

NAMES IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

A GREAT deal has been written on the internal evidence of the Fourth Gospel as to the nationality, date, character, and so on, of its author. Here two rather new pieces of evidence as to the identity of the author are adduced, followed by other remarks on the same subject, all being concerned with the use or omission of names by the Evangelist.

A table is necessary : but I omit from it the lists of Apostles in Matt., Mark, Luke, Acts, and the lists of the brethren of the Lord in Matt., Mark. I assume that James, son of Mary and brother of Josès, is an apostle, although it makes no difference to my subsequent argument ; and I do not assume that Judas Barsabbas was the Apostle.

	<i>Matt.</i>	<i>Mark</i>	<i>Luke</i>	<i>John</i>	Total	<i>Acts</i>	<i>Paul</i>	Grand Total	Totals without John	
Peter	21	18	17	17	73	52	2	127		
Simon	2	6	10	5	23			23		
Simon called Peter	2	1	1		4	4		8		
Simon Peter	1		1	17	19			19		
Symeon						1		1		
Cephas				1	1		8	9	Total Synopt.	Grand total
Total for Peter	26	25	29	40	120	57	10	187	80	147
John	2	9	6	0	17	9	1	27	17	27
James	2	9	4	0	15	1		16	15	16
Sons of Zeb. (not named)	3			1	4			4	3	3
Andrew	1	3		5	9			9	4	4
James the Less	1	2	1		4	3	4	11	4	11
Thomas				7	7			7		
Philip				12	12			12		
Matthew	1				1			1	1	1
Jude				1	1			1		
Judas Iscariot	4	2	3	8	17	2		19	9	11
Total	40	50	43	74	207	72	15	294	133	230

	<i>Matt.</i>	<i>Mark</i>	<i>Luke</i>	<i>John</i>	Total	<i>Acts</i>	<i>Paul</i>	Grand total
Brethren of the Lord	5	5	2	4	16	1	2	19
Joseph of Arimathæa	2	2	1	1	6			
Mary Magdalene	3	3	2	5	13			
Mary of Bethany			2	9	11			
Martha			3	9	12			
Mary of Clopas	3	3	1	1	8		(1?)	
Lazarus				11	11			
Nathanael				6	6			
Nicodemus				5	5			
Total	13	13	11	51	88	1	2	91
Adding Apostles	53	63	54	125	295			383

I. *The omission of John in John.*

This table in the first place suggests some familiar facts : St Peter is mentioned more often in every Gospel than all the rest of the Apostles taken together ; St John mentions individuals much more often than do the other evangelists ; he alone tells us anything of the Apostles Philip and Thomas ; he alone mentions Lazarus, Nathanael, and Nicodemus. His total is 125, against 53, 63, 54.

Every one knows that the Synoptists put three Apostles in a special place : Peter and the sons of Zebedee : they alone are present at the cure of the daughter of Jairus, at the Transfiguration, and at the Agony in the Garden. The list shows that in the Synoptists the highest numbers (putting Peter aside) are for James and John, 15 and 17, and if we add 'sons of Zebedee' 3, James 18, John 20 ; Judas 9, Andrew 4.¹

Turn to John : we find Philip 12, Judas 8, Thomas 7, Andrew 5 ; but James 0, John 0, 'sons of Zebedee' 1.

The conclusion is plain enough : either the writer, the 'beloved disciple', is John, or else John and his brother are deliberately ignored by him.

2. *Peter and John.*

It follows that we must examine the passages where the writer mentions himself :

A. i 35 : τῆ ἐπαύριον πάλιν εἰστήκει ὁ Ἰωάννης, καὶ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ δύο . . . ³⁷ καὶ ἤκουσαν οἱ δύο μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, καὶ ἠκολούθησαν τῷ Ἰησοῦ . . . ⁴⁰ ἦν Ἀνδρέας ὁ ἀδελφὸς Σίμωνος Πέτρου εἰς ἐκ τῶν δύο τῶν ἀκουσάντων παρὰ Ἰωάννου καὶ ἀκολουθησάντων αὐτῷ. εὗρίσκει οὗτος πρῶτον τὸν ἀδελφὸν τὸν ἴδιον Σίμωνα . . .

B. xiii 23 : ἦν ἀνακείμενος εἰς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ὃν ἠγάπα ὁ Ἰησοῦς. ²⁴ νεύει οὖν τούτῳ Σίμων Πέτρος, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ . . . ²⁵ ἀναπέσων ἐκείνος οὕτως ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ λέγει αὐτῷ . . .

C. xviii 15 : ἠκολούθει δὲ τῷ Ἰησοῦ Σίμων Πέτρος καὶ ἄλλος μαθητῆς. ὁ δὲ μαθητῆς ἐκείνος ἦν γνωστὸς τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ, καὶ συνεσηλθε τῷ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως. ¹⁶ ὁ δὲ Πέτρος εἰστήκει πρὸς τῆ θύρα ἔξω. ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ μαθητῆς ὁ ἄλλος ὃς ἦν γνωστὸς τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ . . . καὶ εἰσήγαγεν τὸν Πέτρον.

D. xix 26 : Ἰησοῦς οὖν, ἰδὼν τὴν μητέρα καὶ τὸν μαθητὴν ὃν ἠγάπα, λέγει τῇ μητρὶ . . . εἶτα λέγει τῷ μαθητῇ . . . ἔλαβεν αὐτὴν ὁ μαθητῆς εἰς τὰ ἴδια.

E. xx 2 : (Μαρία ἡ Μαγδ.) τρέχει οὖν καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς Σίμωνα Πέτρον καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἄλλον μαθητὴν ὃν ἐφίλει ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς . . . ³ ἐξῆλ-

¹ For the whole N.T. without John ; John 27, James 16, James the Less and Iscariot 11.

θεν οὖν ὁ Πέτρος καὶ ὁ ἄλλος μαθητής, καὶ ἤρχοντο εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον. ⁴ ἔτρεχον δὲ οἱ δύο ὁμοῦ· καὶ ὁ ἄλλος μαθητής προέδραμε τάχιον τοῦ Πέτρου . . . ⁶ ἔρχεται οὖν καὶ Σίμων Πέτρος ἀκολουθῶν αὐτῷ . . . ⁸ τότε οὖν εἰσῆλθε καὶ ὁ ἄλλος μαθητής ὁ ἐλθὼν πρῶτος . . . ¹⁰ ἀπήλθον οὖν πάλιν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς οἱ μαθηταί.

F. cxii 2 : ἦσαν ὁμοῦ Σίμων Πέτρος καὶ Θωμᾶς ὁ λεγ. Διδ., καὶ Ναθαναήλ ὁ ἀπὸ Κανᾶ τῆς Γαλ., καὶ οἱ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου, καὶ ἄλλοι ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ δύο ¹ . . . ⁷ λέγει οὖν ὁ μαθητής ἐκεῖνος ὃν ἠγάπα ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ Πέτρῳ, ὁ Κύριός ἐστι. Σίμων οὖν Πέτρος, ἀκούσας . . .

G. cxii 20 : ἐπιστραφεὶς ὁ Πέτρος βλέπει τὸν μαθητὴν ὃν ἠγάπα ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀκολουθοῦντα, ὃς καὶ ἀνέπεσεν ἐν τῷ δαίτην ἐπὶ τὸ στήθος αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπεν· Κύριε, τίς ἐστίν ὁ παραδιδούς σε; ²¹ τοῦτον οὖν ἰδὼν ὁ Πέτρος λέγει τῷ Ἰησοῦ· Κύριε, οὗτος δὲ τί; . . . ²³ ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ λόγος οὗτος εἰς τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ὅτι ὁ μαθητής ἐκεῖνος οὐκ ἀποθνήσκει . . . ²⁴ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ μαθητής ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ τούτων, καὶ γράψας ταῦτα· καὶ οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἀληθής ἐστιν ἡ μαρτυρία αὐτοῦ. ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλα ἃ ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς . . .

The obvious remark to make is that 'the other disciple' is always associated with another : we will call 'the other disciple' John :

- A. John and Andrew (and Peter).
- B. John and Peter.
- C. John and Peter.
- D. John and Mary.
- E. John and Peter.
- F. John and Peter.
- G. John and Peter.

a. That is to say, excepting D, *every time the author mentions himself, he is with Peter*; they are seen to be the closest friends, inseparable, devoted. Peter whispers to John : Peter follows John to the High Priest's hall : Magdalen finds them together, and they run together to the tomb : it is to Peter that John confides his amazement, 'It is the Lord' : when his martyrdom is prophesied, Peter's first thought is 'What shall this man do?'

¹ Obviously the 'beloved disciple' is here either one of the 'sons of Zebedee' or one of the two 'other disciples'. It might be argued that he is elsewhere called ἄλλος μαθητής (cxviii 15, 16, cx 2, 3, 4, 8); but this does not prove that he is always one of ἄλλοι μαθηταί. On the other hand, we should not expect 'the sons of Zebedee' in a list of names : the readers are supposed to know another Gospel, or more than one : those other Gospels would have said 'James and John'. But if the writer is John, he would have been obliged to say 'James, the son of Zebedee, and the disciple whom Jesus loved' (which would be awkward) or something of the sort. So he says 'the sons of Zebedee', as Matt. does (xx 20, xxvi 37, xxvii 56). It seems fairly evident that the reader is definitely meant to understand that the beloved disciple is one of the sons of Zebedee, whom the writer supposes known.

β. Let us turn back to the table. Papias tells us that Mark in writing the *διδασκαλία* of Peter cared only to omit nothing of what he heard, and not to falsify any of it (Eus. *H. E.* iii 39), and Justin calls Mark 'the memoirs of Peter'.¹ Now Mark has John 9 times, against Matt. 2 and Luke 6; this corresponds to the converse: Peter in John 40, in the Synoptists only 26, 25, 29.

γ. In the Synoptists we have Peter and James and John, as I said above. But let us notice particularly the preparation of the passover (Matt. xxvi 17-19, Mark xiv 12-16, Luke xxii 7-13). Matt. says Christ sent 'the disciples' into the city; Mark says 'two disciples', and gives all the details about the man with a pitcher of water; Luke follows Mark, but tells us the two were 'Peter and John': the fact that Peter was one of them is why Mark was able to give so many details.

δ. The same phenomenon in Acts is well known.² *Just as in John six out of the seven incidents about the beloved disciple shew us Peter associated with him, so in every mention of John in Acts his name is coupled with that of Peter:*

Acts i 13: (the list) Πέτρος καὶ Ἰωάννης καὶ Ἰάκωβος . . .

iii 1: Πέτρος δὲ καὶ Ἰωάννης ἀνέβαινον . . .

3: ἰδὼν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην μέλλοντας εἰσιέναι . . .

4: ἀπενίσας δὲ Πέτρος εἰς αὐτὸν σὺν τῷ Ἰωάννῃ.

11: κρατοῦντος δὲ αὐτοῦ τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τὸν Ἰωάννην.

iv 13: θεωροῦντες δὲ τὴν τοῦ Πέτρον παρρησίαν καὶ Ἰωάννου.

19: ὁ δὲ Πέτρος καὶ Ἰωάννης ἀποκριθέντες εἶπον.

viii 14: ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτοὺς Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην.

xii 2: ἀνείλεν δὲ Ἰάκωβον τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰωάννου μαχαίρα . . . προσέθετο συλλαβεῖν καὶ Πέτρον.

ε. It may be added that curiously St Paul, who only mentions John once, places him next to Peter: Gal. ii 9 Ἰάκωβος (the Less) καὶ Κηφᾶς καὶ Ἰωάννης.

I conclude from β, γ, δ, ε that the beloved disciple in the Fourth Gospel, who is represented as its author, is intended to be John, the

¹ *Dial. c. Tryph.* cvi 3. The calling James and John 'Boanerges' is only in St Mark. The modern idea that the 'Gospel of Peter' is meant is therefore too paradoxical to need comment.

² Harnack spoke years ago of 'the strange introduction of St John as a kind of lay figure in company with St Peter is certainly not original' (*Luke the Physician*, Eng. Tr. p. 116, and note): cp. also pp. 150-151 'He (Luke) has seven times smuggled St John into the source which contains the Petrine stories.' Harnack is so rightly severe on the wild assertions of liberal critics that one regrets his own occasional lapses into amusing but unconvincing statements of this kind. The considerations in the text shew that this 'smuggling in' of a 'lay-figure' was anything but 'strange'. And after this, on p. 151 note, we are told that St Luke cannot have read the Epistle to the Galatians because he does *not* mention John in Acts xv.

son of Zebedee, the friend of Peter. This seems to me an unanswerable argument, and I fancy it is a new one in this form. Adding this to the preceding argument from the omission of the name of John in the Fourth Gospel, I do not see how the view which has been so fashionable for the last twenty years can be maintained—that the ‘beloved disciple’ was not the son of Zebedee, but a young man of no importance at the time, probably named John, very likely the ‘John the Presbyter’ discovered with so much ingenuity by Eusebius.¹

3. *John and John the Baptist.*

This old argument was well known to the old-fashioned conservatives. I will not give the evidence in full, but summarily :

	<i>Matt.</i>	<i>Mark</i>	<i>Luke</i>	<i>John</i>	<i>Acts</i>
John the Baptist	7	5	3		
John	16	11	21	19	8

In Acts it was neither necessary nor possible to add ‘the Baptist’; for seven times out of eight βάπτισμα goes with the ‘John’; the exception is xviii 25, where βάπτισμα was preached by John in the preceding verse.²

No other John is mentioned in the Fourth Gospel, except the father of Simon Peter (i 43, xxi 15-17). The readers of the Gospel would think of John as ‘the Baptist’. But the writer of it had been the Baptist’s disciple, and thought of him merely as John. The old infer-

¹ The ordinary objection to this theory is that the ‘beloved disciple’ was at the Last Supper, where only ‘the twelve’ were present (Matt., Mark), and the reply to it that this young man did not count, is hardly peremptory. The traitor was to be εἰς τῶν δώδεκα (Mark xiv 10, John vi 71), εἰς ἐξ ὑμῶν (John xiii 21: cp. xii 4 εἰς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ὃ μέλλον αὐτὸν παραδιδόναι); and immediately after, the ‘beloved disciple’ is described as εἰς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, which obviously means ‘one of the apostles’, since St John does not use ἀπόστολος. Otherwise in all probability we should have τῆς instead of εἰς. But any one present with the Apostles would of course be a ‘disciple’; so that there is little sense unless we understand ‘apostle’; and μαθητῆς in John cannot mean ‘disciple’ as opposed to ‘apostle’.

² In the Fourth Gospel, on the other hand, the reader is supposed to know all about the Baptist from the other Gospels. He is introduced in i 6 as ‘a man sent from God’; we are told he was so notorious that the Jews at Jerusalem sent an embassy to him to know if he was the Christ, and only after his reply are we told that all this took place ‘where he was baptizing’. Till then nothing suggested that he ever did such a thing. The author of the Gospel is usually taken to imply that he was himself John’s disciple. I assumed this above. In iii 23 we are again told John was baptizing, this time in a different place; and it is added that he was not yet imprisoned—obviously, as he was baptizing. Hence we gather that the readers are supposed to have learned from one or other of the Synoptists that John was imprisoned about the time our Lord’s public ministry began.

ence is natural, though not imperative, that this was because the writer's own name was John. This familiar and interesting observation is reinforced by the preceding arguments.

But it has often been pointed out that its force largely depends on the further observation that John is particularly careful to distinguish people who might be confused. He never calls Peter merely Simon, because other Simons are mentioned: St Luke has Symeon, and Simon the leper, and Simon the Pharisee; but there is another who is an Apostle, a 'brother of the Lord', a very important person; so John always has 'Peter' or 'Simon Peter'.

So Philip is of Bethsaida, the village of Andrew and Peter (i 44 sq.); in vi 5 the reader is expected to remember him; but in xii 21 we are reminded again that Philip of Bethsaida was meant, for Philip the deacon was also a disciple. In xiv 8 no explanation is needed, as only apostles could be present at the Last Supper.

Similarly, xiv 22, Jude is distinguished as 'not Iscariot' from the other Apostle of that name. In three of the four chapters where Thomas is named, he is carefully called Didymus. The first time Mary and Martha are mentioned (xi 1) John remembers that, though they are mentioned in Luke, he has not himself spoken of them hitherto, so he notes (xi 2) that Mary is the woman who is to be mentioned in xii 3; and he is very careful to explain Lazarus and Martha and Mary when they recur (xii 1, 2). And so with other persons mentioned.

4. *Simon Peter.*

Matt. never calls Peter simply 'Simon', but he makes Christ address him once as 'Simon', once as 'Simon Barjona'. So John has 'Simon, son of John' four times in the mouth of our Lord, and once 'Andrew findeth his own brother, Simon'.

But in Mark Peter is spoken of four times as merely 'Simon', without the honourable title; obviously because Peter is speaking. Luke uses Mark and imitates him, so that he speaks eight times of Peter as Simon.

There is thus a contrast of usage between Matt. John and Mark Luke.

But 'Simon Peter' occurs only once in Matt. or Luke, and in Mark never; whereas John has it 17 times. The origin of this seems to be that John's readers were familiar with the name Peter, which John has also 17 times; but John habitually thinks of him as Simon, and adds Peter as an explanation, and perhaps partly as a title of honour.

As 'Simon Peter' only occurs twice outside St John (and 2 Pet. i 1) I should explain it in these two places as short for 'Simon who is

called (or surnamed) Peter', which is found 12 times (and counting the lists of Apostles, 15 times); so that one may regard the 'Simon Peter' of John as an innovation, and the equivalent of 'my friend Simon, as I call him, whom you know as Peter'. For 'Peter' is a Greek translation, and not the original name, and this form may have come into use some years after the day of Pentecost. St Paul thinks of Simon as 'Cephas', and only says 'Πέτρος' in Gal. ii 7 sq. to emphasize to Gentiles that Peter is the 'Rock', an idea which Cephas would not suggest to Galatians.¹

5. *Mary, James, John.*

There are three Marys mentioned in John: Magdalen 5 times, of Bethany 9 times, of Clopas once. He never gives the name of the Mother of Christ, Mary (but 'His Mother', 9 times); just as he never gives the name of the brother of John, James.

Three names are therefore patently and expressly avoided in the Fourth Gospel: 1. that of the writer; 2. that of the Blessed Virgin, whom he took to live with him; 3. that of James, the elder brother of John. We naturally infer that there was also a close relationship between James and the writer, for James is mentioned 15 times in the Synoptic Gospels, not counting the lists of Apostles, and the omission by John cannot be accidental.

6. *The anonymity of the Fourth Gospel.*

There is no reason in history or tradition for thinking that the Fourth Gospel was published anonymously; on the contrary, the early authorities imply that it was published by the Apostle John just before his death.

The internal evidence is conclusive that the writer claimed to be a witness, and not an anonymous witness, but a personage quite well known to those whom he addressed. He does not hide his name under the periphrasis of 'the disciple whom'; he supposes that every one knows it, and he must have put it at the head of the book.

It is often thought that 'the beloved disciple', 'the other disciple' is a periphrasis for 'John'. Of course it is not. It is a periphrasis for 'I'. Had the Gospel been anonymous, and its authorship a secret, the name of the writer would naturally have been given without difficulty; only it would not have been stated that he was the author.

What we find is exactly the contrary. The name of the writer is never given, but he is frequently spoken of, his witness is emphatically insisted on, and his authorship affirmed. All this means that the writer is addressing people who know him quite well, who are aware

¹ Cp. *Revue Bénédictine* xxix 2 (April 1912), pp. 133 sqq.

that his age entitles him to be a witness, and that his character suggests that he is a true witness. Out of mere modesty he will not say 'I', 'me', 'my', but uses a periphrasis.

In the Epistles, the style and matter of which proves their authorship, the author does use 'I' or 'we' without distinction, but avoids giving his name. He was evidently known familiarly and affectionately as 'the Old Man' to those whom he addressed.¹

It seems that neither an author who desired anonymity nor a forger could possibly have chosen the particular literary artifice which the writer of the Fourth Gospel has chosen to employ.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

THE ORIGINAL FORM OF THE ANAPHORA OF ADDAI AND MARI: A SUGGESTION

THE rediscovery of the Nestorian Christians by English and American travellers in the first half of last century was destined to prove no less happy for the students of Christian antiquity than for the Nestorians themselves. Their isolation from the rest of Christendom and their tenacity of tradition made it impossible to class them as just such another group as the Copts, the Armenians, or the Jacobites. They belonged to a category of their own; they had a genius of their own: and though it was true that their waters had been muddied by Nestorian heresy, there seemed ground for entertaining the hope that they might bear important testimony to, and cast valuable light upon, what was held to be the primitive catholic tradition. These hopes were not realized exactly in the form in which they were first entertained; but not all expectations were disappointed. The Nestorian community could properly claim to be the sole surviving independent representative of the church which had as its centre Seleucia-Ctesiphon and which

¹ This may be used as an argument that the Apocalypse is by a different author. I am not now engaged in comparing the Gospel and the Apocalypse; but it may be pointed out that the argument will not hold water: for the John who wrote from Patmos to the Churches of Asia was away from Asia; and he is sending his vision to seven different Churches, not all of which probably would know him as 'the Presbyter'. We were not asked above to think that he would not answer to the name John, and never used it!