

Durham E-Theses

Christology and ecclesiology in the fourth gospel

Andrew J. Bigger

How to cite:

Bigger, Andrew J. (1983) Christology and ecclesiology in the fourth gospel. Masters 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/7258/> 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.

CHRISTOLOGY AND ECCLESIOLOGY IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

ANDREW J. BIGGER

Presented for the degree of M.A. in the
University of Durham

1983

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.



24. MAY 1984

ABSTRACT

The aim of this thesis is to show the connection between christology and ecclesiology in the Fourth Gospel; how the latter is based totally on the former to such an extent that the christological and ecclesiological models are treated as one subject, the community being the continuation of Jesus' presence on earth.

In Part One, christology is examined, and with it the question of whether John has clarified or obscured the Synoptic tradition's account of the life of Jesus. The central motif is shown to be that of oneness, and where a subordinat-
ionist tendency occurs it is reinterpreted in accordance with the complete oneness of Father and Son, so that sender and sent are seen as identical, and yet distinct and in relationship to each other.

Part Two examines ecclesiology as derived from the Father-Son model. The Christian community is shown to stand in the same relation to Jesus as does Jesus to the Father; the community thus takes on the role of the continuation of the incarnation, of God walking on the earth. The oneness motif is therefore not limited to the Father-Son relationship but works in an ecclesiological direction also. What has been affirmed christologically, that Father and Son are totally one, is now affirmed of the community and Jesus.

The conclusion is that these two motifs, christology and ecclesiology, are one and although in the theological development christology preceded ecclesiology, now they are fused together and both interact on each other.

The final conclusion is that in regard to the Synoptic tradition, John has attempted to draw out the true significance of Jesus' message, but in so doing has forced everything into the oneness motif, thus obscuring something of the humanity of Jesus. From an ecclesiological viewpoint, he has developed the material in a way not previously done before.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
PREFACE	vii
PERIODICALS	vi
INTRODUCTION	1

PART ONE: CHRISTOLOGY OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL : THE FATHER-SON MOTIF

CHAPTER ONE : MAKING HIMSELF EQUAL WITH GOD 15

- A. THE ACCUSATION (5:1-18)
- B. CLARIFICATION OF THE ONENESS MOTIF.
 - a. Logion and interpretation (vv19-23)
 - b. ἴσωςταίεν and κρίεν (vv21-30)
 - c. Witness (vv31-47)
- C. CONCLUSIONS

CHAPTER TWO : THE OUTWORKING OF THE ONENESS MOTIF 43

- A. THEMATIC OUTWORKING OF ONENESS
 - a. Witness and Judgement
 - b. Sending
 - c. ἔργα
 - d. Love
 - e. Knowledge
 - f. δόξα
- B. CONCLUSIONS

CHAPTER THREE : SUBORDINATIONIST CHRISTOLOGY?

62

- A. CHRISTOLOGY OF SUBORDINATION OR EQUALITY?
- B. CHRISTOLOGICAL PICTURE
- C. RELATIONSHIP OF JOHN'S CHRISTOLOGY TO THE SYNOPTIC TRADITION

CHAPTER FOUR : THE PERSPECTIVE OF ONENESS

80

- A. THE PRE-EXISTENT LOGOS
- B. THE ΛΟΓΟΣ BECOMES FLESH
- C. THE PROLOGUE AND THE ONENESS MOTIF
- D. THE INTRODUCTION OF THE FATHER-SON MODEL
- E. ECCLESIOLOGICAL AND SOTERIOLOGICAL CONCERN

PART TWO : CHRISTOLOGY AND ECCLESIOLOGY

CHAPTER FIVE : THE APPLICATION OF ONENESS

104

- A. CHRISTOLOGY AND ECCLESIOLOGY
- B. CHRISTOLOGICAL BASIS & SETTING (13:31-14:11)
- C. CHRISTOLOGICAL OUTWORKING OF THE ONENESS MOTIF
 - a. *ἔργα*
 - b. Indwelling (15:1-8)
 - c. Love
- D. ECCLESIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

CHAPTER SIX: CHRISTOLOGY AS ECCLESIOLOGY

124

- A. VERTICAL EXEGESIS
- B. THEMATIC EXEGESIS
 - a. *δόξα*
 - b. Sending
 - c. Love

d. Indwelling and Oneness

C. ECCLESIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

CHAPTER SEVEN : CONCLUSIONS

144

A. CHRISTOLOGY

B. ECCLESIOLOGY

C. THE ONENESS OF THE CHRISTOLOGICAL & ECCLESIOLOGICAL MOTIFS

BIBLIOGRAPHY

153

PERIODICALS

- BJRL : The Bulletin of John Rylands Library
- BT : Bible Translator
- BTB : Biblical Theology Bulletin
- EQ : Evangelical Quarterly
- ET : Expository Times
- HJ : Hibbert Journal
- HTR : Harvard Theological Review
- INT : Interpretation
- JBL : Journal of Biblical Literature
- JSNT : Journal for the Study of the New Testament
- JTS : Journal of Theological Studies
- NT : Novum Testamentum
- NTS : New Testament Studies
- SJT : Scottish Journal of Theology

PREFACE

When studying John's Gospel in my second year at Kings College London, I became fascinated and puzzled by various statements in the farewell discourses. These spoke of Jesus and his disciples reciprocally in terms of their relationship with the Father; specifically they seemed to indicate that the disciples' relationship with Jesus was equivalent in some sense to Jesus' relationship with the Father.

This made me wish to pursue this line of enquiry, and, starting with christology, show how the Father-Son model is the basis for the relationship between Jesus and the community from which the author was writing.

I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr. John McHugh, who has allowed me to pursue this line of enquiry. He has restrained me from being diverted away from the relevant field of study, and has been a help and encouragement throughout.

Introduction

"What customary scholarship endeavours methodologically, namely to show that John approximates to or complements the Synoptic tradition, is then expressed in practice, quite remarkably through the almost universal attempt to find a christology of humiliation even in the Fourth Gospel."¹ In this rather provocative way, Ernst Käsemann formulates "one of the most important if not the decisive problem of Johannine interpretation".² It is a problem which every generation of scholarship has had to examine and re-examine, because as yet there has been no satisfactory solution.

In recent times, theological trends and movements have tended to obscure rather than to clarify the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. All too often a theological framework is imposed on the text, and it is this which determines exegesis rather than exegesis which determines the theological framework. A few examples of this will suffice: Bultmann's exegesis, particularly of the Pauline and Johannine literature, is influenced very deeply by Heidegger's categories of existentialism, and these are imposed upon the text in a rather arbitrary way. Where something does not fit (where for example futurist eschatology is introduced), this is very often put down to the work of redactors or editors.³ Whereas Bultmann dismisses this futuristic element to a large extent, Cullmann's scheme of Heilsgeschichte tends not to do justice to the aspects of realised eschatology in John. From yet another perspective, evangelical theology has often obliterated the meaning of this gospel by imposing on it a twentieth century concept of history,⁴ foreign to the author.

In all these interpretations, exegesis can become very tortuous; we must be very wary of putting hermeneutics before exegesis. If we wish to show how the New Testament is applicable today, the process is a valid one only after the text has been "killed stone dead". If we do not heed this caution our task



will be eisegesis not exegesis. It is worth mentioning this from the start, because although it is impossible to approach the gospel without presuppositions, we must always allow these to be changed by exegesis, and be careful not to impose a rigid theological schema of our own, into which everything, at all costs, must fit. With this in mind, we may turn our attention to the problem before us.

The first question we must ask is that of the identity and nature of the "Synoptic tradition" as it is usually called. This will not be treated fully here, partly because it is impossible to reach really precise conclusions, and partly because there is a wide degree of agreement among scholars as to the more general conclusions we may reach. Nevertheless, a few observations will be helpful.

That John knew of the tradition behind the Synoptic Gospels is almost universally held. It is difficult to be certain of the extent of this knowledge and the precise nature of it, but we may be fairly sure that he knew traditions about Jesus, many of which are incorporated in the Synoptic Gospels. This is proved by the various stories in John which find parallels in one or more of the other gospels: the cleansing of the Temple (2:13-22), the feeding of five thousand (6:5-15), the walking on the lake (6:16-21), the healing of the official's son (4:46-54). The story about John the Baptist in 1:19-34 is also an echo of Synoptic-type tradition, even if it has been worked over and employed to a different purpose.

Literary dependence need not be postulated to maintain this observation. This position came under fierce attack from Windisch, Gardner-Smith and Wilckens in particular, although it has found recent support in Barrett,⁵ who maintains John knew the Gospel of Mark. Howard and Bailey may also be said to give qualified approval to some degree of literary dependence, as may Lightfoot and Hoskyns. Barrett's argument, if inconclusive (as he himself recognises), does at

least show that John must have known the traditions behind Mark: Bailey has attempted to show the same thing for Luke, and whether or not he is right, the similarities between the two gospels at certain points is suggestive. From this it can be seen that the overwhelming probability is that John either knew one or more of the Synoptic Gospels, or, as is more likely, knew of independent, parallel traditions of the kind which lie behind the Synoptic Gospels, and although it is not possible to say which traditions John knew and which he did not, he must have been aware of the essential nature of these traditions and the picture they gave of the person of Jesus.

The key question now is how John used this tradition and developed it, and the criteria on which he did so. Has he done justice to the christological picture of the Synoptic tradition, and drawn out what was already there, or has he added something of his own and obscured the tradition by imposing foreign theological categories onto that tradition? Does he retain the human figure of Jesus presented by the Synoptics, or is the humanity of Jesus unbelievable in this gospel? Is there in this gospel a christology of humiliation and subordination, or is his humiliation "the absolute minimum of costume designed for the one who for a little while dwelt among men" ?⁶

This christological question has been asked time and time again by scholars of the Fourth Gospel. The more usual answer given, as the quotation from Käsemann at the beginning of the chapter was intended to show, is that John complements the Synoptic Gospels (or tradition) and brings out their real meaning. R.H. Lightfoot, suggesting that John knew the other Synoptic Gospels, asks "Whether, if, so far as St. John knew, his gospel would stand alone, over against a diffused, miscellaneous mass of earlier tradition, he would have been prepared to write a gospel in which, in order to explain the Lord's work, he reinterprets the tradition with the great freedom that he shows".⁷ On this showing, the author presumably intended his gospel to be read in conjunction with the other three. Lightfoot's solution to the question of whether John's treatment has been a valid one, is that in regard to the other gospels, "he sought to interpret them, and to draw out the significance of the original

events",⁸

Hoskyns, a little earlier, asked the same question. "Has the Church, in thus binding the four gospels together, well nigh destroyed the proper meaning of the last of them?"⁹ Did the author of the Fourth Gospel assume his readers knew the traditions, or the Synoptic Gospels themselves? If the answer to either is affirmative, it must affect our judgement of the christological picture in this gospel for the simple reason that John may have intended his gospel to be read with the other traditions or gospels in mind. "The important question", he says, "...is whether it is or is not a work existing in its own right, and whether it is or is not to be interpreted independently and by itself."¹⁰ Again, the answer is to treat John as drawing out what is implicit in the Synoptic Gospels, and showing their true meaning. This position can be traced back at least as far as Harnack, who maintained that "even according to John's Gospel, Jesus finishes the work which the Father has given him, and is obedient even unto death".¹² That is to say, the picture given by the Synoptics is essentially the same as that given by John.

More recently, Barrett has argued that the subordinationist element is very strong in John. Again, the same question is being asked: has John obscured or clarified the teaching of Jesus in regard to himself and his relationship with the Father? Although Barrett does not think John's picture totally convincing, he does find that subordination to the Father plays a large part in John's christology. "The Son", he says, "is not an independent, spontaneous source of activity; his work is entirely derivative, both in its form and its content. He does only what he sees the Father doing, and would indeed not be able to do this if the Father had not granted him the privilege of having life in himself."¹³ Subordination in itself however does not necessarily mean that we have the truly human figure of the Synoptic Gospels; Barrett himself says that John "simplifies the theme of the relation of Jesus to God by presenting him in a somewhat inhuman

humanity".¹⁴ The question is not merely whether John keeps a subordinationist element in his christology, but whether he retains the human element, or whether this is lost by stressing the divine. Barrett on the whole sees John as drawing out of the Synoptic tradition what is already there and not radically altering the tradition save in terminology.¹⁵

In Christology of the New Testament Cullmann takes a similar view. He too sees continuity between the Synoptic tradition and Johannine christology. In John however, the divine sonship of Jesus is openly proclaimed whereas in the Synoptic tradition it is not. Again, the problem is formulated, perhaps not as sharply as it could be, in terms of a comparison of Synoptic and Johannine material. That is to say that in terms of christology, it is asked whether the transition from the one to the other is a valid one and whether he has added to the tradition by that process. Cullmann does not discuss in any detail why John treated the material in this way; for instance, did John intend his gospel to supersede the other traditions? However, Cullmann can say quite confidently that "the Gospel of John as a whole penetrates more deeply than Matthew or Luke into the ultimate mystery of Jesus' consciousness of sonship, as we believed we could and should infer it from the Synoptics".¹⁶ John has then done nothing underhand in his treatment of the Synoptic traditions.

Barnabas Lindars also upholds this view; it is worth mentioning him at this stage because he does state the problem clearly, even if in the last analysis he remains in the mainstream of Johannine criticism. He points out the continuity in the gospel itself between historical Jesus and risen Lord; the claim that Johannine Christianity goes back to Jesus himself is quite strong in the Fourth Gospel: "John values the tradition, because he thinks that his christology is consistent with it, and indeed is the truth which it contains."¹⁷ Thus John is a continuation of the Synoptic tradition, a genuine development whereby John has "attempted to seize the essential meaning of the sayings of Jesus which were

available to him".¹⁸ Whether or not this is a fair judgement of the evangelist is something we shall have to ask in due course.

Finally, in this brief summary of scholarly opinion, the position of Käsemann deserves special mention, because he stands in opposition to most of what has been said by more conservative scholars. He differs very sharply from Bultmann who believed the Johannine Christ to be a totally human person; the difference arises from the fact that Bultmann sees "The Word became flesh" as the crux, Käsemann preferring "we beheld his glory". Therefore Käsemann sees the humanity of Jesus in John as no more than a minimum requirement; he regards any transition from the Synoptic material to Johannine as a particularly radical one, not a case of drawing out what is already there, but pressing a theological conception of Jesus onto the framework of his historical life. John is "the first Christian to use the earthly life of Jesus merely as a backdrop for the Son of God proceeding through the world of man and as the scene of the inbreaking of the heavenly glory."¹⁹ For Käsemann then, the problem is much the same: the problem is one of continuity, or lack of it, between John's Gospel and the Synoptic tradition, and it is one which is rooted in theology and dogma, and not just in history. For Käsemann, the presentation of Jesus as risen Lord and pre-existent Word is in John so strong that there can be no christology of humiliation.

All these people are asking the same question: is the Jesus of John compatible with the Jesus of the Synoptics and ultimately, with the Jesus of history? Has John worked over the tradition in such a way as to clarify or obscure the person of Jesus, and his relation to God? As we have seen, it is a problem which is defined in various ways and it raises other questions in its wake. These we must look at in turn.

First, how does John use the tradition behind the Synoptics? That is to say, does he regard this as valuable, if somewhat incomplete, or does he regard it as inferior to his own message? This raises the question as to the precise relationship of John to his sources (whether written or oral), and the precise way in

which he has worked over earlier tradition. Has he, for example, as Lindars has suggested,²⁰ taken the pericope about the apprenticed son (John 5:19-20a), and brought out the true meaning of it in christological terms of the Son as dependent on the Father? Or has John started from the pre-existent *Λόγος*, the Lord of the community, and taken the pericope and employed it in his theological argument? To put it more simply, has he built up a christology from the traditions about Jesus, or has he built back a christology from the experience of Jesus within the community from which he is writing?

Second, does John intend to bring the true meaning out? Perhaps this is much the same as the first question, but it is from a slightly different perspective and therefore worth asking. It is by no means easy to decide whether John is concerned about any kind of historicity; according to Bultmann, he has no concern for this at all.²¹ Therefore the question arises, does John have any regard for the life of Jesus as it actually was, so long as his theological message about Jesus is proclaimed? The fact that he has set this in the form of a gospel, and actually put words into the mouth of Jesus would suggest John is concerned to interpret correctly; but then John would have no strict dividing line between earthly Jesus and risen Lord, in the sense that to put into his mouth words formulated by the community's experience of Jesus, would not be seen as an invalid process.

This leads on to the question as to whether John has actually brought out the true meaning of the Synoptic tradition or overlaid it with his own theological conceptions. These last two questions must be considered together. It is inconceivable that John could have written a document, which quite openly aimed to bring people to faith in Jesus Christ as "my Lord and my God" (20:28), without at the same time presenting what he believed to be the truth about the person of Jesus. It is quite another thing to say that historical traditions were all that concerned him. The question here is whether we are concerned with

the interpretation, so to speak, of the Synoptic narratives, making explicit what is implicit therein, or whether we are concerned with the Lord of the worshipping community. The problem is that these cannot be split up because they are so closely intertwined and rather than there being two questions, it is the same question on two fronts.

Third, what is the nature of the gospel? It must affect our appreciation of the author, and his use of the tradition to formulate his christology if, on the one hand, the book is meant for general circulation to clarify "Synoptic" christology, or if on the other hand it is merely a justification of the particular branch of Christianity which it portrays. The latter position is that of Cullmann²², who argues that the gospel attempts to show that Johannine Christianity is grounded in the historical life of Jesus just as much as is the mainstream Church. This will be discussed more fully at a later point. For the moment it will suffice to say that if polemic is the chief constituent in the gospel, no matter whom it is directed against, it must affect our appreciation of the intentions of the author as to his presentation of christology.

The last question which forms part of this whole christological problem of Johannine interpretation is the one Käsemann refers to as the approximation or complementation. Did John intend to put his work alongside Synoptic tradition, or replace it? Presumably he was not satisfied with the tradition as it stood, probably because the christological picture which emerges from it is inadequate as an expression of the way Jesus is related to God. That does not necessarily mean, although it is a strong indication, that John wished his gospel to supplant and not supplement the other traditions. The answer given to that question however would depend on various factors. If it is maintained that John's gospel is a defense of his community, showing the divine origin of it, John's aim would probably not be to supplant, neither would it be to supplement, but rather to assert that this tradition was a valid one and had its origins in Jesus himself.

Again, if it were maintained John knew one or more of the Synoptic Gospels, it could be argued either that he wishes to supplement them, or that he is unhappy with them and wishes to show in which ways they are inadequate. It is an example of how complex is the problem and what a wide variety of interpretations and solutions can be attached to it.

The problem we have defined, and which has been defined by all scholars of the Fourth Gospel, basically concerns John's knowledge and use of tradition, and his intention in developing it in the ways he has done. In order to come to any conclusion, we must inevitably look at the Synoptic tradition itself, and see if in general and specific christological terms it conforms to that of the Fourth Gospel. Not that conformity in itself is really to be looked for; rather whether the Synoptic tradition bears the interpretation John has put on it, or whether we should look elsewhere for the origin of his christology.

Of course, if John has added elements of his own, that does not necessarily invalidate his christology; at least we shall be able to see what these elements are and whether their inclusion has clarified or distorted the christological picture of the Synoptic tradition. Additional elements may come from different traditions just as ancient and reliable as Synoptic traditions but which do not conform to it. On a mere cursory reading of the gospel it is clear that John was aware of traditions which have no counterpart in the Synoptic gospels. Although we do not know the extent of the traditions available to him, it is clear that he had access to stories and possibly discourse-tradition not contained in the Synoptics, and we cannot blindly maintain it was of exactly the same nature. As Lindars has said: "It cannot be taken for granted that he is more reliable than the Synoptics, or less so."²³

In concluding this particular aspect of Johannine christology, it must be stressed that there can be no rigid hypothesis as to the exact nature of John's interpretation of tradition. There is too much uncertainty for that. We do not

know the exact content of the traditions and documents to which John had access or of the exact influences on his work. Scholars are split over whether it is to be placed in gnostic thought, or with Cullmann in heterodox Judaism, or elsewhere. Brown puts it in the "mainstream of Christian thought",²⁴ Dodd suggests there is no book like it, either in the New Testament or outside.²⁵ We are always limited by uncertainty; all our conclusions are on the balance of probability. As Käsemann has said: "Historically, the gospel as a whole remains an enigma, in spite of the elucidation of individual details."²⁶ From time to time we shall have to give tentative answers to these questions, but it is more important to remain aware of the complexity of the problem than to form a comprehensive solution which cannot be verified.

In being aware of the problem, it is important not to lose sight of John's christology in its own right. Clearly there is more to his christology than the Synoptists. We must not merely ask how he is developing tradition, but also what it has come to mean for him and for the community for which he writes. What function does it play in his gospel, and how does it alter the κήρυγμα? We must also analyse his christology in depth to see what it means for him and the part it plays in the gospel. This will largely be done, as with John himself, by means of the relationship between the Father and the Son. The chief concern here is the subordination and equality of Son with the Father and the relationship between these two aspects.

It is worth mentioning briefly these issues. These are the issues we must come to terms with if we are to gain an understanding of John's christology both in relation to the Synoptic tradition and in relation to the Gospel of John itself.

In talking of the part christology plays in the Gospel of John we come to what it perhaps the most pertinent aspect of christology, namely the outworking of that christology in ecclesiology. It is indeed a most surprising fact that the Fourth Gospel has often been seen in the past as devoid of any explicit

ecclesiology, and as having very little even implicitly. The relationship between christology and ecclesiology in John is a strange one. While it cannot be said that christology dominates ecclesiology, it is true that without such a christological picture as John gives us, ecclesiology would inevitably be weak. However what seems to have happened in John is that ecclesiology has exerted as much influence over christology as vice versa. Not only is the content of ecclesiology christology, but ecclesiology is now the content of christology, and both have interacted with each other to give us an inseparable whole.

To talk of ecclesiology in John is therefore to talk of Christ. The relationship of oneness between Father and Son which is the basis of John's christology, is also applied to the relationship between Christ and the Church, and the Church becomes in a very real sense, the continuation of the Incarnation. This is not pursued to such contradictory or paradoxical depths as is the relationship between Father and Son, but we shall see that it is a very striking and dynamic ecclesiology which is directly related to Incarnational theology. We shall pose the question this way round because our appreciation of the community of which John was a part depends largely on his christological appreciation of who Jesus was, his relationship with the Father, and the work which he accomplished.

It would be interesting, and not entirely invalid, to pose the question in a different way, and ask first about the community and its relationship with God and the work which has been accomplished through it, and see if this gives us any insight into John's christological thought. Again it must be reiterated that these two aspects of his theology are very closely bound together and have inter-reacted so much that it may not be possible to separate them in this way; nor, if that is the case, should we attempt such a task rigorously. We must always be aware that for John chronological schemes are largely unimportant.²⁷ Both Käsemann²⁸ and Bultmann²⁹ have pointed out, quite rightly I think, that the whole salvation drama of incarnation, death, resurrection, Pentecost and parousia

are concentrated in one event (although there is some futurist eschatology in John). Käsemann criticised Bultmann for not placing the earthly life of Jesus into the category of the single saving event and therefore he "does not recognise the complexity of the situation".³⁰ But perhaps this criticism could also be applied to Käsemann because he does not place ecclesiology into this category.

Cullmann is nearer the truth when he says: "in each individual event of the life of the incarnate Jesus the evangelist seeks to show that at the same time the Christ present in his Church is already at work."³¹ Both events are considered "in one and the same perspective". He compares this with the work of Luke who writes two volumes, one for the life of Jesus, the other for the Church, the two being seen in chronological perspective. John on the contrary, "seeks to consider Jesus after the flesh and the present Christ together in one and the same perspective. He writes only one volume. His framework is that of the life of the Incarnate Lord."³² Obviously the truth of this will have to be evaluated, and if we are to talk of a continuation of the Incarnation, that language must also be defended. But it can be done only after an examination of John's christology.

The problems we are faced with then are considerable, and we must bear them in mind if we are to achieve any degree of success. Perhaps the major reminder shall be that the Fourth Gospel "is in the end about God".³³

NOTES ON INTRODUCTION

1. Käsemann E., The Testament of Jesus (SCM, London, 1968) p.8.
2. Käsemann E., op.cit., p.9.
3. cf. Bultmann R., The Gospel of John (Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1971) pp.219f.
4. e.g. Morris L., Studies in the Fourth Gospel (Paternoster, Exeter, 1969).
5. Barrett C.K., The Gospel according to St. John, 2nd edn., (SPCK, London, 1978) pp.42-54.
6. Kasemann E., op.cit., p.10.
7. Lightfoot R.H., St. John's Gospel. A Commentary (Clarendon, Oxford, 1956) pp.31-2.
8. Lightfoot R.H., op.cit., p.33.
9. Hoskyns E.C., The Fourth Gospel vol.1., (Faber & Faber, London, 1940) ed. Davey F.N., p.69.
10. ibid.
11. Barrett C.K., 'The Father is greater than I', first published in Neues Testamentum und Kirche : für Rudolf Schnackenburg, ed. Gnirke J., (Freiburg, Herder, 1947) pp.144-159. Also published in Essays on John pp.19-36.
12. Harnack A., History of Dogma, vol.1., (Williams & Norgate, London, 1905).p.64.
13. Barrett C.K., art.cit., p.149.
14. Barrett C.K., art.cit., p.159.
15. Barrett C.K., John pp.51-4.
16. Cullmann O., Christology of the New Testament (SCM, London, 1959).
17. Lindars B., 'Discourse and tradition: the use of sayings of Jesus in the discourses of the Fourth Gospel' JSNT 13, (1981), pp.83-101 .
18. Lindars B., art.cit., p.98.
19. Käsemann E., op.cit., p.13.
20. Lindars B., art.cit., pp.8 ff.
21. Bultmann R., Theology of the New Testament vol.2. (SCM, London, 1955) pp.3-75.
22. Cullmann O., The Johannine Circle (SCM, London, 1972).
23. Lindars B., The Gospel of John (Oliphants, London, 1974) p.27.
24. Brown R.E., The Gospel according to John (Godfrey Chapman, London, 1968) vol.1. p. CXXVI.

25. Dodd C.H., The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (C.U.P., Cambridge, 1955), p.6.
26. Käsemann E., op.cit., p.2.
27. This does not mean that all historical considerations are irrelevant but that John on occasions collapses time (e.g. 20:23).
28. Käsemann E., op.cit., p.17.
29. Bultmann R., Theology vol.2: p.58.
30. Käsemann E., op.cit., p.17.
31. Cullmann O., op.cit., p.14.
32. ibid.
33. Barrett C.K., art.cit., p.159.

PART ONE:

CHRISTOLOGY OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL:

THE FATHER-SON MOTIF

We begin our investigation with chapter 5 because here John has focused on a problem of vital importance for the interpretation of his gospel. The Synoptic tradition, in emphasising that Jesus called God his Father and had a special relationship with God in terms of a Father-Son affinity, does not make clear the implications of such a standpoint. John, in the most extreme way possible, poses the question and attempts to answer it : if Jesus called God his own Father, and justified his actions by referring to this relationship, is Jesus therefore making himself equal with God? Further, if this is the implication, in what sense is it true? The answer to this question does not really cease until the end of the gospel.

Taking this as the beginning of this question is to assume a certain textual position which must be examined. It has been argued, notably by Bultmann and Schnackenburg,¹ that chapters 5 and 6 should be transposed. The difficulty lies in 6:1 which states that Jesus went across the Sea of Galilee (or Tiberias), when according to 5:1 he is in Jerusalem; further the sign at the end of chapter 4 is set in Galilee so that 6:1 reads very smoothly after 4:54. However, there is no convincing explanation of how this occurred; theories of displaced leaves are always problematical because even if it could be shown that the manuscript was in the form either of loose leaves glued onto a scroll, or of a codex, it would be an unlikely coincidence that a self-contained chapter should drop out so neatly and have been reincorporated in a similarly neat fashion elsewhere.² Lindars' suggestion, while still conjectural, that chapter 6 is an addition to the original gospel, placed where it would fit best, at least makes good sense of the facts.

On top of this, the transposition of those chapters entails problems of its own; for example, the conversation between Jesus and his brothers (7:3-9) would be strangely out of place, the only solution being the postulation of

further textual misplacement for which we have no textual evidence. If we were to place it after 7:1 or elsewhere in chapter 7, 5:1 would become very problematical in view of the feast of tabernacles mentioned in 7:2. In addition these two chapters have a theological relationship which would be destroyed by their transposition, chapter 6 being a lengthy illustration of 5:41-7, namely the Christian interpretation of Scripture, and the way Moses gives testimony to Christ. As these chapters fit together perfectly from a theological viewpoint, and because there is no textual evidence to support their transposition, it is preferable to maintain the original order at this point.

A. THE ACCUSATION (5:1-18)

The healing of the cripple at the pool of Bethzatha provides the immediate context for the discourse, the sign probably coming from the written or oral sources that John had to hand; there is no reason to suppose that John has composed the story himself as it is similar to the Synoptic healing stories and gives unnecessary and accurate geographical details. He has then, taken it from tradition in some form or other.

The healing itself is a Synoptic-type story to which we may compare Mark 2:1-12 (parallels Mt. 9:1-8 Lk. 5:17-26) and 3:1-6 (Mt. 12:9-14 Lk. 6:6-11); although it is possible that John was using Mark at this point, it is more probable that here we have a combination of a similar story to that of Mark 2:1-12 and the words of command (the only exact parallel between the Markan and Johannine stories), ἔειπε ἄρον τὸν κράββατόν σου καὶ περπάτει,³ which in the tradition may well have been regarded as a formula for all such stories. Lindars' suggestion that this story is an amalgamation of two others, one a Jerusalem healing tradition, the other almost identical to that found in Mark 2:1-12 may also have some truth in it. What is certain, is that it is not a free composition, but that it has its roots in the tradition, even if

John has developed that tradition to suit his purpose.

What is of real interest here is the way the story is used so that the accusation of vv16-18 is rooted in an historical event. The smoothness of the movement of thought is remarkable, brought about by the introduction of new motifs, first that of the Sabbath, then the Father-Son relationship. This may well have been missing in the original story, although Jesus as Sabbath breaker forms a strong element in the Synoptic tradition⁴ and the tradition itself has tied together the motifs of Sabbath breaker and Father-Son relationship in Mark 2:23-28. So far as the dialogue in John 5:10-18 is concerned, it has been introduced to give a reason for the accusation in vv16-18, whether part of the original story or not.

There are two stages in this movement to v18: first is the statement "it was the Sabbath on that day" (v10); second is Jesus justification for his actions: "my Father is still working and I am working" (v17). A full explanation of this phrase, linked as it is to the Sabbath rest of God, need not detain us here; the importance of the comment lies in the fact that it introduces the Father-Son relationship for the first time, although the Prologue has already broached the subject and prepared ground for this motif.⁵ Here the relationship is placed on the lips of Jesus for the first time; the problem is to be posed and answered from now on. The movement from dialogue to accusation is achieved by basing the introduction of the Father-Son motif on the actions of Jesus of Sabbath breaking and thus engineering a conflict between Jesus and the Jews. The dialogue in vv9c-18 brings together these two motifs and focusses them in the accusation of v18.

The accusation is a threefold one, and is the logical outcome of the Sabbath breaking together with the justification for it (v17). Not only did Jesus break the Sabbath, but in defence of his action he claimed God was his own (*ὁ θεός*) Father and thus made himself equal with God. The three clauses move in a logical

progression until the problem is spelt out in its most extreme form. From the outset therefore, John is making clear the implications of the Father-Son motif: by calling God his own (ἰδίον) Father, Jesus is ἴσον ἑαυτὸν ποιῶν τῷ θεῷ. The reason for John's use of such strong terminology in his introduction of what we will call the oneness motif, must be sought both in the historical background in which John was writing and also in an ecclesiological context.

First, we must see the accusation as part of the Jewish-Christian debate which was taking place towards the end of the first century; it may even represent the precise words used by the Jews against the Christian community of which John was a part. We could compare them to Pliny's "Christo quasi deo",⁶ the content of which is identical to ἴσον ἑαυτὸν ποιῶν τῷ θεῷ. These words were probably not chosen by the Christian community because of their clumsiness and polemical edge and it makes good sense, although it remains conjecture, to see them as words of accusation by Jews against Christians: it is the Jews who speak these words in the prelude to the discourse, and they are clarified and defined by that discourse which could be taken to indicate that they are not the words the evangelist would himself have chosen.

Second, the discourse must be seen in an ecclesiological context, as a statement of what the Christian community from which John was writing believed about the person of Jesus and the sense in which he did indeed make himself equal with God; linked very closely with this is the Church's awareness of its own relation to Jesus, and the relationship between christology and ecclesiology, to which we shall return in due course.

John's attitude to the Synoptic tradition and his development of it must also be seen in historical and ecclesiological contexts; he is determined both by the Jewish-Christian debate, and by ecclesiological concerns. If John is drawing out and making explicit what was already, but only implicitly, in the Synoptic tradition (in this case the Father-Son relationship), it may be because the

Synoptic tradition was under attack for implying, but not explaining, that Jesus made himself equal with God. In this sense, John could be seen as complementing the tradition and making it more precise.

From an ecclesiological standpoint however, John not only makes explicit, but also develops the Synoptic tradition. The implications of the tradition, spelt out in 5:18 must be brought out and defined, and although John bases his discourse on tradition, he develops it by taking it to its logical conclusion, and developing the christological content in both christological and ecclesiological directions.

The accusation spells out the Synoptic tradition's emphasis on the fact that Jesus called God his Father, and claimed a special filial relationship with God; by calling God his own (ὁ Θεός , in John) Father, Jesus was doing no less than making himself equal with God. We will give more content to this observation when we discuss vv19-20a.

B. CLARIFICATION OF THE ONENESS MOTIF

John has already set the scene for his treatment of the historical Jesus by dealing with the pre-existent Λόγος in the Prologue⁷: in chapter 5 we have the Father-Son relationship worked out thoroughly, not from the viewpoint of pre-existence, but within the framework of his historical life. Both elements are at work in John's handling of this relationship; note the continual references to returning to the Father⁸, and to being glorified "with the glory I had with you before the world was made" (17:5). It would be illegitimate to differentiate between pre-existent and earthly, between divine and human nature in John's christology, as the early Church did in such arbitrary fashion. We shall see that his christology is based on pre-existence and that the problem is indeed one of how Jesus was God walking on the earth, but it is specifically the historical life of Jesus with which we are concerned. Thus, while we must

be aware of both these factors at work, we must create no artificial tension between them: for John they are not in tension but are complementary and contribute to a single picture.

The crux of the chapter is found in the words "making himself equal with God": v19-47 is a clarification of this statement, which is not denied, but rather interpreted by the Father-Son relationship which John has taken over from the tradition. A few general comments are in order.

This oneness motif is central to John's christology. For him, Jesus was not only one with God, but such was his special relationship with God that he was equal with God and was God. The Prologue lays great stress on this, and throughout his ministry Jesus claims that he and his Father are one (10:30), that his will and the Father's is one will, that his action and his judgement are the action and judgement of the Father as much as it is his.⁹ The Father has sent him, as the bread which has come down from heaven to give eternal life (6:32-3); he is sent not as one subordinate but so as to draw attention to the identity of sender and sent. His signs declare his glory and are identified as God's works (5:17; 9:14). Finally the reader is brought to the declaration of Thomas: "My Lord and my God" (20:28).

The development of this motif begins in chapter 5 although it has been prepared beforehand; however before we can understand its development we must grasp John's essential christological thought, not simply the oneness of Jesus and his Father but the relationship between the oneness and so-called subordinationist passages, a subject we shall discuss fully in chapter 3 but which must be mentioned briefly here.

It would be impossible to give a full account of scholarly debate on the subject; the two most extreme positions will therefore be sufficient. On the one hand Barrett suggests that "the Son is not an independent, spontaneous source of activity; his work is entirely derivative, both in its form and its content".¹⁰

On the other, Käsemann adopts an entirely different position when he says that "John is...the first Christian to use the earthly life of Jesus merely as a backdrop for the Son of God proceeding through the world of men and as the scene of the inbreaking of the heavenly glory".¹¹ The tension between "I and the Father are one" (10:30) and "The Father is greater than I" (14:28), has long been the cause of theological dispute. From Barrett's viewpoint Jesus is dependent on the Father for everything; he does only what he sees the Father doing and can do nothing ἀπ' ἑαυτοῦ; he has only what the Father has granted him and submits to the Father's will in all things. Only then is "no honour too high".¹² Yet all this evidence points in an entirely different direction if we change our point of view: Jesus does nothing ἀπ' ἑαυτοῦ because he is one with the Father, and his works are in fact the Father's works and his words the Father's words. On this showing Jesus is dependent on the Father for everything, but rather than this being a sign of subordination, it is a striking example of the oneness motif the content of which is that "He who has seen me has seen the Father," (14:9).

Also, to talk of a paradox between oneness and subordination is very unhelpful; it would render John's handling of the Father-Son motif meaningless because it does justice to neither aspect and the result is an unsatisfactory feeling that very little has been said at all. However, to say that "John's christology leaves no room for even incipient subordinationism",¹³ does not even attempt to come to terms with the dependence motif. The view adopted here is that neither of these two positions is tenable; what John is doing in his christological thought is using one in the service of the other. Käsemann comes close to this position with his categories of correlation and complementariness. Where a more negative or dependent christology emerges (not subordinationist) it serves the interests of the oneness motif without obliterating itself. Far from being paradoxical, what has been seen as subordinationism, is in fact

an explanation of the oneness motif, not in conflict with it.

With these observations, we now turn to the discourse which falls into 3 sections.

a. Logion and interpretation (vv19-23)

The discourse begins with a logion about a father and his son:

ἀμήν ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ δύναται ὁ υἱὸς ποιεῖν ἄψ' ἑαυτοῦ οὐδὲν ἕαν μὴ τι βλέπῃ τὸν πατέρα ποιούντα· αἱ γὰρ αὖ ἐκεῖνος ποιῇ, ταῦτα καὶ ὁ υἱὸς ὁμοίως ποιεῖ. ὁ γὰρ πατήρ φιλεῖ τὸν υἱὸν καὶ πάντα δείκνυσιν αὐτῷ ἃ αὐτὸς ποιεῖ (vv19-20a).

That this was originally a parable about an apprenticed son is probable enough. Dodd, who calls this "a true parable" where "there is no single expression which is not appropriate in describing a situation in real life",¹⁴ Gaechter,¹⁵ and Lindars¹⁶, all give support to this view. Certainly it is similar in form and content to some of the Synoptic parables, such as Matthew 11:27 (parallel Lk. 10:22) and it may well be that John is here taking a traditional saying and employing it in support of his christology. The parable is certainly very important in its context since it is repeated (in part) in v30 bringing the section to a close; although this cannot amount to conclusive proof of this being a tradition logion, the balance of probability lies in that direction, it being totally consistent with the Synoptic presentation of Jesus' Abba relationship with God.

The content of the logion as employed here, is contained in the words ἄψ' ἑαυτοῦ οὐδὲν, a phrase which is developed here and elsewhere in a christological direction. The most significant parallel is Numbers 16:28(LXX):

ὅτι κύριος ἀπέστειλέν με ποιῆσαι πάντα τὰ ἔργα ταῦτα, ὅτι οὐκ ἄπ' ἑμαυτοῦ.

Numbers 24:13 has the similar παρ' ἑμαυτοῦ, both of these phrases translating the Hebrew "עַל־יְדִי". The significance of Moses in this and subsequent chapters may give this some importance as an example of Jesus and Moses in agreement with each

other, on the same side so to speak.¹⁷ This is the more likely in view of the Jewish belief in Moses as intercessor; if this is the case here, it is another way of turning Jewish expectations against themselves, anticipating 5:45. In Numbers the passage stresses the divine origin of the works of Moses; John may be deliberately using this as a starting point for christology with this in mind: in both cases it is the ἔργα which are the issue. However, the parallel is too loose to suggest this with certainty although it may well have been in the background.

The saying emphasises the total dependence of the one on the other, and is brought up again in 7:17, 18, 28; 8:28, 42 and 14:10. In 7:18 for instance, Jesus states that ὁ ἄπ' ἑαυτοῦ λαλῶν τὴν δόξαν τὴν ἰδίαν ζητεῖ. Contrary to this, Jesus does not speak from himself and does not therefore seek his own glory, but the glory of him who sent him. This ties in with the logion here; Jesus does nothing on his own authority, but as the Son, he does only what he sees the Father doing. On the surface this might seem to imply the role of subordinate, but two things should be borne in mind:

- a. ὁ γὰρ πατήρ φιλεῖ τὸν υἱὸν καὶ πάντα δείκνυσιν αὐτῷ ἃ αὐτὸς ποιεῖ
- b. 14:9-10: ὁ ἑωρακὼς ἐμὲ ἑώρακεν τὸν πατέρα • πῶς σὺ λέγεις • δεῖδον ἡμῖν τὸν πατέρα; οὐ πιστεύεις ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐστίν; τὰ ῥήματα ἃ ἐγὼ λέγω ὑμῖν ἀπ' ἑμαυτοῦ οὐ λαλῶ, ὁ δὲ πατήρ ἐν ἐμοὶ μένων ποιεῖ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ.

The ἀπ' ἑαυτοῦ here is certainly not indicative of the subordinate; it is however indicative of total dependence one on the other, a motif which is used in such a way as to explain the oneness of Father and Son, not form a contrast to it. Dependence does not mean that the Son merely bases his authority on God as his Father: rather, the words he speaks and the works he performs are the very same words and works as his Father's because the action of Father and Son is identical. To speak of Jesus as having authority in himself, outside

his relationship with the Father, would be to destroy the oneness motif. The thesis of the oneness motif is not that Jesus is equal with God as a separate being but that he and the Father are one and the same, and yet distinct. Therefore it is said that Jesus does nothing of himself: it is he and the Father who act together, and can therefore be spoken of reciprocally and to some degree interchangeably; this is the meaning of ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ in regard to christology. Dependence is thus the explanation of the oneness of the Father and Son, not something in tension with it, having subordinationist overtones.

15:4 provides us with an ecclesiological outworking of ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ.¹⁸ As Jesus is said to be totally dependent on the Father, he says to the disciples μένετε ἐν ἐμοί, καὶ γὰρ ἐν ὑμῖν. καθὼς τὸ κλήμα οὐ δύναται καρπὸν φέρειν ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ εἰ μὴ μένη ἐν τῇ ἀμπέλῳ, οὕτως οὐδὲ ὑμεῖς εἰ μὴ ἐν ἐμοί μένητε. The same characteristic which marks Jesus' relationship with the Father, should therefore be manifest in the Church's relationship with Jesus. It would be easy to tone this down and give ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ a much weaker meaning than in 5:19. It cannot in any case mean exactly the same thing in 15:4 as in 5:19, because each individual is not one with Jesus so as to be equal with him, but as a community the Church is to be dependent on the vine who is Jesus (15:1) as Jesus is dependent on the Father, so that the actions, will and words spoken are identical to those of Jesus himself, just as Jesus' words and works are also those of the Father, Indeed, it could be said that the Church does nothing of itself, only what it sees and hears Jesus doing.

If ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ is the content of the logion, christologically speaking, it is the Father-Son model which is used to illustrate this concept, and it should now be considered in more depth. Its origin, in this logion, as we have already suggested, is to be found in the Synoptic tradition. It is a saying cast in parabolic form about a father and his apprenticed son. Is it therefore valid to seek the whole of this motif as used in John, in this tradition?

Certainly there are other influences at work which have fashioned John's development of this motif, but it is difficult to prove that they are the origin of it. The Mandaean literature has an interesting parallel in the Deliverer, the Great Life who plays a significant soteriological role: the messenger is appointed and sent into the world to deliver it and set it free.¹⁹ The sources for this myth however are late and therefore suspect; and even if it could be shown that John knew of it, it is insufficient to explain John's emphasis on the Father-Son relationship. It may have influenced it at various points, or again it may not; there is no effective means of ascertaining this. At most it was one of many influences at work on it.

More striking is 3 Enoch's picture of Metatron: he receives from the Holy One all secrets and all works, and the Holy One himself shows teaches and reveals all things to him. Metatron obeys every utterance of the Holy One who confers upon him the authority of judgement.²⁰ If, as Odeberg suggests,²¹ these are first century fragments, this could be a very interesting parallel, in general terms and specifically in regard to the logion in v19-20a influencing John's interpretation of it and subsequent development of the Father-Son relationship. However, it should be noted that mythical language about a heavenly envoy is common and although John may have been influenced by it the parallels are not conclusive enough to be considered as proof of origin of the Father-Son model adopted in the Fourth Gospel.

These may or may not have influenced the content of John's Father-Son model. For its origin we need look no further than the Synoptic tradition itself. As Jeremias has demonstrated,²² although the tradition has developed and added to the Abba concept, this development is limited and is building on an already prominent feature in the tradition. Matthew for example adds "Father" to accounts taken from Mark, only four times (10:32 (Mk 8:38); 12:50 (Mk 3:35); 20:23 (Mk 10:40); 26:29 (Mk 14:25)); from which Jeremias concludes that "the

key word 'Father' was already provided for him in the tradition",²³ He accepts that there was a tendency to add this title for God into the sayings of Jesus but this increase "had already begun in the stratum which was available to Matthew".²⁴ The title was thus well entrenched in the tradition.

Especially important in reference to John 5:19-20a is Matthew 11:27 (Lk 10:22):

Πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μου, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγινώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ὃ ἔαν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.

This logion is so similar to that of 5:19-20a it may even be a parallel tradition. Its significance lies in its indication that Jesus spoke of God as his Father outside of his prayers (according to the tradition at least), and that the Father-Son model which John has developed was already provided for him in the Synoptic tradition. The similarity of these logia also makes it more likely that we have in v19-20a a logion taken from tradition and developed christologically which would support the view that John was attempting not to read in but read out the true significance of the traditions about Jesus, and was interested in grounding his theology on traditional sayings. Matthew 11:27 (Lk 10:22) provides conclusive proof that some development on Jesus' Abba experience, had already taken place, either in the tradition or with the historical Jesus himself. John 5:19-20a cannot therefore be discounted as Johannine but must be seen against other traditions dealing with the mutual knowledge of Father and Son.²⁵

The address "Father" is prominent in the prayers of Jesus in the Synoptic tradition. (Mk 14:36//Mt 26:39 Lk 22:42; Mt 6:9//Lk 11:2; Mt 11:25-6//Lk. 10:21ab; Lk. 23:34,46; Mt 26:42). Jeremias reads this back into the life of the historical Jesus saying he had an intimate relationship with God in terms of Abba experience. The Synoptic traditions certainly present this as being the case, and John, in taking this over, is taking over a prominent motif in the tradition, and something which probably goes back to the historical Jesus; Jeremias believes Jesus saw his relationship with God primarily in filial terms. Whether or not this is so is outside our terrain; what we can

say is that John is not being original in latching onto this motif and taking it to be the main mode of expression used by Jesus.

Almost certainly then the origin of this motif is to be found in the Synoptic tradition. If so, John wishes to base his christology upon the words of Jesus and bring out their true significance. The logion in Matthew 11:27 gives him theological justification for this, as does 5:19-20a, and John has woven his christology around this analogy; whatever the content of his christology the origin certainly goes back to tradition.

This filial relationship is therefore stated at the beginning of the discourse. A son does nothing on his own initiative but watches what his father does and copies him. Out of his love for him the father shows his son all the secrets of the trade. This simple parable is applied christologically: Jesus is utterly dependent on the Father for everything, deflecting all responsibility for his actions away from himself. The effect of this is to see Jesus only in the context of his relationship with the Father; what Jesus does is the work of the Father also because Jesus is utterly dependent on the Father and does only what he sees the Father doing. Everything he does is therefore the work of the Father and Son together. There is tension here between the negative and positive affirmations of christology:

Negative: "The Son can do nothing of himself, only what he sees the Father doing: whatever he does the Son does likewise.

Positive: "The Father loves the Son and shows him everything he does."

Vv21-3 show that the second part interprets the first and explains it. The Son has been shown everything the Father is doing, sharing completely in the Father's knowledge. The "negative" point now comes into focus: ὅσα ἑαυτοῦ οὐδὲν means oneness not subordination. That the Son does nothing of himself, only what he sees the Father doing, means the two never act separately, but that they are one and that everything Jesus does the Father does. This then is the

reply to the charge that Jesus is making himself equal with God: it is not equality, but oneness to the extent that sender and sent are very nearly spoken of as identical.

5:19-23 taken together can now be shown to be a striking statement of the oneness motif. First the parable is interpreted in this fashion, possibly changing the import of the tradition, so the emphasis lies on ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ οὐδέν not as a negative, but as a positive characteristic, reinterpreted by the complete reciprocal knowledge of Father and Son. Vv21-3 help to complete the reinterpretation of the parable declaring that the Son both gives life and executes judgement, actions reserved for God alone. The logical conclusion is that all honour is due to the Son; the Son receives the same honour as the Father and he is therefore equal with God.

A logical argument is apparent here. If we take vv19-20a as a traditional logion (v20b being secondary to the argument), the logical outcome is that the Father and Son share all knowledge as in Matthew 11:27. Therefore the Son does whatever the Father does because the Father has shown him everything. Thus they must share activity, including giving life and judging, God's prerogative. This is also stated in the Prologue where the Λόγος, it is said, made all things and "without him there was nothing made that was made" (1:3). These two functions are the most striking because, as we shall see, they belong exclusively to God.²⁶ The culmination is that honour, from which we may also imply worship due, as it is applied to God, is due to both Father and Son in equal amount. In fact such is the oneness between them, it is not possible to worship one without the other (v 23). Thus it is spoken of as one act of honour. Simply the logical progress can be put as follows:

The Son does nothing of himself, but what he sees the Father doing (v19).

The Father shows the Son everything (v20a).

The Son therefore gives life and judges (vv21-2).

Honour due to the Father is therefore also due to the Son (v23).

But for John, the culmination in v23 is only what vv19-20a is saying: the Father and Son act together in such a way that their activity is identical. So therefore is the honour due to them. If there is any possible subordinationist overtones, they are made to serve the interests of oneness by making ἄφ' ἑαυτοῦ οὐδέν a positive reflection of oneness.

Thus, although the accusation is defined it is barely qualified. The only qualification is that it is oneness not equality that is characteristic of the Father and Son. Singly, the implication of vv19-20a and vv21-2 is striking: their cumulative affect is conclusive, so that the climax in v23 gives the true meaning (for John) of vv19-20a.

b. ζωοποιεῖν and κρίνειν (vv21-30)

The functions of giving life and judging belong exclusively to God. In regard to the former, the Old Testament occasionally speaks in terms of preserving life,²⁷ but more often it refers to God's prerogative of giving life to someone, either in an organic or salvific sense: Μη θεὸς ἐγὼ τοῦ θανατώσαι καὶ ζωοποιῆσαι; (4 Kings 5:7). As such God breathes life into man (Gen. 1:30; 2:7); he gives life, and also sustains it: εὐ ἐποίησας τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν στάσιν αὐτῶν, τὴν γῆν καὶ πάντα, ὅσα ἐστὶν ἐν αὐτῇ, τὰς θαλάσσας καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐταῖς, καὶ εὐ ζωοποιεῖς τὰ πάντα. (2 Esdras 19:6 (Neh. 9:6)). Since only God has creative power in this way, he is the origin of all life, and the giving of life must always originate in him. To claim to be able to give life is therefore to claim equality with God.

By way of background, Qumran texts provide parallels to life, by which is meant spiritual life or salvation. Man is seen as in the realm of wickedness or darkness; alongside this is talk of being given life, being saved from the

underworld and being raised to an eternal height.²⁸ Man becomes holy by being cleansed from the "perverted spirit of great sin",²⁹ and even though he is in death man can receive life and become part of the community of the heavenly ones. Here again though, it is only God who gives this life.

Gnostic mythology is more important in which, according to Schnackenburg, "the origin and background of this way of thinking about life and death must undoubtedly be sought".³⁰ The lower world is in darkness having fallen from the upper world of light. In the Redeemer myth, the divine messenger from the upper world redeems the world by awakening the particles of light and the soul begins its ascent to the upper world of light. It is not difficult to see the influence at work here: Jesus comes down from heaven as the light of the world and imparts life to the world. It is also easy to see the differences: Jesus is not merely a heavenly messenger but is himself one with God; there is no ascent of the soul; and there is no awakening of inner consciousness. Rather, Jesus evokes a response which brings either life or death. Schnackenburg himself does not believe this has influenced John's ideas about how man receives life although Bultmann would insist that the redeemer myth lies behind the whole of this chapter, even though the content of mythology has been radically altered.

There is undoubtedly some influence at work on John from this direction. How much we cannot say, because the basic outline is not gnostic but Jewish, and it has been extended, not just by gnostic categories, but also by the Greek belief in ζωή as the absolutely other-worldly power.

For John, ζωή represents the life of Jesus whose source is the Father: ἐν αὐτῷ ζωή ἦν. Therefore whoever believes in him does not die but has eternal life (3:15-21). The reason for this is that the Father has life in himself and has granted the Son to have life in himself (5:26); this life is imparted to all those who believe in him; it is receiving and participating in the life of God himself, which although essentially present seems to have a

future aspect (5:27-9; 14:1-2), both being truly eschatological in nature. There is a simple equation: whoever believes in him has eternal life: whoever does not is already judged because it is a rejection of the one God has sent.

In John, it is Jesus who is the source of this life, although the source of his life is in the Father. He is the bread of life (6:25-71) or living water that satisfies completely (4:10-11). Whoever eats his flesh and drinks his blood has eternal life, and whoever believes in him will never die but has already passed from judgement to life. Immortality is not intended here,³¹ because in 11:25-6 Jesus declares that he who believes in him, though he dies, shall live because Jesus is the resurrection and life. The soteriological factor is most important in John's use of ζωή; it is also ecclesiological in the sense that Jesus has imparted his life to the community and not simply given it to individuals.

So far as judgement is concerned, this is not in the Old Testament an exclusive act of God, inasmuch as there were judges and judicial procedure. For instance the LXX uses κρῖνειν to translate a number of legal words, notably דָּפַד, דָּפַדָּד, דָּפַדָּד and דָּפַדָּד; thus preserving a judicial meaning everywhere salvation or deliverance for the oppressed is implied (cf. Ps. 71 (72):4). That God is judge is well attested: Yahweh is the ruler of the tribe; his rule is expressed in judgement which in turn shows he is ruler of the tribe (cf. Josh. 7:10-26). Eventually this concept was applied to man's obedience to the Torah, and all his fortunes and misfortunes were put down to the judgement of God.

The future judgement is a relatively recent development. We find it creeping into the Hebrew religion with the Day of Yahweh (cf. Isaiah 2:12; 13:6,9; 34:8; Jer. 46:10; Lam. 2:22; Ez. 13:5; 30:3; Amos 5:18; Zeph. 1:18; Mal. 4:5), and in Judaism the idea of a judgement with regard to merits and demerits may have

been pronounced;³² doubtless it was one approach. The Synoptic tradition has judgement at its centre of its proclamation: repent, because the Kingdom of God is at hand and the only protection is the forgiveness Jesus brings. Belief in future judgement is also well attested³³ and again provides the best background for John's development.³⁴

In the Fourth Gospel, Jesus is the $\kappa\rho\iota\sigma\tau\eta\varsigma$; that he executes judgement is of secondary importance. Jesus is the light of the world and men have chosen darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil (3:16-21). Judgement lies in the response to Jesus. The believer does not come to judgement; the unbeliever is already judged, because he has rejected the light which has come into the world. The believing and unbelieving are separated by their own response to Jesus, whether or not he has come from God.

Both giving life and judging are functions of God, and both are given by the Father to the Son. Not that the Father does not give life or judge; rather the action of Father or Son giving life or judging is at the same time the action of the other. That all judgement has been given to the Son does not mean that the Son judges in isolation from the Father. When the Son judges, the Father is also judging.

Vv9-23 therefore state categorically that the Father and Son act together in everything. The Son only does what the Father does; in particular he judges and gives life, the actions of God himself. The conclusion that he is entitled to the same honour as the Father is inescapable because the two are in reality one: this is the answer to the accusation of v18. The whole of this section is therefore consistent: the oneness motif is stated by the use of the Father-Son relationship and illustrated by the functions of giving life and judging.

Both of these characteristics are taken further in vv24-9. Initially, the state of the believer is emphasised: he has already passed from death to life. But the rest of this section is obscured by a future resurrection and judgement

which does not fit in with John's theology as expressed elsewhere. A little time must be taken to come to grips with this.

Vv24-9 falls into two parts. Vv24-6 is entirely consistent with vv19-23. Merely putting into future perspective the soteriology which derives from the Son's giving of life and judging. Only the reference to θανάτος and οἱ νεκροὶ (vv24-5) is ambiguous. It could refer to a physical death; in this case immortality is intended, the believer bypassing death which the unbeliever cannot. οἱ νεκροὶ must thus also refer to the physically dead who had not heard Jesus' message and those who hear shall live. The problem with this view is that nowhere else does John talk in such terms. On the contrary, he accepts that the believer will die, but even though he dies, he shall live (11:25). Also the "now is" of v25 makes this interpretation untenable because John is not here or elsewhere advocating a general present resurrection from the dead.³⁵

So we are thrown back upon the other interpretation, that θανάτος and οἱ νεκροὶ refer to spiritual death. This also raises certain problems: it does not come to terms with νεκροὶ which should properly be translated "corpses"; v21 also talks in terms of a physical resurrection, although there could be a shift in meaning between the first and second uses of νεκροὶ. This however is unlikely as the second certainly refers back to the first. The Son gives life as the Father raises (ἐγείρει) the dead and gives them life. Now we are told that the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God and those who hear will receive life.

οἱ νεκροὶ then must refer to the physically dead. Yet for John life is not merely physical and we cannot limit it to physical life here. θανάτος must be spiritual and not physical although it implies that physical death too cannot hold him who believes in Jesus. Thus we have both physical and spiritual death in these verses, so intertwined that they fuse into each other.

This is consistent with vv19-23. The believer receives life and does not come

to death, by which is meant spiritual death, but it also implies that physical death is rendered powerless in regard to the believer. $\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\kappa\rho\acute{\omicron}\iota$, picking up v21 refers to the physically dead, but does not exclude unbelievers, who will hear the voice of the Son of God and be brought to life. V26 goes on to indicate that the Father and Son both have life in themselves, although the Son has this granted to him, again emphasising the function of giving life (v21), bringing us back to the complete oneness of action between Father and Son: both give life and their giving of life cannot be spoken of in isolation from the other.

The oneness motif therefore has been stated in v19-23; v24-6 is an illustration of the life-giving Son mentioned in v21. He gives life to whom he wills, both spiritual and physical showing he exercises the same action as the Father himself, which is a striking affirmation of the accusation that Jesus is equal with God. The central thrust of the passage is complete oneness based on complete dependence; an identity of persons rather than a comparison of two separate entities. The action of the Father is that of the Son and vice versa.

Vv27-9 are a problem however. So great a problem is it that Bultmann banishes it altogether as the work of a later redactor.³⁶ It is relevant to our task because it provides an illustration of the Son's activity as judge, which, as we have shown, is a function in eschatological terms ascribed only to God. If we dismiss this as redaction we cannot do so, as Bultmann may have done, simply because it uses traditional eschatological language; but if it retracts and alters what has gone before we may be justified in questioning its authenticity.

V27 is no problem to us. It gives a short illustration of the judgement mentioned in v22, as v24-6 illustrated the Son's power to give life. The completeness of the Son as Judge is emphasised: as present judge, he evokes a response leading to either death or life, and as future eschatological judge he executes judgement because he is the Son of Man. This brings into focus the

giving of life, since judgement leads to either giving or taking of life.

Vv28-9 is incidental to this and gives a concrete account of his activity as eschatological judge.

Vv28-9 develop the idea of judgement in a way contrary to the rest of John's theology. The really conspicuous phrase is in v29 which states a resurrection of life and of judgement for those who have done good and evil respectively. Not only does this not tally with John's overall idea of judgement, but it does not tally with the preceding section where judgement has nothing to do with doing good but simply with believing that Jesus is sent from God:

ὁ τὸν λόγον μου ἀκούων καὶ πιστεύων τῷ πέμψαντί με ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον καὶ εἰς κρίσιν οὐκ ἔρχεται; ἀλλὰ μεταβέβηκεν ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὴν ζωὴν (v24).

Judgement results from the response given to Jesus who now represents the κρίσις; this is entirely inconsistent with the resurrection spoken of in vv28-9.

There are two possibilities. First, it could be an interpolation at an early stage. There is much to recommend this view: we have already discussed the change in the meaning of judgement; further there is the addition of μή θαυμάζετε τοῦτο, contradicting v21 where it is said that the greater works would make the people marvel. Again v30 would read very well after v27 or even after v27a. The problem with this view is that there is no textual evidence for it being added at a later stage. However, there is no reason why it could not have been added before or shortly after the gospel was published.

Second, it could be a piece of tradition at variance with the rest of the gospel, but which John felt he had to include. But John's radical attitude to the traditions he has makes this extremely unlikely; where he does take over tradition, he often reinterprets and refashions it according to his purpose. The logion of vv19-20a is a good example. He would certainly have not taken over a logion such as this without radically altering it.

The most likely supposition is that v27b was part of the original text and

that shortly after its publication this short illustration of the eschatological judge was interpolated as a commentary on v27b, formulating it in typical eschatological and forensic terms.

Vv21-7 therefore present the Son, who, it has already been asserted, is one with the Father, by doing nothing ἄφ' ἑαυτοῦ, as exercising the prerogatives of God, giving life (v24-6) and judging (v27a). The fundamentally important idea of the whole section is that total dependence equals identity of persons and the section is tied up neatly by repeating the logion of vv19-20a in the first person; this is the real illustration of v27: judgement is exercised by the Father and Son together. The Son seeks only the will of the Father and judges accordingly: this again brings back the perspective to the Father and Son acting identically and reaffirms that nothing ἄφ' ἑαυτοῦ means total equality. The section is therefore consistent in purpose: to show that the Father and Son are one and act together in giving life and in judging.

c. Witness (vv31-47)

The Father's witness to the Son is an intrinsic part of the oneness motif and is demanded by it because such a dynamically formulated christology must be justified.

We have seen that the fundamental idea behind vv19-30 was how total dependence could be cited as proof of oneness, not of subordination. Vv31-47 carry forward this idea by stating that since the Son does nothing of himself, neither is his witness of himself:

Ἐὰν ἐγὼ μαρτυρῶ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ, ἡ μαρτυρία μου οὐκ ἔστιν ἀληθής· ἄλλος ἐστὶν ὁ μαρτυροῦν περὶ ἐμοῦ. What has already been applied to the Son in relation to the Father is now applied to the Son's self-authentication. Witness is both a justification and extension of the oneness motif as described above. If Father and Son are one and act together, the witness of the Father must also be that of the Son, an argument which ends in circularity,

because only by believing that Jesus has come from God can you know the witness of the Father that he has come from God.

The passage splits into five parts, there being a preamble as to the nature of witness before the four witnesses to Jesus are adduced. The logion at the beginning of v30, is a remodelled version of vv19-20a: the Son is dependent on the Father to such an extent, he can bear no witness to himself but claims the Father as his witness. This reciprocity of action, that is, both Father and Son acting identically, is expressed in 8:14 where Jesus does testify to himself. The contradiction between that and 5:30 where he claims his witness would be untrue if he did testify to himself, can only be explained by the fact that the Son cannot act in isolation to the Father or vice versa. But as the Son does nothing of himself, neither does he testify to himself: it is the Father who testifies to him, even if there is a sense in which the Father's testimony is also Jesus' testimony to himself.

Witness is now adduced fourfold. First John provides human testimony although this is qualified by the statement that Jesus does not receive his testimony from men. However, John's witness is still valid since he was sent from God (1:6) and was a light shining in the darkness. He bore witness to the truth, that Jesus came from God, but his witness was rejected.

Second, the ἔργα (and therefore the σημεῖα) bear witness because they are not just the works of Jesus but of the Father also. If the ἔργα of Jesus are those of the Father, they must constitute a witness to this fact. Again the argument is circular: the works in themselves are not conclusive proof that Jesus was God and would not compel this conclusion in the reader, and yet the question at issue is whether the works are the works of God.

Neither would the Father's own witness bring the reader to this conclusion because it is not defined. Most probably it is an inner assent, as is mentioned in 1 John 5:9ff where the witness of the Father is granted to those who believe in the Son. This begs the question: you must believe before you see what the

witness is, rather than the witness bringing you to belief. It may also be an introduction to the Father's witness in the Scriptures, a theme continued to the end of chapter 6.

Even with this witness however the Jews are told that although they search the Scriptures they do not see the Father because they do not turn to Jesus to have life. The Scriptures bear testimony to Jesus but the Jews cannot see it, precisely because it is from God and because their orientation is not towards God but is based on human precepts.

So is this witness meaningful in any sense? At best we could say all these various forms of witness are available to all prepared to believe. What is nearer the truth however is that witness follows κρῖσις. Jesus as κρῖσις evokes a response as to whether or not he has come from God. This response is the centre of Jesus' proclamation in John; it leads either to death or life. Witness functions in the same way: it is in fact another way of saying Jesus is the κρῖσις. It is not based on external evidence so much as a response which brings death or life. Thus it can only be appreciated from the angle of the believer.

So where does this motif bring us christologically? First it is a validation of what has been asserted in vv19-30 that Jesus is equal with God; that sender and sent are one and the same yet distinct. It is an emphasis on the fact that it is the Father who is asserting that vv19-30 is true, that Jesus is sent from God. It is unsatisfactory however because it fails to bring forward any objective proof; even the lengthy illustration of the witness of Scripture in chapter 6 is a very subjective interpretation of Exodus 16/Numbers 11. Its strength is that it is an appeal to the κρῖσις Jesus brings, detectable in his words and works, that he has come from God and it is a different way of stating this motif.

Second, vv31-47 is an illustration of vv19-30 in so much as it continues the logion in vv19-20a. Dependence is once again stressed in "I do not bear witness to

myself" and all attention is directed to the Father. Again, this can only be understood when it is understood that the sender and the sent are equivalent and that both w³¹⁻⁴⁷ and v¹⁹⁻³⁰ constitutes the witness of the Father. That is why there is no objective witness; since Father and Son act identically, the witness of the Father is perceived only when it is believed that Jesus is the Father's witness and, although this begs the question from an objective point of view it draws attention to what we have already seen in w¹⁹⁻³⁰: that Jesus cannot be seen in isolation from the Father because his actions are also the actions of the Father.

Third, the appeal to Scripture is interesting, focusing on Moses as intercessor. Jesus claims a far greater status for himself by showing, although not until chapter 6 in detail, that Moses bore testimony to him that he was the bread come down from heaven. Thus, Moses becomes accuser because the Jews will not believe his words and because they do not believe his words, they cannot believe Jesus. The Jews' argument is therefore turned against itself and the comparison with Moses which may form part of the introductory logion (ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ οὐδέν) culminates in Moses bearing witness that Jesus is sent from God.

C. CONCLUSIONS

The discourse in 5:19-47 therefore answers the accusation in the affirmative. John has taken a traditional logion and applied it christologically: the Son does nothing of himself only what he sees the Father doing. This is the basis of the discourse, and is expounded in terms of a complete oneness between Father and Son to the extent that the Son shares in the Father's prerogatives of giving life and judging; he therefore receives the same τιμή as does God himself. Both these functions are expounded and illustrated and the discourse is concluded by an examination of witness, a notion only intelligible in terms of the sender and the sent being equivalent. It again rests on the dependence motif.

This is the fundamental tenet of John's high christology of oneness: that although Father and Son are one, that sender is sent, and yet separate, the outworking of this is done in terms of dependence: ἀπ' ἐαυτοῦ οὐδὲν. This is radicalised and expunged of any subordinationist overtones; ἀπ' ἐαυτοῦ οὐδὲν expresses complete oneness; not the equality of two persons, but their essential identity with each other. Because he does nothing of himself, it draws attention to the fact that his origin and nature is that of the Father and that the action which provoked the discourse was not his action but the Father's. Complete oneness is thus based on complete dependence. To say Jesus does nothing of himself is to say "He who has seen me has seen the Father " (14:9).

NOTES ON CHAPTER 1

1. Bultmann R., The Gospel of John (Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1971) pp.209-10. Schnackenburg R., The Gospel according to St. John, vol.2 (Burns & Oates, London, 1979) pp.1-9. cf. also Guilding A., The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship (Clarendon, Oxford, 1960) pp.45-6.
2. cf. Bernard J.H., A Critical and exegetical commentary on the Gospel according to St. John, vol.1. (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1928) pp.XXVI11ff. who has attempted to work out the number of letters in each leaf, to support his displacement theories.
3. John 5:8 and Mark 2:9 with the omission of καὶ after ἔειπε. cf. also Mark 2:11-12a.
4. cf. Mark 2:2 -3:6; Luke 13:10-17; 14:1-6 (cf. also Mark 1:21-8).
5. cf. also 2:16; 3:16-21 31-6.
6. Pliny, Epp. X.96:7. Quoted in Stevenson J., A New Eusebius (SPCK, London, 1957) pp.13-14.
7. See chapter 4.
8. cf. 8:21f; 14:1-4,18-19.
9. cf. 8:15-16; 14:8-11.
10. Barrett C.K., 'The Father is greater than I' Neues Testamentum und Kirche: für Rudolf Schnackenburg, ed. Gnilka J., (Freiburg, Herder,1974) p.149.
11. Käsemann E., The Testament of Jesus (SCM, London, 1968) p.13.
12. Barrett C.K., art.cit., p.149.
13. Appold M., The Oneness Motif in the Fourth Gospel (JCB MOHR, Tübingen, 1976) p.22.
14. Dodd C.H., Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel (C.U.P., Cambridge, 1963) p. 86 note 2. cf. also More New Testament Studies (Manchester University Press, 1968) pp.30-40.
15. Gaechter P., in Neutestamentliche Aufsätze, Festschrift für Prof.J. Schmid, ed. Blinzler J., Küss O., Müssner F. (Verlag Friedrich Pöste, Regensburg, 1963).
16. Lindars B., The Gospel of John (Oliphants, London, 1972). cf. also 'Discourse and tradition: the use of sayings of Jesus in the discourses of the Fourth Gospel.' JSNT 13 pp.83-101.
17. The same procedure is adopted with Abraham in 8:56.

18. In 16:1 ὅφ' ἑαυτοῦ is used in much the same way: he will guide into all truth, declaring only what he hears.
19. cf. Odeberg H., The Fourth Gospel (Argonaut, Inc., Chicago, 1928) pp.191-8 for details.
20. Odeberg H., op.cit., pp.204-5.
21. Odeberg H., op.cit., p.204.
22. Jeremias J., 'Abba', quoted from The Prayers of Jesus (SCM, London, 1967) pp.11-65.
23. Jeremias J., art.cit., p.31.
24. Jeremias J., art.cit., p.32.
25. cf. Dodd C.H., The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (C.U.P., Cambridge, 1953) p.166.
26. Although man could judge, according to the Old Testament, he could not do so in an eschatological sense.
27. Psalm 70 (71) :20 for God's action. Man can also preserve life however - cf. Judges 21:14.
28. 1 QH :19-22.
29. Ditto.
30. Schnackenberg R., The Gospel according to St. John p.110.
31. Contrary to Käsemann op.cit., p.15., who thinks that John believed the bodily resurrection to have taken place.
32. Although cf. Sanders E. P., Paul and Palestinian Judaism (SCM, London, 1977).
33. Matthew 24-25; Mark 13;14:62. This also lies behind the urgency of Jesus' message.
34. Although cf. Odeberg, op.cit., pp.195-214 for Mandaean and Jewish parallels (from Odes of Solomon and 3 Enoch).
35. cf. Kasemann op.cit. p.15: "It is quite disturbing that the evangelist, at the very centre of his proclamation, is dominated by the heritage of enthusiasm against which Paul had already struggled violently in his day and which in the post-apostolic age was branded as heretical.", namely, "that the resurrection of the dead had already taken place." However, he admits John has modified this heritage.
36. Bultmann R., The Gospel of John, p.261.

CHAPTER TWO : THE OUTWORKING OF THE ONENESS MOTIF

The basic christology has been stated in the discourse of 5:19-47; the rest of the gospel develops the various themes expounded, or just mentioned, in that discourse. Most of these are fully developed by the end of chapter 12, 13-17 giving their ecclesiological application, but never is there any clear dividing line between christology and ecclesiology, so closely are they intertwined. Thus we will find christological comment in chapter 17, and ecclesiological as early as the Prologue. From a christological viewpoint the major themes John uses to expound the Father-Son relationship - witness, judgement, sending, mutual knowledge, works, love and glory - must now be examined in depth.

A. THEMATIC OUTWORKING OF ONENESS.

a. Witness and Judgement

Witness and judgement must be examined together because they are completely intertwined and function in similar ways. The witness theme is continued in 8:12-20, although it plays an important role in the gospel as a whole. It is used of John the Baptist (1:7-8,15,32-4; 3:26-8; 5:33-5) who bore witness to the light, that "this is the Son of God" (1:34). More importantly it is used as in 5:31-47 as a validation of Jesus' claim to be from God, to exercise the same prerogatives as God and to be one with the Father (5:19-30). There is no idea of Jesus as μαρτυρος however, in terms of death.¹

The Pharisees in 8:13 accuse Jesus of bearing witness to himself because he has declared "I am the light of the world". Although he denied doing so in 5:31f, he admits it here; in 5:31f however, we saw that 5:19-30 was the witness of the Father, that "the union between himself and the Father is so close that the Father's witness and his own witness to himself are really indistinguishable".² The Father and Son are thus spoken of interchangeably in

the context of witness. Put in terms of Jewish law (cf. Num. 35:30; Dt. 17:6), "I bear witness concerning myself, and the Father who sent me bears witness to me" (v18), thus making up the two witnesses required.

The witness theme is important for the oneness motif because it is inextricably intertwined with the Father-Son relationship. In 5:31-47, it was the Father's witness to Jesus which was the issue; in 8:12f it is the witness of both to the fact that Jesus has come from God. Neither is concerned with an external proof, as with Jewish law, because there cannot be any such proof. In terminology there is an appeal to an objective validation of Jesus' claim to be one with the Father, but the content of the term witness in John assumes there is none, because it is only another way of stating that claim. The Father and Son are one, and can thus be spoken of interchangeably; the Father's witness to Jesus is Jesus' own witness to himself. The Father bears witness to Jesus precisely because Father and Son are one, but the only external witness (apart from an original interpretation of Scripture explored in chapter 6) is that of Jesus himself. And if the Father's witness is contained in the words and works of Jesus, then from an objective point of view we have merely moved in a circle.

The real importance of witness is not therefore external validation. Rather it is another way of stating the striking claim that Jesus and the Father are one and the same, yet distinct. Only from the angle of the believer does it make sense : it can be proved true only by believing and coming to the Son to have life (5:39-40). It is still a claim then that the Father is the sole content of the Son, that Jesus has come from God and is one with God. But by presenting it from the point of view of the witness testifying to the truth, John has given the oneness motif a new slant : 5:19-30 state the case from the angle of the Son; 5:31-47 from the angle of the Father; and finally 8:12f equate the one with the other, although this development had itself already taken place in 5:19-30.

The witness of the Father then is also that of the Son. Thus works are seen as part of that witness (5:36; 10:25) as is the content of Jesus' words, as we saw with 5:19-30. It is not a justification of the oneness motif therefore but part of it.

As we noted earlier, this is also part of the judgement theme; 8:12f uses both themes to illustrate the oneness of the Father and Son. Having stated that his own testimony is true, the same is said of judging, that although Jesus judges no-one (cf. 5:21-2 where all judgement is given to the Son), if he does judge then his judgement is true: once again the explanation is that it is not Jesus who judges but him and the Father who sent him. Both concepts are part of a legal outlook which sees judgement as following on from the testimony of witnesses, yet in the last analysis, neither is interpreted in a forensic sense. Instead of this procedure, the Father bears witness to Jesus and gives him power to judge: the Father's witness itself becomes a κρίσις, because of the response it demands. Witness and judgement are thus linked, and to some degree are synonymous.

The meaning of κρίσις is best illustrated in 3:16-21, where it is given a soteriological perspective. God loved the world to such an extent he sent the Son into it to save it; the purpose was not to judge the world, but those who would not believe in him had already been judged. Judgement is therefore inevitable once the Son is sent. The κρίσις is Jesus and men's response to the light determines whether they have been judged or whether they have passed from judgement to life. Judgement is not a forensic concept: rather it only takes place when there is a negative response to the light:

αὕτη δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ κρίσις ὅτι τὸ φῶς ἐλήλυθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον καὶ ἠγάπησαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι μᾶλλον τὸ σκοτὸς ἢ τὸ φῶς (3:19).

The judgement is therefore the light which shines in the darkness; the purpose may be to save, but man is judged by his response to the light.

This is consistent with 5:21-30 as we saw. Whoever believes in Jesus is not judged but has already passed from death into life. But what impact has this on the oneness motif?

First, as we have shown in chapter 1,³ judgement is the act of God and ultimately is reserved for him alone. We need not discuss this again here; suffice to say that for John there is a future judgement (cf. 5:25-6; 8:15-18), but it is based on response to the one God has sent, not on works of any sort, so that time can be collapsed and once the response is made judgement is seen to have already taken place. Whether or not the Son functions as the eschatological Son of Man in traditional terms, there is certainly a judgement of some kind envisaged at which the Son will take over God's prerogative as Judge.

This however, particularly in 8:12-18, is seen as the mutual activity of both the Father and the Son: "it is not I alone who judge but I and the Father who sent me." In 5:21-30 it was the Son alone who judged because the Father had given him all power to judge. In reality, neither judges alone because neither can act in isolation from the other. If the Son judges then the Father, in that very act, judges also. Again they can be spoken of interchangeably

I judge no one (8:15) : (the Father) has given all judgement to the Son (5:22).

The Father judges no one (5:22) : it is I and the Father who sent me (8:16).

This, as we have seen, is also the case with witness: first, Jesus does not bear witness to himself, then he speaks on his own behalf (5:31; 8:12f). This is the statement of the oneness motif, that Father and Son act identically; neither acts in isolation from the other. The witness of the Father is also that of the Son, and the judgement of the Father is the Son's judgement also. This interchangeability takes emphasis away from any notion of two beings of equivalent quality and status: Father and Son are one and act identically.

Witness therefore is not an independent proof but another way of stating

the oneness motif, that Jesus has been sent from God. As such it functions in the same way as judgement; both contribute to the oneness motif by asserting that Jesus and the Father are one, that sender and sent are identical yet distinct. The witness motif does this simply by asserting that the Father testifies to this fact, the judgement motif by asserting Jesus' function as $\kappa\rho\iota\sigma\tau\eta\varsigma$, because the $\kappa\rho\iota\sigma\tau\eta\varsigma$ is precisely this, that Jesus has come from the Father. Finally, in executing judgement, the activity of Father and Son is seen as identical. Both judge in a way only ascribed to God in the past.

Finally both motifs are related to the theme of sending. The witness of the Father to the Son testifies that the Father sent the Son into the world. Likewise with judgement: $\kappa\rho\iota\sigma\tau\eta\varsigma$ is the response to the question of whether or not Jesus is sent from the Father. He who believes does not come to judgement: he who does not is already judged. The question of who is judged and who is not is thus determined by a positive or negative belief that Jesus has been sent by God; the motifs are completely intertwined in this way. The witness of the Father is that he has sent the Son; that the sender and sent are one. The witness motif illustrates that Jesus is from the Father and is a $\kappa\rho\iota\sigma\tau\eta\varsigma$: the judgement motif presents Jesus as the $\kappa\rho\iota\sigma\tau\eta\varsigma$, to whom a response must be made, either for or against the Father's witness that he has sent the Son into the world. Both function within the oneness motif in the same way, namely they show sender and sent to be one and demand a positive or negative response to that oneness.

b. Sending

The sending motif is therefore central. It relates to the oneness motif by a heavy use of irony, a technique used frequently in the Fourth Gospel (cf. 5:45-7; 8:39-47). The usual implication of one person sending another, an implication confirmed by the Greek background to the notion of sending, is

that the person sent is subordinate to the sender. If we were to transfer this to the Fourth Gospel the Son would emerge as a secondary figure, subordinate to God and with the authority of the deity only in that he is sent by him and endowed with the authority of the sender. The Philonic Logos doctrine could be applied to the Fourth Gospel in this way. Thus the Son is subordinate to the Father and any authority he has is strictly delegated.

John even uses traditional logia to support this outlook. The sending motif itself is probably derived from the Synoptic tradition; 5:19-20a is a good example of a logion which seems to be implying a subordinationist outlook which in the rest of the discourse is related to the Son having been sent by the Father. Both aspects are then reinterpreted.⁴ Christologically, the sending motif is used to demonstrate the total unity of Father and Son, a unity which is shown to entail the oneness and identity of the two persons concerned. Only once, in 13:16 is it used with any subordinationist overtones, and the traditional logion is again followed by an affirmation of oneness: "he who receives me, receives him who sent me" (13:20).

The sending motif is a statement of oneness, not of secondariness, and it is interpreted in this way in exactly the same way as 5:19-20a. To say the Son only does what he sees the Father doing is to say the two are one and act identically: to say Jesus is sent by the Father and that his actions are not his but the Father's is to say the same thing. Dependence and sending are inextricably bound up with each other, and both are interpreted as oneness; because the two are completely dependent on each other for their actions, they act identically: they are one and the same, if still distinct. The sender and sent are in the same way identical and separate.

The use of the sending motif falls into three categories. First, simply stating "him who sent me" or "the Father who sent me", almost as a proper name (cf. 5:23-4; 7:28; 8:26,29; 12:49; 13:20; 15:21 etc.). The formula serves

to give additional authority to all Jesus' sayings and does so by utilising the theme of dependence to ensure that Jesus is never seen in isolation from the Father. Continually, we are confronted with the unity of Father and Son in this way; the phrase is added on to statements with monotonous regularity.

The reason for this repetition is that Jesus' whole life and ministry must not and cannot be spoken of in isolation, because in his words and works the Father is speaking and working (5:17): "My teaching is not mine but his who sent me" (7:16). To speak of Jesus as sent from the Father is to move away from any self-glory on Jesus' part. He seeks not his own glory but that of the Father, though at the same time it is also true that "he who has seen me has seen the Father" (14:9). Again this must be seen through the theme of dependence: "It is not I who judges, but I and the Father who sent me" (8:16). Dependence is defined as equality and identity. His works are in fact the Father's (9:4), and the Father's witness to him is partly his own words in 5:19-30. Everything Jesus does he does on the Father's authority, and this draws attention to the identical acting of Father and Son. It is not humility which prompts Jesus to say "I can do nothing of myself"; it is a statement of fact that everything he does is the action of the Father as much as of himself. The phrase "him who sent me" emphasises that when Jesus speaks of his own work he is of necessity speaking of the Father's : the action of Father and Son is one.

This borders on the second way the sending motif is used: this finds expression in the *Θέλημα* of Jesus: "My judgement is just because I do not seek my own will but the will of him who sent me" (5:30). This is bound up with the complete lack of self-seeking expressed in the maxim "he who speaks on his own authority seeks his own glory" (7:18). Jesus, on the contrary, seeks only the glory of him who sent him. This is only a variation on what we have seen above: as the Son who is sent he does nothing on his own authority,

seeks nothing for himself and does not seek his own will but the will of the one who sent him. This could be applied to any man in a moral sense; here the key is found in 14:10: "I am in the Father and the Father in me" (cf. 10:38). He is at once the sender and the sent; all things are therefore done on the Father's authority. The *Θέλημα* of the Father is also that of the Son.

In both these aspects of sending, it is important to differentiate this christology from the christology of humiliation contained in Philippians 2:6-11. In John's thought there is no humiliation followed by exaltation: it is God himself who comes down from heaven. The Son is sent from the Father; that is the only point of comparison. Whereas there are two beings in the primitive Christian hymn, there is only one here: Father and Son may be distinct, but they are not two separate beings. The Father is in the Son and vice versa; the sender and sent are one. There is no abasement, only manifestation of glory. What has been seen as subordinationism is in fact a striking statement of oneness: Father and Son act identically and to say the Son is sent by the Father is another way of saying "He who has seen me has seen the Father" (14:9).

This then is the christological meaning of the sending motif. In a sense Jesus does seek his own will because his will and the Father's is one. The irony is that if Jesus did seek his own glory and act on his own authority, it would show that he was not from the Father. It is because the Father and Son act together that no other statement is possible. Both dependence and unity are defined in this way. Jesus could act on no other authority than that given him by the Father; if he did so he would cease to be one with the Father. If Jesus claimed any authority in isolation from the Father, there could be no oneness motif; he would be a *δεύτερος Θεός*. Only by placing the two side by side and describing them as one and the same has John succeeded in depicting them as truly one. That is why Jesus says he does nothing of himself, that he is sent, that his authority rests in the Father: no other statement is possible

in the context of the oneness motif.

The result of the sending motif is complete oneness: Father and Son are spoken of interchangeably (14:26; 15:26); he who receives Jesus receives the Father; Jesus is in the Father and the Father in him; the words he speaks are not his but his Father's. Therefore Father and Son have the same honour due to them. Not only that, but anyone who does not honour the Son is as a result not honouring the Father (5:23). They are identical and yet distinct.

Third, the sending motif is also used soteriologically and hence ecclesiological-ly: "God sent the Son into the world, not to condemn the world but that the world might be saved through him" (3:17). The work of God is that the world might believe him whom he has sent (6:29). There may well have been influence here by the gnostic Redeemer myth: Jesus is sent into the world to bring light and life and to bring it salvation. The ultimate purpose for being sent is that everyone might be the recipient of salvation; chapter 17 deals with the Christian community who believe and have passed from judgement. Such is the purpose of his being sent. To this aspect we will return later.

c. ἔργα

The theme of ἔργα is also used in support of the affirmation of oneness. In chapter 5 it forms part of the accusation that Jesus is making himself equal with God; it is based on the ἔργον in 5:1-9 (and on the nature of all Jesus' ἔργα and ἔργα). Jesus' reply is that his Father is still working and he is working,⁵ which emphasises the nature of the dispute; it also equates the works of Jesus with the works of God, thus clarifying the problem, and leading on to the discourse in vv19-47. The logion takes up the question of the works of the Son, and develops this christologically; the ἔργα draw attention to the fact that Jesus is sent from God, and he has the right to work on the Sabbath because his Father is still working. If the Son only does what he sees the Father

doing (v19) and the Father is working on the Sabbath, it follows that the Son will do likewise. The central pivot of the discourse is the ἔργα of the Son; the central thought is his oneness with the Father.⁶

Further, v36 adduces the ἔργα as a witness. This is consistent with both the theme of witness and the logion in vv19-20a. The argument is somewhat circular however: Jesus performs the ἔργα because he is from God and does only what he sees the Father doing; but the ἔργα themselves in turn show that this is so. He is his own witness therefore that he is from the Father, yet the works he does are not his, but the Father's. This is how they can be spoken of as a witness:

αὐτὰ τὰ ἔργα ἃ ποιῶ μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ ὅτι ὁ πατήρ με ὑπέσταλκεν.

It is not an independent witness but an affirmation looking back to vv19-20a. There they are used to affirm the fact that Father and Son are one. The works of the Son are also the works of the Father. What the Son does, not only has its basis in the Father but is the work of the Father as well as of the Son. There is no distinction between the two; they act together, and the work of the one is of necessity that of the other.

This is how the ἔργα theme is used to support the oneness motif: John refuses to credit Jesus as doing anything in isolation from the Father. The works of Jesus are the works of the Father because the two are one and cannot be seen separately. All the ἔργα and σημεῖα of Jesus are the works of the Father and they bear witness to the Son that the Father sent him. As a support for the oneness motif they function in three ways, illustrating the statement that "my Father is still working, and I am working".

First as a witness. According to 5:36 the ἔργα are part of the Father's own witness to the Son; this is picked up again in 10:23-9 where Jesus' defense is that if he does not do the works of the Father he is not to be believed, but if he does, ταῖς ἔργοις πιστεύετε, ἵνα γινώτε καὶ γινώσκητε ὅτι ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ πατήρ κἀγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ. The works are a witness because they are the Father's works;

again oneness is the point at issue. If Jesus' works are, as he claims, from the Father, and the actions of the Father, then his words are not blasphemy but bear witness to the fact that he is from the Father. The ἔργα demonstrate this oneness: they cannot be ascribed to either Jesus or the Father exclusively.

Second, the works are a judgement because they are a witness that Jesus is from the Father. Men loved darkness rather than light because ἦν γὰρ αὐτῶν πονηρὰ τὰ ἔργα. Jesus, who is light in the darkness, sheds light by performing the ἔργα of God. This constitutes a judgement because men must choose between light and darkness: the Jews would have no sin if Jesus had not done the Father's works. As it is there is no excuse.

Finally the works are a revelation of δόξα (2:11). When confronted with the man blind from birth (chapter 9), Jesus insists that it was not that anyone sinned but ἵνα φανερωθῆ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ. This is not exclusive to the ἔργα however: δόξα is revealed in the whole ministry of Jesus, of which the ἔργα are a significant part. This again forms part of the oneness motif. The δόξα does not belong to Jesus: rather it is the revelation of the Father, another way of saying that they are the works of the Father.

There is a distinction between the works and work of God. The ἔργον τοῦ Θεοῦ is that the world believes him whom the Father has sent (6:29), while for Jesus ἐμὸν ἄρωμα ἐστὶν ἵνα ποιήσω τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με καὶ τελειώσω αὐτοῦ τὸ ἔργον (4:34). In the prayer of chapter 17 Jesus declares that this work is done, anticipating the τετέλεσται on the cross. This work is the soteriological function of the one who is sent: it is to bring life to the world, that all who believe in him (that he is from the Father) should have eternal life and not come to judgement. The Son was sent to save the world not to condemn it; judgement therefore lies in response to the one who is sent.

The ἔργα then support the oneness motif in that they affirm that Jesus does nothing on his own authority, only what the Father does. Father and Son are not differentiated in this respect: the action of the Son is also that of

the Father. Sender and sent are identical and distinct. On any showing the works of the Son are the works of God. This will later be developed in an ecclesiological direction.⁷

d. Love

The theme of love is developed mainly in terms of ecclesiology although the basis for it is the love of Father and Son. It forms part of the logion in 5:19-20a:

ὁ γὰρ πατήρ βίβη τὸν υἱὸν καὶ πάντα δείκνυσιν αὐτῷ ἃ αὐτὸς ποιεῖ.

The Father-Son relationship is therefore based on love. This love is contrasted with the Jews' love for their own reputation (δόξα), a characteristic which prevents them from seeking the love which comes from God (5:41-4). Again the emphasis is on the total oneness of the Father and Son and Jesus' complete dependence on the Father rather than on human testimony.

The logion of v20 would originally have meant that a father naturally loves his son and wants to share with him all the aspects of his trade. This has been reworked so that God who takes the place of the father, having sent the Son into the world, demonstrates his love for him by sharing everything with him and giving him all authority. John's Father-Son model fits this perfectly.

This is borne out by 3:35: "The Father loves the Son and has given all things into his hands". This is also linked with the notion of the Son doing nothing ἄφ' ἑαυτοῦ. The Father loves the Son because the Son's will is to do the will of the Father, to lay down his life (10:17; 14:31). The Jews who seek praise from men and not God (5:41-4; 12:43), are in direct contrast. Jesus is completely dependent on the Father for everything he does.

Love is used to strengthen the idea of relationship between Father and Son, to stress that this relationship is not the independent activity of two separate beings, but is the one activity of two distinct beings who are nevertheless not two but one. As such it plays a vital part in the oneness motif because it forms

the bridge between 5:19-20a and 14:9. It supplies the answer to the problem of how Jesus and the Father are identical, and yet separate and distinct. The relationship between the two, which results in their being totally one, is one of love, the love which caused the Father to send the Son into the world to save it. Christologically, the reason why Jesus and the Father act as one, and why they can almost be spoken of interchangeably is based on the love of the one for the other. It is used in conjunction with the concept of dependence, so that the Father and Son are one because although the Son only does what he sees the Father doing, the Father shows the son $\tau\acute{\iota}\kappa\eta\tau\alpha$ because he loves the Son; love is thus given as the reason for the oneness of the two.

This permits the two to remain distinct and, rather than merely allowing oneness, actually propounds it. It is not a moral oneness however; because of the perfect relationship of love, there is no essential difference between the two save that one is sender and one is sent. The relationship of love allows Father and Son to be described as one ($\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ in a sense), while retaining their distinctness. It is important therefore in an evaluation of the oneness motif, because not only is it a bridge, but it develops the theme of dependence away from subordinationism towards a christology of oneness.

e. Knowledge

Knowledge also plays a part in this relationship. The logion in 5:19-20a again provides the starting point for this theme. It is concerned with what the Son sees rather than knows, but the thought is that of mutual knowledge. Father and Son share all knowledge, because the Father has shown everything to the Son. The Son's activity is therefore based upon the complete mutual knowledge of Father and Son, and the oneness motif rests on the knowledge of both being identical. It is interesting that Matthew 11:27, the parallel logion in the Synoptic tradition, is specifically concerned with mutual knowing. This is

taken up in 8:54-9 where more explicit terminology is used: talking of the Father, Jesus says that although the Jews claim to know him, οὐκ ἐγνώκατε αὐτόν, ἐγὼ δὲ οἶδα αὐτόν. καὶ εἶπω ὅτι οὐκ οἶδα αὐτόν, ἔσομαι ὅρατος ὑμῖν ψεύστης. ἀλλὰ οἶδα αὐτόν καὶ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ τηρῶ. This is a further emphasis of what is

stated elsewhere in other terms, that Jesus has come from the Father and knows the Father. The Jews do not know Jesus and cannot therefore know the Father.

This has already been stated in 7:28-9: ἔστιν ἀληθινὸς ὁ πρέσβυς με, ὃν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε. ἐγὼ οἶδα αὐτόν, ὅτι παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐμὶ κακένως με ἀπέστειλεν.

His logical conclusion is summed up at 8:19: οὔτε ἐμὲ οἴδατε οὔτε τὸν πατέρα μου. εἰ ἐμὲ ᾔδειτε, καὶ τὸν πατέρα μου ἂν ᾔδειτε. (cf. 14:7 where γινώσκω is used).

The mutual knowledge of Father and Son is thus another description of their oneness. Jesus shares in totality the knowledge of the Father (5:19-20a), and therefore he can say that he knows the Father, and that it is impossible to know the Son without knowing the Father and vice versa (8:19; 14:7), this again bringing to mind the logion in Matthew 11:27. Knowledge therefore becomes almost synonymous with oneness itself; it is not knowledge such as a man might have normally. Jesus can say to his disciples, who could presumably be said to "know" him, "If you knew me you would know my Father also" (14:7). Christologically, the knowledge of Father and Son is complete, and is bound up with oneness as defined in chapter one: the Father and Son are so much one that they are identical and yet distinct. The theme of knowledge is another way of expressing this motif of oneness.

One of the most important examples of this is the logion in 15:15: ὁ δοῦλος οὐκ οἶδεν τί ποιεῖ αὐτοῦ ὁ κύριος. Although used ecclesiologically here it also has christological importance. Jesus does know what his Father is doing and the "servant-Lord" description is entirely inappropriate to the Father-Son relationship. The last remnants of a christology of humiliation have been banished.

f. δόξα

Finally the δόξα theme is of vital importance within the oneness motif which it serves. It is not a wholly consistent theme as developed by the author, but its primary significance is clear: Jesus manifested the δόξα of God, and ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ (1:14). This glory is at the same time his and the Father's, a concept which serves the oneness motif and which is developed in terms of reciprocity.

Two passages in particular highlight this. In 13:31 Jesus declares οὐν ἐδοξάσθη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ. This is similar to the introduction of the prayer in 17:1, δόξα σοῦ τὸν υἱόν, ἵνα υἱὸς δοξάσῃ σε. Here the thought is not a mutual glorification in chronological sequence, the Father glorifying the Son, followed by the Son glorifying the Father. It is one action; the glorification of the Son is at the same time the glorification of the Father, only here it is spoken of in terms of two events. The reciprocal nature of this description however tells against a twofold glorification and in favour of a single glorification supportive of the oneness motif because it equates the glorification of the Son with that of the Father. 14:13 brings these two aspects together by talking of the Father being glorified in the Son. Elsewhere Father and Son are spoken of interchangeably as possessors of this δόξα. In 1:14 he (the Logos) dwelt among us and we beheld his glory; similarly, in the ἔργα and σημεῖα Jesus revealed his glory to the disciples (2:11). However it is the Father who glorifies the Son (12:28) and it is the Son who is glorified by the Father (12:23; 13:31-2). Jesus insists ἔάν ἐγὼ δοξάσω ἑμαυτόν, ἡ δόξα μου οὐδέν ἐστιν. ἔστιν ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ δοξάζων με (8:54). Reciprocally, ἐγὼ σε ἐδόξασα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς "with the work you gave me to do"; thus Jesus requests to be glorified παρὰ σεαυτῷ τῆ δόξῃ ἣ ἔειχον πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι παρὰ σοί. (17:4-5).

Jesus' glorification is thus equated at least in part with his glorification of the Father. By glorifying the Father on earth he has at the same time manifest-

ed his own glory because the mutual glorification of Father and Son is one act of glorification. To take one example, the ἔργα of Jesus proclaim his glory (2:11); yet as we have seen the ἔργα of the Son are at the same time those of the Father, so that this manifestation of δόξα belongs to both Father and Son. In it the Son is glorifying the Father and the Father glorifying the Son. The result is the manifestation of glory, which is the outcome of an entirely reciprocal act of glorification. Thus the two phrases "I glorified you on earth" (17:4), and "he manifested his glory" (2:11 cf. 1:14), are both applicable to this one event.

The manifestation of glory takes place in the entirety of Jesus' ministry; whether or not there is any essential change in his glory once he became man is disputable. 1:14 would suggest there was not: 7:39; 17:4-5,24, would suggest that some difference is envisaged. Whichever the case, there is certainly a special emphasis on the hour (ᾠρα) of glorification, the death on the cross.⁸ Death is envisaged as a lifting up (ὑψώω: 3:14; 8:28; 12:32-4) not in shame or humiliation but in glory. It is the hour when the Son of Man is glorified (12:23). He could not be arrested before his appointed time (8:20), but once it has arrived there is no shrinking back: καὶ τί εἶπω; πᾶτερ ᾤδόν με ἐκ τῆς ᾠρας ταύτης; ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦτο ἦλθον εἰς τὴν ᾠραν ταύτην. πᾶτερ, δόξαδόν σου τὸ ὄνομα (12:27-8). The two concepts are intertwined, the hour is the hour of glorification.

This hour though should not strictly be equated with death. According to 13:1 it is the hour when he has to depart out of this world and the placing of this comment is not without significance. We shall see that the whole farewell and death is in fact "the hour" of glorification, of return.

Δόξα therefore is another way of expressing oneness. The δόξα of the Father is that of the Son, both glorifying each other with perfect reciprocity. As such Father and Son are spoken of interchangeably as recipients and givers

of this glory which is finally expressed in the farewell and death of the Son. However there is no attempt at concrete description: it is akin to the witness motif in that it requires belief in the Son to be seen and understood. It is the ultimate of the oneness motif, referring back to the יְהוָה of Yahweh: to describe the Son as both being glorified and glorifying with this $\delta\delta\zeta\alpha$ is yet another powerful way of saying Father and Son are identical and yet distinct. The $\delta\delta\zeta\alpha$ theme must be seen against this background of oneness if it is to be taken seriously.⁹

The concept of τιμῆ also enters into the $\delta\delta\zeta\alpha$ theme. It is limited to three passages, but all show signs of the reciprocal activity of Father and Son. 5:23, as we have seen, is the culmination of the logion of 5:19-20a and its interpretation. It is employed therefore in support of oneness, declaring that the same honour due to the Father is also due to the Son; it follows that if the Son is not honoured then ipso facto neither is the Father. Again this is simply another way of saying "He who has seen me has seen the Father". John is close to identifying the sender with the sent, but he is also at pains to stress the aspect of relationship. No further insight into how the two are one is offered.

This concept of honour reappears in 8:49 where Jesus tells the Jews that the devil is their Father. In contrast $\text{τιμῶ τὸν πατέρα μου, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀτιμάζετε με. ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ δεικνῶ τὴν δόξαν μου}$. This shows that these two concepts are intertwined somewhat; here Jesus honours the Father; in 5:22-3 it is the Son who is honoured. Again, reciprocal activity is evident; the Son honours the Father and in that act is honoured. The Father cannot be honoured in isolation from the Son; if the Son is not honoured neither is the Father.

The precise relation of this to $\delta\delta\zeta\alpha$ is debateable as is the exact nature of both these motifs. The important thing to realise is that they illustrate the oneness motif, both by their reciprocal nature and by the fact that honour or glory is given, is applicable to both Father and Son; it is not possible to speak of one in isolation from the other.

B. CONCLUSIONS

The result of our explorations into the various motifs of John's christology is a conviction that the central thought is that of oneness, around which all other themes orbit. They are all intertwined because they all serve the same basic function: to show how Jesus and God are Son and Father and are one; identical and distinct. The normal method of communicating this oneness christology is reciprocity: Jesus and the Father are spoken of interchangeably, or they receive the same glory or honour, or again their actions are identical because they act identically; what God does, Jesus does. Even the more traditional aspects of christology - humiliation, servanthood and subordination - are reworked and eventually harmonised with the oneness motif. The dependence theme for example is turned around to mean oneness instead of subordination; that the Son is dependent on the Father is the only possible mode of expression because the two are one; not equal, but one. As such all these negative elements are interpreted positively and dependence is shown to be a sign of oneness.

To this charge of subordinationism we must now turn.

NOTES ON CHAPTER 2

1. But cf. 18:37, ἵνα μαρτυρήσω τῇ ἀληθείᾳ.
2. Lindars B., The Gospel of John (Oliphants, London, 1972) p.316.
3. cf. chapter 1, pp.29-36.
4. cf. chapter 1, pp.22-29, for the reinterpretation of the logion in 5:19-20a.
5. cf. Daube, D., The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, (Athlone Press, London, 1956) who suggests that ἐργάζομαι may be borrowed from Ruth (LXX : ἐργασίᾳ).
6. cf. chapter 1, pp.16-29.
7. cf. chapter 5, pp.110-113.
8. The ὤρα must certainly be seen as a more intense glorification than such as is manifested in Jesus' entire ministry, although this is not to imply that there was therefore different quantities of glory according to time, a grading of glory from earthly ministry, to the cross, and finally return to the Father.
9. For a fuller discussion of τὸ ἔργον in relation to δόξα, see pp.92-95.

CHAPTER THREE : SUBORDINATIONIST CHRISTOLOGY?

A. A CHRISTOLOGY OF SUBORDINATION OR EQUALITY?

Christology is the very heart of the Fourth Gospel and our evaluation of this aspect of it is vital to the interpretation of the entire gospel. The answer we give to this question will largely determine our subsequent position in terms of both christology and ecclesiology. Somehow or other, this aspect of "subordinationism" has to be related to the oneness motif as we have affirmed it, either by standing in contrast, or paradox to it, or as a different facet of it supporting, not negating what we have affirmed thus far.

This chapter will in the main confine itself to Professor Barrett's 'The Father is Greater than I', and the issues raised therein, since this is the crux of the matter and is the text we must inevitably come back to in any attempt to show a subordinationist undercurrent in this gospel. From our interpretation of this aspect of John's christology, we will therefore arrive at as balanced a picture as is possible of John's christology, and of its relationship to the tradition which underlies it.

Already, in our examination of the oneness motif, the problem has been posed and to some degree answered. We have seen that the sending of the Son from the Father is not part of any subordinationist element, nor is it part of a christology of humiliation akin to that found in the hymn of Philippians 2:6-11. Rather it is a potent statement of the equality of the Father and Son. Similarly, judgement and giving life, witness, works, and love all fit into this framework as supportive of the oneness of Father and Son, not the subordination of the Son to the Father. The problem lies in whether or not there is another side to the coin, and if so, what it is. We shall find however that although christological formulas are presented from more than one angle, there is no stark contrast, contradiction or paradox between oneness and subordination, because they are

different ways of saying the same thing. A statement can cut in an entirely different direction once your viewpoint has been changed, and so called subordinationist passages may actually be part of the oneness motif. Certainly, our examination so far would indicate that in answer to the question of whether or not there is subordinationist christology in this gospel, we have inclined to a negative position.

It is interesting that our examination of oneness in this gospel has largely derived from one of Barrett's so-called subordinationist passages. This implies that the relevant material may be interpreted differently according to viewpoint, and thus we must be careful not to impose an arbitrary theological framework on it from the outset. It was notable however that in chapter 5 its own theological framework emerged before the discourse started: how Jesus is equal with God. Wherever possible therefore, we must allow the material to interpret itself.

Barrett adduces four passages in support of his thesis that subordinationism plays a significant role in Johannine christology: 1:1-18; 5:1-47; 10:22-30 and 14:28. We must deal with each of these individually.

Of 1:1-18 Barrett affirms that "what is said in the Prologue about God is absolute; the only clear affirmation about him is that in his proper being he is unknowable, for the οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν of verse 18 implies more than invisibility to the physical eye".¹ The μονογενὴς is God in his knowability, or revelation, he is God's agent and an "honoured friend".² Revelation is central to the Prologue, he insists, thus declaring the function of the Λόγος: revealer, executive agent, he who is with God. This however does not do justice to the whole tenor of the Prologue. As Barrett rightly recognises, it opens with a statement that he intends should govern the understanding of his gospel: Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος. The Prologue is an attempt to suggest how this is related to the historical Jesus: there is no concept of subordination after the Philonic model as v1 firmly indicates. The designation of the Word as μονογενὴς, εἰς τὸν κόλπον and as the

exegete of the Father, that is, the centrality of revelation in the Prologue, likewise cannot be adduced to support any subordinationism. Once again, Θεός ἦν ὁ Λόγος provides the key: the revealer and revealed are the same and yet distinct; the sender and the sent are identical, although distinct. Thus revelation does not imply that the revealer is a subordinate being, something less than God, or divine in a secondary sense. The Prologue contains the essence of all John's christology: that Jesus and the Father are one and the same thing and yet distinct. If we were to interpret John's incarnational christology along Nicene or Chalcedonian lines, we should distort its meaning: there is no theology of eternal relations, in the strict Augustinian sense, even in the Prologue of John's Gospel. All is directed to explaining how the Λόγος was God; how the revealer and revealed were identical. The use of the Λόγος concept has encouraged a subordinationist explanation not present in the writer's mind. Θεός ἦν ὁ Λόγος emerges as the essential thought. The rest of the Prologue sets out to show how this is identified as μονογενής and then as the historical Jesus. There is not even an undercurrent of subordinationism here.

The same is true of chapter 5 as we have seen in detail. For Barrett the assertion that Jesus was making himself equal with God is qualified by "verses most strongly insistent on the subordination of the Son".³ Of v19 he says that "the Son is not an independent spontaneous source of activity; his work is entirely derivative, both in form and content. He does only what he sees the Father doing, and would indeed not be able to do this if the Father had not granted him the privilege of having life in himself (v26)... He does the things God does, but in a secondary, dependent relationship".⁴

Again justice is not done to the discourse because dependence is equated with subordination. The purpose of the discourse is not to show how equality and subordination are linked, albeit paradoxically: it is rather to show how the "Word become flesh" is equal to God when the fact that he has taken flesh

automatically implies an inferior being. It is therefore to show how the historical man Jesus was equal with God, and by the introduction of the Father-Son model, to show that dependence means oneness not subordination. Jesus does not do the things God does in a secondary dependent relationship: the works he does are the works of the Father too, and doing only what he sees the Father doing does not mean a subordination of the one to the other: only that the works of one are the works of the other, that dependence is another way of talking about equality; indeed not to do so would leave us with ditheism. We have discussed this elsewhere; suffice to say that there is no hint of subordination in John 5:1-47. The entire discourse is inclined to only one objective: to show how Jesus is one with God.⁵

The third passage adduced by Barrett is 10:22-39, and as we have not dealt with this earlier we shall spend more time on this. Again Barrett sees this as a mixture of oneness sayings and subordinationist sayings. He says that it would be "wrong to read too much christology out of the *ἔν εἶπεν*"⁶ because of the context of caring for the sheep and v29: "My Father is greater than all". This, he thinks, incorporates "The Father is greater than I" of 14:28 and a subordinationist christology is thus postulated. He takes further support from the reference to Psalm 81(82):6: *ἐγὼ εἶπα θεοὶ ἐστε* a phrase which weakens considerably the meaning of *θεός* "and involves a considerable reduction in the claim ascribed to Jesus. Jesus is indeed one with God; but the nature of his unity with the Father, which is not discussed here as it is in chapter 1 and chapter 5, is such as to accommodate a real distinction between the two divine figures".⁷ Barrett thus interprets *ἔν εἶπεν* by *πάντων μεζόν* and thus sees the whole passage as part of his subordinationist element.

Any subordinationism in this passage must be derived from v29 and vv34-6. However, vv24-30 must be taken together; it is similar to the question and discourse of chapter 5 although much shorter, and the same conclusion is

reached in both cases: that Jesus is equal with God, or one with the Father, or as the dialogue continues to v39 "you, being a man make yourself God" (v34). Initially, the works are adduced as a witness as in 5:36, and as we have shown, the implication of this is that the works of Jesus are the works of the Father. They are one expression of Jesus making himself equal with God; because he and the Father are one, all he does is as much the work of his Father as of himself and the two can thus be spoken of interchangeably. Here however a further insight is offered as to why this witness is not self-evident: it is not self-evident until it is accepted as true, that Jesus is sent from the Father and therefore those who are not of his sheep will not believe.

In vv28-30 the almost interchangeable use of the function of Father and Son gives a rather complicated picture. This is further complicated by the textual difficulties of v29. If we follow the Nestle-Aland text, there is no problem of subordination at all: What my Father has given me is greater than all. Yet even following Barrett's reading, ὅς δέδωκέν μοι περισσότερον πάντων (Θ), and take the meaning of the verse to be that "My Father is greater than all", there is no subordination of the Son to the Father because the culmination is to follow: "I and the Father are one". The second statement gives content to the first.

The context is that of protection; "no one shall snatch them out of my hand". This is given justification and authority by the pronouncement that "My Father is greater than all and no one can snatch them from my Father's hand". Thus we have a reciprocity statement not a subordinationist one. The Son's function of being able to keep safe his sheep is identified with the Father's authority to do so, and the latter is given as the reason for the former. Only two possibilities emerge from this: either Jesus and the Father are themselves identified or Jesus takes his authority from God rather than possessing it himself. The former is the more likely, especially in view of the christological affirmation in chapter 5, and to dispel any doubt, John has actually stated it: "I and the Father are one".

There is therefore no subordination here. The culmination is not "My Father is greater than all" but that, granted that premise, Jesus is identified with ΠΑΝΤΩΝ ΜΕΓΙΣΤΩΝ because he and the Father are one, and to talk of the Father is in a sense to talk of himself also. This does not read in what is not there, because the two are spoken of reciprocally and then affirmed to be one. Instead of interpreting "I and the Father are one", by "My Father is greater than all" the former gives content to the latter and interprets it as part of the oneness motif. The Father is greater than all: Jesus as the Son is one with the Father and is likewise greater than all.

The dialogue continues and in an indirect way, and contrary to the Jewish statement, the works of Jesus are identified with his claim to be God. Jesus' reply, quoting the LXX of Psalm 81 (82):6 : ἐγὼ εἶπα θεοὶ ἐστε is out of place and problematical unless we take it as an example of argument from the premises of the opposition and not a true indicator of christology. The argument is that if God himself calls men θεοὶ then Jesus has all the more right to be called the Son of God; his claim therefore does not constitute blasphemy. Again, reference is made to the works as a witness that he has been sent by the Father. The crux of the problem is the phrase θεοὶ ἐστε : does this, as Barrett claims, involve a considerable reduction in the claim ascribed to Jesus?

The argument from Scripture is certainly more typical of the Synoptic tradition than of John. This, and the fact that having quoted the Psalm the passage immediately refers back to the proper meaning (as opposed to the applied meaning) of θεος, and picks up again the Father-Son model, indicates that too much christology should not be derived from θεοὶ in v34. The rapid change of direction once the Psalm has been quoted also indicates that it has been introduced for the purpose of argumentation. The idea of vehicles for God's word being called "gods", and the status implied by θεοὶ, is immediately lost by reference to "him whom the Father consecrated and sent into the world". For the

purpose of the argument however, the Jews are defeated by their own case; the movement from gods to God, or Son of God, is an ironic one, for on the one hand it follows Psalm 81 (82):6 already quoted, και υιοι ὑψιστου παντες , and on the other it moves away from that verse to a more concrete and proper meaning for Θεος within the oneness motif already formulated.

The quotation, although conspicuous and inappropriate, is therefore not subordinationist in its import, nor does it reduce the claim of Jesus. It is rather an argument conducted on the word Θεος, consisting largely of irony: it is unhelpful because it does not answer the question but simply confuses it. Possibly this has been taken from tradition; it is similar to the arguments used in Mark 12:13-27 but is out of place in the Fourth Gospel.

The passage 10:22-39 is therefore far more concerned about the oneness of the Father and Son, oneness already laid out in detail in 5:1-47, than with a subordination of the Son to the Father. Even when there might be a subordinationist undercurrent it is immediately counteracted by a oneness saying and when we look carefully at the context, we see that it is all leading up to v30:

οὐ μὴ ἀπόλωνται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ οὐχ ἄρπάσει τις αὐτὰ ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς μου (v28).

is reciprocated by

ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ (ὁς) δέδωκέν μοι πάντων μίσθον (μίσθων) ἐστίν
καὶ οὐδεὶς δύναται ἄρπάζειν ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ πατρὸς (v29).

These two statements of the activity of Father and Son, where first the Son then the Father act in a particular way, speak of this activity in a reciprocal way, applicable to both Father and Son. The Son is thus incorporated in the subject of πάντων μίσθον, since both are spoken of identically. This leads to the explicit conclusion of v30: ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἐν ἑσμεν. Given this reciprocal relationship, such a conclusion is unavoidable.

Of Barrett's three passages, there is none that gives any justification

for subordinationist christology. On the contrary, all have been shown to cut in the opposite direction and state the oneness of the Father and Son.

Neither can much be said for Barrett's equation of dependence and subordination. He makes a long quotation from Davey⁸ showing how Jesus depended on the Father for everything; whether or not Barrett would agree that this reaches back into Jesus' pre-existence, it is clear that he sees these references to dependence as a foil for the oneness sayings. Yet as we have shown, dependence is not an expression of subordination but oneness. He depends totally on the Father because the two are one; it is entirely inappropriate to speak of Jesus in isolation from the Father; for John his dependence on the Father means the total equality of the two. To have spoken otherwise would have meant either subordination or ditheism; in either case there would be no equivalence of Jesus with God: whatever his status the two would be kept strictly separate. This is precisely what John does not do: he speaks of Jesus and the Father together, often interchangeably and whether he says "He who has seen me has seen the Father" or "The Son can only do what he sees the Father doing" the purport is the same: "I and the Father are one". Dependence means oneness because it affirms that the actions of the one are those of the other also. Jesus' life is also the Father's life, and to speak of Jesus as reliant on the Father emphasises the complete unity of the two, a unity which declares Father and Son identical, if still distinct.

We are left with 14:28: "The Father is greater than I",⁹ a passage not examined in Barrett's article even though it is the title. In view of what we have said though, we cannot assume that this verse has subordinationist overtones; not only would it cut against the whole tenor of John's christology, it would also be unwarranted on exegetical grounds.

It is found in the context of the farewell. Jesus is going away and the disciples response is one of sadness; their response, however, ought to be joy

that Jesus is going to the Father because ὁ πατήρ μείζων μου ἐστίν . This, remember, after Jesus had declared to Philip that "He who has seen me has seen the Father". It comes then, as a surprise to see the two compared in this way and one placed before the other; this incongruity, coupled with the christological picture of the rest of the gospel, forces us to look for an alternative solution.

There are only three possibilities open to us with this statement. First it could be speaking of a strict comparison and grading as to status. On this showing Jesus would be subordinate to the Father because he was not of the same status; if taken in this way, it ought properly to be taken back into pre-existence and applied absolutely.

Second, in his human state, Jesus is obviously limited by becoming flesh, so that while he is on earth Jesus is understandably less powerful and great than his Father. The problem with this view of greatness is that John does not seem to share it ! As he has propounded his oneness motif, there is no reduction allowed for his becoming flesh: this is the whole essence of the oneness of Father and Son. The miracle in 4:46-54 dispels any possibility of merely local power confined by the body or flesh. And elsewhere there is certainly no trace of this view of christology and it would be eisegesis if we were to accept it.

The third possibility is to look for an explanation along the lines explored not only with 10:28-30 but also with the whole of the dependence motif: that instead of being a foil for the oneness sayings, standing either in paradox, contradiction or contrast to them, this actually forms part of the oneness motif. In 10:28-30 we noticed how what seemed to be a saying about the Father being greater than all was in fact two statements declaring the reciprocal relationship of the Father and Son culminating in a statement of oneness. Here we have that same relationship of oneness spoken of as greater than Jesus alone. The Father is greater than the Son only in the sense that the Son cannot be spoken of in isolation, but derives his authority from the fact that he and the Father are one.

If we took "he who has seen me has seen the Father" and applied it here, this would fit also. For if Jesus and the Father are equivalent and identical then of course Jesus as one with the Father has no significance outside that relationship.

This is not to force exegesis because it has already been stated that "I and the Father are one". Since Father and Son are identical there can be no strict comparison, and neither can be spoken of in isolation from the other. What we have here is a striking affirmation that the two are greater than the one, that it is better for Jesus to go to the Father than to remain on earth because of this fact. Its import is that spoken of in isolation the Father is greater than Jesus, but that such an isolation is not possible, and the net result is an affirmation of oneness; that Jesus cannot be spoken of outside his relationship with the Father.

Subordination then is foreign even to this statement. In fact, it is only another way of saying that Jesus does nothing on his own authority, that he does only as he sees the Father doing. All along it is the Father who is in mind: Jesus as himself claims nothing. It is not that surprising then that he should declare the Father greater than himself: the oneness motif is still central. Jesus is going to the Father so that their oneness may be perfect again, as it was before he became flesh.¹⁰ Here he is taking the emphasis away from himself and placing it on the fact that he is one with the Father and to have seen one is to have seen the other. Far from being subordinate to the Father he is totally and completely one with him to such an extent that to speak of Jesus outside the oneness motif would be entirely meaningless.

None of the passages adduced by Barrett therefore, is about a christology of humiliation or subordination. Even 14:28, properly examined, arises from the oneness motif. What they do suggest is that reliance and dependence mean equality

and oneness, a novel concept at a time when slaves under their master's charge were treated as subservient, not as equal.¹¹ John has turned humiliation into equality.

B. CHRISTOLOGICAL PICTURE

The christological picture which emerges is thus a consistent one, not marked by a paradox or contrast of two features which come into conflict with each other and whose relation to each other is never explained: rather a single feature is expounded from both a positive and a negative viewpoint, each part being necessary to the presentation of the whole.

The negative side is expressed in 14:28 and in the whole of the dependence motif. Jesus relies upon the Father for power (5:19), knowledge (8:16), love (10:17), authority (17:2), glory (17:24) and so on. It is best put forward in 5:19-20a where it is said that the Son can do nothing by himself, but only what the Father is doing. This negative side however is turned around so that it points not to inferiority but to equality; it is in fact necessary to speak of the relationship in this way in order to draw attention to the fact that the two are not so much equal as one. The oneness motif in John's Gospel is not the equality of two persons, but their one identity; that is why Jesus constantly talks of "the Father who sent me", not because it corresponds to the type of sending described in Philippians 2:6-11 but because it draws attention to the fact that the essential identity of the Son is that of the Father: the two are one.

The so-called negative side therefore does not in reality provide a foil for the oneness sayings, but explains them; they are the key to the understanding of the oneness motif because they forbid the notion of ditheism and ensure that the reader is left with the oneness of the Father and Son, not the equality of two separate beings.

Thus, both the sending and dependence themes serve this function. They are

not part of a subordinationist strain, but in themselves promote oneness.

Indeed, if Jesus were not totally reliant on the Father for everything, and was not sent by him, there could be no oneness between the two, but since the sender and the sent are one and the same it is said that the one sent the other and everything the Father does the Son does likewise.

The positive side to John's christological affirmations gives content to this expression: The Son exercises the authority to judge and to give life (5:23-4), and is honoured as the Father is honoured. His works are the Father's works (5:36; 4:34; 9:4; 10:25, 32-9; 14:10-11; 15:24; 17:4), which he does in his Father's name, and which are not his works but the Father's. More directly he informs us that he and the Father are one and not two beings. Therefore everything which he is and does and says are equally the being, works and words of the Father as of Jesus. They all reveal the glory of the Father, or the glory of the Son, since it is spoken of as one event, and it follows that what the Father is the Son is and vice versa. It then comes as no surprise to hear that "He who has seen me has seen the Father". The positive side of the oneness motif culminates in this saying: such is the oneness of the Father and Son, that to have seen the Son is to have seen the Father. Positively, the oneness motif declares that Jesus was "equal with God" not as a separate identity over and against God, but because he was the Father in his revelation.

Taken together, these two aspects of oneness give us a complete picture of the incarnation as "God walking on the earth". This is worked out by means of the $\delta\epsilon\iota\alpha$ concept, which permeates the whole of the gospel. It is linked to the $\sigma\eta\mu\epsilon\iota\alpha$ because they are a means by which he revealed his glory (2:11; 11:40); the confession of the Prologue declares that "we have seen his glory - glory as of an only Son from the Father". All along Jesus has no wish to assert his own glory, except within the oneness with his Father which leads him to seek

only the Father's glory (7:18; 8:50-54). On earth, then, Jesus was the revelation of the $\delta\delta\zeta\alpha$ of the Father; the culmination in the death and return is his hour and when he says "Glorify your Son that the Son might glorify you" it is one act of glorification which is envisaged, not two; it is not his own glory he is receiving but that of the Father, and the revelation of $\delta\delta\zeta\alpha$ illustrates the oneness motif and shows how it functions in the incarnation. The outworking of this motif is the manifestation of God on earth.

John's christology then lies in the identification of Jesus with the Father. The two are one; therefore Jesus claims equality with the Father because he is sent by him and is dependent on him. Everything the Father does, Jesus does; Jesus is the revelation of the Father and one with him to such an extent that it is as if he is him - certainly to have seen and understood Jesus is tantamount to having seen the Father. There is no subordinationism here, only oneness.

As such it can be summarised by the following sayings, all necessary to a true understanding of Jesus:

"He who has seen me has seen the Father" (14:9) states the positive idea of the Father and Son being one in totality; "The Father is greater than I" (14:28) presents the negative view, also present in 5:19-20a and "I and the Father are one" (10:30) explains both as two sides of one motif, not two motifs placed in juxtaposition. That the Father and Son are one has both an element of dependence and equality inherent in it and only by stating both aspects can true oneness, as opposed to the equality of two persons, be affirmed. And there is certainly no concept of two gods in the Fourth Gospel: the Father, the only God, is revealed in the Son who has made him known. The two "constitute a single unit of being".⁷

C. RELATIONSHIP OF JOHN'S CHRISTOLOGY TO THE SYNOPTIC TRADITION

We now arrive back at the question posed at the outset, namely, the relationship between John's presentation of Jesus, and the Synoptic tradition which he obviously made use of and to some degree relied on. Has he been an exegete or eisegete of his sources? Has he merely drawn out the true significance of the Synoptic presentation of Jesus, or substantially added to it so that the two are now at odds?

It is impossible to compile a Synoptic christology and expect it to correspond exactly with the tradition known to John; we can though, focus on two aspects which we have seen to be important, first the Father-Son relationship and second what we may call the subordinationist element, which includes the humanity of Jesus, inherent in the Synoptic tradition.

We have discussed the origin of the Father-Son relationship in the first chapter. Here it is sufficient to note that it is the very centre of Jesus' self-awareness, according to the tradition, characterised by his calling God "Abba". Further, Matthew 11:27, at least shows that development of this theme had already taken place; whether or not that, or John's development of Jesus' awareness as God's Son, is a true description of Jesus' own self-awareness, it certainly begins in an important strand of tradition.

John 5:19-20a is an important test case.¹³ The logion is about a father and his son; it is transformed christologically in a way not immediately evident in the logion itself. The starting point is the tradition, but it is developed because it must make explicit what is not so. The final form of the saying is then qualified by the following words in the discourse and gives a strong christological content to the saying.

This is the case with the whole Father-Son relationship. It is grounded in the tradition, but it does not reproduce it; rather, it makes christologically

explicit what is not explicit, and at least attempts to draw out the true significance of what Jesus said.

But does it do so? Surely John's use of such sayings as 5:19-20a to prove the oneness of the Father and Son is saying more than Jesus himself would have said; even if we were to read that logion christologically, we would not arrive at the conclusions John does in chapter 5. True it gives content to Jesus' relationship with his Father; what is not so clear is whether it is a justified inference from the tradition he derives it from.

We may say that the Father-Son relationship is based on tradition; what we may not say is that he has drawn the true significance from that tradition.

Related to this is the impression of manhood, frailty and subordination. The logion mentioned above could be added to this category also.

The most John can allow on this aspect of Jesus' relationship to the Father is "The Father is greater than I", a statement which declares not subordination but one side of the oneness motif. There is nothing for example to compare with Mark 13:31: "Of that day or of that hour no-one knows, not even the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father". Jesus does not thus share all knowledge with the Father; there are some things of which the Son is ignorant. Similarly the Jesus of the Synoptics relies more on faith than his inbuilt authority. He declares, after casting out a particularly difficult demon, "This kind cannot be driven out except by prayer" (Mk. 9:39). Time and again Jesus withdraws to pray (Mt. 14:23; Mk. 1:35 (cf. Lk.4:42-3); Mk.6:46; Lk.3:21; 5:16; 6:12; 9:18,28-9; cf. also the Gethsemane tradition). All this is very different to the Jesus of John, who only prays for the sake of those listening (11:42).¹⁴ He performs signs easily and with no effort; because of his relationship with the Father, he does not need to withdraw to pray.¹⁵ The Synoptic tradition surely suggests that precisely because of his relationship with the

Father, he does need to do so.

This aspect of the Jesus of tradition is lacking in John because it has been reinterpreted in line with the oneness motif; now dependence on the Father is another way of talking of oneness with him. This side then has been reinterpreted and is in disagreement with the tradition; Jesus, as presented by John, has no such limitations of knowledge, does not pray to accomplish miracles, is in no anguish in the garden of Gethsemane. His humanity is not entirely neglected, but it is when it comes into conflict with his oneness with the Father.

However, on the positive side, the Fourth Gospel does reflect the Synoptic traditions' belief in Jesus as being from God. The birth stories (Mt.1-2; Lk. 1-2) are examples of answers given to the vexing problem of how Jesus was to be seen in relation to God. The story of the paralytic lowered through the roof (Mk.2:1-14; Mt. 9:2-8; Lk. 5:18-26) deals with Jesus' authority to forgive sins and the sermon on the mount presents Jesus as having authority to give a new law to replace the old.¹⁶ But in the Synoptic tradition there is little attempt to reconcile these two aspects systematically; this is what John attempts to do by means of the oneness motif which he combines with the Father-Son relationship. The effect is that his Jesus is more divine than human: in the Synoptic tradition he is more human than divine.

From a christological viewpoint then, John's use of the Synoptic tradition is rather complex. On the one hand he is dependent on it; certainly the Father-Son motif comes from here, as, in all probability, does most of the discourse material, even if it has been developed and radicalised. Chapter 5 is one example of a discourse working in this way, chapter 6 of a narrative developed into a discourse to bring out its true significance. But on the one hand, John develops his traditions, and uses them radically sometimes changing their original meaning, and on the other he presses everything into the oneness motif.

He has drawn out what he believes to be the true significance of Jesus, but in so doing he has surely done much more than this: he has imposed his own christology onto the material, significantly distorting and changing the tradition which came down to him, in his attempt to present a consistent and systematic christology.

NOTES ON CHAPTER 3

1. Barrett C.K., 'The Father is greater than I', first published in Neues Testamentum und Kirche : für Rudolf Schnackenburg, ed. Gnllka J., (Freiburg, Herder, 1947), pp.144-159. Also published in Essays on John pp.19-36.
2. Barrett C.K., art.cit., p.148.
3. Barrett C.K., art.cit., p.149.
4. Barrett C.K., art.cit., p.149,150.
5. Note how vv21-4 give content to the logion in vv.19-201, showing that the dependence of the Son on the Father means equality, not subordination. The entire witness motif (cf. esp. 30-47 which utilised the ἔργα theme (5:36; 10:22-9) is geared to oneness. The discourse in chapter 5 is thus entirely about oneness, not subordination.
6. Barrett C.K., art.cit., p.150.
7. Barrett C.K., art.cit., p.151.
8. Davey J.E., The Jesus of St. John (Lutterworth, London, 1958).
9. 20:17 is not strictly relevant here.
10. This is not to imply that his status was reduced by his becoming flesh, but simply that it was better for him to return to the Father rather than remain on earth.
11. cf. the traditional logion in 13:16.
12. Barrett C.K., art.cit., p.145.
13. For a fuller discussion cf. chapter 1, pp.22-9. For the similarity of the logion in 5:19-20a with Mt. 11:27 (parallel Lk. 10:22) see pp.26-7.
14. The prayer in chapter 17 is a literary device, not genuine petition.
15. The words προσευχή, προσεύχονται are not used in John. Where he wants to convey any notion of prayer he uses ἐρωτώ, again not in a petitionary sense.
16. In particular John (as does Matthew) contrasts Jesus and Moses (1:17; 3:14), and insists that Moses was in agreement with Jesus (5:41-7; 6:5-71: 7:19-24). cf. pp.22-3, for the possibility that ἄφ' ἑαυτοῦ οὐδέν (5:19), refers back to Numbers 16:28. Nowhere does he see Jesus as the new Moses, but both stand on the same side, Jesus superceding him because of his oneness with the Father, and both stand over against the Jews, Moses becoming not their intercessor but accuser (5:45-7).

CHAPTER FOUR : THE PERSPECTIVE OF ONENESS

The Prologue of the gospel is the cosmological setting for the life of the incarnate God. In the order of the gospel it must come first; however we have examined the material in this order because this is the order in which christology developed. Speculation about the nature and status of Jesus led back first to his baptism, then to his birth and finally to pre-existence. John misses out the birth and baptism;¹ instead he concentrates on the pre-existent Logos and the fact that this Logos "became flesh".

The question we are concerned with is therefore the connection between the historical Jesus and God himself. We have shown how this is worked out in the historical context of Jesus' life, that he was one with "the Father", that "he who has seen me has seen the Father" (14:9). This of necessity raises the question of pre-existence; the Prologue sets the scene for the oneness motif and defines it in its eternal perspective, by declaring the unity of Jesus and the Father to extend not just to earthly ministry but also to the period before the creation of the world. It therefore asserts that oneness is eternal and not temporal.

In defining this as the basic question of the Prologue, we leave aside various peripheral issues such as the postulation of a pre-Johannine hymn, or a pre-Christian one, and its content and structure, whether poetic or prosaic. The importance of the Prologue as it now stands in the gospel lies in its theological content.

A. THE PRE-EXISTENT LOGOS

The word $\Lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ is not used as a title elsewhere in the gospel, yet its

use in the context of the Prologue is of vital importance to the understanding of the entire book because it interprets the whole life of the historical Jesus and insists that that life be viewed against this background. We shall show the significance of this for the oneness motif defined earlier.

The background of the *Λόγος* concept is complex; parallels can be adduced from a number of sources, all of which may have played their part in influencing the evangelist. To unravel which of these is primary in giving content to the concept, or which is responsible for its origin is an impossible task. The view adopted here is thus a somewhat hypothetical one in terms of detail; in essential content however there is more certainty. It is possible to see what the evangelist meant by his use of the term *Λόγος* : it is not possible to trace the precise history of development of which John's concept is the result.

The opening words of the gospel, *Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος* are striking and immediately suggest the opening words of Genesis : *Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν* (LXX). The verbal similarity of *Ἐν ἀρχῇ* makes it extremely unlikely that this is a coincidence or simply a weak allusion to the Genesis account of creation; the content of both texts concerns the same event and describes it in similar terms, the Johannine account reading almost like a commentary on the Genesis story. It seems likely therefore that John has deliberately fashioned his opening in this way, not just to direct the readers' attention to the Genesis creation narrative, but to transpose his narrative into that drama, so that it is read within the context of it. The reader is thus taken back to the Old Testament and placed within the drama of the creation of the world, and only then does he hear of the *Λόγος* and his function in creation.²

The parallelism is taken further. The first reference to the Word of God in Genesis, though not a direct reference to a word (but rather, God said), takes the form of a statement or command that there be light, *Γενήθητω φῶς*.

God's word therefore brings into being "light" just as it is in John 1:4-5:

ὁ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων. καὶ τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει, καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν.

With this we can compare the whole of Genesis 1:3-4 (LXX):

καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Θεὸς Γενηθήτω φῶς. καὶ ἐγένετο φῶς. καὶ εἶδεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸ φῶς ὅτι καλόν. καὶ διεχώρισεν ὁ Θεὸς ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ φωτὸς καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ σκοταύς.

The word of God is Γενηθήτω φῶς, translating the Hebrew לֵבַי וְאֵלֶיךָ : in John we read τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, the Word of God being τὸ φῶς.

A connection between these narratives is almost certain. If we pushed this argument to its furthest point, we could suggest that לֵבַי וְאֵלֶיךָ is the Λόγος of the Prologue, which has been hypostatized from a statement consisting of words spoken by God, to the actual word or words themselves, these taking on a separate identity but at the same time being in no essential sense different from God himself. However it must be remembered that God's word in Genesis is not τὸ φῶς but Γενηθήτω φῶς ; the utterance creates light but is itself not light. The similarity between this and the Λόγος of the Prologue is however still striking.

But the concept is not developed precisely in this way. The Λόγος as לֵבַי וְאֵלֶיךָ is only the starting point on which a theological concept has been built. That this is to be regarded as the starting point, including it within the drama of creation, is probable : the verbal similarity; the identification of the word as light, or bringing forth light, the separation of light from darkness; and that both are concerned with creation and with the word of God as having creative power.

This has been influenced in a number of ways: the Λόγος of John is not a pre-existent utterance waiting to be uttered, but a pre-existent being. It has taken on existence of its own. The word and God who spoke are in the Prologue distinct and yet remain synonymous. God's word by which he created is now itself

the agent of creation rather than remaining as God's speech or will.

A secondary background is necessary however because the word $\Lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ is not used in Genesis 1:1-5 (LXX) nor is $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ in the Hebrew³; in fact the word is charged with meaning in the Hellenistic world and has been deliberately chosen by the evangelist for this reason. The fact that there is little identification of the deity with light in the Old Testament⁴ is also in favour of some Hellenistic meaning being given to the $\Lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$.

There are at least four strata from which John could have been influenced. First, there is the Old Testament concept of $\aleph\aleph\aleph - \aleph\aleph\aleph$. For the prophet, the Word of the Lord was a dynamic force almost with an existence of its own in the sense that it could create and act, but the $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ was never fully hypostatized. The nearest we come to this is the statement that it "shall accomplish that which I purpose" (Isaiah 55:11); it can be spoken of as separate from God in some sense, but never personally.

So far as creation is concerned, Psalm 32:6 provides an interesting commentary to the Genesis account:

$\tau\acute{o}\ \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omega\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon\ \delta\acute{\iota}\ \omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\epsilon\omega\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$
 $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\acute{o}\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\tau\omicron\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\ \eta\ \delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \text{(LXX)}.$

This may well be in the background of John's $\Lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ but there is much it does not account for, in particular the hypostatization of the word as the agent of creation. The most that can be said of the Old Testament speculation about the word is that it is an extension of God, not having a separate identity until it has been spoken.

This basic criticism is accounted for by the Wisdom literature. This was a theological development which hypostatized the thought of God and replaced $\aleph\aleph\aleph - \aleph\aleph\aleph$ by $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ which was then seen as the agent of creation. Thus, although the Word of the Lord is mentioned, it is $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ ($\epsilon\sigma\phi\acute{\iota}\alpha$) who creates and reveals. If John has taken over this model of hypostatization, he has not done so completely, otherwise he would have used $\epsilon\sigma\phi\acute{\iota}\alpha$ ⁵; rather, the $\Lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ has taken on many of the attributes of $\epsilon\sigma\phi\acute{\iota}\alpha$, perhaps in an attempt to combine it more

fully with the Old Testament notion of $\aleph \beth \daleth$. Wisdom 9:1-2 shows that these concepts were related:

$\delta \text{ ποιησας τα παντα εν λογω σου, και τη σοφια σου κατασκευασας ανθρωπων.}$

Wisdom was present at creation (Wis. 9:9) and took part in the creation of the world (Prov. 8:22-31); however it is never said that Wisdom existed alongside God eternally. Wisdom was created as the first of God's acts (Prov. 8:22-3), before the world was created: "Ages ago I was set up, at the first, before the beginning of the earth " (Prov. 8:23).

There is probably some influence from this direction; the hypostatisation in particular owes a great deal to the Wisdom tradition. Also the description of the $\aleph \gamma \omicron \varsigma$ as light and life can be traced back to the Wisdom literature: "He who finds me finds life" (Prov. 8:35); again in Wisdom 7:26 we are told that σοφια is a "reflection of eternal light, a spotless mirror of the working of God". Other parallels to the Prologue can also be found⁶: she is in the world (Wis. 8:1; cf. Jn. 1:10) and the world hates her (Prov. 1:29; cf. Jn. 1:10-11); she dwelt (κατοικηνησεν) among us (Sir.24:8ff; cf. Jn. 1:14), yet foolish and sinful men do not see her (Sir. 15:7; cf. Jn. 1:10-11).

The Memra of the Lord in the Aramaic Targums is of interest, especially in relation to the Old Testament background of Genesis 1:1-5 and מִן־הַיְהוָה . There is a possibility that when quoting from Scripture John uses neither Hebrew nor Spetuagint, and may therefore be using the Aramaic Targums,⁷ so his acquaintance with these texts is certainly possible. In general terms, the Memra of the Lord is not the Word of the Lord so much as a euphemism for God himself, and is certainly not an hypostasis; in terms of content therefore it has little in common with the much richer $\aleph \gamma \omicron \varsigma$. But John may still have been influenced by it in certain ways since for John too the Word was God. The

terminology if not the content may in part be taken from here, for in the Targums the Memra is a paraphrase for God, "a buffer for divine transcendence"⁸ functioning akin to the use of אֱלֹהִים in the Old Testament. It does not correspond to the Johannine Λόγος , but it certainly offers a valuable insight into it.

The Memra of the Lord however may be of great importance in regard to the use of Genesis 1:1-5 in the Johannine Prologue. The actual paraphrase of this text is of no help, but in the midrash on the four nights of Exodus 12:42, sacred history is summed up in these four passover nights: creation; the promise of posterity to Abraham; the slaying of the Egyptian firstborn; and the advent of the Messiah when the world is redeemed. Of the first night the Neofiti text reads that "when the Lord was revealed above the world to create it; the world was without form and empty, and darkness was spread over the face of the abyss. And the Word (Memra) of the Lord was the light⁹ and it (or he) shone, and he called it the first night".¹⁰ The opening of the Prologue makes excellent sense against this background: in him was life and light, and "the light shines in the darkness and the darkness has not mastered it" (1:5).

All texts of this passage identify the light of the world with primordial light, and if, as some scholars believe, Neofiti is pre-christian, it is certainly possible that John knew of this tradition and incorporated it into his Λόγος of the Prologue. If John has quoted from the Targums, and this is not certain, this suggestion is rendered the more likely. In conclusion then, it is certainly possible that the Memra of the Lord, possibly in connection with Genesis 1:1-5 as quoted above may be in the background, although it is impossible to say this with certainty.

Dr. Hayward's recent and important study of the Targumic Memra is relevant here. He suggests that the Memra is to be identified with the name מִמְרָא ,

ממרא' being the name of the Memra. He shows that the entire Prologue can be interpreted by the key notion Memra as a substitute for Λόγος, calling it "the term par excellence to expound the presence and activity of God in Jesus".¹¹ The entire Prologue makes sense when viewed from this angle, justice being given to the difficult concept of oneness in duality. In summary he says that "St. John.... depicts Jesus as the Memra, who is God's Name, manifesting God's glory full of the grace and truth of the covenant, dwelling with us in the flesh, which Jesus himself describes as a Temple (2:19), the very dwelling place of the Memra".¹²

This certainly helps to explain the notion of two beings who are identical, yet distinct, and its advantage is that it does not do so by the concept of hypostatisation. The Memra is God, yet is with him; it creates, and was with God in the beginning, before creation. Finally, it is especially associated with the Tent or Temple, giving an interesting insight into verse 14 of the Prologue.

Although Hayward suggests that the Prologue can be interpreted solely along these lines, he does not think it possible to explain the Prologue by any one concept. What does seem likely however, is that John knew of the Memra, and has probably used this concept, together with others, to illustrate his Λόγος concept.¹³

Finally, the Greek background is suggestive. In various strands of tradition, the Λόγος is used to mean the universal principle of order, the mind of God or the seed of nature which gradually unfolds itself. In Stoicism, the λογος denotes the ordered and teleologically orientated nature of the world, while in Neoplatonism a man, by his λογος can break free from the world and attain λογος ἀληθής. The most close approximation to John's Λόγος however, comes from Philo. For him, the λογος is hypostatized (as in the Prologue),

but for Philo this represented a secondary figure inferior to God but playing some part in creation. It is therefore difficult to see in John "the substance of a Logos doctrine similar to that of Philo",¹⁴ as Dodd has maintained. In Philo, he is a mediating figure who makes the link between God and the created world, guiding the world like the Stoic λόγος, a δεύτερος Θεός, a god of the second rank. There may be some connection between John and Philo, but this is certainly not to be construed as a relationship of literary dependence. Both writers shared a common theological climate and worked within the limits of Hellenistic popular philosophy, making points of contact inevitable.

The gnostic belief in the deity as light, awakening the particles of light and bringing life as a result is also important. The problem with evidence of this kind though is that it is very late (third century AD) and although we can read this back into the first century, it is impossible to say how far this process is legitimate. The most that can be said is that John may have been aware of this thought world, but even there we have no certainty.

It is impossible to say how these various influences relate to each other in the Prologue and in particular in the Λόγος concept. It is likely that they are all in the background to a greater or lesser degree. But however the concept is to be seen, John has chosen a word which makes excellent sense, both to his Hellenistic and Jewish readers;¹⁵ it is impossible and undesirable to postulate one background for it. This would be to deny the richness of it, a richness mainly derived from the Old Testament but which has also been influenced by popular Greek philosophy.

In the context of the Prologue, this pre-existent being begins to emerge not as an hypostasis of σοφία, nor as a δεύτερος Θεός; we are told, and this is the very heart of the Prologue Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος. As we have said,

this places the Prologue within the drama of creation as narrated in Genesis 1. However, it introduces a new subject into the Genesis account, namely ὁ Λόγος. The Word, developing the notion of God's first words, "Let there be light" through popular Greek philosophy and through various Jewish systems of thought, in particular the hypostatization of σοφία (ΠΡΟΦΗ), thus introduces a foreign element into the material, and denies that in the beginning there was only God in the way accepted in the Judaism of the time. This is even foreign to the Wisdom literature: Wisdom herself was a created being: the Word is not. Verse 1 continues to say that he was πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος. The Word then is identical with God, yet has a distinct identity as ὁ Λόγος. He exercises the function only ascribed to God in the mainstream Old Testament: πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν (v3). The Word is therefore a distinct being, described as Θεός and exercising the functions of God, notably creating.

The anarthrous Θεός in this context cannot be used to support any theory of eternal subordination of Λόγος to Θεός ; nor can it support a translation of Θεός as divine since predicate nouns before the verb normally lack the article. There is no clarification of any possible relationship between Λόγος and Θεός ; it is merely stated that the Λόγος was with God and was God. It thus equates the one with the other while maintaining that the two are in some way distinct. As such the Λόγος is not an intermediary, a δεύτερος Θεός or abstract concept to refer to the mind of God. But neither can the Λόγος be described as a person; he is obviously a being of some sort who is God but has his own identity apart from God and with God.

The phrase πρὸς τὸν Θεόν preserves this notion of relationship and enables John to speak of both identity and distinctness in regard to the Λόγος

and Θεός . This is further illustrated by v18 where μονογενής Θεός is spoken of as εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς . Both phrases indicate that Λόγος and Θεός stand in relationship to each other which allows John to develop the oneness motif along these lines; the two are identical and yet distinct, and this can only be bridged by the concept of relationship, πρὸς indicating both the identity of persons and their relationship to each other. On the one hand the Λόγος was with (πρὸς) God, showing that God and the Λόγος are essentially the same: on the other he was with (πρὸς) God, showing that the two are distinct and stand in relationship to each other.

There is thus absolute oneness between the Λόγος and ὁ Θεός : Θεός ᾧ ὁ Λόγος. In this sentence, the two are strictly equivalent, the one is the other, and yet they can be called by different titles, one Θεός one ὁ Λόγος.

No explanation is offered for this. There is no notion of the one emanating from the other, no philosophical critique of how two can be one while still being two. The fundamental idea is simply that the Λόγος was with God (and so distinct from him) and was God. The most that could be derived from this treatment is that although a distinct being the nature of the Λόγος was such that the description Θεός was appropriate. Yet John says more than this; he puts the two in such close juxtaposition that he claims that they are not two, but one, yet not one, but two. Identical and yet distinct.

This is further enforced by vv3-5: it is the Λόγος who creates. Protology thus gives way to cosmology. The Λόγος is responsible for the whole of creation: Χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν. Everything therefore which came to existence owes that existence to the Λόγος (ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ᾧ) reinforcing the completeness of the Word's creation. This is only to emphasise v1, that Θεός ᾧ ὁ Λόγος. for the function of the Λόγος is described in terms of functions only

exercised by God. He thus takes over God's creative activity and role, demonstrating that he is Θεός . There is no sense in which vv1-3a implies the world was created by a being other than God. The thrust of vv1-5 is that the Λόγος is identified with Θεός , not Θεός or δεύτερος Θεός . Verse 5 is at pains to bring the cosmological picture of Genesis 1 back into the description of the Prologue; his life is the light of men, which shines in the darkness. The picture is therefore completed by a return to God's first utterance "Let there be light" and emphasises the unity of that statement with the nature of the Λόγος as a light which separates darkness from light.

After the parenthesis about John the Baptist in vv6-8, this notion is continued. The Λόγος is τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν which enlightens every man. Both the parenthesis in vv6-8 and the words ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον , show that now we have passed from primeval light and darkness to the sphere of human experience. Verses 9-13 are a brief history, not pre-history, of the Word's historical ministry in the world; he came to the world but it did not know him; he came to his own and they did not know him; those who did receive him became children of God, and born of God. This is certainly the confession of the Christian community, placing the coming of the Λόγος within the soteriological and ecclesiological context which makes the whole book a witness to the light.

The Prologue up to verse 13 is therefore concerned mainly with the pre-existent Λόγος and his function as creator, although this is placed in an ecclesiological context (the confession of the community), as well as a cosmological one.

B. THE ΛΟΓΟΣ BECOMES FLESH

Verse 14 marks the moment of incarnation, although vv9-13, taken by some commentators to refer to a period before the incarnation, must also be taken as

part of the historical context. John the Baptist has already been introduced (vv6-8) so we are clearly in the historical realm.

καὶ ὁ λόγος ἐὰρ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν καὶ ἐθεάσαμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ. (v14).

Thus the *Λόγος* has begun to be associated with a historical figure, as yet unnamed; he does not merely take flesh to himself or disguise himself with it, but becomes it; this enables the notion of a historical person functioning as the *Λόγος* described in the first part of the Prologue, to be introduced. That section was marked by the phrase *Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος* : v14 is the key to the latter part of the Prologue, and these two verses together are the heart of the Prologue and the heart of the gospel.

Again, there is no explanation of how the *Λόγος* can take flesh. The word *ἐὰρ* however should not be read as the usually negative word of Pauline theology, for there is no *πνεῦμα-ἐὰρ* contrast here. It symbolises only the sphere and manifestation of the earthly. "The paradox in 14a consists in the fact that the Creator enters the world of createdness and in so doing exposes himself to the judgement of the creature."¹⁶ The step however from the pre-existent *Λόγος* to the Word become flesh is a large one, identifying with God himself a historical character, part of God's creation, since all living things originate with him. John equates creator with creature; it is the *Λόγος* who has become flesh, and *Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος* . As Käsemann has astutely pointed out: "He who has become flesh does not cease to exist as a heavenly being".¹⁷ The statement of v14 then is the claim that the pre-existent *Λόγος* who has created all things now becomes man, becomes a creature, and yet without any change in his status or nature as the *Λόγος*.

The argument as to which part of v14 is the dominant thought for the gospel is a blind alley; both are vital in understanding John's thought, and must be taken together to be understood. "The Word became flesh and dwelt among us" is

only part of the picture; its content is filled in by the notion of manifesting, and beholding of $\delta\delta\zeta\alpha$ which explains the nature of the transition from the heavenly to earthly sphere. The $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ has taken human flesh; the creator becomes part of the created realm with no reduction in his status. The corollary of this is that "we beheld his glory, as of the only begotten of the Father". We can see here, that although Jesus has not been mentioned yet, his identity is being disclosed (v17 is the culmination of this process); although the $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\rho\epsilon\varsigma$ is as yet impersonal, it is the historical Jesus that is being spoken of in this way, being identified with the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ of vv1-5: thus we can speak of incarnation.

"Incarnation for John is really epiphany."¹⁸ In particular Exodus 33:17-34:8 is in the background here. The incarnation is the embodiment of such epiphanies, the localisation of God's presence, and concentration of his $\pi\lambda\omicron$ as described in Exodus, or 2 Samuel 6:6.¹⁹

Two ideas are especially important here, those of tenting ($\epsilon\kappa\eta\nu\omicron\upsilon\nu$) and the $\pi\lambda\omicron$ or $\delta\delta\zeta\alpha$ of the Lord. In Exodus 25:8,9 the instruction to build the Temple ($\epsilon\kappa\eta\nu\eta$) is made: it is where God will dwell amongst his people. The idea of "shekinah", presence, may have influenced John here also; it is used in the Aramaic Targums to denote the dwelling of God with his people.

The words $\epsilon\kappa\eta\nu\eta$, $\epsilon\kappa\eta\nu\omicron\upsilon\nu$ may well be an allusion to the tabernacle; that Jesus is later described as the Temple is no surprise (2:13-22). The thought here is not that the Word made flesh is the fulfilment of Scripture, although this may be in the background: rather, the incarnation is described as an epiphany akin to the Old Testament manifestation of the $\pi\lambda\omicron$ of the Lord. To say that the Word $\epsilon\kappa\eta\nu\omega\sigma\epsilon\nu \epsilon\nu \eta\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$ is the same as saying that in him God's presence and glory is located; more than this, in fact, for because

this is located in human flesh the barrier between God and man, creator and creature, has already been overcome. The Word dwelt among us as the tabernacle or Temple; in him God's glory is to be seen.

Tenting and dwelling can only be fully appreciated by reference to the T720 of Yahweh, which was often characterised by a cloud (Ex. 24:15-16; 40:34-5; 1 K. 8:10-11). One quotation will suffice to indicate the significance of this for John:

$\text{Τὸ ψῆφον τῆς ἀλήθειας καὶ τῆς χάριτος ἐπέλησθη ἡ σκηνή} \quad (\text{Ex. 40:34})$
 καὶ ἐκάλυψεν ἡ νεφέλη τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ μαρτυρίου καὶ δόξης κυρίου ἐπέλησθη ἡ σκηνή (LXX)
 Here the $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ fills the $\sigma\kappa\eta\nu\eta$: in John the Word made flesh dwelt among us ($\epsilon\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\eta\nu\omega\sigma\epsilon\nu$) and was full of grace and truth. It follows that this $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ was manifested, "and we beheld his glory" (v14b). No matter where John's idea for the Word becoming flesh originated, the outworking of it is undoubtedly Semitic: the association of ideas in v14 must be seen against the background of the $\text{מִתְּוֹךְ הַבְּרִית}$ residing in the tabernacle or Temple.

We have indicated the similarity of the Old Testament epiphanies with verse 14. Exodus 33:12-34:8 is also interesting in this respect. Moses requests the Lord: $\text{וְיִבְרַחֲנִי מִפְּנֵי הַיְיָ} \quad (\text{Δείξον μοι τὴν εἰσαυτοῦ δόξαν}) \quad (33:18)$. The Lord agrees to make his goodness pass before Moses, and declare his name to him; however he is not permitted to see his face because "no one can see me and live" (cf. Jn. 1:18). The Lord passes before him and declares, "The Lord, the Lord, a God merciful and gracious, slow to anger and abounding in steadfast love and faithfulness" (34:6). In the last phrase, וְרַב־חַסְדִּים , וְרַב־חַסְדִּים can mean abundant, numerous, great or enough, and is translated as well by $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\eta\varsigma$ as by the strange compound $\pi\omicron\lambda\upsilon\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ (LXX). The whole phrase is adequately translated $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\eta\varsigma \chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\tau\omicron\varsigma \text{ καὶ } \alpha\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha\varsigma$; and although this does not prove John was using this text, it seems not unlikely that he was doing so,

especially as 1:17 draws attention to Moses as a contrast to Christ: Moses brought the law, Jesus Christ brought grace and truth.

From this evidence, I think it is fair to assume that the epiphanies of the Old Testament form the most important background to 1:14 and go a long way towards explaining it. On this reading Jesus is the $\sigma\kappa\eta\upsilon\eta'$ and in him God reveals his $\tau\eta\lambda\omicron\varsigma$; once again God fills the $\sigma\kappa\eta\upsilon\eta'$ so that it is full of grace and truth, but because this $\sigma\kappa\eta\upsilon\eta'$ is $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi$, that glory can be seen.

It is interesting that v14 is saying the same thing as v1, $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma \eta\upsilon\ \acute{\omicron}\ \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$. If reading v14 through the eyes of the Old Testament epiphanies is correct, John is claiming that the Word made flesh is a manifestation of God, as God filled the $\sigma\kappa\eta\upsilon\eta'$ in Old Testament times. There is therefore no reduction in his glory or status, no humiliation of any sort. As the Word become flesh, the claim $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma \eta\upsilon\ \acute{\omicron}\ \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ is still applicable.

Thus far, vv1-13 have insisted upon this fact as being true before the creation of the world. There is no hint of the $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ being a created thing; he was with God always and was God. In particular, this is the thrust of vv1-5.

Vv14-18 insist upon that fact being carried through to the historical realm. The Word becomes flesh with no difference in his exalted position as $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$. As such he manifests his glory.

From v14 onwards, the historical Jesus is intended. John's witness naturally precedes it; Jesus is finally named as the subject: he is the Word become flesh, he is the one of whom it is said that there is no diminution in his status as $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$, or as $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$. He is identified with the $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ of vv1-5 and of v14. Notice the tentative $\tau\acute{\omega}\sigma\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$ of v18, qualifying the statement $\Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\delta\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\omega\pi\alpha\kappa\epsilon\nu$. Now the Word has become flesh, we behold his glory; his glory can be seen in a human person, Jesus, a person identified with

ὁ Λόγος as the pre-existent creator of the world. It is the contention of the Prologue that these two are one and the same. The person of Jesus is the pre-existent Λόγος. Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος and ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν are thus speaking of the same person in regard to his status and relationship with Θεός .

C. THE PROLOGUE AND THE ONENESS MOTIF

The identification of the historical Jesus with the Λόγος, made in vv14-18 allows us to pose the question of whether we can interpret Jesus' relationship with God within the context, not just of Father-Son motif, as elsewhere in the Gospel, but also of Θεός-Λόγος.

The starting point must be 1:1, Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος , given that the Λόγος has been identified. All that we stated about the pre-existent Λόγος now takes on personal significance. The being who created the world, was with God and was God, has become flesh in the person of Jesus. Thus, what is stated of the Λόγος can also be attributed to Jesus, if historical restraints are exercised (one could not say for instance ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Ἰησοῦς); the Λόγος has ceased to be an invisible being and has taken physical form in the person Jesus.

The oneness of Θεός and Λόγος is therefore of importance. The oneness motif as expressed here is that "the Word was God", that is, he was with God at the beginning, he was God, and to illustrate this, he created the world: there was nothing made except through him. He is described as Θεός and as sole creator,²⁰ a tautology of emphasis. Thus, although the Λόγος is distinct from God, he is God; the two are in fact one and distinct. No real explanation of this is offered; it is simply stated that they are the same and yet distinct; they can be spoken of distinctly, but never in isolation.

Looking at this from the viewpoint of christological development, there has almost certainly been a tracing back from the historical life of Jesus to his heavenly origin. This has led to the creation of birth narratives, and ultimately to a notion of pre-existence. The question then raises itself, how is the historical Jesus to be ascribed the nature of God if God is one? The *Λόγος* concept attempts to answer this; in a sense we must interpret their oneness through the lines already provided by the Father-Son motif, because this has given rise to the whole pre-existence motif in the first place. The oneness of *Θεός* and *Λόγος* therefore is to be seen as a literary device whereby God can be spoken of in two ways, as *Θεός* and as *Λόγος*, the revelation (*φῶς*) of *Θεός*.

This oneness is then extended to the earthly sphere, although in reality this has worked the other way round. The Word becomes flesh and the oneness of *Λόγος* and *Θεός* is thus extended to the historical Jesus and the Father because as we have shown there is no diminution of glory or status when the Word becomes flesh; it is a translating of the divine sphere to the human sphere given the limitations of human flesh. All that has preceded about the *Λόγος* is now identified with Jesus. He is thus established as *μονογενὴς Θεός*.²¹ so that the reader has now been treated to privileged information with which to interpret the rest of the gospel.

The contention of the Prologue is therefore the divine, pre-existence of *ὁ Λόγος*, and the identification of *ὁ Λόγος* with Jesus, the absolute and complete oneness of the *Λόγος* and *Θεός* and therefore of Jesus and the Father. It has been set out systematically but the end result is a christology of oneness with no hint of subordinationism, either in a pre-existent or historical context;²² the eternal *Λόγος* suffers no diminution or humiliation, but is *Θεός* both before and after becoming flesh. The oneness is thus of an absolute nature: the two are identical and yet distinct.

It is instructive to compare with this other liturgical reflections on Jesus; vv1-5 are very similar to the rather static protology of Colossians 1: 15-20 which speaks of Jesus in similar terms. The difference is the Λόγος concept, and the oneness within duality of the Λόγος and God. Both in the Prologue of John's Gospel and in the Colossian hymn, ὁ λόγος or ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀρχαίου (Col. 1:15), creates all things and has authority over all things; these opening words of the Colossian hymn however do pose the problem of a physical deity of some sort, though without any attempt to answer it, and without any attempt to show how oneness is expressed through duality. As in the Prologue of John's Gospel, here too there is no notion of a humiliation followed by exaltation, although there is little mention of any descent to the human sphere.

Perhaps it is easier to see the thrust of the Johannine account by comparing it with Philippians 2:6-11. There Christ is ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ but did not wish to grasp ἴσα Θεῷ (cf. Jn. 5:18), but abased himself and took the form (ἐν μορφῇ) of a slave, eventually being rewarded for this self-subjugation by being exalted. Nothing could be further from John's theology in the Prologue. The descent of the Λόγος involves no humiliation whatever, nor is his status less than God. It is God himself who takes on human flesh, not merely someone in his shape (μορφῇ).

The oneness motif has an eternal perspective. Jesus is one with the Father on earth; but this is extended back to before creation. He is the Λόγος who has always been with God and has always been one with him. Eternally they are identical and yet distinct. Oneness is thus justified by its eternal reality. For the Jews the problem can only be defined by the words ἐν ἄνθρωπος ὃν τρεῖς θεοὶ (10:33), whereas the crux of the problem is found in 1:14, ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο. How can a man claim to be God? Yet how can God

claim to have become flesh? The problem is two-edged, but for John its solution lies in the pre-existent $\Lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, as distinct from and yet identical to $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$.

D. THE INTRODUCTION OF THE FATHER-SON MODEL

The Prologue gives content to the Father-Son model by giving it an eternal perspective; but it also introduces it by calling God, $\delta\ \pi\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$ (vv14,18). The section as it stands does not demand interpretation in terms of Father and Son; not even the designation of the Word as $\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\mu\acute{o}\varsigma\ \pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\ \pi\alpha\tau\rho\acute{\varsigma}$ demands this. However, in the context of the gospel in which the Prologue now stands, this amounts to an introduction of the motif. The use of $\delta\ \pi\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$ and $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \kappa\acute{o}\sigma\mu\omicron\nu$ prepare for the filial relationship developed from chapter 5 onwards.

It is not quite clear how John intends us to interpret this model from an eternal standpoint. That he has not formally introduced it yet, may mean he does not want to trace this relationship back to the $\Lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ and $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$. The terms do not overlap and so may be used of different eras. On the other hand Jesus is identified as the Word became flesh, so that it could be argued that they can be spoken of interchangeably. Yet they are not. The most likely solution is that the Father-Son model is helpful only to the historical ministry of Jesus; any attempt to push this further back is not only futile, but irrelevant, although as stated earlier, this does not mean there is no relationship between the $\Lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ and $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$.

Once the Word has become flesh (v14) there is a change of terminology. The shift is slight but noticeable; it enables John to introduce the Father-Son motif in its barest outline and give it its essential content. $\delta\ \pi\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$ replaces $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ although $\delta\ \upsilon\acute{\iota}\acute{o}\varsigma$ does not occur absolutely until 3:35-6, if the

textual reasoning in regard to 1:18 is correct. It is therefore invalid to interpret the Prologue in terms of the Father-Son relationship we have seen in chapters 1-3; nevertheless, some observations are possible.

First, $\pi\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$ is used absolutely, typical of the rest of the gospel. Thus "the Son" immediately suggests itself and given the content of the rest of the gospel we can assume the thought was in John's mind when he wrote or took over the Prologue. If he was not the original author, Father-Son terminology would not be appropriate anyway, since it is a motif especially developed in this gospel. $\delta\ \upsilon\acute{\iota}\acute{o}\varsigma$ would therefore be incongruous whereas $\delta\ \pi\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$ is acceptable.

Second, $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ is used absolutely. To read back from the historical Jesus to a pre-existent being must necessarily involve a second eternal being, other than $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$; since this second being is identified with the historical Jesus there is at least continuity between $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma\ \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ terminology on the one hand and $\pi\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\rho/\upsilon\acute{\iota}\acute{o}\varsigma$ on the other.

What we have here is a preparation for the Father-Son motif. The most important aspect is the content given to the motif: the historical Jesus who is one with God is identified with the $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, the agent of creation who was one with God and was God. Thus the astonishing claim of 5:17-18 is answered here by an even more astonishing one that the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory. The oneness motif is therefore given eternal validation and proof. What the gospel does historically, the Prologue does protologically and cosmologically, the latter giving validity and explanation to the former.

E. SOTERIOLOGICAL AND ECCLESIOLOGICAL CONCERN

Although the main concern of the Prologue is the protological and

cosmological setting for the oneness motif, this is intertwined with the purpose of the Word becoming flesh and being sent into the world.²³ As early as v7, in what is probably an addition to the original hymn, John the Baptist is introduced; he bears witness to the light so that all may believe through him. This leads onto the key statement in v12: ὅσοι δε ἔλαβον αὐτόν ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα Θεοῦ γενέσθαι . Once again soteriology and ecclesiology can hardly be distinguished from christology. The former are an integral part of the latter because for John, incarnation is seen on two fronts: Christ and the Church. Soteriology links the two so that the three form a single unity. As such it is impossible to split the Prologue up neatly; only vv1-5, a sort of self-contained cosmology, can be treated apart and even that is closely linked to what follows.

The Prologue is the confession of the community, "we have seen his glory" (v14), "we have received of his fullness grace upon grace" (v16). It is a hymn of praise to the Λόγος who is Jesus Christ and who is Lord of the Christian community; the testimony of that community therefore plays an important part.

Finally, from an ecclesiological viewpoint the phrase μονογενῆς Θεός ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς is very important. This phrase has a counterpart in 13:23, where, at the meal, ἦν ἀνακείμενος εἰς ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ὃν ἠγάπα ὁ Ἰησοῦς . This must be seen in the context of v20, "Truly, truly I tell you that whoever receives anyone I send receives me; and he who receives me receives him who sent me." The reciprocal nature of both christology and ecclesiology is expressed as the background, and in that context "the specially favoured disciple is represented as standing in the same relation to Christ as Christ to the Father".²⁴ The beloved disciple is anonymous and although conjecture as to his identity can have no certainty, there is good reason to suppose that he may not have been an

historical person at all, but a literary device used to symbolise, not the ideal disciple, but the particular Christian community which John represents. This has the advantage of explaining his presence at the meal, his anonymity, and the criticism that he is told no secret revelation only a matter of fact: his presence indicates that the particular branch of Christianity which John represents goes back to Jesus himself and is as valid as the Petrine branch.²⁵

The disciple is said to have the same relation to Jesus as Jesus to the Father, a theme not developed individually but ecclesiologically in chapters 13-17. This interpretation therefore fits in perfectly with this ecclesiological picture and makes very good sense in the context of the gospel. The Christian community, represented by the beloved disciple, has the same relationship with Jesus as Jesus has with the Father, a motif already developed in dynamic terms of oneness, so that the community becomes a continuation of God walking on the earth.



NOTES ON CHAPTER 4

1. Although 1:32-4 may be an allusion to Jesus' baptism, especially the words τὸ πνεῦμα καταβάσκειν ὡς πτεροῦσαν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐπ' αὐτόν, to which we may compare Mk.1:10; Mt. 3:16 and Lk. 3:22.
2. The passion narrative is also dealt with in terms of a drama. Cf. Evans C.F., Explorations in Theology 2 (SCM, London, 1977) pp.50-66.
3. Although cf. the Memra of the Lord in the Aramaic Targums.
4. But cf. Ps. 27:1.
5. John may however have required a masculine noun for consistency. Lindars B., The Gospel of John (Oliphants, London, 1972) p.83, supports this view.
6. Cf. Dodd D.H., The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (C.U.P., Cambridge, 1953) pp.274-5.
7. Cf. 3:14; 4:6,12; 7:38; 12:41.
8. Brown R.E., The Gospel According to John (Geoffrey Chapman, London) Vol. 1, p.524.
9. See McNamara M., 'The Logos of the Fourth Gospel and Memra of the Palestinian Targum'. ET 79 (1967-8) pp.115-17.
10. Hayward C.T.R., 'The holy name of the God of Moses and the Prologue of St. John's Gospel'. NTS 25 pp.16-32, who argues that this identification of Memra and light cannot be derived from Neofiti. See especially p.31.
11. *Ibid.*, p.29.
12. *Ibid.*, p.30.
13. See also Bergen P., 'Observations on the Targumic character of the prologue of John' NTS 16 pp.288-295.
14. Dodd C.H., Interpretation, p.279.
15. These two thought-worlds were anyway not totally separate by this time: there can thus be no real isolation of Jewish and Hellenistic as if there were no interaction between them.
16. Käsemann E., 'The Prologue to St. John's Gospel', in New Testament Questions of Today (SCM, London, 1969) p.158.
17. Käsemann E., *op.cit.*, p.160.

18. Käsemann E., op. cit., p. 161, summarising Loisy A., *Le Quatrième Evangile* (Nurry, Paris, 1903) p. 186.
19. See the article by Hooker M.D., 'John's Prologue and the Messianic secret', NTS 21, pp.40-59.
20. This is not to imply that he is sole creator over and against $\delta \Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$.
21. $\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\varsigma$ $\upsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ is the easier reading and is probably a harmonisation to 3:16,18. Theological development could have softened the $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ to $\upsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$, or could have intensified $\upsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ to $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$. The Sonship motif is so strong in the Gospel that $\upsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ is more likely to be an assimilation to this.
22. Eternal subordinationism is anyway foreign to John.
23. Although the sending motif has not yet been introduced. Cf. 3:17.
24. Barrett C.K., The Gospel According to St. John, 2nd edn., (SPCK, London, 1978) p.446.
25. Cf. Cullmann O., The Johannine Circle (SCM, London, 1975) pp.63-85, where he argues that the Beloved disciple is the author of the Gospel, one of the Twelve, but not the apostle John. Validation of the community for which he wrote is thus still the primary concern. This argument however, is tenuous and implies an esoteric teaching of Jesus as opposed to the author's interpretation of traditional sayings.

PART TWO:

CHRISTOLOGY AND ECCLESIOLOGY

CHAPTER FIVE: THE APPLICATION OF ONENESS

A. CHRISTOLOGY AND ECCLESIOLOGY

The farewell discourses of chapters 13-16, and the farewell prayer of chapter 17 show quite clearly that the oneness motif is not confined to the Father-Son model. In its wide application, this motif is the basis of all John's theology.

We would expect John to give some information about the community from which he was writing, either directly or indirectly. The unusual characteristic of the Fourth Gospel however, is that ecclesiology is explicit and is worked out in terms of christology; incarnation belongs to the Christian community as well as to the historical Jesus. This parallelism is striking: the relationship between Father and Son is the same as that between Jesus and the community, and the same terms are used of both.

Two things should be noted before we discuss this parallelism. First, ecclesiology and christology in John are one. That is to say they cannot be separated from each other and isolated as entities on their own. To talk of Johannine christology is to imply an ecclesiological application of that christology; one cannot talk of Johannine ecclesiology without first examining christology, because the former is based utterly on the latter. In the tradition, christology must have come first and ecclesiology been linked to it as a development from it. In John's Gospel, although this observation must hold true here also, we are left with the feeling that the two were never really separate; they have developed as one and interacted with each other to give what we now have in the gospel. The gospel certainly sees christology beyond the historical and even glorified Jesus; this christology is continued by the Christian community. The development of christology is paralleled by the

development of ecclesiology, natural because the Church is based on Jesus' life, death and resurrection, and the parallel has become so close that no difference can now be discerned between them. Rather than the Church being based on Christ, in John's Gospel, it also takes the place of Christ on earth, and takes as a result the christological model previously only applied to Jesus.

Second, how are we justified in using the word ecclesiology? In the context of 13-16 Jesus is talking to his disciples and even where he gives more general injunctions, individual and not corporate concern is implied. However, although Jesus may be speaking to his disciples, it is clear that there is a much wider meaning to 13-16 than that; the whole tenor of the farewell discourses implies a later standpoint: the persecution of the Church (15:18-20) and being thrown out of synagogues (16:1-4a). It is also certain that John was writing for the Church of his day - any document of this kind is bound to do so - and that its purpose was to bring others to belief. The development of original material in the farewell discourses necessitates a message to the Christian community from which he was writing, and also to outsiders. John's aim was not just to write an account of Jesus' last words to his disciples, but to develop that material in an ecclesiological direction: to give the true meaning of Jesus' words and at the same time make them serve the Church of his day. The dialogue is thus an artificial device, used to provoke the problems of the community and to provide the answers.

That this is so is proved conclusively by 17:20: "I pray not just for these, but also for those who believe in me through their word". The framework may be that of the historical Jesus, but the aim of the work is to encourage those who believed later, and explain how they are to respond in the world that hates them, and it is put into the mouth of Christ because the evangelist believes that they are the words of the risen Lord to the Church.¹ Thus, we shall take these discourses as directed to the Christian community and interpret them accordingly.

B. CHRISTOLOGICAL BASIS & SETTING (13:31-14:11)

13:31-8 provides an interesting basis to the subsequent chapter; it serves to introduce various themes which will play an important part in the discourses and prayer of chapters 14-17. First, glorification is introduced by way of vv31-2, the precise purpose of which is unclear. The overall effect is to stress the fact that now the Son of Man is glorified, the hour has come in which the Son of Man will be lifted up in glory on the cross. Verse 32 however, as an explanatory comment, is confusing. Presumably "God will also glorify him in himself" corresponds to "now is the Son of man glorified", for how is the Son of Man glorified if not by God?² This only confuses the matter because it implies a two-fold glorification: the present and the future, yet the future is immediately couched with a present tense, "God will glorify him at once". If the whole of verse 32 were to be omitted the text would be much smoother, but unfortunately there is no textual evidence for this.

Second, the little while is brought into view; this will be taken up later on, and will provide the setting for ecclesiological comment. The disciples without the physical Jesus is the problem, and the answer is worked out on the basis of the return to the Father.

This leads directly on to the third theme introduced at this point, that of love. Again, this will be developed in great depth later; it is enough at this point to assert it as an introduction.

What is the nature of vv31-5 though? It cannot serve as a synopsis to the rest of the discourses because so much is left out. But it could refer to the two most important points of the discourse, the glorification of the Son of Man acting as an introduction, or as the cause behind Jesus going away to the Father. On this reading there would be an argument in the passage, three steps answering the problem of how the Christian community is to exist without the historical Jesus, although an argument is certainly not apparent from the text. The argument would begin with the glorification of Jesus, giving rise

to the return to the Father, and the answer to how they should replace the presence of the historical Jesus is given in obeying his command to love one another. As they stand however, there is no continuity between the three statements.

14:1-11 gives a christological setting to the discourses, by reaffirming the Father-Son oneness which we have examined above. The important dialogue is in vv8-11 the crux of which is the phrase "He who has seen me has seen the Father". Before the relationship between Jesus and the Christian Church is explored, attention is drawn to the oneness of the Father and the Son. Although there is a sense in which "The Father is greater than I" (14:28), the Father and Son are also identical, although they are distinct and can only be seen within the context of their relationship with each other: in a sense the Father is the Son and the Son the Father, even though this is always worked out in relational terms. Jesus is thus equal with God because he and the Father are one. If to see him is to see the Father, then he must be the sender as well as the sent. There is no weaker view of the representative being seen as the subordinate of the represented. The works Jesus does are the works of the Father just as much as of the Son. As v11 puts it: "I am in the Father and the Father is in me".

It is important that this position is asserted at the outset, for it is the basis for all that follows; a detailed analysis is not required, because we have already had this in the earlier part of the gospel. Here it is simply reiterated: "He who has seen me has seen the Father". This is of vital importance for what follows, as it interprets ecclesiology within the christological assertions of the oneness motif.

C. CHRISTOLOGICAL OUTWORKING OF THE ONENESS MOTIF

We have looked in detail at the relationship between Father and Son and

suggested that the Church's relationship with Jesus is to be seen along these lines. In fact we shall see how this is worked out in detail with works, indwelling and love in the farewell discourses, and with sending, glorification and unity, with further remarks on love, in the farewell prayer of chapter 17. However, a few general remarks are necessary first.

The culminative effect of this indicates that the Father-Son relationship is mirrored in the relationship between Jesus and the Church. The question is how strongly this presents itself? Paul's doctrine of the Church as the body of Christ could be worked out dynamically, but it is not; similarly John's ecclesiological picture could also be a dynamic one or it may not. If it is based, however, on a high christology which is the centre of the gospel, we would expect it to occupy an important place and to mirror that christology accordingly.

The most striking aspect of this ecclesiology is its relation to what we have called the oneness motif. If the oneness motif of Father and Son is applied to the Church, the result is that, whether or not such status is derivative, the status of Jesus and the Church, in relation to the Father, is parallel, or even equivalent. Taken to its logical conclusion, this would mean that the Son and the Church³ are expressions of the same thing, the same manifestation of God walking on the earth. As we shall see however, this is not the way in which John develops his material. The progression is from the Father-Son relationship as a mirror for the Son-Church relationship. The Church is the continuation of the revelation of Jesus on earth; the oneness of Father and Son is illustrated in Jesus and the Church. Rather than the two being aspects of the same thing, the one is a continuation of the latter: the Church is Jesus, in the same way that Jesus is the Father.

It is difficult to see where the difference between the two relationships

lies. It is true that 15:1-8 makes it clear that this relationship can be severed by ceasing to remain in the vine, who is Jesus; that the disciples can do nothing of themselves but rely entirely on Jesus for bearing fruit. But, Jesus says the same things about himself in the discourse in chapter 5: he can do nothing except what he sees his Father doing. However there must be a difference, because the Church was brought into existence, Jesus, as the *Λόγος* was not. The difference lies in the fact that it is not individuals spoken of here (although they are in mind, as members of the community), but it is the community as a unit, the corporate community of Christians, which fulfill this function.

The oneness between Jesus and the Father is thus identical to the oneness of Jesus and the community. As long as it remains in the vine and does only what it sees Jesus doing, it is the continuation of Jesus walking on the earth. All that we have said of this Father-Son oneness is applicable here: christology has become ecclesiology. What is said in the farewell discourses about the disciples (or the community) is based on christology and christology applies itself immediately by relating it to those who believe. The question inevitably arises: can everything said of Jesus, particularly in the first part of the gospel (chapters 1-12) be applied to the community? The answer must be no - there is no *Λόγος* parallel for instance. It is therefore best to confine ourselves to the passages where John applies the oneness motif to the Church and allow the other material to fit in around that, rather than reading into the text what we would like to get out of it.

The consequence of this is that the Church is seen in purely incarnational terminology. The revelation of the Father in Jesus is continued by those who believe in him. He gives them power to become children of God and sends them as his representative, as the Father sent him. Again, the sender and sent

are one and the same, yet distinct. As with the Father and the Son so with the Son and the community: the community is the continuation of Jesus' ministry on earth, and is seen in the gospel dynamically as God walking on the earth. It is dependant on Jesus and ceases to be this incarnation as soon as it ceases to remain in him and obey his commands. While it remains in him, it is in oneness with him to such an extent that it cannot be separated from him. The oneness motif operates in the same way as it does in a christological connection. The community, which is sent, is therefore one with Jesus, so much so that Jesus as sender, and community which is sent are one and the same, and yet distinct.

We must now see how this works out specifically, bearing in mind what we affirmed of these themes in a christological context, in chapters 1 and 2.

a. ἔργα

ἔργα are first to be mentioned in this regard, in the farewell discourses. This has been a very important theme throughout the gospel. In chapter 5 Jesus' reply that his Father was still working and he is working brought about the accusation that Jesus was making himself equal with God. This statement indicates that the works of Jesus are in fact the works of God. Jesus is sent from God and has the right to work on the Sabbath because his Father is still working. This is further picked up in 5:36 where the ἔργα bear witness that he has come from God, and are part of the Father's own witness to Jesus:

αὐτὰ τὰ ἔργα ἃ ποίω μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ ὅτι ὁ πατήρ με ἀπέσταλκεν.

The ἔργα and σημεῖα of Jesus are those of God himself; they reveal and bear witness to the fact that the Son is sent by the Father. the works are God's works which he has given the Son to complete. The witness aspect of is developed in 10:22-39; there, Jesus defends himself by saying that if he

does not do the works of the Father he is not to be believed, but if he does the works of the Father τὰς ἔργα πιστεύετε, ἵνα γινώσκετε καὶ γινώσκῃτε ὅτι ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ πατήρ καὶ γὰρ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ . Thus the works are a witness, not from a moral point of view in that they are good works, but because they are the Father's own works. This demonstrates how the oneness motif is worked out christologically; it is not possible to separate Jesus and the Father: the works of Jesus are the works of the Father, which he must do while it is still day (9:4). His works are a revelation of the Father as Jesus himself is; to use John's terminology, they are what he has seen the Father doing and has done likewise (cf. 5:19-20a).

The ἔργα and σημεῖα are thus both revelation and judgement. Revelation because they are God's works, and reveal his δόξα (2:11; 9:1-4) and judgement because Jesus as the light constitutes judgement. Men loved darkness as opposed to light because their works were evil. The judgement is that the light has come into the world (3:19); Jesus' ἔργα reveal his light which judges evil. The ἔργα are also a judgement because they are a witness. If Jesus had not performed these works which revealed that the Father had sent him, his opponents would have no sin - now there is no excuse. Because he has done them "they have seen and hated both me and my Father " (15:24).

These are the ἔργα which the disciples will continue. The oneness motif is once again stated to bring home the point: ὁ δὲ πατήρ ἐν ἐμοὶ μένων ποιεῖ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ (14:10). This is followed by an imperative: believe me, that I am in the Father and the Father in me, or believe the works themselves. In reality both are the same, because the works are equally those of the Father and the Son. To believe the works is to recognise that the Father sent the Son into the world, and that Jesus is in the Father and the Father in him. Again, the oneness motif is at the centre of christological affirmations.

From an ecclesiological angle, the important words are in v12:

ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ τὰ ἔργα ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ καὶ κείνος ποιῶσαι καὶ μείζονα
τούτων ποιῶσαι, ὅτι ἐγὼ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα πορεύομαι.

There is no getting away from the fact that it is the same works that Jesus does that are mentioned here. This can mean one of two things. It could mean that as Jesus healed, and performed miracles, so will his disciples do so; this would imply that the actions were identical. More probably, however, ἔργα means what it means elsewhere in the gospel, actions which reveal the oneness of the Father and the Son, and show that the Son was sent by the Father. In this case, the works would indicate the oneness between itself and Jesus and reveal that the Christian community has been sent by the Son. That these works are identical stresses that there is no essential difference between the community's works and Jesus'; the former is not a scaled-down version, or an imitation of the latter.

In fact, it is asserted that these works are greater. This brings to mind 5:20. Thüsing⁴ has suggested that these are the same, that the greater works they shall see are those performed by the Christian community, but in context this seems unlikely, although the parallel is an interesting one.

Contrary to Lindars,⁵ it is unlikely that "greater" implies a numerical value; rather, quality seems to be the meaning here. This must mean that the effect, or the revelation, is greater, and perhaps more astounding, not that these works are put into numerical order of importance or difficulty. The fact that Jesus is only one, and the community many is not irrelevant but is not the primary meaning here. The ἔργα of the community are greater because they are the continuation of the ἔργα of both Father and Son, and declare their glory in a more dynamic sense because the community is not confined to a single historical figure.

Given what we have affirmed about the works of Jesus, this statement is striking. The oneness motif is thus extended to the community; they perform the works of Jesus as he does and these works must also therefore constitute judgement, revelation and a witness that they are Jesus' disciples. Since "he who has seen me has seen the Father", that is, since Jesus and the Father are one and the same, this relationship could be equally asserted of the community and the Father himself. The works of the community are the works of Jesus, as Jesus' works are the works of the Father; and therefore the Church continues the revelation of the Father, which is Jesus. It is not that they become an entity of their own, a different medium of revelation, but that they are one with Jesus as Jesus is one with the Father, and as such constitute the continuation of his presence on earth.

This relationship underlies the whole of John's ecclesiology, and is based upon the christology he has already formulated. The same oneness is the centre of both. The works of the Church are the equivalent of both the *σημεία* and *ἔργα* of Jesus; they reveal the nature of the Christian community as a continuation of the oneness between Jesus and the Father.

That all this is derived from Jesus and the Father is shown by the stress placed on asking the Father "in my name". Whatever the disciples ask in his name he will do. This is related in 15:7 to abiding in the vine; both here and in 14:11-12 the purpose is that the Father is glorified (in the Son according to the latter passage). There is no question of his followers having any power or authority apart from him; it is the fact that they live in him and constitute the continuing of his presence in the community, that gives them the power to do "greater works", for they are his works. Asking in his name is another expression for living in the vine.

b. Indwelling (15:1-8)

To split up chapter 15 in this way is a little artificial. Verses 1-17 form an entity, but since two themes are linked to each other, but which are quite different, it is valid to examine them individually, without forgetting their relation to each other.

Indwelling is introduced by the symbolism of the vine; this may refer to the nation of Israel⁶ (in which Jesus would presumably be the new Israel), it may have a eucharistic meaning, or refer to the Messiah himself after 2 Baruch 39:7). The background is most likely to be the Old Testament,⁷ although it is impossible to be certain why John has opted for this particular analogy.

It functions as an illustration of the dependence of the community (or disciples), on Jesus, and the purpose of the community within the context of the oneness motif. Jesus is the vine, and his disciples are part of that vine, the branches. However they can be removed if they cease to bear fruit. The significance of the vine here, lies in the illustration of mutual indwelling; it is all one plant, they are the branches and Jesus the whole vine. When branches are cut off and destroyed it is the vine which is cut back. It is best however not to push the analogy too far; John quickly dispenses with it.

The crux of the parable is μένωτε ἐν ἐμοί, καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν. μένω should here be translated "live" or "dwell". Again this indicates a relationship akin to that of Jesus and the Father. In 14:10 Jesus says that the Father who lives in me (μένω) does his work. The meaning of μένω is identical to ἐν τῷ πατρὶ in the same verse; Jesus is in the Father, is one with him, and is indwelt by him. It is all the language of oneness. He is in the Father and the Father in him (14:10), to such an extent that the two act as one and are one. Here it is spoken of the disciples, that they are to be in Jesus and Jesus in them,

the inference being that they also should be one with Jesus so they act as one and are one.

The language used shows that the oneness of Father and Son is the background for this indwelling, two things being important in this context. First is the oneness motif itself in the relationship between Father and Son which we have examined. Jesus and the Father exercise mutual indwelling - this is part of the description of their oneness. This indwelling means simply that the two are one, and act together; there is no difference between the sender and the sent; Jesus is the Father and the Father Jesus. Jesus is therefore one with the Father and indistinguishable from him, "he who has seen me has seen the Father". It is this that is behind the language of mutual indwelling. Second, this is spoken to his followers; they are to be part of the same oneness by living in him and he in them. What has been affirmed between Jesus and his Father is now spoken of between Jesus and those who believe in him. If this is so, then we can affirm that the community of believers has the same authority as Jesus because they are him, so long as they remain in the vine. They are one with him and live in him. To that extent, their actions are his as his are the Father's. They continue his revelation because he dwells in them.

This is further emphasised by the following words in v4: καθὼς τὸ κλήμα ὃ δύναται καρπὸν φέρειν ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ εἰ μὴ μένη ἐν τῇ ἀμπέλῳ, οὕτως οὐδὲ ὑμεῖς εἰ μὴ ἐν ἐμοὶ μένητε ⁸. This recalls 5:19-20a⁹ where Jesus declares that he can do nothing ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ but is dependent on the Father for everything. The same characteristic which marks Jesus' relationship with his Father, should mark the Christian community's relationship with Jesus. We should not tone this parallelism down too much. It cannot mean exactly the same thing, since the individual is not one with Jesus so as to be equal with him, but corporately the community is to be dependent on the vine as Jesus is dependent on the Father,

so that the action, will and words that it speaks will be identical to, and will in fact be, the words of Jesus himself. It could be said that the community does nothing of itself, only what it sees Jesus doing (cf. 5:19-20a). This parallel is therefore important. It gives us an exact parallel; as we have shown in the context of the Father- Son model, far from meaning subordination, dependence agrees with "I and the Father are one" (10:30), so we are justified in attributing a similar meaning to it here. Because those who believe in Jesus are in the vine - they dwell in him and he in them - therefore nothing they do or say can be of themselves. The community can only function by doing nothing of itself, only what it sees Jesus doing. As such it is one with him. That does not mean that it is not subordinate to him: rather that subordination is not what is being affirmed. What is being affirmed is that the community's relationship with Jesus is identical to Jesus' relationship to the Father and thus constitutes the continuation of the Father's presence on earth and of the manifestation of his glory.

The purpose is that καρπὸν πλείονα φέρη , that is dwell in the vine and do only what they see the Son doing; performing the greater works mentioned in 14:12. This is just another way of saying what we have just stated, that the community is one with Jesus as Jesus was, and is, with the Father; anyone not part of that is excluded because he does not bear fruit. Likewise the promise to give anything which they ask in his name is a natural consequence if their actions are also his.

c. Love

Love in the farewell discourses is of vital importance. It is developed largely from the discourse of mutual indwelling (15:1-8) and should be seen in that context. However it is introduced earlier in 13:34-5; 14:15-24.

As a christological theme love does not play as important a part as one might expect. It is stated in 3:35 that ὁ πατήρ ἀγαπᾷ τὸν υἱόν, words repeated in 5:20, except that ἀγαπᾷ is replaced by φιλεῖ. The consequence is that the Father has given all things into the Son's hand, and shown him everything he is doing. However this is not developed as a purely christological concept.

It is developed ecclesiologically however. As we have seen, 13:34-5 introduces the new command to love one another as Jesus has loved them, so that everyone would know they were his disciples. It is not new as such (cf. Lev. 19:18); however it is new within the context of the relationship between Jesus and the Father and Jesus' love for his disciples. As we have seen, love is the basis of the Father-Son relationship of oneness; it is also the basis of Jesus' relationship with those who believe in him. Thus much fits the view we have formulated: the basis for both these relationships is love. However with this theme it is taken further. It must be the basis of the community itself. The meaning of this is not developed here.

It is taken up again in 14:15. There the proof of love lies in obeying the commands of Jesus, the primary one being to love each other. However, this is not made explicit in chapter 14. In fact, the plural ἐντολάς is used twice, and in 14:23 Jesus says : εἴν τις ἀγαπᾷ με τὸν λόγον μου τηρήσει. Here it is love for Jesus which is involved without it being related within the community. This love consists of obeying his commands; not a series of instructions so much as dwelling in the vine and being part of the community which bears fruit by continuing his ministry and revelation of the Father. The λόγον refers to Jesus' entire message; his revelation of the Father and his message is essentially the same as the "work of God", which is ἵνα πιστεύητε εἰς ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ἐκεῖνος (6:29). To obey his commands, or word, is to believe that he has been sent by God and that God is his Father and has shown him everything he is doing.

15:9-17 both develops and links the two aspects of love discussed above. The important words καθὼς ἠγάπησέν με ὁ πατήρ, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἠγάπησα· μένουμε ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ τῆ ἐμῆ (v9) show that although the love of Father-Son is not much developed separately, it is developed with the parallel relationship we have described. There is a difference here though: instead of mutuality, there is a line running down from the Father to the Church. The Father loves the Son and the Son loves those who believe in him, rather than there being a mutual love of Father-Son and Son-disciples. However this is not to be taken too far; love is expected of the disciples. The following words are, "remain in my love", so that mutual love is expected within the relationship between Jesus and his disciples. As the Father loves the Son, the Son loves those who believe.

Love is certainly the most important part of the oneness between Jesus and the Church, because it extends on a human basis throughout the whole Christian community. We have touched upon the new command, although it is not called new here. Again the plural ἐντολὰς is used (v10), whereas when this is developed in v10 it reverts to the singular ἐντολή. This is the only specific command given; "live in me and I in you", and "live in my love" are both part of this command. It originates in the love of Father and Son, extends to the love of Jesus and his followers, and finally is to permeate the entire Christian community. To love one another is to do no more than dwell in the Son and in his love, that is to be part of the oneness between Father-Son and Son-Church, part of the continuation of his presence. While it is called a command, it is really a symptom of oneness; without it there could be no basis for the relationship which mirrors that between Jesus and the Father. It is a command because without living in Jesus' love and loving one another there can be no love for Jesus. If the community loves Jesus, then it will be apparent.

The linking of ἀγάπη and ζωὴ is interesting. ἀγάπη is here seen as a

sign that Jesus possesses $\zeta\omega\eta$, and the community, as the continuation of his presence on earth likewise possesses $\zeta\omega\eta$. Love is certainly related to the death of Jesus by the words "as I loved you" and the idea may be that Jesus' death, which was a result of his love for the world, brings life and leads to life, paving the way for the beginning of the community's existence (cf. 12:24-5).

The only thing we are told of the nature of this love is that it is $\kappa\alpha\theta\omega\varsigma$ $\eta\gamma\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\sigma\alpha$ $\upsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, and this is in turn described as laying down his life for his friends. Specifically, death is implied here, and presumably this limitless love must be demonstrated between the disciples, although whether or not death is expected is not made clear. The two are not tied in explicitly.

Two things are stressed in this regard. The first is the command itself. We found it in 13:34-5, it reappeared in 14:15,21 and in this passage it is stressed all the way through.

Second is the mutuality of it. We have already quoted 15:9; v10 demonstrates this again by saying that their obeying his commands only mirrors his obeying the Father's commands. By doing so he remains in the Father's love, and by obeying his commands the disciples will remain in his love. The rest of the passage states the command and puts it in the context of the oneness motif.

This is where we can see the real importance of it. Love is the most important outworking of oneness. It is vital as the continuation of Jesus' presence after he has gone to the Father. More important, it is part of the oneness between Jesus and the Church illustrated in 15:1-8, that living in the vine and bearing fruit means being part of Jesus' relationship with the community as a whole. Thus love fits into that relationship as part of indwelling. They remain in his love, and thus his love in them. It is a vital part of the oneness motif as it is expressed ecclesialogically. As they do greater works than Jesus, they also continue his love by being part of the love relation-

ship with Jesus and by expressing that to each other in the Christian community.

The result of 15:1-17 is to emphasise that the disciples are to remain in his love and to demonstrate it to one another. It is part of the oneness of the Father and Son and likewise of Jesus and the Church, and continues Jesus' revelation on earth because it is his love they live in. Again, the oneness motif is at the fore. As love is the basis of the Father and Son's relationship, so of Jesus and the Church, and of the Christian community itself.

From an ecclesiological viewpoint therefore, love works in two directions, vertically and horizontally. Vertically, the relationship between Jesus and the Father, a relationship of love, is expressed in the relationship between Jesus and the community; horizontally this characteristic is expressed throughout the different members of that community: "Love one another". Again the effect is to place the community in the place of Jesus, continuing his presence on earth.

A final comment on John's narrowing of the universal love commanded in the sermon on the mount is necessary here. Fenton¹⁰ asserts this to be the case, but Barrett (p.452) will not allow that this is so. In reply it must be said that the ecclesiological outlook in John is certainly an insular one; the world is seen as evil and preferring the works of evil, and the only hope for it lies in recognising the light and ceasing to be the world. Love of neighbour is left unmentioned; even Jesus' laying down his life is for his friends. The community is commanded to love one another, not the world, and in his prayer (17:9) Jesus will not pray for the world, although God loves the world (3:16). No one will be turned away, and yet love is not extended by the community to the world until it becomes part of the community. Some narrowing has certainly taken place.

D. ECCLESIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

A detailed discussion on the παρακλήτος passages is outside our scope, but it is necessary to understand that first, the little while, and going to the Father, and second, the sending of the Paraclete was necessary and vital to the outworking of the oneness motif in an ecclesiological context. Two things are of note:

First is the necessity of Jesus going to the Father. Whether or not the little while refers to going to the Father and returning, as well as the more obvious meaning of his death and resurrection, Jesus stresses that he must return to the Father: συμφέρει ὑμῖν ἵνα ἐγὼ ἀπέλθω. εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἀπέλθω, ὁ παράκλητος οὐκ ἐλεύσεται πρὸς ὑμᾶς. εἰ δὲ πορευθῶ, πέμψω αὐτὸν πρὸς ὑμᾶς (16:7). If Jesus does not go, his presence on earth, in the form of the community cannot be continued. The soteriological concern is evident here, the aim being to continue Jesus' life and bring the world into the community so that it is part of that relation with Jesus. If he does not go the oneness motif cannot be extended.

Second the Paraclete is the means by which the oneness motif is extended. He will "teach you all things" (14:26), and will be another Counsellor. This could be seen in Trinitarian terms, but more likely it is a way of describing how Jesus' presence continues on earth, in the Christian community. It is therefore the spirit of Jesus in the sense that it enables the community to live as the continuation of his revelation and life, and exercise the same power and demonstrate the same love as Jesus in his historical life.

The Christian community is then to continue Jesus' ministry on earth. It will do the same works, and greater, and declare the same glory as Jesus himself, because it is one with Jesus as Jesus is one with the Father. This equivalence of relationship is striking; we have already affirmed that the Father-Son relationship is one of oneness, without any subordinationist overtones, and

given this view of Jesus as God walking on the earth, this presentation of the community as the continuation of God walking on the earth is a very dynamic one, and one explored in more depth in chapter 17.

NOTES ON CHAPTER 5

1. In this respect, see also 20:29, "Blessed are those who have not seen and yet believe".
2. The thought may be that the Son of Man is in fact the Son of the Father, and that Christ's Sonship is revealed by his being both Son of Man and Son of the Father.
3. The word ἐκκλησία is not used in John; however it is clear that the Christian community from which he wrote is in mind.
4. Thusing W., Die Erhöhung und Verherrlichung Jesu im Johannesevangelium (Münster, A.Schendorff, 1960) pp.59-61,115.
5. Lindars B., The Gospel of John (Oliphants, London, 1972) p.475.
6. Cf. Isaiah 5:1-7; Jer. 2:21; 12:10f; Ez. 15:1-8; 17:5f; 19:10ff; Ps. 80:9-16.
7. Bultmann's tree of life as derived from the Mandaean literature is unlikely.
8. Cf. Ez. 15:1-8 for the uselessness of the wood of the vine.
9. Cf. chapter 1.
10. Fenton J.C., The Gospel according to John (Clarendon, Oxford, 1970) pp. 27, 148.

CHAPTER SIX : CHRISTOLOGY AS ECCLESIOLOGY

The farewell prayer of chapter 17 occupies an extremely important place in the Fourth Gospel. On the one hand it is the testimony of a man about to die, the final words spoken before death; and on the other it is the final words of exhortation before departure from a certain scene, in this case the κόσμος. This style of writing, summing up what is important and relating it in terms of an exhortation, implies that the content of a final discourse is always important; John 17 is certainly no exception in this respect.

It would not be true to say that this chapter sums up anything that is important in the whole of the gospel; there is no repetition of christological formulation as such, but where christology is implied, and stated, it is always accompanied by ecclesiological development and application. The two are viewed together and in this chapter neither is treated separately at any time. The most important christological formulations have already been made by this time: "I and the Father are one" (10:30), "he who has seen me has seen the Father" (14:9) and "the Father is greater than I" (14:28). This christological treatment is assumed by chapter 17; there is no attempt to cover this ground again. It is assumed and is applied ecclesiologically. The early part of the gospel limits itself to christological reflection, 13-16 placed christology and ecclesiology in juxtaposition; here they are viewed almost as a single unit and even when they are not identical they are always treated in reference to each other.

This implies a certain view of the audience or readership, and therefore of composition. To ascertain the exact time and place from which John was writing is a task which has haunted exegetes for centuries and remains unfinished. Observations can be made however, concerning the nature of that community as the object of the farewell prayer. The final part of the prayer (vv20-26) deals with

those who will believe afterwards; yet the whole of it concerns the community, as indeed does the whole of chapters 13-16. John manipulates his material so as to direct it at the community from which he was writing, rather than any concern for historicity in the modern sense. "In an astonishing and to some degree anachronistic fashion, he persistently calls the Christians 'disciples' and in so doing takes up the earliest Christian self-designation and employs it as a substitute for all ecclesiological titles."¹ Thus, the whole of this chapter is written with the community in mind. When Jesus talks of the disciples in vv 6-19, it is no less "those who believe in me through their word" (17:20), than in vv 20-26: it is all dealt with under the one heading of "the disciples" or "those you have given me". The audience is therefore not the disciples who overheard, nor even to God to whom it is supposedly addressed, but rather the Christian community of which John was a part.

Historicity then, is not something we should expect of this prayer. That it is directed to a certain group of people is very suggestive of free composition, especially as the ecclesiological content is so explicit. Leaving aside the question of whether or not John has based his exposition on tradition, it is certain that in its present form the prayer is a freehand composition of the Evangelist. The choice of a prayer as the vehicle for expression provides considerable proof for this: dialogue may be a much more fitting type of address when a specific group of people is being addressed. Yet what is said here can only be expressed in terms of either discourse or prayer; and because it is in written form, prayer can be addressed both to God and the community at the same time. The repetitive style and the thematic treatment also indicates that this is a carefully composed work dealing with various aspects mentioned but not thoroughly developed in the earlier part of the gospel.

The prayer then as it stands is a freehand composition by the author of the gospel. We may even go so far as to say there may be no historical content whatever. The Evangelist clearly feels that it is inspired by the Spirit of truth and that he has grasped the true significance of Jesus to such an extent that these words are as authoritative as the tradition he has before him. Gone is the urgency of the ἀμήν, ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν , replaced by the calm certainty that Jesus is in control of the situation, and that all his requests will be granted because he is in the Father and the Father in him. Therefore the composition is free, as in 13-16, although there is far more traditional material there, and not controlled as with the earlier part of the gospel, especially after chapter 5. The prayer is what John thinks is the significance of Jesus' whole life and death: the continuation of his presence on earth. The prayer is an exposition of the outworking of this continuation, which is the community and is based on the central tenet of Jesus' message in this gospel: that he is sent from the Father.

If this is drawing out the true significance of the tradition, then here it does so in a much more indirect way than elsewhere. It is one thing to say that the true significance of "A Son can do nothing of himself, only what he sees his Father doing" (5:19) is that Jesus is equal with God, sent by him, yet identical with him; it is quite another to derive an ecclesiology based upon this, when there was very little in the tradition to suggest that Jesus would have made this development himself. Here we can see that unlike Luke who deals with the two stages successively, John has only one perspective and the Christian community is not just another stage of development but is already contained in the life of the historical Jesus. Thus on this count, John has freed himself from tradition and is drawing out from Jesus' message, what he

thinks is its significance, bearing in mind the community which has come into existence as a result of Christ's life. He reads it back into the historical life of Jesus by showing it to be contained within it.

If we were to examine the tradition at this point in order to compare it with John's account, we should be convinced of John's departure from it. The Gethsemane tradition presents Jesus as being in anguish. This prayer is not the calm collected thoughts of one about to leave the world for the Father; rather he falls down to the ground and prays *ἄββα ὁ πατήρ, πάντα δυνατά σοι. ΠΡΟΕΝΕΥΚΕ Τὸ ΠΟΤΗΡΙΟΝ ΤΟΥΤΟ ἄπ' ἑΜΟῦ. ὌΛΛ' ὍΣ ΤΙ ἘΓΩ ΘΈΛΩ ὌΛΛΑ ΤΙ Σὺ* (Mk.14:36). Indeed one tradition has it that such was the anguish that his sweat became like great drops of blood falling to the ground.² This feeling is entirely absent in John 17. Whether or not he is influenced by this tradition, as Lindars asserts,³ at this point there is no fear; in fact the crucifixion is strangely out of place: "Here the evangelist might have put down his pen, and in a sense, a passion narrative is unnecessary to this gospel".⁴ That there is a passion says more about the nature of the prayer than about the possibility that John only included Jesus' death and resurrection as a concession. The prayer is unreal if considered as historical, but vital if considered from the perspective of the community.

The farewell prayer then is a final exhortation from Jesus before his death. It is addressed to the community from which John was writing and is a free composition drawing together all the threads of the oneness motif and applying them from a christological and ecclesiological viewpoint simultaneously. As such its relation to the tradition is tenuous; however, although it bears little similarity to the Gethsemane tradition, it is a natural progression from John's christology which as we have seen is an attempt to draw the full and true significance of Jesus' message according to the Synoptic tradition.

A. VERTICAL EXEGESIS

It has been a matter of some dispute as to how the prayer should be split up. The first section could end at either v5 or v8. If the former is accepted then the second section could begin at either v6 or v9 and if the latter, there would be a subsection vv6-8. Dodd⁵ adopts this latter position, Lagrange⁶ adopting the former. The final part of the prayer has likewise been split in different ways, some preferring to keep vv20-26 together, others splitting vv20-23, vv24-6. Still other scholars interfere with the central section vv6(9)-19.⁷ In the face of all this disagreement it is not advisable to seek a rigid structure, particularly if that implies any system of strophes, which seems especially out of place in this passage. The most natural division in terms of subject matter is a threefold one: vv1-5; vv6-19, vv20-26. However, these are not self-contained entities but overlap somewhat, as we shall see when we look at the chapter thematically.

The prayer opens with a request for glory from the Father, thus presenting the accomplished mission of the Son; he was sent from the Father to the world. This is the prerequisite of the community's existence. This serves as an introduction to the prayer from both a literary and theological angle. Before the requests can be made, the christological picture has to be drawn, this time not in terms of formulations - the hour for that has gone - but in terms of $\delta\delta\zeta\alpha$ which Jesus had with the Father before the world was made. The $\delta\delta\zeta\alpha$ theme does not end here, but is caught up in ecclesiological definition throughout the chapter.

The prayer moves chronologically to the disciples although we have already suggested that the entire prayer be interpreted in the light of the later Christian community; it is a description of the completed mission of the Son, and the imparting of knowledge to the $\mu\alpha\theta\eta\tau\alpha\iota$. Their position is evaluated and the appropriate prayers are made on their behalf.

Finally the later Church is brought into the picture, expressed by those who "believe in me through their word" ; unity is the catchword here, the important theme of love reappearing in this context to finish off the prayer.

These last two paragraphs (vv6-19, vv20-26) are the key to John's ecclesiology. As we shall examine the various motifs which illustrate this in detail, we will confine ourselves to more general observations here.

The real context of the prayer, and its overall thrust, is the return of the Son to the Father. That is, the end of Jesus' earthly ministry and the emergence of the Christian community to continue that ministry. By v6, this return has been made and the community has been brought into existence. The rest of the prayer concerns how it is outworked in the hostile κόσμος. vv6-8 contain an interesting parallelism, the prime significance of which is not literary (i.e. poetical) but theological. v6-7 speak of revealing, v8 of the giving; the result is that they (the disciples) have kept your word (v6) and received your words (v8) and in both cases the net result is belief. Thus:

νῦν ἔγνωκαν ὅτι πάντα ὅσα δέδωκάς μοι παρὰ σοῦ εἰσιν. (v7).

καὶ ἔγνωσαν ἀληθῶς ὅτι παρὰ σοῦ ἐξῆλθον, καὶ ἐπίστευσαν ὅτι σὺ γάρ με ἀπέστειλας (v8).

Hence the community comes into view. The christological basis, that "everything I have comes from you" and "you sent me", is the content of the disciples' faith. That belief opens up the possibility of vv9-26 and is the origin and basis of the Christian community.

That it is only this which is in mind is indicated by v9. Jesus prays for them; however, οὐ περὶ τοῦ κόσμου ἐρωτῶ ἀλλὰ περὶ ὧν δέδωκάς μοι. The world is not prayed for, and it is only seen in this chapter in antithesis to the Christian community, which is sent into the world on the same terms as Jesus is sent into the world: in order that it might provoke a decision between light and darkness. It is a judgement on the world because it shows that the world is

darkness and prefers the works of darkness. Even on the weakest interpretation of this chapter it is clear that Jesus does not pray for the world and that the sphere of love is confined to the community.

The remainder of vv 9-19, before the strong appeal for Christian unity in vv 20-26, is taken up with the movement from Jesus to the Father, and the provision for the disciples in his absence. All the way through however, there are reciprocity statements: "they may be one even as we are one" (v11 anticipating vv 20-26), "they are not of the world as I am not of the world" (v14,16), "as you sent me...I sent them" (v18) and "I consecrate myself that they also may be consecrated in truth" (v19). These reciprocity sayings are the heart of the chapter.

We have seen in the previous chapter that the ecclesiological model is based on the christological: the relationship between the Father and the Son is identical to the relationship between Jesus and the Church, and horizontally, between members of the Church. That these reciprocity statements are the key to John's ecclesiology has been grasped, with a greater or lesser success, by various commentators who usually tone it down by stressing individualism or turning it into a vague mysticism.

Lightfoot for instance will go so far as to say that Jesus keeps the disciples "in order that their unity and union may be like that of the Father and the Son".⁸ But he fails to realise the full import of these sayings because he looks at things from an individual viewpoint only, not an ecclesiological one. Dodd goes further, saying that "this relation between Christ and his followers is always in this gospel, grounded in the archetypal relation in which he stands to the Father",⁹ and he even insists corporateness is essential to this passage. However, he attributes to John a fairly low christology, and a low ecclesiology accordingly.

Bultmann's analysis is again inclined towards the individual decision and response to Jesus. He grasps the fact that believers are in "simultaneous unity with the Father, in whom the Son is and who is in the Son",¹⁰ but takes it no further than an individual plane. Barrett comes a lot nearer the truth when he says that "the unity of the Church is strictly analogous to the unity of the Father and the Son...the relationship between the disciples and the Godhead is of a similar reciprocal kind".¹¹ He goes on to talk of "the equivalence of the relation between the Father and the Son and the Church".¹² Again, the consequences are not driven home, largely because Barrett attributes some degree of subordinationism to John's christological picture. Again ecclesiology is not recognised as the dynamic christological force with which it appears in this chapter.

Lindars gives more force to the ecclesiology of the prayer by insisting that "the grounds on which Jesus has made all the petitions in this chapter have been the analogy between his own relation to the Father and the Church's relation to himself".¹³ However even here, the Church as the continuation of God walking on earth is not identified with this process. Käsemann has hit the nail on the head though when he states: "The community addressed is actually attached more closely to heaven than to earth. Even though it still exists in earthly form, it belongs in its very essence to the realm of the Father and the Son".¹⁴ Appold, one of his pupils, likewise: "The line leads from christology to soteriology to ecclesiology, and oneness serves as the theological abbreviation of the constitutive aspects of all three".¹⁵

The oneness motif as related to christology and ecclesiology (and therefore soteriology) is what the final prayer is concerned with. It is not some weak mystical union but rather addressed to a community, a corporate body of those who believe in him. The oneness between the individuals in that community and

between the community and Jesus is described by the oneness of the Father and the Son. If this, and a true appreciation of John's christology is grasped, ecclesiology must be interpreted as highly as christology. The community must be God walking on the earth.

We must now show how this is worked out.

B. THEMATIC EXEGESIS

The oneness motif we found to be important in regard to ecclesiology in the last chapter. Certainly, this prayer should be juxtaposed with chapters 13-16 for a full picture of the way John sees the community as functioning after Jesus' return to the Father. Here again it is treated thematically, not successively, focussing on sending, glory, love and unity. They are not dealt with successively because they are all part of one phenomenon and so overlap constantly.

a. δόξα

The δόξα theme immediately comes to the fore. It is stated that ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα. The hour which had often been mentioned as a future event (2:4; 7:30; 8:20), has now arrived; likewise, as long ago as 12:23 and 13:1 we are told that it has arrived. It is the time when the "Son of Man is glorified" (12:23) and when, according to 13:1, he departs to the Father. That it is stated at both these times assumes that it is not synonymous with the lifting up of the Son of Man, that is, the death. The view that in this gospel the supreme glorification of Jesus is on the cross, fails to take account of the hour. The concepts of lifting up and glorification are linked, but the glorification of the Son now that the hour has arrived is far wider than this. The hour is not just the moment of death, and death is seen, not as the end of life, but as

the moment when Jesus returns to the Father leaving the disciples in the world. It is the moment when his ministry ends and the community is born; when the community takes over and continues to be light and judgement to the world. That this is linked inseparably to the death of Jesus is not disputed, but the hour as such applies to the whole of 13-16 as well as the present passage. It all relates to the final hour when Jesus departs to the Father. It is his farewell.

Recognition that the hour is here, is followed by a demand: *δοξάσω σου τὸν υἱόν, ἵνα ὁ υἱὸς δοξάσῃ σέ.* The *ἵνα* clause here is misleading if it is taken as conditional, "If you glorify the Son, the Son can glorify you". Nor in any sense are there two actions spoken of in chronological order. Barrett's position, that "if the Father glorifies the Son...this is in order that the Son may by his obedience, thus ratified, glorify the Father",¹⁶ is also untenable for this reason. Rather "the glorification of both constitutes a unity".¹⁷ The christology which John has already affirmed, that the Father and Son are one and equal, makes this interpretation necessary. If the Son is glorified, then by necessity, the Father is glorified in the same act. The Son cannot glorify the Father without himself being glorified, or without the Father glorifying him. Thus one act is spoken of reciprocally.

The glorification of the Son in v1-5 consists of this demand (v1) and a reiteration of it in vv4-5. Jesus glorified the Father on earth, by completing the work the Father had given him to do. This probably refers to the whole work, culminating in *τετέλεσται* and is spoken from the point of view of the post-Easter community. However it is not really the death which is stressed, but rather the whole mission of the Son to the world, to be a judgement on the world. In view of what we said about the declaration in v1, the fact that

Jesus glorified the Father means inevitably that the Son was also glorified in so doing; this recalls the ἐθεασάμεθα of 1:14 and the ἐφανέρωσεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ of 2:11. The δόξα was declared by both words and works of Jesus and by the simple fact that ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ᾧ.

It has been a matter of some importance for John that Jesus does not seek his own glory. He does not receive glory from men (5:41-4); he does not seek his own glory because he does not speak on his own authority (7:18); he does not glorify himself (8:54). Rather he declared the glory of God and his own as a consequence (11:4,40; 2:11).

But what is meant by his glorification? In 7:39 (cf. 16:5-11) we are told that Jesus was not yet glorified; 12:16 assumes its future aspect also, and yet other passages (e.g. 8:54; 11:4; 13:31-2) speak of it as a present reality characterised by $\nu\theta\nu$. Ultimately though, Jesus' glorification culminates in his return to the Father; thus, although it is true to say his ministry is a continuation of his pre-existent glory, not until he has returned, having accomplished everything the Father sent him to do, is he glorified in a complete sense, and since the works of Jesus are those of God anyway, and reveal his glory, the ultimate glorification of death, resurrection, return and emergence of the community to continue his mission, as the purpose of his coming to earth is the "special" event, separated from the glory revealed in everything that Jesus said and did. The farewell then, occupies a special place in the δόξα theme.

17:1-5 splits into 3 statements of the δόξα theme:

δόξασον σου τὸν υἱόν, ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς δόξασεν σε (v1).

ἔγώ σε ἐδόξασα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τὸ ἔργον τελειώσας ὃ δέωκός μοι ἵνα παύσω (v4).

καὶ νῦν δόξασον με σύ, πάτερ, παρὰ σεαυτῷ τῇ δόξῃ ἣ εἶχον παρὰ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι παρὰ σοί (v5).

They sum up what we have affirmed about the δόξα theme: that although δόξα is revealed through the whole ministry of Jesus, through the works the Father gave him to do, now (the urgent *νῦν*) the hour has come - δόξασον με ! There seems to be a difference between the glory with which Jesus glorified the Father on earth, and the glory Jesus had with the Father before the world was made, and this can only be that the farewell declares δόξα in more potent form because it is the culmination of the ministry.

This relates to the reciprocity we have postulated in two ways, or rather in two aspects of one. First, when Jesus is praying for the disciples he declares (within the context of a tedious reciprocal account of possession: "they are yours (those you have given me); for all mine are yours and yours are mine") : "I am glorified in them". That is, specifically in the words and works which the community says and performs, and generally in its existence as a judgement on the world, of which it is not a part. We could also link this up to the love theme in that obeying Jesus' commands (cf. "doing the work you gave me to do") also constitutes glorification.

Second, and more striking from a reciprocity angle, *καὶ γὰρ τὴν δόξαν ἣν δέδωκας μοι δέσωκα αὐτοῖς (v22)*. The relationship of reciprocity is the key here: the glory between Father and Son, or the glorification of the Son by the Father, is expressed in the relationship between Jesus and the community, or again in Jesus' glorification of the community. And since the one is a continuation of the other it follows that here also glorification cannot be applied to either separately but is entirely reciprocal and mutually conditioned.

The δόξα theme then contributes to the reciprocity of the Father-Son, Jesus-community relationship. The community glorifies Jesus, and is given the glory which the Father gave to Jesus. One difference remains: the community

is not said to be "glorified" by Jesus. However he does give them glory and the difference is not notable.

b. Sending

The sending theme, so important in the christological aspect of the oneness motif, is also prominent as an ecclesiological reciprocal quality. We saw that far from any subordination resulting from the sending of the Son by the Father, the opposite was in fact true: that it proved the equality of sender and sent and demonstrated to a remarkable extent the oneness, and identity of the Father and Son. Here, sending is spoken of both directly, and in terms of sanctification as a prerequisite.

17:16-19 begins with an assertion as to origin, that they (the disciples) are not of the world just as he is not of the world. That is important in this context because it indicates the nature of the task, the sending to the *κόσμος* of which they are not a part. Sending thus creates an antithesis between the community and the *κόσμος*, for which Jesus does not pray.

The use of *ἁγιάζω* to interpret *ἀποστέλλω* is quite striking. As it now stands, the central reciprocity statement about sending is sandwiched between two statements about sanctification:

Sanctify them in the truth: your word is truth.

As you sent me into the world, so I send them into the world.

On their behalf, I sanctify myself, that they might be sanctified in truth. To sanctify means to bring into the sacred sphere, usually in a sacrificial sense, and the use of *ὡς* in v19 would support that meaning here. However, there is no sign that it is linked with the death of the disciples, but with their being sent. The meaning here, though by no means devoid of sacrificial connotations, is thus primarily concerned with not being of the world. They are

not of the world, in the same way as Jesus is not of the world. Consecration is the separation to the sphere of the holy so that the mission to the world constitutes the antithesis of the holy and the unholy, or in Johannine terminology, light and darkness. It is then the setting aside as the light of the world, being kept from evil and kept in antithesis to the κόσμος, which is the realm of darkness.

Reciprocity applies to both parts of vv16-19, to sanctification and to sending. In 10:36 Jesus is spoken of as the one ὃν ὁ πατήρ ἡγίασεν καὶ ἀπέστειλεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον. Jesus is also sanctified therefore and sent into the world. Notice that being sent εἰς τὸν κόσμον also accompanies Jesus' sanctification. It involves being set apart from the world in order to expose its darkness. Jesus then is sanctified and sent by the Father; in turn the disciples are also sanctified and sent by Jesus. Jesus' sanctification in 10:36 is by the Father. Here, in 17:9 he sanctifies himself; likewise the disciples are to be sanctified by the Father (v17), yet in v19 Jesus said he sanctified himself so that the disciples might be sanctified in truth. This is another way in which the functions of Father and Son are spoken of interchangeably; it shows moreover that just as Jesus was sanctified and sent by the Father, the disciples are sanctified and sent by Jesus. Both parts then are reciprocal, as is the whole viewed together: the community is the continuation of Jesus' presence on earth.

If we place this within the context of the oneness motif as we have seen it apply to the sending theme, the ecclesiological picture is startling because the community continues Jesus' oneness with the Father by being one with him. In a sense they can be spoken of interchangeably, as can the Father and the Son; the sender is equivalent to the sent, and is equal with him because it is

the continuation of his presence on earth. If it ceases to be that, it ceases to function in the oneness motif. The picture is of the community as the continuation of God walking on the earth. This must apply to the community, not individuals, even if for John the community is always dependent on the individual. It is the corporate community which is being spoken of here.

c. Love

Love is again mentioned (vv24-6) in the prayer with the theme of Church unity. It is as well to single it out here because of the reciprocal statements made which fit in with what we have noted above. In parenthesis it is said that the Father loved the Son before the foundation of the world, which leads up to the reciprocity statement in v26:

ἡ ἀγάπη ἣν ἠγάπησας με ἐν αὐτοῖς ἢ καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς.

Again love and mutual indwelling are completely intertwined as in 15:1-17. Again the relational aspect is the thrust : the love between Father and Son is expressed horizontally ("may be in them") and vertically ("and I in them"). It is the characteristic within the community, and is characteristic of the community's relationship with Jesus. This also relates to knowledge. It is stressed that the world does not know the Father, ἐγὼ δέ σε ἔγνων, καὶ οὗτοι ἔγνων ὅτι σὺ με ἀπέστειλας. καὶ ἐγνώρισα αὐτοῖς τὸ ὄνομα σου καὶ γυνώσκω. This is probably not based on gnostic thought but Judaistic. John further stresses the importance of knowledge in v3, when in an aside he defines eternal life as knowing the only God and Jesus Christ whom he has sent. Although initiation into secret knowledge and mysteries may be in the background, it is more likely that the Old Testament provides the key. Proverbs 11:9 is a good parallel: ". . . by knowledge the righteous are delivered".¹⁸ It is certainly as common to Hebrew as to Hellenistic thought. The interesting aspect of its place in vv25-6

is that love and knowledge are firmly linked together by a $\nu\alpha$ clause. The reason that the love between Father and Son may be in them, is their knowing that the Father sent the Son. Likewise eternal life is knowing the only God and Jesus whom he sent. This is interesting in view of the logion in 5:19-20a:

"...for the Father loves the Son and shows him everything he is doing" (v 20a). The love between Father and Son is similarly based on mutual knowledge. As the Father made known ($\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\kappa\nu\sigma\iota\nu$) everything to the Son, the Son made known ($\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\nu\acute{\omega}\rho\iota\sigma\alpha$) the Father's name to the disciples. Love then is the basis for both the Father-Son relationship, and that of Jesus and the disciples, and the disciples themselves.

d. Indwelling and Oneness

The theme of unity is broached fully in vv20-26. The primary concern is the oneness of the community and vertically the oneness of that community with Jesus; however there may well be the uncurrent of an appeal for a unity which was at the time of writing, non-existent; that the various branches of Christianity (cf. 15:1-8) were disunited and needed to be brought back into the unity of Father and Son. Whether or not this is the historical background the unity John affirms, implies a united and not a disunited Church.

Vv20-26 deals explicitly with the later Church, and is addressed to "those who will believe in me through their (the disciples') word". Jesus prays that $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\nu \omega\sigma\iota\nu, \kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\omega}\varsigma \sigma\acute{\upsilon}, \tau\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon\rho, \acute{\epsilon}\nu \acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\iota, \kappa\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omega\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\nu \sigma\omicron\iota, \nu\alpha \kappa\alpha\iota \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota \acute{\epsilon}\nu \eta\mu\acute{\iota}\nu \omega\sigma\iota\nu, \nu\alpha \acute{\omicron} \kappa\acute{\omicron}\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma \mu\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\eta \acute{\omicron}\pi\iota \sigma\acute{\upsilon} \mu\epsilon \acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\lambda\alpha\varsigma$. Thus the oneness motif is related to indwelling, as later to glory and love. The simple reciprocity saying is that they may be one as we are one; this fits into the ecclesiological picture we have so far affirmed: once more the relationship of the Father and

Son is reflected in the Church's relationship to Jesus. Reciprocity in this respect is initially vertical, that the community as a whole is one as the Father and Son are one. Again, that as the indwelling of Father and Son is one way of describing their oneness, the community's indwelling of Jesus is a similar expression of oneness. Unity is then mutual and expressed by indwelling. However as indwelling itself means oneness, unity between the Church and Jesus and the Father, is also an expression of oneness. The Church is one with Jesus and Jesus is one with the Father. This confirms our view of the community continuing Jesus' presence on earth.

This works horizontally also. The request is that the community in itself may be one, and this oneness is identical to the oneness between Father and Son. Possibly this is the most striking ecclesiological statement of all. Not only the Church as a whole, but also the constituent parts of it are said to participate in the oneness of Father and Son. It is important to note however that the community as corporate is not lost sight of, for they are "one in us". Thus they are one with each other because they are all one in the Father and Son. Their total unity springs from the oneness of the Father and Son.

In w 20-23 various themes meet up in the context of the oneness of Father and Son. Indwelling however is the most important meaning attached to this oneness. It is stated that all the disciples are to be one, as Father is in Son and Son in Father; thus they are one in both Father and Son. Then the phrase $\text{ἵνα ὡσιν ἔν καθὼς ἡμεῖς ἔν}$ is explained by the reciprocity statement: $\text{ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ σὺ ἐν ἐμοί}$. Again indwelling is used to explain the oneness motif; here we move away from the more complex mutuality of v21. There it was the mutual indwelling of Father and Son which explained the believers' horizontal unity, and the unity of the community as a whole was ἐν ἡμῖν . The mutual

unity of the disciples is identical to that of Father and Son. Here there is a simple statement of reciprocity of the kind previously noted ecclesialogically: I in them, you in me. Reciprocal unity then is between Father and Son, and Son and disciples. This fits in with what we have seen in regard to the relationship of the community to the Godhead.

Unity therefore works vertically and horizontally. Vertically by the relationship of the community to Jesus, reflecting Jesus' relationship to the Father, horizontally in that they are all one in the Father and the Son. Different terminology means little when we recognise the identity and equality of Father and Son; to affirm a rigid account of the different functions of the two would be very wrong.

The meaning of unity is "that they may be one". On the vertical level we have seen in other areas that this means the oneness of Father and Son demonstrated in the oneness of the Son and the disciples; the community is therefore the continuation of Jesus' mission and presence on earth. Thus, all we have affirmed for Jesus in relation to the Father can be affirmed for the community in relation to Jesus. Oneness means that the same love, works, glory, unity and indwelling characterise the ministries of both. The Church's ministry is the same as Jesus' own ministry. The very startling consequence is the affirmation that the Church is the continuation of God walking on the earth.

Horizontally unity extends between believers. This is analogous to the unity of Jesus and the Father. However each believer is not equal to Jesus, except in so far as he is part of the community and participates in their oneness with Jesus. Among the believers unity exists as it does between Father and Son; because this is a different status it remains a loose parallel and does not imply that the status of individual believers is analogous to Father and Son. But unity functions in the same way and believers are one with each other.

C. ECCLESIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

Πάτερ, εἰ δέδωκάς μοι, θέλω ἵνα ὅπου ἐπι ἐγὼ κἀκεῖνοι ὡσιν μετ' ἐμοῦ (v24).

Then they can behold his glory. Interestingly though, this says nothing new, because the disciples are where Jesus is; their community is the continuation of Jesus' presence on earth; it performs the same works as Jesus (and greater), proclaims the same message, is sent as Jesus is sent, having first been consecrated, loves as Jesus loved and reveals the same *κββα*; it stands in the same relation to Jesus as Jesus stands to the Father. The only meaning of v24 therefore is as a change of scene, not state. The Church is where Jesus is (cf. Paraclete passages) and continues his mission. Just as Jesus himself is not separate but can only be spoken of in relation to his Father, so the Church cannot be spoken of except in relation to Jesus. It is therefore part of the oneness motif: outside the vine (i.e. on its own) it is nothing.

Christology and ecclesiology therefore are not just linked, but in this chapter at least, almost identical. Christology has determined ecclesiology and become the basis of it. "The Church does not determine the meaning of Jesus. Rather Jesus determines the meaning of the Church".¹⁹

The ecclesiological model is thus based on the christological. The relationship of Father and Son provides the basis for the relationship of Jesus and the community; both are part of the oneness motif. As Jesus is one with the Father, as sender and sent are identical, yet distinct, so with the community and Jesus; thus it performs the same works, declares the same glory, oneness and judgement on the world, and expresses the same love. Given the dynamic christology which has no place for subordination, this picture of the community is striking: it is the continuation of God walking on the earth.

NOTES ON CHAPTER 6

1. Käsemann E., The Testament of Jesus (SCM, London, 1968) p.30.
2. Lk. 22:43-4, relegated to brackets in the Nestle-Aland text (26th edition).
3. Lindars B., The Gospel of John (Oliphants, London, 1972) p.515.
4. Evans C.F., Explorations in Theology 2 (SCM, London, 1977) p.57.
5. Dodd C.H., The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (C.U.P., Cambridge, 1953) p.417.
6. Lagrange M.J., Evangile selon Saint Jean, 8 edn. (Gabalda, Paris, 1948) p.436.
7. Cf. Brown R.E., The Gospel According to St. John Vol. 2 (Geoffroy Chapman, London, 1966) p.749.
8. Lightfoot R.H., St. John's Gospel, a commentary (Clarendon, Oxford, 1956) p.298.
9. Dodd C.H., op.cit., p.419.
10. Bultmann R., Theology of the New Testament, Vol.2 (SCM, London, 1955) p.84.
11. Barrett C.K., The Gospel according to St. John, 2nd edn. (SPCK, London, 1978) pp.512-13.
12. Barrett C.K., op.cit., p.513.
13. Lindars B., op.cit., p.529.
14. Käsemann E., op.cit., p.6.
15. Appold M., The Oneness Motif in the Fourth Gospel (JCB MOHR, Tübingen, 1976) p.285.
16. Barrett C.K., op.cit., p.502.
17. Appold, op.cit., p.26.
18. See Barrett C.K., op.cit., p.503, for further references.
19. Appold, op.cit., p.270.

CHAPTER SEVEN : CONCLUSIONS

A. CHRISTOLOGY

John's christology is a christology of oneness. The gospel intends to bring the reader from $\epsilon\upsilon\ \alpha\rho\chi\eta\ \eta\upsilon\ \delta\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ (1:1) to $\delta\ \kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\ \Theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \mu\omicron\upsilon$. (20:28).

The Prologue of the gospel sets this out at the very beginning showing the $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ and God to be one and the same, and yet distinct. From the first therefore two things are asserted, that the $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ and $\Theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ are not two but one, and that they are distinct and in relationship with each other. The historical Jesus is then identified with the $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, and the reader is let into the secret of who Jesus is and his status in relation to God.

From an historical viewpoint John's christology is entirely consistent; there is no paradox between oneness and subordination and if there is a paradox of any sort it is how Father and Son can be two when they are one. This christology of oneness is developed from chapter 5 onwards, although it has been introduced by this time, and has been given an eternal perspective by the Prologue.

John's christology is firmly based on tradition. This is shown by the use of the traditional logion in 5:19-20a and its interpretation in the following verses. This verse is made the basis for the christology of oneness, intending to show the true and full implications of the Synoptic tradition.

John's handling of this tradition is characterised by his reinterpretation of the dependence motif, expunging from it all subordinationist overtones and making it serve the oneness motif. That Jesus does nothing of himself means that he and the Father are one. Total oneness is based on total dependence.

Once the dependence motif has been introduced, the various themes - giving life, judgement, witness, sending, mutual knowledge, works, love and glory - are expounded within the confines of the oneness of Father and Son. The Son is declared to be totally one with the Father, all these themes serving the same motif of oneness over and again. We have shown how this works out in detail;¹ suffice to say that the one basic motif is that of oneness, and all the other themes revolve around it, showing how in various ways the Father and Son are one.

The result is to identify the words of Jesus with the words of God; similarly with his works, his judgement, his witness and his glory, for they are not just his works, but because they are his works, then ipso facto, they are also the Father's. This motif is developed in two ways.

First, Father and Son are spoken of interchangeably. They perform the same actions and speak the same words and are thus equated with each other. They are thus spoken of reciprocally: both judge, bear witness to the other, and perform the same works. It is a relationship of reciprocity.

Second, the words and works are seen to belong equally to both Father and Son, not simply speaking of them reciprocally, but equating sender with sent, so that to speak of one doing an action is of necessity to speak of the other. It is not just that they do the same things but a single action can be attributed to either Father or Son, such is their oneness.

The oneness motif therefore asserts that Father and Son are identical and yet distinct, that to speak of one is at the same time to speak of the other. There is no equality of two beings, but the identity of two distinct beings who are not two but one.

Jesus is, as the Son, thus presented as God walking on the earth. He is

in no way subordinate, but neither is he a separate being over against God. Rather "I and the Father are one"; they are identical, yet distinct. "He who has seen me has seen the Father" does not suggest that Jesus has the same status as the Father, but that in a sense he is the Father, and to have seen him is to have seen the Father. The sender and sent are one and the same, and yet they are still distinct and in a relationship with each other.

John has fused the positive and negative aspects of christology. On the one hand he stresses the positive side, the total oneness of Father and Son expressed in 10:30 and 14:9; on the other, he reinterprets the negative aspect to support the positive, so that "The Father is greater than I" no longer contradicts the oneness motif but forms part of it. The dependence motif becomes vital towards an understanding of oneness; precisely because the Father and Son are not two but one, is such a mode of expression the only possible one. To say Jesus does nothing of himself is to say that sender and sent are one and the same and yet distinct.

For John then, christology is consistent. Its content is that Father and Son are one, and because of that the Son can only do what the Father does. The end result is that Jesus, the Son, is given the same honour due to God himself (5:23), an inevitable conclusion, given that he and the Father are identical and yet distinct.

B. ECCLESIOLOGY

The ecclesiology of the Fourth Gospel is based on the oneness motif and is part of it, using the Father-Son relationship to demonstrate that the Church, or Christian community, since John does not use ἐκκλησία, is the continuation of God walking on the earth.

This is a startling claim to make. The oneness of Father and Son we have

shown to mean the identity of two distinct persons : from an ecclesiological perspective, the oneness motif operates by showing that Jesus and the community are one and the same, yet distinct. The relationship between Jesus and the Father is the same as the relationship between Jesus and the community, and hence, the community takes on the same status as Jesus himself.

We have shown how this works out in detail.² Suffice to say here, that as with christology, both positive and negative aspects are presented: the community does nothing of itself (15:4), as Jesus does nothing of himself (5:19); rather, positively, it lives in Jesus (15:1-4) as Jesus is in the Father and the Father in him (14:10). Thus both aspects are treated in exactly the same way as in the christological model, the net result being that sender and sent are identical and yet distinct. The oneness motif as it operated between Jesus and the Father, now operates between Jesus and the community. Again this is worked out in terms of interchangeability and reciprocity.

Jesus and the community are spoken of interchangeably in the sense that the community continues Jesus' life. It does the same works, and greater (14:12), the emphasis being on the fact that they are the actual works of Jesus, and only the works of the community in so much as the community and Jesus are one and the same. The same love is demonstrated (15:12), and the same glory manifested (17:22). Finally the entire relationship between Jesus and the community is spoken of in terms of indwelling and dependence (15:1-8), the same relationship as Jesus has with the Father (14:10; 5:19-201).

Reciprocity is fully demonstrated by chapter 17: "I consecrate myself that they might be consecrated " (v19); "the glory which you have given me, I have given them" (v22); and the thought is summed up in v23 : "I in them and you in me."

This relationship has been spoken of in the same way as the Father-Son relationship; specifically this has been outworked with the themes of sending, works, love, glory, indwelling, and oneness, the community mirroring the Father-Son relationship by its own relationship with Jesus.

The result of this handling of motifs is that the community is seen as the continuation of God walking on the earth, the continuation of Jesus' life; as Jesus and the Father are identical yet distinct, so it is with the community and Jesus, the oneness motif declaring them not to be two separate entities, but one. The suggestive parallelism in the words εἰς τὸν κόλπον (1:18; 1:23) also indicates that what Jesus is to the Father, the community is to Jesus, and given what we have affirmed christologically, this is a dynamic ecclesiology.

The question remains, can we apply everything we have affirmed of christology to ecclesiology? Is the Father-Son relationship an exact replica of the Jesus-community relationship so that everything applied to the Son can be applied to the community?

The answer to this question must be a qualified affirmative. If we are right in saying that christology is not confined to the Father-Son model, but that it extends to the community, and that the same model of oneness is used for both, we are led inevitably to the conclusion that Jesus and the Christian community are one and the same. To say the community is a judgement on the world, or receives the same honour as the Father, would in any case only be saying that Jesus is a judgement and receives honour. Once again it must be stressed that the community is not something over and against Jesus, but is him, and is the continuation of his incarnation, his epiphany. The community then can be spoken of as identical to Jesus, the continuation of the Word become

flesh, and everything applicable to Jesus must also be applicable to the community, given that the community is nothing outside its relationship with Jesus.

The danger is to suggest that individual parts of the community occupy this position. Although John stresses the individual he does not do so in this way; it is the believers as a collective whole who stand in the same relationship to him as he to the Father.

The Christian community is thus, for John, the continuation of epiphany, for this is what the Word made flesh is. It continues his works, declares his message and love, manifests his $\delta\delta\zeta\alpha$ and is one with him to such an extent that sender and sent are not two but one, yet not one but two. The community is identified with Jesus, not in a vague sense of solidarity, but as an equation: the two have one identity, that of the Word made flesh, the one being a continuation of the other. All this is held together by the relational aspect of the oneness motif.

C. THE ONENESS OF THE CHRISTOLOGICAL & ECCLESIOLOGICAL MOTIFS.

It has been our thesis throughout that we are here dealing not with two subjects or motifs, but with one.³ In the development of tradition, christology and ecclesiology would not have been strictly separate, but always it would have been christology which influenced ecclesiology, not the other way round. Reflections on the person of Jesus would have led to new ways of understanding the Christian communities in their local and universal contexts. Of course, ecclesiology would have also developed along other lines, as in fact happened when structures were solidified, mainly after the first century of the Church. But where christology and ecclesiology are linked (via soteriology) it is the former which gives content to the latter. We can see this in regard to Paul's

doctrine of the body and Christ, and the way it was developed in the deutero-Pauline letters (Ephesians 4:15; Colossians 1:18), where rather than Christ being the whole body, he is the head, and the Church presumably the rest of the body.

In John however this observation does not hold good. Christology and ecclesiology have fused together so that now they are indistinguishable. To talk of Christ, is, for John, also to talk of the community, which is the continuation of Christ on earth. It is difficult to see the extent to which one has influenced the other; each has influenced the other, because rather than being two motifs, they are reciprocally conditioned in the context of the oneness motif. It is this motif of oneness which is the centre of both and which makes the two motifs into one.

Thus it is true to say that although reflections as to the person of Jesus have determined the community's self-understanding, the reverse is also true, that the self-understanding of the community, in the context of its relationship with Jesus, has influenced reflections on the relationship between Jesus and the Father. It is impossible to define exactly how this development has taken place, but the result is that ecclesiology and christology are now inter-dependant and have become *one*. Now, to talk of Jesus in relation to the Father, is of necessity, to talk of the community in relation to Jesus, for the two relationships are strictly equivalent.

If the community is the continuation of the Word become flesh, this is no surprise. We cannot therefore speak of the community in isolation from Jesus just as we cannot speak of Jesus without speaking of the community. This in turn mirrors the reciprocal relationship between Father and Son.

For John then christology implies soteriology and hence ecclesiology. The oneness motif covers all three modes of expression, basing ecclesiology entirely

on the christological model of the Father-Son relationship. There is therefore no division; each implies the other.

From this perspective it seems likely that John's attitude to tradition is not simply a desire to bring out what is already there. Christologically, he uses tradition as the basis of the Father-Son relationship, and even uses tradition logia to support his view of Jesus' relationship with God. But even there he interprets the tradition radically, forcing everything into a single idea, that of oneness, which is proved by the dependence motif rather than being in tension with it. It is fair to ask whether this reinterpretation of the dependence motif is a valid one, or whether it is making explicit what is only implicit in the tradition. Certainly, he has lost some of Jesus' humanity in the attempt to make the oneness motif the basis of all his theology.

In regard to ecclesiology, he has made a development which the tradition does not make, but it is a development which does not concern the Synoptic tradition. Again we may ask whether this process has been legitimate.

It is in this ecclesiological direction that John has made a radical contribution to Christian theology. Not only has he attempted to bring a fairly systematic picture of Jesus in relation to God, he has interpreted all his theology in the framework of the Father-Son model as it stands in the oneness motif.

NOTES ON CHAPTER 7

1. See chapters 1-4.
2. See chapters 5-6.
3. Theology, for John, cannot thus be split up into christology, soteriology and ecclesiology : they all constitute part of a single picture, the Father-Son relationship being the model for all three.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

COMMENTARIES

- Barrett C.K., The Gospel according to St. John, 2nd edn. (SPCK, London, 1978).
- Bernhard J.H., A Critical and exegetical commentary on the Gospel according to St. John (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1928).
- Brown R.E., The Gospel according to John (Geoffrey Chapman, London, Vol.1, 1966, Vol.2, 1970).
- Bultmann R., The Gospel of John (Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1971).
- Fenton J.C., The Gospel according to John (Clarendon, Oxford, 1970).
- Hoskyns E.C., The Fourth Gospel, ed. Davey F.N., (Faber & Faber, London, 1940).
- Lagarange M.-J., Évangile selon Saint Jean, 8th edn. (Gabalda, Paris, 1948).
- Lightfoot R.H., St. John's Gospel. A Commentary (Clarendon, Oxford, 1956).
- Lindars B., The Gospel of John (Oliphants, London, 1972).
- Loisy A., Le quatrième Évangile (Nurry, Paris, 1903).
- Marsh J., The Gospel of Saint John (Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1968).
- Odeberg H., The Fourth Gospel (Argonaut, Inc., Chicargo, 1928).
- Sanders J.N., A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John ed. Martin B.A., (A. & C. Black, London, 1968).
- Schnackenburg R., The Gospel according to St. John (Burns & Oats, London, Vol.1, 1968, Vol.2, 1980).

OTHER BOOKS AND ARTICLES

- Aland K., Synopsis Quatuor Evangeliorum (Deutsche Bibelstiftung Stuttgart, 1976).
- Appold M., The Oneness Motif in the Fourth Gospel (JCB MOHR, Tübingen, 1976).
- Barrett C.K., 'The Father is greater than I', first published in Neues Testamentum und Kirche : für Rudolf Schnackenburg, ed. Gnilka J., (Freiburg, Herder, 1974), pp.144-159. Also published in Essays on John (SPCK, London, 1982) pp.19-36.
- The Gospel of John and Judaism (SPCK, London, 1975).
- Bauer W., Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature ed. Arndt W.F., and Gingrich F.W. (University of Chicago Press, 1957).
- Birdsall J.N., 'John 10:29'. JTS New Series 11, pp.342-44.
- Blass F., Debrunner A., A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian literature, revised and translated by Funk R.W., (University of Chicago Press, Chicago/ C.U.O. Cambridge, 1961).
- Borgen P., 'Observations on the Targumic character of the Prologue of John' NTS 16, pp.288-295.
- Brown F., Driver S.R., Briggs C.A., A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament (Clarendon, Oxford, 1906).
- Bultmann R., Theology of the New Testament (SCM, London, Vol.1, 1952, Vol.2, 1955).
- Burney C.F., The Poetry of our Lord (Clarendon, Oxford, 1925).
- Bury, R.G., 'John 10:29' JTS Old Series 41, pp.262-3.
- Caird G.B., 'The will of God in the Fourth Gospel' ET 72 pp.115-17.
- 'The Glory of God in the Fourth Gospel' NTS 15 pp.265-77.
- Cullmann O., Early Christian Worship (SCM, London, 1953).
- 'A new approach to the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel' ET 71 pp.8-12, 39-43.
- Christology of the New Testament (SCM, London, 1959).
- The Johannine Circle (SCM, London, 1974).
- Daube D., The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism (Athlone Press, London, 1956).

- Davey J.E., The Jesus of St. John (Lutterworth, London, 1958).
- Dodd C.H., The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (C.U.P., Cambridge, 1953).
- Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel (C.U.P., Cambridge, 1963).
 - More New Testament Studies (Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1968).
- Drummond R.J., 'Genesis 1:1 and John 1:1-14' ET 49 p.568.
- Evans C.F., Explorations in Theology 2 (SCM, London, 1977).
- Gaechter P., in Neutestamentliche Aufsätze, Festschrift für Prof. J. Schmid, ed. Blinzler J., Küss O., Müssner F (Verlag Friedrich Pöste, Regensburg, 1963).
- Grant R., 'The Fourth Gospel and the Church' HTR 35, pp.95-116.
- Griffiths J.G., 'A note on the anarthrous predicate in Hellenistic Greek' ET 62 pp.316-16.
- Guilding A., The Fourth Gospel and Jewish worship (Clarendon, Oxford, 1960).
- Harnack A., History of Dogma, vol.1 (Williams & Norgate, London, 1905).
- Hayward C.T.R., 'The Holy name of the God of Moses and the Prologue of St. John's Gospel' NTS 25, pp.16-32.
- Higgins A.J.B., 'The words of Jesus according to St. John' BJRL 49, pp.363-86.
- Hill D., 'The request of Zebedee's sons and the Johannine $\Delta\Theta\Xi\text{A}$ theme'. NTS 13, pp.281-85.
- Hindley, J.C., 'Witness in the Fourth Gospel'. SJT 18, pp.319-38.
- Hooker M.D., 'John's Prologue and the Messianic secret'. NTS 21, pp.40-59.
- Howard W.F., 'The Father and the Son :exposition of John 6:19-29'. INT 4, pp.3-11.
- Howton D.J., 'Son of God' in the Fourth Gospel'. NTS 10, pp.227-37.
- Jeremias J., The Prayers of Jesus (SCM, London, 1967).
- Kasemann E., The Testament of Jesus (SCM, London, 1968).
- New Testament Questions of Today (SCM, London, 1969).
- Kilpatrick G.D., 'Some notes on Johannine usage'. BT 11, pp.173-77.
- Kittel G., Friedrich G., Theological Dictionary of the New Testament (Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, London 1964-1976).

- Kittel R., Biblia Hebraica (Württembergische Bibelanstalt Stuttgart, 1937).
- De Kruijf Th. C., 'The Glory of the only Son (John 1:14) from Studies in John presented to Prof. Dr. J.N. Sevenster. Supplement to NT 24 (E.J. Brill, Leiden, 1970).
- Lindars B., 'Discourse and tradition : the use of sayings of Jesus in the discourse of the Fourth Gospel'. JSNT 13, pp.83-101.
- Lofthouse W.F., 'Fatherhood and Sonship in the Fourth Gospel'. ET 43, pp.442-48.
- Martyn J.L., History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel (Abingdon, Nashville, 1968).
- Mastin B.A., 'A neglected feature of the christology of the Fourth Gospel'. NTS 22, pp.32-51.
- McNamara M., 'The Logos of the Fourth Gospel and Memra of the Palestinian Targum'. ET 79, pp.115-17.
- Meecham H.G., 'The anarthrous *Θεός* in John 1:1 and 1 Corinthians 3:16'. ET 62, pp.314-16.
- Metzger B.M., 'On the translation of John 1:1'. ET 63, pp.125-6.
- A Textual commentary on the Greek New Testament (United Bible Societies, London & New York, 1971, 1975).
- Michael J.H., 'The Text and context of John 10:29'. JTS Old Series 24 pp.51-54.
- Moody D., 'God's only Son. A translation of John 3:16 (RSV)'. JBL 72, pp.213-19.
- Morris L., Studies in the Fourth Gospel (Paternoster, Exeter, 1969).
- Morrison C.D., 'Mission and ethic. Interpretation of John 17'. INT 19, pp.259-73.
- Moule C.D.F., An idiom book of New Testament Greek (CLU.P., Cambridge, 1953).
- Moulton J.H., Howard W.F., Turner N., A Grammar of New Testament Greek (T. & T. Clark, Vol.1, 1906, Vol.2, 1919, Vol.3, 1963, Vol.4, 1976).
- Moulton W.F., & Geden A.S., A Concordance to the Greek Testament 4th edn., revised Moulton H.K., (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1963).
- Nestle E., Aland K., Novum Testamentum Graece 26th edn. (Deutsche Bibelstiftung, Stuttgart, 1979).
- O'Grady J.F., 'Individualism in Johannine ecclesiology'. BTB 5, pp.227-61.
- Pancaro S., ' 'People of God' in St. John's Gospel?' NTS 16, pp.114-29.
- The Law in the Fourth Gospel Supplement to NT 42 (E.J. Brill, Leiden, 1975).

- Rahlfs A., Septuaginta, 2vols. (Deutsche Bibelstiftung, Stuttgart, 1935).
- Sanders E.P., Paul and Palestinian Judaism (SCM, London, 1977).
- Schillebeeckx E., Jesus. An experiment in Christology (Collins, London, 1979).
- Smith D.M., 'The presentation of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel'. INT 31, pp.367-78.
- Stevenson J., A New Eusebius (SPCK, London, 1957).
- Taylor V., 'The psychology of the Johannine Christ testimonies'. HJ 27, pp.123-37.
- Thusing W., Die Erhöhung und Verherrlichung Jesu im Johannesevangelium (Munster, A.Schendorff, 1960).
- Torrey C.C., 'When I am lifted up from the earth (John 12:32)'. JBL 51, pp.320-22.
- Trudinger L.P., 'The seven days of the new creation in John's Gospel'. EQ 44, pp.154-58.
- Wilcox M., 'The "prayer" of Jesus in John 11:41b-42'. NTS 24, pp.128-32.
- Wilson R. McL., 'Philo and the Fourth Gospel'. ET 65, pp.47-49.
- 'The Fourth Gospel and Hellenistic thought'. NT 1, pp.225-27.

