

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 Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

small-souled, a mean, or an unworthy part than he can annihilate himself. It is unthinkable, for he is the soul of honour, chivalry, and heroism. Spiritual freedom demands the absence of a strained, affected, and self-conscious service, and it is only by self-transcendence, as Bosanquet so clearly demonstrates, that a man can truly realize himself. This is indeed possible when a man is loyal, through and through, to his Superior, and when he is fully conscious that he is not his own, but that he is 'bought with a price.'

Whatever developments our modern complex life has wrought in our ideas of religious and moral obligation, and even in the conception of loyalty itself, it is vitally important to reinstate in our religious conceptions the concrete values of personality, and above all our personal relationship to Christ, who as perfect Man and God can alone claim and command the totality of our powers. To express and demonstrate the response to this all-embracing and imperative claim, we know of no better word for our day than 'loyalty.'

Irenæus and the Fourth Gospel.

BY THE REV. H. A. A. KENNEDY, D.D., D.SC., PROFESSOR OF EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY,
NEW COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

II.

LET US NOW narrow down our discussion. Irenæus was personally acquainted with Polycarp and Pothinus, the one born about 69, the other about 87 A.D. He may also have known Papias, a contemporary of Polycarp, and at any rate he had read his writings. Further, both directly and indirectly (through Papias' works and, doubtless, other written documents), he was in touch with information handed down by elders, men of outstanding authority in the Churches of Asia and Gaul, and his language in the Letter to Florinus seems to imply that he knew some of the earlier 'elders who were disciples of the apostles.' What did he learn from these various sources, or did he learn anything, regarding the Fourth Gospel and the prominent Churchman, John, with whose name it seems at least from the last quarter of the second century to have been regularly associated?

(1) *Polycarp*. A central matter in Irenæus' celebrated statement of his intimacy in his early days with Polycarp is his recollection of how the bishop 'used to tell of his intercourse with John and the rest of those who had seen the Lord, and how he would repeat their words. And what he had heard from them about the Lord, and about His miracles, and about His teaching, Polycarp, as having received it from eye-witnesses of the life of the Word, used to relate in complete accordance with the Scriptures' (Eus. v. 20. 6). Plainly, the

intercourse of Polycarp with John was the paramount feature of his intimacy with 'those who had seen the Lord.' The others of the group are not named. But John and they are classified together under the designation, 'eye-witnesses of the life of the Word.' The phrase can scarcely be dissociated from Jn 1¹⁴ and 1 Jn 1¹⁶. Moreover, although we cannot be sure whether it is Irenæus' own, or represented Polycarp's way of speaking, it gives a presumption in favour of some connexion between the 'John' mentioned in the same context and the documents through which the term 'Logos' had gained currency in the Church. That presumption is strengthened by the concluding words of the sentence, 'in complete agreement with the Scriptures.' Irenæus was well acquainted with the four Gospels. The juxtaposition of the phrase we are discussing with this reference, following the mention of an influential eye-witness named John, indicates the links of association in the mind of Irenæus. We are not surprised, therefore, to find in the only extant writing of Polycarp, his brief Epistle to the Philippians, clear echoes of the 'Johannine' literature: 'Every one who confesses not that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is Antichrist, and whosoever confesses not the testimony of the cross is of the devil'; cf. 1 Jn 4² 3⁸, and possibly Jn 8⁴⁴.

But Irenæus makes further reference to Poly-

carp's connexion with John. Victor, bishop of Rome, had severed intercourse with the Churches of Asia Minor, because they refused to abandon their practice of terminating 'the feast of the Pass-over of salvation' on the 14th of Nisan, and to conform to the Roman order of making the festival culminate on the Sunday that followed the equinoctial full moon. Irenæus, who was himself in accord with the Roman practice, writes to Victor, remonstrating with him for his harshness, and reminding him that his predecessors in the Roman See recognized the difference of opinion on this question, and never made it an occasion for excommunicating their brethren. 'When the blessed Polycarp sojourned at Rome in the time of Anicetus, and they had some trifling differences about other matters, they at once came to terms, and on this important question put away all love of strife. For Anicetus was unable to persuade Polycarp to give up keeping the feast [on the 14th Nisan], seeing the latter had always kept it [on that day] along with John the disciple of our Lord and the rest of the apostles with whom he lived constantly' (Eus. v. 24. 16). Two most important points emerge from this passage. Again, Polycarp's intimacy with 'John, the disciple of our Lord,' is emphasized. And here Irenæus includes John among the apostles.

Once more, the setting of Polycarp's career is put before us by Irenæus. 'Polycarp, moreover, was not only instructed by apostles and intimate with many of those who had seen Christ, but he was also appointed by apostles bishop in Asia, in the Church at Smyrna. Him I myself also have seen in my early youth (for he remained long with us and died in extreme old age, after a glorious and illustrious martyrdom). He ever taught those things which he learnt from the apostles, the things which are also handed down by the Church, and which alone are true. To them bear testimony all the Churches in Asia and Polycarp's successors up till now, regarding him as a witness far more stable and worthy of confidence than Valentinus and Marcion and the rest of the perverse in mind. . . . And there are some who have heard him tell that John, the disciple of the Lord, at Ephesus, having gone to bathe, saw Cerinthus in the bathing-house and rushed out without bathing, exclaiming, "Let us flee in case the bathing-house collapse, since Cerinthus the enemy of the truth is inside"' (iii. 3. 4). Several inferences are obvious. Irenæus

is in touch with the continuous tradition of the Churches in Asia. Polycarp, with whom he had been acquainted, is a very important link in that tradition. Smyrna, the seat of his bishopric, was, roughly speaking, a neighbour Church to that of Ephesus. With Ephesus the name of 'John, the disciple of the Lord,' is associated. Polycarp is known to have been a disciple of John's. Probably the words, 'appointed by apostles . . . bishop,' are meant to include John.

Eusebius corroborates Irenæus' statement in general terms: 'Prominent in Asia at that time was Polycarp, a disciple of the apostles, who had been entrusted with the bishopric of the Church at Smyrna by the eye-witnesses and ministers of the Lord' (Eus. iii. 36. 1). It is needless to cite Eusebius' testimony as to the intimacy of Polycarp with Ignatius, bishop of Antioch (iii. 36. 5, 10), as we have Polycarp's own evidence in his Epistle to the Philippians (13). The bearing of their intimacy upon the present discussion may be indicated by such an estimate of Ignatius' relation to the Fourth Gospel as that of an unbiassed scholar like Dean Inge, who says (*N.T. in Apostolic Fathers*, p. 83): 'Ignatius' use of the Fourth Gospel is *highly probable*,¹ but falls some way short of certainty.'

Let us collect the results of our examination of Polycarp's relation to a leading Churchman in Asia named John, and to the 'Johannine' documents, as described by Irenæus, and confirmed by Eusebius. (a) This John was a disciple of the Lord. (b) He was evidently the most eminent of 'those who had seen the Lord,' in the Church of Asia Minor, for when Irenæus earnestly warns his old friend Florinus against heretical opinions and appeals to their common master Polycarp, the one authority who is named as standing behind Polycarp is John. Similarly, in referring to Polycarp's position in the Paschal controversy, John's is the one name given by Irenæus from the earlier generation whose practice influenced Polycarp. The reference is quite incidental. (c) Polycarp is regularly described as a 'disciple' of the apostles. That must mean primarily apostles who had settled in Asia Minor. And in the story of Cerinthus Polycarp associates John with Ephesus, which was not far distant from Smyrna, his own See. Certainly Polycarp must have been for a large part of his life in close touch with the affairs of

¹ Italics mine.

Ephesus. (d) There is no clear evidence that Polycarp was acquainted with the Fourth Gospel. Of one reference in his Epistle to the Philippians (5⁸): 'Even as he promised us to raise us from the dead,' we may say with the careful scholar who has examined the Epistle for *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, that it 'seems certainly to be to a Johannine tradition (cf. Jn 5^{21, 25, 64}), though it need not necessarily be to our Fourth Gospel' (p. 104). But it must be remembered that Polycarp's single work consists of only thirteen brief sections, so that the argument from silence is peculiarly hazardous. Even within this short compass, on the other hand, there occurs the passage (7¹) already quoted in which 'the numerous coincidences of language render it probable that Polycarp either used 1 John or was personally acquainted with its author' (*op. cit.* p. 100). Some scholars have laid emphasis on Irenæus' statement as to Polycarp's discourses being 'in complete accordance with the Scriptures,' inferring from this language that he may have in view 'Johannine accounts of Jesus' work and teaching—but not our fourth gospel—current in the time of Polycarp' (Lewis, *The Irenæus Testimony to the Fourth Gospel*, p. 35). But the inference rests on precarious arguments and ought not to be pressed. There is significance in the description of John and his fellow-disciples as 'eye-witnesses of the life of the Word.' It may have no connexion with Polycarp's standpoint, but its casual employment by Irenæus in this context seems to hint at a Johannine atmosphere in which Polycarp had moved.

(2) *Papias*. We have seen that the bishop of Hierapolis was a contemporary of Polycarp. The fact that Eusebius 'discusses him . . . in connexion with the fathers who flourished in the reign of Trajan or before, while the notice of Polycarp is deferred till a much later point in the history' (*Essays on Sup. Religion*, p. 150), suggests to Lightfoot that Papias was the older man of the two. Irenæus describes him as 'the hearer of John.' Eusebius, taking for granted that John the apostle is meant, corrects the statement: 'Papias himself as a matter of fact in the preface to his discourses does not profess to have been a hearer and eye-witness of the holy apostles.' But there is some force in Lightfoot's caution that 'Irenæus does not state that he derived his knowledge from this preface, or indeed from any part of the work' (*op. cit.* p. 144). Curiously enough Eusebius him-

self, in his *Chronicle* (ed. Schoene, ii. p. 162), describes Papias along with Polycarp as a 'hearer' of John the apostle. Harnack, followed by most scholars, holds that he took this information directly from Iren. *Contr. Her.* v. 33. 4 (*Chronologie*, i. p. 36). It would appear, therefore, that Eusebius had revised his opinion. In a fragment of Apollinaris, bishop of Hierapolis c. 170 A.D., a successor of Papias and a contemporary of Irenæus, Papias is called ὁ Ἰωάννου μαθητῆς (Harnack, *Patr. Apost. Opp.* i. p. 187). This, however, is ambiguous, in view of his own famous and elusive statement, to which we must now turn (Eus. iii. 29. 3-4).

'I will not hesitate,' he says in his preface, 'to incorporate for you along with my interpretations all that once upon a time I carefully learnt from the elders and carefully remembered. . . . On any occasion when a follower of the elders happened to come, I used to question him about the discourses of the elders—what was said by Andrew or Peter or Philip or Thomas or James or John or Matthew or any other of the disciples of the Lord, and what Aristion and the elder John, disciples of the Lord, say.' Eusebius, commenting on this passage, notes the twofold mention of the name 'John,' first, among the apostles, 'evidently meaning the evangelist,' and, second, outside the number of the apostles, along with Aristion, and designated 'the elder.' He remarks that this agrees with a statement current that there were two persons of that name in Asia, and that the tombs of both were at Ephesus. Here we are face to face with one of the most puzzling problems of early Church history.

In spite of Dom Chapman's vigorous arguments to the contrary (*John the Presbyter*, pp. 9-26), I find myself obliged to believe, with Lightfoot, that when Papias speaks of 'those who had been followers of οἱ πρεσβύτεροι,' and of himself as 'inquiring into (ἀνέκρινον) the discourses of the πρεσβύτεροι, what was said by Andrew or Peter, etc.,' he must mean by οἱ πρεσβύτεροι here the apostles and disciples whose names follow, using the word as the writer to the Hebrews (11²) does of the famous Old Testament worthies, or as we speak of the 'Fathers' of the Church.¹ Otherwise, the situation described would be a curious one. We have seen reason to believe that Papias

¹ Cf. Irenæus' account of what a certain elder related *de antiquis* (iv. 31. 1). πρεσβύτερος was obviously a most elastic word in the second century.

was at least as old as Polycarp. That means that he was easily in a position to have known apostles who were in Asia within the last ten or twelve years of the first century. But if we take of *πρεσβύτεροι* in the sense of the Christian leaders who came after the apostles, we make Papias depend on those who were disciples of these leaders, that is to say, on persons who would usually be much younger than himself. Does this shed any light on the phrase at the close of our quotation from Papias, *ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης*? It is remarkable to find the epithet applied to him, and not to the 'disciple of the Lord' mentioned along with him, Aristion. And we cannot but be struck by the coincidence with the Second and Third Epistles of John, where the author designates himself by no other name than *ὁ πρεσβύτερος*, as if further explanation were unnecessary. A Church leader named 'the elder' or 'the ancient' must have been a marked man. In view of second-century tradition as to the very advanced age of the apostle John, 'the ancient,' as Dom Chapman remarks, 'was not an unnatural title to receive or to assume,' and he compares Paul's description of himself as *Παῦλος πρεσβύτης* in Philemon⁹ (*op. cit.* p. 39, note 1).

The crux lies in Papias' previous mention of John among the familiar names of the Twelve. Is it conceivable that, after saying that he used to inquire of followers of 'the old worthies' what they had heard from men like Andrew and Peter and John, he should return to this same authority at the close of the sentence? In the one case he inquires *τί Ἰωάννης εἶπεν*: in the other, *ἄ τε ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης λέγει*. The most noteworthy difference is the change from past to present. Will this distinction admit of a reference to the same person? May we here apply Lightfoot's important criterion as to oral and written tradition, and refer *λέγει*, as contrasted with *εἶπεν*, to Johannine *documents*, by this time in private although not yet general circulation? The latter hypothesis seems to me by no means impossible. Perhaps the change from the *τί*-construction of the earlier part of the sentence to the *ἄ τε* of the later points to a silent alteration of this kind in the writer's standpoint for the moment. It is certainly curious, and I know of no adequate attempt to explain it. One is very doubtful whether it is correct to translate *ἄ τε* (as commonly): 'and what Aristion, etc.,' or 'also' (with Moffatt).

Eusebius, continuing his observations on this passage, remarks: 'Papias, of whom we were now speaking, confesses that he had received the words of the apostles from those who had been their followers, but says that he was himself a hearer of Aristion and the elder John. At all events, he mentions them many times in his writings, and records their traditions' (iii. 39. 7). But there is nothing in the extract from Papias to justify Eusebius' statement that he had been a personal hearer of 'the elder John.' The bishop professes to have received reminiscences of his discourses, perhaps written down, at second-hand. And it is merely begging the question to say that Eusebius must have known some other passage in his works to justify his assertion. For he proceeds to suggest that he had made too sweeping an inference from Papias' statement (possibly misled by the strange alteration in the construction from *τί εἶπεν* to *ἄ τε . . . λέγει*), and that the data really at his disposal consisted in repeated references by name to Aristion and the elder John. Similarly, in a later paragraph of the same chapter, he mentions that Papias 'hands down in his own work narratives of the words of the Lord which have come from Aristion, who was referred to above, and traditions of the elder John.' But he does not even hint that Papias received them at first-hand.

As a matter of fact, the evidence of this keenly discussed fragment rather obscures than clarifies the situation. And the interpretation of it by Eusebius, on which so much has been built, reveals a great deal of vagueness in his mind also. Writing nearly 200 years after the death of Papias, he probably was as little in a position to estimate its meaning as we are. We must return to this passage later. Meanwhile, as to the question whether any traces have been preserved of an acquaintance of Papias with the 'Johannine' documentary tradition, Eusebius tells us that he 'used testimonies from the former (*προτέρας*) Epistle of John' (iii. 39. 17). That appears to be the only direct reference. It has been suggested above that certain passages in Irenæus, where he seems to refer to published works, may reasonably be ascribed to Papias. In one of these (v. 36. 1), which describes the bliss that awaits the redeemed, and which Irenæus ascribes to the 'elders,' they are reported by him as saying that one group 'shall be taken up into the heavens, and the second shall dwell in paradise, and the third shall inhabit the city: and

that therefore our Lord has said, "in my Father's house are many mansions (ἐν τοῖς τῶν πατρὸς μου μοναῖς εἶναι πολλὰς)." A good case can be made out for connecting the passage with Papias. It deals with his favourite subject of eschatology, and it represents his method of blending traditions of

the elders with his own interpretations of Scripture. If it comes from him, there is a presumption that he was acquainted with the Fourth Gospel or one of its sources, but, of course, this saying of Jesus (Jn 14²) may have simply been current in oral tradition.

Literature.

MALORY.

MR. ALFRED W. POLLARD has spent time in modernizing Malory's *Morte D'Arthur*. We envy him the duty for the pleasure of it. We might not have been able to do it, for this is the work that is so easy to do and so difficult to do well. But the longer the labour the greater the pleasure, for you must live with Malory, as Tennyson did, to know how remunerative he is.

Mr. Pollard has done well, but with all his doing the book would have been only half the joy it is had not Mr. Arthur Rackham been enlisted on the illustrating of it. The plates are so characteristic and so artistic that few but Malory could outshine them.

The title is *The Romance of King Arthur and his Knights of the Round Table* (Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net).

NATIONALISM.

'Have you not seen, since the commencement of the existence of the Nation, that the dread of it has been the one goblin-dread with which the whole world has been trembling? Wherever there is a dark corner, there is the suspicion of its secret malevolence; and people live in a perpetual distrust of its back where it has no eyes. Every sound of a footstep, every rustle of movement in the neighbourhood, sends a thrill of terror all around. And this terror is the parent of all that is base in man's nature. It makes one almost openly unashamed of inhumanity. Clever lies become matters of self-congratulation. Solemn pledges become a farce,—laughable for their very solemnity. The Nation, with all its paraphernalia of power and prosperity, its flags and pious hymns, its blasphemous prayers in the churches, and the literary

mock thunders of its patriotic bragging, cannot hide the fact that the Nation is the greatest evil for the Nation, that all its precautions are against it, and any new birth of its fellow in the world is always followed in its mind by the dread of a new peril. Its one wish is to trade on the feebleness of the rest of the world, like some insects that are bred in the paralysed flesh of victims kept just enough alive to make them toothsome and nutritious.'

The quotation is from Sir Rabindranath Tagore's book on *Nationalism* (Macmillan; 4s. 6d. net). It is enough to show what opinion Tagore has of patriotism as it is professed by some patriots. It is a book which only a few will be able to read with pleasure before the war is over. But then—

PRIEST OF THE IDEAL.

Mr. Stephen Graham will make what he writes interesting, whatever his subject be. What is his subject in *Priest of the Ideal* (Macmillan; 7s. 6d. net)? Look at Biggleswade. Biggleswade is a Chaplain to the Forces, home for a short rest. He tumbles into the company whose acquaintance we have made as if his entrance were an accident or an episode. But he represents the demand for a new world when the war is over—new books, new churches, new priests, and new prophets. He stands for the men at the front who are coming back with new thoughts and the resolve to realize them. Does Mr. Graham mean to tell us that we may give way too much to these demands?

An American millionaire, or agent of millionaires, comes to England for the purpose of buying up all the ancient historical monuments for which we no longer care. He would buy a cathedral and transport it stone by stone if he could find one for sale. He does buy gargoyles, jewels, and other things. Does Mr. Graham mean that we may go