

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 *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE V.

ON SOME TEXTUAL QUESTIONS IN THE GOSPEL
OF JOHN.

BY HENRY HAYMAN, D.D., EX-HEAD-MASTER OF RUGBY SCHOOL.

AMONG the peculiar features of John's Gospel, the extent to which several of the larger members of the narrative hang loosely on the thread of continuity claims more consideration than it has yet received; while the famous *pericope de adultera*, or narrative of the woman taken in adultery, both as regards genuineness, and position if genuine, stands on ground apart from the rest of the Gospel. This last, as having an independent interest, and as involving simpler issues, shall here be considered first.

This *pericope* is probably referred to by Eusebius at the end of the third book of his Ecclesiastical History, where he says of Papias, the well-known collector of apostolic tradition unrecorded elsewhere, that he *ἐκτέθειται δὲ καὶ ἄλλην ἱστορίαν περὶ γυναικὸς ἐπὶ πολλαῖς ἁμαρτίαις διαβληθείσης ἐπὶ τοῦ Κυρίου, ἣν τὸ κατ' Ἑβραίους εὐαγγέλιον περιέχει*, "has set forth too another account of a woman accused of many sins to our Lord, which the Gospel according to the Hebrews contains." Here "many sins" might of course be many repetitions of the same sinful act. The narrative in John viii. is not inconsistent with this, although only the act in which she was taken is there specified. The Lord's words to her, "Go, and sin no more," are equally consistent with a single act or with repeated acts. Still, in that narrative she is not accused of many sinful acts, but specifically of one. This, therefore, must be allowed to be a discrepancy, although not an inconsistency. It is somewhat similar to the discrepancy of two demoniacs or one (Matt. viii. 28; Mark v. 2); and of two blind men or one (Matt. xx. 30; Mark

x. 46). But Eusebius goes on to say that the narrative is contained in the Gospel according to the Hebrews. It is possible that the Gospel according to the Hebrews may have contained the narrative as we have it in John viii., and that the feature of difference, ἐπὶ πολλαῖς ἁμαρτίαις, may be due to Papias himself — having been received by him from oral tradition, of which he professed to be a diligent collector, through the most authentic channels. Indeed, the remarks which Eusebius makes upon Papias would prepare us to find the latter diverging from the current Gospel standards, even where the main facts might be those of the accepted evangelistic narrative; compare especially Euseb. H.E. 136, 36 sq. “It seems right,” says Eusebius there, “to conjoin with the utterances put forth by Papias other statements of his, among which he narrates several other startling (παράδοξα) things,” as well as one which the historian specially proceeds to notice; and also *ibid.* 137, 12, “Other things, too, he delivers which came to him from unwritten tradition, and specially some parables and teachings of our Saviour unheard of elsewhere (ξένας).” Thus Papias might easily have found in the Gospel according to the Hebrews a narrative corresponding exactly with that in John viii., and have introduced this new feature, derived perhaps from some such source as “the daughters of Philip the apostle” (*ibid.* 136, 40). Indeed, from the way in which Eusebius introduces the subject, — ἐπέθειται δὲ καὶ ἄλλην ἱστορίαν, — it seems most likely that he intends to mark some difference in the ἱστορία as given by Papias from the received one; which latter was to be found in the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Now, the *pericope* as we have it, as will further appear, contains among the many diversities of its text, or rather texts, some which seem plainly due to various translations from a common original. This, of course, might be the Gospel according to the Hebrews. There are others, however, which are so bold and conflicting in their substitutions and omissions or insertions as to suggest archetypal diversity; and these may most easily be accounted for by supposing that some of the Greek

texts of the *pericope* which became current were founded on Papias or the school which he represented, others on the Gospel according to the Hebrews in the various translations which it underwent.

It may be added that the language of Eusebius goes far to prove that he did not know of the narrative as forming part of the text of our fourth Gospel, or he would certainly have referred to that Gospel, rather than to that according to the Hebrews, as containing it. This is confirmed by the fact that none of our four greater uncials, α , A, B, C, contain it anywhere; and that of those MSS. which contain it about a dozen relegate it to the end of John, while four place it at the end of Luke xxi.

It is remarkable for its equal lack of contextual connection with what precedes and with what follows it, and seems as unlike John's usual style as it is unconnected with the rest of his narrative. The chief features of its conflicts of style with that of John will be found noted in Dean Alford's commentary, who, however, proceeds to ask: "If it was not originally found in the text [of John], why should this place of all others have been selected for its insertion? It has no connection with the context,—belongs, apparently, to another portion of our Lord's ministry,—what could induce the interpolators to place it here? Nor are we helped much by its variations of position in some MSS. The end of Luke xxi. seems most to approve itself as the fitting place; but if it was the original one, it is totally inexplicable that we should find no trace of the fact there, except in four of the (best) cursive MSS. Its occurrence here, then, seems to me much in its favor. After all, the most weighty argument against the passage is found in its entire diversity from the style of narrative of our Evangelist. It is not merely that many words and idioms occur which John never uses, but that the whole cast and character of the passage is alien from his manner, in whichever of the existing texts we read it." This last fact seems to me undeniable and unanswerable. The styles are as distinct as those of Raphael and

Michel Angelo in painting. The passage cannot have been written by John, unless all the laws which govern human speech as a vehicle of thought, alike in the New Testament and out of it, are suspended to make way for it. I will endeavor, however, to answer some of the questions which Dean Alford asks.

Having, on its own intrinsic merits, and through the authority of the Gospel according to the Hebrews and Papias, — as well as probably on other more general authority, — obtained currency in the church, and four Gospels only being recognized in her Bible, a place had to be found for it in some one of the four. Why should it preferentially be assigned to John? I believe that the more highly episodic character of the fourth Gospel was a primary general reason; to which add the probability, which I shall presently show, that several of these episodes, although unquestionably genuine, were originally distinct and detached — the first draft of the Gospel having been completed without them. A more special reason is to be found in the phrase already referred to, *πορεύου καὶ μηκέτι ἀμάρτανε* (viii. 11); the two last of which words occur also as our Lord's (v. 14). This would probably be sufficient, to superficial critics, for determining the affinity of the whole passage; the rather so, that in this place the phrase concludes and sums up the ethical teaching of the *pericope*, and is that which gives its character to the entire incident. But "why should this place," the dean asks, "of all others, have been selected for its insertion?" The answer is, that this is precisely the place where the episodic character comes out most fully of all places in the whole Gospel; indeed, where the lack of obvious links of mutual cohesion seems not improbably to have led to the displacing of some important passages from their true order. I shall further show that the entire portion from chap. iv. to chap. vii. inclusively, and perhaps even further, bears some marks of having been a series of detached *addenda* by the original writer, deranged in the process of incorporation; and that the real order is iv., vi., v., vii. There was, in fact, a loose

joint just here in the structure of the narrative, and to it the *pericope* in question found its way by a sort of attraction. Of course, the position at the end of the Gospel was the natural resource of those who, regarding it as Johannine, were wholly at a loss where to insert it. But here, again, the fact is remarkable that the end itself is now formed by just such another addition or extension of the narrative. Dean Alford remarks *ad locum* that chap. xxi. "is evidently an *appendix* to the Gospel, which latter has already been concluded, by a formal review of its contents and object, at **xx. 30, 31.**"

Thus there were just two places, and only two, in the whole Gospel, where convenient points of attachment for floating *addenda* might be found; and we see they were fastened upon, although in highly unequal proportions, by all the ancient editors or copyists who attach the *pericope* in question to John. The insertion in Luke after chap. xxi. was due to a higher critical discernment ruling against the force of habit and the weight of traditional authority, and, as might have been expected, found but little acceptance. Only a few saw the affinity of its style to that of the synoptic Gospels, and of its period with the last stage of the Lord's ministry. Thus, I think, the questions raised by Dean Alford will be answered when I have made good my argument with regard to chap. iv., vi., v., and vii. Before doing this, however, I wish to adduce the evidence which points to diversity of archetypes in the *pericope* (vii. 53-viii. 11), and to the fact that one of them exerted its influence on the text through the *media* of various translations. I will take, first, the variants which seem to me to show the fact of diverse translators' hands at work. I follow in this Tischendorf's (last edition) register, in which the Latin words sometimes represent Syriac, etc., versions, sometimes stand for the text of the Vulgate or *vetus Ital.*

The *pericope* begins at vii. 53, in which verse we have, ἐπορεύθησαν, ἀπήλθον or ἀπήλθεν; τὸν οἶκον, τὸν τόπον, τὰ ἴδια; viii. 1, Ἰησοῦς δὲ, καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς δὲ, καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς;

ἐπορεύετο, *ascendit*; 2, ὄρθρου δὲ πάλιν, καὶ ὅτε πάλιν, N.B. some add *βαθέως* or *βαθέος* to ὄρθρου; *παραγίνεται, παρεγένετο, ἦλθεν*; ὁ λαός, ὁ ὄχλος; 3, ἄγουσι, φέρουσι, *προσήνεγκαν*; ἐν, ἐπὶ; ἀμαρτία, μοιχεία, *stultitia*, N.B. *γυναίκα* transposed by some to follow this word; *εὐλημμένην, καταληφθεῖσαν, καταλημμένην*; 4, λέγουσιν, εἰπὸν; 5, ἐκέλευσεν, ἔγραψεν, *ἐνετείλατο*, N.B. some transpose verb and subject; *λιθοβολεῖσθαι, λιθάζεσθαι, λιθάζειν, lapidare, lapidari, ut lapidetur*; σὺ οὖν, σὺ δὲ νῦν; ἔχωσι, σχώσι, εὐρωσι; *κατηγορεῖν, κατηγορήσαι, κατηγορίαν κατ'*; κάτω κύψας, κάτω κεκυφώς, κάτω νεύσας, *κατακύψας, κύψας* or *κύμψας* without κάτω, *inclinans se deorsum, inclinatus capite*; ἔγραφεν, ἔγραψεν, *κατέγραφεν, κατατέγραφεν*; 7, ἀνακύψας, ἀναβλέψας, ἀνεκύψεν καὶ, *erigens caput, caput elevans, erexit se et, elevavit caput et*; πρὸς αὐτούς, αὐτοῖς; τὸν λίθον, λίθον; ἐπ' αὐτῆς, ἐπ' αὐτήν, N. B. order of words here also varies; 8, ἔγραφεν, ἔγραψεν, *κατέγραφεν*; εἰς, ἐπί; 9, ὑπὸ τῆς συνειδήσεως ἐλεγχόμενοι, *et intelligentes eius vituperationem*; ἐξήρχετο, ἐξήρχοντο, ἐξῆλθεν, ἐξῆλθον, ἀνεχώρησαν, N. B. order of words here also varies; εἰς καθ' εἰς, εἰς ἕκαστος; οὐσα, ἐστῶσα; 10, ἀνακύψας, ἀναβλέψας, ἀνανεύσας; αὐτῆς, πρὸς αὐτήν, τῇ γυναικί, *ad eam ad mulierem*; ἡ γυνή, γυναίκα. It seems impossible to account for these closely crowded examples of double and sometimes triple variants, which introduce synonymes from totally different etymological sources, on any other hypothesis than that of rival translations of one original. Different translators would inevitably fall into such varieties, but no mistake of copyists could produce them: τὸν οἶκον, τὸν τόπον, and τὰ ἴδια, is a crucial instance of what I mean. And it will be noticed that two or three of these sometimes occur in the course of a verse.

The evidence in favor of two archetypal documents, i.e. of the same tale by two different tellers, is less widely distributed over the surface, but I think is no less cogent and clear. Not a few of the differences here are similar to those found between the accounts of the incident in the synoptic Gospels. In viii. 2, seven uncials omit καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἤρχετο πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ καθίσας ἐδίδαξεν αὐτούς. The omission of

the latter clause might be due to the homoioteleuton πρὸς αὐτόν in vs. 3, but not so that of the former. 3, οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, ἀρχιερεῖς κ. Φ., one manuscript omits οἱ γρ. κ., a few bring καὶ οἱ γρ. after οἱ Φ.; some omit πρὸς αὐτόν. Here some add πειράζοντες αὐτόν, *temptantes, captantes*; one manuscript has ἐκπειράζοντες αὐτόν οἱ ἱερεῖς ἵνα ἔχωσι κατηγορίαν αὐτοῦ, which participial clause, or one closely equivalent, most introduce later in vs. 6 (so the *text. rec.*), after τοῦτο δὲ ἔλεγον; while one has it at the close of the entire *pericope* in vs. 11; 5, ἡμῶν omitted; ἡμῶν introduced after νόμῳ; many add περὶ αὐτῆς after τί λέγεις; 6, γνοὺς introduced after Ἰησοῦς; 8, some add after ἔγραφεν the words ἐνὸς ἐκάστου αὐτῶν τὰς ἀμαρτίας, and so the Latin of a perished Alexandrine manuscript, *uniuscuiusque eorum peccata*, words which are confirmed by Jerome in an argumentative passage. Some add μὴ πρόσποιούμενος; 9, here D has ἕκαστος δὲ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, omitting οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες ἐλεγχόμενοι of *text. rec.*; one version inserts *ad domum suam*; D omits ὡς τῶν ἐσχάτων, but adds ὥστε πάντας ἐξελθεῖν; the versions represent both clauses. D omits ὁ Ἰησοῦς after μόνος, some omit μόνος, one version omits μόνος ὁ Ἰησοῦς καί; 10, a version omits the entire participial clause καὶ ἀνακίψας θεασάμενος γυναικός, substituting καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς only before εἶπεν; many omit καὶ μηδένα γυναικός; in ποῦ εἰσιν ἐκεῖνοι οἱ κατήγοροί σου some omit ἐκεῖνοι, some the last four words, some the entire question. In all this we have no trace of the circumstance ἐπὶ πολλαῖς ἀμαρτίαις mentioned above. The prevailing tradition seems to have been so moulded as entirely to exclude it. We can only say that whereas Eusebius names two sources, Papias and the Gospel according to the Hebrews, here are clear traces of two sources, and there is no reason why they may not have been the two mentioned by Eusebius, although the distinctive feature which he records, ἐπὶ π. ἀμ., has been rejected by consent of tradition.

I pass on to the question of the order of the chapters iv., v., vi., and of the portion which, beginning at vii. 1, probably

continues to the end of **x. 21**, including all the discussions and attempts on the Lord's liberty and life provoked by his miracles on the Sabbath. I would note that there are in this Gospel five sections distinguishable by their all commencing with the phrase *μετὰ ταῦτα*. They are (1) iii. 22 to end of iv. (2) chap. v. (3) chap. vi. (4) chap. vii., viii., ix., and to **x. 21** end, (5) chap. xxi. It is difficult to read these discontinuously from the rest of this Gospel and from each other without being impressed by their episodic character. Some of them have more, some less, of express or tacit connection with the remaining portions, and with each other; the most frequent and closest links being found, as will further appear, between (2) and (4). It is conceivable that they may have formed so many enlargements (as, indeed, with regard to the last, (5) chap. xxi., seems indisputable) of the original design of the evangelist, but equally genuine and equally prompted by the Holy Spirit at successive times. Each has its own note of time, as it were intentionally appended, (1) being dated by "John (the Baptist) being not yet cast into prison," (2), (3), and (4) by some festival of the Jews, and (5) by being the third time of the Lord's meeting the disciples after the resurrection. This would leave for the first projection, so to speak, of this Gospel, the following members of the narrative (*α*) chap. i., ii., iii., to 21 end, (*β*) **x. 22** to xi. 54, (*γ*) xi. 55 to end of xii. (*δ*), xiii., to end of **xx**. Of these (*β*), (*γ*), and (*δ*) seem to contain a group of events really consecutive in time; while (*α*), besides the theological exordium, gives the early calls and earlier Galilaean ministry up to the first Passover inclusively. Now the great Galilaean ministry and farewell to Galilee, with the journey up to Judaea, had formed the larger bulk of the synoptic Gospels, and falls between (*α*) and (*β*) of these supposed original sections of John. John may therefore be supposed in his original projection to have left intentionally a gap between its earlier and later portions which those synoptic Gospels would be found to fill, and subsequently to have himself done something towards filling it by the enlargements now sup-

posed. I would add that the apparent connection of reference in (β) x. 26 to (4) x. 3, found in the words there standing in the A.V., "as I said unto you," is probably unreal, as the words seem to be not genuine. Tischendorf omits, and Alford brackets them. If they are dropped, there will remain no link of connection between (β) and (4) save the tacit one of the image of the shepherd and the sheep being found in both. It is clear that the break found in (1) at the end of chap. iii. is only a subdivision, since *οὖν* in iv. 1 connects chap. iv., with the previous iii. 22-36. In short from iii. 22 to the end of chap. iv., is one entire member; although in the course of it the scene changes from Aenon to Samaria, and thence to Galilee, where our Lord is found in iv. 54. We see then that chap. iv., clearly belongs to (1) of our supposed enlargments, and chap. vii., to (4); and the only remaining question is that of the position and sequence of (2) chap. v. and (3) chap. vi.

Now let the reader carry his eye from iv. 54 to chap. vi. which begins rather abruptly, "After these things Jesus went (forth or away, *ἀπῆλθεν*), over the Sea of Galilee," etc., the note of time being added in vs. 4 by the "Passover" being "nigh," i.e. not yet come. He will find the incidents throughout this chap. vi. lying on either side of the same "sea." They include the miraculous feeding of the five thousand, and the long consequent discourse in the Capernaum synagogue, with the doubts and desertion thence arising. All this well adjusts itself in continuity with iv. 54. I suppose then that this (3) either directly continues (1), i.e. chap. vi., continues chap. iv., or at any rate succeeds it after a short interval. Next, let us go back to chap. v. It speaks of "a feast or the feast (the weight of evidence seems against η before *ἑορτή*) of the Jews," and of the Lord's "going up to Jerusalem," where follows the miracle at the pool of Bethesda on the Sabbath. This gives rise to an attack of the Jews on his teaching, with an attempt on his life, vs. 16, 18, as not only a Sabbath-breaker but a blasphemer. In the controversy thence arising he refers to John's ministry as com-

pleted, and perhaps vs. 35 may even imply that it was closed in death. This controversy is still at its height when the chapter closes with the Lord's question, "If ye believe not his (Moses') writings, how shall ye believe my words?" In chap. vii. 1 the scene is abruptly changed, but we are at once told why, to Galilee: "Jesus walked (*περιεπάτει*, imperf., 'was continuing his course or circuit') in Galilee; for he would not walk in Jewry (Judaea), because the Jews sought to kill him (again, 'were seeking,' *ἐζήτουν*, imperf., of sustained action). Now the Jews' feast of Tabernacles was at hand." This sustained attempt "to kill him," comes in most naturally as a sequel to the overt acts of persecution recorded at vs. 16, 18 of chap. v., as noticed above. Thus, dropping chap. vi., the change of scene between chap. v., and chap. vii., has its ground in the recent facts of the previous narrative. Further, his reply to the unbelieving brethren in vs. 7, "Me it ('the world,' i.e. the Judaeian public, in which sense they had used the word in vs. 4) hateth, because I testify of it, that the works thereof are evil," is another plain reference to the controversy and persecution of chap. v. Subsequently appearing in the Temple he demands, vii. 21, "why go ye about (lit. seek ye, *ζητεῖτε*, the exact word used before in v. 16, 18), to kill me?" This continuance of the attempt on his life, resumed the moment that he appears in Jerusalem, harmonizes with the fact of his retirement to Galilee in v. 1, and with its reason, and forces the whole into a close *vinculum* with chap. v. Again, in the same chap. vii., he says, vs. 21, "I did one work, and ye all are marvelling." The sequence of tenses has its importance here. It was a "work" done, we should infer, at his last previous visit, not at his *then* visit, which would rather require the perfect tense. The present "are marvelling" refers to the feeling consequent upon it as still maintained. And here he at once resumes the controversy on the Sabbatarian branch of the question between himself and the Jews, asking in vs. 23, "Are ye angry with me because I made a man every whit whole on the Sabbath?" (again, not "*have* made," as in

A.V., but suitably to the retrospective stand-point). Thus definitely he refers to their attitude in v. 16-47 as still continuing. We have thus far three distinct references in chap. vii. to the miracle, controversy, and persecution of chap. v. "The multitude" in Jerusalem carry on the same retrospect by their question in vs. 31, "When the Christ cometh, will he do more miracles than these which this man doeth?" (again, not "hath done," as in A.V.; some authorities read *ἐπολήσειν*, but none *πεπολήσειν*). Further, in vii. 28 the Lord declares, "I am not come of myself, but He that sent me is true," — words which reflect the sense of his previous statement in v. 37, "The Father himself which (hath, A.V.), sent me, he hath borne witness of me," and vs. 43, "I am come in my Father's name." Thus both the facts and the words bear out abundantly the close connection of chap. v., and vii.; and by reading these two in sequence, we find that chap. vi., by intervening, jars the unity thus established, and interrupts the current of clear and pertinent reference which prevails between them. Thus assuming chap. v. and vi. transposed, which formed the second and third of our supposed enlargements of the original plan, all seems to fall into its natural place. The continuity however of chap. v. and vii. is not absolute; the former closing, as we have seen, abruptly in Jerusalem, whereas the thread is resumed in Galilee in the latter.

As regards the general chronology of the Gospel history, this sequence which I have endeavored to establish makes its adjustment more easy. For the close of chap. iv. with "the second miracle that Jesus did when he was come out of Judaea into Galilee," while it probably suggested the right place for the insertion of this first enlargement, forms a suitable point of departure for the Galilaean ministry with its three, or possibly four courses of miracles and teaching.¹ This Galilaean cycle seems an unbroken whole; and we know that the feeding of the five thousand, the only miracle

¹ These are, Matt. iv. 23-25; Luke viii. 1 seq.; Matt. ix. 35-38, and possibly identical with, but also possibly distinct from, this last, Luke x. 1 seq.

mentioned in the course of it by all four Evangelists, took place comparatively late in it, being shortly before the Passover next before that at which he suffered (vi. 4). By this solitary miracle John represents the whole of it. This one fact shows us, more perhaps than anything else, how widely his plan differed from that of the first three Gospels. Now there seems no room in the course of it for such a visit to Jerusalem as we find recorded in v. 1, but by transposing chap. v. and vi. as suggested, this difficulty vanishes. The visits to Jerusalem in the course of his entire ministry will then be as follows: 1. That of John ii. 13, at the first Passover after his baptism; 2. John v. 1 at some "feast of the Jews," possibly the "Passover" mentioned in vi. 4 as "nigh" (assuming vi. 4 to precede v. 1), but more probably not, when we compare the sequel to the miracle in the other Evangelists; 3. John vii. 2 at the Feast of Tabernacles, to which he "went up" privately; 4. John x. 22 at the Feast of the Dedication, "in Solomon's porch"; 5. John xi. 55; xii. 1, at the last Passover, mentioned by all the four Evangelists. Our Lord is in Galilee between (1) and (2) of these, and again between (2) and (3). The narrative of John x. seems to leave no room for a return to Galilee between (3) and (4). Indeed, Matt. xix. 1 and Mark x. 1 both imply that, in the departure there recorded from Galilee into "the coasts of Judaea beyond," or "by the farther side of Jordan" (*πέραν* in both places), he finally quitted that region until after his resurrection. This appears to be the same visit to the Peraea recorded in John x. 40, to "the place where John at first baptized." The great difficulty is, that in John his last stage of departure for it is Jerusalem, whereas the first two Gospels make it Galilee. In short, these two read as though ignoring wholly the scenes in Jerusalem at the Feasts of Tabernacles and of the Dedication, found in John vii. 14-x. 39. So also does Luke's account, which equally ignores that visit to the Peraea itself. These, however, are difficulties which beset any system of adjustment equally, and I have only been led to glance at them in refer-

ence to the more peculiarly Johannine question, the alternations of the Lord's presence in Galilee with his visits to Jerusalem. It only remains to notice that between (4) and (5) he is not in Galilee, but in those "coasts of Judaea beyond Jordan" spoken of thus generally by Matthew and Mark, more precisely by John as being in Bethany beyond Jordan, Bethany of Judaea, Ephraim (the city), and again in Bethany of Judaea. Compare with John x. 40 and i. 28 (where read *Βηθανία*), the following, xi. 1, 7, 54; xii. 1, which last brings us to "six days before the Passover."

I have said that, transposing chap. vi. and v., the "feast" of v. 1 might be the Passover mentioned as nigh in vi. 4. It might also be (if we reckon four Passovers in the entire ministry), the Passover of the year following vi. 4, or any later feast of the year reckoned to begin at the Passover of vi. 4. This, however, opens the wider question of the duration of the ministry. The reasoning in support of either opinion turns mainly upon considerations external to John; except that, if four be reckoned, then v. 1 must be one of them — the second of them as the order of chapters stands, but the third if the transposition of chap. v. and vi. be adopted; and that, whether we transpose or not, John will, if four be reckoned, be found to leave an entire year (that between the second and third Passovers) without any event recorded. On this wider question, however, I do not propose entering now.

In comparing chap. vi. with chap. xxi. there are some common features both of incident and language. The appearance of the Lord is to the disciples on the lake in a boat in chap. xxi.; cf. vi. 17–20, where the same conditions appear. In each, the appearance itself has something sudden, and as if supernatural, about it. In the one case, they spend some part of the night toiling in rowing; in the other, in profitless quest of fish. In each there is a miraculous feeding of bread and fishes, which he takes into his hands, and delivers to the disciples. In each there is a remarkable passage between the Lord and Peter — that in chap. xxi. being marked by a

solemn tenderness which has no adequate parallel in their intercourse. In each, alone in the New Testament, is found the word *Τιβεριάς* for the Lake of Galilee, and the word *ὀψάριον* for fish. Probably this amount of coincidence points to something similar in the conditions under which each passage originated; and as we cannot doubt that chap. *xxi.* was an appendix subsequently incorporated, we may reasonably think that chap. *vi.* was a similar insertion. But chap. *xxi.* found its place naturally at the end. There was no such certain clue to the position of chap. *vi.*, and it was perhaps not correctly inserted.

[For some portion of the above argument I am indebted to a paper in the "Journal of Philology," Vol. *iii.* No. *5*, by Archdeacon Nooris.]

ARTICLE VI.

THE SCHOOL-LIFE OF WALAFRIED STRABO.¹

TRANSLATED BY PROF. JAMES DAVIN BUTLER, PH.D., MADISON, WISCONSIN.

THIS autobiography of a school-boy, and that of a secular scholar in the second decade of the ninth century, was first printed, in 1857, in the annual report of the educational establishment in a Swiss monastery — die Erziehungsanstalt des Benedictiner-Stiftes Maria Einsiedeln.

The narrative was introduced by the following remarks: "How they taught and learned a thousand years ago, as related by a contemporary of St. Meinrad [founder of Einsiedeln], Walafried Strabo. The church of Christ is the educator of mankind. Her founder opened this school eighteen hundred years ago, and in the end of days he will return in order to hold the final examination. A great portion of the activities of the church for this end consists in teaching and training the young. Every age has, indeed, its

¹ The school-life of Walafried Strabo (der Schielende), and the educational curriculum in the Swiss cloister of Reichenau between the years 815 and 825.—The importance of the present Sketch is seen in a reference to it in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for July 1883 (pp. 405, 406).