Durham University

Durham E-Theses

The holy one of God : A study in John 6:69.

W.R. Domeris

How to cite:

Domeris, W.R. (1983) The holy one of God : A study in John 6:69. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/1210/ is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the full Durham E-Theses policy for further details.

Academic Support Office, The Palatine Centre, Durham University, Stockton Road, Durham, DH1 3LE
e-mail: e-theses.admin@durham.ac.uk Tel: +44 0191 334 6107
https://etheses.durham.ac.uk

THE HOLY ONE OF GOD. A STUDY IN JOHN 6:69

William Robert Domeris

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

Ph.D. Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty of Divinity

University of Durham

April 1983.



27. APR. 1984

ABSTRACT

Peter, according to John 6:69, confesses Jesus, not by one of the more familiar Christological titles, but by the enigmatic expression "The Holy One of God". The literature of the time offers few clues beyond an exorcism in Mark, where a demoniac uses the same title (Mk 1:24 repeated in Lk 4:34). What does the title mean? May we describe its contents as messianic or prophetic, priestly or descriptive of Jesus' deity?

Our quest takes us into a consideration of these and other possible interpretations. We discover that the key to the title lies in the sense of agency inherent in the one half of the title ("of God") and the sense of divinely given authority implicit in the other half ("the Holy One"). For Mark, the agency, within the broader context of the Gospel, may be described as messianic, although in the narrower confines of the exorcism, we are probably to think of a holy man or hasid. For Luke, the cry of the demoniac becomes a confirmation, in accord with much of ch 4, of Jesus' prophetic role. Behind both the Marcan and Lucan redaction, we catch a glimpse of an earlier setting in which the demons recognize the agent of God's Council, God's servant and holy one.

For John, the messianic, prophetic and priestly answers fail to satisfy. The Holy One, in John 6, transcends these categories and points beyond to the realm of divine agents like Wisdom or the Son of Man. In the tension between Jesus and Judas, and in the positive response of Peter in his confession, we may recognise a parable of Wisdom, coming to earth, being played out. The Holy One comes from the presence of God, enters (10:36) and exits from this world (17:19). Peter, as the spokesman of the believing community and as if in anticipation of the crisis of Jesus' crucifixion, recognizes the one who has power over life and death.

Statement of Copyright

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without his prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Statement of Copyright		3
Preface		9
CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION		10
1:1	The Purpose of the Investigation	10
1:2	The Text of John 6:69	12
1:3	A Survey of Contemporary Scholarship on John 6:69	15
1:3:1	The Royal Messiah	16
1:3:2	The High Priestly Messiah	19
1:3:3	The Prophet	19
1:3:4	Solutions based on an understanding of ἅγιος in John	21
1:3:5	The Way Forward	23
1:4	The Johannine Use of Titles	26
1:4:1	The Main Titles	26
1:4:2	The Confessions found in the Fourth Gospel	29
1:5	The Holy One of God and related titles	31
1:5:1	The Old Testament	32
1:5:2	The New Testament	35
1:5:3	Other Literature	38
1:6	Some Methodological Considerations ..	40
Footnotes to Chapter One		300
CHAPTER TWO THE MESSIANIC INTERPRETATION OF "THE HOLY ONE OF GOD"		44
2:1	Introduction	44
2:2	The Messianic Interpretation of ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ in Mk 1:24 and Lk 4:34	47
2:2:1	The Conflict with Demons and the Messiah	48
2:2:2	Exorcism, the Son of David and Matthew 12:22f.	49
	(a) The Messiah as a Wise Judge	52
	(b) The Messiah as a Warrior	54
	(c) Exorcism : Conflict and Judgement	57

		Page
2:2:3	The Messianic Secret and the Demonic Confessions	59
2:2:4	The Son of God and the Messiah	60
	(a) The Marcan understanding of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ	64
	(b) The Lucan understanding of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ	68
	(c) Conclusion	71
2:2:5	The Authority of Jesus	73
2:2:6	The Verdict on the Messianic Interpretation of Mk 1:24 and Lk 4:34 - A Qualified Affirmative	76
2:3	The Johannine Evidence	78
2:3:1	The Confession of Peter according to the Synoptic Gospels	80
2:3:2	The idea of the Messiah according to John	90
2:3:3	The Verdict for John : An Open Question	96
	Footnotes to Chapter Two	309
CHAPTER THREE	THE HOLY ONE OF GOD AS A HIGH-PRIESTLY MESSIAH	99
3:1	Introduction	99
3:2	The High Priest and the Priestly Messiah	103
3:2:1	The Old Testament Picture	104
3:2:2	The Qumran Scrolls and the High-Priestly Messiah	107
3:2:3	The Twelve Testaments	113
3:2:4	The Book of Jubilees	115
3:3	Jesus as High Priest	116
3:3:1	Jesus as Intercessor	116
3:3:2	Jesus in the Epistle to the Hebrews ..	118
3:4	The Evidence against the High Priestly Interpretation	120
3:4:1	The Synoptic Picture	121
3:4:2	The Johannine Picture	123
	Footnotes to Chapter Three	320

		Page
CHAPTER FOUR	THE HOLY ONE OF GOD AS A TITLE FOR A PROPHET	130
4:1	Introduction	130
4:2	The Prophetic Interpretation of the Holy One of God	131
4:2:1	The Function of the Prophet in the Old Testament	133
4:2:2	Jesus as Prophet in the New Testament Tradition	137
4:2:3	Exorcism as a Prophetic Function	140
4:2:4	The Marcan Redaction	141
4:2:5	The Scene in the Synagogue according to Luke	146
4:3	The Prophet and the Holy One in John ..	151
4:3:1	Jesus and Elijah and Elisha	152
4:3:2	Jesus and Moses	154
4:3:3	The Prophet and the Holy One in Jn 6 ..	159
4:3:4	A Primitive Tradition	161
4:3:5	Conclusion : Something More	165
Footnotes to Chapter Four		328
CHAPTER FIVE	THE IDEA OF HOLINESS	166
5:1	Holiness as a guide to the Holy One of God	166
5:2	Form and Content	169
5:3	Holiness, a study in terms of קדוש and קודש	170
5:3:1	Holiness, in relation to God	170
5:3:2	Holiness in relation to Objects, Places and Times	173
5:3:3	Holiness in relation to the Court of Yahweh	176
5:3:4	Holiness in relation to People	178
5:4	Holiness, a Study of the Greek terms ἅγιος and ἁγιάζω ..	189
5:4:1	Holiness in the New Testament	192
5:4:2	The Johannine Literature, excluding the Gospel	196
5:5	Holiness and the Fourth Gospel	201
5:5:1	Holiness in relation to the rest of the New Testament	201
5:5:2	Ἁγιάζω in the Fourth Gospel	203
5:5:3	Chapter 10	203

		Page
5:5:4	Chapter 17	213
5:6	Conclusion	224
Footnotes to Chapter Five		337
CHAPTER SIX THE MESSENGER FROM GOD		225
6:1:1	Introduction	225
6:1:2	The Positive Sense of the Holy One ..	227
6:1:3	The Negative Sense of the Holy One ..	230
6:2	The Dualism in the Fourth Gospel ..	232
6:2:1	The Anthropological Aspect	233
6:2:2	The Cosmological Aspect	235
6:2:3	The Soteriological Aspect	237
6:2:4	The Ethical Aspect	240
6:2:5	The Dualism in John and the Holy One of God	242
6:3	The Demonology of the Fourth Gospel ..	244
6:3:1	Cosmic Tension in John	245
6:3:2	The Term δαιμόνιον	247
6:3:3	The Term διάβολος	250
6:3:4	The Term Σατανᾶς	254
6:4	The Cosmic Dimension of the Holy One of God	254
6:4:1	The Demonic Perspective	255
6:4:2	The Michael Tradition	259
6:5	Conclusion	261
Footnotes to Chapter Six		352
CHAPTER SEVEN THE DIVINE REVEALER		263
7:1	An Exposition of John 6	263
7:1:1	The Question of Unity	263
7:1:2	The Figure of Wisdom	266
7:1:3	The Feeding of the 5000 (6:1-15) ..	268
7:1:4	The Walking on the Water (6:16-21) ..	271
7:1:5	The Bread from Heaven (6:22-59) . ..	272
7:1:6	Conflict and Confession (6:60-71) ..	281
7:2	The Holy One as a Divine Agent	290
7:2:1	The Holy One and the Son of God	290
7:2:2	The Holy One and the Son of Man	292
7:3	Conclusion	296
Footnotes to Chapter Seven		358

Page

Abbreviations 298
A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF CITED WORKS 368
Reference works 368
Commentaries on the Fourth Gospel 370
Books and Articles on the Fourth Gospel 373

PREFACE

Pen to paper, and a deluge of memories descend like an African thunderstorm. This thesis drew its inspiration from a meander of the river Wear and the granite stones of a Norman Cathedral. It blossomed into life in an English College which bubbled with sheer exuberance and Christian joy. I remember dark winter's mornings in the dampness of of the boathouse, cobbled streets misty in the light of the gas lamps, the choir in the college Chapel making heaven ring in notes bitter-sweet, and the silence of the river banks thickly covered with snow. I remember most vividly a study in Abbey house where a master scholar taught his apprentice to see the vision behind the stone.

So first of all I thank the Rev. Prof. C.K. Barrett for that glimpse of a vision, for his advice and criticism and most of all for his encouragement which helped me to reach beyond my limitations and for his time, given so very generously even after I left Durham. I thank also the staff and students of St. John's College for creating an atmosphere where fun and hard work could grow and mature side by side. I think in particular of the Principal, Ruth Etchells and the Rev. Dr. Bruce Kaye, who allowed my wife Shona and I to serve as tutors and so opened the way for us to cope financially during the two and a half years in England. I am reminded also of the conversations with Bruce and Dr. John Painter into the early hours or while jogging through Pelaw Woods.

For the folk in South Africa who made this thesis possible, thanks are due. To Mrs. Shirley Kerr for allowing me leave during the period I was in Durham and for her endless encouragement. To David Lloyd-Jones and Glenda Kruz who assisted with the proof reading. Finally to two very important people. My mother who patiently typed and retyped this thesis and travelled 2000 miles to complete the work. Thank you for those many, many hours. Finally to the one who is the real inspiration behind the thesis. The one who supported me in so many ways both in England and here in South Africa. To the one who so unselfishly gave of herself that this thesis might become a reality. To Shona, my wife, I dedicate this thesis.

CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION

		Page
1:1	The Purpose of the Investigation	10
1:2	The Text of John 6:69	12
1:3	A Survey of Contemporary Scholarship on John 6:69	15
1:3:1	The Royal Messiah	16
1:3:2	The High Priestly Messiah	19
1:3:3	The Prophet	19
1:3:4	Solutions based on an understanding of ἅγιος in John	21
1:3:5	The Way Forward	23
1:4	The Johannine Use of Titles	26
1:4:1	The Main Titles	26
1:4:2	The Confessions found in the Fourth Gospel ..	29
1:5	The Holy One of God and related titles	31
1:5:1	The Old Testament	32
1:5:2	The New Testament	35
1:5:3	Other Literature	38
1:6	Some Methodological Considerations	40
	Footnotes to Chapter One	300

CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION

1:1 The Purpose of the Investigation

The sixth chapter of the Gospel according to John commences with the narrative of the Feeding of the Five Thousand (6:1-15), which is followed by a description of Jesus' appearance to his disciples on Lake Galilee (16-21). There are some striking parallels with the Synoptic accounts of both incidents. The next block of material in the chapter is largely without parallel in the other Gospels[1], as so many of the Johannine discourses are, and contains detailed teaching on Jesus as the Bread of Life (22-59). Thus the miraculous feeding of the crowd becomes a sign, pointing to the new teaching on the person and mission of Jesus. This teaching results in dissension among the followers of Jesus (vs 60) and indeed defection on the part of some (vs 66).

(66) After this many of his disciples drew back and no longer went about with him. (67) Jesus said to the twelve, 'Will you also go away?' (68) Simon Peter answered him, 'Lord, to whom shall we go? You have (the) words of eternal life; (69) and we have believed and have come to know, that you are the Holy One of God.' (70) Jesus answered them, 'Did I not choose you, the twelve, and one of you is a devil?' (71) He spoke of Judas the son of Simon Iscariot, for he, one of the twelve, was to betray him.

In Mark and Matthew there are two feedings recorded, so that in Mark 6:30-44 we have an account of the loaves and fishes, which is then followed by Jesus' appearance on Lake Galilee (vss 45-52), and a comment about the disciples' misunderstanding the miracle of the feeding (vs 52). Then later there is the feeding of the 4000 (as opposed to the earlier 5000) found in Mark 8:1-10, which is shortly followed by Peter's confession of Jesus as "the Christ" (8:29) and Jesus' rebuke against Peter as "Satan" (8:33). While the writer of the Fourth Gospel seems to know a tradition similar to that of the Feeding of the 5000 in Mark 6 (followed by the incident on Galilee), there are also indications that he knew a tradition in which Peter's confession followed a feeding miracle. So when we compare the Fourth Gospel narrative in ch 6 with the Markan version (in chs 6 and 8) we are confronted by obvious parallels and remarkable differences.

Perhaps the most pointed contrast is to be found in the very words of Peter, which contain the confession, σὺ εἶ ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ and the interesting statement, ῥήματα ζωῆς αἰωνίου ἔχεις. The latter reminds us that one of the chief concerns of the Evangelist is to present Jesus as the one who brings eternal life to those who believe in him, and this concern is voiced through the attention given to Jesus' teaching on eternal life and in the conclusion to ch 20— vs 31: "These things are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you may have life in his name." The former statement, that Jesus is ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ stands in sharp contrast to the Synoptic confessions of Peter in which Jesus is acclaimed ὁ χριστός in Mark (8:29), ὁ χριστὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ in Luke (9:20) and ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος in

Matthew (16:16).

The title ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ may be rendered in translation as "the Holy One of God" and is not unknown to the Synoptics, that is, to Mark and Luke (cf Mk 1:24 and Lk 4:34), but there it is the confession (if that is an accurate term for the action) of a demon-possessed man. It is the intention of this work to examine the expression ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ as it is found in Jn 6:69 in relation to the Synoptic usage and to related expressions which occur in the Jewish literature of the time, the relevant non-Jewish works, and the New Testament, so as to determine the background and intention of the title. We shall discover that the title contains within it several layers of tradition and that at different times it could mean different things. Our task is then to determine as far as possible what the writer of the Fourth Gospel understood by the title. - Secondly, we will attempt to explain the relation between the Fourth Gospel usage and the Synoptic usage. Thirdly, we will undertake an examination of the relation between this title and the other titles of Jesus found in John, particularly ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ.

So far as I am aware, there has been no major work devoted to these three questions[2] and apart from brief comments found in the Commentaries on John (or Mark and Luke), the fullest discussion of the question is that of H.L.N.Joubert.[3] Presently we shall have occasion to examine the various suggestions which have been made in the course of this century, at first briefly and then later in greater depth so as to assist us in arriving at the correct decision. The task is made more interesting by the variety which is apparent within the various scholarly works on Jn 6:69. We turn now to an examination of the text.

1:2 The Text of Jn 6:69.

The text of Jn 6:66-71 is quite straightforward until we come to the words of Peter, particularly the phrase which we have undertaken to interpret. All in all there are six readings[4] for vs 69b including ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ. They are the following :-

(a) The Holy One of God (ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ) which is found in ℵBCDLA et alia. The reading in P75 is uncertain but most likely it should be included here.(5) (The symbols are those of Nestle; NT Graece).

(b) The Christ, the Holy One of God (ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ) which is found in P 66 E(Sah codd boh.).

(c) The Christ, the Son of the Living God (ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος) which is found in N.W.Δ (vt^sq) S(vg^ms) G ab Bas Chr Victorin 2/2.

(d) The Christ, the Son of God. (ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ) which is found in I + C 33.565. L(vt^e dl vg) S(vt^s) E(boh^codd) Cyr. Saec 4/5.

(e) The Son of the Living God (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος) which is found in L(vt^b) S(vt^c).

(f) The Christ (ὁ Χριστός) which is found in Tertullian.

Present day scholarship is unanimous in its support of ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ as the original reading. This reading is found in all the major critical editions of the Greek text(6) and in the important modern translations from the R.V. onwards.(7) The Textual evidence suggests that ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ was the original reading and that in time a harmonising process (whether intentional or accidental) made itself felt. Part of this process had its origin in the messianic confession of Peter at Caesarea Philippi as found in the Synoptics. Thus variant (f) coincides with Mk 8:29, while (c) repeats the Matthean confession (Mt 16:16). The other part of this process was a remembrance of the confessional statement at the end of the Fourth Gospel (Jn 20:31 cf 11:27), which affected variant (d). Whether through scribal error or deliberate change the original reading was made to conform with the traditional idea that Peter's confession of Jesus was (or should be) a messianic confession. Perhaps the most significant reading is (b) which clearly evidences the first step in this direction by the insertion of ὁ Χριστός.

Another question which should be considered at this stage is that of the place of Jn 6:60-71 within the Gospel context. Several scholars have suggested that the order of the Johannine Gospel has suffered serious

dislocation so that the present order is not that of the original Gospel.(8) There are redactional comments within the Gospel(9) and some difficult transitions between one section and another, such as in the Farewell discourses.(10) This has led to a feeling of dissatisfaction with the present arrangement of the Gospel on the part of some scholars, of whom perhaps R.Bultmann is best known.(11) Bultmann places 6:60-71 after 11:55 - 12:33; 8:30-40 and before 12:37-41. In this way Bultmann sets alongside each other two of the "summaries of Jesus' public ministry",(12) which in the present order mark the end of Jesus' ministry in Galilee (6:60-71), and in Jerusalem (12:37-50). There appears to be no good reason to move Peter's confession in 6:69 to a Jerusalem context,(13) and indeed this pericope appears to look back (cf vs 60f) to 6:52-59, particularly the verb σκανδαλίζει in vs 61 (cf 6:52);(14) so that in its present form chapter 6 moves quite naturally from one section to another. The order thus makes good sense as it now stands and there seems little reason to disturb this form.(15)

A more difficult question is that of the order of the chapters, in our case chs 5 and 6, since there are fairly good reasons for understanding ch 6 as chronologically prior to ch 5,(16) for example - 6:1 is rather abrupt in its present context, with Jesus' departure to the other side of the Sea of Galilee following on ch 5, which centres in Jerusalem. If we place ch 5 after ch 6, the problem is eased somewhat. This re-ordering is discussed by R.Schnackenburg(17) and although there is no manuscript evidence to support it, it must remain a possible alternative to the present order.(18) We do well to remember also the work of J.L.Martyn(19) who compares the Fourth Gospel to a "Tell", in which indications are apparent of different strata, corresponding to different periods in the life of the Johannine community. Such a view of the Fourth Gospel has much to commend it, and it has the advantage of explaining abrupt transitions in the text without making complex re-arrangement necessary.

It seems unlikely that 6:60-71 should be understood as an isolated pericope and accordingly we will attempt to understand its place both in its present context within

ch 6,[20] and within the broader perspective of the whole Gospel. Where appropriate we will consider the alternatives presented by the redaction critics, and in particular the question of 6:69 and its relation to the history of the Johannine community in so far as such a comparison is possible.

1:3 A Survey of Contemporary Scholarship on John 6:69.

In the course of the last thirty years in particular and generally over the duration of this century, a number of suggestions have been made about the precise interpretation of ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ in Jn 6:69. The very diversity of these opinions testifies to the enigmatic quality of the title, which is probably largely attributable to its very infrequency of use - three times in all the available literature pertinent to the time.[21] We cannot rule out the possibility that a sense of enigma was evident even within the NT use, so that the title was used precisely on account of its slightly enigmatic flavour; or possibly that its pre-christian usage was largely forgotten by the time it was incorporated into the Johannine context. Nevertheless we believe that it is possible to arrive at a conclusion not only about the Johannine understanding of the title, but also about its development in pre-Johannine tradition, without impairing completely its enigmatic quality.

With the risk of oversimplification attendant upon such an endeavour, we have attempted to divide the opinions of scholars on Jn 6:69 into four basic categories. Naturally there will be some degree of overlap, with some scholars belonging to two groups at once, so that in certain cases the classification is based on emphasis within a more general opinion. The four categories are as follows :-

(i) Those scholars who understand "the Holy One of God" as a messianic title for Jesus similar to the usual ὁ Χριστός .

(ii) Those scholars who also argue for a messianic interpretation, but instead of the traditional Royal Messiah, they understand the figure of the High Priestly Messiah as evidenced in the Qumran writings.

(iii) Those scholars who see in "the Holy One of God" the

recognition of Jesus as Prophet after the model of Moses or Elijah/Elisha.

(iv) Those scholars who concentrate their attention upon the adjective ἅγιος rather than upon the idea of prophet, priest or king, so that they emphasize <u>the content</u> of the title in terms of ethical qualities or divine qualities, and not the <u>functional form</u> of the title.

As we shall see the interpretations of ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ in Mk 1:24 and Lk 4:34 may be similarly divided. For both John and the Synoptics, the most popular interpretations are (i) and (iv).

1:3:1 The Royal Messiah

A large number of scholars understand ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ as messianic, by which they mean that the title is equivalent in some way to ὁ Χριστός . Although this is not always specifically stated, it is reasonable to suggest that "messianic" implies some sense of continuity with the traditional Jewish expectation surrounding the figure of the expected Davidic king. Since the messiahship of Jesus is a belief which is evident at most levels of New Testament thinking, there is some truth in the statement that any title which is applied to Jesus is "de facto" messianic from a Christian perspective. Thus the NT messiah can be shown to exhibit traits which were foreign to the traditional Jewish hope of an eschatological king. At the same time the NT clearly shows cognisance of OT and general Jewish eschatological expectation so that at times we are very close to the traditional messiah. On this account we deem it correct to phrase the messianic question as follows :- <u>Does the confession of Jesus as "the Holy One of God" come from a recognizable tradition which incorporates the idea of the traditional Royal Messiah of Judaism, or is it "messianic" only within Christian tradition</u>?

Some writers do not appear to distinguish between the two types of messiah in their proposed "messianic" solutions to Jn 6:69. Thus W.F.Howard, B.Lindars and J.N.Sanders and others simply designate the title as "messianic" without further elaboration.[22] For example J.N.Sanders writes, "This is a messianic title and thus in John as in Mark,

Peter confesses that Jesus is the Christ".(23)

In contrast there is a note of distinction in the following writers :-

C.H.Dodd After grouping ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ along with some of the other Johannine titles Dodd says that John is "calling the role of the traditional titles of the Lord. For in primitive Christian usage they are all messianic, though for the most part they cannot be shown to have been current in this sense in pre-Christian Judaism".(24)

V.Taylor While the "Holy One of God" does not appear to have been an "accepted messianic title", it is used by Peter as a "messianic designation".(25)

If we understand Taylor correctly, "messianic designation" implies more or less the same as "primitive Christian usage" does for Dodd. However it appears to us to be a reasonable assumption that, for a title to be termed "messianic", one should understand some sense of continuity with the traditional messiah.

Outside Christianity the messiah is not called ἅγιος (26) and so in response to the absence of the tradition of a holy messiah, apart from the Qumran tradition of a High Priest, we find some writers who place the emphasis on the process of becoming holy (dedication or consecration). The following serve as examples :-

B. Weiss "Jesus was in the absolute sense of the term, the Holy One of God i.e. the One dedicated to the highest calling, that of the Messiah".(27)

E.C.Hoskyns "The Title belongs to the Synoptic tradition where it is the equivalent of the Christ. In the Fourth Gospel it expresses the consecration of the Son to be the Saviour of the world, 10:36; 17:17ff; cf Rev 3:7." (28)

J.H.Bernard The title implies "He whom God consecrated as the Christ". (29)

It is evident that the two instances of ἁγιάζω at Jn 10:36 and 17:19 are central to the correct interpretation of 6:69. Then the Synoptic references in Mk 1:24 and Lk 4:34 follow in importance,(30) so that in this work we will devote time both to the idea of holiness in John and to the theme of exorcism in the Synoptics.

Perhaps the most interesting of the messianic solutions are those of C.K. Barrett and R. Schnackenburg in which the tension between the traditional Jewish expectation of a messianic king and the Christian perspective of the Johannine author, finds clear expression. Their opinions are expressed as follows :-

> C.K.Barrett "Jesus is the emissary of God: in Jewish terms the Messiah, more generally the Holy One of God, who comes from God and goes to God ... At this point John is moving away from the technical language of Judaism into more universal categories."(31)

> R.Schnackenburg "In view of its association with the synoptic confession of Peter in the history of tradition, (it) must refer to Jesus' Messiahship. John, of course, uses it in a deeper Christian sense, in a similar way to Matthew, who adds the interpretative phrase, 'the Son of the Living God'."(32)

We notice the degree of flexibility among scholars in their description of ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ as Messianic,(33) and the apparent disagreement among them as to what constitutes a messianic title. We feel, as we emphasized above, that it is important to retain the traditional sense of the word χριστός and its connection with Jewish eschatological hopes, for a correct analysis of 6:69 as messianic or otherwise. Unless such a connection is recognised the term "messianic" is reduced to a somewhat nebulous description. For this work we will use the term "messiah" in either its traditional Jewish sense or in its Jewish-Christian sense. It is in this, the traditional sense, that most writers who support the messianic interpretation of Jn 6:69 understand the adjective, with the accepted proviso that the Fourth Gospel is after all a Christian work and influenced profoundly by the view that Jesus is the Messiah. The Gospel, as we shall see, understands "Messiah" as a Jewish concept and demonstrates the continuity between Jesus and the contemporary messianic expectations, (cf. 1:37-51).(34) When we formulate the question of the messianic interpretation of Jn 6:69, we need to bear this in mind, and to ask whether <u>there are definite links between the traditional Jewish hope of a Messiah and the title</u>. This of course does not preclude the idea that such links were known (if they existed) to John as well as the Synoptics, but are not immediately

obvious to us. Nor does it preclude the possibility that one or other of the instances of the title are non-messianic while the rest are messianic.

1:3:2 The High Priestly Messiah

The suggestion was made by G.Friedrich(35) that ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ is a title for Jesus in his role as the High Priestly Messiah. On the basis of Ps 105(6):16; 2 Chr 23:6; Ex 28:36 and Sir 45:6 Friedrich suggests that the title comes from a priestly (specifically high priestly) milieu. He then examines the Qumran tradition of the High Priestly Messiah together with the tradition contained within the Twelve Testaments and concludes that not only is there cognisance of high priestly messianism in the use of the term "Christ" in the Gospels, but "the Holy One of God" is a specific reference to Jesus as a type of High Priestly Messiah.

From time to time various authors have observed within the Fourth Gospel certain traits which might be construed as "high priestly" such as the role of Jesus in ch 17.(36) Thus J. Gnilka, who is extremely sceptical of Friedrich's construction, nevertheless suggests that in the Fourth Gospel, Jesus is presented as a High Priest. Gnilka himself prefers for 6:69 an understanding of Jesus as the divine agent of God.(37) If one does accept that John understands and uses a tradition of Jesus as High Priest, it seems to us possible that Friedrich's solution is correct. Friedrich, on the basis of Qumran and the Twelve Testaments, suggests a connection between the role of the Priestly Messiah and the action of exorcism. Although there are many hidden weaknesses(38) in the hypothesis of Friedrich it remains at face value one of the most interesting alternatives.

1:3:3 The Prophet

Within the human realm the OT recognized the holiness in particular of two groups of persons, the priests and the prophets, although in later times the tendency was to include all members of a certain community.(39) It is therefore not surprising given a text like Ps 105(6):16 that Friedrich should identify ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ as a

title for Jesus as High Priest; nor is it surprising given a text like Jer 1:5 or 2 Kings 4:9, that some writers prefer a prophetic interpretation. One of the writers in this group is E. Schweizer whose main concern however is to establish a link between Mk 1:24 and Judges 16:17, thus presenting Jesus as a Nazirite, one consecrated to God, and thus in turn analogous to the consecrated prophet of Jer 1:5.(40) Other writers with Jn 6:69 in view have followed other paths to their solution. The following form a representative selection :-

S.Schulz "Der vierte Evangelist wird demnach diesen prophetisch-charismatischen Hoheitstitel aus dem hellenistischen-orientalischen Judenchristentum übernommen haben."(41)

F. Hahn "It is beyond question that John uses a portion of tradition; on the other hand it is not difficult to recognize that this confession statement has been built into the theological context of the Gospel and must now be understood from there: 'the Holy One of God' is equated with 'Son of God' (10:36); he is sanctified by the Father and sent into the world (10:36) and has himself the function to sanctify others (17:19b). But ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ is doubtless an earlier prediction... for in Mk 1:24 the phrase is already assumed in a fixed sense...(42) the τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί in Mark 1:24 .... has connections with the tradition of the Old Testament charismatic persons and men of God, ... then ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ may be regarded very much ... as the equivalent of the designation of a charismatic person rather than as parallel to the designations of Aaron ... "(43)

Hahn's interpretation of the confession in Jn 6:69 is somewhat unusual. He argues that John inherited the "original" confession of Peter, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ, and that it was intended as an acclamation of Jesus as "Prophet". Subsequently this was altered by the introduction of new theological content like Jn 10:36 and 17:19, to bring it into line with the rest of the Gospel in its final form. Mark however changed the form of the confession, thus making it messianic.(44)

Perhaps the most unusual form of a prophetic interpretation of "the Holy One of God" in Jn 6:69 is that of J. Bühner who writes :-

"Auch das Bekenntnis des Petrus in 6:69 macht den Zusammenhang deutlich zwischen der Heiligkeit und dem Amt des Boten, der Gottes Wort bringt."(45)

For Bühner, "Boten" or "Gottesboten" in John (particularly

in relation to the Son of Man) includes both "Lehre vom prophetischen und gleichzeitig engelhaften Gottesboten" drawn from the Jewish traditional beliefs evident in the Apocalyptic literature.(46)

1:3:4 Solutions based on the understanding of ἅγιος in John

In the Fourth Gospel, quite apart from the other Johannine literature, we find the term ἅγιος is used of Jesus (6:69), God (17:11) and the Holy Spirit(47) (20:22); ἁγιάζω is used of Jesus (10:36 and 17:19) and of the disciples (17:17+19). There is thus some basis upon which to construct the Johannine doctrine of holiness, and we will attempt this at a later stage.

The term ἅγιος or its Hebrew counterpart קדש is an important OT term particularly within the cultic milieu. It is one of the important descriptions of Yahweh Himself and consequently well suited to describe those things which belong to Him and are for His service. There are two sides to the idea of קדש, the positive sense of relation or encounter, and the negative sense of separation from the profane.(48) One of the problems we will encounter in our study of holiness is that of choosing between these two aspects in order to stress the one or the other, as indicated by the context. In Chapter Five we will show that while it is important to keep tension between the two sides of holiness, the positive and the negative, time and again it is the positive side which predominates. This ambivalance in meaning for ἅγιος is noticeable within a selection of interpretations on Jn 6:69, with the stress falling on one side or the other, or both :-

> R.H.Lightfoot "Jesus the Word become flesh, is also and uniquely He who is separated from sinners (Heb 7:26) and belongs to God; and He it is whom the Father sanctified and sent into the world (10:36)." (49)

> A. Schlatter "Die Formel kennzeichnet Jesus als Gottes Eigentum, als den Einzigen, der durch seine Verbundenheit mit Gott von allen gesondert ist."(50)

> B. Schwank "Als 'der Heilige' ist Jesus gleich Jahwe 'der Heilige Israels' abgensondert von allen profanen. Und trotzdem kommt er in der unheilige Welt, er kommt, um sich für uns 'zu heiligen' (17:19 vgl 10:36)."(51)

> J. Gnilka "Jesus ist der 'den der Vater geheiligt hat'.

> Das heisst, Jesus ist vom Vater zu einem besondern Beruf, nämlich dem des Gottesgesandten, erwählt und dafür mit der erforderlich Vollmacht ausgerüstet." (52)

It is in the last quotation that our attention is drawn to the significant expression "mit .. Vollmacht ausgerüstet" which for Gnilka is "göttlicher Vollmacht".(53) The same sense of the divinity of Jesus, "the Holy One of God", is evident within a number of other scholarly solutions of this category, and indeed this group makes up the greater part of the category and stands as the most serious challenger (in terms of scholarly support) to all other solutions, particularly that of the first category - the Royal Messiah. Among the following writers the common link is the idea that in some way the term "holy one" implies the divinity of Jesus, but the means of arriving at this conclusion are somewhat varied and consequently some are less convincing than others. The following writers present a representative assortment of views:-

> W. Bauer For Mk 1:24 a messianic solution suffices but "bei Johannes jedoch bekommt der Ausdruck einen viel volleren Gehalt und eine besondere Note, (10:36; 17:17-9; 1 Jn 2:20; Apc 3:7). Er will sagen, dass Christus von Gott mit himmlischen Wesens erfüllt worden wäre." (54)

> O. Procksch "The recognition of Jesus as ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ is here called a confession of faith (ἡμεῖς πεπιστεύκαμεν καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν), so that again more is at issue than the recognition of the popular Messiah. As ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ Jesus is set by John at the side of God whom he addresses as πατὴρ ἅγιος (Jn 17:11) ... in all the passages adduced ἅγιος is used to describe the deity of Christ." (55)

> C. Brown "Although John was thoroughly aware of Jewish Christology (1:39ff, 49ff; 4:25; 10:36 and 12:31), he apparently refrains from giving an accepted christological title here. Nevertheless the fact that he uses the epithet 'holy' elsewhere only of Father and Spirit sets Jesus with God and not men."(56)

> L. Morris "It (the Holy One of God) is rare in the OT but it does remind us of the 'Holy One of Israel'. There can be not the slightest doubt that the title is meant to assign to Jesus the highest possible place. It stresses His consecration and his purity. It sets him with God and not men." (57)

> H. Odeberg Peter "has already seen the Son of Man ascending up where he was before". Jesus as "the messenger, the bringer of the spiritual from the Godhead to man", is he who "connects the Godhead with man".(58)

Perhaps the most lucid solution in this category is that

of

R. Bultmann who writes, that ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ "is a designation which has no recognisable tradition at all as a messianic title. This description expresses first of all that Jesus stands over against the world as the one who comes from the other world and belongs to God, and indeed he is the sole one to do so ... Finally in the context of 12:20-33 and anticipating 17:19 the title points to Jesus as the one who has consecrated himself as a sacrifice for the world." (59)

We need to make mention here also of R. Schnackenburg who although he argues for a messianic interpretation of 6:69, also registers that contained within the title there is "a more specific meaning".(60) This is expanded by Schnackenburg to include the reception by Peter of the divine revelation incarnate in Jesus. He points to the sayings in ch 6 (20, 35, 48, 51) and says, "the σὺ εἶ of Peter's confession could be a counterpart to them. In the authoritative 'I am', Jesus expresses his closeness to God ... 'Holy' expresses the closest possible intimacy with God, a participation in God's deepest and most essential being".(61)

This brief survey of the views in this last category illustrates one of the issues to be faced in our search for the true interpretation of ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ in Jn 6:69, namely the intention and implications of the term ἅγιος in the Johannine context and the way in which passages like 10:36 and 17:17-9 may be used to cast light upon 6:69. On the question of issues, it is a good point to pause and take stock of the situation and to consider the way forward.

1:3:5 The Way Forward

It is important at this stage to list some of the important issues which are at stake. So far we have outlined through the medium of different scholarly suggestions on Jn 6:69, four different solutions to an understanding of ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ . Each of these four solutions raises different questions which we need to answer before we can arrive at a satisfactory conclusion.
(a) The Messianic solution poses two questions, one of which we have already formulated, namely the <u>question of the connection between</u> ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ <u>and the Jewish or Jewish-Christian concept of the messiah, apart from the person of Jesus himself</u>. Only if we can answer this question

affirmatively may we fairly describe the title as messianic. This is in accord with our definition of "messianic" as indicative of a connection with the OT expectation of a king like David, and the clear NT affirmation that Jesus fulfilled such a messianic hope.

The second question arises out of the Synoptic use of "the Holy One of God" (Mk 1:24 and Lk 4:34) and the variety of scholarly opinion thereupon. As with the Johannine scholars, opinions may be divided into roughly the same four categories - (a) Messianic, (b) High Priestly, (c) Prophetic, (d) Solutions based on an understanding of ἅγιος in Mark and Luke. However there is an added dimension to the fourth category, the question of the relationship between ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ and ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, which is the other confession of a demoniac (also found in the form υἱὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου Mk5:7), and suggests for a number of scholars some degree of continuity between the Holy One and the Son of God. God.(62) Thus C.E.B.Cranfield writes, "It is better here to understand ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ as in line with ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ in Mk 3:11 and υἱὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου in 5:7. It is as the divine Son of God rather than as Messiah that the demoniacs address Jesus."(63) O. Cullmann(64) and A. E. Harvey(65) on the basis of the demoniacs' use of ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ and υἱὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου have suggested that both in the Synoptics and in John (cf. 10:36) the <u>key to the solution</u> of the former lies in its relationship with the latter titles. Cullmann writes on "the Holy One of God" that "this name closely resembles that of Son. It too describes the unique distinction of Jesus from all other creatures" and he refers to 10:36 and Lk 1:32,35 in support of this claim.(66) Our question then is as follows :- <u>What is the relation between "the Holy One of God" and "the Son of God" which verses like Jn 10:36 appear to presuppose</u>? Since "Son of God" might be either indicative of Jesus' messiahship or of his filial relationship with his Father God, we need also to determine (given there is some relation between the titles) what Mark, Luke and John understand by "Son of God".

(b) In so far as the category of High Priest is concerned, there are two questions. The first is the question raised by Friedrich, who finds behind the exorcisms of Jesus, a High Priestly tradition. Is the casting out of demons a high priestly action and if it is do the Gospel writers show cognition of such a fact? The second question concerns only the Fourth Gospel and asks: Does the Evangelist present Jesus as a High Priest and if so is such a figure tenable outside of the Passion Narrative for John?(67)

(c) The Prophetic solution likewise poses two questions:- Is there evidence within either the Synoptics or John of a connection between Jesus as "the Holy One of God" and the idea of Prophet? The second question arises out of Hahn's conjecture about Peter's confession in John as being the original form of the confession.(68) We ask: Is it possible that the Fourth Gospel follows the original wording of Peter's confession? We must admit that this is possible so we enquire, What would such a confession have implied in its original form? We acknowledge also the possibility that the idea of Jesus as a Prophet might, but not necessarily does, precede the Christian belief that Jesus was the Messiah.

(d) The last category is in our opinion the most important category and the questions are thus crucial to this work. The first question is the interpretation of ἅγιος within the Johannine context - What does ὁ ἅγιος mean given John's use of ἅγιος and ἁγιάζω? The second question is related to this and also to the question under (a) above on the relation with "Son of God", namely - Does John's presentation of "the Holy One of God" imply a clear connection with the divinity of Jesus?

Apart from these questions we need to examine Jesus' action as that of one who casts out demons, and consider some of the ways in which such a role may be used in clarification of "the Holy One of God". If John inherited the title from the Markan usage or a similar setting, then an understanding of its intention in the Synoptics, whether messianic or otherwise is obviously important for the Johannine tradition. This does not mean that John has simply adopted the same basic meaning without change or conversely that he has effected basic

changes; both are viable possibilities, and have individual merits. On the other hand, like so many of the NT titles for Jesus, differing contexts may elicit different nuances of meaning; and it is the belief of the present writer that this is particularly true for "the Holy One of God". We believe moreover that <u>at different times in the tradition of the history of the Holy One of God, it meant different things to the users precisely on account of its enigmatic quality which we mentioned above</u>. Accordingly we will attempt to put together the development of the title through different stages of meaning up to and including Jn 6:69, by isolating <u>the various strata of tradition</u> through which the title has passed, in so far as the sources at our disposal allow.

1:4 The Johannine use of Titles

1:4:1 The Main Titles

The key titles in the Gospel are "Son of God", "Son of Man" and the absolute "the Son", which is the most common form of self-designation for Jesus. R. Schnackenburg(69) writes of "the Son" that it is together with Jesus' use of Father, "the key to the understanding of Jesus as portrayed by the Evangelist, and of his words and actions as interpreted by him".(70) Schnackenburg goes on to make an important distinction between the absolute use of "the Son" and the title "Son of God".

> "The Johannine Jesus does indeed speak of himself as the 'Son of God' (3:18; 5:25; 10:36; 11:4), and with the same meaning as when he says 'the Son'; but it can be seen from the Gospel itself that the title 'Son of God' has a different root and a different Sitz im Leben (confessional formula: 1:34; 1:49; 11:27; 20:31) from the absolute use of 'the Son' which is reserved to Jesus alone".(71)

Apart from the Christian inheritance concerning the sending of Jesus, his knowledge of God (Mt. 11:27; Lk 10:22), and his use of Father (Mk 14:36),(72) Schnackenburg singles out two further possible areas of influence in relation to John's "Son-Christology". The first is the Jewish sphere and in particular the Jewish doctrine of "the God-Messiah relationship as a Father-Son relationship".(73) For Schnackenburg, "the 'Son of God' title, originally messianic (was) understood in a deeper sense by John as part of his 'Son-Christology'. The second area of

influence isolated by Schnackenburg is the Gnostic literature, in particular the Odes of Solomon, the Gospel of Truth, and the non-canonical Epistle of James.(74) In a convincing fashion Schnackenburg points out the continuity and disjunction in the respective presentations of Father/Son relationships in the Gnostic Texts. Although the Gnostic writings to which he refers are clearly influenced by Christian thinking, it appears feasible that certain elements of the Gnostic myth related to Sonship may predate the Johannine presentation of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel. With an eye open to such a mutual interaction of sonship ideas Schnackenburg writes:-

> The Evangelist wished to give "the Christian answer to the Gnostic question, and over against the mythical figure of the Gnostic redeemer to set the one true 'Son' who as man upon earth, truly reveals 'the Father' and leads the way to him." (75)

J.H.Charlesworth's detailed examination of the Odes of Solomon has confirmed that idea of mutual interaction between the Johannine community under the Evangelist and the Gnostic milieu, thus supporting the conclusion of Schnackenburg.(76)

In the same way that John the Evangelist set out to combat the mythical figure of the Gnostic Redeemer, so also we find signs that he is concerned to combat certain "false" teaching about Jesus as the Messiah and perhaps also as the expected Prophet like Moses.(77) M. de Jonge has shown, quite convincingly, that although John acknowledges the belief that Jesus is both king and prophet, both roles are reinterpreted and "redefined in terms of the unique relationship between Son and Father, as portrayed by the Fourth Gospel".(78) John does not reject the idea that Jesus is the Prophet or the Christ, but he points beyond both of these titles to the divine Sonship of Jesus. Thus Nathanael is told he will see greater things,(79) and the blind man who knows Jesus as "prophet" and "messiah" encounters in Jesus the Son of Man.(80) According to De Jonge, these terms "are not wrong but insufficient; they may be used in a wrong context and are, therefore, in need of further definition".(81) This "further definition" is to be found in Jesus' teaching on the Son, the Son of Man or the Son of God.(82) Thus in 20:31 "Christ" and "Son of

God" stand together for Jesus is both these figures and a process of mutual interpretation is to be understood.

Two pressures are brought to bear upon the Johannine community and each is reflected in the Gospel presentation. The first and most obvious is the tension resulting from the severing of links with the Synagogue as a result of the decision to expel the followers of Jesus.(83) The second pressure arose from within the community. It probably took the form of a division between members of the community who held to variant expressions of Christianity. Thus M.de Jonge comments,

> "Johannine christology is developed not only in contrast with Jewish thinking but also with other christological views. The Johannine community does not only assert its identity by pondering over the true reason for its being separated from the synagogue and by developing christological motifs in explanation of that; it also tries to formulate its own standpoint over against christological discussions in the Church, particularly over against Christian arguments adduced in the debate between Christians and Jews." (84)

J.L.Martyn's analysis of the historical development likewise takes cognizance of these two pressures and allocates them to the middle and later period of the history respectively.(85) De Jonge draws attention in particular to the group of so-called Christian Jews who remain within the synagogue (Jn 8:31ff and 12:42) and who are therefore ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ.(86) Another group might have consisted of those influenced by Gnostic thinking and holding to a docetic view of Jesus.(87) Clearly within the historical situation of the Gospel the formulation of its christology was crucial - in view of both the conflict with the Synagogue and the conflict within the community over divergent expressions of Christology. Hence the titles of Jesus needed to be most carefully chosen and placed within the complex Gospel formulation of Jesus, the incarnate Son of God.

> R. Schnackenburg writes: "In the Johannine christology, the most divergent impulses and aspects are merged into a consistent composition: along with the notion of the 'Son of Man' there is also that of the 'Son' who is sent by the Father and returns to him, and that of the Logos of the Wisdom type .... The evangelist may and should be credited with the final amalgamation of the various elements." (88)

It is this "amalgamation" of the various elements which is the most striking aspect of the Johannine use of titles. Diverse traditions from the respective realms of Judaism, Christianity and Hellenism are drawn together under the masterly touch of the Fourth Evangelist to become a single testimony to God's divine Son. The best example of this is the Fourth Gospel presentation of the Son of Man, which seems to share the synoptic understanding of the Son of Man and yet at the same time demonstrates quite individual traits: For example the pair καταβαίνειν and ἀναβαίνειν which has given rise to a number of explanations of which the most important, as R. Schnackenburg so clearly shows, is that of the Wisdom Myth.(89)

Many of the titles in John have links with Jewish and Hellenistic systems of thought, yet his usage is not explicable on the basis of either the one or the other, nor can Christian tradition supply all the answers - we must take account of a period of theological reflection upon not only Christian traditions but also the other influences which entered into the Johannine community from outside.

In conclusion then, there are two important facts about John's use of titles :-

The first is the way in which certain titles, like Son, Son of Man and Son of God, are used to interpret other Christian titles found in the Gospel; understanding, of course, the crucial importance of the Father-Son relationship.

The second is the evidence that behind each of the titles used in the Gospel, we need to understand a period of deep theological reflection, prior to their final incorporation within the closely constructed theology of the Gospel.

In our study of Jn 6:69 and the Holy One of God, we will endeavour to use these facts as means towards a fuller appreciation of that title, both from a theological and historical point of view.

1:4:2 The Confessions found in the Fourth Gospel

Pressures like the friction with the Jewish community and various differences in contemporary christologies led the writer of the Fourth Gospel to include several confessional statements about Jesus in the Gospel apart from the stated aim of the work (20:31). These are :-

(a) John the Baptist confesses Jesus as ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ (1:29,36) and either ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ (1:34) or ὁ ἐκλέκτος τοῦ Θεοῦ, depending on the text.
(b) Nathanael confesses Jesus as ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ and βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ (1:49).
(c) The Samaritans confess Jesus as ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου (4:42).
(d) Peter confesses Jesus as ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ (6:69).
(e) Martha confesses Jesus as ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐρχόμενος (11:27).
(f) Thomas confesses Jesus as ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ Θεός μου (20:28).

It appears likely that the confession of Thomas is the climax of the Gospel and represents the fullest appreciation of Jesus' person.(90) Conversely within the context of chapter one, it is possible, following the statement "We have found the Messiah" (1:41 cf 45) that the confession of Nathanael is primarily messianic.(91) If we confine our attention to the confessions of the disciples of Jesus, (leaving aside for the present the confessions of the Samaritans and of John the Baptist),(92) we find that each confession is linked with some manifestation of his power; and connected with some definitive teaching about the role of Jesus; apart from the last confession which deals more with the response of Thomas and the unseeing believer to the risen Christ. So we find that the demonstration of power for Nathanael is first of all the "prophetic" words of Jesus, "Before Philip called you, when you were under the fig tree, I saw you." (vs 48) Then there follows Nathanael's confession (vs 49) and very briefly Jesus promised that Nathanael will see the Son of Man in glory, (vss 50f). The confession of Peter is preceded by Son of Man teaching (6:62) which is not altogether different from the previous reference (1:51). Although the demonstration of Jesus' power might be found in the feeding of the five thousand there is another demonstration closer at hand; Jesus shows his knowledge of those who believe (vs 64) and those like Judas who do not believe (vs 71).

The confession of Martha is in response to Jesus' teaching about himself as "the resurrection and the life" (11:25f), so that in a sense her confession anticipates the miracle that will follow, namely the raising of Lazarus and

the climax of Jesus' public ministry; just as 6:69 is probably the climax of the Galilean ministry. The final confession of a disciple is that of Thomas which is in response to the crucified and risen Lord and is immediately followed by one of the most important verses of the Gospel, "have you believed because you have seen me? Blessed are those who have not seen and yet have believed." For tne Johannine community these words marked the sense of continuity and association with the belief expressed by Thomas and indirectly with the other believers and their confessions recorded earlier.

It is possible that there is a <u>sense of development</u> within the confessional statements found on the lips of the disciples (including Martha), from that of Nathanael to that of Thomas: Just as there is an increase in the associated miracle from "seeing Nathanael" to the very resurrection of Jesus. It is not yet clear how the confessions of Peter and Martha fit into the pattern; although the development within the associated miracles seems plain enough - from knowledge of Nathanael, to knowledge generally of men's hearts, to Jesus as the one who raises the dead and finally to the risen Lord. There are other points of continuity between the confessions which deserve a mention. We note the use of the Son of Man figure as a guide to the confessions of Nathanael and Peter, and that eternal life is a key point for the confession of Peter (6:68) and of Martha (11:25): It is probably also to be understood in the confession of Thomas. <u>We conclude therefore that the confessions of the Fourth Gospel appear to be part of a regular pattern, so that an appreciation of such a pattern will assist us in our understanding of the confession of Peter in 6:69</u>.

1:5 The Holy One of God and related titles

Apart from the three occurrences of ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ in the NT (Jn 6:69; Mk 1:24;Lk 1:34), the title is never duplicated either in the centuries preceeding the Common Era or in the first few centuries of Christianity, in so far as the evidence available at this time shows. There are, as we shall see, titles which are very similar, but the actual title is nowhere to be found. Most of the related titles are found either in the OT or in the NT

with only a few exceptions, so we will consider all the titles in three groups :-

(i) Old Testament (inclusive of Ecclesiasticus).
(ii) New Testament.
(iii) Other writings, (inclusive of Nag Hammadi and Qumran).

1:5:1 The Old Testament

There are three titles which come to mind when we think of ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ in relation to the OT. The first is clearly the closest parallel to the NT title, and it is found in the Psalms:

Psalm 106:16: καὶ παρώξυναν Μωυσῆν ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ καὶ Ἀαρὼν τὸν ἅγιον κυρίου.

The Greek τὸν ἅγιον κυρίου translates the Hebrew קְדוֹשׁ יְהוָה . We note further in Numbers 16:7 (to which the Psalm refers) that Aaron is called ὃν ἐξελέξατο κύριος οὗτος ἅγιος rendering the Hebrew אֲשֶׁר יִבְחַר הוּא הַקָּדוֹשׁ, (and cf. the M.T. of Num 16:5). In Sirach 45:6 we read, Ἀαρὼν ὕψωσεν ἅγιον ὅμοιον αὐτῷ ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ἐκ φυλῆς Λευί . The reference to ἀδελφὸν points back to Moses who according to 45:2 was made like δόξῃ ἁγίων : and in 45:4 Moses is sanctified by God and "chosen out of all men", the Greek verbs being ἡγίασεν and ἐξελέξατο respectively. Thus both Moses and Aaron are distinguished as "holy" although it is Aaron who is "the Holy One of the Lord". It is not clear how sharply we should distinguish κυρίου from τοῦ θεοῦ , but it is wise to leave the question open. We also would like to leave open the possibility that following the references in Ecclesiasticus to the holiness of Moses, he may also be considered a candidate for the title ὁ ἅγιος κυρίου , (cf vs. 6 ἅγιον ὅμοιον ... ἀδελφὸν).

The second title is found in 2 Kings 4:9 and refers to Elisha, ἔγνων ὅτι ἄνθρωπος τοῦ θεοῦ ἅγιος οὗτος... which translates the Hebrew אִישׁ אֱלֹהִים קָדוֹשׁ הוּא . This is somewhat further removed than the title used of Aaron, nevertheless for many scholars it is logical to postulate a connection between Jesus as an exorcist and the prophetic tradition. The words of the demons in Mk 1:24 are said to be reminiscent of 1 Kings 17:18 (addressed to

Elijah) - Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοὶ Ἰνθεωπε τοῦ Θεοῦ ; E Schweizer suggests that in Mk 1:24 we have a synthesis of the OT passages, 2 Kings 4:9 and 1 Kings 17:18 (93). The connection between Mark and the reference to 1 Kings 17:18, is in our opinion rather tenuous and may suggest little more than that Τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί is a well known form of challenge.(94) We do not however deny that Jesus might be seen as reviving the traditions of Elijah and Elisha,(95) so that 2 Kings 4:9 is extremely important from the synoptic perspective and we shall consider the implications at length.(96)

The OT shows that priests and prophets could be called holy and according to certain of the Greek texts, so too could Samson. So we find that in place of ναζὶε Θεοῦ we might read ἅγιος Θεοῦ , which although in indefinite form is a close parallel to ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ.
Judges 16:17 (According to B). ὅτι ἅγιος Θεοῦ ἐχώ εἰμι ἀπὸ κοιλίας μητρός μου... (A) reads ὅτι Ναζὶε Θεοῦ The Hebrew reads כי נזיר אלהים .
Judges 13:7. ὅτι Θεοῦ ἅγιον ἔσται τὸ παιδάριον ἀπὸ γαστρὸς ἕως ἡμέρας θανάτου αὐτοῦ.
Judges 13:5. ὅτι Ναζὶε Θεοῦ (B) ἔσται τὸ παιδάριον ἀπὸ τῆς κοιλίας..Alex. reads Ναζιραῖον
The translation of ναζὶε as ἅγιος raises the possibility of a known connection between the two titles. E. Schweizer(97) made use of this possibility to suggest that the words of the demons in Mk 1:24 contained a play on words whereby "Jesus of Nazareth" was in fact equivalent to Jesus the Nazirite (on the basis of Matt 2:23 which reads :- καὶ ἐλθὼν κατῴκησεν εἰς πόλιν λεγομένην Ναζαρέθ ὅπως πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν ... ὅτι Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται).
The second title, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ, is then another affirmation of Jesus as Nazirite, understanding ὁ ἅγιος as the equivalent of ὁ ναζὶε . Schweizer also points to Judges 13:5(A) and the spelling of Nazirite which is in accord with Matt 2:23. His final conclusion suggests that it is the idea of "consecration"(98) which is stressed by this "play on words". While we agree with the idea of consecration as important (cf. Jer 1:5) the play on words is

not easy to maintain particularly if one takes into account that Matt 2:23 might have been influenced not by Judges 13:5(A) but by the Hebrew of Isaiah 11:1 and particularly the messianic term נֵצֶר.(99) We note incidentally that in modern Hebrew Christians are still called נוֹצְרִים.(100)

Of these three titles for priest, prophet and nazirite which we have considered, it is the priestly title (Ps 106:16) which initially at least appears to hold the most promise for our quest. The title, provided we accept τοῦ κυρίου as basically the same as τοῦ θεοῦ, is very close to Jn 6:69 and the holiness of the priesthood in the OT is very well attested (cf Lev 21:6). Our attention is then drawn to Judg 16:17(B) and 2 Kings 4:9 in turn, each being one step away from the title in John. However we are not just conducting a linguistic exercise and the determining factor is the present context.

Perhaps another title merits attention, if only to illustrate its basic difference from "the Holy One of God". L. Morris(101), as we noted above, remarks that Jn 6:69 "reminds us" of the OT "Holy One of Israel" - a title frequently used for Yahweh within a covenant context.(102) It seems to us that on reflection there is very little basis on which to speak of such a reminder; indeed the titles have very little in common, apart from a slight formal resemblance. A more promising comparison would have been with the absolute "the Holy One", often used interchangeably with "the Holy One of Israel", and common in the later rabbinic works.(103) We will see shortly that Jesus was so called in the NT, particularly in the Johannine literature outside of the Gospel, with every sign that the title implied something of his divinity. So for a different reason from that cited by Morris, we find ourselves sympathetic to his final conclusion for Jn 6:69 - "It sets Jesus with God and not men"; sympathetic but at this stage not yet persuaded.

The last of the OT titles which deserves a mention is to be found in Ps 15(16):10b which reads :- οὐδὲ δώσεις τὸν ὅσιόν σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν. The expression τὸν ὅσιον σου translates חָסִידְךָ. The title recurs in Acts 2:27 and 13:35 but only as a quotation of the Psalm, and although it is applied to Jesus the title itself is not repeated. Since the idea of Jesus as

Messiah occurs in both passages in Acts, some writers consider that the title is therefore messianic and then proceed to use this as evidence for the messianic interpretation of ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ .(104) This is a most misleading use of the passage, for although the RSV renders it as "Holy One" it actually translates τὸν ὅσιον which in turn renders ח'וֹסִיד and perhaps "Pious One" might be a better term. It would seem that the LXX always renders ח'וֹסִיד as ὅσιος and never by ἅγιος or one of its cognates.(105) The titles therefore have quite separate traditions although this does not mean that "the Pious One" is not an interesting and pertinent parallel to Jn 6:69.

1:5:2 The New Testament

The title ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ is found in Mark in the context of an exorcism. The incident is repeated with minor alterations in Lk 4:31-7, but is absent from Matthew. The pericope according to Mark 1:21-8 runs as follows :-

> 21. And they went to Capernaum; and immediately on the sabbath he entered the synagogue and taught. 22. And they were astonished at his teaching, for he taught them as one who had authority (ἐξουσίαν ἔχων), and not as the scribes. 23. And immediately there was in their synagogue a man with an unclean spirit; 24. and he cried out, 'What have you to do with us (τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί), Jesus of Nazareth? Have you come to destroy us? I know who you are, the Holy One of God.' (ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ) 25. But Jesus rebuked him saying, 'Be silent (φιμώθητι) and come out of him! ' 26. And the unclean spirit, convulsing him and crying with a loud voice came out of him. 27. And they were all amazed, so that they questioned among themselves, saying, 'What is this? A new teaching (διδαχὴ καινὴ)! With authority (ἐξουσίαν) he commands even the unclean spirits, and they obey him.' 28. And at once his fame spread everywhere throughout all the surrounding region of Galilee.

Two aspects immediately come to our attention; the first is the mention in vss 22 and 27 <u>of authority</u> (ἐξουσία) and indeed this along with the pericopes preceding and following (Mk 1:16-20 The calling of the disciples; Mk 1:29-34 Jesus' healing ministry - in particular his healing of Peter's mother-in-law) presents something of Jesus' impact upon the region of Galilee. The Lukan setting is similar.

The second aspect is the tension between "the unclean spirit " (πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ) and the Holy One of God; between the Agent of God and the demons, there is room only for animosity. We will consider the meaning of these two aspects and their relation to the title ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ in more detail as we follow the course which we have set ourselves.

Apart from the abovementioned titles like ὁ ὅσιος in Acts 2:27 which we have already discussed, there are two further NT titles which deserve attention :-

(a) The Righteous One. This title is found in the First Epistle of John (1 Jn 2:1), in Acts 3:14 and 7:52 and in the OT in Is 53:11 (the righteous one, my servant) and Hab 2:4. The idea of a righteous messiah is well known from Pss of Sol 17:35 and Qumran - 4 Q Patr.Bless.:"until the Messiah of Righteousness משיח הצדק comes, the Branch of David". When we come to consider the role of the Messiah as revealed in the OT and related literature, we will find that the adjective "righteous" is frequently applied to the Messiah, particularly in relation to his "righteous judgement". It is therefore not surprising that such a title should be applied to Jesus. But there is more to the usage than just a recognition of Jesus as Messiah. In the passages in Acts there is a consistent emphasis on the innocence of Jesus and his place within the long role of persecuted prophets. Thus in Acts 3:14 we read:

> But you denied the Holy and Righteous One,
> and asked for a murderer to be granted to you."

and Acts 7:52

> Which of the prophets did not your fathers persecute? And they killed those who announced beforehand the coming of the Righteous One, whom you have now betrayed and murdered."

Thus there is a clear ethical element within the use of the title, so that Jesus, the Righteous One, is the Messiah who, in spite of his innocence, has been crucified. Yet God has raised him up as clear proof of his innocence (cf 3:13), and has given him the task of "turning everyone of you from your wickedness". There are affinities here with Paul's use of the second Adam (cf Rom 5:17 and 18) and according to R. H. Fuller also with Isaiah 53:11.(106) The latter

connection is not unlikely in view of the presentation of Jesus in Acts 3:22-6 as a type of Prophet - in fact the promised "Prophet like Moses"; and the parallel between Jesus' death and the persecution of the prophets in 7:52.

In the First Epistle we read -

1 Jn 2:1bf "But if anyone does sin we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the Righteous; (2) and he is the expiation (ἱλασμός) for our sins, and not for ours only but for the sins of the whole world."

In 1 Jn 2:29 the theme recurs,

"If you know that he is righteous, you may be sure that every one who does what is right is born of him."(107)

In both instances we are aware of the clear ethical content understood within the title, but here the effect is not so much to stress the innocence of Jesus as to mark him as belonging to the sphere of the Righteous, which is the sphere of God. Jesus as the advocate is the one who represents the righteous believers and they are born "of him" (vs 29). This is very much in line with the dualism(108) found in John's Gospel and in a more pronounced form in the Epistle, in which all of mankind is divided into children of God (cf. 1 Jn 3:1 and Jn 1:12) and children of the devil (cf 1 Jn 3:10 and Jn 8:44). For the former group righteousness is one of their characteristics along with the anointing (cf 1 Jn 2:20); as it is the mark of Jesus, the Righteous Messiah.

(b) The second title of concern to us is the use of the absolute "the Holy One" of Jesus, sometimes on its own (1 Jn 2:20) and sometimes in conjunction with some other title. So for example we find Acts 3:14 "the Holy and the Righteous One" (ὁ ἅγιος καὶ δίκαιος), and Rev 3:7 "the Holy and the True One" (ὁ ἅγιος, ὁ ἀληθινός). In Luke 1:35 we find mention of the birth of Jesus:- "And the angel said to her, 'The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you; therefore (the child) to be born will be called holy (ἅγιον), the Son of God!" It appears likely that a term like τέκνον should be understood to agree with the neuter ἅγιον .(109) In Acts there is a mention of Jesus as ἅγιος παῖς (4:27,30) which is either "Holy servant" perhaps with links

with Isaiah's servant songs, or "Holy Son" linking up with Lk 1:35. We note that Acts 4:27, 30 is quite clearly set within a messianic framework; there is a quote from Ps 2:1-2 with the inclusion of the term "anointed", which is then applied to Jesus (vs 27) the one who works "signs and wonders" (vs 30). The reference from Luke 1:35 also suggests a messianic interpretation through the connection with the title "Son of God". On the other hand the Johannine references (1 Jn 2:20 and Rev 3:5) do not immediately strike one as messianic and indeed the title in Rev 3:5 is later applied to God (6:10), so that there is some justification for calling it a divine title. All this suggests that for different writers, the holiness of Jesus could carry with it different connotations, from a sense of his messiahship to a sense of his divinity. At a later stage we will return to a consideration of the holiness of Jesus in the NT, but for the present it is clear that such a doctrine was well known, but variously understood. Each reference to his holiness needs to be carefully compared with ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ in Jn 6:69 for possible links, and deductions about Jesus' messianic role or his divinity, or both, drawn out of such comparisons where deemed necessary and logical.

1:5:3 Other literature

In the literature which comes from Qumran we find a well attested doctrine of holiness which includes angels and sectarians. We will deal with this doctrine at length in ch 5, so we need only to outline a few of the uses of "holy" in relation particularly to angels. We find that among the terms used to describe the angels, the term קְדוֹשִׁים or holy ones occurs frequently. Sometimes it is found in the form קְדוֹשִׁים, similar to the OT usage, to describe the fact that these holy ones belong to Yahweh.(110) Moreover, we find that the expression "holy ones of the Most High"(קְדוֹשֵׁי עֶלְיוֹן) is to be found in the Damascus Document 20:8. This has not before been related to Jn 6:69 perhaps because an angelic title was considered inappropriate, or the plural form deemed too far removed from the singular. In response to these hypothetical obstacles we note the confession of

Peter in the Gospel of Thomas (You are like a righteous angel).(111)

The other title used of the angels was בני שמים or "sons of heaven" which was perhaps a respectful orthodox way of referring to the "sons of God". We note the similar preference in Matthew's Gospel for Kingdom of Heaven rather than Kingdom of God, and perhaps a similar sentiment lies behind the frequency of the form הקדושים rather than קדושי עליון. The interesting point about these titles, namely קדושים and בני שמים, is that they appear to be interchangeable. Thus in 1QH 3:22 we find them appearing as parallel terms :-

להתיצב במעמד עם עבא קדוש
ולבוא ביחד עם צדת בני שמים.

For the present we will do no more than note these terms and suggest that they warrant more attention than they have received hitherto. Moreover the parallel between קדוש and בני שמים opens up certain possibilities for the relationship between ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ and ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ in the NT. But so far these are just vague suggestions and we are at this stage a long way from coming to any definite solution. When we consider the idea of holiness in the OT, NT and related literature we will find that קדוש or ἅγιος was frequently applied to members of a particular religious group such as the Sectarians of Qumran or the Christians. The wide variety of "holy ones" including the OT prophets and the angels and the members of these groups illustrates something of the problem involved in the interpretation of the title ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ .

The last title for our consideration is found in the Nag Hammadi writings, the Melchizedek scroll.(112) Here we find that Melchizedek is addressed as "Holy One, High Priest, the Perfect Hope and Gift of Life"(113) all in the vocative case following "O Melchizedek". The context does not make clear the basis for Melchizedek's claim to the title Holy One - whether it is on account of his priesthood or his divine qualities as evidenced in the scroll. As with the other titles, we will refer back to Melchizedek in the course of our study.

In conclusion then, our study of the related titles to Jn 6:69 has shown no identical form apart from the Synoptic usage at Mk 1:24 and Luke 4:34. Thereafter the OT parallels deserve attention, particularly the prophetic and priestly usage. Finally we note the NT testimony to the holiness of Jesus. <u>One point has come out of this survey, namely that "holy" is a perfectly acceptable attribute for an Agent of God sent and commissioned by Him, whether human or angelic or divine.</u>

1:6 Some Methodological Considerations.

Our investigation into the meaning and background of "the Holy One of God" in Jn 6:69 will proceed in two stages. In the <u>First Stage</u> we will examine the various <u>functional</u> solutions for the Holy One of God; first of all the <u>Messianic function</u> in line with the Jewish idea of the royal Messiah; next the <u>Priestly function</u> in line with the Qumran idea of the High Priestly Messiah; and finally the <u>Prophetic function</u> in line with the Jewish hope of an eschatological prophet like Moses or Elijah/Elisha. In making a choice between these functions for Mark, Luke and John individually, we will remain alert to the two further possibilities; namely that the title is not functionally identical with one of the above; or that it is identical with more than one, that is with some form of synthesis.

The second stage of our research will concentrate upon the <u>content</u> rather than the form of the title, and upon the <u>meaning of ὁ ἅγιος in the Johannine and Synoptic contexts</u>. In particular we will consider ideas of ethical separation, consecration, otherworldliness and divinity. At the end of this section we will come to a conclusion about both the form and content of the Johannine understanding of ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ, and relate this to the Markan and Lukan levels of interpretation.

In this work we will refer to the writer/redactor of the Gospel as John or the Evangelist. This does not imply any particular theory about the authorship of the Gospel. There are however two assumptions which we will make:-

(a) J.L.Martyn has compared the Fourth Gospel to a "tell" in

in which he finds that although this "literary 'tell' exhibits a remarkable degree of stylistic and conceptual homogeneity",(114) it is nevertheless possible to discern a variety of literary strata which "to some extent ... may be differentiated from one another" ... "In other words, the literary history behind the Fourth Gospel reflects to a large degree the history of a single community which maintained over a period of some duration its particular and rather peculiar identity." We will be dealing with the Gospel in its final form, but where necessary we will consider some of the theories of redaction criticism. More important however we believe is this cognisance of the "growth" of the Fourth Gospel and where pertinent we will associate certain texts with different levels of this "growth". We will follow the breakdown of Martyn(115) and R.E.Brown(116) who both identify three periods in the history of the community - the early period with pronounced over-tones of Jewish Christianity; the middle period following the break with the synagogue and the threat of expulsion from the synagogue for those confessing Jesus as Christ; and the late period with tension within the community as they attempt to understand their position vis à vis other Christian communities. R.E.Brown writes of this stage,(117) "The insistence upon a high christology, made all the more intense by the struggles with 'the Jews', affects the community's relations with the other Christian groups whose evaluation of Jesus is inadequate by Johannine standards." In similar vein J.L.Martyn(118) writes, "The period also finds the Johannine community forming its own theology and its own identity not only vis à vis the parent synagogue, but also in relation to other Christian groups in its setting". The fundamental tenet of the literary reconstruction of Martyn and Brown, is what Martyn(119) calls "the highly probable correspondence to the Birkath ha-Minim of the expressions ἀποσυνάγωγος γενέσθαι and ἀποσυνάγωγον ποιεῖν of Jn 9:22; 12:42 and 16:2". This acts as the watershed in Johannine history and we will have occasion to note its effect from time to time, in relation to the community view, before and after this event - the Early and Later periods respectively.

(b) The second presupposition is that the Gospel was written for the Johannine community, rather than as a missionary document or as a general Christian sourcebook for the life of Jesus.(120) For Martyn this implies that "it was written for a community of people who had shared history and who in the course of that history developed a highly symbolical language with numerous expressions which they could easily understand as referring to their shared history".(121) We note from a slightly different perspective the similar conclusion of M. de Jonge, when writing on 20:31 (where two texts are possible πιστεύητε and πιστεύσητε). De Jonge questions whether the aorist, if taken as the correct text, should be understood as an 'aoristus ingressivus' in which case "the purpose of the Gospel would be to bring outsiders to faith in Jesus Christ, the Son of God". He continues, "If either πιστεύητε is original or the ingressive aspect of the aorist is not intended here, the Gospel is directed towards a people who already believe, but read it to strengthen and deepen their faith".(122) It is clear that De Jonge favours the latter,(123) and in this he follows H. Riesenfeld who compares ἵνα - sentences in the Gospel and First Epistle of John, to conclude that such sentences reflect catechetical instruction within the Johannine community rather than missionary practice.(124) This conclusion has obvious implications for any study in the Fourth Gospel. As Martyn suggests, this would mean that the symbols and expressions found within the pages of the Gospel (and the other Johannine writings), although at times opaque and enigmatic to us, would be transparent and readily understandable to the readers who lived within the Johannine community.(125)

In considering the Johannine usage of "the Holy One of God" we need to be open to the possibility that even if John inherited the title from the Christian tradition similar to Mark or the other NT sources of the Gospels, there seem to be grounds for believing in a period of theological reflection(126) upon such traditions. As a result the Johannine use of the title may have involved a process of re-interpretation and reworking of the content in accord

with the general Christology of the Gospel and perhaps also of the context within which the title first appeared.

So our search is not for the original meaning of the title "the Holy One of God" nor for its intention within the Synoptics, except in so far as these cast light upon the Johannine usage and intention. Naturally the more we understand about the title and its development the better we will be able to understand its place within the Fourth Gospel, but we wish to emphasize that we do not believe the answer to Jn 6:69 is to be located outside the Gospel,

CHAPTER TWO THE MESSIANIC INTERPRETATION OF "THE HOLY ONE OF GOD"

		Page
2:1	Introduction	44
2:2	The Messianic Interpretation of ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ	
	in Mk 1:24 and Lk 4:34	47
2:2:1	The Conflict with Demons and the Messiah ..	48
2:2:2	Exorcism, the Son of David and Matthew 12:22f	49
	(a) The Messiah as a Wise Judge	52
	(b) The Messiah as a Warrior	54
	(c) Exorcism : Conflict and Judgement ..	57
2:2:3	The Messianic Secret and the Demonic Confessions	59
2:2:4	The Son of God and the Messiah	60
	(a) The Marcan understanding of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ	64
	(b) The Lucan understanding of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ	68
	(c) Conclusion	71
2:2:5	The Authority of Jesus	73
2:2:6	The Verdict on the Messianic Interpretation of Mk 1:24 and Lk 4:34 - A Qualified Affirmative	76
2:3	The Johannine Evidence	78
2:3:1	The Confession of Peter according to the Synoptic Gospels	80
2:3:2	The idea of the Messiah according to John	90
2:3:3	The Verdict for John : An Open Question ..	96
	Footnotes to Chapter Two	309

CHAPTER TWO THE MESSIANIC INTERPRETATION OF "THE HOLY ONE OF GOD"

2:1 Introduction

The Old Testament treasured the hope that one day Yahweh would intervene in the history of mankind so as to establish within the Israelite community His own Kingdom. Although this hope was to change over the years particularly in the era of the apocalyptic writings, many

of the fundamental aspects remained constant. So it was that the picture painted by the pre-exilic prophets was to have a lasting effect.

> "The hope of the pre-exilic prophets was that the community would be morally purified and cleansed of all its bad elements; that it would flourish unmolested and respected in the midst of the Gentile world, its enemies either destroyed or forced to acknowledge Israel and its God; that it would be ruled by a just, wise and powerful king of the house of David, so that internal justice, peace and joy would prevail; and even that all natural evils would be annihilated and a condition of unclouded bliss come into being." (1)

The New Testament reflects the belief that Jesus fulfilled the OT hope of a messianic king. Indeed the title Χριστός was to become part of the very name of Jesus, to form the composite Ἰησοῦς Χριστός or Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς. Several scholars would today acknowledge that the idea probably originated with Jesus himself,(2) and anyway forms an essential part of the earliest NT comprehension of the Stranger from Galilee.(3) That Jesus understood(4) the role of the Messiah to be different from contemporary expectation is indicated in the Gospels by his apparent reluctance to accept the title. W. Grundmann(5) writes, "At all events, the tradition shows that the history of Jesus gives rise to a new form of Messianic teaching. What is decisive is not earthly descent, but the thought and act of God". It was the fundamental belief of the NT writers that Jesus was the anointed Agent of God(6) and as the unique representative of God, he fulfilled the roles of prophet and king (and in some instances priest), and yet he also transcended them.(7)

The NT uses several titles of Jesus, some of which correspond with the OT messianic hope (Χριστός, ὁ δίκαιος and Βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ), while others seem to imply some other aspect of his function or person, (Κύριος, υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ(8), υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου), G.H.Dalman(9) says of Jesus' use of Son of Man: "In using the title He purposely furnished them with a problem which stimulated reflection about His person, and gave such a tendency to this reflection that the solution of the problem fully revealed the mystery of the personality of Jesus".

Son of God is another title which effectively lifts the level of consciousness of the reader beyond the messianic stage to a true appreciation of the filial relationship which is unique to Jesus.

Our task in this chapter is to examine critically the messianic interpretation of ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ particularly in relationship to two other NT titles, namely ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ [10] and ὁ Χριστός. As with all the chapters in this work we shall confine ourselves to those works which are generally accepted as relevant to the NT period.

The OT offers little evidence for the expectation of a "Holy Messiah" as we have seen. Qumran knew of a "holy anointed one" in 11Q Melch. but there it refers to a herald rather than to a king, and the fragment from cave 1 mentioned by P. Winter is inconclusive.[11] Only once is the king connected with holiness and that is in the Psalms of Solomon, which we shall consider below.

We have already noticed the appearance of ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ in Mk 1:24 and Lk 4:34. If we can show that the title is intended to be messianic, in either Mark or Luke, then the possibility exists that John knew and used such a tradition. We have already drawn attention to a number of Johannine scholars who view the messianic interpretation of Jn 6:69 with favour - C.H.Dodd,[12] V. Taylor,[13] B. Weiss,[14] E.C.Hoskyns,[15] J.H.Bernard [16] and B. Lindars[17]. In opposition to such an interpretation we notice particularly R. Bultmann, who is often quoted as saying that the title is a "designation which has no recognizable tradition at all as a messianic title".[18] Less often is attention drawn to his footnote, on the same page, which reads - "As a Messianic title, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ occurs only in Mk 1:24 = Lk 4:34." So Bultmann did in fact accept the title as messianic but not for John.

It is in the writings of R.Schnackenburg[19] and C.K.Barrett[20] that we find the important suggestion that the confession in Jn 6:69 has two levels of

interpretation - a Messianic level and another more profound level. As Barrett writes, "Jesus is the emissary of God; in Jewish terms the Messiah, more generally, the Holy One of God, who comes from God and goes to God".(21) In this chapter we shall observe some of the details of this added dimension which renders the simple messianic interpretation of John 6:69 somewhat inadequate.

2:2 The Messianic Interpretation of ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ in Mk 1:24 and Lk 4:34

Whether the writer of the Fourth Gospel knew the Synoptics or not, we still have to ask whether ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ in Mk 1:24 and Lk 4:34 is messianic - implying some connection with the Jewish tradition of the Messiah. There are a number of scholars who are of the persuasion that the Marcan use is messianic, including W.F.Blunt, D.E.Nineham, B.H.Branscomb, P.Carrington, A.Farrer, A.M.Hunter and H.B.Swete.(22) Similarly a number of Lucan scholars hold the same for Luke 4:34, such as G.W.H.Lampe, S. Maclean Gilmour, K.H.Rengstorf, G.B.Caird, J.M.Creed, E.Earle Ellis and J.R.H.Moorman.(23) There are of course many others of the same opinion; however there are dissenting voices which we are not at liberty to ignore, including such notable writers as C.E.B.Cranfield(24) on St. Mark and I.H.Marshall(25) on St. Luke: Both writers suggest that the title includes the divinity of Jesus, and Cranfield in fact denies any messianic content in line with R. Bultmann's interpretation of John 6:69. This is the crux of the interpretation of the Holy One of God - the main problem to which we shall refer time and again in this work: Does ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ imply Jesus' role as Messiah, or His role as the Divine Son of God?

Already in this chapter, we shall find our attention drawn to the need to understand some development in the tradition from Mark to Luke concerning "the Holy One of God". Indeed one of the questions we shall attempt to answer as this chapter unfolds is the following :- What is the difference between Lk 4:41 (ᾔδεισαν τὸν χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι) and (ὅτι ἤδεισαν αὐτόν) in Mk 1:34? Another question to which we will immediately direct our

attention is as follows :
Is the role of the Holy One of God as an exorcist an indication that Jesus fulfils the role of the Messiah, or an attempt to link Jesus with the prophetic tradition (or even with the Divine Man)?
We turn now to this question.

2:2:1 The Conflict with Demons and the Messiah

There are two ways of understanding Jesus' action as described in Mark 1:25 and in other passages where Jesus expels (ἐκβάλλω) demons and unclean spirits. Thus Jesus is by definition an exorcist, and indeed there are parallels with contemporary figures who performed exorcism, as is shown by C.K.Barrett:(26) There are also differences between Jesus and contemporary exorcists,(27) and there is a noticeable lack of emphasis on the magical aspect of Jesus' actions;(28) instead the focal point in the present context in Mark is the person of Jesus as shown through his unquestioned authority over the demons and their confessions of him. Some scholars are critical of the term "exorcist" and deny that Jesus acts as such; P. Carrington states, "The use of the word exorcism is a very serious blunder"(29) and A. Farrer suggests that, "St. Mark's antitype for exorcism is not exorcism but cleansing".(30) Farrer raises a sound point; there is an ethical note present, as we shall demonstrate at a later stage. One cannot however escape the conclusion that Jesus' actions place him within the category of exorcists and wonder-workers, yet at the same time pointing beyond these figures. We shall therefore continue to use the term exorcism. Mark has however provided another framework within which to interpret the actions of Jesus, and this leads us to the second level of interpretation.

The second way of interpreting the exorcisms is to understand a framework of conflict arising from the clash of forces implicit in Mark's Gospel, in which Jesus stands as the representative of the forces of God in opposition to the forces of evil. Jewish tradition linked the Messiah with the

punishment of the evil spirits;(31) although there was another tradition in which Michael or Melchizedek performed that role. We will examine at this stage the possibility that Mark made use of the idea that it was part of Jesus' role as Messiah to cast out demons. There are in fact four arguments in favour of such an understanding, particularly when we consider the other two synoptic Gospels.

(a) The first argument is based on Matt 12:23 and suggests that Jesus as an exorcist fulfilled certain messianic expectations.

(b) The second argument based on the so-called "Messiasgeheimnis" of W.Wrede,(32) suggests that Jesus commands the demons to be silent (1:25) because they understood his messianic function(33) and attempted to forestall his mission through a premature disclosure of his messiahship.(34)

(c) The third argument in favour of a link between Jesus as the expeller of demons and his messianic function, is to be found in Lk 4:41, which argues that the demons knew Jesus as Messiah.

(d) The fourth argument suggests that there is a deliberate antithesis between Jesus as the Messiah, anointed with the Holy Spirit,(35) and the demon-possessed man filled with unclean spirits. (36)

In fact, as we shall see, the presentation in Mark is different from the Lucan presentation, so that to use the evidence of Luke to cast light on the Marcan interpretation may be misleading. However a consideration of these four arguments individually is vital and will lead us to a fuller understanding of the pericope in Mark and its distinction from the Lucan version. We examine now the arguments for a messianic interpretation of the exorcisms and the light these cast on the confessions of the demons.

2:2:2 Exorcism, the Son of David and Matthew 12:22f

The most precise link between Jesus casting out demons and the Messiah is to be found in Matt 12:22f:-

> (22) Then a blind and dumb demoniac was brought to him, and he healed him so that the dumb man spoke and saw. (23) All the people were amazed, and said, 'Can this be the Son of David?'

There are however some problems in this passage.[37] First of all this is not a true exorcism since there is no interaction with the demons; Jesus heals (ἐθεράπευσεν) the man, he does not cast out the demons; Secondly the title "Son of David" may be understood as messianic, as a comment about Jesus' family connections, or as a description of Jesus as a magician. It was L.R.Fisher[38] who made the latter suggestion, in preference to the messianic interpretation on the basis of folk-legends about the magical practices of Solomon,[39] the Son of David. Fisher refers to the magical papyri and Josephus (Antiq 8:45). According to Fisher, Jesus wishes to dissociate himself from such an interpretation of his actions,[40] hence his words "a greater than Solomon is here" (Matt 12:42).[41]

The general use of "Son of David" in the Gospels, in their present form, is so obviously messianic[42] that it is difficult to give credence to the suggestion that it is not messianic in Matt 12:23. This is not to say however that the Messiah was not in some way indebted to the Solomonic traditions,[43] nor that the Gospel presentation of Jesus is not influenced by charismatic wonder-workers[44] like the hellenistic Divine Man.[45]

The idea of the Messiah as presented in the NT is a synthesis of a number of traditions and it is difficult to separate the strands which are now so intricately interwoven. In chapter four we shall consider the Rabbinic traditions of the Messiah as a Second Moses,[46] and the possible synthesis in the NT presentation of Jesus, as the worker of wonders, and as king and prophet. Without a doubt the Exodus narrative had a formative effect on the concept of the messianic hope,[47] as did the narratives found in the Elijah/Elisha sagas.[48] These however are just some of the strands combined under the single idea of the NT Messiah. K. Berger suggests that one of the other strands was that of the Solomonic traditions. Unlike Fisher he sees the contribution of Solomon as an ancillary one to be ranked along with the prophetic tradition under the umbrella of the NT presentation of the "Son of David". He writes :

> "Zahlreich sind ferner die Belege aus Papyri und Inschriften in denen Salomo als Sohn Davids, Prophet und Magier bezeichnet wird - jeweils im Kontext von Herrschaft über Dämonen. Aufgrund dieser Beobachtungen erscheint es als möglich, das Vorkommen des Titels 'Sohn David' in ntl. Heilungsberichten zu erklären. Weisheit und Herrschaft über Dämonen sind daher kein Gegensatz zur Figur des endzeitlichen Davididen, sondern diesem Aufgrund der Salomo-Typologie zugeordnet".(49)

Berger continues by saying that equal weight should be given to the prophetic tradition; contrast M. Smith's picture of "Jesus the magician".(50) The idea that the messianic tradition includes "Weisheit und Herrschaft über Dämonen" suggests that the OT messianic king was a combination of the traits of two kings in particular - David the Warrior and Solomon the Wise Judge. Berger draws attention to the presentation in the Chronicler of the figures of David and Solomon.(51) Solomon is depicted by the Chronicler as a wise and just king who inherits his kingdom and rules in peace and prosperity.(52) The writer indeed exonerates Solomon of all his faults (cf. 2 Chr. 1:1-9:31 in comparison with the report in Samuel/Kings). In particular we note the way in which the promise to David (2 Sam 7:6) is altered to make Solomon, not David, the beneficiary: "Your throne" becomes in 1 Chr 17:14 "his throne". In the same work David is designated as אִישׁ מִלְחָמוֹת (1 Chr 28:3) while Solomon is אִישׁ מְנוּחָה (1 Chr 28:3); moreover we note the reason given against David's right to build the temple (1 Chr 22:7-13, cf 1 Kings 5:17ff). The exoneration of Solomon and the denigration of David suggests that the Chronicler was deliberately modifying tradition in the light of his present historical perspective.(53) The reasons for his actions may be found in the need to present a picture of an ideal king which flattered the reigning monarch or conversely attacked him - we find similar modification in the presentation of the ideal king as recorded in the Psalms of Solomon.(54) A similar pattern is also to be found in the NT (including exorcism) as in the process of time the actions of Jesus were understood as messianic, and linked with the twin roles of the Messiah - those of Judge and of Warrior.

(a) The Messiah as a Wise Judge

R.B.Laurin[55] has pointed out the frequent use of מִשְׁפָּט and צֶדֶק in connection with the OT presentation of the wise king. The following serve as examples:

Isaiah 16:5 "Then a throne will be established in steadfast love and on it will sit in faithfulness in the tent of David one who judges and seeks justice (שֹׁפֵט וְדֹרֵשׁ מִשְׁפָּט) and is swift to do righteousness (וּמַהֵר צֶדֶק)."

Isaiah 32:1 "Behold a king will rule in righteousness (לְצֶדֶק) and princes will rule in justice (לְמִשְׁפָּט)."

Jer 23:5 "Behold the days are coming, says the Lord, when I will raise up for David a righteous branch (צֶמַח צַדִּיק) and he shall execute justice (מִשְׁפָּט) and righteousness (צְדָקָה) in the land."

Prov 16:10 "Inspired decisions are on the lips of a king; his mouth does not sin in judgement. (בְּמִשְׁפָּט)."

In an excellent survey of the picture of the ideal king and its relationship to Solomon, K.W.Whitelam[56] concludes, "The important Solomonic ideological development emphasized the internalization of God-given judicial wisdom within the king over against the previous reliance upon the oracular guidance by the priests". However Whitelam adds a cautionary note about the translation of the root שָׁפַט purely in terms of a legal action.[57] Along with S. Mowinckel[58] he suggests that in the earlier texts it probably meant "to govern" and with the growth of the technical term מָלַךְ for government it gradually lost some of the early content.[59] Consequently we need to bear both meanings in mind when we consider the picture of the ideal king.

Several writers have drawn attention to the apparent absence of the conflict motif within the OT presentation of the ideal king.[60] Is this perhaps because such a king is modelled upon Solomon rather than David? There are a number of similarities in the presentation of the ideal king as one who receives a kingdom already established and whose reign

is marked by prosperity and peace. Only once is the king said to establish (לְהָכִין) the kingdom (Is 9:5f) and there is added the qualification קִנְאַת יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת תַּעֲשֶׂה זֹּאת . The following writers draw attention to features in the picture of the ideal king that are based on the story of Solomon. Thus W. Harrelson[61] writes that in Zech 9:9-10 and "in other texts as well (excluding Is 11:4), it is Yahweh who establishes peace, the royal figure seems to be at most the preserver of peace established by Yahweh". D. Duling[62] suggests, on the basis of Is 11:1 and Jer 23:5, that the figure presented there, "is not the conquering warrior of nationalistic proportions, but the wise king who executes justice and righteousness in the land and brings salvation to the people".

So it is that in a number of OT passages,[63] the king appears to play a somewhat passive role in relation to Yahweh. At times the warrior aspect of the king is played down - as in the preference in the Chronicler for Solomon,[64] yet in general it is often implicit within the concept of Judgement (מִשְׁפָּט) - which is a good reason for not understanding מִשְׁפָּט in too legalistic a fashion. It is clear that where the emphasis is upon Yahweh as a Divine Warrior,[65] there is correspondingly less place for a warrior king. As P.D.Hanson remarked in connection with the Messiah in the Apocalyptic literature, the role of the king as conqueror is inversely proportionate to Yahweh's role as the Divine Warrior.[66] It must be added that in the OT the usual practice is to give Yahweh the credit for all major battles, rather than honouring the human agent involved. Such a qualification must surely be considered even for the following verses :

Ps 110:1 The Lord said to my lord, Sit at my right hand until I make your enemies your footstool.

2 Sam 7:13 I will establish the throne of his kingdom for ever.

Ps 2:8 Ask of me and I will make the nations your heritage.

Ps 89:23 I will crush his foes before him.

The general pattern then presents Yahweh, the Warrior as the one who establishes the kingdom and then appoints his king as vice-regent - perhaps as His adopted son[67]

(cf Ps 2:7) but in any case as his representative, who rules in justice and righteousness, by rewarding the righteous and punishing the wicked.

(b) The Messiah as a Warrior

There can be very little doubt, in spite of the claims to the contrary,(68) that the OT ideal king is a warrior. Although the credit for the action is invariably given to Yahweh, the role of the king must nevertheless be understood as an active one. If we understand the term צדק correctly it implies far more than the simple passing of a judicial sentence - at least in the OT.

The term שפט perhaps also shows indications of a wider context than the legal one: Ps 110:6 "Yahweh/He will execute justice (שפט)(69) among the nations filling them with corpses". Judgement and warfare are closely related in the OT.

> Ps 72:1,4 Give the king thy justice O God, and thy righteousness to the royal son. May he judge (שפט) thy people with righteousness and thy poor with justice... (4) May he defend the cause of the poor of the people, and give deliverance (ישע) to the needy and crush the oppressor.

> Isaiah 11:3b,4 He shall not judge by what his eyes see or his ears hear. But with righteousness will he judge (שפט) the poor and meek and he shall smite (נכה) the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay (מות) the wicked.

It was however the next passage which appeared to hold a particular fascination for the Qumran writers as we shall see:

> Num 24:17 "A star shall come forth out of Jacob and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel; it shall crush (מחץ) the forehead of Moab, and break down (קרקר) all the sons of Seth.

It is this passage which more than the others defines the role of the Messiah as a warrior - and it is this element which Qumran and the Psalms of Solomon emphasize. We note also the claim made by Rabbi Aqiba on behalf of Simon bar Kosiba in the early second century of the Common Era; using

the same verse.(70)

The royal Messiah in Qumran is variously referred to as "the Messiah of Israel", "the Branch of David", "the Righteous Messiah" and "the Prince of the Congregation". The king is presented pre-eminently as a Warrior King and three times Num 24:17 is cited with reference to him (4Q Test 12f 1QM 11:6f CD 7:19f). He is the one who will save Israel (4Qflor 1:13) which as J.F. Sawyer has shown in the OT represents what is normally a divine function.(71) We note the emphasis on the Warrior aspect in the following two passages :-

The Pesher on Isaiah (1QpIs frag a)

> "Interpreted this concerns the Branch of David who shall arise at the end of days ... God will uphold him with the spirit of might, and will give him a throne of glory and a crown of holiness and many-coloured-garments ... He will put a sceptre in his hand and he shall rule over all the nations, And Magog ... and his sword shall judge all the peoples."

IQSb - The Scroll of the Blessings 5:20-29

> "The Master shall bless the Prince of the Congregation and shall renew for him the Covenant of the Community that he may establish the kingdom of his people for ever ... that he may dispense justice ... May the Lord raise you up to everlasting heights and as a fortified tower upon a high wall. May you smite the peoples with the might of your hand and ravage the earth with your sceptre: May you bring death to the ungodly with the breath of your lips. May He shed upon you the spirit of counsel and everlasting might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord ... For God has established you as the sceptre. The rulers and all the kings of the nations shall serve you. He shall strengthen you with His Holy Name and you shall be as a lion; and you shall not lie down until you have devoured the prey which nothing shall deliver."

There are two reasons for the development in the Warrior aspect of the Messiah as envisaged in the Dead Sea Scrolls :-

(i) The historical situation, perhaps in anticipation of conflict with the Romans, to whom "the Kittim" probably refers, would strengthen the hope for a political and religious leader.

(ii) The Qumran texts give the priority in judgement (משפט) (understood in its strict legal sense)

to the High Priest. Indeed in the Temple scroll the waging of war depends upon the authorisation of the High Priest and in the Isaiah Pesher we read of the king that "as they (the priests) teach him so shall he judge". But the priests do not fight - that is the role of the Messiah of Israel and his forces. As a result of this apportioning of roles, the king emerges as primarily a warrior and only secondly a judge. Conversely the Priest is primarily a judge and although he directs the war (IQM) he is debarred from actual contact with the enemy (along with the other priests) on account of his holiness.

Perhaps the clearest expression of the king's concern with the destruction of evil comes in the Psalms of Solomon (particularly 17 and 18) which give us many insights into the NT idea of Messiah. We note in particular verses 21-5 :-

> Behold O Lord and raise up unto them their king, the son of David, at the time in which Thou seest. O God, that he may reign over Israel Thy servant. And gird him with strength that he may shatter unrighteous rulers and that he may purge (καθαρίσαι) Jerusalem from the nations that trample her down to destruction. Wisely and righteously he shall thrust out sinners from the inheritance. He shall destroy the godless nations with the word of his mouth. At his rebuke shall nations flee before him, and he shall reprove sinners for the thoughts of their heart.

It is possible that we are witnessing in these Psalms the taking over of language and functions, at one time applicable to Yahweh, now part of the presentation of the ideal king. For example the phrase "at his rebuke shall nations flee before him" reminds one of similar sentiments about Yahweh (cf Is 2:4; Mic 4:3; Ps 46:6).

The most striking aspect in our opinion comes in verses 25-7 following :-

> He shall gather together a holy people (λαὸν ἅγιον) whom he shall lead in righteousness, and he shall judge the tribes of the people that have been sanctified (ἡγιασμένου) by the Lord his God. And he shall not suffer unrighteousness to dwell anymore in their midst, nor shall there dwell with them any man that knoweth wickedness. For he shall know them that they are all the sons of their God (υἱὰ θεοῦ αὐτῶν).

These sentiments could equally well have described the

action of Yahweh. The cleansing of Jerusalem appears again in verse 30, "And he shall purge (καθαρίσει Jerusalem making it holy (ἐν ἁγιασμῷ) as of old." We note also the end of verse 32:- For all shall be holy (ὅτι πάντες ἅγιοι) and the king the anointed (of the) Lord (καὶ βασιλεὺς αὐτῶν χριστὸς κυρίου).(72)

The Psalms are usually dated about the middle of the last century before Christ, and Psalm 17 is equated with the rise of Pompey and the subsequent demise of the Hasmonean dynasty,(73) which by all accounts had brought the cult and priesthood into disrepute (cf 17:33,36). In the Psalm we find a close pre-occupation with the holiness of Israel(74) and Jerusalem in particular, which accords well with the suggested background. Moreover the strong warrior imagery found in the Psalm probably reflects something of the person of Pompey but is quite definite proof of the increasing interest in a warrior king prior to the first Christian century.(75) The theme of a purged and holy Jerusalem adds a new dimension to the idea of a warrior king (cf vss 25 and 33), and indeed he is himself declared to be "free from sin" (17:41). There is no mention of Solomon in the Psalms although the title "Son of David" is found (17:21); With regard to the NT picture of the Messiah as a political warrior, there can be little doubt that the Psalms of Solomon or at least the type of thinking characterized by these Psalms, is of tremendous importance for the New Testament.

(c) Exorcism : Conflict and Judgement

R. Bultmann suggested that the exorcisms in the Gospels should be understood as proofs for the early Church of Jesus' Messiahship.(76) He is critical of a synthesis which would combine Messiah and the Mosaic Prophet in order to explain the miracles of Jesus, prefering the simple messianic solution. We consider that insofar as Mark is concerned such a solution might suffice, whereas in Luke we are obliged to take cognizance of the prophetic aspect (as we shall see). We have drawn attention to the twin roles of the messianic king - as Judge and as Warrior - and both have their place in the NT interpretation of exorcism. Apart from the examples we quoted above we find that the Targums present the Messiah as a warrior, while in the

Parables of Enoch[77] it is his judicial role which is significant. Other witnesses from the same period show a similar variety, sometimes as in 4 Ezra within the same work, with the messiah appearing sometimes as judge within the Divine Court and at other times as a warrior.[78]

To return to the use of Son of David in the Synoptics and its relation to exorcism - we believe that the title applies directly to the ideal king and lacks reference to the magical abilities of Solomon. The exorcisms like the parables refer to the advent of the Kingdom - signs of its imminent arrival:[79] So the people recognize in the miracles the presence of the Messiah the Son of David, for this is what the title conveys in its present situation, whatever it might have intended originally. K. Kertelge writes,

> "In Zusammenhang der Erzählung dient der doppelte Ruf zur Akzentuierung der Erwartung, die sich auf Jesus richtet, der in der Blindenheilung ein Zeichen der anbrechenden eschatologischen Königsherrschaft Gottes setzt." (80)

And on the subject of the Marcan exorcism he writes :

> "Der Dämon, dem in der Synagoge ... entgegentritt weiss nicht nur um die wahre Bedeutung Jesu als des Gesandten Gottes. Er weiss sich von ihm auch sehr ernsthaft bedroht. Seine Anklage: 'Du bist gekommen, uns zu vernichten' signalisiert den eschatologischen Kampf, in den Jesus jetzt in einem ersten öffentlichen Beispiel mit dem Widersacher Gottes eintritt. Bereits die Versuchungsgeschichte 1, 12-13 hat den Blick auf die Auseinandersetzung mit dem Satan gerichtet. Der Kampf gegen Satan und seine Macht durchzeiht das ganze öffentliche Wirken Jesu." (81)

The idea that Jesus was engaged in "der Kampf gegen Satan" may be compared with the suggestion made by H. Braun,[82] that the clue to the interpretation of the exorcisms is to be found in the OT pattern of Holy War. So several themes come together in the picture of Jesus as exorcist. There is the essential note of conflict which points to Jesus as the messianic Warrior. There is the eschatological note suggestive of the advent of the Kingdom. There is the fear the demons have of punishment which reflects the theme of the Messiah as Judge (and reminds us of the Jewish tradition that the Messiah would punish the demons). Finally there is the antithesis of the Spirit-filled Messiah in contrast to the unclean spirit.

In Mark, Jesus compares exorcism to conflict, and in Luke the warrior imagery is even more pronounced for we read (Lk 11:21f) :

> "When a strong man, fully armed, guards his own palace, his goods are in peace; but when one stronger than he assails him (ἐπελθὼν) and overcomes him (νικήσῃ αὐτόν) he takes away his armour in which he trusted and divides his spoil".

The conflict motif is so obviously important(83) that ideas of magic or traits of the Divine Man pale into insignificance, and with the Psalms of Solomon as a reference point it is easy to understand the exorcisms as the Messianic purging out of evil.

2:2:3 The Messianic Secret and the Demonic Confessions

We have suggested a possible way of understanding the exorcisms within a messianic framework, and we come now to consider the response of Jesus to the demonic confessions. We note the Marcan imperative Φιμώθητι (Mk 1:25) which literally means "Be muzzled!" and the later remark in 1:34, καὶ δαιμόνια πολλὰ ἐξέβαλεν καὶ οὐκ ἤφιεν λαλεῖν τὰ δαιμόνια ὅτι ἤδεισαν αὐτόν. What is it that the demons know? Do they know that Jesus is the Messiah, or do the titles "Son of God/of the Most High God" and "Holy One of God" have some other significance?

There are certain indications that, at least in the present form of the Gospel, part of the content of the demonic knowledge included Jesus' role as Messiah. There is first of all their fear of punishment and destruction, which accords well with the picture of the Messiah that we outlined above (cf Mk 1:24 and 5:7). Secondly the title "Son of God" as used by the demons might imply the messianic use of the title (cf Ps 2:7 and 2 Sam 7:14) rather than a reference to Jesus' filial relationship with God, or together with such an insight.

However, when we consider the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, we find clear indications of a tendency to add a messianic dimension or colour to the Marcan narrative. So, where Mark has in 1:32 the fact that the demons knew Jesus, Luke interprets this as implying they knew that he was the Messiah (Lk 4:41).(84) Where Mark has in 8:30 a

command not to make him known (καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ λέγωσιν περὶ αὐτοῦ) Matthew has τότε διεστείλατο τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ εἴπωσιν ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ χριστός 16:20. This tendency is observable in the variants to the Gospel texts in which the term ὁ χριστός plays a not insignificant part: for example we note P66 on Jn 6:69.

If the messianic secret depends upon the traditions found in Matthew and Luke rather than in Mark, then there are real grounds for suggesting "Sohnesgeheimnis" as the key to the Marcan presentation.(85) The idea that this secret might include Jesus' Messiahship as well as the knowledge of his relationship with the Father, or apart from such knowledge again depends on how we interpret the Marcan use of "Son of God". If "Son of God" is nothing more nor less than the equivalent of "Messiah" then the knowledge of the demons, portrayed in their exclamations, may be fairly described as messianic - and the command that they be silenced is indicative then of a "messianic secret". However in view of the total gospel phenomenon, "Son of God" probably means something more than Messiah. Yet since it is convenient the term "messianic" will probably continue in use for some time to come, even if it is inadequate.

We turn now to an examination of the Marcan and Lucan use of the title Son of God.

2:2:4 The Son of God and the Messiah

The title "Son of God"(86) appears in a variety of contexts in the Jewish writings, from the description of Israel to the angels of God, from the righteous man to the Jewish charismatics, from the royal messiah to certain of the Rabbis.(87) In Philo it is used of the Divine Logos and in Philostratus's life of Apollonius of Tyana, of the divine man. With regard to the NT there are two discernible tendencies among present day scholars. The first is to interpret "Son of God" as implying the functional divinity of Jesus, inclusive of his Messiahship, which led in time to the ontological divinity of the later NT writings. The whole transition is explained from within the context of Judaism, allowing for the minor influence of Hellenistic thinking - as might be expected

even in Palestine.

The second tendency is to interpret "Son of God" as being largely influenced by the use of the same title of the Hellenistic Divine Man; so that the transition from what Hahn(88) calls sonship which is "primär funktional" to sonship which is "wesensmässigen", is directly attributable to the influence of the understanding of Jesus as a Θεῖος Ἀνήρ . Thus also H.D.Betz writes:-

> "the Divine Man Jesus occupies an important place in Mark's Gospel. To be sure, Mark's Christology is the product of much more reflection and is more complicated than that of his sources. He interprets, and thereby changes, the earlier Christology by placing his material in a new Christological framework ... In the Markan view, all Christological titles designate Jesus' divine nature. The title most prominent in Mark is 'Son of God' (chs 1:11; 3:11; 5:7; 9:7; 13:32; 14:61; 15:39), a title for the Divine Man, now combined by Mark with the title for the eschatological messianic king (chs 14:61; 15:26.32)." (89).

The problem with the theory as presented by Hahn and the others is the rigid separation of Jewish and Hellenistic thought. While the NT writers do show signs of a concession to their Gentile readers, and also the adoption of certain non-Jewish patterns of thought, we need to bear in mind that Palestine was no less a part of the Hellenistic world,(90) so that it is feasible that an ontological comprehension of Jesus' divine sonship may have arisen within the Jewish Church founded in Palestine.

A second problem concerns the idea of the Divine Man. We know from the work of L. Bieler(91) that there are a number of parallels between such a figure and the Gospel Jesus. We note also the careful study of E.Jones(92) on the subject and his conclusion - "The NT writers could hardly ignore the language, concepts and imagery of their day. The conception of the Θεῖος Ἀνήρ as held by Philostratus is therefore traceable in the Gospels".(93) Jones however adds the qualification that Philostratus might have been influenced by the presentation of Jesus as found in the Gospels,(94) or similar traditions. M. Hengel(95) is critical about the claim that "Son of God" was a title for the Divine Man during the first Christian century,(96) and there are a number of other

writers who express similar doubts about the value of the Θεῖος Ἀνήρ for the interpretation of Jesus in Mark, such as P. W. von Martitz, O. Betz, E. Schweizer, G.Theissen and K. Berger.(97)

If the title "Son of God" does not imply Jesus as a kind of Θεῖος Ἀνήρ, then we need to ask what it does imply. There are two answers which crop up again and again in works on the subject, which are the following :
(a) The title ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ is a messianic title drawn from the idea of the king as an adopted son of God, and it describes Jesus' function as the appointed agent of God.(98)
(b) The title describes Jesus' relationship with the Father, reflected in his use of Abba, in his prayers and in his frequent reference to himself as "Son".

Once again we need to ask the question, what does the knowledge of the demons imply? Is it (a) or (b) or both? Part of the problem in finding an answer is to know what "Son of God" meant during the time of Jesus, and whether it was used as a messianic title prior to the NT time. The Qumran evidence provides the only instance demonstrably pre-Christian,(99) in which the Messiah is referred to as Son (100)(4Qflor 1:11f) and there it is in quotation from 2 Sam 7:14. This is not definite evidence but, as R.H.Fuller(101) has suggested, it does open up the possibility that the title was coming into use as a technical term for the Messiah during NT times. Another scroll from Qumran is the mysterious fragment from Pseudo-Daniel which reads:

> "(But your son) shall be great upon the earth (O King). All men shall make (peace), and shall serve him. (He shall be called the son of) the Great God, and by his name shall he be named. He shall be hailed as the Son of God and they shall call him the Son of the Most High..."

It is uncertain to whom this scroll refers, and we await the publication of the full scroll. J.T. Milik suggests that it refers to Alexander Balas,(102) while J.Fitzmyer(103) conjectures that it refers to some other Jewish ruler. The possibility that it has messianic intention appears to be somewhat remote. We believe the important fact about this

scroll and certain other uses of "Son of God" in pre-Christian times is the regularity in which the person or being so described functions as the agent of God. Thus the angelic Son of God, Philo's Logos, the Hypostasis of divine Wisdom, the king and even Israel itself fulfil the function of God's agent (104) - His Son.

With regard to the question of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ as a pre-Christian title for the Messiah, given the fact that it could be used of various agents of God, there is good reason for its employment as a title for God's special agent - the Messiah (quite apart from the OT use of the theme of the king as "son" of God). E. Schweizer's study of the motif of agency underlines this argument. (105) However since even at Qumran the title itself is not clearly messianic, it seems reasonable to us to suggest that it was just coming into vogue as a messianic title during the time of the NT. In fact the NT is itself the earliest witness to this trend.

In the NT, the title Son of God is on several occasions used in conjunction with the title Messiah:-

In the Fourth Gospel Jesus is twice called "the Messiah, the Son of God" (11:27 and 20:31) and once "Son of God ... king of Israel".

In the Synoptics Jesus is asked if he is the Messiah, the Son of the Blessed One (Mk 14:61) and the parallels preserve the titles with minor amendments (Lk 22:67ff; Matt 26:63). In Matthew Peter confesses Jesus as "the Christ, the Son of the Living God" and in the Synoptic crucifixion narratives both titles appear.

In Romans 1:3,4 we have what is probably the earliest record of the conjunction of the two titles:
περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ κατὰ σάρκα, τοῦ ὁρισθέντος υἱοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν. Some critics (See n.87) would remove the phrases κατὰ σάρκα and κατὰ πνεῦμα as redactions. Even if this argument is accepted the fusion of the two ideas of the Messiah and the Son of God is manifestly early. (106)

The posing of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ opposite ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Δαυίδ in Rom 1:3f is interesting since it

indicates to our mind something of the tension inherent in the former title. There is the functional equation in which Jesus' divinity is interpreted within the framework of his messianic role - thus Son of God and Messiah alike describe the agency of Jesus. There is also the disjunction of a divine Messiah in a Jewish tradition: "Christ belongs to two spheres or orders of existence, denoted respectively by flesh and spirit; in these he can be described as Son of David and as Son of God."(107) The idea of an adoptionist Christology as propounded by E. Käsemann(108) is a possible solution to the tension, but it is perfectly possible (perhaps preferable) to understand Jesus' baptism and resurrection as confirmation rather than initiation of his divine sonship.

(a) The Marcan understanding of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ

When we consider Mark's understanding of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ particularly in relation to his use of ὁ χριστός, we find that there are both similarities and differences in comparison with the employment of these titles in the other Gospels. We shall see that Mark and John have certain traits in common, but each of the four Gospels has quite distinctive emphases peculiar to their own Gospel. The title "Son of God" and the absolute use of "Son" or "Father" need to be seen together, part of a single picture, as I.H. Marshall(109) has shown, rather than as separate entities following F.Hahn(110); at least as they are now presented to us in the final form of the Gospels.

Several writers have suggested that Mark understands Jesus as divine.(111) The question about the form of his divinity is very complex, indeed given the briefness of the Gospel teaching on the subject in comparison with the Johannine teaching for instance, it is very difficult to say any more than that it is probably functional(112) in so far as it reflects Jesus' relationship to his Father and his own agency. Whether it intends a divinity in essence as opposed to a functional divinity (in which Jesus is divine because he fulfils the function of the Son of God, and acts as God's representative) is extremely difficult either to prove or to disprove. Legitimately one might

enquire whether such categories (like functional or ontological divinity) are necessarily the right divisions into which NT Christology is to be subdivided. Yet without these there is a certain danger of reading Post Nicene or Post Chalcedonian problems into the literature of the NT.

E. Schweizer's analysis of Mark's use of "Son of God" (113) to our mind has much to commend it. He suggests that the climax of the Gospel is to be found in the confession of the Centurion at Mk 15:39, ἀληθῶς οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος υἱὸς θεοῦ ἦν. The lack of an article should not lead us to translate this phrase as an indefinite expression, for there are good grammatical grounds for understanding the definite article. (114) The facts that it is a gentile who makes the sublime confession and that it comes at the moment of Jesus' death, are obviously important; the former in the light of the Gentile mission, and the latter in the light of the Marcan interpretation of Jesus' sonship - he fulfils the mission for which he was appointed Son in and through his death. In obedience to his Father, Jesus, through the medium of the cross, is confirmed as Son of God. Such an interpretation is in basic accord with Rom 1:3f and suggests the antiquity of the view. Son of God forms the key to the Marcan understanding of Jesus - it is the most authoritative christological statement.

The confession of Peter in Mk 8:29 has ὁ χριστός and cannot simply be equated with the title υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. Indeed, Jesus needs to correct the understanding of the term χριστός through his teaching on the Son of Man who suffers and rises from the dead.(115) It is important not to concentrate solely on the aspect of suffering to the exclusion of the perhaps more remarkable aspect of a Messiah who rises from the dead.(116) O. Cullmann has suggested that Peter was thinking in terms of a political Messiah, someone who would drive out the enemy Rome and establish God's Kingdom within the land of Israel.(117) His thoughts are limited to this political sphere, the human realm, and he fails to comprehend the true nature of the Son of Man.

When we compare Peter's confession with some of the

other confessions in Mark, particularly the demonic confessions or the heavenly voice at the baptism and the transfiguration, we notice there the lack of the term Χριστός and the frequency of the theme of sonship. E. Schweizer suggests that the confession of Peter fails to reach the same level as these other confessions,(118) for unlike those confessions Peter fails to recognise the divinity of Jesus - so closely associated in the Christian tradition with the Sonship of Jesus.(119) There is a tension within the Marcan use of Son of God which moves between its Jewish messianic background and the Christian belief in the resurrected Son of God and something of this tension permeates the other titles including Messiah and Son of Man. Hence Peter's confession is not wrong, nor is it inaccurate - for Mark Jesus is the Messiah (cf Mk 1:1) - yet Peter is told off so that the reader is obliged to look beyond the confession of Peter towards the Son of Man, who suffers, dies and rises from the dead - and the Son of God.

It is characteristic of Mark and his use of titles that he allows titles like Son of Man and Messiah to rest side by side without strictly defining their inter-relationship. The traditions of Jesus as Son of God, Son of Man and Messiah are three strands in the Gospel tradition, sometimes interwoven and at other times separate, they co-exist without the more precise formulations found in the Lucan and Johannine Gospels. Nevertheless, already here in Mark one is aware of the way in which Son of God and Son of Man act as guides to the interpretation of the messianic role of Jesus, something which we have seen in the Fourth Gospel. It is a witness to the tension generated by the belief that Jesus as the Messiah had been raised from death and proclaimed Son of God - the divine Son of God. Jesus' divinity is an inherent part of the kerygma of the Gospel and cannot be accounted for solely on the basis of the Hellenistic divine man, but rises out of Jewish-Christian use of Son of God to describe Jesus as the divine Messiah.

When we consider the question of the High Priest and the response of Jesus to this question we come to the very heart of the Marcan christology. Here are the three titles

together, and between the question of the Priest, σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ, and the answer of Jesus lies the tension basic to the Gospel presentation of the divine Messiah. In the phrase "Son of the Blessed One" there is the messianic hope of the Jewish people summed up and poised opposite the Christian belief in the divinity of Jesus - and the charge of blasphemy has obvious implications for the later conflict which developed between the Church and the Synagogue.

W. Grundmann writes on 14:61 as follows :-

> "In this form the question is shaped by the Christian confession of Jesus as Messiah and Son of God, cf. Mt 16:16; Jn 1:49 and 20:31. Hence Jesus has to reply in the affirmative. He thus describes himself as the Son of Man and expounds His Messiahship, which includes divine sonship, in terms of Son of Man christology." (120)

In concurring with Grundmann we must underline the need to preserve the tension within the three titles and understand something of the conflict generated in the synagogue by the preaching of Jesus as a divine Messiah,(121) and the possible confusion of such divinity with the mythological belief in divine men fathered by the Greek and Roman gods. It was only by retaining the delicate balance between the three titles that the picture of Jesus as presented by Mark and the other Evangelists could meet the challenge of the Jewish and Hellenistic critics.

In so far as the title "Holy One of God" is concerned, the Marcan presentation indicates that it implies something more than the confession of Peter as suggested by E. Schweizer above;(122) perhaps it is an alternative for Son of God and in content means much the same, thus indicating in part the divinity of Jesus. Or perhaps it implies the agency of Jesus and thus includes both the sense of his messiahship and the functional understanding of Jesus as the Agent/Son of God. We prefer the latter formulation with the emphasis upon the idea of Jesus' agency as the key to the interpretation of ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ and its relationship with the title "Son of God". It is an open question whether such agency included from the beginning the idea of the Messiah, but the Marcan presentation of Jesus would argue strongly in favour of such a conclusion. Mark uses Messiah or Χριστός in a precise fashion

showing clearly his awareness of its Jewish antecedents (13:21f and 14:61, cf 15:32) and its Christian usage (1:1). The title, as we have shown, needs the guiding lines of the other titles in Mark, nevertheless Jesus is presented as the Messiah(123) and although he is misunderstood by his disciples(124) and rejected by the Jews he remains the focal point of the OT expectation for a king. In the Synagogue in Capernaum, it would seem likely that the title ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ had also some relation to the Jewish hope of the Messiah, but Mark does not elaborate and so we can only surmise.

(b) The Lucan understanding of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ

In comparison with Mark, Luke presents a somewhat different picture of both "Messiah" and "Son of God". If we include the Acts of the Apostles we have access to the sermons contained therein and the apologetical attempts to maintain both the Messiahship of Jesus and his resurrection. In comparison with Mark there is much more material available and consequently more information on which to build up a detailed understanding of the Lucan christology. From the beginning of the Gospel, Jesus is described as the messianic Son of God (cf 1:32-5) with clear links with the Davidic promises, and this pattern is also found in the Acts (cf 2:34ff), and other places in which David is held to speak in prophecy of Jesus. In Luke and Acts the title Messiah appears to be quite adequate on its own to describe the function of Jesus, even after the resurrection (cf 24:46). When Peter confesses Jesus as τὸν χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ (9:20) there is no remonstration with Jesus on his part and no consequent rebuke against Peter. Effectively Luke has removed not only the blight on Peter's character, but also shielded his confession. The importance of Peter for Luke is adequately demonstrated within the Acts and this is an obvious motivation for his presentation of the Confession of Peter. For Luke the idea of Jesus as Messiah adequately expresses the person and mission of Jesus and thus performs the function of "Son of God" in Mark. So, for example, on two occasions following the death of Jesus, Jesus himself is found explaining his specifically

messianic role on the basis of the OT evidence (24:46 and 24:26), just as the sermons in Acts deal with the suffering and resurrection of Jesus by recourse to the OT (cf for example 2:25 and 8:32ff). Thus Luke has extended the Jewish sense of Messiah to incorporate the life, death and resurrection of Jesus, as did Mark, but unlike Mark he does not regard Son of God as the primary corrective (along with Son of Man) to the term Messiah. In other words the readers of the Lucan Gospel understand Messiah in a wider sense than the readers of the Marcan Gospel, and this is explicitly seen in Acts where "the anointed one" is often linked with the Prophet like Moses. So in Acts 3:17-24 we find an easy transition from the Messiah to the Prophet and we notice the use in 3:14 of the Holy and Righteous One.

Thus in Luke there are two notable points about the use of Messiah:

(a) The first is what may be described as Luke's extended use of the title Messiah to include Jesus' death and resurrection, without obvious recourse to some other title like Son of Man/ Son of God. W. Grundmann writes,

> "Only the way through the cross to glory actualises the Messiahship proclaimed at the outset. Hence Luke's picture of the Messiah is decisively shaped by the crucifixion and the resurrection of Jesus." (125)

The title Messiah has grown to encompass aspects of the separate traditions of Son of God and Son of Man as found in Mark. Jesus fulfils the hope for the Jewish Messiah through his death and resurrection so that it is only in retrospect from these events that Jesus can be truly understood as the Messiah.

(b) Apart from the Passion narrative Jesus is also presented in the birth narratives as the promised Messiah,(126) and in between these two poles, the actual mission of Jesus is often closer to a prophetic role than a royal role (cf 4:16ff).(127) The reader of the sermons in Acts is led to a similar conclusion about the prophetic mission of Jesus. In the Lucan presentation of Jesus as Messiah, "Messiah" includes not only the kingship of David but the prophetic role as typified by Moses.(128) Since both roles are understood within the context of the miraculous birth and

resurrection of Jesus, we must needs acknowledge that there was also a divine dimension in the Lucan presentation of Jesus as the Anointed One. However the sense of divinity is differently construed from that found in Mark, where the dominant sense was the agency of the Son and lacked the idea of a miraculous birth or post-resurrection teaching from the lips of Jesus himself.

In contrast to his use of Messiah we find Luke's use of Son of God somewhat reserved, perhaps because of the danger that his readers might misunderstand the title in terms of the pagan myths of the time.(129) In place of Mark's version of the centurion's confession, Luke has ἄνθρωπος ἁγαθὸς καὶ δίκαιος(23:47). His use of Son of God is always qualified in terms of the davidic sonship theme (1:69; 2:4; 4:41 cf Acts 2:30f; 13:23,33-6) but this is not to be understood in political terms as E.Schweizer points out,

> "The expectation of the rule of the Son of God in fulfilment of the Davidic promises has been long since taken out of the political sphere and related to the rule of the exalted lord over his community." (130)

In other words the divinity of Jesus permeates Luke's use of Messiah and Son of God. This is particularly evident in 1:32-5 about which R.E.Brown has the following to say:-

> "The term 'Son of God' is a parallel to 'Son of the Most High' and both echo God's designation of the Davidic ruler as His 'son' in 2 Sam 7:14 and Ps 2:7. But the way these ideas are combined in 1:35 takes us out of the realm of Jewish expectation of the Messiah into the realm of early Christianity. The action of the Holy Spirit and the power of the Most High come not upon the Davidic king but upon his mother. We are not dealing with the adoption of a Davidide by coronation as God's son or representative; we are dealing with the begetting of God's Son in the womb of Mary through God's creative Spirit. If vss 32-33 could have been part of a purely Jewish narrative announcing the Messiah's birth, as we saw from the Qumran parallel, the same cannot be said of vs.35, since as we have seen, there was no Jewish expectation that the Messiah would be God's Son in the sense of having been conceived without a male parent." (131)

The same sense of divinity is present in Luke's use of Messiah as I.H.Marshall demonstrates with reference to

4:41:

> "Luke's elucidation of the title (Son of God) in terms of Messiah (4:41) does not mean that he has downgraded 'Son of God' to become merely an attribute of the Messiah: this is impossible in the light of 1:32-5. Rather the term 'Messiah' is seen to be applicable to a more-than-earthly figure, able to exorcise demons and on a different level from political Saviours." (132)

The knowledge of the demons is then not limited to Jesus as a Messiah in the traditional Jewish sense, but incorporates within it the sense of Jesus' divinity. This understanding of Luke's use of the terms ὁ χριστός and ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, has immediate consequences for our understanding of Lk 4:34 and ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ which, particularly in view of Lk 1:35, appears to be indicative not only of Jesus' messiahship but also of his divinity. In Mark 1:34 the demons are silenced because they know Jesus (ὅτι ᾔδεισαν αὐτόν) while in Luke 4:41 we find that they know that Jesus is the Christ (ᾔδεισαν τὸν χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι). Some of the variants to the Marcan version supply χριστὸν εἶναι to match the Lucan claim. Probably we are to understand Lk 4:41 as part of a similar process of messianization in which more and more aspects of the life and teaching of Jesus were drawn within the framework of his messianic function. There is evidence of this process elsewhere in the NT.

(c) Conclusion

In response to the question of the messianic interpretation of Son of God in Luke and Mark, based on Lk 4:41, we have established four factors which need to be taken into consideration :-

(a) The Marcan and Lucan use of the titles ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ and ὁ χριστός are quite distinctive and peculiar to each, so that Lk 4:41 cannot be used as evidence for the Marcan understanding of either title.

(b) Luke tends to read into "Messiah" the miraculous birth, death and resurrection of Jesus including his divine sonship (4:41). It is thus the key term for his Christology and all aspects of Jesus' mission including his role as a prophet are subject to it. Jesus is the Son of God because he is first and foremost the Messiah

(cf Lk 1:32-5) so that there can be no accusation that he is a divine man of the pagan myths.

(c) Mark is content to allow the traditions of Son of God and Messiah to rest side by side with each other, as separate but related traditions. His preference appears to be for Son of God and Son of Man as the definitive expressions vis-à-vis the person of Jesus, but each in turn is loosely connected to Jesus' messiahship if only as a guide to the true understanding of that concept. Perhaps there is a note of reserve in the attitude of Jesus towards the title "Messiah" which necessitates the qualifications of the other titles; and perhaps this is because there lies behind the Gospel the working through of a political messianic tradition in the light of the life and teaching of Jesus as understood after his resurrection - the kind of conceptual development that Peter, the Galilean, might have undergone. Hence we find a sense of conflict within the Marcan use of titles - a necessary conflict since it bears witness to an important development in the early Christological reflection behind the Gospel.

The consequences for our understanding of the title ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ in Mark and Luke, depend upon the suggestion that "the holy One of God" is somehow parallel to "Son of God", so that the content of the two titles is to an extent identical. If this is so, then we may suggest that a <u>qualified affirmative</u> to the question of the messianic interpretation of either title is indicated:-

(i) Mark's use of Son of God holds together both the messianic role and the divinity of Jesus. It seems plausible that the Holy One of God is a title which describes a similar appreciation of the role of Jesus as the agent of God. So, in as far as Mark is concerned, the Holy One of God is messianic, provided we use that term to include its Christian content inclusive of the divinity of Jesus and perhaps exclusive of the political overtones which seem to characterise Mark's use of Messiah.

(ii) Luke's use of Son of God and Messiah suggests the priority of the messianic framework for the interpretation of Jesus' divinity and a consequent lack of some of the

political expectations in place of an increased attention to the prophetic side of Jesus' mission and his fulfilment of the hope for an eschatological prophet. For the title "Holy One of God", the interpretation cannot exclude the idea of Jesus' miraculous birth or his resurrection, and indeed, 1:35 specifically connects Jesus' birth and his holiness as divine Son of God. However, in Acts, the use of titles like "the Holy servant" and "the Holy and Righteous One" argue very strongly in favour of a prophetic understanding of the Holy One of God, or, more correctly, a messianic interpretation which is largely dependent upon the tradition of a prophet like Moses.

2:2:5 The Authority of Jesus

The OT method of describing the agent of God on the human level, is by recourse to the idea of the Spirit of God. The Spirit marked out the agent as belonging to God and therefore in a special way privy to His Will. It was a sign of a divinely given authority.

The baptism of Jesus is understood variously as Jesus' commission,(133) as his adoption,(134) or as confirmation of an already existing relationship(135) and there are some grounds for believing that the variety is already found within the four Gospels. For example, E. Schweizer distinguishes the various uses of the baptismal pericopes in the four Gospels(136) from each other. Although we may not agree with his conclusion, we do agree that in the individual Gospel presentations of Jesus as Messiah and as Son of God, the Baptismal scene is a crucial passage. In Mark, for instance, the words are addressed only to Jesus and this accords with the "Sohnesgeheimnis" of the Gospel. In Luke, according to a variant reading, Jesus is addressed as the messianic king in the words of Ps 2:7 - which might suggest the idea of Jesus' adoption, or a confirmation of an already existing relationship - as with the king in the OT (cf 2 Sam 7:14); God's words, whether or not drawn from the legal institution of adoption, proclaimed not a new fact about the king's person but his right to act as the representative of God. In the NT presentation of Jesus' baptism, we find the same concern to demonstrate the authority of Jesus, a divinely ordained authority.

There are a number of reasons why the idea of the authority derived by a special portion of Holy Spirit should lead one to think of the Messiah: The rabbinic literature and the Psalms of Solomon are two such instances.(137) However there were others who were associated with the same Spirit, such as the Priests and the Prophets. What then of the NT? Is the authority of Jesus and his baptism by the Spirit messianic?

The Gospel of Luke contains an interesting variant at this point (3:22) apparently reflecting Ps 2:7 (LXX)

Κύριος εἶπε πρὸς μὲ, υἱός μου εἶ σὺ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε.

This may suggest a messianic context for Luke's baptism, however in Mark the context is rather that of Jesus' authority in general. The theme of Jesus' authority is a constantly recurring one in Mark, and the clash with the demon in Capernaum is just one example.

Mark places the incident in Capernaum at the very commencement of Jesus' mission and as the first indication of Jesus' authority (cf 1:22 and 27). In chapter 3 Jesus is held to defend himself against the accusation of the Scribes through reference to blasphemy against the Holy Spirit and vs 30 indicates that the redactor or author clearly saw the connection between exorcism/authority and the Holy Spirit. We note that Matthew 12:28 is even more explicit in this connection. Later in Mark the authority of Jesus is again the focal point for discussion between him and the Jewish leaders - Jesus responds by a reference to the baptism of John the Baptist (Mk 11:27-33), so that one is left with the impression that Jesus, like John, possessed a divinely given authority. This latter incident takes place in the Temple almost at the end of his earthly teaching, so that it is fitting to understand some sense of balance between the first questions asked in the Synagogue in Capernaum and these enquirers in the Temple at the end of his ministry. The teaching is quite clear - from first to last, the officials among the Jews grappled with but failed to understand and come to terms with the manifest authority of Jesus; whereas "the great throng heard him gladly" (Mk 12:37).

Kertelge writes,

> "Dass die Menschen zwar von der Macht Jesu angerührt werden, aber nicht an Jesus festhalten, bleibt das einstweilen noch ungelöste Rätsel des Evangelisten, das er allerdings gerade nicht in dieser Erzählung betont".(138)

Mark, like John, presents Jesus as the one who, by his words and signs, provokes division among those who hear him and see his works; some recognise in Jesus the Messiah (Mk 8:29) and Son of God (Mk 15:39) while others attempt to kill him and indeed succeed in doing so.

What then is the authority of Jesus intended to imply? If we restrict our attention to the exorcisms we find that the demons fear punishment or destruction at the hand of Jesus. In the Gospel according to Matthew this receives an eschatological twist (which may or may not have already been implicit) - "Have you come to torment us before the time?" (Matt 8:29). The most striking analogies which come to mind are those which concern Melchizedek (as in 11QMelchizedek) or Michael, whose role it was in the eschatological era to punish the angels of darkness.(139) Jesus, like Melchizedek or Michael, stands as the agent of God's judgement upon the forces of evil. There are in Mark, aspects which may remind one of a cosmic conflict or perhaps more accurately a soteriological and ethical conflict.(140) Jesus as the Holy One of God stands against the πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον . It is this note of conflict and tension within the exorcisms and particularly this first one which leads us to concur with one of the conclusions of Kertelge.

> "Durch das geschilderte Wundergeschehen wird die überragende ἐξουσία Jesu offenbar. Konkret äussert sie sich hier als sein Sieg über Dämonen
> ἐξουσία ist hier nicht im hellenistischen Sinne ausdruck übermenschlicher Kraft und Kenntnis einer zauberkräftigen Allmacht über die Natur. Eine solche Auffassung würde dem Bild des Θεῖος Ἀνήρ entsprechen.
> Die ἐξουσία ist hier vielmehr die im Kampf gegen die Dämonen sich durchsetzende Rechtsmacht Gottes. Dieses Verständnis ist durch die Septuaginta vorbereitet wo ἐξουσία zunächst Gottes Macht als seine 'unumschränkte Souveranität' bezeichnet."(141)

Mark apparently understands a link between the authority of

Jesus, and the idea of Jesus as "Messiah/Son of God". Both Luke and Matthew however are more specific about the authority of Jesus vis-à-vis his role as Messiah. Matthew writes, "But if it is by the Spirit of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you", (12:28). For Matthew, Jesus' power and authority are indicative of the breaking in of God's Kingdom - the messianic age of the Spirit. For Luke who has δακτύλῳ Θεοῦ in place of πνεύματι θεῶ we are perhaps to understand a reference to the Exodus (cf Exod 8:19)(142) in line with the tendency of Luke to describe Jesus' mission in terms of the Prophet like Moses - a tendency which continued into his reporting of the early sermons in the Acts of the Apostles.(143)

For Mark, then, it is the Son of God who faces the onslaught of the demonic hordes with the suggestion that he is thinking in terms of the Messiah and the conduct of Holy War. For Luke the assumption is similar as Jesus the Prophet-Messiah wages war in the prophetic tradition against the forces of evil. The authority of Jesus in both Gospels is inextricably bound up with the belief that in the man Jesus was united the function of the Messiah (Prophet-Messiah for Luke) and the fact of his divine Sonship.

2:2:6 The Verdict on the Messianic Interpretation of Mk 1:24 and Lk 4:34 - A Qualified Affirmative

We have presented in turn four arguments for the messianic interpretation of ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ. These were:

(a) The interpretation of exorcism as a messianic action. We found that it could be so understood particularly in the light of the conflict motifs attached to the Gospel presentation of exorcism; however this does not exclude other ways of understanding the action such as the prophetic interpretation or the messianic-prophetic. In the present form the emphasis is on the authority of Jesus and not on the miraculous elements in the story. "Das markinische Interesse richtet sich vor allem auf die Worte des Besessenen und das Verhalten Jesu dazu..."(144) In Luke the action is probably to be understood as one of the functions of the Prophet-Messiah. In Mark the action is more on the level of conflict between the Agent of God and

the forces of Evil; it is an indication of the commencement of the messianic Holy War with the stress upon the sense of Jesus' authority.

(b) The Messianic Secret. This is in some ways more applicable to Luke than to Mark (cf Lk 4:41) and we have shown reasons for preferring the idea of a Son of God-secret for Mark; this simply confirms what we already know - Mark's preference for Son of God rather than Messiah and Luke's preference for Messiah rather than Son of God. It tells us that the titles of Jesus were living traditions and not static doctrines and that there was during the time of Jesus and later considerable mystery surrounding his person. How we describe this secret depends upon our perspective. The title Holy One of God was another insight into the mysterium Christi, and as such is neither accurately to be described as part of the messianic secret nor the Son of God secret, rather it is part of the general Jesus secret and therefore related to but perhaps not identical with either tradition.

(c) The whole question of the messianic interpretation of Son of God has been discussed above and, provided some connection is understood between the Holy One and the Son of God, there appear to be good grounds for a qualified affirmative: qualified as we have explained above by the obvious Christian teaching about the divinity of Jesus and the tension explicit within a kerygma which proclaimed a resurrected Messiah. We have shown grounds for understanding the Marcan use of both titles as messianic - implying the agency of Jesus in line with the idea of the appointed and the chosen son of God, who in conflict with the demons stands as the messianic holy one. The emphasis remains upon the idea of agency rather than a specific type, even that of a royal messiah so that it is very important to note that the Holy One of God is not the same as the Messiah and in some ways perhaps distinct also from Son of God. Nevertheless we believe that the Holy One of God may be described as messianic when the elements it has in common with Son of God are included. The Lucan perspective differs in that "messianic" in Luke includes prophetic as well as royal functions; this is made explicit in the Acts. So the Holy One of God is messianic by the

Lucan definition, denoting Jesus as the messianic prophet who works miracles and wonders (cf 10:38) and is at the same time the royal Son of God.

(d) The Authority of Jesus. Again this highlights the difference between Luke and Mark, with Jesus, the Agent of God, portrayed in Mark as a divine Son who fulfils the role of Messiah, and in Luke as the messianic prophet who is also the divine Son of God. This distinction may be over-stressed and we are aware of this danger, but we believe it is a valid difference and of some consequence for the interpretation of the Holy One of God.

So we conclude with a qualified affirmative - the Holy One of God is messianic if you allow the general idea of the Marcan agent, the prophetic role of the Lucan agent and the overall Christian belief in the divinity of Jesus. Certainly the enigma of the figure of Jesus rests within this title also.

2:3 The Johannine Evidence

The most important evidence in favour of a messianic understanding of the Holy One of God in Jn 6:69 is the connection with the confession of Peter at Caesarea-Philippi as recorded in the Synoptic Gospels. However scholars are divided in their opinion about the exact dimensions of the relationship generally between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics. One theory which is commonly encountered is that John knew Mark, or the pre-Marcan tradition and perhaps also Luke.(145) The alternative which is often presented is that John was completely independent of the Synoptics except insofar as his presentation follows the Gospel genre.(146) There is something to be said in favour of both views, but as we proceed it will become clear that the confession of Peter in John is not unrelated to that found in the Synoptics, and the most likely solution is that they derive from a single tradition.

If John knew the Marcan or Pre-marcan tradition then it is possible that he made use of it in ch 6 for his version of the confession of Peter. This would not automatically imply that the Holy One of God is a messianic title, but it does suggest that John might have

been aware of the need to supply a title which, although messianic, did not include the political ingredients normally inherent in 'Messiah'. The Fourth Evangelist, like Matthew and Luke, would then be seen as adopting and adapting the Marcan version - perhaps, like Matthew, to include the divinity of Jesus, as suggested by R. Schnackenburg.(147) There are indeed certain basic similarities, as we shall see, between the Synoptic and the Johannine confessions; there are also differences. With regard to his use of titles, John has some interesting parallels with Mark which suggest that there might be a valid connection on this level. Obviously John has the more detailed exposition but nevertheless the parallels are interesting.

The first parallel is in their respective uses of Son of God - which in both Gospels forms the key to their Christology and is preferred to the title Christ in so far as Son of God adequately comprehends both the function of Jesus and his divinity. For both writers it is the term for the agent of God who both fulfils and yet transcends the Jewish hope of a messianic king.

The second parallel is found in the way both Mark and John depict the divinity of Jesus as Son as effective from the beginning of his ministry, but not truly comprehended until after Jesus' death, when, in Mark, a centurion, and in John, the disciple Thomas, confess it.

The third parallel is found in the use of Messiah as a vehicle primarily for the Jewish expectations and as appropriate for the role of Jesus only through its association with the titles Son of God and Son of Man.

Given these parallels it is tempting to speculate that Johannine Christology might in some ways be indebted to the Marcan Christology, but this is an area which requires more space than we can afford in this work. In so far as the Holy One of God is concerned we shall endeavour to ascertain the extent of the connection between the Marcan use of the title and its use within the Fourth Gospel. In so doing we shall explore the possibility that confessions about Jesus were associated

not only with individuals but also with geographical locations, and on this level are related to certain of the Marcan confessions.

F. Hahn suggested that the Johannine version of the Petrine confession is the original form - depicting Jesus as Prophet - and that the Synoptic presentation exhibits signs of a gradual process of messianization.(148)

It is pertinent to note that even if John knew the Synoptic traditions, this does not exclude the possibility that he incorporated independent traditions in his work - some of which might pre-date the present form of the Marcan material. The question whether the prophetic role of Jesus is earlier than his messianic role, depends upon one's understanding of Messiah during the time of Jesus: Did this title imply only the Royal Messiah or could it be used in a wider sense of a prophet? The idea that Jesus, the prophet, was only recognized as messiah after his death as a "messianic pretender" has some credibility - but then it is only one possible interpretation of the NT evidence. The alternative suggests that Jesus was recognised as prophet and messiah prior to his death.

The opinion of Hahn(149) and the concept of Johannine dependence upon the Marcan version of the confession of Peter form the two poles between which we need to work in pursuit of the meaning of the Holy One of God. Is the confession of Peter, as found in John, adopted from the Synoptic tradition or is it independent? If it is dependent, the question is raised whether John has also adopted the messianic intention of Mark, and, if so, what changes he has introduced through his use of "the Holy One" in preference to "the Messiah". In order to answer these questions we turn now to an examination of the Petrine confession as found within the four Gospels.

2:3:1 The Confession of Peter according to the Synoptic Gospels

It is curious that so little attention has been given to the comparison of the confessions of Peter in spite of the obvious importance of this confession for the christological development of the Early Church. We have mentioned the work of Hahn and we note also the

important contribution of other scholars like P. Gardner-Smith, but these writers leave many questions unanswered and the original form of Peter's confession remains an open question and an enigma of the first order. The Synoptic versions of Peter's confession are the following :- (150)

Mark 8:29

ὁ Πέτρος λέγει αὐτῷ : σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός (151)

Matthew 16:16

ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος εἶπεν : σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος (152)

Luke 9:20

Πέτρος δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν : τὸν Χριστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ. (153)

The similarities between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptic confession are the following :-

(a) The confession is made by Peter on behalf of the other disciples as a response to a question of Jesus.

(b) It follows a feeding miracle, not the second miracle as in Matthew and Mark, but an earlier one which included the scene on the Sea of Galilee and Jesus' reproach to the disciples for their slowness to understand (Mk 8:21). The latter suggests a parallel with 6:60f, but only on very general grounds.

(c) In both John and the Synoptics the confession of Peter marks the highlight of the Gospel narratives concerned with Jesus' Galilean ministry: for the Synoptics the Transfiguration acted as a related high point, and it contains yet another of Peter's misunderstandings. (Mk 9:5 and parallels).

(d) The confession leads to an indictment against one of the disciples as being on the side of the Devil - for Mark it was Peter, for John it was Judas.

The similarities must be considered along with the differences of which there are a number; sufficient indeed to suggest an alternative source :-

(a) The confession of Peter in Mark and Matthew takes place at Caesarea Philippi while that in John apparently is located in the Synagogue of Capernaum. Its location there recalls the concern of the Gospel with the disciples who were afraid to confess Jesus as Messiah and those who in their confession were expelled. Capernaum was also the place where according to Mark and Luke the demoniac confessed Jesus as ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ.
(b) The occasion of the confession is a different one and follows a schism in the group of believers in John, rather than a general questioning of the disciples by Jesus as in the Synoptics. Once again we are reminded of the difficulties within the Johannine community which might have reflected a similar schism within the ranks of the believers. In this case the confession of Peter is a rebuke against those who turn back from following Jesus, preferring the Synagogue and the traditional Jewish way of life.
(c) There follows the confession of Peter according to John, the denunciation of Judas - in clear contrast to Peter and the others, though it accords in some ways with the Synoptic denunciation of Peter. So Peter, according to Mark, is called "Satan", while Judas, according to John, is a "devil". Since the character of Judas is deliberately blackened throughout the Fourth Gospel (cf 12:6, ὅτι κλέπτης ἦν) this is not unduly surprising. Both Luke and Matthew take steps to exonerate Peter, not only with regard to Jesus' indictment but also through their formulation of the actual confession.
(d) The actual confession of Peter in John's Gospel is formally quite different from either Mark or Matthew but has some resemblance to Luke's version. It lacks the crucial term "Christ", which is the single common factor of the other confessions. The earliest attempt at synthesis amends this deficiency, when P66 supplies ὁ χριστός to produce a clearly messianic confession: ὁ χριστὸς ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ.
These differences might suggest an alternative tradition for the Fourth Gospel but there are signs which appear to indicate deliberate alterations of the Marcan or a similar

tradition, in part influenced by the didactic intention of the Fourth Gospel writer. These alterations are parallel to the changes in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, but more far reaching in their effect. We shall now study each report of Peter's confession in detail :-

(i) The Gospel of Mark (8:27-38)

The confession of Peter, as recorded in Mark, follows a feeding miracle and hinges upon the question of Jesus, "Who do men say that I am?", asked while the group of Jesus and his disciples are at Caesarea Philippi. In response to the question, the disciples say, "John the Baptist ... Elijah ... one of the prophets" all of which were views held perhaps not only during the time of Jesus but subsequently. Mark intends now to correct these views. We find that Jesus then rephrases the question, "Who do you say that I am?" to which Peter replies, "You are the Christ" (vs 29). It is clear that "Christ" intends more than just the anointed one as an abstract title for an agent of God, which might include also Priests or Prophets. It is here intended as elsewhere in Mark to refer to the royal Messiah of David's line. It is posed opposite the prophetic explanations of the people and we may perhaps have an insight into the contemporary situation during the writing of the Gospel in which the Christian message proclaimed Jesus as Messiah, while some would only accept that he was an Elijah-type prophet (perhaps because of the miracles he performed). Mark has Peter, as the representative of the disciples, utter a confession of faith in Jesus as the Messiah, indicating what, in some ways, might already have been a source of conflict within the Synagogue (before the separation of Judaism and Christianity).

Jesus enjoins them to keep this secret and then begins to teach them about the suffering Son of Man. Mark (vs 31) counters the argument that the death of Jesus represented the failure of his mission. For Jesus, the suffering and indeed resurrection were already expected as an integral part of his mission. There is some evidence, such as the

Targums and the Qumran text of Isaiah 53, for the belief in a suffering messiah,(154) but the teaching on the resurrection must have been somewhat strange to the ears of the first century Jew. It is the question of the resurrection which recurs in the next pericope, that of the transfiguration (cf 9:9-10), and causes controversy among the disciples there. Mark clearly understands Jesus' teaching on the Son of Man as a reference to Jesus himself, and the mention of the Son of Man coming "in the glory of his Father with the holy angels" (8:38) shows some indication of Mark's awareness of the apocalyptic figure so titled. So, in this way, Mark defends also the death and resurrection of Jesus, balancing the traditional Jewish hope of a Messiah against the Christian teaching about Jesus as the divine Messiah.

The rebuke against Peter, as we have explained above, was probably the result of Peter's failure to comprehend the role of Jesus, perhaps because he was attracted to the political possibilities within the messianic role. Again there is a suggestion here of the contemporary Marcan situation in which the question of Jesus' fulfilment of the messianic ideal must have often been debated. The rebuke is thus a polemic against all those who look for political gain in Christianity rather than becoming obedient to God's will, which must have been a significant problem in first century Rome. Peter is told that he has in mind not the things of God, but the things of man. Perhaps also Peter's failure to comprehend the role of Jesus implies through his failure to visualize the resurrection, that he has closed his eyes to the divinity of Jesus. The subsequent teaching on the Son of Man (vss 37f and 9:9) focuses upon the resurrected and triumphant Son of Man and forms an interesting parallel to the scene in the trial of Jesus (14:61f) with the same movement from Messiah to glorified Son of Man. Thus Mark balances the messianic role of Jesus against the teaching on the suffering and exalted Son. Peter is the representative not only of the disciples but of all those Jews who fail to comprehend the divine Sonship of Jesus. However his confession as such is not wrong, simply his inter-

pretation of the role and function of Jesus, without which the divinity of Jesus is incomprehensible for Mark and those who view Jesus from his perspective.

It is thus not surprising that immediately after Jesus' teaching on the exalted Son of Man, there follows the incident of the Transfiguration - this is the continuation of the revelation of Jesus' person and is in answer to the question Jesus raised, 'who am I?' Yet once again Peter misunderstands (9:6) and the question of the resurrection of the Son of Man remains for the disciples an enigma. It is difficult to know what lay behind the suggestion of Peter, whether he envisaged the setting up of some holy shrine(155) or the securing of time to hear the words of these august visitors, but it suffices to note that there exists the sense of misunderstanding - once more the disciples fail to come to terms either with the divinity of Jesus or his role as Son which includes suffering and resurrection. The transfiguration has been termed by Calvin, "a temporary exhibition of his glory", and by C.E.B.Cranfield, "an exhibition or prolepsis of the Resurrection and of the Parousia".(156) R. Bultmann suggested(157) that a resurrection appearance underlies this incident in his attempt to explain something of the apparent incongruity of the transfiguration. From our perspective, it appears that the important detail of the transfiguration is the sense of misunderstanding which underlines the failure of the disciples to come to terms with the uniqueness of Jesus before the resurrection. We suggest that it should be seen as an important complement to the confession of Peter, and qualifies the role and function of the messianic Son.

The divine voice reveals the sonship of Jesus, which at the baptism was reserved as a private communication. The command "hear him" probably has some connection with the prophetic hope found in Deut 18:15, 18, as does the presence of Elijah and Moses. The idea of Jesus as prophet will be discussed later, but it is worth noting that such a belief was not necessarily separate from the idea of Jesus as Messiah. Indeed there are indications in the four Gospels and in Acts that as the royal Messiah, Jesus was expected to display prophetic traits. It would seem then

that in the present context the importance of the portrait of Jesus at the transfiguration looks beyond the role of prophet to the divine Son, whatever its original intent may have been.

What has come out of this examination of the Confession of Peter, as found in Mark, is as follows :- Peter falls prey to a misunderstanding of the role of Jesus, limited as he is by his human intellect. Jesus has to castigate him and to correct his impression through the teaching on the Son of Man and perhaps also the transfiguration. Even then, Peter continues to have problems with the revelation given by Jesus and the disciples fail to comprehend the resurrection teaching. The message given by these narratives indicates the inability of the disciples to grasp the reality of Jesus' divinity prior to his resurrection. As we study the other gospels we shall find how the pattern provided by Mark was suitably revised to ease certain of the problems and questions raised in the Marcan narrative. The Marcan presentation of Peter's confession accords well with the tradition that Peter's preaching and teaching lie behind the Gospel.

(ii) The Gospel according to Luke (9:18-27)

Luke represents another stage in the history of the tradition. His last mentioned geographical location following 9:10, appears to be Bethsaida; although Jesus' question is the same, there are certain differences in the answer given by the disciples, for it includes the phrase "one of the ancient prophets is risen again" (προφήτης τις τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀνέστη vs 19). Perhaps there is some significance here - an indication possibly of the belief in Jesus as a prophet raised to a new life, and in a sense anticipating the belief that Jesus himself would be raised from the dead. The connection with Elijah and Moses is also suggested, for their deaths, according to Jewish tradition, raised hopes for their eventual return. We note also in Acts the connection between Jesus the prophet and his resurrection (Acts 3:12ff) and of course the use of Messiah in Luke to depict Jesus as the Mosaic prophet, which we noticed above.

In response to Jesus' second question Peter responds,

τὸν χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ and after the command to keep silence, Jesus teaches on his suffering as the Son of Man (vs 21) without the rebuke and castigation of Peter; and we find then the Marcan teaching on the return of the Son of Man. The transfiguration follows without the debate among the disciples on the meaning of the resurrection, nor the additional teaching by Jesus on the Son of Man, as in Mark. There is a curious reference to the sleepiness of Peter and the others (vs 32) reminiscent of Gethsemane, but the words διαγρηγορήσαντες δὲ εἶδον stress that what they saw was no vision.

Luke has no castigation of Peter so that the political aspect of the confession is not cause for question. Indeed with the Lucan use of Messiah it is probable that Luke intends some reference to the eschatological prophet, which would obviate some of the political overtones (although we note Lk 24:19ff). By and large however one gains the impression that the confession of Peter is not only adequate but approved as an accurate description of the role of Jesus and not at odds with either the suffering and resurrection of Jesus or his transfiguration. The answer is undoubtedly found in the idea of a suffering and resurrected prophet which probably formed part of Luke's Jewish heritage and which is now preserved in some of the sermons in Acts.

(iii) The Gospel according to Matthew (16:13-28)

Matthew presents the confession of Peter in such a way that he avoids the problems raised in the Marcan version, without recourse to the Lucan method of dropping the rebuke of Peter entirely. Moreover he does not present Jesus as the prophet Messiah, but, like Mark, seems to use the term exclusively of the royal Messiah. He sets the scene in the neighbourhood of Caesarea Philippi (16:13) as in Mark, but his first question is "Who do men say that the Son of Man is?" which in a way anticipates the teaching on the Son of Man which follows. The present context indicates that it is unlikely that Jesus is here referring to a third person. We note also in the answers given by the disciples that Jeremiah is introduced - clearly the reference has implications for the Matthean situation: perhaps Matthew knows of a tradition which links Jesus and Jeremiah, such as the theme of suffering.

The next question is as in Mark, but Peter's response is different - σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος. Moreover, Jesus blesses the response by giving it his sanction (vs 17) and, by accrediting it to a divine revelation, raises the confession to the same level as the Marcan response of Jesus to the High Priest's question. No longer is the confession of Peter inadequate. There is no sign of Peter's misunderstanding, but as vss 18f show he is now the foundation of the ἐκκλησία . By separating the confession from the rebuke of Peter, the authority and accuracy of the confession itself is preserved. Jesus, in vs 20, forbids the disciples to tell anyone that he is the Christ. We note the difference from Mark and Luke, both of which lack the term Χριστός in the command of Jesus.

One might argue that the simplicity of the Marcan and Lucan confessions rendered the term Messiah superfluous. Matthew however draws attention to the danger of publicly announcing Jesus as Messiah prematurely and the attendant political overtones (cf vss 22f) attached not to Son of God but to Messiah.

We notice the tendency to amplify the whole pericope particularly in the words of Peter ἵλεώς σοι, κύριε οὐ μὴ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο, and Jesus' response, ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου σατανᾶ: σκάνδαλον εἶ ἐμοῦ ὅτι οὐ φρονεῖς τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀλλὰ τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων. (158)

The transfiguration narrative follows and we see that it lacks the remark that Peter did not know what he said, and there is no mention of the discussion of the disciples on the resurrection of Jesus, as in Mark. The general impression, in comparison with the Marcan version, is that Matthew deliberately introduces "Son of God" to bring in the sense of the divinity of Jesus lacking in the original confession of Peter, and secondly commends the confession of Peter through his inclusion of the blessing. Peter is obviously a key person for Matthew and presumably for his audience and Matthew takes pains to exonerate him of some of his faults.

(iv) Conclusion

Our study of the confession of Peter as recorded in the Synoptic Gospels has revealed a number of important points, which we need to bear in mind for a correct understanding of John 6:69. These are the following :

(a) The confession of Peter displays significant variations in the three versions some of which are obviously deliberate alterations for theological reasons resulting from the issues raised by the Marcan version. It would not be beyond the bounds of reason then to argue that in John 6:60ff we have a similar adaptation. One might suggest, as does R. Schnackenburg,(159) that John, like Matthew, introduces through the confession of Peter, a sense of the divinity of Jesus. However, the alterations in the Johanine version, if that is what they are, are far more drastic than in either Matthew or Luke, which means that we must accept the possibility that John was working from an alternative version apart from or together with the Marcan version of Peter's confession. The path is then open to suggest, as does Hahn, that this was the original version as now found in John.

(b) Two of the issues raised by the Marcan version account for the most obvious changes in Matthew and Luke, namely, Jesus' castigation of Peter and the underlying political insinuations of his confession. Both Luke and Matthew cope with these problems in their own individual ways - Luke through his avoidance of the confrontation between Peter and Jesus, and Matthew by his inclusion of a blessing on Peter. Both writers allow the confession of Peter to stand as an adequate theological reflection on the person of Jesus, including the recognition of his divine status. Luke achieves this through his extended use of Messiah in a non-political sense, Matthew through his addition of the title 'Son of God' and

the divine sanction of Peter's words. We need now to ask if these two issues are reflected in the Johannine presentation of Peter's confession. If they are then it will be evidence in favour of John's cognizance of some form of the tradition now included in Mark, if not the Marcan version itself.

(c) It is possible that some of the variety seen within the versions of Peter's confession may be related to the respective audiences of the three Gospels. If Luke is writing for a largely Gentile audience within the diaspora, then there might have been a deliberate avoidance of an unqualified use of Son of God as in the Marcan version of the centurion's confession, because of the possibility that such a confession might have been understood as the title for Jesus as a divine man (θεῖος ἀνήρ). Similarly he might have been able to use 'Messiah of God' to describe adequately the person of Jesus just as he presents Jesus in the sermons in Acts as the Prophet-Messiah. Matthew however appears to have been addressing an audience who had reservations about linking Jesus with the political messiahs of the time, so that the messiahship of Jesus needs to be carefully qualified by the title Son of God.

2:3:2 The idea of the Messiah according to John

The idea of the Messiah plays an important part in the Fourth Gospel;(160) and apart from the term Χριστός which appears 17 times, we find also the transliteration Μεσσίας (Jn 1:41 and 4:25). There are several indications, including the use of Μεσσίας, which suggest that John was anxious to anchor his messianic concept firmly to its Hebraic origin. There is also a polemical motif evident, when on the lips of "the Jews" statements appear which to the believer clearly point to Jesus as the expected Messiah. We are able to sense something of the contemporary conflict with the Synagogue, at the centre of which was the confession of Jesus as the Christ. In a masterly way the Evangelist builds up a picture of Jesus, the Messiah, almost entirely through the

reported speech of the actors in the Fourth Gospel Drama. Jesus does not use the word himself yet he does acknowledge that he is the Messiah (4:25f); it occurs once in an editorial comment (17:3) apart from the confessions and the aim stated in 20:31, but it is in the comments of the Jews and the local people that we see several interesting beliefs about the Messiah come to light.

As far as the teaching of Jesus is concerned we notice that in 10:34, in response to an enquiry about his messiah-ship, Jesus answers the question by his reference to Sonship (10:36); it is his union with the Father which effectively acts as a barrier between the Jews and their interpretation of Messiah and the Christian concept found in words of Jesus. It is a re-interpreted messianic concept which is presented through the pages of the Fourth Gospel.

There are other debates about the Messiah and his work, wherein various odd items of information are raised. The Samaritan woman who is told by Jesus of his messiahship, reveals that when the messiah comes "he will tell (ἀν ἀγγελεῖ 4:25) us all things". In fact Jesus has just demonstrated to her his unique knowledge of human-kind, and through the rest of the Gospel he does indeed act as a revealer, (cf 14:6f). There are various ideas about the Jewish or Samaritan "messiah" (taheb) as a revealer which might be indicated here, such as Deut 18:18. Jesus is he to whom God has given His words as he promised to give them to the Prophet like Moses; so it seems best to under-stand Messiah here as "the Prophet" in accord with the Samaritan hopes.(161)

The next instance in the debate is 7:41-4 where the place of the origin of the Messiah is in question. John is apparently citing Jewish traditions about the Messiah and perhaps at a deeper level raising questions about the concern of Christian traditions (Like Matthew and Luke's infancy stories) to demonstrate Jesus' link with OT davidic tradition. In 7:42 Bethelehem is cited as the place of origin for the Messiah, and the argument adduced, that since Jesus comes from Galilee (vs 41) he is perforce disqualified.

Perhaps John here assumes that the reader is familiar with the Synoptic tradition of Jesus' birth in Bethlehem - this would imply that the reader would recognise the falseness of the conclusion.(162) On the other hand Jesus is not called "Son of David" in the Gospel, and there is no open connection with either Bethlehem or David. Jesus is a king, but his kingdom is not of this world (18:36) or else "his servants would fight!" The political implications of messiahship are seriously questioned by the statements of Jesus before Pilate, and in parallel perhaps with Mk 12:35ff. Jesus is Lord rather than Son of David - he is Messiah because he is first of all the Son of God. John plays down the connection with David (absent even from the Entry to Jerusalem unlike the Synoptic tradition) so as to stress the divinity of Jesus, and to distance the true comprehension of Jesus' kingship from its political rivals.

The third instance concerns again the origin of the Messiah (7:26-31) and this time the idea appears that the origin of the Messiah will be unknown (vs 27). Jesus' origin is known (vs 27) so he cannot be the Messiah. We note that these arguments all follow the same form. It is obviously based on the rabbinic form of argument and perhaps reflects some of the dialogue between the Synagogue and the Johannine community. Indeed these may be actual arguments used by the Synagogue to discredit the messianic claims of the Christian community. The idea of a "concealed Messiah" who awaits a divinely initiated disclosure (such as at the hand of Elijah), is perhaps to be understood.(163) Jesus questions the knowledge of the people (vs 28) and within the context of the whole Gospel, the people do not really know Jesus' true origin: they know nothing of his pre-existence or of his relationship with the Father, both of which are open only to the eye of the believer.

Then we find the Jewish belief (12:34) that the Messiah will not die but remain εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. Perhaps Ps 88:37 (LXX) is intended here, or the idea that the Messiah will not die until he has ushered in the Kingdom. Once more to the eye of faith, this is clear proof that Jesus is the Messiah and more than the Messiah, he is the divine Son of

God, one with the Father. So the arguments raised by the Jews as arguments against Jesus' messiahship become under the masterly touch of the author, proof of that very fact.

There is the tragedy of the Jews who know so much about the expected messiah, but fail to see how the evidence of their writings points to Jesus - the note for the contemporary situation in the Johannine community is unmistakable; as is the note of condemnation pronounced on those who fail to believe, or who in believing fail to show their true colours "for fear of the Jews" (12:42f). In contrast there are those who accept Jesus as Messiah, not as a result of a lengthy period of discipleship but from the beginning (1:41), and they mirror in their confessions and experiences the beliefs and hopes and sufferings of the Johannine community (cf 9:34).

Jesus as the divine Agent of God, the Son, is at the same time the anointed one, the king of Israel. He is sent into the world to accomplish the will of the Father (10:36), and this includes fulfilling the functions of king and prophet. But as M. de Jonge clearly observes, "Jesus' kingship and his prophetic mission are both redefined in terms of the unique relationship between Father and Son as portrayed in the Fourth Gospel." (164) It is only when Messiah is seen in the light of Jesus' Sonship that it can begin to point to the reality of Jesus.

We have seen the way in which John took into account some of the prevailing Jewish views on the Messiah; but to do justice to his presentation it is necessary that we recognise the way in which the idea of Jesus as either the Messiah or the expected Prophet fits into the general framework of Johannine Christology. The key passage in this regard is 1:19-51 which, as R. Schnackenburg has shown, is concerned with the concept of Jesus as the fulfilment of Jewish messianic hopes.(165) In the passage Jesus is recognised by Andrew as the Messiah according to the scriptures and this knowledge is shared with Peter (vs 41). Later Philip makes a similar discovery (vs 45): "We have found him of whom Moses in the law and also the prophets wrote, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph." Unlike the

discovery of Andrew there is here no reference to Christ or Messiah, instead we find clear indications that for Philip, Jesus is the fulfilment of the promise of a second Moses - hence perhaps the words "of whom Moses wrote in the Law". Previously John the Baptist was depicted as making a series of denials, which in effect opened the way to a portrayal of Jesus as the fulfilment of these roles. John denies that he is the Christ; he denies that he is the Prophet and he denies that he is Elijah. By deduction it seems probable that the writer of the Fourth Gospel intends Jesus as the recipient of these roles. If we understand the words of Philip correctly Jesus is here identified not only with the Prophet like Moses but also with the prophetic tradition including Elijah. Jesus displays to Nathanael evidence of his supernatural power (vs 48) possibly in response to the test cited in Deut 18:21-2, for Jesus' words are true words. Thus Jesus identifies himself, and Nathanael responds with a confession which is now more messianic than prophetic and probably coincides with one of the confessions held by the Johannine community: "Rabbi, you are the Son of God. You are the king of Israel". The passage might have ended there with the presentation of Jesus as the hope of the Jews - the Prophet and the King of Israel, but it does not and instead we are pointed to greater things (note the change in person from vs 50 to 51: σε or σοι to ὑμῖν), the open heavens and the Son of Man.

The addition of vs 51 presents a deliberate correction of the previous hopes and bears witness to a tradition from the idea of Jesus as Prophet or Messiah, to the belief enshrined in the Logos hymn and elsewhere in the divinity of Jesus over and above these roles. The use of the Son of Man above and beyond the titles Prophet and Messiah is also found in ch 9.

We find there that Jesus is first of all described as a prophet (vs 17); later his messiahship is mentioned as the cause of the man's expulsion from the synagogue (vs 34 cf vs 22). The story as with Nathanael does not end there, but goes on to tell of the encounter of the man with Jesus

again, and this time the discovery of Jesus as the Son of Man overshadows all that has preceded. As the man is faced with the divinity of Jesus implicit in the concept here of the Son of Man, he responds by "worshipping Jesus". It is evident in the present form of the Gospel, whatever its redactional history may have been, that the teaching on the Son of Man - Jesus' self-revelation as such - deliberately acts as a corrective for the interpretation of Jesus as either Messiah or Prophet. Both chapter 1 and chapter 9 bear witness to this.

There is a reflection here of the history of the Johannine community and the break away from the Synagogue. The Johannine community while still within the synagogue discover Jesus as Messiah and the Prophet; later for the confession of Jesus as Messiah, they are expelled from the synagogue; while outside the synagogue they truly discover Jesus, as the Son of Man, and their eyes are opened to the divinity of Jesus - the Logos made flesh. Once they were blind to the revelation incarnate in Jesus, but now they see. In contrast those within the synagogue come under judgement because they claim that they can see, but in reality they are blind to the truth found in Jesus (9:40f). The incident ends with just such a polemic.

M. de Jonge sums up the whole picture of John's use of Messiah and Prophet as follows :- "Titles like 'prophet', 'teacher sent by God', 'king' or even 'Messiah' do not correspond completely with the real status and authority of Him to whom they point. The terms are not wrong but insufficient; they may be used in a wrong context and are therefore in need of further definition."(166)

He goes on to point out quite correctly the way in which clarification "is given with the help of the terms Son of Man and Son of God". We have considered the use of the former title, but we need to notice with De Jonge the use of Son of God, particularly in the confessions (1:49; 11:27 and 20:31). The Gospel might at one stage have been written simply to present Jesus as Prophet and Messiah, but in its present form these concerns take second place. This is a powerful reason for believing that in our interpretation

of "the Holy One of God" we cannot stop at the messianic level, but must consider a more profound intention, which is to be related in some way to the role of Jesus as Son of Man, Son of God.

2:3:3 The Verdict for John : An Open Question

At the opening of this chapter we outlined two possible arguments for a messianic understanding of John 6:69. These were the following :-

(A) The Holy One of God is used as a messianic title in Mk 1:24 and Lk 4:34 as indicated by the parallel title "the Son of God" and the conclusion voiced in Lk 4:41.

(B) The confession of Peter according to the Synoptics is clearly messianic and John does not depart from this tradition.

At this stage of the chapter it is clear that these arguments are insufficient to prove that the Holy One in 6:69 is messianic. In the first place we have shown that even in the Synoptics there are problems involved in the messianic interpretation of the title, to which the most satisfactory solution appears to be one of conditioned affirmation. The title in Mark is only messianic in so far as it describes generally Jesus as the agent of God. For Mark the clue to the interpretation of the title appears to be its relation with Son of God, an area to which we shall return. Moreover since the title occurs in the context of an exorcism we become aware of a sense of conflict between Jesus the Holy One and the Unclean Spirit.

In so far as the confession of Peter was concerned, we took note of two difficulties inherent in the Marcan version: the political overtones inherent in the term Messiah, and the way in which Peter is castigated by Jesus. We also noticed the ways in which Matthew and Luke overcame these problems. It is most significant that in the confession of Peter as found in the Fourth Gospel the problems do not arise - the confession is not political, Peter has no cause to rebuke Jesus and when Jesus calls a disciple a demon it is Judas to whom he refers. Thus two of the major differences between the Synoptic confession and the Johannine confession may be attributed to a

deliberate re-working of the passage as found in Mark, and in line with Luke and Matthew. It therefore seems unlikely that John knew of an original confession of Peter depicting Jesus as the Holy One, and far more likely that he knew the confession as recorded in either Mark or Luke. Moreover as we have seen there are good reasons for suggesting that John intends something more than a messianic title in 6:69, and our attention may be drawn either to Son of Man or on the basis of 10:36 to Son of God. Indeed given the freedom which John appears to have exercised in the manipulation of his material, one might justly describe the messianic interpretation of Jn 6:69 as still an open question.

We have stated the reasons why we believe that Jn 6:69 cannot be limited to a messianic title as the straight-forward equivalent of ὁ Χριστός , and we have suggested instead that it is to be linked with ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ . There are two further reasons which may suggest that Jn 6:69 is not messianic except in a most rudimentary way. We find both of these reasons in John chapter 1. As we have already noticed Jn 1:19-51 is concerned to demonstrate how Jesus fulfils the Jewish hopes for a Messiah (cf 1:41) and the confession of Nathanael - 1:49 - (σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ σὺ βασιλεὺς εἶ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ) is probably to be understood as deliberately messianic in tone[167] and thus needing the corrective of vs 51.

The first point is to be found in vs 41 which reads :- εὑρίσκει οὗτος πρῶτον τὸν ἀδελφὸν τὸν ἴδιον Σίμωνα καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ εὑρήκαμεν τὸν Μεσσίαν.... Andrew goes to Peter and Peter comes to Jesus, the one pointed out to him as Messiah! (vs 42) Then there follows a parallel story in which Philip brings Nathanael to Jesus and he confesses Jesus as Messiah, (King of Israel, Son of God). It seems to us rather extraordinary for John to have kept Peter's response to Jesus as the Messiah (Holy One of God) until ch 6, when it would have been most appropriate at about 1:43 when Peter is named Cephas. He has just been told that Jesus is the Messiah, so why does he have to wait so long before making a response? The answer must surely be

that Peter's response means much more than that Jesus is the Jewish Messiah. The alternative may be sought along the lines of "Son of God".

The second point is that the confession of Nathanael has some interesting parallels with the Petrine confession in Luke. First of all it takes place in Galilee, near Bethsaida (the Lukan location of Peter's confession cf Lk 9:10). Nathanael is the true Israelite, the representative of true Judaism, who comes to meet the Messiah. After confessing Jesus as Messiah, Nathanael is told he will see greater things - his confession is inadequate and needs to be clarified by Jesus' teaching on the exalted Son of Man (inclusive of Jesus' death and resurrection). There are therefore interesting parallels with the Synoptic confession of Peter and may suggest that John is deliberately adapting Peter's confession into a new context at the opening of his work so as to allow Peter to make a more profound confession at a later stage.

CHAPTER THREE THE HOLY ONE OF GOD AS A HIGH-PRIESTLY MESSIAH

		Page
3:1	Introduction	99
3:2	The High Priest and the Priestly Messiah	103
3:2:1	The Old Testament Picture	104
3:2:2	The Qumran Scrolls and the High-Priestly Messiah	107
3:2:3	The Twelve Testaments	113
3:2:4	The Book of Jubilees	115
3:3	Jesus as High Priest	116
3:3:1	Jesus as Intercessor	116
3:3:2	Jesus in the Epistle to the Hebrews	118
3:4	The Evidence against the High Priestly Interpretation	120
3:4:1	The Synoptic Picture	121
3:4:2	The Johannine Picture	123
Footnotes to Chapter Three		320

CHAPTER THREE THE HOLY ONE OF GOD AS A HIGH-PRIESTLY MESSIAH

3:1 Introduction

The messianic interpretation of the Holy One of God does not explain the title as found in John 6:69, and is only partially successful in explaining its occurrences in Mark and Luke. To be sure, the Holy One serves as an agent or servant of God and the latter half of the title implies exactly that. In the Old Testament we find mention of "the priest of the Most High God" (Gen 14:18), "the prophets of God" (Ezra 5:2), "the servant of God" (2 Chr 24:9) and there are other examples. If the Holy One of God is not intended to mean the Messiah, or not just the Messiah, we need to consider some of the other options. We need also to bear in mind the possibility that as an agent of God, the Holy One of God might constitute a category of its own, independent of the normal offices of priest, prophet and king.

The search in a priestly milieu for the origin of the title "the Holy One of God" should be undertaken for several reasons. Unlike the royal Messiah, the High Priest on more than one occasion is described as holy (cf Exod 28:36, Num 16:7). Like Aaron and his sons the High Priest was

consecrated to the service of Yahweh (Lev 21:12), and in the later rabbinic tradition was believed to function as the agent or שליח of God.(1) It was Aaron who was described as ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ κυρίου in Ps. 106:16, which we have already described as the closest parallel to the Holy One of God to be found in any of our sources for the New Testament period. Apart from the High Priest like Aaron, whom we encounter through the pages of the OT, Jewish tradition also knew of two other priestly figures - the High-Priestly Messiah and the eschatological High Priest. Our prime sources for the High-Priestly Messiah are the Qumran writings (although some writers would prefer to speak of an eschatological High Priest, who accompanies the royal Messiah)(2) and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. The major problem arises when one turns to the NT and attempts to discover some evidence that in the Gospels Jesus was seen to be a High Priest. The best known attempt is that of G. Friedrich, who on the basis of the Twelve Testaments argued that behind the NT use of the term "Messiah" lay not the traditional Davidic king as had previously been maintained, but rather the imagery of a High-Priestly Messiah.(3)

For Friedrich, the eschatological High Priest had equal claim to the title Messiah during the NT time. His research focuses on the Synoptics although he later extended his field into the Epistle to the Hebrews. Part of his proof for the presence of the idea of Jesus as High Priest was based on the understanding of exorcism as a priestly action and he interprets ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ therefore as a priestly title.(4)

It is this conclusion of Friedrich's which for our purposes is most interesting. There are four stages in his argument :-

(a) The High Priest is according to the OT, a Holy One (2 Chr 23:6; Ex 28:36 and Ps 105(6):16). Indeed holiness is the mark of the High Priest as justice and righteousness are the marks of the messianic king.

(b) The title in Mk 1:24, Lk 4:35 and Jn 6:69 is obviously messianic, implying either a royal messiah or a priestly messiah. In support of this claim Friedrich cites Lk 4:41 and the earlier work by B. Weiss on NT theology.
(c) The royal Messiah is never portrayed as an exorcist in the Jewish writings whereas the Testament of Levi (18:12) ascribes to Levi the task of binding Beliar and in T.Dan 5:10f we read that Levi "wages the war of God". Friedrich therefore concludes that for the synoptics, Jesus the Holy One, is an expression of his High-Priestly role.
(d) According to Friedrich, John then chooses the title to fit in with his doctrine of the High Priesthood of Jesus.(5)

We have already seen some of the ways in which the royal Messiah could be connected with exorcism,(6) without recourse to a High-Priestly picture. We have also seen the need to take account of the title Son of God which quite clearly has associations with the messianic king(7) (cf Lk 1:32). These two factors supply adequate alternatives to the arguments in favour of the High-Priestly solution, but before we can disprove Friedrich's thesis we need to examine his argument at a deeper level, namely at the level of his presuppositions. His first presupposition is his conviction that during the period of the NT "Messiah" was not a technical term for the royal Messiah.(8) His second presupposition is closely connected with this and argues that the High Priest whether eschatological or messianic was a known figure in contemporary Judaism at the time. Thus he writes :-

> "Da Christos Messias nicht nur den gesalbten König bezeichnet sondern auch den gesalbten Hohenpriester, werden wir an allen Stellen der Synoptiker, an denen Christus nicht schon zum Namen geworden ist, fragen müssen, ob hier ursprünglich der messianische König oder der eschatologische Hohenpriester gemeint ist." (9)

The presuppositions may be challenged.(10) One might justly enquire whether the idea of a High-Priestly Messiah was common outside of Qumran during the first Christian

century so as to compete on an equal basis for the title Messiah.

Friedrich is not alone in the belief that the Gospels saw in Jesus the fulfilment of the high-priestly hope. We find that W. Grundmann believes that Mark 1:24; 3:11 and 5:7 describe just such a connection.(11) Unfortunately Grundmann does not give reasons for his conclusion, but perhaps he has in mind the same reason as Friedrich presents, namely that his role as exorcist links Jesus with the figure of High Priest rather than with that of king.(12) R.Schnackenburg makes mention of a similar reasoning - but unlike Friedrich he holds that it applies only to Mark and Luke. He writes, "However important this background may be in explaining the cry of the demons, since one of the tasks of the high-priestly Messiah was to be the elimination of all impurity and demonic influence, a 'high-priestly' theology of the Messiah does nothing to explain Peter's confession in John".(13)

We have thus two questions which we need to consider in this chapter :-

(a) Is there sufficient evidence in the NT and related literature to suggest that "Messiah" in the Gospel record, might imply either king or priest?

(b) Is the role and function of the High Priest (whether eschatological or messianic) compatible with the Gospel picture of Jesus as an exorcist?

Only when we have dealt with these two questions will we be in a position to consider the implications for the Fourth Gospel and the Holy One of God in Jn 6:69.

On the <u>formal level</u> it cannot be doubted that the High-Priest has a good claim to the title "Holy One of God" as Friedrich has shown, but it must also be remembered that there are other claimants to the title who, as we have shown,(14) possess equally good grounds for their claim, such as the Nazirite Samson and the Prophet Elisha. So Aaron as "ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ κυρίου" (Ps 106:16) does not constitute a final claim to being the Holy One of God, nor is it an exact duplicate of the

title " ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ " as found in Mark and John. At the most one could say that in the OT the High Priest has generally a better claim to the adjective "Holy" than either the Prophet or the King. Much of course depends on how " ἅγιος " is to be understood within the context of the Marcan and Johannine accounts.(15)

On the <u>functional level</u> Friedrich bases his understanding of the High-Priestly Messiah upon the picture in T. of Levi 18:12 and T. of Dan 5:10f.(16) Schnackenburg spoke of the High-Priestly task of "elimination of all impurity and demonic influence".(17) This would seem to be borne out by the Qumran War Scroll.(18) On the other hand this task is exactly that of the Royal Messiah as found in the Psalms of Solomon (17 and 18).(19) Further, Rabbinic teaching(20) connected the Royal Messiah with punishment of demons.

3:2 The High Priest and the Priestly Messiah

There are certain key concepts which make up the picture of the Jewish High Priest common to most of the sources - which include the OT Rabbinic writings, Qumran, Philo and the NT. These characteristics are important, for they reveal the uniqueness of the Qumran belief in a Priestly Messiah as distinct from the traditional High Priest. They are the following :-

(a) The High Priest is connected with sacrifice and the Temple,(21) although these themes might be understood in a spiritual rather than a physical sense.(22)

(b) The High Priest is the Representative of God and acts as the Mediator between God and men.(23)

(c) The High Priest is a Judge and is connected with the Law of God.(24)

Since the Jews rarely conceived of a kingdom without a Temple it is likely, as L. Gaston has indicated,(25) that even in the eschatological era there would be envisaged as a matter of course some kind of Temple Cultus and probably also a High Priest.(26)

3:2:1 The Old Testament Picture

There are two aspects of the OT picture of the High Priest which are of particular interest to us. The first of these is the way in which the High-Priest is fitted for his office. Three verbs are found in the Hebrew מלא יד , תשח and קדש . The expression מלא יד literally means "to fill the hand" and in the pi'el it carries the sense of "to institute to a priestly office" as in Ex28:41; 29:9; 29, 33, 35; Nu 3:3; Ju 17:5,12 and 1 Chr 29:5. It depicts the granting of authority to the priests (27) and is the most common of the three expressions for the action of becoming a priest. The verb משח means "to anoint" - the characteristic manner in which God's chosen agents were signified. Ps 133 provides a vivid description of the Priestly anointing. It is only used in the "P" source of the Priests. The verb קדש means in hiphael and piel "to make holy", or "to consecrate for the service of God", and is applied to Aaron and his sons in Ex 29:21 where the action is accomplished through the blood of a sacrifice, (cf Ex 28:3,41; 30:30; Lv 8:12 and 2 Chr 26:18). Unlike the first two terms, קדש is often found in the context of the cult. Usually the verb "קדש" and the adjective "קדוש" refer either to people or to objects which have been consecrated to God's service. When it is used of the Priests there is often a sense of separation from things unclean (cf Lev 21:7-15 with the emphatic "לא מלא יד "). The same verb is also applied in the process of becoming a Nazirite (Num 6:5) and once more there appears that sense of "separation " from the unclean, (cf vss 6ff). (28) However separation is only the negative side of קדש , and is to be balanced against the positive sense of belonging to Yahweh. So there are the three actions implicit in the process of becoming a priest. The actions of anointing and consecration are of course applicable to the offices of prophet and king also (cf 1 Sam 26:11 and Jer 1:5). The phrase בית יד is much more of a technical term for the institution to the priestly office.

The second aspect of priesthood which deserves some attention is that of the Priest as the Agent of the Divine Council. It is usual to connect the Prophet with the Council on the basis of Jer 23:26.(29) However, Jeremiah often links Priests and Prophets together (Jer 14:18; 23:11,33 cf Lam 2: 20). Indeed, by the time of Josephus and the Rabbinic writers the gift of prophecy was believed to be given to the reigning High Priest.(30) In Proto-Zechariah we find in the Fourth Vision the picture of the High Priest Joshua. The genre of the vision(31) is clearly that of the Divine Council gathered in its capacity as a legal body. In 3:7 Joshua is given "the right of access among those standing here" (ונתתי לך מהלכים בין העמדים האלה) implying (apparently) the angels, who three times in the vision are said to be standing (vss 3:1, 3:4, 3:5). In contrast the "men of Good Omen" in vs 8 are described as "seated". Thus Joshua is purified (vs 4), clothed in High-Priestly garments (vs 5), appointed in charge of God's House and given the right of access into the very presence of God and His Council. Like Prophet and King the Priest as the Agent of God functioned against the backdrop of the Council.

Several times the clothes of the High Priest are mentioned and indeed we would do well to add this to our list of key concepts. The High Priest is distinguished by his garments (cf Lev 21:10) in particular the colour "blue", the colourful Ephod and his ornamental headdress. The Rabbis on the basis of Malachi 2:7 argued that Aaron was arrayed "like one of the Angels".(32) In some ways this has more relevance for the ordinary priest who, like the angels, wore white (Matt 25:3 cf Bab. Talmud Middoth 5^a). It would be interesting to posit a connection between wearing white and being pure or holy. There is some evidence for this in the NT (Rev 3:5) and in the dress of the Essenes for their sacred meal.(33)

Malachi 2:7 raises a number of interesting and perplexing points. The term "מלאך" is capable of meaning "angel" or "messenger" and 2:7 is therefore open to both interpretations. The Rabbis as we have seen, understood 2:7 as a visual connection, based on the clothing of the Priest and Angel. A more likely

interpretation of the verse is that the Priest functioned as a messenger of the Divine Council and could therefore be termed "מלאך", as were the other agents, whether human or angelic. The word is thus a term <u>of function</u>.

The correct understanding of the "מלאך" of 3:1 is also a matter of some debate. Perhaps since his task is directed towards the priests and the Temple Cult he might be understood as a "Priestly Agent". Perhaps also on the basis of 3:3-5 and 4:5 we are to understand Elijah as the Agent in question, and we note in this connection the NT picture of John the Baptist[34] and the Rabbinic legend of Elijah the High Priest.[35]

In Malachi, unlike Zechariah, it is the importance of the priesthood generally which is stressed. The same is true of Jer 33:17-22 where the promises to David are cited alongside the promises to Levi. However, the perpetual covenant made with the royal man (vs 17) represents a contract with an individual, whereas in vs 18 the man is a representative of the priesthood generally, for in vs 21 the royal son is posed opposite "the priests". Here in Jeremiah and again in Ezekiel, the king (or prince) is associated not with a High Priest but with "the priests" implying the priesthood generally. All this seems to indicate that apart from Qumran, Jewish eschatological thinking focused not on a single high priest, but upon a corporate body of priests who would serve as the ministers of God (Jer 33:22) alongside the messianic king. This conclusion is of great consequence for the correct understanding of the High Priest from Qumran and his relation to the writings of the NT.

J.R. Villalón draws attention to a number of OT passages which he believes contributed to the Qumran doctrine of two messiahs. He refers to Zech 4:14 which reads "sons of oil" (בני־היצהר) and which is usually rendered "the two anointed ones". Villalón correctly observes that we have before us a good description of a Messiah with a High-Priest as companion, which might have been influential in the development of the doctrine of two messiahs. Unfortunately the writers of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Twelve Testaments do not appear to have made use of this verse, unless the verb נתך is such an

indication.(36) There are allusions to other OT passages like Ezra 2:63 and I Sam 2:35 (cf IQSb 4; IQS 9:5ff and IQpIs^{a}) but beyond these verses we know very little about the formation of the hope for a messianic High Priest.

Apart from the Qumran teaching and the Rabbinic doctrine of the return of Elijah (which in later times included his high priesthood),(37) there is no evidence that other Jews expected during NT times the advent of an eschatological High Priest or a High-priestly Messiah. Indeed it seems highly probable that the hopes of the Qumran writers were coloured by their unique "Sitz im Leben" within a predominantly priestly community or at least a community governed by priestly ideals. They are thus separate both in the structure of their community and in the expression of their eschatology from the common traditions and teachings of their time.

3:2:2 The Qumran Scrolls and the High-Priestly Messiah

Within the Qumran Scrolls, the book of Jubilees and the Testaments of the Twelve patriarchs, we find a unique picture of a high-priestly Messiah. It is unique because neither the New Testament nor the Rabbinic writings including related apocalyptic works depict the High Priest in precisely the same way.

There is some controversy whether the Dead Sea Scrolls present a figure of a priestly Messiah, or whether this is in fact an eschatological high priest who functions alongside of the royal Messiah in the last days.(38) In favour of the former conclusion is M. de Jonge who argues that the term Messiah was only in the process of becoming a technical term for the king during the time of the NT,(39) and so could perhaps be used also for the High Priest. In the Qumran writings we find that whenever the term Messiah is used it is always qualified. It is never used where it might be ambiguous and in each instance the qualification indicates whether priest, prophet, herald or king is intended. Naturally such qualification would have been unnecessary where the title was already a terminus technicus for the king. The writers of the NT expected that the title ὁ Χριστός would carry to their readers a precise sense, and there is ample evidence in the Gospels that this sense included the

OT hope for an ideal king. The fact that in Qumran the title is used mainly for the king suggests that it was already becoming a technical term and the messianic development as depicted by J. Starky is in line with this belief.(40)

In comparison with the number of times that the king is called messiah, we find the High Priest is infrequently so termed. In IQS 9:11 we read עד בוא נביא ושני משיחי אהרון וישראל which when we consider the parallel phrase in CD 20:1 (עד עמוד בת שיח תאהרון ומישראל) might be understood as a reference not to two messiahs but to the Sect itself as the anointed ones of Aaron and Israel. There is some evidence for referring to the sect as the Anointed in 4 QFlor 1:17-19. The second instance of the High Priest as Messiah is found in 1QSa 2:12f [אל] את[ם] המשיח את ם יבוא בהכוה[ן] רואש כול עדת ישראל וכול (ו) א[חיו בני] אהרון הכוהנים . . The identification of המשיח (line 12) with the High Priest is a logical conclusion since in line 14 the messiah of Israel follows him ואחר ינשב תשיח ישראל וישבו לפניו ... and thus cannot be the same. The Priestly Messiah thus has good claim to the title המשיח.

The High Priest in Qumran displays the following characteristics :

(a) According to the War Scroll the High Priest takes the leadership in the battle; along with the other priests he forms the staff of the sect's army. He is supported by twelve "chief priests" (IQM 2:1 ראשים), one for each of the tribes. Although the passage which deals with the dress of the High Priest is missing, we find that the regular priests have on "white linen vestments girdled with flax, embroidered with blue, purple and scarlet thread" (IQM 7:10f) and each wears a mitred turban. Behind the elaborate dress we may detect the garb of the high priest as found in Exodus. The High Priest directs the war, recites the special Prayer-in-time-of-war

(1QM 15),[41] marshals the formation (1QM17) and generally encourages the troops, (1QM 15). He is concerned apparently with the details of trumpets (1QM 8), banners (1QM 4) and external appearances rather than with the actual fighting. Indeed the holiness of the priests generally prevents any of them from actual contact with the enemy - "They shall not profane the anointing of their priesthood with the blood of the nations of vanity, for they are holy" (1QM 9:8f).

(b) The High Priest, with the aid of the Urim and Thummim, counsels the king in matters of government. Indeed the king may not declare war without the sanction of the High Priest (Temple Scroll 56-9). In $1QpIs^a$ 1ff it is the priests who teach the Davidic Messiah the art of righteous judgement: In IQS 9:7 we read that "the sons of Aaron alone shall command in matters of justice (משפט) ... and every rule of the community shall be in accordance with their word" (cf CD 13:5-7 and 1QSa 1).

(c) The High Priest is connected with the Temple and Cult in the Temple Scroll, but at other times this connection is either overlooked or perhaps assumed. Obviously the view of the Sect vis-à-vis the present Temple and the cult of Jerusalem played a role here. We note in this regard the teaching found in Qumran on the spiritual temple[42] and cultus which in view of its focus on the corporate role of the Sect, tended to overlook the function of the High Priest.

On the question of the High Priest and exorcism we find that one of the most interesting actions of the High Priest during the war is to be found in Col 13. The High Priest and his retinue stand together formally to bless "the God of Israel and all His works of truth" and to curse[43] (ואורור בל) Satan there and all the spirits of his company" - כול רוחי גורלו - (lines 1-6). The passage includes the actual curse on Satan and his spirits. Line 5 reads "Cursed be all the spirits of the company for their ungodly purpose and may they be execrated (זעום בל) for all their service of uncleanness ...". The verb זעם normally means "to be indignant" (Num 23:8 and Mic 6:10) but it may be used of denouncing or cursing (as here in 1QM 13 cf also

Pr 24:24). In one case in Ps 7:11(12) the Hebrew reads אלה'ג שופט צדיק ואל זעם בכל-יום which in the Greek becomes ὁ Θεὸς κριτὴς δίκαιος καὶ ἰσχυρὸς καὶ μακρόθυμος, μὴ ὀργὴν ἐπάγων καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν. reading אָל instead of אֵל. If the Hebrew is read as it stands there appears to be a parallel between אלה'ג שופט and אל זעם. Thus to be execrated and to be judged may be understood as parallel terms sharing some of the same intention and meaning.(44) When we consider the action of the Priest at Qumran as he curses Satan and his spirits, there is a sense in which this curse is a pronouncement of divine judgement. Although the war continues and the immediate effect appears negligible, in fact it has a predetermined end - the advent of Michael who is the agent of Yahweh for the judgement of the spirits of darkness.

It should be noted that according to the plan of the War there is a battle on two levels, a heavenly and an earthly. Since Michael and his armies take command of the heavenly level, the task of the High Priest is largely confined to the earthly level and the human foes. In fact the "spirits of Satan" are the direct concern of Michael, for ultimately "God will raise up the Kingdom of Michael in the midst of the gods, and the realm of Israel in the midst of all flesh." (45)

The exact relationship between Priests and the Angels in Qumran is not quite clear. Several times we encounter the phrase "כי צבא קודש עם צבאותם" (cf 1QM7:6) which implies the presence of the angels in some way. It is sometimes a present "reality" and it also represents a future hope.(46) Indeed as H-W. Kuhn has argued(47) it is a combination of both. He lists three categories which are as follows :-

(i) The union in the eschatological war (1QM) where sectarians and angels form the army of God against the army of Satan which is also composed of humans and spirits. There is a strong sense of an ethical dualism present.

(ii) The cultic unity (kultisch bedingter Anschluss) which represents the sectarian priests worshipping and serving God in the company of the angels. The priests

are like (כ'א) angels (IQM, IQSa, 4Qfl and CD) and in the eschatological age they will serve in the heavenly cult. (iii) The priestly communion and temple service with the angels, without strong dualistic overtones where the key word is עדת , (IQH, IQS, IQ36 and 4Q181) and the sense is present.(48)

Perhaps the basis for the understanding of the union of angels and men is to be found in the sense of identity between the structure of the sect, particularly its hierarchy, and the order of the Divine Council. The government of the sect was ordered by the Council of Holiness, comprising priests and Israelites, but this was also the name for the Divine Council found in the scrolls (סוד אלת). This sense of identity between the human and divine councils was not peculiar to Qumran and is also found among the Rabbis (who compared the Sanhedrin with the heavenly court),(49) and the Church Fathers (who compared the early Church structure with the Council of Yahweh).(50) The idea of the human court as a microcosm of the Divine Council raises the possibility that the holy ones who belonged to the Council, namely the angels, should be evident among the men of holiness who made up the Sect. So whether in battle, in worship or in judgement the Sect believed that its life of holiness raised it into the experience of heavenly holiness (cf IQH:3:20f ...

כ'א יש תקוה לאשר יצרתה תצפר לסוד
עולם ... להתיצב בתעמד עם צבא קדוש'ם...
)

which they alone shared with the angels. All facets of their life were viewed from the perspective of their union with the members of the heavenly court.

A rather different picture appears in the interesting scroll entitled IIQ Melchizedek.(51) The scroll, which is fragmentary and brief, describes the time of the Jubilee year, the reward of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked - the spirits of Beliar (בליעל ועל רוחי גורלו). It concludes with a reference to the Day of Atonement. It has been described as a Pesher upon the OT passage in Lev 25:13; it also includes an exposition of Ps 82:6 and Is 40:9. The setting is the Court of Yahweh in which the Holy Ones meet to assist Melchizedek in his Judgement. The most crucial question raised by the scroll is that of the identity of

Melchizedek. It is normally Michael who will judge and punish the spirits of the Evil One, or God Himself, which has led to the suggestion that Melchizedek is somehow related to Michael.(52) We note that Melchizedek is in fact written as two words, which may suggest that it is not intended to imply a connection with the Melchizedek, priest and king of Salem (Gen 14). It might indeed be a title for the angel of Judgement, although of course it lacks the definite article. There is no reference in the scroll to the passage in Genesis or to Ps 110:4, which is unusual in the Melchizedek literature available at present, including the Melchizedek fragments from Nag-Hammadi. There is therefore some difficulty in arguing that this Melchizedek is the same figure as the one found in the OT, although there are similarities with the Melchizedek of Pistis Sophia - who is quite clearly an angelic figure.(53)

The figure of Melchizedek as portrayed in the Scroll from Qumran has been described as "a heavenly redeemer" (himmlische Erlösergestalt), but this probably exaggerates his role. That he is a judge is quite clear but because of the fragmentary nature of the scroll, clearly shown by the photographs, it is difficult to be certain about the priestly nature of Melchizedek. One conjectured reading has Melchizedek atoning for the sect. However, the scroll at this stage is too fragmentary for such a conclusion, and so the subject of the atonement must remain uncertain. In the same way it is not certain that the reading (25) ואלוה֯ך והואה בגלכי צדק is correct, since the scroll contains only the words ואלוה֯ך והואה, while Melchizedek is last mentioned several lines previously.(54) If Melchizedek was an angel as the scroll suggests then such a reading would be possible, but one must allow that the reading is only conjectural and cannot be used as evidence for the nature of Melchizedek.

The scroll depicts the scene within the Divine Court at the time of a new year just before the Day of Atonement.(55) According to the Rabbis the Heavenly Court judged most men on the New Year, but for a few sentence was only passed during the Day of Atonement.(56) There can be little doubt, even though humans might listen

to the debating of the divine court, or as in Qumran imagine themselves to be part of the Court, that no human presided over the Divine Council. It was Elohim who did so - whether this was Yahweh Himself or an angel. There is no evidence that Melchizedek is the Messiah, whether Priest or King, but the whole sense of the scroll argues for an angelic figure appointed like Michael for the punishment and reward of the wicked and righteous respectively. In the War Scroll (IQM) Michael appears as the heavenly counterpart of the Prince of the Congregation - probably the Messiah of Israel. In the same way Melchizedek operates as the counterpart of the royal Messiah, whom as we saw in the OT was directly concerned with judgement.

In conclusion, three features of the Priestly Messiah have appeared which mark this figure as unique among those general beliefs surrounding the High Priest drawn from the OT. These three features are the following :

(a) Authority <u>in War</u>, over the authority of the Messiah of Israel.

(b) Authority in <u>Judgement</u>, over the authority of the lay leaders of the Sect.

(c) Authority in the <u>Future Kingdom</u>, over even the authority of the King.

These three areas of authority combine to present a picture of the general superiority of the Priesthood over the Laity and the specific superiority of the Priestly Messiah over the Royal Messiah. The resulting picture stands in clear contrast to the other Jewish writings of the time (as also the New Testament) with the exception of the Twelve Testaments and the Book of Jubilees.

3:2:3 The Twelve Testaments

Our study of the Priestly Messiah of Qumran and in particular our understanding of his role and exercise of authority, provides a suitable basis upon which to commence a brief study of the priestly figure in the Twelve Testaments. When we take each of the features in turn

we find some striking parallels between the Priestly Messiah of Qumran and the Messiah of Levi in the Testaments :

(a) Authority in War. T. Simeon 5:5.

> But your sons shall not be able to withstand Levi for he shall wage the war of the Lord and shall conquer hosts.

(b) Authority in Judgement. T. Reuben 6:8

> Therefore I command you to hearken to Levi, because he shall know the Law of the Lord and shall give ordinances for judgement and shall sacrifice for all Israel until the consummation of the times, as the anointed High Priest of whom the Lord spoke.

T. Levi 18:2

> Then the Lord shall raise up a new priest. And to him shall all the words of the Lord be revealed. And he shall execute a righteous judgement upon the earth for a multitude of days.

(c) Authority in the future Kingdom. T. Levi 18:10

> He shall open the gates of Paradise, and he shall remove the threatening sword against Adam. He shall give the Saints to eat from the Tree of Life, and the spirit of holiness shall be upon them.

(d) Superiority over the King. T. Judah 21:2

> For to me (Judah) the Lord gave the kingdom and to him (Levi) he gave the priesthood and he set the kingdom under the priesthood. For to me he gave the things of the earth and to him the things of the heavens. As the heaven is higher than the earth so is the priesthood of God higher than the earthly kingdom.

Apart from these important similarities with the Qumran picture we encounter also certain differences. Some of these may be explained away as Christian interpolations.(57) One case is of particular interest to us. In T.Levi 12:18 we read "And Beliar shall be bound by him" that is by the Priestly Messiah. As we have seen the Qumran Messiah wages war with human enemies, who may indeed be the forces of Beliar - but the actual defeat of Beliar is at the hand of Michael(58) and the judgement is passed on him by Melchizedek. The action of binding Beliar has closer affinities with the Michael traditions than with the Priestly Messiah

of Qumran. It is probable therefore that a Michael myth lies behind the incident.

This is not the time to delve into the relationship between the Twelve Testaments and the Qumran writings, and the involved question of the dating and authorship of the Testaments. It suffices to say that as far as the Priestly Messiah is concerned the general picture revealed in the Testaments has more in common with the Qumran writings than either the Rabbinic works or the New Testament.

3:2:4 The Book of Jubilees

The Book of Jubilees, also found among the scrolls of Qumran presents a picture of the High Priest which is in conformity with the other Qumran writings. We note particularly the promise to Levi (Jub 31:12-5) which has some striking parallels with 1QSb 3,4.

Jubilees 31:13-5 (The Blessing of Levi). And may the Lord give great glory and greatness to thee and thy seed, and cause thee and thy seed from among all flesh to approach Him to serve in His Sanctuary as the angels of the Presence and as the holy ones. Even as these will the seed of your sons be for glory and greatness and holiness, and may He make them great unto all the ages. And they will be princes and judges and chiefs of all the seed of the sons of Jacob; they will judge all his judgements in righteousness. And they will declare My ways to Jacob and My paths to Israel.

IQSb4:3,20-25 ....may everlasting blessings be the crown upon your head for He has chosen you to number the saints and to bless the people ..... the men of the Council of God, by your hand and not by the hand of a prince .... May you be as an Angel of the Presence in the Abode of Holiness to the glory of the God of hosts ..... May you attend service in the Temple of the Kingdom and decree destiny in company with the Angels of the Presence, in common council with the Holy Ones for everlasting ages and time without end.

There are three points which come to our attention:
(a) The genre of both passages is that of a blessing, which in both instances show preference for the priest over the king.
(b) The priests in both instances take part in a form of heavenly cultus, being compared to the angels, and in the former instance to the holy ones.

(c) The judgement of the priests is mentioned in both instances, for they alone are the appointed judges with respect to human matters.

There are some basic suggestions of passages like Malachi 2:7 and Zech 3:7, but by and large there are no real parallels to all three ideas in Jewish literature apart from the Qumran writings and the Twelve Testaments which as we have shown have probably been influenced by the Sect.

3:3 Jesus as High Priest

We turn now to the New Testament and in particular to the presentation of Jesus as High Priest. While the picture of the High-Priestly Messiah is still clear before us we need to ask if its distinctive imagery is to be encountered within the pages of the New Testament. The High Priest according to the Dead Sea Scrolls had authority in War, in Judgement and in the future Kingdom which surpassed that of the Messiah King. Friedrich, as we have noted, believed that this High-Priestly figure, particularly as he is found in the Twelve Testaments, might be discovered within the NT writings, notably the Synoptics, John and the Epistle to the Hebrews. To test this hypothesis we will look for signs of the "Priesthood" of Jesus within these works. We will commence with what is probably the oldest "High-Priestly" function attributed to Jesus and indeed supplies the key for all the other NT passages, the function of ἔντευξις (intercession).(59)

3:3:1 Jesus as Intercessor

The OT and related Jewish literature testify to the importance of the High Priest as one who intercedes on behalf of Israel, acts as the mediator between God and man, and has the right of access to the very presence of Yahweh. It is particularly the Day of Atonement which underlines these three respective actions, when the High Priest intercedes for the people and as their mediator enters the Holy of Holies to obtain forgiveness for the nation's sin. Although Qumran emphasized the idea of spiritual sacrifice

and atonement through obedience to the Law, yet the members of the sect believed that in the last days God would establish a new Temple in which the whole sacrificial cult would be resumed and the traditional Day of Atonement ritual reestablished (Temple Scroll 25-7). Even in the NT we find the idea of atonement connected either with the idea of Jesus as High Priest as in the Epistle to the Hebrews, or with the thought of Jesus as a sacrifice (1 Jn 1:7).

The NT presents Jesus as mediator of the new covenant (Heb 9:15), as one who intercedes on behalf of men (Rom 8:34; Heb 7:25) and as one who obtains on our behalf access into God's presence (Heb 9:24; Rom 5:2). The Greek terms are the following : ἐντυγχάνω (Rom 8:34; Heb 7:25), νῦν ἐμφανισθῆναι (τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ) ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν and προσαγωγή (Rom 5:2). O. Moe has used such verses to explore the idea of Jesus as High Priest outside the Epistle to the Hebrews.(60) It is not always clear that there is a connection between the function of Jesus as Intercessor, for example, and the belief that Jesus fulfilled the role of a High Priest. While such a connection may be obvious in the Epistle to the Hebrews, it is much less obvious in the Pauline writings, and indeed may not be present at all. One of the reasons for this is the use made by the early church of Ps 110(109), mainly with reference to the role of Jesus as a mediator. D.M.Hay has listed the different ways in which verses 1 and 4 of this Psalm were used in the NT and early Christian literature.(61) We think that he goes too far in assuming that a quotation of vs 1 implies automatically some cognisance of vs 4. Of course in the Epistle to the Hebrews itself, such a connection is obvious; but in a verse like Rom 8:34, one would be hard pressed to show cognition of Ps 110:4, whereas vs 1 is suggested by the phrase ὃς καί ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ . In fact since legal language predominates in this chapter of Romans, one might be justified in seeing not a cultic scene but one drawn from the courts of Law.(62) Jesus as the defender stands on the right of God, the presiding judge. The prosecutor as evidenced in Zech 3 would stand on the

left of the Judge, which would be on the right of the accused, who faced the judge.

A similar picture may be discerned in the Fourth Gospel. The description of the role of the Paraclete, particularly in Jn 14:16, suggests that the writer is making use of the legal setting and verbs like μαρτυρέω (15:26) ἐλέγχω (16:8) and κρίνω (16:11) are best understood within such a framework. The Paraclete is therefore not a priestly mediator, for such an interpretation would ignore the legal setting. Rather we are reminded of the tradition of Moses as mediator,(63) which has its origins in the OT,(64) particularly in the theophany at Sinai. It is likely that the writer of Hebrews drew on this tradition (cf Heb 9:15) and when we read Philo and Josephus, we discover that Moses is described as the παράκλητος.(65) Moses plays a major role in the Fourth Gospel, as T.F.Glasson has shown,(66) but the legal significance of his role in relation to Jesus has not been fully explored. In Jn 5:45, Moses is represented as the accuser (ὁ κατηγορῶν) in apparent contradiction with what the Jews expect. The court-house door is opened and we glimpse Moses, not as the defender of the Jews but as their accuser, leaving the dual office of defence council and judge open for Jesus. (The two offices were combined also in the vision of Zechariah).

There have been a number of attempts to understand the Gospel within the framework of a Court Case. John never fully develops this idea and it remains a secondary motif, visible only in the forensic nature of some of the key discourses (cf chs 6, 9 and 10).(67) In the first Epistle of John, Jesus is explicitly identified as an Advocate (Jn 2:1); an idea which is probably hinted at in the Gospel (cf Jn 14:16). The use of such imagery and language suggests that the idea of Jesus as a Mediator might be viewed, not against a priestly background, but within a legal context in which Jesus assumes the role of Advocate in God's heavenly Council.

3:3:2 Jesus in the Epistle to the Hebrews

The Epistle to the Hebrews is clearly the greatest work on the Priesthood of Jesus known to us. We need therefore to enquire into the sources of the writer's tradition, if

indeed he made use of sources for his presentation of Jesus as High Priest. Some writers see a connection between Hebrews and Qumran, and suggest that the letter was written to a Church which counted among its members ex-sectarians.(68) The evidence is too uncertain for such a conclusion, and indeed some key studies indicate the exact opposite. For example, F.L. Horton has made a detailed study of the Melchizedek tradition(69) and he concludes that Qumran (particularly 11QMelch) and Hebrews form two distinct branches of the tradition. There are no signs that they influenced each other in any way whatsoever. 11QMelch is an apocalyptic midrash on Ps 82 and there is no reference, as we have seen, to passages like Ps 110 and Gen 14. By contrast, Hebrews is an extended midrash on precisely those two passages. Understanding Hebrews in this way enables us to see that the genius of the writer lies in his ability to interpret key OT passages so as to build up a picture of Jesus as the heavenly High Priest. While his methods resemble those employed at Qumran or by Philo(70) his conclusions are radically different. His major source is the OT, but his Christian standpoint marks him out from his non-Christian contemporaries and ensures that any similarity in content is only superficial.(71)

If then, the writer of Hebrews did not make use of the Melchizedek tradition from Qumran, but relied upon his own ability as an exegete and expositor of scripture, perhaps he knew of some tradition linking Jesus with the priesthood. More likely however, is the idea that he inherited the tradition of Jesus as mediator and then developed this as a priestly tradition. This theory is put forward by J. Gnilka who writes :

> "Verfasser des Hebräerbriefes baut diese Sicht schliesslich zu seiner Hohenpriesterlehre aus indem er die Züge des Ebed-Yahve mit denen des Priesterkönigs Melchisedek verbindet." (72)

A.J.B. Higgins, like Gnilka, considers that there is no connection with the Qumran writings, but that the imagery in Hebrews "is unique and rests upon Jesus' Son of Man sayings concerning intercession and Jesus' role as an advocate".(73) Unfortunately, the Epistle shows no overt indication of the influence of either the Servant Songs of Isaiah or the teaching of Jesus on his role as Son of Man

(ch 2 is a midrash on Ps 8:4-6 and there is little in that chapter which suggests that the writer knew of Jesus' teachings on himself as the Son of Man). So the preferable solution is that the writer inherited a tradition in which Jesus was presented as an advocate or mediator, perhaps the Christian use of Ps 110:1. This tradition, coupled with his genius as an expositor, explains a great deal of the Epistle and answers the question about his sources to our satisfaction.

3:4 The Evidence against the High Priestly Interpretation

Friedrich's interpretation of Messiah as a high-priestly title has not found general acceptance.(74) However he succeeded in alerting the scholarly world to the possibility that Messiah, in the Gospels, meant something other than the Davidic king.(75) As a result of his work attention has been given to the importance of the immediate context for a correct rendering of even a familiar title.

Friedrich's understanding of the Holy One of God also as a high-priestly title has received more positive support.(76) He correctly identifies the context of the exorcism as an important guide to the meaning of the title, but his conclusions are faulty. In spite of the apparent connection between the Holy One of God and the traditional picture of the holiness of High Priest, or the apparent connection with exorcism found in the actions of the High Priest as depicted in the War Scroll, there is little reason to believe that the Gospel picture of Jesus knew of a tradition such as that found in Hebrews linking Jesus with the priesthood. This is not to say that as the royal Messiah, Jesus did not perform tasks which people would recognise as "priestly", such as intercession. David was no less a king when he wore the linen ephod to dance before the Lord, nor did he become a High Priest, but he performed the function of the High Priest as did Solomon. In the same way Jesus could perform functions associated with a range of offices including in some cases priesthood without the absolute identification between him and the office.

In Jesus' fulfilment of the messianic office, it is possible to detect functions which are prophetic or royal. However, one cannot escape the conclusion that Jesus defines the messianic office rather than that the messianic office

defines Jesus. The very term Messiah, drawn from the traditions surrounding the house of David, became a technical term in Christian thinking for Jesus and his role as preserved within their traditions. Actions such as exorcism and healing fall under the over-riding concern with the belief that Jesus was the divinely ordained Messiah of God: the one who was chosen by God to fulfil a unique function. Jesus by genealogy was associated with the house of David, and unlike John the Baptist he was never seen to be of high priestly stock. When the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews writes about the priesthood of Jesus, he/she is obliged to turn to Melchizedek to legitimize Jesus' claim to the high-priesthood. The genealogies of Matthew and Luke likewise show no indication that Jesus was believed to be connected by genealogy with any family other than the royal house and lineage of David.

The title ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ as we have already suggested, points to the belief that Jesus was the agent of God, not one of a number of holy ones, but the Holy One. It is quite clear, as A.T.Robertson(77) has shown, that we have to do here with a distinctive agent - what H.L.N. Joubert(78) has called "the Agent of God par excellence". Since Jesus is manifestly not presented as of the house of Aaron or Levi, since he is not confessed unequivocally as High Priest, and since the representative vox populi connected Jesus with an assortment of figures, but never a priest, it seems unlikely that the Holy One of God is an exception. If the High Priest had sole claim to the title, it would be a different matter, but in fact prophet and Nazirite could equally well be described as Holy ones.

3:4:1 The Synoptic Picture

We come then to the suggestion implicit in the writings of W. Grundmann,(79) and explicit in the writings of Friedrich(80) and R. Schnackenburg,(81) which posits a connection between the confessions of the demons and the function of the eschatological High Priest (or high-priestly Messiah). We have already given a possible means by which exorcism might be connected with the royal Messiah acting within the arena of Holy War, but we need to consider an

alternative. We have examined the relevant passages from Qumran and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. We have raised the difficulty of relying upon the evidence of the latter work(82) and more specifically the passage in T. of Levi 18:12 which speaks of the "binding of Beliar". We suggested that this action was not attributed elsewhere in the Qumran writings to the Priestly Messiah, and might be a reflection of a Michael legend. In our survey of the action of the Priest in the War scroll we noticed the "curse" of the Priest as a possible link with exorcism. Hahn argues that neither the Qumran texts nor the Testaments present an actual picture of exorcism.(83) This is true, but the parallel in the War Scroll cannot be discarded lightly. We remember however, that the final defeat of the spirits of Belial required divine intervention in the form of the angel Michael. So in truth, for Qumran, the real victor over Belial is Michael, and the same tradition probably lies behind the T. of Levi 18:12. The scroll 11QMelch. presents Melchizedek as another "angelic" figure passing judgement on the spirits, possibly emulating Michael.(84)

Jesus, the Holy One acts as the agent who is sent to carry out, among other things, the punishment of demons. In so doing he may be likened to the High Priest of the War Scroll, or to Michael the Cosmic agent; he may also be likened to the Messiah as depicted in the Psalms of Solomon. In 17:33 we read of the Messiah "purging Jerusalem and making her holy as of old". In the face of the paucity of information generally about exorcism in the first Christian century, we feel constrained to suggest that exorcism is no more priestly than it is messianic. If we are correct in following Braun's suggestion of a Holy War setting,(85) then in line with the picture in the Psalms of Solomon, it seems that the Holy One is the eschatological agent of judgement - in NT terminology the Messiah, Son of David.

In Mark, Jesus as the Holy One of God, is no High Priest. Rather he is the Son of God, filled with the Spirit,

empowered with the authority of God to wage war against the forces of evil.(86) For Qumran this would perhaps imply that Jesus was a high-priestly Messiah, but the NT is not Qumran; Jesus was not generally accepted as High Priest, but he was known to be a prophet and attested as the Davidic Messiah. There appears to be no good reason to look beyond either of these figures for a perfectly adequate understanding of exorcism.(87). Even if one could prove exorcism to be a high-priestly task, which one cannot at present, it would still leave open the possibility that Jesus as prophet or king performed priestly functions. We conclude then by quoting Hahn's conclusion,

> "A connecting of Mk 1:24 with the idea of the messianic high priest may be justified only if the influence of the high priestly messianism permits of it being identified elsewhere in the earliest tradition". (88)

Since Mark offers no such tradition, nor does he use obviously priestly motifs in his presentation of Jesus, it appears logical to look elsewhere for an explanation of Jesus as Exorcist and Holy One.

Luke depicts Jesus as prophet and king, but never as priest whether in the Gospel or in the Acts. Jesus as the Holy One is filled with the Spirit (4:1), the Holy Son (1:35 cf 4:34) and the one chosen by God to bring the good news of salvation. We are much closer to the OT prophets like Elijah and Elisha, than to Aaron or Levi. Even if exorcism was originally high-priestly, the Lucan context denies such a connection and leads us to translate the Holy One of God within in its present setting as the understanding of Jesus as prophet and messianic king.

3:4:2 The Johannine Picture

There are two aspects to the suggestion that the confession of Peter according to John, is a High Priestly confession. In the first place it raises the question of ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ as a title for the High Priest, which, as we have seen, is far from settled. Secondly it raises the question of Jesus as High Priest generally in the Fourth Gospel.

Apart from Friedrich who connects Jn 6:69 " ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ " with the High Priestly Messiah, several other writers have pointed to the Fourth Gospel as expressing a concern for the Priesthood of Jesus.(89) Evidence in this respect has been drawn from the so-called "High Priestly Prayer" in chapter 17, the " χιτὼν ἄραφος " in 19:23 (said to be reminiscent of the High Priest's robe,(90) Ex 39:22) and of course " ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ ". The most detailed examination of this question is the thesis of J.T.Williams, Cultic Elements in the Fourth Gospel, with special reference to priestly and sacrificial ideas.(91) In pursuit of this aim he examines the use of the following terms as found in the Fourth Gospel :

λατρεία, καθαρός, καθαίρειν, ὕδωρ, λούεσθαι, νίπτεσθαι, ἅγιος, ἁγιάζω, ἁγνίζω, ἀμνός, αἷμα, ἱερεύς, ἀρχιερεύς, λευίτης, ναός, σκηνόω, ἄρτος, παράκλητος and others.

In conclusion he makes two observations which are worthy of note :

(a) Sacrificial language is clearly employed in the Fourth Gospel to describe the meaning of the death of Christ, but it is a vicarious self-sacrifice rather than an expiatory sacrifice (Jn 10:15, 21 and 17:9).

(b) There is a definite tendency towards a spiritualizing of the temple cultus, as three examples show - σκηνόω (Jn 1:14), ναός (2:19f) and προσκυνεῖν (4:22-4).(92)

If John is dated around A.D.90, as most scholars suggest, then this spiritualization may be set against the similar movement on the Jewish side. The name of Yohanan ben Zakkai is traditionally associated with the spiritualization of the Jewish Cult. The following are some examples cited by J. Neusner(93):

Avot de Rabbi Natan, Chap.6.

> Once as Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai was coming forth from Jerusalem, Rabbi Joshua followed after him and beheld the Temple in ruins. "Woe unto us", Rabbi Joshua cried, "that this the place where the iniquities of Israel were atoned for is laid waste!"
>
> "My son", Rabbi Yohanan said to him, "be not grieved. We have another atonement as effective as this. And what is it? It is acts of loving kindness, as it is

> said, 'For I desire mercy and not sacrifice'." (Hos 6:6). (94)

Neusner notes that the work of Yohanan stood within the tradition and work of the Pharisees with their emphasis on purity. "Even outside of the Temple, in one's own home, one had to follow the laws of ritual purity in the circumstances in which they might apply, namely at the table. They therefore held that one must eat his secular food ... in a state of ritual purity as if one were a Temple priest." (cf B.T. Berakhot 55a "as long as the Temple stood the altar atoned for Israel. But now a man's table atones for him.")(95)

Neusner concludes "The destruction of the Temple, Jerusalem, and the cult therefore marked a considerable transformation in the antecedent symbolic structures of Judaism. The ancient symbols were emptied of their old meanings and filled with new ones; they continued formally unchanged but substantively in no way the same." (96)

For the Christians it was the advent of Jesus and especially his death and resurrection which promoted a similar response. In particular we may note the imagery of the community as a Temple which has certain parallels with the Community of the Dead Sea.(97) The three examples which Williams quotes σκηνόω , ναός and προσκυνεῖν illustrate the Johannine touch. Jesus is now the "resting place of the Shekinah" rather than the Jewish Temple. It is from Jesus that living waters flow and not from the base of the Temple as Ezekiel portrayed. Jesus and not Jerusalem is the "Light of the World". These and other examples are adduced by Williams. "In himself (Jesus) symbolises the Paschal Lamb, the Water of Tabernacles and supplants the Rites of Purification"..."these features of the theology of the Gospel point clearly to the theme of spiritualization of the Cult and of the terms associated with it, and they indicate a firm belief that Judaism has been replaced by Christ".(98) The new form of worship is "in Spirit and in Truth" (Jn 4:24).

In the Second part of Williams' work he concentrates on the actual imagery, some of which we have mentioned above, that has led writers to speak of the Jesus of the Fourth Gospel as Priest or High Priest. As far as chapter seventeen

is concerned Williams concludes that "the verb ἁγιάζειν has strong priestly connections but it would be illegitimate to see Jesus represented as High Priest in this chapter. It is rather in the general character of the chapter that we can discern certain priestly characteristics in his intercession on behalf of his disciples."(99) This neatly sums up the opinion of most commentators on the passage.(100) We would be inclined to go further and question whether the verb ἁγιάζειν and the intercession of Jesus on behalf of his disciples may be described as "priestly". Indeed at a later stage we will show just how difficult it is to be precise about the exact understanding of ἁγιάζειν in this chapter. However we go along with the general conclusion of Williams and the general tenor of his argument - if Jesus is understood as High Priest in the Fourth Gospel, it would need more than the vague intimation of ch 17 to support such a belief.

The second point discussed by Williams and other proponents of the priesthood of Jesus in John, is to be found in the description of Jesus' robe in 19:23 - the tunic was without seam, woven from top to bottom. The phrase ὁ ἄρραφος χιτών is not a common expression but it does occur in the writings of Josephus,(101) apparently as the translation of the Hebrew term for the high-priestly robe (cf B.T. Yoma 72b). If this is correct and ὁ ἄρραφος χιτών was the technical term for the robe of the High Priest, then it would appear that this is a deliberate attempt to connect Jesus with the Priesthood. Again we are cautious about such a conclusion. Unless one was familiar with such a technical usage, it would be quite easy to overlook the connection. The priesthood of Jesus is not a key aspect within the passion narrative, and receives no explicit affirmation in any of the discourse material. In contrast to the use made of sacrificial language and various other pointers to the idea of Jesus as the paschal lamb,(102) one is hard pressed to discern any direct connection between the death of Jesus and a picture like that in Hebrews of a vicariously suffering high priest.

It is possible that one might be able to trace within the Passion narrative the sense that Jesus fulfils the cult and is both its climax and its culmination. This would tie up with the tendency we observed in the Gospel towards the spiritualization of the cult, and the mention of themes like water and light. So John would be enabled to use even a high-priestly robe to mark the end of the Jewish cult.(103) But obviously this is not the major theme of the Passion, instead like some minor theme of the Johannine symphony, it appears and disappears without causing any fundamental change to the flow of the whole work. There is thus no reason to believe that the description of the robe of Jesus indicates anything more than a general connection between Jesus and the cult - it certainly does not prove that John believed Jesus to be a High Priest. In fact one might justly enquire whether John intended anything more than an actual report on the clothing of Jesus to be grouped along with other odd details which are scattered through the Gospel.(104)

The central confessions for John (1:49; 11:27 and 20:31) apart from 6:69 make use of the title "Son of God" and add to "Messiah" a dimension which is not basic to it, namely the sense of relationship between God and His Son. John does not ignore the functional aspect of "the son"; indeed as we have seen this is his basic term for Agent. At the same time it is the union of the Father and the Son which makes John's presentation of Jesus "the Son of God" unique in the NT and most of all gives new direction to the traditional messianic confessions. This fact leads us to ask about Jn 6:69 and its relation to the Sonship of Jesus. Like the other "approved" confessions it carries the Johannine stamp of approval. It is found on the lips of a disciple of Jesus. Jesus' approval follows - an approval somewhat qualified by the next words

οὐκ ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς τοὺς δώδεκα ἐξελεξάμην (6:70).

It is addressed directly to Jesus (unlike some of the other confessions found on the lips of "the people" 6:14; 7:40f). Yet there appears to be no line of thought prior to 10:36 which would lead the reader to understand that "the Holy One of God" is intended to imply Jesus - the Son

of God. It must be considered along with two other confessions which also lack apparent connection with "Son of God" namely "the Lamb of God" (Jn 1:29,35) and "the Saviour of the World" (4:42) and perhaps a third, the confession of Thomas (20:28). So the "Holy One" may point towards a <u>functional</u> understanding in line with the former titles (1:29;4:42) and the confession of Jesus as "Messiah" (1:49; 11:27), or it may point to an <u>ontological</u> understanding in line with the latter title (Lord and God) (20:28) or "Son of God" (11:27). Both understandings are possible and the split between the two is clearly indicated in the varied interpretations of Jn 6:69.

In the face of the other confessions we need to enquire whether a confession of Jesus as High Priest would be out of place. If placed alongside the three major confessions it is apparent that it lacks the qualifying factor of "Son of God", and serves only as a witness to the function of Jesus. As such Jesus the Priest would need to be linked with Jesus "the Saviour" or the "Lamb of God", and with Jesus as "Teacher" or "the Prophet". When we consider these titles, we find support from the Gospel for the ideas incorporated in the titles. Thus Jesus in the Passion is presented as the Lamb of God; for the Samaritans he is the Saviour, not of the land of Israel, but of the world; Jesus is both teacher and prophet (cf 6:14) - but at no stage is he described as priest. Without a doubt the confession of Jesus as High Priest would rest uneasily within the walls of the Fourth Gospel. The title is apparently not a technical term for the High Priest or high-priestly Messiah, and we are unable to find direct evidence for Johannine knowledge of the high-priesthood of Jesus. There is a world of difference between the sacrificial lamb and the sacrificing High Priest. There is also a great difference between a Messiah who is a high priest and a Messiah who is primarily a king but who is enabled to exercise priestly or prophetic functions. While the general tenor of the Gospel prevents us from concluding that the Holy One of God is necessarily a High Priest, we must admit the possibility that it includes the idea of the sacrifice of Jesus[105] or his role as

intercessor - a role which could in some circumstances be said to be priestly,(106) but is not necessarily so.

The Holy One of God depicts the agency of Jesus and is presumably in accord with the agency described in the Gospel as a whole. Thus it is messianic, but more than that, it apparently identifies Jesus as the divine agent. It has thus a functional level and an ontological level. As far as the former is concerned, part at least of this function is to be understood as messianic, implying Jesus' fulfilment of the OT promises. Another part of this function concerns the bearing of the "words of eternal life". This latter task is an important key to the interpretation of the Holy One of God and leads us now to consider the prophetic aspect of the title and finally to the connection with the Son of God. Nowhere in the two levels do we find space for Friedrich's belief that the Holy One was a High Priest. We leave open the possibility that the title intends either the sacrifice of Jesus or his role as intercessor until our in-depth consideration of the term ἅγιος.(107)

CHAPTER FOUR THE HOLY ONE OF GOD AS A TITLE FOR A PROPHET

		Page
4:1	Introduction	130
4:2	The Prophetic Interpretation of the Holy One of God	131
4:2:1	The Function of the Prophet in the Old Testament	133
4:2:2	Jesus as Prophet in the New Testament Tradition	137
4:2:3	Exorcism as a Prophetic Function	140
4:2:4	The Marcan Redaction	141
4:2:5	The Scene in the Synagogue according to Luke ..	146
4:3	The Prophet and the Holy One in John	151
4:3:1	Jesus and Elijah and Elisha	152
4:3:2	Jesus and Moses	154
4:3:3	The Prophet and the Holy One in Jn 6	159
4:3:4	A Primitive Tradition	161
4:3:5	Conclusion : Something More	165
Footnotes to Chapter Four		328

CHAPTER FOUR THE HOLY ONE OF GOD AS A TITLE FOR A PROPHET

4:1 Introduction

There are a number of reasons why the Holy One of God, particularly in the context of Luke's Gospel, may be considered to be a prophetic title, implying either a prophet generally or the prophet like Moses specifically. Our attention is drawn to the suggestions made in this regard by F. Hahn, E. Schweizer and R.H.Fuller[1] One of the key OT references is Jeremiah 1:5, which reads :

> "Before I formed you in the womb I knew you, and before you were born I consecrated you (ἡγίακά σε); I appointed you a prophet to the nations."

The three stages indicated by the verbs (ἐπίστα μί σε, ἡγίακά σε and τέθεικά σε) are very important to the general understanding not only of the prophetic agency but of divinely ordered agency in all its human functionaries. There is a sense of continuity between the three actions of knowing, consecration and appointing, which is basic to the commission of any of God's

human agents. The distinctive prophetic task is made apparent in the verses which follow verse 5. The prophet is sent by God (vs 7) with the explicit task of speaking the words of God - "Behold I have put My Words in your mouth", (vs 9). Moreover the prophet is given special authority for he is "set over nations and over kingdoms", although the actual term "authority" is not used.

The connection between the attribute of holiness and the prophetic office is evident in the OT (II Kings 4:9 and Jer 1:5), Qumran (CD 2:12 and 6:1 - "the holy anointed ones"),(2) and in the NT (Lk 1:70 and Acts 3:21). Etymological grounds exist, therefore, for connecting "the Holy One of God" with the prophetic office, just as we found for the High Priest. Since various agents of God might be described as holy, the possibility emerges that no single office is intended by the title, but rather that the title is to be understood in the general sense of a consecrated agent of God. E. Schweizer,(3) underscores this basic sense of consecration in his interpretation of Mk 1:23f. Leaving aside his arguments on a play on words, which we have already discussed,(4) Schweizer's emphasis seems to our mind to be well placed. He begins with the sense of Jesus as the consecrated agent of God, like the Nazirite of the OT, and moves towards an understanding of Jesus, the Holy One, as "der endzeitliche Prophet"(5). Implicit in this suggestion is the belief that Mark had taken over a title with a general application and has given to it a specific content. This accords well with the redactional indications we observed in the Marcan passage.(6) So then the title ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ bears the sense of the agency of Jesus, which includes his election by God, his consecration and his commission. Apart from these aspects, the title is also coloured by its immediate context and it is on this level, the redactional level, that the prophetic tradition becomes important. In this chapter we will consider the Holy One against the backdrop of the traditions connected with Moses, Elijah and Elisha and charismatic figures like Hanina ben Dosa.

4:2 The Prophetic Interpretation of the Holy One of God

For each of the three appearances in the NT of the Holy One of God, we need to enquire anew into the meaning of the

title. It is misleading to suppose a similar content for all three occurrences and nowhere is this more apparent than in a study of the effect of the prophetic tradition upon the title. Our redactional study of Mark[7] has already pin-pointed some of the issues involved here, and our consideration of Luke's Christology hinted at the contribution of the prophetic tradition to Luke's portrait of the Holy One of God.[8] We have chosen to concentrate, in this chapter, on Luke because of his obvious reliance upon the prophetic models for his description of Jesus' mission, but first of all we need to make some general observations.

Several exegetes claim on the basis of the similarity between the challenge addressed to Elijah, Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοὶ ἄνθρωπε τοῦ Θεοῦ (I Kings 17:18), and the challenge aimed at Jesus Τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ (Mk 1:24, Lk 4:34), grounds for interpreting the Holy One of God as prophetic. The verbal parallel is quite striking, but this only serves to confirm that Jesus, like Elijah, was addressed in a stylized form of challenge. Behind the Greek of Mk 1:24 (Lk 4:34) we may discern an original Hebrew and perhaps Aramaic expression,[9] but this is hardly grounds upon which to base a prophetic interpretation of the Holy One of God, and the same conclusion may be drawn for the thesis of R.H.Fuller.[10] He connects the Holy One of God, with another title, namely Ὁ ἅγιος καὶ δίκαιος found in Acts 3:14, so as to suggest that both titles signify "Jesus in his connection with the Mosaic prophet-servant concept".[11] Several problems are raised by this explanation. The titles are not identical, are used in different settings and derive from different sources.[12] Fuller's understanding of the title "the Righteous One" as prophetic rather than messianic is open to question and the probable answer lies in a type of Prophet-Messiah, a synthesis of both offices. We believe that while titles like "the Righteous One", "the Pious One" and combinations including the phrase "Holy One" are not to be excluded from our search, we are cautious about using another title to solve the enigma of an earlier expression. Certainly for Luke as we shall show, the expressions found in the sermons in Acts are able to cast light on the Lucan

use of the title, the Holy One of God, and particularly the way in which he has interpreted the Marcan title. But this is peculiar to Luke, and it is far from being definitive for either Mark or John as Fuller appears to maintain.

G. Vermes[13] has noted the importance of the Elijah/Elisha Epics for an understanding of the miracle tradition in the Synoptic Gospels. Whether the miracles have been consciously modelled upon such Epics is more difficult to determine; clearly Luke 4 has Jesus link his mission with that of Elijah and Elisha both in word (vss 24ff) and in deed (vss 38ff). This suggests that the words of the demon in 34 may be the recognition of Jesus as an eschatological Prophet, (cf I Kings 17:18), remembering that Elisha is called ἄνθρωπος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἅγιος in II Kings 4:9 (LXX). Jesus as the Prophet like Moses is in evidence both in Acts and in the Fourth Gospel. Is ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ to be interpreted as a title for a Prophet like Moses in Luke 4:34 and John 6:69? In order to answer these questions we turn now to an examination of the function of the Prophet as God's Agent.

4:2:1 The Function of the Prophet in the Old Testament

G. von Rad commences his study of the OT Prophets with the warning that there are different kinds of prophets and different kinds of prophecy.[14] As with the High Priest however we are able to make a list of certain key characteristics, which illustrate something of the uniqueness of this office.

(a) The prophet was the messenger of God who brought the "Word" of God to the people. He could speak as the mouthpiece of God.

(b) The prophet was a charismatic figure in as much as he acted under the direction of God's Spirit.

(c) The prophet was given the right to stand in the Council of God, and to hear the secrets of the Council and to convey the decisions of the Council to mankind (rather like a clerk of the court).

(d) The prophets stood in a special relationship to Moses and to the Covenant, and their message was a reminder of the Covenant obligations of the people.

(e) The words of the prophet brought the message of God's judgement and His salvation, and were effective in so far as they initiated these events. The historical realization of the message was the confirmation that the prophet had indeed spoken the "Word of God".

These five characteristics form the OT picture of the נביא and for our purposes, the prophet as the Messenger of the Council of Yahweh provides a most important insight. Jeremiah says of the false prophets, they have not stood in the Council of Yahweh (23:18,22) "to perceive and to hear His Word".

Many of the prophetic oracles are framed within the so-called "Rîb pattern".(15) This is the prophetic lawsuit, combining accusation, defence and judgement as seen for example in Isaiah 1:2,3; 3:13-5; Hosea 4:1-3; 2:4-17 and Psalm 50. The people of Israel are on trial with the Covenant supplying the basic legal structure and Yahweh sitting with His Court as supreme Judge. The pattern is as follows : The prophet reads out the accusation, asks for a defence (without response so the question is rhetorical, and the guilt is obvious) and then there follows the pronouncement of judgement. According to K. Nielsen the Sitz im Leben of the oracle was the New Year Festival.(16)

We have noted that king and priest served the Council of Yahweh and that both were connected in some way with the judgement of Yahweh. Their function however was different from that of the prophet in that the prime task of the prophet was as a messenger of the Word of God, whereas(17) the real task of the king was righteous government and the task of the priest was holy service from within the cult.

As we have already indicated the king and priest occur in forensic settings.(18) The king is the bearer of righteous judgement and it would seem that he operates within the setting of the Divine Council, perhaps operating as one of the judges delegated by the Council. In contrast, the prophet was the messenger of the Council, and the forecaster of judgement, pronouncing the coming judgement and indeed bringing it about by the very act of announcement. The high priest is likewise drawn into the legalities of the judgement of God, particularly in Qumran.

At different times a priest, a king or a prophet might operate as agents of the Divine Council, and as a result their role as the agent of the Council might displace their original functions. The essential function of the three offices was service of Yahweh, and where that service involved judgement or warfare, the priest might become a warrior. Where pronouncement of God's word was concerned the priest or king might become a prophet - which to the Greek reader implied the ability to foretell the future.(19) When we consider the prophecy of Caiaphas (Jn 11:49-52) there are hints of the Jewish belief that the High Priest was believed to have the gift of prophecy.(20) The NT also calls David a prophet, (Acts 2:30). Instances like this demonstrate the need to recognize above the separateness of the Jewish offices, certain settings in which these offices might merge.

One of the most perplexing problems which we have encountered in our study of the different offices particularly as applied to Jesus, is to know when the term "prophet", to quote one example, implies the office of the prophet and when it means just the prophetic function.(21) Clearly king or priest might function as prophet, and yet not belong to the prophetic order. At the risk of oversimplifying the situation we would suggest that there is a distinction between the general term prophet used in the NT implying someone who operated at times like a prophet and was recognized as coming from God; and a specific term which signified the basic OT meaning of a prophetic class. Both kinds of prophets appeared in the pages of the NT and the world of the first century.

In the first book of Maccabees 4:46 we read that during the purification of the Temple, there was some uncertainty about the altar of holocausts which had been profaned. It was decided to pull it down and deposit the stones in a suitable place on the Temple hill "to await the appearance of a prophet who should give a ruling about them" (J.B.). This rather abstract idea of the arising of a prophet in time developed so that in the first century A.D. there were a number of different groups who looked for the advent of a prophet. This hope was found in the Qumran writings, the Samaritan writings,(22) the Rabbinic writings(23) and the NT. Sometimes the expectation was linked with the hope of a

prophet like Moses (Deut 18:18f), and sometimes it was associated with the return of Elijah or one of the other great prophets; at other times it is indefinite as in 1 Maccabees - simply "a prophet".

In Qumran the prophecy in Deuteronomy is actually quoted, in a scroll which has been called the Testimonia Scroll from Cave Four. The messianic promises are cited concerning the king and the priest (Num 24:15-7 and Deut 33:8-11) and these are prefaced by Deut 5:28-9 and 18:18f. The scroll thus appears to be a list of eschatological promises which the Sect held to, including the hope for the Prophet like Moses, a High Priest and the King. The order suggests that the Prophet was to precede the coming of the two Messiahs.(24)

In QS 9:11 three figures are again present. We read (1QS 9:9b-11) :

> "They shall depart from none of the counsels of the Law to walk in the stubbornness of their hearts, but shall be ruled by the primitive precepts in which the men of the community were first instructed until there shall come the prophet and the messiahs of Aaron and of Israel."

This at least is how G. Vermes(25) renders the Hebrew עד בי"א נביא ומשיחי אהרון וישראל which in fact lacks the articles before prophet.

We note that E. Lohse(26) also understands the definite article (der Prophet und die Gesalbten). Strictly speaking the lack of the article before prophet should imply that we render the phrase as in 1 Maccabees - until a prophet shall arise, rather than as the prophet thereby implying some connection with 4Q Testimonia. The phrase בבוא שמירות לבם probably comes from Jeremiah (cf 13:10), but there may be a suggestion of the apostasy of the people at Sinai (cf Deut 9:13ff). There is simply not enough evidence to conclude that the expectation here in 1QS is also for the prophet like Moses.

In 4Qflor 1:11 we read "the Branch of David who shall arise with the Interpreter of the Law (דורש התורה)." It seems reasonable to suggest(27) that the דורש התורה is to be related to the prophet like Moses. At the same time some writers connect the Teacher of Righteousness with the hope for the prophet.(28) In the Damascus Document the reference to the Interpreter (CD 6:7)

might conceivably fit into the general framework of what is known about the Teacher (cf 1QpHab 2), but the reference in 1QS 8:12 is rather less certain. We know very little about the Teacher and his history, or indeed whether there was only one teacher or a whole line of them, bearing the same title.(29) At the most we can say that it is possible that the Interpreter of the Law draws on the figure of the Teacher as well as the hope for a prophet like Moses. In conclusion then, we have only found one definite reference to the prophet like Moses, namely the Testimonia Scroll.

In the Samaritan writings,(30) particularly their version of the Decalogue, we read of the Taheb, a prophet like Moses, who will restore the Kingdom of God in the last days. Unfortunately many of the Samaritan writings are late and may not always reflect earlier traditions. This is just one of the problems involved in the use of these writings, for there is also the question of the correct interpretation of the Taheb: Was he indeed a Prophet-King? Was he to be the ruler of the new Kingdom? It therefore seems wise to do no more than to recognise the fact that the Samaritan ideas are consistent with the expectation found in the NT concerning the Prophet like Moses.

The Rabbinic writings present similar problems of dating and interpretation, but they too must be seen as adding their voice to the varied groups of Jewish and non-Jewish writers who looked for the coming of the prophet who would be like Moses.(31) At times this prophet is fused with the messianic hope: So in Mid Rab Eccl 1:9:1 we find that the second Redeemer (the Messiah) will be like the first (i.e. Moses).(32) There are certainly close parallels to this style of thinking in the NT, such as the sermons in Acts (cf Acts 3:22-6). The Rabbinic writings also testify to the expectation of the coming of Elijah, although there is evidence of some diversity when we come to the actual role which he will fulfil.(33) Similarly the NT testifies to the expectation of the coming of Elijah, and there the role seems to be at least in part affected by the life of John the Baptist.

4:2:2 Jesus as Prophet in the New Testament Tradition

There is very little doubt that one of the most

interesting aspects of the life of Jesus, particularly his mission of healing and preaching, fulfils the OT ideal of the man of God - the prophet. Several writers have drawn attention to the parallels between the life of Jesus and this ideal.(34) A brief examination of the Vox Populi in the Gospels reveals that "Prophet" is a favourite designation for the man from Galilee (Mk 6:15; 8:28). But in Matthew, Luke and John, as also in Acts there is striking evidence for an association of Jesus with the prophet like Moses.(35) Jesus is portrayed as comparing himself to a prophet, when he finds an apathetic response to his ministry in his home environs,(36) and although he may be simply quoting a well known expression the parallel is still there. In the list of possible answers to Jesus' question "Who do men say that I am?", prophetic solutions predominate and there is little reason to doubt the authenticity of these beliefs. They are a vocal testimony to the actual belief of the local people concerning the person of Jesus.

It is the Gospel of Luke which, taking into consideration the Acts of the Apostles, testifies most vividly to the belief that Jesus fulfilled the role and function of a prophet - yet remained as Messiah or perhaps was made Messiah through his death (cf Acts 2:36 and 3:20). In Luke 13:33f when Jesus foretells his own death it is in terms of the death of a prophet. Twice in the sermons found in Acts the Deuteronomic promise is quoted, (3:22f and 7:37). There can be little doubt that these sermons reflect to some extent the theology of Luke,(37) and this is substantiated by the fact that even after the resurrection Jesus is called a prophet in the Third Gospel.(38)

Space does not permit us to make a detailed study of Jesus as either the Prophet like Moses or more generally as a Prophet, whether eschatological or not, but we note the contribution to the subject made by G. Vermes, F.Schnider, W.A.Meeks, R.H.Fuller and J.L.Martyn.(39) In particular one of Fuller's conclusions is worth quoting :

> "Jesus does not identify himself expressis verbis with the eschatological prophet in any of the current forms of Jewish expectation. But he does interpret his mission in terms of eschatological prophecy ... As eschatological prophet he was not merely announcing the future coming of salvation and judgement, but actually

initiating it in his words and works. It is the expressed, implicit figure of the eschatological prophet which gives a unity to all of Jesus' historical activity, his proclamation, his teaching with ἐξουσία ('authority'). his healings and exorcisms, his conduct in eating with the outcast, and finally his death in fulfilment of his prophetic mission. Take the implied self-understanding of his role in terms of eschatological prophet away, and the whole ministry falls into a series of unrelated, if not meaningless fragments." (40)

While recognizing much of what Fuller says as an accurate understanding of the Gospel picture, we nevertheless feel that it is necessary to distinguish between the understanding of Jesus as fulfilling the function of the eschatological prophet, and Jesus' own interpretation of his role in terms of an agent of God - the Son of Man. Moreover the question must be asked whether Jesus saw himself as a Messiah. If we believe, as does Fuller, that the messianic agency is the direct contribution of the Early Church,(41) then naturally the prophetic ideal predominates in any consideration of the self-understanding of Jesus; but if we believe that Jesus saw himself as Messiah, albeit a re-interpreted Messiah, then perhaps the prophetic aspect was only a function of his messianic agency. Taking the (Synoptic) Gospels as they now stand, particularly the Gospel of Luke, we cannot but notice the strong resemblance to the Rabbinic tradition - "like the first redeemer so also the second redeemer". The Messiah is at the same time a fulfilment of the hope for a prophet like Moses.(42)

Another writer who is important for an understanding of Jesus as Prophet is D. Hill, although his presuppositions are quite different from those of Vermes and Fuller, and consequently also his conclusions. Hill acknowledges that,

> "It is true that from the historian's point of view the working concept which guided Jesus in the task of his ministry was that of 'prophet': true also that as far as speech-forms, authority, action and attitude are concerned we can point to many similarities between Jesus and the Old Testament prophets, as well as the charismatics of his day which are sufficient to justify his being called 'a prophet' or 'the prophet' by some of his contemporaries. But this 'prophet' was unique in the sense that his proclamation and activity were confronting men and women with the present

> saving action of God in the midst of history and that his commitment and obedience to God made him the channel of that gracious and saving action." (43)

The testimony to the uniqueness of Jesus' "prophetic" ministry is demonstrated in the very early realization of the inadequacy of this term to encompass the life and teaching of Jesus, in Early Christian Christology. In the best work on Jesus the Prophet available at present F. Schnider concludes,

> "Jesu Anspruch, verglichen mit dem Anspruch der Propheten, kann deshalb nur in analoger Weise prophetisch genannt werden. Jesu Anspruch ist absoluter Art. Jesus ist nicht einer der Propheten, sondern "der Prophet" als der absolute Heilbringer, der alle eschatologischen Erwartungen erfüllt und in radikaler Nähe zum Vater steht." (44)

Jesus as the Son, the agent of God and His Council fulfilled the role of Prophet but also transcended it, because of his uniqueness. The expression of this uniqueness was for the early Church, to be found in the concept of Jesus the Christ, the Son of God.(45)

4:2:3 Exorcism as a Prophetic Function

The setting used by Mark and Luke for the title "the Holy One of God" is that of an exorcism, which raises the possibility that title and context may be connected in some way, so that by understanding the connection one might gain a new insight into the content of the title. Holy War is one possibility, which we have considered, and there are others. For example in Jubilees 48 Moses is depicted as rescuing the children of Israel from Egypt and in the process, assisted by the angel of the Presence (cf 2:1), he "binds" Mastema (the prince of evil).(46) This is just one of the traditions associated with the binding of Satan or his various allies, but it does bring new light onto the Gospel narratives. In the first place, light is shed on Lk 11:20-22 and the enigmatic reference in vs 20 to the "finger of God", which E.E.Ellis correctly identified as a reference to the Exodus.(47) Jesus in his conflict with the demons may be understood as the one who ushers in the New Exodus (cf Jub 48:13 and 50:5).(48) The New Exodus includes the binding of Satan (the strong man of Lk 11:22), which is

anticipated in the exorcisms of Jesus, and also the signs and wonders which Jesus performs (cf Acts 2:22 and 43). Perhaps it provides also a framework in which to understand the authoritative teaching of Jesus.(49) We know that the later rabbinic theology connected Moses and his task (the former redeemer) with the Messiah (the latter redeemer)(50) but the basis for comparison was in terms of the miracles which the Messiah will perform. Nevertheless, there are passages in the Gospels where the figure of the great teacher, casts a Mosaic shadow.(51)

In so far as Moses might be viewed as a prophet, indeed the greatest of the prophets (Deut 34:10), the ushering in of the New Exodus might be conceived of as a prophetic task, including even the act of binding Satan. But the act of exorcism is not in itself a prophetic act and in the first Christian Century, exorcism was ascribed to a number of OT characters from Abraham (IQGen.Apoc.20:28f) to Solomon (Josephus, Antiquities 8:46). On this account we are not justified in describing the title, the Holy One of God, as prophetic simply because Jesus is engaged here in an exorcism. If it was some other miracle with prophetic parallels it would be a different matter, but as far as we can determine, exorcism itself was not connected with a person claiming to be a prophet. (Moses' role in Jub.48 is not that of an exorcist). We need to examine the context of the incident in Mark and Luke in order to decide whether the title, in its present context, means that Jesus is a prophet.

4:2:4 The Marcan Redaction

As we study the passage in Mk 1:21-9, we are able to detect signs of the way in which the Evangelist has tailored this story to fit in with the overall purpose and design of the Gospel.(52) We will attempt to discover what changes Mark affected upon this passage, but at the same time try to understand the passage in its present context. For example, we read that the demons know who Jesus is (Mk 1:34), which in the present context means that they know Jesus as Son of God and Messiah. The cry of the demon in 1:24 must then be related to this knowledge and the title found there extended accordingly to include these two ideas, even if they were not already implicit in the title. On this basis we

concluded, in a previous chapter, that the Holy One of God was messianic in Mark and a synthesis of prophet and Messiah in Luke.(53) Then we note that in Mk 1:14f, Jesus' mission is outlined as the proclamation of the Kingdom, which suggests that his arrival in the Synagogue may be understood as the advent of the Herald of the Kingdom (an idea more fully developed in Luke), who is the bearer of the Spirit (cf 1:10 and 11QMelch.16). Accordingly, the demon reacts both to Jesus' eschatological function and to his charismatic, or more correctly, pneumatic nature. In its present setting the Holy One of God responds to Jesus as the Messiah and his role as the bearer of God's Spirit, but what about the pre-Marcan setting? Are we able to penetrate beneath the surface of the Gospel and uncover the "original" intention of the title?

Our examination shows traces of a deliberate structuring of the episode in the synagogue. One of the key themes in the first three chapters of the Gospel is that of the authority of Jesus, particularly as a teacher.(54) The exorcism itself is neatly framed between two verses which deal with the teaching of Jesus, namely vss 22 and 27, and the whole episode in the synagogue is introduced by vs 21 which mentions Jesus' intention - he entered the synagogue on the sabbath and <u>he taught</u>. Later in vs 39, Jesus' role as exorcist is linked with his mission of preaching in the synagogues. Moreover, the disciples are sent to preach and to have authority over demons (3:14f). Mark creates a balance in his presentation between the miracles of Jesus and his role as exorcist on the one hand, and the preaching of Jesus on the other. To put this another way, he sets on one side the sense of wonder associated with supernatural events and on the other the more formal understanding of Jesus as the messenger of God, who preaches the word of God. Mark's intention is clear. He wishes to divert attention from the miraculous (in this case the exorcism) to Jesus' authority as a teacher, to play down the former in the interests of the latter. A study of the traditions surrounding the Jewish miracle worker, Hanina ben Dosa, show a similar trend and is therefore useful for comparative purposes.(55)

Hanina ben Dosa lived in the first century AD and was

renowned for his miracles.(56) He is described as a "Man of Deeds" (אי'ש מעשה) on account of his wonderful works (M.Sot. 9:15 and T.Sot.15:5). If S.Freyne is correct in his analysis of the tradition, and there seems little reason to doubt that this is so, the earliest stratum of the tradition concerns Hanina as a Galilean of humble stock (perhaps an עם־הארץ), who shows himself to be a charismatic healer and rain-maker.(57)

> "The world of the Hanina stories has a rural and peasant ring about it - inquisitive or incredulous neighbours, need for rain and sun with the changing seasons, trespassing goats and wandering donkeys and hens."

At some stage in the tradition Hanina was connected with the northern prophet Elijah - the types of miracles recorded point in this direction - although it is explicit only in the later references (cf B.T.Ta'an 24b).(58)

There is some question about whether Hanina was a Hasid, with references in favour of such a connection and M.Sot.9:15 which explicitly differentiates Hanina as a "man of deed", from the hasidim. Freyne offers a reasonable solution. Following D. Berman he defines a hasid as "the ideal of the active life, distinguished by his radicalism, spiritual fervour and zeal for the law".(59) The description of Hanina as a Hasid suggests, for Freyne, an attempt to "link his miracle-working activity with other acceptable aspects of Jewish piety",(60) and "to smooth out the tensions... in the earlier strata of the miracle stories between country charismatic and temple officials".(61) Later Hanina is described as "a man of truth" (Mek.R.Ishmael Ex 18:21) and particularly in the Palestinian Talmud his piety and obedience to rabbinic halakhah are underscored.(62) A definite trend appears, particularly after Jamnia, to bring Hanina into line with the respectable class of Hasidim and to separate him from the other miracle-workers of Galilee. He recites the Tefillah in the process of performing a miracle (T.Ber.3:20), he is a Rabbi and some of his teaching remains(63) yet beneath this picture we glimpse a rather unorthodox character, who used "free prayer", kept goats (a forbidden activity cf M.Dem.2:3), and whose teaching needed the correcting influence of the

sages of Jamnia.(64)

The movement from the charismatic miracle worker to the respectable Hasid is paralleled in part in the traditions surrounding Honi, the Circle Drawer, and there are other examples.(65) The traditions which surrounded Jesus followed a similar course and the pericope in Mark 1, which is our immediate concern, is a case in point. Mark diverts attention from the act of exorcism to the "confession" (for that is the purpose it serves) of the demon possessed man. There are no magic phrases or acts performed by Jesus, just the command to silence (φιμώθητι). The dialogue is cryptic and quite different from Hanina's conversation with Agrath, princess of demons (in BT Pes.112b), or the normal form of exorcism depicted in the magical papyri. The demon leaves the man and the focus returns to the picture of Jesus the authoritative teacher in the synagogue. The geographical location is not fortuitous (cf 1:39). Mark is making a theological point, Jesus is not a wandering miracle-worker, but a great teacher - a teacher whose authority exceeds even that of the scribes and pharisees. His miracles take place in the synagogue which clearly shows that he stands within the Jewish tradition. The people acclaim him as a teacher and not as a magician. This supplies one reason for Mark's redactional activity, and is probably one reason why the traditions surrounding Honi and Hanina were transformed. It is not that the idea of miracle is unacceptable in itself, but that "behind the figure of the miracle-worker lurks the sinister presence of the magician and no self-respecting community or group could officially accept the burden of such an image, even if there are many examples of popular accommodation in both traditions".(66) The rabbinic tradition of Jesus as a magician shows how real was the danger which Mark sought to avoid.(67)

After the performance of the exorcism, the onlookers comment, Τί ἐστιν τοῦτο : διδαχὴ καινὴ κατ' ἐξουσίαν κτλ. (Mk 1:27) It is not clear how we should punctuate this remark. There are two alternatives:

(a) What is this? A new teaching! With authority he commands even the unclean spirits, and they obey him (R.S.V.)

(b) What is this? A new teaching with authority!
Even (καὶ) the unclean spirits he commands
and they obey him.

It is unlikely that, even if we follow the second reading, Mark intended a separation between the authoritative teaching (cf vs 22) and the act of exorcism. The particle καί should be rendered "even" as an indication of the sense of continuity between the teaching of Jesus and his act of exorcism. The herald of the Kingdom proclaims the imminence of the Kingdom in word and deed. What Mark describes as authoritative teaching incorporates the exorcism as a vivid illustration of this teaching and vss 22 and 27 serve to reinforce the link.

If we remove the Marcan framework (particularly vss 22 and 27) we are left with what in all likelihood is the original setting for "the Holy One of God", namely an exorcism where Jesus resembles miracle-workers like Hanina or Honi or Apollonius of Tyana. Vermes describes this group as charismatics(68) and he regards the figure of Elijah as providing the necessary prototype for the lives and activities of the group.(69) Freyne questions whether such a charismatic type actually existed and we need to take care not to fall into the same trap as R. Bultmann did, with his myth of the Gnostic Redeemer.(70) We also need to distinguish between miracle-workers and Hasidim,(71) although the two might be fused in one person like Hanina. The pre-Marcan level is best understood in the context of Jewish wonder-workers, and the title "Holy One of God" probably relates to that context as a general title for such a figure. If a class of charismatics was recognised at that time, then it describes Jesus the Charismatic. If this class was connected with Elijah (or Elisha) then we might consider the title as the equivalent of titles like "Holy Man of God" (used of Elisha in I King 4:9) and "Man of God" (used of Elijah in I King 17:18). We do well to note however that Hanina explicitly rejected the title of prophet in the words of Amos 7:14.(72) With some reluctance we suggest that even in the pre-Marcan stratum, the title was not necessarily a prophetic title and is better understood as the title for a worker of miracles.

If the synagogue context is part of the pre-Marcan unit then one might go further and suggest that some sense of the Hasidic figure might also be present! We shall return to this idea later in this work.(73)

We conclude then that Mark took over an early tradition of Jesus as an exorcist and incorporated this within the context of the teaching ministry of Jesus and his conflict with Satan (cf 1:13 and 3:22-27) as the anointed one - the Messiah and the Herald of the Kingdom. This effectively protected Jesus from the possible accusation that he was a magician. In consequence the title, "the Holy One of God", in its present place in the Gospel is coloured by its new context and to some extent is overshadowed by the title "Son of the Most High God", used by the demons in Mk 5:7. We find no evidence to suggest that "the Holy One of God" is a prophetic title as it now stands. Indeed, in the Gospel, John the Baptist is the prophet (cf 11:32) and Mark's handling of the confession of Peter, over against the opinions of the crowd (8:28 which repeats 6:14f), suggests that he is critical of the connection between Jesus and the prophets. This is brought out by the juxtaposition of the two questions: "Who do men say that I am?" and "Who do you say that I am?", with the second question introduced by the emphatic Καί . So in neither the pre-Marcan level nor in the Gospel as it now stands is there sufficient evidence to support the theory that the Holy One of God is a prophetic title. In Luke, however, a different situation prevails.

4:2:5 The Scene in the Synagogue According to Luke

The fourth chapter of Luke is filled with the sense of the pneumatic nature of Jesus - three times we read that he is endowed with the Holy Spirit (vss 1, 14, 18). Jesus "full of the Holy Spirit returned from the Jordan"; was "led by the Spirit for forty days in the wilderness, tempted by the devil" (vss 1 and 2); he returns to Galilee "in the power of the Spirit" (vs 14); and when he reads from Isaiah, it is from chapter 61:1-2; "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me because he has anoînted me to preach the good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty

those who are oppressed, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord" (Lk 4:18f). Luke makes two points - Jesus is the one filled with the spirit and therefore the anointed one whose task is to preach, to proclaim, to set at liberty and to bring healing.

Thus Luke maps out the future ministry of Jesus and he is not long in bringing forward examples of Jesus' proclamation, preaching and setting free (cf 4:31-44). In the synagogue Jesus elaborates on the passage he has just read and at the same time issues a sharp rebuke against the faithlessness of the people of Nazareth, in anticipation of their rejection of him (cf vss 23-7). The people have heard of Jesus' works in Capernaum (cf 4:14f and 4:31ff), but in emulation of the fathers they display a lack of faith. Jesus can do no mighty works "in his own country". One further result of this lack of faith is that it allows Jesus to compare himself to Elijah and Elisha (vss 25-7), whose ministry carried them over the borders of Israel into the gentile world as Luke makes clear. Jesus, like these venerable prophets, is sent to proclaim a message not only to the Jews (his own people in Nazareth), but also to the Gentiles - a message, which to gauge from the book of the Acts, is very close to Luke's heart. The reaction of the people to Jesus' words only acts to reinforce what Jesus has said. "They rose up and put him out of the city, and led him to the brow of the hill on which their city was built, that they might throw him down headlong". We are reminded of the verse in Acts 7:52 when Stephen asks, "Which of the prophets did not your fathers persecute?", and his condemnation in verse 51 "You stiff-necked people, uncircumcised in heart and ears, you always resist the Holy Spirit. As your fathers did, so do you." The theme of persecution of the prophets is also found in Lk 11:45-52, with the sense of judgement on "this generation" (vs 51) in anticipation of the death of Jesus, (cf 23:18-25 where the innocence of Jesus is sharply contrasted with the guilt of Barabbas).

Finally when Jesus speaks of his own death (13:31-5) he utters the words "it cannot be that a prophet should perish away from Jerusalem". Like chapter 4:24, this verse sounds rather like a proverbial expression - a well known idiom. However, within the framework that Luke has devised, the

idioms become prophecies of the suffering of Jesus and the antipathy of the Jews. From his baptism to his death, Jesus' mission is conceived of in terms of the prophetic ideal[74] and indeed when we consider the use of the terms εὐαγγελίσασθαι and κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν found in Luke 4:18f we find that through the Gospel Jesus is true to this outline of his task:

He proclaims the message of God by preaching in
Galilee and Judaea;
He heals those who are blind or afflicted in
other ways, and
He sets free those who are held captive by the
evil spirits.

Already in the same chapter (ch 4) we see evidence of this pattern: Jesus is anointed with the Holy Spirit (3:22 cf 4:1), and in Capernaum he teaches the people (4:31) with authority. He sets free the demon possessed man (vss 33-5) and again the people are amazed at his authority and his power (vs 36), a significant change in emphasis from the Marcan version, (from "new teaching" to authoritative and powerful commands). While Mark has tended to underplay the miraculous, Luke re-emphasizes the sense of the "power" of Jesus. While Mark sets the scene generally within a teaching framework, Luke sets it within the framework of the charismatic expression of the prophetic mission of Jesus.

An examination of the "holy servant", if that is the correct rendering of τὸν ἅγιον παῖδα (Acts 4:27 and 30), at this stage is important. We find that Luke has incorporated an earlier tradition for his sermons in Acts - the tradition of Jesus as the eschatological prophet and one which we have already encountered in the Gospel. In Acts, Luke links this tradition with the promise in Deut 18:15ff, (or perhaps it was already linked), to present Jesus as the prophet like Moses (cf Acts 3:22ff and 7:37). A study of the tradition of Moses, or the prophet like Moses, reveals two key phrases. The first of these phrases is "signs and wonders" which in the LXX is rendered τὰ σημεῖα καὶ τὰ τέρατα (MT את אותת ואת מופתים) and usually occurs in some context related to the Exodus events. The apocalyptic literature shows a similar tendency (cf Jub 48:12), so that

we are justified in suggesting that this phrase is a regular feature of the Mosaic tradition and has been carried over into the tradition of the New Exodus. In Acts the phrase τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα is used of Jesus (2:22) and of Moses (7:36). For Luke it bears the technical sense of Jesus as the prophet like Moses but he uses the phrase also of the actions of the apostles (cf 5:12, 8:13 and 14:3).(75) In the Gospel the expression is not used, which means that Luke has omitted the reference to "false christs" in Mk 13:22 (Matt 24:24). The Gospel does not present Jesus as the Prophet like Moses as obviously as does Acts, but there are several pointers towards this understanding, like Luke 11:20 (discussed above),(76) and the transfiguration. The mention of the transfiguration brings us to the second phrase αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε used at the transfiguration and harking back directly to Deut 18:15, (cf Acts 3:22). The command is common to Matthew and Mark, but Luke adds the title ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος (which is similar to the title he uses in the crucifixion scene, namely ὁ ἐκλεκτός Lk 23:35). If the term ὁ υἱός should be read as ὁ παῖς, as J. Jeremias suggests,(77) then the words as recorded in Luke point back to Is 42:1 where ὁ παῖς and ὁ ἐκλεκτός are found in parallel. The title παῖς is used of Jesus 4 times in Acts (3:13,26; 4:27,30), and appears twice with the adjective ἅγιος to form the composite title ὁ ἅγιος παῖς, (4:27,30). An investigation of the background to the title παῖς suggests that it was a title of honour applied to eminent men of God during the time of the NT. Luke uses it of David (4:25) and in Wisdom 10:16 we find it applied to Moses:(78) "she inspired a servant of the Lord, and with his signs and wonders he defied formidable kings". It is no surprise then, to find that Luke uses παῖς of Jesus in connection with signs and wonders; "while thou stretchest out thy hand to heal, and signs and wonders are performed through the name of thy holy servant Jesus" (4:30). In the title ὁ παῖς or ὁ ἅγιος παῖς we find both the sense of Jesus' Messiahship and the sense of his prophetic role as the prophet like Moses.(79) The title, the Holy One of God, likewise represents this

synthesis of Messiah and prophet. However, the prophetic component is not necessarily derived from the Mosaic tradition, since the immediate context of ch 6 is concerned with the epics of Elijah and Elisha.(80)

(i) The anointing of the Spirit and the underlining of Jesus' charismatic nature are intended to connect him with the prophetic tradition.

(ii) The comparison with Elijah and Elisha clearly links Jesus with their work particularly in view of the gentile mission so close to Luke's heart.

(iii) The miracles which follow are not unlike the type of miracles performed by Elijah and Elisha, particularly vss 38-40 and the cure of Simon's mother-in-law.

If We include chapter 5 we find mention of the healing of a leper which reminds us of 4:27 - the reference to Naaman. Then in 7:11-7 Jesus goes to Nain where he raises a widow's son in apparent emulation of the miracle performed by Elijah (I Kings 17:17-24). This miracle is peculiar to Luke and our attention is immediately drawn to the exclamation of the people (vs 16) "A great prophet has appeared among us!" They said: "God has come to save his people".

It is difficult to be precise about the sources which Luke incorporated within his Gospel and the Book of the Acts, and how he altered them within his writings, but it is clear that one of the motifs with which he was familiar was the idea of Jesus as Prophet - whether like Moses or Elijah or both. It is likely that both traditions derive from his Christian tradition rather than his own thinking, but the way in which he presents Jesus' fulfilment of these offices is clearly Lucan. The fact that Luke presents Jesus as the Holy One (Luke 4) and the Holy Servant (Acts 4) in settings which may be described as prophetic, suggest that for Luke the titles point to the prophetic nature of Jesus. <u>In other words both of these titles carried for Luke a sense of the prophetic personality of Jesus, who is both the holy servant like Moses and the holy worker of miracles like Elijah and Elisha</u>. By stressing the prophetic aspect of Jesus' mission Luke was not unfaithful to the evidence yet he clearly separated Jesus from certain types of miracle workers, and were

the evidence more abundant we might conclude that in particular he separated Jesus from the Θεῖος Ἀνήρ or hellenistic Divine Man. We do not know in what form or frequency such figures were found during the NT time, nor the extent to which Mark's portrait of Jesus was so influenced. The fact that some modern writers find the Θεῖος Ἀνήρ tradition in Mark, shows how real was the danger of the misunderstanding of Jesus' divinity.(81) To protect the presentation of Jesus and to prevent the misunderstanding of either ὁ ἅγιος τ. Θ. or ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ Luke brings the titles within the OT tradition of prophet and messiah.

In conclusion then, we suggest that ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ was employed by Luke within the immediate context of the prophetic role of Jesus, parallel to the miracle traditions of Elijah and Elisha: Secondly and in a wider context, since the messianic role of Jesus overshadows all the titles in Luke, so ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ must also be messianic. It is therefore a title like ὁ Χριστος (Acts 2:27) and ὁ ἅγιος παῖς (Acts 4:27) which have been drawn out of their original settings to serve as pointers to Jesus as the Prophet-Messiah.

4:3 The Prophet and the Holy One in John

On no less than five occasions in the Fourth Gospel, Jesus is called ὁ προφήτης (Jn 4:19; 6:14; 7:40,52 and 9:17). The presence of the article distinguishes this usage from the Synoptic use, where Jesus is usually likened to "a prophet". T.F.Glasson(82) pointed out the importance of Deut 18:15-22 for the correct interpretation of the Johannine usage, and his conclusions have been carried forward by W. Meeks.(83) Meeks points in particular to chapter 7 (cf vss 14:24) as a debate centred upon Jesus as the prophet like Moses.(84) If Meek's interpretation of this passage is accurate, and we have no reason to doubt this,(85) then Jesus is seen to be judged by the test, cited along with the promise of the mosaic prophet in Deuteronomy (cf vss 20-22), pertaining to the veracity of his words:

> "When a prophet speaks in the name of the Lord,
> if the word does not come to pass or come true,

> that is a word which the Lord has not spoken; the prophet has spoken it presumptiously, you need not fear him." (18:22).

In John 7:16f Jesus says,

> "So Jesus answered them, 'My teaching is not mine, but His who sent me; if any man's will is to do His will, he shall know whether the teaching is from God or whether I am speaking on my own authority.' "

and then in 18c adds,

> "but he who seeks the glory of Him who sent him is true, and in him there is no falsehood."

Jesus is accordingly the true prophet like Moses, his word is true and not false because it derives from God himself, the One who sent Moses and now sends Jesus.

4:3:1 Jesus and Elijah and Elisha

In the opening chapter of the Fourth Gospel, two important events take place. John the Baptist appears as a witness to Jesus and Jesus is recognised by some of John's disciples as the Messiah (1:41). John not only confesses Jesus as "Son of God" (1:34) and "Lamb of God" (1:29,36), he also categorically denies that he is either the Messiah (1:20 - note the three verbs employed in this verse), Elijah (1:21), or the Prophet (1:21). Now it is not difficult to understand why the titles "Messiah" and "the Prophet" are reserved for Jesus, but why does the Baptist deny that he is Elijah, given the tradition found in Matt 17:13? One answer, commonly found, is that the three-fold denial of John is part of a polemic aimed against a group of John the Baptist supporters, whose claims for John rivalled the Christian claims for Jesus.(86) Verse 20 certainly suggests that the writer of the Gospel wishes to counter any opinion which linked the Baptist with the messianic office, but what was so objectionable about the title "Elijah"? If it is not part of a polemic, then perhaps we are dealing here with an authentic denial - John did not know he was Elijah, or that Jesus would connect him with that figure.(87) Or perhaps the denial is part of the dramatic presentation of the Gospel. By reducing John to "a voice in the wilderness" the Evangelist precludes the

possibility that Jesus might be upstaged by John. As little more than a disembodied voice, John bears witness to the real hero of the drama. The final possibility, and the one most to our liking, is that the Evangelist was motivated by a combination of the possibilities we have listed.

We know that Jesus is presented in the Gospel as the Messiah and the Prophet like Moses (6:14), but is he also the Prophet like Elijah, given the existence of that tradition in Luke?(88) G.W.Buchanan points out a number of possible parallels between the Signs in the Fourth Gospel and the epics of Elijah and Elisha.(89) Unfortunately not all of the parallels are equally convincing. In his comparison of the Wedding at Cana (Jn 2:1-11) with I Kings 17:10-16 (incorrectly cited by Buchanan as 17:1-6) and II Kings 4:1-7, he draws attention to the request in II Kings 4:2 and Jn 2:4. We find no real parallel there, although in the actual miracles a parallel does exist in the sheer abundance of the provision. Further examples, cited by Buchanan, include a comparison of the healing of the son of an official (Jn 4:46-54) with the curing of Naaman (II Kings 5:1-14); and the most promising of all - the feeding of the 5000 (Jn 6:1-14) with Elisha's feeding of the sons of the prophets (II Kings 4:42-44). Since the feeding also exists in the Synoptic tradition, we need to ask whether John shows any connection with the Elisha event which is not paralleled in the Synoptics. The command of Elisha (vs 43 δὸς τῷ λαῷ καὶ ἐσθιέτωσαν) is closer to the Synoptic tradition (Mk 6:37 Δότε αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν) than to the words of Jesus in John (6:5 Πόθεν ἀγοράσωμεν ἄρτους ἵνα φάγωσιν οὗτοι), but only John uses the term κρίθινος (vs 9) found also in II Kings 4:42.(90) Unfortunately the term is too common and the other parallels, adduced by Buchanan, too slight for a convincing case in support of John's use of the Elijah/Elisha traditions.

J.L.Martyn suggests that John inherited a tradition in which the Elijah traits and the Mosaic traits had already been synthesized.(91) Obviously there were a number of expectations current during the First Century, some of which may have been reminiscent of Elijah (or Elisha) and others of Moses, while others defied any attempt to place them into such sharp categories, retaining either a completely general sense

of one sent by God, or representing a synthesis of the various expectations. The Gospel, rather than comparing Jesus to the traditional figures of Judaism, tends instead to contrast Jesus with them. Thus F. Schnider writes :

> "Jesus steht damit über Abraham und den Propheten: in der eigenen Kraft des Lebens, in der Vermittlung des Lebens, und in Bezug auf die Offenbarung. Er ist also 'grösser' (Joh 8:53) als die Gestalten der Heilsgeschichte Israels." (92)

While Jesus' works may be reminiscent of the ancient prophets, his authority and claims far surpass those of the prophets. He both fulfils and radically transcends the OT expectations (cf 5:46). Therefore we consider the attempt to discern Elijah-like traits in the Johannine Jesus to be doomed to failure. Moreover, in the light of the Gospel as it now stands, the general presentation of Jesus militates against a simple prophetic solution for Jn 6:69.

4:3:2 Jesus and Moses

Unlike Elijah, Moses plays a key role in the Fourth Gospel, appearing by name no less than eleven times.(93) Particularly in ch 6, Exodus motifs come to the fore,(94) and there may well be a connection between Peter's affirmation, "Lord to whom shall we go? You have words of eternal life" and Deut 18:18b καὶ δώσω τὰ ῥήματα ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ, καὶ λαλήσει αὐτοῖς ... (95)

If this connection is justified, then the way is open to interpret the next verse within the same tradition, so that the Holy One is none other than the Prophet like Moses. On the other hand, if Peter's affirmation in vs 68 implies a contrast with the prophetic and particularly the Mosaic tradition, then it is highly unlikely that the Holy One of God is a prophetic title, at least in its present setting.

The main question, then, concerns the relation between Jesus and Moses as portrayed in the Gospel. Is the figure of Jesus modelled upon the figure of Moses, or is there evidence of a move to play down the connection? We believe that the Evangelist has made use of traditions linking Jesus and Moses, but has used them critically so as to enhance the status of Jesus at the expense of the status of Moses. A study of the Gospel makes this clear.

Certain passages in the Gospel suggest a link between Jesus and the Prophet like Moses. Schnackenburg mentions four such passages, namely 5:46, 6:14 and 7:40,52.(96) Only 6:14 and 7:40 make the connection explicit, in so far as they present the confession of Jesus as "the Prophet". The presence of the article strongly suggests the tradition found in Deut 18:15-18. In both 6:14 and 7:40, however, the confession is made by the crowd, and may be contrasted, therefore, with the confessions of the disciples and John the Baptist, which are the normative confessions in John (cf 20:31). M. de Jonge writes,"(the confessions of the crowds) are the statements of people who are just beginning to believe" and are "in need of further interpretation on the basis of deeper insight into Jesus' true function and being, but are yet accepted by the evangelist as first and promising steps on the road towards a full understanding".(97)

W.A.Meeks(98) ascribed the prophetic themes in John to the picture of Moses as a Prophet-King, meaning that John uses a synthesis of Prophet and King drawn from the Mosaic traditions - the basic idea being a prophet who functions also as a king. Some passages in John do suggest a connection between the two offices. For example, both instances of the confession of Jesus as Prophet are linked with Jesus' role as Messiah or King. In 6:15 the people try to force Jesus to become king, and in 7:41, some of the crowd confess Jesus as Messiah. But in our view this does not necessarily imply that John, like Luke, has in mind a synthesis of Prophet and King.(99) This is most clearly expressed by F. Schnider who writes,

> "Jesus ist auch nach Joh 6:24 der eschatologische Prophet, der Verheissung von Dtn 18:15 zur Erfüllung bringt. Aber Jesu Anspruch, der eschatologische Heilbringer zu sein, wird nach Joh 6:15 vom Volk in einem irdisch-politischen Sinn verstanden." (100)

In seeking to express their belief in Jesus as the Prophet like Moses, the people are moved to the nearest political avenue available, that of acclaiming Jesus as their King. There are in fact the equivalent of two confessions here and the people correctly identify Jesus as Prophet and King. But, in misunderstanding the implications of these offices, they fail to come to faith in Jesus. Parallels exist

between this incident and the Marcan version of Peter's confession,[101] in which Peter unwittingly attempts to force Jesus into the mould of his own political hopes and ideology. The selfsame movement from Prophet to Messiah or King, to political misunderstanding of Jesus' role is evident. As with Peter so with the crowds: the confession is right but the interpretation is faulty and in John 6:14f the way is open to an abortive attempt to make Jesus king.

There is a tension between Jesus who is the Prophet and Jesus who is quite obviously greater than Moses by virtue of his unique authority as the Son of God. In the context of the Gospel, the Evangelist can brook no rival to the unique status of Jesus. John denies the Moses typology any dogmatic force, mainly through his polemic against the Jewish claims for Moses. We read in Jn 3:13 "No man has ascended into heaven" which strikes at the roots of those claims concerning the ascent into heaven by Moses and Elijah, treasured by the Jews of the time and probably basic to the transfiguration account in the Synoptic Gospels. In Jn 6:46 "No man has seen God" likewise denies the claims surrounding Moses and his encounter with God on Mt Sinai, and gives us an insight into the way in which the Johannine community countered the Jewish arguments in the last few decades of the First Century.

In Jn 5:46, Jesus declares that Moses wrote about him. Schnackenburg understands this verse as a "probable" reference back to Deut 18:15, 18.[102] This may be so, but we do well to remember John's distinctive use of the OT,[103] preferring to refer to the Scriptures generally (cf 1:45) and only infrequently quoting specific passages (e.g. 10:34, 12:15 and 19:36). One reason is the belief held by John and explicit in 5:39, that Scripture testifies to Jesus. It is no surprise to find that Schnackenburg offers, as an alternative suggestion, that "the reference may be to all the writings of Moses (the Pentateuch)",[104] particularly in the light of 5:47. Given the general nature of the references in both vss 39 and 47 (and in spite of W.A.Meeks views to the contrary)[105] we suggest that the phrase Moses "wrote of me" means no more and no less than that, like John the Baptist (5:33), Jesus' works (5:36), his Father (5:37) and the Scriptures (5:39), <u>Moses is a witness to Jesus</u> and therefore the accuser of the unbelieving Jews (5:45). <u>The precise nature of Moses'</u>

testimony is not at issue.

The fourth reference mentioned by Schnackenburg(106) is 7:52. For support he refers mainly to P66 which reads the article before the term Prophet.(107) The reading of the article makes good sense, particularly in view of 7:40, but for just that reason B. Lindars argues for a case of assimilation.(108) The contention in 7:52 (like 7:41) is not about the origin of figures like the Messiah or the Prophet (if that is the correct reading), but about Jesus' claims to these titles, given his origin in a little town in Galilee. Schnackenburg(109) rightly draws our attention to the interaction between the Johannine and the Jewish communities as the true setting for the debate. Part of the debate concerned the relation between Jesus and Moses and so if we do not adopt the reading of P66 for 7:52 perhaps we should understand the article. Nicodemus in ch 3 confesses Jesus as "a teacher come from God" which De Jonge(110) understands as a veiled reference to the Prophet like Moses. Certainly Moses does figure in the discourse which follows and the form of the comparison in vs 14 (just as...so) suggests a formula(111) comparable to the Rabbinic tradition of the Messiah and Prophet mentioned above. Leaving 7:52 aside, we have sufficient evidence in 6:14 and 7:40 to show that the Fourth Evangelist not only knew of a connection between Jesus and the Prophet like Moses, he also considered this to be a step in the direction of true faith.

Thus in ch 9, a blind man, when cured, registers his faith in Jesus as a prophet (9:17), is expelled from the Synagogue presumably for believing Jesus to be the Messiah of God (cf 9:22 and 9:33f), and finally finds Jesus to worship him as the Son of Man (9:35ff). In ch 6 there is a similar movement from Prophet (6:14) to King (6:15) to Son of Man (6:27). In both chapters the progression culminates in a response of faith in Jesus (6:68f and 9:38). W.A.Meeks is therefore wrong when he suggests that prophet and king are "ordering themes" (112) in John. They are not. The ordering theme is the Sonship of Jesus and the key titles are Son of God and Son of Man, which define other titles like Messiah and Prophet. Meeks(113) is also wrong when he suggests that kingship in John "is being redefined

in terms of the mission of the prophet". If anything, the Prophet is redefined in terms of the messianic status of Jesus so that the signs performed by him lead to faith not in Jesus as the Prophet, but as the Messiah and Son of God, (20:30f).(114)

The role of Moses in the Gospel is best understood, as we suggested, as the result of the Evangelist inheriting a tradition linking Jesus and Moses and using parts of this same tradition to prove the superiority of Jesus over Moses. The Gospel preserves some of the most accurate portrayals of Jewish belief to be found in the NT concerning Moses. So we read :

John 1:17 For the Law was given by Moses...
7:19 Did not Moses give you the Law...?
7:22 Moses therefore gave unto you circumcision...
7:23 ...that the Law of Moses may not be broken (through circumcision being performed even on the Sabbath).
9:28 We are the disciples of Moses.
9:29 We know that God spoke to Moses.

These are just the claims we might expect the Jews of the time to make. Moses is the mediator of the Law, the one with whom God communed. At the same time there is a consistent defence of Jesus' claim to be the agent of God par excellence. "The Law was given through Moses, grace and truth came through Jesus Christ"(1:17). Moses gave the Law to Israel, but they have failed to obey its commands (7:19). He will be their accuser for he has written about Jesus and the Jews have not believed his writings (5:45). In the forensic setting of the Gospel(115) Jesus is on trial, but when the Jews call on Moses to support the case for the prosecution, they find that he is a witness in Jesus' defence, and his testimony is crucial to the final verdict. Not Jesus, but the world is found guilty and Jesus is revealed as judge (Jn 5:22-4). The very ammunition of the Jews is turned against them, when they find their own Law cited against them in favour of Jesus (1:45 and 5:46). If the Jews really were disciples of Moses (9:28), and believed his writings, they would as a consequence come to belief in Jesus, just as the disciples of John the Baptist became the followers of

Jesus (1:35-42). True witness leads to true faith. To reject Jesus is to reject the true witness of the Scriptures for Scripture may not be broken (7:23 and 10:35).

4:3:3 The Prophet and the Holy One in Jn 6

The important issue in ch 6 is not the question of Jesus as the True Prophet (as in 7:14-24 or 9:29f), nor Jesus as Messiah, but Jesus as the Bread of Life and it is this theme which demands our attention. Schnider accurately draws attention to this :

> "Die wunderbare Speisung ist nicht einfach Ausdruck von der grenzenlosen Wunderkraft 'des Propheten' (Joh 6:26), sondern ein Zeichen für wahre vom Vater geschenkte Brot des Lebens, das Jesus selber ist (Joh 6:32-35)." (116)

Likewise the healing of the blind man is not recorded to present Jesus as the true Prophet but to show that Jesus is the Light of the World, (8:12 cf 9:39-41) who reveals the Judgement of God. In ch 9 as the ultimate object of faith for the blind man we find Jesus as the Son of Man rather than Prophet or Messiah. So with ch 6 the presentation is such that the reader is pointed by means of the misunderstandings of the crowd to the picture of Jesus as Son of Man and Bread of Life. The Confession of Peter should be distinguished from the confessions of the crowd, just as the confession of the believer ought to be distinguished from that of the non-believer.

So when we consider 6:69 we become aware that it follows a confession of Jesus as the Prophet which led to a misunderstanding of Jesus' role as King. It is at least unlikely that Peter's confession on behalf of the other disciples should simply repeat that of the crowd. Indeed a prophetic understanding of 6:69 would make nonsense of the theology of ch 6. Is Peter no more enlightened than the crowd? We should understand ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ as something more than the confession of the crowd, something more than the confession of Jesus as either the Prophet or a King. Is the difference to be found in the manner of the confession? The crowd expressed their confession in an attempt to make Jesus king; Peter recognises Jesus as the One who has the words of life. We remember that Meeks[117] connected "the words" of Jesus with the passage in

Deut 18:18b. However now "the words of life" are not used in a prophetic sense in John. Jesus' "words" may be compared with the writings of Moses (cf 5:46), but as the one who has the "words of life" Jesus bears an authority which goes far beyond that of a Prophet even a Prophet like Moses.

Moreover it would be very curious that John, if he wanted to have Peter confess Jesus as Prophet, should not simply make use of that title. He has shown no reluctance to use it before. The misunderstanding of 6:14f as we have seen does not negate the applicability of the title since chs 7 and 9 return to the question of Jesus as the Prophet who comes from God, and John is concerned to demonstrate that Jesus does fulfil this role. But Jesus also exceeds this role and ch 6:26f has Jesus make use of the Son of Man as the corrective against the misunderstanding (cf 6:26 which stresses the 'earthly' overtones implicit in the crowd's reactions). At the end of the discourse some disciples are scandalized by the words of Jesus (vs 60 and vs 66) and no longer follow him. It is then that the words of Peter occur. The contention of the Prophet is no longer relevant - the focal point is the Son of Man (in parallel with ch 9); and there appears to be some undercurrent of a contemporary Church situation in which people are losing their faith (vs 66). Corrective teaching about right belief is necessary, hence Peter's confession.(118) In such a context it is difficult to imagine that Peter's words have to do with the Prophet like Moses.

Jesus, prior to Peter's confession, has been occupied in a discourse in which he presented himself as the "Bread of Life": 6:63 looks back to this discourse in describing his words as "spirit and life" (6:63). In contrast to the Bread which Moses gave - by which we may understand an allusion to the Law of Moses perhaps as living oracles (cf Acts 7:38) - <u>Jesus is now depicted not as the New Moses but as the New Law, the New Revelation of God</u>. As F. Schnider succinctly puts it,

> "Jesus vermittelt nicht nur Offenbarung Gottes, sondern ist die Offenbarung Gottes in Person." (119)

The conditions of the situation are such that Peter speaking as the head of the disciples (the true believers) and over

against the Jews and the unfaithful disciples, makes a confession καὶ ἡμεῖς πεπιστεύκαμεν καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ. This cannot be an emulation of 6:14f. It must be understood as the response of the true believers in the face of contemporary issues, and in the light of Jesus' teaching on the Son of Man. Ch 6 resembles in many ways ch 9, which depicts the initial recognition of Jesus as "a prophet"; but culminates in revelation of Jesus as the Son of Man which causes true belief to operate (6:55ff cf 9:35f). It would be just as ludicrous for the blind man then to confess Jesus as "the Prophet" at that stage as for us to understand "the Holy One of God" in 6:69 as the Confession of Jesus as Prophet, or the Prophet. Even the idea of a Messiah is somewhat inadequate - for that too goes little further than 6:25!

4:3:4 A Primitive Tradition

It was F. Hahn(120) who suggested that behind Jn 6:69 ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ there was the primitive confession of Jesus as the Prophet. He argues that this was the original confession of Peter which has been subsequently messianized by the Synoptic writers.(121) This is, in the first place, extremely difficult to prove - in fact one wonders whether it is now possible to reconstruct the original form of the confession of Peter. It is also difficult to decide whether John has chosen a confession to fit into the pattern of ch 6, and then made Peter the source of the confession or whether he has inherited a primitive tradition which included among other things the sign of the bread and fish, and the confession of Jesus (perhaps by Peter) as ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ. D.M.Smith suggests that one of John's original traditions was a source which was composed of a series of signs bearing witness to Jesus as the prophet like Moses.(122) In particular Smith draws attention to the term σημεῖα which according to him "evokes Moses' performance of signs - indeed legitimating signs - before Pharoah and the Egyptians". He concludes :

> "The fact that Moses appears in the Fourth Gospel as a foil for the presentation of Jesus is fully consonant with this view of the Johannine semeia. The later explicit Jesus-Moses dialectic might

> well then have its roots in the miracle tradition." (123)

It was R. Bultmann who first suggested[124] that behind the miracles of the Fourth Gospel, we may discover a written source which he named the "Semeia-Quelle" - the Signs Source. The Wedding at Cana is designated the first of the signs, which Jesus performs (2:11) and thereafter there is regular mention made through the Gospel of the signs of Jesus. At times these are seen as provoking faith (e.g. 20:30f), while at other times it seems that the faith generated by the signs is somewhat suspect (cf 2:24 and 6:15). This apparent tension is used as proof of a tension between the theology of the Source and that of the Evangelist. While the Signs Source is accepted by a great number of scholars, particularly after R.T.Fortna's attempt at the reconstruction of the Source,[125] there yet remains a considerable body of eminent scholars who deny its existence.[126] J.L.Martyn's succinct analysis of present scholarship on this question concludes quite correctly that the debate is likely to continue for some time to come.[127] Martyn himself is of the opinion that the Signs Source theory enjoys "a considerable degree of probability" particularly as it is presented by R.T.Fortna.[128] We are inclined to agree with Martyn's conclusion, with one reservation, namely that given the present evidence, we find great difficulty in distinguishing between the theology of such a source and the theology of the Evangelist purely <u>on literary grounds</u>.[129] Certain indications are believed to suggest a tension between the theology of the Sign Source and that of the Evangelist. In the first place there is a tension between the faith engendered by the signs which leads to true acceptance of Jesus and that faith which results in misunderstanding.

Thus we read in 20:30f :

> "Now Jesus did many signs in the presence of the disciples which are not written in this book; but these are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you may have life in his name."

This contrasts oddly with 12:37,

> "Though he had done so many signs before them yet they did not believe in him."

However, this example is not inconsistent with John's style of writing, which has been described by C.K.Barrett[130] as "the Dialectical Theology of St. John". We note for example passages like 1:11 and 12 and 12:37-42, in which John commences with a general statement "they did not receive him" or "they did not believe him" and then goes on to show that in fact some did receive him including (12:42) some "from the chief rulers". Over and above John's dialectical style of writing, we detect indications also of a real historical situation which John knew and to which he responded. Not all those who enthusiastically recognized the signs of Jesus were destined to be counted among the true believers. A theology based only on the signs of Jesus might lead to true faith, but then again it might not. The tension in John is an existential experience, rooted in the historical milieu, in which the realm of belief and unbelief stand in violent opposition to each other. It is possible therefore to understand this tension without recourse to the theology of a source, which John may have inherited. The same historical situation testifies however to the importance of Moses.

In the Lucan tradition the Redeemer (λυτρωτής) Moses, the performer of signs and wonders (cf Acts 7:35b-9),[131] serves as a model for Jesus. This raises the possibility that in John also the deeds and perhaps the words of Jesus may be modelled on those of Moses. J.L.Martyn[132] has taken some of the miracles and sayings of Jesus, found in the Fourth Gospel, to be Mosaic signs. For example he refers to the feeding miracle in ch 6 (cf 6:14) and the promise of living water in ch 7 (cf 7:40). In 6:30f the crowd asks Jesus, "What sign (σημεῖον) do you do, that we may see and believe you? What work (ἐργάζῃ) do you perform? Our fathers ate manna in the wilderness; as it is written, 'He gave them bread to eat'". In spite of the miracle which Jesus has just performed, they demand of him a sign, some authenticating evidence of his office, presumably as the prophet like Moses. In fact the reader knows the evidence is there for them to see and to believe. As the discourse unfolds, however, Jesus appears, not as the Prophet like Moses, but as "the Bread from Heaven" - so the <u>comparison</u> is

between Jesus and the Torah[133] and the <u>contrast</u> is with Moses (cf 6:32 and 46).

In the second example cited by Martyn, the sign is in fact the words of Jesus (7:37f) concerning living water, which leads the people to remark, "This is really the prophet" (7:40). In view of this confession, Martyn connects the words of Jesus "If any one thirst let him come to me and drink" (vs 37) with the water miracle of Moses (Exod 17:1-7). Our first problem with this suggestion is that Jn 7:37f is not a sign but one of the sayings of Jesus. Secondly, the response of the people is divided with some calling Jesus "the Prophet" (vs 40) and others calling Jesus "the Messiah" (vs 41), so that the significance of the words of Jesus now point to his double role as Prophet and King. Thirdly, both chs 6 and 7 are dated according to Jewish festivals (Passover and Tabernacles respectively), and it may well be that the true appreciation of the symbolism of Bread and Water lies therein.[134] Martyn[135] lists other examples like Jn 3:14, but the overall case is inconclusive. The signs of the Gospel are not obviously Mosaic, and although John used traditional material, we know very little about its original form. S. Smalley raises an alternative solution, when he suggests that, not the signs, but the symbols in John derive from the Exodus traditions.[136] He refers to symbols like the bread, water and light in support of his thesis that "In many ways Jesus in the Fourth Gospel is in fact a new Moses, who accomplishes a new Exodus".[137] We doubt that the Gospel as it now stands, is conditioned by the desire to present a new Exodus, but certainly John's choice of symbols have been influenced by the OT traditions, including the Exodus. The very commonplaceness of most of the symbols prevents us from returning a more definite answer. While the death of Jesus may be linked with the Paschal Lamb, and the Bread of Life with manna, generally the connection is not clearly made with a particular OT setting.

Neither the signs nor the symbols in John provide us with conclusive proof that one of John's written sources was concerned entirely with the presentation of Jesus as a

type of Moses. Rather the evidence suggests that in the contemporary debate, the picture of Jesus as a Redeemer like Moses was used by the Johannine community, in their dialogue with the synagogue. O. Cullmann's connection between John and the Hellenists of Acts[138] is an important consideration here, and one to which we shall return. The most promising solution for the primitive tradition behind Jn 6:69 is located in the history of the Johannine tradition and the implicit quest for true belief. The confession of Peter, as our redactional study of ch 6 will show, mirrors at least one of the stages in this long process[139] - it is a milestone in the history of the Johannine community, and a sign pointing towards the ultimate realization of the truth incarnate in Jesus.

4:3:5 Conclusion : Something More

Whatever 6:69 meant in its original setting, or in its original tradition (perhaps a "sign source", or an hellenistic primitive christian Confession), it is evident that in its present position a prophetic interpretation is inconsistent with both the immediate setting and the general theology of John; it is inadequate as a description of the person and mission of Jesus. The Holy One of God is to be understood as something more profound and to be connected with the teaching on the sonship of Jesus.

CHAPTER FIVE THE IDEA OF HOLINESS

		Page
5:1	Holiness as a guide to the Holy One of God	166
5:2	Form and Content	169
5:3	Holiness, a study in terms of קדוש and קודש	170
5:3:1	Holiness, in relation to God	170
5:3:2	Holiness in relation to Objects, Places and Times	173
5:3:3	Holiness in relation to the Court of Yahweh	176
5:3:4	Holiness in relation to People	178
5:4	Holiness, a Study of the Greek terms ἅγιος and ἁγιάζω	189
5:4:1	Holiness in the New Testament	192
5:4:2	The Johannine Literature, excluding the Gospel	196
5:5	Holiness and the Fourth Gospel	201
5:5:1	Holiness in relation to the rest of the New Testament	201
5:5:2	Ἁγιάζω in the Fourth Gospel	203
5:5:3	Chapter 10	203
5:5:4	Chapter 17	213
5:6	Conclusion	224
Footnotes to Chapter Five	.. ..	337

CHAPTER FIVE THE IDEA OF HOLINESS

5:1 Holiness as a Guide to the Holy One of God

We come now to a study of the doctrine of holiness and the final stage of the interpretation of the Holy One of God in John 6:69. It is not sufficient to enquire into the type of office behind ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ without also asking what a study of holiness might contribute to an understanding of the title. When we describe the Holy One as either prophetic or messianic, we are but stating a half-truth: we need to go on to say something about the general idea of holiness and its relevance for this specific instance. This is not to deny the validity of the argument that ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ is messianic[1] or prophetic;[2] but rather to urge that

such conclusions be placed alongside those of writers like R. Bultmann,[3] who directs attention away from the traditional offices of prophet and messiah and towards a deeper understanding of the term ἅγιος in the title. Bultmann speaks of the "divine revealer"[4] in preference to a messianic understanding of the title in John; other writers prefer a midstream position such as "the one consecrated as prophet"[5] or "the one consecrated as messiah"[6] thereby giving some weight to the crucial term ἅγιος .[7]

We have shown that, particularly in the Gospel of Luke, the essence of the title the Holy One of God is the understanding of Jesus as the Prophet-Messiah.[8] Both the general context of Luke's christology and the immediate context of the pericope in ch 4 point in this direction. Moreover, Luke places the major emphasis upon the prophetic aspect and Jesus, as the Holy One, may be compared with other charismatic figures like Hanina ben Dosa or the great prophets like Elijah and Elisha. In Mark, the messianic aspect of the title comes to the forefront.[9] The exorcism and the title are set within a messianic sequence, with a deliberate stress upon Jesus' unique authority, which distinguishes him from other wonder workers of the time. The difference between the Holy One of God and the other messianic titles in Mark, like Son of God and Messiah, is to be found in the sense of Jesus as the one who drives out demons, who bears the Spirit and Authority of God, and most importantly is Holy. To lose sight of the individual note inherent in the Holy One of God is to misunderstand the major thrust of the title[10] and in effect to replace it with one of the better known titles.

When we correctly interpret ὁ ἅγιος in the title ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ and give it its due weight, a link is discovered between the messianic aspect of Jesus' mission and his role as an inspired and holy worker of miracles. We are thus allowed to acknowledge the difference between ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ and ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ , as well as the basic similarities. As with each of the titles of Jesus, we

need to allow for a change of content resultant upon the application of an idea (in this case the title ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ) to a living person. When such a person is also recognized as divine and the messiah, then the change in content is very significant. Much of the force of this change is carried by the term ἅγιος , and the tension reflected in this term,(11) provides us with the most important guides to our understanding of John 6:69.

So far in our study we have had occasion to consider three OT officers, the Priest, the Prophet and the King, and have compared each with the sense of agency basic to the title "the Holy One of God". We have paid little attention to the background of the term ἅγιος and its usual OT counterpart in the MT namely קדוש . It is to this that we now turn our attention. The term ἅγιος is capable of different nuances of meaning and indeed as far as Jn 6:69 is concerned there are four main suggested interpretations each positing a certain particular nuance for the adjective. These are the following :

(a) The first suggestion posits an <u>ethical</u> understanding for ἅγιος , so that Jesus in 6:69 is to be seen as the one who is ethically "other than" and so separated from the world of sin.(12)

(b) The second suggestion considers ἅγιος in 6:69 to be descriptive of Jesus' supreme <u>self-sacrifice</u>. Thus the "Holy One of God" is he who is "consecrated by God as the sacrifice on behalf of all mankind".(13)

(c) The third suggestion translates "consecration" in terms of possession of the <u>Holy Spirit</u>, so that Jesus is doubly holy: ὁ ἅγιος , through consecration as the Agent of God and through his possession of God's Spirit of Holiness.(14)

(d) The fourth suggestion points to the very Holiness of God and understands the title in 6:69 as the affirmation of <u>Jesus' relationship</u>

> with the Father, his sharing in the sphere of the heavenly.(15)

Behind each of these four suggestions lie various notions which are bound up with the OT understanding of holiness, as it is understood by different expositors. Consequently for John 6:69 (also 10:36 and 17:17-9) we need to commence with the OT and the root meaning of קדש .

5:2 Form and Content

Two of the leading expositors of the Fourth Gospel, R. Bultmann and R. Schnackenburg, have chosen to interpret the title in 6:69 in a two dimensional fashion.(16) Thus Bultmann understands ἅγιος as a pointer to Jesus' divinity as well as a term descriptive of Jesus and his sacrifice. For Schnackenburg the title is both messianic and yet also corresponds to Jesus' self-revelation and therefore includes his unique relationship with his Father. This technique of two-level interpretation has much to commend it and a parallel may be found in the confession of Nathanael, σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, σὺ βασιλεὺς εἶ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ in 1:49. This confession forms the climax of a passage dealing with Jesus as the Messiah (1:19ff). So, on the primary level, it is a messianic confession. The teaching of the Son of Man introduced a new element into the pericope. Nathanael and indirectly the reader is warned to expect greater things. Attention is thereby turned "from the confession of a this-worldly king, the king of Israel, to the heavenly situation".(17) It is a retrospective action since the first encounter with 1:49 would not necessarily point the reader in such a direction, but within the context of the whole Gospel such a conclusion (the heavenly situation) seems inevitable.

The confession of Peter in Jn 6:69 has a similar potential for a two level interpretation. The term is naturally capable of different levels of understanding, so that at one level the title "the Holy One of God" may suggest "God's eschatological Agent" and at another level depict the idea of Jesus' unique relation with the Father. In <u>form</u> it may appear "messianic" but with the inclusion

of the special Johanine content, it is given a completely new vitality, so for this reason a study of ὁ ἅγιος needs to be related to the context of the Fourth Gospel and in particular the use there of ἅγιος and ἁγιάζω.

5:3 Holiness, a study of the terms קדוש and קדש.

The Hebrew קדשׁ and its related forms, is found often in the OT and the extra-biblical literature penned by Jewish writers. The milieu changes as does the meaning over the years, but generally it is possible to trace certain patterns and regular settings and these enable the student to understand something of the development of the term. קדש is an attribute of those things, of those people who are in a particular way associated with Yahweh; moreover it is an attribute of Yahweh Himself. There are specifically four areas which we will consider:

(a) Holiness in relation to God.
(b) Holiness in relation to objects, places and times.
(c) Holiness in relation to the Court of Yahweh.
(d) Holiness in relation to people.

In this work the study of holiness forms a crucial part and it would be a serious omission to brush over it. In particular the areas (c) and (d) are important for a correct understanding of Jn 6:69. The understanding of the OT idea of holiness and the use of the terms ἅγιος and ἁγιάζω as found in John provides us with the most reliable evidence for an accurate understanding of the Holy One of God. It allows us to appreciate the uniqueness of the title and its distinction from titles like Son of God, as well as the degree of overlap with such titles.(18) Accordingly we turn to the study of holiness first of all in relation to Yahweh.

5:3:1 Holiness, in relation to God

H. Wheeler Robinson writes: "The majesty of God finds clearest expression in the use of the terms 'holy' and 'holiness' which seem to have denoted originally the sacred

as separated or withdrawn from the secular. This usage is found in general amongst Semitic people but the designation of the inner nature of deity by it ... has no parallel beyond Israel".(19) For Israel Holiness was intrinsically bound up with Yahweh and the holy had no separate life apart from Him, in contrast to the numinous in the Canaanite religion. Thus in each instance of קדש or קדוש we need to enquire into the relation of that which is "holy", to Him who is supremely "the Holy One of Israel".

Yahweh is frequently described as קדוש and particularly in Isaiah (including the whole book) he is called by the title קדוש ישראל. In the later Rabbinic literature mainly from the third century onwards(20) He is referred to as הקדוש. Two concepts grow out of the awareness of the OT doctrine of the Holiness of Yahweh(21) and are to be found regularly in later Jewish literature. The first concept related to God's Holiness is found in relation to His act of creation and the fundamental idea of Him as the "wholly other" "the incomprehensible" (numen tremendum - Is 57:15; Hos 11:9; Ps 99:5), over against that which He has created. He is distinct from His creation and this distinction is described in terms of His Holiness. The second concept which grows out of the awareness of the holiness of Yahweh, and the sense of His "otherness", is the idea of Yahweh at work in history and particularly in the context of encounter - the encounter of the Holiness of Yahweh with the profanity of Man and his society (cf Is 1:4;6:5). The encounter points to the "Power of Yahweh in Judgement" on the nations, a powerful theme which we encounter through the pages of the prophetic writings especially Isaiah, (cf Is 5:16, 19 and 40:25 and 45:15).

In the Holiness of Yahweh we encounter then both the sense of his separation and otherness from the world and particularly from the profane (חול), and the sense of his power in encounter with the profane. The call of Moses, of Isaiah, of Ezekiel and the grand theophany at Sinai splendidly illustrate the need for man to be in a right state, a holy state (cf Ex 19:10ff where Moses is told to consecrate the people in preparation for the theophany). Failure to meet with God's standards results

in the unleashing of power in judgement as in the two incidents concerning the Ark (I Sam 6:19ff and II Sam 6:6ff) and the revolt of Korah (Num 16). On the other hand obedience to God's standards leads to an experience of His holiness as P. Bonnard says, "His holiness is dynamic and exacting; it confronts man to pour out upon him a new life (Deut 7:6; Is 8:13; Lev 11:44f; 19:2; 20:7,26 and Num 15:40)".(22) It is this sense of "life" of "energy" which O. Procksch singles out(23) as the distinguishing mark between קדש and the related terms (in the context of the Cult), such as טהר (purity).

The Name of Yahweh is holy (Lev 20:3; 22:2 and Ezek 36:20ff)(24) which signifies that the very essence of Yahweh is holiness (cf Amos 4:2 in which Yahweh swears by His holiness). So there is ground for seeing some relation between God's holiness and his divinity, as O. Procksch(25) remarks, "the concept of holiness merges into that of divinity". The awareness of God's holiness (His otherness and power in encounter) is at the same time an awareness of His divinity (Hos 11:9 - I am God).

In the Rabbinic writings the holiness of God was remembered daily in the recitation of the Shemone Esre Benedictions (1,3), and the imagery there is of "the pitilessly stern Judge, as the lofty King, as rex tremendae maiestatis, whom one may approach only with fear and trembling".(26) In Zech 14 especially vs 20ff we read that at the end of time all will be holy in the wake of God's judgement - from the mundane cooking pot to the very nation of Israel.

The Rabbinic writers also make frequent reference to the רוח הקדש, God's Holy Spirit (or Spirit of Holiness), and indeed it "has become almost a fixed formula".(27) This expression is infrequent in the OT, occurring only three times in all (Is 63:10,11 and Ps 51:11), and, apart from the Qumran writings and Wisdom 9:17, is rare in the Intertestamental literature. In the OT the Spirit (רוח) of Yahweh is essentially an expression for Yahweh in action, and the רוח of Yahweh may be translated "wind" (cf Gen 1:2) or "breath" (Job 26:13). It is also the mark of God's choice of an individual, as one who is infused with

רוח , and therefore uniquely equipped to act as His representative on earth.(28) The possession of the Spirit is however conditional upon the obedience of the person concerned (cf Ps 51:11) and it also signifies a right relationship with Yahweh which makes it possible to obey Him (cf Ezek 2:2).

In Qumran we frequently encounter the רוח קודש and less generally the רוח קדושה (1QS 3:7), while in 1QH the favoured form is רוח קדשך (cf 7:7). It is interesting to note that the Spirit is connected with prophetic revelations (1QS 8:16 ורוח קודשו גלוי הנבואים ברוח קודשו) and often with "cleansing" (from sin) as in 1QS 4:21 and 1QS 16:1ff. An added note is found in 1QH 14:13 where the Holy Spirit (רוח קודשך) of God (literally, Your Holy Spirit)is said to have 'drawn' (הנפותה) the writer of the Hymns "near to an understanding of you." A picture is created of the Holy Spirit cleansing men of their sins, drawing them closer to God and enabling them to be obedient to Him (1QH 7:7).

Finally we note that in Qumran the connection between the Messiah and the Holy Spirit (cf Is 11:1) is sustained and in 11Q Melch we read of a המבשר הוא המשוח הרוח.(29) The Spirit is the mark of the chosen agent of God, an idea encountered also in the NT and Rabbinic use of Is 11:2; 52:7 and 61:1f. (30)

5:3:2 Holiness in Relation to Objects, Places and Times

The Hebrew substantive קדש is used in the OT and later Jewish literature to qualify certain select objects, times and places. Unlike the personal adjective (קדוש), קדש is impersonal(31) although it might be used of God's Spirit and His Name. As far as the Greek is concerned the adjective ἅγιος translates without distinction both the substantive קדש and the personal adjective קדוש. The verb קדש, which is variously understood as "consecrate", "dedicate" or "sanctify" according to the differing contexts and forms of the verb, always implies an action which is in some way related to God. In the niph'al form Yahweh is always the subject (e.g. Num 20:13;

Ez 20:41;28:22, 39:27) and in the other forms the sense is evidently "consecration or dedication to Yahweh". The same sense of intent is to be found in the phrase קדש ליהוה (Dt 7:6), where "holiness" is in relation to Yahweh. Yahweh is the "source" of all holiness,(32) and the realm of the holy surrounds Him so that all things and persons who are "holy" are thereby brought into relation with the one from whom all holiness derives. Ezekiel pictured this holiness in terms of concentric circles with varying degrees of holiness according to the distance from the centre, (cf Ezek 40-48) and something of a similar pattern is also found in Qumran (Temple Scroll) and the Rabbinic literature, (Kel 1:6f). The "Holy of Holies" (קדש הקדשים) is the most holy place on earth since it is here that the holy High Priest encounters without harm the very Holiness of Yahweh (Lev 16).(33)

Within the circle of the Cult all objects were considered to be קדש and strict regulations were enforced to protect them against defilement (cf Num 16:36-40; I Sam 6:19ff and II Sam 6:6ff).

In Ezekiel 36:16-23 Israel is accused of having "profaned" Yahweh's "holy name" among the nations. Yahweh promises that through the restoration of the people His Holy Name will be vindicated. The actions of Israel are directly related to the "profanation" or "vindication" of God's Holy Name, and there is a sense here which indicates that infringement of the realm of the holy at any level impinges upon the very holiness of Yahweh. The very raison d'être of the cult is to protect the Holiness of Yahweh and also to protect man in his encounter with this Holiness.

Here in the midst of Israel was the tangible sphere of the Holy, the place of atonement for the sins of the people, and the place where the High Priest once a year met with Yahweh. The cult as the visible sphere of the holy contained furniture, altars, clothing, offerings all of which were described as קדש or קדש קדשים (e.g. Altar Food 29:37)(cf Exod 35-40). It is the "P" School which in particular makes great use of the "holy" (קדוש and קדש) to denote those

things which belong to Yahweh and His cultus, those things which have been separated from the common and the profane and through the ritual of consecration (קדש) have been made available for cultic use. The objects are thus not holy of themselves but as K. Stalder[34] has pointed out, are holy by reason of their association with God in His service. J.A.Hewett comes to a similar conclusion, "Yahweh designates something as his own or he uses something and that something by virtue of its relationship to Yahweh is subsequently designated as holy. It is not holy and therefore used by Yahweh; it is used or possessed by Yahweh and therefore holy".[35] At the centre of the cult is the very Holiness of Yahweh and all that is "holy" is therefore holy in relation to Yahweh.

The qal form of נתן and also the causative form simply indicate "transfer to the possession of God, to whom the person or thing dedicated now exclusively belongs".[36] Such a sense of "belonging" is central, as we have already seen, to the Israelite idea of the holy. W. Eichrodt[37] defines the idea of the holy as follows :- "The decisive element in the concept of holiness is ... that of belonging to God... not that of separation which is secondary". Similarly G. von Rad writes that "Jahweh ... sanctified things or places or times and this meant that he claimed them as his own".[38] The main thrust of the idea of the holy is God-directed and orientated to Him and His service. God possesses an object, enfuses it with a new "life" and the end result of this process is holiness. This is distinct from טהר or purity although the two ideas are related. O. Procksch[39] writes, " קדש is related to טהר ... yet while קדש is the basic cultic term, טהר is the ritual. There is always an energy in the holy which is lacking in the pure or clean". Although in the Dead Sea Scrolls the idea of קדש and טהר are very close (cf 1QS 8:11-17), and we remember the cleansing work of the Spirit (1QS 4:21), even here the two ideas are never fused.[40] The "energy" concentrated within the "holy" is most apparent in moments of confrontation especially with the profane (cf II Kings 6:6ff) and in the Qumran idea of the power of

the holy (for cleansing or for inspiration and in the idea of Holy War) (see 1QM 12:7). We are aware that in this "energy" we are dealing with the power of God Himself.(41)

So on the one side of the holy is the sense of belonging to God and being possessed by Him; on the other side is the consequence of this possession, namely the sense of separation. So N.H.Snaith(42) defined the holy as "that which is separated from the profane", although in a later work he changed the emphasis to the positive sense of "belonging to God",(43) and it remains important to understand both sides.

5:3:3 Holiness in relation to the Court of Yahweh

Several times in the OT we encounter the (substantive) term קְדוֹשִׁים which is usually rendered "holy ones". For the most part the context quite clearly indicates that the persons so described are angels or perhaps more generally "heavenly beings" rather than humans.(44) These קְדוֹשִׁים "Holy ones" are mentioned in a variety of contexts of which two are quite easily identifiable :-

(i) The Context of a Heavenly Court(45) in which Yahweh sits in judgement over heavenly and earthly cases.(46) The other members of this the Divine Council, are variously termed as אלוהים, בני האלהים or קדושים.(47)

(ii) The Heavenly Host or Army of Yahweh who accompany Him in the vivid descriptions of the Day of the Lord,(48) and who together with Yahweh execute vengeance upon his enemies.

In Qumran both of these settings appear, so that in the War Scroll (1QM) we read of the army of the holy ones under the leadership of Yahweh the man of War and His chief angel Michael; while in the Melchizedek Scroll (11Q Melch) we find a graphic picture of the Divine Council passing judgement on the Satanic hordes, with Melchizedek, assisted by הקדוש, as Yahweh's delegated judge. A third setting appears as well, namely that of the heavenly Temple with the holy ones serving as priests and forming the

counterpart of the human cult.(49) For Qumran the term קדושים could also be used of human "holy ones" and the context is a necessary pointer to the understanding of the term.(50)

Leaving aside the human קדושים for the present, it appears likely that the term "holy" in this connection implies a sense of "being in association with Yahweh". This association implies rather more than just "belonging" to Yahweh but carries with it the overtones of divinity. However these holy ones are not divine in their own right (although at one time these angels might have been foreign deities), but are divine in and through their relation to Yahweh. In the Court of Yahweh it is their function in the court which entitles them to be called קדושים or בני אלוהים or אלוהים. They are the emissaries of Yahweh (cf Dan 8:13) and in and through this relation of service and obedience to Him they retain the right to be called "the holy ones", "gods" and "sons of God". Yahweh is at the very centre of the picture and all holiness and divinity are derived from Him and dependent upon Him. Even here in the host of heaven God will execute His judgement (Job 15:15 - "Behold God puts no trust in His holy ones (קדשיו) and the heavens are not clean (זכו) in His sight"; cf 1QH 10:34f.

On some occasions "the Holy Ones" are viewed as separate from Yahweh as in Job 5:1, but by and large the pattern is one of very close association (cf Zech 14:5). Thus we are made aware of the importance of understanding the Holy Ones within the context of a relationship with Yahweh, rather than as independent entities. Their holiness is not an ethical state but one of association and relation to Yahweh. Likewise the other titles of sonship and deity need to be understood within the context of dependence upon Yahweh. The common title for the context of the angels and Yahweh is the so-called Divine Council, and this is the general setting for the holy ones whether they assemble for Judgement, Worship or War.(51)

5:3:4 Holiness in relation to People

The adjective קָדוֹשׁ marks out the personal use of קדש and indicates that the person so described belongs to Yahweh and to the sphere of the holy. The normal phrase is קדוש ליהוה and it is Aaron who is primarily distinguished as "the Holy One of the Lord" (Ps 106:16), although in time the attribute of human holiness was to be applied to all other priests,(52) to the prophets(53) and to the nazirites(54). Although Moses is instructed to consecrate (Exod 28:41 וקדשת) Aaron and his sons, the chapter (29) in fact concludes with a specific connection between Yahweh and their consecration (cf 29:40ff) so that Moses is seen as acting on his behalf and Yahweh remains the source of all holiness.(55) Verse 43 (of ch 29) is interesting for it posits a connection between the Glory of Yahweh and the action of sanctification (of the Tabernacle). In this way the writer of this chapter emphasizes the sense that Aaron and his sons belong to Yahweh, and are possessed by him, in parallel with the Tabernacle which is sanctified and possessed through Yahweh's glory (כבד).

In becoming נזר Aaron and his sons are joined to the sphere of the holy and are brought into a new relation with Yahweh. Possessed by Yahweh they are ordained to serve within the realm of the holy and to come into His presence with impunity.(56) In order to maintain this state and to remain apart from the realm of the profane a list of prohibitions was necessary,(57) for to go before the Holy God in a state of ritual uncleanness was to court certain death. The very Holiness of Yahweh was threatened and the encounter between the power of Yahweh and the profane could have but one consequence, as several OT incidents illustrate (cf I Sam 6:19ff; II Sam 6:6ff).

We noted previously that there were two aspects of the "holy" - the sense of "belonging to Yahweh" and the sense of being "separated from the profane". As far as the root meaning of קדש is concerned most scholars emphasize the positive aspect of belonging(58) over and above the negative aspect of separation. So our initial response to קדש or the personal קדוש is to look

for the sense of separation from the profane, indicated often by cultic or ethical regulations. Unlike the substantive קֹדֶשׁ , the adjective קָדוֹשׁ with its personal application is open to two areas of meaning e.g.:-

(a) In the legal literature the main emphasis is upon the Priests and consequently there is a strong sense of <u>ritual purity</u> (טָהֵר).

(b) In the prophetic literature there is a strong sense of <u>ethical purity</u> (see Isaiah) with the Holiness of Yahweh posed opposite the sinfulness of man (cf 6).(59) Naturally these emphases simply underline the two negative aspects of holiness and we need to remember that this is probably secondary to the positive aspect of belonging to Yahweh. The term קדוש ליהוה is first and foremost a relational term and secondly one of separation. It is ultimately therefore the relational aspect which enables us to understand the idea of the holy.

Within the human realm there was a deep concern with the consequences of being called to be קָדוֹשׁ and since many of these concerns were expressed in a negative fashion it is not surprising that קָדוֹשׁ often appears in a context where separation from the profane seems obvious. Yet even there, for example in the outline of the Levitical task (Deut 10:8f) where the key term הִבְדִּיל appears (vs 8), the sense is also a positive one - the levite is separated to God's service.(60)

As the possession of Yahweh, the Children of Israel are called to be holy (Lev 20:26) and although they are "separated from the peoples" (vs 26) this is not the cause of their holiness but the consequence. So in Num 35:34 we read, "You shall not defile the land in which you live, in the midst of which I dwell; for I the Lord dwell in the midst of the people of Israel" and again in Num 16:3 "For all the congregation is holy, every one of them, and the Lord is among them". Holiness is derived from Yahweh and this principle is enunciated by the writer of 1QS 10:12. It is the presence of Yahweh in the midst of the people which leads to the OT demands for holy living, (Num 35:34) just

as in Qumran the presence of the holy angels led to the exclusion of certain persons deemed to be ritually unclean.(61) At Sinai (cf Exod 19:9ff) the people are consecrated for three days in preparation for the theophany of God, and in later descriptions of the new Jerusalem "holiness" is a necessary requirement for Yahweh's presence, (Is 4; Ezek 40ff).

O. Betz(62) has drawn attention to the use of the Sinai Tradition in Qumran and the NT, and in particular he notes the three main aspects which make up this tradition :

(a) The theophany, the powerful eschatological advent of God who will come as the judge of mankind.

(b) The preparation for this encounter with the Holy God, leading to an "eschatological existence", to the holy life of a consecrated community.

(c) The preservation of such a holy life and community in the midst of an unclean and hostile world.

The first two aspects mentioned by Betz deal with Yahweh as the Holy Judge and as the source of holiness. He chooses Israel, or the Community of Qumran, and establishes them as a consecrated community. The third aspect deals with what is largely the human response - the preservation of the holy life. Throughout the history of Israel the two main aids to such preservation were the Cult and later the Law,(63) with the emphasis in the former on the idea of purity (טהר) and the emphasis in the latter on the idea of ethical righteousness (צדק (ה)). In the Prophetic writings preparation for the advent of Yahweh on the personal level, (over against the impersonal level such as the preparation of Jerusalem or the Temple), tended to concentrate upon the ethical obedience of the people with a growing awareness of the short-comings of the cult. However even in Qumran, where there was a strong sense of a spiritualized cultus, the idea of cultic purity is not forgotten. Several times the terms קדש and טהר occur in close proximity and they are quite clearly seen to be related (cf IQS 8:17 בטהרת אנשי הקודש).

We need to bear in mind that the distinctions between "ethical" and "cultic obedience" are semantically largely

non-biblical. The actual measure in the Hebrew is to be seen in the convergence between צדק and קדש which lies behind our use of the term "ethical" and the convergence between טהר and קדש which lies behind our use of the term "cultic". The OT does not distinguish between cultic holiness and ethical holiness just as it does not distinguish between cultic regulations and ethical regulations, and sin is the breaking of either.

Some scholars have attempted to understand the ethical content as basic to the term קדש, while others as we have noted above prefer the relational idea as the sole basic meaning. Thus R. Otto[64] has argued "if the ethical element was present at all, at any rate it was not original and never constituted the whole meaning of the word". It is a debatable question how far we are justified in understanding an ethical element (or cultic element) within the OT usage of קדש. In Rabbinic writings,[65] holiness is quite evidently a result of obedience to the Law. The idea of separation which initially was the consequence of the "possession" and "consecration" by Yahweh, appears alongside the sense of relation to provide the twin foci of the term קדש. The question that this raises from our perspective is that of timing. At what stage does the concept of the holy become less relational (i.e. with the sense of belonging to Yahweh) and more ethical or cultic (i.e. with the sense of separation from the profane/ separation from sin)?

The answer to this question is made more complicated by the fact that in certain instances of the use of קדש, there is no immediate sense of separation in any sense, but rather a strong sense of belonging to Yahweh and this occurs in all the relevant literature, as in the expression קדוש (of angels) and רוח הקדש. One answer to the question would be that the ethical/cultic separation aspect is very late (NT and Rabbinic) and following Otto, "never constituted the whole

meaning of the word".(66) Another answer would be to point at the juxtaposition of the sin of Israel and the Holiness of Yahweh in Proto-Isaiah and to argue for the date of that work as the terminus ante quem.

Since both the relational sense of belonging to Yahweh and the idea of ethical/cultic separation occur in the Qumran writings, as Fr. Nötscher(67) has quite clearly shown, the obvious course of conduct for an examination of the New Testament idea of Holiness, is to bear both meanings in mind and to use the context to determine the precise nuance of the term. This is the pattern which we shall endeavour to follow. Another possible guide is to make use where possible of the milieu from which the particular contextual expression of the holy has been drawn. So for instance in the OT we encounter certain milieux for the holy, such as the Cult, the Divine Council, and subsidiaries of these such as the Priesthood, Holy War and Prophecy. The immediate context must remain however the ultimate criterion for the interpretation of the holy.

Two milieux which are of interest to us and deserve attention at this stage are those of:

(a) the choosing of Aaron, and of

(b) the general picture of Holy War.

Both of these settings add significantly to our understanding of the holy.

(a) The choice of Aaron as the holy one, takes place within the context of the rebellion of Korah, a Levite who took Moses and Aaron to task for their apparent presumption with regard to their part in the Cult.

Numbers 16:3-5 And they (Korah and his supporters) assembled together against Moses and against Aaron and said to them "You have gone too far. For all the congregation are holy (כל־העדה כלם קדשים) every one of them, and the Lord is among them; why then do you exalt yourselves above the assembly of the Lord." (4) When Moses heard it he fell on his face; (5) and he said to Korah and all his company; "In the morning the Lord will show you who is his and who is holy, (והקדוש) and will cause him to come near to him; him whom he will choose he will cause to come near to him."

In the light of Korah's speech and Moses' reply the idea of the קדוש is somewhat expanded. In the first place we note the connection between the holiness of the

congregation and Korah's deduction, "the Lord is among them". Then secondly in Moses' reply the קדש is paralleled by further elaborations, "the Lord will show you who is his" (which enforces the idea of holiness as belonging to God), the one whom "he will cause to come near to Him" (which again enforces the idea of being in the right state to encounter God) and if we read on we find in vs 21 that Moses and Aaron are commanded by God to separate themselves (הבדל) from Korah and his rebellious followers, (which suggests the idea of separation). So in the idea of the Holy One which in this passage points to Aaron primarily although Moses is not excluded (cf Ps 106:16 and Sir 45:1-5) we find the sense of God in the midst of those who are holy (association), we find the idea of belonging to God (possession), the idea of being in a right state to approach Him (consecration), and of being set apart from the profane (separation).

In the Qumran Scrolls we encounter parallels to each of these four ideas. Moreover Moses is so connected with the holy ones (prophets) that the holiness of Moses is a natural conclusion (CD 5:21f). The idea of holiness as a relational aspect appears in two ways. In the first instance we find the expression "source of Holiness" applied to Yahweh and in the second instance we find the idea of Yahweh and his holy angels actually described as being within the Community (1QM 12:7 and 1QSb 2:8f). The idea of possession is described in terms of God's choice of the community, His establishment of it as a holy community (1QS 11:7ff) and His joining of this community to the Council of Holiness (the Divine Council - 1QS 11:7ff; 1QH 3:19ff). The idea of consecration is depicted in their eschatological existence (ethical and cultic)[68] and is obvious both in the ritual of the community and in the Holy War in which they are engaged. There are several instances in which Exodus motifs are recognizable.

(b) The second milieu which is of interest to us is that of מלחמות יהוה, the Wars of the Lord or Holy Wars. Just as other servants of Yahweh, the High Priest, the Angels, the Prophets and the Nazirites were called to Holy Service so the soldiers engaged in fighting for Yahweh were described as fighting a holy war in which Yahweh, "the Man of War", was at their head. Indeed, He encamped with them and

this involved the men in keeping up a strict state of ritual purity.

The idea of "Holy War" has been well presented by G. von Rad[69] and R. de Vaux.[70] De Vaux describes this phenomenon as follows :-

> "When the people took up arms they were called the people of Yahweh or the people of God (Jg 5:13; 20:2), the troops of God (1 S 17:26), or the armies of Yahweh (Ex 12:41; cf 7:4). The combatants had to be in a state of ritual cleanliness, i.e. 'made holy' (Jos 3:5; cf Jr 6:4; 22:7; Jl 4:9). They were bound to remain continent (1 S 21:6; 2 S 11:11) and this obligation of cleanliness extended to the camp, which had to be kept 'holy' if Yahweh was to encamp with his troops (Dt 23:10-5)." (71)

The Ark was at first the symbol of the presence of Yahweh, and a Priest was chosen as "the Priest Anointed for War" to bless and encourage the forces of Israel, (Eleazer or Phineas). The victory belonged to Yahweh alone and within the time of the monarchy this probably led to a clash of interests so that in the Deuteronomic Code the relative subordination of the king is strongly emphasized. The destruction of the enemy and his possessions (חרם) is a vital ingredient of Holy War, and where the offending party was a rebel Israelite town the חרם was absolute (Dt 13:13-8).

The Qumran scrolls present a vivid picture of the War of Yahweh, and the regulations enclosed therein are a faithful copy of the OT picture. Naturally there are certain new trends introduced not least of which is the role of the Priests in general and the role of the High Priest specifically. The two dimensional pattern of war whereby Michael forms the heavenly counterpart to the Sectarian leader(s) as he and his forces wage war with the spirits of Belial, is already suggested in the book of Daniel (cf 12:1). Holy War is an important aspect of Apocalyptic writing, particularly within a dualistic context in which the men and angels of God's lot (גורל)[72] wage war successfully with the men and angels of Satan's lot.[73] In Qumran part of this warfare was the ritual cursing of the enemy, (1QM13) and the blessing of the Armies of Yahweh (1QM 13).

Holiness in the area of Holy War contains the same four elements which we observed in the choice of Aaron:

(a) Association,

(b) Possession,

(c) Consecration and

(d) Separation.

This is true both for the OT and for Qumran. Thus in Qumran we find

(a) the idea of association through the idea of the presence of the holy angels - כי את מלאכי קדש בעדתם, and in the title for the members of the sect - as the Sons of Light. There both in the setting of War and in the setting of the Divine Council, the members of the Sect enjoy a unique union (חלק) with the angels and by implication with Yahweh Himself. The idea of

(b) possession is similarly basic to the very essence of the Sect as described in 1QM - they belong to Yahweh and their banners proclaim this fact and because they belong to Him they are קדש, just as through association with the angelic קדושים they can describe themselves as קדושי עליון. The idea of

(c) consecration appears both in the titles and in the sense of ritual purity, which points also to

(d) separation.

In general it is primarily the community of Israel which has been chosen by Yahweh, consecrated by Him, and which as defined in terms of sonship, belongs in a unique way to Him.(74) The human response to this Divine overture is encapsulated within the "Sinai Tradition" as described by O. Betz(75), namely the establishment of a holy community in preparation for the advent of Yahweh in His holiness. There are then two perspectives to human holiness: the Divine perspective of Israel as chosen and belonging to Yahweh and thus קדש, and the human perspective of Israel preparing itself primarily through the path of obedience to the Law (the holy life), for the divine advent. The Holy life was not always defined by an eschatological hope and might include rather the sense of obedience to Yahweh's will instead of preparation for His Judgement - a negative motivation thus being replaced by a rather more

positive approach. Nevertheless, the advent of Yahweh is an important aspect of human holiness, and as the Psalm of Solomon 17 illustrates (cf also Is 4:3), includes "preparation for" and "purification as a result of" such an advent, both of which necessitate thinking in terms of קדש / holiness. For Yahweh comes not only to judge but also to purify (make holy) those who belong to Him.(76) Consequently we encounter not only a sense of "belonging" but also a very distinctive "moral/ethical" sense (cf Is 4:3f).

The substantive קדושים as we have already noticed obtains a meaning close to "angels", but in some of the later literature we find that there are instances where קדושים implies "men". The book of Daniel particularly ch 7, is at the centre of the controversy since some scholars(77) interpret קדישים(78) (vss 18,21, 22,25 and 27) as angels and other scholars(79) argue for a human content. The latter is perhaps the more likely conclusion.

The Hebrew term קדושים in most instances of its appearance in the OT denotes angels or a heavenly order like cherubim or seraphim. However in some cases apart from Daniel 7, there is reason to believe that הקדושים are a human order.

Ps 16:3 "To the Saints (להדושים) that are in the earth and to the excellent in whom is my delight."

Ps 34:9(10) "Fear the Lord, you His saints, for there is no want to them that fear him."

Deut 33:3a "Yea, He loves His people.
all His Holy ones are in His hand."

We note also Wis 18:9 "With one consent they declared as a divine law, that the holy ones would partake alike in the same blessings and perils."

The Greek reinforces the connection with the chosen people of Israel by translating "treasured ones (לעם סגלה)" as οἱ ἅγιοι σου , in Ps 82(3):4. However it is primarily the Qumran evidence which is decisive for the understanding of הקדושים within the centuries immediately preceding (and including) the first century of the Common Era. The way קדושים

is used in Qumran is not new, for the OT could use the term both of angels and of men as M.Noth admits.(80) The value of the evidence is that it shows how the meaning of the term could change, sometimes within the same work. There are several instances at Qumran of human holy ones (not just one as argued by Dequeker),(81) and these men are not resurrected humans, but living members of the community.(82)

Brekelmans concludes his study(83) with the words, "in the literature shortly before and after Daniel קדושים was used of both angels and men. From this we gather that only the context in which it occurs can help to reach a decision which sense the word is used in a particular text." S. Lamberigts(84) concurs with Brekelmans in this general conclusion.

It is important to note that the most common milieu for the human קדושים (85) is in the setting of Holy War and the Divine Council. Thus in Daniel 7 we read :

> (21) I had seen how the same horn had made war with the saints (עם - קדישין) and has prevailed against them. (22) Until the Ancient of days came, and procured justice unto the Saints of the Most High and the time came and the saints took possession of the Kingdom."

Also in 1QM we read :

> 1QM 3:4-5 And on the trumpets of the Camps they shall write - the peace of God in the camps of His Holy ones (בתחנ קדושין).
>
> 1QM 6:6 And the sovereignty shall be to the God of Israel and He shall accomplish mighty deeds by the holy ones of His people (ובקדוש עת יעשה חיל).

These clearly refer "the holy ones" to a Holy War situation such as we have already pictured, and it is not surprising since there is already in the OT (e.g. Zech 14:5) reference to the Army of Yahweh as composed of angelic "holy ones". With the development in Apocalyptic times of the human involvement in the eschatological Holy War, (cf Dan 7:21; 12:1), so the human soldiers were included among the Army of the Holy Ones.

The second milieu in which we find a union of angelic and human "holy ones" is the Council of Yahweh - or in the

Qumran terminology עֲצַת קוֹדֶשׁ (Council of Holiness).

In Daniel ch 7[86] the author clearly depicts the Council of Yahweh.[87]

7:10c The Court sat in judgement and the books were opened.

7:26a But the Court shall sit in judgement and his dominion shall be taken away. (27) And the kingdom and the dominion ... shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High.

In 1QH we read :-

1QH 3:21-2 Thou hast cleansed a perverse spirit of great sin, that it may stand with the host of thy holy ones, and that it may enter into community (צְבָא) with the congregation of the sons of heaven.

1QH 4:24-5 All those who are gathered in Thy covenant inquire of me, and they hearken to me who walk in the way of thy heart, who array themselves for Thee in the Council of the holy ones.

The importance of these two passages from 1QH is the overlap of meaning between the heavenly Council described in 3:21-2 and the earthly Council described in 4:24-5. Indeed the Sectarians envisaged a sense of continuity between the two councils, so that in their earthly assembly they understood the presence of the heavenly members and looked forward to the time when they would share completely with their heavenly counterparts in the heavenly Court (cf 1QSb 4). One is struck by the sense of holiness as the mark of the elect, those who have been cleansed (1QH 3), and who have been brought into the sphere of the holy to share with the angelic Court. Once again the relational sense is very strong but the sense of separation is there as well, and sin is posed opposite holiness. So the "holy one" is elected to the holy sphere of service and association with Yahweh, and his election (cf Is 6) involves cleansing from sin.

As we conclude the picture of the personal use of קָדוֹשׁ a few closing remarks are necessary. The adjective קָדוֹשׁ is the normal term which we encounter for the personal expression of holiness and it implies two basic things about the person so described :

(i) It describes the relational sense of belonging to Yahweh and to the sphere of the Holy. In the plural it may describe the eschatological community established by Yahweh in preparation for His advent. In the singular it usually signifies one who has been consecrated by Yahweh (implying as we saw in the Aaron incident one who is chosen by Yahweh for a particular service) and possessed by Him or His Spirit. It is used in both singular and plural of those who in some way (either by membership of His Council or as part of His army, or as part of the Eschatological Community), are associated with Yahweh.(88)

(ii) It describes as the corollary of (i) one who stands in opposition to the world of the profane and the common. It may according to the context take on a sense which is close to קדש and thereby convey the idea of "ritual" (or cultic) purity. On the other hand it may take on a sense which is closer to צדק so that it conveys the idea of ethical sinlessness and goodness. Very rarely if ever does this sense of separation obscure the prime sense of "belonging" to Yahweh. In most cases however one should hold both senses in tension.

As far as the understanding of קדשים used as substantive is concerned, there are two main settings which we have noted, namely the Cult (including Holy War) and the Divine Council(89) (including also the various emissaries of Yahweh).(90) We come now to a study of the Greek ἅγιος/ἁγιάζω and the NT idea of holiness.

5:4 Holiness, a Study of the Greek terms ἅγιος and ἁγιάζω.

The Greek term ἅγιος is used to render the Hebrew קדש as well as קדשׁ. Other related Greek terms which are found in the LXX include ἁγιάζω, ἁγίασμα, ἁγιασμός, ἁγιαστήριον, ἁγιότης and ἁγιωσύνη, and these render the various forms of the root קדש. We shall begin with the two terms found in John namely ἅγιος (91) and the verb ἁγιάζω, using the evidence of the other terms as supplementary.

(a) ἅγιος is found in the LXX as an adjective rendering the Hebrew קדוש which as we have already noted is usually personal, and is used of Priests, the Nation of Israel, Angels and Yahweh Himself.(92) In impersonal settings it refers to the Temple and the Sabbath.(93) In some instances ἅγιος for קדוש is used as a noun emulating the Hebrew usage so הקדוש becomes ὁ ἅγιος ;(94) הקדושים becomes οἱ ἅγιοι (95) and the neuter τὸ ἅγιον translates בתוך הקדש (the temple).(96)

(b) ἅγιος also renders the Hebrew קודש which as we have noticed is usually impersonal. Objects associated with the Cult including times and places are ἅγιος / קדש .(97) Also places and objects associated with Yahweh's dwelling whether on earth or in Heaven, are called ἅγιοι (ν) .(98) As a noun ἅγιος denotes the holy (τὸ ἅγιον) as distinct from the profane, or equally well that which belongs to Yahweh.(99) ἅγιος is also used to modify nouns denoting persons, particularly the corporate people of Israel, (σπέρμα ἅγιον - Ezra 9:2).(100)

Although Gehman considers that קדש suggests primarily the idea of separation from the profane, and secondly the idea of belonging to the divine sphere, it soon becomes clear that the second sense is in fact the primary one.(101) This is shown first of all in the papyri where ἅγιος is used of the gods(102) implying a sense of divinity while in the available Classical Texts it appears only once of men(103) (in a cultic context). Secondly we find the sense of belonging in the usage of the translators of the LXX whereby ἅγιος appears as the free translation(104) for a number of other terms all of which in some sense or other belong to Yahweh. Thus ἅγιος renders "El",(105) "Elohim",(106) "heaven",(107) "its Staves",(108) "priestly garments",(109) "Nazirite"(110) and "the Heavenly Hosts".(111) Often the Greek adds ἅγιος to qualify a noun and to emphasize its relation to the sphere of the holy. Thus "altar of majesty" becomes "altar of holiness";(112) "the surpassing spirit" becomes "the holy spirit"(113) and the "treasured ones"

become "the saints" (οἱ ἅγιοι Ps 82(83):4). Thus the LXX uses the term ἅγιος in basically the same way that the Hebrew term קדש was used with the emphasis on the sense of belonging to Yahweh.

One cannot exclude either the secondary sense of purity and separation from the profane, although again it is of secondary importance in relation to the sense of "belonging to Yahweh". ἅγιος is used to render חנג (114) and here it approximates the term ἁγνός which already in Attic usage(115) carried a sense of "holiness through the medium of cleansing", and has this sense also in the LXX (where ἁγνός renders חנג (2 Macc 13:8)) and in the NT.(116) In general then ἅγιος appears as an umbrella term to cover those things which in a particular way belong to Yahweh, and through its relation to terms like ἁγνός and חנג included a sense of ritual separation.

(c) The verb ἁγιάζω is found mainly in biblical Greek(117) and in Greek influenced by the Bible such as Philo's (Leg All 1:18 Spec Leg 1:167). ἁγιάζω renders the Hebrew קדש in the qal (Ex 29:21), the niph'al (Ex 29:43) the hiph'al (Ex 28:34) and the Pi'el (Gen 2:3). In Chronicles (2 Chr 29-31) where קדש in the Pi'el, Hiph'il and Hithpa'el carries the sense of "consecration-through-purification"(118) the Greek uses ἁγνίζω and this is so for the other instances of this particular Hebrew usage.(119) For the most part the objects are priests, people, and holy places and vessels. The action of קדש is to set them within the sphere of the holy thereby implying also sense of separation from the common.(120) The relational sense of belonging to Yahweh continues in that Yahweh is most frequently the subject of the action; however with the Greek ἁγιάζω, the line between the niph'al (which in the Hebrew was the prerogative of Yahweh) and the Pi'el (which included also Moses - Ex 19:10) is erased; as a result the Greek usage of ἁγιάζω is less restricted than the Hebrew קדש in its various forms. By and large however the term occurs within the sphere of the cult and carries with it the sense of transfer to the possession of Yahweh, either actively through Yahweh's appropriation or passively through

dedication or other ritual act.

Our approach to the study of Holiness in the Fourth Gospel comes within the final areas of concern, namely the New Testament and the other Johannine literature, before we enter into the realm of the Fourth Gospel itself. We have already taken cognisance of the range of meanings attached to the term ἅγιος, and we remember the warning of J. Barr(121) against what he termed "illegitimate totality transfer". Our safest guide then to the understanding of the term ἅγιος or the verb ἁγιάζω remains the immediate context.

5:4:1 Holiness in the New Testament

We have seen that ἅγιος in LXX was essentially faithful to the Hebrew קדוש and קודש in denoting that which belonged to Yahweh and to His holy sphere, as His possession and for His service particularly within the context of the cult. In the apocalyptic literature we noticed that the twin milieux of Holy War and the Holy Council were popular settings for קדושים who, whether human or angelic, tended to operate as the elect agents of Yahweh. Holiness, whether the attribute of Aaron, Moses, Elisha or Samson reflected the sense of one who first of all belonged to Yahweh, was consecrated by Him, and was then given a particular commission. In some cases as with the Prophets (cf Num 16:28, cf Jer 1:5) this commission involved being sent out on a particular mission, while at other times ἅγιος implied faithful obedience to the Law of Yahweh. In most cases of human holiness (cf Is 6) there was the sense of separation from the realm of the profane into the realm of the Holy, and this often implied separation from sin as well as separation from ritual impurity. In the eschatological age all the elect of God would be holy, implying the sense of cleansing and of belonging to Yahweh and thus being in the right state to encounter Him.

The New Testament sense of the holy is in accord with the OT pattern, so that the idea of the relational aspect is uppermost (the idea of the holy as that which "belongs"

to Yahweh), but there is a very clear ethical content. The latter is more pronounced than in the OT, but this is largely due to the fact that in the NT, generally it is personal holiness which receives the greatest attention rather than impersonal cultic (material) holiness. Consequently there is considerable care taken over the concept of holy living with both the negative aspect of rules for living as well as the positive aspect of the infusion (possession) of the Holy Spirit. Thus H. Seebass[122] remarks,

> "The proper sphere of the holy in the NT is not the cultus but the prophetic. The sacred no longer belongs to things, places or rites, but to manifestations of life produced by the Spirit."

Seebass continues by saying that as time went on the cultic was taken up again and reinterpreted within the context of the early Church. Thus we read about the priesthood of believers (1 Pet 2:4-10).[123]

In terms of continuity with the OT we notice that the four categories of the holy (which we considered in our study of ΨΩΤ) recur :

(a) It is used to describe Yahweh, His name and His Spirit, the latter proving to be the most popular, while in comparison with the OT the former is quite rare; (Luke 1:49; John 17:11; Rev 4:8; 1 Pet 1:16).

(b) Several objects and places are marked out as ἅγιος including the Temple (Matt 24:15 cf Heb 9:1), Sacrifice (Rom 12:1), the Law (Rom 7:12), the Scriptures (Rom 1:2), the Covenant (Lk 1:72).

(c) The angels/heavenly beings retain their title as οἱ ἅγιοι and appear in the twin settings of War (Holy War - 1 Thes 3:13) and the Council (Rev 14:10).

(d) It is on the personal level, where people are described as holy, that the NT demonstrates its most exciting development from the OT. Among the people described as holy we find the messengers of God, the Prophets (Lk 1:70; Acts 3:21), the Apostles (Eph 3:5), Jesus (Mk 1:24; Lk 4:34; Jn 6:69; Lk 1:35; Acts 3:14;4:27,30; Rev 3:7), and John the Baptist (Mk 6:20). There are also references to "holy ones" as members of the Christian Church (Rom 1:7 and many other references) and also as a general

group (Matt 17:52). "Holy Ones" or as they are commonly called the "Saints" appear often in the two milieux which are prefigured in the Apocalyptic writings, namely War and the Divine Council (either as a Court 1 Cor 6:2 "it is the saints who are to judge the world" or as a congregation for worship - "the prayers of the saints" Rev 8:4). In specific terms "the saints" are the people of God (1 Cor 1:2), the beloved of God (Rom 1:7), the chosen of God (Col 3:12) and the ones who are allowed to share in the mystery of God (Col 1:26). God through Jesus (Heb 13:12) and the Holy Spirit (1 Pet 1:2) sanctifies the people in accordance with His will (Heb 12:14).

Thus in the NT as in Qumran there is an overlap of meaning in the use of οἱ ἅγιοι, for it denotes not only angels (heavenly ones), but the Christians generally and perhaps even both. So we read in 2 Th 1:10 "when he comes to be glorified among his saints" and in Col 1:12 "thanking the Father who has made it possible for you to join the saints". In these instances we sense the continuity between the saints (holy ones) on earth and the heavenly beings. Also it is present in 1 Thes 3:13 where we note the idea of preparation through the medium of holiness (to establish your hearts blameless in holiness - ἐν ἁγιωσύνῃ) for the advent of Jesus who is accompanied by τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ. This reminds us of the Sinai traditions outlined by O. Betz,(124) wherein the people were consecrated at and in preparation for, the advent of Yahweh the Holy Judge. In the NT the people who form the New Israel are made holy through the death of Jesus (Heb 10:10)(125) and at the same time it is in preparation for his advent in power and glory. (Heb 2:11; Eph 5:26f).

The Pauline corpus reveals a number of interesting uses of ἅγιος and ἁγιάζω. Paul's use of the term οἱ ἅγιοι to refer to the believers is worthy of comment. O. Procksch(126) describes these holy ones as "members of a cultic circle" but it must be asked whether "cultic" is the correct term to use. Certainly there is a sense of belonging to the sphere of the holy, but this sphere is much more than the circle of the cultic,

including the sphere of the divine itself. C.Brown[127] is much closer to the truth when he writes :-

> "In the Pauline epistles those who name Jesus as their Lord are called hoi hagioi, the saints. This was primarily not an ethical expression but a parallel to concepts like "called" (Rom 1:7; 1 Cor 1:2; 2 Cor 1:1), "elect" (Rom 8:33; Col 3:12) and "faithful" (Col 1:2). It implies association with the Holy Spirit. Christ is their sanctification as well as their righteousness and redemption (1 Cor 1:30), and thus the One in whom they become holy to the true God."

Above and beyond any cultic or ethical usage, stands the relational sense of οἱ ἅγιοι , the ones who in a unique way belong to God.

In this state of holiness, certain qualities of life are expected and in this sense there is a moral or ethical dimension to being saints (cf 1 Cor 1:2 and 7:34). Procksch suggests that[128] "the reference of holiness is always to the static morality of innocence rather than to ethical action. But this static morality is closely linked with cultic qualifications. For this reason we should never translate ἁγιότης or ἅγιος as morality or moral, since this is to lose the element of the religiosum." Certainly the concept of righteousness as presented in Romans suggests a state rather than an accumulation of actions, and it is thus conceivable that holiness for Paul implies a parallel state, as Procksch suggests. This links up also with Paul's use of ἁγιάζω which is generally used in a passive way speaking of "the sanctified" (cf 1 Cor 1:2 and Rom 15:16) rather than the process of sanctification. Again the stress falls upon the state in relation to God rather than an ethical list dependent upon the deeds of the individuals concerned. The believers are in Christ and he also indwells them (1 Cor 1:2) so that the result of such a relationship is found within the terms "holy", "sanctified" and "righteous". As in the OT, there is a skilful blending of the double sense of holiness - that of separation from sin and the positive sense of belonging to God, with the emphasis away from the ethical and towards the relational.[129]

Although it is valid to make general remarks about NT holiness it soon becomes apparent that these are indeed

only general, and each NT writer, indeed each instance of the use of ἅγιος , deserves independent attention. If there is a particular characteristic of NT holiness it might be the attention to personal holiness and the preservation of the state of holiness through ethical obedience; on the other hand, it might be the sense of belonging to God and the sphere of the holy (living life in the Spirit).(130) Both of these are key characteristics and yet it remains possible that there are some contexts in which some other characteristic predominates. It is vital for us then to narrow our search still more and examine the idea of the holy in the collection of literature labelled the Johannine Writings.

5:4:2 The Johannine Literature excluding the Gospel

(a) In the First Epistle of John we read in 2:20, Καὶ ὑμεῖς χρῖσμα ἔλαβετε ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου, καὶ οἴδατε πάντες. The anointing χρῖσμα expresses not the act of anointing but the means by which it is performed, in parallel with "anointing oil" (cf Ex 29:7).(131) The logical understanding of this χρῖσμα is according to most interpreters,(132) to be seen against the anointing of Jesus (cf Acts 10:38 and Luke 4:18) and to be thus inclusive of both the sense of commission and the endowment of the Holy Spirit. If we take cognisance of what is said about the Spirit in the Farewell Discourses of the Fourth Gospel and in particular 14:17 where we encounter the title τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας (cf 1 Jn 2:21f), then the role of "the anointing" does appear to be parallel with the work of the Paraclete. Thus we note the connection between the anointing/Spirit and truth (Jn 16:13 cf 1 Jn 2:27). The Spirit as also the anointing, is the mark of those who believe and who belong to the truth. Outside the NT the idea of the anointing by the Spirit appears in 11QMelch 18 and Is 61:1, which taken together with the NT evidence (Acts 10:38 and Lk 4:18) argue for just such an interpretation in 1 Jn 2:20, perhaps rightly so.(133)

If the χρῖσμα is understood as the anointing of the Spirit we are still left with ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου. This on the one hand might imply Jesus or God, understanding ἀπὸ to indicate the source from which the anointing

derives, (in an indirect rather than a direct sense).[134] Thus although there may be a liturgical practice of "laying on of hands" or a similar institution as originally practised by the Apostles,[135] this is passed over in favour of the ultimate source of the anointing-God or more directly (cf Jn 20:22) Jesus. Alternatively if L. Morris[136] is correct the Holy One here is the Spirit.[137] The verses which follow (i.e. vss 22-24) speak of the Father and the Son and indeed this pattern continues for the rest of the chapter so while this does not exclude Morris's solution, it does mean that there is no clear link with the Holy Spirit in the verses following unless vss 27-9 prove to be the exception.

It is when we read vss 27-9 that the χρῖσμα is further developed and ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου is brought into line with ἀπ' αὐτοῦ , with the repetition of ἔχετε . The previous passage (vs 24 esp.) ended with a mention of the Son and the Father (in that order) and consequently ἀπ' αὐτοῦ should refer to one or the other and perhaps both. The αὐτὸς gives the promise of eternal life (vs 25), anoints (vs 27) teaches (vs 27), is true (vs 27) and the Christians are encouraged to remain in him (vs 27 and 28). It is the latter action which argues most pointedly against the conclusion that the term αὐτὸς here refers to the Holy Spirit (cf vs 28). For John the masculine gender proves little here, but the very idea of "abiding" in the Spirit is foreign to the Johannine literature. Rather the normal use of μένω is of abiding in either the Father or the Son (cf 1 Jn 3:24). The Spirit is given (δίδωμι) by Jesus and at the same time the believers are encouraged to remain in Jesus and God. So if we understand vs 27 correctly, the anointing by the Spirit cannot be accomplished without the intermediation of Jesus and the cognisance that the Spirit proceeds from Jesus and ultimately from the Father. Thus, as with the other actions included in vss 27f, χρῖσμα should be understood as pointing to either God or Jesus, as the ones who perform the spiritual anointing and who in vs 27 at least are intended by ἀπ' αὐτοῦ .[138]

Verse 28 speaks also of φανερωθῆ and the idea of "confidence in his presence" (of 3:21 and 4:17 but especially 3:1ff) although the sense might immediately bring to mind either Jesus or God. The ideas of the Father and Son are so closely bound together that although the priority of the Father is to be understood, it is sometimes difficult (as in vs 29 ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεγέννηται) to know which person is intended or even whether as in the advent passages, we are to understand both together. Perhaps Westcott(139) is right when he says that "when St. John thinks of God in relation to men he never thinks of him apart from Christ".

Verse 29 when related to 3:1 shows that ἐξ αὐτοῦ ought to refer to God and yet in relation to δίκαιος here and in 2:1 perhaps Jesus (as the Righteous One) ought to be understood. It is so with much of ch 2, in that αὐτός is used of both Jesus and God and often without clear distinction thus allowing the author to move freely from one to the other.(140)

We return to vs 20 and we ask, who is intended by ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου . Is it God, Jesus or the Holy Spirit? Much depends upon how we take ἀπὸ . If it implies the origin of the "anointing" then the answer is either God or Jesus and bearing in mind Jn 20:22 the latter is the obvious choice. If ἀπὸ is to be taken in the instrumental sense then ἁγίου , like χρῖσμα itself, implies the Spirit. In the light of vs 27 ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου is most likely to be Jesus acting as the agent of God.(141) This is borne out by the two other references to Jesus as ἅγιος in the Johannine literature (Jn 6:69 and Rev 3:7). In the Gospel the Spirit is called ἅγιον but more often some other term is used, and in the First Epistle (bearing in mind its shortness) the Spirit is either τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας or τὸ πνεῦμα but not τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον . Accordingly we conclude that the weight of evidence favours Jesus as the one intended by ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου both in vs 20 and in 27 who gives the χρῖσμα (neuter) which is the Holy Spirit.(142)

However the style of the Epistle is such that the union between Jesus and God is implicit and ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου may include both persons. Jesus as ὁ ἅγιος is in ch 2 of the Epistle, the Agent of God who works the works of God.

(b) In the Book of Revelation, the title ὁ ἅγιος re-appears in 3:7 which reads Τάδε λέγει ὁ ἅγιος ὁ ἀληθινός, ὁ ἔχων τὴν κλεῖν Δαυίδ, ὁ ἀνοίγων καὶ οὐδεὶς κτλ. The κλεῖν Δαυίδ is to be found in Is 22:22 and indeed the verse is substantially a quote from that passage - probably with a messianic sense. The title ὁ ἅγιος ὁ ἀληθινός again points to Jesus as the representative of God who Himself is Holy (cf 4:8) and indeed God is Himself (6:10) described as ὁ δεσπότης ὁ ἅγιος καὶ ἀληθινος. Notably the latter context is one of judgement which accords well with the Rabbinic idea of God the Holy One.

The term ἅγιος occurs in both the singular and the plural οἱ ἅγιοι (144) several times in the Christian Apocalypse. Apart from four references to Jerusalem (145) the "holy city", the usual application of the term is personal. Jesus is as we have seen so termed (3:7) and the same title is applied to God - ὁ ἅγιος καὶ ἀληθινός in 6:10. God is thrice holy (4:8), otherwise it is the believers who are holy and this includes both those on earth and those in heaven (who are the resurrected ones)(20:6) μακάριος καὶ ἅγιος ὁ ἔχων μέρος ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῇ πρώτῃ κτλ., and we note the connection between ἅγιος and priests, (cf 1 Pet 2:9) and also the obvious connection with the resurrection. There is no suggestion of moral perfection here but in 22:11 we find an interesting parallel. The verse reads, ὁ ἀδικῶν ἀδικησάτω ἔτι, καὶ ὁ ῥυπαρὸς ῥυπανθήτω ἔτι καὶ ὁ δίκαιος δικαιοσύνην ποιησάτω ἔτι καὶ ὁ ἅγιος ἁγιασθήτω ἔτι It is possible that the terms ὁ ἅγιος and ὁ ῥυπαρὸς are opposites as clearly ὁ δίκαιος and ὁ ἀδικῶν are. In this case it accords well

with 20:6 where the idea of priesthood suggests a ritual cleansing leading to holiness. It is thus advisable here to understand ἅγιος as implying an absence of ritual defilement and parallel but not identical with δίκαιος, which implies an absence of unrighteousness. Since ἅγιος is clearly elsewhere in the book a mark of the sphere belonging to God, it is advisable to understand also the relational sense of belonging to God (e.g. as his priests).

We find the term οἱ ἅγιοι indicating for the most part a Holy War setting (13:7,10; 16:6; 17:6; 18:20,24; 20:9) not dissimilar to the setting in Daniel where the little horn makes war with "the saints". Another setting is worship since the "prayers of the saints" are mentioned. (cf Rev 5:8; 8:3,4).

Although the term οἱ ἅγιοι includes those who are also righteous (cf 19:8) the full thrust of the term appears to be towards the idea of a group which belongs to God, and this is most clearly seen in the parallel of 18:20 (cf 16:6; 17:6) in which οἱ ἅγιοι as a group occurs along with οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ προφῆται. Like the prophets, like the apostles, the saints have been chosen by God to be holy and to live a life of righteousness. Holiness in this sense implies first of all belonging to God and secondly, in parallel with priests and prophets, being separated from the common to be the obedient servants of Yahweh. The ethical element is subsumed within this obedience but is by no means the obvious content. Like the book of Daniel, from which the writer of Revelation probably derived his use of the saints, the Saints are holy not through their attention to righteousness but because they have passed through God's cleansing, which in Revelation is sacrificial (cf 7:14) and implies the promise of reality of the resurrection, (cf 20:6). Holiness within the general context of the book obviously tends towards the religious (cultic) rather than the ethical, (cf 14:4,5 particularly the terms ἐμολύνθησαν and ἀπεκή cf vs 5 ἄμωμοι). The Seer is making use of the imagery of the Jewish Cult and we are also not far removed from the idea of the Sinaitic traditions in which the people

of God are prepared in a state of holiness for the advent of Yahweh (Rev 5:9f).

As with the First Epistle of John it would appear that Jesus ὁ ἅγιος is so named because of his relation with God who is ἅγιος just as they both share the attribute of ὁ ἀληθινός . There is a difference between this title (Rev 3:5) and ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ which quite obviously could not be used of God, and suggests that a separate tradition underlies the latter title. In Revelation ἅγιος when applied to Jesus affirms his connection with God as one who shares the attributes of God.

5:5 Holiness and the Fourth Gospel

In the Fourth Gospel the use of both the adjective ἅγιος and the verb ἁγιάζω is very restricted. The adjective is to be found five or possibly six times in all.(146) It is probably to be read in 6:69 of Jesus, as we have shown in our first chapter, and then appears in 17:11 where it qualifies the Father. The neuter τὸ ἅγιον qualifies the Spirit in 1:33, in 14:26 (where it is omitted by the Sinaitic Syriac), and in 20:22; possibly we are to read πνεῦμα ἅγιον in 7:39 following the reading of P66(P.M.) and many other manuscripts.(147) The use of ἅγιος in the Gospel is limited to the members of the Trinity. The verb ἁγιάζω is found four times in John: once in 10:36 and three times in 17:17,19, and is used twice of Jesus and twice of the disciples. Both in John display individual traits often without parallel in the other gospels. Holiness in John is a very distinctive doctrine.

5:5:1 Holiness in relation to the rest of the New Testament

When we relate the concept holiness in the Fourth Gospel to the other Johannine literature (excluding II and III John),(148) we find that it is quite in accord with the general picture. Conversely the single instance of ἅγιος in the First Epistle of John, which as we have seen probably denotes Jesus as the Agent of God, the one who gives the Holy Spirit, is quite within the Fourth Gospel perimeter

for the sphere of the holy. Revelation uses both ἅγιος and its plural form ἅγιοι on a number of occasions. Angels (e.g. 14:10), men (e.g. 16:6 and 18:24), and Jerusalem (21:2,10; 22:11,19 and cf 11:2) are all described as holy. In comparison the Gospel usage appears to be infrequent and restrictive. However one needs to bear in mind the setting of Revelation within the milieu of the heavenly cult and the way in which a bond is formed between the heavenly and earthly "holy ones" in the use of the same title for both groups. The sense of identity reminds one of the Qumran setting where "holy ones" implied sometimes men and at other times angels.

When we consider the Fourth Gospel in relation to the other Gospels, leaving aside the expression "Holy Spirit", we find that, generally, the Synoptic Gospels use ἅγιος of a wider variety of subjects. Thus Luke uses ἅγιος of Jesus (1:35; 4:34), God's name (1:49), the prophets (1:70), the Covenant (1:72) and the angels (9:26). Mark uses ἅγιος of Jesus (1:24), of John the Baptist (6:20) and of the angels (8:38). Both Mark and Luke appear to use the term ἅγιος in its relational sense implying belonging to God, with only Mk 6:20 offering a possible exception to the pattern - John is called δίκαιος and ἅγιος, and the latter seemingly may imply an ethical quality like the former. In general the stress is upon the relational and while there are some parallels with the Johannine pattern, the realm of the holy is broader in the Synoptics than in the Fourth Gospel. Ἅγιος in John is limited to those with divine claims.

In Matthew the Temple (24:15), Jerusalem (27:53,4:5) and men who come out of their tombs (27:52) are described as holy. The adjective occurs also in a wisdom saying (7:6). The verb ἁγιάζω in Matthew is used of the name of God (6:9), and twice in a consequence dealing with Temple holiness, (23:17,19). For Matthew holiness is evidently related to the cult, the realm which belongs

to God, rather than just an ethical quality. It is in association with God or the sphere of the holy that the gold or the gift become holy, just as the Temple and Jerusalem in association with God's presence and election are holy.

The process of becoming holy reminds us of the OT cultus and elsewhere in the NT the connection is often made through the mention of Jesus' sacrifice and other primarily cultic terms such as ἀπολούω (149) and ἄμωμος (150). Through the concept of a spiritualised cult, the New Israel was made holy and thus brought into a relationship with God mediated by Jesus and the Holy Spirit, a relationship which more than anything else necessitated obedience.(151) As we noticed in the Pauline writings(152) holiness is not an ethical process but a state - the ethical nuances are then a consequence of this stage. This is important also for an understanding of the Johannine use as we shall now see.

5:5:2 Ἁγιάζω in the Fourth Gospel

The verb ἁγιάζω appears four times in the Gospel; once in 10:36, where it describes Jesus being made holy prior to his advent into the world; and three times in chapter 17 where it parallels Jesus' own mission with that of his appointing of the disciples - they too are to be sanctified and sent, (vss 17f); and in vs 19 where it describes an action performed by Jesus on behalf (ὑπὲρ) of his disciples.

There are then three distinct uses of ἁγιάζω with God as the subject on two occasions and Jesus on the third. This accords well with the belief that consecration was strictly speaking a divine action.(153)

5:5:3 Chapter 10

The pericope of concern to us commences at verse 22 with a brief outline of the setting - the Jewish Festival of Dedication (Hannukah), which may be relevant for the theme of holiness, (see n186), and the note, that it was Winter. Perhaps this festival with its Maccabean associations was

the time when nationalistic hopes were quick to burst into flame, and the question of the Messiah might be appropriate. Jesus is found on the "Porch of Solomon" a comment which might reflect John's interest in his kingship, and just prior to this pericope Jesus has been speaking of himself as the good shepherd, again with probable royal implications. The suspense proves too much for the people and they ask Jesus, "If you are the Christ, tell us plainly" (vs 24). In fact John has already answered the question in previous passages and so the centre of interest as elsewhere in the Gospel moves towards a reinterpretation of the Messianic hope. Jesus' response to the question is to point to his works (ἔργα), and to the shepherd imagery (vss 25-8) and although it constitutes an affirmative answer to the question, the questioners fail to grasp it - the Johannine touch of the inability of the non-believer to comprehend the revelation found within Jesus comes into operation. Jesus is the Christ and his "works" emulating the great OT figures of Moses[154] and Elijah/Elisha make this clear just as the shepherd imagery links him with David the king. This is no more than a repetition of teaching which has already been presented in the Gospel, so that John is now quick to move on to new territory.

Verse 28 with its claim that Jesus gives ζωὴν αἰώνιον breaks with traditional messianic hope. The raising of the dead was not without OT precedent, yet essentially the giving of life is a divine prerogative. John acknowledges this in the next verses (cf vs 30) where he defines Jesus' relationship with the Father - "I and the Father are one", a radical statement indeed.

Jesus' union with the Father (vs 30) is one of an Agent with his Principal and consequently is to be qualified (as here - cf vs 29 "My Father, who has given them to me, is greater than all").[155] The subordinate position does not detract from the uniqueness of Jesus' claim (vs 30). Through the misunderstanding of the listeners John draws out the height and depth of the Jesus "event", rather like some of the Platonic dialogues which also use misunderstanding as a means to an end. The Jewish reaction to Jesus' statement is a cry of "blasphemy". At the time of the writing of the

Gospel such a charge would have been a very present problem to the Johannine community and John here addresses himself to the contemporary situation. It is as if Jesus were on trial and R. Schnackenburg(156) has pointed to possible links with the Synoptic trial of Jesus (cf Mk 14:63ff and Lk 22:71). In the Fourth Gospel trial there is no accusation of blasphemy, but perhaps John is here showing some knowledge of the Synoptic tradition. Since the contemporary scene appears to have included a break with the local synagogue, much of the Johannine Gospel takes on added meaning when understood within the context of dialogue and conflict with the Synagogue. John's response to the issue in this particular setting is twofold - Jesus points to his works (and we may hear the Christian Church speaking of Jesus' life and works) and identifies these as coming from the Father (cf vs 32). If he is on trial his works show that he is innocent, and indeed that he is from God. (We remember the claim of Moses in Num 16:28, who likewise attributes his deeds to God).

As in the Synoptic trial the actual deeds of Jesus move into the background and the central point becomes the issue of blasphemy, and Jesus' life is endangered. Again we sense the presence of the contemporary situation in the mention of blasphemy;(157) and the persecution of local Christians (sometimes by stoning) may be included in the scene. It is however not inconceivable that Jesus faced charges of blasphemy in his own life-time apart from the trial scene (cf Mk 2:7).

Jesus continues his defence while there is a brief interlude in the attempted stoning. In imitation seemingly of the rabbinic "a minori ad maius"(158) vs 34-6 include a biblical proof as Jesus counters his accusers after their own style of argument. Perhaps Ps 82:6 has a history as a proof text within the Johannine Community(159) for indeed at this point we feel the proximity of the current dialogue between that community and the Jewish Synagogue. Perhaps such a verse was used to argue the uniqueness of Jesus and his peculiar claim to divinity, in which case the argument would proceed along lines which are similar to those found in this pericope.

The quotation from Ps 82(1):6 follows the Greek (LXX) closely although curiously enough it lacks the second half of the verse καὶ υἱοὶ ὑψίστου πάντες which might well have been appropriate. Probably we are to hear it in the background[160] either as a strengthening of Jesus' claim to sonship or as a polemic against the Jewish claim. In concentrating attention upon ἐγὼ εἶπα θεοί ἐστε the full force of θεός becomes apparent, and Jesus' right to the title μονογενὴς θεός (Jn 1:18) is ensured.

The phrase in vs 34 ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ὑμῶν is somewhat odd since we might expect Jesus, himself a Jew, to have used "our Law". We note in the variants to this verse that P45 and other texts omit ὑμῶν , perhaps rightly.[161] Yet in 8:17 we find the phrase νόμῳ δὲ τῷ ὑμετέρῳ and this may argue in favour of the inclusion of ὑμῶν in 10:34. The sense is then appropriate to the Johannine Community in its latter stages when it stood over against the Jewish Synagogue as a separate entity, and "your law"[162] would be an objective demarcation.[163] With the reminder καὶ οὐ δύναται λυθῆναι ἡ γραφή the Christian defence takes shape.

The most vexed question is that of the relation of the actual contents of the Psalm in its original setting to the present Johannine context,[164] and the extent to which another setting might appear appropriate. As regards the original setting of the Psalm, the most likely answer is that it is a Divine Council Psalm in which Yahweh as the Chief Judge passes sentence upon the gods of the nations and demotes them from being θεοί and υἱοὶ ὑψίστου to the fate of mortals, ὑμεῖς δὲ ὡς ἄνθρωποι ἀποθνήσκετε . This presupposes the idea of Yahweh sitting as the head of a Council which is made up of the gods each representative of a nation, and Ps 82 verse 1 quite easily may be understood in this light. The question then is of the relation of such a Council scene to the Johannine context. Some writers have suggested that the Psalm is chosen because it is applicable to the "trial" in which Jesus stands accused

of blaspheny and so the defence of Jesus includes a denunciation of his false judges, (cf vs 2 of Ps 82). However that part of the Psalm is not quoted and our attention is not naturally drawn to the idea of Jesus' condemnation of false judges[165] but rather to a defence of his claim to be the unique Son of God. There is no rebuke as in 7:24 nor is there here present the imagery of Jesus as the eschatological Judge (as in 5:22,30).[166]

With the discovery of 11Q Melch. in which the same Psalm is used to describe Melchizedek as passing judgement upon the forces of Evil who are the ones who have judged unjustly, a renewed attempt was made to connect the Council setting with John 10.[167]

J.A. Emerton[168] had already made the suggestion that John 10:32-6 was based on the understanding that Ps 82:6 was addressed to angels. A.T. Hanson in two articles directed attention to the interpretation of John's citation of Ps 82, the second of these articles being in direct response to 11Q Melch.[169] He argued against Emerton's "angelic" solution following M. de Jonge and A.S. van der Woude:[170] Jesus is accused of "making himself God" (vs 33) and it is illogical according to Hanson for him to appeal to a Psalm which is addressed to angels and to an angelic figure like that of Melchizedek in 11Q Melch.,[171] in his defance. Jesus is not claiming to be either a Judge or an angelic figure in this particular pericope (although the idea of judgement as Hanson notes resides in the background). Instead Jesus is ὃν ὁ πατὴρ ἡγίασεν καὶ ἀπέστειλεν.

If angels are not intended by the phrase θεοὶ ἐστε in verse 35, the question must then be asked, who is intended? Most scholars[172] favour an understanding in line with what might have been contemporary Rabbinic teaching, namely that the Psalm was addressed to the children of Israel on Sinai at the moment of the reception of the Law.[173] Against the background of the Synagogue conflict of the Johannine community, John then uses contemporary Rabbinic teaching to argue from the

minor premise (Israelites are called θεοί) to the major conclusion, then how much more right has the One who has been consecrated and sent by the Father, to claim the title Son of God (vs 36).

As C.K. Barrett has noted,(174)

> "Jesus ... goes back to fundamental principles and argues, more generally, that the word "god" can in certain circumstances be applied to beings other than God himself to whom he has committed authority".

E.C.Hoskyns(175) understands a more restricted field -

> "In the mind of the author of the gospel the reference is to all the inspired men of the OT, including the prophets, and prepares the way for a contrast between those to whom the word of God came and Jesus who is veritably the Son of God." (176)

It is the principle rather than the exact example which is important, and it is unwise to speculate too far when the text gives no clear directions.

The next stage of the argument is found in verse 36. As R. Schnackenburg (177) says, "If even those who receive God's word are called 'gods' and 'sons of the Most High', with how much more right should not he, whom God himself sent as the one who transmits God's words and his final and perfect revelation (cf 3:34) say of himself: I am (the) Son of God". The article is missing(178) and verse 36 reads as follows :- ὃν ὁ πατὴρ ἡγίασεν καὶ ἀπέστειλεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι βλασφημεῖς, ὅτι εἶπον υἱὸς θεοῦ εἰμι.

On the one side of the argument are the people or agents of God (Moses, the prophets) who receive the Word of God and on the other side is the Agent par excellence who not only transmits God's word but is himself the incarnate Logos. There is very little connection between John's use of Ps 82 and the use of that same Psalm in 11QMelch., unless in using the Psalm the Evangelist is deliberately offsetting the claims of other divine agents "Sons of Heaven", "angels" or a divine Melchizedek. This might be true even if John had never read the scroll from Qumran, which in all likelihood he had not. In a sense John demythlogises the Council setting of the Psalm, just

as the Rabbis had done when they applied the Psalm to Israel. He uses it as an argument in defence of the divinity of Jesus and because of the uniqueness of Jesus as presented in John, such a use cannot but negate the claims of any other divine agent. Jesus the divine agent, is the one who is truly the Son, truly the Holy One and truly God. For John all this speaks of Jesus' relationship to the Father without which none of these claims could stand. Jesus is from above and so there can be no real comparison between Jesus and other men. In John there are no other claimants to the titles of holy one or son, whether angels (scarcely mentioned in this Gospel) or people like Moses and Aaron, for apart from Jesus there are no holy men, holy prophets or other sons of God. While it would be pressing the case too far to say that these were inconceivable to John, the absence of such ἁγιος is nevertheless noteworthy. There is a great gulf between the accusation "being a man he makes himself God" (vs 33) and the Johannine belief in a divine Logos who becomes flesh (1:14).

As the divine Son of God, Jesus is consecrated and sent. These actions are reminiscent of some of the prophetic vocations (cf Is 6 and Jer 1), but with one very important difference, namely Jesus comes from God, from above and unlike Isaiah presumably does not need to be cleansed from sin. The consecration in 10:36 is different then from the consecration for the removal of sin or ritual impurity, and instead is more concerned with Jesus' mission.(179) In this regard R. Bultmann says,

> "The setting apart from the profane sphere referred to by ἁγιάζειν is at the same time the preparation for his calling, his mission (cf Jer 1:5 and Ecclus 49:7)" (180)

Two points are raised by this suggestion of Bultmann. In the first place on the basis of our study of holiness in the Old and New Testament it seems preferable to speak not about "setting apart from the profane" but rather "marking out as belonging to God". Jesus is marked out as the Son of God, which signifies his unique relation to his Father. Secondly as J. Bühner points out,

> " ἁγιάζειν und ἀποστέλλειν bilden nicht einfach ein Hendiadyoin; vielmehr

> liegt im ἁγιάζειν das Moment des Aussonderns, der einzigartigen und besonderen Hervorhebung: es zielt auf die christologische Besonderheit des in die Welt Gesandten als des vor allen anderen Θεοῦ des himmlischen Thronsaales Erwälten." (181)

This is an important insight particularly if we regard ἁγιάζειν in 17:19 as the moment of re-union of Jesus with his Father.

R. Schnackenburg(182) on John 10:36 argues that "consecrate" is too weak a translation, "since the concept of 'ratification' or 'sealing' is also present in the word. Yet it is not to be understood simply as a juridical act but as an endowment of the Holy Spirit, (cf 3:33f)". Images of the OT prophets come to mind and perhaps also Moses.While John draws on the OT concept of the Agents of God these human parallels are insufficient for Jesus is a heavenly agent - he is the Son of God, the Son of Man the Heavenly Logos. Consecrate or קדש needs to encompass these latter concepts also before vs 36 can begin to make sense in the total Johannine perspective.

The idea behind קדוש , because it is used of Jesus, stands closer to the "holy ones of God" who carry the messages of the Divine Council,(183) than to the idea of a ritual or ethical consecration. The sense is then the authorization of an agent (שלוח) who is "holy" or "a holy one", a "son of God", using the structure of the Divine Council - but since John demythlogises the structure, Jesus in his consecration becomes the unique agent of God, the only Son. As a result קדוש has a unique significance here; detached from previous cultic connotations it resembles rather the election of the new head of the Council, the Son of Man who at the end of time will judge the world; but at the same time it includes the basic humanity of Jesus and his appearance among men as Messiah and Prophet.

Verse 37 brings us back to a consideration of the works of Jesus(184) and reminds us of the words of Moses (Num 16:28f), but this is a greater than Moses here for "the Father is in me and I am in the Father" (38). The agency

of the Prophets and of Moses pales into insignificance and we are once more within the very presence of God as encountered in the person of His unique Agent - Jesus. In his skilful manipulation of the agency concept John moves from the human to the divine and by divesting the angelic members of their importance he is able to transfer these qualities to Jesus so that the heavenly Jesus stands alone within the Council and transcends all earthly agents.

In a setting where Moses might well have been presented in similar fashion (cf Philo), the agency of Jesus stands as a challenge, for his claims exceed those of the Philonic Moses, and his works are proof. The revolt of Korah in which the biblical Moses points to his works as the authorization of God, and in which God promises to reveal his Holy One and to punish Korah and his rebellious folk may well have been one of the sources behind the writing of John 10:31-39; where Jesus is the Agent par excellence. The final verse of the pericope (vs 39) leaves us with a sense of His Power - by virtue of his relationship with God, Jesus stands apart from those to whom the "word of God came".

In deciding upon the correct interpretation of the verb ἁγιάζω in this passage, we find that certain meanings are quite clearly less likely than others. For instance sacrificial[185] or more generally cultic implications are not explicitly developed within this passage, except insofar as there may be a connection with the use of ἁγιάζω in 17:19 where ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν is sometimes understood as suggestive of Jesus' self-sacrifice. Yet even there the connection is not stated and ἁγιάζω is not necessarily to be understood as a sacrificial action. It is doubtful also whether the attempt by E.C.Hoskyns[186] to draw a parallel between the dedication of Jesus and that of the Temple is valid, indeed it is far easier to reason from the Festival of Dedication to the Messianic hope of a new Solomon, given the connection in Second Maccabees 10:1-8 with Solomon - so that the new Temple echoes the dedication of the First Temple and raises the hope of God's new era. This is ideally suited as we have shown to the question

concerning Jesus' Messiahship.

Another interpretation of ἁγιάζω which finds scant support from the text is that of Jesus as the "ethically other" - the one removed from the realm of sin. The idea of separation is not obvious; instead we are left with a strong sense of the union between Father and Son. Accordingly the most profitable line of investigation is that of commission for a task(187) - a peculiar task for a unique agent. Like the Priests, Prophets and Soldiers (of the Holy War setting), Jesus is consecrated to perform God's Will. The consecration as so often in the OT is God-directed and says more about Jesus' relationship with the Father than about his relation to fellow men. In the light of Jesus' union with the Father even the agency of Moses fails and in fact one is forced into a consideration of the heavenly agencies.

We note in this connection R. Schnackenburg(188) who draws an interesting parallel -

> "There is an unmistakable proximity here to Mandaean texts expressing things about the Gnostic redeemer; cf Ginza 70:1-4: 'Before the Uthras existed the great (life) created you and commissioned you. The great one created you and commissioned you, endowed you, commissioned you, sent you and gave you plenary powers over everything whatsoever.' "

There have been many discussions on the agency of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel, from Bultmann's Gnostic Redeemer to the Jewish Wisdom figure, Borgen's halakhic agent to Bühner's prophet-angel.(189) Any one of these heavenly or earthly figures might be indicated in Jn 10. It is clear that John had a wide range of agencies to call upon and it is extremely difficult to be precise about the type of agency in mind. The best parallel is with the heavenly consecrations as suggested by Schnackenburg.(190) One fact which does appear is the uniqueness of the consecration of Jesus as it is presented by John and the way in which other agencies are subordinated to that of the Only Begotten of the Father.

5:5:4 Chapter 17

The farewell Prayer of Jesus forms a climax to the previous discourses although it lacks teaching on the Holy Spirit. It begins with a summation of Jesus' earthly ministry (vss 1-5), "to give life eternal" to glorify God, and "to accomplish the work" which God gave him. It centres around the request (vss 1,5) that Jesus should himself be glorified. Verse 5 implies the sense of "give me back my rightful place with thee in Heaven" - when Jesus says, "Glorify thou me in thy own presence with the glory which I had with thee before the world was made."

The second section (vss 6ff) continues the theme of Jesus' coming to the Father (vs 11) and is mainly concerned with the protection of the disciples[191] (vs 15) from the Evil One - "Keep them from Evil (the Evil One)", (cf vs 11 "Keep them in Thy name"). There is a strong sense of two worlds, the World of the Holy Father and the World of the Evil One,[192] each posed opposite the other - with the disciples living in the one but belonging to the other, (14) "they are not of the world" - Indeed as disciples of Jesus they have been given to Jesus by God (vs 9) and they belong to both God (here termed "Holy Father" vs 11) and Jesus (vs 10). But although they belong, the removal of Jesus from their human realm poses a very real danger to them, the danger that they will be lost (12). So we come to the request of Jesus that God will sanctify them (vs 17), and this is related to Jesus' mission (and thus to 10:36) and also to his own self-sanctification (vs 19).

The third part of the Prayer commences with an extension of the disciples to include "all those who believe in me through their word" namely the Church. There are two petitions; the first for unity (with each other and with God and Jesus) is found in vss 21-23, and the second petition "that they may be with me where I am" - a plea that like Jesus the disciples may be admitted "to behold God's Glory" (vs 24).

The prayer closes with another brief summary of Jesus' mission in revealing God's Name and His Love and the hope that this Love may like Jesus himself be found in the Christians. It is this concern with the disciples (both of

Jesus' time and later) that is one of the most striking aspects of this prayer and has led to the title "The High Priestly Prayer". The petitions which Jesus prays however are not on the whole priestly. Jesus does not pray for forgiveness or God's mercy as the OT priest might do. Although there are parallels with Hebrews 10:10-22 in that Jesus dies a sacrificial death, this is not explicit in ch 17 of the Gospel. The idea of access into God's presence is in both John and Hebrews, with Jesus gaining access for his followers but while Hebrews depicts this using cultic imagery John pictures Jesus as the returning divine agent. The terms "priest", "sanctuary" and "sacrifice" so crucial to Hebrews 10 are absent from John 17, and it is not wise to read the chapter as if they were there.(193)

Jesus asks first for his own glorification, then for the protection of the disciples (vss 11,15), for their unity (vs 11), for their sanctification (17), and finally for their union with himself and God (22) by sharing with him in the presence of God (vs 24). The essence of the prayer is that Jesus, the one sent by God, asks for his share again in God's glory (vs 5) and requests permission for the disciples (and other believers) to share in his glory. The analogy is not dissimilar to the request of a son to bring his friends into his father's house. Since the "friends" are still "outside" they need to be protected, to be assured of their "belonging" and to be encouraged to share the union of the father and the son. It is within such a specific understanding of the prayer that we need to interpret the term ἁγιάζειν.

The sequence of thought from verses 6-11 is chiefly concerned with the disciples (and other believers of that time), who have been given to Jesus by God; they know Jesus comes from the Father; they have received his words and Jesus is glorified in them. Verse 10 puts great stress upon the sense of belonging - "All mine are thine and thine are mine" - the believers are those who belong to Jesus and God. Then comes the moment of disjunction when Jesus picks up a previous request (vs 5 "glorify me in your own presence") and announces "I am coming to Thee",

(vs 11). Death and resurrection are the path by which Jesus regains the glory he shared with the Father "before the world was made".

God is called πάτερ ἅγιε (17:11) and it is therefore natural to find following this title and the request to enter his presence, the petition for sanctification. However there is a brief delay while attention reverts to the believers; Jesus may be leaving the world but they remain in the world, even though through their association with Jesus they do not belong there. Just as the previous chapters in the Gospel have been concerned with the effect on the believers of Jesus' absence so here in the Prayer it becomes a significant issue. The believers have been kept safe during Jesus' life-time (except for the Son of Perdition), but with the absence of Jesus a very real concern arises. It was this concern which permeated the Johannine Community and which is reflected in the writings of the Evangelist, particularly within the farewell discourses. The teaching found therein underlines the sense of continuity between the historical life of Jesus and the life of the community, gives due consideration to the mediating role of the Holy Spirit and points to the hope of sharing in the glory of Christ.

Verse 13 reverts to Jesus' departure from the world and indeed specifically says "these things (i.e. the Prayer and probably the other Farewell discourses) I speak in the world, that they may have my joy fulfilled in themselves". The purpose of this Prayer in particular is made manifest - these things are spoken in the world - in the hearing (or the reading) of the believers, so that they may share the joy of Jesus, the joy of assurance. In recognizing Jesus' joy as He returns to the Father, the believers may in turn realize his joy through their own experience of union with the Father. Out of the reading of the Prayer and the other farewell words of Jesus, a hope is engendered in the hearts of the believers of entering God's house (14:1f), a place prepared for them by Jesus - the joy of Jesus will be confirmed in their hearts by the empty tomb and the Resurrected Lord, (16:16ff) and finally by their own resurrection (11:25f).

Verses 14-16 demonstrate the truth that through the receiving of the word of Jesus (God's word), the believers have lost their earthly citizenship and now belong to the same category as Jesus (vs 14). They "are not of the world" and this description of their being is repeated in verse 16. Verse 15 interrupts with a plea for their safety while they remain physically in the world, although they do not belong to it. The noun πονηροῦ may imply the personal "evil one", mentioned elsewhere in the Gospel, or the abstract "evil", suggesting the power or influence of the evil one.(194) The sense of the request is not greatly altered, whatever choice one makes in the translation of the term. Perhaps John has in mind a particular historical problem, like the threat of active persecution, or an increasing concern with the Parousia of Jesus, which could lead Christians to abandon hope for the present world and to sit back to wait for the final advent. One senses here a reaction to the Apocalypse and its stress upon the end. One might therefore detect a suggestion of the warning, "Do not concern yourselves with the Parousia but concentrate upon the business of living". To this end Jesus prays for their protection, in the face of the world's hatred (vs 14). In verse 16, their "otherness" in the world is stressed and the picture moves in the next few verses to the converse of this teaching, namely their "belonging" to God.

So we encounter the request ἁγίασον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ· ὁ λόγος ὁ σὸς ἀλήθειά ἐστιν (vs 17). We need to be sensitive to the delicate balance of this petition. First of all there is the consciousness that the disciples as also Jesus are "not of this world", and are not to be taken "out of this world", at least not until their deaths, yet they need to be kept apart from evil - separated from all that is profane. So there is first of all the sense of separation. Secondly there is the sense of belonging to God, the positive aspect which we notice in the OT(195) and must certainly be understood here. The believers are to be possessed by God, marked out as belonging to Him, relinquishing their earthly citizenship so that, with Jesus, they may enjoy the pleasure of entering the very presence of God as His own. The request is therefore that the disciples through Jesus may be admitted

into the sphere of the Holy so as to experience the union of the Father and Son and participate in the extension of the mission of the Son.

Since the next verse introduces the idea of "being sent", we are reminded of 10:36 and Jesus' own mission[196] and indeed vs 18 makes just that connection. As Jesus was sanctified and sent so too the believers will be sanctified and sent into the world in continuation of the mission of Jesus, (cf Jn 20:21-3). Sanctification is therefore intrinsically bound up with the idea of mission just as it was in Jer 1:5. The sanctification is "in truth" which argues against understanding a particular ritual like baptism. Indeed the addition of "Your Word is Truth" points us towards the priority of teaching as incarnate in the Divine Logos over all else in John.[197] Sacramental rituals have their place but only within the greater context of the teaching of Jesus - the teaching which he relays from the Father and which has been entrusted to the disciples. There is perhaps an allusion to the Spirit of Truth[198] since in the commissioning of the disciples the Holy Spirit plays a significant part. The sanctification of the disciples would then be fulfilled in their reception of the Spirit, as a sign of their commission. The reminder "Your Word is Truth"[199] acts as a warning against a concept of a charismatic experience which lost sight of God's word.[200] The simplicity of the Johannine "Pentecost" as the disciples receive the Spirit by means of the spoken word of Jesus, contrasts significantly with the version in Acts. Perhaps there were certain tensions within the Johannine community concerning the place of Sacraments and the work of the Spirit.[201] The Evangelist points beyond these tensions to the priority of the Life and Teaching of Jesus the Divine Revealer.

Verse 18 presupposes that the disciples have already been sent. This is best understood from the perspective of the Johannine Community.[202] The Prayer is in many ways the expression of the petitions of this community, for unity, for protection and for the hope of sharing in God's eternal Glory. Jesus prays for the existing community of believers of all ages (cf vs 20), and the Johannine Community in

particular. R. Bultmann[203] says, that this Prayer is in fact that prayed by the Community on their own behalf. The mission of the disciples into the world implies that they are not "of the world" and this idea of mission recurs in ch 20:21-3 when they receive the Holy Spirit.[204] They are given the authority over sins (the authority of judgement),[205] and are sent off with the words, "As the Father has sent me, so I send you".

We may ask whether this ἁγιάζειν includes not only the obvious sense of commission and belonging to God, but also an ethical or cultic understanding. R. Bultmann[206] speaks of a holiness which is "only possible for the community by the continual realisation of its world-annulling way of life, i.e. by continual reference to the word that calls it out of the world, and to the truth that sets it free from the world". Rather than as a washing away of sins or as an obedience to a set of rules the idea of ἁγιάζειν for John finds its true significance as the act of God by which the believers are given the right to become τέκνα θεοῦ (1:12), are called to the life of the Spirit (4:24) and consequently are fitted for their eternal destination (14:1f). There are ritual and ethical implications, but these are not highlighted; they are a consequence of the state of holiness, rather than the cause thereof.[207]

Verse 19 reads, καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν [ἐγὼ] ἁγιάζω ἐμαυτὸν ἵνα ὦσιν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἡγιασμένοι ἐν ἀληθείᾳ. This is undoubtedly a difficult verse to interpret correctly, particularly since ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν adds to ἁγιάζω a vicarious note which before was absent. The verse is probably the climax of the Prayer and denotes Jesus' willingness to suffer and so on the basis of this verse in particular commentators have represented Jesus as "the High Priest", "the Sacrifice", or the "Eucharistic Offering".

The idea of Jesus as a High Priest, who intercedes on behalf of his disciples is a common interpretation of this chapter, but it is as difficult to substantiate as it is to disprove. It is a moot point how far one is justified in reading ideas of atonement sacrifice or ideas drawn from

Hebrews (cf 10:10) into this passage. As we have seen, the idea of priesthood as pertaining to Jesus is absent from the Gospel although other cultic ideas are present and Jesus is associated with great themes like water and light which might have been drawn from a cultic background.(208) We have also shown that mediation or intercession is a task performed by agents other than the high priest, and the idea of a divine Jesus interceding on behalf of the Church is one of the results of the Christian use of Psalm 110:1. The setting is usually forensic and not obviously priestly.

This leaves the interpretation of the verb ἁγιάζω. One of the high priestly tasks was to sanctify objects and people, but it was a task which others (like Moses, Exod 40:11f, and Solomon, 1 Kings 8:64) might perform. If Moses and the king through their actions may be seen as demonstrating a priestly character, then there are significant precedents for Jesus, prophet and king, to perform such a function. There is however an even more significant precedent. While such a task might be described as priestly or cultic, it might also be described as divine - for God ultimately is the one who consecrates (e.g. Jer 1:5). The prayer of Jesus is the declaration of the returning divine agent and includes his request to be allowed back into the presence of his father. The imagery is not unlike the admission of the High Priest into the presence of God (cf Heb 9:11-14) but to read into the words καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἁγιάζω ἐμαυτόν all the soteriology of the Epistle to the Hebrews is to ignore the definitive Johannine structure of the prayer, and its particular presentation of the return of Jesus. The atonement concept is limited to the two words ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν and should not be allowed to dominate the whole passage, rather we should focus on Jesus who through union with His Father performs a divine action.(209)

The second proposed solution concerns the idea of Jesus as a sacrifice and this is naturally related to the third solution which is the eucharistic interpretation. There is yet another solution which has been proposed by R. Asting, and to this we shall return in due course, but for the present we will consider the eucharistic solution and the belief that Jn 17:19 refers to the practice of the Christian

Eucharist. We note in this connection the eucharistic prayer in the Didache[210] and the language employed in the liturgy there. Some scholars have seen in 17:19 a possible connection also with Mk 14:24,[211] with the traditional institution of the eucharist which is notably absent from the Last Supper Discourses of the Fourth Gospel. Mark 14:24 reads, Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν. In this connection R. Bultmann has said,

> "Vs 19 provides us with an interpretation of the old account of the Lord's Supper and its ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν: καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐγὼ ἁγιάζω ἐμαυτόν
> Jesus, the ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ (6:69) proves his holiness by sacrificing himself for his own". (212)

The question is raised of John's attitude towards the eucharist and the place of such a liturgical interpretation within the context of his Christology. C.K.Barrett says,

> "If there is an allusion to Mark 14:24
> (ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν)
> John is interpreting traditional eucharistic language in a non-eucharistic setting. In view of 6:51-8 this is not improbable." (213)

A similar sentiment is described by R. Schnackenburg,

> "Eine Anspielung auf die Abendsmahlsworte (vgl. Joh 6,51c) ist möglich, aber nicht sicher." (214)

In view of the Evangelist's careful handling of the sacraments and the care which he takes to illustrate their ineffectiveness apart from Jesus and his words, it is worth suggesting that in fact ἁγιάζειν in 17 and 19 represents a break with traditional eucharistic (sacramental teaching) such as is now typified in the Didache and perhaps attempts to correct it. In the Didache both the Bread and Wine are holy (9:2,5) and those partaking of these gifts are to be pure (14:1ff). The Eucharist is described as spiritual food and linked with eternal life, (10:3). By contrast John underplays the place of the eucharist in the Church structure so that it is completely absorbed within the revelation of Christ. It has no real existence outside Jesus, for he alone is the avenue of salvation. It seems likely that this is the thrust behind 6:52ff particularly vs 63 "It is the spirit that gives life, the flesh is of no avail". In R. Kysar's

analysis(215) of the eucharistic and other sacramental teaching he brings out the care behind each of the so-called "sacramental" passages and the reserve in giving them too prominent a place in the Gospel teaching. R.E.Brown(216) has suggested that the Johannine Community suffered from a misunderstanding of the sacraments and H.Klos(217) suggests that the Evangelist wanted the sacraments to be understood in the rightful position vis à vis the life and teaching of Jesus rather than in some mechanical way. We are therefore aware that 17:19 might indeed be another instance of the use of eucharistic language in order to introduce a corrective element into the understanding of the eucharist. It is Jesus who gives life and indeed he is the Way to the Father, consequently even the sacraments pale into insignificance in the light of the actual death and resurrection of Jesus. As the Divine Revealer, Jesus sanctifies himself so that in the reception of this revelation the believers are enabled ultimately to share in the unity of Father and Son.

R. Bultmann and R. Schnackenburg(218) draw attention to the theme of Jesus as offering himself as a sacrifice (cf Heb 10:10) on the basis of OT texts like Ex 13:2 and Deut 15:19. Jesus' death might quite easily evoke the sense or notion of sacrifice, but it may be asked how legitimate is it to read into chapter 17 such ideas. It is one thing to refer to the Johannine timing of the crucifixion or the references in the text linking Jesus with the Paschal lamb,(219) but it is another to assume such references when they are not obviously intended. In John ch 17 the self-sanctification of Jesus involves not only his death but also his resurrection and ascension into the presence of God. It is our belief that should, when applied to Jesus, perhaps also in the other instances (vs 17), be understood within the framework of his return to his state of glory with the Father and linked with the request that the disciples be with him (vs 24). Some trace of a similar idea appears in part of the Didache which reads :

> "Remember, Lord, Thy Church to deliver it from all evil, and to perfect it in Thy love; and gather it together from the four winds - even the Church which has been sanctified - into

Thy kingdom which Thou hast prepared for it".(220)

Through the vicarious death of Jesus the church is brought into a state of holiness, so that it might share in the Kingdom of God. R. Asting(221) has suggested that in vs 19 we should understand Jesus as saying, "I am going back into the heavenly sphere on their behalf", and C.K.Barrett(222) in a similar vein writes,

> "The Son who has prayed to be glorified now asks again in other terms that he may re-enter the divine life, in order that he may take his disciples with him, and so, as it were, incorporate them into God."

R. Schnackenburg and R. Bultmann(223) are critical of Asting's interpretation on the grounds that he ignores "den sonstigen Gebrauch von ὑπέρ und verkennt die Sinnverschiebung von ἁγιάζειν", as Schnackenburg points out.(224)

But one may question this critique - the prayer lacks sacrificial language and is only vaguely "cultic". Instead it speaks about Jesus' return to the Father, the reverse of 10:36. The best parallel is not sacrifice but consecration as in Jer 1:5, and the sense of belonging to God. Consequently the best alternative is the solution as proposed by Asting(225) and seconded by C.K. Barrett,(226) namely that the term ἁγιάζω refers to Jesus' preparation for his return to his Father and in vs 17 to the ultimate hope that his disciples will be allowed through the path of sanctification to join with him. The path of the Revealer leads from his consecration at his commissioning through his life in the world and his vicarious death into his self-sanctification at the moment of his return to the Glory he shared with the Father. In some ways this is the path which the believers are called to follow - they too are commissioned and sent into the world and they too will be sanctified in glory, perhaps for some there will also be sacrifice. In 4 Macc 17:20 martyrs are termed ἁγιασθέντες suggesting a link with Daniel and Revelation (Dan 7:21 and Rev 20:6) and a similar system of thought may be present here in John(227) - the Christians are engaged in Holy War and their consecration is to this end. "In the

world you have tribulation; but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world" (16:33). Within the conflict of Christian persecution and hatred (cf 17:14), the Christians are consecrated to continue the work of Jesus and like the warriors of early Israel they are set apart by the presence of God himself in the midst. Like the Israelites at Sinai the disciples in vs 17 are prepared through the process of ἁγιάζειν for the eventual prospect of encountering the Holiness of God.

So we may conclude that vss 17-19 present the following ideas as relating to ἁγιάζειν:

(a) Jesus prays that the disciples (and believers) may be rendered holy so that they may eventually share in his glory with the Father. It is sanctification which leads to union with Jesus and the Father, an opening of the sphere of the holy to include the believers.

(b) In becoming holy the disciples are called to a spiritual existence which obviously involves certain ethical implications (both positive - love, and negative - absence of sin), but more explicitly involves response to the truth incarnate in Jesus.(228)

(c) We are probably to understand the Spirit and the Word as agents in their holiness even though the Spirit connection is not explicit until ch 20 (cf Rom 15:16).

(d) Jesus sanctifies himself "on their behalf" and this clause signifies his death, which opens up avenues of interpreting this event as a vicarious sacrifice. However the point at issue in the prayer is Jesus' return to the Father and his hope that where he is his disciples (and all believers) may be present as well.

(e) Ἁγιάζω in verses 17 and 19 has then a double sense. In verse 17 (cf 10:36) the emphasis is upon commissioning, authorisation and selection as the Agent or agents of Yahweh. In 19 the emphasis is upon the reverse, namely Jesus' return to the Father, the conclusion of his mission and the opening up of the way back to God on behalf of his disciples. The actual death of Jesus is subordinate to the triumphal return of Jesus to Glory - this is the most powerful point of the Prayer and emphasizes the uniqueness of the Johannine Christ.

5:6 Conclusion

As we move towards chapter six and our interpretation of "the Holy One of God" and a consideration of its possible background, we need to pause for a moment and consider what light the verb ἁγιάζω casts upon ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ as a related term within the Fourth Gospel. We have found that ἁγιάζω is used of Jesus in two different ways, apart from his action in sanctifying the disciples (if this is the correct understanding of 19b). "Consecration" is the mark of Jesus' entry into the world (10:36) and his exit from the world (17:19). It implies his preparation (commission and authorization) prior to his advent and on the other hand incorporates his death, resurrection and ascension which mark the end of his earthly mission. "Consecration" is then far too weak a term to incorporate all these ideas, but it is difficult to think of a single substitute. It implies a fundamental relationship between Jesus and God which is also extended to include the believers (17:17), and the sense of "belonging" is quite clearly one of the most important areas of Johannine holiness, rather than ethical separation or even cultic purity.

Jesus' self-sacrifice and his self-sanctification are not to be understood as identical concepts although they are related in that the latter involves the former. The death of Jesus is his pathway to union with the Father, it is his consecration at the end of his mission. Consequently when we consider 6:69 and ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ in the next chapter and the manifold understandings of ἅγιος there, the chief contribution of ἁγιάζω to the question will be to point to Jesus as the One who comes from the other world and who is to return to the other world; he is the one who in a unique way belongs to God and to the sphere of the Holy.

CHAPTER SIX : THE MESSENGER FROM GOD

		Page
6:1:1	Introduction	225
6:1:2	The Positive Sense of the Holy One	227
6:1:3	The Negative Sense of the Holy One	230
6:2	The Dualism in the Fourth Gospel	232
6:2:1	The Anthropological Aspect	233
6:2:2	The Cosmological Aspect	235
6:2:3	The Soteriological Aspect	237
6:2:4	The Ethical Aspect	240
6:2:5	The Dualism in John and the Holy One of God	242
6:3	The Demonology of the Fourth Gospel	244
6:3:1	Cosmic Tension in John	245
6:3:2	The Term δαιμόνιον	247
6:3:3	The Term διάβολος	250
6:3:4	The Term Σατανᾶς	254
6:4	The Cosmic Dimension of the Holy One of God	254
6:4:1	The Demonic Perspective	255
6:4:2	The Michael Tradition	259
6:5	Conclusion	261
	Footnotes to Chapter Six	352

CHAPTER SIX : THE MESSENGER FROM GOD

6:1:1 Introduction

So we come, at last, to the final chapter; to witness the drawing together of the various threads, which make up the complex tapestry of the Holy One of God. For a moment we pause to catch our breath and to consider the way we have trodden. In the first part of this work we concentrated upon the offices of priest, prophet and king as possible ways of describing the agency of the Holy One. When these offices failed to explain the Holy One in Jn 6:69, we turned to a study of the terms קדוש and ἅγιος in search of the key to the Holy One of God. Several facts are now clear. The Holy One of God is a title capable of a number of different meanings, varying according to the context in which it is located. Whatever the title meant originally, it has now been clothed in new garb, since each Evangelist has given to it a particular nuance of meaning. In recognizing this

process, we can discern the present meanings attached to the title and, at the same time, take the first tentative steps towards an understanding of the basic intention of the title.

Mark has used the Holy One of God to describe Jesus as an agent of God, whose mission brings him into conflict with the demons. In the broader context of the Gospel, the agency of Jesus is defined in terms of the messianic office. By recasting the exorcism in ch 1 within a teaching setting and by making the words of the demons the highpoint of the pericope, Mark has diverted attention away from the miraculous and towards the relationship shared by the Holy One, with the Author of all holiness. Jesus is the Holy One because he comes from God and acts with the authority of a divinely appointed agent.

Luke has adopted the Marcan setting with one important emendation. The immediate context of the pericope in ch 4, and indeed much of the content of the early chapters (4, 5, 6), points to the prophetic nature of Jesus' mission. Fear, that Jesus might be confused with the Divine Man of Hellenism, was probably the motivation which led Luke to qualify titles like Son of God and Holy One in terms of the Jewish hope for a prophetic messiah. Jesus is the eschatological agent, directed by the Spirit of God, who emulates the miracles of the prophets and who ushers in the new age, the new Exodus.

John has developed the title in a different direction and our study has suggested that the confession on the lips of Peter cannot be reduced to the level of one of the usual eschatological offices. For the confession to be messianic and nothing more, one would have to explain away the incident in 1:41f. The dilemma of 6:14f argues against a prophetic solution or even a combination like prophet-messiah. The key to the Holy One appears to be along the path of understanding its distinctive qualities; namely the force of the term ἅγιος .

So far we have encountered no less than five suggested interpretations of the term ἅγιος with regard to the title the Holy One of God, particularly as found in John.(1) These are the following :

(a) The term ὁ ἅγιος implies that Jesus is the one who is consecrated as a sacrifice for the world (R.Bultmann).

(b) The term ὁ ἅγιος implies that Jesus is the one who is consecrated as the Messiah (J.H.Bernard, B. Weiss).

(c) The term ὁ ἅγιος implies that Jesus is the one separated from the profane - "the ethically other" (B. Schwanck, A. Schlatter).

(d) The term ὁ ἅγιος implies that Jesus is the divine Son of God (O. Cullmann).

(e) The term ὁ ἅγιος implies that Jesus is the one who comes from the realm of the holy, as the representative of this realm (R. Bultmann).

Our study of the idea of holiness, which we undertook in the previous chapter, led us to the conclusion that there are two sides to the concept - a positive side of belonging and a negative sense of separation. When applied to the holy One of God, the positive side emphasizes that he comes from God and belongs to God in a special way. The negative side emphasizes the sense of separation from the profane - the sense of tension, which is the inevitable result of the "breaking in" of the sphere of the holy into this world. In the suggested understandings of the Holy One listed above, (c) represents the negative sense and the other four represent different ways of understanding the positive sense.

6:1:2 The Positive Sense of the Holy One

Without doubt, the most important aspect of the Holy One is the sense of belonging - the positive aspect which our study of holiness brought to the fore. But in what sense does the Holy One belong to God? Does he belong as the sacrifice for the world (Bultmann), as the Messiah (Bernard, Weiss), as the divine Son of God (Cullmann), or as the representative of the holy sphere (Bultmann)? The answer lies in Jn 6 itself, but that is the concern of the next chapter of this work. Our immediate task is to show why some of the suggestions, outlined above, are unsatisfactory.

The idea that the Holy One describes Jesus as "the sacrifice for the world" was first postulated by R.Bultmann, although it is an addendum to his main interpretation ((e) above). He writes,

> "Finally in this context following on 12:20-33 and anticipating 17:19, it must be said that the title ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ also denotes Jesus as the one who has consecrated himself as a sacrifice for the world". (2)

There are two objections to Bultmann's suggestions. In the first place, there is the question of his re-arrangement of the text, placing 6:60-71 after 12:20-33 and thus separating it from the remainder of ch 6. We have already dealt with this issue and shown reason for keeping 6:60-71 as an integral part of ch 6.(3) In fact the present form of ch 6 is more favourably disposed to a sacrificial interpretation than Bultmann's alternative arrangement, since vss 51-59 deal with the eucharist, which through the association with the last supper might have sacrificial connotations. Moreover, 6:4 sets the scene as just before Passover. What then?

If ch 6 is kept intact, does the term ὁ ἅγιος in 6:69 reflect in any way the previous teaching on the flesh and blood of the Son of Man (6:55)? In response to this question, we suggest that John's careful handling of the sacraments indicates a deliberate stress upon the words of Jesus as the only legitimate avenue to eternal life (cf 6:63). Perhaps John set out to counter an inflated view of the importance of the sacraments, by diverting attention away from such practices back to Jesus.(4) In any case we cannot deny the importance attributed to the words of Jesus in this chapter, and given the words of Peter ῥήματα ζωῆς αἰωνίου ἔχεις it is clear that attention here is focussed on Jesus' role as the revealer. This was, in fact, recognized by Bultmann as the primary focus of ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ, and in this detail we must concur with him. The context then of ch 6:60-71, presents Jesus as the one to whom men turn, forsaken by some and discovered by others - the bearer of the revelation of God, the words of life. If eucharistic or sacrificial implications are to be detected in 6:60-71, they are certainly not obvious either in the context or in the words of Peter.

Secondly, we have considered with some care, the Johannine employment of sacrifical language and the use in particular of the verb ἁγιάζω.(5) We found that although one cannot rule out the possibility that sacrifice forms an element in 17:19, it is not necessarily implicit in the Johannine use of ἁγιάζω as 10:36 shows: rather it is the phrase ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν which introduces the vicarious note in 17:19. The main intention of the term ἁγιάζω in 10:36 and 17:19 concerns

Jesus' relationship with the sphere of the holy - his exit from and his return to that realm, respectively.(6) The idea of sacrifice, if present at all, is only a subsidiary part of the idea of consecration in John, an idea which incorporates not only Jesus' death, but indeed, his resurrection and incarnation. On this account, we consider that the confession of Peter refers to the whole of Jesus' mission and not just to his death - be that vicarious, sacrificial or otherwise. The verb ἁγιάζω , as also the adjective ἅγιος , takes in the whole span of Jesus' earthly existence and points beyond it to his heavenly origin. Jesus is not the Holy One because he is consecrated as a sacrifice. Neither, we believe, is he the Holy One because he is the Messiah. Quite apart from the arguments we have already brought forward,(7) there is a further consideration. If we understand 10:36 and 17:19 correctly, Jesus as the consecrated one is he who comes from the sphere of the holy and, after his resurrection, returns to it. Jesus enters into the world as the commissioned and authorized representative of God and His domain. He comes into a hostile environment and reveals God to mankind. His consecration is not to be understood as a process of setting apart a particular individual for a definite task (like Messiah), but as the process of entry or exit from this world. Such an understanding is meaningless without the recognition of Jesus as the Divine Son.

Indeed, the term John uses to describe the agency of Jesus in the Gospel is not Χριστός but υἱός . Only in 17:3 (an editorial comment) does the term Χριστός appear in conjunction with the verb ἀποστέλλω , and there it is a proper name. The main verbs dealing with the mission of Jesus are πέμπω and ἀποστέλλω and these are connected solely with the titles describing Jesus as the Son, (cf 10:36 and 3:16). The consecration of Jesus is liable to misunderstanding if we forget that Jesus is the divine agent who comes from God. We note also John's use of the term ὁ ἐρχόμενος (8) which is designed precisely to lift the messianic or prophetic agency to another level of thinking. Above and beyond the eschatological hopes of the Jews for a messiah or a prophet is the realization that Jesus is "the Coming One"; not in

the conventional sense of the word, but in the unusual Johannine sense, which lays claim to Jesus' divine origin. Of course the people who claim that Jesus is ὁ ἐρχόμενος are not portrayed by John as understanding the depths of their words, but they are a key for the reader. Likewise, in Jn 6 the keys are present for the reader to unlock the meaning of Jn 6:69.

We are left with the suggestion by Cullmann, that Jesus as the Holy One is really Jesus as the divine Son of God, and the important insight of Bultmann, that Jesus comes as the divine revealer and the representative of the holy sphere. In common to both suggestions is the sense of Jesus as a divine agent - a most important detail. Both suggestions raise a number of problems, which we shall deal with at a later stage.(9) For the present, we need to consider what we have described as the negative dimension of the Holy One - the sense of separation from and of tension with the profane.

6:1:3 The Negative Sense of the Holy One

It has been suggested that ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ denotes a primarily ethical content, implying a sense of absolute separation from the profane. Thus B. Schwank describes Jesus, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ, as being "abgesondert von allen profanen"(10) and A. Schlatter more generally of Jesus "von allen gesondert"(11), while R.H.Lightfoot finds in the title the sense of "being separated from sinners".(12) In these three examples we are reminded of that method of understanding קדוש or the Greek ἅγιος as separation from the profane.(13) In the Gospel there is this sense of separation from the world (ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου) but there is also the other sense of Jesus as the one who comes from above, and consequently, really belongs to the heavenly realm. While we may therefore deduce that Jesus is sinless or separated from all that is profane, his holiness does not result from these qualities but, as our study of ἁγιάζω quite clearly demonstrated, rests upon his relation to the Father. John's careful use of ἅγιος also serves to reinforce the primary sense of belonging. Although the sphere of the holy is a divine one,(14) the believer may

enter through the mediatory activity of Jesus (cf 17:17-9).

In consequence, when we meet ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ in Jn 6:69, we are not justified in limiting the translation to "the sinless one" or "the one who is separated from all that is profane". These conjectures may be the implication of Jesus' relation with the Father, but they are not the cause of that relationship, nor are they basic to that sense of holiness which is discernible from John's use of ἅγιος or ἁγιάζω .

If Jesus is not the one who is "ethically other" for John, we need to enquire in what sense he is separate from the world? The obvious answer is, on account of his divine origin, which manifests itself in a form of cosmic tension within the Gospel. We are not thinking here of the cosmological conflict of Zoroastrianism, but of a spiritual conflict consistent with the modified form of John's dualism.(15) In seeking to understand the Holy One of God, we need to examine the sense of tension which stems from this conflict. A basic part of the content of the title is this sense of tension, found also in the Marcan setting.

O. Procksch writes :

> "Jesus plainly confronts the unclean spirit as a bearer of the πνεῦμα ἅγιον ; there is a mortal antithesis between πνεῦμα ἅγιον and πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον which the demons recognise." (16)

In John the "antithesis" is less obvious but by no means less important. Something of the antithesis is observable in the tension between Jesus the giver of life and the people of this world, including Judas. R. Bultmann gives expression to this when he writes :

> "This description expresses first of all that Jesus stands over against the world simply as the one who comes from the other world and belongs to God, and indeed that he is the sole one to do so: he is the Holy One of God. Thus the title expresses Jesus' special relation to God, corresponding to the phrase ὃν ὁ πατὴρ ἡγίασεν 19:36. And as in that passage it continues, καὶ ἀπέστειλεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον so here also the title ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ not only expresses the negative thought that Jesus does not belong to the world; since the confession is the result of experiencing that Jesus has ῥήματα ζωῆς αἰωνίου , an intimation is at the same time given as to what he is for the world: he represents God in the world as the Revealer who bestows life.

But as these ἐήματα are also the σκλησὲς λόγος, this holiness of his includes his judicial office." (17)

With great perception Bultmann uncovers the heart of the Holy One of God - the positive sense of representing God on earth and the negative sense of his separation from the world. The tension experienced by the demons is made manifest in John in the tension between Jesus and "the world", and particularly Jesus and Judas, the Son of Perdition (17:12). We have chosen to describe the tension as "cosmic", because Jesus and Judas represent different "worlds". As we study the implications of this cosmic tension for John 6:69, we will discover how skillfully John uses this tension to bring out the positive aspect of Jesus' relationship with his Father, as well as the negative aspects consequent upon the hostility of his reception in the world. We come now to a consideration of the dualism in the Fourth Gospel.

6:2 The Dualism in the Fourth Gospel

There have been several attempts to classify the thought-structure of the Fourth Gospel in terms of one or other of the dualistic modes of thought current at the time of the writing of the Gospel.(18) We find that writers speak of cosmological dualism, ethical dualism, soteriological dualism and anthropological dualism. However, these attempts do little more than pay tribute to the uniqueness of the Johannine pattern, in which "this world" is poised against the realm from which Jesus comes and to which he belongs. In fact, the Johannine system is not a true dualism; for all men are in the darkness while initially only Jesus represents light. There is <u>a sense of movement</u> which is not found in any of the other dualistic works of the time, whereby some men are taken out of the darkness of the world in response to the revelation incarnate in Jesus. This revelation brings life at the same time and acts in judgement upon those who refuse to come to the light and prefer to remain in darkness.

We find that the basis of the dualistic structure in the Gospel is outlined in the prologue. We see there the elements of light, darkness, life, truth, grace and the most significant detail of all found in vs 14, namely the incarnation of the

divine Word. It is in the responses to the mystery of the incarnation that we evidence the dividing line - between those who understand and accept Jesus (1:12) and those who do not (1:11) and it is the incarnation which principally makes the Johannine dualism so different from even its closest parallel, namely the Hymn scroll from Qumran. καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο contradicts the usual opposition of flesh and spirit found in the Gnostic systems while the verb ἐσκήνωσεν points to a possible Jewish milieu. Even then the raw earthiness of the expression σάρξ might have seemed somewhat unusual even to a Jew, unless he was reminded of the ritual of sacrifice or the coloquial phrase בשר ודם. While many of the terms in the Prologue are well known from the Gnostic treatises, the Johannine usage is significantly different. "The light shines in the darkness but the darkness did not comprehend it/overtake it" (1:5). One cannot really understand John's use of dualistic forms unless one recognizes something of his dialectical style,(19) and the occurrence therein of apparent contradictions such as that between 1:11 and 12. "They received him not. But as many as received him...". This style of writing stems in part from the stylistic usage of the author in line with contemporary fashions,(20) but theologically it derives from his consciousness of the incarnation of the divine logos - the essential contradition in time, when something by nature divine became "flesh", with all the earthiness of that term.

6:2:1 The Anthropological Aspect

There are two main spheres of influence, this world (ὁ κόσμος) and the world above, the heavenly realm (ὁ οὐρανός). The distinction is quite different from the Hebrew separation of this world (עולם הזה) and the world to come (עולם הבא). The latter, essentially a linear distinction, contrasts with John's belief in the simultaneous existence of two worlds, reminiscent in part of Platonic thinking. In John the phrase "of God" stands in deliberate contrast to "of the world". This already says something about ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ . The hallmark of the people of "this world" is disbelief and

the inability to grasp the revelation incarnate in Jesus. The signs which Jesus does point, like his words, to the essence of the revelation which in many ways is nothing more than the truth about his relationship with the Father. Those who belong to God also belong to Jesus and are termed his sheep.(21) These people understand and receive the revelation of Jesus and in the action of receiving move from judgement into life. From what we have learnt from the OT study of קדש, חרם and Holy War, it is not surprising that when the two opposing realms meet, there is confrontation and reaction which may be described metaphorically as electric. Part of the reaction is to be found in the attempts of the Jews to judge and execute Jesus for his claims. On the other side of the spectrum, the reaction reveals the authority and δόξα of Jesus, the one who, as Bultmann wrote,(22) brings the verdicts of life and death in the revelation which he harbours.

Certain disciples like Peter and Thomas stand out as the representatives of the believers and their confessions receive a normative status. By contrast the figure of Judas receives a notoriety unparalleled in the Synoptics and is quite clearly labelled as one of the servants of Satan.(23) In spite of this, there is no division as in the Qumran texts, between sons of light and sons of darkness, although in the First Epistle we come very close to such a system. The chief representative of the realm above is Jesus; indeed he is initially the only representative, and remains throughout the Gospel as the only one really qualified to function as the agent of that realm - as the Holy One of God. The chief representatives of the other realm - that of this world - are variously Satan (Σατανᾶς), the devil (ὁ διάβολος), Judas (Ἰούδας) or "the Jews" (οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι). Sometimes indeed it is just the abstract term ὁ κόσμος .

In between the two realms we encounter the disciples, who follow a path from light to darkness. J. Charlesworth writes:

> "...the disciples display an ambiguous faith and are portrayed as intermittently moving between belief and doubt; consequently neither are they categorically ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου (15:18-9) nor willing to commit themselves fully to Jesus since he must finally ask them εἰ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἦτε (12:16 and 16:32)." (24)

The ambiguity of faith instanced here must be interpreted within the dialectical style of the writer, with his tendency towards apparent contradictions as in 1:11f. The disciples are in the world, but not of the world (17:12-4); so to each there is an inward struggle, a personal conflict and one which Judas at least loses. We do well to note the importance in this regard of the disciples' confessions in John and the use of the verbs πιστεύω and γινώσκω both present in the confession of Peter (6:69). The dualism in John in fact functions within a framework of belief and disbelief, knowledge (of the truth) and ignorance, rather than upon a "natural" division of mankind into "lots" as we find in the War Scroll from Qumran.(25) The fact that one can move from doubt to belief (as with Thomas) or from being one of the Twelve to being possessed by Satan (as with Judas) illustrates the difficulty we encounter when we compare John's dualism with other more static systems. We take refuge therefore in qualifications such as "modified dualism" when in fact it might be better to invent a new term and so dispose of the misnomer completely. Perhaps instead of dualism we should speak of an ethical or cosmic dialectic. For the sake of convenience however we shall continue to use the accepted terms of reference while we consider some of the various aspects of the Johannine system of thought.

6:2:2 The Cosmological Aspect

The term ὁ κόσμος occurs with great regularity through the whole Gospel: It is found no less than 78 times in John as compared with 8 times in Matthew, 3 times in Mark and 3 times in Luke. This already says something of the importance of the term in John. It implies at times the object of God's love (3:16), the place to which Jesus came (1:10) and the created sphere (1:10), in other words, the inhabited world.(26) But at other times it takes on a different role, for example we read in 8:23: "Jesus said to them, 'You are from below, I am from above; you are from/of this world, I am not of this world.'": In 7:7 we find that the world hates (μισεῖν) Jesus perhaps because the revelation found in him highlights the evil in it. In 16:33

Jesus proclaims that he has overcome (νενίκηκα) the world, while in 1 Jn 5:5, we read "Who is it that overcomes (ὁ νικῶν) the world, but he who believes that Jesus is the Son of God". There is thus a sense of tension between this world and Jesus, the Son of God, which also finds reflection in the reactions experienced by his disciples (cf 15:18-20).

Several terms enable us to differentiate the realm of this world from the realm above. For example we find the former is distinguished by μισέω, σκοτία, ψεῦδος, πονηρός, ἀπειθέω, ἀπορέομαι and the latter by ζωή, φῶς, ἀληθής, ἀληθινός πιστεύω, γινώσκω, ἀγάπη and ἀγαπάω. Many of these are direct opposites such as φῶς and σκοτία, ἀληθής and ψεῦδος, and ἀπειθέω and πιστεύω. It is characteristic of the Johannine dualism that the emphasis always falls on the positive component of the word-pair: So we find that while φῶς occurs 19 times, σκοτία is found 6 times and we could give other examples. It is this positive sense in the Johannine dualism which warns us of one of the basic differences between John and the classical examples of dualism: J.H. Charlesworth writes,

> "A cosmic dualism is assumed by the author of John, not in the sense of two opposing celestial spirits, but in the sense of two distinct and present divisions in the universe. The universe is bifurcated into the "world above", which is the source of all things, especially power (1:3,10; 19:11), and the "world below", which hates the "world above" (7:7) and is similar in meaning to κόσμος, which is an inferior and vulgar force in rebellion against God. The cosmic dualism is modified since the two worlds are not two equal and eternal concepts. The "world below" is limited in quality and quantity." (27)

John, writing from a strict monotheistic perspective, cannot entertain the idea of two co-equal powers in opposition with each other: R.E.Brown neatly sums up the situation,

> "By dualism we mean the doctrine that the universe is under the dominion of two opposing principles, one good and the other evil. Modified dualism adds the corrective that these principles are not uncreated, but are both dependent on God the Creator." (28)

John, like Qumran, incorporates a modified dualism(29) and W.S.Lasor,(30) clearly show how far away from Zoroastrianism the cosmologies of John and Qumran now stand.

Consistently Jesus is presented as far superior to the power of Evil. There are no temptations in John, no exorcisms with the abortive attempts to gain control of Jesus on the part of the demons,(31) and there is little space given in the Gospel to the sense of actual conflict between Jesus and either demons or Satan. Instead we are conscious of an increasing sense of momentum, as Jesus moves towards his death, which is not necessarily a struggle with the Prince of this World (cf 14:30 - ἔρχεται γὰρ ὁ τοῦ κόσμου ἄρχων καὶ ἐν ἐμοὶ οὐκ ἔχει οὐδέν) but represents his final glorification and the ultimate revelation of God's glory (13:31 Νῦν ἐδοξάσθη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ ὁ θεὸς κ.τ.λ.). That there are detrimental consequences for the devil in this glorification cannot be denied, (12:31) but the Johannine perspective assumes them without any real elaboration. When John starts with the Divine Logos and ends with Jesus as Lord and God, there can be no room for any question about the eventual outcome of his task. There is no room for even a suggestion that the devil represents a real threat to Jesus' mission.

We conclude then that when one speaks about the cosmic quality of the Johannine dualism, one has to bear in mind the far reaching implications of the Johannine doctrine of the divinity of Jesus the Son of God. This brings us to the second aspect of his dualism, namely the soteriological.

6:2:3 The Soteriological Aspect

In 4:42 Jesus is called the Saviour of the World - σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου - and this title is found on the lips of those Samaritans who have believed not because of the woman's saying, but because they themselves have heard Jesus, and now know (οἴδαμεν) that Jesus is truly the Saviour of the world. The term κόσμος implies here the universality of Jesus' mission. The term σωτήρ renders the Hebrew יְשׁוּעָה and has a rich OT

background, as J. Sawyer has shown.(32) Usually it refers to God as Saviour, but it can be used of the agents of God, and in particular of the Messiah,(33) although it is the verb which appears rather than the title. The soteriology of the Fourth Gospel is not limited to the one reference to Jesus as σωτήρ , rather the whole Gospel witnesses to the salvation pictured in terms of light and life (cf 1:4) which Jesus brings. We suggest that salvation for John includes the messianic role of Jesus, but it also points beyond the human agency to the divine function of giving life and light.(34)

Several writers stress in particular the soteriological aspect of John's dualism. So we find for example that J. Charlesworth refers to it as "the most important characteristic of the Johannine 'dualism'",(35), a sentiment with which we agree provided of course that one recalls that it is not true "soteriological dualism", as a comparison with the Gnostic systems shows. One of the important writers on the "dualism" of John is L. Schottroff who writes :

> "Das Primäre ist für ihn ein existential gedachter Dualismus von Annahme und Ablehnung der Offenbarung." (36)

and

> "Die grundlegende Einsicht in die Art des johanneischen Dualismus, der nicht von einer mythischen Kosmologie her entworfen ist, sondern von existentialen Kategorien her, verdankt die Johannesforschung R.Bultmann." (37)

Obviously there is an element of truth in both of these statements, John does base his dualism upon the reactions of the people when they come into contact with Jesus, particularly their acceptance or rejection of him or, following Bultmann,(38) of the revelation found in him: also John does perform major surgery upon the traditional cosmologies of his time - a process which in some sense may be described as demythologization. (We hesitate to use this term without some qualification, just as we are somewhat hesitant to ascribe to John an existential approach as Schottroff does.) The prime factor in John's world view is his so-called "higher Christology".(39) His understanding

of Jesus conditions both his selection and his presentation of the material which composes his Gospel. Within such an understanding of the Johannine redaction, a process of demythologization is readily understandable.

The Evangelist does not write in a vacuum but as a result of what he has experienced both individually and in the community of the Church, so that his witness transcends the mythical view of the world - and accepted cosmologies, to point to Jesus as the witness of ultimate reality. In response to the revelation incarnate in Jesus, men still today face the choice implicit in that revelation between light and darkness, life and death. What Schottroff refers to as "existential" is in fact the soteriological outworking of the Johannine dualism, which in turn led to a demythologization of certain categories of thought inherited by John, particularly some of the cosmic myths. This will become evident when we examine the demonology in John below.(40)

One of the terms which teach us a great deal about the soteriology of the Gospel is the frequently used term ζωή or life. It occurs 20 times throughout the Gospel as compared with the 9 times it is found in the Synoptics together.(41) There is a blending of ideas here; John speaks about the Jewish doctrine of the resurrection (5:25, 29 and 6:40), and this underlies some of his teaching on judgement (5:27f). The raising of Lazarus is a sign of the final resurrection (cf 11:25) as is the resurrection of Jesus (cf 14:19). Yet the experience of life - eternal life - is not just a future hope, but already a present reality: 5:24 reads :

> "Truly, truly, I say to you, he who hears my word and believes him who sent me, has eternal life; he does not come into judgement, but has passed from death to life".

The synthesis of present reality and future hope is splendidly illustrated by one phrase in the next verse :

> "the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God, and those who hear will live."

The hour is coming (ἔρχεται ὥρα) and now is (καὶ νῦν ἐστιν). Apart from the combined sense of present and future we notice the qualification - those who hear will live, and implicitly those who do not hear, as in the lifetime of Jesus so often happened, fail to respond to

his words and these are the ones upon whom the judgement of Jesus' word will fall (12:48).

Eternal life stems ultimately from God (5:26 and 6:57-8), but he has given the prerogative of giving life to his Son (5:26). It is this detail which causes us to make two anticipatory comments about the words (ῥήματα ζωῆς αἰωνίου ἔχεις) of Peter. In the first place this affirmation suggests Jesus' relation with the Father - a relationship of divine representation. Secondly it sums up much of Jesus' teaching on eternal life and is a most appropriate response on Peter's part. Yet this does not imply that the Evangelist intends to portray Peter as grasping the full meaning of Jesus' words. Rather we are to compare Peter's confession with that of Martha in 11:27; a response to Jesus' teaching on the resurrection. Both confessions, although theologically accurate, should be understood as steps in the path of true belief and a real comprehension of Jesus. Prior to the moment of Jesus' glorification upon the cross and the realization of his resurrection, and prior to the coming of the Spirit, the darkness of the world cloaks the minds of even the closest of the followers of Jesus. The readers of the Gospel have the advantage of the perspective of their time and while they share in the search of the disciples for the meaning of the mystery which surrounds Jesus, they can see beyond the tomb to the vision of the divine Logos.

6:2:4 The Ethical Aspect

At the centre of John's dualism is not an impersonal power of good, but a living individual named Jesus. He acts as God's messenger, bringing within his very being the revelation of God, and as such he stands apart from other men both in terms of his relation to God and his separation from the world - both aspects summed up in the single title the Holy One of God. Since the stress falls upon the relational rather than the negative sense of separation we decided that we are not justified in speaking of Jesus as the one separated from sin[42] or from the profane, unless we qualify this as the outworking of his unique relation with the Father. While titles like the Holy One

or the Righteous One (I Jn 2:1) obviously carry some ethical content, the key to the meaning of the titles lies elsewhere. Jesus is not holy or righteous on account of his sinlessness, but as a result of his unique relationship with the Father. The ethical aspects attached to the titles are the results of this relationship.

In the Gospel there can be no denying that ethical teaching forms a large part of the Upper Room discourses. The emphasis there is on the positive elements like joy, love and bearing fruit rather than on sin in general or sins in particular: Nevertheless the decision for or against Christ is <u>not an ethical question</u>, except incidentally: As Schottroff writes,

> "Also auch die ethische Forderung ist nicht an einer ethischen Norm orientiert, sondern an dem Ja oder Nein gegenüber der Offenbarungsrede... Die Werke, der Glaube und das Gericht fallen für Johannes zusammen in der Annahme oder Ablehnung der Offenbarung." (43)

In fact Jesus does point to the supreme ethic of love which unites him and his Father and into which he invites the disciples to enter. But indeed Jesus comes not to represent some ethical norm over against the realm of Evil, but to bring the revelation of God, which results in the verdict of life or death consequent upon the encounter of the individual with the revelation. Obedience to the revelation has its natural ethical consequences, just as disobedience does. We might liken the situation to the switching on of a light in a dark room. As we switch on the light, two things happen: Some parts of the room are filled with light, other parts remain in the shadow. It is largely a question of position - and for those parts which remain in darkness we find that the darkness is now accentuated by the light. Initially all men were in the darkness of evil and ignorance, but since the light came a new division has taken place, so that while some men are now in the light, having been drawn to the light, others are in the deepest shadow their doubts preventing any light from shining upon them. The division of mankind is not ethical, or natural, or consequent upon the actions of humankind, except their response to the revelation found in Jesus, (cf 1:4f and 8:24 "Therefore you will die in your sins; for if you do not believe that I am, you will die in your sins") This is the single work needed (6:29).

6:2:5 The Dualism in John and the Holy One of God

A general pattern begins to come to the fore - John is working within a framework of two worlds, representing two distinct poles - light and darkness. However the idea of a cosmic struggle is completely subordinate to the question of man's response to God's unique revelation found in Jesus, the Word become flesh. The pattern revealed in the prologue is our guide in our exploration of the dualism of the Gospel: It is only as we understand something of the mystery of the incarnate Word that we can begin to appreciate the ways in which the Johannine dualism moves away from the conventional dualisms of his time, even the modified dualism of Qumran. L. Schottroff shows the weaknesses of attempts to describe the Johannine dualism as cosmological, through apocalyptic, eschatological, anthropological or even ethical.(44) For her none of these titles adequately accounts for the uniqueness of the Johannine system. While we concur with the reasons adduced by Schottroff, we realize that if we are to categorize the system in terms of modern thought, it is inevitable that certain incongruencies will appear, whether we use mythological or existential categories. Similarly any comparison between the Johannine system and Gnostic or Jewish dualisms, suffers a major dislocation through looking for similarities while at the same time accepting the basic difference of John's view of Christ. So with these reservations we suggest that <u>the dualism in John be described as soteriological, set within a cosmological framework and with consequent ethical features</u>. By soteriological we mean that Jesus is the primary focus of the Johannine system and that in response to him and the revelation found in him divisions occur, resulting in some seeking and finding in him eternal life, while others prefer to stay in darkness of ignorance and evil, (cf 1:5-9 and 8:23-30). It is a dualism of belief and disbelief, of acceptance and rejection of light and darkness, and life and death. The language is mythological but the consequences are existential - John has taken a mythological system and, just as we saw in ch 10, so here he strips the mythical language of much of its old content and fills it with new matter.

Now that we have outlined something of the dualism found in the Fourth Gospel, we can begin to enquire into the effect of this style of thinking upon the title ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ . We shall commence with the soteriological aspect, and conclude with an exposition of ch 6 with particular attention to the cosmological aspect. It will become clear that the most important idea behind the Holy One is that of Jesus as the representative of the sphere of the Holy, whose presence brings both life and judgement. In accepting that Jesus is the Holy One of God, Peter confirms that Jesus comes from the realm of the Holy, he belongs to God and he comes from God; he is τοῦ Θεοῦ .

The mark of the Johannine dualism is belief versus unbelief, so that it is the reception of the revelation incarnate in Jesus which marks out the "children of God" (1:12). Peter in his words ῥήματα ζωῆς αἰωνίου ἔχεις, καὶ ἡμεῖς πεπιστεύκαμεν καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν is to be understood as responding to Jesus' revelation: it is a picture in which Jesus the One from God is accepted by those who belong to him. Yet, even within this close group of believers, there is one who does not belong - Judas - and so the two worlds conflict. Jesus passes judgement on Judas,(45) and as in the exorcisms, so here too we are aware of the <u>cosmological implications</u> of Jesus as the Holy One of God. At the same time the affirmation of Peter and his reference to Jesus' words as "words of eternal life" points to the <u>soteriological role</u> which Jesus plays in the Gospel and at the same time affirms the uniqueness <u>of the relation-ship</u> he shares with the Father. There is much still to be said about the words of Peter as we shall see when we consider the various dimensions in detail.

One of the results of John's use of a modified cosmology is his remarkable doctrine of evil, and particularly his ideas about demonology and Satan. There are differing opinions about this area of Johannine study. For example J.L.Price writes :

> "It is noteworthy that while John's presupposition of the coexistence of two worlds (the above/the below) appears in the development of this discourse, the dualism which interests him most remains a this-worldy struggle, and is restated as a soteriological and ethical conflict. The

> life-or-death encounter between light and darkness is depicted as a collision between two cosmic powers and two groups of men: the one representing the truth; the other, perverse error. On the one hand, God makes his appeal to men through him who is "the light of the world" offering them freedom from sin and death; on the other hand the devil is the source of man's falsehood and opposition to the truth." (46)

Price takes the devil to be the mythological figure known from Jewish Apocalyptic and common also to the Synoptics. The opposite point of view is put forward by J. Charlesworth.(47) He acknowledges traces of an older world-view as in Jn 8:44, but argues that, generally in John, the devil has been demythologized. In support he cites several reasons of which the most important is that "the reason for this Johannine characteristic is, of course, the belief that through his crucifixion Christ overcame the world (16:33) so that the devil is now defeated and destroyed (12:31; 16:11).(48) We would suggest an even more important reason, which will become obvious in our study of the demonology of the Gospel, namely that John has rewritten the cosmic conflict within an historical setting, in which the real opposition to Jesus is the inhabited world and the demonic agents are historically identifiable characters.

6:3 The Demonology of the Fourth Gospel

We have already gathered along the way some information about the respective demonologies of the Synoptic and Johannine Gospels. There are some striking differences such as the complete lack in John of the narrative of the temptation, exorcisms and the consequent words attributed to the demons, and the tension evident between the Holy Spirit and the unclean demons. These are just the differences one might expect if John was deliberately playing down the aspect of a mythological conflict in exchange for an historical conflict, or exchanging a predominantly apocalyptic world-view for some other perspective. We commence with one of the key differences from the Synoptics.

6:3:1 Cosmic Tension in John

According to the Synoptics, particularly Luke, Jesus is anointed with Holy Spirit (cf Lk 4:18 and 4:1,14) and as one filled with Spirit stands against the devil (4:1ff) and his emissaries (4:33f). The resultant conflict is readily understood as a form of Holy War, or a new Exodus. The authority of Jesus surpasses that of the miracle-worker and points to his messianic function. In the Fourth Gospel there is no obvious connection between the authority of Jesus and the Spirit, nor does the Spirit feature in the miracles recorded in John. We read of the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus in 1:32, although the baptism is only implicit. We read also of the role of Jesus to baptize with (the) Holy Spirit, understanding ἐν as instrumental and not defining position.(49) John shares much with the Synoptic tradition at this stage, but during the mission of Jesus, the Spirit takes no part until the discourses in the Upper Room. The promise of Baptism in Spirit is apparently fulfilled after the resurrection of Jesus (20:22), which suggests a divine role (cf I Jn 2:20 and our remarks on that verse above)(50) for Jesus and points beyond the Spirit to Jesus' sonship as the guarantee of his authority. The Spirit is not mentioned at the consecration of Jesus as reflected in 10:36 and only obliquely, if at all, in the consecration of the disciples (17:17,19).(51) Jesus neither debates his authority by reference either to God's kingdom or the Holy Spirit, nor does he give his disciples authority over the demons,(52) (although according to I Jn 5:4, those who believe may overcome the world).

There are interesting parallels between the Johannine Spirit of Truth and the Spirit of Truth in Qumran.(53) In a superficial way the two Spirits are similar but as Charlesworth has shown, there are also significant points of difference.(54) The Spirit's function in John is patterned on Jesus' life and work. This is the reason for the striking differences between the Spirit of Truth as depicted in John and as found in Qumran.(55)

The forensic aspect of the Spirit's role is thus the logical counterpart of Jesus' role as Judge. This is quite

different from the Synoptic presentation. We saw also in the Synoptics the sense of tension between the unclean spirits and the Holy One of God. O. Procksch correctly relates this tension to Jesus' "pneumatic nature"(56) as the bearer of the Spirit. Procksch rejects the messianic dimension(57) but as we have shown, the Synoptic presentation of the baptism of Jesus is at the same time messianic and pneumatic.(58) Consequently a title like ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ cannot relate to the Spirit unless it also relates to Jesus as the Messiah. A different state of affairs is to be found in John. In Jn 6 there is a sense of tension but it is not between the Holy Spirit and an unclean spirit, but between two historical individuals, Jesus and Judas, each one in their own way representing an opposing force.

It is difficult to speak about a cosmic conflict in John without taking cognisance of the historical milieu, and the conflict experienced by the community at different times in its history.(59) The Johannine conflict takes place upon the historical plane and involves not demons or angels of light, but human representatives embodying in different ways the forces and powers of light and darkness and intrinsically related to the present setting of the Johannine community.

Apart from the historical dimension of the Johannine conflict, there is another major contributing factor. John gives pride of place to the idea of Jesus as the victor, the triumphant king who now reigns supreme in his otherworldly kingdom. Jesus' triumph over the world is complete and conclusive; there is no effective power left in the hands of Satan whether aimed at Jesus (14:30) or his disciples (16:33). We notice that one consequence of this is John's unusual eschatology and his infrequent use of the phrase Kingdom of God. The emphasis is away from a possible misunderstanding of the Kingdom as political (cf Jn 6:14f), towards the experience of an ever-present kingdom (18:36); and away from the expectation of Jesus' imminent return as Son of Man, towards his continuing presence in the world ("The world will not see me, but you will see me" Jn 14:19); and finally away from a future judgement and experience of eternal life to the acceptance of these events as existential realities.

6:3:2 The Term δαιμόνιον

Each time we encounter the term δαιμόνιον in John's Gospel we find that it appears in a context of demon possession (δαιμονίζομαι) and the person so accused in all four instances is Jesus (7:20, 8:48f, 52 and 10:20f). It is significant that the actual terms δαιμόνιον and δαιμονίζομαι are not connected with anyone else in the Gospel. Judas is possessed either by Satan or by the devil <u>but not by demons</u>. Either John did not know of Jesus' work as exorcist, or else as we have suggested he deliberately chose not to mention this aspect of Jesus' work.

The accusation that Jesus had a demon is also found in the Synoptics (cf Mk 3:22), where Jesus is said to be possessed by Beelzebul (lit. He has Beelzebul - Βεελζεβοὺλ ἔχει κ.τ.λ.). The question there is that of the authority of Jesus and leads to Jesus' claim to operate by the power of the Spirit (cf Matt 12:28 and the Lucan variant which we have already discussed).(60) In the Fourth Gospel however, there are no exorcisms and the cause for the accusation that Jesus is possessed, revolves <u>first of all</u> around Jesus' announcement that the Jews wish to kill him (7:20), to which the people respond, "You have a devil, who is seeking to kill you?" Here the reference to demon possession may be no more than a colloquial way of saying that Jesus has taken leave of his senses - a belief current among Jesus' friends according to Mark in the passage we referred to above (Mk 3:21). The <u>second instance</u> (8:48) follows Jesus' denunciation of the Jews as being of the devil (8:44) and not "of God" (8:47) As a consequence the Jews abuse Jesus, declaring, "Are we not right in saying that you are a Samaritan and have a demon? (δαιμόνιον ἔχεις)" (8:48). Jesus' reply is sometimes understood as ignoring the former accusation and so we find opinions expressed about Jesus' pro-Samaritan attitude and the consequent possibility that John was intended for a Samaritan audience.(61) We find no reason in ch 8 or in ch 4 to come to such a conclusion. Indeed we would suggest that Jesus' answer in 8:49 "I have not a demon; but I honour my Father and you dishonour me" in fact incorporates both accusations although it only mentions the latter. It is not easy to assess the connection between "Samaritan" and the charge of demon possession. However

since it is the words of Jesus which are in question (cf 8:42-7), one might suggest that Samaritan implies something like heretic or false prophet,(62) or some other derogatory remark. Jesus' response is then particularly appropriate: he neither has a demon, nor is disloyal to his Father. The latter claim explicitly denies the charge of being a Samaritan, or of being any other kind of false prophet who might bring dishonour on the name of God. John's attitude to the Samaritans is already clearly spelt out in ch 4 (cf 4:20 and 22).

The question behind the recording of the accusation is tied in with the forensic aspect of the Gospel - Jesus is on trial(63) and the accusation is that he is not "of God". In fact Jesus is the real judge and the Jews along with the World are in the dock; they are indeed "of the Devil" as Jesus so clearly says (42-7). The Jews might well have described the Samaritans as "of the Devil" or "demon-possessed", but in fact in John's presentation the Samaritans were willing to recognise that Jesus comes as the Saviour of the World (4:42). By their accusation, and in contrast to the confession of the Samaritans, the Jews affirm their allegiance to the Devil in their continued rejection of the words of Jesus which bring life, and so confirm Jesus' earlier judgement (4:42).

As we continue through the passage, we find that after Jesus' reference to his loyalty to God, he makes yet another of the provocative statements which mark this chapter - "If anyone keeps my word, he will never taste death" and once again the accusation is brought of demon possession (8:52). The people ask μὴ σὺ μείζων εἶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ ...; καὶ οἱ προφῆται ἀπέθανον (8:53). So we find the true representative of God is on trial because he claims an authority superior to that of the venerable men of the OT. Only a man who was a heretic or insane (demon-possessed) would make such a claim. John's readers were probably familiar with both conclusions and had heard both expressed in their own private conflict with the world. They know however of the third alternative and as we read through the passage the next few verses make this clear. God glorifies Jesus (vs 54) which means that allegiance to God also implies

receptiveness to the words of his chosen agent. In vs 55 Jesus claims to know God in a unique way, clearly showing his superiority over the prophets; then he voices his most dramatic assertion - "Before Abraham was, I am". However we understand ἐγὼ εἰμί,(64) there can be no doubt of the Jewish interpretation and motivation of the Jews when they attempt to stone Jesus for his words.

Throughout the whole chapter we find the continuous tension between Jesus, who is "of God", and the Jews, who are "of the Devil", with the forensic aspect coming to the fore time and again. The Jews claim allegiance to God, but they serve the ends of the Devil by their continued rejection of the teaching of Jesus. In such a framework, the accusation of demon-possession turns back upon those who give expression to it, for in fact they are themselves of the devil. The original accusation is that Jesus is without his senses and does not know what he says, but within the present setting generated by the conflict motif, it becomes demonic itself. A diagnosis about Jesus' mental health is turned back on the Jews and incorporated in John's cosmological framework to demarcate the realm of the devil from the realm of God; a stark contrast from the true believers and their confessions.

In chapter 10 we have the third occasion on which the audience allege that Jesus is demon-possessed. This time it follows Jesus' claim to be able to lay down his life and take it up again (vs 18) which results in division among the Jews (vs 19ff). Some of them consider that Jesus has a demon and is mad (vs 20), while others point to his words and deeds (the curing of a blind man cf ch 9) and ask, are these the words of a demon-possessed man? Can a demon open the eyes of blind men? We note the use of the particle (vs 21) μή expecting a negative answer. This particular instance generally has some interesting parallels with the Marcan passage 3:20-30. The double accusation is the same as in Mark 3:21,22, and in both Mark and John the understanding of the accusation of demon possession is affected by the question of Jesus' sanity. In both instances also the works of Jesus are cause for comment. The possibility of a literary connection between John and Mark springs to mind, or perhaps we are simply encountering the common ground between the two traditions. In any case the

accusation that Jesus is insane or demon-possessed seems to be an integral part of the early tradition and the very repulsiveness of both suggestions argues strongly in favour of their antiquity and authenticity. To be sure, the claims of Jesus suggest that he is either what he claims to be or has something wrong with him.

In conclusion then we find that in John there are two levels contained within the accusation that Jesus is demon-possessed. The first and most obvious level is that of a common insult, and the reference is not to a possession as such, but to Jesus' state of mind. The other level refers to the misunderstanding by which Jesus who is "of God" stands accused of being "of the devil". Unlike the Marcan setting, where the point of controversy moves from unclean spirit to Holy Spirit, John apparently leaves aside the question of Jesus' endowment of the Holy Spirit, in preference for Jesus' conflict <u>on the historical level</u> with the Jews. R. Schnackenburg astutely remarked that we can visualize in this distinction something of the historical setting of the Gospel. (65) The dualism in John does not require us to understand a spiritual conflict between angels and demons as found for example in Jewish Apocalyptic. Rather we find that the mythological battle is rewritten in time and with the demythologization of the cosmic structures comes the re-interpretation of the concept of demon-possession along with an increase in the role of human opponents who actively throughout Jesus' ministry attempt to trap him and kill him. This motif is striking in John, particularly in comparison with the Synoptics, and we remember that John has no temptations or exorcisms, thus effectively cutting out that area of conflict.

6:3:3 The Term διάβολος

The term διάβολος or devil is found three times in the Gospel and unlike the term δαιμόνιον is also found in the first Epistle (I Jn 3:8). In the Gospel, two of the three instances refer to Judas (6:70 and 13:2), and we note also that in ch 17:12 he is called ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας. It is fairly clear that just as Peter or Thomas represent the children of God, so Judas represents the children of the Devil, and is in fact a διάβολος or devil

(6:70) and under the influence of the Devil (13:2 and 13:27). In the Synoptics as we have just seen the spiritual opposition to Jesus comes directly from Satan (in the Temptations) or indirectly through the demons; in John there are neither temptations nor exorcism, but rather human spokesmen in "the Jews" and human agents in Judas and those who work with him. The term διάβολος is used then to describe either these agents (6:70 and 8:44) or their source of evil (13:2).

The Jews are connected as a group with the Devil. When we consider 8:44 we are struck by the difficult wording of Jesus' pronouncement - he says : Ὑμεῖς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστὲ ... which translated literally could be: "You are descended from the father of the devil". R. Schnackenburg suggests that logically we should read it as an abbreviated statement in line with Hebrew linguistic usage - "You are descended from the devil - he is your father".(66) This to our mind makes perfectly good sense. The issue as we have seen centres around the question whether Jesus or the Jews may justly claim to be "of God" - Jesus' response is in terms of Sonship and this is in all probability the correlation to his statement about the Jews. They are in fact "of the devil" and the devil is their father in the sense that they belong to him and are obedient to him.(67)

The mention of truth (vs 45) illustrates the dichotomy between the falseness of the devil and the truth incarnate in Jesus, for the devil has lied from the very beginning (vs 44). Time and again in this passage Jesus uses the word (8:14,16,17,26,32,40,44,45,46), and it is used once by his adversaries (8:13). All of this teaching combines to present a graphic picture of the Johannine concept of truth. It is somewhat removed from the Gnostic idea (cf Ginza 374:14-15), and closer to that used by the writers of Qumran (CD 20:15; 1QH 4:10; 1QS 4:23).(68) Basically it reflects the veracity of the revelation present in Jesus over against the lies of the devil - Jesus is the only one who knows God and he would himself be a liar if he denied such knowledge (8:55). As always in John's use of opposites the positive form receives most of the emphasis,(69) in line with his modified dualism and his implacable belief that Christ has conquered the world

and defeated the devil.

As the children of the devil, the Jews here stand in direct opposition to the children of God (cf 1:12). In the First Epistle (cf 1 Jn 3:10) there is a sharp dualism of the children of light and the children of darkness reminiscent of the Qumran scroll of the Wars. It may be that this is also implicit in the Gospel, but on the other hand it may suggest that in the Epistle there is a hardening of the dualism found in the Gospel,(70) a stricter division into camps than the theology of the Gospel allows. In this connection we note that Jesus' mission is defined in the Gospel in terms of overcoming the world (16:33); while in I Jn 3:8 we find that Jesus was made manifest so that he might undo (ἵνα λύσῃ) the works of the devil.

The fact that Jesus' task in the Epistle is aimed against the works of the devil warns us not to press the sense of conflict with the devil himself too closely. At the same time one cannot deny that in some sense at least there is an ethical conflict or tension between Jesus and the realm of sin characterized by the devil. This however is the First Epistle and not the Fourth Gospel. In the Gospel the opponent of Jesus is usually the World, with the figure of Satan vaguely present in the shadows. There is indeed some distinction between the dualism of the Gospel and that of the Epistle. This is due in part to the nature of the contents of the Epistle in distinction from the Gospel, but this is not the whole reason. Rather we believe the Epistle testifies to a hardening of attitude. The sense of two camps in mortal conflict comes closer to the surface. We have the mention of the anti-Christ (4:3) and the promise (4:4) "Greater is he who is in you, than he that is in the world". There are similar sentiments expressed in the Gospel (cf 14:30), but they do not receive the same prominence that they receive in the Epistle, because much of the concentration in the latter is towards the ethical distinctions between the children of God and those of the devil. All this means is that we need to be somewhat cautious about using the First Epistle to reconstruct the cosmology of the Fourth Gospel. This is of particular importance when we ask whether the devil in the Gospel is a personification of evil or an actual mythological figure.

Does he simply represent man's rebellion against God and the revelation found in Jesus, or are we dealing with the apocalyptic figure which emerges in Revelation? J.H.Charlesworth suggests that in the Gospel, Jesus' opponent is not the devil but the κόσμος,(71) in line with his belief that the devil has been demythologised.

It is clear that on certain levels there are some indications of a process of demythologization. For example unclean spirits play no active role in the Gospel. They do not cry out to Jesus, they do not possess anyone, and they are not, as in the Synoptics, part of the eschatological conflict precipitated by Jesus' advent. However, the question of a demythologised Satan is more difficult to show. J.L. Price in fact, as we saw, denies such a process.(72) He observes correctly that both Qumran and John allow for a limited world rule of a cosmic power within God's creation but destined for total destruction.(73) But what does this cosmic power imply? Are the opponents of Jesus spiritual and mythological forces or are we dealing, as Charlesworth suggests, with an abstract force incarnate in various individuals? When we consider phrases like "the Prince of this World" and the use of the proper name "Satan", we are forced to disagree with Charlesworth and we find adequate evidence in the Gospel for a sense of cosmic conflict and tension between Jesus and Satan. This tension culminates in Jesus' hour (cf 12:31) and this is more fully expressed as a struggle in the book of Revelation.(74) The practical manifestation of this tension on the human level is to be found in the attitude of the crowds as some discover in Jesus eternal life and others, through rejection of him, fall under the verdict of death. The Devil works as an evil influence in the world, yet he is never completely demythologized and he appears particularly as the moment of supreme conflict draws nearer. His control over Judas is as progressive as the build-up to Jesus' final hour, an increasing sharpening of the conflict, although there can be no doubt of the eventual outcome. This assurance of the end result is in fact the message of hope and joy that John brings to his listeners or readers - his presentation of the Devil will always be conditioned by the words of Jesus :

"The ruler of the world is coming. He has no power over me" (14:30b): "the ruler of this world is judged"(16:11b) and particularly "Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world" (16:33b).

6:3:4 The Term Σατανᾶς

This term is only used once in the Gospel and the Epistles, namely in Jn 13:27 where we read: "And after the morsel there entered into him, Satan". The verse is important for it marks the final stage in the downfall of Judas. Once called a devil (6:70f), once influenced by the Devil (13:2), now he is possessed by Satan, and when he leaves the Upper Room "it is night". More than any other person in the Gospel Judas stands for the active opposition to the revelation of Jesus. Where the Synoptics left the motives of Judas open, the Fourth Gospel deliberately enhances the evil of Judas' actions and person in contrast to the righteousness and holiness of Jesus. It is not by accident that the title ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ is immediately followed by an attack on Judas as a devil: The title is deliberately chosen to enhance the tension existing between him who represents all that is holy and him who is to become the devil incarnate.

6:4 The Cosmic Dimension of the Holy One of God

We have seen something of the way in which the demonology and consequently the cosmology of the Fourth Gospel differs from the Synoptics and we need now to relate these differences to our understanding of the Holy One of God as found in the Gospels of Mark and Luke over against John. Given the Synoptic setting of a messianic battle between the Holy One and the forces of evil and the accusation in John 6:70 that Judas is a devil, we have deduced that some sense of tension is evident in both - but is the idea of Judas as a devil not just a result of John's reworking of the Marcan rebuke of Peter by Jesus? We believe that it might be,(75) but at the same time we must admit that the character of Judas is not simply substituted for Peter to protect the latter - a far more serious intention is in mind. John as we have reasoned above is using the figure of Judas to highlight the figure of Jesus as the Holy One as effectively as the response of the demons brought into sharp focus Jesus' relationship with God as

marked by the Holy Spirit. We turn now to what we have chosen to call the demonic perspective as we attempt to show the significance of using the demons as a counter to the holiness of Jesus, and the light this casts on Jn 6.

6:4:1 The Demonic Perspective

If the Jews of Jesus' time attempted to understand his authority in terms of their human hierarchy, it is possible that the demons are depicted as making a similar use of their own cosmological structure. We can compare the titles given in the stories of the healings as opposed to the stories in which the demons play a part, such as the expulsion of demons, the temptations and related passages. We believe there is a difference between the demonic utterances and the normal titles found on the lips of those people who come to Jesus for healing, and that this difference is to be related to a difference in perspective rather than the accidental arrangement of the Gospel writers.

Naturally such an approach requires that we see in the conversation of the demons a particular world view, which means that we have to treat the Gospel record in its present form as deliberate. Whether this was what the demons actually said or what the Gospel writers imagined they would say does not alter the question of perspective. The fact remains that these words are spoken not by either Jews or Gentiles but by demons, who in the Synoptic Gospels are so clearly depicted as the agents of Satan. In this regard we note that J. Jeremias argues very convincingly for the authenticity of the exorcisms and the antiquity of their position in the primitive tradition.(76) He refers in particular to Mk 1:23-6 and the Gospel tradition which associates Jesus' mission with authority over the demons. Finally Jeremias draws attention to the way in which Jesus connected the demons and Satan (cf Mk 3:23 - How can Satan cast out Satan?).(77) Even if we are dealing with the later imaginative reflections of the Church, the knowledge of the demons (implicit in their description of Jesus) finds a parallel only in the voice from heaven at the Baptism and Transfiguration and in certain key confessions of faith (like the Centurian in Mk 15:39).

The typical salutations of a sick person are "Lord" (Mk 7:28; Lk 5:12; 7:6;and 18:41; Matt 8:2,8; 9:28; 15:25); "Son of David" (Mk 10:48 and Lk 18:39); "Master" (Mk 9:17 and Lk 9:38) and "Rabboni" (Mk 10:51).

By contrast the demons refer to Jesus as Holy One or Son of God. The stress is initially upon the latter part of the title namely τοῦ Θεοῦ and when Paul and his companion are addressed by a demon-possessed woman it is once more in terms of their relationship to God - they are δοῦλοι τοῦ θεοῦ (Acts 16:17). The description "of God" or of "the Most High God" (cf Mk 5:7) points towards a setting in which the powers of good and evil are poised opposite each other. This is quite different from the titles and their implied background, often messianic, used by the sick. There is in fact no overlap between the titles used by the demoniacs and those employed by the sick in body. This raises the question then of the content of the demonic knowledge and its ultimate origin. The demons know Jesus (Mk 1:34) and while for Luke this implies a form of messianic content, we are wise to look beyond this. Is the knowledge of the demons supernatural?(78) Do they really know that Jesus is the divine Son of God and Holy One?(79) We question this, for that would surely imply that there is no difference in content between the voice of God with all its inherent authority and the cries of the demons, the veritable enemies of God. H. van der Loos discusses the question of the content of the demoniacs' knowledge and concludes that it is not supernatural but rather like the idiotic claims of the mentally retarded to be God or the Devil or some other being.(80) The form of the appellations then, according to van der Loos, belie the fact that the demons do not really appreciate Jesus or his authority. In a sense this is obviously true or else they might well have steered clear of Jesus. Yet van der Loos is wrong for we cannot deny that for the Gospel reader the cries of the demons ring true, they know who Jesus is, and show some insight into the future as their protests indicate. According to Mark, they remonstrate with Jesus and say "What have you to do with us?... Have you come to destroy (ἀπολέσαι) us?" (1:24); "I beg you by God that you do not torment (βασανίσῃς) me" (5:7); nor

indeed to "send them outside the country" (5:10). In Matthew the demons ask Jesus if he has come "to torment" them "before the time" (πρὸ καιροῦ) Matt 8:29. The use of the verbs βασανίζω and ἀπόλλυμι indicate a fear that apparently is felt by the demons and judging from the consequences, rightly so. The verb βασανίζω implies the idea of testing or trial by torture and carries the idea of a judgement between one element and another, at least in some of the earlier sources.(81) The verb ἀπόλλυμι is a normal verb for destruction by force (killing).(82) We are thus given to understand that the demons fear for their very existence and the alacrity with which they obey the commands of Jesus illustrates the power which Jesus wields. It is this power, this authority, which indicates most clearly the earliest level behind the exorcisms in the Gospels. O. Bauernfeind suggested, it is a battle between the forces of evil and Jesus, the chosen champion of God.(83)

The Gospels do not present the demons as making false claims but as coming so close to the core of the matter that Jesus silences them ("Be muzzled") and supplies the reason - because they know him. The reason the Gospels kept record of the demonic cries is because they understood in them a strong element of truth; Jesus is the Holy One of God and he is the Son of God.

How then are we to understand the cries of the demons? Two possibilities suggest themselves -

(i) the demons have heard that Jesus is the Son of God or the Holy One of God, and they then repeat what they have heard; perhaps without full understanding of what they are actually saying, thus resembling children who repeat the words of their parents.

(ii) the demons speak in the categories with which they are familiar. So Jesus is compared with cosmic "sons of God" and "holy ones of God", the members of the Council of Yahweh rather than the members of the council of Satan. Jesus stands as "the Holy One" in opposition to the Evil One (πονηρός 17:15; cf Lk 11:4); he is on the side of God (cf Mk 8:33) and comes from God in the power of the Holy Spirit.

Both of these suggestions have their merits. With regard to the former, there is the possibility that given the proximity of the baptism one might suggest that the demons were eavesdroppers on that occasion and here boast of their newly acquired knowledge; we notice Satan's temptations are prefaced by "If you are the Son of God". With regard to the latter, we refer to the suggestion by O. Bauernfeind(84) that the words of the demons are motivated by a desire to control Jesus by reciting the correct form of his title and that their knowledge of this title is intuitive rather than supernatural and in this case no more surprising than the messianic cries of the sick.(85) It is basic to the Gospels that when one encounters Jesus there is some response to his person.

The challange of the demons is obvious when one considers their choice of words and we can imagine the tone in which they addressed Jesus, using the stylized form of the time - Τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ accurately reflecting the Hebrew or Aramaic idiom.(85)

In the same way Satan challenges Jesus, but he uses a question Εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ (Lk 4:3). Thus he questions the basis of Jesus' authority. Perhaps as a deposed "Son of God" (cf Job 1,2), he seeks to bring about the fall of Jesus, the new Adam. F.H.Borsch notes the parallels in these temptation narratives with the legends that Jewish tradition had ascribed to Adam, including his being fed by angels. He says,

> "Unlike Adam, however, the New Man, the new Son of God, does not fall in the temptation, but instead proves his right to be the Man, to be crowned with glory and honour". (87)

Along similar lines C.K.Barrett writes,

> "It is precisely as the Second Adam, the Heavenly Man, that Jesus effects the eschatological conquest over Satan, which results in a salvation that means the restoration of primeval bliss". (88)

There is another figure drawn from Jewish mythology who might perhaps be relevant here, namely the Arch angel Michael (the traditions about whom are not dissimilar to the Primal Man traditions).(89) When Jesus receives back his seventy or seventy-two disciples in Luke, (10:18) he

exclaims - "I saw Satan fallen like lightning from heaven" which reminds us of the same myth reported in Revelation 12:7-9 where the angel Michael is mentioned. Moreover the demons' fears of punishment remind us of the scroll 11Q Melchizedek in which Melchizedek as a type of Michael issues judgement on the spirits of the Devil.(90) Though it may be no more than a red herring we believe an examination of the Michael tradition is called for, if only to highlight some of the differences.

6:4:2 The Michael Tradition

It is the angel Michael who will defeat Satan at the end of time (As. Mos. 10:1f LXX Dan 8:11 and Dan 12:1 in addition to 1QM 17), and it may be that behind the Synoptic Gospels presentation of Jesus' conflict with Satan, there stands <u>some form of the Michael tradition</u>.(91) It is logical that Michael as one of the angels of God could be spoken of as a Son of God or a Holy one of God; indeed Michael is the chief of the angels, the great prince (Dan 10:13; Yoma 37a). We can only conjecture about the incorporation of such a tradition into the Gospel exorcisms, but certain aspects of the Michael legend are quite striking. In I Enoch 10:15 Michael is commanded to "destroy all the spirits of the reprobate and the children of the Watchers, because they have wronged mankind". In the Gospels Jesus links (according to Mark 3:20ff) casting out demons with actual conflict with Satan and then in a simile compares this with the binding (δήσῃ) of a strong man. In I Enoch 10:11f we read, "And the Lord said unto Michael, Go <u>bind</u> Semjaza and his associates". One of the marks of the end is the advent of Michael to bind Satan and his evil forces. For the Gospels of Matthew and Luke the casting out of demons signifies that the Kingdom of God has arrived (Lk 11:20 and Matt 12:28).

According to Jewish legend, Michael stands at the head of the seventy angels who make up the Divine Council of God,(92) and is thus the first of the holy ones and the first of the Sons of God (the normal titles of the members of such a body). He is moreover the guardian angel of Israel (93) and probably the one who mediates on behalf of Israel in the

presence of God, if he is in fact the angel in T Dan 6:2 and T Levi 5:6, (cf also 3 Bar 11:9,12). According to Pirke Rabbi Eliezer Michael witnesses the fall of Satan and is himself rescued by God:

> "In the hour when the Holy One, blessed be He, called Sammael and his band to descend from heaven, from their holy place, he caught hold of the wings of Michael to make him fall with himself, and the Holy One, blessed be He, saved him from his power". (94)

In Luke's version of the debate on Jesus and Beelzebul and in particular vss 21f (of ch 11) we have the juxtaposition of ἰσχυρὸς and ἰσχυρότερος, and it is likely that the former points to the devil and the latter to Jesus. Such conflict between Michael and Satan is a basic part of the Michael legend.(95)

Jesus as the <u>victor over Satan</u> stands closer to the Jewish traditions associated with Michael than to those traditions of his time relating to the task of the Messiah. The response of the demons is thus quite understandable, for they encounter one who in human form is God's champion like Michael, and they address him as such - Holy One and Son.

J.J.Collins has attempted to build up a connection between Jesus, the Son of Man, in the Gospels and a hypothetical synthesis of Michael and the Son of Man in Daniel.(96) Thereby he deduced that the Michael tradition came into the NT by way of Jesus' use and the Church's use of the Son of Man. Certainly texts like Matt 13:41 which speaks of the Son of Man "sending forth his angels" and Mark 8:38 which refers to the Son of Man coming "in the glory of his Father with the holy angels" (cf also Matt 26:53) might point in that direction. But unfortunately there are also other, perhaps more feasible, explanations for these verses including the idea of Holy War in which God and his angels (including Michael) wage war against evil. We are therefore not obliged to see Jesus as a type of Michael.

The references to the Son of Man as used by Jesus, we believe, manifest a definite link with the OT picture of the Divine Council and the idea of the angelic host participating in Holy War. The importance of the Divine Council for the

NT has been noticed by one writer,(97) but it remains a relatively unexplored territory. However, while elements of this picture do appear in the NT particularly in association with the Son of Man as Warrior and Judge, we are not justified in therefore assuming the immediate influence of Michael or any other angel on the NT Christology. R.Longenecker has suggested(98) that the portrayal of Jesus as an angel, in the patristic period, occurred in both orthodox and heterodox formulations. In fact a close study of the writings of the Church Fathers shows that there is little evidence of anything more than a functional identification between Jesus and the angels.(99) Justin understands the term in its broader sense as "messenger".(100) Tertullian draws a distinction between the functional and personal identification of Jesus with the angels and concludes that only the former is legitimate.(101) Jesus as a divine messenger in function like Michael is the key to the understanding of Jesus as he appears in the Shepherd of Hermas,(102) the Clementine Homilies(103) and indeed in the Christian Apocalypse.(104) The LXX rendering of Isaiah 9:6 is behind the comparison of Jesus with a "Righteous Angel" in certain Patristic writings such as the confession of Peter in the Gospel of Thomas, rather than some form of angelic Christianity.(105)

6:5 Conclusion

We have pointed out some of the aspects in which the function of Jesus as exorcist and victor over Satan parallels the role attributed in Jewish Apocalyptic to Michael. While we find no evidence for "angelic-Christology" in the NT, we do find in the Patristic period use made of the functions of angels to describe the function of Christ. In the NT, in the Book of Revelation, we are close to such a functional identification, between Jesus and Michael, in 12:7-12 where the action of Michael in defeating Satan in heaven is the preliminary to his defeat at the hand of Christ on earth, (cf Lk 10:18). It is clear that some illegitimate use was made of forms of angelic Christology as Hebrews 1 suggests,(106) but the personal identification of Jesus with any of the angels is unknown and probably unthinkable to the NT. Nevertheless through a process of demythologization certain erstwhile

angelic themes, like the Divine Council or the Son of Man, re-appear in the NT in a new form. If one sets the cries of the demons against the backdrop of God's Council, then it becomes clear that the crucial issue is not the messianic role of Jesus so much as his role as the Messenger of God. The cries of the demons on encountering Jesus reflect their understanding of him as a Holy One, a Son of God - like the other messengers of the Council. In particular they recognise in Jesus a figure like Michael come to punish and destroy the forces of evil. It is only by taking seriously such a demonic perspective that our eyes are opened to this understanding of Jesus, the Holy One of God. We must repeat that no judgement is implied upon the historicity of the incident in the Synagogue at Capernaum.

The key, then, to the interpretation of the Holy One is found on this basic level of understanding. Jesus the Holy One is none other than Jesus the Messenger from God. This is true not only for the title as it appears in Mark and Luke, but also for Jn 6:69. For Mark, Jesus the messenger was also Jesus the messiah and so the cries of the demons were given a second level of interpretation. The messenger recognised by the demons was in fact none other than the messiah. The force of the article, employed in the title, was to raise Jesus from among the other messengers sent by God to a position of supremacy. He is the Messenger of God par excellence. Luke, like Mark, makes use of the context to clarify the cries of the demons, to avoid possible confusion between Jesus and the Divine Man of Hellenism, and to draw this aspect (Jesus the messenger) within the total framework of his presentation of Jesus. This means for Luke an emphasis on Jesus as the Prophet-Messiah. But what of John? How does he understand the Holy One of God? Our study of the Gospel and in particular ch 6 will lead us to the conclusion that John took over the basic meaning (Jesus the messenger) and like Mark and Luke he has recast the title by means of the context he employs. We turn now to a study of the Johannine presentation of the Messenger from Heaven.

CHAPTER SEVEN : THE DIVINE REVEALER

		Page
7:1	An Exposition of John 6	263
7:1:1	The Question of Unity	263
7:1:2	The Figure of Wisdom	266
7:1:3	The Feeding of the 5000 (6:1-15)	268
7:1:4	The Walking on the Water (6:16-21)	271
7:1:5	The Bread from Heaven (6:22-59)	272
7:1:6	Conflict and Confession (6:60-71)	281
7:2	The Holy One as a Divine Agent	290
7:2:1	The Holy One and the Son of God	290
7:2:2	The Holy One and the Son of Man	292
7:3	Conclusion	296
Footnotes to Chapter Seven		358

CHAPTER SEVEN : THE DIVINE REVEALER

7:1 An Exposition of John 6

Of all the chapters in the Gospel of John, ch 6 has probably attracted the most attention from the scholarly world. Several important monographs have been devoted to a consideration of the chapter and its attendant problems.(1) In particular we draw the reader's attention to P.Borgen's midrashic interpretation, to the expositions of R.E.Brown and R. Schnackenburg(2) and finally to C.K. Barrett's article on John's dialectical theology.(3) Some of the problems dealt with in these works, like the relationship of John's miracles to the Synoptic tradition, are peripheral to our enquiry. The meaning of the Holy One of God is determined largely by its immediate context (vss 60-71), but there are important clues to be found scattered throughout the discourse on the Bread from Heaven. We shall spend some time on a consideration of the chapter as a whole before proceeding on to a detailed examination of the crucial pericope.

7:1:1 The Question of Unity

Chapter 6 may be subdivided into four sections :

(a) The feeding of the 5000 (vss 1-15)
(b) Jesus walking on the water (vss 16-21)
(c) The Bread from heaven (vss 22-59)
(d) Peter's confession (vss 60-71)

The Greek style, according to E. Ruckstuhl, is uniform throughout the chapter,[3a] allowing for the natural differences between narrative and discourse. W. Nicol, in a form-critical analysis of the chapter, concludes that only the miracle of the walking on the water has not been reworked by the Evangelist.[4] There is no textual evidence for any dislocation, and from the thematic point of view the chapter is readily understood as a unity. The feeding miracle finds its meaning in the discourse on the bread from heaven, which culminates in a division among the disciples of Jesus and leads Peter to make his confession of faith.

If another hand (or hands) is at work in this chapter, apart from the Evangelist, we are obliged to argue from the content of the verses, rather than on any literary grounds. Thus R. Bultmann, who admits to the stylistic unity of the chapter, finds evidence for an editor who has added eschatological and sacramental touches to the chapter.[5] He concludes, "The editor clearly models himself on the Evangelist's technique; but it is easy to see that it is an imitation".[6] With due regard to the greatness of Bultmann's understanding of John, we still find it anything but easy. The complexity of the Evangelist's handling of the sacraments; his working of the sacramental allusions into the very fabric of the Gospel; his unusual form of eschatology with its delicate balance of both future hope and present realization; these form major stumbling blocks in the path of Bultmann's thesis. This is clearly brought out by C.K. Barrett in his discussion on the unity of ch 6 and John's dialectical theology - a theology which involves not only the existence of anithetical propositions, but includes God's discourse with man.[7] Barrett's conclusions may be summarised as follows :

(a) The future element of the eschatology of the Evangelist is not confined to ch 6, and can only be excised from the Gospel with great difficulty.[8]

(b) In ch 6, the sacramental allusions are present already in the miraculous feeding and in the main discourse, and therefore not confined to vss 51b - 58.[9]

(c) It is not necessary to understand in the eucharistic

passage a presentation of the flesh and blood as a divine potion, which confers life upon the recipient. Ignatius may have understood such a teaching, but it is alien both to Johannine thought in general, (cf 6:63) and to the passage in question.(10)

(d) If we understand vs 51 as part of the previous section and start the new section with vs 52, then the sacramental section may be understood as a natural development consequent upon the mention of "flesh" in vs 51.(11)

The unity of the discourse has also been defended by a number of important scholars, including E. Ruckstuhl, U. Wilckens, J. Jeremias, P. Borgen and B. Gärtner to name just a few.(12) Perhaps the strongest argument against the unity of the discourse (apart from R. Bultmann) is that of R.E. Brown, who suggests that 6:51 - 59 is a later addition to the chapter made either by the Evangelist or by an interpolater. Brown admits that ch 6 would be eucharistic even without vss 51-8, as pointed out by Barrett, but goes on to say :

> "Nevertheless, the fact that the eucharistic element is primary in vss. 51-8, while it is secondary in the rest of the chapter, does suggest that 51-58 had a different provenance from the rest of the chapter. The Discourse on the Bread of Life in 35-50 is complete in itself, as we saw in our study of homiletic technique; it comes to an end with a very carefully arranged inclusion. It seems illogical for the discourse to start all over again in vs 51. A far more plausible suggestion is that we have here two different forms of a discourse on the bread of life, both Johannine but stemming from different stages of the Johannine preaching". (13)

Unlike Bultmann, Brown sees vss 51-8 as an elaboration within the Johannine tradition rather than a correction from without of that tradition.(14) An earlier form of this thesis is that of J. Schneider,(15) who thinks that 6:27-59 was composed from three different meditations, originally written by the Evangelist in an earlier period and addressed then to situations quite different to the present one. With a few minor amendations we believe that Schneider is correct. The discourse does indeed fall naturally into three parts, with a break at vs 40 and again at vs 51. The transition on both occasions is provided by an altercation among the Jews, which prompts the next section of the discourse. In vss 41f,

the Jews grumble about Jesus' claim to descend from heaven and in vs 52, they argue sharply about his offer of his flesh to eat. The three parts of the discourse are sufficiently close in content for one to be able to trace key themes from one to another, which leads us to believe that either the discourse was composed as a literary unity using old material, or it was developed over a period of time by the same author, who sought in each new section to add another dimension to his work. Our exposition of the discourse will take into account these two possibilities. The importance of treating each of the three parts of the discourse independently is that it enables us to ask whether vss 60-71 corresponds more closely to one section than to another. For instance G. Bornkamm maintains that these verses refer back not to the eucharistic passage (vss 51-8), but to the main discourse (vss 35-50). Nevertheless the discourse, as a whole, is uniform in its presentation of Jesus as the divine agent and messenger from God, who brings with him the message of eternal life and judgement. We believe and will endeavour to show that Peter's confession may be understood as responding generally to the discourse (including vss 52-59) rather than specifically to a particular section. But before we commence our expositions we need to pause briefly to consider the figure of Wisdom as part of the background to the chapter.

7:1:2 The Figure of Wisdom

R.E. Brown[16] distinguished the main discourse (vss 35-50), from the eucharistic section on the grounds that the early section is mainly sapiential and the latter purely sacramental. This is true to the extent that the latter section emphasises the sacramental aspect, but as Barrett[17] rightly points out, the sapiential is not absent from vss 51-59. From the start the two themes are interwoven and although the emphasis changes both are present throughout. A study of the Wisdom tradition casts valuable light upon the understanding of the whole of ch 6, and is indeed basic to any interpretation of the discourse, from start to finish.[18]

The Prologue applies a number of Wisdom characteristics to the Divine Logos, like participation in creation and

being with God before time began.(19) The idea of Wisdom making her home among men provides us with an important insight into John's understanding of the incarnation. In ch 6, Wisdom reappears and in a manner typical of the Wisdom writings we observe that some men come to her (him) and find life, while others are discouraged and leave without her (him). Thus we read in Proverbs 8:35f, "For he who finds me finds life and obtains favour from the Lord. But he who sins against me does violence in his own soul: all those who hate me love death". So within the context of the wisdom tradition even the confession of Peter and the departure of some of the disciples have their place.

When Jesus (in vs 34) describes himself as the bread of life and issues an invitation to the hungry and thirsty, he is well within the Wisdom tradition. Proverbs 9:5 reads, "Come eat of my bread, and drink of the wine which I have mingled"; Sir. 15:3 reads, "For food she will give him the bread of understanding and for drink the water of knowledge". The picture of the Son of Man in the eucharistic section of Jn 6, is strikingly reminiscent of Sir. 24:19ff and particularly vs 21, "Whoever feeds on me will be hungry for more, and whoever drinks from me will thirst for more". In Enoch 42, Wisdom seeks a place on earth but finds none, and returns to take her seat among the angels. Yet the final verse implies that the righteous discover her - Wisdom dwells with them, "as rain in a desert and dew on a thirsty land". Therefore the whole discourse fits within the Wisdom tradition, and this alone argues for its basic unity.

Chapter 6, as P. Borgen(20) has shown, includes not only the figure of Wisdom but also the figure of Torah. This does not mean that John was necessarily operating within the Haggadhic tradition, for already in the Wisdom tradition the two figures of Wisdom and the Law had been blended. We read that the acquisition of Wisdom includes the fulfilling of the Law (e.g. Sir. 19:20), and in Bar. 3:37f we read: "Thereupon wisdom appeared on earth and lived among men. She is the book of the commandments of God, the law stands forever. All who hold fast to her shall live but those who forsake her shall die" (cf also Wisdom 6:18). In applying to Jesus the figure of Wisdom, John was also able to view Jesus as the

revelation of God. Wisdom speaks, "I am the word which was spoken by the Most High; it was I who covered the earth like a mist" (Sir. 24:3), and the same connection between Wisdom and the divine word is found in Wisdom of Solomon 9:2. Like Philo, John makes use of a whole wealth of ideas including Wisdom, Torah, Manna and the divine Logos - a whole spectrum of God's agents for revelation condensed into a presentation of Jesus as the Bread from Heaven. Exactly how he accomplishes this is best described in an exposition of the text. We turn therefore to a consideration of ch 6, starting with the feeding of the 5000.

7:1:3 The Feeding of the 5000 (6:1-15).

A prelude to the miraculous feeding of the 5000 may be found in Jn 4:48 (bearing in mind the possible transposition of chs 5 and 6), where Jesus announces, "Unless you see signs and wonders, you will not believe". The great performer of "signs and wonders" was, of course, Moses and we remember the tradition which pictured the Messiah as a redeemer figure like Moses. One of the miracles mentioned by the Rabbis, was the provision of manna.(21) Accordingly ch 6 opens with a presentation of Jesus as the Mosaic Prophet and Messiah (cf 6:14f). The term σημεῖον or the plural σημεῖα is used 17 times by John, but in 4 cases the singular form is used of a specific miracle, namely 2:18; 4:54; 12:18 and following ℵ D W al. al. also 6:14. The purpose of these signs, according to 20:30f, is to lead to faith in Jesus, the Messiah and Son of God or to confirm such faith. However, on reading the Gospel, we discover people who see the miracles yet apparently do not comprehend their meaning and do not come to faith in Jesus. The answer to this puzzle is dependant upon an understanding of John's use of the term σημεῖον and his presentation of the miracles of Jesus. "The sign", according to Barrett, "is not a mere portent but a symbolic representation of the truth of the Gospel". For Mark, the miracles of Jesus underline his authority as Messiah and the Messenger from God. In John, the miracles prefigure the form of the salvation which Jesus brings. The four signs, explicitly described as such, include the changing of water into wine, the healing of the official's son, the raising of

Lazarus and the feeding of the 5000. Leaving aside the other miracles narrated by John and concentrating just on these four, it is not difficult to discern in them common eschatological and soteriological themes. The miracle of the wine, like that of the bread, points towards the eschatological banquet anticipated in part by the celebration of the Christian eucharist.(22) The raising of Lazarus, like the healing of the son, share a common sense of Jesus as the one who brings life (cf 4:50 "Your son will live"). In all four signs one glimpses the dual aspect of Jesus' mission; the present experience and the future hope. However many of the people who watch Jesus at work fail to see beyond the immediacy of the present, which they understand purely in terms of the physical. They recognise Jesus as a great worker of miracles, because they have felt the immediate benefits (cf 6:26), but beyond the symbols of bread and wine lies the scandal of a crucified Messiah and beyond the action of healing and resurrection lies the scandal of the Word incarnate, and these they cannot see. True belief is a matter of perspective. The Christian reader of the Gospel, familiar with the Christian tradition, would be able to recognise the soteriological significance of the signs. The indictment in Jn 12:37-41 emphasizes the inability of many to penetrate the truth behind the signs, and brings to the fore the existential element of the Gospel. Hand in hand with John's use of the signs of Jesus is the sense of the paradox of the incarnation, which he saw played out in the life of his own community.

In the feeding of the 5000, John points beyond the miracle to the eschatological event (the messianic banquet or the New Exodus), when God will gather together his people from the four corners of the earth (cf vs 12). At the same time it incorporates the sacramental experience of the eucharist, and the sense of sharing in the life and death of Jesus. These ideas are implicit in the miracle, but explicit in the discourse which follows. For example, in vs 4 we read: "Now the Passover, the feast of the Jews, was at hand". On this verse Barrett writes :

> "He mentions the Passover primarily because, as will appear, some of the acts and words of this chapter have a eucharistic significance, and the eucharist like the last supper must be understood in the context of the Jewish Passover." (23)

The mention of the ἄρτους κριθίνους or barley loaves may be another allusion to the eucharist as J. McHugh has suggested.(24) The most important aspect of the feeding in this regard is John's use of the term εὐχαριστήσας in vs 11. Mark uses both εὐχαριστέω and κλάω to describe Jesus' actions at the feeding miracle (ch 8 cf. vs 6) and at the Last Supper (14:22f). The repetition of the verbs is probably deliberate and suggests Mark's attempt to bring out the sacramental meaning of the feeding miracle. John has no institution of the Eucharist at the Last Supper so we cannot do the same comparison. However taking the feeding miracle on its own, we find that not only the verb εὐχαριστέω is used, but also the term κλασμάτων (vs 13) which presupposes a breaking (κλάω). On the basis of these two actions, one may safely conclude that John intended his readers to catch a glimpse of the spiritual realities which lie behind the miracle. However we should guard against allowing vss 51-9 to colour our perception of these verses, just as we should not disturb the delicate way in which John prevents the sacramental aspect from dominating the scene, allowing it place at the fringe of our perception like the faint indication of the perfume of a half-familiar flower in a moonlit garden.

Jesus in vs 12 instructs the disciples to gather up the leftovers, a detail shared by the Synoptics and cause later for a brief discourse (Mk 8:14-21). The stress on Jesus' concern that nothing be lost is probably not a sacramental allusion(25) but refers instead to Jesus' care for his disciples (cf 17:12), a theme also common to Mark (cf 8:19-21), and to the hope that in the end of time God will gather together his people.

Vss 14f conclude the pericope and we have already dealt with these verses, so we shall not delay over them except to remind the reader that neither prophet nor messiah is adequate for John's christological purposes.(26) Both ideas require the corrective of the teaching on the Son of Man (cf vss 27 and 62) and the confession of Peter (vs 69).

We notice that John does not make use of the division of people into groups, reminiscent of the Exodus,(27) such as we find in Luke or Mark; nor does the miracle take place

in a desert region (cf Lk 9:10). In view of the confession which concludes the pericope, John might have used such details to his advantage had he been concerned to present Jesus as the Second Moses, but in fact that is not his intention. The crowd's <u>understanding</u> of the confession, as vs 15 so clearly shows, is misguided, and in the discourse which follows the real comparison is not between Moses and Jesus, but between Jesus and the Manna, and the realities which the Manna symbolizes.

7:1:4 The Walking on the Water (6:16-21)

This section is relatively straightforward and adds little to our quest, so that we shall not delay long over it. Once more there are parallels with the Synoptics, where a similar story is found. However in the Synoptic report Jesus' action in calming the storm assumes a prominent position which is absent from the Johannine version. John records a double miracle, that of Jesus walking on the water (ἐπί implies "on" and not "next to"),[28] and of the miraculous arrival at the shore (vs 21). The words of Jesus in vs 20 (Ἐγώ εἰμι, μὴ φοβεῖσθε ; cf. Mk 6:50) are taken by L. Morris[29] and C.H. Dodd[30] to be an affirmation of his deity. Schnackenburg goes one step further and connects vs 20 with the other "I am" claims of Jesus.[31] In fact if Jn 5 is to be understood as succeeding ch 6, then this would be the first of the "I am" claims. Since Mark employs the self-same words, we suggest that John is here using traditional material. However in the context of John's Gospel, the reader might have understood a deeper theological motif.

Schnackenburg's reference to the crossing of the Sea of Reeds as a possible parallel to Jesus' action designed to connect him with the Exodus narrative or the Passover haggada, seems to be rather far fetched.[32] If we were to enquire into the reasons for the inclusion of the miracle of walking on the water, the logical reason appears to be John's adherence to a source which connected the feeding with the walking on the water, similar to the Synoptic source. We doubt whether a connection with the Passover haggada is intended,[33] but we agree with Schnackenburg

that the words of Jesus, particularly ἐγώ εἰμι may have been a contributing factor in John's allocation and use of the pericope.(34) We are already aware of the way in which the chapter is building up to Peter's confession, through the reporting in detail of two miracles and the mention (vs 2) of many signs. Who is this man who can do these things? If he is not just a prophet, nor a political messiah and identifies himself enigmatically as ἐγώ εἰμι then, who is he? In direct response to such a question the ensuing discourse proceeds.

7:1:5 The Bread from Heaven (6:22-59)

The feeding of the 5000 is usually understood as providing a starting point for the discourse on Jesus as the Bread of Life, but in fact there is little direct connection apart from vs 26. No further mention of the attempt to make Jesus king is made, and the request for a sign (vss 30f) seemingly ignores the feeding miracle and the confession in vs 14. The discourse develops not as a portrait of Jesus as the prophet like Moses, but as a depiction of Jesus as the revelation of God. The focus quickly moves from the provision of bread to Jesus as the bread who comes down from heaven. John draws on a number of traditions (some already fused in the hellenistic Judaism of Philo), including the Wisdom tradition, the Jewish teaching about Torah and perhaps also the early Gnostic teaching of a divine revealer or the Jewish Merkabah Mysticism.(35) According to the Rabbis, "The words of the Torah, which I have given to you (Moses), are life to the world."(36) In Acts 7:38, Moses is described as receiving the "living oracles" of God. John's presentation is modelled upon the midrashic style of the expositers of the time.(37) The reference to Jesus preaching in the Synagogue (vs 59) is deliberately intended to remind readers of the Jewish technique - John presents Jesus as preaching in the style of his contemporaries, although the content of his teaching strikes at the heart of Jewish belief.

The midrash develops out of a quotation which is part of the crowds request for a sign, "He gave them bread from

heaven to eat" (vs 31), and looks back to a number of OT verses[38] rather than a single verse. John may have intentionally blended one verse with another in order to provide the necessary elements for the discourse which follows. Each section of the discourse picks up a new idea and develops it. So in the first section (vss 26-40) the reader discovers that it is God who gives the true bread, which is in fact Jesus himself. In the second section (vss 41-51), the consequence of eating the bread is spelled out in terms of eternal life. The third section brings the emphasis to bear upon the actual act of eating and drinking. Although the emphasis moves from one point to another, one is aware that the sections do flow into each other with themes anticipated and interwoven into the complex tapestry of the discourse. Let us now turn to an examination of the three parts of the midrash.

(a) Vss 26-40

An introduction to the discourse is provided by vss 22-5, with <u>vs 26</u> forming an indictment upon the motives of those who seek Jesus. They seek Jesus not because of who he is but for what they can get from him. We are reminded in some ways of the temptation narratives in Matthew and Luke, drawn from Q, in which the devil tempts Jesus to change the stones of the wilderness into bread. Jesus' response in that instance was to quote Deut 8:3 (cf Matt 4:4). In Jn 6:27, the response recorded there is in content, if not in form, similar: "Do not labour for the food which perishes, but for the food which endures to eternal life". One might have expected, in a situation like that of the Synoptics, for Jesus to break into a discussion on the importance of the Law, not so in John. John turns his attention to the true bread from heaven, not the Torah, but Jesus.

<u>Vs 27</u> introduces the reader to the Son of Man as the one who gives the food which leads to eternal life. This verse is one of the most important in the whole discourse and in view of vs 62 crucial to our interpretation of the confession of Peter. While the idea of bringing food for eternal life derives probably from the Wisdom tradition outlined above, John's inclusion of the title Son of Man

introduces another dimension into the picture. Apart from ch 5, previous teaching on the Son of Man has included the idea that he comes down from heaven (3:13), is the only one who has ascended into heaven (3:13), and as the one who is lifted up into heaven he brings salvation and life eternal (3:14f). If W. Meeks and C.H. Talbert are correct,(39) and we believe they are, John's use of the ascending/descending Son of Man is a result of his fusion of the theophany of Daniel 7 with the Wisdom tradition. The result is a divine figure who descends from heaven to bring the revelation of God and who in his ascension accomplishes the salvation of mankind, and receives his due in glory and honour. So Jesus, the Son of Man, is none other than the divine Wisdom who offers himself to the hungry (cf Sir. 15:3). The idea of "sealing" or ἐσφράγισεν probably refers to the Spirit of God, the sign that the Son of Man is sent by God.(40) It is his badge of office. At the same time we remember that Wisdom was connected with the Spirit, although the link was more in the nature of a comparison than an identity (cf Wisdom 1:5 and 7:22b). Jesus like Wisdom carries with him the authority of the Spirit of God and like both figures he brings God's revelation. Later, Peter will respond to Jesus as he who has "words of eternal life".

The response of the people in vs 28 plays upon the verb ἐργάζομαι as they enquire, "What shall we do that we may work the works of God?" In a Jewish situation such as the Wisdom tradition, one might expect a response to this question in terms of seeking after Wisdom or the Law or both. Once again John departs from the tradition, for in vs 29 works (or obedience to the Torah) is replaced by the single work of belief in Jesus. Later Jesus will speak of a new commandment, but here, in an almost Pauline way, faith in Jesus (πιστεύω εἰς) becomes the means of pleasing God. The use of the accusative with εἰς after πιστεύω rather than just the dative, is typical of John and may reflect the Hebrew ... ב האמין. L. Morris suggests that it implies not intellectual credence, but personal commitment: "Faith, for John, is an activity which takes men right out of themselves and makes them one with Christ".(41) C.H. Dodd speaks of "the moral element of personal trust".(42) The oneness motif is brought out

later in the eucharistic passage (vs 56 and cf ch 15:1ff). The absence of the noun πίστις in the Fourth Gospel may be significant here.(43) Certainly, John seems anxious to show that the object of true belief is not some form of esoteric knowledge, or a system of laws and regulations, but Jesus himself - the true revelation of God. The Jews appear to miss the point and they ask for a sign that they may believe (πιστεύω plus the dative). Misunderstanding is one of the literary techniques employed by John, often to bring to the reader's attention some important aspect of his Christology or soteriology.

Is Jesus the Prophet like Moses or the Messiah like Moses, the first redeemer? This seems to be the question which lies behind the request for a sign in vs 30, and vs 31 confirms this possibility. The reference to the Manna (although that term is not used) follows, and the midrash proper begins.

The tone of vs 32, with its emphatic οὐ is not difficult to mistake. It was not Moses but God who gives the true bread from heaven. The phrase could also be understood as implying that the bread given by Moses was not "from heaven". The Evangelist may have intended a deliberate ambiguity so that both meanings could be obtained.(44) However one reads the verse, one thing is clear. There is a deliberate denigration of Moses' role, not so much as a worker of miracles (although that is present also) but as the revealer of the Law. At the same time the contrast between Jesus and the Torah comes to the fore. The true revelation of God is not the Manna (Torah) but the divine Word - the Word which became flesh.

The contrast with the Torah continues in vs 33 and again John draws upon the Wisdom tradition (cf the idea of the descent of Wisdom to dwell among men and bring them eternal life).

Vs 34 demonstrates the continued inability of the crowd to comprehend what Jesus has to offer.(45) Vs 35 reminds us of Wisdom who calls people to come that their hunger and thirst may be satisfied.(46) The identification of Jesus with the Bread of Life, one of the "I am" sayings, by introducing the double feature of eating and drinking prepares the way for the final part of the discourse. So with Brown, we suggest that the verse blends together the twin themes of the sacramental and sapiential.(47) Barrett draws attention to the use of the

emphatic אנכי in the Hebrew of Proverbs 8, where Wisdom proclaims her own virtues.(48) The idea of "coming to" Jesus is another familiar part of the Wisdom tradition, and in ch 6 is a metaphor for "believing in" Jesus.

Vs 36 reminds the reader of the inability of even those who have seen Jesus to believe in him and we are reminded of the words addressed to Thomas, 20:29. The reason for such blindness comes in the next verse - vs 37, for it is only those whom the Father has given to Jesus who are able to come to him. There is again a curious sense of imbalance between the predestination of the first part of the verse and the seemingly open invitation of the latter half. It is doubtful whether this seeming contradiction can be resolved without doing damage to either aspect, for both are integral to John's theology. The verse indirectly opens the way for Peter's confession of belief and in some ways parallels Jesus' response in Matthew to the confession of Peter - It is of God; (Matt 16:17 "Flesh and blood has not revealed this to you, but my Father in heaven"). Those who come to Jesus, come not of their own accord but because they have been chosen by God (cf 17:9 and 15:16ff); yet even, as we shall see, among the chosen there is one who does not belong, namely Judas (cf 6:70f and 13:18). The whole idea of coming to Jesus and of not being turned away reminds us of Wisdom 6:12f, "Wisdom shines bright and never fades; she is easily discerned by those who love her, and by those who seek her she is found. She is quick to make herself known to those who desire knowledge of her".

Vs 38 defines the agency of Jesus as a heavenly agency, he like Wisdom comes down from heaven. Like Wisdom he is obedient to God's instruction - Wisd 7:15 "...for even Wisdom is under God's direction". Basic to John's understanding of the divinity of Jesus is his belief in the subordination of the Son to the Father.(49) To state that Jesus comes from heaven necessitates a defining of the relationship between Jesus and God; a recognition that Jesus acts as the agent of God. Vs 39 spells out the content of God's will, namely that Jesus should not lose any of those

entrusted to him, but raise them on the last day. There is perhaps a reflection of the concern of vs 12 (cf 17:11f). The main thrust of the verse lies in the promise of the resurrection. The eschatological hope is John's contribution[50] and it is a real hope for the future. There is a balance in vs 40 between the present possession of the Christian and his future hope (the Johannine dialectic).[51] Vss 39 and 40 connect those given to Jesus by God and those who see and believe in the Son (cf vs 36). Peter's response in vss 68f looks back to this hope of eternal life. As the Holy One of God, Jesus comes with the verdict of "not guilty"; he brings the words of life; for he has power over death. The stress on "I" affirms Jesus as the divine agent - for to give life is the prerogative of God, and as before confirms John's use of the Wisdom tradition.

(b) Vss 41-51

The gist of vss 41f picks up Jesus' claim to be bread (wisdom) from heaven. Since the listeners know his parents, how can he claim to come from heaven?[52] The apparent lack of belief brings us to the second aspect of the Wisdom tradition, namely the inability of some to hold on to Wisdom - which culminates in the crisis of vss 60f. The basic question remains, who is this Jesus? Much of this section is a repetition of the first part of the discourse, but with a change in emphasis. Thus vs 44 refers back to vs 37, but with the emphasis now upon the action of the Father in "drawing" (ἑλκύσῃ) the believer to Jesus. The idea of resurrection (found already in vs 40) now receives full attention (vss 44, 47-51). Vs 47 looks back to vs 35, but it is stated more emphatically; vs 48 refers back to the same verse and 49 recalls vs 31. In anticipation perhaps of the third part of the discourse, vs 50 introduces the idea of eating (φάγῃ). This is all in accord with our understanding of the midrashic method which John employs, as outlined above, whereby each part of the discourse looks back to the quotation in vs 31. We are also conscious that each part of the discourse anticipates in some way the coming division among the followers of Jesus, as the Jewish concept, of the

rejection of Wisdom by all but a few, is played out. Indications of the Wisdom tradition may be found in the idea of God as a teacher (vs 45) and the idea of seeing God (vs 46). Wisdom is the teacher par excellence and the one who by virtue of her presence among the angels,(52a) can claim to have seen God. Jesus, as Wisdom, takes over the revelatory role as in vs 46 he claims not only to have come from God, but to have seen God. The emphatic statement that no-one has seen God has a polemical edge,(53) but to focus only on this is to miss the force of the verse - Jesus is the true bearer of the revelation of God because he alone has seen God and is therefore uniquely equipped to tell others about God. The content of his revelation consists in an explanation of his own person (his divinity) and mission (namely to bring life to those who believe in him). Thus Jesus is both the bread of heaven, and the bread of life (vs 48). The reminder of the death in the wilderness (vs 49) brings into focus the greatness of Jesus' promise in vs 50, He who eats shall not die, he who eats shall live forever (vs 51).

The verb καταβαίνω in vs 50 is one of the pair of verbs associated with the Son of Man (cf 3:13). Here in ch 6 it is used within the discourse seven times in all (vss 33, 38, 41, 42, 50, 51, 58), and in effect forms the counterpart to the ascent of the Son of Man in vs 62. It is not by accident that a chapter which draws so clearly upon the wisdom tradition should include an idea so basic to the whole tradition, namely the descent of Wisdom into the world (cf Bar 3:29). The Prologue is the other passage in which this motif, if not the verb, is in evidence.

In Sir 24:19-22, Wisdom, who offers, "Come to me, you who desire me, and eat your fill of my fruit", is heard to say, "Whoever feeds on me (οἱ ἐσθίοντές με) will be hungry for more, and whoever drinks from me will thirst for more." So an offer of fruit becomes an offer of Wisdom herself. Similarly Jesus in vs 51, now offers himself to be eaten.(54) Perhaps the best way of understanding vs 51 is as transitional, marking the end of one section, but anticipating the theme of the next section. In the previous section vs 44 performs much the same function, being largely

a repetition of the previous themes, but with an introduction of the idea of drawing, which is then explicated in terms of God's role as a teacher.

(c) Vss 52-59

The third section of the discourse introduces both a sacramental emphasis (for the theme itself is already present), and an historical note. Just as the Logos hymn moves from a philosophical abstraction into history with the introduction of the incarnation (vs 14), so here in ch 6 the Wisdom tradition leads into the historical event of the crucifixion. The symbols of the eucharist become the symbols of the incarnation. The recognition of this fact is one of the most powerful arguments for the retention of vss 52-59 as an integral part of the Bread of Life discourse. By taking these verses as the work of another writer and so divorcing them from Jn 1:14, one may distort the teaching of those verses and so lose sight of the central issue - the fact of the incarnation, and in the process give undue attention to the symbols involved. As a result the flesh and blood tend to assume a magical quality which is at odds with the rest of ch 6.(55) In fact this is precisely the misunderstanding which John seeks to avoid. His deliberate use of the title Son of Man, which incorporates the divinity of Jesus,(56) in a context which describes the basic essence of all mankind (flesh and blood) provides us with a precise parallel to the incarnate Logos of ch 1. The paradoxical expression of Jesus' divinity in the symbols of flesh and blood is more than a polemic against some form of docetism.(57) It is no less than the heart of Johannine theology. By our participation in the basic elements which mark Jesus' humanity, we share his suffering and his resurrection. Hence John stresses abiding in Jesus (vs 56) and the parallel between the experience of Jesus and that of the believer (vs 57), "As the living Father sent me, and I live because of the Father, so he who eats me will live because of me". Beyond the physical reality of the here and now is the spiritual experience of eternity (cf vs 63).

Vss 52-9 look back to the quotation in vs 31 and in turn develops upon the theme of "eating" and the consequences of such an act. (John uses two verbs, φαγεῖν aor. inf. of ἔσθίω

and τρώγω , apparently without intending any difference in meaning.)[58] R.E. Brown,[59] in his discussion of this section of ch 6, draws attention to the connections with the main part of the discourse. Thus vs 53 looks back on vs 47, 58 reflects vss 49 and 50 and there are other examples. This reminds us of the pattern we observed in the first two parts of the discourse, and is not necessarily an indication of a redactionary hand. Brown fails to see the continuation of the Wisdom Midrash, although he recognises the essential unity of the presentation when he writes, "we may well suspect that the redactor was only completing and perfecting a process of assimilation that had already begun".[60] His description of the final product as "a juxtaposition of Jesus' twofold presence to the believers in the preached word and the sacrament of the Eucharist"[61] may be true at a superficial level, but it conceals John's true intention, which was to use this discourse to present Jesus as <u>the divine revealer and the incarnate Son of Man</u>.

Much nearer to the truth is the penetrating study of this chapter by C.K. Barrett.[62] He points to the presence of the sapiential theme not only in the early part of the discourse but also in vss 57f. A detail which Brown appears to have overlooked. Barrett[63] goes further and asks, why is the title Son of Man employed? In response he offers three areas for consideration:

(a) John was affected by a tradition connecting the Eucharist with the title, Son of Man, perhaps the Last Supper (as described in the Synoptics) with its attendant eschatological hope.

(b) The Son of Man is a suitable description for a figure who descends from heaven (cf Jn 6:62 and Mk 13:26).

(c) The Son of Man is a suitable term for a self-giving figure (cf Mk 10:45).[64]

The extent to which John was familiar with the Synoptic tradition is a vexed problem, but even if we were to suppose that John followed his own independent source the fact that the Son of Man was envisaged as descending from heaven (Jn 3:13), as dying for the world (3:14f) and as performing an eschatological function (5:27) provides

us with complementary considerations to those of Barrett. Moreover John's picture of the Son of Man was influenced by the Wisdom tradition.(64a) Thus the Son of Man descends from and ascends to the presence of God, brings life (cf 6:27) and like Wisdom offers himself to the hungry and thirsty (cf Sir 24:21). Quite apart from the Synoptic tradition of the Last Supper, therefore, good reasons may be found for John's use of the title Son of Man in a context which combines sacramental and sapiential themes. The crux of the verses, as we have already pointed out, is the paradox of the incarnation. In such a setting John might have used any one of his divine titles to bring home the contrast between the human and the divine. His choice of the Son of Man, given the themes of descent in the discourse, was obvious.

We return now to the question about the writing of ch 6 and whether the author in fact composed it in stages or in one sitting. The parallels between each of the three parts of the discourse suggest that we have <u>three forms of the same discourse, added over a period of time by the same writer</u>. In the Upper Room discourses a similar process may be detected.(65) There also the discourses deal with common themes but each section develops in a different direction. In ch 6 the midrashic method and the development of the Wisdom motif, in combination with the presentation of Jesus as the divine revealer, supplies grounds for the essential unity of the discourse, as it now stands. But if there were three forms of the discourse added over the course of time the question is raised of the inter-relationship of Peter's confession to this three-part discourse. Is Bornkamm right when he argues that vss 60ff do not build upon vss 51c - 58?(66) The answer to this question lies within the fourth part of ch 6.

7:1:6 Conflict and Confession (6:60-71)

The presentation of Jesus, the Divine Wisdom and Revealer, continues with a description of dissension among the hearers. We are reminded of Sir 4:17ff:

> "Her discipline will be a torment to him, and her decrees a hard test (πειράσει) until he trusts her with all his heart. Then she will

> come straight back to him again and gladden him, and reveal her secrets to him. But if he strays from her, she will desert him and abandon him to his fate."

In John 6, it is the disciples of Jesus who find his teaching difficult (vs 60), who are scandalized (vs 61) and many of whom draw back from following him. Jesus enquires of the Twelve, whether they too will desert him (vs 67), and Peter responds with his confession of faith on behalf of the Twelve. <u>The whole sequence of events resembles an enacted parable illustrating Jesus' teaching in the discourse: a parable of the Divine Wisdom finding a home in the hearts of a few men in the face of rejection by the many (cf Enoch 42:1-3)</u>.Two crucial verses for the understanding of the relation between Jn 6:60-71 and the three parts of the Bread of Life discourse are verses 61 and 63. What is this "hard saying" which causes the disciples to stumble and lose faith? Is it to be located in the early parts of the discourse (as Bornkamm maintains), or is it the thought of eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the Son of Man?

John uses the verb σκανδαλίζω in 16:1 to convey the general idea of falling away from the faith (cf I Jn 2: 10). We find a similar usage throughout the NT (cf Mk 4:17). The "scandal" of the NT has little of the English ingredient of malicious gossip, but certainly the idea of eating flesh might be considered to be a stumbling block in the path of faith. Several times, as G. Stählin points out(67) the verb σκανδαλίζω or noun σκάνδαλον refers to the crisis precipitated by the death of Jesus. For example, in Mk 14:27 Jesus warns of a severe crisis which the disciples will face. "You will all fall away (πάντες σκανδαλισθήσεσθε); for it is written, 'I will strike the shepherd, and the sheep will be scattered.' " The setting is the Last Supper and Jesus after prophesying his death as the Son of Man (vs 21), institutes the eucharist and then goes on to speak of the falling away of the disciples. Interestingly enough, it is Peter who responds with the words, " Εἰ καὶ πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐγώ "(vs 29), while of Judas it is said, "It would have been better for that man if he had not been born" (vs 21b). When one compares Jn 6:60-71 with Mk 14:17-31 one

is struck by the number of parallels.(68) There is Jesus' teaching on the Son of Man (in both cases a reference to the death of Jesus is implicit); Jesus' warning to the disciples that they will fall away in Mark may be compared with the question in Jn 6:67; the response of Peter in Mk 14:29 may be compared with his confession in Jn 6:69; and finally the indictment on Judas in Mk 14:21 may be compared with Jn 6:70f. If Barrett is correct in his understanding of Jn 6:51-8 as a Johannine adaptation of the institution of the Eucharist as related in the Synoptics,(69) then Jn 6:60ff might be similarly viewed as an adaptation of the Last Supper narrative as found in the Synoptic tradition. <u>The crisis of Jesus' death is thus moved back into the teaching ministry of Jesus</u>, just as the institution of the Eucharist at the Last Supper is replaced by Jesus' teaching on the flesh and blood of the Son of Man.

R. Bultmann writes,

> The editor, in placing 6:60-71 after 6:1-59 obviously understood vv 51b-58 in terms of vv 60f, as a σκληρὸς λόγος and σκάνδαλον. For him the σκάνδαλον consisted in the fact that the historical Jesus, while he was still alive, had referred to his flesh and blood as food, which was of course unintelligible to his hearers. On the other hand the idea of the sacrament itself is not as such a σκάνδαλον and cannot be so. But this has the result of externalising the concept of σκάνδαλον and makes a literary motif out of one of the characteristics of the revelation, which as such - ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο ! - always remains a σκάνδαλον. Here it has been reduced to the idea that the hearers cannot understand that Jesus is speaking of the Lord's Supper. (70)

The English translation is misleading particularly the last sentence which renders the German (die Hörer konnen nicht verstehen, dass Jesus vom Herrenmahl redet). Bultmann does not in fact speak of a "reduction" per se, but certainly he views vss 51b-8 as a distortion of the "Charakter der Offenbarung". Perhaps, however, the distortion lies not in the passage itself but in Bultmann's interpretation of the passage. We have shown that behind the flesh and blood of the Son of Man is the paradox of the divine revealer,

whose flesh is real flesh (σάρξ μου ἀληθής ... βρῶσις) and whose blood is real blood (αἷμά μου ἀληθής ... πόσις). So vss 51b-8 form an essential part of the discourse and provides the link between the divinity of the one who comes from heaven and his humanity. Moreover the path is opened for the believer to participate in the life of the Son of Man (cf 6:56).

Even if we retain ch 6 as it is the "scandal" of vs 61 and the "hard saying" might refer back to some other part of the discourse, perhaps to Jesus' claim to come from heaven or to his claim to have the power to raise the dead (cf vs 40). So a claim of Jesus becomes the subject of debate and Jesus responds by saying in vs 61, "then what if you were to see the Son of Man ascending to where he was before?". The sentence lacks its apodosis, but we may imagine something like "then would you believe I have descended from heaven/ I have power to raise the dead." Both of these suggestions make good sense and must be seen as alternatives to the more common suggestion of "then the scandal would be even greater".(71) In Mark 6, Jesus preaches in a Synagogue and the people respond to his mighty words and deeds (vs 2), but after reflecting upon what they know about Jesus and his family (vs 3, cf Jn 6:42) they are offended (ἐσκανδαλίζοντο). So in John also the key to the interpretation of the σκληρὸς λόγος and the σκάνδαλον lies less in the actual content of his words than in the paradox of a human agent who performs divine deeds and makes divine claims. The proof of his authority lies in his resurrection and ascension to his Father, and this is the gist of vs 62. In other words, we suggest that vss 61f apply not singly to a particular part of the discourse, but to the discourse as a whole and its presentation throughout of Jesus as the divine revealer. There is a deliberate ambiguity in the terms σκληρὸς λόγος and σκανδαλίζω which enables the reader to think back to the objections expressed by the Jews in vss 41f, and vs 52 and to the whole mystery of Jesus the Divine Wisdom of God. The offence is disbelief and the rejection is of the Wisdom which comes from God in search of a home (cf Enoch 42:1-3). The stress on ascent (vs 62)

complements the earlier teaching on descent and the double movement reminds us that the origin of John's Son of Man tradition lies in his wedding of the Danielic Son of Man with the Wisdom traditions.(72)

Vs 63 is a difficult verse to understand(73) particularly if one views the whole discourse as a unity. Taken in a superficial way, the verse appears to contradict Jesus' teaching of the flesh of the Son of Man.(74) Various attempts have been made to show that the contradiction is more imaginary than real.(75) Barrett(76) distinguishes the general use of "flesh" in this verse from "the flesh" of the Son of Man. So flesh implying human endeavour, avails nothing, whereas the Spirit brings eternal life. The contrast between flesh and spirit has also been used to argue that Jesus was pointing beyond his human existence to his divine reality,(77) or to support the claim that John was critical of a particular view of the sacraments.(78) Perhaps there is some truth in all of these opinions, but the crux of the matter lies elsewhere. In Wis 7:22 we read that Wisdom is "a spirit intelligent and holy" and it is possible to interpret Jn 6:63 in the light of the Wisdom tradition, which linked the Holy Spirit and Wisdom in a careful balance of unity and diversity.(79) As the personification of Wisdom Jesus speaks words which are spirit and life. Thus the verse harks back to the main theme of Jesus as the Divine Revealer. Like vss 60-2 it relates generally to the whole of the discourses rather than just the third section. "Spirit and life" have been described as an hendiadys rather like the phrase "spirit and truth" in 4:24.(80) Nevertheless "spirit" in both verses contains an implicit reference to the Holy Spirit and this detail must not be overlooked. In particular, for ch 6, it reminds us of the revelatory role of the Spirit, which in turn underlines Jesus' claim to come from heaven as the divine emissary (cf vs 27). Flesh in this context epitomises all that is in opposition to the realm of the spirit, and most importantly the element of human reason. Devoid of spiritual insight man sees only the human Jesus of earthly parents and fails to penetrate the veil. Words about descent from heaven, eternal life and eating flesh

and blood are meaningless. But these words are in themselves spirit and life which enable the believer to see and live.

Vs 64 continues this theme - "But there are some of you that do not believe". Clearly Jesus, like Wisdom in Wis 8:9, "can foretell the outcome of events and periods". The implicit reference to Judas reminds the reader of the extent of the schism which reaches even to the inner group of the Twelve. So the circle of the flesh is defined in contrast to the circle of the spirit, with the dividing line described in terms of belief. Vs 65, which echoes vss 37 and 44, moves the emphasis from man's response to God's activity and effectively prepares the way for Peter's confession of faith. A sense of divine sanction is present (cf Matt 16:17 "Flesh and blood has not revealed this to you, but my Father who is in heaven"). Peter, in Jn 6, comes to confess Jesus, drawn and prompted not by his human reason(81) but in response to the activity of God and the revelation incarnate in Jesus. Vs 66 in describing the division among the disciples, continues the motif of belief and disbelief. We are probably correct in understanding an historical allusion here, either to an event in Jesus' lifetime or to an event in the life of the Church. Perhaps it refers to a schism in the Johannine community as might have occurred following the break from the Synagogue. Following the Wisdom myth, we have here the rejection of Wisdom by all but a few. In vs 67 the words of Jesus address those who remain "Will you also go away?", and there is a definite sense of an existential element at work here. Jesus is speaking to the Johannine community, unsettled perhaps after the cutting of their roots in the Synagogue and uncertain of the future. Their doubts and fears, the misunderstandings of their enemies and the inability of human reason to comprehend the depth of the Christ-event combine to present a good case for turning back from belief. Faith is at the point of crisis, balanced on the brink of unbelief.

Peter is the spokesman of the Twelve in vss 68-9 (note the plural form of the verbs). But he speaks also on behalf of all true believers. His confession may be divided into

three parts: "Lord to whom shall we go?"; "You have words of eternal life"; "We have believed and have come to know that you are the Holy One of God". In spite of the interrogative form of the first part, all three are in fact statements about Jesus. The first statement affirms Jesus as "Lord", not with the same sense as Thomas does, but it does prepare the way for that confession. Peter recognises that in the existential drama of the crisis that he can turn only to Jesus. This is a tacit acceptance of Jesus as the unique representative of God. By comparison the Torah, the words of ancient wisdom, are dead.

"You have words of eternal life" sums up the teaching of the discourse on the Bread from Heaven (cf also vs 63) and brings the reader's attention to the role of Jesus as the one who speaks with divine authority - the divine Revealer. This is no statement about Jesus' prophetic ministry but an affirmation of his authority over death as the divine judge who utters the verdict of life or death, not guilty or guilty. It affirms implicitly Jesus' own resurrection and expressly the hope of all believers that they will receive eternal life. It responds to the portrait of Jesus as the divine Wisdom of God (Prov 8:35 reads, "He who finds me finds life, and he obtains favour from the Lord".)

The three parts of Peter's confession form an ascending trio culminating in the words, "We have believed and have come to know that you are the Holy One of God". The first two clauses find their meaning in the third, In what way is Jesus Lord? By what authority does he utter words of life? The answer is defined in terms of the person of Jesus, (He is the Holy One) but more importantly in terms of his relationship with God (He is...of God). As usual John is careful to draw the reader's attention to Jesus' subordinate position vis-a-vis the Father. Peter therefore responds to the revelation incarnate in Jesus. Like Wisdom, Jesus is divine and like Wisdom he is holy. He gives life and conquers death. Like Martha (11:27) Peter gains a glimpse of Jesus as the one who stands beyond death and is himself the resurrection and the life.

Finally in contrast to the demons in Mark and Luke who see only a figure who comes from God to bring judgement upon them, Peter and those whom he represents find in Jesus eternal life. Peter thus responds to the risen and glorified Lord. He speaks from the post-resurrection standpoint of the Johannine community. He testifies not to Jesus' messiahship, but to his fulfilment of the divine figure of Wisdom - the incarnate Logos. Directly he responds to Jesus as the Bread of Life and the Son of Man, who will ascend to where he was before (cf vs 62). The Holy One of God is an ideal title to capture these thoughts for its basic sense is that of agency, and frequently, as here, divine agency.

Holiness for John implies the divinity of Jesus, his separation from the world and his unique relation with the Father. R. Bultmann(82) describes Jesus in this passage as "the Revealer who has the ἐξουσία of κρίνειν and of ζωοποιεῖν ." Peter finds life, but Judas and the others who reject Jesus find death. Wisdom literature abounds in the descriptions of those who reject Wisdom. For example in Sir 4:19 we read, "But if he strays from her, she will desert him and abandon him to his fate" and in 15:9, "Worship is out of place on the lips of a sinner, unprompted as he is by the Lord". Judas is singled out in vss 70f as διάβολος and the tension between the Holy One and the Son of Perdition reminds us of the conflict between Jesus and the demon in Mk 1.

In vs 70, Jesus speaks of his choice of the Twelve (cf vs 67) which reminds us of the first discourse in which the issue of coming to Jesus was balanced over against those who reject him (cf vss 36f). Peter epitomizes the believers, Judas by contrast is a devil (διάβολος). The editorial comment vs 71 which connects Judas with the undefined devil, raises one question in particular. Is this John's attempt to protect Peter and his confession? When we considered the Synoptic confession of Peter, we observed the measures taken by Luke and Matthew in this regard. Is John then following suite? This is the most obvious understanding of the attack on Judas but it does not preclude the possibility that John had other motives in mind, nor the possibility that he was working from a tradition rather different

from Mark's.

In a dualism of belief versus unbelief, as here in John, Peter could no more easily be called a devil, or Satan, than a demon could confess Jesus as the Holy One of God. The dualism in John militates against any such phenomenon and it is on this account that exorcisms in John have no place, just as there is no space for the temptations if delivered by a devil who prefixes his demands with an appeal to Jesus' sonship. It is the crowd who tempt Jesus, the Jews who belong to the Devil, while the conflict is not with Satan, but with the κόσμος (16:33), and with Judas who is possessed by Satan (13:27). The healings of Jesus become signs to faith not a systematic attack on the symptoms of evil. The "hour" which Jesus expects is the single moment of conflict with the Prince of the World, although the result is already known and anticipated (14:29), so there is no space for petty battles with demonic forces. Instead the stage is cleared for the historical conflict in which Judas plays a leading role. In such a setting it is almost inevitable that Judas, the devil, should find himself ranged alongside Jesus, the Holy One of God. The darkness of Judas highlights not only the confession of Peter, but more importantly from the Johannine perspective, brings into focus the holiness of Jesus.

John's Gospel is like a drama(83) in which the characters hover on the outskirts of the stage, with only Jesus in the spotlight. One by one they are drawn into the light and by their reactions and Jesus' words we discover more and more about Jesus. To this end the characters of the Gospel are often no more than foils for the person of Jesus.

Judas as the devil, the epitome of evil, the son of Perdition, is the counterpart of Jesus the Holy One of God. The deliberate use of the title ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ vs.69 and the term applied to Judas vs 70, διάβολος , emphasize the cosmic tension inherent in the former. It is the dualism in John which explicates this sense of tension by pointing to the soteriological aspect of Jesus' mission (he brings the words of life), to the ethical aspect of

Jesus' mission (he is the Holy One in opposition to the devil), and to the cosmic sense in which Jesus "of God" stands in sharp contrast to all who are "of the world". He is the Wisdom of God who divides mankind in two.

7:2 The Holy One as a Divine Agent

The root meaning of the Holy One of God is found in the idea of an agent or messenger of God. Thus it may describe a prophet or a messiah or as in John a divine agent like Wisdom. Some scholars would go so far as to say that the title includes a sense of the deity of Jesus even in Mark and Luke.(84) This raises the question of the relation of the Holy One of God to a title like Son of God. Secondly with particular reference to John we need to ask about the relation of Holy One of God to titles like Son of Man as well as Son of God. In the answering of these questions we uncover the last of the mysteries which surround the Holy One.

7:2:1 The Holy One and the Son of God

Several writers take the view that the Holy One of God and the Son of God are closely related titles. Thus A.E. Harvey, O. Cullmann and C.E.B. Cranfield use the latter title to interpret the enigma of the former.(85) All three writers arrive at the conclusion that like Son of God, the Holy One describes the deity of Jesus. With reference to Mark 1:24, Cranfield writes,

> "So it is better here to understand ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ as in line with ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ in 3:11 and υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου in 5:7. It is as the divine Son of God rather than as Messiah that the demoniacs address Jesus." (86)

Commenting on the same verse in Mark, Cullmann says,

> "It is certainly not by chance that besides 'Son of God' the demons in the Synoptic Gospels use only one other title for Jesus: 'The Holy One of God' (Mk 1:24). This name describes the unique distinction of Jesus from all other creatures..."(87)

Cullmann goes so far as to say that the two titles are "almost interchangeable". We have suggested(88) that against the backdrop of the Divine Council, a messenger of God might be recognised as either a son of God or a holy one. However

in the Christian tradition both titles were reinterpreted and Son of God was chosen, perhaps on account of its messianic content, to represent the orthodox view of Jesus. Holy One of God, perhaps because of its association with the angelic holy ones, was used less and less often. Even in Jn 6:69 the scribes of later centuries chose to replace the title by bringing the confession into line with the Synoptic versions and particularly that found in Matthew. The danger which faces the scholar today is to follow this tendency and to interpret the Holy One in the light of the better known titles like Son of God and Messiah and to read into the former all the content of the latter. In so doing sight is often lost of the one arena in which Son of God and Holy One of God are interchangeable, namely the Divine Council. The demonic perspective is lost and the effect of the Marcan and Lucan redaction is to interpret the demonic utterances as if made by Christian believers, which in effect is what the Gospel writers intended.

In John there are no demonic voices and the presentation of the Holy One is quite different. Peter makes the confession in response to Jesus as the divine revealer. He speaks on behalf of the twelve but in reality represents the Johannine community. The importance of the Divine Council remains, but here the messenger is divine and like Wisdom he comes from the realm above. The immediate connection is with the title Son of Man and not Son of God with Peter responding to Jesus as the ascending and descending Son of Man.

In the Synoptics the Son of God carries with it a sense of Jesus as the Messiah and in Mark and Luke this sense has been carried over into the Holy One. But in John, the messianic content is absent from the Holy One and the focus rests upon Jesus as the one who comes from God and by his words reveals the authority of God. The authority of an otherwordly messenger. The Messiah might be a Holy One (as in Mark or Luke) but not <u>every</u> Holy One is a Messiah. Whenever a Holy One appears there is a sense of tension engendered by the very fact of his holiness. It is this sense of tension which we find in Mark and Luke and John

and which warns us of the uniquenessness of this title - its cosmological dimension. Here Jesus stands as the representative of the realm of the holy, the champion of God sent to destroy the realm of evil and according to John to bring life to the believers.

7:2:2 The Holy One and the Son of Man

If the Holy One does not lead us automatically to the idea of Jesus as Son of God, but rather points more generally to the agency of Jesus, we need to ask whether it necessarily includes an actual reference in some other way to the deity of Jesus.

In the course of his exposition of 6:69 Schnackenburg defines ἅγιος as implying "participation in God's deepest and most essential being".(89) Such a usage is very distinctive and one which is not necessarily justified in terms of the Johannine doctrine of holiness as far as we have understood it. The three verses which he cites in support are 10:36; 17:11 and I Jn 2:20, but beyond the fact that both Jesus and God are referred to as ἅγιος, there is no indication in these verses of "a participation" in "God's being". Nevertheless as Bultmann has suggested " ἅγιος denotes the divine sphere over against the world, and therefore also that which is marked out as apart from the profane world and belongs to God".(90) There is the potential within the Johannine usage of holiness for more profound understanding of holiness than is encountered elsewhere in the NT, on account of his general Christology as well as his use of ἅγιος or ἁγιάζω. It is the doctrine of holiness in John which warns us to look beyond the realm of human agencies towards the one who comes from above and returns thither. It is his use of other heavenly agencies such as Wisdom and the Logos which reflects back and enhances the agency implicit in the Holy One. In other words the deity of Jesus <u>is an implicit part not of the titles in John, but of his unique understanding of the function of Jesus</u> in terms of a divine agency which incorporates ideas drawn from early gnosticism, Jewish Wisdom literature, the Haggada and Jewish apocalyptic.

Consequently the Holy One as a title in John for Jesus as the agent of God must include his divinity, and the immediate context (cf vs 62) reinforces this observation.

L. Morris argues on the basis of the selective use of ἅγιος and its connection with the OT title for God (the Holy One of Israel) that this title elevates Jesus to the divine sphere.(91) C. Brown says, "Nevertheless, the fact that John uses the epithet 'holy' elsewhere only of the Father and the Spirit sets Jesus with God and not man".(92)

The selective use of ἅγιος although striking is hardly a sufficient basis on which to argue that ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ must indicate the divinity of Jesus. Since we read in 17:17 of Jesus' request that the believers be made holy it is somewhat unlikely that ἅγιος itself should be translated "divine". It is rather in the general presentation of Jesus as one with the Father, the one who comes from the realm of the divine that we register Jesus' claim to divinity. The Johannine community were hardly ignorant of the fact that men like the prophets would be termed οἱ ἅγιοι and perhaps they knew also the Christian title οἱ ἅγιοι for the believers, found in Paul's epistles. Consequently the basis for Jesus' divinity rests not just upon the Johannine use of ἅγιος or ἁγιάζω but upon the doctrine of Jesus as the divine agent of God. This is what we have suggested.

The fact that there were heavenly holy ones should be taken into account, but the connection between Jesus and the angels basic to J. Bühner's concept of agency(93) is at variance with John's theology and christology as we have seen. By itself the Holy One of God implies no more and no less than what it says, that the one so described is holy (in both the positive and negative senses of that term) and comes from God as the agent of God. Everything beyond this, such as the connection with Son of God or, as in John, Son of Man derives from the context in which the title is found. This includes concepts like divinity, judgement and life-giving which are now intrinsic to Jn 6:69.

Although Jn 10:36 connects the action of consecration with the title Son of God, ch 6 points to some connection with Son of Man. Ch 6:68 refers, as Bultmann observed, to ch 5:21,7 which mentions both titles but connects judgement with Son of Man.

Clearly in Jn 6:70f there is a sense of judgement upon Judas, but this connection is too tenuous to posit a deliberate reference to Son of Man on John's part. The passage in question reads as follows :

5:21-2, 24-7.

"For as the Father raises the dead and gives them life so the Son also gives life to whom he will. (22) The Father judges no one, but has given all judgement to the Son...(24) Truly, truly, I say unto you he who hears my word and believes him who sent me, has eternal life (ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον); he does not come into judgement, but has passed from death to life. (25) Truly, truly I say to you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God, and those who hear will live. (26) For as the Father has life in himself so he has granted the Son also to have life in himself, (27) and has given him authority to execute judgement, because he is a Son of Man".

The idea of judgement reminds us of the Divine Council and the holy ones there. Jesus functions like Melchizedek at Qumran. It reminds us also of Daniel 7 with its picture of the Council and the presence there of the Son of Man.(94) It is not beyond the realm of possibility to conjecture that Son of Man in Daniel who represents the holy ones, might himself be described as holy. It is significant that Jesus is worshipped as Son of Man by the once blind man following Jesus' revelation of himself as such.(95) A study of ch 6 shows us that John is intent on presenting Peter as responding to Jesus, the Son of Man. In such a setting Holy One of God is an appropriate substitute and does not lose the sense of resurrection life(96) (for the Holy One is he who has been raised from death, cf. Dan 7:22) nor the sense of Jesus as the divine agent (cf. Dan 7:13).

In ch 6 in two of the discourses Jesus speaks of himself as the Son of Man, and again in the pericope just prior to Peter's confession :

(a) In the First Discourse

6:27 Do not labour for the food which perishes, but for the food which endures to eternal life (εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον), which the Son of Man will give to you; for on him has God the Father set His seal.

(b) In the Third Discourse

6:53 Truly, truly, I say to you, unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, you have no life in you: (54) he who eats my flesh and drinks my blood has eternal life (ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον) and I will raise him up at the last day.

(c) In the Confession Narrative

6:62 Then what if you were to see the Son of Man ascending to where he was before? (63) It is the spirit that gives life, the flesh is of no avail; the words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life.

6:68 Simon Peter answered him, "Lord, to whom shall we go? You have (the) words of eternal life".

Peter, by recognising that Jesus has the words of life responds not only to the Son of God in ch 5, but most immediately to the Son of Man in ch 6. Son of Man is an enigmatic title[97] and is used by John to explain Jesus' heavenly nature (in contrast to the belief of F.J.Moloney,[98] who holds that it is limited in meaning to Jesus' humanity). And through the use of verbs like ζωοποιεῖν and κρίνειν (5:21,27) it connects the title with ideas of heavenly agents already found in the Gospel. Jesus the Holy One is he who, like the Son of Man in Daniel, symbolizes the resurrection life. At the same time he brings judgement on Judas (cf 5:27). Addressed to such a figure, a heavenly agent, a Son of Man, Peter's confession looks beyond the traditional use of Holy One into a completely new world - a world only truly comprehended from the standpoint of the post-resurrection Christian community, for whom Peter speaks.

7:3 Conclusion

We believe that the key to the Holy One whether in Mark, Luke or John is the idea of agency, particularly against the backdrop of the Divine Council. To translate the concept into English one would probably speak of the Messenger of God who carried with him the authority of the Spirit. The demonic utterances should be understood against the background of the Council, in which God was served by holy ones and sons of God. However Mark, Luke and John have given to the title another level of interpretation, dressing it in Christian garb and bringing it into line with their own theology. Mark presents Jesus as the charismatic herald of the Kingdom, the champion of God who wages war with the hordes of Satan. Later Jesus is recognised as the Messiah. Luke presents us with a prophetic interpretation of the Holy One ranking Jesus with Elijah and Elisha and casting upon him the mantle of prophet-Messiah. Finally John offers his understanding of the Holy One. It is distinctive because he introduces the element of the deity of Jesus so that the Holy One is now understood as a divine agent to be seen alongside the other divine agents like Wisdom, the Logos and the Son of Man. The inherent danger in this presentation was that it might develop into angelic Christology. Thus in the Gospel of Thomas, Peter confesses Jesus as like a Righteous Angel.(99) As the divine agent Jesus brings words of life. He comes with the verdicts of guilty and not guilty and so functions as the judge of the Divine Council, like Melchizedek in 11Q Melch.

The closest title to the Holy One in Mark or Luke is Son of God (in its pre-Christian sense), but in John it is Son of Man, thus preserving the connection with the Council. At the same time both titles incorporate the sense of Jesus' divine agency but there are also differences and the unique sense of the Holy One remains. As the one who is holy and belongs to God, the Holy One stands apart from the world (the stranger from heaven) and the sense of tension which ensues when the Holy One is recognised is unmistakably the most important insight into the meaning of the title.

Finally, in the Johannine context where the crisis of Jesus' death is read back into the "scandal" of Jn 6, Peter responds to one who conquers death. The Holy One is he who stands beyond the confines of this world, the resurrected Lord.

ABBREVIATIONS

B.D.B.	F. Brown, S.R. Driver, C.A. Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament Oxford, 1907.
Bib.	Biblica (Rome).
B.J.R.L.	Bulletin of the John Rylands Library (Manchester).
B.Z.	Biblische Zeitschrift (Freiburg).
C.B.Q.	Catholic Biblical Quarterly (Washington).
D.J.D.	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert (6 Vols ff.) Oxford, 1955ff.
D.S.S.E.	G. Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English. Second Edition New York, 1975.
D.N.T.T.	C. Brown (Ed.) The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. Exeter, 1976.
E.T.L.	Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses. (Louvain).
Ev. Th.	Evangelische Theologie (Munich).
Exp. T.	Expository Times (Edinburgh).
H.T.R.	Harvard Theological Review (Cambridge, Mass.).
I.D.B.	Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. (4 Vols) Ed. by G A Buttrick et al. New York, 1962.
I.E.J.	Israel Exploration Journal (London).
J.B.L.	Journal of Biblical Literature (Minnesota).
J.J.S.	Journal of Jewish Studies (London).
J.N.E.S.	Journal of Near Eastern Studies (Chicago).
J.S.J.	Journal for the Study of Judaism.
J.T.S.	Journal for Theological Studies (Oxford).
J.T.S.A.	Journal of Theology for Southern Africa (Cape Town).
L.S.	H.G. Liddell and R. Scott. A Greek-English Lexicon, Oxford, 1968.
Neot.	Neotestamentica (Pretoria).
N.T.	Novum Testamentum (Leiden).
N.T.S.	New Testament Studies (Cambridge).
O.T.S.	Oudtestamentische Studiën
R.B.	Revue Biblique (Paris).
R.H.P.R.	Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religièuses (Strasbourg).
R.Q.	Revue de Qumran (Paris).
R.S.R.	Recherches de Science religieuse (Paris).
Stud. Theol.	Studia Theologica (Lund).
S.N.T.	Supplements to Novum Testamentum (Leiden).

Str.B.	H.L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch (5 Vols.) Munich, 1922-61.
S.V.T.	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum (Leiden).
T.B.	The Babylonian Talmud. English Ed. by I. Epstein, London, 1961.
T.D.N.T.	G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (Eds.) Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. (9 Vols.) London, 1964-74.
T.D.O.T.	G.J.Botterwick and H. Ringgren (Eds.) Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament (4 Vols.ff.) Michigan, 1974ff.
Th.L.Z.	Theologische Literaturzeitung (Leipzig).
Th. R.	Theologische Rundschau (Tübingen).
Th. St.	Theological Studies (New York).
T.Z.	Theologische Zeitschrift (Basel).
V.D.	Verbum Domini (Rome).
V.T.	Vetus Testamentum (Leiden).
Z.N.W.	Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentum (Giessen).
Z.T.K.	Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER ONE

1) In Mk 8:14-21 and 14:22-6 we find material which in a general way parallels the content of Jn 6, but there the resemblance ends.

2) We draw the reader's attention to Section 2 of the bibliography (pp371f) and in particular to the following four commentaries: C.K.Barrett, The Gospel according to St. John (2nd ed), p.301; R. Bultmann, The Gospel of John (E.T. of Das Evangelium des Johannes), pp.449f; R.E.Brown, The Gospel according to John I-XII, p.298; R. Schnackenburg, The Gospel according to St. John (E.T. of Das Johannesevangelium) II, pp.76f. Other works of importance apart from the Johannine Commentaries are O. Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, p.285; F. Hahn, The Titles of Jesus in Christology (E.T. of Christologische Hoheitstitel, but one to be handled with care and constant reference to the German original) pp.223-8 and pp.231-9; R.H.Fuller, The Foundations of New Testament Christology, p.48; O. Procksch, "Ἅγιος κτλ.," in T.D.N.T.I pp.89-95; H. Seebass and C. Brown, "Holy", in D.N.T.T.II, pp. 223-8; A.E. Harvey, Jesus on Trial, pp.36-45.

3) H.L.N. Joubert, "The Holy One of God (John 6:69)", Neot II (1968), pp.57-69.

4) According to the major critical Greek texts including H. von Soden, Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt; L.F.C. von Tischendorf, Textkritik des Neuen Testamentes (Prepared by C.R.Gregory) and Novum Testamentum Graece: Editio critica octava maior. Also the following editiones minores: B.F.Westcott and F.J.A. Hort, The New Testament in the Original Greek; E. Nestle, Novum Testamentum Graece (25th Ed); K. Aland, M. Black, B.M. Metzger and A. Wikgren, The Greek New Testament (3rd Ed); A. Souter, Novum Testamentum Graece; B. Weiss, The New Testament in Greek (2nd Ed).

5) See V. Martin and R. Kasser, Papyrus Bodmer XV, P75, p.71. The photograph shows a lacuna at the crucial point, but the space accords with the reading (ὁ ἅγιος) τοῦ θεοῦ . Nevertheless the evidence of this manuscript cannot be used as anything but supplementary evidence.

6) See n.4 above. In the Third Edition of Aland, Black, et al, The Greek New Testament, the reading ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ is given as "A" symbol which signifies that, in the opinion of the editors, it is "virtually certain".

7) In particular we note the Revised Standard Version (1952); The New English Bible (New Testament 1961); Today's English Version (1976), which renders the Greek as "the Holy One who has come from God"; The Jerusalem Bible (1966) and the New International Version (2nd Ed) 1981.

8) See W.F. Howard, The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation, pp.19-175, 276-303; S.Schulz, Untersuchungen zur Menschensohn-Christologie im Johannesevangelium, pp. 41-81; W.G.Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament (E.T. of Einleitung in das Neue Testament) pp.146-154; R. Kysar, The Fourth Evangelist and his Gospel, pp.45-65 and D. Moody Smith, The Composition and order of the Fourth Gospel, who deals primarily with the suggested re-ordering of the Gospel according to R. Bultmann, John, passim.

9) There are several verses, such as 6:64b, 71 (concerning Judas) and 19:35; 20:9 (concerning the Beloved Disciple), which suggest the presence of an editor.

10) We note the difficulty of vs 14:31c, "Rise let us go hence", over against 18:1. See the excellent article on this question by J. Painter, "The Farewell Discourses and the History of Johannine Christianity", N.T.S. XXVII (1981), pp. 525-43.

11) We note the general lay-out of Bultmann's Commentary on John and his critical comments at the beginning of each new section. For a methodical critique of Bultmann's analysis see D.M. Smith, The Composition and Order of the Fourth Gospel: Bultmann's literary theory.

12) Bultmann, pp.419-51. He writes, "Since however it earlier appeared that the supposedly connected fragments 8:30-40, 6:60-71 perhaps belonged to the situation of κρίσις implied in 12:23-33, the further question suggests itself whether these fragments can be understood as a suitable continuation of 12:23-33. Without a doubt this is the case" (p.420).

13) So Barrett, John, p.301. For a detailed discussion, see Smith, The Composition and Order, pp 52, 139-41, 150-2 and 166-8. He writes, "While 8:30-40 and 6:60-71 do not really fit together very well, there are patent allusions to 6:27-51 in 6:62,65" (p.151). "It is my view that the text may be interpreted with sufficient clarity and coherence to warrant leaving it as it is. Its incongruities or inconsistencies may be attributed as easily to the evangelist as to the redactor". (p.152).

14) See n.13 and for a detailed exegesis pp. 281-89 below.

15) So M. de Jonge, Jesus: Stranger from Heaven and Son of God, p.209 : "Chapter 6 constitutes a complicated and closely knit whole". See also our important discussion on pp.263-5 below.

16) As pointed out by Schnackenburg, Gospel II, pp.5-9. See also Bultmann, John pp.209f; H.Strathmann, Das Evangelium nach Johannes pp.96-8; C. Spicq, Agape III pp.126f and W. Grundmann, Zeugnis und Gestalt des Johannesevangelium pp.39-43.

17) Schnackenburg, loc.cit. He lists in all six arguments of which the two most important are the first two:
(a) That 6:1 follows more easily after 4:54;
(b) That 7:1 follows more logically after the events recorded in ch 5, than those of the latter part of ch 6.

18) This allows us to leave the text as it is in line with the recommendations of I. de la Potterie, Getuige van het woord pp.43-6; F.M.Braun, Jean le Theologien I pp.22-3; Brown, John I-XII, pp.235-6; Barrett, John, pp. 23-5, 272. Yet at the same time we are not prevented from considering the suggested rearrangement.

19) J.L.Martyn, History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel; idem, "Glimpses into the history of the Johannine Community" in L'Evangile de Jean, M. de Jonge (Ed), pp.149-75. See however R.E.Brown, The Community of the Beloved Disciple, for a critique of Martyn and other writers, pp.175-80.

20) As suggested by Schnackenburg, John, II, p.10 and Barrett, John, p.301.

21) The title ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ is found in Mk 1:24, Lk 4:34 and of course Jn 6:69. For similar titles see our discussion on pp. 31-5 below.

22) W.F.Howard, The Gospel according to St. John; B.Lindars, The Gospel according to St. John, pp.275f; J.N.Sanders and B.A.Mastin, A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John pp.199f. For a similar point of view see also J.H.Bernard, The Gospel according to St. John I, p.222; B. Schwanck, Das Johannesevangelium II, p.92.

23) Sanders, Gospel, pp. 199f.

24) C.H.Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, p.228.

25) V. Taylor, The Names of Jesus, p.80.

26) However, in two cases we come quite close to this, namely in the LXX of Is 6:13 (the holy seed) and Psalms of Solomon 17:36,42.

27) B. Weiss, A New Commentary on the New Testament II, p.288

28) E.C. Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel I, p.342

29) Bernard, John I, pp 221-3.

30) This does not imply that John knew the Synoptics. Moreover, as we shall see, John tends to interpret traditional titles after his own fashion. See pp. 90 - 96 below.

31) Barrett, John, p.307.

32) Schnackenburg, John II, p.76

33) This varies from the use of the term "messianic" in a way that would be intelligible to a Jew, to the use of the term in a purely Christian sense, inclusive of the deity of Jesus (see Joubert, "The Holy One", p.66, who writes, "In every detail of the Messiah-figure there beats the mighty pulse of Deity"). An important work in this area is M. de Jonge, "The use of the word 'Anointed' in the time of Jesus" N.T. VIII (1966) pp. 132-148.

34) See Schnackenburg, John I, pp.507-14 and M. de Jonge, "Jewish expectations about the 'Messiah' according to the Fourth Gospel", N.T.S. XIX 1972/3), pp.246-70.

35) G. Friedrich, "Beobachtungen zur messianischen Hohepriestererwartung in den Synoptikern" Z.T.K. LIII (1956), pp.265-311. See also W. Grundmann, "χρίω, χριστός κτλ. ", in T.D.N.T. IX, p.531.

36) See Bernard, John I, p.222; O. Moe, "Das Priestertum Christi im NT ausserhalb des Hebräerbriefes", T.L.Z. LXXII (1947), pp.335-7 and C. Spicq, "L'origine johannique de la Conception du Christ-prêtre dans l'Epitre aux Hebreux" in Aux Sources de la Tradition Chrétienne, pp.258-69.

37) J. Gnilka, "Die Erwartung des messianischen Hohenpriesters in den Schriften von Qumran und im NT", R.Q. II (1960), p. 423.

38) In this connection see the valuable critiques of Friedrich's position by Gnilka, Op.cit., pp.409-18 and Hahn, Titles, pp.229-39.

39) See below pp.178-188 for a full discussion.

40) E. Schweizer, "Er wird Nazoräer heissen (zu Mc 1:24; Mt.2:23) in Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche, (F/s J.Jeremias), pp.90-3; idem, Evangelium nach Markus, p.24. For a similar point of view see Hahn, Titles, pp.229-39; R. Pesch, Das Markusevangelium, p. 122; and W. Grundmann, Das Evangelium nach Lukas, ad loc.

41) S. Schulz, Das Evangelium nach Johannes, pp.111f.

42) Hahn, Titles, p.233.

43) Hahn, p.232.

44) Hahn, pp.227 and 233. For an alternative point of view, see below pp. 161-5.

45) J.A.Bühner, Der Gesandte und sein Weg im 4. Evangelium, p.231.

46) Bühner, pp.341-99. For a brief critique of Bühner's work see M. de Jonge, "Johanneïsche Studies", Ned.Theol. Tijd XXXII (1978), pp.318-30, and in particular his conclusion, which reads: "Het is ook een moedig boek, waarin de schrijver een schat aan zeer gevarieerd material bijeen heeft gebracht, ontleend aan joodse bronnen van allerlei tijden, benevens aan samaritaanse geschriften met het doel de godsdiensthistorische achtergrond van de Christologie van het vierde evangelie te belichten ... Vooral bij het in deel III verzamelde materiaal moet kritisch gevraagd worden naar de datering van allerlei uitspraken en voorstellingen ..."

47) Apart from 20:22 we note also 1:33. The reading in 7:39 is doubtful and, given the evidence of $P66^{c}$, P75 and Cod. Sin., should remain simply πνεῦμα . On the general idea of holiness in John, see below pp. 201- 224.

48) See below pp. 170 - 3.

49) R.H.Lightfoot, St. John's Gospel, p. 164.

50) A. Schlatter, Der Evangelist Johannes, ad loc.

51) Schwanck, Das Johannesevangelium II, p. 92.

52) Gnilka, "Erwartung", p. 423.

53) Ibid.

54) W. Bauer, Das Johannesevangelium pp.104-6, who follows R. Asting, Die Heiligkeit im Urchristentum, p.312.

55) Procksch, T.D.N.T. I, p.102.

56) Brown, D.N.T.T. II, p.231.

57) L. Morris, The Gospel according to John, pp.389f.

58) H. Odeberg, The Fourth Gospel Interpreted in its relation to contemporaneous religious currents in Palestine and the Hellenistic-Oriental World.

59) Bultmann, John, pp.449f.

60) Schnackenburg, John II, p.76

61) Schnackenburg, p.77.

62) See below pp. 290-2 and for a bibliography see notes 63-5.

63) C.E.B.Cranfield, The Gospel according to St. Mark, p.77.

64) Cullmann, Christology, pp.284ff.

65) Harvey, Jesus on Trial, pp. 37-45.

66) Cullmann, Op.cit., p.284.

67) We discuss this question in ch. 3 of this work, especially pp. 123-9.

68) Hahn, Titles, p. 227, n.13. See also our discussion below pp. 161-5.

69) Schnackenburg, John II, pp. 172-86.

70) Schnackenburg, p.172. See for an alternative point of view G.P. Wetter, Der Sohn Gottes, who suggests that the hellenistic Divine Man formed the key to the interpretation of Sonship in John. See also W.Bauer, Das Johannesevangelium pp.37f; R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, I, pp.130-33; Hahn, Titles, pp.292-319. For a view closer to that of Schnackenburg see Cullmann, Christology, pp. 270-305; E.M.Sidebottom, The Christ of the Fourth Gospel, pp.149-65; E. Haenchen, "Der Vater, der mich gesandt hat", N.T.S. X (1962/3), pp. 208-16 and J. Howton, "Son of God in the Fourth Gospel", N.T.S.XI (1963/4), pp. 227-37. For a further discussion see below pp. 290f.

71) Schnackenburg, John, II, p.73.

72) pp. 177-80.

73) p.180.

74) pp.181-4.

75) p. 184. We draw attention in this connection also to the important work by C. Colpe, "New Testament and Gnostic Christology" in Religions in Antiquity, J. Neusner (Ed), pp.227-43.

76) J.H.Charlesworth, "Qumran, John and the Odes of Solomon" in John and Qumran, pp.107-36. He suggests, "It is improbable that the Odist systematically borrowed from John. The most probable solution at this stage in our research is that both the author of John and the Odist shared not only the same milieu but perhaps also the same community" (p.125).

77) This is a suggestion made by Brown, Community, pp.43-5 and pp.171-82, and by .J.L.Martyn, "Glimpses into the history", pp.163-66. For further discussion see below pp. 154-8.

78) De Jonge, Jesus, pp.49-69 and especially p.52.

79) Jn 1:50. See below pp. 93f.

80) Jn 9:35, cf 9: 17:22. The reading υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου seems preferable to υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ and has the better manuscript support.

81) De Jonge, Jesus, p.83. See our discussion below pp.90-5.

82) As De Jonge, Op Cit., p.69, writes: "Jesus is prophet and king because he is the Son sent by the Father, and only as the Son sent by the Father".

83) So Martyn, History and Theology, pp.47ff and Brown, Community pp. 22, 40-3. In a private conversation L. Morris raised the question whether the Birkath ha-Minim existed in an unofficial form before the time of Yavneh. Clearly there are several questions in this area still awaiting answers.

84) De Jonge, Jesus, p.99

85) Martyn, "Glimpses", pp.160-75. See also Brown, Community p.23, who terms these periods "Phase 2" and "Phase 3" respectively.

86) De Jonge, Jesus, pp.29-47 and especially pp.33f.

87) As suggested by Brown, Community, pp.111-6. E.Käsemann, The Testament of Jesus, p.26, postulates that the writer of the Fourth Gospel was in some ways a "naive docetist" himself. In our opinion Brown is closer to the truth.

88) Schnackenburg, John, p.556

89) Schnackenburg, Op.Cit., pp.551-6: See also R.G.Hamerton-Kelly, Pre-existence, Wisdom and the Son of Man, passim; C.H. Talbert, "The Descending - Ascending Redeemer in Mediterranean Antiquity" N.T.S. XXII (1975/6), pp.421f; M. Hengel, The Son of God, pp.48-51; Bühner, Der Gesandte, pp. 99-103, is critical of this view but in our opinion his "prophet-angel" is a weak substitute.

90) So Barrett, John, who writes, "The return to the opening proposition of the gospel is intended, and there can be no doubt that John intended this confession of faith to form the climax of the gospel" (p.573). See Also Bultmann, Gospel, p.695.

91) So J. Painter, "Christ and the Church in John 1:45-51" in L'évangile de Jean, M. de Jonge (Ed), pp.359-62. See also S. Pancaro, "The relationship of the Church to Israel in the Gospel of John", N.T.S. XXI (1974/5), pp. 396-405; De Jonge, Jesus, pp.58f. For a somewhat fuller discussion see below pp. 97f.

92) It is suggested that certain of the confessions recorded in John carried more weight than others. De Jonge, Jesus, p. 80 writes, "Representative people (disciples, ordinary people ... the crowds, Jewish leaders, Samaritans) express representative beliefs and raise

representative objections". The logical extension of this view is that the confessions of the disciples were of particular importance to the writer of the Fourth Gospel, probably because of the Christian community of which he found himself a part.

93) E. Schweizer, Evangelium nach Markus, p.24

94) So O. Bauernfeind, Die Worte der Dämonen im Markusevangelium, pp. 3-10, 14f, 28-31 and 68f. See also H. van der Loos, The Miracles of Jesus, p.380.

95) So G. Vermes, Jesus the Jew, pp. 86-99 and especially p.89. For the Fourth Gospel we do well to consider the article by G.W. Buchanan, "The Samaritan Origin of the Gospel of John", found in Religions in Antiquity, J. Neusner (Ed), pp.166-70. He gives a list of parallels between the signs of Jesus in John and the Elijah/Elisha epics. See our discussion below pp. 152f.

96) See below pp. 130-154.

97) E. Schweizer, "Er wird Nazoräer heissen", pp.90-3.

98) Schweizer, p.92. See also Gnilka, Markus, p.77; F. Mussner, "Ein Wortspiel in Mk 1:24?", B.Z. IV (1960), pp.285-6, and H.C. Kee, "The Terminology of Mark's Exorcist Stories", N.T.S. XIV (1967/8), p.232.

99) R.E.Brown, The Birth of the Messiah, pp.207-13 and 223-5.

100) See also B.T. Sanh. 43a.

101) Quoted above p. 22.

102) Is 10:16; 40:25 and 45:18ff to cite just some of the examples. For further information, see Procksch, "ἅγιος κτλ. " pp. 93f.

103) See Str. B. III, p. 762

104) So A.W.F. Blunt, The Gospel according to St. Mark, p.148: "The Holy One of God is a messianic title quoted as such in Acts 2:27 from Ps. 16:10"; H. Rengstorf, Das Evangelium nach Lukas, p.70; F.C.Grant, The Gospel according to Mark, p. 662 and, to a lesser extent, D.E. Nineham, The Gospel of St. Mark,p.79: Possibly a later Christian term (based on the association of Ps. 16:10 with the resurrection - See Acts 2:27)". In no case is there obvious recognition that the title in Ps. 16:10/Acts 2:27 is different to that used in Mk 1:24; Luke 4:34 and Jn 6:69.

105) So F. Hauck, "ὅσιος κτλ. ", in T.D.N.T.V, pp 490-2.

106) Fuller, Foundations, pp.47f.

107) For a detailed examination of this verse, see below pp. 196-200.

108) See our discussion on pp. 242-54 below.

109) So F. Blass, A. Debrunner and R.W.Funk, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament, §§ 138. We suggest τὸ παιδίον (2:40) as a further possibility.

110) See K. G. Kuhn, Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten, pp.189-91, for a list of most of the occurrences of this term in the Qumran writings.

111) In the Gospel of Thomas, 13f, we read, 'Jesus said to his disciples, "Compare me with someone and tell me whom I am like". Simon Peter said to him, "You are like a righteous angel". Matthew said to him, "You are like a wise philosopher". Thomas said to him, "Master, my mouth is wholly incapable of saying what you are like".' Nag Hammadi Library in English, (Ed. J.M. Robinson) p. 119.

112) Nag Hammadi, pp.309-403.

113) Melchizedek (IX,I) 5:14f.

114) Martyn, "Glimpses", p. 149.

115) Martyn, pp. 151-75.

116) Brown, Community, pp. 22-4 and 171-82.

117) Brown, p.23.

118) Martyn, p. 164.

119) Martyn, p. 151.

120) Martyn, p. 150. See also De Jonge, Jesus, pp.1f 97-102, and R. Schnackenburg, "Die Messiasfrage im Johannes-evangelium", in Neutestamentliche Aufsätze (F/s J. Schmid), pp.240-64.

121) Martyn, loc.cit.

122) De Jonge, Jesus, pp. 1f.

123) De Jonge, p.2.

124) H. Riesenfeld, "Zu den johanneischen ἵνα - Sätzen", Stud.Theol. XIX (1965), pp.213-20.

125) Martyn, loc cit: "That is to say, it was written for a community who had a shared history and who in the course of that history developed a highly symbolic language with numerous expressions which they would understand as referring to their shared history. In short, to a large extent the Gospel is written in the language of a community of initiates".

126) See J. Painter, "Johannine Symbols", J.T.S.A. XXVII 1979, pp.26-41.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER TWO

1) E. Schürer, The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (Rev. Ed) II, p.493.

2) So M. Hengel, "Nachfolge und Charisma", B.Z.N.W. 34 (1968), pp 42ff; Brown, Birth of the Messiah, pp.505-16; Cullmann, Christology, pp.127-33. For the view that the messiahship of Jesus is a post-resurrection view of Jesus, see especially Bultmann, Theology I, pp 26-32.

3) As early as Rom 1:3f (see Hengel, Son of God, pp.61f).

4) On Jesus' understanding of the messianic task, see C.K.Barrett, Jesus and the Gospel Tradition pp.19-34; W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah pp.5-19; Moule, Christology pp.31-5.

5) Grundmann, Op.cit., p.530.

6) This affected their understanding of Jesus and at the same time led to a new interpretation of the messianic role in the light of the Jesus tradition.

7) Notably as a result of the doctrine of the exalted Son of God associated with his resurrection (cf.Rom 1:3f and Acts 2:36).

8) "Son of God" might be classed as a messianic title (see below pp. 60-71), but it also might imply other aspects of Jesus' person or function, such as his divinity or his filial relationship with the Father.

9) G.H.Dalman, The Words of Jesus, p.258. See also E. Schweizer "Son of Man", J.B.L. LXXIX (1960), p.128 and "The Son of Man again", N.T.S. IX (1963), p.359; I.H.Marshall, "The Divine Sonship of Jesus", Interpretation XXI (1967), p.93 and "The Synoptic Son of Man sayings", N.T.S. XII (1966), pp.350f.

10) See also below pp.290-2 where this discussion of Son of God in relation to Holy One of God is renewed.

11) P. Winter, "The Holy Messiah" Z.N.W. L. (1959), p.275; The text may be found in D.J.D. I, p.132.

12) Dodd, Interpretation, p.228

13) Taylor, The Names of Jesus, p.80.

14) Weiss, Commentary II p.288.

15) Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel I p.342.

16) Bernard, John I, pp.221-3.

17) B. Lindars, The Gospel of John, pp. 275f.

18) Bultmann, John, p.449: Cf. his n.4 on the same page.

19) Schnackenburg, John II, pp.76f.

20) Barrett, John p.307.

21) Ibid.

22) W.F.Blunt, The Gospel according to St. Mark, pp.146-9.
D.E. Nineham, The Gospel of St. Mark (Rev.Ed.), p.79.
B.H. Branscomb, The Gospel of Mark, p.31.
P. Carrington, According to Mark, p.80.
A. Farrer, A Study in Mark, p. 230.
A.M. Hunter, The Gospel according to Mark, p.33.
H.B. Swete, The Gospel according to St. Mark, p.20.

23) G.W.H. Lampe, "Luke", in Peake's Commentary on the Bible, p.822.
S. Maclean Gilmour, "Luke", in the Interpreter's Bible VIII, p. 97.
K.H. Rengstorf, Das Evangelium nach Lukas, p. 70.
G.B. Caird, St. Luke, p. 89.
J.M. Creed, The Gospel according to St. Luke, p.70.
E. Earle Ellis, The Gospel of Luke (Rev. Ed.), pp.99ff.
J.R.H. Moorman, The Path to Glory: Studies in the Gospel according to St. Luke, p. 51.

24) Cranfield, Mark, pp. 76f.

25) I.H. Marshall, The Gospel of Luke, p.193. In a private communication with the present writer, Dr. Marshall suggested that Luke's use of the title carried overtones of the divine sonship of Jesus (cf. 1:35). Mark's use on the other hand pointed towards the prophetic role of Jesus.

26) C.K. Barrett, The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition, pp.70f. makes mention of a number of Jewish traditions about exorcism. See also Str.B. IV, p. 527. On the idea of Jesus as a miracle worker, see our discussion below, pp.137ff. and pp. 152-4.

27) Barrett, Op.cit., pp.61-3, 68f. He points out that the exorcisms are not worked by magic: Matt 12:27 implies a difference from the methods employed by contemporary exorcists, and Matt. 12:28 implies a connection with the Kingdom of God and with the Holy Spirit.

28) This may be seen by a comparison with the methods employed by Apollonius of Tyana (see Philostratus' Life 3:38).

29) Carrington, Mark, p.81.

30) Farrer, Mark, p.65.

31) See n.26 above.

32) W. Wrede, Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien.

33) On the messianic secret in relation to Jesus' commands to the demons see: G.H. Boobyer, "The secrecy Motif in St. Mark's Gospel", N.T.S. VI (1959/60), pp.225-35; C.H.Cave, "The Obedience of the Unclean Spirits", N.T.S. XI (1964/5), pp. 93-7; L.S. Hay, "Mark's use of the Messianic Secret", J.A.A.R. XXXV (1967), pp.16-27; H.C. Kee, The terminology of Mark's Exorcism Stories", N.T.S. XIV (1967/8), pp.232-46; C. Maurer, "Des Messiasgeheimnis des Markusevangeliums" in N.T.S. XIV (1967/8), pp.515-26 and E. Schweizer, "Zur Frage des Messiasgeheimnisses bei Markus", Z.N.W. LVI (1965), pp. 1-8.

34) So Moorman, The Path to Glory, p. 51.

35) So Procksch, T.D.N.T. I, p. 101f.

36) See below pp. 254-61.

37) See the critical notes on this passage in W.F.Albright and C.S.Mann, Matthew, pp.153-7.

38) L.R. Fisher, "Can this be the Son of David?", in Jesus and the Historian, F.T.Trotter (Ed.), pp.82-97.

39) See 2 Macc 2:9-12 and other examples found in Fisher, pp. 85ff.

40) Fisher, p.92: "Jesus seems to be saying 'no' to the people's question. He is not the 'Son of David'. He is not the great magician".

41) Fisher, p.92. See also K. Berger, "Die königlichen Messiastraditionen des Neuen Testaments", N.T.S. XX (1973/4), pp.3-8. However it is open to question whether the verse is pertinent to the title 'Son of David', given the fact that they belong to different pericopes.

42) See Mk 12:35 and Matt 21:9 and the following writers : J.A. Fitzmyer, "The Son of David tradition and Mt 22:41-6 and parallels", in his Essays in the Semitic Background of the New Testament, pp.113-26; J.M.Gibbs, "Purpose and pattern in Matthew's use of the title 'Son of David'", J.B.L.XCV (1976), pp.591-602; A. Suhl, "Der Davidssohn im Matthäus-Evangelium", Z.N.W. LIX (1968), pp. 57-81.

43) So Berger, "Die königlichen Messiastraditionen", pp.7-9, who correctly notes a connection between the expected Messiah and the Solomonic tradition - the Psalms of Solomon is a case in point.

44) Though not in the way M. Smith suggests, in his book Jesus the Magician. His overemphasis on the so-called magic of Jesus and his total refusal to allow for prophetic influence in the miracles of Jesus, makes his work of little scholarly value. However the concept of Jesus as a magician did exist as T.B. Sanhedrin, 104 shows. See also C.K.Barrett, The Holy Spirit in the Gospel Tradition, pp.53-68.

45) On the idea of Jesus as a Divine Man, see L. Bieler, ΘΕΙΟΣ ΑΝΗΡ (2 Vols); H.D. Betz, "Jesus as Divine Man", in Jesus and the Historian, F.T. Trotter, (Ed.) pp. 114-33; and the detailed study by E. Jones, "The concept of the θεῖος ἀνήρ in the Graeco-Roman World with special reference to the first two centuries A.D." (Unpublished PhD Thesis - Durham, 1973). These writers all see some influence of the θεῖος ἀνήρ on the Gospels. For a critical view of such "influence" see the excellent article by O. Betz, "The concept of the so-called 'Divine Man' in Mark's Christology", in Studies in the New Testament and Early Christian Literature, D.E. Aune, (Ed.) pp. 229-40, and K. Kertelge, Die Wunder Jesu im Markusevangelium, p. 57.

46) See below pp. 154-9.

47) For an enlightening study of this, see O, Betz, "The Eschatological Interpretation of the Sinai-tradition in Qumran and in the New Testament", R.Q. VI (1967), pp. 89-107.

48) As pointed out by Vermes, Jesus the Jew, pp.97f and Buchanan, "The Samaritan Origin", pp.166-70.

49) Berger, Op.cit., p.8.

50) See n.44 above.

51) Berger, Op.cit., pp 7-9.

52) II Chr.1:1-9:31; cf I Kings 1:11-11:43. See K.W.Whitelam, The Just King, pp. 149-66.

53) This is the view of Whitelam, Op.cit., p.161 and the motivation appears to be Solomon's connection with the Temple.

54) See below pp. 56-7.

55) R.B. Laurin, "The problem of the Two Messiahs in the Qumran Scrolls" R.Q. IV (1965), pp.40f.

56) Whitelam, The Just King, p.220

57) Whitelam, p.58.

58) S. Mowinckel, He that Cometh, pp.170f.

59) Whitelam, loc.cit.

60) So Laurin, Op.cit., pp.40f; D. Duling, "The promises to David and their entrance into Christianity", N.T.S. XX (1973), pp. 55-77; W. Harrelson, "Nonroyal motifs in the Royal Eschatology", in Israel's Prophetic Heritage, B.W.Anderson and W. Harrelson (Eds), pp.147-65.

61) Harrelson, Op.cit., p.163.

62) Duling, Op.cit., p.58.

63) For example, Ps 110-1; II Sam 7:13; Ps 2:8 and Ps 89:23.

64) See above p. 51.

65) On the idea of Yahweh as a Divine Warrior, see F.M. Cross "The Divine Warrior" in his book of essays entitled Canaanite Myths and Hebrew Epic, pp. 91-111. Cross was the first to draw attention to this motif in relation to the Canaanite myths but the first major work on the subject was by his student, P.D. Miller, The Divine Warrior in Early Israel; "El the Warrior", H.T.R. L (1957), pp. 411-31 and "Two critical notes on Psalm 68 and Deuteronomy 33", H.T.R.LVII (1964), pp. 240-3.

66) P.D. Hanson, "Jewish Apocalyptic against its Near Eastern Environment", R.B. LXXVIII (1971), pp.31-58, esp. p.57.

67) On the king as the "adopted" Son of God see T.N.D. Mettinger, King and Messiah, pp.254-74; G.H.Jones, "The Decree of Yahweh (Ps 2:7)", V.T.XV (1965), pp.336-44; P.A.H. de Boer, "The Son of God in the Old Testament", O.T.S.XVIII (1973), pp.188-207 and W. Schlisske, Gottesöhne und Gottessohn im Alten Testament passim.

68) So Harrelson, "Nonroyal motifs", pp.147-68.

69) For example, Esther 1:13, where it may be rendered as "government", according to B.D.B. p. 192.

70) T.J. Ta'an. 4:8, 68d.

71) J.F.A. Sawyer, Semantics in Biblical Research, pp.53ff.

72) Lit. "The king the anointed lord". This has led to some scholars suggesting that we have evidence here for the use of the title "lord" of the messiah: so H.Schürmann, Das Lukasevangelium, p.111. For a critical view of this suggestion see Schürer, The History II, p.504, n.17.

73) According to O. Eissfeldt, Introduction to the Old Testament, pp. 610 and 773; A Weiser, Introduction to the Old Testament, pp. 420-22.

74) See especially 17:26,30,32,37 and 43. Schürer, History, p.504, speaks about a "holy king" and "one who is free from sin". In line 36 we read μαθαρὸς ἀπὸ ἁμαρτίας, but nowhere is the king said to be holy. Schürer refers to lines 41 and 46 but in neither case is the king explicitly said to be holy.

75) We note also the Targums, where the messiah is depicted as a mighty warrior who defeats his enemies in battle - Targum Jonathan on Isaiah 10:27 and the Palestinian Targum on Genesis 49:11. See M. McNamara, Targum and Testament, pp. 75f and 140f.

76) R. Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, p.219.

77) In the Parables of Enoch, the messiah plays the role of judge and general; Schürer, Op.cit., pp.527f., tends to underplay the latter, but cf. I En 46:4-6 and 52:4-9.

78) See M. Stone, "The concept of the Messiah in IV Ezra", in Religions in Antiquity, J. Neusner (Ed), pp.295-311.

79) Mt 12:28.

80) K. Kertelge, Die Wunder Jesu im Markusevangelium: Eine redaktionsgeschichte untersuchung, p. 181.

81) Kertelge, p.59.

82) H. Braun, Qumran und das Neue Testament I,pp. 62,119. The connection was apparently first made by O. Bauernfeind, Die Worte der Dämonen im Markusevangelium, pp.97-99. See further O. Betz, "Jesu heiliger Krieg", N.T. II (1957), pp. 116-37, and R. Leivestad, Christ the Conqueror, pp. 40-9.

83) See our discussion below, pp. 254-61.

84) See our further discussion, below pp. 76f. and 255-61.

85) See J. Bieneck, Sohn Gottes also Christusbezeichnung der Synoptiker, who first made this observation and more recently Kertelge, Die Wunder Jesu, p.192.

86) On the interpretation of "Son of God" see the following: M. Hengel, The Son of God; Cullmann, Christology, pp.279-333; P.W. von Martitz, E. Schweizer, E.Lohse, et.al., " υἱός, υἱοθεσία ", T.D.N.T.VIII, pp.334-97; B.M.F. van Iersel, 'Der Sohn' in den Synoptischen Jesusworten (2nd Ed); C.A.Wanamaker, "The Son and the Sons of God: A Study in elements of Paul's Christological and soteriological thought" (unpublished PhD thesis - Durham 1980); Wetter, Der Sohn Gottes; I.H. Marshall, The Origins of New Testament Christology, pp. 111-25 and C.F.D. Moule, The Origin of Christology, pp. 22-30, to name just some of the many works about this important area of NT theology. See also n.67 above and below, pp.290-2 for the relation of Son of God to Holy One of God.

87) See the examples cited by Hengel, Son of God, pp.21-56. In particular we note Sir 4:10 and Wisdom 2:18 cf vs 13 where the "just man" is considered as a son of God. We refer the reader also to the tradition recorded in T.B.Taan 24b (cf. Ber. 17b and Hull 86a) in which Hanina ben Dosa is called "son of God" (Hengel, p.42 n.85).

88) Hahn, Titles, p.306.

89) H.D. Betz, "Jesus as Divine Man" in Jesus and the Historian, F.T.Trotter (Ed.), pp. 114-133. The quotation is from p.122.

90) As pointed out by I.H. Marshall, "Palestine and Hellenistic Christianity: Some critical comments", N.T.S. XIX (1972/3, pp.271-87.

91) Bieler, ΘΕΙΟΣ ΑΝΗΡ . See also n.45 above.

92) Jones, "The Concept of the θεῖος ἀνήρ ", pp.258-77.

93) Jones, p.274.

94) Jones, p.266.

95) Hengel, Son of God, p.31f. See also W.von Martitz, T.D.N.T. VIII, pp.339f.

96) A view by Wetter, Der Sohn Gottes and H.D.Betz, "Jesus as Divine Man", pp. 114-133.

97) Von Martitz, loc.cit.; O. Betz, "The concept of the Divine Man" pp.229-40; E. Schweizer, T.D.N.T. VIII, p.356; G. Theissen, Urchristliche Wundergeschichten, pp.262-5. Berger, "Die königlichen Messiastraditionen" N.T.S. XX (1973/4), pp.3-8.

98) See above n.67 and also R. Longenecker, The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity, pp. 93-4.

99) Other instances such as I Enoch 105:2 and IV Ezra 7:28f and passim are usually considered to be contemporary with or later than the NT.

100) And this as Longenecker, Op.cit., p.94, points out "is not quite a titular use".

101) Fuller, Foundations, p.32.

102) Quoted without full details by Hengel, Son of God, p.45.

103) J.A. Fitzmyer, "The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament", N.T.S. XX (1973/4), pp.391ff.

104) See E. Schweizer, "Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund der 'Sendungsformal' Gal 4:4f, Rom 8:3f, Joh 3:16f, I Joh 4:9," Z.N.W. LVII (1966), pp.199-210.

105) Ibid.

106) So H. Schlier, "Zu Röm 1,3f" in Neues Testament und Geschichte, H. Baltensweiler and B. Reicke (Eds.), pp.207-18, esp. p.213.

107) C.K.Barrett, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, p.19.

108) E. Käsemann, Commentary on Romans, p. 13. See, however, C.E.B. Cranfield, Romans I, pp.61-4.

109) Marshall, The Origins, p.112

110) Hahn, Titles, pp.279f.

111) So Hengel, Son of God pp. 61-5; Cullmann, Christology, pp. 270ff; Cranfield, Mark, pp. 76f.

112) So Hahn, Titles, p.306. The use of terms like "functional" and "ontological" in statements about First Century Christian thinking, is sometimes questioned. The accusation often raised is that they impose Twentieth Century philosophical thought upon First Century problems or issues. The response to this accusation is that the terms are used for the prime purpose of avoiding the debates and language of post-Chalcedonian period.

113) Schweizer, T.D.N.T. VIII, p.379.

114) So E.C.Colwell, "A definite rule for the use of the article in the Greek New Testament", J.B.L. LII (1933), pp. 12-21. See also C.F.D. Moule, An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek, pp. 115f.

115) This does not mean that Jesus rejects the confession or even the title used therein; however he sees fit to qualify it by recourse to the suffering Son of Man (see Cranfield, Mark, p. 275).

116) We notice the stress on the suffering aspect in the following expositions: Cranfield, Mark, p.280; Nineham, Mark, p. 225-7. Of course the idea of the resurrection may not have been a part of the original form of this saying, in which case the emphasis on the suffering, provided that was included, is justifiable.

117) O. Cullmann, Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr, pp.60-5 and idem, Christology, pp.122f and 280f.

118) Schweizer, T.D.N.T. VIII, p.378

119) Schweizer, loc.cit. This is debatable, but perhaps from the perspective of Matthew, it might explain the form of his confession.

120) Grundmann, T.D.N.T. IX, p.528.

121) Ibid.

122) See n. 118 above.

123) Grundmann, Op.cit, pp. 528f.

124) Ibid. He writes, "Jesus' attitude to the designation is one of reserve". See also Cullmann, Christology, p. 122: "The fact is that Jesus neither affirms nor denies Peter's messianic confession".

125) Grundmann p. 534.

126) See R.E. Brown, The Birth of the Messiah, passim.

127) So Grundmann, p.529. "As distinct from Matthew, Luke presents the story of Jesus between his birth and his crucifixion and resurrection as prophetic rather than messianic action".

128) See esp. Acts 3:22ff and 7:37ff. See also below, pp. 146-51.

129) According to Schweizer, T.D.N.T. VIII, p. 382 "The strong reserve of Luke to the title Son of God misunderstood in terms of the divine sons of paganism, shows that fundamentally he is not referring to anything other than the election of God". The present writer feels that this is an overstatement of the case, although it might have relevance for Lk 23:47. See below p. 151.

130) Schweizer, loc.cit.

131) Brown, Birth, p. 312.

132) Marshall, Luke, p. 196.

133) On this aspect see Barrett, The Holy Spirit, pp. 40-5.

134) Ibid.

135) So Cranfield, Mark, p.55: "It confirms his already existing filial consciousness".

136) Schweizer, T.D.N.T. VIII, pp. 367f.

137) T.B. Sanh 93b, which applies Is 11:2f to the Messiah: Ps Sol 17:37 and 18:7. See also T. Levi 18:7 and T. Judah 24:2 and generally on the Holy Spirit, E. Schweizer, The Holy Spirit.

138) Kertelge, Die Wunder, p. 58.

139) See below pp. 259ff.

140) See Procksch, T.D.N.T. I pp. 101f. For a detailed consideration of this topic, see pp.266-61 below.

141) Kertelge, Die Wunder p. 57.

142) So E.E. Ellis, The Gospel of Luke, p. 165, on Lk 11:20.

143) See below pp. 148-51.

144) Kertelge, Op.cit. p.55.

145) See S. Smalley, John:Evangelist and Interpreter pp.122-4; Barrett, John pp. 42-54; L. Morris, Studies in the Fourth Gospel, pp. 15-63.

146) With particular relation to ch 6, see R.H.Strachan, The Fourth Gospel, p.181; P. Gardner-Smith, Saint John and the Synoptic Gospels, pp.29f; Smalley, John, pp.15-6. H.E. Edwards, The Disciple

who wrote these things, p. 104, writes, "There is no sign of literary dependence whatever. If he is quoting St. Mark, it must be from memory, in which case his memory must have been one that retained all the facts and forgot all the phrases". This conclusion is relevant not only to ch 6, but to the whole Gospel. We note also the firm conclusion of F.C. Grant, The Gospel of John, p.10: "The distinctive characteristic features of Mark, Luke or Matthew, the peculiar and unique impress given the tradition, or its specific interpretation, by the early evangelists - none of this is traceable in John, either positively or negatively."

147) Schnackenburg, John II, p.76

148) Hahn, Titles, pp.227 and 233.

149) Ibid.

150) Gardner-Smith, Saint John and the Synoptic Gospels, pp. 29f.

151) The variant ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ is found in ℵ(WΦ)Δ. and ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος is found in WΦ (Nestle).

152) The variant σώζοντος for τοῦ ζῶντος occurs in D* (Nestle).

153) The inclusion of υἱὸν is found in D(p.)e (Nestle).

154) See Schürer, History, pp. 547-9 and the texts cited there; and on Qumran, J. Carmignac, "Les Citations de l'ancien Testament et spécialement des Poèmes du Serviteur dans les Hymnes de Qumrân, R.Q. II (1960), pp. 357-94.

155) It is not easy to translate with confidence the term σκηνάς in Peter's suggestion (vs 6). It might imply "tents" or some such secular sense, or it may have to do with some type of sacred dwelling like the OT tabernacle.

156) Cranfield, Mark, p. 295.

157) Bultmann, Theology I, p.27. See idem, Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition (2nd Ed.), p. 278

158) On the term σκάνδαλον see below, pp.250-4.

159) Schnackenburg, John, II, p. 76.

160) See the important article by M. de Jonge, "Jewish expectations about the 'Messiah' according to the Fourth Gospel" N.T.S. XIX (1972/3) pp. 246-70.

161) On the Samaritan idea of the Taheb, see W.A. Meeks, The Prophet-King, pp. 216ff, and below, p. 137.

162) On the general question of Bethlehem as the birth place of Jesus, see Brown, Birth, pp. 513-6. He concludes that the evidence is much weaker than the claim that Jesus was of the house of David. For a discussion of Jn 7:41-4, see De Jonge, "Jewish Expectations", pp. 259f.

163) See especially E. Sjöberg, Der verborgene Menschensohn in den Evangelien, pp. 41-98; Str.B. II pp.339f and 488f; I En 48:6-7; 62:7; 2 Apoc Bar 29:3; 39:7; 73:1; 4 Ezra 7:28; 12:32; 13:26, 32, 52; 14:9.

164) De Jonge, Jesus, p. 52.

165) Schnackenburg, John I pp. 282-322. See also Dodd, Interpretation, p. 228.

166) De Jonge, Op.cit. p. 83.

167) See above p. 30.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER THREE.

1) See Str. B. III, p.683, who lists several instances of the High as the שר הפנים of God.

2) See Gnilka, "Die Erwartung", p.408; A.J.B.Higgins, "The Priestly Messiah", N.T.S.XIII (1966/7), pp. 211-319, esp. p. 217; R.B. Laurin, "The Problem of two Messiahs in the Qumran Scrolls", .R.Q. IV (1965), pp. 39-52; S. Sabugal, "IQ Regla de la Comunidad IX, ii : Dos Unigidos, un Mesias", R.Q. VIII (1969), pp. 417-23. For a contrary point of view, see G. Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English (2nd Ed), pp. 47-50 and the important work by A.S. van der Woude, Die messianische Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran.

3) So Friedrich, "Beobachtungen", pp 265-311. See however Gnilka, "Die Erwartung", pp. 395-426 for a detailed critique of Friedrich's position; and the important comments in this regard made by Cullmann, Christology, p.104 and Braun, Qumran I, p. 62.

4) Friedrich, Op.cit., p.267 (on Mk 1:24) and pp.278f (on Jn 6:69).

5) Friedrich, p. 278.

6) See our discussion above, pp. 49-59.

7) See above p. 60.

8) Friedrich, pp. 267, 274f.

9) Friedrich, p. 275.

10) See n.3. above.

11) Grundmann, T.D.N.T. IX, p. 531.

12) Friedrich, p. 275.

13) Schnackenburg, John II, pp. 76f.

14) See above pp. 32-40.

15) For a full discussion, see below pp. 192-224.and p. 290.

16) T. of Levi 18:12 ascribes to Levi the task of binding Beliar, while in T. of Dan 5:10f, he "wages the war of God".

17) Schnackenburg, John II p. 76.

18) See our discussion of IQM 13, below pp. 109f. See also Lane, Mark, p. 75 and Kee "Terminology", pp.232-46, who connect exorcism in a general way with the Qumran High Priest.

19) See above pp. 56-7.

20) For pertinent references see Str.B IV pp. 501-535 and

Barrett, Holy Spirit, pp.57-60. For a general discussion of the whole subject of exorcism and magic in the Jewish and Hellenistic world, see J.M. Hull, Hellenistic Magic and the Synoptic Tradition, pp. 45-72

21) Outside of the Pentateuch, see Jer 34:17f; IQSb 4 and Heb 8:3.

22) Asxin Qumran (IQS 9:4ff), Philo (De Somnis I 214/5) and the NT (Heb 9:23ff). See B. Gärtner, The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament and R.J. McKelvey, The New Temple : The Church in the New Testament.

23) The special ritual of Atonement brings out this function - see Lev 16:32-4; Philo, De Somnis II 187 and Heb 9:15.

24) Particularly in Qumran: CD 13:5-7 (priests) and the Temple Scroll 25-7 (High Priest). See also Ex 28:15, Ezra 2:63 and Philo, De Fuga 118.

25) L. Gaston, No Stone on Another, pp. 149-50.

26) In Ezek 40-48, Tob 13:16 and Sib Or 702-9, 764-74, the High Priest is not mentioned, but is probably to be understood.

27) See B.D.B., p.570. There are 16 occurrences of the term in this sense of the OT, according to B.D.B., loc.cit, and R. Young, Analytical Concordance to the Holy Bible, p. 198.

28) See below pp.170-91 and our discussion there on the different ways of understanding the concept of holiness.

29) See E.C. Kingsbury, "The Prophets and the Council of Yahweh" J.B.L. LXXXIII (1964), pp. 279-286; P.D. Miller "The Divine Council and the Prophetic Call to War", V.T. XVIII (1968) pp. 100-107; E.T. Mullen, The Assembly of the Gods, pp.209-226 and below pp. 176-188

30) See Josephus, Antiquities, 13:299f and J. Bowman, "Prophets and Prophecy in the Talmud and Midrash", E.Q. XXII (1950) pp.107-14. See also Jn.11:49.

31) According to N.L. Tidwell, "Wā'ōmer (Zech 3:5) and the genre of Zechariah's Fourth Vision" J.B.L. XCIV (1975) pp. 343-55.

32) Middoth 5a and Mid.Rab.Exod 38:3.

33) As described by Josephus, War 2:124.

34) John comes from a priestly family (Lk 1:5ff) and he is connected with Elijah in Matt 11:14.

35) See R. Hayward, "Phineas - the same is Elijah. The Origin of a Rabbinic tradition", J.J.S. XXIX (1978) pp. 22-34 for a list and analysis of the relevant traditions.

36) J.R. Villalón, "Sources vétéro-testamentaires de la doctrine qumrânienne des deux Messies", R.Q. VIII (1969), pp.53-64.

37) See n.35 above. The question is whether this tradition was early enough to be relevant for the NT.

38) See n.2 above.

39) De Jonge, "The use of the term 'Messiah'", pp.132-48.

40) J. Starky, "Les quatre étapes du Messianisme á Qumrân", R.B. LXX (1963), pp.481-505.

41) This reminds us of the later Rabbinic tradition about the High-Priest-Anointed-for-War, for both the High Priest at Qumran and the Rabbinic figure are based ultimately on Deut 20:1-9. H-W. Kuhn, "Die beiden Messias in den Qumrantexten und die Messiasvorstellung in der rabbinischen Literatur", Z.A.W. LXX (1958) pp. 200-8, shows that the two figures are in fact witness to parallel but independent traditions.

42) The Sect considered themselves to be a spiritual temple (4Q Flor 1:6), while their obedience to the Law brings atonement for sin (IQS 9:6). See n.22 above.

43) B.D.B. p. 76 offers "curse" as one of the possible translations for the term when it occurs in Mal 2:2, Ex 22:27 and Num 22:6,12.

44) So B.D.B. p. 276.

45) IQM 17:7 and 8; cf 13:7-16.

46) So F.M. Cross, The Scrolls and Christian Origins, pp73, 106f. He writes, "In the new age the sectarians will live eternally (sic) in the presence of the Holy ones, the angels of God" (p.73). It is too much to read into the texts the sense of "eternal life", but certainly the union with the angels formed a part of the future hope of the Sect.

47) H-W. Kuhn, Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil, pp.66-78.

48) Kuhn, Op cit, pp.69-70. For a discussion of the relevance of this feature of Qumran to the Holy One of God, see below pp. 178-88 and 290-6.

49) T.B. Rosh Hashanah 8a and b; cf Mid. Rab. Exod 4:29.

50) Ignatius, Magnesians 6 and Trallians 3.

51) On 11QMelchizedek see the following :

A.S. van der Woude, "Melchisedech als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midraschim aus Qumran Höhle XI" O.T.S. XIV (1965), pp. 354-73 and in collaboration with M. de Jonge, "11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament" N.T.S. XII (1966) pp.301-26; D. Flusser, "Melchizedek and the Son of Man", Christian News from Israel XVII (1966) pp.228-39; R. Meyer, "Melchisedek von Jerusalem und Moresedek von Qumran", Sup. to V.T.XV (1966), pp.228-39; Vermes, D.S.S.E. pp.252f; J.A.Emerton, "Melchizedek and the Gods: Fresh evidence for the Jewish background of Jn 10:34-6", J.T.S. ns XVII (1966), pp.399-401; A.J.B.Higgins, "The Priestly Messiah", N.T.S. XIII (1967), pp.321-36; J.A.Fitzmyer, "Further light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11", J.B.L. LXXXVI (1967), pp.25-41; J.A. Sanders, "Dissenting Deities and Phil 2:1-11", J.B.L. LXXXVIII (1969), pp. 279-90; J.D. Amoussine, "Novyj eskhatologicheskij tekst iz Kumrana", Vestnik Drevnej Istarii Moscou,III (1967) pp.45-62; M.P.Miller, "The role of Isaiah 61:1-2 in 11QMelch. "J.B.L. LXXXVIII (1969) pp. 467-9; J. Carmignac, "Le Document de Qumrân sur Melkisedeq" R.Q. VII (1970), pp.343-78; D.F. Miner, "A suggested reading for 11Q Melchizedek 17", J.S.J. II (1971), pp. 144-48; J.T.Milik, "Milkî-sedeq et Milkî-resa dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens", J.J.S. XXIII (1972), pp.95-144; F. du Toit Laubscher, "God's Angel of Truth and Melchizedek. A note on 11Q Melch 13b", J.S.J. III (1972), pp. 46-51; D. Aune, "A note on Jesus' Messianic consciousness and 11Q Melch" Ev.Q. XLV (1973), pp. 161-5; F.L. Horton, The Melchizedek Tradition and R. Longnecker, "The Melchizedek Argument of Hebrews" in Unity and Diversity in New Testament Theology (F/s G.E. Ladd) pp 161-85.

52) So van der Woude, "Melchisedech" pp.370-3. But see Carmignac, Op.cit., pp.368f.

53) Pistis Sophia Bk I:25-6 and Bk IV: 136.

54) Melchizedek is mentioned last in line 13, so that one can not simply conclude that he is the person intended in line 25 as the candidate for the title "Elohim", as argued by van der Woude, "Melchisedech als himmlische Erlösergestalt", p. 366.

55) See 11Q Melch. lines 7, 8 and 26.

56) Rosh Hashanah 16 a and b. This material dates from late Third Century (c 280), but the possibility exists that it reflects earlier traditions.

57) The idea that one might detect the hand of a Christian interpolater in the book of the Twelve Testaments was first expressed by R.H.Charles, The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriachs and is still current as A. Weiser, Introduction to the Old Testament, pp.442-447 indicates. A contrary point of view is that of M. de Jonge, Studies in the Testaments of the

Twelve Patriarchs. In an address delivered at the New Testament Studies Conference in Durham, England 1979 entitled "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" he argued that the Testaments were in their present form essentially a Christian work patterned upon a traditional Jewish style of writing.

58) Michael appears in 1QM 1:25; 13:10 and 17:6. At the end of the war the "kingdom of Michael" is set up among the "gods" and "the kingdom of Israel among all flesh" (So 17:6).

59) On this aspect of the role of Jesus, see E. Riggenbach, Bibelglaube und Bibelforschung, p.42; O. Michel, Der Brief an die Römer, on 8:34; O. Moe, Das Priestertum Christi im NT ausserhalb des Hebraërbriefs", T.L.Z. LXXII (1947), p. 338. The references most often cited in this connection include Rom. 8:34, I Jn 2:1 and Heb 7:25.

60) Moe, Op.cit, pp.335-7.

61) D.M. Hay, Glory at the Right Hand; Psalm 110 in Early Christianity. One of the problems in this work is the tendency of the writer to see references to the Psalm and particularly the idea of mediation even when this is not explicit in the actual passage under observation. The positioning of Jesus at the right hand of God might imply not just the recollection of Ps 110:1, but the function of Jesus as an advocate - a picture drawn from the OT and Apocalyptic understanding of the Divine Council of Yahweh (cf Zech 3).

62) See the suggestion made by J. Calvin, Institutes 2.16.15 who comments on Rom.8:34 as follows : "a comparison... drawn from kings who have assessors at their side..." Legal terms in Rom 8 include κατάκριμα. (vs 1), νόμος, ἐλευθερόω (vs 2), υἱοθεσία (vs 15), συμμαρτυρέω (vs 16) and κατακρινῶν, ἐντυγχάνει (vs 34).
See A.N. Sherwin-White, Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament generally on the use of legal imagery and terminology in the NT.

63) On the function of Moses as a mediator, see Meeks, Prophet-King, pp. 118, 136f and 159f.

64) G. von Rad, Theology of the Old Testament I pp.289-96.

65) Philo, Mos II, 166 and Quaes II, 49; Josephus, Antiquities IV, 194.

66) T.F. Glasson, Moses in the Fourth Gospel. See also Meeks, op.cit, and Martyn, History and Theology, pp.102-128.

67) The major study is by S. Pancaro, The Law in the Fourth Gospel. See also Meeks, Op cit, pp. 65ff. and particularly Harvey, Jesus on Trial. The latter provides the most balanced view of the matter.

68) Y. Yadin, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Epistle to the Hebrews", in Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls,,pp 1-12. We note the critical comments in F.F. Bruce, The Epistle to the Hebrews pp. xxvii - xxx and idem, " 'To the Hebrews' or 'to the Essenes' " N.T.S. IX (1963), pp. 217-32.

69) Horton, The Melchizedek Tradition, pp 155 and 164.

70) See C. Spicq, "Le philonisme de l'Epître aux Hébreux", R.B. LVI (1949) pp. 542-72 and LVII (1950) pp.212-42.

71) So S. Sandmel, Philo of Alexandria, p. 161.

72) Gnilka, "Die Erwartung", p. 426.

73) A.J.B. Higgins, Jesus and the Son of Man, p.231.

74) Such critics include Gnilka, "Die Erwartung" pp.396ff.; Higgins, "The Priestly Messiah" pp.222ff.;Cullmann, Christology 104 and Hahn, Titles pp.229-230.

75) Friedrich, "Beobachtungen" pp.278f on Jn 6:69 and p.267 on Mk 1:24.

76) Grundmann, T.D.N.T. IX p. 531.

77) A.T. Robertson, A Grammar on the Greek New Testament, pp. 756-8, 63.

78) Joubert, "The Holy One", p. 62.

79) See n.76 above.

80) See n. 75 above.

81) Schnackenburg, John II, p.76f. He refers also to Matthew 16:16ff as indicative of the priestly nature of Jesus in line with Friedrich, Op cit pp. 292-3, concerning the establishment of the ἐκκλησία (Matt 16:18). But it is difficult to be sure whether anything more is intended than the attempt by the Church to find divine sanction for its origin.

82) See above p. 116.

83) Hahn, Titles, pp.232f.

84) See above p. 112.

85) Braun, Qumran, I, p.62. See above pp. 57f.

86) See below for a full discussion of the conflict motif, pp. 254-62.

87) For the idea of Jesus as a prophetic worker of miracles see below pp. 137-54 , and Hahn, Titles, pp. 372-406.

88) Hahn, Titles, pp. 233f.

89) Such as C. Spicq, "L'origine Johannique de la Conception du Christ-prêtre dans 1-Epître aux Hebreux", in Aux Sources de la Tradition Chrétienne, pp. 258-69: A. Feuillet, "Le sacerdoce du Christ et ses envoyés les apôtres, d'après Isaïe 53 et d'après le quatrième, évangile", Nova et Vetera XLIX (1974), pp. 102-112: Gnilka,"Die Erwartung", pp.421-3 and Moe, "Das Priestertum", pp.335-7. The idea of a Priest-King in John is presented by B. Schwank, Das Johannesevangelium, of which only the first two volumes are complete (i.e. up to ch 12). But see his article, "Vater, verherrliche deinen Sohn. Joh 17:1-5", in Sein und Sendung XXVIII (1963) pp.436-49, in which he argues that ch 17 is the sacrificial prayer of a Priest-King.

90) So Morris, John, p.809, "John may wish us to discern a reference to Christ's priestly activity as He offered Himself in death". See the use of χιτὼν ἄρραφος in Josephus, Antiquities 3:161 and discussion below pp.213-223.

91) This was an unpublished PhD thesis submitted to Aberystwyth University, Wales in 1976.

92) Williams, Cultic Elements , pp.128-183; conclusions pp.181ff.

93) J. Neusner, Development of a Legend. Studies in the traditions concerning Y. ben Zakkai, pp.16f.; idem, Early Rabbinic Judaism pp. 44-9, and Life of Yohanan ben Zakkai (Rev Ed) passim.

94) Neusner, Early Rabbinic Judaism p.46.

95) Neusner, Op cit., p.44.

96) Neusner, Op cit., p. 49.

97) It is primarily the Pauline references which come to mind like I Cor. 3:16f and the reference in I Peter 2:5. But for a detailed treatment of this subject see Gärtner, The Temple and the Community, and McKelvey, The New Temple.

98) Williams, Cultic Elements , p.173.

99) Williams, p. 183.

100) So Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel Vol.II, pp 585f; Sanders John, pp.375f; Morris, John, p.716; Schwanck, "Vater" pp.436-49; M.E. Boismard, L'évangile de Jean, ad loc.

101) See n.90.

102) Such as the exclamation of John the Baptist in ch 1:36, the reference to Ex 12:46 after Jesus' death on the cross (19:36), and the dating of the crucifixion to coincide with the Paschal sacrifices (19:31). C.H.Dodd, Interpretation, pp. 233ff, quite rightly points out that 19:36 might be a reference not to Ex 12:46 but to Ps 33(34):21 since the two other scriptures cited in this chapter are from the Psalms (Ps 21:19 and 68:22 respectively). He further argues that the dating of the death of Jesus might have no connection with the Paschal sacrifice since John does not make much of that parallel, and instead the verse should be understood simply as a chronological note. However, we suggest that the combination of both Jn 9:31 and 36, coming so close to each other militates against Dodd's view and is evidence in favour of the more traditional interpretation, see Bultmann, John, p.664, n.5.

103) Bultmann, John, p.671 n.2 suggests this possibility but then dismisses it - "The disposal by lot could of course symbolise in a derisive manner the finish of the Jewish high priesthood; but this cannot be represented by the χιτών of Jesus."

104) It is always a temptation to find some symbolism in the terminology of the Gospel, such as the robe, which from the time of Cyprian was the subject of much debate. Cyprian himself connected it with the unity of the Church (an idea found more recently - I de la Potterie, "La tunique sans couture symbole du Christ grand prêtre?", Biblica LX (1979), pp. 255-69). We notice also the recent attempts to find meaning in the numbers of the Gospel, such as the 153 fish and the jars of water, 6 in all, or the 5 porches at Bethesda.

105) On the idea of sacrifice see Bultmann, John, p. 450, and our comments in this regard below pp. 226-30.

106) But in neither case is this the main thrust of the title, so that priestly elements are only incidental to the correct interpretation of this title in John.

107) See below pp. 192-224.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

1) Hahn, Titles, pp. 233-9; Schweizer, Markus, pp.24f and Fuller, Foundations, pp. 47f.

2) In CD 6:1 we find "the holy anointed ones" juxtaposed with prophecy, as Moses is with the commandments. cf. Lk 1:70.

3) Schweizer, "Er wird Nazoräer heissen", pp.90-3.

4) See above pp.33f.

5) Schweizer, loc cit. See also his commentary, Das Evangelium nach Markus pp.24f.

6) See above pp. 74-6 and see below pp.141-5.

7) See above pp. 74-6.

8) See above pp. 69-71 , and cf Lk 4:18-20 and 24:19f. For a study of the prophetic theme in Luke see J.A. Fitzmyer, The Gospel according to Luke I-IX, pp. 213-217; R.E. Brown, "Jesus and Elisha", Perspective XII (1971), pp. 84-104; Dubois J.D., "La figure d'Elie dans la perspective lucanienne", R.H.P.R.LIII (1973), pp.155-76. P. Hinnebusch, "Jesus the New Elijah in St. Luke", T.B.T. XXXI (1967). 2175-2182; XXXII (1967) 2237-2244; Grundmann, T.D.N.T. VIII, p. 534f. writes, "As distinct from Matthew, Luke presents the story of Jesus between his birth and his crucifixion and resurrection as prophetic rather than Messianic action".

9) See M. Black, An Aramiac Approach to the Gospels and Acts, pp.106f.

10) Fuller, Foundations, pp.47f.

11) Ibid.

12) Lk 4:34 derives from Mark rather than one of Luke's other sources and therefore the title comes from a tradition which is separate from that which lies behind Acts 3:14.

13) Vermes, Jesus p.87

14) Von Rad, Theology II, p.7.

15) See. K. Nielsen, Yahweh as Prosecutor and Judge. An Investigation of the Prophetic Law Suit (Rîb-pattern).

16) Nielsen, Op.cit., pp. 51-55. We note that 11Q Melch. is set within the New Year/Tabernacles complex, harking back to the old autumnal New Year celebrations.

17) See J.F. Ross, "The Prophet as Yahweh's Messenger" in Israel's Prophetic Heritage, (F/s J.Muilenburg), pp.98-107 esp. p.107.

18) See above pp. 52-4 and pp. 105,113.

19) On the subject of the prophet in the Hellenistic world, see H. Krämer, "προφήτης κτλ." , T.D.N.T., VI, pp. 781-96.

20) See Josephus, Wars 1:68f, Antiq.11:327, 13:282f, 299: E. Bammel, "ἈΡΧΙΕΡΕΥΣ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΕΥΩΝ" Th.L.Z. LXXIX (1954) pp.351-6 and C.H. Dodd, "The Prophecy of Caiaphas (Jn xi 47-53)" in Neotestamentica et Patristica (F/s O. Cullmann), pp.134-43.

21) The chief function of the prophet is a messenger from God and bearer of the word of God. However not all the messengers of God were prophets and particularly in Judaism at the turn of the Era, since prophecy was presumed in some circles to have ceased with Malachi, other figures might function as bearers of the inspired word; (cf Philo, Spec Leg IV, 192 and Tos.Sotah 13.5.6.)

22) For an insight into the Samaritan expectation, see Meeks, Prophet-King pp.216ff and J. Macdonald, The Theology of the Samaritans pp. 195-214, 359-79.

23) Mid Rab Deut 3:17 and Mid Rab Gen 71:9 and 99:11. The texts date from the Third Century or later, but may preserve an earlier tradition similar to that found in the NT - see Hayward, "Elijah" pp.22f. and Vermes, Jesus the Jew pp.94-7.and 244f.

24) See the discussion on the Qumran Messiahs and Messianism in Schürer, History II, pp.550-54 and the bibliography on pp. 490-92. See also G. Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls Qumran in Perspective, and W.S. Lasor, The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament, pp.93-105.

25) G. Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, p.87

26) E. Lohse, Die Texte aus Qumran, p.33 who renders the Hebrew as נביא but the translation as "der Prophet".

27) Vermes, D.S.S.E. p. 49 connects the Interpreter of the Law with the Priestly Messiah, wrongly in our opinion. See N. Wieder, "The Law Interpreter of the Scrolls of the Dead Sea Sect. The Second Moses", J.J.S. IV (1953), pp.158-75.

28) Vermes, D.S.S.E. pp.185f, 195; Jesus the Jew p.96; Teeple, Prophet pp.51f. and Jeremias, "Μωυσῆς" , T.D.N.T. IV pp.863 and 866.

29) See J. Pryke, "Eschatology in the Dead Sea Scrolls" in The Scrolls and Christianity (ed M.Black), p.53.

30) See n.22 above.

31) See R. Bloch, "Quelques aspects de la figure de Moïse dans la tradition rabbinique" in Moïse, l'homme de l'Alliance pp.156-61.

32) Mid. Rab. Eccl. 1:9:1.
Rabbi Berekiah said in the name of Rabbi Isaac: "As the first redeemer was, so shall the latter Redeemer be. What is stated of the former redeemer? And Moses took his wife and his sons, and set them upon an ass (Ex4:20). Similarly will it be with the latter Redeemer, as it is stated, Lowly and riding upon an ass (Zech 9:9). As the former redeemer caused manna to descend, as it is stated, Behold, I will cause to rain bread from heaven for you (Ex 16:4), so will the latter Redeemer cause manna to descend, as it is stated. May he be as a rich cornfield in the land (Ps 72:6). As the former redeemer made a well to rise, so will the latter Redeemer bring up water, as it is stated, And a fountain shall come forth of the house of the Lord, and shall water the valley of Shittim (Joel 4:18)." There is also an earlier reference attributed to Rabbi Aquiba, which reads :
How long will the days of the Messiah last? Rabbi Aquiba said; "Just as the Israelites spent forty years in the wilderness, so will he (the Messiah) draw them forth and cause them to go into the wilderness and make them eat loaves and straw" (Tanchuma 'Ekeb 7: quoted in Martyn, Theology, p. 109. See also Jeremias, T.D.N.T. IV pp. 859f. and Str.B I, p.85.

33) See Schürer, History of the Jewish People II pp.515f.

34) On Jesus as a Prophet, see D. Hill, New Testament Prophecy, pp.48-69; Teeple, Prophet; Meeks, Prophet-King; Hahn, Titles, pp. 352-406 and Cullmann, Christology, pp.13-50; F. Schnider, Jesus der Prophet, which is probably the best work on the subject at the present time, and with particular reference to the Fourth Gospel, Martyn, Theology, pp. 102-28.

35) Matt 21:11,46 (cf 13:57 and 14:5); Jn 6:14, 7:40,52; Lk 7:16; 20:6, 24:19; Acts 3:22f, 8:35ff. See Hill, Op.cit. pp. 53-6 for further references and discussion.

36) So Matt 13:57 and parallels.

37) On the sermons in Acts, see R. Maddox, The Purpose of Luke-Acts, pp66-82; M. Hengel, Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity, pp. 59-68; M. Dibelius, Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, pp. 138-91.

38) See Lk 24:19.

39) Vermes, Jesus the Jew, pp.86-102; Schnider, Jesus der Prophet, pp.191-230; Meeks, Prophet-King, pp.17-25; Fuller, Foundations, pp.46ff, 67, 125-30, 167-72; Martyn, Theology, pp.102-28.

40) Fuller, Op.cit.pp. 129f.

41) Fuller, pp. 182-92.

42) See n.32 above.

43) Hill, Prophecy, p.68.

44) Schnider, Prophet, p. 259.

45) For a discussion of the title Son of God and particularly its relation to the Holy One of God, see below pp. 290-2.

46) Jub 48:15,18, which reminds us of the tradition concerning Levi in the T of Levi 18:12. Hull, Hellenistic Magic, p. 69, suggests that the verb φιμόω used in Mark 1:25 "is almost the equivalent in the Greek magic to καταδεῖν and κατάδεσμος. The idea is to reduce an enemy by magical means to a state of impotence."

47) Ellis, Luke, p. 165, who refers to Exod 8:19 (cf Lk 6:17-49 and 9:10-17.

48) See Betz, "The Sinai Tradition", pp.104-7 and J. Manek, "The New Exodus in the Book of Luke", N.T. II (1958), pp. 8-23.

49) We note for example the way in which Matthew presents the Sermon on the Mount, bearing in mind the reservations expressed by G. Barth, Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew, pp. 153-59. See also G. Friedrich, "προφήτης κτλ." T.D.N.T. VI pp.841-88.

50) See n. 32 above.

51) See Hahn, Titles, pp.372-387 and with particular reference to Luke's travel narrative p. 387. See also C.F.Evans, "The Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel" (F/s for R.H. Lightfoot), pp. 37-53.

52) On the magical element of the miracles in Mark, see Hull, Hellenistic Magic, pp.73-86. For an in depth study of the miracle tradition in Mark, see Kertelge, Die Wunder Jesu.

53) See above pp. 65-71.

54) Mk 2:10 and 3:15 - see M. Hengel, Christ and Power.

55) See S. Freyne, "The Charismatic" in Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms (J.J.Collins and W.E. Nickelsburg (Eds.) pp.223-58, esp.pp.248f.

56) Apart from Freyne, Op.cit., p.230, see also G.Vermes, "Hanina ben Dosa. A Controversial Galilean Saint from the First Century of the Christian Era", J.J.S. XXIII (1972), pp.28-50 and XXIV (1974), pp.51-64.

57) Freyne, p.244.

58) Freyne, pp.241f. for a detailed discussion.

59) Freyne, p.226; D. Berman, "Hasidim in Rabbinic Tradition" in Society of Biblical Literature 1979 Seminar Papers (Ed. P.J. Achtemeier) II, pp. 15-33 esp p.17.

60) Freyne, p. 248; see also p.227.

61) Freyne, p.244.

62) See the Table in Freyne, p. 230.

63) Aboth R. Nathan 67; M.Ab.2:6 and M.Ab. 3:10 (cf M.Ber.5:5). In T. Ber. 3:3, both sayings are attributed to R.Akiba.

64) See especially Freyne, pp. 237f.

65) See Freyne, pp. 247f and D.L. Tiede, The Charismatic Figure as a Miracle Worker passim. D. Flusser, Jesus p.56 speaks of "the inevitable tension between charismatic miracles...and institutional Judaism".

66) Freyne, p. 249.

67) Recorded in Tosephta Hullin 2:22.

68) Vermes, Jesus pp.58-82. See also Tiede, The Charismatic figure.

69) Vermes, Op cit pp.89f.

70) Freyne, pp. 247f.

71) As pointed out by Freyne, pp.224-227.

72) T.B.Ber. 34b.

73) See below pp.167f.

74) Note the use of the term ἔξοδος at the Transfiguration to describe Jesus' death (Lk 9:31), and the use of the term "redeem" of the hope associated with Jesus (Lk 24:21) and the title "redeemer" associated with Moses (Acts 7:35). For further details see Manek, "The New Exodus" pp.8-23 and Friedrich, T.D.N.T. VI p.847.

75) See K. H. Rengstorf, "σημεῖον κτλ. " in T.D.N.T. VII pp.241-3.

76) See above p.76.

77) Jeremias, T.D.N.T. V pp.700f.

78) See also Exod 14:31; Num 12:7 and Deut 34:5.

79) As pointed out by Fuller, Foundations, pp.45f.

80) P. Dabeck, "Siehe, es eschienen Moses und Elia", Biblica XXXIII (1942), pp. 175-89 suggests that Luke presents Jesus as a Prophet like Elijah, in the Gospel and as a Prophet like Moses in Acts. For a similar point of view see the writers listed in n. 12 above. Hahn, Titles, argues (in our opinion correctly) that even in the Gospel the Moses typology also plays a part (pp.386f). See also Manek, "The New Exodus" pp.8-23.

81) See H.D. Betz, "Jesus as a Divine Man", in Jesus and the Historian (F/s E.C. Colwell), pp 114-33, and for a critique of this position, O. Betz, "The concept of the so-called 'Divine Man' in Mark's Christology" in Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature (Ed. D.E. Aune), pp. 229-40 and C.H.Holladay, Theios Aner in Hellenistic Judaism, esp. pp. 237-42.

82) Glasson, Moses, pp. 27-32.

83) Meeks, Prophet-King, pp.42-7.

84) Meeks, pp.222f.

85) See Schnider, Prophet, pp. 225-229, who points out that the understanding of Jesus as Prophet is nevertheless inadequate from the perspective of the Evangelist (p.225).

86) So Cullmann, Christology, pp. 28f, 38ff. and A.Geyser, "The Semeion at Cana of the Galilee", in Studies in John (Suppl. to Novum Testamentum XXIV (1970) pp. 1-12.

87) Matt 11:14; Mk 9:13 (cf. Matt 17:12).

88) See Martyn, Theology, p. 113 and his essay "We have found Elijah" in The Gospel of John in Christian History.

89) G.W.Buchanan, "The Samaritan Origin of the Gospel of John" in Religions in Antiquity (Ed. J. Neusner), pp. 149-175.

90) See our discussion on "barley loaves", below p 270.

91) Martyn, Theology, p.113.

92) Schnider, Prophet, p. 229.

93) Jn 1:17,45; 3:14; 5:45,46; 6:32; 7:19,22f (2x) and 9.28f (2x) cf. Matt 8:4; 17:3,4; 19:7,8; 22:24 and 23:2, (7 times in all), which is more often than Moses' appearances in Matthew.

94) See Borgen, Bread from Heaven, pp.59f. and "Observations", pp. 232-40 and our discussion below pp. 268-71, 275.

95) The connection between the words of Jesus as recorded in John and the office of prophet generally is made by Bernard, John II, p.222. Meeks, Prophet-King, connects the words of Jesus in 5:47 with Deut. 18:18, pp.47-58 and pp.286f.

96) Schnackenburg, Gospel II, p. 129.

97) De Jonge, Jesus, p. 52.

98) Meeks, Prophet-King.

99) So De Jonge, Jesus, pp. 56f. Schnider, Prophet, p.211-5; Schnackenburg, John II, p.19, who writes, "It is therefore wrong to bracket the two verses together and regard them as a simple development of one idea. The function of vs 14 is to express the evangelist's judgement on the great feeding in positive theological terms, to draw, as it were, its direct Messianic and Christological conclusion. Vs. 15 is intended to show the negative side, the people's lack of understanding of this symbolic event, their mentality, which does not go beyond externals, and its mistaken consequences".

100) Schnider, Op.cit., p. 213.

101) Mk 8:27-38.

102) Schnackenburg, John II, p.129.

103) E.D. Freed, Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John; B. Noack, Zur johanneischen Tradition, pp.71-89 and Barrett, John, pp. 27-30, 270.

104) Schnackenburg, loc.cit.

105) Meeks, Prophet-King, pp. 25ff.

106) Schnackenburg, loc.cit., and pp. 161f.

107) Support for this variant, apart from P66, is not as clear as some scholars suggest. The reading in P75 is conjectural, as is the reading in Bohairic P. Bodmer III. In support of the variant, see J. Mehlmann, "Propheta a Moyse promissus in Jo.7:52 citatus", Verbum Domini IV (1966) pp. 79-88, and B.M. Metzger, The Text of the New Testament, p.40. In The Greek New Testament by K. Aland, M. Black, et. al. (Ed.) the reading of P66 is not even mentioned.

108) Lindars, John, pp. 302f.

109) Schnackenburg, John, II, p. 158.

110) De Jonge, Jesus, pp. 38-42

111) So Martyn, Theology, p.119.

112) Meeks, Op.cit., p. 57.

113) Meeks, p.67.

114) See the critique of Meeks in De Jonge, Jesus, pp.49-76 esp p. 57.

115) As outlined by Harvey, Jesus on Trial. See also S. Pancaro, The Law in the Fourth Gospel, esp. pp.63ff and p.87.

116) Schnider, Prophet, p. 229.

117) See above p. 154.

118) See below p. 286.

119) Schnider, loc.cit.

120) Hahn, Titles, pp. 233-39.

121) Hahn, p.233 and p. 227 n.13.

122) Smith, "The Milieu", pp.164-80.

123) Smith, Op cit. p. 168.

124) Bultmann, John, pp.6f. For a bibliography of writings pertinent to the study of the Signs Source see Martyn, Theology, pp. 164-8.

125) R. T. Fortna, The Gospel of Signs: A reconstruction of the Narrative Source underlying the Fourth Gospel, and idem, "Source and Redaction in the Fourth Gospel's Portrayal of Jesus' Signs", J.B.L. LXXXIX (1970), pp.51-66. For a critique of Fortna's presentation, see E.D. Freed and R.B. Hunt, "Fortna's Signs-Source in John", J.B.L. XCIV (1975) pp. 563-79 and R.Kysar, "The Source Analysis of the Fourth Gospel. A growing consensus?" N.T. XV (1973) pp. 134-52.

126) See the discussions in Martyn, Theology, pp.164-8 and Schnackenburg, John, I, pp. 48-58 and pp. 64-68. Barrett, John, pp.18f. argues cogently against using the source as a "valuable exegetical tool" and calls the very existence of the source into question.

127) Martyn, Theology p. 166

128) Ibid.

129) De Jonge, Jesus pp. 117f and B. Lindars, Behind the Fourth Gospel, p.39 are both critical of the attempts to reconstruct the theology of the Signs Source over against the theology of the Gospel itself.

130) C.K. Barrett, "The Dialectical Theology of St. John" in New Testament Essays, pp. 49-69.

131) We note terms like ἄρχοντα, λυτρωτήν (vs 35); τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα (vs 36); and most important of all (vs 38) λόγια ζῶντα See the discussion in Jeremias, T.D.N.T. IV pp.868f, and particularly with regard to the task of redemption, cf. Lk 1:68; 2:38 and 24:21. Another parallel is found between Acts 7:22b and Lk 24:19 (ὃς ἐγένετο ἀνὴρ προφήτης δυνατὸς ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ ...).

132) Martyn, Theology, pp. 112-114.

133) See below pp. 271-3.

134) As suggested by Williams, Cultic Elements, pp.266-297. See above p. 124.

135) Martyn, Theology, p. 166.

136) Smalley, John, p. 241.

137) Ibid.

138) O. Cullmann, "A New Approach to the Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel", Exp.T. LXXI (1959/60) pp.8-12 and pp. 39-43 and idem, The Johannine Circle: A Study in the Origin of the Gospel of John.

139) See below p. 281.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER FIVE

1) See above pp. 76f., 96-98.

2) See above pp. 146-165.

3) Bultmann, John, pp. 449f.

4) Bultmann, op.cit., p. 450. The title reflects Bultmann's belief in the Gnostic Redeemer myth, but it is not inappropriate for the Holy One who has the words of eternal life, and is himself the bread from heaven.

5) So Schulz, Das Evangelium, p. 111f, and Hahn, Titles, p. 233.

6) So B. Weiss, A New Commentary on the New Testament II p. 288; Hoskyns, Fourth Gospel I, p. 342, and Bernard, John I, pp.221-3.

7) Which the simple messianic explanation fails to do; see above, pp. 96ff.

8) See above, pp. 146-50.

9) See above, pp. 76f.

10) See below, pp. 290-6.

11) See below, pp. 254-261, and p. 296.

12) So Lightfoot, John, p. 170; Schlatter, Der Evangelist, ad.loc.; Schwank, Johannes II, p.92; and with reference to Lk 4:34, Schürmann, Lukasevangelium, pp. 247-9 and Procksch, T.D.N.T. I, pp 101f.

13) So Bultmann, John, p.450 and see our comments below, pp.227-30.

14) See especially Procksch, loc.cit., and Kertelge, Die Wunder, pp. 181-190.

15) Bultmann, John, loc.cit. This is the main thrust of Bultmann's interpretation, the sacrificial aspect being only a subsidiary concern. See also Schnackenburg, John II p.-7 and Cullmann, Christology, p. 285.

16) Bultmann, loc.cit; Schnackenburg, loc.cit.

17) J. Painter, "Christ and the Church in John 1, 45-51" in L'Évangile de Jean, Souces, Redaction, Theologie (Ed. M. de Jonge), p. 361.

18) See below, pp. 290-5.

19) H. W. Robinson, Record and Revelation, p. 323.

20) K.G. Kuhn, T.D.N.T. I, pp. 97-99 and Str.B. III, pp.165f and p. 762.

21) P. Bonnard, "Holy" in Vocabulary of the Bible (Ed. J.J. von Allmen), p.166

22) Bonnard, loc.cit.

23) Procksch, T.D.N.T. I, p. 89.

24) See also IQpH 2;4.

25) Procksch, p.91.

26) Kuhn, T.D.N.T. I, p.98.

27) Ibid.

28) Cf II Sam.23:2; Is 11:2, 42:1, 61:1, II Kings 2:9 and Ezek 36:26f.

29) According to Y. Yadin, "A note on Melchizedek and Qumran", I.E.J. XV (1965), pp. 152-4.

30) Str.B III, pp. 9-10: See also D. Aune, "A note on Jesus' Messianic consciousness and 11Q Melch., E.Q. XLV (1973), pp. 161-5.

31) Procksch, T.D.N.T. I, p.91.

32) Von Rad, Theology I, p. 205. "God is the source of all that is holy".

33) In some later works attention moved from the Temple to Jerusalem as in the Pss. of Solomon, and the Christian Apocalypse, (cf. Rev.21).

34) K. Stalder, Das Werk des Geistes in der Heiligung bei Paulus, p. 210.

35) J.A. Hewett, The Use of the Hagios group of words for "Holiness" in the Pauline Corpus (excluding the Pastoral Epistles) in the light of its Old Testament Background. Unpublished PhD thesis submitted to the University of Manchester (1973) p.13.

36) Procksch, T.D.N.T. I, p.91.

37) W. Eichrodt, Old Testament Theology, I, p.137.

38) Von Rad, Theology I, p.207.

39) Procksch, op cit., p. 89.

40) See Fr. Nötscher, "Heiligkeit in den Qumranschriften" R.Q. II pp. 163-82 and pp. 315-344, esp. p. 166.

41) H. Cremer, "Holy" in B.Th.W.N.T., p. 45.

42) N.H.Snaith, Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament, pp.24ff.

43) N.H. Snaith, Leviticus and Numbers (Century Bible), p.78.

44) See M. Noth Laws and the Pentateuch, pp. 215-228, esp. p. 222 understands קדושים as a special class of angels, but this is doubtful for as the Qumran texts show קדוש includes not only angels, but men also - see n.51 below.

45) The idea of the Divine Council has been touched on briefly above, pp. 105, 111-3. The important works on the subject are the following : H.W. Robinson, "The Council of Yahweh" J.T.S. XLV (1944) pp.151-7; F.M.Cross, "The Council of Yahweh in Second Isaiah", J.N.E.S. XII (1953), pp.274-77, and "עדת אל" T.D.O.T. I, pp. 242-66; G. Cook, "The Sons of (the) God(s)" Z.A.W. LXXVI (1964), pp. 22-47; E.C. Kingsbury, "The Prophets and the Council of Yahweh" J.B.L. 83 (1964), pp. 279-86; P.D.Miller, "The Divine Council and the Prophetic Call to War" V.T. XVIII (1968), pp.100-107; R.N. Whybray, The Heavenly Counsellor in Isaiah XI, 13-14: A study of the Sources of the Theology of Deutero-Isaiah; and E.T.Mullen, Jr., The Divine Council in Canaanite and Early Hebrew literature.

46) See Job 1 and 2. Zech 3. Pss 58, 82,89 and I Kings 22:19-23 to list only the most obvious references. Perhaps Daniel 7 belongs here as well: see M. Black, "The Throne-Theophany Prophetic Commission and the Son of Man" in Jews, Greeks and Christians (F/s W.D. Davies), pp. 57ff.

47) בני אלים (Ps 89:6ff). בני האלוהים (Job 1:6) בקהל קדושים (Ps 82:6)

48) Deut 33:2 and Zech 14:5.

49) IQSb 4.

50) For a discussion on human and angelic "holy ones" see below pp.186-9.

51) See J. Coppens, "Les saints dans le Psautier", E.T.L. XXXIX (1963), pp. 485-500. "De ces recherches il résulte que le terme qedôsîm, employé substantif, désigne communément dans la Bible massorétique les êtres supraterrestres, qui forment la cour céleste de Yahvé" (p.485): and H. Brekelmans, "The Saints of the Most High and their Kingdom", O.T.S.(1965) pp.305-29, who comes to the same conclusion after a detailed examination of all the relevant texts both in Qumran, the OT and the Apocalyptic writings: also S.Lamberigts, "Le Sens de Qdwšym dans les Textes de Qumrân" E.T.L. XLVI (1970) pp. 24-39.

52) Priests - Lev 21:7,8; Levites - II Chr. 35:3. See also IQM 9:8.

53) Prophets - II Kings 4:9; see C.D. 6:1.

54) Nazirite Num 6:5 and 8. Judges 16:17(LXX).

55) See IQS 10:12 where God is called מקור קודש or "Source of Holiness".

56) Num 16:5.

57) For example Lev 21 and 22.

58) So Eichrodt, Theology I, p. 137: Von Rad, Theology I, p.207: Procksch, T.D.N.T. I, p.91: H. Seebass, D.N.T.T. II, p.224.

59) See Isaiah's use of the title "the holy One of Israel", particularly Is 10:6 and Procksch, op.cit., pp.93-4.

60) The Hebrew reads: הבדיל יהוה את שבט הלוי לשאת ... לעמד ...לשרתו

61) See IQSa 2.

62) O. Betz, "The Eschatological Interpretation", pp.89-108, esp. p.90.

63) Procksch, Op.cit. p.94 speaks of "two intermingling streams, the priestly and the cultic on the one hand and the prophetic and the ethical on the other".

64) R. Otto, The Idea of the Holy, p.5f (see also p.77 of his work, where he enlarges on this comment).

65) See K.G.Kuhn, T.D.N.T. I, p.100. He refers to Tanch. שלח 31 (37b); S.Lv.20:7 (91d).

66) Otto, loc.cit.

67) Nötscher, "Heiligkeit", pp. 165f.

68) See the connection between "holiness" and "cleansing from sin" in IQH 3:19ff. On the general idea of atonement in the Qumran writings, see P. Garnet, Salvation and Atonement in the Qumran Scrolls.

69) G. von Rad, Der Heilige Krieg, pp. 42-59.

70) R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel. Its Life and Institutions, pp.258-67. See also J. Pederson, Israel III - IV, pp.1-32. and C.H.W. Brekelmann, De herem in het Oude Testament.

71) De Vaux, Israel, pp. 258f.

72) On the idea of "lot" see H.W. Kuhn, Enderwartung, pp. 74ff, and note the extremely important verse in Wis 5:5 "And now he is numbered among the sons of God (ἐν υἱοῖς Θεοῦ) and his lot (ὁ κλῆρος) is with the holy ones." This parallel between sons of God and holy ones is most important for our purposes, see below pp.255-62 and 291-7.

73) We note particularly IQM. On the specific idea of binding Satan see Jubilees 48:18 and Testament of Levi 18:12 and Revelation 20:2.

74) Ex 19:6; Num 16:7; 15:40 and 16:3; Deut 7:6; 14:21 and 26:19; Hos 11:12; Is 4:3; Ezra 9:2 et alia.

75) Betz, "The Eschatological Interpretation", pp.89-108.

76) Note especially Is 4:3f "and he who is left in Zion and remains in Jerusalem will be called holy (קדוש ירשלם), everyone who has been recorded for life in Jerusalem, (vs 4) when the Lord shall have washed the filth of the daughters of Zion and cleansed the bloodstains of Jerusalem from its midst by a spirit of judgement and by a spirit of burning". There is evidence here as also in the Pss of Solomon 17 of an expectation of eschatological holiness, about which we shall have more to say: see below pp. 257-62.

77) So Noth, Laws and the Pentateuch, pp.215-228 who follows O. Procksch, Theologie des Alten Testaments, p.537. See also L. Dequeker, "Daniel VII et les Saints du Très-Haut". E.T.L. XXXVI (1960), pp.353-92 and J. Coppens, "Les Saints du Très-Haut sont-ils à identifier avec les milices célestes?" E.T.L. XXXIX (1963), pp.94-100.

78) The phrase is קדשי עליונין translated by the R.S.V. as "saints of the Most High" which implies for the modern reader a certain ethical content, not actually found in the context of Daniel 7 - these were not the pious saints of the middle ages, but a group of redeemed people who belonged to God and are therefore holy.

79) So Brekelmans, "Saints", pp.305-29. See also S. Lamberigts "Le sens de Qdwsym dans le textes de Qumran" E.T.L. XLVI (1970), pp.24-39, who comes to the same conclusion.

80) Noth, Laws and the Pentateuch, p 219.

81) Dequeker, "Daniel VII et les Saints", pp.371ff , on the basis of IQM 10:10. But see S Lamberigts, Op. cit., who writes, "Au total dans les roleaux édités jusqu' à présent neuf textes seulement attestent l'emploi qdwswm pour désigner les membres de la secte alors que dans quatorze textes qdwswm vise les anges". (p.33.)

82) The community described itself as "the holy ones of His people" (IQM 6:6); "God's holy people" (IQM 14:12); and "men of holiness" (IQS 8:13). This was a present reality, this experience of holiness and not just a dream for the future: So Lamberigts, "Le sens", p.33. Seebass, T.D.N.T. I p. 228; Brekelmans, "Saints", p.328: Kuhn, Enderwartung, pp.69ff and Garnet, Atonement, p.38.

In other literature outside of Qumran, the holy ones when used of men may refer to :-

(i) The remnant after the final judgement.
(ii) The resurrected dead who are judged not guilty.
(iii) The righteous men on earth.

The context remains the most valuable guide, as pointed out by Brekelmans, p. 318; Nötcher, Heiligkeit, p.328.

83) Brekelmans, pp.325f.

84) Lamberigts, "Le sens", p.34.

85) Brekelmans, pp. 319-20 lists the following texts as those in which the holy ones are men: Ps.34:10; Tobit 12:15; Wis.18:9; I Macc 1:46; III Macc 6:9; T. of Levi 18, 11,14; T. of Iss. 5:4; T. of Dan 5:11,12 and I Enoch 38:4,5; 39:4; 41:2; 43:4; 45:1; 48:1,4,7,9; 50:1; 51:2; 58:3,5; 62:8; 65:12; 93:6; 99:16 and 100:5. This is a convincing set of texts for the use of קדושים of man rather than angels: This is apart from the Qumran texts notably IQM 3:4-5; IQM 6:6; 10:10; 16:1; IQSb 3:25f and 4:23; 4QS1 I 1:23-5. To this list Lamberigts, Op.cit., pp.33f adds 1QH 4:25. IQFlor 1:4; IQM 9:8 and IQM 12:8. We suggest that Brekelmans' more cautious list is the safer of the two.

86) See M. Black, "The Throne Theophany Prophetic Commission", pp.57-73.

87) We note the idea of the Council as a Judicial Court above pp. 111 and 115 and perhaps most clearly visualized by 11Q Melch. See also Enoch 48:9 and 62:8, which may be dependent on Dan 7.

88) In which the positive sense of belonging to God predominates as is shown by the parallel title for the members, namely "sons of God" cf. Wis 5:5 which links the two titles, but in a different context, namely that of the righteous before God. (See n.85, and the threefold division of Kuhn, Enderwartung, p. 69 mentioned above pp. 110f.).

89) See above pp. 57f.

90) See the further discussion below, on the relation of the Council to the Holy One of God, pp. 257f., 290ff.

91) See the important article, by H.S. Gehman, "Ἅγιος in the Septuagint, and its relation to the Hebrew original", V.T. IV (1954), pp.337-48.

92) Israel - Ex 19:6; Num 15:40; Deut 7:6; Priest - Lev 21:6-8; God - Josh 24:19; Is 5:16 and Angels Job 5:1.

93) Temple - Ezek 42:13; Ps 64(65):5 and Sabbath Is 58:13.

94) Aaron-Ps. 105(6):16; Angel Dan 8:13;and God I Sam 6:20.

95) Ps 19(20):7; Ps 101(2):20 and Deut 26:15.

96) Eccl 8:10.

97) Neh 10:31; Num 18:9 and see Gehman, Op cit., pp.341ff.

98) Ps 19(20):7; Ps 101(2):20 and Deut 26:15.

99) Ezek 22:26 and Ps 59(60):8 use the adjective on its own to refer to the Temple. In Is 26:21 it refers to Heaven or the place where God dwells.

100) For example, the priests in Lev 21:6.

101) Gehman, Op.cit., p.337. He prefers the negative sense of separation to the positive sense of belonging, which is the opposite of the present scholarly understanding of holiness in the OT. See Seebass, D.N.T.T. /II p.224.

102) So J.H. Moulton and G. Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament, p.4 who refer to two instances, namely O.G.I.S. 37:81 and 721:1.

103) Aristophanes, The Birds p.522. See Seebass, D.N.T.T. II p. 224.

104) See Gehman, "Ἅγιος ... pp. 337-43.

105) Sir 43:10(11); 47:8(9) and 48:20(22).

106) Jer 3:21 (יהוה אלהיהם is rendered as θεοῦ ἁγίου αὐτῶν), Is 60:9 (יהוה אלהיך is rendered as κυρίου τὸ ἅγιον), and Lev 18:21 (שם אלהיך is rendered as τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ἅγιον).

107) Is 26:21, where the Hebrew תקוגו is rendered in the Greek as τὸ ἅγιον.

108) I Kings 8:7, where the Hebrew דביר is rendered in the Greek as τὰ ἅγια.

109) Ezek 10:6f, where the Hebrew הבדיל is rendered in the Greek as ἡ στολὴ ἡ ἁγία .

110) Jud 16:17 (Alex). See above, pp.33f.

111) Is 14:27, where Yahweh Sebaoth is rendered as ὁ θεὸς ὁ ὕψιστος.

112) Sir 1:11(12).

113) Ps 142(3):10.

114) Lev 10:14. See G.L.Bray, Holiness and the Will of God. Perspectives on the Theology of Tertullian, p.137.

115) See Bray, Holiness, pp.138ff and F. Hauck T.D.N.T. I pp.122f. Another Greek word related to ἁγιάζειν is ἁγιασμός which has no clear Hebrew equivalent (so T.D.N.T. I, p.113), but it may be distinguished from ἅγιος and ἁγιάζειν by its emphasis on the moral element (T.D.N.T. I, p.113).

116) I Jn 3:3; I Tim 5:22; James 3:17 and Phil 4:8.

117) Moulton and Milligan, Vocabulary, p.4 write, "Clear evidence for the verb outside biblical and ecclesiastical writings appears to be wanting". See T.D.N.T. I, p. 111f.

118) For example II Chr 30:15-18. Note the parallel between הת קדשו (vs.17) and הטהרו (vs.18).

119) Bray, p.138. "The Hebrew word is infrequent occurring only 19 times, 12 of which are in II Chr. 29-31."

120) See T.D.N.T. I, pp.90-1.

121) J. Barr, The Semantics of Biblical Language, pp.217f.

122) Seebass, D.N.T.T. II, p. 228.

123) See J.H. Elliott, The Elect and the Holy.

124) Betz, "The Eschatological Interpretation", pp.89-108.

125) See also Acts 26:18 and I Cor 1:2.

126) Procksch, T.D.N.T. I, p.108 and p.110, "In both (the OT and the NT) a cultic element is retained in the people of God. This is spiritualized, but can never disappear. For it is present in the worship of the supramundane God, in reconciliation by Jesus Christ and in the new creation as the temple by the Holy Spirit". (p.110).

127) Brown, D.N.T.T. II, pp.231f.

128) Procksch, Op.cit., p.109.

129) See above pp. 178-82.

130) See Procksch, T.D.N.T., pp.100-115. Brown, D.N.T.T. II p. 231f.

131) B.F. Westcott, The Epistles of St. John (Rev.Ed.), p.73.

132) See, for example, I.H. Marshall, The Epistles of John, p.153; R. Schnackenburg, Die Johannesbriefe (Rev.Ed.) pp.151-4; and G.E. Ladd, New Testament Theology, pp. 610f.

133) This is the present opinion of most scholars, see note (130) above. However, C.H. Dodd, The Johannine Epistles, pp. 58-64, considers that the anointing (Χρῖσμα) is the "word" spoken by Jesus and transmitted by the believers (cf Jn 17:17f), "Thy word is truth". There is some truth in Dodd's analysis for correctly it places the emphasis on the words spoken by Jesus as the avenue to eternal life according to the Gospel: But in the Epistle, such is not necessarily the case and in the absence of more definite proof we will retain the idea of the Spirit as the anointing which remains the most likely. Apart from the scholars already listed, we note also M. de Jonge, De Brieven van Johannes, pp.101-14 and I. de la Potterie, "L'onction du chretien par la foi" Bib XL (1959) pp.12-69. The latter convincingly sets out reasons for connecting 1Jn 2:20 with the Spirit, on the basis of verses like Acts 4:27 and Luke 4:18, but including also the sense of the words of Jesus (cf. Jn 16:12f).

134) L.S. (Intermed), p.94.

135) Acts 9:17 and cf 6:6.

136) L. Morris, "I John, II John, III John" in New Bible Commentary (Rev.Ed.), p. 1266.

137) Understanding ἐν in an instrumental sense.

138) We note that in Sinaiticus (p.m.) the second Χριστὸς is replaced by Πνεῦμα , which suggests that the scribe may have understood a connection, perhaps in the use of the verb μένει (ἐν) (cf.3:24).

139) Westcott, Epistles, p.83.

140) Ibid.

141) As suggested by Marshall, Epistles, p.153: Schnackenburg, Johannesbriefe: De Jonge, Brieven, pp.113f and De la Potterie, "L'onction", pp.12:69, esp. pp.65ff.

142) Marshall, Op.cit. p.155, "The Sequence of Pronouns in 2:27f is strong evidence that Jesus is meant here (i.e. in verse 20)": In contrast to Morris, "I John", p.1266.

143) Rev 3:7; 4:8(3x); 6:10; 11:2; 14:10; 20:6; 21:2,10 and 22:11,19.

144) Rev.5:8; 8:3,4; 11:18; 13:7,10; 14:12; 15:3; 16:6; 17:6; 18:20,24; 19:8 and 20:9.

145) Rev. 11:2; 21:2,10; 22:19.

146) Jn.1:33; (7:39); 14:26; 17:11; 20:22 apart from 6:69. The instance in 7:39 is debatable: In the Third Edition of Aland, Black et al, Greek New Testament the readings (found in p.66c, p.75 and Sinaiticus apart from several other texts), οὔπω γὰρ ἦν πνεῦμα ,... without ἅγιον receives an "A" symbol.

147) Also L(019), 046 and others of lesser value.

148) Where neither the adjective nor the verb appears.

149) Acts 22:16 and I Cor 6:11. See A. Oepke " λούω, ἀπολούω, λουτρόν " T.D.N.T. IV, pp. 295-307, esp. p.300, in which he draws attention to the cultic usage in the OT.

150) Heb. 9:14. cf Rev. 14:5. See F. Hauck, T.D.N.T. IV, pp. 829-31 esp. p.830, where the predominance of the cultic usage is described.

151) See above for the idea of the spiritualized cult, pp124f.

152) See above, p. 195.

153) So Procksch, T.D.N.T. I, p.111.

154) See Num 16:29.

155) We note here a number of variants, including μείζων for μεῖζον found in ℵ.L.D.f.66 P75 et alia which is preferred by Barrett, John p. 381, but see Brown, John I p.403, who chooses the reading with the neuter (μεῖζον). Both Nestle, N.T.Graece, p. 264 and Aland, Greek New Testament p.370 print the neuter μεῖζον . But given a verse like 14:28 a case can be made for the masculine μείζων . On the idea of a link between 10:29 and 14:28, see Barrett, "'The Father is greater than I' (Jo 14:28): Subordinationist Christology in the New Testament" in Neues Testament und Kirche (F/s R. Schnackenburg), pp. 144-159, esp. p.150.

156) Schnackenburg, John II, p.310. He concludes that "no certain conclusions can be drawn; the Johannine scene retains its own marked features". The idea was first treated in detail by C.H. Dodd, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel, p.91 following Lightfoot, John, p.209. On the idea of a trial in John see Harvey, Jesus on Trial and the elaborate work by S. Pancaro, The Law in the Fourth Gospel.

157) See Barrett, John, pp.383f, particularly on the idea of first century "blasphemy" and "stoning".

158) So Bultmann, John, p.389 and Str.B III, pp. 223-5.

159) Schnackenburg, John II, p.310f.

160) Barrett, Op.cit., p.384: Bultmann, Op.cit., p.389 n.1.

161) Barrett, loc.cit.

162) On the idea of Psalms as "Law" see Morris, John, pp.525f.

163) Schnackenburg, loc.cit.

164) The opinions range from those J.A. Emerton, "The Interpretation of Psalm 82 in John 10", who links the "gods" with angels, J.T.S.xi (1960) pp.329-32 to J. Sanders, John, p.260 who writes "The original meaning of the verse is irrelevant to its use in the Fourth Gospel". See the critique of both stand-points in A.T.Hanson's two articles, "John's citation of Ps.LXXXII" N.T.S. XI (1965), pp. 158-62 and "John's citation of Psalm LXXXII reconsidered" N.T.S. XIII (1966/7) pp.363-7.

165) In contrast to Morris, John, who argues that "the passage (Ps.82:6) refers to the judges of Israel, and the expression 'gods' is applied to them in the exercise of their high and God-given office". Consequently, if Morris is correct, Jesus would in this round about fashion be passing judgement on the Jews as false judges. This in our opinion receives little support from the actual passage; see also

Schnackenburg, John II p.311 and Hoskyns, John II, p.455.

166) See Schnackenburg, loc.cit.pace R. Jungkuntz, "An approach to the exegesis of Jn 10:34-6", Concordia Theol. XXXV (1964), pp. 556-65.

167) Discussed by Hanson "John's citation...reconsidered" pp. 363ff.

168) J.A. Emerton, "Melchizedek and the Gods", J.T.S. XVII (1966) pp. 158-62.

169) Hanson, see note 164 above.

170) M. de Jonge and A.S. van der Woude "IIQ Melchizedek", pp. 301-26. See p. 111 above.

171) Hanson, "John's citation...reconsidered", p.314 writes, "In the Johannine context there is no reason to think of angels: vs 33 even makes a clear contrast between god and men".

172) So Barrett, John, p.384: Schnackenburg, John II, p.311 and Hanson, Op. cit., pp. 366f.

173) See Abodah Zarah 5a.
R. Jose (c AD 150) said, "The Israelites have only received the Law that the angel of death may have no power over them as it is written (Ps 82:6)..."

174) Barrett, Op. cit., p. 385.

175) Hoskyns, John II, p. 455: See also Macgregor, John, p. 242.

176) See also Schnackenburg, John II, p.311, who stresses the contrast between those who "receive God's word" and he who is God's Word incarnate.

177) Ibid.

178) "Sometimes pressed but wrongly" - so Morris, John, p.527 n.97.

179) Schnackenburg, John II, p.311 ἁγιάζω is tied up with the mission of God's Son.

180) Bultmann, John, p.389 n.5

181) According to Bultmann there is an overlap of meaning between "being sent" and "being made holy" in vs 36 (see n.180); To this statement Bühner responds, Der Gesandte, p. 394, cf. also p. 231.

182) Schnackenburg, loc.cit.

183) See Bühner, "Der Gesandte", p.394.

184) Including in John both the words and the deeds of Jesus according to Bultmann, John, p. 390, cf. Jn 14:10 which supports this conclusion.

185) See Barrett, John, p.385, "It is sometimes assumed that this 'sanctification' or 'consecration'.... implies a sacrificial meaning, but this is not so, though of course sacrificial ideas may be implied by the context". This is the opposite of what Bultmann suggests, John, p.511. Our study supports the former.

186) Hoskyns, John II, p. 456: Barrett, Op.cit., pp.379 and 385 suggests a more likely alternative in the first verse of the Dedication lesson - Num 7:1.

187) So Bernard, John II, p. 369.

188) Schnackenburg, John II, p.312.

189) Borgen, "God's Agent in the Fourth Gospel" in Religions in Antiquity (Ed. J. Neusner), pp.137-48; Bühner, Der Gesandte passim, but esp p. 414 and 393f speaks of an "apokalyptischer Prophet".

190) Schnackenburg, John II, p.312, " ἁγιάζω here denotes more in the OT sense, a 'consecration, setting apart'. Jesus' spiritual endowment (1:33; 3:3 and 6:63) is in line with the prophetic tradition (cf. Is 42:1 and 61:1) and at the same time it exceeds it".

191) This did not exclude other believers, but allowed the focus of the prayer to rest on the historical milieu before moving to the ecclesiastical plane.

192) See N.H. Cassem, "A grammatical and contextual inventory of the use of κόσμος in the Johannine Corpus, with some implications for a Johannine Cosmic Theology", N.T.S. IX (1972/3), pp.81-90, esp. pp. 88f.

193) See note 185 above.

194) So Morris, John, p.730 (cf I Jn 5:19) and see also Brown, John II, p.761. Thus stressing the dualistic instead of the ethical aspect.

195) In contrast to the view expressed by Lightfoot, John, p.298, "the root idea of Holiness is separation", an idea also present in Macgregor, John, p. 318.

196) Bultmann, John, p.509, links the disciples' mission with Jesus' mission of judgement in view of Jn16:8-11; the mission of the Paraclete is in fact, the mission of the disciples, for the Spirit works through them.

197) Ibid.

198) See Bernard, John II, p.574, "Although this is not expressed in the passage, the 'Spirit of Truth' would be the agent, (cf. 16:13)".

199) We are reminded of Ps 119:42 (LXX): We note also that vs 19 omits the article before truth and therefore gives the phrase in ch 17 a more definite impact. The trouble is that it is difficult to be sure whether John has left the article out by design, or whether he still intends it to be understood.

200) We are reminded of I Jn 2:20 in which the Spirit and perhaps also the word (see above pp. 196ff.) form part of the anointing, according to De la Potterie, "L'onction", pp. 12-69. See note 133 above.

201) There may have been a party within the Community who placed a higher value upon the Sacraments than John was prepared to consider. Such an idea will be explored when we consider ch 6 in detail, particularly vss.51-9. As far as the work of the Spirit is concerned, the forms of the Upper Room discourses according to Painter, "Discourses", pp.539-41 suggest a need, to correct various misunderstandings concerning the Spirit and its role, was the motivation behind the second and third versions of the discourses.

202) So Barrett, John, p.510: But see Schnackenburg, Das Johannesevangelium III, p.208, who writes, "Doch die Situation der Jünger in der Welt, um die es hier geht, ist inzwischen...eingetreten und steht so lebhaft im Bewusstsein, das sich der Aorist aufdrangte(vgl.auch 4,38). Veilleicht hat auch der poetische stil der LXX (für benr. Perfekt) eingewirkt, wie deutlich im Magnifikat (Lk 1:51-4)...Jedenfalls darf man daraus nicht schliessen dass Jesus schon als Erhohter sprechen soll".

203) Bultmann, John, p.522, "Who is in fact praying? Not the 'historical Jesus' but historically speaking the community. But he is himself speaking in the community as the δοξασθείς ".

204) See Schnackenburg, Das Johannesevangelium III, p.208, "Der Geist als Inbegriff dieser Kraft, die im Wort Gottes bzw. in den Worden Christi wohnt (vgl.6:63; I Joh 2:20,27;3:9 σπέρμα), wird zwar genannt, aber wohl nur wegen der Kürze der Bitte, die auf die Anwesenheit des Wortes Gottes in der Gemeinde angelegt ist".

205) So Bultmann, John, pp.692f, "Thus the judgment that took place in the coming of Jesus (3:19; 5:27 and 9:39) is further achieved in the activity of the disciples".

206) Bultmann, p.509, "Thus holiness is not due to its own quality, nor can it manufacture its differentiation from the world by itself, by its own rite, its institution, or its particular way of life, all this can only be a sign of its difference from the world, not a means of attaining it". Bultmann, loc.cit., then contrasts this with the position in Judaism evidenced by Tanch קדושים 31,74.

207) Bernard, John II, p. 573, " ἁγιάζειν is not equivalent to καθαρίζειν : One who is holy is not necessarily impure ..."

208) See Williams, Cultic Elements for a detailed treatment of this subject, pp. 298-335 and see above pp. 124-129.

209) Brown, John II, p. 748. "This is more a prayer of the union or Communion of the Son and the Father than it is a prayer of petition". See also Barrett, John, p.500 and Dodd, Interpretation, pp.418f.

210) Did 9:2 - 10:6. We note the use of the title Πάτερ ἅγιε (10:2) (cf. Jn 17:11) and the phrases τοῦ ἁγίου ὀνόματός σου (10:2) (cf. Jn 17:6) and ῥύσασθαι αὐτὴν ἀπὸ παντὸς πονηροῦ (10:5) (Text - K. Bihlmeyer, Die Apostolischen Vater (3 ed), pp. 1-9). In 10:5 the congregation is described as τὴν ἁγιασθεῖσαν (cf. Jn 17:17). For further parallels see Brown, John II pp.746f. It is possible that the Didache was influenced by Jn 17 or a similar tradition - Barrett, John, p.501.

211) See Hoskyns, John II, p. 599: Bultmann, John, p.510.

212) Bultmann, loc. cit.

213) Barrett, John p.511.

214) Schnackenburg, Evangelium III, p. 213.

215) Kysar, Fourth Evangelist, pp. 249-64.

216) Brown, John I, pp. cxiii-cxiv.

217) H. Klos, Die Sakramente im Johannesevangelium, passim but see esp. pp. 97-99.

218) Bultmann, John, p. 510 n.5: Schnackenburg, Evangelium III, p.213. See also Hoskyns, John II, p.598 and F.M. Braun, Jean le Theologien III Sa theologie, Le mystere de Jesus-Christ, pp.165f.

219) See above, pp.124-7.

220) Didache 10:5 Text - J.B. Lightfoot, The Apostolic Fathers (Rev.ed), p. 233.

221) Asting, Heiligkeit, pp.314f.

222) Barrett, John, p.511.

223) Bultmann, loc.cit - "Since there is no disputing the allusion to the words of the Lord's Supper, Asting's interpretation must be wrong" : But in so stating his position, one wonders whether Bultmann might himself be wrong, as there is not necessarily an allusion to the words of the Last Supper, unlike ch. 6:51ff. Schnackenburg, Evangelium III, p.213 emphasizes the note of vicarious suffering in 17:19 - but again this is not contained in the verb ἁγιάζω - so much as in the general context.

224) Schnackenburg, loc.cit.

225) Asting, Heiligkeit, pp.314f.

226) Barrett, John, p.511.

227) So Bultmann, John, p. 510, n.5.

228) Barrett, p. 507, "though no-one could stress more strongly the ethical result of holiness in love, (John) ... is careful to bring out the root of holiness in a relationship".

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER SIX

1) See above pp.168f.

2) Bultmann, John, p.450.

3) See above pp.13-15 and below pp. 263-66.

4) So Martyn, Theology, p.138; Guilding, The Fourth Gospel, p.59 and Barrett, John, p.304. But, for the belief that 6:51^{c}-8 has no bearing upon the interpretation of 6:63, see E. Lohse, "Wort und Sakrament in Johannesevangelium" N.T.S., VII (1961) pp.110-125 and G. Bornkamm, "Die eucharistische Rede in Johannesevangelium" Z.N.W., XLVII (1956) pp.161-9.

5) See above pp. 203-224.

6) See above p. 224.

7) See above pp. 96-8.

8) Jn 6:14 and 11:27. In both cases ὁ ἐρχόμενος serves to bring an eschatological note to the titles prophet (6:14) and Christ/Son of God (11:27), but also introduces an open element into which John can inject his own content.

9) See below pp. 290ff.

10) Schwanck, Das Johannesevangelium, II, p.92.

11) Schlatter, Der Evangelist, ad loc.

12) Lightfoot, John, p.164.

13) See above p. 191.

14) The term ἅγιος is used only for the persons of the trinity. See Morris, John, p.126.

15) See n.29 below.

16) Procksch, T.D.N.T., I, p.102.

17) Bultmann, John, pp.449f.

18) On dualism in John see the following :
L. Schottroff, Der glaubende und die feindliche Welt. Beobachtungen zum gnostischen Dualismus und seiner Bedeutung für Paulus und das Johannesevangelium:
O. Böcher, Der Johanneische Dualismus im Zusammenhang des nachbiblischen Judentums:
J.L. Price, "Light from Qumran on some aspects of Johannine Theology", John and Qumran, (Ed J. H. Charlesworth) pp.9-37: J.H.Charlesworth, "A Critical Comparison of the Dualism in IQS 3:13 -

4:26 and the 'Dualism' contained in the Gospel of John", John and Qumran, pp.76-106.

19) See Barrett, "Dialectical Theology" pp.49-69 and esp. pp.68f.

20) See Barrett, "Dialectical Theology" p.69, "And while the Gospel itself presents us with many other components of a dialectical theology - life and death, truth and error, light and darkness, flesh and spirit, sight and blindness, love and hate - it is in this tension (which incidentally points a way to a reconciliation between dialectical and kerygmatic) that Christian dialectical theology arises".

21) Jn 10:1-18. The image is more soteriological than pastoral. See Schnackenburg, John, II p.295.

22) Bultmann, John, p. 450.

23) Judas is mentioned in the following verses: 6:71; 12:4; 13:2;13:26, 29 and implied reference is found in 6:64; 13:11, 18 and 17:12.

24) J. Charlesworth, "Dualism" p.90.

25) IQM 1:13f and on the use of "lots" in Qumran see H. W. Kuhn, Enderwartung, pp.71-93.

26) See N. Cassem, "The use of κόσμος ", pp.84f. and H. Sasse, "κόσμος κτλ." in T.D.N.T.III, pp.871f.

27) Charlesworth, "Qumran, John and the Odes of Solomon" in John and Qumran, p.114.

28) R.E.Brown, "The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles" in The Scrolls and the New Testament, p.184.

29) A term used by Charlesworth, "Qumran, John and Odes", pp 115f. Barrett, "Paradox and Dualism" p 106 refers to John's dualism as "not absolute but qualified". He adds, "It is dualism in motion, in becoming".

30) W. S. la Sor, The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament, pp.78-81 and pp.196-201: See also Schottroff, Der glaubende, pp.228-45 and Böcher, Dualismus, pp.23-7.

31) See above pp.48f. and Bauernfeind, Die Worte, pp.96ff.

32) See Sawyer, Semantics, pp. 53ff on the OT idea of salvation.

33) Sawyer, p.55.

34) See Jn 1:4; 8:12-19; 12:44-50.

35) See Charlesworth "Qumran, John and the Odes of Solomon" p. 116 and also Price, "Light", p.22.

36) Schottroff, Der Glaubende, p.238.

37) Schottroff, p.236.

38) Bultmann, Gospel, pp.203-78 and 450.

39) A phrase used by Brown. Community and defined by him as the Johannine view of Christ incorporating his heavenly origin, pre-existence and as revealed in his "I am" claims (pp.43-47).

40) See below pp. 244ff.

41) So W.F. Moulton and A.S. Geden, A Concordance to the Greek New Testament. See Schnackenburg, John II pp352ff.

42) See above pp. 230-2.

43) Schottroff, Der Glaubende, p.238.

44) Schottroff, pp. 229-238.

45) Bultmann, Gospel p.451 and see below pp 289-95.

46) Price, "Light" p.21.

47) Charlesworth, "Qumran, John, Odes" p.115.

48) Charlesworth, "Dualism" p.93.

49) See the discussion in Morris, John, pp.152f. The stress is upon the action of the Spirit rather than upon the initiative of the believer.

50) See above pp. 196-200.

51) See above pp. 213-24.

52) As in the Synoptics (See Mk 6:7).

53) See A.R.C. Leaney, "The Johannine Paraclete and the Qumran Scrolls" in John and Qumran, by J.H. Charlesworth (ed), pp. 38-61.

54) See Charlesworth, "Dualism" p.94 and Price, "Light" p22.

55) Leaney, "The Johannine Paraclete" p.51.

56) Procksch, T.D.N.T., I p.102

57) Ibid.

58) See above pp. 72-6.

59) See our own discussion pp.40f. above and Brown, Community, pp. 62-71.

60) See above 49-51.

61) See Buchanan, "Samaritan Origin", pp.149-75.

62) So Schnackenburg, John, II p.218.

63) For the idea of Jesus on Trial, see Harvey, Jesus on Trial, and S. Pancaro, Law in the Fourth Gospel.

64) See Schnackenburg, John, II pp.223f and we note that the term γενέσθαι is omitted by D and other texts - which tends to soften the contrast.

65) Schnackenburg, p.305: This is true of most of the discourses.

66) Schnackenburg, p.213.

67) The comment may be understood in a number of different ways. Essentially what John is describing is the rejection of Jesus and his mission on the part of the Jewish leaders. There is a sense of anticipation as if the crucifixion of Jesus was already accomplished and the verdict of guilty already passed upon those responsible. The clash between Jesus and the Jews resembles in some ways the clash between Jesus and the devil in the Temptation scene (see below pp. 273f). Here in John the devil has been moved off stage to make way for his human agents. Yet we do well to bear in mind that John does not envisage a world divided into two opposing camps (as in Qumran and cf I Jn 3:10). There is a sense of hope for all men, if they believe. See Schnackenburg, John, II, pp. 212-7 and 259-74.

68) Schnackenburg, John, II pp. 214f and see his excursus, pp. 225-237, entitled "The Johannine concept of Truth".

69) See above p. 236.

70) See Brown, Community, who points out the differences between John and the Epistle in their use of dualism, pp. 133ff.

71) Charlesworth, "Dualism", p. 93.

72) Price, "Light", p. 21.

73) Ibid.

74) Cf Rev 19:11-16.

75) See the discussion below pp. 288f.

76) Jeremias, Theology, I pp. 86-92 and esp. p. 92.

77) Ibid.

78) On this question see our discussion above pp. 59f. and Cullmann, Christology, pp.284f.

79) So Cranfield, Mark, p.77, but see below pp. 290-2.

80) Van der Loos, Miracles, p.367.

81) L.S. (Interm) p.147.

82) L.S. (Interm) p.101.

83) Bauernfeind, Die Worte, pp.97-9. See also H. Braun, Qumran, I p.62 and above pp. 75f.

84) Bauernfeind, pp.96f.

85) We are not concerned here with the actual cries of the sick but with the representation of these cries as with the representation and interpretation of the demonic utterances.

86) Cf I Kings 17-18 and on the possibility of an Aramaic equivalent to this phrase see M. Black, An Aramaic approach to the Gospel and Acts, pp. 106f.

87) Borsch, Son of Man, pp.370f.

88) Barrett, Holy Spirit, p.50.

89) See the collected information about Michael in Collins "The Son of Man" pp.50-66.

90) See above pp. 110-3.

91) On Michael generally, see T.H. Gastor, "Michael" I.D.B. III pp.372-3: P.J. Budd " Μιχαήλ " in D.N.T.T. I, pp.104f: H.B. Kuhn, "The Angelology of the Non-canonical Jewish Apocalypses" J.B.L., LXVII (1948) pp.217-32: H. Schlier, The Relevance of the New Testament, pp.172-92: J. Daniélou, The Theology of Jewish Christianity, I, pp.117-72: and W. Grundmann, G. von Rad and G. Kittel, article " ἄγγελος κτλ. " in T.D.N.T., I, pp.74-87.

92) II Enoch 22:6; 33:10; he is in fact the angel of the Presence - Sib Or 2:15.

93) Jub 1:29 and 2:1, cf Dan 12:1.

94) Mid. Rab. Deuteronomy 10;11 (Pirke Rabbi Eliezer).

95) See Jude 9; Test of Abram 19; I Enoch 10;11ff and Ass Moses 10;1ff.

96) Collins, "The Son of Man", pp.50-66: and see below pp. 292-5.

97) J.M. Baumgarten, "The Heavenly Tribunal and the Personification of Sedeq in Jewish Apocalyptic" in Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt (Ed H. Temporini and W. Haase) pp 219f; By the same author, Studies in Qumran Law, pp. 145-71

98) Longenecker, Christology, pp.26ff.

99) See S. Giet, "Hermas et les Pasteurs", "Même si l'auteur attribuait à cet ange des fonctions que le christianisme réservera au Verbe, on ne saurait en inférer que notre auteur les lui reserve." p.228 n.2.

100) Justin, Dialogue, 61, pointed out by Talbert "Descending - Ascending", pp.430f.

101) Tertullian, De Carné Christi, 14:5, and see J. Barbel, Christos Angelos, p. 286.

102) On the Shepherd of Hermas, see especially Daniélou, Theology, pp.119-124. This is criticised by L. Pernveden, The Concept of the Church in the Shepherd of Hermas, pp.58-64 and S. Giet, Hermas, p.228.

103) Clementine Homilies 18:4 and Recognitions 2:42.

104) See Rev 12:7-9 and G.B.Caird, The Language and Imagery of the Bible, pp.55f.

105) But see below p. 296 for a further consideration.

106) See Heb. 1:4-14 and the contrast particularly in vs 5 and vss 7 and 8. Cf Col. 2:15, 18 and Rev. 22:8f.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER SEVEN

1) P. Borgen, Bread from Heaven and B. Gärtner, John 6 and the Jewish Passover, provide us with two of the more detailed studies. See also Borgen, "The Unity of the Discourse in John 6", Z.N.W.,L (1959), pp.277-78; idem, "Observations on the Midrashic Character of John 6", Z.N.W.,LIV (1963), pp.232-40; G. Bornkamm, "Die eucharistische Rede in Johannes-Evangelium", Z.N.W.,XLVII (1956), pp.161-9; A. Feuillet, Johannine Studies, pp.53-128; J. Jeremias, "Joh.6:51c - 58 redaktionell?" Z.N.W., XLIV (1952-3) pp.256-7; E.D. Johnston, "The Johannine Version of the Feeding of the Five Thousand - an Independent Tradition?" N.T.S.VIII (1961/2) pp.151-4; E.J. Kilmartin, "Liturgical Influence on John 6", C.B.Q., XXII (1960) pp.183-91; X. Léon-Dufour, "Le mystere du pain de vie (Jean VI)", R.S.R., XLVI (1958) pp.481-523; Macgregor G.H.C., "The Eucharist in the Fourth Gospel", N.T.S. IX (1962/3) pp.111-9; Mees M., "Sinn und Bedeutung westlicher Textvarianten in Joh.6", B.Z. n.s. XIII (1969) pp.244-51; U. Wilckens, "Der eucharistische Abschnitt der johanneischen Rede vom Lebensbrot (Joh 6, 51c-58)", in Neues Testament und Kirche, (F/s R. Schnackenburg), pp.220-48; G. Ziener, "Johannesevangelium und urchristliche Passafeier", B.Z., II (1958), pp.263-74.

2) P. Borgen, "Observations on the Midrashic Character of John 6", Z.N.W., LIV (1963), pp.232-40; R.E.Brown, John I - XII, pp.231-304 and Schnackenburg John,II, pp.10-78.

3) Barrett, "Dialectical Theology" in his New Testament Essays, pp.49-69. See also his essays "The Flesh of the Son of Man" and "Sacraments" in his Essays on John, pp.37-49 and pp.80-97 respectively.

3a) E. Ruckstuhl, Die literarische Einheit des Johannes-evangeliums, pp.220-72. See also D.M. Smith, The Composition and Order of the Fourth Gospel, pp.139-53. E. Schweizer, "Das Johanneische Zeugnis vom Herrenmahl" Ev.Th, VIII (1952/3) argues that 6:51-9 contains both Johannine and unjohannine features. (pp.341-63).

4) W. Nicol, The Semeia in the Fourth Gospel, pp. 25f. His correlations between the style of the Evangelist and the various sections of Jn 6 are as follows : 6:1-15 is 1.1 (S and J); 16-21 is 0.7 (S); 22-25 is 0.75(S); 26-59 is 2.4 (J.D.) and 60-71 is 1.3 (J.N.). S = Signs Source; J = Johannine redaction; J.D. = Johannine Discourse and J.N. = Johannine Narrative.

5) Bultmann, John, pp. 234-237.

6) Bultmann, John, p. 235 n.4.

7) Barrett, "Dialectical Theology", p.65

8) Barrett, Op.cit., p.52 and pp.66f.

9) Barrett, "Sacraments", p.90f.

10) Barrett, Op.cit., p.67. Ignatius, Ephesians 20 speaks of φάρμακον ἀθανασίας and the ἀντίδοτος τοῦ μὴ ἀποθανεῖν. See also Barrett "Sacraments" pp.84f.

11) Barrett, "Sacraments" p.90f. See also D.M. Smith, The Composition and Order of the Fourth Gospel, pp.140-9.

12) E. Ruckstuhl, Die literarische Einheit pp.220-67;
U. Wilckens, "Der eucharistische Abschnitt" pp.220-48;
J. Jeremias, "Joh.6,51c-58 redaktionell?";
P. Borgen, "The Unity of the Discourse" pp.277f;
B. Gärtner, John 6 and the Jewish Passover.
For a discussion of the scholarly debate, see R. Kysar, The Fourth Gospel, pp.249-59 who follows R. Bultmann, G. Bornkamm and E. Lohse in his conclusion that "the feeding miracle has no intentional eucharistic overtones, and that verses 51c-59 are more than likely a later addition. The latter persuasion grows out of the mounting evidence that the gospel underwent a number of additions in the final stages of its composition in order to include an anti-docetic theme" (p.255). See also H. Klos, Die Sakramente im Johannesevangelium pp.66-9,73 for a detailed examination of mid-twentieth century opinion. He finds five distinctive categories of opinion ranging from the idea that the evangelist was antisacramental to the belief that he was intentionally underlining the importance of the sacraments.

13) Brown, John I - XII, p.286.

14) Brown, loc.cit. He writes, "There is evidence that these verses contain genuine traditional material (e.g., eucharistic formula) and that they represent true Johannine thought and not a correction of it".

15) J. Schneider, "Zur Frage der Komposition von Joh.6, 27-58 - Die Himmelsbrotrede", I.M.E.L. (1959), pp. 132-42.

16) Brown, John I - XII, pp.266, 269, 272-274. See also the works quoted by Brown, Op.cit., p.272.

17) Barrett, "Sacraments" pp.89f.

18) Contrary to Brown, Op.cit., p.272, who writes, "Our view, which is also that of Feuillet, sees the two themes in the first part of the discourse (35-50) which refers primarily to revelation but secondarily to the Eucharist; the second part (51-58) refers only to the Eucharist".

19) Cf. Proverbs 8:22-34 and Wisdom 722-727. On Wisdom motifs in John, see Brown op.cit. pp.CXXII-CXXVIII.

20) Borgen, Bread from Heaven, pp.147-177 esp. 148-158.

21) See above p. 137.

22) The origin of the messianic feast lies in passages like Is 25:6f; I Enoch 62:14; II Bar 29. On the eschatological significance of the Last Supper see I. H. Marshall, Last Supper and Lord's Supper, pp.79-80 and references cited there.

23) Barrett, John, p. 274

24) J. McHugh, "Num solus panis triticeus sit materia valida SS Eucharistiae", V.D.,XXXIX (1961) pp.229-39. On this Schnackenburg, Gospel,II p.445 n.58 argues that this usage, to his knowledge, is nowhere attested directly for the early Church.

25) See Didache 9:4. Other symbolic ideas include the unity of the Church, based on the passage from the Didache in which the Church is gathered into the kingdom: Some scholars point to the Jewish tradition concerning food and wastage - Str.B., IV pp.626f. Dodd, Historical Tradition, p.207 refers it to the abiding bread which Jesus brings and which "abides" and is not "lost". As in Didache 9 :4, where the verb συναχθήτω is used for the gathering up of the remnants of the eucharistic bread. See Barrett, John, p.277 and for another point of view Dodd, Historical Tradition, p. 207, who refers it to the abiding bread which Jesus brings and which "abides" and is not "lost"

26) See above p. 95 and Barrett, John, p. 277.

27) Cf. Mark and Luke's division of the people into hundreds and fifties (Mark 6:40 and Luke 9:14), which probably relates to Deut 1:15; Num 31:14 and see also the Qumran' divisions in I.Q.M. 4.

28) As pointed out by Morris, p.350 and in distinction from Bernard, Gospel, ad loc, who understands that due to the uncertain light, the disciples misunderstood Jesus to be walking on the water - in fact they were closer to the shore than they realized, hence the remainder of the miracle (vs 21).

29) Morris, p.350: "Ἐγώ εἰμι is often a style of deity, especially in the Greek Old Testament... But here it is primarily a means of self-identification".

30) Dodd, Interpretation, p. 345.

31) Schnackenburg, John, II p. 27.

32) Schnackenburg, pp. 29f.

33) As argued by A. Guilding, The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship pp. 62ff and see also Gärtner, Passover, pp. 15f.

34) Schnackenburg, p.27.

35) So Borgen, Bread from Heaven, p.147, who lists other authors who support a connection between Philo, John, and early Merkabah mysticism.

36) Tanhuma Shemoth 25 (Hebrew text and Greek translation in A. Schlatter, Der Evangelist Johannes, p.173).

37) As pointed out by Borgen, "Observations on the Midrashic Character". It is doubtful that John followed the midrashic style as closely as Borgen maintains, since the initial quotation in V 31 comes not from the Pentateuch but from either Psalm 78:24 or Nehemiah 9:15. See the caution voiced by Barrett, John, pp.284f and the comments of Martyn, Theology, pp.108-119. The view that John 6 follows the Jewish lectionary put forward by A. Guilding, The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship, pp. 62ff, has been criticized by a number of scholars including L. Morris, The New Testament and Jewish Lectionaries.

38) Exod 16:4,15 but it is closer verbally to Neh 9:15 and Psalm 78:24.

39) Meeks, "The Man from Heaven" pp.58-61 and Talbert, "The Myth of a descending-ascending Redeemer" pp. 438-40.

40) See Barrett, John, p.287.

41) See Morris, Gospel, "Additional note on 'believing'" pp.335-7.

42) Dodd, Interpretation, p.183.

43) Morris, p.335, "It is usually held that the use of the noun in some pre-Gnostic systems of the day gave it unhealthy associations and rendered the word suspect with John".

44) So Barrett, John, p.290.

45) On the motif of misunderstanding in John 6 see H. Leroy, Rätsel und Missverständnis. Ein Beitrag zur Formgeschichte des Johannesevangeliums, pp. 103-124.

46) Sir 15:3 and 24:19-21. Prov 9:5.

47) Brown, John I - XII, p.269 and pp.272-4.

48) Barrett, John, p.292.

49) See C.K. Barrett, "'The Father is greater than I' (Jn 14,28): Subordinationist Christology in the New Testament" in Neues Testament und Kirche (F/s R. Schnackenburg) pp.144-159. Barrett draws the attention of the reader to the paradox of Jesus' relationship with the Father, a result of John's

simplification of the mystery so that he presents Jesus "in a somewhat inhuman humanity, and as both claiming and denying quality with the Father". Cf. Wis. 7:15, "For even wisdom is under God's direction."

50) So Barrett, John, pp. 67-70 and pp. 283, 294. Pace Bultmann, John, p.219, who believes that the phrase κἀγὼ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ in vss. 39, 40 and 44 is the work of an ecclesiastical editor. On the eschatology of the Fourth Gospel generally see Schnackenburg, John, II pp.426-43 and the bibliography on p. 532 n.1.

51) Barrett, "Dialectical theology" pp.52f. Compare Jn 6:29, 35, 40 and 63 with 6:47, 50f. and 58 for the same contrast between "present" or "realized" eschatology and the hope of a resurrection on the last day.

52) The questions remind us of Mk 6:2-6 where the teaching of Jesus provokes a similar response from his hearers in the synagogue. The lack of faith prevents Jesus from mighty works (vs 5) and Jesus marvels at their unbelief. In Mark as in John one is conscious that the historical milieu of the church has intruded upon the interpretation of Jesus' relationship with his Jewish audience. In both cases there is an implicit indictment upon the Jews for their unbelief.

52a) Sir 24:2 and Enoch 42:2. In the former reference Wisdom is described as addressing the Assembly of the Most High in praise of herself.

53) Aimed probably against Moses (See Jn 1:18 cf Exod.33:23 and Deut 34:10) and possibly against the visionary experiences of the prophets and apocalypticists. But the stress of the passage is positive and points to Jesus as the Mediator who comes from the very presence of God (cf Wis 7:26-28 and Sir 24:10).

54) Brown, John I-XII, p. 294 divides the discourses between vss. 50 and 51. Barrett, John, p. 284 understands the break after vs 51 and Bultmann, John, p. 234 between 51a and b. See above pp. 263-4.

55) See Bultmann, John, p.219f and p.235 who understands the flesh and blood in vs 54 as φάρμακον ἀθανασίας. Barrett, "Sacraments", pp. 84-6 points out that even after the believer has partaken of the flesh and blood, he must still be raised up by the Son on the last day.

56) C. Colpe, "ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου" in T.D.N.T., VIII pp.464-70 connects this title with the heavenly "Man" tradition. He writes, "What Jesus says about Himself as Son of Man showed the Evangelist that the Man had now come down or had been sent down and had become the Redeemer, and that in a different way as compared with earlier views the Logos, Nous or Anthropos could dwell here below

among men" (p.470). On the ascent-descent motif and its connection with divine figures see Talbert, "The Myth of a descending-ascending Redeemer" pp. 410-440. See further, the discussion F.H. Borsch, The Son of Man in Myth and History, pp.257-313 and Schnackenburg, John,I pp. 529-557. Schnackenburg concludes, "But in Johannine Christology, the most diverse impulses and aspects are merged into a consistent composition: along with the notion of the 'Son of Man' there is also that of the 'Son' who is sent by the Father and returns to him, and that of the Logos of the Wisdom type who was with God and pitched his tent among men. The evangelist may and must be credited with the final amalgamation of the various elements." (p.557).

57) The docetic element has been highlighted by E.Schweizer, "Das johanneische Zeugnis vom Herrenmahl", Ev.Th., XII (1952/3), pp. 341-63; Borgen, Bread from Heaven, passim and Brown, John I - XII, p. 291. Cf. I Jn 4:2 which reads, "Every spirit that acknowledges that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is of God".

58) So Barrett, John, p.299. But Brown, John I - XII, disagrees and suggests instead that John's use of τεώγω "is part of John's attempt to emphasize the realism of the eucharistic flesh and blood"(p.283).

59) Brown, Op cit, pp.287-9.

60) Brown, p.290.

61) Ibid.

62) C.K. Barrett, "'The Flesh of the Son of Man' John 6:53" in Essays on John, pp.37-49.

63) Barrett, "The Flesh" pp. 44ff.

64) Barrett, Op cit, pp. 45-48.

64a) See above p. 274 and Schnackenburg, John,I pp.556f.

65) J. Painter, "The Farewell Discourses and the History of Johannine Christianity", N.T.S., 27 (1981) pp. 525-43.

66) Bornkamm, "Die eucharistische Rede" pp. 161-9.

67) G. Stahlin, " σκάνδαλον κτλ." in T.D.N.T., VII pp. 356-7.

68) Barrett, John, p.301, suggests that Jn 6:60-71 seems to rest upon a number of Synoptic passages like Mk 6:1-6, Mk 8:29 and Mk 14:18. However John's tradition may have been independent of the Synoptics, in which case the parallels arise from a connection between a John tradition like that of the Synoptics, which has been interpreted by both John and the Synoptics in different ways.

69) Barrett, John, pp.297f. See also Marshall, Last Supper and Lord's Supper, p.134. J. Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, pp.107, suggests that Jn 6:51c-8 is an independent version of Jesus' word of interpretation over the bread.

70) Bultmann, John, p. 237.

71) Bultmann, John, p.445 suggests, "Then the offence will be great".

72) See above pp.274,281. For John's use of Dan 7:13 see P. Borgen, "Some Jewish exegetical traditions as background for Son of Man sayings in John's Gospel (Jn 3:13-14 and context) in L'évangile de Jean, ed. M. de Jonge, pp.243-258; C.F.D. Moule, "Neglected features in the Problem of the 'Son of Man'" in Neues Testament und Kirche, (F/s for R.Schnackenburg) pp.413-428 and particularly his diagram on p.415. It remains an open question whether John also incorporated a tradition like the Son of Man of the Synoptic Gospels into his Gospel.

73) The reason for this difficulty is the phrase "ἡ σὰρξ οὐκ ὠφελεῖ οὐδέν" which apparently contradicts the teaching on the flesh of the Son of Man (vss 53-54) in which those who eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον. If the contradiction is a real one then there would be good reason for supposing 51c-8 to be the work of someone other than the Evangelist.

74) So Wilckens, "Der eucharistische Abschnitt",pp.220-48; Bornkamm, "Die eucharistische Rede", pp. 161-9; Bultmann, John,pp.235-7 (Note his qualification on p.472) and Brown, John I - XII pp. 285-287. Brown writes, "The form in 51-58 represents a more radical rethinking of the discourse in which the eucharistic theme has become primary. It was added to 35-50 at a fairly late stage on the editing of the Fourth Gospel, probably in the final redaction" (p.287). In view of Brown's comments on the style and language of these verses (pp.285f) at its provenance within the Johannine tradition (p.286), one wonders why he does not attempt to interpret the discourse as a unity. Schnackenburg, John II, writes, "The clear links which connect the eucharistic section with the metaphor are a very skilful piece of work if they stem from editors, but easier to account for if the whole section is the work of one author". (p.65).

75) Vs.63 with its contrast between "flesh" and "spirit" has been interpreted in several different ways. That "the flesh avails nothing" has been understood as a corrective to the sacramental passage (51c-58), lest the symbols of the eucharist be seen as life-giving in their own right (see above pp.279f.). R. Schnackenburg, John II, suggests that "flesh" and

"spirit" correspond to Jesus' earthly and heavenly roles - a Christological interpretation (pp.72f). He writes, "it is not the flesh and blood of the earthly Jesus, but that of the heavenly Son of Man, who, filled with the Spirit, possesses a new mode of existence." (p.72). G. Bornkamm, "Die eucharistische Rede", understands "flesh" in terms of the human condition of mankind. Man is called to faith but he can only respond through his reception of God's Spirit (pp.167f). Brown, John I - XII, pp.299-300 follows Bornkamm. Barrett, John, p.304 combines a Christological interpretation (Jesus, the bearer of the Holy Spirit) with an anthropological interpretation. ("There is no revelation apart from the Spirit and the Word, and no reception of revelation apart from the initiative of God himself (6:44)")

76) Barrett, "The Flesh of the Son of Man" pp. 42-4.

77) Schnackenburg, John II, p.72. See n.75 above.

78) Some writers hold that John was critical of the Sacraments themselves - so Bultman, John, p.237. Others like Martyn, Theology, p.138, understand John as qualifying the role of the eucharist vis-à-vis the problem caused by the separation of Jesus from his disciples. See also the general discussion in Kysar, The Fourth Evangelist and his Gospel, pp.249-59, on the sacraments in John.

79) As pointed out by J.C. Rylaarsdam, Revelation in Jewish Wisdom Literature pp. 100f.: cf Job 32:8 and Wis. 1:7; 9:17 and 11:20.

80) So Dodd, Interpretation, p. 342.

81) Peter responds to Jesus in vs 68 with the two verbs πεπιστεύκαμεν and ἐγνώκαμεν, but we are not to understand the latter as implying the rational over against the realm of belief. In John, "the verb πιστεύειν is used almost synonymously with γινώσκειν ....and knowledge itself implies relationship in addition to cognition: to know God is to be united with him..." (Barrett, John, p.82). W. Grundmann, "Verständnis und Bewegung des Glaubens im Johannes-Evangelium", in Kerygma und Dogma, VI (1960) pp. 131-54 discusses the whole subject at length and concludes, "Die Erkenntnis des Glaubens besteht nicht in der Übernahme dogmatischer Formulierungen, so gewiss sie sich in dogmatischen Formulierungen ausspricht, die, wie an Nathanael und Thomas und auch an Petrus deutlich wird, anbetendes Bekenntnis sind. Die Erkenntnis wächst in der Begegnung mit Jesus unter seinem Wort." (p.146).

82) Bultmann, John, p.449f.

83) See C.M. Connick, "The Dramatic Character of the Fourth Gospel", J.B.L., LXVII (1948) pp.159-69 and my forthcoming article, "The Johannine Drama" in the March issue of J.T.S.A. (1983).

84) So Cranfield, Mark, p.77; Marshall, Luke, p.193; Joubert, "The Holy One of God", pp.57-69; R. McL. Wilson, "Mark" in Peake's Commentary, p.801; G.A. Buttrick, "The Gospel according to St. Mark" in the Interpreter's Bible, VII, p.661; W. Manson, The Gospel of Luke, p.46; A.R.C.Leaney, The Gospel according to St. Luke, p. 120; and A. Plummer, The Gospel according to St. Luke, p.139.

85) Harvey, Jesus on Trial, pp. 37-45; Cullmann, Christology, pp.284-6; Cranfield, Mark, p.77.

86) Cranfield, loc cit.

87) Cullmann, p. 284.

88) See above pp. 255-62.

89) Schnackenburg, John, II, p.77. He refers to Asting, Heiligkeit, pp. 307 and 312.

90) Bultmann, John, p.449.

91) Morris, John, p.390.

92) Brown in D.N.T.T., II p. 231.

93) Böhner, Der Gesandte und sein Weg, passim, but see esp. pp. 231-5 and p.414. He believes that John combines elements of the "Apokalyptischer Prophet", the "Anabatiker vom Himmel" and "eine himmlische Boten - bzw. גלאך - Figur."

94) On the connection between Melchizedek, Daniel and the Son of Man see D. Flusser, "Melchizedek and the Son of Man" in Christian News from Israel, V (1966), pp. 22-9. This is clearly an area for further research, but one which requires more time and space than at our disposal.

95) Jn 9:35-9, reading τοῦ ἀνθρώπου with P^{75} B ℵ*. We note that the man does not use the title itself.

96) See J. Blank, Krisis, Untersuchungen zur johanneischen Christologie und Eschatologie stresses the double function of the Son of Man to bring life and judgement (p.160), and the dual aspect of the Son of Man (p.164) as "menschgewordene Christus" and "eschatologischer Lebenspender und Heilbringer". The term "Holy One" is able to contain all these ideas. And since the process of κρίσις marks Jesus' entrance 10:36 and exit 17:19 from this world, the holy one encompasses the whole of Jesus' existence and particularly his own resurrection.

97) Perhaps deliberately so, see I.H. Marshall, The Origins of New Testament Christology. pp. 77f.

98) F.J. Moloney, The Johannine Son of Man, esp. pp. 209-220.

99) See our discussion on this form of Peter's confession above pp. 260f., where we point out the importance of Is 9:6 (LXX) in this connection.

A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF CITED WORKS

Reference Works

Allegro, J.M., "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature", J.B.L. 75 (1956), pp.174-87.

_____, "Fragments of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological Midrashim", J.B.L.77 (1958), pp. 350-54.

Allegro, J.M. and Anderson, A. (Eds), Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan. Qumran Cave IV. Vol.5, Oxford, 1968.

Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, The (2 Vols) Ed. by R.H. Charles. Oxford, 1913.

Barthelemy D. (Ed.) and J.T. Milik, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert. Qumran Cave I. Vol.I. Oxford,1955.

Blass, F., and Debrunner A., A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Trans. and Rev. by R.W. Funk. Chicago, 1961.

Braun, H., Qumran und das Neue Testament Ein Bericht über 10 Jahre Forschung (1950-9). (Theologisch Rundschau XXX), 2 Vols. Tübingen, (1966).

Brown, F., Driver, S.R., and Briggs, C.A. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: 1907.

Charles, E.H., The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Oxford, 1908.

Greek New Testament, The Ed. by K. Aland, M. Black, C.M. Martini, B.M. Metzger and A Wikgren. Third Ed., London, 1975.

Holy Bible : New International Version, The (2nd Ed.) Cape Town, 1981.

Holy Bible. Revised Standard Version, The London, 1973.

Jerusalem Bible, The (Reader's Edition). London, 1968.

Jonge, M. de (Ed.), Testamenta XII Patriarcharum. Leiden, 1964.

_____, Studies in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Leiden, 1975.

Kittel, R. Biblia Hebraica, (7th ed. rev. by P. Kahle, A. Alt and O. Eissfeldt), Stuttgart, 1962.

Kuhn, K.G., Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten, 1960 Göttingen.

_____. Nachträge zur Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten R.Q. 4 (1963) pp. 163-234.

Liddell, H.G. and Scott R., A Greek-English Lexicon. (Intermediate Volume). Founded upon the 7th Ed. Oxford, 1968.

Lightfoot, J.B., The Apostolic Fathers. London, 1891.

Löhse, E., Die Texte aux Qumran. 2nd Ed., Munich, 1971.

Malatesta, E., St. John's Gospel, (1920-65) A cumulative and Classified Bibliography of Books and Periodical Literature on the Fourth Gospel. (Analecta biblica 32). Rome, 1967.

Martin V., Bodmer Papyrus II (P66) Évangile de Jean Chaps 1-14. New Ed. with photographic reproduction. Geneva, 1962.

_____ and Kasser R., Papyrus Bodmer XV (P75) Évangile de Jean chap 1-15. Geneva, 1961.

Metzger, B.M., The Text of the New Testament. New York, 1971.

_____, Index to the Periodical Literature on Christ and the Gospels. (New Testament Tools and Studies) Leiden, 1966.

Milik, J.T., (Ed.) The Books of Enoch. Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4. Oxford, 1976.

Moule, C.F.D., An Idiom book of New Testament Greek. Cambridge, 1968.

Moulton, J.H. and G. Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament, Illustrated from the Papyri and other non-literary sources. London, 1914-29.

Nag Hammadi Library in English, The Trans. by members of the Coptic Gnostic Library Project of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity. J.M. Robinson, Director. San Francisco, 1977.

Nestle, Eberhard, Novum Testamentum Graece cum apparatie critico curavit. (25th Edition by Erwin Nestle and K. Aland). Stuttgart, 1963.

New English Bible, New Testament, The Oxford, 1961.

New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology, The Brown, C. (Ed.) (Translated from Theologisches Begriffslexicon zum Neuentestament (1971)). Exeter, 1976.

Rienecker, F., Lexicon zur Bibel, 4th Ed. Wuppertal, 1960.

Robertson, A.T., A Grammar on the Greek New Testament, Nashville, 1923.

Septuaginta. Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes. ed. A. Rahlfs - 7th ed. 2 Vols. Stuttgart, 1962.

Strack, H. and Billerbeck, P. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. Vols. 1-6, Munchen, 1922-61.

Soden, H. von, Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt (Vols. 1-4). Göttingen, 1913.

Souter, A., Novum Testamentum Graece. Editio altera. Oxford, 1947.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament (Vols. 1-9). Ed. by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Trans. by G.W. Bromily from Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. London, 1964-74.

Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament (Vols. 1-4) edited by G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. Trans. by J.T. Willis and D.E.Green from Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament, 1974-1980 (Still in progress). Michigan.

Thyen, H., "Aus der Literatur zum Johannesevangelium", Th. R. 39 (1974/5) pp. 53-69 and pp. 222-52.

Tischendorf, L.F.C. von, Novum Testamentum Graece. (Vol.1-2), 8th Ed., Leipzig, 1869-1872.

Vermes, G., The Dead Sea Scrolls in English. 2nd Ed. New York, 1975.

Weiss, B., Das Neue Testament 2nd Ed. (Vol 1-3) Leipzig, 1894-1900. Second smaller edition (Vol.1-3) 1902-5.

Westcott, B.F and Hort, F.J.A., The New Testament in the Original Greek. (Vol. 1-2). Cambridge and London. 1881-96.

Commentaries on the Fourth Gospel

Barrett, C.K., The Gospel according to St. John. 2nd Edition. London, 1978.

Bauer, W., Das Johannesevangelium. (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 6) 3rd ed. Tübingen, 1933.

Bernard, J.H., A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John. (International Critical Commentary) 2 Vols. Ed. by A.H. McNeile. Edinburgh, 1928.

Brown, R.E., The Gospel according to John. Vol. 1, I - XII, Vol. 2, XIII - XXI. (The Anchor Bible). New York, 1966-70.

Bultmann, R., The Gospel of John. A Commentary. (Trans. by G.R. Beasley-Murray from Das Evangelium des Johannes), Oxford, 1971.

Hoskyns, E.C., The Fourth Gospel (2 Vols.) London, 1939.

Howard, W.F., "The Gospel according to St. John": The Interpreter's Bible. Vol. 8. New York, 1952.

Lightfoot, R.H., St. John's Gospel. A Commentary. (Rev. Ed. by C.F. Evans). Oxford, 1956.

Lindars, B., The Gospel of John. (New Century Bible). London, 1972.

MacGregor, G.H.C., The Gospel of John. (Moffat New Testament Commentary). London, 1928.

Morris, L., The Gospel according to John. (New London Commentary of the New Testament). London, 1972.

Odeberg, H., The Fourth Gospel interpreted in its Relation to contemporaneous religions current in Palestine and the Hellenistic-Oriental World. Uppsala, 1929. Reprinted Chicago, 1968.

Sanders, J.N. A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John. (A. and C. Black series). Ed. and completed by B.A. Mastin, London, 1968.

Schlatter, A., Das Evangelium nach Johannes, (Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament 3), Stuttgart, 1970.

Schnackenburg, R., The Gospel according to St. John. Vol I and II, up to Jn 12. (Trans. by C.Hastings, F. McDonagh, D. Smith and R. Foley). New York, 1968-80.

_____, Das Johannesevangelium, Vols. I - III. Freiburg, 1967-75.

Schulz, S., Das Evangelium nach Johannes. Göttingen, 1978.

Schwank, B., Das Johannesevangelium, 2 Vols. (Chs.1-12) Düsseldorf, 1966-68.

Strathmann, H., Das Evangelium nach Johannes übersetzt und erklärt. 6th Ed., Göttingen, 1951.

Temple, W., Readings in St. John's Gospel. First and Second Series), London, 1947.

Books and Articles on the Fourth Gospel

Albright W. and Mann C.S., Matthew. (The Anchor Bible), New York, 1971.

Appold, M.L., The Oneness Motif in the Fourth Gospel. Motif Analysis and exegetical Probe into the Theology of John. (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament), Tübingen, 1976.

Asting, R., Die Heiligkeit im Urchristentum.(Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments. New Series Vol. 29). Göttingen, 1930.

Aune, D., "A note on Jesus! Messianic Consciousness and 11Q Melchisedek". E.Q. 45, (1973), p.161-5.

Baley, J.A., The Traditions Common to the Gospels of Luke and John. (Supplement to Novum Testament 7) Leiden, 1963.

Bammel, E. "ἈΡΧΙΕΡΕΥΣ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΕΥΩΝ" Th. L.Z. LXXIX (1954) pp.351-6.

_____, The Trial of Jesus. (Cambridge Studies in honour of C.F.D. Moule), London, 1970.

_____, Barrett, C.K. and Davies W.D.(Eds.) Donum Gentilicium. (NT. Studies in honour of D. Daube). Oxford, 1978.

Barbel, J., Christos Angelos. Die Anschauung von Christus als Bote und Engel in der Gelehrten und volkstümlichen Literatur des christlichen Altertums, Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Ursprungs und der Fortdauer des Arianismus.(Theoph.; Vol.3). Bonn, 1941. Rev. and Reprinted Bonn, 1964.

Barr, J., The Semantics of Biblical Language. 1961, London.

Barrett, C.K., The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition. London, 1954.

_____, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. London, 1957.

_____, "The Dialectical Theology of St. John" pp.49-69, in his New Testament Essays . London, 1972.

_____, Jesus and the Gospel Tradition. London, 1967.

_____, "'The Father is greater than I' (Jn 14:28): Subordinationist Christology in the New Testament", in Neues Testament und Kirche.(F/s for R.Schnackenburg) Ed. by J. Gnilka, Freiburg, 1974. pp. 144-159.

_____, The Gospel of John and Judaism. E.T. of German Das Johannesevangelium und das Judentum London, 1975.

_____, "Das Fleisch des Menschensohnes (Joh.6,53)" in Jesus und der Menschensohn.(F/s for A. Vögtle). Ed. by R. Pesch and R. Schnackenburg Freiburg, 1975, pp.342-54. Reprinted in idem, Essays on John pp.19-36.

_____, "Sacraments" in idem, Essays on John. London,1982. pp. 80-97.

Bauernfeind, O., Die Worke der Dämonen im Markus-evangelium. (Beitrage zur Wissenschaft vom alten und Neuen Testament, 3), Stuttgart,1927.

Baumgarten, J.M., Studies in Qumran Law. (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 24), Leiden, 1977.

_____, "The Heavenly Tribunal and the Personification of Sedeq in Jewish Apocalyptic" in Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. 2:19:1 Principat, Gen. Ed.H. Temporini and W. Haase, Berlin,1979.

Beasley-Murray, G.R., "The Two Messiahs in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs". J.T.S. 48 (1947), pp.1-12.

Becker, J., "Wunder und Christologie: zum literarkritischen und christologischen Problem der Wunder im Johannesevangelium". N.T.S. 16 (1970), pp.130-48.

Bentzen, A., King and Messiah. Tübingen, 1955.

Berger, K., "Zum traditionsgeschichtlichen Huntergrund Christologischer Hoheitstitel". N.T.S. 17 (1970/1) pp.391-425.

_____, "Die Königlichen Messiastraditionen des Neuen Testaments". N.T.S. 20, (1973/4) pp.1-44.

_____, Zum Problem der Messianität Jesu, Z.Th.K. 71, (1974) pp. 1-30.

_____, Die Auferstehung des Propheten und die Erhöhung des Menschensohnes.1976, Göttingen.

Berman, D., "Hassidim in Rabbinic Tradition", Society of Biblical Literature, 1979 Seminar Papers. Ed. P.J. Achtemeier, Vol. II. Missoula, pp. 15-33.

Betz, H.D., "Jesus as Divine Man" in Jesus and the Historian (written in honour of E.C.Colwell). Ed. by F. T. Trotter, Philadelphia,1968. pp. 114-133.

Betz, O., Der Paraklet, Fürsprecher im häretischen Spätjudentum, im Johannesevangelium und in neu gefundenen gnostischen Schriften. Leiden,1963.

____, "The Eschatological Interpretation of the Sinai-Tradition in Qumran and in the New Testament. R.Q.6 (1967) pp. 89-107.

____, "The concept of the so-called "Divine Man" in Mark's Christology", Studies in NT and Early Christian Literature. (Essays in Honour of A.P. Wikgren) (Suppl. New Testament 33) Ed. by D.E.Aune, Leiden, 1972. pp. 229-40.

Bieler, L., ΘΕΙΟΣ ΑΝΗΡ. Das Bild des "Göttlichen Menschen" in Spatantika und Frühchristentum. (2 Vols.) Vienna,1935. (Reprinted Darmstadt,1967).

Bieneck, J., Sohn Gottes als Christusbezeichnung der Synoptiker. Zurich, 1951.

Black, M., The Scrolls and Christian Origins, London.1961.

____, An Aramaic approach to the Gospels and Acts. 3rd Ed. Oxford, 1967.

____, "Die Apotheose Israels : eine neue Interpretation des danielischen Menschensohns", pp. 92-99, in Jesus und der Menschensohn.(F/s for A. Vögtle) Ed. R. Pesch and R. Schnackenburg. Freiburg,1975.

____, "The Throne Theophany Prophetic Commission" in Jews, Greeks and Christians. (Essays in honour of W.D. Davies), Ed. R. Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs. Leiden, E.J. Brill 1976. pp.57-73.

____, "Jesus and the Son of Man", J.S.N.T. I (1978) pp. 4-18.

Blank, J., Krisis. Untersuchungen zur johanneischen Christologie und Eschatologie. Freiburg, 1964.

Blunt, A.W.F., The Gospel according to St. Mark. (The Clarendon Bible). Oxford, 1929.

Böcher, Otto, Der johanneische Dualismus im Zusammenhang des nachbiblischen Judentums. Göttingen, 1965.

Boer, P.A.H. de., "The Son of God in the Old Testament" . O.T.S. 18 (1973) pp. 188-207.

Boismard, M.E., "Jesus, Le Prophète par excellence d'après Jean 10;24-39." in Neues Testament und Kirche. (F/s for R. Schnackenburg. Ed by J. Gnilka, Freiburg, 1974. pp. 160-171.

____, and Lamouille A., L'Évangile de Jean, Paris, 1977.

Bonnard, P. "Holy", Vocabulary of the Bible, (E.T. of Vocabulaire Biblique 1954) ed. J.J. von Allmen, London, 1958. pp. 165-8 .

Boobyer, G.H., "The Secrecy Motif in St. Mark's Gospel" N.T.S. 6 (1959/60) pp. 225-35.

Borgen, P.,"The Unity of the Discourse in Jn 6". Z.N.W. 50 (1959), pp. 227-8.

_____, "Observations in the Midrashic character of John 6". Z.N.W.54 (1963), pp. 232-40.

_____, Bread from Heaven. An exegetical study of the concept of Manna in the Gospel of John and the writings of Philo. (Suppl. Nov. Test.) 10 Leiden, 1965.

_____, "God's Agent in the Fourth Gospel" in Religions in Antiquity. (Essays in memory of E.R. Goodenough) Ed. J. Neusner, Leiden,1968, pp.137-48.

Bornkamm, G., "Die eucharistische Rede im Johannesevangelium". Z.N.W., 47 (1956), pp. 161-9.

_____, Barth, G and Held, H.J., Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew (New Testament Library) (E.T. of Überlieferung und Auslegung in Matthäusevangelium.Trns.by P. Scott). Philadelphia, 1963.

Borsch, F.H., Son of Man in Myth and History. (New Testament Library) London, 1967.

_____, The Christian and the Gnostic Son of Man. (Studies in Biblical Theology. Second Series), London, 1970.

Bowker, J., "The Son of Man", J.T.S.(ns) 28 (1977) pp.19-47.

Bowman, J., "Prophets and Prophecy in the Talmud and Midrash" in E.Q. 22 (1950), pp. 107-14.

Branscomb, B.H., The Gospel of Mark (Moffat). London,1937.

Braun, F.M., Jean le Théologien (3 Vols) Paris, 1959-66.

Bray, G.L., Holiness and the Will of God. Perspectives on the Theology of Tertullian. (New Foundations Theological Library). Exeter, 1980.

Brekelmann, C.H.W., De herem in het Oude Testament. Nijmegen, 1959.

Brekelmans, H., "The Saints of the Most High and their Kingdom", O.T.S, 14, 1965, pp.305-29.

Brown, R.E., "The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles" in The Scrolls and the New Testament. Ed. K. Stendahl, London,1958, pp. 183-207.

_____,"Incidents that are units in the Synoptic Gospels but dispersed in St. John". C.B.Q.23 (1961) pp. 143-60.

_____, "The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel" N.T.S. 13 (1966/67), pp. 113-32.

____, "Jesus and Elisha", Perspective 12 (1971) pp.84-104.

____, The Birth of the Messiah. A Commentary on the infancy narratives in Matthew and Luke. London,1977.

____, The Community of the Beloved Disciple. New York, 1979.

Brownlee, W.H.,"The cosmic role of angels in the 11Q Targum of Job",J.S.J. 8 pp. 83-4.

Bruce, F.F., Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews. (New London Commentary on the N.T.) London, 1964

____, "'To the Hebrews' or 'to the Essenes' " N.T.S.9 (1963), pp. 217-32.

Buchanan, G.W. "The Samaritan Origin of the Gospel of John" in Religions in Antiquity (in memory of E.R. Goodenough) Ed. J. Neusner. Leiden,1968 pp.149-175.

Budd, P.J. "Μιχαήλ " in D.N.T.T. I, pp.104-5.

Bühner, Jan-A., Der Gesandte und seun weg im 5 Evangelium. (Wissenschaftliche Undersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2), Tübingen, 1977.

Bultmann, R., "Die Bedeutung der neuerschlossenen mandäischen und manichäischen Quellen für das Verständnis des Johannesevangeliums" Z.N.W. 24 (1925), pp. 100-40.

____, Theology of the New Testament, 2 vols. (Trans. by K. Grobel from Theologie des Neuen Testament, 1953), New York, 1952-55.

____, The History of the Synoptic Tradition (E.T. of Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition, trans. by J. Marsh), Oxford, 1963.

Burger, C., Jesus als Davidsohn, Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung. (F.R.L.A.N.T. 98) Göttingen,1968.

Burrows, M., More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls, (1958) London, 1958.

Caird, G.B., St. Luke. (Pelican New Testament Commentaries). London, 1963.

____, The Language and Imagery of the Bible. (Duckworth Studies in Theology). London, 1980.

Carmignac, J. "Les, Citations de l'ancien Testament et spécialement des Poémes du Serviteur dans les Hymnes de Qumrân". R.Q.II (1960) pp. 357-94.

____, "Le Document de Qumrân sur Melkisedeq". R.Q.7 (1970). pp. 343-78.

Carrington, P., According to Mark. Cambridge, 1960.

Cassem, N.H., "A Grammatical and Contextual Inventory of the use of κόσμος in the Johannine Corpus with some Implications for a Johannine Cosmic Theology." N.T.S. 19 (1972/3), pp. 81-90.

Cave, C.H., "The Obedience of Unclean Spirits". N.T.S. 11 (1964/5), pp. 93-7.

Chamberlain, J.V., "The Functions of God as Messianic Titles in the Complete Qumran Isaiah Scroll." V.T. 5, (1955), pp. 365-72.

Charlesworth, J.H.,(Ed.), John and Qumran. London 1972.

_____, "Reflections on the Society of New Testament Studies. Pseudepigrapha Seminar at Duke on the Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs." N.T.S. 23 (1977), pp. 296-304.

_____, "The concept of the Messiah in the Pseudepigrapha" in Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt. Ed. H. Temporini and W. Haase. Vol. 2 Berlin, 1979 pp. 188-218.

_____, "Qumran, John and the Odes of Solomon" in idem, John and Qumran. London, 1972. pp. 107-36.

Colewell, E.C., "A Definite Rule for the use of the Article in the Greek New Testament". J.B.L. 52, (1933), pp. 12-21.

Collins, J.J., "The Son of Man and the Saints of the Most High in the Book of Daniel". J.B.L. 93 (1974) pp. 50-66.

_____, "The Mythology of holy war in Daniel and the Qumran War scroll. A point of Transition in Jewish Apocalyptic." V.T. 25 (1975). pp. 596-612.

_____ and Nicklesburg, W.E. (eds). Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms. Chico.,1980.

Colpe, C., T.D.N.T. VIII, pp. 400-77.

_____, "New Testament and Gnostic Christology" in Religions in Antiquity (in memory of R.E.Goodenough). Ed. J. Neusner. Leiden, 1968 pp. 227-43.

Connick, C.M., "The Dramatic Character of the Fourth Gospel" J.B.L. 67 (1948), pp. 159-69.

Conzelmann, H., An outline of the Theology of the NT (Trans. by J. Bowden), London, 1969.

Cook, S., "The Sons of (the) God(s)". Z.A.W. 66 (1964) pp. 22-47.

Cooke, G., "The Israelite King as Son of God". Z.A.W. 73 (1961), pp. 202-225.

Coppens, J., "Les Saints dans le Psautier", E.T.L. 39 (1963), pp. 485-500.

_____, "Les Saints du Trés-Haut sont-ils à identifier avec les milices célestes?" E.T.L. 39 (1963) pp. 94-100.

_____, Le Messianisme et sa relève prophétique: Les anticipations véterotestamentaires leur accomplissement en Jésus. (Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 38). Louvain, 1974.

Corell, A., Consummatum Est: Eschatology and Church in the Gospel of St. John. London, 1958.

Cranfield, C.E.B., The Gospel according to St. Mark. (Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary). Reprinted with revised additional supplementary notes. London, 1977.

_____, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. 2 Vols. (I.C.C.) Edinburgh, 1975, 1979.

Creed, J.M., The Gospel according to St. Luke. (The Greek Text). London, 1930.

Cremer, H., "Holy" in B.Th.W.N.T. p. 45.

Cribbs, F.L., "St. Luke and the Johannine Tradition". J.B.L. 90 (1971), pp. 422-50.

Cross, F.L., (ed) "Studies in the Fourth Gospel". London, 1957.

Cross, F.M., The Scrolls and Christian Origins. The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies. Rev. Ed. London, 1961.

_____, "The Council of Yahweh in Second Isaiah" J.N.E.T. 12 (1953). pp. 274-77.

_____, The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies. (The Haskell Lectures 1956-7). New York, 1958.

_____, "The Divine Warrior" in idem, Canaanite Myths and Hebrew Epics. Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1973. pp.91-111.

_____, " אֵל " T.D.O.T. 1 pp. 242-66.

Cullmann, O., "L'opposition contre le Temple de Jérusalem, Motif Commun de la Théologie Johannique et du Monde Ambiant." N.T.S. 5 (1958/9) pp. 157-73.

_____, "A New Approach to the Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel". Exp.T. 71 (1959-60) pp.8-12. and 39-43.

_____, Peter - Disciple, Apostle, Martyr. A historical and theological study. (Trans by F. V. Filson) 2nd Ed. London, 1962.

_____, The Christology of the New Testament. Rev. Ed. (Trans. by S.C.Guthrie and C.A.M. Hall from Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments). Philadelphia, 1963.

_____, The Johannine Circle: a Study in the Origin of the Gospel of John. (Trans by J. Bowden from Der johanneische Kreis, Sein Platz im Spätjudentum, in der Jüngerschaft und im Urchristentum. Zum Ursprung des Johannesevangeliums.) London, 1976.

Dabek, P., "Siche, es ershienen Moses und Elia", Biblica 33 (1942) pp. 175-89.

Dahl, N.A., "The Johannine Church and History" in Current Issues in NT Interpretation. Essays in honour of O.A. Piper. Ed. W. Klassen and G.F. Snyder. London, 1962. pp. 124-42.

_____, "Der Erstgeborene Satans und der Vater des Teufels (Polyk. 7,1 und Johannes 8,44)." B.Z.N.W. 30 (1964) pp. 70-84.

Dalman, G.H., The Words of Jesus, (Trans by D. M. Kay from Die Worte Jesu. Mit Berücksichtigung des nachkanonischen jüdischen Schrifttums und der aramäischen Sprache.) Edinburgh, 1902.

Daniélou, J., The Theology of Jewish Christianity (Vol I). Trans. and Edit. by J.A. Baker. London, 1964.

Davies, P.R., 1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran. Its Structure and History. (Biblica et Orientalia 32). Rome, 1977.

Davies, W.D., The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount. Cambridge, 1964.

Deissler, A., "Der 'Menschensohn' und 'das Volk der Heiligen des Höchsten' in Dan 7" in Jesus und der Menschensohn. (F/s for A. Vögtle) Ed. R. Pesch and R. Schnackenburg. Freiburg, 1975. pp. 81-90.

Dequeker, L., "Daniel VII et les Saints du Trés-Haut." E.T.L. 36 (1960) pp.353-92.

_____, "The 'Saints of the Most High' in Qumran and Daniel." O.T.S. 18 (1973) pp.108-87.

Dibelius, M., Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, ed. by H. Greeven. London, 1956.

Dodd, C.H., The Johannine Epistles. (The Moffat New Testament Commentary). London, 1946.

_____, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. 2nd Ed. Cambridge, 1968.

_____, "The prophecy of Caiaphas (John 11:47-53) Neotestamentica et Patristica (In honour of O. Cullmann) Suppl.to N.T.6. Leiden, 1962. pp. 134-43.

_____, Historical Tradition and the Fourth Gospel. Cambridge, 1963.

Donaldson, T.L., "Moses Typology and the Sectarian Nature of Early Christian Anti-Judaism: A Study in Acts 7." J.S.N.T. 12 (1981), pp. 27-52.

Dubois, J.D., "La figure d'Elie dans la perspective lucanienne". R.H.P.R. 53 (1973) pp. 155-76.

Duhaime, J.L., "La Rédaction de 1QM XIII et l'evolution du dualism à Qumran." R.B. 84 (1977) pp.210-38.

Duling, D.C., "The Promises to David and their Entrance into Christianity - Nailing down a likely Hypothesis." N.T.S. 20 (1973), pp. 55-77.

Eckhardt, K.A., Der Tod des Johannes als Schlüssel zum Verständnis der Johanneischen Schriften. Berlin, 1961.

Eichrodt, W., Theology of the Old Testament, Vol 1 and 2. (Translated by J.A. Baker from Theologie des Alten Testaments). Philadelphia, 1961 and 1967.

Eissfeldt, O., Introduction to the Old Testament (Translated by P.A. Ackroyd). Oxford, 1965.

Elliott, J.H., The Elect and the Holy. (Suppl. to N.T. 12) Leiden, 1966.

Ellis, E. Earle, The Gospel of Luke. (The Century Bible, New Edition). London, 1966.

Emerton, J.A., "Origin of the Son of Man Imagery". J.T.S. n.s. 9 (1958) pp. 225-230.

_____, "The Interpretation of Ps. 82 in John 10". J.T.S. n.s. 11 (1960) pp. 329-32.

_____, "Melchizedek and the Gods: Fresh Evidence for the Jewish Background of John X, 34-6", J.T.S. n.s. 17 (1966) pp. 399-401.

Farrer, A., A Study in St. Mark. London, 1951.

Fawcett, T., Hebrew Myth and Christian Gospel. London, 1973.

Feuillet, A., Le Sacerdoce du Christ et de ses envoyés les apôtres, d'après Isaïe 53 et d'après le quatrième évangile. Nova et Vetera 49 (1974). pp. 102-112.

_____, Johannine Studies. (Trans. by T.E. Crane from Etudes Johanniques) New York, 1965.

Fisher, L.R., "Can this be the Son of David?" in Jesus and the Historian, in honour of E.C. Colwell, (ed) F.T. Trotter. Philadelphia, 1968. pp. 82-97.

Fitzmyer, J.A., "Further light on Milchizedek from Qumran Cave II. J.B.L.86 (1967). pp. 25-41.

_____, The Semitic Background to the N.T. London, 1971.

_____, "The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament". N.T.S. 20 (1974). pp. 382-407.

_____, The Gospel According to Luke I - IX. A new translation with introduction and commentary. (Anchor Bible). New York, 1981.

Flüsser, D., "Melchizedek and the Son of Man". Christian News from Israel. Vol.17 (1966). pp. 228-39.

Fortna, R.T., The Gospel of Signs. A Reconstruction of the Narrative Source underlying the Fourth Gospel. Cambridge, 1970.

_____, "Source and Redaction in the Fourth Gospel's Portrayal of Jesus' Signs." J.B.L. 89 (1970) pp. 51-66.

Freed, E.D., "Variation in the language and thought of John". Z.N.W. 55 (1964), pp. 167-97.

_____, Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John. Leiden, 1965.

_____, "The Son of Man in the Fourth Gospel". J.B.L. 86 (1967) pp. 402-9.

_____ and Hunt, R.B., "Fortna's Signs-Source in John". J.B.L. 94 (1975) pp. 563-79.

Freyne, S., "The Charismatic" in Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms. Eds. J.J.Collins and W.E. Nicklesburg. Missoula, 1980. pp. 223-58.

Friedrich, G., "Beobachtungen zur messianischen Hohepriesten-erwartung in den Synoptikern". Z.Th.K. 53 (1956), pp. 265-311.

_____, Krämer, H., Rendtorff, R. and Meyer R. " προφήτης, προφῆτις κτλ. " T.D.N.T. VI pp. 781-861.

Fuller, R.N., The Foundations of New Testament Christology. Glasgow, 1965.

Gardner-Smith, P., St. John and the Synoptic Gospel. Cambridge, 1938.

Garnet, P., Salvation and Atonement in the Qumran Scrolls. (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. No. 2). Tübingen, 1977.

Gärtner, B., John 6 and the Jewish Passover. Copenhagen, 1959.

_____, The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament. Cambridge, 1965.

Gaston, L., No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels. (Suppl. N.T. 23), Leiden, 1970.

Gastor, T.H., "Michael". I.D.B. III, pp. 372-3.

Gehman, H.S.," Ἅγιος in the Septuagint and its relation to the Hebrew original" V.T. 4 (1954), pp. 337-48.

Geyser, A., "The Semeion at Cana of the Galilee" in Studies in John. F/s for J.N. Sevenster. (Suppl to N.T. 24). Leiden, 1970. pp. 1-12.

Gibbs, J.M., "Purpose and Pattern in Matthew's use of the title 'Son of David'". J.B.L. 95 (1976), pp.591-602.

Giet, S., Hermas et les Pasteurs. Paris, 1963.

Glasson, T.F., Moses in the Fourth Gospel. (Studies in Bib. Theology 40). London, 1963.

Gnilka, J., "Die Erwartung des Messianischen Hohenpriesters in den Schriften von Qumran und im NT." R.Q. 2, (1960), pp. 395-26.

Grant, F.C. and Luccock, H.E., "The Gospel according to Mark" in The Interpreters Bible in Twelve Volumes. (Ed. G.A. Buttrick). New York, 1951.

Grayston, K., "The Meaning of Paraklétos". J.S.N.T. 13 (1981), pp. 67-82.

Gressman, H., Der Messias. (F.R.L.A.N.T. 26, n.5 43) Gottingen, 1929.

Grundmann, W., "Verstandnis und Bewegung des Glaubens im Johannesevangelium". Kerygma und Dogma. 6 (1960). pp. 131-54.

_____, Das Evangelium nach Lukas. (Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament) 3rd Ed. Berlin,1966.

_____, Das Evangelium nach Markus. (Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament) 5th Ed. Berlin,1971.

_____, Hesse, F., de Jonge, M. and van der Woude, A.S. "χείω κτλ. " T.D.N.T. IX pp. 493-580.

_____, von Rad, G. and Kittel, G., " ἄγγελος κτλ. " T.D.N.T. I, pp. 74-87.

Gryglewicz, F., "Das Lamm Gottes". N.T.S. 13 (1966/7), pp. 133-46.

Guilding, Aileen, The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship. Oxford, 1960.

Haenchen, E., "Der Vater, der mich gesandt hat". N.T.S. 9 (1962/3) pp. 208-16.

Hahn, F., The Titles of Jesus in Christology. (Trans. by H. Knight and G. Ogg from Christologische Hoheitstitel Ihre Geschichte im Frühen Christentum) F.R.L.A.N.T. 83, London, 1969.

Hamerton-Kelly, R.G., Pre-existence, Wisdom and the Son of Man - a study of the idea of Pre-existence in the New Testament. Cambridge, 1973.

Hanson, A.T., "John's citation of Ps. 82", N.T.S. 11 (1964/5) pp. 158-62.

_____, "John's citation of Ps. 82 reconsidered", N.T.S. 13, (1966/7) pp. 363-7.

Hanson, P.D., "Jewish Apocalyptic against its Near Eastern Environment". R.B. 78 (1971), pp. 31-58.

Harrelson, W., "Nonroyal Motifs in the Royal Eschatology". Israel's Prophetic Heritage. Essays in honour of J. Muilenburg. B.W. Anderson and W. Harrelson (Eds.) New York, 1962. pp. 147-65.

Harvey, A.E., Jesus on Trial: A Study in the Fourth Gospel. London, 1976.

Hauck, F., " μῶμος, ἄμωμος, ἀμώμητος " T.D.N.T. IV pp. 829-31.

Hay, D.M., Glory at the Right Hand Ps.110 in Early Christianity. (Soc. of Bib. Lit. Monogr. Series 18). New York, 1973.

Hay, L.S., "Mark's use of the Messianic Secret". J.A.A.R. 35 (1967) pp. 16-27.

Hayes, J.H., "The Resurrection as Enthronement and Earliest Church Christology". Interpretation. 22 (1968). pp. 333-45.

Hayward, R., "Phinehas - the same is Elijah: The Origins of a Rabbinic Tradition." J.J.S. 29 (1978) pp. 22-34.

Hengel, M., Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity. London, 1979.

_____, Nachfolge und Charisma. (B.Z.N.W. 34), Berlin, 1968.

_____, The Son of God: the origin of Christology and the history of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion. (Trans. by J. Bowden from Der Sohn Gottes). London, 1976.

_____, Christ and Power. (Trans. by E.R. Kalin from Christus und die Macht). Philadelphia, 1977.

Hewett, J.A., The Hagios group of words in the Pauline Corpus (excluding the Pastorals) in the light of the Old Testament background. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. Manchester Univ. 1973.

Higgins, A.J.B., Jesus and the Son of Man. London, 1964.

_____, "The Priestly Messiah", N.T.S. 13 1966/7) pp. 321-36.

_____, The Son of Man in the Teaching of Jesus. (Society from N.T. Studies. Monograph Series 39) Cambridge, 1980.

Hill, D., New Testament Prophecy. London, 1979.

Hinnebusch, P., "Jesus the New Elijah in St. Luke". T.B.T. 31 (1967) pp. 2175-2182.
T.B.T. 32 (1967) pp. 2237-2244.

Hinson, G., "Hodayoth III, 6-18. What sense Messianic?" R.Q. 2 (1960) pp. 183-204.

Holladay, C.H., Theios Aner in Hellenistic Judaism: A Critique of the Use of this Category in New Testament Christology. Missoula, 1977.

Hooker, M.D., Jesus and the Servant. London, 1959.

_____, The Son of Man in Mark. A study of the Son of Man and its use in St. Mark's Gospel. London SPCK 1967.

Horton, F.L. (Jr.), The Melchizedek Tradition a critical examination of the sources to the 5th Century A.D. and in the Epistle to the Hebrews. (Soc. for N.T. Studies Monograph 30), Cambridge, 1976.

Howard, W.F., The Fourth Gospel in recent Criticism and Interpretation. 4th Ed. Rev. C.K. Barrett, London, 1955.

Howton, J. "The Son of God in the Fourth Gospel" N.T.S. 11 (1963/4) pp. 227-237.

Hull, John M., Hellenistic Magic and the Synoptic Tradition. (Studies in Biblical Theology Second Series 28). London, 1974.

Hunter, A.M., The Gospel according to Mark (Torch Bible Commentaries). London, 1949.

Iersel, B.M.F. van, 'Der Sohn' in den Synoptischen Jesusworten. (Suppl. N.T. 3). Leiden, 1961.

Jeremias, G., Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit. Göttingen, 1963.

Jeremias, J., "Jo. 6,51c - 58 Redaktionell?" Z.N.W. 44, (1953), pp. 256-7.

_____, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus. (Trans. by N. Perrin from 3rd Ed. of Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu). Philadelphia, 1966.

_____, " Μωυσῆς ", T.D.N.T. IV pp. 848-873.

Johnston, E.D., "The Johannine Version of the Feeding of the 5000 - An Independent Tradition?" N.T.S. 8 (1961/2) pp. 151-4.

Jones, Elwyn, The concept of the Θεῖος ἀνήρ in the Graeco-Roman World with special reference to the first two Centuries AD. (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Durham University, 1973).

Jones, G.H., "The Decree of Yahweh (Ps. 2:7)" V.T. 15 (1965) 336-44.

Jonge, M. de, De brieven van Johannes. (De Prediking van het Nieuwe Testament) 2nd Ed. Nijkerk, 1973.

_____,(Ed.) L'Évangile de Jean. (B.E.T.L. 44) Louvain,1977.

_____, "The Use of the Word 'Anointed' in the time of Jesus." N.T. 8 (1966) pp. 132-48.

_____, "Jewish Expectations about the 'Messiah' according to the Fourth Gospel." N.T.S.19 (1972/3) pp.246-270.

_____, Jesus: Stranger from Heaven and Son of God. Jesus Christ and the Christians in the Johannine Perspective. Montana, 1977.

_____, "Johanneïsche Studies" in Ned. Theol. Tijd 32 (1978).

Joubert, H.L.N., "The Holy One of God". Neotestamentica 2 (1968), pp. 57-69.

Jungkuntz, R., "An approach to the exegesis of Jn 10:34-6". Concordia Theol. 35 (1964) pp. 556-65.

Käsemann, E., The Testament of Jesus. A study of the Gospel of John in the light of Chapter 17 (N.T.L.) (Trans. by G. Krodel from Jesu letzter Wille nach Johannes 17) London, 1968.

_____, Commentary on Romans. (Translated by G.W.Bromily from the 4th Ed. of An die Römer). Grand Rapids, 1980.

Kee, H.C. "The Terminology of Mark's Exorcist Stories", N.T.S. 14 (1967/8). pp. 232-46.

Kertelge, K., Die Wunder Jesu im Markusevangelium: Eine redaktionsgeschichte Untersuchung. (Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 23). Munich, 1970.

Kingsbury, E.C., "The Prophets and the Council of Yahweh". J.B.L. 83 (1964) pp. 279-86.

Kilmartin, E.J., "Liturgical influence on John 6." C.B.Q. 22 (1960) pp. 183-91.

Klos, H., Die Sakramente im Johannesevangelium. Vorkommen und Bedeutung von Taufe, Eucharistie und Busse im Vierten Evangelium. Stuttgart, 1970.

Koch, D.A., Die Bedeutung der Wundererzählungen für die Christologie des Markusevangeliums. B. Z. N. W. 42 New York, 1975.

Krämer, H., " προφήτης κτλ. ". T.D.N.T. VI. pp. 781-96.

Kuhn, H.B., "The Angelology of the Non-canonical Jewish Apocalypses". J.B.L. 67 (1948) pp. 217-32.

Kuhn, H-W.,"Die beiden Messias in den Qumrantexten und die Messiasvorstellung in der rabbinischen Literatur". Z.A.W. 70 (1958) pp. 200-8.

_____, Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil. Untersuchungen zu den Gemeindeliedern von Qumran mit eines Anhang über Eschatologie und Gegenwart in der Verkündigung Jesu (St.U.M.T. 4). Göttingen, 1966.

Kuhn, K.G., "The Two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel" in K. Stendahl, The Scrolls and the N.T. London, 1958. pp. 54-64.

_____, " ἅγιος κτλ. " T.D.N.T. I pp. 97-100.

Kysar, R., "The Source Analysis of the Fourth Gospel. A growing Consensus". N.T. 15 (1973) pp. 134-52.

_____, The Fourth Evangelist and his Gospel: an examination of contemporary scholarship. Minneapolis, 1975.

Lacomora, A., "Deuteronomy and the Farewell Discourse (Jn 13, 31 - 16,33)". C.B.Q. 36 (1974) pp. 65-84.

Lamberigts, S., "Le sens de Qdwšym dans les textes de Qumrân." E.T.L. 46 (1970) pp. 24-39.

Lampe, G.W.H., "Luke" in Peake's Commentary on the Bible. (Rev. Ed.) M. Black, (Ed.) London, 1967. pp.820-843.

Lane, W.L., The Gospel of Mark. (The New London Commentary on the New Testament). London, 1974.

La Sor, W.S., The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament. Michigan, 1972.

Leaney, A.R.C., "The Johannine Paraclete and the Qumran Scrolls" in John and Qumran, J.H. Charlesworth (Ed.). London, 1972. pp. 38-61.

Laurin, R.B., "The Problem of two Messiahs in the Qumran Scrolls". R.Q. 4 (1962) pp. 39-52.

Leivestad, R., "Enthalten die Segenssprüche 1QSb eine Segnung des Hohenpriesters der Messianischen zeit". Stud. Theol. 31 (1977), pp. 137-45.

_____, Christ the Conqueror. Ideas of Conflict and Victory in the New Testament. London, 1954.

Leon-Dufour, X., "Le mystère du pain de vie (Jean VI)" R.S.R. 46 (1958), pp. 481-523.

Levey, S.H., The Messiah - An Aramaic Interpretation. The Messianic exegesis of the Torgums. Monographs of the Hebrew Union College No. 2, New York, 1974.

Lindars, B., "Discourse and Tradition: The use of the sayings of Jesus in the Discourses of the Fourth Gospel." J.S.N.T. 13 (1981) pp. 83-101.

_____, Behind the Fourth Gospel. (Studies in Creative Criticism 3), London, 1971.

_____ and Smalley, S.S. (Ed). Christ and the Spirit in the N.T. In honour of C.F.D. Moule, Cambridge, 1973.

_____, "Re-enter the Apocalyptic Son of Man". N.T.S. 22 (1975/6). pp. 52-72.

Liver, J., "The Doctrine of the Two Messiahs in Sectarian Literature in the Time of the 2nd Commonwealth". H.T.R., 52 (1959), pp. 149-85.

Lohse, E., "Der Konig aus Davids Geschlect Bemerkungen zur Messianischen Erwartung der Synagogue." in Abraham unser Vater: Juden und Christen im Gespräch über die Bibel. (F/s O. Michel) Ed. O. Betz, M. Hengel and P. Schmidt. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spätjudentums und Urchristentums 5. Leiden, 1963. pp. 337-345.

_____, "Der Menschensohn in der Johannesapokalypese" Jesus und der Menschensohn (F/s A. Vögtle) Ed. R.Pesch and R. Schnackenburg. Freiburg, 1975. pp. 415-420.

Longenecker, R., The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity. Studies in Biblical Theology: Second Series No. 17. London, 1970.

_____, "The Melchizedek argument of Hebrews. A study in the Development and Circumstantial Expression of N.T. Thought." in Unity and Diversity in New Testament Theology (in hon. of G.E. Ladd), Ed.R.A.Guelich, Michigan, 1978. pp. 161-85.

Loos, H. van der, The Miracles of Jesus. (Suppl. to N.T. 8) Leiden, 1962.

MacDonald, J., The Theology of the Samaritans. (New Testament Library). London, 1964.

MacGregor, G.H.C., "The Concept of the Wrath of God in the New Testament". N.T.S. 7 (1960/1) pp. 101-9.

MacLean - Gilmour S., "Luke" in Interpreter's Bible.N.York 1952.

McHugh, J., "Num solus panis triticeus sit materia valida S.S. Eucharistiae". V.D. 39 (1961) pp. 229-39.

McKelvey, R.J., The New Temple. The Church in the N.T. Oxford, 1969.

McNamara, M., Targum and Testament. Aramaic Paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible: A light on the New Testament. Michigan, 1972.

McNeil, B., "The Quotation at John 12:34." N.T. 19 (1977) pp. 22-33.

Maddox, R., The Purpose of Luke-Acts. (Studies of the New Testament and its World). Edinburgh, 1982.

Malatesta, E., "The Literary Structure of John 17." Biblica 52 (1971) pp. 190-214.

Manek, J., "The New Exodus in the Book of Luke". N.T. 2 (1958) pp. 8-23.

Manson, T.W., On Paul and John: Some selected Theological Themes. Ed. M. Black, S.B.T. 38. London, 1963.

_____, Studies in the Gospels and Epistles. Manchester, 1962.

_____, Jesus the Messiah. The Synoptic tradition of the Revelation of God in Christ: with special reference to form-criticism. London, 1943.

Mansoor, M. The Thanksgiving Hymns. (Sup. Studies on the Text of the Scrolls of the Desert of Judaea Vol.8). Leiden, 1961.

Marshall, I.H., "The Divine Sonship of Jesus". Interpretation 21 (1967) pp. 87-103.

_____, "The Synoptic Son of Man Sayings in Recent Discussions", N.T.S. 12 (1965/6) pp. 327-51.

_____, "Palestinian and Hellenistic Christianity. Some Critical Comments". N.T.S.19 (1972/3) pp. 271-87.

_____, The Origins of N.T. Christology. Leicester ,1976.

_____, The Epistles of John. Grand Rapids, 1978.

_____, The Gospel of Luke. Grand Rapids, 1978.

Martyn, J.L., History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel. Revised and enlarged. Nashville, 1979.

_____, "Glimpses into the History of the Johannine Community", in L'Évangile de Jean. Ed. M. de Jonge. Lovain, 1977. pp. 149-75.

_____, "We have found Elijah" in idem, The Gospel of John in Christian History. New York, 1979. pp. 9-54.

_____, The Gospel of John in Christian History. New York, 1979.

Mastin, B.A., "A Neglected Feature of the Christology of the Fourth Gospel". N.T.S.22 (1975/6) pp. 32-51.

Martitz, P.W. von, Schweizer, E., Lohse, E. et al. "υἱός, υἱοθεσία " in T.D.N.T. VIII pp. 334-399.

Maurer, C., Des Messiasgeheimnis des Markusevangeliums" in N.T.S. 14 1967/8 pp. 515-26.

Meagher, J.C., "John 1:14 and the New Temple". J.B.L. 88 (1969) pp. 57-68.

Meeks, W.A., The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology. (Suppl. to N.T. Vol.14) Leiden, 1967.

_____, "The Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism." J.B.L. 91 (1972) pp. 44-72.

Mehlmann, J., "Propheta a Moyse promissus in Jo.7:52 citatus". Verbum Domini IV (1966) pp. 79-88.

Mettinger, T.N.D., King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings. Lund, 1976.

Meyer, R., Melchisedek von Jerusalem und Moresedek von Qumran. Congress Volume Geneva. 1965 V.T. Suppl 15. Leiden 1966. pp. 228-239.

Michel, O., Der Brief an die Römer. (Kritisch-Exegetischer Kommentar.) 5th Ed. Göttingen, 1955.

Milgrom, J. "The Temple Scroll". B.A. Vol. 41. (1978). pp. 105-120.

_____, "Studies in the Temple Scroll". J.B.L. 97.(1978). pp. 501-23.

Milik, J.T., Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea, trans. J. Strugnell. SCM.London 1959.

_____, "Milkî-sedeq et Milkî-resa dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens", J.J.S. 23 (1972) pp. 95-144.

Miller, M.P., "The Function of Isaiah 61:1-2 in 11Q Melchizedek". J.B.L. 88 (Dec.1969) pp.467-9).

Miller, P.D., "El the Warrior". H.T.R. 50 (1957) pp. 411-31)

_____, "Two Critical notes on Psalm 68 and Deuteronomy 33" H.T.R. 57 (1964) pp. 240-3.

_____, "The Divine Council and the Prophetic call to war." V.T. 18 (1968) pp. 100-107.

_____, The Divine Warrior in Early Israel. Cambridge. Massachusetts, 1973.

Miner, D.F. "A suggested Reading for 11Q Melchizedek 17." J.S.J. 2 (1971) pp. 144-8.

Moe, O., "Das Priestertum Christi im N.T. ausserhalb des Hebräerbriefes." T.L.Z. 72 (1947), pp. 335-7.

Moloney, F.J., The Johannine Son of Man. Biblioteca di scienze religiose 14 . Rome, 1976.

Montefiore, H.W., The Epistle to the Hebrews. Blacks N.T. Commentary. London, 1964.

Montgomery, J.A., The Samaritans. London, 1907.

Moorman, J.R.H., The Path to Glory. Studies in the Gospel according to St. Luke. London, 1961.

Morris, L., Studies in the Fourth Gospel. Michigan, 1969.

_____, "I John, II John, III John" in New Bible Commentary, Rev. Ed. London, 1970. pp. 1259-1273.

Moule, C.F.D., "The Individualism of the Fourth Gospel" N.T. 5 (1962) pp. 171-90.

_____, "Neglected Features of the Son of Man" in Neues Testament und Kirche. (F/s R. Schnackenburg). Ed. J. Gnilka. Freiburg, 1974. pp. 413-28.

_____, The Origin of Christology. London, 1977.

Mowinckel, S., He that Cometh. (Trans. G.W.Anderson) New York, 1954.

Mullen, E.T., The Assembly of the Gods. The Divine Council in Canaanite and Early Hebrew Literature. (Harvard Semitic Monographs No. 24). California, 1980.

Mussner, F., "Ein Wortspiel in Mk 1:24?" B.Z. 4 1960. pp. 285-6.

Neufeld, V.H., The Earliest Christian Confessions. (New Testament Tools and Studies), Leiden, 1963.

Neusner, J., Development of a legend. Studies on the tradition concerning Yohanan ben Zakkai. (Stud. Post Biblica Vol. 16). Leiden, 1970.

_____, Life of Yohannan ben Zakkai. 2nd Ed. Leiden, 1970.

_____, Early Rabbinic Judaism. (Historical studies in Religion, Literature and Art Studies in Antiquity 13). Ed. J. Neusner, Leiden, 1975.

Nicol, W., The Semeia in the Fourth Gospel. Tradition and Redaction. (Supp. to N.T. Vol. 32) Leiden, 1972.

Nielsen, K., Yahweh as Prosecutor or Judge. An investigation of the Lawsuit (Rîb-pattern). (Trans. by F. Cryer) (J.S.O.T. Supplement 9). Sheffield, 1978.

Nineham, D.E., The Gospel of St. Mark. (The Pelican New Testament Commentaries.) Reprinted with revisions. Middlesex, 1969.

Noack, B., Zur johanneischen Tradition. Copenhagen, 1954.

Noth, M., The Laws on the Pentateuch and other Essays. (Reprinted from his volume of Essays, Gesamelte Studies zum Alten Testament). Edinburgh, 1966.

Nötscher, Fr. "Heiligkeit in den Qumranschriften". R.Q. 2 (1960) pp. 163-182 and pp. 315-344.

Oepke, A., " λούω κτλ. " T.D.N.T. IV pp. 295-307.

Otto, R., The Idea of the Holy. Oxford, 1958.

Pagels, E.H., The Johannine Gospel in Gnostic Exegesis. Heracleon's Commentary on John. New York, 1973.

Painter, J., "Christ and the Church in Jn 1:45-51" in L'Évangile de Jean (Ed. M. de Jonge). Louvain, 1977.

_____, John: Witness and Theologian. Second Edition, London, 1979.

_____, "Johannine Symbols", in J.T.S.A. 27 (1979) pp. 26-41.

_____, "The Farewell Discourses and the History of Johannine Christianity" N.T.S., 27 (1981) pp. 525-43.

Pancaro, S., "The Relationship of the Church to Israel in the Gospel of John". N.T.S. 21 (1974/5). pp. 396-405.

_____, The Law in the Fourth Gospel. The Torah and the Gospel of Moses and Jesus, Judaism and Christianity according to John. (Suppl. to Nov.Test.) 42, Leiden, 1975.

Pederson, J., Israel: Its Life and Culture. New York, I - II (1926) and III - IV (1940).

Pernveden, L., The Concept of the Church in the Shepherd of Hermas. (E.T.)Studia theologie Lundensia 27. Lund, 1966.

Perrin, N. Re-discovering the Teaching of Jesus. London, 1967.

Pesch R. and Schnackenburg R.,(Eds.) Jesus und der Menschensohn. (F/s for A. Vögtle). Freiburg, 1975.

_____, Das Markusevangelium, Basel, 1976.

Pfitzner, V.C., "The Coronation of the King - Passion Narrative and Passion Theology in the Gospel of St. John". Luth.Theol.Journal 10. (1976) pp.1-12.

Pollard, T.E., Johannine Christology and the Early Church. Cambridge, 1970.

Potterie, I. de la, "L'onction du chrétien par la foi" Bib.40 (1959) p. 12-69.

_____, "La tunique sans couture symbols du Christ grand prêtre?" Bib. 60 (1979) pp. 255-69.

Price, J.L., "Light from Qumran on some aspects of Johannine Theology", in John and Qumran, ed. J.H. Charlesworth London, 1972 pp. 9-37.

Prigent, P., "Le symbole dans le Nouveau Testament". R.S.R. 49 (1975) pp. 110-115.

Procksch, O. and Kuhn, K.G., " ἅγιος κτλ." T.D.N.T. I pp. 88-115.

Pryke, J., "Eschatology in the Dead Sea Scrolls" in The Scrolls and Christianity, by M. Black (Ed.) London, 1969, pp. 45-57.

Rad, G. von, Der Heilige Krieg im alten Israel. Zürich, 1958.

_____, Old Testament Theology. Vol. 1. The Theology of Israel's Historical Traditions Vol. 2. Israel's Prophetic traditions trans by D.M.G. Stalker from Theologie des Alten Testaments. London, 1975.

Reim, G., Studien zum Altestamentlichen Hintergrund des Johannesevangeliums. S.N.T.S. Monograph Series 22). Cambridge, 1974.

Rengstorf, K.H., " σημεῖον κτλ. " T.D.N.T. VII pp. 200-268.

_____, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Das Neue Testament Deutsch). Göttingen, 1966.

Ricca, P., Die Eschatologie des Vierten Evangeliums. Zürich, 1966.

Richardson, A., An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament. London, 1958.

Richter, G., Studien zum Johannesevangelium. (Biblische untersuchungen 13). Regensburg, 1977.

Riedl, J., "Wenn ihr den Menschensohn erhöht habt, werdet ihr erkennen (Joh. 8,28)". Jesus und der Menschensohn (F/s A. Vögtle). Ed. R. Pesch and R. Schnackenburg. Freiburg, 1975. pp. 355-70.

Riesenfeld, H., "The Mythological Background of the New Testament Christology" in The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology. Ed. W.D.Davies and D. Daube. Cambridge, 1956. pp. 81-95.

_____, "Zu den johanneischen ἵνα – Sätzen". Stud. Theol. 19, 1965 pp. 213-20.

Robinson, H.W., "The Council of Yahweh" in J.T.S. 45 (1944), pp. 151-7.

Robinson, J.A.T., Twelve N.T. Studies (S.B.T. 34) London, 1962.

Rollins, W.G., "The New Testament and Apocalyptic" N.T.S. 17 (1971), pp. 454-76.

Ross, J.F., "The Prophet as Yahweh's Messenger" in Israel's Prophetic Heritage. (In honour of J. Muilenburg,) ed. by B.W. Anderson and W. Harrelson, New York, 1962. pp. 98-107.

Rowley, H. Harold, The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Oxford, 1952.

Ruckstuhl, E. Die literarische Einheit des Johannes-evangeliums, der gegenwärtige Stand der einschlägigen Forschungen. (Studia Friburgensia n.f. 3) 1951.

_____, "Absteig und Erhöhung des johanneischen Menschensohns". Jesus und der Menschensohn, (F/s for A. Vögtle,) Ed. by R. Pesch and R. Schnackenburg. Freiburg, 1975. pp. 314-341.

Sabugal, S., "I.Q. Regla de la Communidad IX, II: Das Ungidos, un Mesias". R.Q. 8 (1969), pp. 417-23.

Sanders, J.A., "Dissenting Deities and Phil.2:1-11." J.B.L. 88 (1969) pp. 279-90.
_____, The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll. Cornell Univ.Press New York, 1967.

Sandmel, S., Philo of Alexandria. An Introduction. Oxford, 1979.

Sasse, H. "κοσμέω, κόσμος" T.D.N.T. III pp. 868-897.

Sawyer, John F.A., Semantics in Biblical Research New Methods of defining Hebrew words for Salvation. (Stud. in Bib. Theology, 2nd Series 24). London 1972.

Schäfer, P., Rivalität zwischen Engeln und Menschen. Untersuchungen zur rabbinischen Engelvorstellung (Stud Jud 8). Berlin, 1975.

Schlatter, A. Der Evangelist Johannes. Stuttgart, 1975.

Schlier, H., The Relevance of the New Testament. (Trans. by W.J.O'Hara from Besinnung auf des Neue Testament) New York, 1968.
_____, "Zu Röm 1,3f" in Neues Testament und Geschichte Historisches Geschehen und Deutung im Neuen Testament,(For O. Cullmann) Ed. H. Baltensweiler and B. Reicke. Zürich, 1972 pp. 207-218.

Schlisske, W., Gottessöhne und Gottessohn im Alten Testament (B.W.A.N.T. 97), Stuttgart, 1973.

Schnackenburg, R., Die Johannesbriefe. (H.T.K.) 2nd Rev. Ed. Freiburg, 1963.

_____, "Die Messiasfrage im Johannesevangelium" in Neutestamentliche Aufsätze. (F/s J. Schmid) Ed.by J. Blinzler and K-F. Mussner. Regensburg, 1963 pp. 240-264.

Schneider, G., "Zur Vorgeschichte des Christologischen Prädikats "Sohn Davids' ", T.T.Z. 80 (1971) pp. 247-53.

_____, "'Der Menschensohn' in der Lukanischen Christologie" in Jesus und der Menschensohn. (F/s für A. Vögtle) Ed. R. Pesch and R. Schnackenburg. Freiburg, 1975. pp. 267-282.

Schnider, Franz. Jesus der Prophet. Göttingen, 1973.

Schottroff, L., Der Glaubende und die feindliche Welt. Beobachtungen zum gnostischen Dualismus und seiner Bedeutung für Paulus und das Johannesevangelium. (Wissenschaftliche Monographen zum A. und NT 37) Neukirchen, 1970.

Schürer, E., The History of the Jewish people in the age of Jesus Christ (175B.C. - A.D.135).(Vol.2). Rev. and Ed. G. Vermes, M. Black and F. Millar. Edinburgh, 1979.

Schurmann, H., Das Lukasevangelium. Freiburg, 1969.

Schweizer, E. "The Son of Man". J.B.L. 79 (1960) pp. 119-29.

_____, "Er wird Nazoräer heissen" (zu Mc 1,24; Mt 2,23). in Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche (F/s J.Jeremias: B.Z.N.W. 26) Ed. by W. Eltester. Berlin,1960. pp. 90-93.

_____, Ego Eimi: die religionsgechichtliche Herkunft und theologische Bedeutung der johanneischen Bildreden, zugleich ein Beitrag zur Quellenfrage das vierten Evangeliums (F.R.L.A.N.T. (n.s.)38). Göttingen, 1965.

_____, "The Son of Man Again". N.T.S. 9 (1962/3) pp. 256-61.

_____, "Zur Frage des Messiasgeheimnisses bei Markus" Z.N.W. 56 1965, pp. 1-8.

_____, "Zum Religiongeschichtlichen Hintergrund der 'Sendungsformel' Gal.4:4f; Rom.8:3f; Joh 3:16f. I Joh 4:9) Z.N.W. 57 (1966) pp. 199-210.

_____, Das Evangelium nach Markus. Göttingen, 1967.

_____, Baumgärtel F. and Meyer R., " σαρξ κτλ." in T.D.N.T. VII pp. 98 - 150.

_____, "υἱός, υἱοθεσία " T.D.N.T. VIII pp. 354-357 and 363-392.

_____, The Holy Spirit. (Trans. by R.H. and I Fuller from Heiliger Geist). London, 1980.

Scott, W.M.F., "Priesthood in the New Testament". S.J.T. 10 (1957) pp. 399-415.

Seebass, H. and Brown C., " ἅγιος " in D.N.T.T. II pp. 223-238.

Segal, A.F., Two Powers in Heaven. Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism. (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity Vol.25.) Ed. J. Neusner. Leiden, 1977.

Sherwin-White, A.N., Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament. Oxford, 1963.

Sidebottom, E.M., The Christ of the Fourth Gospel. London, 1961.

Sjöberg, E., Der Verborgene Menschensohn in den Evangelien. Lund, 1955.

Slingerland, H.D., The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Critical History of Research. (S.B.L. Monographs) Missoula, 1977.

Smalley, S., John, Evangelist and Interpreter. Exeter, 1978.

Smith, D. Moody, The Composition and order of the Fourth Gospel: Bultmann's Literary Theory. London, 1965.

_____, "Johannine Christianity: some reflections on its character and delineation". N.T.S. 21 (1974/5) pp. 222-48.

_____, "The milieu of the Johannine miracle source: a proposal." in Jews, Greeks and Christians, Religious cultures in late Antiquity. (Essays in honour of W.D.Davies.) Ed. R. Hamerton-Kelley and R. Scroggs. Leiden, 1976. pp. 164-180.

Smith, Morton, Jesus the Magician. San Francisco, 1978.

Smith, R.H., "Exodus Typology in the Fourth Gospel" J.B.L. 81 (1962) pp. 329-342.

Snaith, N.H., Distinctive ideas of the Old Testament. London, 1944.

_____, Leviticus and Numbers. (The Century Bible) London, 1967.

Sor, W. La, "The Messiahs of Aaron and Israel" V.T.6 (1956) pp. 425-9.

Spicq, C., "Le philonisme de l'Epître aux Hébreux". R.B. 56 (1949) pp. 542-72 and R.B. 57 (1950) pp. 212-42.

_____, "L'origine Johannique de la Conception du Christ-prêtre dans l'Epître aux Hebraux" in Aux Sources de la Tradition Chrétienne (For M. Goguel) Paris,1950 pp. 258-69.

Starky, J., "Les quatre étapes du Messianisme á Qumrân." R.B. 70 (1963) pp. 481-505.

Stendahl, K.,(Ed.) The scrolls and the N.T. London, 1958.

Stone, M., "The Concept of the Messiah in IV Ezra" Religions in Antiquity (For R.E. Goodenough) Ed. J. Neusner. Leiden, 1968. pp. 295-311.

Strachan, R.H., The Fourth Gospel: its Significance and and Environment. 3rd Ed. London, 1941.

Suhl, A., "Der Davidssohn im Matthäusevangelium". Z.N.W. 59 1968 pp. 57-81.

Swete, H.B., The Gospel according to St. Mark: the Greek text, with introduction, notes and indices. (Macmillan New Testament Commentaries) 3rd Ed. London, 1909.

Talbert, C.H. "The Myth of a Descending and Ascending Redeemer in Mediterranean Antiquity" N.T.S.22 (1976) pp. 418-40.

Taylor, V., The Names of Jesus. London, 1953.

_____, The Gospel according to St. Mark. The Greek text with Introduction, Notes and Indexes. (Macmillan N.T. Commentaries) 2nd Ed. London, 1966.

Teeple, H.M., "Qumran and the Origin of the Fourth Gospel". N.T. 4 (1960) pp. 6-25.

_____, The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet. (J.B.L.MS.10) Philadelphia, 1957.

Temple, S., "A Key to the Composition of the Fourth Gospel", J.B.L. 80 (1961) pp. 220-32.

Theissen, G., Untersuchungen zum Hebräerbrief. (Studien zum Neuen Testament - Vol. 2) Gütersloh, 1969.

_____, Urchristliche Wundergeschichten. (Suppl. to N.T. 8) Leiden, 1974.

Tidwell, N.L.A., "Wa'omar (Zech 3:5) and the Genre of Zechariah's Fourth Vision." J.B.L. 94 (1975) pp. 343-355.

Tiede, D.L., The Charismatic figure as Miracle Worker. (S.B.L. Dissertation Series 1). Montana, 1972.

Toit Laubscher, F. du, "God's Angel of Truth and Melchizedek. A note on 11Q Melch. 13b." J.S.J. 3 1972 pp. 46-51.

Trotter, F.T. (ed), Jesus and the Historian (written in Honor of E.C. Colwell). Philadelphia, 1968.

Vaux, R. de, Ancient Israel, Its Life and Institutions. E.T. of Les Institutions de l'Ancien Testament trans. by J. McHugh (In one Volume). London, 1961.

Vawter, B., "Some recent Developments in Johannine Theology". B.Th B. I (1971). pp. 30-58.

Vermes, G., "Hanina ben Dosa. A Controversial Galilean Saint from the First Century of the Christian Era." in J.J.S. 23 (1972) pp. 28-50 and J.J.S.24 (1974) pp. 51-64.

_____, Jesus the Jew. A Historian's Reading of the Gospels. London, 1973.

_____, The Dead Sea Scrolls. Qumran in Perspective. London, 1977.

_____, "The'Son of Man' Debate." J.S.N.T. 1 (1978) pp. 19-32.

Villalón, J.R., "Sources vétéro testamentaires de la doctrine qumrânienne des deux Messies". R.Q. 8 (1969), pp. 53-64.

Walker, W.O. Jr. "The Origin of the Son of Man Concept as applied to Jesus". J.B.L. 91 (1972) pp. 482-90.

Wanamaker, C.A., The Son and the Sons of God; a study in Elements of Paul's Christological and Soteriological thought. (Unpublished PhD Thesis, Durham University) 1980.

Weiser, A., Introduction to the Old Testament, (trans. by D.M. Barton from Einleitung in das Alte Testament) London, 1961.

Westcott, B.F., The Epistle to the Hebrews. The Greek Text with notes and Essays. 3rd Ed. London, 1903.

_____, The Epistles of St. John. London, 1883. Reprinted Abingdon, 1966.

Wetter, G.P., Der Sohn Gottes: Eine Untersuchung über den Charakter und die Tendenz des Johannesevangeliums. (F.R.L.A.N.T. 9) Göttingen, 1916.

Whitelam, K.W., The Just King: Monarchical Judicial Authority in Ancient Israel. (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, 12). Sheffield, 1979.

Whybray, R.N., The Heavenly Counsellor in Isaiah xl.13-14: a study of the sources of the Theology of Deutero-Isaiah. (Society for OT Studs. Monograph Series I). Cambridge, 1971.

Wieder, N., "The Law Interpreter of the Scrolls of the Dead Sea Sect. The Second Moses." J.J.S. 4. (1953) pp. 158-75.

Williams, J.T., Cultic Elements in the Fourth Gospel with special reference to priestly and sacrificial ideas. (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis Aberystwyth University, Wales) 1976.

Winter, P., "The Holy Messiah". Z.N.W. 50 (1959) p.275.

Worrel, J., " סוד 'Counsel' or 'Council' at Qumran" V.T. 20 (1970) pp. 65-74.

Woude, A.S. van der, Die Messianische Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran. (Studie Semitica Neerlandica 3) Assen, 1957.

———, "Melchisedech als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midrasahim aus Qumran Höhle XI". O.T.S. 14 (1965). pp.354-73.

——— and de Jonge, M., "11Q Melchisedek and the New Testament". N.T.S. 12 (1965/6). pp. 301-26.

Wrede, W., Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien. Göttingen, 1901.

Yadin, Y., "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Epistle to the Hebrews" in Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls. (Scripta Hierosolymitana IV) Jerusalem, 1958 pp. 14-27.

———, "A crucial passage in the Dead Sea Scroll", J.B.L. 78 (1959) pp. 238-41.

———, "A note on Melchizedek and Qumran". I.E.J. 15 (1965) pp. 152-4.

Young, Frances M., Sacrifice and the Death of Christ. London, 1975.

Zehrer, F., "Jesus, der Sohn Gottes". Bib. Liturg. 48 (1975) pp. 70-81.