to show that a knowledge of Palestine was not limited to born Jews. . . . It is remarkable that in the Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew, a work which is universally dated long after the destruction of Jerusalem, there are a large number of very exact references, not only to the topography of Palestine and neighbouring countries, but also to Jerusalem and the buildings of the Temple, much more than are to be found in any of the Gospels, or perhaps in all of them together."[1]

It may be well therefore to pause a moment, and ask a little more precisely how far this argument will carry us. There are obvious limits to it, and it is important that these limits should be borne in mind. It will be hardly necessary for me to say that the argument has not been invented for the purpose of application to St. John's Gospel, but that it is in common use amongst critics; and I confess that, so far as I can judge, the use hitherto made of it is a sound one. Some of the best examples would, I think, be taken from the writings of Professor Ramsay. I may refer, for instance, to his treatment of the stories of St. Artemon and St. Abercius in THE EXPOSITOR.[2] "Fidelity of local detail," he says, "is one of the most important characteristics of the class of tales which is here described." However, the notes of place may be right, but the notes of time wrong. The inference is that the story grew up where the scene is laid, though it took the exact shape in which it has come down to us at a later period. The case of St. Abercius is peculiarly interesting because the growth of the legend can be traced from its beginning in an epitaph cut in stone by the order of Abercius himself, and rediscovered by Professor Ramsay.[3] Other examples of the same kind might be taken

[1] *Critical Review*, Feb., 1891, p. 157 f.
[2] 1889, 1, 141 ff., 253 ff., 392 ff.
[3] See the articles referred to above; also Lightfoot, *Ignatius*, i. 476 ff.

from the same traveller's recent work on Asia Minor. Thus it is proved that the tale of St. Zosimus "first took literary form after the reorganization of the provinces attributed to Diocletian; but the local knowledge is a clear mark of a genuine popular tradition living in the country."[1] In regard to another document, the "Acts of Theodore Sykeota," Professor Ramsay does not require confirmation for all the details, where enough are confirmed to be a guarantee for the remainder. At the same time, a distinction is drawn between the different parts of the area to which the evidence extends. "The numerous topographical details which we cannot control by independent testimony may be accepted with confidence for the country within a moderate distance; but in regard to remoter cities, the author's geographical knowledge is defective."[2] Like traces of local knowledge appear in the Acts of Basiliscus and John of Kybistra.[3]

Another writer who has made a brilliant use of local indications is Von Gutschmid in his Essay on "Names of Kings in the Apocryphal Acts" (*Die Koenigsnamen in den apokr. Apostelgeschichten*[4]). I may mention for the benefit of our own explorers, in case it should happen to have escaped them, that he calls attention (p. 388) to the material that may be obtained from the "Acts of Barnabas" for the topography of the island of Cyprus. Throughout this essay there is the underlying assumption that geographical accuracy shows where, if not when, a legend arose.

On one of the Acts discussed by Von Gutschmid the last word has probably not yet been spoken. It was a striking discovery that the Princess Tryphæna, who plays a part

[1] *Historical Geog. of Asia Minor.* London, 1890, p. 400 n.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 246 f.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 262, 337.

[4] Reprinted in vol. ii. of his posthumously collected *Kleine Schriften* (Leipzig, 1890).

in the Acts of Paul and Thecla, was a historical personage, the discarded wife of Polemo II., king at different times of Pontus, the Cimmerian Bosphorus, and Cilicia. Von Gutschmid locates this lady at Antioch in Pisidia, which is, or ought to be, the scene of the Thecla legend. Dr. Gwynn, in an elaborate article in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography* (*s.v.* Thecla) speaks more doubtfully. We know in any case from Tertullian that the original Acts of Paul and Thecla, which are probably ours, though possibly only the base out of which ours have been constructed, were written by a presbyter of the province of Asia. Dr. Gwynn thinks that he shows signs of some, but not an exact, acquaintance with the localities with which he is dealing.[1] We may look for more light on this subject;[2] and it may be observed in passing that it is important to get at the true text of the Acts for which Lipsius, following Tischendorf, has now given us ample materials.[3]

It was by following a similar method to Von Gutschmid and Ramsay, that Usener was able to assign an Ephesian origin to the Acts of St. Timothy, which he was the first to publish in the Greek,[4] though in their present form they seem to date from the fourth century. On the one hand there is the mention of the *Catagogia*, a festival probably of Artemis, and the suburb of Pion; on the other hand Lycaonia is described as a "province," which it did not become till the time of Diocletian. In contrast with these Acts we have the *Acta Johannis* of Prochorus: their scene is laid at Ephesus, and a number of would-be Ephesian or Asiatic localities are mentioned, all either non-existent or wrongly

[1] *Ut sup.*, p. 893 f.

[2] Since this was written (and I leave it exactly as it stood) I hear that the new light desiderated is soon to be thrown in the pages of THE EXPOSITOR by Professor Ramsay.

[3] *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha* (Lipsiæ, 1891), i. 235 ff.

[4] Univ.-programme, Bonn, 1877.

placed.[1] This is enough to mark a pure romance. Like the Acts of Timothy, that ancient Syriac work the *Doctrine of Addai* itself belongs to the fourth or early fifth century, but there are local traits which clearly connect it with Edessa.[2] An example of the way in which a single local touch may reveal the nationality of a writer is supplied by an interesting work published not long ago for the first time by Gamurrini. The work in question bears the title, *S. Silviae Aquitanæ Peregrinatio ad Loca Sancta ann.* 385–388 (Romæ, 1887),[3] mainly on the strength of two allusions. The authoress, who is writing to the sisters in a nunnery with which she had been connected, is seen to be a native of Gaul from the way in which she compares the Euphrates in the rush and breadth of its waters to the Rhone; and her date is fixed approximately by the state of things at Edessa, which she visits, and on the Eastern frontier of the empire.[4] The identification with Silvia, the sister of Rufinus, the minister of Theodosius and Arcadius, also rests on fair grounds, and has not yet been questioned. One is reminded of another coincidence on which stress has recently been laid. It will be remembered that the scene of the Ninth Similitude in Hermas is laid in Arcadia. For this Zahn proposed to read "Aricia," but Professor Rendel Harris pointed out in the *Journal of Biblical Exegesis* for January, 1887, that the description given corresponds closely to the view of the surrounding mountains from the plain of Orchomenos, with the hill of Orchomenos answering to the ὄρος μαστῶδες in the midst. An opinion of this kind gains greatly when more than one person is struck by the same thing. Professor Rendel Harris appears to base his

[1] *Acta Johannis* (ed. Zahn, Erlangen, 1880), p. lii.

[2] Tixeront: *Origines de l'Église d'Édesse* (Paris, 1888), p. 145; Zahn, *Diat. Tatian's*, p. 382.

[3] A more correct text is promised, though as an *editio princeps*, accompanied by a commentary, Gamurrini's is by no means without merit.

[4] Gamurrini, pp. xxvii.–xxxii.

arguments on maps and descriptions, but Mr. Armitage Robinson, who has himself visited the spot, assures me that the coincidence is very marked. The inference which Mr. Harris draws is that Hermas has made use of Pausanias, or (as there is a difficulty about the date of Pausanias' *Arcadia*) of some other work similar to his. But would it not be a still simpler explanation to suppose that he was born and brought up under the shadow of these very mountains, and that the scene which he describes is drawn from the recollections of his youth? I am not aware that there is anything in the way of this supposition. We know that Hermas was sold as a slave to a Roman lady called Rhoda; but that is the point at which his recorded history begins. We are not told where he came from; and in the absence of such knowledge an indication like this may be followed.

The question is pertinent to the point from which we started. Mr. Cross seems to think that the author of the Fourth Gospel might have got his knowledge of Palestine from books, or at least from a prolcnged visit. It was a rare thing in ancient times for a country to be described with so much fulness as Pausanias has given to the parts which he visited of Greece. Most of the works which do duty for geographies are little more than lists of names.[1] Palestine in particular has had scant measure dealt to it in the works which have come down to us. Pomponius Mela was a geographer of some note in the first century; and he mentions a single place, Gaza, about which he gives us the interesting information that the name is the Persian word for "treasure."[2] Ptolemy in the second century is

[1] For instance, of the ancient authorities of which Professor Ramsay makes use in his *Historical Geography of Asia Minor*, the *Synecdemus* of Hierocles, the *Notitiae Episcopatuum*, the Antonine Itinerary and the Peutinger Table are all of this character.

[2] For a more probable derivation see Keller, *Lateinische Volksetymologie*, p. 249.

more scientific, and has given his name to a complete astronomical system. Yet he merely gives the boundaries of Palestine, and then a list of towns and cities, with a rough sort of latitude and longitude. In the whole of Galilee he only mentions four names: Sepphoris, Caparcotni (on the southern edge of the Plain of Esdraelon, opposite Nazareth), Julias (Bethsaida Julias), and Tiberias. In Samaria he only mentions two names, Neapolis (Sichem) and Thena. In Judæa he mentions twenty names, many along the Maritime Plain, but of these only one, Jerusalem, occurs in St. John. The reproduction of Ptolemy's view of the geography of Palestine, and the adjacent countries in Spruner-Menke's *Atlas* (p. 27) shows that he had a curious idea of its configuration. Strabo, the greatest of all the geographers of antiquity, gives a very poor account of Palestine. He knows something about the coast-line, but betrays his dependence on literary sources by speaking of Gaza as "deserted," although it had been refounded by Gabinius (57–55 B.C.).[1] He has then a brief and barely recognisable sketch of Jewish history, which becomes a little more definite as it approaches the taking of Jerusalem and other strongholds by Pompey. Then there is a sketch of the plain of Jericho. Then some account of the remarkable phenomena of the Dead Sea, which Strabo calls ἡ Σερβώνις λίμνη, clearly confusing it with the real "Serbonian bog" near Mount Casius on the frontier of Egypt. Then he mentions another instance of water with curious properties in the district of Gadara. That is all. The Itineraries again furnish very little help.[2] The Peutinger Table, for instance, only gives the stations along the Roman roads, and appears to make the Hieromax

[1] Schürer, *Gesch. d. jüd. Volkes*, ii. 62.

[2] These Itineraries are based upon a survey begun under Julius Cæsar, and completed under Augustus, the results of which were represented upon a globe which was kept in the portico of Polla (Jung in Iwan Müller's *Handbuch*, iii. 469 f.).

(Jarmuk) fall, not into the Jordan, but directly into the Dead Sea. When we come to Christian times naturally rather more was done. Eusebius and Jerome both made a study of Biblical sites; but still the results only take the form of bare statistics of names and distances, often with etymologies giving the meaning of the names.[1] The stream of pilgrims to the Holy Places begins with the Bordeaux pilgrim in 333—unless we are to count Origen the first of the pilgrims.

But it will have been seen from this sketch how scanty were the materials which the author of the Fourth Gospel would have had to work upon if he had tried to prepare himself for his task by literary studies. It is not as if it were likely that he had access to other and fuller authorities which have perished. Those which have survived enable us to take the measure of those which have not survived. And that by the help of either class, or indeed of any form of literary description current in antiquity, he could have hit upon the topographical allusions in the Gospel, is simply impossible. Think for a moment what these are: First, we have Bethany beyond Jordan, not mentioned by any other writer, but guaranteed by its precise distinction from the other Bethany, which is identified by its distance (15 stades) from Jerusalem. Then we have Cana of Galilee, also not mentioned, unless—what is not certain—this is the same with a village three times named by Josephus.[2] Here however again the sure hand of the author appears, because he alone gives the distinguishing epithet "of Galilee," and Josephus mentions another Cana in Judæa.[3] The modern explorer has two sites in Galilee which bear the name of Cana to choose between. Aenon, M. Renan calls "un trait de lumière":

[1] See especially Lagarde, *Onomastica Sacra*, 2nd ed. Göttingen, 1887.
[2] *Vit.*, 16; *Ant.*, xiii. 15, 1; *B. J.*, i. 17, 5.
[3] *B. J.*, i. 4, 7.

it simply represents the Aramaic for "springs." It is placed by Jerome eight Roman miles from Scythopolis near to Salim which he takes as known.[1] Sychar is not quite so certain, but it is now generally identified with the modern village of Askar. The details of Jacob's well with Gerizim rising above it, are exactly given as they may be seen to this day.[2] Readers of the *Palestine Exploration Fund Reports* will know the claim that has recently been made for the rediscovery of the Pool of Bethesda ("Beth-saida," or still more probably "Bezetha," as the name is read in some MSS.), with substantial remains even of the five colonnades. The identification may not be certain—though the presence of such remains tallying with the description and exactly in the quarter where we should expect to find them, must count for something; but in any case, the very precise statement (including the "Sheep-gate"), must be set down to the credit of the writer. The city of Ephraim readily identified with Ophrah of the Old Testament, and probably with the modern *et-Taiyibeh*; the "treasury" and Solomon's porch in the Temple; Gabbatha, Golgotha, the Kedron ravine, taken together, if not taken singly, were far too minute and precise to have come from literary sources.

But then, Mr. Cross urges, the author of the Gospel though not a Jew, may have settled for a length of time in Palestine, as Origen did and Jerome. True, he may have so settled. But it must have been for a long time; and he must have moved about considerably from place to place to lay his finger with so much accuracy on spots so far apart as Cana and Bethany, Aenon, and the Kedron ravine.

However this may be, Mr. Cross still urges, and however the fact is to be explained, the Fourth Gospel need

[1] Lagarde, *Onomast.*, p. 134.

[2] See especially Lightfoot, EXPOSITOR, 1890, i. 176-9.

not have been written by a Palestinian Jew in the first century, because there are examples of works, neither genuine nor contemporary, which yet are distinguished by precise topographical details. Such an example he finds in the Apocryphal Gospel of Matthew, which it may therefore be interesting to test somewhat fully. The case would certainly be a strong one, if it should be found to hold good, as Lipsius assigns the work in question to the second half of the fifth century. I should imagine that this is not far wrong. To avoid repetition in the next section of our inquiry, we may take at once the indications which bear upon the date of the so-called Gospel and upon its place of origin. The text of the Gospel exists only in Latin, and is published by Tischendorf in his *Evangelia Apocrypha*, pp. 51–112 (ed. 2, 1876). We have also facilities for comparing the Pseudo-Matthæan legend with an older version in the *Protevangelium Jacobi*, which precedes it in Tischendorf's collection.

In cap. i. we are told how Joachim lived the life of a pious shepherd, showing his devotion by his liberality towards those who ministered in sacred things, *duplicia offerens munera in timore Dei et doctrina laborantibus et simplicia offerens his qui ministrabant eis*. Indeed, he divided the produce of his flocks and all that he had into three parts, and gave one part to the widows, orphans, strangers and poor, one part to the priests (*colentibus Deum*), while he only reserved the remaining third to himself and his house. The stress which is laid on gifts to the priests (or clergy) points to a late date. For the single and double gifts to the different orders of the ministry I have not found a parallel. In the *Apostolic Constitutions* (vii. 29), firstfruits of certain specified things are to go to the priests, tithes and some other firstfruits to the widows and orphans. The common rule for the distribution of tithes was that they should be divided into four parts,

not always applied in quite the same way. But besides the quadripartite division, there was also a tripartite. The earliest example of this quoted by Dr. Hatch in his *Growth of Church Institutions* (p. 112) is dated 801. Here the division applies to tithe, in Pseudo-Matthew to all produce. No doubt an exceptional degree of virtue is intended; still the idea of threefold division had apparently defined itself when the author wrote. The *Protevangelium* simply says that Joachim doubled his gifts (*προσέφερε τὰ δῶρα αὐτοῦ διπλᾶ*, i. 1).

In cap. ii. Joachim goes up among those "who offered incense to the Lord." The offering of incense belonged specially to the priests; but Joachim we are told was of the family of David. He is repelled from sacrificing by the *scriba templi*, an official, I believe, not otherwise heard of. The "scribes" (*γραμματεῖς*) are mentioned in the *Protevangelium*, but not in this connexion.

Meantime Anna is promised the birth of a daughter, and goes to meet her husband at the "golden gate." The epithet is an addition to the *Protevangelium* (iv. 4), and not a very happy one. The designation "golden gate" does not, I believe, occur before Justinian (if indeed then), and the present structure probably dates from that period.[1] It led out of the Kedron ravine through the east wall into the temple area—hardly a natural place for Anna to meet her husband. The part of the wall in which it was situated appears to have been in ruins at the time of Paula's visit (*circa* 383, A.D.), and the *porta speciosa* of Antoninus was still ruined in his time (*circa* 570 A.D.).[2]

[1] See Prof. Hayter Lewis, *Holy Places of Jerusalem*, p. 96 (cf. p. 92). The Bordeaux pilgrim speaks of *a* gate, and Antoninus of a gate which he calls *porta speciosa*.

[2] Sir C. Wilson thinks that this may have been the present "golden gate" (*Pal. Pilg. Texts*, No. 1, pp. 14, 15); but are not the domes against this? The date assigned to Antoninus on the title-page of *P. P. T.* is a misprint (cf. p. v., and *Antonini Placentini Itinerarium*, ed. Gildemeister, p. xvii.).

Mary is born, and while yet an infant is presented to the Lord *in contubernium virginum quae die noctuque in Dei laudibus permanebant.* Elsewhere (cap. viii.) we are told that from the time of Solomon onwards there had always been in the temple "daughters of kings who were virgins, and of prophets, and of chief priests and priests." Mary takes her place among the "senior virgins," and apportions out her own day from dawn to the third hour, from the third hour to the ninth (cap. vi.). Clearly all this group of ideas is taken from the convents and the convent schools which were not fully organized before the fifth century. The *Protevangelium* speaks only of the presentation of the Virgin without these embellishments.

At last (in cap. iv.) we come to what seems an accurate local touch. On her presentation in the temple Mary, though quite an infant, runs up "the fifteen steps" without looking back for her parents. It is true that there was a well-known flight of "fifteen steps" in the Temple on which the "Psalms of Degrees" are traditionally said to have been recited by the Levites.[1] It is however unfortunate for Pseudo-Matthew (1) that these steps led, not into the court of the women (which was entered by a flight of *twelve* steps, not fifteen), but from that of the women into the court of Israel; and (2) that the steps are not placed by him within the Temple at all, but outside it (*ante Templum* in some MSS., which Tischendorf favours; *ante foras Templi* in others). Still in spite of these errors the mention of "fifteen steps" may attract some notice. The "steps of the Temple" early gained and long maintained a place in Christian history or legend. It was on them that according to one version St. James met his death. There was an Ebionite *Apocryphon* called the *Ἀναβαθμοὶ*

[1] Neubauer in *Stud. Bibl.*, ii. 56. The *Protev.* describes how the child was set on the "third step of the altar"—a different matter.

Ἰακώβου,[1] with which it is natural to compare the title of Psalms cxix. (LXX.) to cxxxiii., *ᾠδαὶ τῶν ἀναβαθμῶν*.

In cap. vii. there is a discussion on virginity which would have been much out of place in the Jewish Temple. Abel is said to have received "two crowns, the crown of oblation and the crown of virginity."

We now have the story of the espousal of Mary and Joseph, the Annunciation and Nativity, told largely in Biblical language, but with the cave as well as the manger. These features are also found in *Protevangelium*, which ends at this point. The descent into Egypt is more fully elaborated. Here it is that we get the allusions to the topography of other countries besides Palestine. The well-known miracles of the legend take place upon the way. The travellers have their journey preternaturally shortened, and arrive first at the district (?) of Hermopolis, where they enter a city called Sotinen (*devenerunt in finibus Hermopolis et in unam ex civitatibus Egypti quae Sotinen dicitur*). There does not seem to be any "district" or "nome" bearing the name Hermopolis: there are however two cities of that name, neither of which seems to suit the conditions which appear to require a place on the main route from Palestine. Hermopolis Magna is far up the Nile, about mid-way between Memphis and Thebes; and Hermopolis Parva (the modern *Damanhur*) is not far from Alexandria.[2] Heroopolis might have been rather nearer the mark, as there is a city and nome so-called on the road to Palestine. There is however no variant in the MSS. of Pseudo-Matthew. The nearest approach I can find to "Sotinen" is a city of the Delta called in the Coptic documents PSENETAI, and said to be repre-

[1] Epiph., *Haer.*, xxx. 16; Lipsius, *Apokr. Apostelgesch.*, ii. 2, 245; Salmon in *Dict. of Chr. Biog.*, i. 568.

[2] Dümichen conjectures the possible existence of another Hermopolis in the 15th Nome, not far from the Phatnitic arm of the Nile (*Geographie des alten Aegyptens*, p. 261).

sented on the maps as "Schenit, El-Seneta and Seneda." Whether this has anything to do with Sotinen I should not like to say; but at any rate it is in quite a different nome (the 11th) from either Hermopolis or Heroopolis. The Nile would have to be crossed to reach it, and it is not near either the road to Palestine or the "mountains" which had just been described as coming in sight.

At Sotinen there is a temple, *quod capitolium Egypti vocabatur*. In this temple there are 365 idols, which on the entrance of Mother and Child fall to the ground and are broken in pieces. Affrodisius, *dux civitatis illius*, arrives "with all his army" to take vengeance for the sacrilege, but instead falls down and worships. The title *dux civitatis* does not belong at all to the first century. It does not seem to have been until the time of Constantine that *dux* was used of any of the smaller units in the army or of local garrisons, and then it ranks above the "chiliarch."[1] In Egypt the *strategi* were officers of the nome, and only had under their orders a few police.[2] The Egyptians were not likely to call their temple the "Capitol of Egypt." It is true that the term is used of any large and splendid temple,[3] but of course only in the West. The pantheon of gods with their rotating days of honour needs verification; but in any case it does not agree either with Hermopolis, which was dedicated specially to the god Thoth, or with Senetai, which was dedicated specially to Horus.[4]

The narratives of the pilgrims to the Holy Places supply a further means of obtaining at least a *terminus a quo* for the date of the apocryphal Gospel. Of the five pilgrims before the Arab invasion of whom accounts have come down to us, three made a point of visiting Egypt, and a

[1] οὐ μόνον ἑκατοντάρχων καὶ χιλιάρχων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν λεγομένων δουκῶν οἳ στρατηγῶν ἐν ἑκάστῳ τόπῳ τάξιν ἐπεῖχον (Zosimus, *Hist.* ii., 33).

[2] Marquardt, *Röm. Staatsverwaltung*, i. 290.

[3] See Georges *ad voc.*

[4] Dümichen, *ut sup.*, pp. 261, 254.

fourth (Theodosius) has a note on Memphis which may be derived from personal knowledge. The two earliest, Paula, whose movements are described by Jerome, and Silvia of Aquitaine, evidently had a double interest. They visited the sites connected with Israel in Egypt and the Exodus, and they were also interested in monasteries and monasticism. But of the legend which surrounds the flight of the Holy Family into Egypt there is not the slightest trace. The first and only indication of this is in Antoninus of Placentia (*c.* 570, A.D.), of whom it is said that at Memphis he saw the door (*regia, i.e.* "main door") of a church, formerly a temple, which had shut itself to against the infant Christ, and could never afterwards be opened. Not even in Antoninus is there any allusion to "Sotinen" and "Hermopolis." We may however suspect that these names are more or less distorted versions of the reports brought back by pilgrims.

In any case, I do not think it can be said that the Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew supplies a substantial argument against the inferences which have been drawn from local knowledge.

Going back then to the Gospel of St. John, we are left, with two alternatives. Either the author of the Gospel was a Jew born and bred in Palestine, or he must at least have made so long a stay there, and have so gone about from place to place as to have become intimately acquainted with a great part of the country and able to handle local names with sureness and ease. In order to decide between these alternatives we must have recourse to other criteria. We must endeavour to enter into the mind of the author and see from what point of view he looked out upon things, whether from that of one who was from the first wholly a Jew, or from that of one in whom Jewish ideas were mingled with ideas foreign to Judaism.

Let us take our first test under this head from the use of the Old Testament.

In my book of twenty years ago I used an expression which was rather too strong about this. Assuming that St. John in two places gave a version of his own directly from the Hebrew, without regard to the LXX., I spoke of this as "convincing." Mr. Cross demurs:[1] and in view of some new light which has been thrown upon quotations from the Old Testament on the New and in early writers, I accept the correction, though I still think that the argument has some not inconsiderable weight.

Bishop Lightfoot,[2] with his usual lucidity and force of reasoning, pressed home three passages as showing a direct influence of the Hebrew.

St. John xix. 37 (=Zech. xii. 10), "They shall look on Him whom they pierced."

St. John xii. 40 (=Isa. vi. 10), "Because that Esaias said again, He hath blinded their eyes," etc.

St. John xiii. 18 (=Ps. xli. 9 Heb.; xl. 10, LXX.), "He that eateth bread with Me hath lifted up his heel against Me."

It is well known that in the first of these passages the Septuagint has not "whom they pierced," but "because they insulted." The first of these two versions was correct as a rendering of the Hebrew—at least of our present Hebrew. Mr. Cross however challenged the inference that St. John made a new version for himself. He pointed to the fact that "whom they pierced" is found not only in the Gospel but also in the Apocalypse, in Justin Martyr, in some MSS. of the Septuagint, and in the three versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion; and he argued that the author of the Fourth Gospel did not translate for himself, but adopted another version current at the time.

Dr. T. K. Abbott replied to this,[3] that Aq., Symm., Theod., MSS. of LXX. might be reduced practically to Aquila, from

[1] *Class. Rev.*, 1890, p. 453 f., also 1891, p. 142 f.

[2] Expositor, 1890, pp. 19–21. It should be remembered however that the Essay, though printed at this date, was written in 1871.

[3] *Ibid.*, Feb., 1891, p. 11 f.

whom all the other renderings or readings were derived. The same article contained some criticism of Dr. Hatch, who had adopted a view similar to that of Mr. Cross.

The state of the case in regard to divergent quotations from the Old Testament is this.

Generally speaking, it may be said that up to the year 1884 the assumption had been made that where an author quoted from the Old Testament in a form more nearly resembling the Hebrew than the Septuagint he had either himself translated directly from the Hebrew or followed some other writer who had so translated. But from that year onwards, starting from a small beginning but with a wider accession of facts as it proceeded, the conviction has been growing that there were current as far back as the period of the New Testament itself, at least for certain books, other Greek versions than those which go under the name of the Septuagint and in some cases more nearly representing the Hebrew.

The impulse was given by two observations of Professor Rendel Harris and Dr. Hort.[1] Professor Rendel Harris noticed that a passage in the Shepherd of Hermas was really based upon the Greek of Daniel, but upon the Greek in a peculiar form. Dr. Hort thereupon pointed out that the form in question implied the version of Theodotion, not the text which properly bore the name of Septuagint. Hitherto it had been supposed that Theodotion's version was at least some forty years later than Hermas, but doubt was at once thrown on this. It happened that Dr. Salmon had a special interest in the date of Hermas, as he maintained a view which, though no doubt defensible, is as yet held by a minority of scholars. At his instance Dr. Gwynn worked out yet further the traces of a version similar to Theodotion's, but before Theodotion, with the result that it has been made highly probable that the name of that editor has

[1] *Johns Hopkins University Circulars*, 1884, Apr. and Dec.

been given to a version not only current but largely preferred to the Septuagint version before his day.

Dr. Hatch, in his Essays in *Biblical Greek*, published in 1889, maintained not exactly this theory but another which somewhat resembled it, viz., that many of the quotations in early Christian writers were taken not directly from the Books of the Old Testament quoted but from collections of extracts or short manuals compiled from the Old Testament by the Jews. This too is a possibility that has something in its favour and that must be distinctly contemplated, though it is not the only hypothesis which will explain the facts.

As a consequence of these investigations, the old simple inference has at least lost its stringency. It is no longer certain that a writer who agrees more nearly with the Hebrew than the Septuagint is himself translating from the Hebrew. He may be using a different version or he may be using a collection of extracts.

What are we to say to the particular instances adduced by Dr. Lightfoot and by others who have dealt with the Introduction to the Fourth Gospel? As between Dr. T. K. Abbott and Mr. Cross, it seems to me that Dr. Abbott has certainly reduced considerably the apparent body of evidence for the existence of a version of Zechariah xii. 10 distinct from that of the LXX. It now stands as Gosp. Apoc. Just.-Mart. Aq. If the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse are both by the same hand, or at least closely connected, and if, as is possible, the form of the quotation in Justin is influenced by these writings, then the evidence would be reduced still further, it would in fact consist of only two items, *Script. Joan.* and Aquila; and between these two, for reasons which Dr. Abbott has urged, the coincidence of rendering might be accidental. Still each of these steps involves a certain amount of assumption; and on the other hand the existence of a version not identical with the LXX.

seems to be sufficiently proved; so that on the whole, if this passage had stood alone, I should have been inclined to side with Mr. Cross, and to think that the use of such a version was the easier hypothesis of the two.

But it must be remembered that there are two other passages in regard to which the balance of probability seems to be different. In xiii. 18 (=Ps. xli. 9, "lifted up his heel") the Fourth Gospel stands alone: Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion are all extant, and agree more with the LXX. than with the Gospel.

ST. JOHN: ἐπῆρεν ἐπ' ἐμὲ τὴν πτέρναν αὐτοῦ.
LXX.: ἐμεγάλυνεν ἐπ' ἐμὲ πτερνισμόν.
AQ., THEOD.: κατεμεγαλύνθη μου πτέρνᾳ.
SYMM.: κατεμεγαλύνθη μου ἀκολουθῶν.

Here the Johannean rendering is quite isolated, and looks as if it were affected either by the original text or by a Targumic paraphrase.

There is a like isolation in xii. 40 (=Isa. vi. 10). This verse is quoted in two other places in the New Testament (Matt. xiii. 15 and Acts xxviii. 27), in both closely with the LXX.; and Symmachus, who alone is extant, is nearer to the LXX. than to St. John and the Hebrew.

There is some difficulty in supposing that in these two instances an alternative version had reached the writer of the Fourth Gospel and had not reached any of the companions which he had with him in the quotation from Zechariah. So that, on the whole, and with some hesitation, I lean to the old view that the Gospel does show signs of the influence of the original either directly or indirectly through an Aramaic paraphrase.

I lean to this view the more readily because it only falls in with a conclusion arrived at in other ways. Whether or not in the outer circumference of his mind the writer of the Gospel had imbibed ideas derived from Alexandrian Hellen-

ism must for the present be left an open question, but in any case at its centre he was essentially a Jew. The argument from style and diction I do not propose to discuss. It will be found excellently stated by Bishop Lightfoot [1] and by Dr. Westcott;[2] I may add also by Keim in the passage referred to above.[3] But the question of modes of thought is perhaps more debateable, and to that I hope to return in the next paper.

W. SANDAY.

NOTE.—The last of these papers brought me two letters from Dr. Hort, which are of great value to me personally, and require a word of notice.

In the first place, I hasten to disclaim a construction which I fear might have been placed upon my words. In saying that Dr. Hort had urged all that could possibly be urged against the words τὸ πάσχα in St. John vi. 4, I did not mean to imply that this was done with any harmonistic object. The paragraph in which I spoke of the effect of the omission upon the harmony of the Gospels was not meant to be connected logically with the paragraph which went before, though I can see that it might be taken as so connected. There is no writer, English or foreign, who is so entirely above suspicion of being influenced by any such object; and to suggest otherwise was far indeed from my mind.

I was well aware that I was myself more open to the charge of "Harmonistik," from the attempt which I made to reconcile the Synoptic and Johannean narratives on the day of the Crucifixion. I could not plead guilty to the charge, because I was only dealing with the Gospel narratives precisely as I should have dealt with any two other historical authorities under similar circumstances. I also, as I hope, succeeded in making it understood that the reconciliation which I put forward—not as my own, but on the lines of Edersheim, Nösgen, and others—was put forward most tentatively, and subject to the validity of certain premises which, as neither Hebraist nor Talmudist, I did not feel competent to criticise personally.

Dr. Hort has been so good as to give me his opinion on these premises. On every one he goes behind the data on which I was relying, with the result that as a whole I no longer regard the explanation offered as tenable. I can only fall back on the views which I expressed twenty years ago, with just this reservation, that because the two accounts are not reconciled I do not think it follows that they are not reconcilable. I venture to quote the sentences in which Dr. Hort states his conclusion.

"I feel sure," he says, "that St. John meant to place the Crucifixion on Nisan 14, and that he may safely be trusted here, more especially as this chronology is supported by often-noticed details in the Synoptic accounts. But

[1] EXPOSITOR, 1890, pp. 15–19. [2] *Comm.*, pp. 50–52.

[3] p. 162. See also Bleek-Mangold, p. 363: the only dissentient among recent writers appears to be Scholten.

I am by no means so confident as to the interpretation of the Synoptic chronology. The most obvious, and perhaps the most probable, view is that St. John is tacitly but deliberately correcting an error of the Synoptists. But the greatness of the supposed error is very perplexing if any of the Twelve had any part in the redaction of any one of the three Gospels. . . . I think there is real force in what Westcott urges (*Introd.*, p. 344) against treating the Synoptic language as due to mere blunder or fiction, though I cannot be as hopeful as he seems to be that fuller knowledge would justify it in all particulars."

I would gladly express my adhesion to this judgment, with perhaps some emphasis on the point contended for by Dr. Westcott. It was really this (*e.g.* a verse like St. Luke xxii. 15, "With desire have I desired," etc.) which put me upon attempting the reconciliation which I now believe to have failed.

Another correspondent reminds me that in pointing out the parallels between the Synoptic sayings in Matthew xi. 27, Luke x. 22, and St. John, I should have bracketed the prepositions in [παρ]εδόθη, [ἐπι]γινώσκει, as St. John (like St. Luke in the case of γινώσκει) uses the simple and not the compound verbs, but there are a great number of parallels which are very close in sense (*e.g.* δοῦναι ἐξουσίαν, John i. 12, v. 27, xvii. 2; δοῦναι ἐν τῇ χειρί, iii. 35; εἰς τὰς χεῖρας, xiii. 3; also iii. 27, v. 22, 36, vi. 37, 39, etc.; and for γινώσκειν especially John x. 14, 15, xiv. 7, 9, 17, xvi. 3, xvii. 25, etc.). That this was not more fully verified before was due to an accident which I need not explain at length.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

III. St. Peter.

We shall now consider the teaching of the Book of Acts and of the Epistles of Peter.

The discourses preserved in the Book of Acts, while frequently mentioning the death of Christ, do not say much about its spiritual significance. The Apostles were more eager to proclaim that the Crucified had come forth living from the grave than to expound a recondite doctrine, which can be appreciated only by those who have already put faith in Him. We have however, in St. Peter's inaugural address on the Day of Pentecost and in an address by St. Paul, two important passages bearing most closely on the subject before us. These now demand attention.

In Acts ii. 23 Peter is recorded to have said, in reference to Christ, "whom, being delivered up by the determinate