

Concordia Theological Monthly



N O V E M B E R ♦ 1 9 5 0

John's Gospel in Current Literature

By WALTER G. HEYNE

Who wrote the Fourth Gospel? For centuries there had been almost unanimous agreement on this point. Tradition, based on very ancient authorities, as well as the book itself all seemed to agree that it was the work of John, the Beloved Disciple, son of Zebedee. But about the turn of the eighteenth century, students of the Bible were shaken by voices which dared to question this supposedly impregnable claim. In England a man by the name of Evanson (ca. 1790) attributed the Gospel to some Platonic philosopher of the second century. Six years later a German named Eckermann took up the refrain, with more and more voices joining the chorus. In 1820 Bretschneider published his *Probabilia de evangelii et epistolarum Johannis apostoli indole et origine*, in which he suggested that the Gospel was the work of a pagan Christian, probably of Alexandrian origin, who lived during the first half of the second century. From this work many people date the concentrated modern attack on the tradition of Johannine authorship.

The nineteenth century witnessed one long procession of attempts of so-called liberal theologians to solve the problem of the authorship of the Fourth Gospel. Conservative Bible students, however, held fast to the traditional view. It was not until about 1915 that there was a noticeable change in this sector, for in that year William Sanday, who for many years had stoutly maintained that John the Apostle was the author of this book, declared openly that he had changed his mind on the subject. It has been claimed that Sanday's about-face was the signal for a general rout among conservative scholars who studied the question with an open mind.

This paper presents the findings of an attempt to trace the development of critical thinking on the subject of the authorship of the Fourth Gospel from about the year 1915. All books on the subject available to the writer were examined to determine the position of the authors.

Before summarizing the results, it might be well for the better

understanding of the reader briefly to state the case for and against the Apostolic authorship.

Evidence for Johannine Authorship. — External evidence includes mention of John as the author by Theophilus, ca. A. D. 180, and a statement by Irenaeus, ca. 190, that John, the disciple of the Lord, published the Gospel while at Ephesus. Irenaeus' writings include about a hundred quotations from the Gospel. In the Muratorian Fragment, also of the second century, and in several other early fathers we have ample testimony to the existence and Apostolic authority of all four Gospels.

Internal evidence rests mainly on chapter 21, especially the last five verses, although 19:35 must also be considered. But this internal evidence is inseparably linked up with the identification of John, the son of Zebedee, with the Beloved Disciple, an identification that has provoked much opposition.

Evidence Against Johannine Authorship. — External evidence against the traditional view includes early signs of opposition to this Gospel, either in the form of unwillingness to accept it or of unusual concern about defending it. Stronger than this are the various indications of an early martyrdom of John.¹ The silence of Ignatius regarding John's presence in Ephesus while referring to other Apostles who did work there, as well as a statement of Papias which seems to indicate that John the Apostle was already dead in the days of Papias' youth,² are other links in the chain of evidence against John's having written the Gospel.

Opponents of John's authorship, however, claim that it is the internal evidence which first led scholars to re-examine the external evidence. The striking difference between the picture of Christ presented in the Fourth Gospel and that in the Synoptics, they said, makes it unlikely that the book was written by one of the Twelve. John stresses the divine nature of Christ, while the Synoptics make little of it. They also pointed out that it is hard to explain the failure of the Synoptics to mention a story like the raising of Lazarus if this really happened or the placing of the cleansing of the Temple at the beginning of Jesus' ministry instead of at the end, as the Synoptics do it, or the silence of the Synoptics regarding the discourses in the Upper Room.

What has the scholarship of the last thirty-five years done with

this problem, and where do we stand today? That is the question we are attempting to answer. The subject will be treated under the following headings:

- I. Two Important Questions Regarding John the Apostle.
 1. Did John Die a Martyr's Death?
 2. Who Is the Beloved Disciple, and What Part Does He Play in the Writing of the Fourth Gospel?
- II. Candidates for the Authorship of the Fourth Gospel
- III. Opinions on the Date and Place of Writing
- IV. The Historical Value of the Gospel
- V. Summaries and Conclusions

I. TWO IMPORTANT QUESTIONS REGARDING JOHN THE APOSTLE

1. DID JOHN DIE A MARTYR'S DEATH?

This is an important question. If John died a martyr's death at the hands of the Jews in Palestine, he was never in Ephesus. Then the theory that John wrote the Gospel in Ephesus, late in the first century, falls down.

Many modern scholars go all out for the martyrdom. In Germany, Bauer,³ Dibelius,⁴ and Hirsch, to mention only a few, are all for it. The last-named says: "Der Maertyrertod des Johannes, zugleich mit Jakobus, ist fuer mich zur Gewissheit erhoben."⁵ Jackson⁶ and Charles⁷ are English scholars who definitely lean toward the "red martyrdom" of St. John.

On the other hand, the evidence is not so convincing that there is no disagreement. Henry Bernard, author of the commentary on the Fourth Gospel in the *International Critical Commentary*, considers the evidence in favor of John's martyrdom worthless, and he continues to believe in the death of John in Asia Minor at an advanced age.⁸ Broomfield⁹ and Nunn¹⁰ agree with him. Among German commentators, Buechsel¹¹ might be mentioned as one of many who still hold to the tradition.

2. WHO IS THE BELOVED DISCIPLE, AND WHAT PART DOES HE PLAY IN THE WRITING OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL?

If we can definitely prove who is meant by the Beloved Disciple, the matter of authorship becomes fairly simple for those who con-

sider chapter 21 an integral part of the Gospel. Tradition says that the Beloved Disciple is John, the son of Zebedee, and that he is the author. This is based on John 21:24. These words do seem to state quite clearly that the Beloved Disciple wrote the book. But the identity of the Beloved Disciple must still be determined.

Almost all who accept the Johannine authorship also accept the identification of John with the Beloved Disciple. In addition, there are some who accept it even though they do not consider the Apostle John the author. Thus Bernard finds himself forced to see in John the Beloved Disciple because there is no other tradition, even though he leans towards the Elder John as the author.¹² Strachan makes this identification because John would otherwise not be mentioned in the book, but he sees in the Beloved Disciple the writer's source of information and inspiration.¹³ Jeremias, who reaches his conclusions on the basis of "*Schallanalyse*," comes to the same conclusion.¹⁴

Many modern scholars find in the Beloved Disciple the "witness" for the Gospel, but cannot identify him with any known person. There is a tendency to see in this familiar figure a "Jerusalem disciple." MacGregor suggests that he stood in the same relation to the writer of this Gospel as did Peter to Mark.¹⁵

II. LEADING CANDIDATES FOR THE AUTHORSHIP

1. THE ELDER JOHN

When Sanday declared that he no longer held the Apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel, he provisionally took refuge in the theory that the so-called Presbyter John of Ephesus was the writer. This study has revealed that he is a very popular candidate for that honor. The Presbyter John looked like the tailor-made answer when doubts were cast on the authorship of the Apostle John, for not only was his name John, but he was connected with Ephesus, and he was called a "disciple of the Lord."¹⁶

Details regarding the Elder's authorship are worked out in various ways.

Harnack says that the Presbyter John is the author, and the Son of Zebedee is the authority on whom he relied.¹⁷ Bernard casts his vote for the Elder John as author,¹⁸ while Jeremias calls him "den Redaktor."¹⁹ MacGregor credits three people with turning out the Gospel: 1. The Beloved Disciple, a young Jerusalem dis-

ciple, as witness; 2. The Evangelist himself, a disciple of the witness, later called John the Elder; 3. The Redactor, who after the Evangelist's death added the Appendix. MacGregor recognizes the possibility of an Aramaic original, and in that case the redactor supplied the Greek translation.²⁰ A. M. Hunter, well-known for his book, *The Message of the New Testament*, suggests that one may "neatly describe the Fourth Gospel as 'The Gospel of John (the Elder) according to John (the son of Zebedee).'"²¹

Others who favor the Elder as author are Dibelius,²² Temple,²³ McNeile,²⁴ Burkitt,²⁵ and Hirsch.²⁶ Goodspeed also nominates the Elder, but he considers him a Greek Christian.²⁷

Opponents of the Elder John theory have tried hard to disprove it. Some admit the existence of the Elder John, but question his relationship to the Elder of I and II John. Others claim he is pure fiction and the result of a misunderstanding of Papias. Barth,²⁸ Appel,²⁹ and Feine³⁰ are unanimous in claiming that the Elder John theory raises more problems than it solves. In regard to the reference to two graves of John in Ephesus, Feine suggests that the second John may well be laid into the same grave with the first, as there will still be only one there. Zahn identifies the Elder John with the Apostle,³¹ and Holland,³² Thiessen,³³ Cadoux,³⁴ and Buechsel³⁵ join in the chorus of voices which protests the existence of the Elder John apart from the Apostle.

Bacon claims to know that the Elder of I and II John is a man named Stratias,³⁶ while Taylor sees the Elder of I and II John as the author of the Gospel but claims his name is unknown.³⁷

2. JOHN THE APOSTLE

Hunter, in a book which appeared in the last decade, makes the surprising statement that "scarcely a reputable scholar in this country nowadays is prepared to affirm that the Fourth Gospel was written by John the Apostle."³⁸ We don't know whom Hunter considers a reputable scholar, but we do know that his fellow citizen of England, A. C. Headlam, in his last book, published posthumously just two years ago, says "that the balance of probability is that the author of the Fourth Gospel was, as the Christian Church has always held, the Son of Zebedee."³⁹ Holland,⁴⁰ Nolloth,⁴¹ Broomfield,⁴² and Hart⁴³ are other Englishmen whose writings reveal their agreement with the old tradition.

In Germany, Riggenbach asserts that Papias—who is quoted so often in favor of the Elder—"testifies to the composition of the Gospel by the Apostle John."⁴⁴ Appel,⁴⁵ Feine,⁴⁶ Buechsel,⁴⁷ Schlatter,⁴⁸ and Rump⁴⁹ are other German scholars who see no reason for deserting the traditional view. In the United States many conservative scholars still name John the Apostle as the author of the Fourth Gospel. Prominent among these is A. T. Robertson, who in a late work writes:

After a lifetime of study of the Johannine problem as presented by Bretschneider, Baur, Bacon, Moffatt, and all the rest, my own mind finds fewer unsolved difficulties in the single great figure who wrote the Johannine literature and became the eagle who soared above the clouds into the clear sky of eternal truth in Christ.⁵⁰

3. OTHER THEORIES

Other theories include 1. *The Aramaic Original Theory* as propounded by Burney and Torrey. Surprisingly Burney considers the Elder John the author, and he sets the date of writing between 75 and 80 and the place of writing at Antioch.⁵¹ Torrey, who also believes in an Aramaic original, believes the Gospel was written before 70.⁵² 2. *The Anonymous Theory*. The elusiveness of the Presbyter John has caused some people to lean towards the belief that the Gospel is anonymous. Scott suggests that the author took pains to leave his book anonymous.⁵³ 3. *The High-Priest John Theory*. Robert Eisler, in his book *The Enigma of the Fourth Gospel*,⁵⁴ bases this theory, at least in part, on a statement of Polycrates that "John, a priest who wore the frontlet," wrote the book. As far as we can see, few people take this seriously.

III. OPINIONS ON THE DATE AND PLACE OF WRITING

WHEN WAS THE FOURTH GOSPEL WRITTEN?

The traditional date of the writing of the Fourth Gospel is the end of the first century. Late dates were advanced by the Tuebingen School, some going as far as 170 A. D., but few moderns hold to such a late date. Advocates of an early dating are increasing, for one thing, because there do not seem to be any good reasons for the later date once the traditional theory that John the Apostle wrote it at an advanced age in Ephesus has been surrendered.

Among those who still hold to a late date, we mention Enslin,

who thinks that "it would seem most likely to have been penned during the first three or four decades of the second century."⁵⁵ Grill places the book between 135 and 145 A. D.,⁵⁶ and Couchoud⁵⁷ agrees with him. But advocates of such a late date are exceptional, and we must agree with Buechsel when he says: "Die Nachfolger Baur datieren allgemein das Buch wesentlich frueher, auf 100 bis 125 A. D."⁵⁸

The trend toward late first-century dating is shown by words such as this: "The appearance of the Johannine writings at the end of the first century may safely be accepted as a sound historical conclusion."⁵⁹ Moffatt sets the *terminus ad quem* not much later than 110 A. D. and says that the *terminus a quo* "is determined approximately by the date of the Synoptic Gospels, all of which, as we have already seen, were probably known to the writer."⁶⁰ Not all agree on John's use of the Synoptics, but Moffatt's words represent a common viewpoint, regardless of whom the writer considers the author. Authorship and date are not necessarily connected.

Those who espouse an early date are, generally speaking, proponents of some unusual theory regarding authorship. Shelton sees the Gospel written in Alexandria about the same time as the other Gospels.⁶¹ Burney and Torrey, advocates of the Aramaic original, both date the Gospel early, the former placing it after the fall of Jerusalem and the latter before. Burch⁶² and Goodenough⁶³ are others who look on John as an early Gospel.

WHERE WAS THE GOSPEL WRITTEN?

1. *Ephesus*.—The consensus on this point is still, even among those who have forsaken the Apostolic authorship, that the Gospel was written at Ephesus. Huegel,⁶⁴ Goodspeed,⁶⁵ and Hunter,⁶⁶ to mention only a few, fall in this class. Broomfield takes an unusual position in that he believes that John wrote the Gospel, but not in Ephesus.⁶⁷ The Lakes question both the Johannine and the Ephesian origin of the Gospel.⁶⁸

2. *Alexandria*.—Both Broomfield⁶⁹ and the Lakes⁷⁰ vote for Alexandria as the place of writing, and Perry^{70a} is inclined to agree with them. The Alexandrian theory is intriguing from this angle that several of the latest papyrus finds made in Egypt, including the Egerton Papyrus,⁷¹ have had portions of John's Gospel inscribed on them.

3. *Other Places.*—Burney makes quite a case for Antioch in Syria, while Mingana, on the basis of a fairly modern manuscript recently discovered, which states that John "wrote in Greek in Bithynia," says that "the possibility that it was composed in Bithynia has to be considered."⁷² Considered perhaps, but until further and more ancient evidence is found, not too seriously considered.

IV. DOES THE FOURTH GOSPEL HAVE ANY HISTORICAL VALUE?

Form criticism, which questions the historical value of all Gospels and sees in them not biographies, but writings which grew up in connection with the developing life of the primitive Christian communities, ends up with little or no history in the Gospels. Thus Bultmann says: "I do indeed think that we can now know nothing concerning the life and personality of Jesus."⁷³ Dana agrees that "the Gospels were never intended as chronological biographies."⁷⁴ Naturally, the Fourth Gospel would fall under this judgment.

Many see history in the Synoptics, but not in John. Thus Denny dismisses the historical character of the Fourth Gospel with these words:

Modern scholars almost without exception recognize that this Gospel cannot be used as an historical source with the same confidence that we feel towards Mark and the "Teaching Source." It is not so much biography as an interpretation of Jesus that we find in John. . . . Hence, as history, the fourth Gospel has very little value.⁷⁵

Burkitt thinks that "the Evangelist was no historian; ideas, not events, were to him the true realities."⁷⁶ The Lakes consider Mark a true account of the ministry of Jesus and Matthew and Luke a true account of His teaching. And since John's account is so very different from them, "it must be largely, if not entirely, fictitious and written by a Hellenistic Christian in order to support the sacramental theology which finds a centre in the divine Jesus."⁷⁷

On the other hand, there are still many even in the ranks of those who are usually considered "liberals" who find history in John. Jeremias, in opposition to Denny, says: "Wir haben nicht drei, sondern vier Synoptiker."⁷⁸ Gardner-Smith goes so far as to say: "In the last few years there has been a distinct tendency to admit that in some respects the Fourth Gospel is nearer to primitive

tradition than either Matthew or Luke." ⁷⁹ And Scott, in his recent book *The Purpose of the Gospels*, writes concerning the Fourth Gospel: "It is coming to be recognized that while this Gospel has a character of its own, it is yet historical in the same sense as the others." ⁸⁰

V. SUMMARIES AND CONCLUSIONS

It is seldom possible to speak of a real consensus on the various points discussed in this paper. Certain trends are, however, evident, and it is these that shall be treated in this final section.

Many serious scholars are reminding us that *the question of the authorship of the Gospel should not be confused with that of its integrity and reliability*. They believe it weakens the authority of the book if we make that authority dependent on a position which is not demanded by the book itself. So it is being emphasized more and more that the book per se is anonymous. And if it is anonymous, there is no more reason for questioning its place in the inspired Scriptures than there is for questioning the place of the other Gospels; for they are all anonymous. The fact that questions concerning John's authorship first came from liberal-minded scholars is not easily forgotten, but this fact should not lead us to make belief in John's authorship a *sine qua non* of orthodoxy. This trend toward open-mindedness is very evident even in the writings of those who finally come to the conclusion that John did write the Gospel.

The denial of Johannine authorship is, it must be admitted, very widespread. For this there are chiefly two reasons. The first is the subjective feeling that the book is not in keeping with the character of a personal eyewitness disciple of Jesus. This is largely the result of comparing the Synoptic picture of Christ and His life with that found in the Fourth Gospel. The assumption is that the Synoptic picture is historical and therefore John's picture cannot be. Therefore the writer evidently did not know the real Jesus and so could not have been John. The second reason, and this one looms larger in the minds of those who find no difficulty in harmonizing the two accounts, is the evidence for the early martyrdom of John.

The only outstanding consensus on a substitute for the Apostle is the Presbyter John of Ephesus. In view of the rather inconclusive evidence on this point, it seems surprising that so many scholars should come out unreservedly for this candidate. It would seem to

indicate a lot of "follow the leader" spirit. Outside the popularity of the Elder John, the only other noticeable trend is that which makes an unnamed disciple of Jesus the author. This trend is proof of the weakness of the evidence for the Presbyter.

It must also be pointed out that *there are still many who cling to the Apostolic authorship* as offering less difficulties than any other theory. A number of Introductions which have come from Germany during the period considered are included in the works which espouse this view. And also in England, where Hunter ventured the opinion that hardly any reputable scholar still held to that view, there are outstanding scholars who see no reasons for changing their position. A leaning in the direction of Johannine authorship might also be indicated by the large number of "reputable scholars" who see the influence of St. John behind the writer. From assuming John's influence it is not too big a step to assuming his authority. And when you have gone that far, the next step is to say that he was the author.

Opinions on the date of the Gospel are overwhelmingly in favor of the traditional late first-century date. Lightfoot's prediction made in 1871 seems to be approaching fulfillment:

We may look forward to the time when it will be held discreditable to the reputation of any critic for sobriety and judgment to assign to this Gospel any later date than the end of the first century, or the very beginning of the second.⁸¹

Even the extremest critics have receded far from the date proposed by F. C. Baur, 170 A.D. A slight trend in the direction of dating the Gospel with the Synoptics is making its presence felt. The general trend, then, is away from late dating.

While we have not considered the question of the use of sources in the writing of the book and of its unitary character in the general discussion, it might be mentioned that the *tendency is to emphasize the unitary character of the book*. There are some who find different source materials in it. Many believe the twenty-first chapter to be an addition by a different hand. There is talk about interpolations and parts of the Gospel having been disarranged, but on the whole, as Dodd says, "it is fashionable at present in critical circles to accept the unity of the work, and to reject either partition theories or the presence of large interpolations."⁸² There is re-

markable agreement in the works studied that from the standpoint of style and thought patterns there is a unity that will not be denied.

The final conclusion is that there is a *noticeable tendency to uphold the historical character of the Fourth Gospel*. Some are willing to concede only that on a few points the Fourth Gospel has more reliable sources than have the Synoptics. Others will say that the Fourth Evangelist deliberately sets out to correct the other Gospel writers. By and large, there are many who no longer make the claim that the Fourth Gospel was never meant to contain history, but admit that there is definitely an historical basis in the Fourth Gospel.

That this trend is persisting is shown by the following quotations from recent works. In the third edition of Howard's *The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation*, 1945, we read:

With one notable exception, there is no reason why the Synoptic account of the Galilean ministry, with journeys through Samaria and into the North, should not fall within the time limits marked clearly in this Johannine outline of the life of Jesus from the Baptism to the Cross. . . . In John there are indications of superior sources of information regarding the last days in Jerusalem. . . . The main result of this part of our examination is that in certain respects the Fourth Gospel is a valuable source for our knowledge of the course of the ministry of Jesus, supplying information where the Marcan narrative fails us.⁸³

The title of Bishop Headlam's last published work, *The Fourth Gospel as History*, published in 1948, speaks for itself. Both Scott and Duncan,⁸⁴ in books bearing the date 1949, stand up for the historical nature of the events recorded in the Fourth Gospel. The former, after remarking about the changed attitude of criticism, states point-blank that in spite of the peculiar character of the Gospel "it is yet historical in the same sense as the others."⁸⁵

In summing up the last three conclusions, we should note that not a single one contains anything which would make the Apostolic authorship impossible or even improbable. Wherever there has been a change in the attitude of criticism, as in the case of the date, the unity, and the historical character of the work, the change has been such as to re-establish the theory of Johannine authorship as a possible solution of the problem. This does not mean that

the people who represent these positions are necessarily supporting the traditional view. No, many have reached these conclusions in spite of the fact that they do not hold to the Johannine authorship. This makes their opinions all the more meaningful.

These recent trends are significant for readers of John's Gospel regardless of whether they hold to the inspiration of Scripture or not. Those who look upon the Gospel as a divine message, but not the inerrant Word of God will consider it important because they still believe that the Christian faith is grounded in history, on the historical Christ, the Son of God. The Fourth Gospel, which has contributed so much to that faith, be it ever so wonderful as a work of art, would lose immeasurably if the picture it paints of the Word made flesh were just the figment of the imagination of one who had experienced the meaning of this Jesus rather than a true-to-life presentation by one who had walked and talked with Jesus for several years and had entered into close personal fellowship with Him. The believer in the inspiration of Scripture is also interested in these trends. They confirm him in his determination to abide by these Scriptures as God's very message of life in spite of all contrary human opinions. Even if he should be forced to the conclusion that not John, but some other disciple of Jesus wrote the Gospel, it would still remain Scripture with all that that implies. On the other hand, many have the feeling toward this Gospel that it is particularly close to the source of Christianity, to the divine-human Christ Himself. They will feel relieved to discover that there is no compelling reason for discarding authorship by John, the Beloved Disciple, who also leaned on Jesus' breast at the Last Supper.

St. Louis, Mo.

NOTES

¹ Many see the martyrdom of John indicated Mark 10:39. George Hamartolos, a ninth-century writer, refers to this when he says that Papias in his second book writes that John "was killed by the Jews, thus plainly fulfilling, along with his brother, the prophecy of Christ concerning them and their own confession and common agreement concerning Him." The De Boor Fragment, discovered about 1888, containing portions of the *Epitome* of Philip of Side, a seventh- or eighth-century work, says: "Papias, in his second book, says that John the divine and James, his brother, were killed by the Jews." In a fourth-century Syriac church calendar, John and James, Apostles, are commemorated together, on December 27, as having both suffered martyrdom in Jerusalem.

² The statement of Papias to which reference is here made is given in trans-

lation as follows: "If anyone came who had followed the presbyters, I inquired into the words of the presbyters, what Andrew or Peter or Philip or Thomas or James or John or Matthew, or any other of the Lord's disciples, had said, and what Aristion and the presbyter John, the Lord's disciple, were saying." From the past perfect tense used in the first part, the conclusion is drawn that John, like the others mentioned in that list, was already dead in the days of Papias' youth. Others, however, consider "the presbyter John," referred to in the second part, as being identical with the first John, who, it must be admitted, is also referred to as a presbyter. In other words, if the latter are correct, Papias inquired what John and the other Apostles had said; but regarding one of them, John, who was still living, he also inquired what he was saying. This statement of Papias is also very important to those who claim that a second John, whom they call the Presbyter John, wrote the Fourth Gospel in Ephesus.

³ Walter Bauer, *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Zweiter Band, p. 4 (1912).

⁴ Martin Dibelius, "Johannesevangelium," *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Vol. III, p. 362 (1929).

⁵ Emanuel Hirsch, *Studien zum Vierten Evangelium*, p. 141 (1936).

⁶ H. Latimer Jackson, *The Problem of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 150 (1918).

⁷ R. H. Charles, *The Revelation of St. John*, *International Critical Commentary*, Vol. I, page L.

⁸ Henry Bernard, *The Gospel of John*, *International Critical Commentary*, Vol. I, p. xlv.

⁹ Gerald Webb Broomfield, *John, Peter, and the Fourth Gospel*, p. 170 (1934).

¹⁰ H. P. V. Nunn, *The Son of Zebedee and the Fourth Gospel*, p. 51 (1927).

¹¹ F. Buechsel, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, p. 26 (1946).

¹² *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. xxxvii.

¹³ R. H. Strachan, *The Fourth Gospel, Its Significance and Environment*, p. 82 (1941).

¹⁴ Johannes Jeremias, *Der apostolische Ursprung der vier Evangelien*, p. 57 (1932).

¹⁵ G. H. C. MacGregor, *Moffatt New Testament Commentary, The Gospel of John*, pp. xlvii and xlvi (1928).

¹⁶ See Note 2.

¹⁷ Adolf v. Harnack, quoted by Hans Windisch in "Literature of the New Testament," *Harvard Theological Review*, January, 1926, p. 63.

¹⁸ *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. xxxiv.

¹⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 112.

²⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. lxiii f.

²¹ A. M. Hunter, *Introducing the New Testament*, p. 50 (1945).

²² *Op. cit.*, p. 362.

²³ William Temple, *Readings in St. John's Gospel, First Series*, p. x (1939).

²⁴ A. H. McNeile, *An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament*, p. 264 (1927).

²⁵ F. C. Burkitt, *The Gospel History and Its Transmission*, p. 254, (1911, reprinted 1925).

²⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 154.

²⁷ E. J. Goodspeed, *Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 314 f. (1937).

²⁸ Fritz Barth, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, p. 310 f. (1921).

- ²⁹ Heinrich Appel, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, p. 183 (1915).
- ³⁰ Paul Feine, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, p. 90 f. (1923).
- ³¹ Th. Zahn, *Grundriss der Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, p. 77 (1928).
- ³² H. S. Holland, *The Philosophy of Faith and the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 196 to 203 (1920).
- ³³ H. C. Thiessen, *Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 165 (1944).
- ³⁴ C. J. Cadoux, quoted in F. F. Bruce, "Some Notes on the Fourth Evangelist," in *Evangelical Quarterly*, XVI, No. 2, p. 101 (1944).
- ³⁵ *Op cit.*, p. 24.
- ³⁶ Benjamin W. Bacon, "The Elder of Ephesus and the Elder John" in *Hibbert Journal*, Vol. 20, p. 116 ff. (1927).
- ³⁷ Vincent Taylor, *The Gospels, A Short Introduction*, p. 106 (5th Ed., 1945).
- ³⁸ A. M. Hunter, *op cit.*, p. 50.
- ³⁹ A. C. Headlam, *The Fourth Gospel as History*, p. 70 (1948).
- ⁴⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 198.
- ⁴¹ C. F. Nolloth, *The Fourth Evangelist*, pp. 36 and 89 (1925).
- ⁴² G. W. Broomfield, *op cit.*, p. 210.
- ⁴³ J. S. Hart, *The Gospel Foundations*, p. 144 (1930).
- ⁴⁴ Quoted in Windisch, "Literature on the New Testament," *Harvard Theological Review*, January, 1926, p. 62.
- ⁴⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 37.
- ⁴⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 86.
- ⁴⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 7.
- ⁴⁸ Adolf Schlatter, *Der Evangelist Johannes, Wie er spricht, denkt und glaubt*, p. 375 (1930).
- ⁴⁹ Johann Rump, *Das Johannesevangelium*, p. 436 f. (1918).
- ⁵⁰ A. T. Robertson, *Epochs in the Life of the Apostle John*, p. 7 (1935).
- ⁵¹ C. F. Burney, *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 141 (1922).
- ⁵² Charles Cutler Torrey, *The Four Gospels, A New Translation*, p. xiii (1947 — 2d Ed.).
- ⁵³ Ernest F. Scott, *The Literature of the New Testament*, p. 246 (1932).
- ⁵⁴ Published in 1938.
- ⁵⁵ Morton Scott Enslin, *Christian Beginnings*, p. 451 (1938).
- ⁵⁶ Julius Grill, *Untersuchungen ueber die Entstehung des vierten Evangeliums*, Part 2, p. 408 (1923).
- ⁵⁷ P. L. Couchoud, "The Historicity of Jesus — A Reply to Alfred Loisy," *Hibbert Journal*, 37:2, p. 211 (1938).
- ⁵⁸ F. Buechsel, *op. cit.*, p. 2.
- ⁵⁹ J. Iverach, "John, Gospel of," *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, 1925 Ed., Vol. III, p. 1720.
- ⁶⁰ James Moffatt, *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, p. 581 (1922).
- ⁶¹ H. S. Shelton, "The Authorship and Date of the Gospels Reconsidered," *Hibbert Journal*, Vol. 41 and 42, p. 171 (1943).
- ⁶² Vacher Burch, *The Structure and Message of St. John's Gospel* (1928).
- ⁶³ W. R. Goodenough, "John a Primitive Gospel," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1945, pp. 145—182.

⁶⁴ Baron F. v. Huegel, "John, the Gospel of," *The Encyclopædia Britannica*, 14th Ed., Vol. XIII, p. 98.

⁶⁵ Edgar F. Goodspeed, *The Story of the New Testament*, pp. 107—112. (1916).

⁶⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 51.

⁶⁷ G. W. Broomfield, *John, Peter, and the Fourth Gospel*, p. 172 (1934).

⁶⁸ Kirsopp Lake and Silva Lake, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 53 (1937).

⁶⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 181.

⁷⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 53.

^{70a} Alfred M. Perry, "Is John an Alexandrian Gospel?" *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 63, pp. 99—106 (1944).

⁷¹ "A fragment of papyrus has recently been discovered in Egypt, the very oldest remnant of a Christian book which has yet come to light, and the two verses written on it are from the Gospel of John. Another early fragment has been recovered which can be dated, by scientific tests, somewhere about 150 A. D. (Egerton Papyrus, *Fragments of an Unknown Gospel*.) It belonged apparently to a Gospel of later origin and is made up of extracts from those already in existence, with one or two additions. Most of the verses are from the Gospel of John." E. F. Scott, *The Purpose of the Gospels*, p. 110 (1949).

⁷² A. Mingana, *The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel, A New Document*. Reprinted from a Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, p. 7.

⁷³ Rudolf Bultmann, *Jesus and the Word*, p. 8, quoted in George S. Duncan, *Jesus, Son of Man*, p. 21 (1949).

⁷⁴ H. E. Dana, "The Stratification of Tradition in the Fourth Gospel," *The Journal of Religion*, Vol. 17, p. 62 (1937).

⁷⁵ W. B. Denny, *The Career and Significance of Jesus*, p. 25 (c. 1933, Tenth Printing 1947).

⁷⁶ F. C. Burkitt, *The Gospel History and Its Transmission*, p. 256 (1911, reprinted 1925).

⁷⁷ Lake and Lake, *op. cit.*, p. 50.

⁷⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 145.

⁷⁹ P. Gardner-Smith, *Saint John and the Synoptic Gospels*, p. 95 (1938).

⁸⁰ E. F. Scott, *The Purpose of the Gospels*, p. 110 (1949).

⁸¹ Quoted in H. C. Vedder, *The Johannine Writings and the Johannine Problem*, p. 154 (1917).

⁸² C. H. Dodd, quoted in A. C. Headlam, *The Fourth Gospel as History*, p. 83 (1948).

⁸³ Wilbert Francis Howard, *The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation*, p. 176 f. (3d Ed., 1945.)

⁸⁴ George S. Duncan, *Jesus, Son of Man*, p. 16 (1949).

⁸⁵ E. F. Scott, *The Purpose of the Gospels*, p. 110 (1949).

NOTE: Hugo Odeberg, *The Fourth Gospel*, Uppsala och Stockholm, 1929 — a profound interpretation of John's Gospel in its relation to contemporaneous religious currents in Palestine and the Hellenistic world — does not discuss the problem of authorship. I am informed, however, that the editors of CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY are planning to publish an article by Professor Odeberg in which he defends the Johannine authorship.