

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 *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS
OF
The Victoria Institute
OR
Philosophical Society of Great Britain

VOL. LXXVII
1945



LONDON:

PUBLISHED BY
THE INSTITUTE, 12, QUEEN ANNE'S GATE, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

861ST ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING

HELD AT THE NATIONAL CLUB, 12, QUEEN ANNE'S GATE,
LONDON, S.W.1., AT 6 P.M. ON JUNE 4TH, 1945.

F. F. BRUCE, ESQ., M.A., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed and signed.

The CHAIRMAN then called upon Sir Frederic Kenyon, G.B.E., K.C.B., D.Litt., LL.D., to read his paper entitled "The Fourth Gospel."

The Meeting was later thrown open to discussion in which Wing Commander Anderson, Air Commodore Wiseman, C.B.E., Rev. G. R. Beasley-Murray, B.D., and the Rev. A. W. Payne took part.

Written communications were received from Dr. Cawley, Major H. B. Clarke, and Brig.-General Harry Biddulph, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O.

The following elections have been made: Rev. James Hominuke, B.Sc., M.A., B.D., Fellow; Frederick F. Bruce, M.A., Member; Christopher Elliott, Esq., M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., Member; Walter L. Emmerson, Esq., Member; Miss C. Hussey, Member.

The Rev. S. Runsie Craig Memorial, 1945.

In accordance with the terms of the Trust the Council have selected for the 1943 Memorial the paper on "The Fourth Gospel," read before the Society on June 4th, 1945, by Sir Frederic G. Kenyon, G.B.E., K.C.B., D.Litt., LL.D., as affording strong confirmation of the genuineness of "the Faith which was once for all delivered to the Saints."

THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

By SIR FREDERIC KENYON, G.B.E., K.C.B., D.Litt., LL.D.

THE question of the authorship and date of the Fourth Gospel has been one of the storm-points of New Testament criticism for over a century. The Tübingen School, which took its rise with F. C. Baur in 1831, assigned it to the second half of the second century (about A.D. 170), and P. W. Schmiedel at the beginning of the present century maintained that about A.D. 140 was the earliest possible date for it. Such datings excluded not only the authorship of the Apostle St. John, but also that of any eye-witness of the events recorded, such as "John the Elder," mentioned by Papias. It was represented as a pseudonymous work, produced more than a century later

than our Lord's life, quite unreliable for historical detail, and embodying a theology of post-apostolic character, profoundly tinged with Gnosticism.

Even scholars who assigned it an earlier date and a far higher value still hesitated with regard to its authorship. Thus Dr. Streeter, in his valuable work, *The Four Gospels* (1924), argues strongly for the authorship of the Elder John, regarding the attribution to the Beloved Disciple in xxi, 24, as a later addition and a mistaken attribution. He assigns the Gospel to about the years 90-95 A.D. On the other hand, the great English scholars, Lightfoot, Westcott, Sanday, and Salmon, have steadily maintained the authorship of the Apostle, with a date between A.D. 80 and 95.

It seems opportune to review the problem of authorship in the light of the recent discoveries which have gone far towards settling the question of date. These discoveries are two papyrus fragments, very small in size but very significant in their content. One is a fragment of a manuscript of the Gospel itself, acquired with a parcel of other papyri by the John Rylands Library at Manchester from Professor B. P. Grenfell in 1920, and identified by Mr. C. H. Roberts, who published it in 1935. It is only a scrap of papyrus, measuring $3\frac{1}{2}$ by $2\frac{1}{4}$ in., bearing on one side parts of ch. xviii, 31-33, and on the other parts of xviii, 37, 38. Its importance lies in the fact that it is written in a hand which papyrologists agree in assigning, on purely palæographical grounds, to the first half of the second century. Since the text on the back follows directly on that on the front, it is evident that we have here a portion of a leaf of a codex, not of a roll, and we have other evidence of the use of the codex form by Christian scribes at this early date. It need hardly be added that, small as the fragment is, it suffices to prove that a copy of the Fourth Gospel was in existence in Egypt in the first half of the second century; and this alone is enough to demonstrate the falsity of the assertions of Baur and Schmiedel.

But it does not stand alone. Earlier in the same year as Mr. Roberts' publication, Dr. H. I. Bell and Mr. T. C. Skeat, of the British Museum, published some fragments, purchased in the preceding year, of three leaves of a papyrus codex containing a narrative of our Lord's life differing from the four canonical Gospels and not identifiable with any other known work. Here again it is the age of the manuscript which gives it its special significance; for this again is confidently assigned by the leading

papyrologists to the first half of the second century. The extant leaves contain four episodes in our Lord's life. One (unfortunately much mutilated) evidently contains an incident not recorded in our four Gospels. One is a version of the healing of the leper recorded by all three Synoptists (Mk. i, 40-42, Mt. viii, 2-3, Lk. v, 12-13), told in the same simple, straightforward style, quite unlike the later apocryphal gospels. Another is similarly a version of the temptation of our Lord by the craftily designed question as to the lawfulness of paying tribute to Caesar, recorded in Mk. xij, 14, Mt. xxii, 16, Lk. xx, 21, but incorporating also Mk. vii, 6, 7 and Mt. xv, 7-9 ("Well did Isaiah prophesy of you, saying, This people honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me. In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men"). These passages show decisively a knowledge of the Synoptic Gospels, or of the documents which underlie those Gospels; but the remaining incident bears equally clearly the colour of the Fourth Gospel. It runs as follows:—"And turning to the rulers of the people he spoke this saying, Search [*or* Ye search] the scriptures, in which ye think that ye have life; these are they that bear witness of me. Think not that I came to accuse you to my Father; there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, on whom ye have set your hope. And when they said, We know well that God spake unto Moses, but as for thee, we know not whence thou art, Jesus answered and said unto them, Now is your unbelief accused. . . ." Here three passages of the Fourth Gospel (v, 39, v, 45, and ix, 29) are combined, with their distinctively Johannine style. It follows that before the middle of the second century the Fourth Gospel was sufficiently well known to be excerpted and combined with passages from the Synoptics in a record of our Lord's life which circulated in Egypt.

If then this Gospel was known in Egypt (and that not merely in Alexandria, but in the provincial cities or villages whence these papyri are derived) by a date which cannot be put later than A.D. 130-150, it may be taken as certain that the Gospel itself must have been produced at least a generation earlier. Such a conclusion would be drawn as a matter of course in the case of a secular work, and it would be hypercritical not to apply the same reasoning to the Gospels; and this brings us as near as makes no matter to the traditional date in the neighbourhood of A.D. 90. Especially would this interval be none too long if (as general tradition asserted) the Gospel was written in Asia

Minor, since some time would be needed for its circulation in Egypt.

We are now, therefore, in the position of being able to examine the internal evidence of authorship from the basis of an assured date. Let us look, therefore, with a fresh eye at this internal evidence. First, there is the explicit testimony at the end of the book (xxi, 24) : " This is the disciple which testifieth of these things and wrote these things, and we know that his testimony is true." And the disciple who is thus declared to be the author of the book is described (xxi, 20) as " the disciple whom Jesus loved, which also leaned on his breast at supper, and said, Lord, which is he that betrayeth thee." The " disciple whom Jesus loved " is universally identified as St. John, and the conclusion is indeed irresistible ; for only the twelve apostles were present at the Last Supper, and the inner circle of apostles consisted of Peter, James, and John, of whom Peter is excluded as the other interlocutor in this conversation, while James was dead long before the Gospel was composed. We have therefore what amounts to a direct statement that this Gospel was written by St. John. It is true that these last verses appear to be a post-script added by some person or persons other than the author of the book. Now if this addition had been made as late as A.D. 170, or even 150, its authority might be questioned. Pseudonymous works claiming to be written by apostles began to appear by then or not much later. The Second Epistle of Peter is probably one such work ; the so-called Gospel of Peter is certainly one, written before A.D. 190. But the matter is very different if this attestation was written about A.D. 90, in the life-time of St. John or very shortly after his death.* Such an attestation could not have been made when, if false, it was immediately open to authoritative contradiction.

We have therefore a direct contemporary affirmation that this Gospel was the work of " the beloved disciple," who can only be the Apostle St. John. And, as has frequently been noticed, the narrative is full of indications that it is the work of an eye-witness. Take first the numerous instances of the reference of particular words to a named speaker. In the narrative of the feeding of the five thousand, where the Synoptists have merely

* Even this alternative is almost excluded by the context, which quotes the saying that this disciple should not die, and proceeds to say, in the present tense, " this is the disciple which testifieth," etc.

“They” (or “The disciples) say unto him,” St. John has “Philip answered him” and “Andrew, Simon Peter’s brother, saith unto him” (vi, 7, 8); and at the end of the following discourse, “Simon Peter answered him” (vi, 68). In the story of Lazarus, it is Thomas who says to his fellow disciples, “Let us also go that we may die with him” (xi, 16). In xii, 21, 22, Philip and Andrew are specifically mentioned; and in the long discourse which occupies chapters xiii-xvi, particular words are attributed to Peter (xiii, 6-9), the “disciple whom Jesus loved” (xiii, 25), Peter again (xiii, 36-7), Thomas (xiv, 5), Philip (xiv, 8), Judas (xiv, 22). Again, after the Resurrection there is express mention of Thomas (xx, 24-9), Peter, Thomas, Nathaniel and the sons of Zebedee (xxi, 2), the beloved disciple (xxi, 7), and Peter again in the final scene (xxi, 15-22). Such specific references, written a hundred and twenty years after the event, might be regarded as an attempted dramatisation; but in the lifetime of those who were or might have been present they would be intolerable. So also the fullness of detail in the narratives of the calling of the disciples, the feeding of the five thousand, the discussions with the Pharisees and other questioners, the raising of Lazarus, the Crucifixion and Resurrection, gives the impression of an eye-witness, and is hardly credible as an effort of dramatic imagination. The topographical detail, also—“Bethany beyond Jordan” (i, 28), “Aenon near to Salim” (iii, 23), Jacob’s well at Sychar, near to the parcel of growth that Jacob gave to his son Joseph (iv, 5), the pool of Bethesda (v, 2), the boats from Tiberias (vi, 23), Solomon’s porch (x, 23), the place beyond Jordan where John baptized (x, 40), Bethany, about fifteen furlongs from Jerusalem (xi, 18), the city called Ephraim in the country near to the wilderness (xi, 54), the brook Cedron (xviii, 1), the place called the Pavement (xix, 13)—all this is surely more natural as the work of a man writing his own reminiscences than as research or invention over a century later, and some eighty years after the destruction of Jerusalem and the practical evacuation of Palestine by the Jewish community.

The difference in tone and style between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel is sometimes urged as a reason for separating them widely in date. But since it is now clear that the separation cannot be great, another explanation must be sought, and it is not hard to find. The Synoptics were writing down the records of oral tradition, which would naturally embody the plainer and

simpler teaching of our Lord, suited to the comprehension of the common people, and more easily kept in mind and handed on by word of mouth. St. John, on the other hand, was writing down (or dictating) his own reminiscences, often of more special and intimate discourses, and no doubt coloured in expression by the style which he had formed in the course of a long life. Just as there is much of Plato's style in the teaching of Socrates as he has recorded it, or of the style of Thucydides in his record of the Funeral Oration of Pericles, while we yet believe that we have in them the substance and much of the actual utterances of Socrates and Pericles, so we may find in the Fourth Gospel the intimate teaching of our Lord, treasured in his memory by the beloved disciple who heard it, and written down at the end of a long life in the literary style which he had formed for himself, and which we find also in the Epistles which are unquestionably his personal utterance.

The argument that the Fourth Gospel represents a later form of theological doctrine, and specifically one coloured by the form of thought known as Gnosticism, also falls to the ground if the first century date of the Gospel is established. It is futile to argue that the style is too late for St. John if the only alternative is that it is by a contemporary of St. John. It must be accepted that this form of thought and expression existed in the last decade of the first century, and, if so, why not in the mind of St. John as well as that of another ?

Some writers, influenced by the difference in style between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel, have hesitated to accept the latter unreservedly as representing the teaching of our Lord. But, in fact, if the reasoning in this article is sound, the testimony of the Fourth Evangelist, though later in date, is more direct than that of the Three. They give in the main a collection of the oral tradition of the generation following our Lord's life on earth, and (together with the speeches recorded in the earlier chapters of Acts) represent the teaching given to the general public by the first Christian missionaries ; while St. John gives us at first hand his own recollection of " that which we have heard, which we have seen with our own eyes, which we have looked upon and our hands have handled, of the Word of Life." If John the Apostle wrote the Fourth Gospel, it is the direct evidence of the most intimate associate of our Lord, recording some of His deepest and most vital utterances, which had not passed into the oral tradition. In the course of a long life

the phraseology may have acquired something of a personal tincture, but it cannot be doubted that the substance had been repeated throughout that life without material change.

Thus the internal evidence, derived from the study of the Gospel itself, seems wholly consistent with the tradition which ascribes its authorship to the Apostle, the son of Zebedee. That tradition was firmly established in the Church, at any rate from the time of Irenaeus. Eusebius, who was fully acquainted with the literature of the early Church, including much that is now lost to us, treats it as certain.

There are, however, some considerations on the other side, and this examination of the evidence would not be complete without taking them into account. They relate to (1) divergent testimony as to the date of St. John's death, (2) the authorship of the Apocalypse, (3) the personality of "John the Elder."

The general tradition of the early Church was that John, the apostle and evangelist, outlived the persecution of Domitian and died at Ephesus. This is attested by Eusebius, who quotes Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus about A.D. 195 (*Hist. Eccl.* iii, 31, *cf.* iii, 18), and Irenaeus, about A.D. 175-200 (*ib.*, v. 8). A fifth century author, however, Philip of Sidé, states that, according to Papias, John, like his brother James, was killed by the Jews. He does not say that he was killed at the same time, which indeed would be irreconcilable with the record in Acts, but it would presumably (though not necessarily) have been before the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. This evidence, however, is far too slender to stand against the general tradition. Papias himself, who is spoken of as a companion of Polycarp and fellow-disciple with him of John, cannot have been born much before A.D. 70. He *may* have attributed the Apostle's death to the Jews, but he cannot have put the date much earlier than the traditional one. Moreover, if the identification of "the beloved disciple" with St. John be accepted (and it seems irresistible), it is impossible to imagine anyone in the last decade of the century solemnly affirming that the Gospel was the work of one who had died more than twenty years before.

A more serious problem is connected with the authorship of the Apocalypse, which in our Bible bears the title of "The Revelation of St. John the Divine." No two books could be written in Greek of such totally different character as the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel. The Gospel is written in good Greek with a distinct literary style. The Apocalypse is

written in Greek which has no literary merit (our Authorised Version gives it a quality which the original does not possess), and is often quite ungrammatical. At one time, when it was believed that the Apocalypse was written at the time of the Neronian persecution, the discrepancy was sometimes explained away on the ground that between A.D. 65 and 90 St. John had learnt to write good Greek. Since in A.D. 65 he would have been well over 50 years of age, so complete a change of style is in the last degree improbable; but the explanation becomes impossible if, as is now generally held, the persecution referred to in the Apocalypse is that of Domitian, about A.D. 95. Nor is it admissible to argue that the style of the Gospel is that of a disciple, writing to his master's instructions, since the style of the Epistles is identical, and it cannot be supposed that the apostle would have employed a disciple to put his letters into a literary style totally unlike his own language.

It must therefore be taken as certain that, whoever wrote the Apocalypse, it was not the author of the Gospel. The author of the Apocalypse gives his name as John, but does not call himself an apostle, and says nothing to identify him with the beloved disciple. The testimony of the early Church is divided. Justin Martyr and Irenaeus refer the book to St. John, which is good second century evidence from writers who, though born and educated in the East, spent most of their writing life in the West; but Dionysius of Alexandria in the third century argues strongly against it on the ground of the diversity of style, and says that the identification was rejected by "some of those before our time," one of whom at least appears to have been the presbyter Caius (about A.D. 200). Jerome says the Greeks of his time did not receive the book as canonical, and it was not accepted by the Syriac Church. On the other hand it was generally accepted in the West. The early Church therefore speaks with an uncertain voice; but it is observable that the apostolic authorship is most questioned in the East, where the book had its origin. It seems therefore rather perverse to refuse apostolic authorship to the book that claims it, and to allow it to the book which does not claim it and to which it was not allowed in the place of its birth. There are those to whom any view is preferable to the traditional one; but that is not scientific criticism. It is no more "scientific" to accept unsound evidence for a non-traditional view than for a traditional one. Science consists in weighing evidence impartially.

Some, however, have sought to find a solution of these problems by reference to a certain "John the Elder," who is named by Papias, in a passage quoted by Eusebius (*H.E.*, iii, 39), as a disciple of the Lord (other than St. John, whom he has already referred to among the apostles). Some scholars accordingly suggest that he was the author of the Apocalypse, which was only attributed to the apostle at a later date, and primarily in distant lands, which had never heard of John the Elder. It may be so, but it is impossible to prove it; and, as Dionysius remarks, there were many people who bore the name of John. Dr. Streeter, on the other hand, maintains that John the Elder was the author of the Gospel, and that yet another John ("John the Seer") was the author of the Apocalypse. He has one plausible argument in the fact that the writer of the Second and Third Epistles, whose style is similar to that of the First Epistle and the Gospel, describes himself as "the Elder"; but on the whole his argument seems to me singularly unconvincing.

It is full of arguments of the type of: "We must then infer that," "This suggests that," "Surely all this looks like," "It is not unlikely that" Polycarp "would have listened" "He may have read," etc. It assumes (without any evidence) that Irenaeus was only a few months in Smyrna and that when he heard Polycarp describe his intercourse with "John and the others who had seen the Lord," he never realised that he was talking of John the Elder, not John the Apostle; which is much as if a young Liberal in London in the early years of this century should have heard much talk about "Gladstone" without realising that it was Mr. Herbert Gladstone that was meant, not the great W. E. G. A conclusion which rests on an accumulation of such "probabilities" (or improbabilities) is surely very insecure. Streeter's quotation, *Homines facile id quod volunt credunt esse*, cuts both ways.

I believe, therefore, that with the evidence now available an impartial critic would come to two conclusions: first, that the Fourth Gospel was written not later than the last decade of the first century; and secondly that, if that is so, the evidence in favour of the authorship of St. John the Apostle far outweighs the evidence against it. I believe, further, that this result should re-assure those who fear or resent the application of criticism to the Scriptures, by showing that in the end the position of the Scriptures will be stronger, not weaker, than before.

DISCUSSION.

F. F. BRUCE, Esq., M.A., said : It is with great satisfaction that I have listened to Sir Frederic Kenyon's masterly survey of the evidence for the authorship of the Fourth Gospel. It is customary to dismiss the external evidence as "wholly elusive," and yet it is in truth extraordinarily strong. Taking it along with the *prima facie* sense of the indications in the Gospel itself, we cannot lightly evade the conclusion that the Fourth Evangelist was indeed John, the son of Zebedee. The implications of this conclusion for the historicity of the Gospel are obvious.

The difficulties raised by the comparison of this Gospel with the Synoptics weigh heavily with many, and they cannot be adequately dismissed in a few words. The chronological discrepancies can be adjusted (*cf.* G. Ogg, *Chronology of the Public Ministry of Jesus*, 1940.) The distinctive character of our Lord's teaching in the Fourth Gospel has been recognised by Jewish scholars, such as Israel Abrahams, as preserving a genuine aspect of His teaching not found in the Synoptics, although the *logion* of Matt. xi. 27 and Luke x. 22 is a noteworthy exception. This aspect persists in the "Odes of Solomon," in the Epistles of Ignatius, and (in substance if not in style) in some of the Oxyrhynchus Sayings. Our Lord's different procedure in revealing His Messiahship, as between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics, can largely be explained by the differing political conditions of Judæa and Galilee.

The relation of this Gospel to the Apocalypse is a vexed question. The earliest evidence for the apostolic authorship of the latter is also remarkably strong. In addition to the explicit statements of Justin and Irenæus (and we must remember that Justin was in Ephesus about 135), we have the evidence of the Anti-Marcionite Prologue to Luke's Gospel (c. A.D. 170), which ends : "And later John the Apostle, one of the Twelve, wrote the Apocalypse in the isle of Patmos and afterwards the Gospel." Professor C. F. Burney, in his *Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel* (1922), p. 149, points out that "if the Gospel is a translation from Aramaic, the criterion of Greek style as differentiating the two books at once falls to the ground. On the other hand if the Gospel was written in Aramaic prior to the author's arrival in Ephesus somewhat late in his life, and

he then adopted Greek owing to the exigencies of his new surroundings, such Greek as we find in the Apocalypse would not be surprising." I myself am inclined rather to regard the Greek of the Johannine Gospel and Epistles as John's own Greek, and to account for the curious Greek of the Apocalypse by its being a deliberately and excessively literal translation of an original Semitic writing. Just as Paul heard the Heavenly Voice address him in his mother tongue on the Damascus road, so the apocalyptic visions may well have been communicated to the Seer of Patmos in his native Aramaic, written down by him in that language and translated into Greek by another. An interesting examination of the language of the Apocalypse along this line will be found in Professor C. C. Torrey's *Documents of the Primitive Church* (1941).

The identity of authorship of the Gospel and Apocalypse has also been denied because of their divergence of viewpoint. This argument can be exaggerated. If one and the same English poet could be the author of two such apparently diverse portrayals of Christ as those of the hymns " Jesu, Lover of my soul " and " Lo ! He comes with clouds descending," the case against common authorship cannot be maintained by simply setting the mysticism of the Gospel against the apocalyptic of the Revelation—or, shall we say, the " realized eschatology " of the former against the " futurist eschatology " of the latter—as if the two could not exist together in one and the same mind.

But enough of this matter. Whatever our conclusion may be, Sir Frederic Kenyon has earned our gratitude by his convincing demonstration that the critical approach to the Scriptures, undertaken in the true scientific spirit, serves only to reveal more clearly the trustworthiness of the foundation records of our faith.

It gives me the utmost pleasure to express our sincere gratitude to Sir Frederic for his very valuable paper, and to propose that he be accorded a hearty vote of thanks.

The Rev. G. R. BEASLEY-MURRAY, B.D., asked for explanation of two difficulties: 1. The Synoptic Gospels appear to show that Jesus was reluctant to make known His Messiahship to the people at the beginning of His ministry; compare, *e.g.*, His silencing the demonic attestation to Himself, as also the charge to the disciples

after Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi not to reveal that He was the Christ. In the Fourth Gospel there appears to be no such reserve or gradualness of apprehension as to the fact of the Messiahship of Jesus. John the Baptist announces Him as the Lamb of God, the first disciples immediately recognise Him as the Christ, and the discourses centre largely around His person.

How are these two representations to be reconciled ?

2. The author accounts for the differences in the respective traditions (Synoptic and Johannine) of our Lord's teaching by postulating that the former gives the oral tradition of the teaching, while John gives his personal reminiscences. That which John has recorded, being more complex and intimate than that passed on by word of mouth, could in the nature of the case have hardly found a place in the oral tradition.

My difficulty is, that these conditions were precisely those which presumably caused the formation and circulation of the document "Q"; this contains the more profound and connected teaching of our Lord contained in Matthew and Luke, being too complex to form part of the oral tradition. It is nevertheless homogeneous with the rest of the Synoptic tradition, whereas the Johannine teaching is not. Moreover, it is thought by many that "Q" consists of the recollections of Christ's preaching set down by the apostle Matthew. If that were so, it is not legitimate to offset the personal recollections of John with the less intimate record of the Synoptists, as Sir Frederic does on page 121 ("The testimony of the Fourth Evangelist . . . is more direct than that of the three"). I am, therefore constrained to feel that the suggestion put forth by our esteemed author is not adequate to meet the facts. Would he kindly enlarge on his own views, so briefly set out in his address ?

I would add that these two difficulties which I raise are met with in almost every essay on the Fourth Gospel, usually to the detriment of its authority, yet a satisfactory solution of them is hardly to be met with. Westcott's contention, that the situations and persons addressed in the Synoptics are different from those of John's Gospel, is only partly true ; the discourse in John 6 is set in Galilee after the feeding of the Five Thousand, addressed to the common people, and is still "Johannine."

Wing Commander F. ANDERSON, said : In discussing the difference in style between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel, the lecturer states (page 121) that St. John gives us at first hand his own recollections of "that which we have heard, which we have seen with our own eyes, which we have looked upon and our hands have handled, of the Word of Life." I would suggest that he has here touched lightly upon what is in fact the strongest internal evidence for both the date of the Gospel and its authorship. John is writing of something that he has both heard and seen, and draws particular attention to this by repeating the statement in inverse Order. 1 J. 1, 1 "heard" "seen" verse 3 "seen" "heard. The writer of The Revelation uses the same expression, but in the opposite order : Rev. 21, 8 "saw" "heard," "heard" "seen."

This "parallelism" of expression provides the key to the structure of both books. The structure of the Revelation is as follows :— Introduction (1, 1). The Son of Man in the midst of seven lamp-stands (1, 8), followed by the letters to the seven churches (2, 1). The Lamb in the midst of the throne (4, 1) followed by the seven sealed book of judgment (6, 1). Conclusion (22, 10).

The same characteristics are found in the Fourth Gospel. It is found that it is constructed so as to show the Lord first as the light of the world, and then (from 11, 46) as the Lamb of God ; which is precisely the same theme as that of the Revelation. This similarity of design provides an adequate explanation of John's choice of incidents and discourses.

It is submitted, therefore, that the internal evidence confirms the lecturer's conclusions as to the date and authorship of the Fourth Gospel, but contradicts his view that "whoever wrote the Apocalypse, it was not the author of the Gospel."

Mr. G. J. E. ASKEW argued in favour of the common authorship of the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse.

Rev. A. W. PAYNE regretted the author's reference to 2 Peter. He thought similarities between the Johannine Epistles and the Apocalypse indicated common authorship.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

The Rev. Dr. CAWLEY wrote: In my judgment, this paper is of particular value, since it confirms the long-held contention of conservative scholars that the day would come when the apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel would be amply vindicated.

For the last few years we have noticed how scholars within this field have had to draw nearer the conservative position, convinced that any extreme presentation of its data had become out-moded. But no one ever dreamt that such a vindication of Johannine authorship was about to take place.

The trouble all along was that both conservative and extreme critics were working practically on internal evidence, with our subjective bias often clouding judgment. But now this scrap of papyrus must necessarily make all the difference, with the result that many other New Testament scholars will be as happily dogmatic as is the lecturer. Its value, therefore, is beyond all price, and will have wide repercussion throughout the whole field of Johannine criticism, with great effect upon other New Testament research work.

Furthermore, this paper comes in an hour when the authority of the Bible is being re-asserted in a remarkable degree. In face of all the fresh evidence before us at the present hour, it is not too much to say that the whole critical position is, as it were, in the melting pot, with no one able to say what the final issue will be. Certainly, on quite a number of great points, it is a good day for conservative scholarship, and a growingly serious one for extreme criticism.

It is fitting, therefore, that so outstanding a Christian and scholar as Sir Frederic Kenyon, is prepared to lay the latest findings on the Fourth Gospel before the Institute. It is difficult to express adequately our thanks for facts so cogently set before us, and for the lucidity of the entire argument. The cumulative effect of the paper leads one to feel that conservatives may await the future with sober confidence, a matter of profound gratitude, especially when we recall earlier years.

In conclusion, I would like to underscore the lecturer's *caveat* that in no wise ought we to be antagonistic to the application of critical methods to the interpretation of Scripture. Truth in the end prevails over every untenable theory. Our attitude, therefore, should be that whoever searches the Scriptures with a sincere mind is a friend, at least potentially, not an enemy.

Brig.-Gen. H. BIDDULPH, wrote : I should like to have Sir F. Kenyon's opinion on the following suggestions as to the divergent styles of language and grammar, exemplified in the Gospel and the Revelation.

The apostle John was a Galilean fisherman ; and as we know the Galilean spoke a very uncouth Aramaic. John's education must have been slight and his knowledge of grammatical Greek extremely scanty.

His gospel must have been dictated to a fairly literate amanuensis, who (as is customary in the East) would clothe the spoken word in his own language and in good grammatical style. When, however, we come to the exile on Patmos, we must envisage him as being deficient in every literary help and with no amanuensis. In order to record his vision he must perforce have recorded it in his own uncouth and illiterate Greek. Assuming all this to be approximately correct, difference in style and grammar would not necessarily mean diversity of authorship.

Major H. B. CLARKE, wrote : I should like to suggest that the difference in style may well be due to the difference in subject. Men who have received such a vision as the Apocalypse are hardly likely to write in the same manner as the Gospel and Epistles.

I would draw the lecturer's attention to one fact, that the three first chapters of the Apocalypse are directly addressed to the Seven Churches of Asia. In view of the tradition that St. John worked and died at Ephesus, one of the seven, I submit that no such work as the Apocalypse would have been received for a moment unless the author were recognised as an Apostle. Yet the book, as the lecturer admits, was recognised as canonical as early as the time of

Justin and Irenaeus. Naturally there were adversaries to this view, having regard to its contents.

As regards the point of his being described as "the Elder," I would refer to 1 Peter 5, 1, where the writer also describes himself as "an elder," and yet in chapter 1, verse 1, also expressly claims his apostleship.

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

I have little to add by way of comment on the discussion. Such difference of opinion as is indicated relates mainly to the authorship of the Apocalypse. I find it difficult to accept the explanation that the style of the Gospel and Epistles is that of an amanuensis. I cannot conceive a disciple venturing to transmute the Apostle's reminiscences into the highly individual style of the great discourses in chapters vi-viii, xiv-xvi. With regard to the argument from early attribution of the Apocalypse to the Apostle, it is significant that this evidence does not come from Asia Minor, but from the West; on this point I can only refer to my original paper.

But my main thesis was the confirmation of the traditional attribution of the Fourth Gospel to the Apostle John; and I am glad that the strength of the evidence for this seems to be generally appreciated.