

# NEW TESTAMENT STUDIES

AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL  
PUBLISHED QUARTERLY UNDER THE AUSPICES OF  
*STUDIORUM NOVI TESTAMENTI SOCIETAS*

EDITORIAL BOARD FOR 1961-62

THE PRESIDENT AND SECRETARY OF THE SOCIETY *ex officio*

PROF. DR G. BORNKAMM (*Heidelberg*)      PROF. H. J. CADBURY (*Haverford, Pa., U.S.A.*)  
PROF. DR G. FRIEDRICH (*Erlangen*)      REV. PROF. C. K. BARRETT (*Durham*)  
PROF. DR F. L. LEENHARDT (*Geneva*)      PROF. DR B. NOACK (*Birkerød, Denmark*)  
DOM J. DUPONT (*Bruges*)      REV. PROF. C. F. D. MOULE (*Cambridge*)  
PROF. DR G. SEVENSTER (*Leiden*)

CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD: REV. PROF. C. H. DODD (*Oxford*)

EDITOR AND SECRETARY OF THE BOARD

REV. PROF. M. BLACK (*St Andrews*)

---

---

VOL. 9

OCTOBER 1962

No. 1

---

---

EDITOR'S NOTE

page 1

PROFESSOR DR WALTER BAUER 1877-1960 (F. W. Gingrich)

1

ARTICLES

PROFESSOR F. W. GINGRICH (*Reading, Pa., U.S.A.*). The Contributions of Professor Walter Bauer to New Testament Lexicography

3

PROFESSOR DR W. SCHNEEMELCHER (*Bonn, Germany*). Walter Bauer als Kirchenhistoriker

11

PROFESSOR DR E. FASCHER (*Berlin-Adlershof, Germany*). Walter Bauer als Kommentator

23

SHORT STUDIES

DR G. W. S. FRIEDRICHSEN (*Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*). Notes on the Gothic Bible

39

REV. DR S. L. EDGAR (*Auckland, New Zealand*). Respect for Context in Quotations from the Old Testament

55

REV. W. STOTT (*Oxford*). The Conception of 'Offering' in the Epistle to the Hebrews

62

REV. PROFESSOR A. CABANISS (*Mississippi, U.S.A.*). Christmas Echoes at Paschaltide

67

REVIEW

W. F. ARNDT and F. W. GINGRICH, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (W. Barclay)

70

---

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Bentley House, 200 Euston Road, London, NW1 2DB

American Branch: 32 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022

PRICE £1.50 (U.S.A. \$4.50)

# OBITUARY

## JOSEPH NEWBOULD SANDERS

TREASURER OF S.N.T.S., SEPTEMBER 1954 TO DECEMBER 1961

When J. N. Sanders died at the age of forty-eight, the Society lost a devoted officer and scholar. His name appears on the list of members invited to the conference which was to have been the first General Meeting in September 1939. Thus he followed the fortunes of the Society almost from the beginning. During his seven years as Treasurer, the Society trebled in size and made considerable demands upon him, yet he fulfilled the duties of his office with care, efficiency and foresight. His extensive knowledge of scholars and scholarship, his wise and incisive judgement put the Committee constantly in his debt. At the Eighth General Meeting he read a paper, subsequently published in volume 1 of *New Testament Studies*, on 'Those whom Jesus loved (John xi. 5)'. Other volumes of the *Journal* contain articles and reviews from his pen; and the present special part prints a brief study, 'St John on Patmos', which he delivered at the closing session of the Sixteenth General Meeting. Those who were present to hear him recall that he spoke with his customary learning, wit and good humour. Any member who knew him would wish to echo what has been said elsewhere, that he was much respected and loved.

Sanders entered Peterhouse in 1932 with a major scholarship in Classics, and took First Class honours with distinction in the Classical Tripos 1935 and in the Theological Tripos 1937. He was awarded the Senior Scholefield Prize, the Crosse Studentship, and the Carus Greek Testament Prize. At Cambridge he was a pupil of P. Gardner-Smith (who aroused his interest in the problem of the origin of the Fourth Gospel) and of Sir Edwyn Hoskyns and Professor J. M. Creed; and in Germany of Professors R. Bultmann and F. Heiler. In 1939 he was awarded the Kaye Prize for an essay on *The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church—its Origin and Influence on Christian Theology up to Irenaeus* (Cambridge University Press, 1943). In 1938 he returned to Peterhouse as Bye-Fellow, and was ordained as Assistant Chaplain, in due course becoming Chaplain. From 1940 to 1941 he was priest-in-charge of the parish of Wilburton, near Cambridge; from 1941 to 1943 Assistant Master at Denstone College, Staffordshire; and from 1943 to 1946 Rector of Glaston with Bisbrooke, Rutland. In 1946 he became Rector of Rampton, Cambridge and held a research fellowship at Peterhouse. At this time he worked on the materials of his book on *The Foundations of the Christian Faith* (Black, 1950). In 1950 he was appointed a University lecturer in Divinity. In 1951 he became Domestic Bursar of his College, later Senior Bursar; and in 1953 Dean of Peterhouse with an official fellowship. He contributed essays to two symposia, *Studies in Ephesians* and *Studies in the Fourth Gospel* (Mowbray, 1956 and 1957 respectively). He provided a section on 'Textual Criticism of the Pauline Epistles' for Professor C. F. D. Moule's Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary on *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Colossians and to Philemon* (Cambridge University Press, 1957),



and another section on 'Textual Criticism of the Gospels' for C. E. B. Cranfield's commentary in the same series on *The Gospel according to Saint Mark* (Cambridge University Press, 1959). His most recent work is an article on 'The Literature and Canon of the New Testament' and the commentary on Galatians in *Peake's Commentary on the Bible* which Professor M. Black has recently edited (Nelson, 1962); an essay on 'The Meaning and Authority of the New Testament' in *Soundings—Essays Concerning Christian Understanding*, ed. A. R. Vidler (Cambridge University Press, 1962); and articles in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick (Abingdon Press, 1962). It was known that he had been working for some time at a commentary on the Fourth Gospel, and it is much to be hoped that some at least of his material is sufficiently far advanced to appear in print.

K. GRAYSTON

†J. N. SANDERS

## ST JOHN ON PATMOS

The purpose of this paper is to discuss some aspects of the—to me—perennially fascinating problem of the Johannine literature: in particular of the relationship of the Gospel, the Epistle and the Apocalypse; and to put forward some rather speculative views of my own—though they are not wholly original—which owe their origin to some ideas I have had about the John who on the island of Patmos saw the Apocalypse. Who was he, and why was he there? What, if anything, had he to do with the Gospel and the Epistle? In the course of some twenty-five years' study of the Johannine literature, desultory though it has inevitably been, I have gradually become convinced that the problem cannot be solved piecemeal, and that any theory designed to account for the Gospel must be applicable also to the Epistle and the Apocalypse, and vice versa. And I may as well lay my cards on the table, and state the view which I have been led to hold. It is that the Fourth Gospel shows clear traces of two minds at work upon it—an original author, the Beloved Disciple (whoever he was), who was responsible for the collection of the material, which, I believe, he assembled in a roughly chronological order, and an editor, who imposed upon the material a new, theological and dramatic, order, but made few additions to the Gospel. He was, I believe, John, the Seer of the Apocalypse, and also the presbyter who wrote the Epistle.

I turn then to the genesis of the whole theory, the question about John on Patmos. Rev. i. 9 f. 'I John, your brother and partner in the tribulation and the kingdom and the endurance in Jesus, found myself on the island called Patmos in consequence of the word of God and the witness of Jesus. I found myself in the Spirit on the Lord's day, and I heard behind me a great voice as of a trumpet saying "What thou seest write in a book, and send to the seven churches".'

The name Ἰωάννης occurs in three other places in Revelation (i. 1, 4; xxii. 8), but the only extra information to be got from these is small—in i. 1 τῷ δούλῳ αὐτοῦ (i.e. Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) Ἰωάννη, and from xxii. 9 'I am a fellow slave of thee and of thy brethren the prophets' we may infer that John called himself προφήτης: apart from this there is the precarious negative evidence that he does not claim to be an apostle. Neither does Paul in I and II Thessalonians and Philippians. Phil. i. 1 has only Παῦλος καὶ Τιμόθεος δούλοι Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ. This is the normal form. But it may be thought that one of the Twelve would hardly speak of the heavenly Jerusalem having on its foundations the names of the Apostles of the Lamb (Rev. xxi.

14). Rev. xviii. 20 also seems to suppose the Apostles to belong to the heavenly choir. The absence of 'apostle' incidentally virtually rules out the possibility that it is pseudonymous. If it were, the author could hardly have resisted the temptation to put in ἀπόστολος. Thus the Apocalypse is a unique specimen of its kind, hardly 'apocalyptic' in the narrow sense but rather prophecy.

John found himself (ἐγενόμην) in Patmos διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ not 'for the sake of', that is, in order to hear the word of God—and see the Apocalypse, or to preach it—which would have to be ἐνεκα (A.V., R.V. 'for' is ambiguous), but because, as a Christian prophet, he had been preaching it.

Patmos is a small island in the Aegean, some 40–50 miles south-west of Ephesus, volcanic in character. It was used, according to Pliny (*N.H.* iv, 23) as a place of exile, and so we must suppose that it was as a political exile, or rather as a victim of religious persecution, that John found himself there. With this the ancient tradition agrees—Tertullian (*de praem.* 36), Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius (*H.E.* iii, 18), and Jerome. Now there were various grades of punishment. A man could be made 'servus poenae' and condemned, for example, to work in the mines. No doubt the conditions of working as a slave in a Roman mine would be conducive to apocalyptic visions, but they would leave no leisure for writing them down at the time, or much prospect of survival to record them later. And in any case Patmos does not seem to have had any mines. It was, however, used for the less drastic punishments of 'deportatio' and 'relegatio'. The former involved loss of civil rights and forfeiture of property, while the latter involved only compulsory residence in a designated area, to leave which was a capital offence. Tertullian speaks of John as 'in insulam relegatus': he had been a lawyer, and may be assumed to use the term correctly. We have no means of judging the value of the tradition on which he relied, but it seems reasonable to accept its veracity. 'Relegatio' was a punishment reserved for 'honestiores', provincials as well as citizens, except when it was meted out to a whole class of persons, as, for example, in Claudius's expulsion of the Jews from Rome. Thus the poet Ovid was 'relegated' from Rome to Tomi on the Black Sea, and Herod Antipas to Lugdunum in Gaul—cf. Josephus, *Ant.* xviii, 252, αὐτὸν δὲ φυγῆ αἰδίῳ ἐζημίωσεν ἀποδείξας οἰκητήριον αὐτοῦ Λυγδούνον πόλιν τῆς Γαλλίας—Flavia Domitilla to Pontia (Eusebius, *H.E.* iii, 18). The point of 'relegatio' was to remove a person far from his old associations and so keep him out of mischief.

From this, three pieces of evidence may be inferred about John and his exile in Patmos: (1) the scene of the crime for which he was expelled can hardly have been as close to Patmos as Ephesus—Jerusalem, Alexandria or Rome (so Tertullian) are possible, but he probably never set foot in Ephesus until his release from Patmos; (2) John was 'honestior', a member at least of

the Jewish aristocracy—which presumably means a Sadducee; (3) if his offence was preaching the Gospel, he must have suffered banishment before there was any precedent clearly established for making the preaching of Christianity a capital offence. As St Paul was presumably executed in the early sixties on the charges brought against him in Acts xxiv. 5 as ἄνδρα... λοιμὸν καὶ κινουῦντα στάσεις πᾶσιν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τοῖς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην πρωτοστάτην τε τῆς τῶν Ναζωραίων αἰρέσεως. John may even have been sentenced *before* Paul's execution—certainly before the Neronian persecution.

He is said by Eusebius to have returned from exile after the death of Domitian (A.D. 96) (*H.E.* III, 23), and thus may have lived in exile over thirty years. He chose to go to Ephesus upon his release as being the nearest centre of Christian life. Any connexions he may once have had with his home would have been severed in the interval—particularly if it had been from Judaea that he originally came. According to Irenaeus (*adv. H.*, ed. Harvey, I, 331) παρέμεινε... μέχρι τῶν Τραϊανοῦ χρόνων, that is, until A.D. 98–117. If then he was one of the Twelve, he must have lived to a great age, and exceeded the 86 years of Polycarp his disciple. But the inferences drawn from his being exiled may tell against his having been an apostle in the narrow sense. They were the kind of men who got crucified—*humiliores*.

Now if his exile lasted over thirty years, he could well have seen his visions and written the Apocalypse at any period during it, or at intervals. Thus there is no necessity to force the internal evidence of the Apocalypse to fit any particular epoch, and one can interpret naturally pieces of evidence that point to different dates, and still hold that the Apocalypse contains nothing but visions seen during John's exile on Patmos. A clear case in point is Rev. xvii. 9–11. 'The seven heads are seven hills, on which the woman sits, and are seven kings: the five have fallen, the one is, the other has not yet come, and when he comes he must stay a short time. And the beast which was and is not, he also is an eighth, and is one of the seven, and goes to destruction.' Rome and its emperors are here clearly meant. The five are Augustus, Tiberius, Gaius, Claudius, and Nero. The sixth, emperor at the time when these words were written, must be Galba. There is no reason in the text itself to ignore the three emperors Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, and pass on at once to Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian, as must be done by commentators who feel obliged to give Revelation a date in the reign of Domitian. The author of Revelation accepts the belief, current immediately after Nero's death, that the world had not seen the last of that fantastic figure, the last member of the Julio-Claudian line which had ruled the Empire since its inception, and a man whose showmanship had caused a tremendous impression, particularly in the East, while his savage persecutions of the Christians had equally impressed the Church as demonic in its inspiration. It was officially reported that Nero had committed suicide, and had been succeeded by the elderly Galba. But the ancient world was quite as sceptical about official communi-

qués as is the modern. The belief that Nero would return was most likely to have grown up as soon as his death was reported. Evidence for the early belief that Nero would return is given by Tacitus (*Histories*, II, 8, 9) who says that early in 69 A.D. a pseudo-Nero raised an insurrection in Asia and set sail for Rome. The author of Revelation fixes the number of emperors at seven, the perfect number. He is in any event convinced that the time before the end is short. Galba was an old man, who could not be expected to last long. He must have a successor, who will bring the line to an end, and after him comes Nero *redivivus*, the eighth who is also one of the seven. This dates this vision at least to the period mid-summer 68 to spring 69, the times when the deaths of Nero and of his successor would be known in Asia.

The letters to the seven churches also seem to require a fairly early date. Persecution was threatened, but nothing much beyond the usual hazards of the early Christian Church actually seems to have happened. The only martyrdom mentioned is that of Antipas at Pergamum (Rev. ii. 13). The souls of the martyrs mentioned later (Rev. vi. 9) need not be Asian martyrs. The church of Rome had provided martyrs enough, and, if John expected the return of their persecuted Nero, he might well expect what had so far only happened in the capital would in the near future engulf the Church throughout the Empire. The Apocalypse as it stands may well be a compilation of the Seer's prophecy and from widely differing dates from Nero to Domitian, made like the books of the Old Testament Prophets, by his disciples, and like the Old Testament books liable to interpolation. One Seer was not the only prophet in Asia Minor.

It may be objected that the mere fact of the existence of the letters to the Seven Churches implies that their writer had previously lived and worked in Asia Minor. But the early church kept its members throughout the Empire well informed of news (cf. the news of Timothy's release, Acts xiii. 23), and it is not rash to suppose that the churches of Asia were informed of John's arrival in Patmos, and got in touch with him, with that solicitude for sufferers for their faith which Lucian noted as a characteristic of Christians. Thus he could well have learnt of the state of the churches in Asia, and have acquired all the information about them which his letters presuppose. Moreover, the church of Ephesus may have had a particular interest in John, if, as I shall suggest later, he was a former companion of their founder, St Paul.

Who then was this John? The tradition which ascribed to him not only Revelation but the Gospel and Epistle as well, asserted that he was John bar-Zebedee. Modern scholars are, however, generally reluctant to admit the truth of this, and those who ascribe the Gospel and Epistle to John bar-Zebedee appeal to the differences of style between the Gospel and Revelation, which Dionysius of Alexandria had already noted (Eusebius, *H.E.* VII, 25) as evidence that they cannot be by the same hand, and ascribe Revelation

to a Jewish-Christian prophet, perhaps the Elder John to whom Dionysius and Eusebius wanted to ascribe it. This could be supported by the internal evidence of Revelation, which I have already noted as making it seem unlikely that it was written by an apostle. But Revelation was in fact attributed to the apostle John before any orthodox writer had attributed the Fourth Gospel to him—Justin Martyr, who had lived in Ephesus *c.* 135 A.D. before he went to Rome, says that it was written by one of the apostles of Christ: *Dial.* LXXXI, 15: ἄνθρωπος τις, ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰωάννης, εἰς τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ Χριστοῦ. If external evidence is to be rejected in this instance, one wonders what the value may be in the case of the Fourth Gospel. But it is doubtful if Justin meant by 'apostle' one of the Twelve exclusively. And so I turn to an examination of the information we have about the John or Johns who lived in Ephesus and wrote one or other or all of the Gospel, Epistle and Revelation, in the conviction that the problems of the authorship of the Johannine writings cannot be solved piecemeal. But first it is necessary to examine the internal evidence of the Gospel and Epistle and their authorship, and the literary relationship between the Gospel, Epistle and Revelation.

I John is anonymous, but II and III are the work of a man who calls himself 'the elder' (ὁ πρεσβύτερος). He could, therefore, be the John of Revelation—or even John the Apostle, for I Pet. v. i records Peter as addressing the elders as their fellow-elder (συμπρεσβύτερος). But the fact that his authority was clearly questioned may tell against his having been one of the Twelve. But the authorship of the Epistle depends on that of the Gospel.

As for the Fourth Gospel, there is nothing in it which absolutely prevents the identification of its author with John bar-Zebedee. In John xxi. 24 the Fourth Gospel is ascribed to the disciple whom Jesus loved, and it is in this chapter only (xxi. 2) that the sons of Zebedee are mentioned, along with Peter, Thomas, Nathanael, and two other unnamed disciples. The Beloved Disciple is first mentioned in xii. 23–5, at the Last Supper, and again by the Cross, xix. 25 ff.: he was thus the witness who saw the blood and water come from Jesus' side (xix. 35). This is emphasized by the fact that the same words 'his witness is true' are used both in xix. 35 and xxi. 24. It seems most likely from xxi. 23, 'This saying went out to the brethren, that that disciple was not going to die', that the disciple *had in fact died* when these words were written. Thus he cannot himself have written xxi. 24.

From his association with Peter in xiii and xxi it is natural to infer that he is the other disciple also associated with Peter in xviii. 15 f. and in xx. 2 ff. But in xii. 23; xix. 26; xxi. 20 the verb used is ἀγαπάω and in xviii. 15 and xx. 2 φιλέω. Unless these verbs are used simply as synonyms—which I think unlikely—one may have to distinguish the other disciple of xviii. 15 and xx. 2 from the disciple whom Jesus loved.

The Beloved Disciple, whether or not he is the same as the other disciple, could be any one of the seven mentioned in xxi. 1, 2, but the choice is in fact

restricted to John bar-Zebedee or one of the unnamed disciples. The tradition fixed on John bar-Zebedee, and, as I have said, there is nothing in the rest of the Fourth Gospel to prevent this attribution. But it does involve certain difficulties.

Thus would a Galilean fisherman, even a wealthy one, perhaps with trading interests in Jerusalem—purveyor of fish by appointment to the High Priestly palace?—be 'known' to the High Priest? He could have been if, as Professor Riesenfeld suggests, John bar-Zebedee was of a priestly family which ran a fishing fleet in Galilee during the periods when they were not in residence in Jerusalem. Or if the Beloved Disciple is not the same as the 'other disciple'.

But this is not the only difficulty. The Beloved Disciple was by the Cross, yet Mark xiv. 50 shows that the Twelve forsook Jesus and fled. Then again the Fourth Gospel mentions none of the Synoptic incidents in which John bar-Zebedee figured. This would not be difficult if the Fourth Gospel were meant as a supplement to the Synoptic Gospels. But it contradicts them too often to suggest that it was a supplementary rather than an alternative Gospel. Again, the Beloved Disciple was next to Jesus at the Last Supper. Would Jesus have done this in view of the request of the sons of Zebedee to sit at his right and left in his kingdom? Again, in the Fourth Gospel Jesus entrusts his mother to the care of the Beloved Disciple. Would he have done this if the Beloved Disciple were one of those whom he had called to abandon their families—and John bar-Zebedee's mother was still alive? Finally, the standpoint of the Fourth Gospel is Judaeian rather than Galilean: it is Judaea which is Jesus' own country (John iv. 44), and in and around Jerusalem that most of the events related in the Fourth Gospel occurred.

None of these difficulties may be insuperable, and even taken together they would not absolutely rule out John bar-Zebedee, if the important conditions are fulfilled—(1) that nothing in the Fourth Gospel points to a different identity for the Beloved Disciple, and (2) that the external evidence is clear and unanimous.

(1) John xi. 5 'Jesus loved (ἠγάπα) Martha and her sister and Lazarus' is, I believe, with many other scholars, a clear indication of the identity of the Beloved Disciple. He was Lazarus, and, having once died and been raised from the dead by Jesus, it might well have been believed that he would survive until the Second Coming. But this cross-bench opinion neither commends itself to the traditionalists, to whom the Johannine authorship is a kind of ark of the covenant—to be handled with care and not looked into—nor to the liberals, who doubt whether Lazarus in fact rose from the dead. But one free both of traditional and liberal prejudices can, I hope, see that Lazarus as the Beloved Disciple avoids all the difficulties which beset the Johannine hypothesis. With Lazarus as the Beloved Disciple the hypothesis of a distinction between Beloved Disciple and 'other disciple' loses much of

the attractiveness it may otherwise have. Yet it may nevertheless still be correct.

(2) Ignatius' letters, written shortly before his martyrdom, which took place not later than A.D. 110, contain many resemblances in thought and language to the Fourth Gospel, which make it highly probable that Ignatius knew and read the Gospel. Yet when he writes to the Ephesians he makes no mention of John, though he refers to Paul and to the bishop of Ephesus, Onesimus. But perhaps he was so preoccupied with the prospect of martyrdom that he passed over John in silence. The most that we can infer from him is that the Fourth Gospel, or some form of it, was current in Antioch early enough to have influenced Ignatius' thought and language.

We can, however, learn much from Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, and Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna; Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons from about 178, says of Polycarp that 'not only was he instructed by apostles, and associated with many who had seen the Christ, but also was appointed by apostles in Asia bishop in the church in Smyrna', and that he himself had seen Polycarp when he was very young and Polycarp very old (*adv. H.*, ed. Harvey, II, 12). Polycarp died a martyr about 156, aged 86. He was thus born about 70, and could well have met John. Irenaeus, in a letter to an old friend Florinus who had fallen into heresy (*H.E.* v, 20), also mentions John as one of those who had seen the Christ and whom Polycarp had known. He also says that Papias was a hearer of John and a companion of Polycarp, though Eusebius, when quoting this statement (*H.E.* III, 39), adds that Papias' own words show that he had not himself seen or heard the apostles, but had received the faith from those who had done so. In support of this Eusebius quotes Papias' own words. 'If by chance anyone came who had been a follower of the elders, I asked him the words of the elders: what Andrew or what Peter said, or what Philip, or what Thomas or James: or what John or Matthew or any other of the Lord's disciples; and the things which Aristion and the elder John, the Lord's disciples, say.' These, incidentally, show that Papias knew the Fourth Gospel, for the order of the names Andrew, Peter, Philip is that in which they occur in John i. 40-3.

Eusebius himself concluded from this passage that the inclusion of the name John twice, once in the list of apostles and again with the epithet 'elder' and in association with Aristion, supported the view of Dionysius of Alexandria that there had been two men named John in Asia. Eusebius, of course, wanted to find an author for the Apocalypse who was not an apostle, but it does not follow that he misrepresented Papias' meaning. For the natural sense of Papias' words is that there were two Johns, though Papias does not say they were both in Asia. The first is in a list of names, all of which are apparently those of Apostles, and they are referred to in the past tense, while the elder John is mentioned along with Aristion and in the present tense. This suggests that the former were dead, and the latter still

alive, at the time to which Papias was referring. But it does not prove that Papias himself knew the elder.

Eusebius also says that Papias knew I John, and that Polycarp knew it is suggested by the parallels to it which occur in his Epistle. From this it would seem that the John who was contemporary with Papias was the elder who wrote the Epistles.

Papias indeed is said to have been John's amanuensis by the 'Anti-Marcionite' Prologue to the Fourth Gospel (published by de Bruyne, *Revue Bénédictine*, 1928). This was accepted by Harnack as a translation of a Greek original of the latter part of the second century. 'The Gospel of John was revealed to the churches by John while he was still in the body, as Papias of Hierapolis, John's dear disciple, recorded in his five books (the text is here corrupt). He wrote down the Gospel correctly at John's dictation.' The motive for this is obviously apologetic, to defend the Fourth Gospel against attacks by Marcionites, as the sequel suggests. For the Prologue continues: 'But the heretic Marcion, having been rebuked by him for his contrary opinions, was rejected by John.'

As Irenaeus' story of Polycarp's rebuke of Marcion as the firstborn of Satan shows, Marcion had been in contact with John's disciples, presumably at Ephesus, but can hardly have met John himself. Nevertheless, Eisler suggests that in the original Greek *Marcion* was the amanuensis, and introduced ideas of his own in the Gospel, and was rejected by John for this. This he thinks explains why Marcion had to fall back on an emended Luke for this Gospel, and why orthodox Christians at the end of the second century were attacking both the Gospel and Revelation as heretical. But it does not explain why they attributed them to *Cerinthus*. In fact, Eisler is being much too ingenious. The most that one can derive from this Prologue is that the Fourth Gospel was published during John's lifetime and that Papias was believed to have been associated with him.

Papias is also quoted as the authority for the early martyrdom of John by Philip of Side (fifth century) and George the Sinner (ninth), but this is so dubious that nothing can safely be built on it.

For the final assessment of the value of Papias and Polycarp one must wait to consider Irenaeus.

Contemporary with Papias and Polycarp was Valentinus. The recently published 'Gospel of Truth', if it is his work, shows that he was familiar with the Fourth Gospel, which was current in Egypt at this time, as the Rylands Papyrus (P<sup>52</sup>) shows. The Valentinians certainly knew the Fourth Gospel—Heracleon wrote a commentary on it, Irenaeus preserves Ptolemaeus' exposition of the Prologue, and Clement of Alexandria fragments of Theodotus. Ptolemaeus ascribed it to 'John' and so probably did Heracleon since Origen nowhere says that he did not. It is the Valentinian use of the Fourth Gospel which explains the hostility to it of the Alogi. Now by 'John' the

Valentinians probably meant the apostle, and if so this is the first time this identification was made. The Leucian Acts of John about A.D. 150 identify the Beloved Disciple with John bar-Zebedee, but deny that he wrote a Gospel. These Acts use the Gospel, however, and their denial that John wrote it is simply a heretical attempt to discredit a work which was fatal to their Docetism.

Later in the century Tatian quotes the Fourth Gospel as scripture, without naming its author, and about 180 Theophilus of Antioch quoted it and ascribed it to John, one of the πνευματοφόροι.

This brings us to Irenaeus who describes the origin of the Fourth Gospel as follows: 'Then (i.e. after the Synoptic Gospels) John himself, the disciple of the Lord, who also had leaned against his heart, also published the Gospel when he was living at Ephesus in Asia.' This information he presumably derived from Asia, where he had lived in his early years, from the writings of Papias or from Polycarp, whom he had heard. But Irenaeus does not tell us who was the authority for his identification of the Beloved Disciple as John, which was, I think, his own guess; but even so he never actually says that the Beloved Disciple was John bar-Zebedee. Indeed in one passage in which he is clearly referring to John bar-Zebedee he does not say he was the Beloved Disciple, though it would have strengthened his case to do so. This is when, alluding to Gal. ii. 9, he reads the names of the apostles in the order Peter, James and John as do <sup>46</sup> D G lat it, Marcion, Tertullian and other Latin Fathers, and calls them 'the apostles whom the Lord made witnesses of his whole ministry and his whole teaching'. He is arguing against Marcion's attempt to set Paul against the other apostles. Thus it is not even certain that Irenaeus thought John was the son of Zebedee, and there is no evidence whatever that Papias or Polycarp did. The only John in Ephesus for whom there is any early evidence is the Elder. He is only a shadowy figure because his substance has been transferred to John bar-Zebedee, about whose life after the New Testament period there is no evidence at all.

Another account of the origin of the Fourth Gospel is given by the Muratorian Canon. 'The fourth of the Gospels is by John, one of the disciples. When his fellow-disciples and bishops exhorted him to write it, he said "Fast with me today for three days, and whatever is revealed to any of us, let us tell it to one another". In the same night it was revealed to Andrew, one of the apostles, that, with the approval of them all, John should write down everything in his own name.'

John is only called a disciple, Andrew an apostle. This reads like an attempt to give apostolic authority to a work known not to be of strictly apostolic authorship interpreting John xxi. 24 'We know that his witness is true' as a kind of *imprimatur*.

Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus at the very end of the second century, has some curious information about John of Ephesus. In a letter to Pope Victor

defending the Asian method of keeping Easter, he quotes as authorities for the Asian use first 'Philip, one of the twelve Apostles, who sleeps in Hierapolis, and his two daughters, aged virgins, and his other daughter who lived in the Holy Spirit and not in Ephesus'. Only then does he add 'John, who leaned against the Lord's heart, who had been a priest wearing the *petalon* (that is, the gold plate worn on the High Priest's turban), both martyr and teacher'. This seems to show that he did not regard John as one of the twelve. And even if he did, his evidence for John is no more reliable than it is for Philip, whom a reference to Acts xxi. 8 f., identifies at once as the deacon, not the apostle, unless both had families of virgin prophetesses.

John's titles to consideration are that he was the Beloved Disciple, and, if Polycrates means what he says, had once been High Priest. Again, Eisler has a suggestion: he was the John of Acts iv. 6, High Priest from A.D. 37-41. However sceptical one may be about this—we should remember that Acts vi. 7 claims that many priests became Christians—Polycrates' evidence increases the probability that John of Ephesus was a real person distinct from John bar-Zebedee. It was the local patriotism of Ephesus that elevated Philip, and eventually John, to the apostolate.

Thus there is no clear continuous and unanimous tradition as is necessary to establish that the Beloved Disciple was John bar-Zebedee. Instead, it probably began as a heretical opinion, accepted in Asia as flattering to local pride, and by the Church at large to set the seal of apostolic authorship on the book which Irenaeus had made the touchstone of orthodoxy.

There was, however, at Ephesus at the end of the first century a former disciple called John, known to Papias and Polycarp, who, according to the Anti-Marcionite Prologue, the Muratorian Canon, and Irenaeus, published the Fourth Gospel in his lifetime. He cannot have been the Beloved Disciple, for he was clearly dead when the Fourth Gospel was published. I suggest that he was the exile from Patmos.

What then of the linguistic difficulties in attributing the Gospel, the Epistle and Revelation to the same person? These can, I think, be met by supposing that John obeyed the angel and wrote down the Apocalypse himself in his own idiosyncratic Greek, whereas he followed the usual practice of dictating to a scribe when he wrote his Gospel at Ephesus, leaving to the scribe (as Peter is supposed to have done to Silvanus) the final form of the work. As the basis for the Gospel he used, I believe, the work of Lazarus, written possibly in Aramaic, which he either already possessed when he went into exile, or subsequently acquired. It may indeed have already had a restricted currency, for instance, in Antioch. If the suggestion is that the Beloved Disciple and the 'other disciple' are different persons, he may have been the 'other disciple' known to the High Priest, perhaps of high-priestly descent himself.

That the Fourth Gospel is the deliberate rearrangement in a formal

pattern of a previously existing work seems to me the best explanation of the curious roughness of the narrative at certain points, which has evoked many theories of the dislocation of the text. The present order of the Gospel is clearly intentional, but seems to be superimposed upon an earlier order.

Finally, let me go even further into speculation, and suggest that this John is none other than John Mark of Jerusalem, the relation of the Levite Barnabas, the companion of Paul and later of Peter, exiled from Rome perhaps between the death of Paul and the outbreak of Neronian persecutions, or from Jerusalem during the years that led up to the rebellion. There is nothing in the ascription to him of the Second Gospel to prevent this. Mark may be Peter's Gospel, but it was written by a man who did not know Palestine himself, and used sources other than Peter, one perhaps Lazarus' own Gospel. There is nothing in his books to exclude this—and much consistent with it—though equally there is no positive evidence for it. I hope, however, you have found some interest in this attempt to account for the existence of the Johannine literature, and may look with favour on my substantial hypothesis, that John of Ephesus, the seer and exile of Patmos, was a Sadducean aristocrat, a Jerusalem disciple of Jesus, the last survivor of the eye-witnesses of the incarnate Logos, but not the son of Zebedee, and that he wrote down in his own hand the visions he had seen as he received them, and in response to requests dictated a new version, perhaps a translation or rearrangement, of an earlier Gospel by another eye-witness, a man he must have known and trusted.