

Docetism. But as to who the ἐκεῖνος was (or gave himself out to be) who made this report, we can only say that the guess of the author of the appendix (viz., John himself, author of the Gospel) is a very bad one, and that the story reappears in slightly different form in the spurious addition to Mt. xxvii. 49, while Rev. i. 7 employs the scripture fulfilment.

Much might be said of the already marked tendency (carried so much further in the period of the spurious gospels) away from the period illuminated by the Markan tradition into the unknown. The traditions connected with Bethany (c. xi.), with Cana and the unknown figure of Nathaniel (ii. 1-11, iv. 46-54, xxi. 2 (!)) present tempting fields for conjecture. Still more suggestive is the extraordinary phenomenon of chapter xiii., substituting a rite of foot-washing for the Lord's supper. In any other writer the suppression of this sacrament in favour of a lustration would certainly suggest the use of a Gnostic source characterised by repudiation of the memorial of the Lord's death and by a Christ coming "by water only, and not by water and by blood." So that there is some excuse even for the wild lucubrations of Kreyenbühl. In reality the attachment of the interpretation of this rite, vi. 51-58, to the narrative which commemorated the institution of the ἀγάπη (vi. 1-21) not only reflects the practice of the Church in making the sacrament follow upon the ἀγάπη, but in one sense agrees with historic tradition; for, as Lk. xxiv. 35 shows, the *special* symbolic sense attached by Jesus to the "breaking of bread" on the last supreme occasion was only an adaptation to that occasion of a practice which had been observed at least since the time of the great Galilean ἀγάπη.

But we must turn from such remoter problems of the history of this "Johannine" material to one of the gaps (if we may coin a term) which has an immediate bearing on the question of the traditional authorship.

Undeniably there is throughout the Gospel a curious "veiling" of the sons of Zebedee, particularly John, which has led advocates of the traditional authorship to talk of the

“modesty” of the author, ignoring the fact that this superficial suppression of the name is but a diaphanous veil for claims of pre-eminence, of priority in every title to religious authority over Peter in particular, which strike the follower of synoptic tradition as fairly astounding. This is a singular type of “modesty,” especially in a writer who, if anyway possible, should assure to his readers the historical trustworthiness of his report by saying, “I, John, am he that heard and saw these things.” In view of this, the most noteworthy of all the “gaps” is that implied in i. 40, 41, where we wait (but wait in vain) to hear of the call, anterior to Peter’s, of the first and “beloved disciple,” and to learn why he bears this remarkable title. The answer which I have to suggest is based upon the phenomena of the appendix, so much of which is occupied with a harmonistic balancing of the relative claims of Peter and John, and the rest with a restoration of the Galilean (Petrine) tradition, side by side with that of Jerusalem, regarding the resurrection. Adjustment is the motto of this editor. Suppose, then, that the source employed related the call of John in some such laudatory way as the spurious *Acts of John*, representing this Apostle by name as “the beloved” because specially chosen by Jesus for exceptionally intimate relations with himself. Suppose that the evangelist who used this “Johannine” source felt the same need of adjustment of this material in order to give it circulation at all in a Church fully committed to the primacy of Peter, which the writer of the appendix feels towards the work as he edits it, on the score of these conflicting claims of primacy. The result would be that the bolder and more outspoken declarations would be shorn away, leaving the underlying substance of the claims as they now appear. Conjecture is admittedly hazardous, but until some better explanation is offered of the *twofold* aspect of the case, both the making *and* the veiling of the claims, this must be accepted.

It is needless to add our protest against the Tübingen “holy-coat” miracle. The Fourth Gospel is not woven in one

piece. It would be incredible at so late a date. It is an old garment with many a patch of unfulled cloth. Only the elaborate embroidery by which the whole is overlaid makes it appear "seamless." We may never be able to separate or identify the materials, but that is not yet a reason for giving up the attempt. Fundamentally they are Palestinian.

And one factor of the long and doubtless complicated history is assured. The appendix represents an editorial hand surely distinguishable from that of the principal author, whom we have every reason to identify with the sublime "theologian" of the Epistles. Also the list of those who admit the evidence of transpositions grows longer and more formidable, and includes now even Blass, since Syr<sup>sin</sup> has cast its weight into the balance. Long ago Scholten conceded on linguistic grounds that ii. 13-22 contains an interpolation by the author of the appendix. We may now add that it is a doublet of vi. 30-35 interpreting the sign of the Son of man to be the resurrection after three days, in line with Mt. xii. 40; whereas Jn. vi. 30-35 follows Lk. xi. 30 in interpreting it as Christ himself. And if it be not interpolated from some other source, why is Jesus made to speak of God as "my Father" (ii. 16) without exciting offence, whereas in v. 17 the appellation evokes a charge of blasphemy? Both halves of ch. ii. are later appended narratives, drawn from unknown sources to supplement the self-manifestation of the Messiah in i. 35-51, but really serving, along with the transferred material of iii. 1-21, to separate it from its true sequel in iii. 22-30. A similar origin for what relates to Peter's denial in xiii. 36-38, xviii. 15-18, 25-27, unmistakably connected as it is with the appendix on the one side, and the displacements of ch. xiv. and xviii. 12-28 on the other, has been shown elsewhere. The revision seems to have aimed at adjustment to synoptic tradition, but it marks only the final stage of a process which was far from being a casting in one piece.

Our review of the indirect internal evidence of the X literature must come to a close, if not a conclusion. But however



much it may lack of cogency or definiteness on the affirmative side, it is hard to see how unbiassed minds can find in it any solid ground for the rough and ready judgment expressed by the final editor in his appendix (xxi. 24), and thenceforward canonised by tradition. We see, indeed, a desperate clinging to the traditional view, even after the admission is made that the author is using ideal conceptions rather than historical data. But that is only because there is so little appreciation of the religious value of the more critical view. Some nameless Elder-theologian of Ephesus seems a meagre substitute for the bosom Apostle, especially when the colours for his portrait are all borrowed from the literature in debate. In reality we have in the five writings of the Ephesian canon a literature which should be viewed as the exponent of the life of one great branch of the Church in its most critical period. Especially the X literature in its whole structure reveals to us the effort of Paulinism in the second generation after the great Apostle, and in the principal seat of his activity, partly to define itself over against the pseudo-Paulinism of the Docetic Gnostics, partly to find solid anchorage, like that of the mother church, in the historic life of Jesus, and the "new commandment which he gave unto us."

BENJ. W. BACON.

YALE UNIVERSITY.